

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

**This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.**

**The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.**

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.**
- 5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.**

**Xerox University Microfilms**

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

75-15,269

NIX, William Edward, 1931-  
PROLEGOMENA TO A LIFE OF CHRISTOPHE DE LONGUEIL.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1974  
History, modern

**Xerox University Microfilms,** Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© 1975

WILLIAM EDWARD NIX

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA  
GRADUATE COLLEGE

PROLEGOMENA TO A LIFE OF CHRISTOPHE DE LONGUEIL

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY  
WILLIAM EDWARD NIX  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1974

PROLEGOMENA TO A LIFE OF CHRISTOPHE DE LONGUEIL

APPROVED BY

Leslie F. Smith

A. J. Harrison

Jonathan W. Sprague

James L. Goldsmith

Richard D. Baker

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE



DEDICATION

In memory of  
my sister-in-law

Ruth

and

my dear friend

O. T. Ventress

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Although the present research project was begun several years ago, it has been interrupted and delayed on different occasions by my relocation, travels abroad, and the exigencies of the human experience. Throughout the long task, numerous persons have contributed of their thoughtfulness, labor, and concern which have enabled it at long last to come to fruition.

It would be impossible to adequately express my appreciation to each individual who has contributed to this undertaking. The staffs of numerous libraries in the United States and abroad have added inestimably to this final product. Of special note are those staffs at the Newberry Library and the Folger Shakespeare Library, as well as the University of Oklahoma and the University of Michigan. The assistance of their counterparts in the British Museum, the Bibliotheque Nationale, the National Archives, and the Vatican Library, as well as those other archival repositories throughout Europe was equally as valuable.

Certain individuals and colleagues deserve mention as well. Among them are my former colleagues at Trinity College, Deerfield, Illinois, who gave encouragement as the

administration of that institution provided a research grant to accompany a similar grant from the University of Oklahoma. These grants were made even more meaningful by the efforts in my behalf of Professor Donald J. Berthrong, who wrote letters of introduction to various libraries and archives, and His Eminence John, Cardinal Cody (Archbishop of Chicago), who anticipated my arrival in Rome with letters of introduction to the Vatican Library and to its Secret Archives.

While in Europe I was greatly assisted in my travels throughout Italy by Ray and Lois Whitlock. In Switzerland my stay was made even more pleasant by the hospitality of Mme. Beatrice Buri and her parents. In Ireland I was especially delighted to spend some time with Professor and Mrs. Leslie F. Smith. These friends made that journey a less tedious time of absence from my dear wife, Eulaine, who has been a constant source of strength and encouragement to me.

By far the greatest debt I owe is to Professor Emeritus Leslie F. Smith of the University of Oklahoma. His ripe experience as a scholar and teacher, his sane judgment, his prudence and moderation, are all alike reflected throughout this project. In addition, his willingness to remain at the helm of my doctoral committee beyond his regular academic career is meaningful to me in a way that I find is impossible to express.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.	MANUSCRIPTS PERTAINING TO A LIFE OF CHRISTOPHE DE LONGUEIL . . . . .	1
CHAPTER II.	PUBLISHED MATERIALS PERTAINING TO CHRISTOPHE DE LONGUEIL . . . . .	15
CHAPTER III.	BIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES RELATED TO CHRISTOPHE DE LONGUEIL . . . . .	54
CHAPTER IV.	THE CHRONOLOGICAL PROBLEM ABOUT LONGUEIL'S BIRTH . . . . .	78
CHAPTER V.	THE CHRONOLOGICAL PROBLEM IN LONGUEIL'S CORRESPONDENCE . . . . .	117
CHAPTER VI.	THE CHRONOLOGICAL REALIGNMENT OF LONGUEIL'S CORRESPONDENCE . . . . .	151
CHAPTER VII.	A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF LONGUEIL: HIS EARLY YEARS . . . . .	185
CHAPTER VIII.	A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF LONGUEIL: HIS LAST YEARS . . . . .	213
BIBLIOGRAPHY	. . . . .	238
APPENDIX A.	CHRISTOPHORI LONGOLII VITA . . . . .	261
APPENDIX B.	CHRISTOPHORUS LONGUOLIUS ILLUSTRISSIMO VALESII DUCI ET ANGOLISMAE COMITI FRAN- CISCO VALESIO, SA. DI. AETERNAM . . . . .	284
APPENDIX C.	IACOBUS RENALDUS TURONENSIS FACUNDISSIMO ORATORI ATQUE EXIMO PHILOSOPHO ET JURIS- CONSULTO CHRISTOFORO LONGUOLIO. S. D. . . . .	290
APPENDIX D.	CHRISTOFORUS LONGUOLIUS IOANNI BALAENIO BELOVACENSI . . . . .	294

APPENDIX E.	CHRISTOPHORUS A LONGOLIO PETRUM BRISSEUM SALVERE JUBET . . . . .	301
APPENDIX F.	GULIELMUS BUDAEUS CHRISTOPHORO LONGOLIO S. . . . .	331
APPENDIX G.	GULIELMUS BUDAEUS CHRISTOPHORO LONGOLIO S. . . . .	341
APPENDIX H.	ΓΟΥΛΙΕΛΜΟΥΣ ΒΟΥΔΑΙΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΦΟΡΟΥ ΛΟΓΓΟΛΙΟΥ ΕΥ ΠΡΑΤΤΕΙΝ . . . . .	349
APPENDIX I.	CHRISTOPHORUS LONGOLIUS JACOBO LUCAE DECANO AURELIANENSI S. D. . . . .	359
APPENDIX J.	ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS CHRISTOPHORO LONGOLIO S. D. . . . .	365
APPENDIX K.	BALDASSARE CASTIGLIONE TO ISABELLA D'ESTE . . . . .	370
APPENDIX L.	L'ARCIDIACONO DI GABBIONETA A MARIO EQUICOLA . . . . .	373
APPENDIX M.	CHRONOLOGICAL REALIGNMENT OF LONGUEIL'S CORRESPONDENCE . . . . .	377

# PROLEGOMENA TO A LIFE OF CHRISTOPHE DE LONGUEIL

## CHAPTER I

### MANUSCRIPTS PERTAINING TO A LIFE OF

### CHRISTOPHE DE LONGUEIL

Ever since his untimely death on 11 September 1522, Christophe de Longueil has persistently remained before the world of humanistic scholars. As early as December 1524 his Vita was published anonymously.<sup>1</sup> Periodically this Vita has been reissued and other biographical sketches have supplemented it until 1911, when Th. Simar published what has become the standard biography of Christophe de Longueil Humaniste (1488-1522).<sup>2</sup> Since Simar's work appeared, there have been additional items which have built upon and supplemented his work.<sup>3</sup> In addition, in 1924 another work appeared which has been almost universally overlooked by scholars interested in the study of Longueil's life.<sup>4</sup> Perhaps the oversight of this treatise by Ph. Aug. Becker is to be attributed to the almost overwhelming problems which have confronted Europe during the decades following its publication. Then, again, it would appear that there may have

been a patent apathy if not a latent antipathy toward the enterprize of Becker. Whatever the reason, for all practical purposes the biography by Becker has been virtually unused. Like Simar's earlier work, it was based upon the anonymous Vita, Longueil's orations, and the correspondence between Longueil and his contemporaries. It is the purpose of the present chapter, accordingly, to review and to describe the manuscript materials related to Longueil's Vita, his orations, and his correspondence with a view to establishing whether or not there is a basis for undertaking a new biographical endeavor.

At the outset, the various manuscript sources which remain must be considered. At this juncture one of the major shortcomings of Becker's work arises, for he concerned himself only with printed materials. Simar, on the other hand, lists several manuscripts utilized in his biography. But at least three events have transpired since the publication of Simar's work which have introduced materials either unknown or overlooked by him. In the first place, and by far the most significant of these events, has been the compilation and publication of Paul Oskar Kristeller's Iter Italicum.<sup>5</sup> A second significant event as far as a new biography of Longueil is concerned has been the publication of a booklist, "Longolius' Collection of Books," housed in the Library of New College, Oxford.<sup>6</sup> A third item may be observed in the reprinting with corrections of

the Bodleian Library Quarto Catalogues.<sup>7</sup> In order to better utilize the materials involved, and to facilitate their presentation, these three publications will be treated in reverse order, moving from the least to the most complex contributions made by the materials.

Included in Simar's list of several manuscripts that were utilized in his study are two items found in the Bodleian Library.<sup>8</sup> Since Simar completed his work, however, a third item which is said to have belonged to Longueil has been added to the Bodleian Catalogue.<sup>9</sup> This manuscript is collated with the 1616 edition of Joannes Meursius' work, Aristoxenus. Nicomachus. Alypius. Auctores Musices Antiquissimi, Hactenus non editi.<sup>10</sup> Here then is a total of no less than fifty-six pages of printed text having collated annotations,<sup>11</sup> none of which was known or utilized by either Simar or Becker. In addition to the fact that a new item has been discovered, the subject matter involved is striking, for this appears to be the only surviving manuscript or book having belonged to Longueil concerned with the subject of music, or more particularly, harmonics.<sup>12</sup>

The booklist of Longueil's collection of books in the library of New College, Oxford, has brought to light a host of items which appear to have been unknown to either Simar or Becker. In that collection, twenty-five printed books, in eighteen volumes, have survived, although some titles have since disappeared.<sup>13</sup> This collection demon-



strates in a tangible manner the breadth of interest and the intensity of the learning of Longueil, since nearly every title contains underlinings, marginal notes, and additional annotations written by him. Among the scholars represented in the Longueil collection are Homer, Livy, Euclid, Procopius, Pliny, Tacitus, St. Basil the Great, and Valla. In addition, two titles by Cicero are included, being bound together, in which liberal annotations are supplied from the pen of Longueil.<sup>14</sup>

To these printed books at New College should also be added two volumes housed in the library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.<sup>15</sup> The first of these is a 1499 publication of Astronomical Tracts,<sup>16</sup> and the second is a collection of fourteen medical texts bound together.<sup>17</sup> The Astronomical Tracts would appear to be a complement to Vettius Valens Antiochenus, Anthologia Astrologices (in eight books), also housed in the Bodleian collection,<sup>18</sup> whereas the marginal notations in the fourteen medical texts would indicate some insights into Longueil's concern for his own health.<sup>19</sup> The knowledge and use of many of these items from Longueil's personal library must certainly not only complement, but actually supplement those materials to be found in his Vita, orations, and correspondence, as well as any biographical study which has been made without their consultation.

The publication of the Iter Italicum has unlocked additional doors to the study of Christophe de Longueil.

Until the appearance of these two volumes in the mid-1960's, Simar's bibliography of manuscripts was accepted as authoritative. Since that time, however, new materials have been brought to light which have a cumulative effect of casting new light on Longueil. On the surface, there seems to be no significant difference between the materials presented by Simar and those found in Kristeller, at least so far as those items housed in the collection of the library at Vatican City are concerned.<sup>20</sup> Both sources indicate that the "Codex Ottobonianus Lat. 1517" is incomplete.<sup>21</sup> Other Vatican manuscripts known to Simar include the "Discourse of Celso Mellini Against Christophe de Longueil [1519],"<sup>22</sup> a "Letter from Bembo to Francis I in favor of Longueil,"<sup>23</sup> and the "Longolius Epitaph" by Pietro Bembo (Petrus Bembus) containing three lines.<sup>24</sup> One other item in the Vatican holdings is listed by Simar, namely, "Two Letters of Leo X in favor of Longueil," dated 12 April 1519.<sup>25</sup>

Proceeding from Rome to other centers in Italy, it becomes quite apparent that there is an immediate and obvious departure in manuscript evidence as presented by Simar and Kristeller. Simar lists only one Italian manuscript outside Rome, a heading under which he includes Vatican City, and that is an item he places in Viterbo. It is, "Christophori Longolii orationes parte stampo e parte scritto e fra [sic] Zenobio delle laudi de Roma, 4<sup>o</sup>."<sup>26</sup> It is probable that Kristeller's apparent oversight of this manuscript is

not really such, for the city of Viterbo was heavily bombarded during World War II, as was its Biblioteca. Many items from that collection which actually survived these incidents have not yet been restored or recatalogued. The Christophe de Longueil item mentioned by Simar appears to be among those objects still missing. The omission in Kristeller's list having been explained, attention may now focus on those manuscripts which he includes and which Simar omits. These items will be treated as they appear in various Italian cities and in the National Archives at Paris.

In the Biblioteca Statale di Cremona, for instance, is a manuscript copy of an eight-line epitaph for Longueil.<sup>27</sup> The manuscripts at Florence, however, are of much more importance to a biography of Longueil than is the epitaph at Cremona. In this the Queen city of the Italian Renaissance are two significant manuscripts. In the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale — Firenze, for example, is a manuscript containing several letters written by Longueil to Pietro Bembo.<sup>28</sup> Three of these letters are written in Latin and they comprise the first three items in "Chr. Longolii Epistol. Liber Primus," in the Junta edition of Longueil's Opera.<sup>29</sup> The four remaining letters appear to have been overlooked in the biographies of Simar and Becker.<sup>30</sup> A manuscript in the Biblioteca Riccardiana in Florence has provided the basis for Robert Aulotte's recent article comparing the translations by Erasmus and Longueil of Plutarch's De Bene-

ficiis.<sup>31</sup> This is another item which was not incorporated into the biographies of Simar or Becker, or their predecessors for that matter.

Continuing on to Milan, additional manuscript items are to be found in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana. One example of the importance of these sources may be seen in the fact that two letters from Longueil are among a collection of original letters and poems housed there.<sup>32</sup> These two letters have not appeared in biographical studies about Longueil. In another source in this library are two orations of interest, especially as they bear on the great controversy of the Ciceronians as related to Erasmus and Longueil. One is entitled "Pro Longolio" and the other is "In Desiderium Erasmum Rotterdamum Invectiva."<sup>33</sup> In addition to the above-mentioned manuscripts, the Biblioteca Ambrosiana also houses the "Celsi Melini Accusatio in Longolium," for which Longueil wrote his two defense orations.<sup>34</sup> In the Biblioteca Comunale di Trento are a series of six items which have been damaged by water. Among them is a manuscript copy of another letter by Longueil.<sup>35</sup> Still another item, although of a later date, may be observed in the Biblioteca Comunale "Vincenzo Joppe" — Udine, Augusti Vatis Odae, entitled, "Epicedion Longolii ad Arnaldum Principem Britannum."<sup>36</sup>

Outside Italy, the available manuscript sources used by Simar are limited to the National Archives at Paris.<sup>37</sup> Other than these documents, the materials pertaining to

Christophe de Longueil are related to the various publications of his works, the controversy over Ciceronian style,<sup>38</sup> and other biographical studies about him. Sufficient manuscript data has come to light since the time of the biographies by Simar and Becker to warrant a new investigation into their treatments of Christophe de Longueil. Before turning to that review of their works, however, a survey of the various editions of the published works of Longueil must be undertaken. To that survey the present study now turns.

CHAPTER I (FOOTNOTES)

1. [Christophe de Longueil], Christophori Longolii Orationes / duae pro defensione sua in crimen lesae maiestatis, longe / exactiori quam ante iudicio perscriptae, ac / nunc primum ex ipsius autho / ris sententia in lucem / editae. Oratio una ad Luterianos / Eiusdem epistolarum libri quatuor. Epistolarum Bembi & Sadoleti liber unus. / Longolij vita perdocte quidem atq; eleganter ab ipsius ami / cissimo quodam exerata [Colophon, fol. 163b is as follows:] (Florentiae per Haeredes Philippi Iuntae. Anno Domini, M.D.XXIIII. Mense Decembris. Clemente VII. Pont. Max.). Hereafter this work will be identified as Longueil, Opera, Junta. The anonymous "Vita" is on fols. 3a-8a, following the "Bernardus Iunta Ad Lectorem," fol. 2a-b. The entire volume has been reprinted by the Gregg Press Limited (1967). The "Vita" from this edition appears as "Appendix A" in the present study.

2. Th. Simar, Christophe de Longueil Humaniste (1488-1522) (Louvain: Bureaux de Recueil, 1911). This volume is actually a reprint of three articles by Simar, "Christophe de Longueil Humaniste (1488-1522)," Le Musée Belge: Revue de Philologie Classique, XIII, nos. 3-4, XIV, and XV (1909-1911), 157-206, 65-110, and 87-205.

3. P. S. Allen and H. M. Allen (eds.), Opus Epistolarum Desid. Erasmi Roterodami, III (Oxonii: Clarendoniano, 1913), 472-473, refers to Th. Simar's "full treatise" in the Musée Belge, XIII-XV, 1909-1911, as the major authority underlying the brief biographical sketch of Longueil; Hermann Kopf, "Christophorus Longolius," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, LV, nos. 3-4 (1936), 634-649, follows the lead of Simar although he does not mention that author. In the post-World War II era Longueil studies again have appeared in print in various journals. E. Ph. Goldschmidt, "De Longueil's Letter on His Adventure in Switzerland, 1513," Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance: Travaux et Documents, XII (1950), 163-182. Immediately following Goldschmidt's article is another by Comte Jean de Pins, "Jean de Pins et Longueil," Ibid., 183-189. Alois Gerlo, Bibliographie de l'Humanisme Belge (Bruxelles: Presses Universitaires de Bruxelles, 1965), pp. 182-183, lists the works of Simar, Becker, and Kopf. R[obert] Aulotte, "Une Rivalité d'Humanistes; Érasme et Longueil, Traducteurs de Plutarque," Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance: Travaux et Documents, XXX (1968), 549-573, also lists Becker's work in a cursory treatment of materials. M. -M. de la Garanderie, "Les Relations d'Érasme avec Paris au Temps de Son Séjour aux Pays-Bas Méridionaux (1516-1521)," Scrinium Erasmanum, Vol. I (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), 29-53. Numerous other works have made passing mention of Longueil, but none have departed from the above-mentioned pattern of

dependence upon Simar. It should be noted that Mario Emilio Cosenza, Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300-1800, Vol. III: K-Ph (2nd edition revised and enlarged; Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1962), 2007, does not list any of these biographical studies of Longueil.

4. Ph. Aug. Becker, Christophle de Longueil, Sein Leben und Sein Briefwechsel (Bonn: K. Schroeder, 1924). Although Becker did make use of Simar's study, there are several points wherein the two are at variance. These variations are not only numerous, they are of enough significance that an authentication of the system of dating the correspondence in both Simar and Becker is essential before an authoritative biography can be raised with regard to Longueil.

5. Paul Oskar Kristeller (Compiler), Iter Italicum: A Finding List of Uncatalogued or Incompletely Catalogued Manuscripts of the Renaissance in Italian and Other Libraries, 2 volumes (London: Warburg Institute, 1963, 1967).

6. This collection of "eighteen volumes, containing twenty-five printed works, which once belonged to Christophe de Longueil (Longolius)" was published in P. S. Allen, H. M. Allen, and H. W. Garrod (eds.), Erasmi Epistolarum, XI, "Appendix XXVIII," 379-383.

7. O. H. Coxe, Bodleian Library Catalogues, I: Greek Manuscripts (reprinted with corrections from the edition of 1853; Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1969).

8. Simar, Longueil, p. 207, under the heading "Sources manuscrites," cites "Deux manuscrits ayant appartenu à Chr. de Longueil." Simar's use of call numbers does not altogether correspond with current usage at the Bodleian Library, or many other repositories for that matter. Thus, while "'Codices Miscellanei' 92. chart., 281ff, saec xvi. Auct F. 3. 18." will suffice for the first of his entries, the second item appears under "[Arch. Seld. B. 19]" instead of Simar's entry, "Cod. Seldeniani, 22 cart., f<sup>o</sup>, 146ff., xvi<sup>e</sup> s."

9. Coxe, Bodleian, [col. 596] 20, [Arch. Seld. B. 17]. Codex chartaceus, in folio, ff. 138, sec. xvi. ineuntis; initio mutilus; [ol. 3363,] . . . 2. Aristoxeni de arts Musica libri tres. fol. 7b. This item actually appeared in an earlier index by P. D. Record, A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford which have not hitherto been catalogued in the Quarto Series (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953), p. 288, item 17290.412 (now D'Orvil 412).

10. So says a note in Bodleian Ms. D'Orvil 412, p. 3. The manuscript notations of Longueil, Bodleian [Arch. Seld. B. 17], are collated with this item, which includes only the Aristoxenus portion.

11. [Arch. Seld. B. 17], extends from fol. 7b to 34b, inclusive, and the annotated portion of Ms. D'Orvil 412 extends from p. 4 to p. 59, inclusive. The contents of these two items is identical, the former being a handwritten Greek text with annotations, whereas the latter is a printed Greek text with markings in the margins and underscorings in the body of the text itself.

12. Ms. D'Orvil 412, p. 2, indicates that the Aristoxenus selection includes three books on "Elementa Harmonica."

13. Allen, Epistolarum Erasmi, XI, 380, n. 3, makes the suggestion that the missing titles include an edition of Euclid printed in Venice in 1505 (erroneously listed in the Benefactors' Book as Basle, 1537), the works of Politan in two volumes, and Josephus De Bello Judaico. The Euclid entry must certainly be in error as the editors suggest, for a copy of the Euclid, Opera (Venice, 1505), is extant in the New College collection.

14. Ibid., p. 382, items 16 and 17 are bound together, probably by the publisher, and contain Marcus Tullius Cicero, Opera Rhetorica: Oratoria et Forensia (Paris: Jehan Petit, 1511), and Marcus Tullius Cicero, Orationes (Paris: Jehan Petit, 1511). The former is liberally annotated throughout, and so is the latter so far as the annotations were made in it. Perhaps Longueil was working on this text at the time of his death.

15. Ibid., p. 383.

16. Ibid., p. 383, item 1. This volume contains several tracts under the authorship of Julius Firmicus, Marcus Manilius, Aratus, and Proclus.

17. Ibid., p. 383, item 2. The first of these fourteen medical texts is "Hysagoge Ioannitii" (Venice: Petrus Bergomensis, 1507).

18. Cf., [Arch. Seld. B. 19]. This work, according to Coxe, Bodleian [ols. 597-598], is "Codex chartaceus, in folio, ff. 146, sec., sumptibus Christophori Longolii descriptus, postea Johannis Dee; [ol. 3365] l. Vettii Valentis Antiocheni Anthologiae astrologicae libri octo. fol. 1."



19. One of the outstanding features of Longueil's last days was his apparent knowledge of impending death. His letters are replete with discussions of his health, and his biographers have so noted the fact.

20. These differences are to be expected from the nature of the works involved: Kristeller's is a "finding list" and Simar's is an "annotated guide."

21. Kristeller, Iter, II, 418, merely indicates that this item is listed: "1517. Christ. Longolius, 6 orations, partly impr." Simar's entry, Longueil, p. 207, reads, "Cod. Ottobonianus lat. 1517. Christophori Longolii perduellionis rei defensio (deest. in cod.). Oratio apologetica in Urbis encomium manuscripta, et aliae quattuor ejusdem generis (Ex codic. Joannis Angeli Ducis ab Aeltemps, 146ff<sup>o</sup>s, pagination primitive: f<sup>o</sup> 44a-185b." It should be noted that the title-page of the entire volume is to be cited as "Ex Codicibus Joannis Angeli Ducis ab Altaemps," as found on fol. 42a (or fol. 1a of the more recent pagination entry). Folios 1-41, consisting of "Christophori Longolij perduellionis rei defensio," as indicated on the title-page, have been removed from the manuscript as it appears in the Vatican Library.

22. Simar, Longueil, p. 207, correctly indicates the source of this manuscript as Vat. Lat. 3370, f<sup>o</sup> 203a-227a, although the item on fol. 202b indicates the author and subject of the following folios. The entry in the Inventari Mss. Latin. Bib. Vat. 2142, Tome IV, no. 304, erroneously marks the item as being found on fol. 205.

23. Vat. Lat. 3364, fol. 373b-375a, is the sixth and last item in the group entitled, "Petri Bembi Epistolarum Leonis .x<sup>m</sup> Pont. Max. Nomine, Scirtarum [sic]. (The word "Scirtarum" was originally "Datarum," but the "Da" has been scratched out and "Scir" added.) Lib. Primus," fols. 370a-375a. There are several corrections added to the text of this letter, as there were in the title. The first line of this particular letter to Francis I, as well as several other minor changes, was altered from the manuscript before being incorporated into [Longueil], Opera, Junta, fol. 158b [sic, it should be fol. 157b]. These changes are as follows: "Francis — Gallorum Regi. Christophorus Longolius. . . ." [Vat. Lat. 3364]; "Leo PP. X. Francorum Regi. Clarissime in Christo fili sal. &c., Christophorus Longolius. . . ." [Junta].

24. Codex Barbarinus Latinus, 1868, Petri Bembi Carmine, fol. 26a-39b. These three lines of "Longolij Epitaphium" appear on fol. 39a:

"Te iuvenem rapuere Deae fatalia nentes  
Stamina, cum scirent moriturum tempore nullo  
Longoli tibi si canos, seniumque dedissent."

25. Simar, Longueil, p. 207, lists "Archives vaticanes, l, K, 43, as the manuscript of these two letters which had been published by Vittorio Cian, "Due Brevi de Leone X in favore di Christoforo Longolio," Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana, XIX (1892), 373-388, although Simar cites only the pages beginning with the text of the letters (pp. 278ff.). The call number used by Simar is quite a mystery, especially since Cian correctly indicates his source for these two letters. The first is to be found in "Archivio Vaticano, Leonis X Secr. an. i ad 8. vol. II, lib. 204, n<sup>o</sup> 1194, fol. 227r-230v" (p. 377), and the second is to be found "ibid., fol. 231r-233r" (p. 382). The Registri Vaticani concurs with Cian's entries, and the manuscript, no. 1194, is currently housed in the Archivio Segreto Vaticano.

26. In light of other references made by Simar, it is questionable whether he actually used this manuscript or is merely referring to L. Dorez, "Latino Latini et la Bibliothèque Capitulaire de Viterbe," in the Revue des Bibliothèques (1892), 382, which he cites on Longueil, p. 207.

27. Kristeller, Iter, I, 50-51, describes the holdings in Cremona, Biblioteca Governativa, Fondo Civico, Aa. 6. 26. cart. XVI. III, 176 fols., and mentions this item which is located on fol. 101a.

28. Ibid., p. 132, indicates manuscript Magl. VIII, 1302, misc., XVI-XVIII, in the Fondo Magliabechiano inventories. Following an anonymous "Carmen," fol. 1a, there are seven letters written "in volg. and Latin," fols. 2a-11a.

29. [Longueil], Opera, Junta, fols. 65a-66b. These letters are also clearly indicated in both Simar, Longueil, pp. 157-159, and Becker, Longueil, p. 207.

30. An observation of Magl. VIII, 1302, reveals that this may be because these four letters were written in Italian rather than Latin. They were written from Venice, "di ciotto d. Aprilo" (Letter 1, fols. 2a-b), Padua, "28 di Maggio" (Letter 3, fols. 3b-4b), and "10 di giugno" (Letter 5, fols. 5b-7b), and from an unknown place, without a date (Letter 7, fols. 9b-11a). These items appear in Albano Sorbelli (ed.), Inventari di Manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'Italia, LVI (1934), "Roma," p. 171, item 11: "Christophori Longolii epistolarum 7 ad Petrum Bembum et Petri Bembi ad Longolium epistolae versio italica."

31. Aulotte, "Une Rivalité," bases his article on Bib. Ricc. Ms. 896 (S. II, n<sup>o</sup> 24), fols. 1a-6a, although the text actually begins on fol. 2a. Kristeller, Iter, I, 207, correctly indicates that Longueil's "Preface" (fols. 2a-5a) is dedicated to Lud. Buzeus [sic., Ruzeus]. Aulotte places these translations in columns rather than alternating them.

32. Kristeller, Iter, I, 324, lists item "G 109 inf. cart. misc. XVI, 117 fols." On fols. 60a-61a is a letter from Longueil to Mariano Castellano, with no place or date of its origin, and on fol. 61a-b, is another Longueil letter to Domenico Sauli, written from Genoa, on "XV, Cal. Juli."

33. Bib. Ambrosiana, G. 33 inf. cart. XVI, is Io: Baptista Casalis, Epistolae, Orationes, libelli suplices, et alia id generis (1603). Fols. 324a-325a contain the "Pro Logolio," and [II], 82b-87b contain the Erasmus Invectiva. Cf., Kristeller, Iter, I, 324.

34. Bib. Ambrosiana, S. Q. D. III. 15, fols. 1a-25a. On fol. 25a-b is a letter from Io. Baptista Almadianus to Celso Mellini.

35. Kristeller, Iter, I, 191, identifies this item as Manuscript 4959, cart XVI. It consists of two damaged folios, which have been assigned a date of 1521, the Longueil epistle being on fols. 1b-2a. A portion of fol. 1b has been torn away, and a large water stain obscures much of the material on fol. 2a, thus making this manuscript difficult to discern.

36. This item does not appear in Kristeller's work, but it is located at Udine, Biblioteca Comunale "Vincenzo Joppa," Augusti Vatis 43, fols. 12a-13a [new pagination].

37. Simar, Longueil, p. 207, refers to the "Registres du Parlement de Paris, Xa 1517, f<sup>o</sup> 189 (cf., Musée belge, XIII, 3-4, p. 202)." This reference is to the initial publication of one of the articles which later was to be published as Simar's book on Longueil. Several items listing Longueil's name may be found in the Répertoire Numérique des Archives du Parlement de Paris, Série X (Paris, 1889), p. 16. The particular item cited by Simar covers the period 12 November 1514 to 27 October 1515. Although he indicates it as item Xa 1517, it should more properly be identified as "Paris, Archives Nationales, Reg. X<sup>1a</sup> 1517."

38. Although no attempt is made here to present a bibliographical survey of this discussion, the reader would be well-advised to begin his search of this controversy, in which Longueil played no minor role, with Izora Scott, Controversies over the Imitation of Cicero as a Model for Style and Some Phases of their Influence on the Schools of the Renaissance (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1910). Part I of this work concerns the controversy itself, whereas Part II consists of two pamphlets on Imitation as well as a translation of Erasmus' Ciceronianus. Also see Izora Scott's translation of the Ciceronianus: or A Dialogue on the Best Style of Speaking (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1908), as well as Simar, Longueil, pp. 97-151, as he discusses this controversy and the roles of Longueil and Erasmus in it.

## CHAPTER II

### PUBLISHED MATERIALS PERTAINING TO

#### CHRISTOPHE DE LONGUEIL

In addition to the manuscript materials related to Christophe de Longueil, there are the various publications of a Vita, his orations, and his correspondence, as well as materials about him, which bear upon the subject of his biography. The present chapter will concern itself with a review and description of these witnesses to his life.

Even before the publication of Longueil's Opera in 1524,<sup>1</sup> there were several items of importance which had been published previously, and which supplement the materials that were gathered together in his Opera. Among these published items were Longueil's Oration in Praise of St. Louis, his Prefatory Oration to the Exposition of the Twenty-eighth Book of the Pandects, and three epistles which were all put forth by Henricus Stephanus in Paris in 1510.<sup>2</sup> Another edition of these same items was published in Paris by Petrus Gromorus in 1520, although the title-page lists the work as 1510.<sup>3</sup> A third printing of the Oration in Praise of St. Louis appeared,

without the other items, in Franciscus Duchesne's Historiae Francorum Scriptores in 1649.<sup>4</sup> All three of these items have been known by and utilized in the recent biographies of Christophe de Longueil.

By 1514 Longueil had moved from Poitiers, where he had delivered his earlier orations, to Valence, where he studied civil law under Philip Decius. It was at Valence that Longueil delivered his Oration in Praise of Jurisprudence, which has been mentioned by recent biographers only as they cite from the Library Manual at Valence.<sup>5</sup> This oration does exist, however, in the Bibliothèque Nationale,<sup>6</sup> and is an important text for a clear understanding of the early life, training, and development of Longueil. Another of the early works of Longueil was his cooperative effort on an edition of the Younger Pliny's XXXVII Books on Natural History, published in Paris in 1516.<sup>7</sup> Although Simar does include this work in his bibliography, Becker makes no mention of it whatsoever, and neither of them refers to the entry within the Pliny volume by Nicolaus Beraldis, which discusses the various contributors to this enterprise, including Longueil.<sup>8</sup>

The next time Longueil was involved in a published work, he was in Italy. His "Oratio Apologetica in Urbis Encomiū,"<sup>9</sup> had apparently been completed and Celso Mellini had presented his "Accusation Against Longueil."<sup>10</sup> Although the accusation is in manuscript form, it is presently in

usable condition and available for study as an item bound together with Longueil's two Defense Orations in the manuscript collection at the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan,<sup>11</sup> as well as in a printed text published by Gnoli.<sup>12</sup> In Rome, at the Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio-Emmanuele, is another copy of the two Defense Orations. They are purported to be the first edition by Gnoli, and are catalogued a "Volume Raro," with an ascribed date of 1518.<sup>13</sup> Neither Mellini's "Accusation" nor either of these two editions of Longueil's Defense Orations appear to have been utilized by Simar, Becker, or any other recent biographer. Instead, they all use either the text published by Gnoli<sup>14</sup> or one of the other Aldus editions of Christophori Longolii . . . Defensiones Duae.<sup>15</sup> In 1520 two additional editions of Longueil's Defense Orations were released by other publishing houses in Paris: Jehan Petit<sup>16</sup> and Jodocus Badius.<sup>17</sup> Then, in 1522, Longueil composed his Ad Luterianos oration, although it was not published at that time.<sup>18</sup> No other publications were made of Longueil's works during his lifetime.

In December 1524 the first edition of Longueil's Opera was published,<sup>19</sup> and it is this work from which the mass of materials for his biography has been and continues to be gathered.<sup>20</sup> This Opera contains the "Bernardus Junta ad Lectorem," fol. 2, the "Christophori Longolii Viat," fols. 3a-8a, and following a blank page, the "Christophori Longolii Civis Ro. Perduellionis Rei, Prioris Diei Defensio," fols.

9a-26a. This is followed by the "Christophori Longolii Civis Ro. Perduellionis Rei Posterioris Diei Defensio," fols. 26b-43b, and "Christophori Longolii Ad Luterianos Quosdam Iam Damnatos Oratio," fols. 44a-64b. Beginning with folio 65a is the first of five books of correspondence containing some 165 letters, concluding on folio 163b.<sup>21</sup> As Simar indicates, this edition is the basis for all others.<sup>22</sup> In various copies of the 1524 Opera numerous notes, transcriptions of letters and epitaphs, as well as a vast array of signatures of prominent people who have owned them are to be found.

Another edition of Longueil's Opera was published in Paris in 1526.<sup>23</sup> Simar has designated this edition as text "A" of those following the 1524 edition.<sup>24</sup> In addition to the materials found in that earlier edition, the 1526 Opera contains a letter from Christophorus Picartus to Ioānes Picartus, dated from "Parrhisiorum Lutetia, ad eidus Iunias. 1526," fol. 1b, and a letter from Iacobus Tusanus to Arnulphus Ruzaeus, dated "Lutetiae, ex aedibus Ascensianis, pridie Idus Iunias. 1526," fols. 2a-3a. While it is correct to agree with Simar that certain prefatory items are added to the 1526 edition, it is incorrect to follow his lead that the Paris work also added "au Ve livre, deux lettres de Bembo et de Sadoletto à Guillaume Budé concernant Longueil, et une troisième missive de Léon X à François I<sup>er</sup> (Leo PP. X. Francorum regi ... Christ. Longolius, homo Gallus), une lettre d'Alessandro Pazzi au cardinal Jules de Médicis (Superavit

opinionem meam...)." <sup>25</sup> A careful scanning of the 1524 Opera will reveal that all of these items are in that publication. Simar also correctly indicates three "Epitaphs" for Longueil by Germanus Brixius, two in Latin and the third in Greek, on fol. 17b. Other than quite minor changes in punctuation and occasional captializations, the contents of these two editions are identical. <sup>26</sup>

In 1529 Longueil's Ad Luterianos was published in Cologne. <sup>27</sup> The contents of this volume are identical with Longueil's Opera, Junta, folios 44a-64b, except that it deletes the last two lines of the earlier text, <sup>28</sup> and adds "Omnibus Numeris Absoluta" to the title of that oration. The volume contains only the Ad Luterianos oration. <sup>29</sup> A reissue of Longueil's Opera, 1526, made its appearance in Paris in 1530, <sup>30</sup> and in 1533 another printing was published in Paris. <sup>31</sup>

It was also in 1533 that the first book printed in Bourges was made. This volume has the title, Christophori Longolij de Suis Infortunijs Epistola, <sup>32</sup> and only two copies are known to exist. <sup>33</sup> In this little volume are two items of interest to the study of Christophe de Longueil. The first is a letter from Andreas Levescatius to Joannes de Morvillier, datelined "Biturigibus Cal. April. M. CCCCC. xxxiiij." <sup>34</sup> It refers to a second, a letter which was written to Pierre Brisson, from Valence on 4 November 1513. <sup>35</sup> This last-named letter has been recently translated into English and published by E. Ph. Goldschmidt. <sup>36</sup> Another item



listed under "Christophorus Longolius" in the catalogue of the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal in Paris appears to be quite in error.<sup>37</sup>

A month prior to the publication of the 1533 Paris edition of Longueil's Opera, another major work made its way into the book shops.<sup>38</sup> In this Habes Lector are six particular pieces which had not been published earlier, and which would be irregularly reproduced in later editions of Longueil's Opera. The first of these is a letter from Guillaume Budé to Longueil dated "e Marliano nostro, v. cal. Mar."<sup>39</sup> It is followed by another letter from Budé to Longueil, written "Romorantij, postridie Regalium."<sup>40</sup> A letter from Budé to Longueil written entirely in Greek is another item in this Habes Lector.<sup>41</sup> From Rome Longueil wrote a letter "Iacobo Lucae Decano Aurelianensi," which is also included in this collection,<sup>42</sup> as is a letter from Erasmus to Longueil, dated 1 April 1519.<sup>43</sup> The sixth piece in the Habes Lector which is new is the "Graecorum Verborum in Epistolis Budaei Interpretatio Latina."<sup>44</sup> As important a contribution to Longueil's biography as the Habes Lector is either unknown to or overlooked by Simar, although Becker was well aware of its existence.<sup>45</sup>

In 1539 a new, critical edition of Longueil's Opera was published in Venice.<sup>46</sup> This edition was influenced by the Habes Lector of 1533, although Simar was apparently unaware of the fact. He notes, for example, that "Cette édition

diffère de A, en ce qu'elle ajoute à la lettre d'Alessandro Pazzi (livre V), la lettre célèbre de Longueil à Jacques Lucas d'Orléans et la réponse d'Erasme (1<sup>er</sup> avril 1519), ainsi qu'une missive de Gu. Budé à Longueil (Hilaribus ad vesperam...). Au f<sup>o</sup>264<sup>b</sup>, on trouve une traduction latine des mots grecs contenus dans les lettres de Budé."<sup>47</sup> The letter to Jacques Lucas, Erasmus' response of 1 April 1519, the letter of Budé, and the Latin translation of Greek words had all been incorporated into the Habes Lector of 1533.<sup>48</sup> Becker observes that this Opera of 1539 is "Mit den Erweiterungen der Basler Ausgabe von 1533."<sup>49</sup> It is to be noted, however, that this 1539 Opera does not include two other letters which are contained in the Habes Lector of 1533, but this may be because these two letters contain large portions of Greek text.<sup>50</sup>

In 1540 what appears to be a reissue, with slight modifications, of the Habes Lector, 1533, was published in Basel under the title of Christophori Longolii Epistolarum Libri IIII.<sup>51</sup> This volume is identified by Simar as a reproduction of the Longueil Opera, 1539, with a Greek letter to Longueil from Budé and the preliminaries of edition A.<sup>52</sup> Simar is in error when he asserts that "Cette édition est la plus complète de toutes,"<sup>53</sup> since two additional epistles are contained in the Habes Lector, 1533, which are not in the 1540 publication.<sup>54</sup> In addition, he errs in identifying this as a reissue of the Opera, 1539, since it does not include

either of his Defense Orations or his Ad Luterianos.<sup>55</sup>

It was not until 1542 that another edition of Longueil's Opera was published under the title Christophori Longolii Lucubrationes in Lyons.<sup>56</sup> This volume, as Simar correctly observes, is a reproduction of Longueil's Opera, 1526, "moins la lettre de Chr. Picart à Jean Picart et celle de J[.] Toussain à Arnould Ruzé."<sup>57</sup> Then, in 1545, a second edition of Longueil's Ad Luterianos, 1529, was published in Cologne,<sup>58</sup> although Simar, Becker, and the British Museum Catalogue list this slightly different title as 1546.<sup>59</sup> At the end of this Ad Lutheranos Oratio are three brief items completing a —4<sup>o</sup> volume of 45 folio leaves.<sup>60</sup> These three anonymous items are "Ad Lutheranos Elegia Paraenetica," "Problema de Luthero," and an "Epigramma."<sup>61</sup>

Nicolas Episcopus published another edition of Longueil's Epistolarum Libri IIII from Basel in 1558.<sup>62</sup> This volume is in the tradition of the Habes Lector, 1533, and the Epistolarum, 1540, both of which were published at Basle. There are, however, enough differences between the 1558 edition and its forebears for Simar to identify it as "edition B" of the works of Longueil.<sup>63</sup> The first item in the Epistolarum, 1558, is the anonymous "Vita," fols. a2a-b3b. Next is the "Christophori Longolij Elogium," which is followed by "Christophori Longolii Epitaphia."<sup>64</sup> A blank page precedes the numbered pages (1-350) which contain the four books of Longueil's correspondence and the additional book of letters

in the Bembo and Sadoletto correspondence. As in Longueil's Epistolarum, 1540, the letters in the first four books are enumerated. Unlike the 1540 edition, however, the epistles are not numbered in the Bembo-Sadoletto liber. Again, unlike the 1540 edition, there is an additional letter added to Liber IIII.<sup>65</sup> In comparison with all the earlier editions of Longueil's correspondence, there are several variations between the Epistolarum, 1558, in the Bembo-Sadoletto Liber.<sup>66</sup> In the tradition of the Habes Lector, 1533, the Epistolarum, 1558, does not include any of Longueil's orations. Should it be deemed appropriate to designate this edition as a major departure in the texts of Longueil's works, as Simar asserts, it would seem more appropriate to regard it as "edition C," rather than "edition B," this last-named designation to be applied to the Habes Lector, 1533. If it should keep the designation "edition B," however, it would be more appropriate to regard the Epistolarum, 1558, as "edition B<sup>1</sup>," since it is indeed a modification of the Habes Lector, 1533, tradition rather than a completely new departure. Within five years a reproduction of this Epistolarum, 1558, was issued by Episcopius.<sup>67</sup>

A new departure in the publication of Longueil's correspondence did appear, however, in Lyons in 1563, as the Christophori Longolii Epistolarum Libri IIII. Bartolomaei Item Riccii de Imitatione Libri Tres, edited by Joannes Michael Brutus.<sup>68</sup> This work was published in —16<sup>o</sup>, although

Simar mistakenly lists it as —12<sup>o</sup>.<sup>69</sup> The contents of this volume include "In Christophori Longolii Epistolas Ioannis Michaelis Bruti ad Iosephum Bonuisium. Praefatio," pp. 3-7, Dolet's "In Obitum Christophori Longolij," p. 8, and the anonymous "Christophori Longolii Vita," pp. 9-32. Longueil's "Epist. lib. I," pp. 33-133, contains 41 letters, with 39 in "Epist. lib. II," pp. 134-241, 37 in "Epist. lib. III," pp. 242-325, and 33 numbered and one unnumbered item in "Ep. lib. IIII," pp. 326-421. Pages 421-466 contain the "Petri Bembi et Iacobi Sadoleti Epist. Liber." From that juncture begins Bartholomaeus Riccius' three books on "Imitation," covering pages 467-523, 524-603, and 603-669, respectively. The Germanus Brixius Obituaries fill pages 670-671, with Rosetus' "Carmen" on the last numbered page (p. 672). All this is followed by four pages of "Elenchus Epistolarum Christophori Longolii," which marks the first such index of Longueil's epistles to be published. As it relates to the textual traditions of Longueil's correspondence, this edition follows after the Habes Lector, 1533, and the Epistolarum, 1540 and following. In the Epistolarum, 1563, however, these letters are coupled together with the work of another author.

Longueil's correspondence continued to appear as a separate work even after the publication of the combined Longueil-Riccus work in 1563. This fact may be observed in Longueil's Epistolarum Libri IIII, published in Basel in 1570.<sup>70</sup> Simar incorrectly identifies this work as a "Reproduction de

l'edition B," although Becker makes no such claim.<sup>71</sup> One example will suffice to illustrate Simar's error in this matter. In the Epistolarum, 1570, a letter appears which was not published in Longueil's Epistolarum, 1558 (Simar's "edition B"). This letter was written by Budé to Longueil, and it was previously published in both the Habes Lector, 1533, and the Epistolarum, 1540.<sup>72</sup>

Another departure in the publication of Longueil materials was made by Simon Verrepaes in his Selectiores Epistolae of 1573.<sup>73</sup> This treatment marks the first time that Longueil's correspondence was published in selected samples rather than as a complete work in themselves. Among the letters chosen by Verrepaes are three from Longueil's Epistolarum, Book I, one letter from Book II, four from Book III, three complete and one partial letter being reproduced from Book IV. None of the letters from so-called Book V were used. Among those letters from Book IV is the one which first appeared in the Habes Lector, 1533.<sup>74</sup> The epistles selected by Verrepaes for this selection were from the pens of "Petrus Bembus, Iacobus Sadoletus, Christophorus Longolius, and Paulus Manutius."<sup>75</sup>

Just three years later, Longueil's "Ad Luteranos Oratio" made its appearance in the third edition of Hieronymus Osorius' De Religione Libri Tres.<sup>76</sup> This volume, from the same publisher as Verrepaes' Selectiores Epistolae, marked the first time in thirty years that one of Longueil's orations

was published, and this was apart from an edition of his Opera as it had been at that earlier time.<sup>77</sup>

In 1580 Eusebius Episcopus published a new edition of Joannes Brutus' Longueil-Riccius work of 1563.<sup>78</sup> This volume has been identified by Simar as a "Reproduction de l'éd. B plus les liminaires de A (Epitaphes de Germain de Brie), et les pièces nouvelles de Bembo, Claude Rosselet, Lycosthenes," although some of these items are found in earlier publications.<sup>79</sup> Bound together with one of the Vatican Library copies of the Epistolarum, 1580, is an anonymous, undated work without a typographic or colophon marking. This item is simply identified as "Chr. Longolii Epistolae Selectae."<sup>80</sup> It contains a 146-page selection of letters from Longueil (pp. 3-120), and letters from Bembo and Sadoleto to Longueil (pp. 121-146), and appears to be a copy of portions of Pierre Bunel and Paolo Manuzio (eds.), Epistolae Ciceroniano Stylo Scriptae, published in 1581.<sup>81</sup> The Longueil portion of this volume contains 63 letters, including Book IV, 34, as it appeared in Longueil's Epistolarum in 1558 and 1570.<sup>82</sup> In the section of this volume containing the letters from Bembo and Sadoleto to Longueil, there are ten letters. Nine of these were in the Epistolarum editions of 1558 and 1570, and the tenth is the letter from Sadoleto to Longueil which had been omitted from those two earlier editions.<sup>83</sup>

The fifth edition of Osorius' De Religione Libri III was published in two places, by different publishers, in

1585.<sup>84</sup> In 1588 the sixth edition appeared in Cologne,<sup>85</sup> and another printing of this sixth edition by a different publisher was done in 1589.<sup>86</sup> Becker was aware of the two 1585 printings, although he did not identify one of them as the "editio quinta."<sup>87</sup> He was not, however, aware of the 1588 or 1589 publications. Simar fails to mention any of these items, just as he did Osorius' De Religione Libri Tres, 1576. In the last two printings, an extract from the anonymous "Vita" appears along with Longueil's "Ad Lutheranos Oration."<sup>88</sup>

Peter Horst published another edition of Longueil's Epistolarum in 1591.<sup>89</sup> It is identified by Simar as "Pas de liminaires. — Répétition de B," on the order of order of Epistolarum, 1562/63, and Epistolarum, 1570.<sup>90</sup> The difficulties attached to this line of argument have been shown, and the absence of Longueil's orations as well as the removal of the preliminary items, tends to stem from the Habes Lector, 1533, tradition with which Simar was unfamiliar. Simar also lists another edition of Longueil's Epistolarum which was purported to have been published in Cologne in 1595.<sup>91</sup> No other recent biographer refers to this edition, and Simar himself was unable to find it, so that entry must surely be erroneous.

