Hyperboreo sono: An Exploration of Erudition in Early Modern Germanic Philology

Sophie van Romburgh[1]

University of Leiden

Abstract

This essay aims to contribute to the reflection on practices for studying early modern erudition. Arguing that poetic thinking and sensitive engagement were intrinsic to the erudition of the learned Commonwealth, it explores how to read Septentrional philology as a lively practice impacted by the generative force of visualization. 'Hyperborean' sounds in an epigram by Joseph Justus Scaliger show erudite play in performance when considered conjointly with the 'Getic' poetry of Ovid, and rhyme in Bonaventura Vulcanius's *Literis getarum*. Ole Worm and Francis Junius's readings of runes as vivid scenes demonstrate the work of the 'imagination' (*Phantasia*), the process of visualization aimed for refined judgement theorized in Junius's *Pictura veterum*. Their *Rune Poem* interpretations illustrate how visualization was tacit throughout their scholarship. Lastly, observations by Gerald Langbaine, Abraham Wheelocke, Melchior Goldast, Martin Opitz, and Junius (on Gothic) exemplify how each read for perspicuity--and how we may overlook these endeavors.

Keywords: erudition, vividness, early modern Germanic philology, rhyme, reflection on learned practice

I. Otium

This essay aims to contribute to the reflection on practices for studying early modern erudition.[2] It starts from the understanding that the learned Commonwealth's erudition was an act of cultivation in the literal sense: not critically distant, but masterfully involved--erudition meaning a scholar had digested what was taken in, refining both learning and the self. It argues that poetic thinking and thoughtful engagement were intrinsic to the erudition to which early modern intellectuals aspired. Nor were play, sophistication and vivacity accidental or ornamental extras to scholarship 'proper'; rather, while drawing on knowledge, early modern erudition equally enlisted wit, the senses, and moral and ethical sensibilities. Pre-eminently a practice of *otium*, moreover, erudition embodied that productive free time and intellectual space of the Commonwealth of Letters, forging the bonds of the Commonwealth's intellectual culture and marking its quality of life. For us today, the challenge is to ensure that we do not inadvertently reduce the vivacity of early modern erudition to what fits our analytical perspective. How do we do justice to the liveliness and sensibilities of early modern erudition in our scholarship on scholarship?

When he was in the course of writing his *Etymologicum anglicanum* in the mid-seventeenth century, the philologist and art theoretician Francis Junius asked his friend Gerald Langbaine, provost of Queen's College, Oxford, for his judgement on Junius's thoughtfully argued conjecture that the Old English word *loppestra*, which glosses the 'locustas' John the Baptist had for food, should perhaps be understood as referring to the river Jordan's freshwater crabs or crayfish, rather than to locusts, although both ancient

and contemporary authorities testify to the insects' edibility. In a witty, learned letter, Langbaine responds by comparing Junius, with a quote from Pliny, to Eratosthenes laying down a method to investigate the circumference of the earth: 'An extravagant venture, yet expressed by such refined calculation that it causes shame not to believe it'.[3]

Langbaine, in turn, proceeds to match Junius's 'extravagant venture' (improbum ausum) with equally wide-ranging yet thoughtful conjectures. He recounts a conversation with his friend John Gregory on the Old English word *olfend*, used in reference to the camel hair of the Baptist's raiment, which had made Gregory doubt the Anglo-Saxons had known the difference between camels and elephants. Langbaine then adduces several finds from his study of the Old English homilies to demonstrate that the Anglo-Saxons had not confused the animals, even though they called camels *olfendas*.[4] 'But I hear you, Junius, crying out for a while', Langbaine interrupts himself, playfully speaking for Junius with a saying of Martial's that adds to the menagerie: ''Ponticus, now tell us about the three goats!' What does this have to do with *lopsteras*, with locusts, with cicadas?'[5] Langbaine's carefully reasoned conjecture follows: if an Anglo-Saxon verb *lopian* 'to leap' existed, one could derive *lopestre* or *loppestra* from it in the sense 'dancer or female dancer, *a leaper*' (saltator vel saltatrix, *a leaper*), just like the French 'sautereau' and 'sauterelle' (locust). 'Here the dialect of my home country (dialectus patria) comes to the rescue'. Langbaine, who was from Cumbria, explains: northerners invariably use *lowp* for southerners' 'to leap'.[6]

My concern is: when we focus on analyzable and narrative aspects of what is expressly marked by liveliness, sophisticated play, and ingenuity, we conceive of erudition as if it simply equals advanced scholarly *knowledge*. We risk drawing a data-

oriented fabric over erudition's lively practice and studying that fabric as if it reveals erudition. We risk reducing the love the humanist professes for *bonae litterae* to what fits a distanced, reifying inquiry and the writing of histories. Wit loses some of its luster once comprehended: sensitivity and presence are less immediate, and the vividness of erudition turns dull.

Langbaine's letter, including the comparison of Junius with Eratosthenes, the conversation with Gregory about camels and elephants, Langbaine's playful interruption of his own side-tracking--and, no less, the queen of Sheba, leavened bread, and Quirin's pretty yet humpbacked daughter--is incorporated in the entry 'Lopster, *lobster*' of the *Etymologicum anglicanum*, after Junius's own extended discussion of freshwater crabs and locusts (which is how we know of their exchange). Those looking up 'lobster' will be cross-referenced to 'Lopster, *lobster*', in accordance with Langbaine's suggestion to interpret a lobster as a leaper, and find the dictionary entry concluding with Langbaine granting to Junius, 'You will have Phyllis for yourself' (Tu Phyllida solus habebis): the words with which the shepherd Menalcas, in Vergil's *Eclogue* 3, grants Phyllis to his fellow shepherd Damoetas if he can solve the riddle posed.[7]

In this essay, I therefore seek a reading practice that honors the play, refined judgement, and sensibilities of early modern erudition. Instead of focusing on formal knowledge organization, the history of scholarship, and scholarly exchange, I will explore how to read early modern erudition as a lively practice. For doing so, I have benefited from work that acknowledges the force of rhetoric, the poetic and associative thinking in humanities and science writing, which I review below. It is my contention that such an exploration will help us better understand the generative and structuring force of

visualization, thoughtful engagement and poetic thinking in studious pursuits of the learned Commonwealth's.

I will concentrate on the field of early modern scholarship with which I am most familiar: early modern philology on what nowadays are called Germanic literatures and languages, with some emphasis on the work of Francis Junius. To underline the difference between early modern perceptions of the earliest medieval Northern European materials and studies and our own today, I refer to the humanists' philology as 'Septentrional'.[8] I ask: how did early modern philologists look? What did they see that enabled them to read the words of the Septentrional ancients with refined judgement? How is it that these words and texts were treated as *bonae litterae* (fine [classical] literature) in the humanist learned community to the extent that they could be considered Septentrional Letters?[9] How is it that Septentrional words were not just politically or ideologically useful, not just a rich thesaurus for embellishing the mother tongue, not just new objects ('data') for study; but rather voices touching the early modern intellectual's *humanitas*, enlisting their most refined perception, and calling for their care, engagement, and contemplation?[10]

The Septentrional materials known in the early modern period, poetic texts especially, might seem rather resistant to such treatment--rather 'other' to what shapes a humanist's sense of refinement. Early modern knowledge, sources, and resources of the Germanic past seem almost too rudimentary and patchy to allow for sophisticated judgement of a text's elegance. Gaps in knowledge are apparent not only from today's vantage point, but also from the scholars' own, contemporary perspective, certainly in comparison to their understanding of the Classics. And there were no generations of

Septentrional scholarship--as there were for established *bonae litterae*--to direct early modern studies into these materials. In addition, a scholar's praise of Septentrional materials could not afford to be just facile, or overly exaggerated. While it may have been motivated by northern pride, a scholar's appreciation of the ancient voices of the North was bound up with a sense of good judgement about established *bonae litterae*. Judgement of Septentrional Letters also represents, then, the refinement of the intellectual's discernment--and refinement of discernment reflects on their standing in the learned Commonwealth. ''Humanitas' … implies striving to development and perfection by means of exchange', Dirk van Miert summarizes.[11] How one passes the free time of one's *otium* is neither leisurely nor informal: it matters whether one spends one's lamp oil with Cædmon or Ovid, Notker or Vergil, Snorri or Quintilian.

It is in spite of, or indeed thanks to, their resistance that Septentrional Letters were food for early modern erudition. While geographically on the philologists' doorstep, materials of the Germanic past marked the edges of early modern understanding. They addressed the scholars' northern, common self that had never been part of scholarship, and in so doing extended the space and scope of erudition, and of materials for the learned Commonwealth, so that they might engage intellectually with something like Langbaine's northern *lowp*. Their interpretation challenged the intellectuals' ingenuity and wit, while also satisfying a polymathic desire to understand the greatest diversity of scripts, words, literatures and languages. Septentrional philology thus makes an ideal case for an exploration of the process of early modern erudition.

Below, I will consider the sound play of 'Hyperborean' rhyme in an epigram by Joseph Justus Scaliger in connection with Ovid's 'Getic' poetry and the poetry in

Bonaventura Vulcanius's *De Literis getarum* (1597) to better understand the liveliness of erudite play; and to see how imaginative understanding includes aural and other sensibilities. I will explore the vivacity of Ole Worm's (1636) and Junius's (1665) interpretations of runes as vivid scenes in connection with the erudite practice theorized in Junius's art treatise (*The Painting of the Ancients*, 1638) to see how the scholars' emphatic visualization reads life in minimal shapes; and how their *Rune Poem* interpretations demonstrate the extent to which their sensitive engagement and poetic thinking are intrinsic to their scholarship. Finally, remarks by Abraham Wheelocke, Melchior Goldast, Martin Opitz and Junius illustrate their keenness to read for perspicuity, their aim engagement rather than distance--and how we, today, with our analytical, reifying perspective, may hardly recognize what they were doing.

II. Negotium

Modern studies on early modern Germanic philology have yielded valuable insights into the efforts of humanists to amass knowledge, as well as into their scholarly rationale, and their contributions to the field of Germanic studies.[12] They have described the learned networks of these humanists; their discovery and circulation of source materials; their transcription and editions (sometimes of materials since lost); and their annotations of antiquarian and linguistic interest. They demonstrate how this scholarship was motivated by pride in a native identity and by desire for establishing a self with a laudable, northern heritage. Early modern Germanic (or Septentrional) philological scholarship was useful for embellishing the mother tongue and rooting it in an ancient, vernacular past. To

support contemporary political and religious programs, it uncovered documents about local history, early medieval law, customs, politics, and the organization of the Church. It was useful, furthermore, for affirming that the early ancestors had practiced their Christianity not only in accordance with the Early Church, but also, a point dear to Protestants, in their own tongue.

From today's vantage point, it is easy to assume that during these early modern 'beginnings' of what were to develop into Germanic studies, the relatively limited knowledge and available resources surely correlated with, indeed excused, scholars' basic, or limited, understanding. It may seem obvious that a considerable amount of knowledge must be gathered before one can engage in the wit, liveliness, and play of erudition. Thus, we may infer, early modern scholars' Septentrional thinking must have been rather rudimentary. Refined, sensitive interpretation must have come at a later stage in scholarship, closer to the present day, once the scholar--and the scholarly field--had mastered their ABC's, assembled glossaries and grammars, read ever more complex text passages. Only then could one engage thoughtfully with the most poetically embellished, stylistically and conceptually challenging literature.

Mind you, erudition does not proceed systematically like a didactically responsible course curriculum. True, there is a need for scholarly tools, sources and resources, and there is also refinement in analysis as knowledge of materials expands. But early modern scholars in a novel field did not *think* more simply or more rudimentarily because they had fewer materials and resources, or they were newer to them than later generations. In fact, we would do well to expect the opposite, as

numerous and major gaps in knowledge placed huge demands on wit, visualization, and 'mental acrobatics' in order for the scholar to, literally, make sense.