Early in the seventeenth century Joannes Buchlerus published a volume into which he incorporated, with some modifications, seven letters written by Longueil.<sup>92</sup> Simar makes



a correct identification of this source in his general bibliography, but he again errs by listing it as —18<sup>o</sup> instead of —12<sup>o</sup>.<sup>93</sup> This error, however, is a minor one when compared to the only other published item listed by Simar. He indicates a 1570 publication as a "Reproduction intégrale" of Longueil's Epistolarum, 1563.<sup>94</sup> Simar misquotes the date of this edition as 1570, although it was actually published in 1620. The publisher, although not identified, was situated in Lyons, the volume was in —8<sup>o</sup> instead of —12<sup>o</sup>, and the later edition had an "Elenchus Epistolarum" which was not in the earlier one.<sup>95</sup>

It would be over two hundred years before another edition was published which included source materials written by Longueil. Then, in 1837, a volume of Epistolae was published in Bern.<sup>96</sup> Included in this volume are the 63 letters written by Longueil, and the ten written to him by Bembo and Sadoleto, which had been selected by Peter Bunel and Paul Manuti for their work in 1581.<sup>97</sup>

Another century passed before Goldschmidt published his translation of Longueil's letter to Pierre Brisson, a letter written in 1513 and published in the Habes Lector, 1533, but overlooked by Simar.<sup>98</sup> Then, in 1968, Robert Aulotte published the text of Longueil's translation of Plutarch's De Beneficiis.<sup>99</sup> This last-named item was published shortly following the Gregg Press photographic reprint of Longueil's Opera, Junta.<sup>100</sup> With these works, all the printed

source materials related to Longueil have been scrutinized, and there is ample reason from this review to reevaluate them with a view to writing a new biographical study of Longueil. But a third line of evidence is yet to be evaluated, in addition to the manuscript materials and the published source materials, which will include the biographic works which have utilized varying quantities of the above-mentioned source materials and printed editions of Longueil's works. It is to this review of biographical studies and related works that the present study will now direct its attention.

1. Longueil, Opera, Junta, as cited in ch. i, n. 1.

2. These items appear under the general title of [Christophe de Longueil], Christofori Longoulii / Parisiensis Oratio De laudibus diui Ludouici, Atq; Francorum, habita Pyc-tauij in / Coenobio Fratrum minorum. (Parisijs: Henricium Stephanum, 1510). Copies of them may be found in such libraries as the British Museum (London), the Bibliothèque Royale (Brussels), the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Bibliothèque Mazarine (Paris). It was this last-named location that provided the copy used by Simar, Longueil, p. 208, and Becker, Longueil, p. v, used a copy in the library at Dresden. The present study utilizes the British Museum copy, which has the colophon on fol. [33b], although Simar indicates that it is on p. 63. On fol. a, ij (2a-3b) appears Longueil's letter to Francis of Valois, written from Poitiers on 5 September 1510. See "Appendix B" for the text of this letter. Next is "Christofori Longuolii Parisiensis Oratio de laudibus diui Ludouici atq; Francorum habita Pyctauij in Coenobio fratrum minorum" [fols. 4a-23b], followed by a letter from Jacob Renauld of Tours to Longueil, having no place or date indicated [fols. 23b-24a], as shown in the text of "Appendix C." Longueil's letter "Joanni Balenio Belouacen [Beauvais], [fols. 24b-26a], from Poitiers on 10 December 1510, as shown in the text of this letter in "Appendix D." This item is followed by "Christop. Loguo. parisi, Oratio habita Pyctauij i pfatiōe enarratiōis duodetricesimi libri Pandectarum iuris ciuili- lis" [fols. 26b-33b], although Simar, Longueil, p. 208, erroneously lists this last item as beginning on folio 25. Hereafter this work will be identified as Longueil, Oratio de Laudibus diui Ludouici, 1510.

3. [Christophe de Longueil], Christofori / Longuolii Parisiensis Oratiōes due: vna de laudibus diui / Ludouici: atq; Francorum. Alia in prefatione enarrationis duodetricesimi libri Pandectarum iuris ciuili- habite quide / Pyctauij. Anno domini. M. cccccx (Parisijs: P. Gromorsus). Unlike the Stephanus edition of 1510, this quarto edition has a brief caption introducing the first entry in its contents. These contents are the same as the Stephanus edition, and they appear in the same sequence. The entire work, however, is only twelve folios (clearly identified), and there is no colophon entry on the final page, although the date at the bottom of folio xiib is "M.D.XX," rather than the "M. cccccx" of the title page. The caption on folio iia indicates the ascension of Francis of Valois to the throne of France had occurred: "Epistola ad Franciscum Regem Francorum." Fols. iib-ixa contain the Renauld letter to Longueil, although Simar, Longueil, p. 208, asserts that it is to be found on fol. 10a, as is the letter of Longueil to Balenius. Folios xb-xiib contain the "Preface," and again Simar appears to be in error. Simar used

a copy of this item in the Bibliothèque Nationale, where two copies are housed. Becker, Longueil, p. v, does not seem to have used a copy of this edition, for he lists it as item 1a, and he does not authenticate it or even hint at the problem of a different date. D[omenico] Gnoli, Un giudizio di lesa Romanità Sotto Leone X: Aggiuntevi le Orazioni de Celso Mellini e di Cristoforo Longolio (Roma: Camera dei Deputati, 1891), p. 2, n. 2, makes mention of this publication, but dismisses the date on the title page altogether in favor of "Parisiis, apud Gromorsum, 1520." Henceforth this work will be identified as Longueil, Orationes Duae, 1510/1520.

4. Franciscus Duchesne (ed.), Historiae / Francorum / Scriptores, a Philippo Avgvsto Rege / usque ad R. Philippi IV. dicti Pulchri Tempora, quorum plurimi nunc primum ex variis Codicibus MSS. in lucem / prodeunt: alij vero auctiores & emendatiores. Cum Epistolis Regum, Pontificum, Ducum, / Abbatum, & aliis veteribus rerum Francicarum monumentis, Tomus V. (Lutetiae Parisiorum: Gabrieli Cramoisy, 1649), pp. 500-515. In this edition, only the oration on St. Louis is printed, and the spellings have been updated and abbreviation symbols largely eliminated. The title to this oration now takes the following form: "Christophori Longvolii Parisiensis oratio de laudibus divi Lvdovici Francorum Regis," p. 500. Copies of this particular edition may be observed in Trinity College, Dublin, the British Museum, the Bibliothèque Mazarine, and the Biblioteca Comunale, Trento, among other places. Simar, Longueil, p. 208, cites the Paris copy, whereas Becker, Longueil, p. v, item 1b, cites Simar.

5. Simar, Longueil, pp. 208-209, lists, "4) Christophori Longolii oratio de laudibus jurisprudentiae, habita Valentiae cum a Philippo Decio prolytharum ornamentis insigniretur. Ed. citée par Brunet, Manuel de libraire, in voce Longolius." He completes this entry by asserting, "Je l'ai cherchée inutilement, même à la bibliothèque de Valence." Becker, Longueil, p. v, makes the following bibliographical entry: "2. Christophori a Longolio panegyris de laudibus jurisprudentie, habita Valentie, cum a Philippo Decio prolytarum ornamentis insigniretur." He adds the following note to his entry: "—Presentem panegyrim in formis redigendum curavit Valentie D. Ludovicus Olivelli bibliopola, octavo nonas septembris anno mil. v<sup>e</sup> XIII. (Brunet)." Even the more recent works by Kopf, "Christophorus Longolius," Goldschmidt, "De Longueil's Letter," de Pins, "Jean de Pins," Gerlo, Bibliographie, Aulotte, "Une Rivalité," and M. — M. Garanderie, "Les Relations," all mentioned in ch. i, n. 3, make no reference to the actual text of this oration which they all must have assumed was no longer extant. The item does appear, however, in the Bibliothèque Nationale Catalogue Général Auteurs, IC, "Leabador-Lordat," cols. 867-872, sub

verbo, "Longueil," col. 871. This volume was published in 1930, so the information must have been available to those more recent writers.

6. [Christophe de Longueil], Clarissimi orationis bonarum artium cultoris / ris [.] Ac iuris & legum doctoris locupletissimi / Hac nostra tempestate memoria eloquentiae / Trium; linguarum peritia singularis Ac illu / strissimi principis angulismensis aulici. D. xpofoxi / a longolio panegyricus. In ciuilibus sapientie laudem Dum prolytharum infulis Apud delphinates In florēti & famoso valētino gymnasio. Per ma / gnificum senatorem. D. Philippū decium / donaretur. Duo separatim ad inuicē cuius libet facultatis excellentionibus fa- / cile apperit nullā earū nedū excel- / lere. Sed nec sibi: coequari Ta / lētum inter eas oēs. & istā esse de / lectu. qualis inter cōtinētia / & contenta solet adhiberi. Et hac velut vicaria dei / opera fungente oīs / in hoc seculo egere / neccessario Reli / quis vero cō / tingen- / ter. The colophon of this fine leather-bound copy is on fol. c.iiib [11b], as follows: "Soli tempore auaritia est honesta. Ut complurimorum morem gereret voluntati sua impensa prius panegyricum in formis redigendū. Curauit valēti. D. Ludouicus oliuelli uniuersitatis eiusdē bibliopola iuratus octauo nonas septembris. Anno dñi mil. vc. xiiii."

7. [Caius Plinius Secundus], Caii Plinii Secundi Naturalis Historie Libri. xxxviij nuper studiose recogniti, / atq; impressi Adiectis varijs Antonij Sabellici, / Raphaelis Volaterrani, Beroaldi, Erasmi. Budei, Longolij adnotationibus, quibus Mundi huius / storia locis ple / risq; vel re / stituitur, / vel il- / lustratur (Lutecie: Regnavlt Chavdiere). The date added to the title page of the British Museum copy is 1516.

8. Ibid., fol. iia-iib, "Nicolaus Beraldus Clarissimo viro Nicolao Bracheto, Regio Consiliario. S P D.," which is dated, "Lutecie Idus Octob. MDXVI," although the numerals may have been supplied at a later time.

9. See Cod. Otto. 1517, as indicated in the discussion of manuscripts pertaining to Longueil in ch. i and n. 21.

10. See Bib. Ambrosiana, S. Q. D. III, 15, for the "Celsi Melini Accusatio in Longolium," as indicated in ch. i, n. 34. Although it is not from this source, the text of the "Accusation" has been published as "Oratio Celsi Mellini, in Christophorum Longolium, Perduellionis Reum," in Gnoli, Un giudizio, "Appendix I," pp. 97-118.

11. Ibid., items 2 and 3. Inside the front cover of the binding containing these three items, a librarian has

made an entry that this is the "Edizione secondo il Mediomardi del 1518," which must be an allusion to the Longueil orations. These orations were published as [Christophe de Longueil], Christophori Longolii / Civis Romani Perdv- / ellionis Rei De- / fensiones Dvae. This work has the typographical mark of "Aldvs" on the title page, and a letter by Baptista Casalius on the verso side. On the next page, marked fol. 3, begins "Christophori Longolii Ci- / vis Ro. Perdvellionis / Rei, Prioris Diei Defensio." This oration is completed on fol. 31a, and "Christophori Longolii / Civis Ro. Perdvellio / nis Posterio / ris Diei De- / fensio," fols. 31b-[58b], is followed by a page of "Errata," [fol. 59a], and the colophon page, fol. [60a], with the following entries: "a b c d e f g h Omnes Quater / niones Praeter Duernionem," and "Venetiis in Aedibvs / Aldi, et Andreae / Soceri." The pagination appears on each of folios 3-56, inclusive. Otherwise, it has been supplied.

12. Gnoli, Un giudizio, "[Appendix] II," pp. 119-160, "Christophori Longolii Civis Ro. perduellionis rei defensio," contains both orations, but transcribed from the 1519 edition. See infra, n. 14, for the precise identification of this source.

13. [Christophe de Longueil], Christophori Longolii / Civis Romani Perdv- / ellionis Rei De- / fensiones / Dvae. This volume also has the typographic mark "Aldvs" on the title page. Unlike the volume in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, however, there are two blank pages [title page b and fol. 2a] before the letter of Baptista Casalius, [fol. 2b]. Folios 3a-31a contain "Christophori Longolii Ci- / vis Ro. Perdvellionis / Rei, Prioris Diei / Defensio," followed by "Christophori Longolii / Civis Ro. Perdvellio / nis Rei, Posterio / ris Diei De- / fensio," fols. 31b-[58b]. Folio [59a] is blank, the "Errata" appears on [59b], and the colophon is on fol. [60a], being identical with the Ambrosiana item. Both volumes also have the "Aldvs" typographic mark on fol. [60b]. Inside the Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio-Emmanuele copy is a lengthy note by "D.G." [Domenico Gnoli], describing various editions of the publication. Since Simar wrote his study nearly twenty years following Gnoli's Un giudizio and is still unaware of the items in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana and the Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio-Emmanuele, it may be assumed that Gnoli's note inside the cover of the last-named item was written sometime later than Gnoli's own 1891 publication.

14. As has been indicated, supra n. 12, Gnoli, Un giudizio, did not use either of the two editions of Longueil's Defense Orations thus far discussed. Instead, he used another text housed in the Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio-Emmanuele:

[Christophe de Longueil], Christophori Longolii civis Ro. / Perduellio / nis Rei / Defensio. The colophon is on fol. [44b]: "Impressum Romae per Magistrum Stephanū Guillereti de Lothoringia Curante nobili viro Domino Mariano de Castellanis Cive. Ro. Amantissimo Christophori Longolii hospite [.]. Anno. Sal. M.D.XIX. Quinto Idus Augusti Sedente Leone .X. Pont. Max. Anno Septimo." Simar, Longueil, p. 209, lists this volume as being 12<sup>o</sup>, but he must surely be in error since the volume is universally listed as 4<sup>o</sup>. The copy he cites in the Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio-Emmanuele (69.7.F. 20) is itself in 4<sup>o</sup> rather than 12<sup>o</sup>, and there are additional variations between Simar's entry and the item to which he refers. Becker, Longueil, p. vi, appears to follow Simar without question. Extant copies of this edition may be found in the Biblioteca Vaticanus, the Biblioteca Angelica, the Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio-Emmanuele. Venice's Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana has two copies bound into separate collections of several items each, the Bibliothèque Nationale has still another copy, as does the Newberry Library in Chicago.

15. Both Simar, Longueil, pp. 209-210, and Becker, Longueil, p. vi, list separate bibliographical entries for the reproduction of Gnoli, Un giudizio, pp. 119-160. In addition, they both list [Christophe de Longueil], Christophori Longolii / Civis Romani Perduellionis Rei Defensiones / Duae. Simar says the colophon is "Venetiis, in aedibus Aldi et Andreae Soceri, s. d. [1519]," and Becker offers the date "[Mai 1520.]," citing copies of it in Munich, Berlin, Breslau, and Gottingen. The descriptions of the contents within this work, as cited by both Simar and Becker, would indicate either the date 1518, or perhaps a reprinting of that work described *supra*, n. 13. According to the British Museum Gen. MSS Cat., CXLIV (1962), cols. 249-250, several items are listed under "Longolius (Christophorus)." At the end of that listing are four copies of "C. Longolii ... perduellionis rei defensiones duae. ff. 58. In aedibus Aldi, et Andreae Soceri: Venetiis, [1518?] 8<sup>o</sup>." These items are duplicates of those described by Simar and Becker, as well as those copies listed under "s. d." in the Vatican Library, Ambrosian Library and the Bibliothèques Mazarine and Nationale.

16. [Christophe de Longueil], Christophori Longolii Parrhisiensis / civis Romani perduellionis rei defensiones duae. The typographic mark is Jehan Petit, and the title page adds, "Prostant Parrhisiis in edibus Ioannis parui Egidii gromontii: & Petri gromors." On the verso of the title page is "Nicolaus Beraldu Stephanus Poncherio, Adulescenti studioso, auditori suo. S.P.D.," and "Christophori longolii civis ro. perduellionis rei, prioris diei defensio," fols. iia-xia, is followed by "Christophori Longolii civis ro. pduellionis rei, posterioris diei defensio," fols. xib-xxa. After

the oration comes "Germanus Brixius lectori," dated "Lutetiae quinto Kalendas Nouembris. M.D.XX," fol. xxa. There are captions across the tops of each page which read, "Christophori Longuolii perduellionis rei," on each verso page, and "Defensiones duae," on each recto. There is no colophon per se. Simar, Longueil, p. 210, cites this edition as the item described in M. L. Delaruelle, "Nicole Bérault: notes biographiques suivies d'un appendice sur plusieurs de ses publications," Le Musée Belge, XIII, nos. 3-4 (1909), 253-312. This article, under the general heading, "Études sur l'humanisme français," comprises a series of twelve items attached as a bibliographic appendix. Item 8, p. 305, concerns the entry cited by Simar. Becker, Longueil, p. vi, cites the same authority. Two copies of the Longueil Defense Orations are available at the Bibliothèque Nationale.

17. [Christophe de Longueil], Christo / phori Longolii Civis / Romani Perdvel- / lionis Rei De- / fensiones / Duae. The typographic mark on the title page is that of Jodocus Badius, and the volume is "Venundatur in officina Badiana." The letter of Baptista Casalius, on the verso side of the title page, faces the "Germanus Brixius Lectori," fol. 2a, and a six-line epitaph on Longueil appears on fol. 2b, which is also by Brixius. On fols. 3a-b is the "Aegidius Landus ordinis Sacti Augustini professor Laurentio Bartholino. S.P.D.," dated "Lutetiae Parisiorum Quarto Idus Nouembris. MDXX." Following this letter is a brief "Ascensius Longolio," fol. 3b. Folios 4a-31b contain "Christophori Longolii civis Ro. Perdvellionis Rei, Prioris Diei Defensio," and "Christophori Longolii Civis Ro. Perdvellionis Rei, Posterioris Diei Defensio," fols. 32a-59b, concludes the volume. Its colophon, fol. 59b, reads, "Finis in Chalcographis Iodoci Badij Ascensij, Ad quintum Idus Nouemb. MDXX." Simar, Longueil, p. 210, cites a copy in Roma, Biblioteca Angelica, and Becker, Longueil, p. vi, cites copies in Vienna and Munich. In addition, two copies are to be found in the Bibliothèque Nationale.

18. None of the biographers of Longueil indicate the publication of this work in 1522, although there is a copy of [Christophe de Longueil], Christo- / phori Longolii / uiri doctissimi ad Luterianos iam / damnatos oratio, omni- / bus numeris abso- / luta, listed in the Catalogue of Padua, Biblioteca del Museo Civico (item H. 8003), under the date 1522. The place of publication is "Coloniae, Apud Ioannem Gymnicum, An. M. D. XXII." The last two numerals in this date have been added, over what appears to have been an erasure. In addition, there is an inked entry of "1522" supplied just beneath the above-mentioned date. Since there is no colophon, and since the item matches the description of the same publishing house in 1529, it must be that this entry at Padua



is in error. See the discussion infra, n. 27, for a fuller description of this item, which hereafter will be identified as Longueil, Ad Luterianos, 1529.

19. Longueil, Opera, Junta.

20. This has not always been the case, however, for those biographies published before and including the Dictionnaire Universel, Historique, Critique et Bibliographique, Neuvième édition, Tome X, "Leak-Malf." (Paris: 1810), 212, "Longueil (Christophe de), Longolius," did not list any Opera prior to the 1533 edition published in Paris. Beginning with the Nouvelle Biographie Générale Depuis les Temps les Plus Reculés Jusq' à nos Jours, Avec les Renseignements Bibliographiques et l'indication des Sources à Consulter (Paris: Firmin Didot Frères, 1853-66), "Longueil (Christophe de)," col. 576, article signed by "P. L—y [perhaps Ernest Poirée Louisy?]," and La Grande Encyclopédie Inventaire Raisonné des Sciences, des Lettres et des Arts Par Une Société de Savants et de Gens de Lettres, Tome Vingt-deuxième, "Lemot-Manzoni" (Paris: H. Lamirault et C<sup>ie</sup>, [1895-96]), 532b-533a, "Longueil (Christophe de)," an unsigned article, the notation mentions the Opera, Junta, as the "Epistolarum Lib. IV; Florence, 1524, in -4<sup>o</sup>;" or some other designation. The first dated reference to the 1524 Opera, Junta, is Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 1, n. 1, and an article signed by L. Roersch, "Longueil (Christophe de)," Biographie Nationale Publiée par l'Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-arts de Belgique, Tome Douzième, "Les-Ly," (Bruxelles: Bruylant-Christophe & C<sup>ie</sup>, 1892-93), cols. 349-359, although Roersch makes no mention whatsoever of the Gnoli contribution.

21. Folios 65a-88b, "Chr. Longolii Epistol. Liber Primvs," contains 41 letters; "Chr. Long. Epistolarvm Liber Secvndvs," fols. 89a-113b, contains 39 letters; "Christophori Longolii Epistolatvm Liber Tertivs," fols. 113b-133b [sic, it should read 132b], contains another 37; fols. 134a [sic, it should read 133a]-153a, "Christophori Longolii Epistolarvm Liber Qvartvs," has 33 letters; "Petri Bembi et Iacobi Sadoleti Epistolarvm Liber," fols. 153b-163b, completes the volume with another fifteen letters. There are several inaccurately numbered folios in this edition, and the letters are not enumerated. "Liber Tertivs," does not begin at the top of a new page, although all other sections of the volume do begin on a new page. See supra ch. i, n. 1, for colophon material. Copies of the original publication of this edition, not the Gregg Reprint issue of 1967, are available in many libraries throughout Europe as well as the United States. One of five copies housed at the Vatican Library (R. G. Neolatini IV. 137A) is interesting in that the first eight folios are missing. In their stead is a manuscript of later date entitled, "Christophori Longolii Vita A. Reginaldo Polo Descripta."

22. Simar, Longueil, p. 211, although the question of the edition being under the direction of Reginald Pole will be treated elsewhere.

23. [Christophe de Longueil], Christo / phori Longolii Orationes / Duae Pro Defensione Sua ab Lese Maiesta / tis Crimine, Longe Exactiori q̃ Ante Iudi / cio Perscriptae, atq; ex Ipsius Authoris / Sententia in Lucem Editae. / Oratio Una ad Luterianos. / Eiusdem Epistolarum Libri Quatuor. / Epistolarũ Bēbi & Sadoleti Liber Vnae. / Quibus Omnibus praeponetur Ipsius Lō / golii Vita Perdocte atq; Eleganter ab Ipsius Amicissimo Quodam Exarata. This volume adds, "Ac-curatione, typis & impensis Iodoci Badii Ascensii: in in-clyta Parrhisiorum Academia," on the title page, but has no date there. The colophon, fol. 316b, supplies the date, as it asserts, "In Typographia Iodoci Badij Ascēsi in Parrhisiorum Academia : ad Idus Iunias. M.D.XXVI." Hereafter this work will be referred to as Longueil, Opera, 1526.

24. Simar, Longueil, p. 211.

25. Ibid., p. 211.

26. Becker, Longueil, p. vi, says nothing about the contents of this 1526 edition. He mentions copies of it at Munich and Freiburg. In addition to those copies, and to Simar's reference, Longueil, p. 211, to the one in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal in Paris, there are additional copies at the Bibliothèques Mazarine and Nationale, as well as Trinity College Library, Dublin, and the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D.C.

27. Longueil, Ad Luterianos, 1529. See supra n. 18. The pagination in this volume is faulty, as are the various library entries. It is listed in the British Museum Gen. MSS Cat. as -8<sup>o</sup>, as it is in the Bibliothèque Nationale Catalogue Général Auteurs, but as -16<sup>o</sup> in the Padua, Biblioteca del Museo Civico. The Newberry Library listing is "95p. 14 cm.," which avoids the problem altogether. It appears that the Padua Catalogue is in error, just as it is about the date of its publication. The pagination is printed on each page, although it is sometimes incorrect.

28. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 64a, "Quatuor subsecutures orationes immatura morte non absoluit."

29. In addition to the copies at Padua, Paris, London (2), and Chicago, are those in the Bibliothèque Royale and the Folger Shakespeare Library. Becker, Longueil, p. vi, adds copies at Vienna and Freiburg to this list.

30. [Christophe de Longueil], Christo- / phori Longolii Orationes / Duae Pro Defensione Sua ab Lesae Maie- / tis Crimine, Longe Exactiori & Ante Iudicio / Perscriptae, Atq; ex Ipsius Authoris Senten / tia in Lucem Editae. / Oratio Vna ad Luterianos. / Eiusdem Epistolarum Libri Quatuor. / Epistolarū Bēbi & Sadoleti Liber Vnus. / Quibus Omnibus Praeponetur Ipsius Lō- / golii Vita, Perdocte Atq; Elegāter ab Ipsius / Amicissimo Quodam Exarata. This volume appears to be a reprinting of the Longueil, Opera, 1526, as Simar, Longueil, p. 212, indicates, except that he erroneously follows an incorrect pagination of the 1530 printing, which places the colophon on p. 361 [sic, it should be p. 316, and this concurs with the Opera, 1526]. The information of the title page of the 1530 printing is "Accuratione, typis, & impensis Iodoci Badii Ascensii, in inclyta Parrhisiorum Academis. 1530," with the date apparently supplied by the printer at the time of issue. The colophon states, "In typographia Iodoci Badii Ascensii in Parisiorum Academia: Rursus ad Idus Iulias. M.D.XXX." Becker, Longueil, p. vi, merely cites this entry, but Simar, Longueil, p. 212, lists this -8<sup>o</sup> volume as being in Paris, at the Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève. The only other copies of this particular 1530 printing extant seem to have found their ways into Paris libraries: de l'Arsenal, Mazarine, and Nationale (2), which tends to confirm the notion that the 1530 printing was merely a reprint of the 1526 edition of Longueil's Opera. Henceforth the 1530 work will be identified as Longueil, Opera, 1530.

31. [Christophe de Longueil], Christo- / phori Longolii Oratio- / nes Duae Pro Defensione Sua ab Lesae Ma- / iestatis Crimine, Longe Exactiori & Ante / Iudicio Perscriptae. Atq; ex Ipsius Autho- / ris Sententia in Lucem Editae. / Oratio Vna ad Luterianos. / Eiusdem Epistolarum Libri Quatuor. / Epistolarū Bēbi & Sadoleti Liber Vnus, / Quibus Omnibus Praeponetur Ipsius Lō / golii Vita Perdocte atq; Eleganter ab Ipsi / us Amicissimo Quodam Exarata. This volume, according to the title page, is "Accuratione, typis Iodoci Badii Ascensii, & impensis eius, & Ioannis Roigny, in inclyta Parrhisiorum Academis. 1533." The colophon, like that of Longueil, Opera, 1530, is on p. 361 [sic, it should be 316], and its contents are the same as the Longueil, Opera, 1526, except that the title page has been reset and the date supplied on both the title page and the colophon. The colophon entry of Longueil's Opera, 1533, is "In Typographia Iodoci Badij Ascensii impensis eius & Ioannis Roigny, in Parisiorum Academia. Mense Octobri. M.D.XXXIII." There are slight variations in the page locations of some of the items within the issues of 1530 and 1533, but their contents are identical. Extant copies of this 1533 edition, which Simar, Longueil, p. 212, identifies as a repetition of the Longueil, Opera, 1526, housed in the Bibliothèque Mazarine, and Becker, Longueil, p. vi, locates in Munich and Freiburg, may also be

found in Padua, in Rome at the Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio-Emmanuele (2 copies), the Vatican Library (3 copies), Brussels, and the Bibliothèques de l'Arsenal and Nationale (2 copies), as well as the British Museum. All these copies are in -8°, and will be identified hereafter as Longueil, Opera, 1533.

32. [Christophe de Longueil], Christophori Longolii de Suis In- / fortunij Epistola, Ut in Primis / Elegans, Ita & Affectuum / Plena, Adeo, Ut Vel Sili- / ci Lachrymes Excu- / tere Possit. Hacte / nus Nusq; / Excusa. / Huic Accedit Eius- / dem De Laudi- / bus Iurisprudentie Oratio Habita / Valentie, cū a D. Decio Prolytha / rum Ornamentis Insigniretur. This volume is the first book imprinted at Bourges, and there is supporting evidence to the effect that both written on the frontispiece, and pasted inside the front cover. The title page supports this to the effect that it avers, "Biturgibus excudebat Joannes Garnerius. Cum privilegio. 1533." There is no colophon, but the printer's typographic mark is found on [p. 56]. Pagination has been added to this text, beginning with "1" on the title page, although there is pagination of most of the folios according to the following format: Title page, fol. [Aia]; "Andreas Leuescatus Joanni De Moruillier," fols. Aib-Aiiiib]; "Christophorus a Longolio, Petrum Brisoū Saluere iubet," Bia-Eib; "Christophori a Longolio, Panegyris, de Laudibus Iurisprudentiae," Eia-[Giiia]; and an "Errata," fol. [Giiib]. Hereafter this work will be identified as Longueil, De Infortuniis Epistola, 1533. The text of Longueil's letter to Brisson, fols. Bia-Eib, have been reproduced in "Appendix E" of the present study.

33. These two copies are both located in Paris, at the Bibliothèques Mazarine and Nationale. Although Simar, Longueil, p. 209, asserts that they are in -12°, they are in actuality - 8°.

34. Longueil, De Infortuniis Epistola, 1533, fols. [Aib-Aiiiib], pp. [2-8]. The full title of this letter is, "Andreas Leuescatus Joanni De Moruillier viro iuris vtriusq; consultissimo, aequissimo, gaudere et rem bene gerere."

35. Longueil, De Infortuniis Epistola, 1533, fols. Bia-Eib, pp. [9-39], although Simar, Longueil, p. 209, who follows these pages instead of the folio markings as supplied by the printer, has several slight discrepancies in his bibliographical note. Becker, Longueil, p. 70, misnumbers these folios too, but he does use the older system of pagination.

36. Goldschmidt, "De Longueil's Letter," p. 168, n. 1, mentions the fact that the copy he used is from the Bibliothèque Nationale, which has acquired it as early as 1881. He does, however, incorrectly identify the location of the typographer's mark as "(Fol. 56b of the Epistola)." This item is

actually on p. 56 of the new pagination, or fol. [Giiiib] if the old style is followed. Goldschmidt's English translation actually covers pp. 169-182, with his footnotes included.

37. This would be the Catalogue entry "8<sup>o</sup> B.632," which is actually [Gilbertus Longolius], Lexicon / Graecolatinum / Praeter / Omneis Omnium Hactenus Accessio / nes, Nouo Supra Mille Uocabulo / rum Auctario Iam Recens / Locupletatum. Auctore G. Longolio Vtricen. . . . (Coloniae: Ioannis Prael, Mense Septembri, M.D.XXXIII).

38. [Christophe de Longueil], Habes Lector / Christophori Longolii Epistola- / rum Libros Quatuor. Tullianae scilicet Eloquentiae ad Un- / quem Expressam Imaginem. / Item. / Pet. Bembi, Iac. Sadoleti, / Gvl. Bvdæi. D. Eras. Epistolarum / ad Eundem Longolium, Librum Unum. / Ad Haec / Eiusdem uitam, per quendam ipsius studiosissimum con- / scriptam. Omnia in usum simul ac gratiam studiosorum / non castigatus modo, sed & locupletius quam ante hac excusa. This volume was published "Basileae. Mense Septemb. Anno M. D. XXXIII." The colophon, p. 349, is "Basileae. Apud Ioannem Valderum, Mense Septembri, Anno M. D. XXXIII." The volume opens with the three items entitled, "Germanus Brixius in Obitu Christophori Longolii," fol. title page b, with "Christophori Longolii Vita," fols. a2a-a4b. Immediately following this "Vita," begins the consecutively enumerated pages of "Christophori Longolii Epistolarum Lib. Primus," pp. 1-76; "Christophori Longolii Epistolarum Liber II," pp. 76-155; "Christophori Longolii Epistolarum Liber III," pp. 156-217; "Christophori Longolii Epistolarum Liber IIII," pp. 218-284. Pages 284-349 contain "Petri Bembi et Iacobi Sadoleti Epistolarum Liber," although the page captions are "Epist. Lib. V," on the recto, and "Ad Christ. Long.," on the verso. Copies of this edition of the Habes Lector are not to be found in Paris or in the Vatican Library. They may be found, however, in Rome at the Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio-Emmanuel, at Padua, Brussels, and in the British Museum. Simar, Longueil, makes no mention of this work, but Becker, Longueil, p. vii, lists copies of it in Vienna, Munich, Breslau, Göttingen, Königsberg, and Freiburg. This work will henceforth be identified as Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533.

39. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 318-325. For the text of this letter, see "Appendix F" of the present study.

40. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 325-330. See "Appendix G" in the present study for the text of this letter.

41. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 331-342. The text of this letter appears as "Appendix H" in the present study.

42. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 342-346. See "Appendix I" of the present study for the text of this letter.

43. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 346-348. The text of this letter appears as "Appendix J" in the present study.

44. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 348-349.

45. Becker, Longueil, p. vii, item 8.

46. [Christophe de Longueil], Christo- / phori Longolii / Orationes Duae Pro / Defensione Sua in Crimen Laesae Maiestatis, / Longe Exactiori quàm ante / Iudicio Perscriptae, / ac Nunc Primum ex Ipsius / Auctoris Sententia in Lucem Editae. / Item / Oratio una ad Luterianos / Eiusdem Epistolarum Libri Quatuor. / Epistolarum Bembi & Sadoleti Liber Unus. / Ad Haec / Longolij Vita Perdoctè Quidem Atque Eleganter per Quen- / dam Ipsius Amicissimum Conscripta. Omnia in Usus / Simul ac Gratiam Studios / orum non Castigatus / Modò, sed & haec Locupletius quàm / ante hac Excusa. The title page goes on to say that this edition was published, "Venetiis, M.D.XXXIX." The colophon, fol. 264b, reads, "Venetiis Anno Domini M.D.XXXIX. Die XXV. Mensis nouembris." The arrangement of the contents is the same as earlier editions. This edition will be referred to hereafter as Longueil, Opera, 1539. Simar used copies in Paris, at the Bibliothèque Mazarin, and at Ghent, at the Bibliothèque de l'Université. To these may be added copies in the Vatican Library, as well as the Biblioteche Angelica and Nazionale Vittorio-Emmanuele in Rome, the University and Civic libraries at Padua, and the libraries at Trent and Udine (3 copies), in addition to the Folger Shakespeare Library in the United States.

47. Simar, Longueil, p. 212. It should be noted that Simar translates the contents of this edition in his bibliography, although he does leave the title page and the colophon entries in the original Latin.

48. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 342-346, 346-348, 318-325, and 348-349, respectively. Also see "Appendix I," "J," and "F," respectively, for the letters involved.

49. Becker, Longueil, p. vi, where he also refers to his bibliographic entry on the Habes Lector, 1533, on p. vii.

50. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 325-330, and 331-342, contain two letters from Budé to Longueil. The first of these has two passages of Greek text, but the latter is written entirely in Greek. See also "Appendix G," and "H," respectively.

51. [Christophe de Longueil], Christo- / phori Longolii / Epistolarvm Libri IIII. / Tullianae Uidelicet Eloquētiaē ad Un- / quem Expressa Imago. / Item / Pet. Bembi, Iac. Sadoleti, / Gvl. Bvdæi, Des. Eras. / Epistolarum ad eundem Lon- / golium, Liber. I. / Ad Haec / Eiusdem uita, per quendam ipsius Studiosissimū / Conscripta. Omnia in Usū Simul ac Gratiam Studiosorum non Castigatius Modò, sed & Locuple- / tius quàm ante hac Excusa. The type was reset for this edition, which was published "Basileae. Mense Septemb. Anno M. D. XL." The colophon, p. 407, is "Basileae Apud Ioannem Valderum, Mense Septembri Anno M. D. XL," for this work which will hereafter be identified as Longueil, Epistolarum, 1540.

52. Simar, Longueil, p. 213, citing a copy of this work in the Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, mentions a colophon on p. 407, as well as the Brixius "Epitaphs" and a piece of verse by Étienne Dolet. The copy of this same edition in the Biblioteca del Museo Civico (N. 4526), at Padua, does not include the Brixius pieces, nor Dolet's versification, and it has no colophon page. The copy of the work in the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome concurs with Simar's observation, as does the copy in the Bibliothèque Royale. Becker, Longueil, p. vii, cites two copies he found in Munich. All these items are in —8°. Simar and Becker, as well as the various library catalogues involved, fail to mention the fact that this is the first edition in which the "Epistolae" are numbered, and that five-line sections are indicated within the text of the letters.

53. Simar, Longueil, p. 213. Becker, Longueil, p. vii, rightly lists this edition under his heading following the Habes Lector, 1533, as an edition of the "Epistolae."

54. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 342-346, and 346-348, as indicated supra and reproduced in "Appendix I," and "J," in the present study. The three "Epitaphs" by Brixius are also in this publication, although the versification, "Doletus Clarissimo S. D.," is found as a handwritten copy added to the verso side of the colophon page.

55. This tends to confirm the fact that it is a re-issue of Longueil's Habes Lector, 1533, by the same publisher. It also argues against Simar's notion that the Longueil, Epistolarum, 1540, is a reproduction of the Longueil, Opera, 1539.

56. [Christophe de Longueil], Christo- / phori Longolii Lucu / brationes. / Orationes III. / Epistolarum IIII. / His Appensvs / Epistolarum Pet. Bembi, & Iac. / Sadoleti liber I. / Vna Cum / Vita Eiusdem Longolii ab Ipsius Amicissimo Quodam Exarata. This edition of Longueil's Opera is

in —8<sup>o</sup>, with the typographic mark, "Lugduni, Apud Seb. Gryphium, 1542." The colophon, p. 502, is "Lugduni, Apud Seb. Gryphium 1542." Simar, Longueil, p. 213, cites a copy of this edition of Longueil's Opera in the Bibliothèque Nationale, with several slight errors in details, and Becker, Longueil, p. vi, cites copies in Munich and Freiburg. In addition to these are individual copies in the Vatican Library, as well as the libraries at Trent, Udine, Trinity College (Dublin), and the Newberry and Folger libraries. One interesting item, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, is listed in the Catalogue under "[Christophori Longolii Epistola Et Vita.]" It is a damaged volume, with the first 182 pages missing. The handwritten title page covers pp. 183-502, where the colophon indicates that it is another copy of the volume being discussed. From this point, this work will be identified as Longueil, Lucubrationes, 1542.

57. Simar, Longueil, p. 213.

58. [Christophe de Longueil], Christo- / phori Longolii Vi / ri (iudicio quidem / Budaei, Erasmi, Sado- / leti, Bembi, Multorumq; Aliorum) / Doctissimi ad Lutheranos / Oratio. / Psalmo 54. / Praecipita Domine & Divide Linguas Eorum, / Quoniam Uidi Iniquitatem & Contra- / dictionem in Ciuitate. The typographic mark on the title page is followed by "Coloniae ex officina Melchioris Mouesiani, Anno M.D.XLV." There is no colophon in this copy housed in the Vatican Library (R. G. Teol[ogia]. IV 2349 int. 6.), which will be identified hereafter as Longueil, Ad Lutheranos, 1545/46.

59. Simar, Longueil, p. 213, although the particular copy he cites as being in the Bibliothèque Royale is unknown there. No copy of this edition is in Paris either, although there is a copy in the British Museum which is broken apart. Becker, Longueil, p. vi, lists this British Museum copy as well as another in Vienna. The title page is identical to the Vatican Library copy mentioned *supra*, n. 58, except that it was published "Coloniae ex officina Melchioris Nouesiani, Anno M.D.XLVI." There is no colophon in the British Museum copy, which is bound together with a 1534 work on Ecclesiastes [cf., B.M. 1016.g.3(2)], and it too will be identified hereafter as Longueil, Ad Lutheranos, 1545/46.

60. Simar, Longueil, p. 213, lists this as being in —8<sup>o</sup>, but the British Museum Gen. MSS Cat. correctly enters it as —4<sup>o</sup>, while Becker, Longueil, does not treat the matter, and there are folios A-Miiij (as in the Vatican Library copy mentioned *supra*, n. 58).

61. Simar, Longueil, p. 213, lists the first two of these items, but not the third, which is on fols. Mijb-Miijb.



Becker, Longueil, seems to lapse into a slavish following after Simar on this particular reference.

62. [Christophe de Longueil], Christophoro Longolii Epistolarum libri IIII. / Tullianae uidelicet eloquentiae ad un- / quem expressa imago. / Doctorum Item Aliquot / Epistolarum ad eundem Longolium, / liber I. / Quibus eiusdem uita, per quendam ipsius studiosissimum conscripta, est, praemissa. The title page contains the typographic mark of "Episcop.," and the place of publication was "Basileae, M.D.LVIII." There are 350 pages of correspondence numbered, with the colophon on p. 350: "Apud Nic. Episcopium, Iun. M. D.LVIII." Simar, Longueil, p. 213, cites a copy used by him in Mons, at the Bibliothèque Ville, and Becker, Longueil, p. vii, adds copies at Vienna, Freiburg, and the British Museum. He also mentions a copy in Munich, which he undoubtedly misdated as 1550. To these should be added copies at Padua, at the Bibliotheca Universitaria, Paris, at the Bibliothèque Nationale, and the Folger Shakespeare and Newberry libraries. Hereafter this edition will be identified as Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558.

63. Simar, Longueil, p. 214, although there are alterations in the Epistolarum, 1558, which Simar overlooks, and additions which are included from the Habes Lector, 1533, text tradition.

64. Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, fols. b4a-b, contains the anonymous eulogy, and the full title of the "Epitaphia" is "Christophori Longolii Epitaphia, ex magno Epicediorum Epitaphiorumq; opera Conradi Lycosthanis Rubeaquiensis desumpta," fols. b5a-b7a. The first item is the "Patauij in Templo D. Francisci prope chorum, in parte, Meridionali," with "Stephani Doleti in Obitu Christophori Longolij, ad Sebastianum Gryphium, Carmen," the three "Germani Brixii in Obitu Longolij," a fourth "Latomi" epitaph, and the brief "In Commendationem Longolij," and "Claudij Roseti Carmen," to complete the preliminary items accompanying the "Vita" and the "Epistolae" of Longueil.

65. Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, pp. 310-314, is the letter of Longueil to Jacques Lucas d'Orleans first published in the Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 342-346, see "Appendix I." In the Epistolarum, 1558, this letter is item 34 in "Liber IIII," although no earlier edition places it in this position. Technically, the editors are correct in placing this letter in one of the first four books of the "Epistola" rather than in the Bembo-Sadoletto book of correspondence.

66. Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, pp. 314-350, contain these Bembo-Sadoletto letters, with the page captions reading,

"Chr. Longolii, Epist. Lib. V." The letters are not numbered in this fifth book, but six of those which had appeared in all the earlier editions, including Longueil, Opera, Junta, are deleted from the Epistolarum, 1558. Two additional letters contained in Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, are missing, although two other items from that publication are included. The letters omitted from the Longueil, Opera, Junta, are all in Book V, and include V [4, 5, 6, 9, 14, and 15 as listed in that edition]. The Habes Lector, 1533, items deleted are those reproduced in "Appendix G" and "Appendix H" of the present study, whereas the items from the Habes Lector, 1533, included in the Epistolarum, 1558, are reproduced in "Appendix F" and "Appendix J." Of all those items deleted from the Epistolarum, 1558, only one was actually addressed to Longueil. It was a letter to him from Sadoletto, and identified as item [V, 14] in Longueil, Opera, Junta, fols. 162b-163a. All of the other items deleted were to and from other individuals. The two letters included in Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, which were deleted in the Epistolarum, 1558, were both written to Longueil by Budé. Two others included were written to Longueil by Erasmus and Budé respectively, although they appear in reverse order in Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533.

67. [Christophe de Longueil], Christopho- / ri Longolii Episto- / larum libri IIII. / Tullianae uidelicet eloquentiae ad un- / quem expressa imago. / Doctorvm Item Aliquot / Epistolarum ad eundem Longolium, / Liber I. / Qvibvs eiusdem uita, per quendam / ipsius studiosissimum conscripta, / est premissa. The title page lists this work as being published "Basileae, M.D.LXII." Simar, Longueil, p. 214, correctly observes this divergence in the entries, but Becker, Longueil, p. vii, lists only the title-page date entry (1562). These two biographers had access to copies of this particular edition in Paris, the Bibliothèque Mazarin, and in Freiburg and Munich, respectively. Copies are also available for use in the Bibliothèque Nationale as well as the Vatican Library. Hereafter this edition will be identified as Longueil, Epistolarum, 1562/63.

68. [Joannes Michael Brutus, (ed.)], Christo- / phori Longolii / Epistolarvm / Libri IIII. / Bartolomaei item Riccij de / Imitatione Libri Tres. / A Io. Michaelē Bruto emendati. Following the typographic mark on the title page is "Lvḡdvni, Apvd Haered. Seb. Gryphii, 1563." There is no colophon in this volume of 676 pages. Simar, Longueil, p. 214, lists only the first three items in this work, the copy which he used being housed in Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. Becker, Longueil, does not even mention this publication, although additional copies are available at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Bibliothèque Royale, Vatican Library, Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio-Emmanuele, Biblioteca del Museo Civico in

Padua, as well as the Biblioteca Universitaria there. Copies may also be found in the British Museum (2 copies), Newberry, and the Folger Shakespeare Library. Henceforth this volume will be identified as Longueil, Epistolarum, 1563.

69. Simar, Longueil, p. 214. The Vatican Library lists its copy as being 13cm, the Bibliothèque Royale lists is as—24°, as does the Biblioteca Universitaria, although the Biblioteca del Museo Civico lists its copy as —8°. All other copies are identified as —16°, including the entry in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal erroneously cited by Simar. All these copies of this title and edition are the same size and format, hence there are numerous discrepancies among the various library catalog listings. The volume itself has signatures on eight page sets, and the chain markings in the paper are horizontal, indicating that the —16° listing is preferable to the —8°, —12°, or —24° entries. This observation is further verified by J. Baudier (ed.), Bibliographie Lyonnaise: Recherches sur le Imprimeurs, Libraires, Relieurs, et Fondateurs de Lyon au XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle, Huitième Série (Lyon, 1910), 307.