That is why, in this essay, I seek to read early modern erudition as a vivid, engaged practice. Inspiration for doing so I have especially found in the following studies on the poetic, rhetoric, and the role of visual thinking in humanities and science writing. In *The Poetry of Thought*, George Steiner has listened for the poetry and sound of philosophical discourse through the ages. He proposes that '[t]he riddling images of the poetic allow philosophic intuitions to reach daylight', and calls attention to 'the power of a sentence to speak the world', in poetry as much as in philosophical writing.[13] In *Fictions of the Cosmos*, Frédérique Aït-Touati has eloquently expounded the structuring role of narrative and poetics in the literatures of early modern science. To reveal 'the imaginary voyage, satiric enlargement, and the inverted world', she has posited her own study 'in the conceptual space opened up by [Johannes] Kepler's snowflake'.[14] For early modern Anglo-Saxon philology, which is part of the Septentrional philology of my focus, furthermore, Seth Lerer has surveyed the generative power of rhetoric, with the understanding that '[t]he pursuit of the meaning of individual words, their etymologies, resonances, and afterlives, has always been the means by which the reader gained transcendent, emotional experience'.[15] Lerer suggests that '[philology's] practice reveals to its practitioners something about the literary text or social history. But it often also reveals something of the self': 'Philology, in short, is a sublime art'.[16]

In *Visual Analogy*, in addition, Barbara Maria Stafford has undertaken 'to recuperate the lost link between visual images and concepts, the intuitive ways in which we think simply by visualizing'.[17] This 'art of sympathetic thought', as she calls visual

analogy, 'thriv[ed] in antiquity and crest[ed] at the close of the baroque era'.[18] I contend that early modern erudition is no exception to what she describes as its 'performative rhetoric'. Likewise, that the 'energy and discernment' it demanded in the 'beholder' also characterizes the scholarly process of the learned Commonwealth.[19] Moreover, if we today have generally lost that mode of visualizing, our scholarship will likely fail to see and to understand the force of visualization in early modern erudition. My explorations in this essay, then, seek to read for the scholar's 'energy and discernment', the performative force of poetic thinking, and vivid engagement in early modern Septentrional philology.[20]

III. Gustus

To contextualize his anthology of text specimens *De Literis & lingua getarum siue gothorum* (On the Letters and Language of the Getans or Goths, 1597), the Leiden professor of Greek Bonaventura Vulcanius writes in his dedicatory letter to the States of Friesland that, when Ovid was exiled among the Getans in Tomis, he 'had so come to understand their language that he testifies even to have written some things in Getic'.[21] One of Ovid's remarks that Vulcanius must be alluding to is in *Ex Ponto*, where Ovid, 'paena poeta Getes' (almost a Getan poet), exclaims, 'a! pudet, et Getico scripsi sermone libellum, / structaque sunt nostris barbara verba modis' (Oh, it's shameful! I have also composed a writing in Getic speech, and the foreign [or: outlandish] words are arranged to our measures).[22] Beyond several such references, it is not known how Ovid's Getic poetry in Latin meter--or Latin poetry with Getic words--may have looked or sounded. Perhaps that all the more has made it speak to the (aural) imagination. It enticed Leiden's

'*decus academiae*' Joseph Justus Scaliger, for one, to topsy-turvy emulation in an epigram for Vulcanius that appears as the book's single liminary poem:

> In specimen vetustissimae GETARUM LINGUAE, doctissimo viro Bon. Vulcanio Editori.
>
> Naso Tomitanae didicit vetus incola terrae
> Barbara Romanis nectere verba modis.
> At tu docturos gentem sua verba Latinam,
> Vulcani, gelido promis ab axe Getas.
> Contingit nostro, quod nulli contigit, aeuo,
> Vertere Hyperboreo dicta Latina sono.
> Nec facere hoc poterat, quod Naso fecerat olim,
> Quam qui Nasonis corque animumque gerit.[23]
>
> [On the specimen of the very ancient language of the Getans, to the editor, the highly learned Mr Bon. Vulcanius.
>
> Naso, ancient resident of the land of Tomis, learned to set foreign words to Roman measures. But you, Vulcan, bring out Getans from the icy North to teach the Latin nation their words. It befalls to our age, as has befallen to none, to transform Latin sayings with Hyperborean sound. And nobody could accomplish what Naso once did, than he who holds Naso's heart and mind.]

The sample of 'the very ancient language of the Getans' in the epigram's heading is likely several runic inscriptions and sets of runic alphabets which Vulcanius edited as

'Gothic' in *Literis getarum*.[24] Kees Dekker has carefully unraveled that they had been gathered by, and circulated among, a network of contemporary scholars including Charles Danzay, Daniel Rogers, Jens Bille, Philips van Marnix, Lord of St Aldegonde, Niels Kaas, and Arild Huitfeldt, then sent by Friedrich Lindenbrog to Scaliger for forwarding to Vulcanius for publication.[25] This epigram, then, must be *how* Scaliger forwarded the materials.[26] Its mention of 'Getans' in reference to runes which are called 'Gothic' in Vulcanius's book, and the book's title 'of the Getans or Goths' (getarum siue gothorum) in reference to a range of Septentrional languages show how 'Getic' and 'Gothic' did not have today's more narrowly defined cultural or linguistic referents.[27]

Playfully, Scaliger's epigram associates the Getans with the ancient, far North where the legendary Hyperboreans lived: their language 'vetustissimae' (very ancient), their sound 'Hyperboreo' (Hyperborean, polar), they are brought 'gelido … ab axe' (from the icy [North] pole). The *gens Latina* (Latin nation [or: clan, tribe, people]), by contrast, are 'we' of 'our age' (nostro … aeuo) who love 'dicta Latina' (Latin sayings) and pride ourselves in an Ovidian 'heart and mind', or 'intellect and judgement' (corque animumque). This must be the 'nation' of Scaliger, Vulcanius, and the prospective readership of both epigram and publication: that learned Commonwealth, the 'Republic' of humanist intellectuals, whose 'native' language is Latin--in contrast to the Hyperboreans, whose native words and sounds are 'foreign' or 'non-Latin', not to say 'outlandish' (Barbara) to 'us'.

By bringing out the words of the Getans in the Latin nation, so the epigram wittily implies, Vulcanius's publication would seem to subvert the whole humanist project and its love of *bonae litterae*. After all, it had been to purge a 'Latinity … assailed by

outlandish speech' (Latinitas barbaria oppressa) from the 'vernacular barbarisms' of what are referred to as medieval 'Goths and Gauls', that the humanist Lorenzo Valla had composed his highly influential, assertively entitled *Elegantiae linguae latinae*.[28] With his *Elegantiae*, as Ann Moss has described it, Valla promoted 'a Latin that corresponds to the Latin employed by the erudite and that is characterized by 'elegance'', and this 'elegance', she adds, had connotations of 'purity' and 'perspicacity'.[29] Efforts at language purification such as Valla's had been instrumental in bringing about 'the Latin language turn' between medieval and humanist Latin; indeed, in Moss's words, between 'northern Latin speech patterns' and 'the *Elegantiae* set to invade them'.[30]

Now, however, the Getans are deliberately being brought out and dispersed by way of Vulcanius's publication ('tu … promis') to teach the Latin nation a lesson in *their* language ('docturos gentem sua verba Latinam'). This upside-down *translatio studii* is so novel that it merits special announcement: 'It befalls to our age as has befallen to none …' (contingit nostro, quod nulli contigit aeuo). Its imminence is heightened by the present tense of 'contingit' (it befalls), and by the future participle 'docturos', a verb form indicating an action just on the verge of happening ('about to teach').

No sooner has the announcement been made than it happens, it seems. The very couplet that remarks how '[i]t befalls to our age, as has befallen to none, to transform Latin sayings with Hyperborean sound', sounds surprisingly similar to a short-lined stanza with a prominent rhyme pattern *aaaa* of mostly masculine rhyme in sonorous *-o*:

Cóntingít nostró,
quod núlli cóntigit aéuo,

Vértere Hypérboreó

dícta Latína sonó.

Is this how ‘Hyperborean’, ‘Getic’, ‘Gothic’, or ancient Northern European verse sounds to the refined humanist’s ear? Do we here hear Latin sayings altered (or: translated, turned) by Septentrional sound? The epigram’s words suggest so: just as we know we had better listen for reflexivity when a poem mentions verse making, when a Latin epigram announces as novel and imminent the changing of Latin words by Hyperborean sound, we had better listen twice for its performance of that verbal act.

There is more. Once we hear these lines rhyme, we may also hear line 2 rhyme meaningfully as it describes Ovid’s Getic verse making (‘to set foreign words to Roman measures’):

Bárbara Rómanís

néctere vérba modís

Scaliger modelled it, no doubt, on Ovid’s aforementioned exclamation that, ‘almost a Getan poet’, he composed in Getic, ‘structaque sunt nostris barbara verba modis’ (and the foreign [or: outlandish] words are arranged to our measures). Yet where in Ovid, foreign words (barbara verba) are wrapped by Latin measures (nostris … modis), with Scaliger, foreign words and Roman measures interlock (Barbara … verba; Romanis … modis), and ‘Romanis’ seems to join ‘Barbara’ to murmur as ‘barbararoma-’ with *a*’s and *r*’s, like barbarian ‘rhubarb rhubarb’. The line as if foretells what lies ahead of the Latin nation in

‘our age’, when Hyperborean sound (‘Hyperboreo … sono’) envelops Latin sayings: ‘Hyperboreo / dicta Latina sono’. (Scaliger would not have known of the one Latin epigram in the *Anthologia Latina*, in the Codex Salmasianus, which includes a phrase in ‘goticum’ nowadays identified as Vandal.)[31]

Vulcanius has not quoted this particular exclamation of Ovid when mentioning Ovid’s Getic composition in his book’s dedicatory letter, but he has included a passage in which Ovid remarks on the mix of Getic and Greek in Tomis. Rhyming sounds in it, also, in an *abaa* pattern: ‘Hîc quoque sint urbes Graiae, (quis credere posset?) / Inter inhumanae nomina barbariae’ (Here there are also Greek cities--who could believe that?--among the names of uncivil barbarity).[32] In classical hexameter, such so-called leonine rhyme, in which the line end rhymes line-internally with the syllable before the caesura, is sometimes used for variation and aural ornamentation; as such, it is unmarked.[33]

The leonine rhyme in Scaliger’s epigram, however, is loud. It also sounds in its first line:

Náso Tómitanáe
didicít vetus íncola térrae

By referring to Ovid as Tomis’s ‘ancient resident’ (vetus incola), this line varies on the equally rhyming opening of Ovid’s *Ex Ponto,* ‘Naso Tomitanae iam non novus incola terrae’ (Naso, no longer a new resident of the land of Tomis …; *Ex Ponto* 1.1.1). In both these lines, rhyme does not coincide with the meter and emphasis; ‘Tómitanáe’ rhymes with ‘térrae’. This is the form of rhyming hexameter favored in medieval Latin poetry,

but no longer in humanist Latin. Elsewhere, Scaliger adduces the venerable Bede as an authority in a discourse on rhythmic (accentual-syllabic) verse to describe this form as 'our common verse with similar inflection and similar ending', which had been 'fashioned out of leonine hexameter' by 'us Christians'.[34]

Christian, leonine hexameter appears in Vulcanius's *Literis getarum* in the excerpt of Williram of Ebersberg's eleventh-century macaronic Old High German paraphrase of the *Song of Songs*.[35] In the following two lines from Vulcanius's edition, 'votís' rhymes with 'óris', 'venturúm' with 'Vátum', like the opening lines of Scaliger's epigram and Ovid's *Ex Ponto*:

> Quem sitio votis nunc oscula porrigat oris,
> Quem mihi venturum promserunt organa Vatum …[36]
> [I long now with longing for him who offers kisses of the mouth, who the tongues of the prophets told is about to come …]

Vulcanius's judgement of Williram's leonine hexameter is typical. While Williram's work is 'composed in a delightful variety' of Latin and vernacular, poetry and prose, Williram's Latin verse 'is poor in elegance and stylistic beauty, as much as that age's (stylistic) simplicity (ἀφέλεια) tolerated'.[37] It is just useful for better understanding the Canticle's sense and Williram's vernacular--which is prose; its opening reads, 'Chvsser mih mit demo chusse sines mundes. Dicco gehiezer mir sine chunft *per prophetas.* …' (Let him kiss me with the kiss of his mouth. Often he promised me his coming *through the prophets*).[38]

While Williram composed vernacular prose, the ninth-century Alsace monk Otfrid von Weissenburg took leonine hexameter as a model for his rendering of the Gospels in Old High German verse. As T.V.F. Brogan explains, 'the partitioning of long-line Lat[in] verse via internal rhyme paved the way for a multitude of short-line lyric stanzas in the vernaculars'.[39] In the programmatic Latin dedication to his *Evangelienbuch*, Otfrid describes how he had devised a rhyming verse form (scema omoeoteleuton) after the example of Christian Latin, and explains that 'it regularly calls for the (grammatical) 'scheme' of end-rhyme. For words at the end (of an off-verse) require a sound-quality suitable and fitting and similar to the preceding (rhyme-word of the on-verse)'.[40] Otfrid's work circulated in the early modern learned world in the edition by the Lutheran theologian Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1571), who entitled it a 'splendid document' (praeclarum monimentum) of the ancient Germans' grammar, poetry, and theology.[41] Flacius Illyricus also reprinted the appreciation of Otfrid's poetry by the Alsace humanist Beatus Rhenanus, from his *Rerum germanicarum libri tres* (1531). Rhenanus quotes two couplets that illustrate Otfrid's rhyming verse, with *aabb* rhyme, selected from deep within Otfrid's vernacular introductory chapter. Not only are they comprehensible to anyone who knows German, Rhenanus finds, but they also show the chapter to be a 'most elegant preface' (elegantissimam praefationem):[42]

> Nu uuill ich schriban unser heil
> Euangeliono deil /
> So uuir nu hiar bigunnon
> In frenkisga zungun.[43]

[Now I want to write down to our Salvation a selection from the Gospels, as we now have started it in the Franconian tongue]

Vulcanius's *Literis getarum* includes not Otfrid, but some other rhymed (and accentual-syllabic) Septentrional composition. The excerpt from the anonymous Early Middle High German *Annolied*, composed around 1100, also rhymes in an *aabb* pattern. Vulcanius's selection includes four consecutive lines whose rhyme words sound rather similar, 'zug', 'vlug', 'guz', 'vluz':

Daz fuir hauit ufuert sinin zug,
dunner unte wint irin vlug,
Die wolken dragint den regin guz.
nider wendint wasser irim vluz …[44]
[Fire has its draw upwards, thunder and wind their flight. Clouds carry the gush of rain. Water turns its flow downwards.]