70. [Christophe de Longueil], Christophori / Longolii Episto- / larum Libri IIII. / Tullianae uidelicet elo- / quentiae ad / unguem expressa imago. / Doctorum Item Aliqvot / Epistolarum ad eundem Longolium, / Liber I. / Qvibus eius- / dem uita, per quendam / ipsius studiosissimum con- / scripta, est praemissa. Following the typographic mark of "Episcop.," the title page continues, "Basileae, Per Evsebium Episcop. & Nicolai fratris haeredes. Anno M.D.LXX." In the copy of this volume housed in the Bibliotheca Fageliana at Trinity College (Dublin), inked entries have been added to make the date read, "M.D.LXX.IIII." This is clearly an error, as the colophon reads, "Basileae, per Evsebium Episcopium, & Nicolai fratris haeredes. Anno M. D. LXX. Mense Septemb.," p. 378, and a typographic mark appears on p. 380, although the page numbers end on p. 374. Pages 375-377 contain an "Epistolarum Index." In the British Museum copy of this edition, the "Vita" and other preliminary pages are missing, and that copy begins with the "Epistolae." Otherwise, this —8° copy is identical with the two copies in Dublin, the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, the Biblioteca Communale (Trent), and the Biblioteca del Museo Civico (Padua). Simar, Longueil, p. 214, cites the Paris copy, and Becker, Longueil, p. vii, refers to one located in Freiburg. This edition of Longueil's correspondence will henceforth be identified as Longueil, Epistolarum, 1570.

71. Simar, Longueil, p. 214; Becker, Longueil, p. vii. In addition to the differences between Longueil's Habes Lector, 1533, and his Epistolarum, 1558 (which Simar identifies as "edition B"), there are some differences between the

Epistolarum, 1558, and the Epistolarum, 1570. Simar's lack of knowledge of the Habes Lector, 1533, has suggested that his identification of the Epistolarum, 1558, might better be classified as "edition B<sup>1</sup>," or possibly even "edition C," and that ignorance is here abetted by his careless investigation of the materials with which he claimed to be familiar.

72. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 325-330; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1540, V, 17. Additional variations in dates and in deleted portions of letters in Longueil's Epistolarum, 1570, further challenge Simar's accuracy.

73. Simonis Verrepaeus, Selectiores / Epistolae / Clarorum Virorum, / In Vsum Scholarum in Tres / Libros Digestae, / Opera / Simonis / Verrepaei. / Epistolarum Auctores Indicat Versa Pagina. / His Accessit / Breuissima de Epistolis Latine Conscri- / bendis Isagoge, eodem / Auctore. Following the typographic mark the title page reads, "Dilingae Excudebat Sebaldus Mayer. M. D. LXXIII." The colophon, "Dilinge, excvdebat Sebaldus Mayer," appears on p. 160 of this volume. Becker, Longueil, p. vii, identifies this work as being published in 1574, but he seems to be in error. Hereafter this title will be identified as Verrepaeus, Selectiores Epistolae, 1573.

74. Verrepaeus, Selectiores Epistolae, 1573, includes eleven full letters and one partial one by Longueil. Not all of them are correctly identified within his own work, i.e., his pagination is not always correct, and there are some occasions when he mislocates the site of his source. The letters quoted by Verrepaeus are I, 1, 18, 27; II, 16; III, 5, 13, 22, 32; IV, 29, 33 and 34. The incomplete letter he includes is the last portion of IV, 28. No letters from the so-called Book V appear, and letter IV, 34, is the one added to Longueil's correspondence in Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533.

75. Verrepaeus, Selectiores Epistolae, 1573, title page b, lists these four men under "Epistolarum Auctores," and gives very short identifications of each. "Simon Verrepaeus liberali indole & eximia spe Adolescentibus & Pueris, Francisco, Ioanni, Lucae, Gasparo, Melchiori, & Balthasaro Belleris, integerrimi viri Ioannis Belleri Bibliopolae Antuerpiana FF. liberalium artium studiosis. S. P. D.," follows on fols. A2a-A5b, with an "Index Commonstrans quis cui scribat, & quoties," on fols. A6a-A7b. Folio A8 a-b contains "In selectas clarorum virorum epistolas, M. Augustini Viscauij Mechliniensis Epigramma," and an "Ad studiosum Lectorem Adrianus Scherenbergius Antuerpien.," is also on fol. A8b. From that point, the pages are numbered. "Liber Primus," pp. 1-54, "Liber Secundus," pp. 55-95, and "Liber Tertius," pp. 95-134, are followed by the author's "Brevissima ad Epistolas Latinae Conscribendas Isagoge," pp. 135-160.

76. [Hieronimus Osorius], Hieronymi / Osorii Episcopi / Sylvensis in Gaul- / terum Haddonum Anglum, / de Religione Libri / Tres. / Eiusdem / Epistola Ad Elisa- / betham Angliae / Reginam. / Editio Tertia, Prioribus Emendatior. / Accessit Recens Christophori Lon- / golii, Oratoris Eloquentissimi, non / dissimilis Argumenti Oratio. Following the typographic mark the title page adds, "Cum facultate superiorum. Dilin-  
gae, Excudebat Sebaldus Mayer. M. D. LXXVI." Simar, Longueil, does not mention Osorius' work in his study, although Becker, Longueil, p. vii, cites a copy of this —80 volume in Freiburg and another in the British Museum. No other copies have been located of this item, henceforth to be identified as Osorius, De Religione Libri Tres, 1576.

77. See Longueil, Ad Lutheranos, 1545/46.

78. [Joannes Michael Brutus (ed.)], Christophori / Longolii Epistolarvm / Libri IIII. / Tullianae Uidelicet Elo-  
quentiae ad Un- / quem Expressa Imago. / Doctorvm Item Ali-  
qvot / Epistolarum ad Eundem Longolium, / Liber I. / Bartho-  
lomaei Ricci / de Imitatione Libri Tres. / A<sup>o</sup> Ioan. Michaelae  
Bruto Emendati. / Qvibvs Eiusdem Uita, per Quendam / Ipsius  
Studiosissimum Conscripta, / est Praemissa. Following the typographic mark is "Baieleae [sic, it should read "Basileae"] per Eusebium Episcopium & Nic. Fr. haeredes. M.D.LXXX." Simar, Longueil, pp. 214-215, cites the copy in the Biblio-  
thèque Nationale, and Becker, Longueil, p. vii, merely fol-  
lows his lead. Two copies are in the Vatican Library, while the Biblioteca Communale (Trent) and the Biblioteca Ambrosi-  
ana (Milan) also have copies of this —80 volume which here-  
after will be identified as Longueil, Epistolarum, 1580.

79. Simar, Longueil, p. 215. The contents of Longueil, Epistolarum, 1580, pp. 1-8, are identical with the Epistolarum, 1563. The anonymous "Vita" covers pages 9-30, and is followed by "Christophori Longolii Epitaphia, ex Magno Epicediorum, Epitaphiorumq; Opere Conradi Lycosthenis Rubeaquensis Desump-  
ta," pp. 31-32, and the Germanus Brixius "Objtuaries," follow Dolet's to conclude pp. 32-34, where two "Commendations" by Claudius Rosetus appear. The oversight by Simar of Dolet's "Obituary" caused him to identify this volume as "edition A," which he uses to designate Longueil, Opera, 1526. This may be affirmed by the inclusion in Longueil, Epistolarum, 1580, of the letter from Longueil to Jacques Lucas (IV, 34), p. 342. These items indicate the tradition of Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, Longueil, Epistolarum, 1540 (since the issue of Dolet's "Obituary" in the 1540 text is a moot point), and Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558 (which contains Rosetus' "Commendations"). Perhaps Simar would not have been misguided had he been made aware of the Habes Lector textual tradition of Longueil's published materials.

80. [Christophe de Longueuil], Chr. Longolii / Epistolae Se- / lectae. / Item / P. Bembi et I. Sadole- / ti Ali- / quot ad Eum / Epistolae. This item is located in the Vatican Library as "Racc. gen. Neolatini V. 133 int. 2."

81. [Pierre Bunel and Paolo Manuzio(eds.)], Petri Bvn-elli, Galli, Praeceptoris, & Pavli Manvtii, Itali, Discipuli, Epistolae Cice- / roniano Stylo / Scriptae. Aliorvm Gallorvm / Pariter et Italo- / rvm Epistolae Eo- / dem Stylo Scripta. No place or publisher is given on the title page, although the date, "Anno M.D.LXXXI," follows the typographic mark of "Henr. Stephanus." Simar, Longueil, p. 203, lists this volume in his general bibliography as being published in Paris by H. Stephanus, and cites another copy from "Genève, 1581 (même édit)." Copies of this volume, which has seven folios and pages 1-240 preceeding the materials by Longueuil, Bembo, and Sadoleto (which begin on a new series of pages 1-319), are housed in the Vatican Library (in addition to the item mentioned supra, n. 80), the Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio-Emmanuele, the Bibliothèques Mazarin and Nationale, the British Museum, and Dublin, as well as the Folger Shakespeare and Newberry libraries. Becker, Longueil, does not mention this 1581 edition, although he is aware of a later one. The only libraries which list a place of publication in their catalogs are Vittorio-Emmanuele, which enters "([Parisiis], 1581)," and Newberry, which enters "[Geneva? Typis H. Stephani?]." The Vatican entry adds only a note, "Marca tipografica de Henri Estienne," to this item. Hereafter this volume will be identified as Bunel and Manuzio, Epistolae Ciceroniano Stylo, 1581.

82. Bunel and Manuzio, Epistolae Ciceroniano Stylo, 1581, second pagination, pp. 1-120. There is a brief editorial note preceeding the letter on p. 116 (cf., Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, IV, 34) comparing Budé and Erasmus. This note is not in any of the earlier editions of Longueil's correspondence, but with it are some slight variations between the Bunel and Manuti text and that of Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558. The Longueil letters in this collection include Book I, eighteen items; Book II, 23 items; Book III, ten; and Book IV is represented by twelve letters.

83. Bunel and Manuzio, Epistolae Ciceroniano Stylo, 1581, second pagination, pp. 121-146, is devoted to the correspondence of Bembo and Sadoleto with Longueil. All the items of those two individuals are inserted here from all earlier editions of Longueil's correspondence. This brings the Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, and the Epistolarum, 1570, into agreement with the tradition of Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, for the first time.

84. [Hieronymus Osorius], Hieronymi / Osorii Episc.  
/ Sylvensis de Reli- / gione Lib. III. / In Gualterum Had-  
donum Anglum: / Supplicum Libellorum Magist. / Apud / Eliza-  
betham Angliae / Reginam. / Eiusdem ad Ipsam Elisabetham Epis-  
tola. / Editio Quinta. / Accessit Christophori Longolij ad  
Luther. Eiusdem / Argumenti Oratio cum INDICE / copiosissimo.  
The exact title appears in both works, which may have been printed for both publishers as their —12<sup>o</sup> volumes. The first of these copies was published "Treveris, Apud Emundum Hatott. MDXXCV," and the second was done "Coloniae, Apud Gosium Cholinum MDXXCV." On pages 379-456 is Longueil's "Ad Lutheranos," with an "Ex Vita Auctoris," p. 457, and a "Lectori Carmina," pp. 458-465. There is no colophon in this volume, although it does have 22 pages of "Index Rerum." A copy of the "Treveris" printing is in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and copies of the "Coloniae" issue are in the British Museum, Biblioteca Universitaria (Padua), and the Biblioteca Comunale (Trent). No copies of the fourth edition are known, and this may be the clue to Becker's entry. Hereafter this edition will be identified as Osorius, De Religione Libri Tres, 1585.

85. [Hieronymus Osorius], Hieronymi / Osorii Episc.  
/ Sylvensis de Reli- / gione Lib. III. / In Gualterum Had-  
donum Anglum: / Supplicum Libellorum Magist. / Apud / Eliza-  
betham Angliae / Reginam. / Eiusdem ad Ipsam Elisabetham Epis-  
tola. / Editio Sexta. / Accessit Christophori Longolij ad Lu-  
ther. Eiusdem / Argumenti Oratio cum INDICE / copiosissimo.  
This volume was published "Coloniae, Apud Gosium Cholinum MDXXCVIII," and it has no colophon. Longueil's "Christophori Longolij ad Lutheranos Quosdam Oratio, Annos ab hinc LIV. Formis Expressa," is on pages 279 [sic, it should be 379]-456, inclusive. It is followed by "Ex Vita Avctoris," p. 457, and the "Index Rerum," pp. 465-486. This volume will henceforth be identified as Osorius, De Religione Libri Tres, 1588. Copies of it are housed in the Bibliothèque Nationale and in the British Museum.

86. [Hieronymus Osorius], Hieronymi / Osorii Episc.  
/ Sylvensis de Reli- / gione Lib. III. / In Gualterum Had-  
donum Anglum: / Supplicum Libellorum Magist. / Apud / Eliza-  
betham Angliae / Regnam. / Eiusdem ad Ipsam Elisabetham Epis-  
tola. / Editio Sexta. / Accessit Christophori Longolij ad Lu-  
ther. Eiusdem / Argumenti Oratio cum INDICE / copiosissimo.  
This volume was published in Cologne, but another publisher, as the title page indicates, released it: "Coloniae, Apud Petrum Horst, MDXXCVIII." The only copy of this particular printing available is in the Folger Shakespeare Library, and it too is in —12<sup>o</sup>. Hereafter this work will be identified as Osorius, De Religione Libri Tres, 1589.

87. Becker, Longueil, p. vii, does not show the edition of the Treveris copy, although he does cite copies of it in Vienna and the British Museum. The latter is "editio quinta." He located a copy of the Cologne edition at Freiburg.

88. Osorius, De Religione Libri Tres, 1588 and 1589, p. 45 [sic, it should be 457], contain the following "Ex Vita Avctoris:"

"Christophorus Longolius Macliniae, nobili Germaniae oppido, honesto splendidoque inter suos loco, natus fuit..

"Causam totam Lutherianam, cuius oppugnationem iussu Leonis X. Pontificis Maximi, à quo etiam commentarii totius caussae missi ad eum fuere, suscepit, quinque orationibus complecti statuerat, breuique perfecisset (excogitatis iam secum, quaecunque in tali causa dicenda forent) nisi prima statim absoluta, immatura mors consilium eius praevenisset.

"Obijt XXXIIII. aetatis anno III. idus Septembris. Anno salutis generis humani M. D. XXII. atque Patauij in diui Francisci, quemadmodum ipse praescripsit, sepultus."

89. [Christophe de Longueil], Christophori / Longolii Episto- / larum Lib. IIII. / Tullianae Videlicet Eloquentiae as Un- / quem Expressa Imago. / Doctorum Item Aliquot / Epistolarum ad Eundem Longolium, Lib. I. / Quibus Eiusdem Vita, Per / Quendam Ipsius Studiosissimum Conscripta, est Praemissa. Following the typographic mark, the title page continues, "Coloniae Agrippinae, Excudebat Petrus Horst. Anno M. D. XCI." There is no colophon, but an "Elenchus Epistolarum Christophori Longolii," occupies pp. 356-357. The volume also contains the anonymous "Vita," which the Vatican Library Catalogue ascribes to "R. Pole." Simar cites the copy in Rome's Biblioteca Andelica, but identifies it as —8<sup>o</sup>, although the library catalog correctly lists it as —12<sup>o</sup>. A third copy is housed in the Folger Shakespeare Library. Becker, Longueil, p. vii, indicates that another copy is located at Freiburg. Hereafter this volume will be identified as Longueil, Epistolarum, 1591.

90. Simar, Longueil, p. 214.

91. Ibid., p. 215.



92. [Joannes Buchlerus], Laconicarum / Epistolarum Thesaurus / Bipartitus: / Prior Latinorum / Alter Graecorum, Bre- / viiores, Easdemque Ar- / qutas, Iucundas, & Politulas Con- / tinet Epistolas. / Opera M. Ionnis Buchleri à Gladbach, Collectus & Digestus. This volume was published "Coloniae Sumptibus Bernardi Gualther. Anno MDCVI." The letters are placed in the following order on pages 194-199, and they are here identified according to the numerals applied to Longueil, Epistolarum, 1540: [1] III, 22; [2] I, 1; [3] I, 37; [4] I, 38; [5] I, 8; [6] III, 6; [7] IIII, 33. Henceforth this work will be identified as Buchler, Collectus, 1606.

93. Simar, Longueil, p. 203. Becker, Longueil, does not list this work. The copy cited is in Trinity Collège (Dublin), and there it is indexed as —12<sup>o</sup>.

94. Simar, Longueil, p. 214. Cf., [Christophe de Longueil], Christophori / Longolii, / Civis Romani, / Tulliana Eloquentia, & Scientiarum Varietate Excellentissimi, / Epistolae Quae Ex- / stant Omnes / Accessit, / Eiusdem Vitae, cum / Bartolomaei Ricci de / Imitatione Libris III. The typographic mark is followed by "Coloniae Munatiana MDCXX." The copy used by Simar is the very one checked in the Bibliothèque Mazarin. Becker, Longueil, p. vii, merely lists this title with its correct date, but he does not indicate if or where he may have actually seen the volume, which hereafter will be identified as Longueil, Epistolarum, 1620.

95. Longueil, Epistolarum, 1620, has no colophon, and the "Elenchus" is in three columns on p. 543, as Simar, Longueil, p. 214, correctly observes.

96. Frider. Andr. Christ. Grauff [(ed.)], Epistolae / Petri Bunelli, Pauli Manutii, / Christophori Longolii, Petri / Bembi, Jacobi Sadoleti, Aonii / Palearii Verulani / Partim Selectae Partim Integrae. / Brevem Narrationem de VV. DD. Vitis / Praemiss. / Annotatione Perpetua in Bunelli / Epistolas Instruxit / et / Indicem Duplicem Adiecit. This volume was published "Bernae, Curiae Rhaet. et Lipsiae, Sumptus Fecit ac Venundat J. F. J. Dalp. MDCCCXXXVII." Becker, Longueil, p. vii, cites this edition of Bunel and Manuzio instead of their earlier one, Bunel and Manuzio, Epistolae Ciceroniano Stylo, 1581. Simar, Longueil, does not include this item in his listing.

97. Bunel and Manuzio, Epistolae Ciceroniano Stylo, 1581. Cf., supra, nn. 81-83.

98. Goldschmidt, "De Longueil's Letter," pp. 163-182. Also see supra, n. 36.

99. Aulotte, "Une Rivalité," pp. 549-573. Also see supra, ch. i, n. 31.

100. Longueil, Opera, Junta. Cf., supra, ch. i, n. 1.

### CHAPTER III

#### BIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES RELATED TO

#### CHRISTOPHE DE LONGUEIL

Although the primary concern of the present chapter is the biographical studies related to Christophe de Longueil, it will be treated from a three-pronged approach. First there will be a survey of the autobiographical and biographical studies directly focused on Longueil as the subject. Then published source materials and biographical studies of individuals with whom Longueil had personal encounters and correspondence, as well as materials about those who are even more remotely identified with him, will be treated. Finally, attention will be directed toward broader and more general treatments of the period in which Longueil lived and of topics of interest closely associated with Longueil, such as the revival of classical studies and Ciceronianism.

The first of these three areas of inquiry makes it necessary to begin with some autobiographical items done in 1518. These are Longueil's Defense Orations, published separately in 1518 and 1519, and again in 1520 and 1522, before

being incorporated into his Opera, Junta, 1524.<sup>1</sup> The first of these orations is the most important, for it presents Longueuil's own recounting of his coming to Rome and the background preceeding that venture.<sup>2</sup> It is largely from this source that the details of the anonymous "Vita" are derived.<sup>3</sup> That "Vita" itself was again published in Longueuil's Opera, in 1526, 1530, and 1539.<sup>4</sup> It was also included in Longueuil's Habes Lector, 1533,<sup>5</sup> his Lucubrationes, 1542,<sup>6</sup> and his Epistolarum, 1540, 1558, 1562/63, 1563, 1570, 1580, and 1591.<sup>7</sup> This same anonymous "Vita" was also published as a separate item in a collection of "Lives of Superior Men," published in 1536.<sup>8</sup>

During the sixteenth century, however, other biographical sketches of Longueuil's life were also published. In 1557, for example, Paulus Jovius published his Elogia Doctorum Virorum which included a biographical treatment of Longueuil.<sup>9</sup> An extract of Longueuil's "Vita" was published in the Bibliotheca Instituta of 1574,<sup>10</sup> and in the various editions of De Religione Libri Tres by Hieronymus Osorius.<sup>11</sup> These works would provide the basis for subsequent biographies of Longueuil until the late-nineteenth century, and the extensive biography of Theophile Simar in his early twentieth-century work.<sup>12</sup>

In 1602 Aubertus Miraeus published his Elogia Illustrum Belgii Scriptorum which included a biography of Longueuil, using as his sources the anonymous "Vita," Jovius'

biography, and an unknown work.<sup>13</sup> Later in the century, Franciscus Sweertius published another biography of Longueil in his Athenae Belgicae of 1628.<sup>14</sup> Five years later Scaevola Sammarthanus published a biography which is generally cited as a major item.<sup>15</sup> The Bibliotheca Belgica, published in Louvain in 1643, is the first to raise the question about the place of Longueil's birth.<sup>16</sup> In it, the author asks if he may not have been born in Schoonhoven.<sup>17</sup> The same question is raised in the 1698 edition of Louis Moreri's Le grand dictionnaire historique, although the editor errs in dating Longueil's death as 4 July 1522 instead of 11 September.<sup>18</sup> according to Simar, someone named Bates published the Vitae Selectorum Aliquot Virorum, which "Reproduit la Vita de Reginald Pole," in London in 1681.<sup>19</sup> He alone associates Bates with this title, although there was published in London, in 1704, an anonymous Vitae Selectorum Aliquot Virorum which did reproduce the anonymous "Vita" from Longueil's Opera, Junta.<sup>20</sup> In it there are some slight errors in the typeset, including the age of Longueil at the time of his death in 1522.<sup>21</sup>

Another collection of biographies was published by Vincent Paravicini in 1713, as Simar correctly observes.<sup>22</sup> But a 1718 publication housed in the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome, with an entry "Christoph. Longolius" in its index, is in error.<sup>23</sup> Throughout the remainder of the eighteenth century other items were published, as Simar asserts. Included

in them are biographies as well as collections of source materials concerning individuals with whom Longueil was associated either personally or through correspondence. Items not included in Simar's list, however, include the work of Frederic Beyschlag published in 1729,<sup>24</sup> the 1722 edition of Sammarthanus' Elogia Gallorum,<sup>25</sup> the 1739 edition of the Bibliotheca Belgica,<sup>26</sup> and Franciscus Molza's Delle Poesie of 1750.<sup>27</sup> In 1732 R. P. Nicéron published a study on Longueil in French, and this marked a seminal departure in the treatment of Longueil's biography.<sup>28</sup> This item is included in the list of Simar, but omitted in that of Becker.

During the nineteenth century Longueil's biography appeared in the Dictionnaire Universel, the Nouvelle Biographie Générale, as well as La Grande Encyclopédie<sup>29</sup> and other items listed in Simar's bibliography. But it was in 1891 that the major works on Longueil began to make their appearances. At this juncture, Domenico Gnoli published his major study of the Mellini-Longueil conflict as Un Giudizio de lesa Romanità sotto Leone X, and Vittorio Cian published two articles about Gnoli's work in the Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana the following year.<sup>30</sup> In 1892-1893, the twelfth volume of the Biographie Nationale de Belgique was published, in which L. Roersch presented his lengthy biography of Longueil.<sup>31</sup> But even this author had the shortcoming of not incorporating into his article the materials recently published by Gnoli and Cian.<sup>32</sup> All of these contributions, however,

led to the publication of the magnum opus of Th. Simar at the beginning of the twentieth century.<sup>33</sup>

Since Simar's publication, few have dared to write anything but cursory sketches of Longueil's life or detailed treatments of particular items and events to supplement or amend the general scheme of Simar's biography.<sup>34</sup> While his was was profoundly conceived and well documented for its day, there are some severe shortcomings in it and at least one writer has dared to challenge the very heart of Simar's chronological framework.<sup>35</sup> Before turning to that discussion, however, it is necessary to pursue the two other lines of evidence with regard to Longueil's biography.

The various publications of source materials related to Longueil's intimates, correspondents, and other contemporaries, as well as biographical studies about them, has led Philip August Becker to supplement the materials used by Simar.<sup>36</sup> But Simar himself had access to and used much of this evidence, some of which he had discovered from the works of Gnoli and Cian, although Roersch was still unaware of it when he wrote his major article. In 1538, for example, Book XVI of Pietro Bembo's Epistolarum, in which there were three letters to Longueil, was published in Lyons.<sup>37</sup> This volume was enlarged and published again in 1540.<sup>38</sup> Throughout the remainder of the sixteenth century, Peter Bunel, Aldo Manuzio, and Bartolomaeus Riccius edited selections of Ciceronian letters, as Simar indicates.<sup>39</sup> In 1573, the collected epistles

of Gregorio Cortese was published in Venice,<sup>40</sup> and this work provides one of the primary collections of correspondence by an intimate of Longueil.<sup>41</sup>

During the eighteenth century the publication of the Erasmus Opera Omnia,<sup>42</sup> along with that of Bembo,<sup>43</sup> and the Epistolae of Jacopo Sadoletto<sup>44</sup> were accompanied by Angelus Quirinius Epistolarum Reginaldi Poli,<sup>45</sup> as well as biographies of both Erasmus and Pole. Then, in the nineteenth century, other editions of source materials were published. Among these items was the work edited by Jacopo Foscarini on Marin Sanuto in 1837-1838.<sup>46</sup> In 1884 The Diary of Leo X was published,<sup>47</sup> and a biography of Pope Leo X had been published nearly three-quarters of a century earlier.<sup>48</sup> In the first decade of the twentieth century, Louis Delaruelle made a major contribution for those interested in pursuing the correspondence of Longueil's friends and acquaintances with his work on Guillaume Budé.<sup>49</sup> With these items, the present investigation comes again to the works of Gnoli, Cian, Roersch, and Simar, and an overview of the materials concerned with broader and more general treatments is in order.

Although the purpose of this overview is not to reiterate or repeat the listings of general works described by Simar, some of the major items surely must be named. Among them is Étienne Dolet's De Imitatione Ciceroniana of 1535, in which he took up the cudgel against Erasmus and argued on behalf of Longueil.<sup>50</sup> This work, and others in the same vein,



was in response to Erasmus' Ciceronianus which had been published in 1528.<sup>51</sup> These volumes set the tone for the great controversy over Ciceronian style in the sixteenth century, in which both Erasmus and Longueil played such dominant roles.<sup>52</sup> Materials indicative of the intensity of this controversy but not utilized by Longueil's biographers include two sixteenth-century editions of Ciceronian correspondence.<sup>53</sup>

Other than passing comments in general works, which have been admirably covered by Simar, special note should be made of several items listed in his bibliography and utilized by him in his biography of Longueil. Among these are works of Remigio Sabbadini,<sup>54</sup> E. Norden,<sup>55</sup> Ch. Lenient,<sup>56</sup> J. E. Sandys,<sup>57</sup> Ludwig Pastor,<sup>58</sup> the biographical studies of Reginald Pole,<sup>59</sup> and contributions by Gnoli, Cian, and Roersch. He also used Th. Zielinski's Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte, which made its appearance in 1908.<sup>60</sup> Three works which appeared before the bound edition of Simar's biography, but which the author failed to incorporate into his study, are the two editions of Mrs. Julia Cartwright Ady's Isabella d'Este,<sup>61</sup> the Life of Reginald Pole by Martin Haile,<sup>62</sup> and Henry Hallam's four-volume work entitled, Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries.<sup>63</sup> Simar cannot be expected to have used those works published after his biography, but surely Becker should have consulted these last-named publications as well as the biography of Pole done by Reginald Biron and Jean

Barennes in 1922.<sup>64</sup>

Since Becker's publication in 1924, there have been few items appear which are directly concerned with Longueil. In 1927, for example, Becker himself cast light upon the adventure of Longueil into Switzerland in 1513,<sup>65</sup> and Goldschmidt published a translation of Longueil's letter about that event in 1951.<sup>66</sup> Biographical sketches have also appeared in works about other individuals and subjects, such as Cardinal Gasquet's chapter on "Christopher Longolius" and Wilhelm Schenk's more extensive presentation in their biographies of Reginald Pole.<sup>67</sup> In 1936 Hermann Kopf wrote his inquiry into the life of "Christophorus Longolius,"<sup>68</sup> Verdun L. Saulnier presented a short biography of Longueil in 1951,<sup>69</sup> and Comte Jean de Pins focused on the relations of Jean de Pins with Longueil in his article in 1950.<sup>70</sup> Most recently, George B. Parks has made an inquiry into the authorship of the anonymous "Vita" in late 1973.<sup>71</sup>

A survey of other related materials published since the time of Simar and Becker will reveal additional items which need to be incorporated into the preparation of a new biography of Longueil. Of primary concern are those studies devoted to humanism and Ciceronianism in general, and the relationship of Erasmus to these movements in particular. To begin, one must go back to the Burckhardtian thesis on the very nature of the Renaissance in Italy, and the reevaluations of that thesis.<sup>72</sup> Then, various general surveys, monographs,

and articles more directly related to the issue at hand must be consulted.<sup>73</sup>

Raymond Lebègue mentions Longueil in his "Selections de Travail, Humanisme,"<sup>74</sup> as does Jacques Boussard in "L'Université d'Orléans et l'Humanisme au Debut du XVI<sup>e</sup> S.,"<sup>75</sup> and Hans Baron casts light upon the emergence of Cicero as the ideal for humanist writers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.<sup>76</sup> Monographs from this period add further background materials from the pens of Giuseppi Toffanin,<sup>77</sup> Charles Sears Baldwin,<sup>78</sup> and John Herman Randall, Jr.,<sup>79</sup> while Wallace K. Ferguson adds an article on "Humanist Views of the Renaissance,"<sup>80</sup> and late into World War II, Paul Oskar Kristeller contributed his "Humanism and Scholasticism in the Italian Renaissance."<sup>81</sup> The discussion of Italian humanism is enhanced by the works of Eugenio Garin,<sup>82</sup> while G. Valese focuses upon Longueil and Erasmus.<sup>83</sup> As Hanna H. Gray discusses the dangers of reducing Renaissance humanism to a single formula,<sup>84</sup> Roberto Weiss discusses "Learning and Education in Western Europe from 1470 to 1520,"<sup>85</sup> and Denys Hay and A. R. Hall collaborate to treat the "Intellectual Tendencies" at the outset of the Reformation.<sup>86</sup> P. Mesnard,<sup>87</sup> Kenneth M. Setton,<sup>88</sup> and Bonner Mitchell, in his Rome in the High Renaissance: The Age of Leo X,<sup>89</sup> add further materials to the broader background of Longueil and his times, as does the festschrift volume edited by Anthony Molho and John A. Tedeschi in honor of Hans Baron.<sup>90</sup>

Narrowing the focus somewhat, the materials on Erasmus and the Ciceronian controversy provide even more and better information about Longueil. In 1924 Johan Huizinga mentioned Longueil in his treatment of Erasmus,<sup>91</sup> and Pierre de Nolhac does the same in his Érasme et l'Italie.<sup>92</sup> Marcel Bataillon also treats the Erasmus-Longueil issue in his work in 1937.<sup>93</sup> Alphonse Roersch treats Erasmus as illustrative of Northern humanism in the second edition of his Érasme,<sup>94</sup> while Augustin Renaudet discusses Erasmus' Ciceronianus and Longueil in his Études Érasmiennes.<sup>95</sup> Gérard Michel discusses the Ciceronianus of Erasmus in his unpublished thesis which is utilized by M. - M. Garanderie,<sup>96</sup> and A. Renaudet has a significant treatment of the so-called "War of the Ciceronians" in his Érasme et l'Italie,<sup>97</sup> while C. Reedijk cites Longueil's evaluation of Erasmus as a poet and writer as being kinder than some of Erasmus' remarks in his Ciceronianus.<sup>98</sup> These remarks, adds Margaret Mann Phillips, "appeared to hit the French scholars Longueil and Budé, and their compatriots were up in arms."<sup>99</sup> Angiolo Gambaro contributes to this study of Ciceronianism,<sup>100</sup> and Craig R. Thompson mentions Longueil as being "a French scholar whom Erasmus was accused of slandering in Ciceronianus."<sup>101</sup> As an adjunct to his work on the influence of Plutarch in the sixteenth century, R. Aulotte's article compares the translations of Plutarch's Moralia by Erasmus and Longueil.<sup>102</sup> Unfortunately, however, Roland H. Bainton does not so much as mention Longueil in his Erasmus

of Christendom.<sup>103</sup> This shortcoming cannot be charged to M. —M. Garanderie, who has recently published two significant articles on Erasmus.<sup>104</sup>

With these general treatments, the autobiographical and biographical studies, the published editions of Longueil's "Vita," orations, and his correspondence, as well as the manuscripts pertaining to him, the materials needed for a new biographical study have been amassed and surveyed. While no attempt has been made to include a completely annotated or an exhaustive bibliography of the Renaissance, humanism, Ciceronianism, or classical scholarship in the twentieth century, the materials herein added to those supplied by Simar and Becker will provide all the materials presently known to exist which are directly related to Christophe de Longueil. Upon these materials a solid foundation can be laid for a new biography. But before that project can be accomplished, there are problems and conflicts in interpretation which must be identified, addressed, and tentatively resolved. To these issues the present study now turns.

1. Cf., ch. ii, nn. 11-20, for the various printings of these autobiographical materials.

2. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fols. 9a-26a, 26b-43b. Hereafter these particular items will be referred to as "Defense Oration I," and "Defense Oration II," respectively.

3. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fols. 3a-8a.

4. Cf., ch. ii, nn. 23, 30, 31, and 46.

5. Cf., ch. ii, n. 38.

6. Cf., ch. ii, n. 56.

7. Cf., ch. ii, nn. 51, 62, 64, 67, 68, 70, 78, and 89.

8. [Anonymous], Virorum Qvi / Syperiori Nostroque Secvlo Ervditione et / Doctrina Illustres Atque Memorabiles Fuerunt. Vitae. Iam pri- / mum in hoc Volumen Collectae. This work was undoubtedly edited by its publisher, whose typographic mark is followed by "Cum Caes, Maiestatis Priuilegio. Francoforti, Christianus Egenolphus Excudebat." The colophon appears on fol. 119b, following a brief "Lectori S.," and reads, "Francoforti Christianus Egenolphus excudebat, Mense Septembri. Anno M.D.XXXVI." The volume has a "Preface," and a "Qvorvm Vitae hoc Libro Tractantur, Elenchus," which classifies the subjects into Italian, ten items, German, six items, and English, two items. Following Longueil's "Vita," fols. 93b-100b, is an "Epitaphium eiusdem Longolij," fol. 100b. It contains a very brief extract from the "Vita," and three lines of Bembo's "epitaph." This item is unlike a later extract of the "Vita" published by Osorius, and it has been ascribed to Johan Fichard in Karl Schottenloher (ed.), Bibliographie zur Deutschen Geschichte im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung, 1517-1585, 5 vols. (Gesamtdarstellungen Stoffe, 1938), IV, 116b-117b, item 35759a.

9. Paulus Jovius, Elogia Docto- / rum Virorum ab A- / vorum Memoria Publi- / cati Ingenii Monumentis / Illustri- um (Antverpiae: Ioan. Bellarum, 1557). Longueil's biography is item LVII, pp. 145-148, in this edition. A later edition was published in 1571 which has the same item, except that the number is LXVII, pp. 155-158. It is this 1571 edition which is cited by Becker, Longueil, p. vii. Simar, Longueil, p. 205, cites the same item as it appears in still another edition with a slightly different title: Elogia Virorum Literis Illustrium, pp. 127-128. This Jovius work is frequently cited by Longueil's biographers, and indeed it is one of the major sources used for Longueil's biography. Henceforth it will be identified as Jovius, Elogia, 1557, since later editions carry the same text.

10. [Iosias Simlerus Tigurinus], Bibliotheca / Instituta et Collecta Primum a Conrado Gesnero / Deinde in Epitomen Redacta & Nouorum Librorum Accessione Locupletata, Iam Vero Postremo Recognita, & in Duplum post Priores Editiones Aucta, per Iosiam Simlerum Tigurinum (Tiguri: Christophorum Froschovarium, 1574), p. 122, col. b, is a brief biography entitled, "Christophorus Longolius." This item is unknown to Simar, Longueil, and Becker, Longueil.

11. Cf., ch. ii, nn. 84-88.

12. Simar, Longueil, pp. 203-207, has a thorough bibliography of works on and about Longueil. The present study will supplement his listing with items he omits or which have been published since his work was completed. Becker, Longueil, p. vii; Cosenza, Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary, III, 2007; P. L—y [Ernest Poiree Louisy?], "Longueil (Christophe de), col. 576; Roersch, "Longueil (Christophe de)," col. 359; and other biographers have singled out several works which are included in Simar's bibliography. See also chs. i, n. 3, and ii, n. 20. These titles will be discussed as the present study progresses.

13. [Aubertus Miraeus], Elogia Illustrium / Belgii Scriptorum, / Qui vel Ecclesiam Dei Propugnauerunt, vel / Disciplinas Illustrarunt. / Centuria / Decadibus Distincta. / Bibliotheca Auberti Miraei / Canonici Antverp. (Antverpiae: Ioannis Bellerus, 1602), pp. 134-138. Simar, Longueil, p. 205, cites another edition of this work entitled, Elogia Belgica sive Illustrium Belg. Scriptorum (Antwerp: 1609), pp. 114-116. The article in both editions is entitled, "Christophorus Longolius." Becker, Longueil, and others do not list this item.

14. Franciscus Sweertius, Athenae / Belgicae / sive / Nomenclator / Infer. Germaniae Scriptorum / qui Disciplinas / Philologicas, Philosophicas, / Theologicas, Iuridicas, Medicas / et Musicas Illustrarunt (Antuerpiae: Gilielmum A Tungris, 1628), pp. 176-177. Simar, Longueil, p. 207, cites the "Athenae Belgicae. . . .," but gives no date or edition. It must be another, however, for his pagination differs considerably from the edition of 1628. Other biographers do not mention this work in their bibliographies.

15. Simar, Longueil, p. 207, cites from the Opera Omnia edition of Scaevola Sammarthanus, Elogia Gal- / lorum / Saeculo XVI. Doctrina Illustrium (n. p.: 1633), pp. 4-5. Becker, Longueil, p. vii, lists Elogia Doctorum in Gallia, I, 1 (3), but cites no edition. Still another edition is that Elogia / Doctorum in / Gallia Virorum / qui Nostra Patriumque / Memoria Floruerunt, editio nova et auctior iuxta exemplar

Parisiensis (Jenae: Ernestum Claudium Bailliar, 1696), pp. 6-8. The present study utilizes the same title as it was edited by Christophorus Augustus Hermannvs (Isenaci: Officina Boetiana, 1722), pp. 10-13, which was the first edition to have footnotes supplied by the editor.

16. [Valerio Andrea], Bibliotheca Belgica (Louvain, 1643), pp. 136-138, is cited by Simar, Longueil, p. 203. The present study uses a later edition of this work edited by Joannis Franciscus Foppens, Bibliotheca / Belgica. / sive / Virorum in Belgio / Vita, Scriptisque Illustrium / Catalogus, Librorumque Nomenclatura / Continens Scriptores à Clariss. Viris / Valerio Andrea, Auberto Miraeo, / Francisco Sweertio, / Allisque, Recensitos, Usque ad Annum M D C LXXX. Tomus Primus (Bruxelles: Petrum Foppens, 1739), pp. 178-180, including the unnumbered page (facing p. 178) with a portrait of "Christof. de. Longveil. H. Larmessin Sculp." This item will be cited as Foppens, Bibliotheca Belgica, 1739.

17. This question stems from a letter from Erasmus to Damien de Goës, dated 10 August 1535. Both Simar, Longueil, pp. 3-4, n. 3, and Becker, Longueil, pp. 2-3, n. 6, and p. 204, were aware of this problem and addressed themselves to it. The present study will deal with the issue at a more appropriate place.

18. Louis Moreri, Le grand dictionnaire historique, ou le mélange curieux de l'histoire sacrée et profane. Huitième édition où l'on a mis le supplément dans le même ordre Alphabetique, corrigé les fautes censurées dans le dictionnaire Critique de Mr. Bayle, & grand nombre d'autres, & ajouté quantité d'Articles & de Remarques importantes. Tome troisième. MDC XCVIII. (Avec Privilège de Nos Seigneurs les États de Hollande & de West-frise. A Amsterdam chez Henry Desbordes, Pierre Brunel, Antoine. A la Haye chez Adrian Moetjens, Henry van Bulderen), col. 363.

19. Simar, Longueil, p. 203.

20. [Anonymous], Vitae / Selectorum / Aliquot / Virorum / Qui Doctrina, Dignitate, aut Pietate Inclaruere (Londini: Georgium Wells, 1704), pp. 240-249. This work will be identified as [Anon.], Vitae Selectorum, 1704, although the item to which Simar refers as "Bates, Vitae Selectorum," is presumed to be the same work in an earlier edition. It is impossible to ascertain the exact item to which Simar refers, since he gives no publisher in his reference, Longueil, p. 203.

21. [Anon.], Vitae Selectorum, 1704, p. 249, "Obiit XXXIII. aetatis anno. III. Idus Septembris. Anno salutis



generis humani M. D. XXII. atque Patavii in Francisci, quem-  
admodum praescripsit, sepultus." Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol.  
8a, reads, "Obijt xxxiiij aetatis. . . ." Perhaps this is  
the beginning of the erroneous date ascribed to Longueil's  
death as discussed by Simar, Longueil, p. 3, and n. 2. He  
lists several other biographers who either err or hesitate  
between the years 1488 and 1490 as the date of Longueil's  
birth. This subject will also be considered at another more  
appropriate point in the present study.

22. Simar, Longueil, p. 206, although he has taken  
slight liberties with the title. The correct entry should  
be [Vincent Paravicini], Vincentii Paravicini, / Conrect.  
Gymn. Bas. / Singularis / de / Viris Eruditione Claris. /  
Centuriae Tres. / Aliis Fortè Secuturis, Speciminis / loco,  
Praemissae (Basileae: Thurnisiorum Fratrum, 1713).

23. Cf., Rome, Biblioteca Angelica listing BB. 3. 19:  
[Anon.], Miscellanea / Lipsiensia, / ad Incrementum / Rei  
Litterariae / Edita. Tomus VIII (Lipsiae: Haeredum Lanckis-  
ianorum, 1718), pp. 93-112, are indexed under "Christoph.  
Longolius," but they contain the following: "Observatio  
CLXIX. D. Johann. Daniel Longolii, Medicinae Practici Bud-  
issinensis, sistens Vindicias animae Longoliane."

24. Frederic Jacob Beyschlag, Sylloge / Variorum /  
Opusculorum; Tomus I. Fasciculos I. II. III. IV. V. / ab An-  
nis M. DCC. XXVII. M. DCC. XXXVIII: / M. DCC. XXIX. Editos,  
/ Complexus / Cum Indice Triplici. Tomi I, Fasciculus I (Ha-  
lae Svevorum: Georgius Mich. Mayer, 1727), Chap. VI, pp. 61-  
142, is entitled, "Ad Virum Celeberrimum, & de re omni liter-  
aria egregie meritum, Dn. Jo. Gotlibium Kravsiu, Professorem  
Eloquentiae in Acad. Lipsiensi extraordinarium, Dissertatio  
Epistolica, In qua disquiritur, an vita Christoph. Longolii,  
quae Epistolis eius, in editionibus plerisque praefixa, Regin.  
Polum habeat auctorem." This raises the question of the au-  
thorship of the anonymous "Vita," but this issue will be con-  
sidered at another place in the present study.

25. Cf., supra, n. 15.

26. Cf., supra, n. 16.

27. Franciscus Maria Molza, Delle Poesie / Volgari  
e Latine / di / Francesco Maria / Molza / Corrette. Illustrate,  
ed Accresciute / Volume Secondo / Contenente le cose Inedite,  
e gli / Opuscoli / di / Tarquinia Molza / Nipote dell' Autore  
(Bergamo: Pietro Lancellotti, 1750). In this volume are  
three letters from Molza to Sadoletto, one from Bembo, and an-  
other from Longueil, pp. 189-200. The letter to Molza from  
Longueil, pp. 199-200, is the same as that found in Longueil,  
Opera, Junta, I, 16, fol. 76a-b.

28. [R. P. Nicéron], Memoires Pour Servir a l'Histoire des Hommes Illustres dans la Republique des Lettres, Tome XVII (Paris: Briasson, 1732), "Christophe de Longueil," 33-42.

29. Cf., ch. ii, n. 20.

30. Cf., ch. ii, n. 3, for Gnoli's work, and ch. i, n. 25, for one of the two articles by Cian. The second article is a bibliographic review, Vittorio Cian, "Domenico Gnoli. — Un Giudizio de lesa romanità sotto Leone X, aggiuntevi le orazioni di Celso Mellini e di Cristoforo Longolio. — Roma, tip. della Camera dei Deputati, 1891 (80, pp. 165)," Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana, XIX (1891), 151-158. See "Appendix L," for a transcription of Cian's citation, pp. 155-156, of the letter dated from Rome the last of June 1519. This letter was presented by Cian in response to one cited by Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 54. "Appendix K" contains a transcription of the item from Gnoli. Both these letters are concerned with the Mellini-Longueil controversy in Rome, and they are additions to the known source materials related to Longueil.

31. L[ouis] Roersch, "Longueil (Christophe de)," Biographie Nationale Publiée par l'Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-arts de Belgique, Tome Douzième, "Les-Ly" (Bruxelles: Bruylant-Christophe & C<sup>ie</sup>, 1892-93), cols. 349-359.

32. Simar, Longueil, p. 1, n. 1, makes note of Roersch's ignorance of Gnoli's work, although he does not at that juncture mention Cian. Simar also says that Roersch's article was published in 1893, although the title page of the Biographie Nationale . . . de Belgique uses 1892-1893. Becker, Longueil, pp. vii-viii, merely lists the works of these three men without comment.

33. Cf., ch. i, n. 2.

34. Cf., ch. i, n. 3.

35. Cf., ch. i, n. 4. This chronological problem is extensive in breadth and fundamental to a biography of Longueil, but it will be treated at another point in the present investigation.

36. Becker, Longueil, pp. vii-viii.

37. [Pietro Bembo], Petri Bem- / bi Epistolarum / Leonis Decimi / Pont. Max. No- / mine Scri- / ptarum Libri XVI (Lugdunum: Haeredes Simon Vincenti, 1538). Actually, there are six letters in this publication, pp. 411-425. The

first five correspond to Longueil, Opera, Junta, [V, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5], and the other letter was written to Erasmus.

38. [Pietro Bembo], Petri Bembi Epistolarum / Leonis Decimi / Pont. Max. / Nomine Scriptarum / Libri XVI (Lugdunum: Theobaldus Paganus, 1540). The 1538 edition has no date on the title page, but the colophon (p. 340), provides its publication date. The 1540 edition has no date on the colophon (p. 462), but does have one on its title page. This work was again published under a slightly different title, Epistolae Petri Bembi Cardinalis et Patricii Veneti Libri XVI (Argentorati: 1611).

39. Simar, Longueil, pp. 204-206. The work by Bunel is his Familiares Aliquot Epistolae cura ac Diligentia Caroli Stephani (Paris, 1551); also see ch. ii, n. 81. The Manuzio work is [Anonymous], Epistolae Clarorum Virorum Quamplurimis Selectae ad Indicandum Nostrorum Temporum Eloquentiam (Venetia: Aldus Manutius, 1556). For the Riccius item, see ch. ii, nn. 68 and 78.

40. [Gregorio Cortese], Gregorii Cortesii Mutinensis, S. R. Ecclesiae Presb. Cardinalis. Epistolarum Familiarum Liber Eiusdem Tractus aduersus negantem B. Petrum Apostolum fuisse Romae, ad Adrianum VI. Pont. Max. DVPLICI ANNEXO INDICE: Quorum alter, nomina eorum, ad quos Epistolae missae sunt; reliquus vero, scitu digniora complectitur (Venetia: Franciscum Franciscum Senensem, 1573).

41. Simar, Longueil, p. 183, and notes, cites several letters between Cortese and Longueil. Becker, Longueil, pp. 194 and 203, adds three letters written by Cortese to other individuals, which he dates following the death of Longueil, although they are all from the same collection of Cortese's correspondence.

42. Both Simar and Becker were largely dependent upon the Clericus edition of Erasmus' Opera Omnia Emendatiora et Auctiora, 10 vols. (Lugduni Batavorum, 1703-1706), although Becker and all subsequent writers were increasingly able to draw upon the P. S. Allen, H. M. Allen, and H. W. Garrod (eds.), Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami: Denovo Recognitum et Auctum, 12 vols. (Oxonii: Clarendoniano, 1906-1958). Henceforth this work will be identified as Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum.

43. Cf., supra, nn. 36 and 37. Simar, Longueil, p. 203, cites Bembo, "Epistolae familiares (Opere di P. Bembo, Venezia, 1729), t. IV."

44. [Jacopo Sadoletto], Jacobi Sadoleti, S. R. E. Cardinalis Epistolae Quotquot Extant Proprio Nomine Scriptae

nunc Primum Duplo Auctiores in Lucem Editae (Romae: Generosus Salomonius, 1760-1767). This volume has the seven letters of Sadoletto and three of Longueil which appear elsewhere.

45. [Reginald Pole], Epistolarum / Reginaldi Poli / S. R. E. Cardinalis / Et Aliorum ad Ipsum / Pars. I. Quae Scriptas Complectitur ab Anno MDXX. Usque ad An. MDXXXVI. / Scilicet / A Primo Reg. Poli Patavium Adventu / usque ad delatum ei a Paulo III. Cardinalatum. Promittuntur / Animadversiones in Epist. Jo: Georg. Schelhornii, / Vita Cardinalis Poli, & Quaedam Hujus Scripta, / atque Diatriba ad Easdam Epistolas (Brixiae: Joannes-Maria Rizzardi, 1744). This work, in five volumes, is regarded as the most important source of information about Pole according to A. F. Pollard, his biographer in the Dictionary of National Biography.

46. [Jacopo Vincenzo Foscarini], Ragguagli / Sulla Vita e Sulle Opere / di Marin Sanuto / detto il Juniore / Veneto Patrizio e Cronista Pregevolissimo / de Secoli XV, XVI. / Institolati dall' Amicizia di Uno Straniero / al Nobile / Jacopo Vincenzo Foscarini / Opera Divisa in Tre Parti (Venezia: Topigrafia di Alvisopoli, 1837-1838). Another title, not utilized because it is of no direct assistance, is L. A. Muratori (ed.), Rerum Italicorum Scriptores, Vol. XXII, Part IV, compiled under the direction of Giosue Carducci, Le / Vite Dei Dogi / di Marin Sanudo / a Cura / di / Giovanni Monticcolo (Città de Castello, 1900).

47. S. Sede (ed.), Il Diario di Leone X / di / Paride de Grassi / Maestro delle Cerimonie Pontificie (Roma, 1884). Although this work, actually written by Grassi rather than the Pope, fails to mention Longueil or the Mellini controversy, it is strange that Simar and Becker make no reference to it even though it provides information of close proximity to their work.

48. G. Roscoe-Bossi, Vita e Pontificato de Leone X (Milano: Sonzogno, 1816).

49. L[ouis] Delaruelle (ed.), Répertoire Analytique et Chronologique de la Correspondence de Guillaume Budé (Toulouse et Paris, 1907). Simar, Longueil, p. 204, refers to this work as "Capital," but Becker does not list it in his bibliography, although he does make extensive use of this source in his analysis of Longueil's correspondence in Longueil, pp. 68-205.

50. [Étienne Dolet], Stephani / Doleti / Dialogvs, / De Imitatione Ciceroniana, Adversus Desiderium Erasmus Roterodamum, pro Christophoro Long / olio (Lugduni: Sab. Gryphium, 1535). Simar, Longueil, p. 204, cites the edition of 1537, as well as Dolet, De Imitatione Ciceroniana Adversus Floridum Sabinum pro Christophoro Longolio (Lugduni, 1540).

51. Cf., ch. i, n. 38. Scott's translation of Erasmus' Ciceronianus is based upon the Latin text of J. Clericus (ed.), as indicated supra, n. 42.

52. Scott, Controversies over Imitation, Part I, pp. 1-124, has an extensive discussion of the Ciceronian controversy and some materials are included which have been hitherto unused by the biographers of Longueil. In addition to Dolet's "Dialogue in Behalf of Longueil Against Erasmus," pp. 63-89, and "Florido's Criticism of Dolet's Dialogue," pp. 89-97, other items which figured in that controversy have been well treated by Scott. The proximity of his publication to that of Simar's is such that the latter would hardly be expected to know of the former; cf., ch. i, nn. 2 and 38. This excuse, however, should not be extended to include those biographers who have written since Simar.

53. Not even Scott, Controversies over Imitation, made use of these works which were published in Cologne and Frankfort in 1564 and 1570, respectively. They are anonymous, but their titles and contents are illuminating. The first is M. Tul. Cicer. / Epistola- / rum Familiarium Libri XVI. Ex. Christophori / Longolij Eloquentiss. Oratoris Castigationibus Recogniti: Quam / Antehac Multo Etiam a / Mendis Curiosius / Adserti (Colonia Agrippina: Petrus Horst, 1564). The second is M. T. C. / Epistolarum, ut Vocant, / Familiarium Libri XVI. Sum- / morum Virorum Industria, Exemplarium cum Veterum, tum Recentiorum Collatione, Restituti ([Francofordia: Haeredes Chri. Egen.], 1570). The publisher appears on the colophon page rather than the title page of this volume.

54. Remigio Sabbadini, Storia del Ciceronianismo e di Altre Questioni Letterarie nell' età della Rinascenza (Torino: Ermanno Loescher, 1885). Simar, Longueil, p. 206, lists only the first three words as his title, and has a date of 1886. He lists no publisher, and his pagination does not square with the edition of 1885.

55. E. Norden, Die Antike Kunstprosa, vom 6. Jahrh. v. Chr. bis in d. Zeit. d. Renaissance, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1898). Again, Simar, Longueil, p. 206, uses the shortened title form.

56. Ch. Lenient, De Ciceroniano Bello apud Recentiores (Paris, 1855).

57. J. E. Sandys, A History of Classical Scholarship, Vol. II: From the Revival of Learning to the end of the Eighteenth Century (in Italy, France, England and the Netherlands) (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1908). Simar, Longueil, p. 206, cites J. E. Sandys, Harvard Lectures on the Revival of Learning (Cambridge, 1905).

58. Ludwig Pastor, The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages, 36 volumes, edited by Ralph Francis Kerr (London: Kegan Paul, 1891-1950). Simar, Longueil, p. 206, actually refers to Volume IV of this series (published in 1906), but the discussion of the Celso Mellini and Christophe de Longueil controversy is in Vol. VIII (1908). The Longueil discussed in Vol. IV is Richard rather than Christophe, and the events are from 1464 rather than 1516. Simar cites the German edition, and refers to Leo X, so he was apparently unaware of the Mellini-Longueil controversy discussion in Pastor's Vol. VIII.

59. Simar, Longueil, p. 206, utilizes the biography by Quirinius (see supra, n. 45), [Thomas] Phillip's, The History of the Life of Reginald Pole, 2 vols., second ed. (London, 1767), and Timothy Neve, Animadversions upon Mr Phillip's History of the Life of Reginald Pole (Oxford, 1746). He has no mention of Gloucester Ridley, A Review of Mr. Phillip's History of the Life of Reginald Pole (London, 1766), nor any other biographies of this individual.

60. Th. Zielinski, Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte (Leipzig: B. G. Taubner, 1908).

61. Julia Cartwright (Mrs. Ady), Isabella d'Este Marchioness of Mantua 1474-1539: A Study of the Renaissance, 2 vols., second ed. (London: John Murray, 1903).

62. Martin Haile, Life of Reginald Pole (London: Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1910).

63. Henry Hallam, Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries, 4 vols. (Boston: William Veazie, 1866), especially vols. I and II as they pertain to the broader setting and mention Longueil in it.

64. Reginald Biron and Jean Barennes, Un Prince Anglais, Cardinal-Légat au XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle Réginald Pole (Paris: Librairie Générale Catholique, [1922]).

65. Ph. Aug. Becker, Aus Frankreichs Frührenaissance; Kritische Skizzen (München: Kellerer, 1927), esp. pp. 7-46.

66. Goldschmidt, "De Longueil's Letter," pp. 163-182, although he makes no mention of Becker, Aus Frankreichs Frührenaissance.

67. [F. A.] Cardinal Gasquet, Reginald Pole and His Early Friends (London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1927), pp. 28-32, and W. Schenk, Reginald Pole Cardinal of England (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1950), pp. 10-17, with portrait.

68. Kopf, "Christophorus Longolius," pp. 634-649.  
See supra, ch. i, n. 3.

69. Verdun L. Saulnier, "Longueil (Christophe de),  
Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises" Le Seizième Siècle, ed.  
by George Grente (Paris: Arthème Fayard, 1951), p. 460.

70. Pins, "Jean de Pins et Longueil," pp. 183-189.  
See supra, ch. i, n. 3.

71. George B. Parks, "Did Pole Write the 'Vita Longolii'?" Renaissance Quarterly, XXVI, no. 3 (1973), 274-285.

72. For an extensive discussion of this problem see the following titles and volumes listed in them. Wallace K. Ferguson, The Renaissance in Historical Thought: Five Centuries of Interpretation (Cambridge, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1948); Karl H. Dannenfeld (ed.), The Renaissance: Medieval or Modern? (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1959); Wallace K. Ferguson, et al., Facets of the Renaissance (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963); Tinsley Helton (ed.), The Renaissance: A Reconsideration of the Theories and Interpretations of the Age (Madison, Wisc.: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1964); Denys Hay (ed.), The Renaissance Debate (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965); and William J. Bouwsma, The Interpretation of Renaissance Humanism, second ed. (New York: The Macmillan Company, Service Center for Teachers of History, 1966).

73. Among these general works one should consult Wallace K. Ferguson, Europe in Transition 1300-1520 (Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1962), although its heaviest thrust is on economic factors and developments. Also see G. R. Potter (ed.), The New Cambridge Modern History. Vol. I: The Renaissance (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964); G. R. Elton (ed.), The New Cambridge Modern History. Vol. II: The Reformation (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962); S. Harrison Thomson, Europe in Renaissance and Reformation (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963); Lewis W. Spitz, The Renaissance and Reformation Movements (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1971); Frederick B. Artz, Renaissance Humanism 1300-1550 (Oberlin, Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 1966); and Harold J. Grimm, The Reformation Era 1500-1650 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954, 1965), this last-mentioned printing of Grimm's work contains only an updated bibliography, otherwise the volume is a reprint of the first printing.

74. R[aymond] Lebègue, "Selections de Travail, Humanisme," Humanisme et Renaissance, II (1935), 186-192, although it is incorrectly indexed as 187-192.

75. Jacques Boussard, L'Université d'Orléans et l'Humanisme au Debut au XVI<sup>e</sup> S., Humanisme et Renaissance, V (1938), 209-230.

76. Hans Baron, "Cicero and the Roman Civic Spirit in the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXII, no. 1 (April, 1938), 72-97.

77. Giuseppe Toffanin, Il Cinquencento (Milan: F. Vallardi, 1929), was the first volume by this attacker of the secular emphasis on humanism. It has appeared in later editions. G. Toffanin, A History of Humanism, trans. by Elio Gianturco (New York: Las Americas Publishing Company, 1954), is an English version of the 1933 original which contends that humanism was in origin a religious movement.

78. Charles Sears Baldwin, Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice: Classicism in the Rhetoric and Poetry of Italy, France, and England 1400-1600 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939), incorporates Longueil into his discussion of the "Imitation of Prose Forms, Ciceronianism, Rhetorics," pp. 39-64.

79. John Herman Randall, Jr., The Making of the Modern Mind, revised ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1940), has the rather standard approach to the Renaissance, but it should be supplemented by Willson H. Coates, Hayden V. White, and J. Salwyn Schapiro, The Emergence of Liberal Humanism: An Intellectual History of Europe. Vol. I: From the Italian Renaissance to the French Revolution (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965).

80. Wallace K. Ferguson, "Humanist Views of the Renaissance," The American Historical Review, XLV, no. 1 (October, 1939), 1-28, although this is to be supplemented by his Renaissance in Historical Thought and other works mentioned supra, nn. 72 and 73.

81. Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Humanism and Scholasticism in the Italian Renaissance," Byzantion, XVII (1944-45), 346-374. This and several other items were later published as the first of two volumes entitled Renaissance Thought (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1961 and 1965).

82. Eugenio Garin, Italian Humanism, Philosophy, and Civic Life in the Renaissance, trans. by Peter Munz (New York: Oxford, 1965), although this volume was originally published in 1952. Also see Eugenio Garin, Science and Civic Life in the Italian Renaissance, trans. by Peter Munz (New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1969), from the 1968 original. This volume recalls John Herman Randall, Jr., "The Development of



Scientific Method in the School of Padua," Journal of the History of Ideas, I (1940), 177-206, especially in light of Longueil's choice to make Padua his place of residence.

83. G. Valese, L'Umanesimo al Primo Cinquecento: da Cristoforo Longolio al Ciceronianus di Erasmo: Le Parole e le Idee, I (1959), 107-123.

84. Hanna H. Gray, "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence," Journal of the History of Ideas, XXIV, no. 3 (October-December, 1963), 497-514.

85. R[oberto] Weiss, "Learning and Education in Western Europe from 1470 to 1520," pp. 95-126, in G. R. Potter (ed.), The Renaissance. Also see Roberto Weiss, The Spread of Italian Humanism (London, 1964), and George B. Parks, The English Traveler to Italy. Vol. I: The Middle Ages (to 1525) (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1954).

86. Denys Hay and A. R. Hall, "Intellectual Tendencies," pp. 259-413, in G. R. Elton (ed.), The Reformation.

87. P. Mesnard, Le Commerce Épistolaire Comme Expression Sociale de l'Individualisme Humaniste (Bruxelles: Colloque de Bruxelles, 1965).

88. Kenneth M. Setton, "Pope Leo X and the Turkish Peril," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, CXIII, no. 6 (Dec. 15, 1969), 367-424.

89. Bonner Mitchell, Rome in the High Renaissance: The Age of Leo X (Norman, Okla.: The University of Oklahoma Press, 1973).

90. Anthony Molho and John A. Tedeschi (eds.), Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hans Baron (Dekalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 1971).

91. Johan Huizinga, Erasmus and the Age of Reformation, with a Selection from the Letters of Erasmus (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1957). This is the Torchbook printing of the translation by F. Hopman, for Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.

92. Pierre de Nolhac, Érasme et l'Italie (Paris: Les Cahiers de Paris, 1925), pp. 1-86.

93. Marcel Bataillon, Érasme et l'Espagne: Recherches sur l'Histoire Spirituelle du XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle (Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1937), see especially pp. 231-232, 438-441, and 688-689.

94. Alphonse Roersch, Érasme, deuxième éd. (Mons et Frameries: Union des Imprimeries, 1938), pp. 13-18.

95. A[ugustin] Renaudet, Études Érasmiennes (1521-1529) (Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1939), pp. 292-294.

96. Gérard Michel, "Études sur le Ciceronianus d'Érasme, avec une Édition Critique" (Unpublished thesis, University of Paris, 1954), pp. 139-157. Cf., M. —Garanderie, "Les Relations d'Érasme avec Paris," p. 42, and n. 52.

97. Augustin Renaudet, Érasme et l'Italie (Genève: Librairie E. Droz, 1954), pp. 200-207, 220-223, and an "Addenda et Corrigenda" item on p. 261.

98. C. Reedijk (ed.), The Poems of Desiderius Erasmus (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1956), pp. 108-109.

99. Margaret Mann Phillips, The 'Adages' of Erasmus: A Study with Translations (Cambridge: University Press, 1964), p. 142.

100. Angiolo Gambaro, Erasmus, Il Ciceroniano o dello Stilo Migliore (Brescia: La Scuola Editrice, 1965).

101. [Desiderius Erasmus], The Colloquies of Erasmus, trans. by Craig R. Thompson (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 502-503.

102. Robert Aulotte, "Études sur l'Influence de Plutarque au Seizième Siècle," Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance: Trauvaux et Documents, XXI (1959), 606-612, seems to be a prelude to his "Une Rivalité."

103. Roland H. Bainton, Erasmus of Christendom (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969).

104. M. — M. Garanderie, "Recueils Parisiens de Lettres d'Érasme," Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance: Trauvaux et Documents, XXXI (1969), 449-465, although Longueuil is not included in this article. Also see her treatment of "Érasme, Ruzé, Longueuil," in "Les Relations d'Érasme avec Paris," pp. 49-53.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE CHRONOLOGICAL PROBLEM ABOUT

#### LONGUEIL'S BIRTH

Before another biographical sketch of the life of Christophe de Longueil is attempted, several chronological problems must be tentatively resolved. Although these problems have been apparent for half a century, recent biographers have failed altogether in making note of the vast discrepancies between the chronological arrangements of Th. Simar and Ph. Aug. Becker.<sup>1</sup> These men not only disagree about the date of Longueil's birth,<sup>2</sup> but they assign different dates to over half the 170 letters published under the caption "Epistolarum" in the various editions of Longueil's works,<sup>3</sup> and even differ in the total number of epistolae utilized in their respective biographies.<sup>4</sup> The present study will be devoted to an investigation of the first of these chronological problems and some of the issues related to it.

The central issue in this study centers about the time of Longueil's birth. Prior to Simar, most scholars dated that event as 1490,<sup>5</sup> although in 1892-93, L. Roersch

presented Longueil's birth date as the last month of 1488.<sup>6</sup> Simar, drawing together the latest scholarly findings, asserts that Longueil was born in Malines, Belgium, in 1488.<sup>7</sup> To support his claim he cites "Reginald Pole,"<sup>8</sup> Longueil's letter to Jacques Lucas,<sup>9</sup> and the evidence from Bartholomaeus Hauréau in Gallia Christiana.<sup>10</sup> In 1936 Hermann Kopf simply stated that "Longolius wurde geboren zu Mecheln in Flandern im Jahre 1488 oder 1489,"<sup>11</sup> with no clarification. In the meantime, Becker had already arrived at a more radical position while utilizing all the sources used by Simar. He argues of Christophe de Longueil that, "Das licht der Welt erblickte er in Mecheln," and "Als richtiges Datum ist für seine Geburt entschieden 1485 anzusetzen vermutlich im Herbst."<sup>12</sup> More recent biographical sketches have, wittingly or not, ignored this vast discrepancy.<sup>13</sup> E. Ph. Goldschmidt, for example, follows Simar, P. S. Allen, and older works.<sup>14</sup> Robert Aulotte lists Becker's study in his footnote but ignores it altogether when he refers to "un autre humaniste de renom, le malinois Christophe de Longueil (1488-1522)."<sup>15</sup> M.—M. de la Garanderie also cites the works of Simar and Kopf, but is totally unaware of Becker's contribution.<sup>16</sup> All this merely indicates that a resolution of the basic chronological problem as reflected in Simar and Becker will answer all subsequent studies to date.

The chronological conflict between Simar and Becker is quite interesting, for they had access to the same material

and still arrived at dates three years removed from one another. Both agree that Christophe de Longueil was born the natural son of Antoine de Longueil, Bishop of St. Pol de Léon in Brittany. There is not discrepancy in their statements that Antoine became bishop in 1484, and that he was sent as ambassador on a mission to Maximilian, Archduke of Austria and future Emperor, as well as to England. L. Roersch concurs with these observations, indicating Longueil's father as "Antoine de Longueil, évêque de Léon, chancelier de la reine Anne de Bretagne, Envoyé en Ambassade en Belgique."<sup>17</sup> For some unknown reason, Simar has Antoine on two missions into the Netherlands. He does not date the first other than to say, "Il prêta, le 12 juillet de cette année, serment au duc de Bretagne qui lui confia bientôt des missions diplomatiques." After mentioning missions to the King of England and to the "seigneur d'Autriche," Simar asserts that "En 1487, il fut légat auprès de l'empereur Maximilien. C'est alors qu'il fut nommé aumônier et chancelier de la reine Anne et qu'il fut envoyé par elle en divers pays."<sup>18</sup>

Becker is much more precise in his calculations. He cites a court proceeding as evidence that this mission actually occurred in 1484-85. Using the same source as Simar, he begins Antoine's mission on 20 December 1484, and adds, "Diese Gesandtschaft ist uns durch das am 15-19. Juli 1485 mit dem bretagnischen Kanzler Pierre Landais aufgenommene Verhör bezeugt."<sup>19</sup> As far as a similar mission in 1487,

Becker asserts that there is no support for it in the sources. Only by arguing from the assumed birth-year of 1488 does one suppose a 1487 mission.<sup>20</sup>

Such a stance is taken by Simar, who cites Longueil's letter to Jacques Lucas in support of a 1488 birth-year for Longueil.<sup>21</sup> The letter contains an acknowledgement of the greatness of Erasmus as a humanist and a reference to their ages at that time. In it Longueil writes, "Colo autem ob eximias illas animi dotes, quas in eo ita suspicio, ut votorum meorum summa sit hinc ad annum etiam alterum supra vicesimum, quo me aetate superat, si non illum quem nunc tenet, saltem proximum eloquentiae gradum attingere."<sup>22</sup> Simar comments, "Longueil lui-même nous dit dans une de ses lettres qu'il est plus jeune de 21 ans qu'Érasme, né en 1467."<sup>23</sup> Just how he arrives at this date is unknown, for there is no such certainty among recent scholars. Johan Huizinga, for example, says, "Erasmus was born at Rotterdam on 27 October, most probably in the year 1466."<sup>24</sup> Margaret Mann Phillips, after a discussion of the various accounts Erasmus gave of his birth, adds that, "the older he grew, the farther back he tended to push his birth-year, so that from his own allusions it is not possible to decide conclusively when he was born. The probabilities lie between the years 1466 and 1469, with perhaps a bias in favor of 1469."<sup>25</sup> Wallace K. Ferguson supports this position by indicating Erasmus' dates as 1466 or 1469 to 1536.<sup>26</sup> S. Harrison Thomson addresses the issue as "1466?-1536,"<sup>27</sup>

while Lewis S. Spitz uses 1469 as Erasmus' birth-year.<sup>28</sup>

Using Simar's 21-year figure would mean that Longueil was born in either 1487 or 1490. Perhaps this is the reason earlier scholars believed Longueil to be born in 1490.

In support of the 1488 birth-year, Simar follows the argument of Gnoli, which is based on the Junta edition of Longueil's "Defense Oration" rather than the original edition.<sup>29</sup> He asserts that Longueil spent eight years in Paris before going to Spain. In his own words, Simar writes, "Après huit ans d'études à Paris, donc, en 1505, il partit tout à coup pour l'Espagne avec Andres de Burgo, ambassadeur de Maximilien d'Autriche auprès de son fils, Philippe le Beau."<sup>30</sup> But this position is challenged by Becker, who writes, "Sieben Jahre will Longueil de Unterricht in Paris genossen haben; das wäre nach unserer Rechnung von 1493 bis 1501."<sup>31</sup> The basis for this conflict lies within the various editions of the "Defense Orations" of Longueil. In the original edition Longueil says, "a parentibus Lutetiam Parisiorum mittor, septennis quidem."<sup>32</sup> Gnoli and Simar cite the text from Longueil's Opera, Junta, which reads, "statim a parentibus, Lutetiam Parisiorum sum missus, annum tum quidem adhuc octavum agens."<sup>33</sup>

The resolution of this conflict comes from the "Vita" as it appears in the Junta edition of Longueil's Opera. Both Gnoli and Simar are compelled by their chronology to ignore a portion of the text which is correctly incorporated into the discussion by Becker. That text reads, "Quippe qui adolescens

laborem etiam militarem fuerat perpressus, milesque Neapolitano bello cum Ludovico Gallorum Rege in Italiam venisset, et si a robore militari multum abesset, corpusque decorum magis habere, quam robustum videretur."<sup>34</sup> If Longueil had been born in 1488 or 1489, and sent to Paris in 1496 or 1497, it would have been impossible for him to have made this journey before going into Spain in 1505, since Louis XII made no journey into Italy after the summer of 1502. If Longueil had been born in 1485, however, and sent to Paris in 1493 or 1494, he could very well have made this sojourn in 1501 and then travel into Spain in 1505.

Becker suggests that Longueil intentionally misrepresented the year-date of his birth for a better defense. Unlike Erasmus, who misrepresented his age in order to seem older, Longueil desired to appear younger than he really was. As Becker argues, "Es liegt aber der dringende Verdachte vor, dass Longueil sich verjüngte, wenn er glauben liess, er sei 1488 geboren; er tat das absichtlich zu seiner besseren Verteidigung."<sup>35</sup> This observation opposes the claim of Longueil's biographer, whom Simar identifies as Reginald Pole, who writes, "Obiit xxxiiii aetatis anno iii idus Septembris. Anno salutis generis humani M.D.XXII. atque Patavii in Francisci quem ad modum ipse praescripsit septultus."<sup>36</sup> In short, Becker is charging Longueil and his biographer with the perpetration and perpetuation of an erroneous year-date for his birth. The pattern of Erasmus, as well as the intense rivalry between him



Longueil,<sup>37</sup> is sufficient to persuade one to Becker's position, especially in light of his sober treatment of the available evidence about Antoine de Longueil's missions and the journey of Christophe de Longueil in 1501.

A second major issue for this study, and one associated with the date of his birth is that of the place at which Christophe de Longueil was born. In a letter from Erasmus to Damien de Goës, written in 1535, the statement is made that, "Ita Longolium hinc Galliae sibi vindicant, hinc Machlinia sibi asserit, quum revere fuerit purus Hollandus, prognatus a patre Hollando, in oppido celebri Hollandiae, cui hortorum pulchritudo nomen dedit Schonhovia. Hic ne quis mihi protinus obstrepat, quod dico patruus ipsius Petrus Longolius vir ap-  
prime doctus mihi narravit."<sup>38</sup> This Pierre de Longueil was the brother of Antoine, and hence the uncle of Christophe. In his Ciceronianus, published early in 1528, Erasmus revealed that he had not always adhered to the notion that Longueil was born in Schoonhoven, as he writes that "Christophe de Longueil, a native of Brabant and educated among the French."<sup>39</sup> These statements are in conflict with the very title used with Longueil's "Oration in Praise of St. Louis," which reads, "Christofori Longuolii Parisiensis."<sup>40</sup> These identifying comments are in sharp contrast to Longueil's own words in his first "Defense Oration," which reads, "Et quoniam multo isti plura in me falso contulerunt quem de re ipse dixerint, qui me Macliniae, nobili quidem, et illustri oppido, sed hinc longe

tamen trans alpeis natum esse non ignorarent, et ab oculis auribusque vestris procul aetatem egisse scirent, atque ex eo sibi multa impune fingendi, datum esse locum arbitrarentur, date hanc mihi P. C. veniam, ut de superiore mea vita, pauca ipse apud vos dicam."<sup>41</sup> The anonymous "Vita," used in Simar's discussion, states that "Christophorus Longolius Macliniae, nobili Germaniae oppido, honesto splendidoque inter suos loco, natus fuit."<sup>42</sup>

On the strength of these last two statements, Longueuil's biographers have tended to dismiss Erasmus' remarks,<sup>43</sup> although of the four major biographers, Gnoli, Roersch, Simar, and Becker, only Simar attempts a refutation of Erasmus. He does this with three arguments: "1<sup>o</sup> Longueil lui-même affirme sans l'ombre d'un doute qu'il est né à Malines . . .; 2<sup>o</sup> Érasme agissait par amour-propre national. Les Français reclamaient Longueil comme une de leurs illustrations. Érasme, piqué au vif, en fait un compatriote flamand. Il allait même jusqu'à revendiquer pour Antoine de Leon, son père, la nationalité hollandaise, ce qui est une grosse erreur . . .; 3<sup>o</sup> Le témoignage de Pierre de Longueil est suspect. Pourquoi n'a-t-il pas parlé plus tôt et rectifié les assertions de Reginald Pole qui avait publié en 1524 les lettres et la vie de Longolius?"<sup>44</sup>

The first of these so-called refutations by Simar must be evaluated in light of Becker's treatment of the date of Longueuil's birth. Perhaps Simar is jumping too soon to a conclusion. If Longueil had a propensity to misrepresent his

age whenever it was to his advantage, why could he not do the same about his birthplace? In short, Longueil's distortion of facts about his birth date may be used to neutralize Simar's evidence about the place of his birth. Like Gnoli, Simar may have assumed the authority of "l'edizione definitiva del 1524" when its veracity is indeed questionable. As for the second of his refutations, Longueil could very well have consciously taken Malines to himself as a place of birth in an attempt to obtain for himself a reputation which could compete with that of Erasmus. To claim Schoonhoven as his birthplace, especially since there was some legitimate question about it, would have placed him in the very shadow of the birthplace of his chief rival as a Northern Humanist. As for the third point in Simar's refutation his own interpretation of the facts is suspect. It is highly likely that no occasion had arisen which necessitated a refutation of the statement made by Longueil's biographer, but this assertion must be supported.

With the door ajar to the possibility that Simar may have evaluated the evidence too hastily, perhaps a review of the materials will clarify the situation as it relates to the statements of Erasmus and Pierre de Longueil, and thus to add credence to either their claims or to Simar's assertion. Some twenty months before the appearance of Longueil's Opera, in December 1524, Erasmus makes the following comment about the death of his rival: Nunc circuitu facto Louanium redeo. Illic

triduum fruitus sum consuetudine Christophori Longolii Brabantii: nam Mechliniae natus aiunt. Is nuper periit Venetiae, natus annos plus minus xxx. Iuvenis ad literas natus, et in his mature feliciterque institutus; inter nobiles futurus, si licuisset vivere. Postremus omnium nos reliquit Naevius."<sup>45</sup>

On 25 August 1525 he mentions Longueil having been in Bologna in a letter to Germanus Brixius, although he should have indicated Venice.<sup>46</sup> On 28 August of the same year he makes the same reference in a letter to Willibald Pirckheimer.<sup>47</sup> In a letter dated 8 March 1526, surely an excellent opportunity to have responded to the discrepancy between his position and that of the "Vita" of 1524, Erasmus makes no reference to the place of Longueil's birth as he laments his untimely death in a letter to Reginald Pole.<sup>48</sup> Later in the same year, he does mention his meeting with Longueil in Batavia, in a letter to Andreas Alciatus.<sup>49</sup> In a letter to Jacobus Tussanus on 16 May 1526, Erasmus writes of Longueil's erudition but makes no reference to his age or place of birth.<sup>50</sup> Within a month, according to P. S. Allen's reckoning, Erasmus writes of Longueil and his Ad Luterianos, although Becker assigns a date in mid-May.<sup>51</sup> Here again, there is no mention of the date or place of Longueil's birth. Early in 1527<sup>52</sup> Erasmus again raises the issue of Longueil as a Northern Ciceronian in a letter to Petrus Ioannes Olivarius, when he writes, "Benedictus Theocrenus, filiorum Regis Franciae pedagogus, homo ingentis ostentationis, ut solent esse Itali, at nullius eruditionis, solus

grammaticus Graecus et Latinus, insignis impudentiae vir et nullius iudicii, Hetrusca lingua eruditissimus, Battauum te vocat. In hunc procacissimum hominem ego pro te acerrime invectus sum. Aiunt iam, si diis placet, Longolium — novisti hominem — omnium Transmontanorum, ut ipsi vocant, eloquentissimum: sed quis non scit Longolium, dum vellet Ciceronianus esse, incidisse in plures affectationes? Non admittunt ut alicui Trasmontano contigerit felicitas carminis: quibus obieci ego unum aut alterum epigramma Thomae Mori."<sup>53</sup> On 23 March 1527 Erasmus writes to Budé and mentions Longueil's nationality as he writes, "Longolius ante diem nobis ereptus, praeclaram opinionem reliquit apud Italos, quod fuerit Ciceronianus. Et tamen neminem ex illis prodire video qui vere referat Ciceronem, nisi bractea duntaxat orationis ac verbulis aliquot selectis. Qui mihi totum Ciceronis pectus refert, is vere Ciceronianus est. Est Romae chorus eruditorum qui vix ferunt nomen Germanorum aut Gallorum. Habent coryphaeum et incitatorem tibi non ignotum; cuius animo ut nulla satis est gloria, ita non fert praeter ipsum laudari quenquam nec deorum nec hominum. Hos habeo ob hoc etiam iniquiores, quod in epistolis ad te meis alicubi scripserim tibi certamen esse cum Hermolais [et] Barbaris atque adeo Pliniis. Verum hos quominus habemus aequos, hoc arctioribus gratiarum vinculis inter nos iungi decet. Bene vale."<sup>54</sup> Then Budé discusses Longueil in his letter to Erasmus dated 22 April 1527, although the place of Longueil's birth is not mentioned.<sup>55</sup> In his

response to Budé, dated 22 June 1527, Erasmus says, "De Longolio miror si potuit ab amicitia tua discedere. Sed ille satis magnam laudem tulit, periit Ciceronianus. Et tamen illius Ciceroniani lucubrationes paucissimi legunt; nostras naenias Batauas nemo non legit."<sup>56</sup>

All this Erasmus correspondence in which Longueil is mentioned was written before the publication of his Ciceronianus in early 1528.<sup>57</sup> It was with this publication that Erasmus entered into his famous quarrel with Budé and his friends which lasted until 1532. Although the primary issue about which this quarrel revolved was the personalities of Erasmus and Budé, the latter feeling personally slighted by the collocation of his name with that of a printer of no great reputation named Badius in the text of the Ciceronianus,<sup>58</sup> the humanists became sharply divided into two camps. In the wake of this controversy, Erasmus was especially challenged by the Italians,<sup>59</sup> who championed the cause of Longueil.

With such a controversy in full sway, it would appear that the statements of Erasmus would be challenged, even those pertaining to the place of Longueil's birth. Prior to this controversy, neither Budé nor Pole had bothered to correct Erasmus' notion about Longueil's birthplace, but when Erasmus called Longueil a native of Brabant in the Ciceronianus,<sup>60</sup> he was indeed challenged. With this challenge, Erasmus saw fit to identify a living and relatively disinterested person. This authority was called upon as a result of the controversy

over the Ciceronianus, which would make Pierre de Longueil's statement not only well-timed, but also of considerable merit. Thus, the testimony of Simar rather than that of Pierre de Longueil is suspect.

Another line of argument comes from the statements of Longueil himself. In his Oration in Praise of St. Louis in 1510, he is identified as "Christophorus Longolius Parisiensis." According to Simar, this is of little import because, "Paris était la résidence habituelle de sa famille. Il y vint tout jeune et y vécut de longues années. Paris était, en somme, sa seconde patrie."<sup>61</sup> In and of itself, this statement does have little significance, and bears little upon the place of Longueil's birth, but Simar himself reveals another item which helps to erode the very foundation he lays in support of the Malines birthplace. He writes, "Un bref von Léon X déclare, il est vrai, Longueil originaire de Cambrai, mais le diocèse de Cambrai comprenait Malines dans sa circonscription."<sup>62</sup> Further erosion results from Longueil's correspondence in early 1522, when Adrian VI of Utrecht was elected Pope following the death of Leo X in December 1521. At that time, Longueil boasted of the fact that he had close ties with the new Pope in no fewer than three letters.<sup>63</sup> In his analysis of Longueil's actions at this time, Becker makes the following observation: "Longueil für seine Person suchte sich Hoffnungen zu machen, indem er sich und anderen vorstellte, dass Adrian seiner Vater gekannt habe und dass er ja selber

seinerzeit im Dienst Phillips des Schönen gestanden war. Dass er sich seit langen Jahren ständig als Franzosen gegeben hatte, focht ihn nicht an. Im Handumdrehen hatte er ein anderes Herz in seiner Brust entdeckt, das durchaus kaiserlich fühlte. Allerdings hatten die vielen politischen und militärischen Missgriffe der Franzosen seiner Begeisterung bereits einen starken Dämpfer aufgesetzt,"<sup>64</sup> Even Gnoli acknowledges the problem and writes, "Nell'autunno del 1516, anno quarto del pontificato di Leone X, giungeva a Roma un giovine, ora detto gallo ora germano ma che noi diremo belga, di nome Cristoforo Longueil, latinizzato in Longolio."<sup>65</sup> In a later reference to Longueil's move from Paris to Rome, Gnoli cites Paulus Jovius' description of "Christophorus Longolius Macliniae Belgicae sacerdote Antistite genitus, et Lutetiae in scholis frugaliter educatus, patris disciplinarum omnium peramplis opibus, aureo Leonis principatu Romam venit; adeo dissimulata ingenij professione, ut rubro pileo, et astricta penula semiGermani militis habitum mentiretur."<sup>66</sup> In his response to Jovius, Gnoli asks why such an elaborate attire should be used in light of the activities Longueil had in mind, and then he describes those objectives. Nevertheless, he does nothing to respond to Jovius' statement except claim, "Tutto questo non è che una storiella puerile, (e non fa onore al l'acume del Giovio l'averla accolta) messa fuori più tardi, quando tutte le armi si adoperarono a combattere il giovine straniero."<sup>67</sup> Perhaps Jovius is unwittingly caught in the



midst of the two traditions about Longueuil's birthplace and follows the account in the "Vita" with regard to Longueuil's homeland and the "Germanic" tradition about his entry into Rome in 1516. Since his sources are not identified, it is impossible to determine this matter with certainty. What is certain, however, is the fact that military service was central to Longueuil's early life.<sup>68</sup>

With a choice to be made between the "Vita" and the "Germanic" traditions, the question of authorship of the anonymous "Vita" comes to the surface. It is only after this matter is determined that the relative merits of each tradition may be adequately evaluated and the birthplace of Longueuil designated with assurance. To this matter the discussion now turns.

There has been very little dissent from the view that Reginald Pole was the author of the anonymous "Vita" which accompanies Longueuil's Opera, Junta, and its various editions. In fact, until recently, the only notable serious question about the matter is raised in a letter from Pierre Bunel to Émile Perrot dated 30 November 1530. In it Bunel relates that he had accidentally met a physician who informed him of Simon de Villeneuve's untimely death from the Plague. He also reports that neither Giovanni-Battista Egnazio nor Antonio Francini, the former editor at the Junta publishing house and probable overseer of the Junta edition of Longueuil's Opera, can say who authored the "Vita" published therein. He goes

on to relate that some are of the opinion that Longueil himself wrote the "Vita," which Bunel does not believe, while others surmise it to be the work of Villeneuve, although no positive evidence can be given. No mention is made of the possibility that Reginald Pole was its author.<sup>69</sup> George B. Parks comes to a similar position in his recent investigation of the authorship of the "Vita," although he makes no reference to Bunel's letter to Perrot. Primarily using internal evidence from the "Vita" itself, Parks concludes that it is likely the work of several persons who had a hand in helping to publish Longueil's Opera, Junta. He asserts, "If more than one person had a hand in it, no one person would affix his signature, and certainly not Pole."<sup>70</sup>

What is indeed interesting in these accounts is the fact that they provide more positive evidence than does the more traditional account. To illustrate this position, L. Roersch writes, "En 1524, on publia à Florence ses dernières oeuvres: les deux discours dans la cause de perduellion, celui contre les luthériens, quatre livres de lettres et un cinquième livre de lettres adressées à lui par Bembo et Sadolet: Orationes duae pro defensione sua et alia opuscula. Florence, hér. de Phil. Junta, décembre 1524; petit in - 40, 163ff."<sup>71</sup> At the conclusion of his article, however, Roersch comments that, "Parmi ses écrits non publiés, Pole cite, outre ceux que nous avons déjà nommes: Comparatio iuris civilis cum re militari, commentarii quidam in ius civile." He then lists

his authority as "(Regin. Pole), Chr. Longolii vita, en tête des oeuvres publiées à Florence."<sup>72</sup> He offers no other authority earlier than the Elogia Doctorum Vivorum of Paulus Jovius, and this work was published a full generation later than Bunel's letter to Perrot.<sup>73</sup>

Gnoli begins his discussion of Longueil's Opera, Junta, by asserting, "Il Polo adempiè religiosamente la volontà dell'amico pubblicando in Firenze nel 1524, coi tipi dei Giunta gli scritti del Longolio da esso approvati."<sup>74</sup> Later in his treatment Gnoli writes that, "Reginaldo Polo pubblicò il volume degli scritti del Longolio attenendosi religiosamente alla volontà di lui, e coll'intendimento di dimostrare 'quanto egli in dottrina e in eloquenza soprastasse a tutti gli scrittori del secolo.'"<sup>75</sup> With reference to the "Vita" itself, Gnoli adds, "Premise al volume una vita del Longolio, o meglio un elogio; povero di notizie che avrebbe potuto aggiungere, e sparso di errori che avrebbe potuto evitare se avesse attentamente letto e ordinato gli scritti che pubblicava. Egli nascose, non so perchè, il suo nome, dicendosi solo suo amicissimo, ma rivelandosi troppo chiaramente col riferire cose dette dal Longolio a Reginaldo Polo, da solo a solo."<sup>76</sup> These assertions are all made without the slightest corroboration.

In Simar's biography there are numerous references to the anonymous "Vita" as "Reginald Pole," as has been indicated in previous discussion. In his argumentation to support

these assertions, however, Simar offers no documentation whatever for his statement, "Seul, Reginald Pole montra par des actes l'affection qu'il avait vouée à son ancien précepteur. Il réunit soigneusement lettres et discours, et, malgré la volonté expresse de Philippe Junta. En 1524, paraissait l'édition princeps des oeuvres de Christophe de Longueil. Une foule d'éditions se succédèrent dans le courant du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, et toutes prirent pour base le volume de Junta, avec quelques additions ou modifications de détail."<sup>77</sup> This is hardly sufficient basis for the numerous references to the anonymous "Vita" as "Reginald Pole," especially since it does not so much as mention the "Vita" itself.

The account of Becker indicates that, "Den letzten Dienst erwies Reginald Pole dem Verstorbenen als sein literarischer Testamentsvollstrecker."<sup>78</sup> He goes on to state that the letters from Longueil's earlier years, and even his later years, were screened if he thought they would be unworthy of his memory, so that he granted to the world only the creative efforts of his last three years. According to Becker, "Diese Stücke vereinigte Reginald Pole zu einem Bande, der in Dezember 1524 bei Filippo Giuntas Erben in Florenz erschien, kurz bevor Pole Italien verliess, um — voraussichtlich — dauernd nach England heimzukehren."<sup>79</sup> After stating the fact that the prestige of the Junta publishing house enabled it to print some of the candid and personal allusions found in the letters, which a lesser publisher would have been under pressure to

modify, Becker concludes his critical biography of Longueil by attesting, "Der Feder dieses treuen Freundes der letzten Stunde verdanken wir auch den kurzen Lebenslauf, der lange die einzige und auch die ergiebigste und verlässlichste biographische Quelle für die Nachwelt war."<sup>80</sup> As is the situation with Roersch, Gnoli, and Simar, Becker offers no authority for his affirmations. He has only one notation with his discussion, and that refers to the subsequent editions of Longueil's Opera. Nothing is said to vindicate his assumption that Pole wrote the "Vita," and no attempt is made in his volume to address the question raised in Bunel's letter to Perrot.

This pattern of ascribing the authorship of Longueil's "Vita" to Reginald Pole is not limited to Longueil's biographers. Allen, for example, in his edition of Erasmi Epistolarum, merely refers to it as "a life by Pole in Lo[ngoliii] E[pistolarum]."<sup>81</sup> The tradition is also perpetuated by the biographers of Pole.<sup>82</sup> Of these, Quirinus' edition of Epistolarum Reginaldi Poli is the standard authority. In the "Vita Reginaldi Poli" prefixed to that work, a short passage about Pole's stay in Padua and his relationship with Longueil appears. In addition to identifying Longueil as "Belga," the narrative says, "Quod quidem cum alia ejus scripta, tum etiam Longolii, qui apud ipsum mortuus est, vita ab eo litteris mandata, satis declarat, quae etiam typis, una cum ipsius Longolii libris impressa est. Hunc vitae cursum tenens, non Patavii modo, sed Venetiis, atque adeo tota Italia, et extra

Italiam quoque, magnam est nominis celebritatem brevi consequutus. Quod sane ex multorum illius aetatis doctrina praestantium hominum scriptis apparet; in primis autem ex Bembi, Sadoleti, Erasmi, atque etiam ejus, quem paulo ante nominavimus, Longolii Epistolis perspicui potest."<sup>83</sup> There is no claim in the correspondence of Pole to confirm this position, and by the same token, none to deny it.

In the well-documented Phillips edition of The History of the Life of Reginald Pole, the author digresses from a discussion of Pole's correspondence with Erasmus to mention that "Longolius was born at Mecklin [sic]; and his memory, parts, and universal knowledge, made him the wonder of those times."<sup>84</sup> Following a brief statement on Longueil's place in the setting at Padua, and his relationship to Pole at the time of his death, he goes on to say, "But no one has contributed so much to make this extraordinary young man's character known and approved, as the noble friend who wrote his Life; and who, being intimately acquainted with him, was as able as willing to do him justice."<sup>85</sup> After describing the quality of the "Life" prefixed to the "Volume of His Letters," Phillips adds, "This is the first specimen REGINALD gave of the masterly command he had of the Latin language, and of a manner of thinking, which always appeared answerable to the energy of that tongue, and to every subject he treated in it."<sup>86</sup> However straightforward a claim this is, like those made by Roersch, Gnoli, Simar, Becker, and Quirinus, there is an interesting

twist made in Phillips' presentation. He has a richly documented work, even documenting Erasmus' comment to Pole on the death of Longueil and the fact that Longueil bequeathed to Pole "his library, as the only pledge he could then give of his regard."<sup>87</sup> But with that citation, the documentation is discontinued until a reference is cited in which Longueil writes to Stefano Sauli that Pole was "a man of singular modesty, and few words; and who had little relish for those things which are the general topics of conversation."<sup>88</sup>

When subsequent biographers have bothered to address the issue of the authorship of Longueil's "Vita," they have merely cited Phillips as their source, thus bringing suspicion on their statements as well as his. Martin Haile, for example, writes that "He paid a pious tribute to his memory by writing the Life annexed to the published edition of Longueil's works, printed in Florence in 1524. Pole modestly refrained from giving his name to the biography which, in the elegant simplicity of its Latin, is held by some critics to be superior to the more pretentious style of his later writings."<sup>89</sup> Haile again mentions Pole's "Life of Longolius" at the conclusion of the same chapter in his biography, and in both instances he cites only Phillips as his source.<sup>90</sup> Reginald Biron and Jean Barennes do not offer any support for their statement, "Vivement ému de cette prompt disparition, Réginald voulut rendre à la mémoire de cet homme distingué mort à 34 ans, un tribut d'affection. Tandis que Bembo

rédigeait une savante épitaphe pour le tombeau de Longueil, Pole, élevant à sa manière un monument à son ami,, raconta par écrit les détails de sa vie, sans cependant signer son ouvrage."<sup>91</sup> Their discussion goes on to mention the gracious and touching style of this unpretentious biography which "Certains critiques estiment même que Pole n'a jamais été aussi bien inspiré dans ses ouvrages postérieurs, rédigés pourtant avec plus d'art et d'application."<sup>92</sup> They identify this biography as being located at the beginning of the volume of Longueil's correspondence published in Florence. Cardinal Gasquet makes no attempt to verify his citation from "Pole in the life of his friend which he contributed to the volume of Longueil's letters, published immediately after his death in 1522,"<sup>93</sup> or his statement that "Longolius lived with Pole at Padua for about a year; and, as the latter declares, in the 'Life' of his friend, they were ever most united in their interests and in their studies to the last day of Longolius' life."<sup>94</sup> Even W. Schenk does nothing to clarify the issue. In his treatment of Pole's life in Italy, he discussed Longueil and his relationship to the Englishman. Although he utilizes source materials on both Pole and Longueil, Schenk offers not even the slightest support for his comment that, "For our purpose it is worth noting that Pole, in his biography of Longolius, does not sound the slightest critical note about his friend's doctrines and antics, duly recorded there; the biography itself is, indeed, written in faultless



Ciceronian Latin."<sup>95</sup>

The overwhelming conclusion to be drawn from this presentation of the traditional view of the authorship of the anonymous "Vita" is simply that it is seriously open to question as it now stands. Not only do the biographers of Longueil argue from silence, those writers concerned with Reginald Pole argue in the same vein. The mere amassing of voices in support of their cause, however, does not alter their tenuous position in the least. Even a handwritten document under the title "Christophori Longolii Vita a Reginaldo Polo," inserted into a partly damaged Vatican Library copy of Longueil's Opera, Junta, does not help their cause.<sup>96</sup> Until George B. Parks entered upon the scene, Pierre Bunel was the only voice crying out in the wilderness, but their combined efforts make it necessary for supporters of the traditional view to evoke some new line of evidence before Pole can properly be acclaimed as the author of the "Vita."