Sounding close to an *aaaa* rhyme, they must be the epitome of the Hyperborean sound infusing Scaliger's epigram. Vulcanius is sure that, besides its usefulness for embellishing the mother tongue, the sample will be to the reader's 'great delight' (magnae tibi voluptati).[45]

Literis getarum, moreover, prints the only known poetry in what is arguably Crimean Gothic. It consists of the first three lines of a 'cantilena' (little song, old song) written down by Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq during his embassy to the Ottoman Empire,

when he listed Crimean-Gothic ('Germanica') phrases with the help of a Greek informant who lived in the Crimea.[46] The only explication of the verse is Busbecq's brief introduction of it following the word lists in his famous 'Fourth Turkish Letter': 'he also recited a little song (cantilenam) in that language whose beginning was like this'.[47] In *Literis getarum,* the lines conclude Vulcanius's excerpt from Busbecq:

> Wara wara ingdolou
> Scu te gira Galtzou
> Hœmisclep dorbiza ea.[48]

Although various conjectures have been made, the verse has resisted interpretation to this day: What language is it? Are its words real words? Or were they perhaps 'missegmented' as Busbecq tried to write down the song? And what does it mean?[49] Still, one aspect does seem clear: the verse rhymes, in an *aab*- pattern.

In early modern educated perception, it had been 'Goths', and other uncultivated tribes, who had disgraced the medieval world with rhyme. '[R]ude beggerly ryming', Roger Ascham sneers in one characteristic, and often-quoted, instance in *The Scholemaster* (1570), had been

> brought first into Italie by *Gothes* and *Hunnes*, whan all good verses and all good learning to, were destroyed by them: and after caryed into France and Germanie: and at last receyued into England by men of excellent wit in deede, but of small learning, and lesse iudgement in that behalfe.[50]

In his survey of such Elizabethan appreciations of classical meters and vernacular verse, Derek Attridge envisions that to the educated person, 'what went for verse was a mere putting together of words with a rhyme at the end which anyone could accomplish'.[51] He clarifies: 'there was no complex pattern of syllables of different types, and hence no intellectual pleasure to be gained from observing how the pattern was kept and the rules obeyed'.[52] Rhyme pleases those 'of small learning, and lesse iudgement': rhyme, then, is not erudite.

Would it not be a carnivalesque subversion of erudition--and thus of the learned Commonwealth which thrives on erudition--when what has seemed outlandish and unpolished (*rudis*) would come to sound refined and cultivated (*eruditus*)? Already, half of Scaliger's epigram rhymes! Presently, one imagines, the humanist Latin nation would begin to rhyme their *bonae litterae*, too, as if Hyperborean sound is bound to enter the ear to stay as soon as the reader turns the page to engage with the 'Getic' specimens in *Literis getarum*. Such engagement, therefore, requires Ovidian 'intellect and judgement' (corque animumque), the epigram concludes: 'And nobody could accomplish what Naso once did, than he who holds Naso's heart and mind'. The conclusion suggests that Vulcanius does, and, in the epigram's function as a liminary poem, that the learned Commonwealth should nurture 'Naso's heart and mind' for negotiating Septentrional materials likewise.

Scaliger's epigram demonstrates this erudite mode. By not only describing but also performing it, it enacts erudition. Its Hyperborean soundplay, for it to be effective, addresses learned knowledge, visual (aural) imagination, erudite judgement, and wit in an

intellectual space of scholarly exchange. I suggest that this blend of analytical and poetic thinking and engagement, which the epigram evinces in jest, exemplifies early modern erudition. Such, moreover, is the Ovidian 'intellect and judgement' the epigram calls for.

IV. Energia

For better insight into scholars' practice to read materials that might seem crude with refinement, I will consider the detailed appreciations of runes--the letters Vulcanius and Scaliger called 'Getic' and 'Gothic', not to say 'Hyperborean'--by Ole Worm, champion of runic studies and Copenhagen professor of medicine, and, elaborating Worm's readings, by Francis Junius. Their appreciations appear in Worm's treatise on runes *Danica literatura* (1636), and in Junius's 'Alphabetum runicum' prefacing his and the English minister Thomas Marshall's co-edition of the Gothic Gospels (1665), respectively.[53] The mastership they demonstrate in their reading of runes makes manifest how the considerate early modern scholar sought to engage with materials, sources, texts, words, and literatures, also--perhaps, expressly so--with those of which they knew their knowledge to be relatively limited.

On Worm and Junius's readings, runes are not disinterested marks, but reveal themselves as vivid images. As each rune has a sound value, as well as a name, which usually is a common word that begins with the rune's sound value, this invited the scholars to see significance also in a rune's shape in relation to its name and the thing its name refers to. Inspired by Bonaventure Corneille Bertram's interpretation of Hebrew characters as images, Worm submits that in runes, 'the basic straight lines represent the

thing itself and the subject, and the lateral [lines] its parts or accidentals, with which the sense usually uses to move and affect (quibus sensus ut plurimum movere & afficere solet)'.[54] It is the scholar's task to perceive the runes' moving, affective sense in the runes' tittles--which often differ minimally, yet crucially; take, for example, ᚪ, ᛏ, ᛚ, ᚾ (*a*, *t*, *l*, *n*). For some of their interpretations, the scholars benefited from the abecedaric-style Norwegian *Rune Poem*, which has a rhyming couplet for each of the sixteen runes and their names in the order of the *futhark*, the runic alphabet, to which we will return below.

Thus, the rune for '*a*', ᚪ, whose name *aar* means 'harvest' (or: 'abundance of the fields and excellence of produce'), Worm writes, 'is represented by the image of a ploughshare, for it uses to thrive on well-tilled and well-worked lands'.[55] Junius repeats after him, '[h]ence the letter shows the image of a ploughshare; because we owe the abundance of produce especially to the ploughshare, because of the far more pulses of fields rightly cultivated and ploughed'.[56] The *b*-rune ᛒ, called *biarkan* (birch), depicts 'a birch spreading itself with joyous amplitude and verdure of leaves', Worm suggests.[57] Junius repeats, 'The letter outlines a birch spread with the width and breadth of most joyous leaves'.[58] Of the *k*-rune, ᚴ, named *kaun* (ulcer), Worm proposes that 'it denotes 'ulcer' or 'itching', which it also indicates by an arm stretched out for scratching'.[59] It is a reading Junius endorses unproblematically: '*Kaun* is 'ulcer' or 'itching'; therefore the letter signifying 'itching' is expressed by an arm raised and stretched out as if for scratching'.[60]

Their interpretation may seem a whimsical exercise in visual or creative thinking, as if it were an intellectual sport to come up with the richest, most vibrant explanations for the most minimal marks. But there is a logic--and poetry--to it that ensures

interpretation is neither boundless, nor fantastical. Building on Worm's analysis, Junius adds an explication about runes that proves pivotal for our understanding of the early modern process of interpretation of Septentrional materials. He advises that,

> their first inventors had not so much resolved to show the appearance of an art of Painting in sketching them, as to describe superficially and, with the ancient simplicity of a more uncultivated age, as it were, to outline merely the characters' bare shapes--crude, indeed, yet matching their names; so that, supported by the aid of such resemblance, learners' rough and vague imagination (rudis ac vaga discentium Phantasia) more firmly and faithfully transmitted to memory the letters' characters [that are] striking by resemblance to a commonly known thing, yet particularly to the thing signified by the character's very name. Nobody fails to see how well and prudently cautious people gifted with a mind lofty beyond others had devised this in time past.[61]

Mention of the term *Phantasia* (imagination) in connection with runes, and the assurance that their 'inventors' had not pursued an art of painting in sketching them, are instructive for the way Junius read, and proposed the reader to understand and judge, runes: they directly relate to the visual arts theory he had expounded in his treatises *De pictura veterum* (1637), *The Painting of the Ancients* (1638) and *De Schilder-konst der Oude* (1641).[62]

For his treatises, Junius freely adapted classical rhetoric's ideas and concepts for the orator's art of eloquence and its effects on the listener or reader to apply to the artist,

and to the viewer. He theorized not only how the artist is to reach lifelikeness (*perspicuitas*) in their images through vivid conceit and intense imagination (*Phantasia*, *imaginatio*, or 'Phantasie'), but also how the art lover (or expert viewer) is to hone their skills of judgement by cultivating the power of imagination. Like the master painter, the expert viewer seeks to conceive of all possible life and liveliness pertaining to an image in an effort to become virtually present in the work's image space, as if an eyewitness at the scene represented. 'The listener, the reader, or the viewer … cannot alter the outcome of the drama', Philipp and Raina Fehl clarify, 'but he can rejoice and he can suffer'.[63] It is because Junius adapted classical rhetoric's instructions for the orator to pertain to the painter (the word maker and the image maker), and those for the painter to apply to the critical viewer, I suggest, that his instructions for the critical viewer can be understood to pertain to the discriminating reader (the word lover, who, obviously, is the 'philo-logist', including Junius himself).

The painter and viewer's process of studious imagination is theorized in the intertwined concepts of *energeia*, *enargeia*, and *energia*. Thijs Weststeijn explains that for Junius, the classical concept of *energeia* refers to 'the emotive movement expressed and evoked by an image' in the *viewer*, and *enargeia* to the *artist* 'capturing a single moment that shows the viewer events as if he himself were present'.[64] Furthermore, as Weststeijn convincingly proposes, Junius blends *energeia* and *enargeia* in a special concept, *energia*, to 'describe the combined effect of a stilled moment with strong affective power'.[65] Testifying to the importance of the viewer's active, sensitive involvement in a work, *energia* expresses the meeting of the image's vivacity and the

expert viewer through focused imagination (*Phantasia*). 'Perspicuitie is the chiefest thing our Phantasie aimeth at', Junius states, and he has this bear on artist and viewer alike.[66]

If we understand Junius's advice for the critical viewer as also pertaining to the critical reader, Junius's theory is pertinent to, and instructive for, our interest in early modern erudition, because it verbalizes how the critic sought to read. It makes his theory revealing of his, and his contemporaries', erudite engagement with the materials of their studies. To read with vivid imagination is not exclusive to the art critic; rather it evinces how those sought to read who wished to cultivate their perception beyond the generic readers'.

To do so, the expert viewer must cultivate critical judgement through continuous refining and fine-tuning. Their engagement through refined imagination distinguishes the 'Lovers and well-willers of Art' from 'rude spectators'.[67] '[I]t is not enough that wee should have eyes in our head as other men have, but it is also required here that we should bring to these curiosities 'eruditos oculos', that is, 'learned eyes', as *Tullie* termeth them'.[68] As perspicuity is brought about in practice by 'the heaping of telling details', the art lover proceeds to increasingly pertinent and intimate insight by vividly and sensitively considering each and every telling detail.[69]

Runes, of course, hardly have heaps of telling details--but then, they had been invented for learners whose imagination was still rough and vague (rudis ac vaga). To the scholars, the runes' few details are telling. Worm and Junius's appreciation of the runes' simplicity, their 'bare shapes', calls to mind the art lover's appreciation of the sketch, which Junius noted in his art theory. Weststeijn observes: '[Junius's] idea seems to be that unfinished works appeal more strongly than finished ones to the beholder's

imagination. Since the viewer completes the work in his mind, he is involved all the more intensively in the artwork's suggestion of another reality'.[70] As they leave much to the viewer's imagination, both the sketch and the rune place great demands on the viewer's imaginative and interpretive capabilities.

At the same time, it is only the work of true masters, who have similarly cultivated their imagination, that bears the expert's exacting discrimination. That must be why Junius holds that the ancestors who devised runes as simple, yet recognizable, images were 'cautious people gifted with a mind lofty beyond others'. The runes' and their inventors' 'ancient simplicity of a more uncultivated age', moreover, answers to the early modern regard for the Germanic tribes' supposed unadorned plainness, frugality, and straightforwardness in style and morals, which also plays a role in Junius's art theory, as Weststeijn has shown.[71] Worm, too, shows admiration for the rune inventors' *prudentia* (practical judgement, intelligence). He quotes after Vulcanius that, to write majuscle *U*, rune masters had invented the rune ᚢ (*u*) to avoid any possible confusion with the Greek letter ν (*n*)--unlike the 'Latins', who write *U* as *V*.[72] 'Who would not admire our ancestors' practical judgement (*prudentia*) for the remainder', Worm exclaims, 'when in a matter of such slight import they were so careful?'[73] The ancestors' apparent concern for a detail as rare as this confirms that rune letters, and Runic Letters, will reward the early modern scholar's similarly caring scrutiny and judgement.

Worm and Junius demonstrate such finely tuned judgement in the vividness of their descriptions of what rune signs represent in outline. When one reads with 'Phantasie', the rune ᛚ (*l*, 'water') can be seen to depict 'liquid or a stream of water falling down from a mountain summit'.[74] The image must have been inspired by Worm's

reading of the *Rune Poem* line for ᛚ, 'water of itself rushes down from steeps'.[75] Junius repeats, '*Laugr* is 'water'. The letter also represents liquid falling down from a mountain peak'.[76] In line with Worm's aforementioned explanation, it is the rune's tittle that brings about the image's power to 'move and affect'. As that small angled mark represents the mountain peak, it gives the scene a grand and energetic scale; animated in the present participle 'delabentem', water comes down all the way from the peak at the rune's top (ex montis cacumine; à montis vertice), as if the Sublime of a later age manifests itself in this rune sign.

For another example, consider the rune ᚾ (*n*, 'need'). Worm suggests: '*Naud* … expresses the nature of need (necessitatis naturam), which is in need of a support by which it is held upright'.[77] The line in the *Rune Poem* for ᚾ has not directly prompted the image; Worm reads it as, 'Need compels one to spin'.[78] Junius expands: '*Naud* is 'need'. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the ancients endeavored to express the true nature of Need (veram Necessitatis naturam) in the outline of this letter; because, to be sure, it is in need of a support, by which it is held upright'.[79] Whether its tittle is seen to depict buttress or staff, the rune sign embodies the tension between support and its subject, the support poised at an angle that testifies to the pressure put on it.[80] The rune represents 'Need' not coolly, but expresses the 'true nature of Need' with vivid conceit.

My point is that Worm and Junius construe rune signs not just as pictures, but as scenes of emphatic vividness. In their reading, runes are 'stilled moment[s] with strong affective power', whose 'sense uses to move and affect' in the detail of their tittles.[81] Their interpretations suggest that, as expert viewers, the scholars have striven to meet the runes' vigor by making themselves as if present at the scene depicted, like eyewitnesses

who can ‘rejoice and … suffer’.[82] Not only advanced, perhaps arcane, knowledge matters for their appreciation, but also a finely tuned power of visualization. Play and enthusiasm exude from their verbal representations, from their ‘painting’ of the ‘pictures’ of runes in words. For the vivacity they read in those stark rune strokes is, of course, the vivacity of their reading.

Appropriately, their most vivid understanding is for the rune whose name means ‘man, person’ (madur), the *m*-rune ᛘ. Worm interprets ᛘ as, ‘a person contemplating the marvel of the stars with arms stretched out to heaven’.[83] Junius even slightly enhances Worm’s image: ‘the character expresses a person contemplating the stars’ regular courses and returns, and honoring the marvel of such a great matter, hands stretched out to heaven with some jubilation, as it were’.[84] In his art theory, Junius characterized the master painter and art lover, those ‘studying alwayes to enrich their Phantasie with lively impressions of all manner of things’, in words resembling these readings of the *m*-rune: ‘They doe marke the wide heaven beset with an endlesse number of bright and glorious starres …’, he opens his extended, ekphrastic exemplification of writing liveliness.[85] The image highlights contemplation--jubilant contemplation--as a vital, distinguishing human capability; one, moreover, which Northern ancients ‘gifted with a mind lofty beyond others’ had similarly recognized, and chosen for representing ‘man, person’.

I suggest that early modern erudition is characterized by such vividness and engaged visualization. It is through intense visualization that entwines knowledge and imagination (*Phantasia*) that one may be able to understand those rigid rune shapes--even, the runes’ *tittles*, to make the erudite’s focus yet more exacting--as vivid images that move and affect. Junius’s readiness to adopt, even to enhance, Worm’s suggestions,

however slightly, is striking: without reservation, the art theoretician reads runes for perspicuity. Theirs, therefore, is not a contest in thinking out of the box. Instead, their vivid reading of rune marks--what may seem an overly enthusiastic reading *into* rune marks--is not only within the scope of humanist good judgement: it exemplifies such judgement. Their bringing rune marks to life shows pertinent philological acumen. The vivacity of their practice testifies to the scholars' empathetic engagement with the ancient sources: for the meeting of critic (scholar) and the materials' vigor in a space of virtual presence, reading must be energetic. The scholars' rune interpretations thus evince the good judgement and intellect, or 'heart and mind', which Scaliger's epigram called for.

V. Phantasia

If consideration of runes by Worm and Junius reveals their reading for vividness, their sensitive engagement with the aforementioned Norwegian *Rune Poem* illustrates the space of erudition where such reading applies. Worm presents the *Rune Poem* with an interpretation of it in *Danica literatura*; Junius continues in 'Alphabetum runicum' with a thoughtful reading of the poem in tandem with Worm's interpretation.[86] The poem's principal rhetorical device, as Margaret Clunies Ross has explained, relies on 'the juxtaposition of apparently disparate material in order to jolt its audience into an awareness of the factors that relate the yoked subjects'.[87] Such jolts in understanding required to see the commonality of seemingly unrelated ideas address one's faculty of visualization. The *Rune Poem* thus provides a string of interpretive riddles to titillate

humanist wit, as it is not evident whether, and how, the two lines given for each rune can be read to make sense as a couplet.

The *Rune Poem*'s play invites Worm to interpret its verses emblematically, as vignettes (emblema) that have something to say about the human condition, on the understanding that 'in each verse something hidden pertaining to common life is concealed, which offers itself spontaneously to someone who carefully balances not only the words, but also the sense'.[88] Informed by the ingenuity of the poetic conceits and *kenningar* (poetic compounds) of skaldic poetry adumbrated elsewhere in *Danica literatura*, Worm pairs each line of the *Rune Poem* with a humanist adage (without naming classical sources). It permits him to be none too literal in his interpretation, and work around words he may not have understood. Rather, his reading brings out moral sense heeding *humanitas*. Where applicable, it also connects and integrates Nordic and personal common life within the fabric of humanist understanding.

Worm's interpretation of the lines for the rune ᛅ (*o*, 'oys' [river mouth]) may serve as an example. In his commentary, the line 'Oys er flestra ferda' (River mouth is of most passages--Worm's text lacks the word 'fǫr' [journey]) is matched with 'Tuta frequensque via est per amici fallere nomen' (A safe and frequented path is to deceive under the name of 'friend'; Ovid, *Ars amatoria* 1.585).[89] Worm elucidates:

> The most frequent journey is in river mouths' … Just as the most frequented retreat of ships is in sea bays and river mouths, because of a port's convenience, when it is nevertheless there that they are most often either harassed by lurking

> pirates or driven into crags and promontories with a risk of shipwreck, so risks are more frequent in the kind of life to which the majority has resigned itself.[90]

The couplet's second line, 'En skalpur er suerda', which Worm reads as, 'A sword is wont to be sharp' (Gladius acutus esse solet), is paired with 'Nil prodest quod non laedere possit idem' (Nothing is beneficial that cannot also injure; Ovid, *Tristia* 2.1.266).[91] Known from a passage in Ovid's *Tristia* on medicine, which continues, 'Eripit interdum, modo dat medicina salutem, / quaeque iuvet, monstrat, quaeque sit herba nocens' (now medicine gives health, now it snatches it away, and it shows which herb helps, which is harmful; 2.1.269-70), the adage speaks of Worm's professional life as a physician and professor of medicine; it is associated with medicine and pharmacy to this day. There will presently be another such instance. In his interpretations, Worm seeks not distance, but involvement, as the *Rune Poem* connects to his own life, and his own life to the *Rune Poem*, even over and beyond the hidden sense of the verses 'pertaining to common life'.

The commonplaces in Worm's reading inspire Junius, in turn, to seek to connect the sense the individual verse lines make to reach for the sense of the couplet. In a discursive style, he critiques Worm. He adduces Worm's interpretation, concluding it with 'Thus Worm' (Haec Wormius; Ita Wormius; Sic Wormius), and sometimes agrees, sometimes indicates he fails to understand words or verses, and often suggests alternative or better readings. 'Thus Worm', Junius concludes Worm's reading of the ᛅ (o) couplet, '[b]ut perhaps the couplet's sense is such: Ships rest in the safe anchorage of ports, but a sword in a sheath'.[92]

Yet Junius also expands Worm's interpretations. It is to one of these I turn, because, once again, they demonstrate vivid reading in practice and have us witness the process of erudite understanding. Because of its brevity, I select the commentary to the final couplet, for the rune ᛦ (*y, r,* 'yr' [yew, bow]). The couplet in Worm's edition is 'Yr er urtur grónst vida. / Vant er thar er brennr at suida'.[93] Nowadays, Maureen Halsall has read and translated it as, 'ýr er vetrgrønstr víða; / vant er, er brennr, at svíða' (Yew is the greenest of trees in winter; when it burns, it sputters).[94] Worm's interpretation of each line is brief yet involved, revealing humanist engagement:

> ᛦ ᚨᚱ. Arcus tam hyeme quam aestate flexilis. *Cereus in vitium flexi*.
>
> ᚢᛋᚴ. Igne adustus dolere solet. *Ubi morbus ibi dolor*.[95]
>
> [*y er*. A bow is flexible in winter and summer. 'Pliable as wax to vice'.
>
> *uant*. Who is singed by fire is wont to be in pain. 'Where there is ailment, there is pain'.]

The commonplace 'cereus in vitium flexi' is said of youth by Horace (*Ars poetica* 163), while 'ubi morbus ibi dolor' first and foremost seems a physician's wisdom, modelled on the commonplace 'ubi amor ibi dolor' (where there is love, there is pain).

Junius annotates the same two lines, as well as Worm's commentary, as follows:

> ᛦ ᚨᚱ. *Arcus tam hyeme quàm aestate flexibilis*. Egregiè Cerialis apud Tacitum Histor. lib. IV, cap. 74. *Vitia erunt, donec homines*. Appositè quoque Horatius libro Secundo, Satyrâ VII;

Pars hominum vitiis gaudet constanter, & urget

Propositum; pars multa natat, modò recta capessens,

Interdum pravis obnoxia ---

ᚢᛦᚳ. *Solet igne adustus dolere*. Sensus est; Miseras cogitationes nostras, cum omnia fecerimus, subinde recurrere ad indignissimarum calamitatum memoriam; non quia necesse est, *sed quia naturale est*, ut loquitur Seneca Consol. ad Helviam, cap. ult. *manum saepiùs ad id referre quod doleat*. Haec Wormius.[96]

[*y er*. 'A bow is pliable both in winter and in summer'. Eminently Cerialis (says) in Tacitus, *Historia*, bk 4, ch. 74, 'There will be vices as long as there are people'. Appropriately also Horace in *Satire* 7, bk 2 (ll. 6-8): 'A part of humanity unchangingly rejoices in vices, and sticks to that course of life; a great part fluctuates, sometimes engaging in virtues, sometimes guilty of wrongs'.

uant. 'Who is singed by fire is wont to be in pain'. The sense is that, when we have done everything, our miserable thoughts often revert to the memory of the most undeserving misfortunes; not because it is inevitable, 'but because it is natural', as Seneca says *To Helvia on Consolation*, final chapter (11.20.1), 'to bring back the hand more often to that which hurts'. Thus Worm.]