The precise identification of the author of the "Vita" is not, however, essential to the present investigation. Whether it was written by Longueil himself, Reginald Pole, Simon de Villeneuve, or even by several members of their group, the net result of its testimony would be virtually unaltered. If Longueil wrote it, for instance, the fact that he constantly altered his associations and made fabrications about his early life would tend to militate against his assertion that he was born in Malines thirty-four years earlier. As Becker

aptly illustrates in the introduction to his publication of Longueil's letter on his Swiss adventure of 1513, "Wenn aber Longueil in Bezug auf den Kardinal von Sitten geflunkert hat, welchen von seinen Angaben sollen und dürfen wir da noch Vertrauen schenken? Sollen wir uns etwa an die in manchen Punkten etwas abweichende Fassung der Erzählung in der Vita halten?" He goes on to say, "Das ist alles sehr peinlich; denn wenn Longueil fähig ist in den Tag hinein zu fabulieren und das Blaue vom Himmel herunter zu phantasieren, was bleibt dann überhaupt noch glaubhaft von seinem ganzen Leben, das wir fast ausschliesslich aus seinem Selbstzeugnis kennen?"<sup>97</sup>

In his earlier work, Becker illustrates the clue to how Longueil may have come to identify himself as a native of Malines. While he was attending school at Paris, he writes, "Longueil nennt als den Bedeutendsten unter seinem Lehrern Robertus Fortunatus Duraeus, und dieser is offenbar mit dem Robertus Fortunatus oder Rob. Fortunatus Macloviensis identisch, den Jacobus Faber Stapulensis schon 1501 als gleichstrebenden Gesinnungsgenossen nennt, den Beatus Rhenanus 1507 mit einigen Distichen bedenkt, an den Faber 1508 den Geleitbrief zu der Dialektik des Georg von Trapezunt richtet."<sup>98</sup>

Perhaps the greatness of his master and the acclaim accorded him by his peers provided the young Longueil a ready-made identification when his own life took a new turn on his entry into Rome in 1516. Unlike Erasmus, here was an outstanding scholar who would offer an umbrella of protection and no

competetion until the young humanist could come into the full radiance of his own greatness. Longueil could easily bask in the greatness of his former mentor until he surpassed him in his own right. As for Erasmus, he was too near as a contemporary and too much of a rival for Longueil to risk being too closely identified and compared at this juncture in his career.

Should Pole have been the author, the problem of reliability would have been perpetuated. The young Englishman arrived at Padua in 1521, accompanied by Thomas Lupset and Richard Pace. There he met Longueil and they became fast friends. In a letter from Bembo to Pole dated 11 July 1521, the secretary mentions that Longueil had moved into Pole's newly acquired house.<sup>99</sup> There the two men lived until Longueil's death on 11 September 1522. Theirs was indeed a close relationship, as indicated in the letters written by Longueil to Pole in August 1522, and which caused his friend to return hastily from Venice to Padua.<sup>100</sup> Pole remained at the side of the dying Longueil, and from this incident arises the notion that he wrote the anonymous "Vita." Since there are no negative comments about Longueil in that "Vita," and much personal data appears in it, it has been generally assumed that Pole must have written the document. Should this have actually been the case, the anti-Erasmus position about Longueil's place of birth could easily emerge intact, for Pole was himself within the camp of the Italian humanists as

much as Longueil had been. Pole's close connections with them and his affiliation with the intellectual community at Padua in general, as well as his closeness to Longueil in particular, would surely persuade him to take the position that Longueil was born at Malines thirty-four years before his death. His lack of critical evaluation of the materials published under his direction in the Longueil Opera, Junta, could very well account for the contradictory elements accompanying the "Vita," if he actually wrote it or exercised responsibility over its production. Thus, it matters not whether Longueil or Pole actually penned the "Vita," so far as the place and year-date of Longueil's birth are concerned. But what of Villeneuve? Would it matter if he were the author of the "Vita" as it appeared in the Longueil Opera, Junta?

Villeneuve, or Villanovanus, is regarded as either a French or Belgian humanist, who R. Copley-Christie says was born at "Neufvilles en Hainaut, en 1495."<sup>101</sup> This county is situated between the Bishopric of Cambray and the Duchy of Brabant. It is likely that this young man was drawn into friendship with Longueil in part because of the latter's claim to have been born in Malines. In addition, Villeneuve had come to Italy to study Civil Law after he had completed his earlier training. This discipline was the same as that in which Longueil had himself gained considerable notoriety in his earlier years. The parallel of their lives does not end here, however, for Villeneuve also became a champion of the

Ciceronian style.<sup>102</sup> In 1527 Étienne Dolet, author of an attack on Erasmus' Ciceronianus,<sup>103</sup> traveled "to Padua to study under the tuition of Simon de Villeneuve, the successor of Longueil as professor of Latin, at a time when Bembo and the Ciceronian cult were most influential there."<sup>104</sup> Villeneuve's close ties with Longueil are also shown in the correspondence of the latter when Villeneuve departed from Pavia en route to Venice and environs. As Becker indicates of Villeneuve, "Sein Familienname ist unbekannt. Longueil's Briefe geben uns ein Bild von den Schwierigkeiten, mit denen er zu kämpfen hatte, bis er in Venedig Unterkunft fand."<sup>105</sup> Simar, concurring that Villeneuve spent six years at Pavia before these letters were written, disagrees about the dates when they were composed. Since the chronology of these items is of no import to the present discussion, that matter will be deferred to a more appropriate context.<sup>106</sup> Simar's comment, however, is germane, for he says, "Pauvre et dénué de ressources, il se réfugia auprès de son compatriote Longueil qui, malgré l'exiguïté de sa fortune, le nourrit et l'entre-tint plusieurs mois."<sup>107</sup>

Since the quality of the "Vita" is described by some as surpassing that of Pole's later writings, and since there were such close ties among the three men, it is quite possible and plausible that the work may have been written by Villeneuve and added to the collection of orations and correspondence being edited by Pole. This situation would account for

the discrepancies between the "Vita" and the other items in Longueil's Opera, Junta. Reginald Pole returned to England early in 1527, before the publication of Erasmus' Ciceronianus,<sup>108</sup> and Villeneuve died in the midst of the controversy which followed that publication.<sup>109</sup> Pierre Bunel's letter reflects the uncertainty about the authorship of the "Vita" at that time, and the question remains. Whether Longueil, Pole, Villeneuve, or others of their group wrote it, however, has little bearing on the fact that it is heavily influenced by the Italian faction in the conflict between Erasmus and the Ciceronians and the Germanic and "Vita" traditions about the place and year-date of Longueil's birth. All the prime candidates for that honor are expressing the position of Christophe de Longueil, and his equivocations about such matters during his controversy with Celso Mellini in Rome are illustrated in Gnoli's study.<sup>110</sup>

In summary, then, the whole discussion comes to the relative merits of the voice of Christophe de Longueil, as reflected in the traditional view that he was born in Malines in 1488 or later, and that of Pierre de Longueil, his uncle, as reflected in the Germanic tradition that he was born in Schoonhoven at some earlier date. Perhaps the clue to the solution of this conflict comes from Becker, who subscribes to the traditional view about the birthplace and the Germanic view about the year-date, when he writes, "Von seiner Mutter is weder Name noch Familie noch Stand bekannt geworden; wir

wissen nur, dass sie ledig war, und dürfen sie wohl als Niederländerin ansprechen."<sup>111</sup> Having already challenged the mass of Longueil scholars about the year-date of his birth, Becker cannot bring himself to contradict them about the place of that birth. But he does acknowledge that it is difficult to know what to do with the divergent statement recorded by Erasmus.<sup>112</sup> The reason he cannot confront those who have placed him in such an awkward position is that he does not come to the heart of the issue, namely, the relative merits of the authorities upon which the two traditions are based. In a later work he seriously challenges the credibility of Christophe de Longueil with regard to his Swiss adventure and its accounts in the letter to Pierre Brisson and in the "Vita."<sup>113</sup> Surely the relatively removed and dispassionate position of Pierre de Longueil, along with the frequency of communications between Erasmus and Longueil's friends who could have corrected his "erroneous" thinking, must bear heavily upon the entire matter. With Christophe de Longueil's credibility challenged, the question of the authorship of the "Vita" arises, but that has relatively no bearing on the issue at hand, since the three leading candidates for that honor are quite immediately and intimately associated. With nothing negative included in that "Vita," it is evident that all were heavily influenced by the Italian faction in the overall controversy. All factors being considered, it would appear relatively safe to assume that Christophe

de Longueil was born in the Autumn of 1485 and probably in Schoonhoven, Holland, rather than in Malines, Belgium, in 1488 or later.



1. Cf., ch. i and nn. 2-4, as well as the discussion in ch. iii.

2. Simar, Longueil, pp. 3-7, argues that Longueil was born in 1488, as his title indicates, whereas Becker, Longueil, p. 2, prefers 1485. This problem will be treated in a more appropriate place in the present chapter.

3. Cf., ch. ii for treatment of this material.

4. Simar, Longueil, pp. 156-194, identifies 156 letters written by Longueil, but he does not include the letters to or about him. Becker, Longueil, pp. 68-210, summarizes and lists 252 letters, but these go far beyond the limits of those found in the various published materials, for it includes letters to Longueil as well as those written about him as late as 1558.

5. Even as late as 1973, George B. Parks, "Did Pole Write the 'Vita Longolii'?" p. 274, left the issue unresolved by indicating Longueil's dates merely as "(Longolius, ca. 1490-1522)." Cf., ch. iii, n. 71.

6. L. Roersch, "Longueil (Christophe de)," col. 349. Cf., ch. iii, n. 31.

7. Simar, Longueil, p. 3, also see n. 2, which carries his argumentation. Simar agrees with Roersch, but does not know how he arrived at the 1488 date.

8. Ibid., p. 4, and n. 1, cites Pole as the author of the anonymous "Vita," in Longueil, Opera, Junta. Parks, "Did Pole Write the 'Vita Longolii'?" addresses this very issue.

9. This is letter IV, 34, as it appears in Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 342-346. Cf., ch. ii, n. 38, as well as "Appendix I," where the text of this letter is reproduced. Simar, Longueil, p. 185, sub verbo "Erasme," dates this letter 29 January 1519, but Becker, Longueil, p. 72, dates it 29 January 1518. It will be discussed at a later point.

10. Simar, Longueil, p. 4, and n. 1, cites the work by [Bartholomaeus Hauréau], Gallia Christiana in Provincias Ecclesiasticas distributa. . . ., XIV (Paris, 1856), cols. 981-982.

11. Kopf, "Christophorus Longolius," p. 365, but Kopf does not cite even the works of Simar, Gnoli, Cian, et al. Cf., ch. i, nn. 3 and 25, and ch. ii, n. 3, as well as the materials mentioned in ch. iii.

12. Becker, Longueil, p. 2, also nn. 2-6.

13. This dependence upon Simar's authority may well be attributed to the fact that in 1913 P. S. Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, III, 472-473, in the introductory materials to Letter 914, relied upon and regarded Simar's articles in Musée belge, xiii-xv (1909-1911), as a full treatise. Cf., ch. i, n. 2. The widespread use of Allen's work has been indicated in ch. iii, n. 42.

14. Goldschmidt, "De Longueil's Letter," p. 165, n. 1. His ignorance of Becker's work is apparent, even twenty years after its appearance, since he states, "The fullest monograph on L[ongueil] is by T. Simar, in Travaux de l'Université de Louvain, Fasc. 31 (1911)." Cf., ch. i, n. 3.

15. Aulotte, "Une Rivalité," p. 549, and n. 3. Cf., ch. i, n. 3.

16. Garanderie, "Les Relations d'Érasme avec Paris," p. 42, n. 52, is the main entry on Longueil bibliography, but the entire article bears out the author's unawareness of Becker's work. Cf., ch. i, n. 3.

17. Roersch, "Longueil," col. 349. Cf., ch. iii, n. 31.

18. Simar, Longueil, pp. 4-5, n. 1.

19. Becker, Longueil, p. 2, also see nn. 4 and 5.

20. Ibid., p. 2, where he says, "Für das Jahr 1487 ist eine ähnliche Mission nicht belegt, sie wird lediglich aus dem angenommenen Geburtsjahr erschlossen."

21. Simar, Longueil, p. 3, n. 2.

22. Cf., "Appendix I," for the text of this letter. The exact location is approximately ten lines from the end of the letter, which appears in Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 342-346, and Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, "Liber IIII, 34." Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, III, introduction to Letter 473, incorrectly indicates this letter is "at the end of the fifth book of letters."

23. Simar, Longueil, p. 3, n. 2.

24. Huizinga, Erasmus and the Age of Reformation, pp. 4-5. Cf., ch. iii, n. 91.

25. Margaret Mann Phillips, Erasmus and the Northern Renaissance (New York: Collier Books, 1965), p. 29.

26. Ferguson, Europe in Transition, p. 548. Cf., ch. iii, n. 73.

27. Thomson, Europe in Renaissance and Reformation, p. 76. Cf., ch. iii, n. 73.

28. Spitz, The Renaissance and Reformation Movements, p. 294. Cf., ch. iii, n. 73.

29. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 2.

30. Simar, Longueil, pp. 8-9.

31. Becker, Longueil, p. 4.

32. Cf., Gnoli, Un giudizio, "Appendix II," p. 124, for Gnoli's reproduction of the first edition text. This item was available for use by Gnoli, Simar, and Becker, but Becker alone utilized it on this point.

33. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 10b.

34. Ibid., fol. 5b.

35. Becker, Longueil, p. 2.

36. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 8a.

37. Cf., ch. iii, and especially nn. 50-57, as well as Aulotte, "Une Rivalité," pp. 549-552, and Garanderie, "Les Relations d'Érasme avec Paris," especially pp. 49-53.

38. Cf., Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, XI, 208, Letter 3043. This letter, "Des. Erasmus Roterod. Clarissimo Viro Damiano a Goes Lusitano S. D.," is dated 18 August 1535 by Allen on p. 206. Becker, Longueil, p. 2, n. 6, dates it 20 August 1535, but p. 204, item 249, lists it as 10 August 1535. Simar, Longueil, pp. 3-4, n. 3, makes no attempt at dating the letter except for the year date of 1535.

39. Scott, Controversies, Part II, p. 110. Cf., ch. i, n. 38.

40. Cf., ch. ii, nn. 2-4.

41. Cf., Biblioteca Ambrosiana and Vittorio-Emmanuele copies as well as the Aldus edition of Longueil's "Defense Orations," as indicated in ch. ii and nn. 11-17. The text is more readily available in Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 10b, or in the source used by Becker, Longueil, p. 2, n. 2, which is Gnoli, Un giudizio, "Appendix II," p. 125. Simar, Longueil, pp. 3-4, merely refers to Longueil's "Perduellionis rei defensio oratio I."

42. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 3a.

43. Cf., especially Roersch, "Longueil," col, 349, Simar, Longueil, p. 3, and Becker, Longueil, p. 2, from which all subsequent references are derived. Gnoli, Un giudizio, pp. 1-2, n. 1, limits himself in the matter as he says, "ho seguito l'edizione definitiva del 1524." Nevertheless, the question about the place of Longueil's birth has been a moot issue for over three centuries.

44. Simar, Longueil, pp. 3-4, n. 3.

45. Cf., Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, V, 248, Letter 1347. Simar seems unaware of this letter written to Jodocus Gaverius and dated 1 March 1524 by Becker, Longueil, p. 196, as it is in all the sources prior to Allen, who changed it to 1523. He did this because of the conclusive arguments of Prof. de Vocht in 1914, which established the date of Nevius' death as 25 November 1522. Cf., Allen's argument in the introduction to this letter, p. 238.

46. Cf., Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, VI, 149, Letter 1597. Becker, Longueil, p. 196, misdates this letter as 20 August 1525. Also cf., Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, V, 248, Letter 1347; VI, 149, Letter 1597; and VI, 157, Letter 1603.

47. Cf., Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, VI, 157, Letter 1603.

48. Cf., Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, VI, 282, Letter 1675. With the appearance of an uncorrected "Vita" in 1526, there remained a dual tradition about the place of Longueil's birth. Cf., Longueil, Opera, 1526. Also cf., ch. ii, n. 23.

49. Cf., Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, VI, 335, Letter 1706. Becker, Longueil, p. 200, misdates this letter as 1529. This error may be as a result of a misprint in the source used by Becker and discussed by Allen in the introduction to this letter. Although Becker suggests only a year date, Allen indicates the letter was written c. 6 May 1526 on the basis of its contents and the content of other letters from the same period. Simar does not mention this item in his discussion.

50. Cf., Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, VI, 345, Letter 1713.

51. Cf., Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, VI, 353-354, Letter 1719, introduction and text. Allen suggests that "the month-date is difficult, and probably erroneous" as c. 6 June 1526. He offers the July reading instead of Becker's, Longueil, p. 197, 16 May 1526 entry.

52. Cf., Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, VI, 471-472, Letter 1791, introduction, discusses the contents of this partially mutilated autograph. From the mention of the attack on Erasmus by Spanish orthodoxy, the year date 1527 is assigned to the letter. It was written from Valladolid on "3 eïdus, Marti." Becker, Longueil, p. 201, has the letter listed as O[hne] J[ahr]," but inserts it between a letter dated in 1529 and one dated 5 September 1530. Since his list is chronologically arranged, it would appear that Becker prefers a 1530 year date.

53. Cf., Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, VI, 474-475, Letter 1791.

54. Cf., Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, VI, 478-479, Letter 1794. This letter is dated the same by Becker, Longueil, p. 199.

55. Cf., Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, VII, 38-39, Letter, 1812. Becker, Longueil, p. 199, concurs with the date assigned by Allen.

56. Cf., Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, VII, 95, Letter 1840. Again Becker, Longueil, p. 200, agrees with Allen's date for this epistle.

57. Renaudet, Études Érasmiennes, pp. 291-292. Cf., ch. iii, n. 95.

58. Cf., Scott, Controversies, Part I, pp. 24-41, presents an analysis of this controversy and the publications which arose from it.

59. An interesting ramification of the intensity of this Italian hostility toward Erasmus may be seen in the fact that his name has been scratched out of the Padua University copy of Longueil, Opera, 1540. Cf., ch. ii, n. 51. Also see Renaudet, Érasme en l'Italie, pp. 200-207, and ch. iii, n. 97.

60. Cf., Scott, Controversies, Part II, p. 110.

61. Simar, Longueil, pp. 3-4, n. 3.

62. Ibid., pp. 3-4, n. 3. This letter is the first of those listed in ch. i, n. 25.

63. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Epistolarum Liber" III, 11, fols. 118b-119a, III, 12, fols. 119a-120a, and IV, 12, fols. 139b-140a. Simar, Longueil, pp. 171 and 191, concurs with Becker, Longueil, pp. 162 and 182, on the dates

for III, 11, and IV, 12. The fact that Simar uses Longueil, Opera, 1558, as his basic text accounts for the one day discrepancy between his and Becker's date for III, 12. Becker's authority is Longueil, Opera, Junta. These three letters are correctly dated as follows: III, 11 (19 January 1522), III, 12 (19 January 1522), and IV, 12 (17 May 1522). Cf., ch. ii, n. 62, for information on Longueil, Opera, 1558.

64. Becker, Longueil, p. 61.

65. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 1.

66. Jovius, Elogia, 1557, p. 145. Cf., ch.iii, n. 9.

67. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 6.

68. There is unanimity of opinion about this matter which will be discussed and illustrated in the present study as Longueil's biography is developed.

69. This letter appears in Becker's listing, Longueil, p. 242. It is also mentioned in Simar, Longueil, p. 192, as being from P. Bunel, Familiares Aliquot Cura ac Diligentia Caroli Stephani (Paris, 1551), p. 16. Neither author attempts to address the issues raised in the letter.

70. Parks, "Did Pole Write the 'Vita Longolii'?" p. 285. It should be noted that Parks avoids the problem of Longueil's birth date by listing it as "Longolius, ca. 1490-1522," p. 274. Cf., ch. iii, n. 71.

71. Roersch, "Longueil," col. 358.

72. Ibid., col. 359.

73. Cf., ch. iii, n. 9, which indicates 1557 as the earliest edition of Jovius' work, although the 1571 edition is that which is used by Simar and Becker. Roersch does not indicate the edition he used.

74. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 92.

75. Ibid., p. 93. The citation is from the anonymous "Vita," cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 5b.

76. Ibid., p. 93.

77. Simar, Longueil, p. 96.

78. Becker, Longueil, p. 66.

79. Becker, Longueil, p. 66.

80. Ibid., pp. 66-67. In a footnote at the end of this statement, Becker adds that all later editions have come from this original one. He then summarizes those editions rather incompletely and refers to Simar's discussion of Étienne Dolet, but misnumbers the page as 94, it should be pp. 95-96.

81. Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, III, 473, Letter 914, introductory materials. The "Lo." is a reference to Longueil, and the "E." refers to the "Epistolarum," presumably Longueil, Opera, Junta.

82. Cf., ch. iii, nn. 45, 59, 62-64, and 67.

83. Pole, Epistolarum Reginaldi Poli, I, "Vita." Also see IV, 6, and 193-211.

84. Phillips, Reginald Pole, I, 22. The discussion about Erasmus begins on p. 19. Italics in source.

85. Ibid., p. 23.

86. Ibid., p. 24. Capitalization in the source.

87. Ibid., p. 23. The reference is to Ep. IV, 33, as found in Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 153a.

88. Ibid., p. 25. Cf., Ep. III, 12, Longueil, Opera, Junta, fols., 119a-120a.

89. Haile, Reginald Pole, p. 28. He cites "Phillips, Vol. I, p. 24."

90. Ibid., p. 32. Again the author cites his source as "Phillips, Vol. I, p. 24."

91. Biron and Barennes, Réginald Pole, p. 20.

92. Ibid., p. 20.

93. Gasquet, Reginald Pole, p. 30.

94. Ibid., pp. 30-31.

95. Schenk, Reginald Pole, p. 11.

96. Cf., ch. ii, n. 21, (R. G. Neolatini IV, 137A).

97. Becker, Aus Frankreichs Frührenaissance, p. 9. In his introductory discussion, Goldschmidt, "De Longueil's

Letter," pp. 163-168, seems oblivious to the fact that there are many conflicts between the two accounts. Simar does not use this letter. Cf., ch. iii, n. 65.

98. Becker, Longueil, p. 3.

99. Cf., Pole, Epistolarum Reginaldi Poli, I, 383-384, Letter III, written by Bembo.

100. Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 32, fols. 152b-153a, dated 22 August 1522, and IV, 33, fol. 153a, dated 25 August 1522.

101. As cited by Simar, Longueil, p. 193.

102. Becker, Longueil, p. 143, item 124, n. 1.

103. Dolet, Dialogus. Cf., ch. iii, nn. 50 and 52. In his dialogue against Erasmus, Dolet embodied the position of Erasmus in the person of Sir Thomas More, while that of Longueil was done in the person of Villeneuve. Cf., Scott, Controversies, pp. 63-79.

104. Scott, Controversies, p. 63.

105. Becker, Longueil, p. 143, item 124, n. 1. This is a reference to Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 16, fols. 101a-102a, dated "24 Mai und 2 Juni 1521" by Becker, and "10 juin 1524" by Simar, Longueil, p. 194. See *infra*, ch. vi, and nn. 6-17, for a discussion of the Longueil-Villeneuve correspondence.

106. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 16, fols. 101a-102a; II, 22, fol. 105a; II, 24, fols. 105b-106a; and II, 27, fol. 107. There are day and year differences in the dates assigned to these letters by Simar and Becker. Additional references to Villeneuve may be found in the correspondence of Longueil.

107. Simar, Longueil, p. 193.

108. Haile, Reginald Pole, p. 19.

109. Cf., Simar, Longueil, p. 193, says that Pierre Bunel, "attribut sa mort à un mauvais coup des Florentins." Becker, Longueil, p. 143, item 124, n. 1, merely records that "1530 erlag er der Pest."

110. Gnoli, Un giudizio, *passim*, makes repeated references to Longueil's habit of changing his position in such matters as he discusses the various editions of Longueil's "Defense Orations."



111. Becker, Longueil, p. 2. Cf., Simar, Longueil, p. 4, refers to her as "d'une bourgeoise quelconque de Malines." Roersch, "Longueil," col. 349, says, "ce prélat s'oublia avec une demoiselle de Malines." Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 1, identifies her as "una borghese de Malines."

112. Becker, Longueil, p. 2, n. 6.

113. Becker, Aus Frankreichs Frührenaissance, p. 9. Cf., also Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Vita," fol. 4b.

## CHAPTER V

### THE CHRONOLOGICAL PROBLEM IN

#### LONGUEIL'S CORRESPONDENCE

Even with a tentative resolution of the problems of the time of Longueil's birth and related issues, the biographer is confronted by vast discrepancies in the chronological arrangements of his correspondence as treated by Th. Simar and Ph. Aug. Becker. These discrepancies may be put into three basic categories for convenience of presentation. Many of the items, for example, have only minor differences between the dates supplied by Simar and Becker, such as a day or more within a month of one another. Another grouping of letters have major discrepancies, in that the month or year dates assigned are in conflict. The third classification of chronological discrepancies may be identified as miscellaneous. It includes items which have no date, partial date, date assigned in one chronology but not the other, and letters which are either mis-numbered or in some other way mis-identified. Since more than half the correspondence published in Longueil's Opera, Junta, is involved in these discrepancies,

it is imperative that an attempt at reconciliation be made before another attempt at sketching Longueil's biography is presented. The present chapter will be devoted to an identification of these chronological problems in the three categories mentioned.

The minor discrepancies in the dates assigned to Longueil's correspondence by Simar and Becker are quite easily resolved, for they arise from different texts or erroneous reading of the text used by each writer. Becker used as his text the Junta edition of Longueil's Opera, whereas Simar used a copy of Longueil's Epistolarum, 1558.<sup>1</sup> Since the letters concerned are arranged in the same order in both sources, although they are not arranged chronologically, they will be treated as they appear in the sources.

The first letter involved is item I, 37. In the Junta edition, this letter is dated "Patauij. iii Non. Mai." but it is "Patauij 4. Non Mai." in the Epistolarum, 1558.<sup>2</sup> As expected, Simar dates this letter 4 May 1521, and Becker assigns the date 5 May 1521 to it.<sup>3</sup> In "Liber II," there are three similar entries. Item II, 1 is dated incorrectly by Becker, however, as he transcribes "Ex urbe Patauio Idib. Januar,,"<sup>4</sup> into "Padua, 5. Januar 1521." In a footnote he adds, "Der Brief ist datiert Idib. Jan.; aber da Longueil und Bembo ihm in nr. 98 und 100 einhellig von den Nonen datiert sein lassen, so dürfte in der von Longueil aufbewahrten Abschrift ein Schreibfehler vorgelegen haben, wenn es nicht

ein Druckfehler ist."<sup>5</sup> These letters are, in fact, not dated the same. Becker's nr. 98 and 100 are Longueil's items II, a and I, 30, respectively, and both Becker and Simar agree on their dates as 14 January 1521 and 5 February 1521.<sup>6</sup> In all probability, Becker errs in making such a sharp departure from the text of Longueil's Opera, Junta. As for Simar dating "Idib. Januar." 15 January, the Roman calendar simply does not permit it. The Ides of January follows the Nones by eight days, and the Nones of January is on the 5th. Hence, the date of II, 1, has the same date as I, 41, which is 13 January 1521. The other items of minor discrepancy in "Liber II" are not so intricately reasoned, as may be seen letters II, 18, which has a discrepancy of one day, and II, 39, with a two-day variation. Becker dates II, 18 as "28 Juli 1521," and Simar has "29 juillet 1521."<sup>7</sup> Since there is no disagreement between their texts, which read, "Ex urbe Patavio. iiii. Cal. Sextil."<sup>8</sup> the solution is to be found in Becker's misreading of the date, since "iiii. Cal. Sextil." is correctly rendered as 29 July.<sup>9</sup> Item II, 39 is dated by Becker as "Padua, 23. November 1521." Simar correctly follows the sources by dating "Ex urbe Patauio. vii. Cal. Decembr." as "25 novembre 1521."<sup>10</sup> Two other errors are listed in Becker's "Übersicht der Brief in zeitlicher Folge," but they are transcriptional errors which do not agree with the dates assigned by Becker in the course of his discussion.<sup>11</sup>

In "Liber III" there are date variations in five

additional letters, but the verdicts about them are somewhat different from those in the first two books of Longueuil's correspondence. For example, item III, 5 is dated "Ex urbe Patauio Id. Decembr.,"<sup>12</sup> although Simar ascribes to it the date "15 decembre 1521." Becker gives the correct date on this item, as "13. Dezember 1521."<sup>13</sup> The date for item III, 10 is followed by a long postscript, but it reads, "Ex urbe Patauio Prid. Id. Ianuar."<sup>14</sup> For this, Simar incorrectly writes, "13 janvier 1522," but Becker says "12. Januar 1522."<sup>15</sup> In his haste, Simar must have overlooked the "Prid." entry in his source. A textual problem underlies the date discrepancy of item III, 12: In the Junta edition the text reads, "Ex urbe Patauio xiiii. Cal. Februar.," and the Epistolarum, 1558, reads, "Ex urbe Patavio, XIII. Calend. Febr."<sup>16</sup> As a result, the readings in Becker and Simar are "19. Januar 1522," and "20 janvier 1522," respectively.<sup>17</sup> On item III, 16 Simar falls prey to a miscalculation of dates, for he turns the dated "Ex urbe Patauio. vii. Cal. Februar." into "25 janvier 1522," instead of the correct "26. Januar 1522," as Becker records it.<sup>18</sup> Finally, item III, 37 is dated "22. März 1522" by Becker, although Simar indicates it as "23 mars 1522," and the text of both their sources is the same, "Patauij x. Cal. Apr."<sup>19</sup> Here Becker makes the same error as Simar had with III, 16. In all, there appears to be little consistency in the method of dating Longueuil's correspondence by either of the Longueuil authorities.

The first discrepancy in "Liber IV" is a result of another error in the text transmission. Becker follows the Opera, Junta, and Simar is faithful to the Epistolarum, 1558, in IV, 2. This conflict between the sources results in a two-day discrepancy in the assigned dates, and in this case even places the letter in different months.<sup>20</sup> An even greater discrepancy arises over IV, 5, which reads, "Patauij v. Id. Apr." and "Patavij X Id. April," in the respective sources of Becker and Simar.<sup>21</sup> The Epistolarum, 1558, text is erroneous, since there is no such entry as "x Idibus" for any month. Instead, such a date would be indicated as "ii Nonas." Since item IV, 6 has no date included in the text, the entries in Simar and Becker are not really in conflict when they read, Padoue, s. d. [posterieure au 4 avril 1522]," and "Padua, vor Mitte April 1522," respectively.<sup>22</sup> From the contents of this letter to Ottaviano Grimaldi, it is not possible to date it more precisely. Latter IV, 8 has two different dates assigned by Becker. In his analysis of its contents, he dates it "Padua, 15. Mai 1522," but as "13. Mai 1522" in the "Index." The last-named date is correct, and it agrees with Simar's rendition of the text which reads, "Patauij iii. Id. Mai."<sup>23</sup> In another letter to Grimaldi, IV, 15, Simar arrives at an unsubstantiated and totally unbased date of "30 juin 1522." This letter is dated "Patauij. iii. Non. Iun." in both the basic texts, and is so reckoned by Becker as "3. Juni 1522."<sup>24</sup> On letter IV, 30 it is Becker

who returns to the old problem of miscalculating an entry like "Patauij ad. iii. Cal. Sextil," as "29. Juli 1522," instead of "30 juillet 1522," as Simar correctly asserts.<sup>25</sup> Both men err in dating IV, 31 as 29 July 1522 instead of 30 July of that same year.<sup>26</sup>

Since all the items published in the various editions of Longueil's works are relevant to the present study, and all but one of these items appears in "Liber V," a new system of identification has been devised which will incorporate all of the items.<sup>27</sup> In "Liber V" there are only three items which have minor date discrepancies, and one of these items is not found in either Longueil's Opera, Junta, or his Epistolarum, 1558. The first of these does, however, and its problem revolves about the correct rendition of "Romae quarto kalendas Iunias," in V, 1. Both Gnoli and Becker erroneously list it as "28. Mai 1520," whereas Simar's "Rome, 29 mai 1520" is correct.<sup>28</sup> The second item, V, 8, centers about the correct identification of "Ex urbe. vii. Id. De.," in the Opera, Junta, and Epistolarum, 1558, texts. Simar has it as "Rome, 9 décembre 1519," and Becker writes, "Rom, 7. Dezember 1519."<sup>29</sup> Since the Ides of December falls on the 13th, the only correct reading of the source is "7 December 1519."<sup>30</sup> For the other letter in this section, the number V, 17 is assigned, and it is dated "Romorantij, postridie Regalium." This letter must be dated 7 January 1521, since "Three Kings' Day, Epiphany, always occurs on 6 January. Hence, Becker is more

accurate than Simar, who dates it 6 January. Although this letter is not pivotal, it was written in response to Longueuil's correspondence to Budé dated 5 December 1520 according to Becker.<sup>31</sup>

Several other items with date variations ranging from one week to approximately one month may also be classified as minor discrepancies between the chronologies of Simar and Becker. In the first of these, Simar does injustice to the text of a letter to Flaminio Tomarozzo. The date of I, 35 reads, "Venetijs. Palmaribus," in both the Opera, Junta, and the Epistolarum, 1558. Simar offers "jour de Pâques 1521," as the date of this letter, whereas Becker suggests "24. März 1521" as the date.<sup>32</sup> The term "Palmaribus" is interesting, for it must be an attempt to transform a Christian term for Palm Sunday into a Classical form, although there is no counterpart.<sup>33</sup> By no stretch of the imagination, however, can it be construed to mean Easter, or "jour de Pâques," as Simar asserts. Becker's date of 24 March 1521 is somewhat more obscure because of the shift from the Julian to the Gregorian calendar in Catholic Europe in 1582, and in the concomitant suppression of ten days between 5 and 15 October of that year. By projection, Easter would occur on 31 March 1521, making Palm Sunday occur on 24 March, as Becker indicates.<sup>34</sup> As a result, item I, 35 should be dated either as "Palm Sunday" or as 24 March 1521.

In "Liber II" there are two letters with dates listed



which are at one month variation in the chronologies of Simar and Becker. Item II, 20, for example, is dated one month earlier by Simar than it is by Becker, but neither biographer has a tenable position in this matter. Longueil dates the letter "Ex urbe Patauio iiii. Calen. Sextil," which must certainly be 29 July 1521.<sup>35</sup> Longueil's letter to Bembo catalogued as II, 29, also has a one month variation, but Becker's date preceeds Simar's. The Junta edition of Longueil's Opera has a date, "Ex urbe Pat. prid. cal. Quintil."<sup>36</sup> This would have to be dated 30 June 1521, since Quintilis is July, and "Prid. cal." would refer to the day before the first of July.

The discrepancies in "Liber III" indicate both faulty text entries and faulty reading of the texts, with the result that two additional items have minor discrepancies. Letter III, 26 reveals that neither Simar nor Becker have dated it correctly. In Longueil's Opera, Junta, the letter is dated "Patauij xii. Cal. Mart." The same item in his Epistolarum, 1558, reads, "Patauij. Calend. Mart.," making the date 1 March. Simar is faithful to the text of Longueil's Epistolarum, 1558, but it is a misprint, since the numeral "xii" in the Junta edition of the Opera has been omitted. Becker, on the other hand, dates his letter "Padua, 8. Februar 1522," in his analysis, but as 18 February in his "Index."<sup>37</sup> Becker's "Index" reading is correct, since twelve days including the first of March would be 18 February 1522. The other reading is probably a misprint. A textual variation is also the basis

for the discrepancy between Simar and Becker over the date for III, 28. Both men are faithful to their respective texts, which makes Becker's date of 23 February 1522 correct. The text of Longueil's Epistolarum, 1558, has deleted the "vii" from Longueil's letter and erroneously dates it "Patauij. Calend. Mart."<sup>38</sup>

Only four other variations remain to bring this treatment of minor discrepancies between Simar and Becker to its conclusion. The first three are found in "Liber IV," and one final item is in "Liber V." In the first of these conflicts, Becker is patently in error when he dates IV, 21 as "29. Juni 1522." Simar follows the text of Longueil's Epistolarum, 1558, and the Opera, Junta, which read, "Patauij ad. iiii. Cal. Iun.," as he assigns the date of 30 May 1522.<sup>39</sup> For letter IV, 24 it is Simar's error that causes the divergence in chronology. He either ignores the reading of his text, mis-files the letter, or errs in proofreading his own publication, with the net result being a date of "29 juillet 1522" when it should be 30 June 1522.<sup>40</sup> Item IV, 26 is dated 31 January 1520 by both Simar and Becker, when their texts read, "Venetijs. Pri. cal. Ianu." As a result, the latter should be dated 31 December 1519.<sup>41</sup> The discrepancy over item V, 16 centers about Simar's hasty treatment of his source, although this letter is cited from Delaruelle's Guillaume Budé rather than from Longueil's Epistolarum, 1558. Becker uses the same source, and correctly notes that the letter has two

dates instead of one, as Simar indicates. This letter, written by Budé, has appeared in Longueil's Habes Lector, 1533, and his Epistolarum, 1540, as well as the Epistolarum, 1558, which makes Simar's hasty observation of the manuscript entry even more pronounced. In all these sources, V, 16 has two dates recorded: "E Marliano nostro, Cinerarium die." and "è Marliano nostro, v. calend. Mar.," which must be 21 and 25 February 1522 as Becker indicates, since Ash Wednesday of that year occurred on 5 March.<sup>42</sup>

This overview of two varieties of minor chronological discrepancies has considered twenty-eight letters, nineteen in which the variations are within a few days of one another and nine where they differ in time from about one week to approximately one month. The investigation reveals that neither Simar nor Becker may be relied upon as definitive, and the picture will become even more apparent as a review of the major discrepancies between their chronologies is considered.

The net result of these major discrepancies is much more significant to a biographical sketch of Longueil than are the minor ones. Since nearly all of his surviving correspondence was written in a three-year period, the variation of year dates dramatically alters the sequence of events in the last years of Longueil's life. Because of the vast number of items in this category, it too will be subdivided into two sections. In the first, those letters having a conflict in only the year date assigned will be considered, while the

second will be comprised of those letters which have discrepancies in the day and/or month as well as the year date as assigned by Simar and Becker. After identifying these two sets of items as they appear in Longueil's Opera, Junta, the variations themselves will be treated in a less structured manner. The reason for this arrangement is simply because those letters are not arranged chronologically in the Opera, Junta, or the Epistolarum, 1558, although Hermann Kopf is under the impression they are, when he writes, "Alle Briefe ermangeln der Jahreszahl, nur Tages — und Monatsdatum sind vorhanden. . . . Sie sind ohne sonderliche Gesichtspunkte, vermutliche chronologisch geordnet, zu vier Buchern zusammengestellt."<sup>43</sup>

The vast majority of letters in the first set of major discrepancies are found in "Liber I," and the first of these is most certainly an error in Simar's transcription, for he dates I, 7 as "[20 avril 1528]."<sup>44</sup> Since this letter was written by Longueil, Simar is patently in error. The letter was written to Hieronymous Fondulus and fits into the context of several items written in the spring of 1521. Thus, the date 20 April is probably correct.<sup>45</sup> Item I, 10 has the same day in both chronologies, as do the other items in this set of major discrepancies, but Becker's year dates are one year earlier than Simar's. This may be said as well for their differences with letters I, 15, 16, 22, 25, 26,<sup>46</sup> 31, 39, 40, and 41.<sup>47</sup> The individuals to whom Longueil wrote these letters

are Roger Barne, Pietro Bembo, Flavio Crisolino, Ottaviano Grimaldi, Antonio Marsilio, and Francesco Maria Molza. Although most of these items have been included regularly in the editions containing selections of Longueil's correspondence,<sup>48</sup> neither Kopf nor the Comte de Pins mention any of them in their articles.<sup>49</sup> Other major discrepancies in this set may be seen in "Liber II," items 11, 12, 15, and 33.<sup>50</sup> In "Liber III" only items 8, 22, and 36 are in this set of major discrepancies. Of these, Simar dates the last two a year earlier than does Becker. The only other letter in this set of major discrepancies is IV, 34, although it was not included in Longueil, Opera, Junta.<sup>51</sup>

There are eleven letters in the second set of major discrepancy items. For these there are compounded variations or day or month entries as well as year-dates. At this particular juncture, no attempt will be made to ascertain the year dates, but a determination of the day and month will be made so that the question of the year date conflicts can be resolved at a more appropriate point in the discussion.

Unlike the items in question in the first set of major discrepancies, the majority of conflicts in this second set are in "Liber II." Only two letters in "Liber I" have compounded variations, and they involve letters to Sadoletto, I, 32, and Bembo, I, 33, which were written on the same day. Neither of these letters was dated by Longueil, so the question must be resolved by looking into their broader context.

The discrepancy in the date for these letters is actually between 5 December 1520 and 4 January 1521. Simar supports his position by saying, "Cette lettre est sans aucune date dans les recueils épistolaires. Seulement, nous savons qu'elle fut remis à Sadolet le même jour que le billet I, 33 fut transmis à Bembo, soit le 4 janvier 1521."<sup>52</sup> Becker, however, draws upon other correspondence to show that Longueil was sending on to Sadoletto a letter which Guillaume Budé had sent to him by way of Longueil. This letter, also mentioned in V, 10, was included in Longueil's communication to Sadoletto, I, 32. The letter from Budé was sent from Amboise on 14 November 1520 according to Delaruelle's reckoning.<sup>53</sup> This would be most fitting for a 5 December 1520 date, especially since Sadoletto responded to Longueil in V, 10, dated "Ex urbe. iiii. kal. Ian."<sup>54</sup> A date of 5 December seems most appropriate for both I, 32 and I, 33, and results in no tampering with the source materials.

Six letters from "Liber II" are included in this set of major chronological problems. Four of these letters were written to Simon de Villeneuve, and the other two were written to François Lerouge.<sup>55</sup> Without solving the year-date issue here, there are still discrepancies concerning the days and months ascribed to these letters. In II, 16, for example, Simar assigns the date "[10 juin 1522]" without justification. The text of the letter itself, however, reads, "Ex urbe Patavio ix. Cal. Iun.," and following a long postscript Longueil

adds, "Iterum Vale. iiii. No. Iun.," with which Becker concurs by dating the letter, "Padua, 24. Mai. und 2. Juni 1521."<sup>56</sup> Item II, 22 has only one date, but it too has a postscript. There is unanimity of agreement on this date among Longueil's Opera, Junta, his Epistolarum, 1558, and Becker, but Simar again differs without elucidation when he writes, "[30 juin 1522]," instead of 1 July.<sup>57</sup> This exact situation arise with II, 23, although it was written to Lerouge instead of Villeneuve.<sup>58</sup> Becker slides back into his error of miscalculation when he dates II, 24 as "Padua, 5. Juli 1521." All the sources agree that the letter was sent "Ex urbe Patauio N. Quintil.," or 7 July.<sup>59</sup> Becker's error on item II, 25 is inexplicable, for the text he uses reads, "Ex urbe Patauio. iii. id. Quintil." Simar agrees with the text, but Becker dates the letter "Padua, 5 Juli 1521."<sup>60</sup> Finally, Becker's miscalculation of the Ides of a month again causes him to misdate II, 27 as 10 August instead of 8 August, as Simar indicates for the source entry, "Sext. Id. Sextil."<sup>61</sup>

Another example of Simar's alteration of his source to bring it into alignment with his presuppositions is III, 35. He argues, "Dans toutes les Éditions, cette lettre est datée du 19 mars. Mais cette date est certainement fausse, car la lettre I, 5 a été remise à Bembo par Flavio Crisolino après le départ de Longueil pour Padoue et la lettre III, 35 est la suite des heureuses nouvelles rapportées à Padoue par le même courrier. Au surplus. la simple comparaison des deux lettres

indique suffisamment l'ordre de distribution." As a result of this reasoning, he alters the date to read, "Padoue, début avril 1521."<sup>62</sup> Assuming for the present that the year date Simar assigns is correct, his own listing of Bembo's correspondence with Longueil nullifies his assertions. According to Simar, Longueil wrote five letters to Bembo between 1 January 1521 and 1 April 1521, excluding III, 35. Bembo, according to Simar, wrote two letters to Longueil in the same period, but one of them of unknown date has perished. He writes, "Lettre perdue. Bembo y annonçait son arrivée prochaine à Venice et à Padoue. Date inconnue."<sup>63</sup> He lists this lost item between two letters from Longueil, dated 24 February 1521 and 1 April 1521. Longueil's letter, III, 35, could very well be in response to this missing letter, presuming that it was actually written. In short, Simar has not provided sufficient evidence to warrant his tampering with the text of his source. Furthermore, he erroneously identifies that item as written on 19 March according to all the editions. Becker avoids Simar's dilemma by dating III, 35 as "20. März 1522," and by ascribing the same date to I, 5 as does Simar, thus placing them nearly one year apart.<sup>64</sup> Whether or not such a radical treatment is necessary will be determined elsewhere, at present it is sufficient to indicate that Simar's position is based on his unsubstantiated presupposition. The alteration of the text is unwarranted, and this letter should retain its designation of 20 March, which accords with the date in



the Opera, Junta, which reads, "Patauij. xiii. Cal. Apr."<sup>65</sup>

In light of the previous treatment of letters I, 32 and I, 33, Simar's tampering with the text of item V, 10 seems unwarranted. He argues in a footnote, "Dans les recueils, datée du III Kal. Jan. Mais elle est postérieure à la lettre précédente qui est du 4 janvier. Nous rectifions en III Kal. Febr."<sup>66</sup> The preceding letter to which he refers is I, 32, but there is no need to have altered its date from 5 December 1520 to 4 January 1521. Hence, without some other significant reason for altering the text, it would appear that the date of V, 10 should remain as it is in all the sources. Becker dates this letter as 30 December 1520.<sup>67</sup> Simar's alteration of the text of V, 13 is made without explanation. He merely says that this letter from Sadoleto mentions copies of letters sent to Longueil, and adds a note, "Longueil n'avait pas reçu les originaux," but says nothing about dating the letter "24 janvier 1520."<sup>68</sup> The date Simar assigns seems heavily influenced by the other chronological changes he conjectures in Longueil's correspondence for the period 25 December 1520 — 1 April 1521, and these comprise the bulk of variations in this second set of major discrepancies. This fact alone provides an insufficient basis for amending "Ex urbe. iiii. Non. Ian."<sup>69</sup> to 24 January, especially in light of the inconclusive evidence Simar provides for making those changes. Becker's error in dating this letter stems from what must surely have been a simple misreading

of the text. Instead of "iiii Nonas Januarias," he dates the letter as if it were written "iiii Kalendas Januarias," and arrives at a date of "29. Dezember 1519,"<sup>70</sup> for letter V, 13, when it should actually be dated 2 January 1520. With this, the day and month variations of the second set of major discrepancies have been clarified and only the year date portions require further treatment. For that consideration, both sets of major discrepancies will be reassembled and reviewed together.