Clearly, these explications, meditations almost, are not explicit in Worm. The phrase 'thus Worm' (Haec Wormius) concludes not a more or less literal quotation of Worm's annotation, but rather an expression of its sense. Neither presented to outdo Worm or to better elucidate the moral for the reader, Junius's imperceptible re-reading, an intensification of Worm's already sensitive understanding, I suggest, reveals vivid and

imaginative engagement to be obvious and self-evident in their erudite practice. Here we witness Junius engaging with Worm's interpretation as sensitively as with the *Rune Poem*, as if the commonplaces Worm adduces to match the *Rune Poem*'s sense rouse Junius to think of yet other authorities, excerpts rather than commonplaces, which he may have looked up for a full quotation and source reference.

Junius's reference to Seneca, for instance, seems to reflect Worm's reading, 'where there is ailment, there is pain' (ubi morbus ibi dolor), in tandem with the commonplace it echoes, 'where there is love, there is pain' (ubi amor ibi dolor). Seneca writes to his mother Helvia from exile, and, John W. Basore explains, 'seeks to allay his mother's grief at the mishap that has befallen him'.[97] Seneca's words, in Basore's translation, comfort through sympathy:

> though you have done everything, your thoughts must necessarily revert at times to me, and it must be that under the circumstances no one of your children engages your mind so often--not that the others are less dear, but that it is natural to lay the hand more often on the part that hurts.[98]

In his annotation, Junius seems simply to represent Worm's reading, as if those words and sensibilities were Worm's already. And maybe in early modern perception they were: they both engage vividly; both seek the vitality of the *Rune Poem* words; both make the words present. Through thoughtful involvement of the scholars' imagination, the *Rune Poem* lines are made to 'move and affect' within and for the contemporary learned world--commonplaces are so trite, after all, they also have meaning for the present.

These thoughtful readings, moreover, appear in the very midst of the scholars' interpretive blanks about *Rune Poem* words and verses. Worm reads for enough of an impression that he can glimpse the verse's hidden sense: he works with what he understands, not with the many words that stay unaccounted for in his explications. Junius's reading is more literal and more analytical than Worm's, as it considers the sense of all the words in a line or a couplet. Repeatedly, Junius intimates that he fails to comprehend. His acknowledgements make the jolts between sensitive involvement and unknowns all the more palpable: '[A]lthough I will believe I see something in the first verse of this couplet, I honestly admit that I am simply blind in the second'.[99] He refers to '*kollum* (which I do not understand)'--neither did Worm, it seems, who passes over the word.[100] 'I do not sufficiently get the sense of the first verse, unless perhaps *lim* meant 'tree' for the ancient Cimbric people … To the understanding of the second verse it indeed somewhat pertains that *flard* is 'cunning, falsehood' in Icelandic; but I do not yet get the rest sufficiently'.[101] And, '[t]o the second verse pertains that *gull* in Icelandic is 'gold', *gulur*, 'gold-colored'. But I do not understand the rest'.[102] These acknowledgements indicate that scholars' sensitive engagement and what might appear the philological groundwork of finding and understanding the meaning of words in a text did not happen one *after* the other, but rather happened in tandem. It suggests that scholars' engaged visualization was intrinsic and integral to their erudite process.

Contemplation on what it means to be human is couched between the proverbial mists and thickets of time that block comprehension altogether. A reading that involves sensitive and poetic thinking as much as analysis--perhaps, a *humanist* reading--appears to be tacit and obvious throughout their erudite practice. Whether their interpretations are

impressionistic or literal and analytical, the scholars do not merely study Septentrional materials; they seek to be genuinely *moved* by them. That is what matters, unquestioned. It is thanks to Junius's thinking aloud that the process of erudition is easier to follow in his annotations than in the briefer annotations of Worm.

For the scholars, vivid engagement with the *Rune Poem* entails a reading that finds signification in adages. Their interpretations add a dimension not only to the *Rune Poem* verses, but also to their visualization of what the rune shapes represent--and vice versa. Their picturing of rune marks discussed above may have appeared a playful pastime; the *Rune Poem* readings suggest it is not facile. While ᚴ, the *k*-rune that stretches out its tittle to scratch its ulcer makes a memorable, perhaps whimsical, image, it gains depth when considered in tandem with Seneca's image of the hand reaching often to that which hurts. (John Robinson, bishop of London, turned the *Rune Poem* line for that jubilant, contemplating *m*-rune ᛘ into his personal motto, 'madr er moldur auki' [man is dust's increase], and had it inscribed in the wall of Oriel College, Oxford. 'We are dust and shadows', Worm added as explication ['Pulvis & umbra sumus', Horace, *Odes* 4.7.16].)[103]

The resonant space of interpretation is redolent with echoes, play and signification. It is in such a virtual, imaginative space that Junius's simple phrase 'thus Worm' for his imperceptible expanding and refining of Worm's already sensitive interpretation makes sense--and is valid. It is in such a space, if one wants to call it thus, that their sensitive reading and thinking can be mutually reflective, self-evident--indeed, shared and common. This must be the 'vast web of attracting and repelling forces, chained together by correspondences' and woven by a 'performative rhetoric' that Stafford has

characterized in her work on visual analogy.[104] This must be the pulsing, embodied realm of the learned Commonwealth's *otium*: a realm where Scaliger's epigram enacts intellectual engagement with 'Hyperborean' rhyme, and Junius's dictionary entry for 'Lopster' includes Langbaine's extended and witty account of his scholarly conversation with Gregory about the Anglo-Saxons' understanding of elephants and camels. This, too, must be the space where *energia*, that virtual meeting of the critic and of work's vigor, is situated. This, I aver, must be the conceptual space in which early modern erudition flourishes.

VI. Perspicuitas

Once we know what to look for, and how to look, intellectuals' erudite engagement manifests itself throughout Septentrional scholarship. It intertwines with different levels of scholars' analytical knowledge: from an initial 'foretaste' (*gustus*) of a text whose linguistic detail may hardly be understood, through to the commanding overview that speaks with superior judgement. Its practice shows itself active, not facile: it does not offer an easy track that can be followed as a matter of course, but neither does it permit wild speculation or fantasizing.

'The diction here is very ancient and rough (perantiquum & horridum), and requires the reader's candor and attentiveness (Lectoris candorem, & diligentiam)', Abraham Wheelocke notes.[105] Cambridge's university librarian, professor of Arabic and the first professor of Anglo-Saxon added the comment in his *editio princeps* of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (1643) for several annals that differ stylistically from the other

annals; today, these annals are known as the poems ‘The Battle of Brunanburh’, ‘The Capture of the Five Boroughs’, and ‘The Death of Edgar’. Where style is rough (*horridum*), it demands not only the reader’s diligence, but also their lucidity, perhaps their kindness, sincerity, openness, even ‘moral purity’--considering the senses of *candor* listed in Lewis and Short and the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*.[106]

A similar remark is made by the St Gall scholars Joachim Vadianus, Bartholomäus Schobinger, and Melchior Goldast in their appreciation of the Old High German Psalter of Notker of St Gall. As Bernhard Hertenstein has carefully collated, they observe that

> the foreign [or: outlandish] translation (Barbarica versio) of the Psalter has such a great difficulty of words, that it can only be comprehended and understood by an attentive and tarrying reader (attento et immorante lectore). That ancient tongue of the Franks and Alemanni used to be so harsh and gasping (dura … et anhelans), that it could be called foreign [or: outlandish] *par excellence* (‘κατ' ἐξοχὴν barbara’), as it were.[107]

Rather than turning away from the ‘harsh and gasping’, the scholars choose to tarry and bestow their attentiveness--a philologist’s adage. The challenge to make sense of what seems ‘foreign *par excellence*’ (or: unpolished, outlandish, barbaric) is delectable; its author Notker a reassurance that such attentiveness will be rewarding.

Thus, towards Vulcanius, Goldast presents Notker’s Psalter not as ‘harsh and gasping’, but as ‘a most ancient and most elegant (uetustissimum et elegantissimum)

book written in our tongue (linguae nostrae)'. He adds a transcription of Notker's entire psalm 134, 'the first to offer itself where I opened the book', assuring Vulcanius that in it, there are 'other more elegant ones' (alios esse elegantiores).[108] Without commentary, explication or annotation, Goldast's Old High German psalm transcription serves as a foretaste or sample (*gustus*) to savor and whet one's appetite--just as Vulcanius offered most of the Septentrional samples as *gustus* in *Literis getarum,* as Toon Van Hal has noted.[109] However rudimentary their understanding of linguistic particularities, scholars may engage with the vigor of such samples directly. As Kees Dekker has remarked about Vulcanius, editor of the runic materials Scaliger forwarded to him: 'his knowledge of runes was only skin deep'.[110] Pleasure is in the promise the *gustus* holds, both of intellectual riches, and of a scholar's opportunity for refining their judgement. Goldast's presenting Notker's 'harsh and gasping' words as 'elegant' towards Vulcanius thus showcases his power of discrimination: it takes refinement, after all, to see the rough as a Septentrional diamond.

A humanist's assertion that Septentrional text compares with the Classics, therefore, does not just mean that it compares with the Classics. It means, also, that it ranges among *bonae litterae*; it means that Septentrional words move the humanist's cultured, sensitive self. 'This description of divine works is perspicuous (luculenta)', the Danzig poet-scholar Martin Opitz enthuses in his *editio princeps* of the *Annolied* (1639) about the passage that includes the 'delightful' excerpt adduced above in the version of Vulcanius's *Literis getarum*; 'it deservedly must be compared to similar passages of Greek and Latin poets. Especially pertaining to this is Meter 6 of book 4 of Boethius's

Consolation of Philosophy'.[111] Opitz adds his comment at the phrase 'mit wunnen' (with joy), here in R. Graeme Dunphy's edition and translation of *Opitz's Anno*:

> Den Manen vnten sunnen die gebin ire liht mit wunnen: Die sterrin bihaltent ire vart, Si geberent vrost vnte hizze so starc: Daz fuir havit ufwert sinin zug; Dunnir unte wint irin vlug. Di wolken dragint den reginguz: Nidir wendint wazzer irin vluz: Mit blümin cierint sich diu lant: Mit loube dekkit sich der walt: Daz wilt havit den sinin ganc: Scone ist der vügilsanc.[112]
>
> [the moon and the sun, / they emit their light with joy; / the stars maintain their courses, / bringing extremes of frost and heat; / fire draws upwards, / thunder and wind have their flight; / the clouds bear the showers of rain / and the waters pour downwards; / the fields adorn themselves with flowers, / the forest is covered with foliage; / the beasts live according to their kind / and the song of the birds is beautiful.]

Such descriptions of divine works, of which Boethius's Meter, too, is a fine example, also appear in contemporary literary efforts at lifelikeness: it is with a similar description, for instance, that Junius chose to open his ekphrastic demonstration of the vividness the painter and art lover seek by nurturing their imagination, as referenced above:

> They doe marke the wide heaven beset with an endlesse number of bright and glorious starres; the watery clouds of severall colours, together with the miraculously painted raine-bow; … the unaccessable height of the mountaines, …

> pleasant arbors and long rows of lofty trees, clad with summers pride, … the beames of the Sunne here and there breaking through the thickest boughes, … rich meadowes; divers flowers shining as earthly starres; fountaines gushing forth out of a main rock … Lions, horses, eagles, snakes …[113]

Opitz was not just a poet, but a 'master' poet, so to speak. In Dunphy's appreciation, Opitz was 'that most significant of all German baroque poets and poetic theoreticians'.[114] We may assume that he read with a finely tuned poetic heart and mind, with a poet's ear and eye sensitive to words' perspicuity. The *Annolied*'s passage *touched* the poet-scholar.

In line with the rationale voiced in Junius's art theory, the intellectual thus aims to reach for perspicuity through refinement of the power of imagination. As suggested by Wheelocke's and the St Gall scholars' remarks, the process of cultivation ('erudition' in its literal sense) involves scholars and materials alike. The scholar's refining their Septentrional discrimination goes in tandem with the 'refinement' of materials that appear rough, yet promise riches. Junius describes the process rather precisely in the letter with which he dedicated his and Marshall's *editio princeps* of the Gothic Gospels to the Swedish Chancellor Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie.[115] 'A sorrowful shipwreck', Junius recalls how the *Codex argenteus* had come to his hands: 'the noble document of most manifest renown appeared to be nowhere complete, and the Book had gone missing in the book consumed by age in many places, tainted by moisture, once torn into pieces and misarranged, maimed and ugly because of unskilled gathering of the scattered and dispersed sheets'.[116] As the Gothic Gospels became more and more tidied by caring scholarly gestures, the philologist found more and more exacting understanding of the

Gothic--known until then only from briefer samples (*gustus*) circulating in the learned world. Junius elaborates:

> [F]irst from a closer look (propiore intuitu), and soon from a more distant view (prospectu remotiore), finally from a commanding survey (circumspectu) of everything, I have discovered (comperi) that the Goths did not lack any enlightenment (lumen), any flower of speech; thus a natural and by no means beautified brilliance (nitor) flashes forth rather intensely in the almost amplified style of the whole Gospel narration, while the great matters have been seriously and elegantly illuminated by an admirable splendor (splendor) of the choicest words, and proper weight (pondus) of authority and grandeur according with the venerable Book has been observed everywhere'.[117]

The approach Junius describes here closely resembles the process of imagination the expert viewer bestows on a master's painting to reach for its perspicuity. As Junius theorized in his art treatises, as we saw, discerning art lovers will explore a master's work with thoughtful attention for all its telling details, visualizing everything with 'learned eyes' that see, hear, touch, taste, and feel. Taking in detail by detail ('propiore intuitu'), they gradually widen their scope of the scene ('prospectu remotiore'); only then will they finally gain masterful, discriminate understanding ('circumspectu') of the whole drama represented.[118]

From today's more analytical, perhaps positivist, perspective on the history of linguistics, conversely, the studious approach thus detailed by Junius to de la Gardie has

instead appeared indicative of new empiricist methodology. Junius's step-by-step investigative approach--from detail through to overview--, his insistence on working with the materials that are there to be seen, and his emphasis on words, Kees Dekker has argued, seem to reveal, specifically, a Baconian process of inductive reasoning.[119] Dekker explains:

> [Junius] started with the smallest detail, the *alphabetum Gothicum*, and continued by making an inventory of the words [i.e., the *Gothicum glossarium*]. He then concentrated fully on the meaning of the words, and on cognate words from related languages. Junius dissected Gothic and also other Old Germanic languages into parts, and desisted from making any further generalizations until he had come to grips with the meaning of every single part.[120]

The empirical investigation of language based on what can be established first from individual letters, then from words and their cognates, yields solid, indeed scientific, linguistic knowledge that contributes to a philosophical understanding of words as names of things.[121] Junius's verb choice in his explanation to de la Gardie, 'comperi', accords with such an empiricist, evidential attitude: *comperire* means 'to find out [facts] by investigation, learn, discover, ascertain. To learn [a fact] by experience, to find, prove, establish, verify'.[122]

However, notwithstanding its rigor, empiricist practice does not include all--nor does it capture fully the process described by Junius. Methodical scrutiny of linguistic detail is indispensable for pertinent, authoritative discrimination. But it is the actuality of

scholars' participation in *energia*, that virtual meeting of philologist and the vivacity of words through the power of imagination, that will tell of Gothic perspicuity, be dazzled by its splendor, and see brilliance dashing forth from the words. 'The imagination', Francis Wilson suggests in his consideration of the poetry of Francis Bacon's thinking, 'comes to stand for mankind's own small share of 'the Divine', representing our passport into the realm of the mysterious, where … the most profound forms of knowledge are communicated'.[123]

The difference between these interpretations of Junius's studious approach suggests that we may overlook what early modern scholars saw; we have accustomed ourselves to looking with different eyes. In 1926, G.W.S. Friedrichsen extolled the Gothic Gospels in words resembling Junius's, highlighting 'the brilliant originality of his [i.e., Wulfilian] renderings, and the boldness of interpretation that lights up the pages of his book with the vividness of the Gothic imagination'.[124] For the past decades, however, we have focused on the *Codex argenteus* for its East Germanic linguistic detail, its version of the New Testament, and its provenance and codicology.[125] But we have forgotten to read Gothic poetically. Unaware of having limited our scholarly gaze to the analyzable, we may fail to see the vivacity earlier scholars experienced. Without 'learned eyes', moreover, we may miss the scholar's active participation in the perspicuity of the materials they studied, and their involvement in the process of signification: the early modern cultivation of erudition meant reaching refined, pertinent judgement through more and more intense visualization and involvement, rather than through a more and more distanced gaze.

Tarrying at the rough, with attentiveness, candor, and vivid engagement, scholars reached for the vivacity of Septentrional materials, cultivating them as much as getting cultivated in the process. The learned community engaged with Septentrional words in an erudite space of advanced knowledge, detailed investigation, the pleasure of foretastes (*gustus*), and the sensation of splendor that addresses genuine sensibilities as they are felt and lived in the real-life world. In accordance with Scaliger's epigram, the Latin nation thus developed true Ovidian intellect and judgement. After all, Ovid, or Ovid's poetic persona, came to embrace that foreign Getic in his poetry with, Christoph Pieper states, 'renewed, yet adapted poetic vigor'.[126] In a long poem that dedicates Junius's Gothic dictionary to de la Gardie, its author, the philologist and lawyer Janus Vlitius, at some point even addresses Ovid to daringly suggest that, if his Getic verse still existed, his *Tristia* would hardly have been prized so highly.[127]

VII. Lucubratiuncula

In this essay, I have explored how to read the learned Commonwealth's erudition for its liveliness. To do so, I have treated Septentrional philology, humanist erudition in the literatures, and words of the Germanic past, not as a history of early modern scholarship--one that narrates the amassing and expanding of knowledge; that identifies scholars' contributions to the development of a discipline; that evaluates the scholarly relations by which knowledge travelled; or that elicits the programmatic aims for their undertaking these studies. Rather, I have sought to perceive Septentrional erudition by way of scholars' reading for perspicuity. That is why I have focused on scholars' sensitive

engagement, playfulness, blending of analytical and poetic thinking, and the force of visualization.

Early modern erudition, as evoked in the examples adduced here, pulsed in a conceptual space engendered by analytical, as much as poetic thinking. The erudite practice of imagination (*phantasia*) that reaches for virtual presence through refined discrimination, as elucidated in the art theory Junius drew from classical rhetoric, has proved to be, also, scholars' obvious practice in Septentrional philology. Their erudition was not in scholarship of facts, but rather in engagement with signification. Excellence in scholarship, therefore, was characterized not by critical distance, but by the intellectual's sensitive, sophisticated participation in the vigor of the words and the materials they studied. The more obscure the materials, moreover, the more they encouraged the power of visualization--which includes aural imagination and other senses and sensibilities, as we have seen. As such, lively erudition was tacit *throughout* scholars' practice, whether scholarly knowledge was detailed and advanced or remained gestural and patchy.

The liveliness of scholars' engagement with materials prompts us, in turn, to conceive of early modern erudition as thriving in a reflective, wide-ranging yet not boundless realm. To do justice to erudition's vivacity in our research on theirs we need an open, inclusive perspective that probes, besides knowledge and analytical thinking, also visualization, the scholars' desire for vivid engagement, and the imaginative space of the learned Commonwealth's *otium*. We must conceive of early modern erudition inclusively: so inclusively that it accommodates, also and unproblematically, the rune ᚠ stretching its arm to scratch its ulcer, the foretastes and pleasure of Vulcanius's anthology, the candor and care which Wheelocke and Goldast bestow as well as recommend,

Scaliger's Latin rhyming 'Hyperboreally', brilliance flashing from the Gothic, and a witty riddle contest of two early modern scholars turned Vergilian shepherds in a dictionary entry. We must conceive of erudition's vividness as energizing and engendering early modern intellectual practice. Probably, this means we must not only pursue research into early modern erudition, but do so eruditely.

Perhaps Septentrional philology invited scholars to engage playfully, vividly and sensitively, as the field was so novel and 'in the making', not yet directed by generations of discipline-specific learning, and addressing facets of the scholar's everyday, local self that otherwise were not part of scholarship. Junius made the erudition of Langbaine's letter an integral part of the entry 'Lopster, *lobster*' in his *Etymologicum anglicanum*, as we saw. Yet perhaps Septentrional erudition merely seems lively, because we look at other early modern scholarly fields with different eyes, and have come to ask them different questions. Erudite playfulness, the excitement of intellectual challenges, and a scholar moved by words in ways that do not fit parameters and paradigms are hardly particular to the study of Septentrional materials. As Lorraine Daston and Glenn Most advise that '[f]or millennia, to be learned was ... displayed in prodigious feats not only of memory and erudition but also of perspicacity and analytic acuity', it will be a task of the history of learned practices they propose as a commonality between history of science and history of philologies to speak inclusively from erudition's vividness.[128]

Let it be a desired, ongoing challenge in our study of early modern erudition and the Republic of Letters to explore how to read eruditely. To do so likely means that we seek to come to meet their vivacity some way, to some extent, and to find out how not only to make reference to scholars' engaged visualization--poetic thinking, (serious)

play--but also how to bring it to life in our scholarship on theirs.[129] For life wants to be represented as life, by life. To engage with early modern erudition this way asks for the same 'courtesy', 'tact' and 'welcome' which George Steiner has advocated for our engaging with words from another place or time, much like the recommendations of Wheelocke and the St Gall scholars.[130] 'The issue is that of civility', Steiner writes:

> The informing agency is that of *tact*, of the ways in which we allow ourselves to touch or not to touch, to be touched or not to be touched by the presence of the other … What we must focus, with uncompromising clarity, on the text, on the work of art, on the music before us, is an ethic of common sense, a courtesy of the most robust and refined sort.[131]

We will want to contemplate early modern erudition so vividly--considerately, attentively, sensitively, perspicuously--as if we are present in the conceptual space that produced it. Like any encounter, to do so is performative, a reading on the verge, one ready to forego the comfort that can be in data analysis and narrative histories. 'All touch traverses the boundary between interiority and externality and reciprocally returns to the agent of touching', Susan Stewart reminds us in her reflections on poetry and the senses: 'Touch, like dizziness, is a threshold activity--subjectivity and objectivity come quite close to each other'.[132] This essay, then, is a call for expressing erudition's life in our scholarship on early modern scholarship, on the understanding that early modern intellectuals practiced their erudition not for the purpose of our research, but in the lively space of the learned Commonwealth.

[1] s.van.romburgh@hum.leidenuniv.nl

[2] I thank Christoph Pieper for reviewing my translation and scansion of Scaliger's epigram, and for his suggestions, and I thank Kees Dekker for reading a draft of this essay. I thank *ERL*'s two anonymous reviewers, and the editors, for their valuable critique and suggestions. This essay results from research done in the wake of my project 'Renaissance Ideas and Early Germanic Literature: Interconnections between Germanic Studies and Humanist Scholarship and Ideology', funded by The Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research, 2003-2007.

[3] 'improbum ausum, verum ita subtili computatione comprehensum, ut pudeat non credere', Franciscus Junius, *Etymologicum anglicanum*, ed. Edward Lye (Oxford: E Theatro Sheldoniano, 1743), s.v. 'Lopster, *lobster*'; Pliny, *Natural History* 2.108.248. Unless noted otherwise, translations are my own.

[4] For text and commentary on Langbaine and Junius's exchange, I refer to my *'For My Worthy Freind Mr Franciscus Junius'. An Edition of the Correspondence of Francis Junius F.F. (1591-1677)* (Leiden and Boston, 2004), 198g. Reference is to letter number. I also discussed their exchange in 'Reciprocal Bonds between Words and Friends, or Correspondence according to Francis Junius', lecture, 'Cultures of Knowledge' seminar, History Faculty, University of Oxford, 26 May 2011, http://cofk.history.ox.ac.uk/events/seminars-2010-11/#vanromburgh (accessed 16 April 2018).

[5] Martial, *Epigrammata* 6.19.9; 'Sed audio te, Juni, dudum inclamantem, Jam dic, Pontice, de tribus capellis. Quid hæc ad *lopsteras*, ad locustas, ad cicadas?' Junius, *Etymologicum*, s.v. 'Lopster, *lobster*'.

[6] Ibid.; A.J. Hegarty, 'Langbaine, Gerard (1608/9-1658)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16006 (accessed 11 March 2016).

[7] Vergil, *Eclogues* 3.107; Junius, *Etymologicum*, s.v. 'Lopster, *lobster*'; van Romburgh, *Worthy Freind*, 198g.

[8] Cf. my 'How to Make the Past Age Present: Some of Ole Worm's and Francis Junius' Humanist Efforts', in *Mittelalterphilologien heute. Eine Standortbestimmung. Band 1: Die germanischen Philologien*, ed. Alessandra Molinari, with Michael Dallapiazza (Würzburg, 2016), 157-172.

[9] Adrian Marino, *The Biography of 'The idea of Literature'. From Antiquity to the Baroque* (Albany, NY, 1996), 84ff., esp. 168, 170.