Before making such a realignment, however, a third category of discrepancies needs to be considered. These conflicts may be classified as miscellaneous discrepancies, since they include items having no date, partial date, date assigned in one chronology but not the other, and letters which are mis-numbered or in some other way mis-identified or omitted by Longueil's principal biographers. The thirty-one items comprising this category will be considered under four sets of miscellaneous discrepancies.

Two letters are listed without date entries by both Simar and Becker. In neither instance does Simar indicate when the letter may have been written, but Becker lists them among the February and March 1521 entries in his chronological listing.<sup>71</sup> Item I, 23 was written to Fondulus and simply appears under that heading in Simar's synopsis.<sup>72</sup> Letter I, 34 was written for the French ambassador to Leo X by Longueil, and is listed in two places by Simar. In the former he gives

no indication of the date, but he isolates this letter from others written in 1522 in his second reference, although no attempt is made to identify it more precisely. Becker places this letter in March 1521, although it should be 1517.<sup>73</sup>

There are eight items listed in the works of Simar and Becker which have partial dates supplied by one, the other, or both biographers. Of these entries, half appear in "Liber II." Item I, 20 was written to Statius, but is undated in Longueil's Opera, Junta. Simar, following a brief discussion of Statius as an obscure humanist, merely lists it as "s.d. [1521]," whereas Becker places the letter in the month of July 1520, although he identifies it as "Padua, ohne datum."<sup>74</sup> A letter to Marcantonio Michiel, II, 7, is listed as "s.d. [1520]" by Simar, and as "Padua, (10. Juni 1520)" by Becker, although it is simply undated in Longueil's Opera, Junta.<sup>75</sup> Longueil's letter to Alessandro Pazzi, II, 13, was undated from Padua, and is listed as such by Becker, however, he places it in the June-July 1520 period in his list. Simar identifies the same letter as "s.d. [1521]."<sup>76</sup> Statius had another undated letter from Padua, II, 14, which is treated according to the patterns already set forth with I, 20. Becker lists II, 14 as "Padua, ohne Datum," and sets it between letters sent on 31 August and 16 September 1520. Simar lists it as "s.d. [1521]," and Gnoli provides no reference to its date when citing it.<sup>77</sup> The letter to Giulio Tomarozzo, II, 28, is also undated by Longueil, Simar, and

Becker, although both biographers place it in the year 1521.<sup>78</sup> The three remaining letters in this set of miscellaneous discrepancies were written to Roger Barme, III, 34, Francesco Bellini, IV, 25, and Niccolò Dragone, IV, 29, and all appear in Longueil's Opera, Junta, without date entries. For III, 34, Simar ascribes the date "(avril 1522)," and Becker lists it as "Padua, ohne Datum," and places it in March 1522.<sup>79</sup> Item IV, 25 is placed in the June-July 1522 period by Becker, but he lists it as "Padua, ohne Datum." Simar merely classifies it as a letter written in 1522.<sup>80</sup> Finally, IV, 29 is placed after 30 June 1522 by Simar, and as "Padua, Ende Juli 1522," by Becker, although Longueil merely identified it as "Patauiej."<sup>81</sup>

In the third set of miscellaneous discrepancies there are thirteen items listed and dated by Becker but omitted by Simar. Six of these letters are from "Liber V," four of which concern Budé and the other two which involve Leo X either directly or indirectly. The remaining seven letters were written to Pierre Brisson, I, 8, and an item from Longueil, De Infortuniis Epistola, 1533, Lelio Massimo, I, 29, Simon de Villeneuve, II, 26, Ottaviano Gramaldi, II, 34 and II, 35, and Leonardo Pomaro, IV, 4. For all thirteen letters, Becker offers complete day-month-year entries. The De Infortuniis Epistola letter to Brisson is dated from Valence on 4 November 1513, and Becker supplies the date.<sup>82</sup> For I, 8 Becker assigns "Padua, 1. Mai 1521," which agrees with Longueil's

date, "Patauij Cal. Mai."<sup>83</sup> Becker supplies the date "[Padua, 14. Juli 1520]" for item I, 29, although there is no date in Longueil's Opera, Junta.<sup>84</sup> The letter to Villeneuve, II, 26, is dated in Longueil's Opera as "Ex urbe Patauio xi Cal. Sextil.," but Becker incorrectly identifies it as, "Padua, 21. Juli 1521," instead of 22 July, and Simar merely lists the letter without a date.<sup>85</sup> The two letters to Grimaldi, II, 34 and II, 35, are omitted from Simar's list, although he has an extensive treatment of each of the other items written to Grimaldi. These letters are dated from Padua as "viiiij. Cal. Novembr." and "Prid. Cal. Novembr.," respectively. Becker dates II, 34 correctly as "24. Oktober 1521," but incorrectly assigns II, 35 the date "30 Oktober 1521," instead of 31 October.<sup>86</sup> Item IV, 4, to Leonardo Pomaro, is dated "Patauij .v. Id. Apr." in Longueil's correspondence, and as "Padua, 9. April 1522" by Becker, although Simar makes no mention of it whatever in his discussion of Pomaro.<sup>87</sup>

All the Budé letters from "Liber V" included in this set of miscellaneous discrepancies are omitted from Simar's discussion of Budé, which is otherwise rather extensive.<sup>88</sup> This fact may be the result of Simar's dependence upon Longueil's Epistolarum, 1558, which omits letters V, 4, 5, 6, 9, 14,<sup>89</sup> 15, 17,<sup>90</sup> and 18. The letter of Leo X to Francis I, item V, 6, is not mentioned by Simar, nor is the letter of Pazzi to Cardinal Giulio de' Medici, V, 15, although he does include Longueil's letter to Pazzi, II, 13, mentioned earlier

in this discussion. Becker, however, does provide dates for these letters. Item V, 4, a letter from Bembo to Budé is dated "Venetijs Pr. Non. Ianuar," and Becker dates it "Venedig, 4. Januar 1520," instead of 6 January.<sup>91</sup> A second Bembo letter to Budé, V, 5, was written in Rome on 6 April, and Becker assigns 1521 as its year-date.<sup>92</sup> Item V, 6 is the Leo X letter to Francis I, "Datum Romae die .vi. Apr. 1521. Anno Nono. Bembus," as Becker observes.<sup>93</sup> Sadoleto is the writer of V, 9, written to Budé, "ex Urbe septimo. Idus Decembris," which Becker correctly identifies as "Rom, 7. Dezember 1519."<sup>94</sup> The final letter in Longueil's Opera, Junta, is the Pazzi letter to Cardinal Medici, V, 15, which is dated "ex Decimano nostro. Idibus. Sextilis." Becker misdates this entry as "Decimo 15. August 1519," instead of 13 August.<sup>95</sup> Letter V, 18 was written by Budé to Longueil in Greek, and it is dated "Ἐρ' ῥωσο, πρῶτον ἀνέψιδος πέμπτῃ ἐπὶ δέκα," or, as Becker observes, "15 Oktober 1518."<sup>96</sup>

The final set of miscellaneous discrepancies involves several incidental items, including three which appear in no edition of Longueil's correspondence. It also includes one item listed as a major discrepancy.<sup>97</sup> Some of these discrepancies are quite insignificant, as may be seen in Item II, 2, which Becker identifies as III, 2, instead of II, 2.<sup>98</sup> Letters II, 3 and II, 4 present a most interesting situation. Becker dates both letters as "16. September 1520,"<sup>99</sup> but Simar dates them as "16 septembre 1520," "96 sept. 1520," and

lists them together under the date "16 sept, 1521."<sup>100</sup> Simar misidentifies III, 33 as II, 33 in another example of his editorial inaccuracy.<sup>101</sup> All of the other miscellaneous discrepancies are from "Liber V." Item V, 2 is mis-listed as V, 3 by Simar, although the letter is correctly catalogued in his source.<sup>102</sup> As a result, he identifies V, 3 as "Lib. V, f<sup>o</sup> 299b-301b dans l'éd. Paris, 1533," dated "Rome. 15 février 1521." Although there is no disagreement between his discussion and Becker's treatment of V, 3, the catalog error leads to a blurring rather than a clarifying of the materials in the sources.<sup>103</sup> The date for V, 19 is a problem only insofar as Simar cites it, "Au livre V, 10, la réponse d'Érasme, Louvain. 1<sup>er</sup> avril 1519." from Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, and Becker uses the correspondence of Erasmus as his source.<sup>104</sup> The final two items in this set of miscellaneous discrepancies are identified as V, 20 and V, 21 in the present study. These involve a letter from Baldassare Castiglione to Isabella d'Este dated 16 June 1519, which is mentioned by both Simar and Becker, but not listed in Simar's synopsis of the source materials,<sup>105</sup> and one to Alessandro Gabbioneta to Maria Equicola in Mantua dated 30 June 1519. This last-named letter is included in Becker's study but not in Simar's, although it had been published previously to both of their biographies.<sup>106</sup> With this the consideration of the miscellaneous discrepancies is completed to the point where all the materials involved in the major and miscellaneous categories can be realigned and

the chronology of Longueil's correspondence during the last three years of his life reconstructed.<sup>107</sup>



1. Cf., Becker, Longueil, p. 68. Simar, Longueil, p. 157, item 1, n. 1, writes that "la pagination se règle sur l'édition de Bâle, Episcopus 1558, in - 8." See ch. i, nn. 2 and 4, as well as ch. ii, nn. 62-67.

2. Longueil, Opera, Junta, I, 37, fol. 87a; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, I, 37, p. 77. The change from Roman to Arabic numerals is consistently made throughout this later edition, and the numbers assigned to the earlier edition are all supplied in later editions of Longueil's works. Cf., ch. i, n. 1.

3. Simar, Longueil, p. 185, item 40. Becker, Longueil, p. 142, item 121. Simar, on pp. 156-157, introduces his "Répertoire des noms de personne cités dans les lettres de Longueil," with a statement about the Ciceronian style of letter writing: "Nous avons aussi pris soin de dater toutes les lettres, précaution omise par Longueil, sous prétexte que Cicéron ne datait les siennes que du jour et du mois jamais de l'année." When there is agreement about the year entry between Simar and Becker, no issue will be made about it. When the year dates assigned differ, the particular letter will be treated under the category identified as "major discrepancies" in the present study.

4. Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 1, fol. 89b.

5. Becker, Longueil, p. 128, item 95.

6. Ibid., p. 130, item 98, also errs in designating this letter as "III, 2." The letter was written to Andrea Navagero, as was II, 2, whereas III, 2 was written to Ottaviano Grimaldi. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, fols. 89b and 114a.

7. Becker, Longueil, p. 149, item 135; Simar, Longueil, p. 191, item 76.

8. Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 18, fol. 103a; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, II, 18, p. 133.

9. Cf., James Mountford (ed.), 'Bradley's Arnold' Latin Prose Composition, Edited and Revised with an Appendix on Continuous Prose Composition (New York: David McKay, Inc., 1938), esp. pp. 294-297, is the authority by which this and other date entries are evaluated in the present study. Also see H. Grotefend, Taschenbuch der Zeitrechnung des Deutschen Mittelalters und der Neuzeit (Fünfte auflage; Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1922), esp. pp. 140-205, as the various tables relate to movable feasts within the liturgical calendar for authenticating dates of Longueil correspondence.

10. Becker, Longueil, p. 155, item 146; Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 39, fol. 113b; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, II, 39, p. 169; and Simar, Longueil, pp. 172-173, item 3.

11. Cf., Becker, Longueil, pp. 151-152, item 140 (II, 32), p. 155, item 144 (II, 37), and the "Index" entries on pp. 206-210.

12. Longueil, Opera, Junta, III, 5, fol. 113b [sic, it should read 115]; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, III, 5, p. 178, reads the same.

13. Simar, Longueil, p. 170, item 2; Becker, Longueil, pp. 158-159, item 152.

14. Longueil, Opera, Junta, III, 10, fol. 118a; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, III, 10, p. 186.

15. Simar, Longueil, p. 174, item 3; Becker, Longueil, pp. 161-162, item 157.

16. Longueil, Opera, Junta, III, 12, fol. 120a; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, III, 12, p. 193.

17. Becker, Longueil, pp. 162-163, item 159; Simar, Longueil, p. 191, item 76.

18. Longueil, Opera, Junta, III, 16, fol. 121b; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, III, 16, p. 199; Simar, Longueil, p. 175, item 3; Becker, Longueil, p. 165, item 163.

19. Becker, Longueil, p. 175, item 184; Simar, Longueil, p. 177, item 3; Longueil, Opera, Junta, III, 37, fol. 132b; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, III, 37, p. 237.

20. Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 2, fol. 135a [sic, it should be 134]; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, IV, 2, p. 243; Becker, Longueil, pp. 176-177, item 186, dated "30. Marz 1522." Simar, Longueil, p. 177, item 3, dates this item "1<sup>er</sup> avril 1522." Both men are faithful to their respective texts, the Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, merely omits the "iii" contained in the Opera, Junta, text.

21. Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 5, fol. 128b [sic, it should be 135]; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, IV, 5, p. 250; Becker, Longueil, p. 178, item 189, dates it "9. April 1522," and Simar, Longueil, p. 184, item 33, records it as "[4 avril 1522]."

22. Simar, Longueil, p. 178, item 3; Becker, Longueil, p. 179, item 190. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 6, fol. 136b.

23. Becker, Longueil, pp. 180 and 209, item 192; Simar, Longueil, p. 185, item 40. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 8, fol. 138b.

24. Simar, Longueil, p. 178, item 3; Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 15, fol. 141a; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, IV, 15, p. 267. Also cf., Becker, Longueil, p. 184, item 200.

25. Becker, Longueil, pp. 191-192, item 215; Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 30, fol. 152a, and Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, IV, 30, p. 305. Cf., Simar, Longueil, p. 171, item 2.

26. Simar, Longueil, p. 178, item 3, and Becker, Longueil, p. 192, item 216. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 30, fol. 152b, which reads, "Patauij ad iii. Cal. Sextil."

27. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 153b, identifies this "Liber V" as "Petri Bembi et Iacobi Sadoleti Epistolarum Liber." There are precedents for the shorter designation used in the present study, and it is much more adaptable to the format being used. All items included in the various editions of Longueil's correspondence have been incorporated into the numbering system, and those which do not appear in Longueil's Opera, Junta, fols. 153b-163b, will be incorporated as if they had been included in that edition.

28. Longueil, Opera, Junta, V, 1, fol. 154a; Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 84, also cf., ch. ii, n. 3; Becker, Longueil, p. 99, item 48; Simar, Longueil, p. 158.

29. Longueil, Opera, Junta, V, 8, fol. 159b; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, V, 5, p. 331. Simar, Longueil, p. 167, item 2, identifies this item as V, 5, in keeping with the Epistolarum, 1558. Since there are traditions with both sets of identifying markings, the present discussion will hereafter indicate this letter as V, 8. Becker, Longueil, pp. 88-89, item 34, concurs with the identification used in the present study.

30. Simar appears quite unaware of the occurrence of the Ides of various months. Mountford, 'Bradley's Arnold', p. 295, provides a handy guide to their remembrance:

"In March, July, October, May  
The Nones were on the seventh day."

31. Cf., Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 325-330, and Longueil, Epistolarum, 1540, V, 17, pp. 376-383, where the same identification as that used in the present study is also found. Cf., ch. ii, nn. 38 and 51. The date assigned

by Becker, Longueil, pp. 129-130, item 96, is "7 Januar 1521," and the letter to which it is an answer is I, 24, according to Becker, pp. 125-126, item 90. Simar, Longueil, p. 182, item 19, quickly passes over this letter without attempting to identify its contents or its relation to I, 24, which he also fails to date. Delaruelle, Répertoire, p. 131, item 82, n. 4, offers a reasonable account for the date of this letter as 6 January 1521; cf., ch. iii, n. 49.

32. Longueil, Opera, Junta, I, 35, fol. 86b; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, I, 35, p. 75; Simar, Longueil, pp. 192-193, item 82; and Becker, Longueil, p. 136, item 109.

33. Simar, Longueil, pp. 192-193, item 82, would have been correct to have rendered "Palmaribus" as "Pâques fleuries" instead of "jour de Pâques."

34. Grotefend, Taschenbuch, p. 156, table 10; cf., Becker, Longueil, p. 136, item 109.

35. Simar, Longueil, p. 185, item 40, dates this letter "[28 juin 1521]," and Becker, Longueil, pp. 149-150, item 136, dates it "28. Juli 1521." The correct date is 29 July 1521. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 20, fol. 104b, and Epistolarum, 1558, II, 20, p. 138.

36. Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 29, fol. 108b. Simar, Longueil, p. 165, lists this letter as "Padoue, 30 juin 1521." Becker, Longueil, p. 144, item 125, records it as "Padua, 31. Mai 1521," although he offers no explanation.

37. Longueil, Opera, Junta, III, 26, fol. 126b [sic, it should be 125]; cf., Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, III, 26, p. 213; Simar, Longueil, p. 185, item 38; Becker, Longueil, pp. 168-169, item 173, and p. 209.

38. Simar, Longueil, pp. 182-183, item 25; Becker, Longueil, pp. 169-170, item 175. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, III, 28, fol. 127a; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, III, 28, p. 217.

39. Becker, Longueil, p. 187, item 205, and Simar, Longueil, p. 184, item 41. Cf., Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, IV, 21, p. 277, and Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 21, fol. 144a.

40. Simar, Longueil, p. 178, item 3, shows that a re-alignment of the type by one or two lines would have corrected this erroneously listed entry. Becker, Longueil, p. 188, item 208, concurs with the reading found in Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 24, fol. 145b, which reads, "Patauij prid. Cal. Iul." Cf., Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, IV, 24, p. 282.

41. Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 26, fol. 149b. Cf., Simar, Longueil, pp. 167-168, item 2, and Becker, Longueil, pp. 91-93, item 39.

42. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 318-325; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1540, V, 16, pp. 368-376, and Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, pp. 342-350, which is identified as V, 10 in Simar's discussion. Cf., Simar, Longueil, pp. 181-182, item 19, and Becker, Longueil, pp. 94-95, item 41, as well as Grotefend, Taschenbuch, p. 196, table 30. Simar dates this letter "le 21 février 1520."

43. Kopf, "Christophorus Longolius," p. 634; cf., ch. i, n. 3. The edition of Longueil's source materials is the Epistolarum, 1562/63; cf., ch. ii, n. 67.

44. Simar, Longueil, pp. 185-186, item 42. There is another example of imprecise proofreading in the same entry, where letter II, 4 is dated "[96 sept. 1520]" instead of 16 September, but this characteristic is rather common throughout Simar's treatise.

45. Longueil, Opera, Junta, I, 7, fol. 69b, where the date is followed by a postscript. The letter was written "Patauij xii. Cal. Mai." Its contents reflect that it was written in the context of I, 8 and I, 9.

46. Simar, Longueil, p. 172, item 3, misnumbers as "I, 25" instead of "I, 26." It was written to Ottaviano Grimaldi, as Simar indicates, but I, 25 was written to Antonio Marsilio. Cf., Simar's entry, p. 187, item 54.

47. Since there is no discrepancy with regard to the day and month assigned to these letters, there will be no discussion of them at this point. They will be treated as they bear on the broader problem of chronology later in the present discussion, Cf., "Appendix M" for a table indicating the chronological arrangement of Longueil's correspondence which results from this investigation. From that new chronology, a new biographical sketch will be derived.

48. Bunel and Manuzio, Epistolae Ciceroniano Stylo, 1581, cf., ch. ii, nn. 81-83. Also cf., Grauff (ed.), Epistolae, 1837, cf., ch. ii, n. 96.

49. Kopf, "Christophorus Longolius," pp. 634-649. Pins, "Jean de Pins et Longueil," pp. 183-189, uses Longueil, Epistolarum, 1580, as his source, although he mis-titles it as, "Christofori Longolii epistolarum ad familiares libri III, Basilae (sic), 1580, in - 80," the "(sic)" appears in his reference, p. 184, n. 4. Cf., ch. i, n. 3, and ch. ii, nn. 78 and 79.

50. Item II, 33 is the only one of these which Simar dates a year earlier than does Becker. Other items having year date discrepancies are classified under more appropriate settings in the present study.

51. This letter, written to Jacques Lucas d'Orléans, first appeared in Longueil's Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 342-346, although Simar was unaware of it. Cf., ch. ii, nn. 38, 46-67, and especially n. 55, which indicates that Longueil, Epistolarum, 1540, was not the most complete of all editions of his correspondence and works. Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, IV, 34, pp. 342-346, and Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, III, 472-476, item 914, contain the text of this letter, as does "Appendix I" in the present study.

52. Becker, Longueil, pp. 126-127, items 91 and 92, dates them 5 December 1520, whereas Simar, Longueil, p. 170, and n. 1, gives 4 January as his date. For Simar's entire treatment, which adds nothing of significance, see also pp. 170, n. 2, and 161-162, with nn. 3-4.

53. Cf., Becker, Longueil, p. 123, item 85, is a citation of the contents of this letter 74 as it is catalogued in Delaruelle, Répertoire. Simar makes no identification of the letter sent on to Sadoletto.

54. Longueil, Opera, Junta, V, 10, fol. 161a. Simar, Longueil, p. 170, n. 3, amends the date of V, 10, which he wrongly identifies as V, 6. The date of this letter will be discussed in connection with V, 10.

55. François Lerouge was the French jurist also known as Franciscus Rubrius, Francesco Rosis, or Fr. de Rubeis, who succeeded Jean de Pins as ambassador of Francis I to Venice in April 1520, cf., infra, n. 73, and ch. vi, and n. 9.

56. Simar, Longueil, pp. 193-194, item 88. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 16, fols. 101b-102a, with which Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, II, 16, pp. 138-139, is in complete accord. Also cf., Becker, Longueil, pp. 143-144, item 124.

57. Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 22, fol. 105a, and his Epistolarum, 1558, II, 22, p. 140. Both these sources agree that this letter was written "Ex urbe Patavio Cal. Iul." Becker, Longueil, p. 146, item 129, says "Padua, 1. Juli 1522," but not so with Simar, Longueil, pp. 193-194, item 88.

58. Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 23, fol. 105b; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, II, 23, p. 153; Becker, Longueil, p. 147, item 130; and Simar, Longueil, p. 190, item 70.

59. Becker, Longueil, pp. 147-148, item 131. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 24, fol. 106a; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, II, 24, p. 143; and Simar, Longueil, pp. 193-194, item 88.

60. Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 25, fol. 106a; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, II, 25, p. 144. Simar, Longueil, p. 190, item 70, dates this letter "13 juillet 1522." Cf., Becker, Longueil, p. 148, item 132.

61. Becker, Longueil, p. 150, item 137; Simar, Longueil, pp. 193-194, item 88. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 27, fol. 107b, and Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, II, 27, p. 146.

62. Simar, Longueil, p. 164 and n. 1.

63. Ibid., p. 163.

64. Becker, Longueil, p. 174, item 182, and p. 137, item 111. Cf., Simar, Longueil, pp. 163-164, for his treatment of I, 5.

65. Longueil, Opera, Junta, III, 35, fol. 131b, and Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, III, 35, p. 234.

66. Simar, Longueil, p. 170, item 2 and n. 3. It should be noted that Simar identifies this letter as V, 6, but that it is so listed because several items are omitted in his source, Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558. The letter in question is numbered V, 10, in accordance with its place in Longueil, Opera, Junta, fols. 160b-161a.

67. Becker, Longueil, p. 127, item 93.

68. Simar, Longueil, p. 167, item 2, and n. 3. This letter is identified as V, 9 by Simar, but that is because several items are omitted from his source, Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558.

69. Longueil, Opera, Junta, V, 13, fol. 162b. This letter may be found in Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, p. 339.

70. Becker, Longueil, pp. 89-90, item 36.

71. Cf., Ibid., p. 133, item 102, and p. 136, item 108.

72. Simar, Longueil, pp. 185-186, item 42, but there are errors in this listing, as indicated supra, n. 42, and as will be shown later in this discussion.

73. Simar, Longueil, p. 190, items 68 and 70; cf., Becker, Longueil, p. 136, item 108. Kopf, "Christophorus Longolius," p. 640, and n. 24, mentions this letter, but without any attempt at dating it. The letter was written for the French ambassador, whom most biographers regard to have been Lerouge, cf., supra, n. 55. Pins, "Jean de Pins et Longueil," p. 184, and nn. 4-5, corrects this error and indicates that the French ambassador to Venice was in fact Jean de Pins. He also shows that this undated letter was answered by Bembo on 13 April 1517. Hence, I, 34 should be placed in late March 1517.

74. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 78b; Simar, Longueil, p. 192, item 80; Becker, Longueil, pp. 108-109, item 63.

75. Simar, Longueil, p. 188, item 57; Becker, Longueil, pp. 102-103, item 53; Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 95b.

76. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 99b; Becker, Longueil, p. 106, item 58; Simar, Longueil, p. 189, item 63.

77. Becker, Longueil, pp. 115-116, item 70; Simar, Longueil, p. 192, item 80; Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 6, and n. 2. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 100b.

78. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 108a; Simar, Longueil, p. 193, item 83; Becker, Longueil, pp. 141-142, item 120, where the letter is placed in early May 1521.

79. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 131b; Simar, Longueil, p. 179, item 10, where he includes a brief discussion of the letter. Also cf., Becker, Longueil, pp. 173-174, item 181.

80. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 145b; Becker, Longueil, p. 189, item 209, is listed between entries for 30 June and 2 July 1522; Simar, Longueil, p. 179, item 9.

81. Simar, Longueil, p. 184, item 36; Becker, Longueil, p. 191, item 214; Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 151b.

82. Cf., ch. ii, and nn. 32-36, and n. 98, as well as ch. iii, and nn. 65-66. This letter closes with the following entry, "Valentiae, pridie Nonas Novembres. Vale. Millessimo quingentesimo 13. Longolius homo Brabantus, in Gallia educatus." Cf., Longueil, De Infortuniis Epistolas, 1533, fols. Bia-Eib.

83. Becker, Longueil, p. 141, item, 119; cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 70b.



84. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 84a. Simar, Longueil, pp. 187-188, item 55, actually lists this letter as "s.d." Becker, Longueil, p. 108, item 62, supplies the brackets.

85. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 106b; Becker, Longueil, pp. 148-149, item 134; cf., Simar, Longueil, pp. 193-194, item 88.

86. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fols. 110b-111a. Cf., Simar, Longueil, pp. 172-178, item 3, and Becker, Longueil, pp. 152-153, items 141 and 142, respectively. Kopf, "Christophorus Longolius," p. 163 and nn. 40-41, mentions both these letters, but does not discuss their chronology.

87. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 128 [sic, it should read 135]; Becker, Longueil, p. 178, item 188. Cf., Simar, Longueil, pp. 189-190, item 67.

88. Simar, Longueil, pp. 181-182, item 19.

89. Ibid., p. 167, item 2, cites this letter from the "Sadoleti opera omnia, 1737, t. I, epistolae, lib, XVII, n<sup>o</sup> 16," although it does appear in Longueil, Opera, Junta, fols. 162b-163a.

90. Item V, 17 has been treated supra under the category of minor discrepancies.

91. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 158a [sic, it should read 157]; Becker, Longueil, p. 90, item 37.

92. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 158b [sic, it should read 157]; Becker, Longueil, p. 138, item 113. The date is "Romae viii. Id. April."

93. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 158a. Cf., Becker, Longueil, pp. 137-138, item 112.

94. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 160b; cf., Becker, Longueil, p. 89, item 35.

95. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 163b; cf., Becker, Longueil, p. 83, item, 23.

96. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, p. 342; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1540, p. 394. The letter does not appear in Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558. Becker, Longueil, pp. 72-73, cites Delaruelle, Répertoire analytique, nr. 48, where the letter is erroneously dated 15 October [1519].

97. This is item I, 25, a letter from Longueil to Marsilio dated "Ex urbe Patauio. iiii. No. Novembr," in Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 82b, and indicated as 2 November by both Simar, Longueil, p. 187, item 54, and Becker, Longueil, p. 120, item 78. Cf., supra, discussion and n. 42.

98. Becker, Longueil, pp. 130-131, item 98; cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 89b.

99. Becker, Longueil, pp. 117-118, items 72-73.

100. Simar, Longueil, pp. 184, item 31, 185-186, item 42, and 179, item 11, respectively. The dating of letter II, 4 as "96 sept. 1520" occurs in the "Fondulo" entry, which has additional errors in typesetting and proofreading.

101. Simar, Longueil, p. 177. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, fols. 122b [sic, it should read 129]-130a; Becker, Longueil, pp. 172-173, item 180.

102. Simar, Longueil, p. 160, cites letter V, 3, of Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, pp. 321-324, and dates the letter as "Rome, 20 août 1520." His discussion is related to the contents of V, 2, pp. 316-320 of his source. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, fols. 154a-155a; Becker, Longueil, pp. 111-112, item 67.

103. Simar, Longueil, pp. 162-163. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, fols. 155b-156a; Becker, Longueil, pp. 132-133, item 101.

104. Simar, Longueil, p. 185, item 39, and his reference is actually to Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, pp. 339-342, although he does not indicate it. Becker, Longueil, p. 76, item 11, cites Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, III, 520-522, item 935. The reason Becker uses this source is undoubtedly because the letter does not appear in Longueil's Opera, Junta.

105. Simar, Longueil, pp. 71-72. The source utilized by Simar is D[omenico] Gnoli, Nuova Antologia, XXXI, 715. An English translation of this letter also appears in Julia Cartwright (Mrs. Ady), Isabella d'Este Marchioness of Mantua 1474-1539, II, 54-55, although Simar is not aware of her work. Becker, Longueil, p. 79, item 16, cites the reproduction of Gnoli's Nuova Antologia, namely, Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 54. Also see the text of this letter in "Appendix K."

106. Becker, Longueil, pp. 80-81, item 19, Cartwright, Isabella d'Este, II, 168, n. 1, and Pastor, History of the Popes, VIII, 229 (cf., ch. iii, n. 58), all cite V[ittorio] Cian, Giornale Storico Della Letterature Italiana, XIX, 154-

156, where the text of this letter was published in 1892. Also see "Appendix L."

107. See "Appendix M" for a tabulation of relevant correspondence as it has been realigned chronologically. That tabulation will provide the basis for the subsequent biographical information in the present investigation.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE CHRONOLOGICAL REALIGNMENT OF

#### LONGUEIL'S CORRESPONDENCE

The key to unlocking the chronological problems caused by the divergent assertions of Simar and Becker fits into three circumstances and two major events during the years 1520-1522. First is the increasing economic plight of Longueil himself, as all his biographers amply indicated. By 1521 his condition was such that expedience dictated his move into the newly-acquired residence of Reginald Pole in Padua.<sup>1</sup> Associated with his economic problems were the ramifications of Longueil's refusal of an offer to teach at Florence.<sup>2</sup> In addition, the renewal of hostilities between Francis I of France and the Emperor Charles V<sup>3</sup> had a bearing on Longueil's situation. In another dimension, the sudden death of Pope Leo X on 1 December 1521 and the election of Hadrian VI of Utrecht as his successor also had a profound impact on Longueil.<sup>4</sup> How these circumstances and events relate to Longueil's biography will be shown in a more appropriate place. For the present, it is necessary only to show

that they are factors involved in determining an accurate chronology of Longueil's correspondence, and especially those letters for which dates remain to be established. In light of the previous discussion, forty-five letters are in that category. These are distributed among twenty-five individuals, and twenty-three of these letters comprise the total known correspondence between Longueil and sixteen of the persons involved. Following the realignment of their correspondence, the present chapter will consider the still undetermined items of correspondence between Longueil and the nine individuals who have additional letters known and dated in Longueil's epistolae.

Although both Ottaviano Grimaldi and Simon de Villeneuve have five letters still needing to be dated, the former has a total of thirty-six items of correspondence with Longueil and will be deferred until the second grouping of persons is considered. For Villeneuve, however, all his known letters from Longueil must be determined. Four of his letters were treated in the second set of major discrepancies, and the fifth in set three of miscellaneous discrepancies, in the previous discussion.<sup>5</sup> In light of those observations, only the year-date needs to be assigned to all five items. Closely associated with Villeneuve's letters are two undated items to Francois Lerouge which were also identified in the previous chapter, and which need only a year-date.<sup>6</sup> Becker dates all these letters in the mid-1521 period, and Simar

places them all one year later. The parallel between the lives of Longueil and Villeneuve has been shown earlier, including the fact that Villeneuve studied law at Pavia for six years, and then moved across the peninsula where Longueil supported and entertained him for several months.<sup>7</sup> Simar says this six-year period was 1516-22,<sup>8</sup> but this must surely be in error. Longueil could hardly have been in a position to support and entertain anyone following his move into the household of Reginald Pole in 1521. It would seem that the first letter to Villeneuve, II, 16, actually accords with Longueil's straits in mid-1521, for in it he mentions their common background and his economic plight, but refuses the offer to live with his young friend. If this be the case, then Villeneuve must have already completed his work at Pavia in early 1521, moved to Padua, where he spent several months with Longueil, and by late May 1521 taken his position in the employ of François Lerouge, who had recently replaced Jean de Pins as French ambassador in Venice in April 1520,<sup>9</sup> whence he invited his friend and former entertainer to come and live with him now that their positions had been reversed. The recommendation from Lerouge mentioned in II, 22, dated 1 July, would also fit these circumstances, for within the next ten days Longueil had moved into the household of Reginald Pole.<sup>10</sup> His desire to be kept informed also fits into the setting of events in 1521 rather than a year later. One week later, in letter II, 24, Longueil answers Villeneuve's

letter and requests additional news. In addition, he mentions that rumor has it that the citadel at Milan had been struck by lightning and burned, or as he writes, "Percrebuit hic rumor atrocior quidem ille quam ut libeat credere, sed constantior quam ut omnino contemni debeat, Tactam de coelo Mediolani Iovis arcem nuper conflagrasse."<sup>11</sup> This too would fit the earlier period, for on 25 May 1521, Leo X joined the Emperor against the French who were forced to evacuate Milan, with the exception of the citadel, on 19 November 1521.<sup>12</sup> In the meantime, French commander Lautrec was deserted by the Swiss, as confirmed in Longueil's letter to Villeneuve dated 22 July 1521.<sup>13</sup> In II, 27, the sentence, "De Antonij Pratiani ad Iccium portum profectio, iam pridem hic audieramus,"<sup>14</sup> refers to the conference at Calais in the summer of 1521, at which Cardinal Wolsey played such a prominent role.<sup>15</sup> Longueil's letters to Lerouge, II, 23 and II, 25, parallel those to Villeneuve, both mentioning him and discussing the misfortunes befalling the French in the summer of 1521, so that they were doubtlessly penned during the same year.<sup>16</sup> All this is quite in keeping with Gnoli's presentation of Longueil, his companions, and activities during the summer months of 1520, when he writes, "Un giorno della settimana egli avea destinato allo scriber lettere; le quali erano pure una esercitazione ciceroniana; ed anzi col Grimoldo, e col Villanova, mancando altra materia di carteggio, egli solea intrattenersi sui fatti politici del giorno."<sup>17</sup>

Because Bembo, Budé, Marsilio, and Fondulus had additional items of correspondence to those which remain undated, they will be temporarily by-passed and treated in the second grouping along with Grimaldi. Roger Barme, however, received two letters from Longueil which comprise all of their known correspondence. These two undated letters, I, 41 and III, 34, are closely associated with a letter to Leonardo Pomaro, IV, 4, which must also have its date determined. All three of these letters have been treated under the first set of major discrepancies, and under the second and third set of miscellaneous discrepancies, respectively. Item IV, 4 mentions the fact that Pomaro had been well-treated by Barme. Since this letter is dated 9 April, it may be assumed that item III, 34 was Longueil's letter of reference to Barme on Pomaro's behalf. Although this last-named letter was written before IV, 4, it is hardly possible that it was written in April, for nine days were not sufficient time for Longueil's recommendation to go to the President of the Parlement of Paris, for the Portuguese doctor to have been well-treated as a result of that recommendation, for Pomaro to have responded to Longueil, and for Longueil to have sent his letter of 9 April. More probably, the letter to Barme was written in early March 1522.<sup>18</sup> The year-date for I, 41 is listed as 1521 by Becker, and as "[1522?]" by Simar. There is not mention of the changing circumstances in Italy following the death of Leo X in December 1521. In



light of the activities involved with the outbreak of hostilities between Francis I and Charles V in the spring, and the economic straits so apparent with Longueil in the summer, the mention of Guy Breslay recalling his son to Paris from Padua, where he had lived and studied with Longueil, it appears that this letter was written on 13 January 1521.<sup>19</sup>

Two undated letters, I, 20 and II, 14, were written by Longueil to Statius and treated under the second set of miscellaneous discrepancies.<sup>20</sup> Simar identifies Statius as an obscure humanist from Sicily, and makes no attempt to determine his Christian name nor address the fact that Gnoli identifies him in a lengthy discussion of the persons and events of the summer of 1522. In an explanatory footnote Gnoli writes, "Questi è certamente l'Estàço, che latinizzò il nome in Achilles Statius, e la biblioteca del quale fu il nucleo della Vallicelliana. È strano che il Longolio chieda per lettera agli amici s'egli fosse romano o calabrese, come altri gli aveva detto, mentre sappiamo che era portoghese."<sup>21</sup> Becker acknowledges this statement and adds a note of his own on Statius, saying, "Unbekannt. Der Portugiese, an den Gnoli p. 86 dachte, wird es kaum sein, wenn der berühmte Achilles Statius Lusitanus (1524-1581) gemeint ist; s. Jöcher. Es braucht kein Achilles Statius zu sein, ein einfacher Eusthatus genügt, vgl. z. B. den mantuanischen Agenten Stazio Gadio."<sup>22</sup> Statius was among the Mellini partisans who became aroused following the nomination of Longueil to receive Roman

citizenship in 1519. During that controversy, "il avait écrit des lettres grossières à Longueil, l'appelant barbare et ennemi du nom romain, et il avait injurié Salmon Macrin, coupable, à ses yeux, de critiques malveillantes envers Lascaris."<sup>23</sup> After the death of Mellini and the final granting of Roman citizenship to Longueil, Statius apologized and sought Longueil's friendship. These two letters are in response to his overtures. One important item for determining the date of Longueil's letters to Statius is his letter to Hieronymus Alexandrinus, I, 12, dated 28 April 1521. This last-named letter was written in response to one from Alexandrinus dated 17 December 1520, but which had not arrived at its destination until 3 April 1521. In his response to Alexandrinus, Longueil mentions his relations with two of his former opponents, "Quod de Alcyonio & Stathio scribis, ego vero cum altero nullas unquam inimicitias gessi, cum altero, quod ad me quidem attinet, bona fide in gratiam redii."<sup>24</sup> Since the question was raised in late 1520, it would appear that the issue of Longueil and Statius being reconciled was under discussion in that year. In a letter to Lelio Massimo, II, 6, dated 1 August 1520, Longueil wrote, "Stathius Simioli nostri discipulus quidam, Hier. Alexandrino non ignotus, homo Romanus sit an Calaber, fac planè sciam."<sup>25</sup> It seems reasonable to assume that Becker has correctly identified the two Statius letters as late-July and early-September 1520.<sup>26</sup>

Longueil's letter to Augustino Beazzano, II, 11, was

identified with the first set of major discrepancies.<sup>27</sup> It was written from Padua and includes a statement about Stefano Sauli which provides a clue to its year date. Longueil writes to Beazzano that "Steph. Saulius, qui cum hic suavissime conjunctissimeque vivimus, me tibi salutem suis verbis ascribere voluit. Vale. Patauij iiiij. Id. Iun."<sup>28</sup> Item II, 17, written to Sauli and Marcantonio Flaminio, is dated by both Simar and Becker as 12 June 1521.<sup>29</sup> Both Sauli and Flaminio were at Genoa when Longueil wrote his letter of 12 June, thus militating against Simar's view that II, 11 was written only two days earlier, when Sauli was supposedly in Longueil's company. Pietro Alcionio is mentioned in the 12 June 1521 letter as being with Longueil, and there is also information about Martin Luther and the German problem, but neither is mentioned in II, 11. It would appear that Simar's chronology simply does not square with the contents of these letters.

Another letter from the first set of the major discrepancies lists several of Longueil's friends. This letter, to Girolamo Negri, II, 12, is dated from Padua on 10 June, and it refers to Alcionio in two separate instances, including his report of Negri's work on Longueil's "Defense Orations."<sup>30</sup> This letter also fits into the context of 1520 rather than 1521, for Alcionio was in Longueil's company at that time.

An undated letter identified as a miscellaneous discrepancy was written to Marcantonio Michiel informing him of many things, including Longueil's newly bestowed Roman

citizenship.<sup>31</sup> In this letter Longueil again identifies several friends, among them are Pietro Pazzi, Battista Casali, Camillo Porzio, Jacopo Sadoletto, and Pietro Bembo. The identification of Pietro Pazzi ties this letter to II, 12, and the mention of the newly acquired citizenship places both letters in the period of V, 1, which was written by Bembo on 29 May 1520.<sup>32</sup> Hence, Becker's date of 10 June 1520 appears to be well founded, and Simar's listing of "s.d. [1520]," may be regarded as being in general agreement.<sup>33</sup>

The offer to Longueil of a position as public instructor of Latin letters in Florence is the key to determining the date of his letter to Alessandro Pazzi, II, 13, previously identified under miscellaneous discrepancies set two.<sup>34</sup> This offer was made in a letter dated 22 January 1520, although Gnoli erroneously identifies it as "il primo febbraio del 1520."<sup>35</sup> In his discussion of the offer and Longueil's rejection of it, Gnoli does not keep his source materials in their proper sequence, and this fact causes him to somewhat misrepresent the matter. The details of this offer and Longueil's decision will be treated elsewhere, but it is correct to follow Gnoli's conclusion that "tantochè nel giugno se ne parlava ancora: ma egli era ben risoluto di non andare."<sup>36</sup> In Longueil's letter to Bembo, I, 3, dated 10 June 1520, the matter is prominently placed and this letter also discusses the roles played by Pietro Pazzi, Mariano Castellano and others who appear frequently in Longueil's correspondence during

the period.<sup>37</sup> The fact that only one letter was written to Alessandro Pazzi and that both he and his brother Pietro played important roles in obtaining for Longueil the offer from Florence surely militates against assigning Simar's year date of 1521 to it.<sup>38</sup> The contents of the Alessandro Pazzi letter help to place it within the year 1520, although the letter itself is undated.<sup>39</sup> It appears that Alessandro had written to Giulio de' Medici in Longueil's behalf and then informed Longueil of this fact. Unable to find the proper words to express his appreciation, Longueil finally asked Bembo to do it. Following Bembo's letter to Alessandro, he wrote to Longueil offering his friendship, and II, 13 is Longueil's response to Alessandro. The date of Bembo's letter to Longueil, item V, 1, in which these very matters are treated is 29 May 1520,<sup>40</sup> which would make 10 June 1520 quite appropriate as the date of Longueil's letter to Alessandro.

The date of Longueil's letter to Francesco Maria Molza, I, 16, has no reference to those events and circumstances which are the key to unlocking the chronology of Longueil's correspondence. Listed as an item in the first set of major discrepancies, this letter is dated 1520 by Becker and 1521 by Simar.<sup>41</sup> The lack of reference to the renewed hostilities between France and the Empire, Longueil's economic problems, and the offer from Florence all support the earlier date. The general silence on the Florence offer after June 1520 tends to confirm it. All this evidence is argumentation

from silence, however, and does not provide positive proof to the letter's date. In fact, the only positive evidence on this matter comes from the last few lines of the letter itself, which read, "Tu si ante quintum decimum cal. Novembr. diem ad nos exieris, fac omnino Venetijs iter facias. Nos enim ibi offendes qui cras, ad summum perendie, illud animi causa cogitabamus. Vale. Ex urbe Patauio prid. Cal. Octobr."<sup>42</sup>

His letter to Flavio Crisolino, II, 3, dated 16 September 1520 makes a request for travel money, which he will repay upon receipt of his pension from Leo X on 1 November.<sup>43</sup> Simar does not seem to be able to decide upon the year date of this letter, as indicated earlier.<sup>44</sup> The fact that Longueil had a pension from Leo X played a role in his refusal of the offer from Florence earlier in 1520, and its continuation into 1521 may be the basis for Simar's equivocation, but Longueil's desire for travel money for the boy in his charge in mid-September reflects the background of Longueil's comment to Molza in his letter of 30 September 1520.

Another item from the first set of major discrepancies is II, 15, a letter to the French poet Mellin de Saint-Gelais dated 27 April.<sup>45</sup> The letter is ascribed to the year 1521 by Becker, and to 1522 by Simar.<sup>46</sup> In light of Longueil's inclusion of a copy of his "Defense Orations," his assertion that he had received an offer from Florence as a result of having written them, and the fact that he was seeking some

assistance for Saint-Gelais from the poet's relatives, it would seem that this letter was written in the spring of 1521 instead of 1522. The drastic condition of Longueil's own finances had not yet compelled him to move into Pole's residence, but the pending French and Imperial struggles as well as his own failing resources had brought to an end the "French community" studying together in Padua. Leo X had written in Longueil's behalf to Francis I on 6 April, Longueil himself would write to Pierre Brisson on 1 May, and on 24 May and 2 June 1521, Longueil would begin his correspondence with Villeneuve and Lerouge.<sup>47</sup> The letter in behalf of Saint-Gelais fits comfortably into this setting. One year later the circumstances, including the death of Leo X and the election of Adrian VI, would be completely changed to the extent that the only way to bring these factors into agreement with the letter to Saint-Gelais would be to tamper with the available data.

Longueil's only letter to Giulio Tomarozzo, II, 28, was classified under the second set of miscellaneous discrepancies.<sup>48</sup> It fits into the period just described. Tomarozzo wished to have his son Flaminio broaden his education by study with Longueil in Padua. Longueil wrote of this in a letter to Bembo on 24 February 1521. While in Venice on Palm Sunday of the same year, Longueil wrote to Flaminio in Padua expressing the fact that he did not know when he would return and that he was too busy to have the young man come

visit him. Then, on 15 May 1521, Longueil again wrote to the younger Tomarozzo in Padua informing him to make preparations for his return from Venice.<sup>49</sup> Between these last two letters, Longueil must have written the letter to Giulio Tomarozzo, probably about 1 May, for in it he mentions that he does not know where the recipient is, but that he had heard of his arrival in Rome. He also mentions the fact that Flaminio needs no recommendation, that he is indebted to him, and that in spite of bad times he is doing well.<sup>50</sup> In just over two months, these bad times would result in his moving into Pole's household.