[10] Dirk van Miert, 'The Limits of Transconfessional Contact in the Republic of Letters: Joseph Scaliger, Isaac Casaubon and their Catholic Correspondents', in *Between Scylla and Charybdis. Learned Letter Writers Navigating the Reefs of Religious and Political Controversy in Early Modern Europe*, eds. Jeanine De Landtsheer and Henk J.M. Nellen (Leiden and Boston, 2011), 367-408, at 369-370, also for further references; van Romburgh, 'Past Age Present'.

[11] van Miert, 'Limits of Transconfessional Contact', 370.

[12] Selected studies, also for further references: Kees Dekker, *The Origins of Old Germanic Studies in the Low Countries* (Leiden, Boston and Cologne, 1999); *The Recovery of Old English. Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed. Timothy Graham (Kalamazoo, MI, 2000); Richard L. Harris, *A Chorus of Grammars: The Correspondence of George Hickes, and his Collaborators on the* Thesaurus linguarum septentrionalium (Toronto, 1992); John D. Niles, *The Idea of Anglo-Saxon England 1066-1901: Remembering, Forgetting, Deciphering, and Renewing the Past* (Chichester, 2015); Toon Van Hal, *'Moedertalen en taalmoeders': het vroegmoderne taalvergelijkende onderzoek in de Lage Landen* (Brussels, 2010); 'Humanist Discoveries of the Scandinavian Past', eds. Sophie van Romburgh and Karen Skovgaard-Petersen, *Renaessanceforum* 5 (2008), www.renaessanceforum.dk/rf_5_2008.htm (accessed 13 April 2016); R. Graeme Dunphy, ed., *Opitz's Anno: The Middle High German Annolied in the 1639 Edition of Martin Opitz* (Glasgow, 2003).

[13] George Steiner, *The Poetry of Thought. From Hellenism to Celan* (New York, 2011), 64, 28.

[14] Frédérique Aït-Touati, *Fictions of the Cosmos. Science and Literature in the Seventeenth Century*, trans. Susan Emanuel (Chicago and London, 2011), 198, 2.

[15] Seth Lerer, 'Sublime Philology: An Elegy for Anglo-Saxon Studies', in *Error and the Academic Self. The Scholarly Imagination, Medieval to Modern* (New York and Chichester, 2002), 55-101, at 56.

[16] Ibid., 57.

[17] Barbara Maria Stafford, *Visual Analogy. Consciousness as the Art of Connecting* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1999), 61.

[18] Ibid., 10.

[19] Ibid., 11.

[20] This essay continues my consideration of early modern philologists' efforts to make the ancient materials present, as adumbrated in my 'Past Age Present'.

[21] 'Ouidius … apud Getas multos annos in exilio vixit, linguamque eorum ita calluit vt Geticè etiam quædam à se scripta testetur', Bonaventura Vulcanius, *De literis & lingua Getarvm, siue Gothorvm* … (Leiden: ex officina Plantiniana, apud Franciscum Raphelengium, 1597), *3v. On Vulcanius's *Literis getarum*, see Toon Van Hal, 'Vulcanius and his network of language lovers. *De literis et lingua Getarum sive Gothorum* (1597)', in *Bonaventura Vulcanius, Works and Networks, Bruges 1538-Leiden 1614*, ed. Hélène Cazes (Leiden and Boston, 2010), 387-401; Kees Dekker, 'The Runes in Bonaventura Vulcanius *De literis & lingua Getarum sive Gothorum* (1597): Provenance and Origins', in *Bonaventura Vulcanius*, ed. Cazes, 411-449.

[22] Ovid, *Ex Ponto* 4.13.18, 4.13.19-20.

[23] Vulcanius, *Literis getarum*, *1v. Cf. Joseph Justus Scaliger, *Poemata omnia, ex museio Petri Scriverii* ([Leiden]: ex officina Plantiniana Raphelengii, 1615), 51; *Iosephi Scaligeri Iul. Caes. F. Poemata omnia, ex museio Petri Scriverii. [Leiden], Ex Officina Plantiniana Raphelengii, MDCXV*, ed. Jan Bloemendal, http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/Dutch/Latijn/JJScaliger.html (accessed 24 March 2016).

[24] Vulcanius, *Literis getarum*, 43-47.

[25] Dekker, 'Provenance and Origins', esp. 422-433.

[26] Cf. Paul Botley and Dirk van Miert, eds., *The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, vol. 2 (Geneva, 2012), 575 n.

[27] Van Hal, 'Vulcanius and Language Lovers', 394; Kees Dekker, '*Hinc Gothus exorti, nos quoque Belga sumus*. A Gothic Imaginary in a Dutch Perspective', in *Scholarly Environments. Centers of Learning and Institutional Contexts, 1560-1960*, eds. Alasdair A. MacDonald and Arend H. Huussen (Leuven, Paris, and Dudley, MA, 2004), 75-91, at 81-82.

[28] Ann Moss, *Renaissance Truth and the Latin Language Turn* (Oxford, 2004), 36, 39, translation Ann Moss.

[29] Ibid., 41.

[30] Ibid., 2, 43.

[31] Magnús Snædal, 'The 'Vandal' Epigram', *Filologia Germanica-Germanic Philology* 1 (2009), 181-215.

[32] Vulcanius, *Literis getarum*, 4; Ovid, *Tristia* 3.9.1-2.

[33] Cf. T.V.F. Brogan, 'Leonine Rhyme, Verse', in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, eds. Roland Greene, Stephen Cushman, et al., 4th ed. (Princeton and Oxford, 2012), 796.

[34] 'hodierni Iudaici versus sunt plane rythmi nostri vulgares ὁμοιόπτωτοι καὶ ὁμοιοτέλευτοι: quod a nobis Christianis ante annos D plus minus didicerunt, nos autem ex Leoninis Hexametris quae vocant, eos effinximus', Joseph Justus Scaliger, *Animadversiones in chronologica Eusebii. In prologum Hieronymi*, in *idem, Thesaurus temporum* (Leiden: Thomas Basson, 1606), 7.

[35] Vulcanius, *Literis getarum*, 57-61. For Vulcanius's Williram, see Willy Sanders, ed., Willerammi Eberspergensis abbatis in Canticis Canticorum*: die Leidener Handschrift* (Münich, 1971), 76-82.

[36] Vulcanius, *Literis getarum*, 58.

[37] 'iocunda varietate compositos', ibid., 57-58; 'exigua sit (prout illius aetatis ἀφέλεια ferebat) elegantia atque concinnitas', ibid., 59.

[38] Ibid., 60.

[39] Brogan, 'Leonine Rhyme'.

[40] Translation Francis P. Magoun, Jr, 'Otfrid's Ad Liutbertum', *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 58 (1943), 869-890, at 882-883; 'scema omoeoteleuton assidue quaerit. Aptam enim in hac lectione & priori decentem & consimilem quaerunt uerba in fine sonoritatem', Otfrid, 'Ad Liutbertum', in *Otfridi evangeliorum liber: veterum Germanorum grammaticae, poeseos, theologiae, praeclarum monimentum* … , ed. Matthias Flacius Illyricus (Basle: n.p., 1571), 5-6. Cf. Walter Haug, *Vernacular Literary Theory in the Middle Ages. The German Tradition, 800-1300, in its European Context*, trans. Joanna M. Catling (Cambridge, etc., 1997), 29-42.

[41] 'ueterum Germanorum grammaticae, poeseos, theologiae, praeclarum monimentum', Flacius Illyricus, *Otfridi evangeliorum liber*, title page; cf. Norbert Kössinger, *Otfrids 'Evangelienbuch' in der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen, 2009), 132-161.

[42] 'Habet ipsum Opus elegantissimam praefationem, cuius hoc est initium, nulla litera mutata, … Qui Germanicè callet, satis intelligit ista uerba', Rhenanus, *Rerum germanicarum*, quoted in Flacius Illyricus, *Otfridi evangeliorum liber*, γ6r.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Vulcanius, *Literis getarum*, 61-65, at 63.

[45] Ibid., 62.

[46] MacDonald Stearns, Jr, *Crimean Gothic: Analysis and Etymology of the Corpus* (Saratoga, CA, 1978), esp. 9-15, 21-26, 41-86, 121-124.

[47] 'Quinetiam cantilenam eius linguæ recitabat, cuius initium erat huiusmodi', Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq, *Legationis Tvrcicæ Epistolæ quatuor: qvarvm Priores Dvae ante aliquot annos in lucem prodierunt sub nomine Itinerum Constantinopolitani & Amasiani. Adiectæ Svnt Dvæ Alteræ. Eiusdem de re militari contra Turcam instituenda consilium* (Paris: apud Aegidvm Beys, 1589), 136v; cf. Stearns, *Crimean Gothic*, 12, plate V.

[48] Vulcanius, *Literis getarum*, 49-53, at 53.

[49] Stearns, *Crimean Gothic*, 121-124, and at 121.

[50] Roger Ascham, *The scholemaster or plaine and perfite way of teachyng children, to vnderstand, write, and speake, the Latin tong* … (London: John Daye, 1570), 60; cf. Derek Attridge, *Well-Weighed Syllables. Elizabethan verse in classical metres* (Cambridge, etc., 1974), 93.

[51] Ibid., 92.

[52] Ibid., 89.

[53] Ole Worm, ᚱᚢᚾᚨᚱ *seu Danica literatura antiquissima, vulgo Gothica dicta cui accessit de prisca Danorum poesi dissertatio* (Amsterdam: Johannes Janssonius, 1636 / Copenhagen: M. Martzan, 1636), 92-97; Franciscus Junius, 'Alphabetum runicum', in *idem* and Thomas Marshall, … *[G]lossarium Gothicum, cui praemittitur alphabetum*

Gothicum, Runicum etc., opera eiusdem Francisci Iunii (Dordrecht: typis et sumptibus Iunianis, Henricus and Joannes Essaeus, 1665), 17-29.

[54] Bonaventure Corneille Bertram, *Comparatio grammaticae Hebraicae & Aramicae, atque adeò dialectorum Aramicarum inter se: concinnata ex Hebraicis Antonii Ceuallerii praeceptionibus, Aramicísque doctorum aliorum virorum obseruationibus: quibus & quamplurimae aliae in utraque lingua adjectae sunt* … (Geneva: Eustache Vignon, 1574), 1-3. 'lineae rectae fundamentales, rem ipsam & subjectum repraesentarent; laterales vero ejus partes aut accidentia, quibus sensus ut plurimum movere & afficere solet', Worm, *Danica literatura*, 96.

[55] '*ᛦ. Aar*. Ubertam agrorum & annonæ bonitatem notat, hinc vomeris pingitur figura. Nam benè exaratis & elaboratis agris, illa provenire solet', ibid., 95.

[56] 'Hinc litera præ se fert figuram Vomeris; quòd annonæ ubertatem præcipuè debeamus Vomeri, ob multiplicem frugem agrorum ritè cultorum ac proscissorum', Junius, 'Alphabetum runicum', 22.

[57] 'ᛒ. *Biarkan*, Betulam foliorum laeta amplitudine & viriditate se diffundentem', Worm, *Danica literatura*, 95.

[58] '*Biarkan* est Betula. Litera quoque adumbrat betulam laetissima foliorum amplitudine ac latitudine diffusam', Junius, 'Alphabetum runicum', 22.

[59] 'Ulcus autem seu prutiginem denotat, qvod & brachio ad scalpendum extenso indicat', Worm, *Danica literatura*, 94.

[60] '*Kaun* est *Ulcus* vel *Prurigo*; proinde quoque brachio ad scapendum veluti elato exertóque exprimitur litera Pruriginem significans', Junius, 'Alphabetum runicum', 22.

[61] 'primis harum inventoribus non tam fuisse propositum ut speciem artis Pictoriæ in earum delineatione præberent, quàm ut nudas tantùm primorum elementorum Figuras, crassas quidem, ipsis tamen Nominibus congruas, perfunctoriè describerent ac priscâ incultioris ævi simplicitate veluti adumbrarent; quò rudis ac vaga discentium Phantasia, qualiscunque similitudinis adminiculo subnixa, firmius fideliusque memoriæ traderet prima Literarum elementa vulgo notæ rei similitudine conspicua, præcipuè tamen rei ipso Elementi nomine significatæ. Quod quàm benè prudentérque olim excogitaverint homines cauti atque altâ præter cæteros mente prædíti, nemo non videt', ibid., 21.

[62] For Junius's art treatises, see Keith Aldrich, Philipp Fehl and Raina Fehl, eds., *Franciscus Junius. The Literature of Classical Art, 1: The Painting of the Ancients.* De Pictura veterum *according to the English translation (1638)* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford, 1991); Colette Nativel, ed. and trans., *Franciscus Junius.* De pictura veterum*. Edition du livre I* (Geneva, 1996); Thijs Weststeijn, *Art and Antiquity in the Netherlands and Britain: The Vernacular Arcadia of Franciscus Junius (1591-1677)* (Leiden and Boston, 2015).

[63] Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl, *Junius. Painting*, 405.

[64] Weststeijn, *Art and Antiquity*, 272.

[65] Ibid.

[66] Junius, *Painting*, I.iv.6 (Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl, *Junius. Painting*, 58); Weststeijn, *Art and Antiquity*, 293.

[67] Junius, *Painting*, I.v.3 (Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl, *Junius. Painting*, 64-65).

[68] Ibid. (Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl, 66); Cicero, *Paradoxa Stoicorum* 5.38.

[69] Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl, *Junius. Painting*, 376, 388-391.

[70] Weststeijn, *Art and Antiquity*, 270-271.

[71] Ibid., 175-181.

[72] Worm, *Danica literatura*, 94; Vulcanius, *Literis getarum*, 14, 110.

[73] 'Quis igitur in reliqvis majorum nostrorum non admiraretur prudentiam, cum in re tam exigui momenti adeò fuerint accurati', Worm, *Danica literatura*, 94.

[74] 'ᛚ. *Laugr*. Liqvorem aut rivum aqvarum ex montis cacumine delabentem', ibid., 95.

[75] 'Liquor sponte e praeruptis ruit', ibid., 112.

[76] 'ᛚ. *Laugr* est Liquor. Litera quoque repraesentat Liquorem à montis vertice delabentem', Junius, 'Alphabetum runicum', 22.

[77] 'ᚾ. *Naud*. quod jam *Nód* effertur, necessitatis naturam, quae fulcro qvo sustentetur indiget, exprimit', Worm, *Danica literatura*, 94.

[78] 'Cogit penuria nere', ibid., 111.

[79] 'ᚾ. *Naud* est Necessitas. Minimè ergo mirandum est quòd antiqui ipsâ literae hujus delineatione studuerunt exprimere veram Necessitatis naturam; quòd ea nimirum fulcro, quo sustentetur, indigeat', Junius, 'Alphabetum runicum', 22.

[80] While Worm and Junius's rune fonts can for the most part be represented by the Gullskoen digital rune font, their *n*-rune ᚾ, whose 'stick' reaches to the 'ground', mirroring ᛦ, is best represented by a *c*-rune in the Gullhornet digital rune font; Gullskoen's *n*-rune has a shorter tittle, ᚿ.

[81] Weststeijn, *Art and Antiquity*, 272; Worm, *Danica literatura*, 96, cf. above.

[82] Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl, *Junius. Painting*, 405, cf. above.

[83] 'ᛘ *Madur*. Virum extensis ad coelum bracchiis astrorum miracula contemplantem', Worm, *Danica literatura*, 95.

[84] 'ᛘ. *Madur* est Homo. Exprimit ergo litera Hominem statos astrorum cursus recursúsque contemplantem, ac tantae rei miraculum, protensis ad coelum manibus, cum quâdam veluti jubilatione prosequentem', Junius, 'Alphabetum runicum', 23.

[85] Junius, *Painting*, I.v.2 (Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl, 61).

[86] Worm, *Danica literatura*, 104-13; Junius, 'Alphabetum runicum', 23-29.

[87] Margaret Clunies Ross, 'The Anglo-Saxon and Norse Rune Poems: a Comparative Study', *Anglo-Saxon England* 19 (1990), 23-39, at 31.

[88] Worm, *Danica literatura*, 108; 'praeter id quod verba exhibent reconditum quid in unoquoquè latet versu ad vitam communem spectans, quod accuratius non verba solum, sed & sensum trutinanti sponte se ingerit', ibid., 107. Cf. Sophie van Romburgh, 'Septentrional Emblematics: An Early Modern Play on Runes', in *Living in Posterity. Essays in Honour of Bart Westerweel*, eds. Jan Frans van Dijkhuizen, Paul Hoftijzer, Juliëtte Roding and Paul Smith (Hilversum, 2004), 221-228, and idem, 'Past Age Present'.

[89] Worm, *Danica literatura*, 109. Nowadays, the distich is read and translated, as by Maureen Halsall: 'óss er flestra færða / fǫr, en skalpr er sværða' (river mouth is the way of most journeys; but a scabbard is of swords), Maureen Halsall, *The Old English Rune Poem: A Critical Edition* (Toronto, 1982), 182.

[90] 'Ut in maris sinubus & fluminum ostiis, ob portus commoditatem frequentissimus est navium receptus, cum tamen ibidem saepissimè vel a pyratis latitantibus opprimantur, vel in scopulos & promontoria impingant, non sine naufragii periculo: ita in eo vitae genere, cui se pars maxima addixit, pericula crebriora', Worm, *Danica literatura*, 109.

[91] Ibid., 110.

[92] 'Sic Wormius. Fortassè tamen talis est sensus distichi; Naves in tutâ portuum statione consistunt, at in vaginâ gladius', Junius, 'Alphabetum runicum', 25.

[93] Worm, *Danica literatura*, 107. I omit the version in runes here.

[94] Halsall, *Rune Poem*, 183.

[95] Worm, *Danica literatura*, 113.

[96] Junius, 'Alphabetum runicum', 29.

[97] Seneca the Younger, *Moral Essays*, trans. John W. Basore, 3 vols. (London and Cambridge, MA, 1928, 1932, 1935), 2:417 n. *a*.

[98] Ibid., 487.

[99] 'licet aliquid in primo hujus distichi versu videre me putabo; ingenuè tamen fatebor me in secundo planè caecutire', couplet for ᚴ (*k*), Junius, 'Alphabetum runicum', 26.

[100] '*kollum* (quod non intelligo)', couplet for ᛁ (*i*), ibid.

[101] 'Ego non satis capio mentem versus primi, nisi fortè *lim* Cimbris vetustioribus denotaverit Arborem. … Ad secundi versus intellectum nonnihil quidem facit quòd *flard* Islandis est Versutia, falsitas; reliqua tamen necdum satis capio', couplet for ᛒ (*b*), ibid., 28.

[102] 'Ad secundum versum pertinet quòd *gull* Islandis est Aurum. *gulur*, Fulvus. Sed reliqua non intelligo', couplet for ᛚ (*l*), ibid., 29.

[103] James Ingram, ed., 'Oriel College', in *Memorials of Oxford*, vol. 1 (London: Charles Tilt, 1837), 14; Worm, *Danica literatura*, 113.

[104] Stafford, *Visual Analogy*, 11; cf. above.

[105] 'Idioma hîc … perantiquum & horridum, Lectoris candorem, & diligentiam desiderat', Wheelocke, *Saxoniam chronologiam*, 555; cf. Danielle Cunniff Plumer, 'The Construction of Structure in the Earliest Editions of Old English Poetry', in *Recovery*, ed. Graham, 243-279, at 254; Michael Murphy and Edward Barrett, 'Abraham Wheelock, Arabist and Saxonist', *Biography* 8 (1985), 163-185, at 183-184 n. 38; Niles, *Idea*, 116.

[106] *A Latin Dictionary. Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Dictionary, Revised, Enlarged, and in Great Part Rewritten*, ed. Charlton T. Lewis (1879, 3rd reprint, Oxford, etc., 1993), s.v.; *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P.G.W. Glare (Oxford, etc., 1982), s.v.

[107] Bernhard Hertenstein, *Joachim von Watt (Vadianus), Bartholomäus Schobinger, Melchior Goldast: die Beschäftigung mit dem Althochdeutschen von St. Gallen in Humanismus und Frühbarock* (Berlin, etc., 1975), 196, 202, 203, 217, 220. 'Barbarica versio Psalterii cujus tanta verborum difficultas, ut nonnisi ab attento et immorante lectore accipi et intelligi queat. Tam dura olim et anhelans erat vetus illa Francorum et Alamannorum lingua, ut etiam quasi 'κατ' ἐξοχὴν barbara' nuncuparetur', ibid., 196.

[108] 'uetustissimum et elegantissimum linguae nostrae librum scriptum Psalmorum Dauidis a D. Notkero tralatorum. … interibi hunc gustum cape … Hunc Psalmum mitto, qui aperienti librum primus occurrit. Non nego alios esse elegantiores, quos non grauabor describere', ibid., 134, and plate 10.

[109] Van Hal, *Moedertalen*, 176; *idem*, 'Vulcanius and Language Lovers', 398, n. 38.

[110] Dekker, 'Provenance and Origins', 440.

[111] 'haec descriptio diuinorum operum luculenta est, & comparanda meritò locis Graecorum Latinorumque Poetarum similibus. Imprimis huc facit metr. VI. libri IV. Boethii de Consol. Philosophiae', Dunphy, *Opitz's Anno*, 56. Dunphy translates 'luculenta' by its general, not word-oriented meaning 'excellent', ibid., 57; I choose 'perspicuous' to emphasise Opitz's reading of vividness in the words.

[112] Text and translation R. Graeme Dunphy, ibid., 54, 55.

[113] Junius, *Painting*, I.v.2 (Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl, *Junius. Painting*, 61, 400).

[114] Dunphy, *Opitz's Anno*, 12.

[115] Franciscus Junius, [Letter to Count Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie], in *idem* and Thomas Marshall, *Quatuor Domini nostri Iesu Christi Evangeliorum versiones perantiquae duae* … (Dordrecht: typis et sumptibus Iunianis, Henricus and Joannes Essaeus, 1665), *2r-**2r; van Romburgh, *Worthy Freind*, 211.

[116] 'luctuosi naufragii'; 'nobile clarissimae famae monumentum nusquam totum appareret; atque ipse adeo codex desideratur in codice vetustate multis in locis exeso, madore vitiate, frustatim quondam discerpto, ac solutarum dissipatarumque philyrarum imperita compaginatione indigesto, mutilo, foedo', Junius, [Letter], *4v; van Romburgh, *Worthy Freind*, 211g.

[117] 'ex propiore primum intuitu, ac mox e prospectu remotiore, ex omnium denique circumspectu comperi nullum Gothis lumen, nullum florem dicendi defuisse; ita in totius Evangelicae historiae altius quasi exaggerata dictione naturalis quidam ac minime fucatus nitor emicat, dum res magnae admirabili electissimorum verborum splendore graviter ornateque illustrantur, ac iustum ubique servatur pondus authoritatis maiestatisque sacrosancto codici congruae', Junius, [Letter], **r; van Romburgh, 211h.

[118] Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl, *Junius. Painting*, 388-391, 65-67, cf. above.

[119] Dekker, *Origins*, 287-290.

[120] Ibid., 289-290.

[121] G.A. Padley, *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe 1500-1700. Trends in Vernacular Grammar I* (Cambridge, etc., 1985), 325-381, esp. 325-331, 349-352; cf. Francis Wilson, 'Such words in His things: the poetry in Bacon's new science', *Language and Literature* 11 (2002), 195-215.

[122] *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.v.

[123] Wilson, 'Such words', 203.

[124] G.W.S. Friedrichsen, *The Gothic Version of the Gospels. A Study of its Style and Textual History* (London, etc., 1926), 246.

[125] Cf. 'Project Wulfila', http://www.wulfila.be/ (accessed 22 April 2016); Valentine A. Pakis, 'Homoian Vestiges in the Gothic Translation of Luke 3,23-28', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 137 (2008), 277-304; Cor van Bree, *Lotgevallen van de* Codex Argenteus. *De wisselende waarde van een handschrift* (Amsterdam, 1995).

[126] Christoph Pieper, 'Polyvalent Tomi. Ovid's Landscape of Relegation and the Romanization of the Black Sea Region', in *Valuing Landscape in Classical Antiquity. Natural Environment and Cultural Imagination*, eds. Jeremy McInerney and Ineke Sluiter, Mnemosyne Supplements, 393 (Leiden and Boston, 2016), 408-430, 425.

[127] '… Getico … sermone libellum … // Quod modo si dederis utinam superesse volumen, / Non tua tanti, Ovidi, Tristia paene forent', Janus Vlitius, [Dedicatory poem to Count Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie], in Junius and Marshall, *Glossarium Gothicum*, *2r-**4v, ll. 105-110; Dekker, *Origins*, 402-403; *idem*, 'Hinc Gothus', 82.

[128] Lorraine Daston and Glenn W. Most, 'History of Science and History of Philologies', *Isis* 106 (2015), 378-390, 384.

[129] Cf. van Romburgh, 'Past Age Present'.

[130] George Steiner, *Real Presences* (London and Boston, 1989), 146-157.

[131] Ibid., 148, 148-149, original emphasis.

[132] Susan Stewart, *Poetry and the Fate of the Senses* (Chicago and London, 2002), 178.