At about the same time, Longueil wrote his only surviving letter to Thomas Linacre in London. This letter, II, 33, was written just after the arrival of Reginald Pole, Thomas Lupset, and Richard Pace in Padua. Biron and Barennes, as well as Simar, date Pole's arrival at Padua during the same general period as Longueil's when they write, "Enfin, poursuivi par la nostalgie de l'Italie, il revint s'établir à Padoue en 1520, c'est-à-dire à l'époque où Réginald Pole y arrivait lui-même."<sup>51</sup> This is clearly in error, as may be seen by comparing the 1910 work of Martin Haile, reinforced by Becker in 1924, and sustained by W. Schenk in 1950, who all indicate that Pole actually arrived in Padua in 1521, which concurs with the Diary of Marin Sanuto.<sup>52</sup> Thus, the letter to Linacre, which was written just following Pole's arrival in Padua, and listed under the first set of major



discrepancies, is to be dated 7 May 1521.<sup>53</sup>

In 1522 two additional letters were written by Longueil to Girolamo Savorgnano, III, 36, and Francesco Bellini, IV, 25. The former is dated 30 March 1521 by Simar, but the contents reflect the situation in 1522, as Becker indicates. Since this letter is listed under the first set of major discrepancies, the correct date for it is 30 March 1522.<sup>54</sup> The second letter is listed with those in the second set of the miscellaneous discrepancies.<sup>55</sup> Following the example of Constantino Savorgnano, who had visited Longueil in Padua when he delivered his father's letter, Bellini sought to visit Longueil. In his letter, Longueil relates that Bellini had not yet appeared on the scene in Padua even though he had permission to come. In light of Longueil's improved situation, the fact that Bellini had sought an audience with him, and that the number of correspondents communicating with Longueil was enlarged during this period, it would appear that the date 30 June 1522 best fits the contents of IV, 25.<sup>56</sup>

The only other individual to whom Longueil wrote just one surviving letter in this group with its date unassigned is one that does not fit into the 1520-1522 period. It is a letter to Jacques Lucas d'Orleans, IV, 34, which was listed under the first set of major discrepancies.<sup>57</sup> Becker identifies its date as 29 January 1518, although his footnote reads in part, "scheint das Jahr 1518 den Vorzug vor 1519 zu verdienen."<sup>58</sup> Becker had access to the third volume of

Allen's Erasmi Epistolarum, published in 1913, but he does not answer Allen's argument that "the year-date can be assigned" from other items. Allen agrees with Simar that IV, 34 was written in 1519,<sup>59</sup> and Becker is not convincing in his argument in favor of 1518. Thus, this letter to Jacques Lucas should be dated 29 January 1519. With this date assigned, the correspondence involving the first group of individuals is completed and consideration of the second group can be accomplished.

Unlike those individuals in the first group, whose total known correspondence from Longueil needed realignment, merely a portion of the correspondence with Longueil is in need of being definitely dated in the second. Ottaviano Grimaldi, for example, has a total of thirty-six letters included in Longueil's Opera, Junta, but only five of those items still require consideration. Bembo is involved in twenty items of communication with Longueil, but only four still need their dates determined. For Budé and Marsilio there are three each, whereas Fondulus has two, from a total of nine,<sup>60</sup> four and three letters respectively. Of the fourteen letters to and from Sadoletto, only one must still have its date confirmed,<sup>61</sup> as is the case with Flavio Crisolino, Niccolò Dragone, and Lelio Massimo, although they are involved in a total of ten items. Instead of treating these letters by individuals, the present study will discuss them according to their dates, except for the letters from Longueil

to Brisson, De Infortuniis Epistola, 1533, and Budé to Longueil, V, 18, which will be treated at the end.

In the consideration of the second set of minor discrepancies and the third set of miscellaneous ones, two items were identified as December 1519.<sup>62</sup> The earliest of these, V, 9, was sent from Sadoletto to Budé on 7 December 1519 according to Becker. Simar omits the item from his list, undoubtedly because it was not published in Longueil's Epistolarum, 1558. It was written in the same period as V, 4, also deleted from the 1558 work, and V, 16, included in Simar's basic text.<sup>63</sup> These letters all fit into the period of Longueil's return to Italy following his visit to France and England in 1519. They all relate information about Longueil's reception and treatment by Sadoletto and Bembo. The letter from Budé to Longueil, V, 16, mentions his own departure to his estate and mentions his own studies. Since it was written from Marly on 21 and 25 February 1520, there can be no doubt that V, 9 and V, 4 were written on 7 December 1519 and 4 January 1520, respectively.<sup>64</sup> Thus, three of the remaining items are identified.

The second letter is dated 31 December 1519. It is a letter from Longueil to Sadoletto, IV, 26, although both Simar and Becker date it as 31 January 1520.<sup>65</sup> It would appear that Longueil's editor incorrectly dates this letter as "Venetijs. Pri. cal. Janu."<sup>66</sup> The letter itself is quite long, and it discusses four items of correspondence from Sadoletto

which Longueil must answer. The first of these, dated 8 September 1519, was received by Longueil when he was in England, the second arrived in Milan and was dated 12 December 1519, whereas the third was dated 22 January 1520 and concerned the offer from Florence. The fourth letter is undoubtedly the letter written on 2 January 1520.<sup>67</sup> Since IV, 26 discusses the letter of 22 January, it is probable that it was erroneously dated when the editor was compiling the Opera, Junta. Thus, it is likely that Simar and Becker correctly date this letter to Sadoletto as 31 January 1520.

In the summer of 1520, Longueil wrote letters to Lelio Massimo, I, 29, Flavio Crisolino, I, 31, and Pietro Bembo, I, 10, which must be clarified. The first of these was identified with the third set of miscellaneous discrepancies, and the other two were listed among the first set of major discrepancies.<sup>68</sup> In his letter to Massimo, Longueil mentions some events which had occurred five months earlier, while he was still in Venice. He writes, "Ante menses quinque legit mihi quidem binas tuas ad se literas Hier. Alexandrinus, graecas alteras, alteras latinas, in quibus cum alia de rerum tuarum statu diligentissime scriberes, tum tibi duas à me Venetijs redditas esse epistolas significares."<sup>69</sup> In light of the fact that Longueil had just returned from his northern travels, that he arrived at Venice in late December 1519, and that he received several offers in the period January-February 1520, it is likely that the above-mentioned sequence of events

occurred during that period as well. This would place I, 29 somewhere around 1 July 1520. Becker places I, 29 along with Longueil's letter to Statius, I, 20, in July 1520,<sup>70</sup> between his letters to Sadoletto, II, 5, and Bembo, I, 10, dated 14 July and 1 August 1520.<sup>71</sup> In view of Longueil's letter to Massimo, II, 6, dated 1 August 1520, it would appear that Becker is correct, although he does not argue for a specific date, since Massimo had excused himself for his long silence before sending two letters to Longueil. Longueil acknowledges the receipt of these two letters as well as the cause of Massimo's delay in writing, namely, the death of the young Pietro Paolo Castellano.<sup>72</sup> The letter to Crisolino, I, 31, is dated 14 July, and its contents make no mention of the economic plight of Longueil or the hostilities between France and the Empire, which had characterized the summer of 1521. Longueil does discuss his studies in Rome and the Roman citizenship he received,<sup>73</sup> thus confirming that I, 31 was written on 14 July 1520. Item I, 10, written to Bembo on 1 August also reflects the setting of 1520 rather than 1521. In it Longueil tells Bembo of his neck pains and indigestion, but that his studies are progressing and he is planning to visit Verona and Vicenza with Navagero in September. In his letter to Longueil, V, 2, dated 20 August 1520, Bembo speaks highly of Navagero. He also mentions the French ambassador to Venice, Jean de Pins. In a letter to Crisolino, II, 3, dated 16 September 1520, Longueil mentions the fact that Pins

had returned to France and that he would like some travel money in the form of an advance on his forthcoming pension payment.<sup>74</sup> The removal of Pins foreshadowed the outbreak of hostilities between Francis I and Charles V in 1521. This, coupled together with Longueil's economic straits, would make such travel plans virtually impossible in 1521. As a result, item I, 10 should be dated 1 August 1520.

In the autumn of 1520, six additional letters were written which were listed in the first set of major discrepancies.<sup>75</sup> In his letter to Grimaldi, I, 22, dated 27 September, Longueil mentions that Grimaldi has made continued announcements that he will come to Padua and that these have kept Longueil from making a trip to Venice.<sup>76</sup> Simar must surely have erred in assuming that this letter was written in 1521, since after 8 August and certainly on 26 September 1521, Longueil is known to have been in Venice.<sup>77</sup> In Longueil's letter to Bembo, I, 15, dated 15 October, the contents also reflect the year 1520. Longueil tells that he has not yet visited the Podestà, who is said to be an enemy of all Greeks. He also expresses his desire to go to Venice. Since he was in Venice in September 1521, and some items in this letter reflect his recent and independent situation in Padua, it would seem that I, 15 was most likely written on 15 October 1520.<sup>78</sup> In early November, Longueil wrote two letters on the same day, namely 2 November, although one of them is not dated. The first, I, 25, was written to Marsilio

and the second was written to Grimaldi, I, 26.<sup>79</sup> His silence on the issues of his poverty, the hostilities between the French and the Imperial forces, as well as his work on the Lutheran project, militates against assigning the year date 1521 to these letters. As a result, both I, 25 and I, 26 were written on 2 November 1520. Three weeks later, Longueil responded to the replies to his letters of 2 November. These two letters, items I, 39 and I, 40, are also closely associated.<sup>80</sup> In them there is no mention of the war, Longueil's financial difficulties, or the Lutheran project, but there is a reference to the judicial proceedings against him. He writes to Grimaldi, in I, 40, "Equidem nisi maiorem facilitatis meae quàm calumniarum tuarum rationem ducerem, facerem intelligeres quo cum tibi sit negotium, qui me accusandi an-sam inde tibi sumpseris, unde te nobis gratias egisse maxime oportuit."<sup>81</sup> The hope was that Giovanni-Battista Egnazio would read his writings. This is undoubtedly a reference to his "Defense Orations," for in early 1522, Longueil would take up the cause of Villeneuve in a series of four letters to Egnazio.<sup>82</sup> Simar has again erred in dating I, 39 and I, 40 as 1521 instead of 24 November 1520.

Early in 1521 Longueil wrote another letter to Fondulus, I, 23, which was identified under the first set of miscellaneous discrepancies.<sup>83</sup> It fits between two other letters to Fondulus, II, 4 and I, 7, dated 16 September 1520 and 20 April 1521, respectively.<sup>84</sup> In it Longueil has very little

that is worthwhile to write. This state of affairs reflects Longueil's condition in the period about 15 February 1521, as Becker aptly illustrates by placing item I, 23 between Bembo's letter to Longueil, V, 3, dated 15 February, and Longueil's response to Bembo, II, 10, dated 24 February 1521.<sup>85</sup> Several weeks later, Bembo wrote to Budé, V, 5, requesting him to assist Longueil in obtaining a position in France. Simar omits this item from his list, probably because it was not in Longueil's Epistolarum, 1558.<sup>86</sup> At this point in Longueil's life, his financial condition was getting progressively worse, the eruption of hostilities between Francis I and Charles V was only a month from reality, and Longueil's refusal of the Florence offer had resulted in the cooling of relations between him and his former champions. Bembo, in his capacity as Papal Secretary, recommended Longueil to Francis I in a letter, "Datum Romae die .vi. Apr. 1521. Anno Nono. Bembus."<sup>87</sup> Bembo's letter to Budé is dated "Romae viii .Id. April," and is to be considered a companion piece to the letter to Francis I.<sup>88</sup>

Several months later, Longueil wrote two additional letters to Grimadli and another to Marsilio. Items II, 34 and II, 35, written to Grimaldi are both omitted from Simar's listing, as indicated under the third set of miscellaneous discrepancies.<sup>89</sup> They both contain information about the warfare between Francis I and Charles V at Milan and other sites.<sup>90</sup> Since these hostilities erupted in the summer of



1521, and since Longueil died in September 1522, there is no question about the accuracy of II, 34 and II, 35 being dated 24 and 31 October 1521, respectively, although Becker mis-dates II, 35.<sup>91</sup> The only other item from 1521 which remains to be definitely dated is III, 8, to Marsilio, as indicated in the discussion of the first set of major discrepancies. Simar erroneously dates the letter 1522, whereas Becker dates it 25 December 1521.<sup>92</sup> The letter mentions Giovanni-Battista Leoni, of whom Simar writes, "Il présidait l'Accademia Veneziana. Il succéda, pensons-nous, à Longueil dans l'enseignement du latin au jeune Réginald Pole."<sup>93</sup> If this be the case, it is quite likely that III, 8 is a letter from 25 December 1521, which provides a bridge between Longueil's letters of November 1520 and that of 18 February 1522.<sup>94</sup>

Three letters remain from the year 1522 which must have their dates confirmed. Two of them are from Longueil to Bembo, III, 22 and III, 35, and the third is from Longueil to Niccolò Dragone, IV, 29. The first of these was listed with the first set of major discrepancies, the second with the second set of major discrepancies,<sup>95</sup> and the third with the second set of miscellaneous discrepancies.<sup>96</sup> In determining the year date for III, 22, the letter itself provides the clue for an indisputable solution. In his salutation Longueil writes, "Valebis igitur, & à Polo nostro saluebis. Ex urbe Patauio .vi. Id Februar."<sup>97</sup> Even the abridged form of this letter in Buchlerus' collection shows the greeting

of Pole.<sup>98</sup> According to the previous discussion, Pole arrived in Padua in the spring of 1521, thus restricting the date of III, 22 to 8 February 1522. This is confirmed by the fact that in the period 13 January — 24 February 1521 Bembo was in Rome. In his letter to Bembo on 8 February 1522, Longueil was aware of Bembo's being at Venice where he wished him a speedy recovery.<sup>99</sup> Item III, 35 is also dated in 1521 by Simar and 1522 by Becker. The preceding discussion indicated that Becker's date for this letter is correct, but that the year date needed to be confirmed. In it Longueil mentions that Crisolino had at last written, and that he had learned indirectly of Bembo's recovery.<sup>100</sup> Should Simar's reckoning be applied, there would be an irresolvable problem, for Longueil is known to have been in Venice at least from 24 March to 1 April 1521, and III, 35 is dated from Padua.<sup>101</sup> Hence, III, 35 was written on 20 March 1522. As far as Longueil's letter to Dragone, IV, 29, is concerned, the date must surely concur with Becker's assertion, for Longueil mentions receiving Dragone's letter of 24 July and his expectations of making a trip in mid-September. He also discusses Dragone's conversion to Ciceronian style, since he can only study the Latin language through books so why not use the best?<sup>102</sup> As indicated earlier, the year 1521 was too tumultuous for Longueil to plan such a journey, and none of his correspondence in that year speaks of such plans. Longueil's situation had taken a turn for the better by the

summer of 1522, and his plans for a new journey reflect this new-found lease on life. Death intervened, however, before he was able to undertake his newly devised plans, for within a month he was smitten by a fever which would lay claim to his life on 11 September 1522.<sup>103</sup>

The two remaining letters do not fit into the period 1520-1522. One of them, the letter to Pierre Brisson from Valence on 4 November 1513, is not actually open to dispute. It appears here because Simar was unaware of its existence, as indicated under the first set of major discrepancies.<sup>104</sup> The other letter was written to Longueil by Guillaume Budé, V, 18, and is quite another matter, as shown by its inclusion in the first set of miscellaneous discrepancies.<sup>105</sup> That item was written on 15 October 1519 according to Louis Delaruelle's Répertoire, although Becker assigns it to 1518.<sup>106</sup> There are two keys in the letter which assist in determining its year date. The first is the reference to Jean Lascaris, to whom Budé, on 10 June 1516, had written a letter in which he had recommended Longueil for the study of Greek in the school Lascaris had recently founded at the Quirinal.<sup>107</sup> By the middle of 1518, Longueil's interest in Greek studies had become secondary to other matters. The second key is obtained from Delaruelle's use of V, 1, although he errs in some details in his use of the letter, such as his notion that Longueil was born in 1490,<sup>108</sup> and in his statement that this letter was written by Sadoletto rather than by Bembo.<sup>109</sup> In

the letter itself, Bembo writes to Longueil in May 1520, "Curavi mandata tua Florentiae diligenter, idque amplius, quod Protonotario Bartholino, qui mihi uisus est mirifice de te & sentire & loqui, defensionum tuarum librum dedi."<sup>110</sup>

Following his confrontation with Celso Mellini, Longueil was obliged to depart from Rome for a while. He and the protonotary took this occasion to visit Paris, England, and return to France by way of Louvain.<sup>111</sup> On 21 and 25 February 1520

Budé wrote Longueil, V, 16, again mentioning Bartolini, but using his newly acquired title of Abbot of Aspromonte.<sup>112</sup>

While this data is not overwhelming, it is sufficient to sustain Becker's statement, "Der Brief muss von 1518 sein, da er auf Longueils drittes Jahr als bevorstehend hinweist. 1519 was Longueil auf Reisen und Lascaris in Frankreich."<sup>113</sup>

Thus, V, 18 may be assumed to have been written on 15 October 1518. With these two letters now dated, all of the correspondence published in the various editions of Longueil's

posthumous works, plus the two items identified as V, 20 and V, 21 have been brought into realignment with the circum-

stances and events of their context. Together with those letters published in his earlier works, the anonymous "Vita,"

as well as the various orations, translations, and other works by and about Longueil,<sup>114</sup> they provide the basic materials with which a new biographical sketch can be constructed.

To this project the present study now turns.

1. Cf., ch. iv, and nn. 99-106. Pins, "Jean de Pins et Longueil," esp. pp. 185-189, shows Longueil's worsening economic condition and the cooling off of relations between him and his former champions. He does not, however, attempt to address the conflicting chronologies of Simar and Becker, being most likely unaware that such a conflict exists. Cf., Kopf, "Christophorus Longolius," pp. 641-643, which also addresses the matter of Longueil's physical weaknesses and infirmities. Cf., also, ch. i, nn. 2-4 discussion.

2. Pins, "Jean de Pins et Longueil," p. 186, blames the cooling of Longueil's relations with Sadoletto and Bembo on this decision. This comes, as he indicates, after they had already begun to cool following the Mellini-Longueil controversy a year earlier. Cf., Simar, Longueil, p. 80.

3. A. H. Johnson, Europe in the Sixteenth Century, 1494-1598, Vol. IV, Periods of European History (seventh ed.; London: Rivingtons, 1964), 160-164. Pins, "Jean de Pins et Longueil," pp. 188-189, shows how these events brought an end to the ties between the French ambassador and Longueil.

4. Francesco Guicciardini, The History of Italy, translated, edited, with notes and an introduction by Sidney Alexander (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969), pp. 326-331, has a note on the role of Leo X in the rivalry between Francis I and Charles V, as well as his death and the election of Adrian VI, in an introduction to Guicciardini's evaluation of the character of Leo X. Also cf., Johnson, Europe in the Sixteenth Century, pp. 161-162.

5. Cf., ch. v and nn. 55, 56, 57, 59, 61, and 85.

6. Items II, 23 and II, 25 were treated under major discrepancies in the discussion supra, ch. v, and nn. 58, 60.

7. Cf., ch. iv discussion and nn. 97-103.

8. Simar, Longueil, p. 193.

9. Pins, "Jean de Pins et Longueil," p. 184 and n. 4.

10. Cf., ch. iv discussion and n. 99.

11. Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 24, fol. 106a.

12. Johnson, Europe in the Sixteenth Century, p. 160. Also cf., A. F. Pollard, Wolsey: Church and State in Sixteenth-Century England (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966), pp. 124-125.

13. Johnson, Europe in the Sixteenth Century, p. 160; Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 26, fol. 106b. Simar, Longueil, pp. 193-194, item 88, does not date this letter; cf., ch. v and n. 85.

14. Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 27, fol. 107, dated 8 August.

15. Cf., Pollard, Wolsey, p. 125. Also cf., Roger Lockyer, Tudor and Stuart Britain, 1471-1714 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964), p. 44.

16. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 23, fol. 105b, and II, 25, fol. 106a.

17. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 86; cf., ch. ii, n. 3.

18. Cf., ch. v and n. 79.

19. Longueil, Opera, Junta, I, 41, fol. 88b. Simar, Longueil, p. 179, item 10, lists this letter as "13 janvier [1522?];" Becker, Longueil, p. 130, item 97, dates it "13. Januar 1521."

20. Cf., ch. v and nn. 74, 77.

21. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 86, n. 2, italics in the source. Although he does not identify the letter, Gnoli is citing Longueil's letter to Lelio Massimo, II, 6; cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 94a.

22. Becker, Longueil, pp. 108-109, item 63, n. 1.

23. Simar, Longueil, p. 192, item 80.

24. Longueil, Opera, Junta, I, 12, fol. 72a.

25. Ibid., II, 6, fol. 94a. Both Simar, Longueil, p. 187, item 55, and Becker, Longueil, pp. 109-110, item 65, agree on the date 1 August 1520. Also cf., Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 89 and n. 1.

26. Becker, Longueil, pp. 108-109, item 63, and 115-116, item 70, for letters I, 20 and II, 14, respectively.

27. Cf., ch. v and n. 50.

28. Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 11, fol. 98a. Simar, Longueil, p. 180, item 12, assigns its year date as 1521, and Becker, Longueil, p. 104, item 55, gives it as 1520.

29. Simar, Longueil, pp. 185, item 40, and 191, item 76; Becker, Longueil, pp. 144-145, item 126. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 17, fol. 102.

30. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 12, fol. 98, where Longueil mentions several of their common friends to Negri, including Jacopo Sadoletto, Pietro Pazzi, and Mariano Castellano. Simar, Longueil, p. 189, item 60, gives a brief identification of Negri, but offers no rationale for assigning 1521 as the year-date for this letter. Becker, Longueil, pp. 104-105, item 56, makes no defense of his 1520 year date, but the contents of the letter bear out his selection.

31. Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 7, fol. 95b.

32. Ibid., V, 1, fol. 153b. This letter, indicated under minor discrepancies in ch. v, and n. 27, was written by Bembo to accompany the certificate of citizenship on 29 May 1520.

33. Becker, Longueil, pp. 102-103, item 53; cf., Simar, Longueil, p. 188, item 57.

34. Cf., ch. v and n. 76.

35. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 68. The letter in which the offer was made is dated "Romae. xi. cal. Febr.," according to Gnoli's source, which is Longueil, Opera, Junta, V, 14, fol. 163a.

36. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 69.

37. Longueil, Opera, Junta, I, 3, fol. 66.

38. Simar, Longueil, p. 189, item 63.

39. Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 13, fols. 98b-99b, and Becker, Longueil, p. 106, item 58.

40. Longueil, Opera, Junta, V, 1, fols. 153b-154a. Also cf., ch. v and n. 28, for a discussion of the minor discrepancy involved.

41. Cf., ch. v and nn. 46-49; Becker, Longueil, pp. 118-119, item 75; and Simar, Longueil, p. 188, item 58.

42. Longueil, Opera, Junta, I, 16, fol. 76b.

43. Ibid., II, 3, fols. 90a-91b.

44. Cf., ch. v and nn. 99-100.

45. Known as Merlinus Gelasinus in Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 15, fols. 100b-101a.

46. Becker, Longueil, p. 140, item 116, and Simar, Longueil, p. 191, item 75.

47. Cf., supra and letters V, 6, I, 8, II, 16, and II, 22-27.

48. Cf., ch. v. and n. 78.

49. For these three context letters cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 10, fol. 97; I, 35, fol. 86; and I, 38, fol. 87a. Item I, 35 was treated under the second set of minor discrepancies; cf., ch. v and nn. 32-33.

50. Becker, Longueil, pp. 141-142, item 120, says II, 28 was written from Padua, but this appears to be erroneous in light of the context of the letter. Instead, II, 28 must have originated from Venice, before Longueil's return to Padua.

51. Biron and Barennes, Réginald Pole, p. 18; cf., ch. iii, n. 64. Simar, Longueil, p. 89, writes, "C'était Reginald Pole. Il était arrivé à Padoue, en 1520, accompagné de Thomas Lupset et de Richard Pace:" this entry should be compared with his treatment on p. 186, item 49.

52. Haile, Reginald Pole, p. 24; Becker, Longueil, p. 142, item 122; Schenk, Reginald Pole, p. 11. Cf., Marin Sanuto, I Diarii di Marino Sanuto (Venezia: F. Visentini, 1879-1903), XXX, 176, 286, and 298; cf. ch. iii, n. 46.

53. Cf., ch. v and n. 50. Also cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 110a; Becker, Longueil, p. 142, item 122; and Haile, Reginald Pole, p. 24, although his marginal reference, "Long. Epp. 213b," is erroneous.

54. Longueil, Opera, Junta, III, 36, fols. 131b-132a. Cf., Simar, Longueil, p. 192, item 77, and Becker, Longueil, p. 174, item 183. The key to this letter is the reference to "Asopus," where Longueil had been invited to visit Savorgnano, who had recently pacified the area. Becker indicates that this was accomplished in 1521; cf., Sanuto, XXIX, 553-554.

55. Cf., ch. v and n. 80.

56. Simar, Longueil, p. 179, item 9; Becker, Longueil, p. 189, item 209; cf., ch. v and n. 80.



57. Cf., ch. v and n. 51.
58. Becker, Longueil, p. 72, item 6 and n. 2.
59. Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, III, 472-473, introductory materials to item 914; cf., Simar, Longueil, p. 185, item 39.
60. Budé is actually involved in nine letters, three of which were written by Bembo and Sadoletto. The six letters cited here include only three from Longueil's Opera, Junta. The other three items are among those which appear and are deleted from various editions of Longueil's writings as described supra in ch. ii.
61. There are actually fifteen, but V, 9 is included in the Budé tabulation, as were V, 4 and V, 5 from Bembo to Budé. Item V, 10 is another of those items having varied inclusion and deletion in the published works of Longueil as described supra in ch. ii.
62. Cf., ch. v and nn. 41 and 94, respectively.
63. Cf., ch. ii discussion and n. 66. Also cf., ch. v and n. 91, for V, 4, and ch. v and n. 42, for V, 16, which is classified in the second set of minor discrepancies.
64. Cf., Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 318-325, with Longueil, Opera, Junta, V, 9, fols. 159a-160d, and V, 4, fols. 156b-158a [sic, it should read 157].
65. Cf., ch. v and n. 41.
66. Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 26, fol. 149b.
67. Ibid., IV, 26, fols. 146a-149b; cf., V, 7, fol. 159a; V, 8, fol. 159b, as well as ch. v and n. 29; V, 14, fol. 163a; and V, 13, fol. 162b, as well as ch. v and nn. 68-70, respectively. Becker, Longueil, pp. 91-93, item 39, misdates two of these letters as being on 13 instead of 12 December, although he correctly identifies the letters as being written on 7 December and 21 instead of 22 January.
68. Cf., ch. v discussions, and nn. 84 and 47, respectively.
69. Longueil, Opera, Junta, I, 29, fol. 83b.
70. Cf., supra and nn. 20-26.
71. Becker, Longueil, pp. 107-109, items 61-64.

72. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, fols. 92a-94a, with the reference to these details as they appear at the beginning of the letter.

73. Ibid., I, 31, fol. 85b.

74. Ibid., II, 3, fols. 90b-91a, with the postscript appearing on fol. 91a. Longueil had received a letter from Fondulus on 8 September in which the news of Jean de Pins' departure was made known to him. He suggested that the travel money be deducted from his forthcoming pension which was to be paid in November.

75. Cf., ch. v and nn. 46-48 and 97.

76. Longueil, Opera, Junta, I, 22, fol. 80b.

77. Simar, Longueil, p. 172, item 3. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 27, fol. 107, was written from Venice on 8 August 1521, and II, 30, fol. 108b, was sent from Venice on 26 September 1521. On II, 27, cf., ch. v and n. 61, under the first set of major discrepancies, in addition to the discussion on Villeneuve, supra, and nn. 14-15.

78. Longueil, Opera, Junta, I, 15, fols. 75b-76a, for Longueil's discussion of his relationships with Gabriel Bol-du and Marcantonio Flaminio. The former appears in several letters during the year 1520, as does Flaminio.

79. Ibid., I, 25, fol. 82, is dated "Ex urbe Patauio .iiij. No. Novembr." Item I, 26, fol. 82b, mentions its association with the letter written to Marsilio.

80. Ibid., I, 39, fol. 87, and I, 40, fols. 87b-88a.

81. Ibid., I, 40, fol. 88a.

82. Ibid., III, 14, 23 February 1522; III, 21, 8 February 1522; III, 26, 18 February 1522; and III, 32, 5 March 1522.

83. Cf., ch. v and nn. 71-72.

84. Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 4, fol. 91a, and I, 7, fol. 69.

85. Cf., ch. v and n. 72, under the first set of miscellaneous discrepancies.

86. Longueil, Opera, Junta, V, 5, fol. 158 [sic, it should read 157].

87. Longueil, Opera, Junta, V, 6, fols. 158b [sic, it should read 157]-158a. This letter was also omitted from Longueil's Epistolarum, 1558; cf., ch. ii, n. 66, and ch. v, n. 93. The contents of this letter closely parallel those of V, 5.

88. Ibid., V, 5, fol. 158 [sic, it should read 157].

89. Cf., ch. v, n. 86.

90. Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 34, fol. 110, and II, 35, fols. 110b-111a.

91. Becker, Longueil, pp. 152-153, items 141-142.

92. Simar, Longueil, p. 187, item 54; Becker, Longueil, p. 160, item 155. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, III, 8, fol. 119a [sic, it should read 117], where it is dated "Natalibus."

93. Simar, Longueil, p. 186, item 47.

94. Cf., supra, nn. 79-80, as well as Longueil, Opera, Junta, III, 25, fol. 126 [sic, it should read 125], dated 18 February 1522.

95. Cf., ch. v and nn. 62-65; Becker, Longueil, p. 167, item 169; Simar, Longueil, p. 162; Longueil, Opera, Junta, III, 22, fol. 124a; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, III, 22, p. 207.

96. Cf., ch. v and n. 81.

97. Longueil, Opera, Junta, III, 22, fol. 124a; Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, III, 22, p. 207.

98. Buchlerus, Collectus, 1606, p. 195, where almost half the text of this letter is missing. The portion omitted is from Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 124a. Cf., ch. ii and n. 92, for additional items included in the Collectus, 1606.

99. Cf., supra, and nn. 51-53, as well as Longueil, Opera, Junta, III, 22, fol. 123b.

100. Longueil, Opera, Junta, III, 35, fol. 131b.

101. Ibid., III, 35, fol. 131b. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, I, 35, fol. 86, and I, 36, fols. 86b-87a, were written from Venice on 24 March 1521, as were I, 5, fol. 68, and I, 6, fols. 68b-69a, on 1 April 1521.

102. Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 29, fols. 150b-151b.

103. Ibid., "Vita," fol. 8a.

104. Cf., ch. v and n. 82. In ch. iii, nn. 65-66, Goldschmidt, "De Longueil's Letter," pp. 163-182, is shown to be unaware of Becker's work on this letter in Aus Frankreichs Frührenaissance, pp. 7-46.

105. Cf., ch. v and n. 96, as well as "Appendix H."

106. Delaruelle, Répertoire, pp. 84-86, item 48, argues at length in favor of 1519, but it is done with no intimate knowledge of the chronology of Longueil's life. The editor says, "La lettre ne peut être antérieure à 1519, car c'est l'année qui marque le premier voyage de Longueil en Italie." Since 1516 was the date of Longueil's most recent arrival in Italy, and his stated objective was to learn Greek within two years, the date 1518 does not seem inappropriate. Cf., Becker, Longueil, pp. 72-73, item 7, although Simar does not include this letter in his listing, a fact which provided the rationale for Goldschmidt, "De Longueil's Letter," pp. 163-182.

107. Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, III, pp. 472-473, introductory materials to letter 914. Also see Delaruelle, Répertoire, p. 84, item 48, and n. 1, as well as his discussion on pp. 61-62, item 34. In a footnote the editor states, "Pour l'année, il ne saurait y avoir de doute: nous avons la preuve que Longueil était à Rome dès le milieu de l'année 1519 et qu'il venait seulement d'y arriver (voir le premier article de V. Cian cité un peu plus haut)." When Cian, "Domenico Gnoli," p. 152, is consulted, it becomes apparent that the point of Longueil's arrival date at Rome was bypassed by Delaruelle. Cian's statement is as follows: "Non ancora trentenne, il belga, o piuttosto, il francese Cristoforo Longueil era giunto per la prima volta nel 1516 in Roma." Later in that article Cian discusses the incident of 1519. Cf., ch. ii, n. 13.

108. Delaruelle, Répertoire, pp. 61-62, n. 5. Also cf., ch. iii and nn. 2, 5-36.

109. Delaruelle, Répertoire, p. 84, item 48, n. 1, writes, "Dans une lettre à Longueil, Sadolet attribue à Bartolini la qualité de protonotaire." He correctly identifies his source as Longueil, Opera, Junta, V, 1, fol. 153b, but the letter was written by Bembo instead of Sadoletto.

110. Longueil, Opera, Junta, V, 1, fol. 153b, dated "Romae quarto kalēdas Iunias" (29 May 1520). Cf., ch. v and n. 28.

111. Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, III, pp. 472-473, introductory materials to letter 914. Also cf., Delaruelle, Répertoire, pp. 105-107, item 62.

112. Delaruelle, Répertoire, pp. 96-98, item 55. Also cf., Becker, Longueil, p. 94, item 41 and n. 10.

113. Becker, Longueil, pp. 72-73, item 7, n. 10.

114. Cf., chs. iv, i, ii, and iii, respectively. Also cf., "Appendix M," for the tabulation of Longueil's correspondence as it has been realigned in light of the discussion in chs. v and vi.

## CHAPTER VII

### A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF LONGUEIL:

#### HIS EARLY YEARS

The mere fact that there is no biographical study of Christophe de Longueil in the English language is in itself an inadequate reason for undertaking such a project. Coupled with the evidence presented in the present study, however, such an enterprise is not only warranted, it is urgently needed. Perhaps a brief recapitulation of the shortcomings of the current state of scholarship as revealed in this study will suffice to crystalize the need for a new biographical study of this outstanding humanist.

In the first place, new manuscript evidence has appeared since the publication of the principal biographical studies of Longueil by Roersch, Gnoli, Simar, and Becker.<sup>1</sup> In reviewing the very materials utilized by those writers, at least one distinct and previously unknown textual tradition of Longueil's published works is now known to exist.<sup>2</sup> Since these inadequacies have been perpetuated to those who have made more recent individualized and in-depth studies of

Longueil and his work,<sup>3</sup> adjustments are sorely needed. This is especially true in light of the existing undercurrent of disagreement about both the time and place of Longueil's birth,<sup>4</sup> as well as the question of the authorship of the anonymous "Vita" as it relates to those issues.<sup>5</sup> Perhaps the most glaring issue confronting the biographer, however, is that of the discrepancies pertaining to the dates assigned to Longueil's correspondence by his principal biographers, Simar and Becker.<sup>6</sup> This chronological problem itself undermines the very confidence other scholars have placed in their works, and has necessitated a chronological realignment of Longueil's correspondence in the present study.<sup>7</sup>

Based on the findings presented to this juncture, a fresh sketch of the life of Christophe de Longueil will be attempted. Being merely an introductory endeavor at bringing his life into sharper focus, no pretense at exhaustive treatment is made. In order to facilitate this preliminary study, four general topics will be developed: Longueil's family, birth and early training, his years of travel and study, his return to Italy, and his final years and death. The present chapter will be devoted to the first two of these topics.

The family of Christophe de Longueil had a long and illustrious heritage when this humanist of renown was born into it sometime during the latter part of 1485.<sup>8</sup> Originally from that region of Normandy which bears their name,<sup>9</sup> the Longueil family was one of the oldest in France. As early

as the eleventh century it gained renown when Adam de Longueuil accompanied William of Normandy in the conquest of England. Later, the second Guillaume de Longueuil served as chamberlain to the celebrated king of Naples and Sicily, Charles of Anjou.

With Guillaume de Longueuil the family rose to new heights of importance in warfare. His son and nephew both became soldiers, and the latter died in the French defeat at Poitiers (1356). Three members of the Longueuil family found honor and death in the battle at Agincourt (1415),<sup>10</sup> while others in the family gained prominence in the Church.<sup>11</sup>

Guillaume III, one of the warriors at Agincourt, was "seigneur de Varengueville et d'Offreinville, gouverneur de Caen et de Dieppe."<sup>12</sup> His fourth child was Richard-Olivier, the celebrated cardinal who served as Canon and architect of the metropolitan church at Rouen. As Bishop of Coutances, he was involved in the review of the trial of Jeanne d'Arc, which resulted in her reinstatement on 7 July 1456, before he received the cardinal's hat from Pope Calixtus III in that same year. During 1461 he served on diplomatic mission to the court of Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (Pope Pius II). In 1464 Richard-Olivier was a member of the conclave which elected Paul II to the Holy See. Later, he served the new pope as Apostolic Legate to Umbria until he was created bishop of Porto the year before his death in 1470.<sup>13</sup>

In the meanwhile, other members of the Longueuil



family were rising to prominence in the service of the civil government. Jean de Longueil (d. 1430), the older brother of the cardinal, became counselor to the Parlement of Paris at the time it was allied to Burgundy.<sup>14</sup> He later served as Civil Lieutenant at the Châtelet and then became Master of Requests at the Palace.<sup>15</sup> In such circumstances, it is to be expected that the Longueils would intermarry with other important families in financial and civil service circles.<sup>16</sup> Such a match was arranged between Jean de Longueil and Marie de Morvilliers, daughter to the first president of the Parlement of Paris, Philippe de Morvilliers. From that union several children were born, including Antoine, the father of Christophe.<sup>17</sup>

Antoine de Longueil became Bishop of St. Pol de Léon in 1484, ambassador of Charles VIII to the Low Countries, and later chief almoner of the Queen of France, Anne of Brittany. On 20 December 1484, Antoine was sent to the Low Countries on a diplomatic mission to Maximilian, Archduke of Austria and future Emperor. It appears that following the death of his wife Mary of Burgundy, Maximilian was making overtures to marry Anne of Brittany. A proxy marriage to the heiress of Brittany was not consummated, however, and Anne married Charles VIII in 1491. While on this mission, which lasted only a short time and included a visit to England,<sup>18</sup> Antoine's personal activities resulted in the birth of Christophe toward the latter part of 1485, as will be shown.

Virtually nothing is known of Christophe's mother. D. Gnoli refers to her as "una borghese de Malines," but adds an extended footnote about the place and date.<sup>19</sup> L. Roersch asserts that "ce prélat s'oublia avec une demoiselle de Malines."<sup>20</sup> Simar, following a lengthy footnote on the problem of the time and place of Longueil's birth, merely identifies Christophe as the natural son of Antoine "et d'une bourgeoise quelconque de Malines."<sup>21</sup> Becker uses a broader term in his discussion, indicating his reluctance to dismiss Schoonhoven, Holland, as a possible birthplace for Christophe, when he writes, "Von seiner Mutter is weder Name noch Familie noch Stand bekannt geworden; wir wissen nur, dass sie ledig war, und dürfen sie wohl als Niederländerin ansprechen."<sup>22</sup> In light of the discussion presented earlier, it would seem advisable to follow Becker's description of Longueil's mother, especially since the point made there is that Christophe was actually born in Schoonhoven, Holland, rather than Malines, Belgium.<sup>23</sup> For all practical purposes, his mother may have been a prostitute. If such be the case, the social status of the girl would indeed be lost in obscurity.

The first eight years of Christophe's life are also unknown. In fact, his early life is so obscure that it has led his two most prominent biographers of recent date to arrive at opposite positions about his childhood. Simar, for instance, suggests that, "Son père jugea bon de le laisser à Malines jusqu'à l'âge de huit ans."<sup>24</sup> Becker, on the other

hand says, "Augenscheinlich kummerte man sich französischerseits um das Kind, das man den Familiennamen der Longueil führen liess, und der Vater oder andere Angehörige sorgten für seine Erziehung, wenigstens nachdem der geweckte Knabe vor Ablauf seines achten Lebensjahrs nach Paris geschickt worden war."<sup>25</sup> In his more recent study on Longueil, Becker maintains basically the same view, making the remark that Christophe was, "1485 als natürlicher Sohn des Bischofs von Saint-Pol-de-Léon in Mecheln geboren, mit acht Jahren nach Paris gebracht und dem Collège du Plessis zur Erziehung übergeben."<sup>26</sup>

Since biographers are left to their own devices for conjecture about these early years, it would appear that Gnoli provides a position which is supported by the known facts, and which does not read into them more than the evidence permits. He states of Longueil, "Ingegno precoce, penetrativo, di memoria pronta e tenace, fu mandato a otto anni a Parigi, dove attese per circa otto anni con grandissimo profitto agli studi sotto la disciplina principalmente di Roberto Durceo."<sup>27</sup> Whatever is claimed beyond that point is merely conjecture on the part of the biographer, and it currently lacks confirming evidence.<sup>28</sup>

Of Longueil's teacher during these formative years, little is known. What seems certain is that the young Christophe remained under his tutorship for eight years. If his birth occurred in 1485, as assumed in the present study, he

remained in that setting from 1493 to 1501, the year following the death of his father Antoine de Longueil, Bishop of Saint-Pol-de-Léon, on 25 August 1500.<sup>29</sup> If his birth occurred in 1488 or later, it must be assumed that Christophe's family took over the responsibility of his education until he completed it several years following the death of his father. This unlikely position is that taken by Simar when he writes, "Les autres membres de la famille veillèrent à ce que son fils reçut l'instruction du temps, qui consistait, comme on sait, dans l'étude du trivium et du quadrivium, chers à la scholastique."<sup>30</sup> Such an assumption is not necessary, however, if the 1485 birth date is followed. Surely the Bishop would have arranged for Christophe's instruction during the year he himself died.

Undoubtedly prompted by the death of his father, in August 1500, Christophe joined Louis XII in the last campaign or battle in which he would be personally involved. His "Vita" provides information about this expedition which it would seem could come only from Longueil himself. It relates, "Quippe adolescens laborem etiam militarem fuerat perpessus, milesque Neapolitano bello cum Ludovico Gallorum Rege in Italiam venisset et si a robore militari multum abesset, corpusque decorum magis habere, quam robustum videretur."<sup>31</sup>

Of all Longueil's biographers, only Becker addresses the events related to this statement.<sup>32</sup> The occasion must have been 1501, since Louis XII crossed the Alps for the last

time when he visited Milan in the summer of 1502.<sup>33</sup> Had Longueuil been born in 1488, 1489, or 1490, as all his other biographers have assumed, he would not have been old enough to effectively serve in a military career. As a result, Longueuil's biographers have been compelled to overlook or disregard the entry in the "Vita." Knowing that their subject could not have been effective in a military career until he had reached his late teens, they simply ignored this crucial period in his life because of its obscurity. Placing his birthdate in 1488 or later was a means whereby the period 1501-1505 could be discreetly but erroneously bypassed.

If Longueuil served Louis XII at all, or how long he served for that matter, can not be certainly known. The campaign into Italy lasted until 1503, with guerilla activities going beyond that time. Longueuil's activities during this campaign are not recorded, and they have become completely obscured. Nevertheless, he did find that the rigors of a military career were more than he could endure. He did desire the adventure associated with a military life, as noted in the "Oratio Celsi Mellini in Christophorum Longolium Perduellionis Reum" and cited by Becker.<sup>34</sup> In the "Vita" another brief comment appears. It states, "A Ludovico francorum rege multis honoribus affectus, de quibus ille in iudicio cum pro se diceret, adversariis maxime conditionis obscuritatem obijcientibus, commemorare est coactus."<sup>35</sup>

When next he appears on the scene, Longueuil is in

the services of the Archduke Philip the Fair, son of the Emperor Maximilian. Philip had gained custody of the Castilian throne on behalf of his wife Joanna when her mother Isabella of Castile died on 26 November 1504. The time for such a move was propitious for him, since the "forces of anarchy at once rallied round the Flemish claimant."<sup>36</sup> In all likelihood, Longueuil entered into the service of Philip the Fair in the autumn of 1504, under the auspices of the Imperial diplomat Andrea del Borgo. His particular post seems to have been that of a cryptographer. He probably served in that capacity until the untimely death of Philip on 25 September 1506.<sup>37</sup> This is undoubtedly the occasion in view in the "Vita" reference, "*Neque vero istis artibus atque virtutibus premia omnino indigna his temporibus tulit, multaque praeclare de eo iudicia principes viri fecere, à Rege Hispaniae Philippo duodeviginti annos natus, sanctioribus illis reconditarum rerum notis, quibus hodie unis omnia propè regnorum arcana committuntur, praefectus.*"<sup>38</sup> On 8 January 1506 Philip and Joanna embarked on a sea voyage from a port in Zealand. They encountered a storm which scattered their armada. Philip's ship caught fire and narrowly escaped foundering. Finally the ship was brought to port at Weymouth, England. From there their entourage proceeded to Windsor, where they remained for nearly three months with Philip, before he departed for Spain on 28 April 1506.<sup>39</sup> Perhaps Longueuil got his first glimpse of England at this time, provided

he remained close to his employer during the episode.<sup>40</sup>

The sudden death of the young monarch put an abrupt end to every hope Longueil may have entertained about rising in the diplomatic service. Charles of Austria, heir apparent to the throne of his father, was only six years old at this time. Under the care of regents, the future Charles V was in no position to help Longueil, whose hopes for advancement were now removed to the distant future. Thus, at the age of twenty-one, as calculated from the 1485 year-date for his birth, Longueil was at another turning point in his career.<sup>41</sup> On this occasion, he gladly permitted his relatives to convince him to resume his studies. He returned to France where he undertook the study of law. As Simar rightly observes, "C'est ici que sa véritable vocation commence à se dessiner."<sup>42</sup>

Before he could put his mind to the study of law, Longueil had to pursue studies in Rhetoric and Dialectic in order to achieve even the lowest rung of the academic ladder and obtain the degree of Master of Arts, although the place where he obtained his license is unknown. Simar asserts that Longueil was at Poitiers in the early months of 1507,<sup>43</sup> and Gnoli fails to address the issue altogether.<sup>44</sup> Becker has produced evidence to indicate that Longueil was enrolled in the annals of the German Nation at the University of Bologna in 1507.<sup>45</sup> At this time, Longueil had not yet met Desiderius Erasmus.

The study of law launched Longueil on his career as

an academician and scholar. He chose Poitiers, the ancient Limonum Pictavorum, as the place to pursue his objective. It was a city of deep-seated local traditions and a center which attracted scholars from far and wide. As Simar indicates, "Plus tard, Poitiers devint, pour ainsi dire, le siège du mouvement humanistique français."<sup>46</sup> There he was enrolled during the spring of 1508. He and another student named Jean Bibault composed some verse which, along with other epigrams, was published in 1509 by Jean Pieux, a professor at the Collège de Sainte-Marthe in Poitiers.<sup>47</sup>

In 1510 Longueil delivered an oration which was to have a profound influence on the future course of his life.<sup>48</sup> This oration was later published with other items under the general title, Christofori Longolii Parisiensis Oratio De Divi Ludovici, Atque Francorum, Habita Pyctavii in Coenobio Fratrum Minorum. Sometime before its publication, Longueil had been introduced to the sixteen-year-old Duke of Valois, later Francis I. At the time his oration was published, a letter written by Longueil to François Valois, dated 5 September 1510, was attached as a prefatory item in that publication.<sup>49</sup> It indicates that Longueil had already moved into a place of some prominence in his new-found setting, and that he was adapting well to the humanist environment. The oration itself was written and delivered as part of a contest in eloquence at the Franciscan convent in Poitiers. In it Longueil spoke of the superiority of the French over the



nacient Romans and their Italian descendants with respect to the riches of their land, their piety, their skill in warfare, and not least of all, he praised their scholarship, erudition, and literature in most enthusiastic terms.<sup>50</sup>

During the next three semesters, Longueil devoted himself to the advancement of his career in the study of jurisprudence. In addition, he applied himself to the study of Pliny's Natural History, a study which he continued to pursue over the course of the next several years. Even before completing his work in law, Longueil was invited to lecture at Poitiers, and his two orations were published together with his letters by Henricus Stephanus in 1510.<sup>51</sup>

All was not well during Longueil's stay at Poitiers. In his letter Joanni Balenio, Canon of Beauvais, dated 10 December 1510, which precedes the Prefatory Oration in the Stephanus publication,<sup>52</sup> Longueil describes an incident of violence which occurred when he was beginning his first lecture at Poitiers. He asserts that while making his introductory remarks, a large group of students entered into the hall. Armed with knives, they clamored for Longueil to surrender his position to a former professor. They charged that Longueil was making innovations into his lecture materials and that his remarks were inappropriate. He refused to give in to their demands, and they attempted to storm the podium where he stood. He was terrified as they began to climb the stairs and threw three volumes of the Digest at them. With

assistance from other supporters in the hall, he was finally able to gain control of the situation and continue his lectures. Although Simar dates this incident in the autumn of 1509, following Longueil's "Vita," it appears to have taken place in 1510, most likely between the time he wrote the two letters published by Stephanus late that year.<sup>53</sup> He completed his studies during the course of the next year, and severed his relationship with Poitiers by the summer of 1512.

During the summer of 1512, Longueil began another journey in the continuation of his study of Natural History. He undertook such excursions from time to time, wandering through the countryside of various regions gathering data for a proposed study on France he proposed to write.<sup>54</sup> This particular trip was to take several months, since it included a widespread itinerary, as his letter of 4 November 1513 to Pierre Brisson indicates. In it Longueil writes, "Sic me peragrasse reliquam Galliam, sic Germanos, Pannoniam, Moesiam, Illyricum, Italiam, Hispaniam, sic ex melioribus insulis, Cretam, Siciliam, Sardiniam, Baleares, ac Britanniam."<sup>55</sup> The original intent of his travels on this occasion was to include a visit to the Orient,<sup>56</sup> but the reign of Selim I (1512-1520) brought a redirection of Ottoman expansion against the Moslem states of the Middle East. Although this relieved the pressure of the Ottoman threat to Christian Europe, at least for the present, it left the Orient in a state of turmoil for the next several years.<sup>57</sup> In October 1511, the Holy

League was formed among the Pope, Venice, and Ferdinand of Aragon as King of Naples. Henry VIII soon joined, as did the Emperor Maximilian a year later. The Battle of Ravenna, 12 April 1512, resulted in a treaty between France and Venice, and a resurgence of papal leadership under Julius II.<sup>58</sup> Thus the rapidly changing state of affairs made the time propitious for Longueil to make his extended journey, even if it could not include all the places on his itinerary.

Either during the time Longueil contemplated taking various expeditions to complete his overall objective, or at the conclusion of one journey which sufficed to carry out his plan, he decided to attend the University at Valence on the Rhone. There the noted Milanese scholar Philip Decius (1454-1535) was teaching Civil and Roman Law. Decius had favored the Pisan council (1511) while teaching at Pavia. As a result, he was placed under the ban of excommunication by Pope Julius II. At that point, Louis XII became his protector. On 7 January 1513, "les consuls de l'université de Valence en Dauphiné furent informés de son arrivée prochaine."<sup>59</sup> When one of Decius' former students ascended to the papal throne as Leo X in March 1513, the famous teacher was released from the ban and thus freely permitted to continue his brilliant career at Valence.<sup>60</sup>

Just when Longueil arrived at Valence is not known, although he did spend several semesters there studying Civil and Roman law under the direction of Decius. With that

guidance, Longueil was able to complete with highest honors the examinations for the Doctor of Law degree. He writes of this in his first "Defense Oration" against Celso Mellini in 1519.<sup>61</sup> In addition to his examinations, Longueil composed and published his Oratio de Laudibus Jurisprudentiae, in which he compares the military and legal professions.<sup>62</sup>

Even before he had completed this endeavor, Longueil wrote a letter to his friend Pierre Brisson which casts further light on his early life, and which undoubtedly reveals the source of some of Longueil's distaste for military life. This letter was written from Valence on 4 December 1513, only a week following his return from a most adventuresome experience in Switzerland. The exact date of this experience is known, for it is well identified from statements within the letter itself. The period covered in the letter begins on 13 August and ends on 28 October 1513: "Digressus hinc sum Idib. Augusti, prius testatus, quid de vestiario, libris, peculioque meo, si quid mihi accidisset, fieri vellem. Redii quinto Calen. Novembris, cum amicis spem reditus fecissem ad Calen. Septembres."<sup>63</sup>

Although the "Vita" mentions this experience, it offers no explanation for the unexpected extension of the journey, the events or individuals he encountered, nor the maladies which befell him.<sup>64</sup> In his letter to Brisson, Longueil mentions the victory of the Swiss over the French at the Battle of Novara. This victory came to them on 6 June 1513,

although they were outnumbered three-to-one by the French.<sup>65</sup> Their victory maintained the Swiss reputation as a continuous factor in the power politics of Western Europe because of the prestige of their mercenary infantry.<sup>66</sup> Because of his dread of the Swiss at this time, Longueil chose, "*hic socios duos Allobroges, Helvetiorum foederatos, qui me per cisalpinos illos tractus comitarentur.*"<sup>67</sup>

While on that journey, Longueil and his associates were suspected as spies and encountered by a small band of horsemen. In the skirmish which ensued, one of Longueil's associates was killed outright. The second was wounded before he leaped into a river and swam to safety. Longueil himself was severely wounded and taken captive to Martigny. Later he was moved to Glarus where he was interrogated in Latin, probably by Huldreich Zwingli who was then serving as pastor at Glarus and was an outspoken opponent of the French.<sup>68</sup> During his incarceration at Glarus, Longueil was placed on trial as a French spy. While the magistrates (*decemviri*) were in session deliberating his case, "*ab exercitu literae decimviris redduntur, quibus de foedere cum Francis Divioni inito, certiores fiunt.*"<sup>69</sup> This truce came on 13 September 1513, but it was not ratified by Louis XII.<sup>70</sup>

At that juncture, the Cardinal of Sion and Papal Legate, Matthias Schinner, is reported by Longueil to have come onto the scene. This and all the succeeding events in Longueil's letter may be mere fabrications, if indeed the

portion of the letter is to be believed. According to Becker, there was no time in Schinner's schedule for him to make a side trip to visit Glarus during the period immediately following the truce at Dijon.<sup>71</sup> The narrative of Longueil's letter to Brisson from this point becomes so fanciful that even he is compelled to say of his eleven-week trip filled with perils, "Dubitas hic me aut Ulyssis, aut Aeneae aerumnas etiamnum superasse? an non haec potius ficta, quam facta non credentur? an a tot iliadum calamitatibus, relictum novae plagae putares?"<sup>72</sup> Severely wounded, incarcerated in chains (about the feet, wrists and neck), tortured, shipwreck, robbed and beaten, Longueil continued on his way only to be caught in a fire which caused him to leap from an inn window and leave all his remaining possessions behind. Still, in spite of it all, he found time to devote to his scholarly pursuits. He reports that he read Thucydides, Arrian and Ammianus Marcellinus in addition to memorizing the whole of "Titulum de Actionibus ex quarto Civilium institutionum libro: deliniavi graphice quicquid terrarum inter Alpes, Juram, et Rhodanum, Rhenum item, et Massiliense mare jacet," besides exploring the Swiss countryside.<sup>73</sup> In all, it appears that Longueil's imagination is every bit as prodigious as his appetite for learning.

Some credence could be given to his narrative if supportive evidence were forthcoming from another independent source. As it now stands, it seems to be the machination of

his own mind. What it does in fact is undercut the reliability of the foundation for the details of his "Vita," since that too is based primarily on his own authority and influence.<sup>74</sup> With such a vivid imagination, it is not at all surprising to find Longueil attempting to appear several years younger than he was in reality. This would make him seem even greater than he was, since his accomplishments would be condensed into a shorter time span. His passing himself off as being born somewhere other than where he actually was would also begin to help him create an identity which would not be overshadowed by Erasmus, whose fame was already widespread and known to Longueil. In this same letter for instance, Longueil lists, "magna Erasmi adagia" as one of the titles he purchased while on his journey into Switzerland. Sadly, it was destroyed in the fire Longueil encountered at the inn on his return trip according to his account.<sup>75</sup>

Upon completion of his journeys and his doctoral work at Valence, Longueil had arrived at another turning point in his career. Having been granted French citizenship by Louis XII,<sup>76</sup> and at the request of his family and friends, he returned to Paris where he practised law for about two years.<sup>77</sup> Just when he arrived in Paris is not certainly known, but his name appears frequently in the Register of the Parlement of Paris during the period following 12 November 1514. Under the entry of 6 June 1515, the notice of his selection as counselor-clerk to the Parlement appears.<sup>78</sup> Gnoli is mildly

astonished at Longueil, "che giovane com'era fu eletto fra i cento Consiglieri del parlamento de Parigi, altissima magistratura riservata ad uomini già provetti."<sup>79</sup> He would be less surprised about this election and would also be able to fit in the details of Longueil's various travels if he had been apprised of the correct date of Longueil's birth.<sup>80</sup> The fact is simply that Longueil was not extremely young, for in June 1515 he was in his thirtieth year according to the chronology presented in the present study. Nevertheless, it was a very great honor. It was bestowed upon him not only because of his family's standing or the efforts of his own friends,<sup>81</sup> but primarily as a result of his own outstanding accomplishments and abilities. Among those accomplishments was the publication of his Oratio de Laudibus Divi Ludovici (1510), which he had dedicated to the Duke of Valois. In January 1515, the young Duke ascended the throne as Francis I.

During his leisure Longueil continued to pursue his study of ancient literature, especially the work of Pliny the Younger on Natural History. Because of his misunderstanding of the date of Longueil's birth and early activities, Gnoli is compelled to place Longueil's journey into Switzerland in this time-period, but that does not square with the facts as they are now known. Gnoli's statement of a lacuna in the knowledge of Longueil's movements except that he was at Paris before coming to Rome is exaggerated.<sup>82</sup> While he was there, he completed his work on Pliny, often giving lectures on the



subject. He transmitted this data to Nicolaus Beralduſ who collated it into Pliny's XXXVII Books on Natural History, which he was then preparing for publication in late 1516.<sup>83</sup>

Longueil's studies involved more than a mere accumulation of data for the factual content of Pliny's work. It also required first-hand knowledge and facility with the ancient languages. As a result, he and Beralduſ undertook to study Greek together under the Italian humanist Aleander, editor of the Moralia of Plutarch published in 1509. Aleander had taught Greek publicly in Paris from mid-1511 to the end of 1513,<sup>84</sup> and Longueil had taken some instruction from him or one of his students. At any rate, during the first months of 1514, Longueil prepared himself and began translating Plutarch's work later that year. This translation was completed some time after August 1514, and before 1 January 1515.<sup>85</sup> It seems that Longueil had come into conflict with a certain François de Melun following his arrival in Paris. Louis Ruzé, adviser to the Parlement of Paris since 1512, and named Civil Lieutenant of Châtelet in 1515, interceded to placate the troubled adversaries. Longueil thus dedicated his translation to Ruzé, since from Plutarch's work he knows precisely how to draw benefit from the slanderous remarks of his adversary.<sup>86</sup> Longueil's effort was presented to Ruzé as a gift on 1 January 1515, but it was not published until 1968.<sup>87</sup>

Unable to achieve an adequate grasp of those ancient languages in Paris, Longueil was encouraged to go to Italy to

gain expertise in Greek. This encouragement came from several quarters. Francis I had reconquered Milan by a brilliant victory over the Swiss at Marignano on 13 September 1515. This victory opened the Italian peninsula to the French for the first time in over a decade, and it shattered the military prestige of the Swiss.<sup>88</sup> In the autumn of 1515, Janus Lascaris had come to Milan to greet Francis I on behalf of Pope Leo X. While there, he may have solicited students for his new Greek college founded at the invitation of Leo X in an attempt to train the Graeculi ("Greeklings") who had moved to the Eternal City from various places in the former Byzantine Empire.<sup>89</sup> In addition, Guillaume Budé, the most outstanding French humanist of the time, responded to Longueil's request to have daily instruction in Greek by saying that he did not have the time to devote to it.<sup>90</sup> Finally, Ruzé himself offered to bear the entire expense for the program of study Longueil proposed, although this fact has only recently come to light.<sup>91</sup> All these factors came to bear on Longueil's decision and his destination was sealed.<sup>92</sup> As Simar so aptly states, "Alea jacta est: après quelques hésitations, il abandonne parents, amis, carrière, fortune pour se lancer dans la voie des aventures. La Rome des merveilles, la Rome des César, des Cicéron, des Plin, la Rome de Léon X a ébloui l'homme du Nord. Le génie italien continue à exercer son irrésistible séduction!"<sup>93</sup>

1. Cf., ch. i.
2. Cf., ch. ii, and nn. 38-45, 62-67.
3. Cf., ch. iii.
4. Cf., ch. iv, and nn. 5-67.
5. Cf., ch. iv, and nn. 68-111.
6. Cf., ch. v.
7. Cf., ch. vi.
8. Cf., ch. iv, and n. 12.

9. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 1, asserts that the family originated in Burgundy, but he is undoubtedly in error. Perhaps he views the situation at the time of the birth of Christophe rather than the family in its historical perspective. Cf., ch. ii, n. 3.

10. Simar, Longueil, p. 5, identifies these three as "Denis, Guillaume (III) et Robert," and asserts that they were "sous la bannière du connétable Charles d'Albret et y trouvèrent la mort à ses côtés." Cf., ch. i, n. 2.

11. Becker, Longueil, p. 1, indicates that one member of the family, the son of the chamberlain of the Bishop of Le Mans, became a doctor at the Sorbonne. Cf., ch. i, n. 4.

12. Simar, Longueil, p. 5.

13. Becker, Longueil, p. 1, states that the cardinal died under strange circumstances resulting from the maneuvering of Louis XI over the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438).

14. Perhaps this is where Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 1, gets the notion that the Longueil family originated in Burgundy.

15. Simar, Longueil, p. 6. Also cf., Moreri, Le grand dictionnaire historique, III, cols. 361-363, and ch. iii, n. 18.

16. Becker, Longueil, pp. 1-2, and n. 1, follows Moreri on this point.

17. Simar, Longueil, p. 6, n. 2, lists seven children. They include, "Jean (IV), Antoine, Pierre (vicaire-général de

Richard-Olivier), Christophe, seigneur de Noyers en Bourgogne, Jeanne, Girarde, François et Denise."

18. Cf., ch. iv, and nn. 17-20.

19. Gnoli, Un giudizio, pp. 1-2, n. 1. Also cf., ch. iv discussion.

20. Roersch, "Longueil (Christophe, de)," col. 349. Also cf., ch. iii, n. 31.

21. Simar, Longueil, p. 4, as well as the discussion supra, ch. iv.

22. Becker, Longueil, p. 2, as well as n. 6.

23. For an interpretation of Becker's reluctance to reject the traditional view of Longueil's birthplace, cf., supra ch. iv discussion and nn. 111-113.

24. Simar, Longueil, p. 8.

25. Becker, Longueil, p. 3.

26. Becker, Aus Frankreichs Frührenaissance, p. 8. Cf., ch. iii, n. 65.

27. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 2.

28. On this point it is worthwhile to see Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 10b, and the slightly different text of the same oration as it appears in Gnoli, Un giudizio, "Appendix II," p. 124. Cf., ch. i, n. 1.

29. Simar, Longueil, p. 8, n. 2, and Becker, Longueil, p. 4, agree on this date.

30. Simar, Longueil, p. 8.

31. Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Vita," fol. 5b.

32. Becker, Longueil, p. 4. Also cf., supra discussion in ch. iv, and nn. 29-37. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 3, and n. 2, places this incident in 1510, after Longueil had left Poitiers. He asserts that Longueil would have been too young to serve with Louis XII in 1502.

33. Johnson, Europe in the Sixteenth Century, pp. 39-40; cf., ch. vi, n. 3.

34. Cf., Gnoli, Un giudizio, "Appendix I," pp. 110-111, as well as Becker, Longueil, p. 4, and Aus Frankreichs Frührenaissance, p. 8. Also cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Vita," fol. 5b.

35. Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Vita," fol. 6a.

36. R. Trevor Davies, The Golden Century of Spain, 1501-1621 (Torchbook; New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 32.

37. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 2; Becker, Longueil, p. 6, although the author there misdates Philip's death as 27 September. The phrasing of Longueil's job is obscure.

38. Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Vita," fol. 6a. Also cf., Simar, Longueil, pp. 9-10; Becker, Longueil, pp. 4-7; Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 2.

39. William H. Prescott, History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella the Catholic, 3 vol. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1871), III, 221-222.

40. Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Vita," fol. 4a. Also cf., Longueil's letter to Pierre Brisson, dated 4 November 1513, as discussed supra, ch. ii, and nn. 32-36.. The specific reference may be seen in Goldschmidt, "De Longueil's Letter," p. 176, cf., ch. i, n. 3. Becker, Longueil, p. 6, n. 3, erroneously dates this letter as 6 November instead of 4 November 1513.

41. Celso Mellini agrees with this chronology as he addresses his first attack on Longueil. Cf., Gnoli, Un giudizio, "Appendix I," pp. 110 and 113, where Mellini says, "Duos et viginti annos natus, literas adhuc se ait nullas calluisse." Also cf., Simar, Longueil, p. 38, and n. 1; Becker, Longueil, p. 2, and n. 6; as well as the discussion supra, ch. iv.

42. Simar, Longueil, p. 10.

43. Ibid., p. 11, and nn. 1-4.

44. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 2.

45. Becker, Longueil, p. 8, and n. 3, cites E. Friedlander and C. Malagola (eds.), Acta Nationis Germanicae Universitatis Bononiensis (Berlin, 1887), p. 127, which lists Longueil's name and a handwritten note: "Ciceronianae phrasis peritissimus."

46. Simar, Longueil, p. 11.

47. Becker, Longueil, p. 8.

48. Simar, Longueil, p. 15, and nn. 1-3, asserts that the date of this oration is not known with certainty, and assigns to it a year date of 1508 or 1509. In this he agrees with Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 15b, where Longueil dates it eleven years before his "Defense Oration" of May 1519.

49. Cf., ch. ii, and nn. 2-4. "Appendix B," contains the text of this letter.

50. Cf., ch. ii, and nn. 2-4.

51. Cf., ch. ii, and nn. 2-4. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 2, erroneously asserts that Longueil was about twenty years of age. It would be correct to say that he was now in his twenty-fifth year, following the chronology as presented supra, ch. iv. The events of this incident are briefly summarized in Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Vita," fol. 5a.

52. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 3, and n. 1, indicates that he was unable to find this letter Joanni Balenio, so he refers to the incident as it is related by Celso Mellini and recorded in the text of his "Appendix I," pp. 102-103. Cf., "Appendix D," for that text.

53. Simar, Longueil, p. 32, and n. 1. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 16a, places the responsibility for the publication of this material on Pierre Brisson and Geoffroy Bourgeois. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 3, assumes that Longueil was compelled to leave Poitiers immediately following this incident, but he offers no basis for such a view.

54. Cf., Goldschmidt, "De Longueil's Letter," p. 169, and "Appendix E."

55. Cf., "Appendix E."

56. Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Vita," fol. 4. Gnoli, Un giudizio, pp. 3-4, notes this reference to extensive travels and states that he is unable to find them discussed in the various works about Longueil; nor can Gnoli allow for sufficient time in which such travels could take place. The difficulty lies with his assumed year of Longueil's birth. The problem is resolved in the chronology as it is presented in the present study.

57. Ferguson, Europe in Transition, pp. 408-409; cf., ch. iii, n. 73.

58. Thomson, Europe in Renaissance and Reformation, p. 418; cf., ch. iii, n. 73.

59. Simar, Longueil, pp. 39-40.

60. Becker, Longueil, pp. 14-15.

61. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 11a. Also cf., Gnoli, Un giudizio, "Appendix II," p. 125, which has slight textual variations.

62. Cf., ch. ii, and nn. 5-6.

63. Cf., "Appendix E," and ch. ii, and nn. 32-36.

64. Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Vita," fol. 4b.

65. Johnson, Europe in the Sixteenth Century, p. 76.

66. Garrett Mattingly, Renaissance Diplomacy (Peregrine Books; Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1955), p. 114.

67. Cf., "Appendix E."

68. Cf., "Appendix E," which reads, "Ergo jubent me interrogari latine per eius pagi sacerdotem, iisdem de rebus, super queis Octoduri appellatus fueram." Also cf., Grimm, The Reformation Era, 1500-1650, p. 184; cf., ch. iii, n. 73.

69. Cf., "Appendix E."

70. Goldschmidt, "De Longueil's Letter," p. 174, n. 1.

71. Becker, Aus Frankreichs Frührenaissance, pp. 8-9.

72. Cf., "Appendix E."

73. Cf., "Appendix E."

74. Cf., ch. iv, and especially nn. 69-110.

75. Cf., "Appendix E."

76. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 31b.

77. Ibid., fol. 11a, as reprinted with slight variations in Gnoli, Un giudizio, "Appendix II," p. 125.

78. Paris, Archives Nationales, Reg. X<sup>1</sup>a 1517, passim. With reference to this appointment, cf., fol. 189a. Also cf., Simar, Longueil, p. 46, n. 2. Becker, Longueil, p. 17, n. 3,

misdates the event as 9 June instead of 6 June 1515. Cf., also ch. i, and n. 37

79. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 3. Cf., also his "Appendix II," p. 125, for the authority behind his statement. The text there differs slightly from Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 11a.

80. Gnoli, Un giudizio, pp. 3-4; also cf., supra, n. 56.

81. Simar, Longueil, p. 46.

82. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 4.

83. Becker, Longueil, pp. 17-18, dates this publication 16 November, but cf., ch. ii, and nn. 7-8, as well as Simar, Longueil, pp. 46-49, where it is dated 15 October. Cf., Parks, "Did Pole Write the 'Vita Longolii'?" pp. 275-276, as well as ch. iii, n. 71.

84. Aulotte, "Une Rivalité," pp. 549-550; cf., ch. i, n. 3.

85. Ibid., p. 550; it consisted of only one essay.

86. Ibid., pp. 552-553.

87. Ibid., pp. 549-573. Also cf., ch. i, and nn. 3, 31, as well as ch. ii, and n. 99.

88. Johnson, Europe in the Sixteenth Century, pp. 79-80.

89. Mitchell, Rome in the High Renaissance, pp. 93-94; cf., ch. iii, n. 89.

90. Becker, Longueil, p. 18. Cf., Aulotte, "Une Rivalité," p. 550, and Gnoli, Un giudizio, pp. 5-6, who says this is the reason Longueil went to Rome. He asserts, "e attendere in modo a quello studio da superare e oscurare per dispetto la fama del Budeo." M.—M. de la Garanderie, "Les Relations d'Érasme avec Paris," pp. 49-53, indicates that Longueil's attitude toward Erasmus was such that it played an important role in this move, especially in Ruzé underwriting the cost; cf., ch. i, and n. 3.

91. Becker, Longueil, pp. 18-19, n. 4, but he gives an erroneous bibliographic entry. The statement, "Interim cum ab Ludovico Ruzaeo Parisiorum Juridico, cujus unius liberalitate studia mea nitebantur impetrassem, ut hoc quoque anno mihi Romae liceret esse, . . ." is found on fol. 7b.



Cf., ch. ii, and n. 11. Compare the second edition with that reprinted in Gnoli, Un giudizio, "Appendix II," p. 125, as well as Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 11b, for the variations among these three renditions of the same passage.

92. Renaudet, Érasme et l'Italie, p. 202; cf., ch. iii, n. 97.

93. Simar, Longueil, p. 50.

## CHAPTER VIII

### A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF LONGUEIL:

#### HIS LAST YEARS

As he traveled to Rome during the summer of 1516, Christophe de Longueil carried with him a letter he had requested from Guillaume Budé to Janus Lascaris. This letter is simply dated, "Paris, 10 juin," and it has been carelessly ascribed to the year 1519 instead of 1516 by Louis Delaruelle in his Répertoire Analytique et Chronologique de la Correspondence de Guillaume Budé.<sup>1</sup> In that letter, Budé complains of the long silence between friends of some twenty years. He commends Longueil to Lascaris and passes greetings to him from the French ambassador and Royal Advocate to the Parliament of Paris, Roger Barme, as well as François Deloynes and other friends.

D. Gnoli says that Longueil arrived at Rome in the autumn of 1516,<sup>2</sup> and others merely indicate the year as 1516,<sup>3</sup> although J. E. Sandys and P. S. Allen assert that it was not until 1517 that Longueil arrived there.<sup>4</sup> All recent accounts agree that he came to Rome sometime during the illustrious

papacy of Leo X, which began on 11 March 1513, and they rely heavily on the Elogia Doctorum Virorum of Paulus Jovius when relating the incident.<sup>5</sup> The account of Longueil's arrival in Rome as imaginatively related by Sandys captures the adventuresome spirit of Longueil as it has already been portrayed. He writes, "On a day in 1517 a mysterious stranger from the North appeared on the scene. He was apparently some thirty years of age; he wore a distinctly foreign garb; his smart red cap and his closely fitting cloak were suggestive of a German soldier. Unlike the ordinary soldier, he wandered among the half-ruined monuments of ancient Rome, he even visited the modern Libraries, and, in an unguarded moment, he entered a College. He there met some clever Professors, and entered into conversation with them. They were at once struck by his extraordinary acumen, and his skill in word-fence; and they soon found out that the 'German soldier' was really a French or a Belgian scholar in disguise, and that, in fact, he was none other than Longolius."<sup>6</sup>

Although this account does generally follow the narrative of Jovius, it ignores his statement that Longueil was trying to hide his intentions to observe the great ancient monuments, denude the libraries, and acquire the knowledge he fruitlessly sought in other centers of learning.<sup>7</sup> Gnoli believes that this latter story is a later fabrication designed as part of an attack made against Longueil by Celso Mellini, since Longueil only planned to spend about two years

in the study of Greek at Rome. In fact, he feels that it does not warrant serious consideration.<sup>8</sup> All of this points up the fact that Longueil continued to stir up controversy wherever he went, and that controversy continued long after he died in 1522. Some of the divergent strains in Longueil's personality continued to reveal themselves while he was at Rome during the 1516-1519 period.

On the one hand, in order to accomplish his objective of mastering the Greek language, Longueil became a student of Lascaris, as he related in a letter written to Statius in September 1520. In that letter Longueil said, "Nam quod ad Ianum Lascarim attinet, est ille omnino mihi maiore et quasi sanctioris cuiusdam necessitudinis vinculo coniunctus quam tibi, quod eius mihi optima Romae opera uni in graecis literis uti licuerit."<sup>9</sup> In another letter written about the same time, Longueil expressed to Budé his awareness that he should write a book in Greek. In it he wrote, "Deinde eorum hic mihi et iam facta est, et ut spero fiet, graecorum librorum potestas, sine quibus instituta à nobis opera nunquam neque ex sententia neque ex dignitate nostra absolvi potuissent."<sup>10</sup> Midway between the time he arrived at Rome in 1516 and the writing of these letters, Longueil had sent to Budé a letter he had composed in Greek and delivered it by means of Bartolini, probably during the first week of October 1518. That letter received a response from Budé, also written in Greek, dated 15 October.<sup>11</sup> His quick response was in itself enough

to indicate to Longueil that he was not yet ready to unseat Budé as a writer of Greek. Gnoli mentions another letter addressed to Gregorio Cortese, Abbot of Lerins, "in un greco bizzarro dal Longolio."<sup>12</sup> Although Longueil did not maintain his early enthusiasm for mastery of Greek, he did continue its pursuit. As Becker indicates, "Das Griechische blieb für ihn zeitlebens ein ernstes Studium, das Lateinische wurde das Ziel seiner virtuoson Betätigung."<sup>13</sup>

On the more mundane level, Longueil appears to have had certain pecuniary difficulties early in his Roman residence. Even with assistance from Louis Ruzé,<sup>14</sup> it was necessary for Longueil to take up residence as the guest of Giulio Tomarozzo, a Roman citizen engaged in foreign trade who was not only a patron of the arts, but the writer of elegies which drew praises from no less a personage than Pietro Bembo. As compensation for his maintenance, Giulio engaged the services of Longueil as pedagogue for his sons Flaminio and Giuliano.<sup>15</sup> Still, Longueil did not have sufficient funds with which to provide for himself a proper maintenance. At least this is what Celso Mellini said when he charged, "Manifesto quoque omnes sciunt hoc triennium quam diu Romae fuisti, te servitutem servisse, et assectandis in ludum pueris, obediendisque pedagogi muneribus aegre tibi victum comparasse."<sup>16</sup>

Within a year of his arrival at Rome, Longueil departed from the household of Tomarozzo. Gnoli suggests that his move to the household of his kinsman Mariano Castellano, an

honored citizen of culture and refinement, was because of Tomarozzo's leaving Rome possibly because of business reverses.<sup>17</sup> This is confirmed by Longueil's own statement in his "Defense Oration" as it appears in various editions. In the text of Gnoli's "Appendix II," it reads, "Factus sum voti compos, cum aliorum civium vestrorum humanitate, tum Julii Tomarotii atque Mariani Castellani hospitalite: quorum apud hunc, biennium, apud illum, annum fere divertii."<sup>18</sup> The text of the edition housed in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan reads, "Factus sum ejus voti compos, cum aliorum civium vestrorum humanitate, tum vero Juli Tomarotii atque Mariani Castellani virorum clarissimorum hospitalitate. Quorum quidem apud hunc, justum biennium, apud illum annum ferè integrum sum commoratus."<sup>19</sup> Still different is the text of Longueil's "Defense Oration" in the Opera, Junta. It reads, "Ac quod optabam quidem, id cum aliorum civium vestrorum quotidiano usu, tum vero Julii Tomarotii, atque Mariani Castellani, virorum clarissimorum hospicio atque familiaritate sum consecutus."<sup>20</sup> With such variation in the text of Longueil's "Defense Oration" between the time it was delivered in 1518, reprinted twice in 1519, and then published in the 1524 Junta text, the view of Mellini and Gnoli gains credence by default. It seems that Longueil's appreciation of the hospitality, wealth, and learning of his hosts grew as time elapsed.<sup>21</sup>

Besides working at his Greek and trying to earn or find pecuniary support, Longueil also found ample opportunity

to mingle with the most famous literati on the Roman scene during the papacy of Leo X. Of them he says, "Quos tum denique patuit ementito, ejus quod hic literis censeatur collegii nomine, Academiam Rom. isti appellant, senatus consulto quo me civitate ornaveratis, temere intercessisse, nisi vero, qua sunt vel impudentia vel stultitia, illud se vobis probaturos facillime sperabant, quod sibi antea scilicet persuasissent penes egregios illos suos magistros eruditi ordinis consensum existere, civeis autem illos vestros cum omni aliarum laudum genere florentissimos, tum vero doctrina atque optimarum artium studijs eruditissimos Camillum Portium, Baptistam Caselium, Evangelistam Magdalenum, huius gentilem Iulianum, Marcum Torquatum, Baptistam Palinum, Hieronymum Gotofredum, M. Antoninum Alterium, et tanto patre dignum Iulium Alterium, Marium Salomonium, Vincentium Rusticum, Stephanum Thebolum, Vincentium Pimpinellam, Ioannem Goritium, ortu quidem Gemanum illum, sed iure ac virtute Romanum, Laelium ad haec Maximum, Hieronymum Alexandrinum, aliosque non paucos nullo esse neque in precio, neque in numero putandos, haud sane magis quam summa illa duo reliquae Italiae lumina atque ornamenta Petrum Bembum, et Iacobum Sadoletum."<sup>22</sup> In this setting, Longueil quickly acquired a well-deserved fame for learning. As Gnoli puts it, "Acquistatasi la stima, non solo del Bembo, ma del Sadoletto e de' migliori letterati della città, egli entrò in grazia anche ai piu colti cardinali romani, quali il famoso Pompeo Colonna. il Cesarini, il Della

Valle, lo Jacovacci: la sua molta dottrina e l'acume del suo ingegno risplendevano maggiormente per una memoria prodigiosa."<sup>23</sup> Nevertheless, he did not follow the carefree pattern of the literati. Instead, he worked alone as was rather ill at ease in group situations. Gnoli thinks that Longueil was unable to dissemble the high opinion he had of his own talents, as well as a tendency to undervalue those of others. In his manner, Longueil seems to have portrayed barbaric roughness instead of urbanity. Or, as Gnoli says, "Il non saper dissimulare il concetto altissimo che faceva di sè, e basso degli altri, lo rendeva odiosa a molti. Parlava abbondantemente e di tutto, con aria di maestro."<sup>24</sup>

Since he could rely on no one defender, Longueil's position in the Roman setting became precarious indeed when it was discovered that he had delivered his "Oration in Praise of Saint Louis" at Poitiers in 1510.<sup>25</sup> Something had to be done in order to avert a tragedy for Longueil. He quickly applied himself to the preparation of five orations on Italy and Rome. These were designed to offset the damage done in his former oration, when Rome and Italy were unfavorably compared with France and the French. Longueil mentions these panegyrics in his first "Defense Oration." He says, "Altero quam Roman veni non dum plenè vertente anno, cum mihi decretum esset ineunte tertio domum redire, conscripsi orationes quinque de Italiae ac urbis vestrae laudibus, quae essent cum Mariano Castellano dignum mutuae inter nos



caritatis pignus, et tanquam hospitalis quaedam tessera, tum vero perpetuum meae in nomen Romanum pietatis argumentum."<sup>26</sup>

Although these five orations were prepared for publication in 1518, they remain in manuscript form. They are to be found in the Vatican Library under the title, "Oratio apologetica in Urbis encomium manuscripta, et alia quattuor ejusdem generis."<sup>27</sup> Longueil completed the orations, which he dedicated to Mariano Castellano and read before the literati at the home of Giammatteo Giberti. He writes, "Locum, sedes, apparatusque omnem liberaliter nobis praebente Ioanne Matheo Giberto, cive vestro, ut honoris patrii longe amantissimo, sic ad promerendam omnium proborum doctorumque virorum gratiam in primis nato."<sup>28</sup> This was completed by the end of Longueil's projected two-year sojourn into Italy, and indeed it was his finest hour.

His many friends hoped to show a reciprocal sign of affection as a means of keeping him in Rome.<sup>29</sup> On 31 January 1519, a resolution was introduced to the Roman Conservatory by Antonio de' Petrucci. It would bestow on Longueil the honor of Roman citizenship. It was probably voted upon in the 14 February session, and possibly conferred on 9 April, although the events within the Conservatory were such that it was not altogether certain that the certificate of citizenship was actually granted.<sup>30</sup> In addition, Bembo, acting in his capacity as secretary to Pope Leo X, secured for Longueil many favors. Among these were the removal of the defect of

his birth, his elevation and nomination as Notary and Count Palatine, and the grant of a handsome stipend. All these favors were indications of a bright and prosperous future for Longueil. Although the exact date when these favors were bestowed is not clear, there are some indicators which help place them into this setting. They were most certainly conferred by the time of their official acknowledgment stated in two letters written on 12 April 1519 on behalf of Leo X.<sup>31</sup> These honors would be forthcoming at this time because of two additional factors. In the first place, Longueil had received an invitation to become the tutor of the twelve-year-old King Louis II of Hungary, who had recently ascended to the throne of his father two years earlier. This invitation was again associated with Longueil's old friend Andrea del Borgo.<sup>32</sup> In addition, it was time for him to return to Paris, where he could presumably reenter the scene with even more honor and prestige than when he had left to study in Italy.<sup>33</sup> Finally, the transition of the Empire from Maximilian, who died on 12 January 1519, to the King of Spain (since 1516) who would not be confirmed as Emperor Charles V until 18 June 1519, had taken place.<sup>34</sup>

In the meantime, the opponents of Longueil were determined to be heard. They translated portions of Longueil's Poitiers Oration into Italian and distributed it widely.<sup>35</sup> Then, as Baldassare Castiglione relates, a young Roman named Celso Mellini, "delivered a long and eloquent oration in the

finest possible manner. He attacked Longolio in the Pope's presence with so much power and pathos that every one wept to hear him."<sup>36</sup> In addition, they placed a protest before the Council in the name of the Roman Academy.<sup>37</sup> Finally, Mellini drew up a formal deed of accusation by which Longueil "was solemnly cited to appear before the senate and people of Rome on the charge of high treason (*crimen laesae maiestatis*)."<sup>38</sup> Longueil was expected to defend himself against the charge that, "as a youthful student in France, he had once had the audacity to eulogize the ancient Gauls at the expense of the ancient Romans."<sup>39</sup>

A fierce controversy arose on the subject, and soon the whole of Rome was divided into two parties. The finer spirits favored Longueil, but they were far outnumbered by his boistrous enemies, and "Longolio's supporters were hissed in the streets, stones were thrown and people wounded, and the Flemish scholar's effigy was represented on walls transfixed by a dagger or encircled with flames."<sup>40</sup> Although the evidence for this portrayal comes from Longueil himself, the fact that he had stirred up the Roman citizenry to virtual armed revolt against him is stated by Bembo, in a letter written to Longueil when he was beginning to express fears of opposition against him at Padua.<sup>41</sup> Finally, during the second week of June 1519, the "Defense Orations" he had prepared, and which Marcantonio Flaminio had offered to deliver, were withdrawn by Sadoletto and later published.<sup>42</sup> Becker suggests

that Longueil's silence on this occasion was out of fear of reprisal.<sup>43</sup> Although Longueil had presented a more cogent argument, Mellini was the hero of the hour, as the Archdeacon of Mantua di Gabbioneta wrote to Mario Equicola. He said that the young Roman was another Cicero, and related how, following the trial, his father Mario Mellini entertained the whole Academy at his villa, while his rival fled from Rome for fear of his life.<sup>44</sup> With all the tumult, it is not surprising to read Pastor's opinion that, "the Longueil affair caused more disquietude in Rome in 1519 than did the movement of Luther."<sup>45</sup> Entries in I Diarii di Marino Sanuto for the year 1519 tend to confirm this view.<sup>46</sup>

All this notwithstanding, Gnoli perceptively observes, "Il Longolio era gia tanto innanzi negli studi, che Erasmo, fin dall'anno 1518, prevedeva in lui uno di quelli che avrebbero oscurato il suo nome; ma per essere appieno apprezzato nella società romana, gli mancava quel gusto e quel sapore de buona latinità che a Roma si teneva in pregio soprattutto."<sup>47</sup> Even before Longueil became entangled in the Mellini controversy, and while he was preparing his "Orations" on Rome, he continued to attend to his literary pursuits. In addition to the Greek letter he penned to Cortese on 31 October 1518 about his desire to study at Lérins, he also wrote to Jacques Lucas on 29 January 1519.<sup>48</sup> Longueil's direct relations with Erasmus can be traced to this letter, which seems to have been sent from Lucas to Ruzé and then on

to Erasmus.<sup>49</sup> While the turmoil surrounding the Mellini controversy was coming to its peak, Erasmus wrote to Longueil on 1 April 1519.<sup>50</sup> When he fled from Rome, Longueil traveled north, went through Paris to England, and visited Erasmus in Louvain on the way back.<sup>51</sup> Instead of the two humanists establishing a better rapport, however, this meeting drove them farther apart, and it ultimately proved to be the blow that would make their characters irreconcilably incompatible. Even earlier in his career, the youthful "Longueil se refuse à admirer Érasme comme une idole."<sup>52</sup> Now he placed his elder contemporary on the defensive over Ciceronian style. In fact, following their two days of meeting, as Garanderie relates, "L'enthousiasme artificiel et superficiel qui, en 1516 et 1517, portait si haut le renom d'Érasme qu'il paraissait inviolable, s'est tempéré et détérioré. . . . Le dialogue d'Érasme avec Paris cesse d'être actif et vivant après 1519; il se perd dans un silence plein de méfiance."<sup>53</sup> The hostility and animosity grew to the extent that when Erasmus published his Ciceronianus in 1528, four years after Longueil's death, Longueil was the object of his scornful attack.<sup>54</sup> But Erasmus is only the most prominent example of a pattern of deteriorating relationships in Longueil's career. Comte Jean de Pins relates a similar pattern, although not nearly so intense, between Longueil and Jean de Pins, the French ambassador to Venice until April 1520.<sup>55</sup> Similarly, Louis Ruzé, who had underwritten Longueil's studies at Rome, had become

estranged. The catalyst in this instance was none other than Budé.

While he was on his northern sojourn, Longueil's rival, Celso Mellini, had the occasion to gain great favor with Leo X. When he was awarded a post in the papal household, however, he met with a tragic accident and did not live to enjoy it. He was riding home from the papal residence at La Magliana when he drowned one dark November night in 1519.<sup>56</sup> Meanwhile, Longueil's friends in Rome had published his highly polished "Defense Orations." In early August, a copy was sent to Alessandro Pazzi by Giulio de' Medici. Alessandro was delighted at their contents and related to Giulio that Longueil must be persuaded to remain in Italy.<sup>57</sup> In December Longueil returned to Italy and, indeed, "he was offered the Latin chair at Florence by Cardinal Giulio de' Medici, and invited to return to Rome and receive the honors of citizenship."<sup>58</sup>

Longueil returned to Venice instead of Rome, and on 31 January he wrote to Sadoletto.<sup>59</sup> He mentioned being in receipt of several letters while on his trip. The first came to him in England, it was dated 8 September 1519. When he was at Milan he received one dated 12 December. Still a third letter from Sadoletto contained the offer from Florence. Longueil remained at Venice until he decided to take up a permanent place of residence. With assistance from Bembo, he resisted several offers during the early months of 1520

before finally deciding to settle at Padua.<sup>60</sup> There he could be in a prestigious center of learning, a veritable clearing house of political activity and intrigue, a hotbed of anti-Erasmian sentiment and, perhaps most important, out of the limelight of humanistic controversy among the Italian literati in which he found himself to be the focal point. Instead, he could devote himself entirely to study.

From the time Longueil moved to Padua, his life centered about some circumstances which were beyond his control.<sup>61</sup> Even where he may have had some role to play in determining the outcome of some situation, he seemed destined to erroneous judgment. This is reflected in Bembo's letter to him dated 20 August 1520. In it he responded to Longueil's growing anxiety over what seemed to him to be opposition against him at Padua. Bembo writes, "Tu vero qui Romae Populum Romanum stantem in te ac proprè armatum contempseris, sustinueris, fregeris, neque interea timoris signum ullum edideris, aut vocem emiseric, ab illo nunc non solum fracto, sed etiam ad tuas partes traducto, in urbe minime turbulenta Patauio tibi esse timendum duces?"<sup>62</sup>

His decision to reject the Latin chair at Florence, as well as other offers, led naturally to a cooling off in his relationships with those who had tried to assist him. This was especially true with Giulio de' Medici.<sup>63</sup> Not going to Rome left him in a relatively quiet setting, but being out of the center of literary activities left him to his own

resources, especially after the furor of the Mellini controversy had died down and Longueil found his former supporters had cooled in their rapport with him. This was the case in particular with Pins, Bembo, Sadoletto, and Leo X, all of whom showed a diminishing amount of favor for their former protégé.<sup>64</sup> He did receive a fixed stipend, and the Pope made him a request to write against Luther.<sup>65</sup> Surely this would be a way by which he could be kept from coming into conflict with another scholar in good standing with the Pope and other leaders of the literati in Italy. Longueil proposed to make his attack on Luther in the form of five Ciceronian orations. Only one of them was completed before his death in September 1522, although it was not published until 1524, when the Junta edition of his Opera made its appearance.<sup>66</sup>

Moving from the limelight and into the retreat of a scholar merely worsened Longueil's already precarious financial condition. All of his biographers agree that he was troubled about his pecuniary state, but Pins not only acknowledges the uncertain and increasingly impecunious condition of Longueil, he asserts that Longueil's desire to study rather than to do the duties associated with the support of the Court of Rome or other patrons made the matter unsolvable. He writes, "Car c'est bien le drame du malheureux Longueil: à chercher à la fois, et avec quelle maladresse, l'appui de plusieurs patrons, il y gagne que chacun



renvoie la balle à l'autre, et de 'lâchage' en 'lâchage' il vit de désillusions."<sup>67</sup> Longueil had demonstrated an almost uncanny aptitude for alienating his friends and former patrons. His removal from the center where he could adequately utilize the favors and honors he had received during his three years at Rome would merely compound and aggravate his state.

During the last two years of his life, Longueil's correspondence reveals that he began having difficulties with his finances to such a degree that on one occasion he sought assistance in obtaining an appointment in France. This can be inferred from the Pope's letter to Francis I, which was doubtless instigated as well as written by Bembo.<sup>68</sup> Later in 1521 he was finally compelled to move into the residence of a student newly arrived from England. This man became his warm and personal friend, and was the individual to whom Longueil would leave the care of his personal effects upon his death.<sup>69</sup>

These issues were compounded when hostilities between Francis I and Charles V were renewed in July 1521.<sup>70</sup> Some time after 8 August 1521, and certainly by 26 September, Longueil is known to have been in Venice.<sup>71</sup> While he was there, he noticed that his correspondence was not being attended to by those who had been so well-disposed to write earlier. Bembo, for instance, was ill and Longueil was shunted off to an ambassador and then to an aide.<sup>72</sup> He complains first to

one and then to another. In all, the year 1521 was quite gloomy for Longueil. Because of the renewed hostilities, his continually worsening economic condition, and his reluctance to do for himself, he planned no further travel that year. That prospect in itself was difficult for one who had traveled incessantly through the years.

When Pope Leo X died on 1 December 1521, it had a profound impact on Longueil, as did the election of Hadrian VI of Utrecht in January 1522.<sup>73</sup> The tumultuous year 1521 made it virtually impossible for Longueil to plan a trip. In 1522, however, with a new Pope on the throne, Longueil began to look to better things. In the meantime, he had been busy continuing "d'osciller d'un 'sauveur' à l'autre: mais Sadolet reste lointain et réticent; Ottaviano Grimaldi, le cousin de l'évêque de Grasse, plus réticent encore; il était écrit que le malheureux Longueil découragerait tous ses amis. Du reste, Adrien VI, le nouveau pape, est un ascète, un étranger, tout l'opposé d'un mécène."<sup>74</sup>

Early in the year he wrote to Bembo wishing him a speedy recovery. He then made plans to take some trips of his own. Things were beginning to look up for him after they had looked so bleak for so long. When summer came, he was busy making plans for a trip when, "he died at Venice of a sudden attack of fever, to the grief of Bembo and his friends."<sup>75</sup> Pastor says that "Longueil enjoyed his triumph [over Mellini] for a short time only, for, worn out by the

strain of work, he died in September, 1522."<sup>76</sup> It was actually three years, and Longueil may well have been taken by a sudden fever attack. There is ample reason to believe that he was. He may have been susceptible to it because he had worn himself out by his endless travels and disputations. It is apparent, however, that he had been in a state of somewhat poor health for the last two years of his life. When, for example, he wrote to Bembo on 1 August 1520, he complained of neck pains and indigestion.<sup>77</sup> From that time onward, there is a recurring strain of illness reflected in his correspondence. Perhaps he was suffering from some malady which caused a general weakening of his resistance, thus making him susceptible to fall prey to a sudden fever. Included among his books which have survived from his personal library are fourteen medical texts, which certainly indicates his interest, possibly morbid, in such matters.<sup>78</sup> Surely his economic plight did not help his condition. His desire to spend his efforts in the study of literature and eloquence were hard taskmasters, especially since he lacked the economic base to practice them without concern for the necessities of life. His gradual alienation from friends, until virtually all of them were gone, did not help his case. This could hardly be regarded as "enjoying" a triumph.

How sad it must have been for a man filled with such grandiose dreams of accomplishment when he entered into his last days. Seeking adoption into the Franciscan Order before

his death, he also made a plea that his memory be preserved, and that his works be published. His biographer says, "Antequam vero discederet in divi Francisci familiam voluit adoptari, eiusque habitu post mortem et templo sepeliri. Obiit xxxiiij aetatis anno .iiij. idus Septembris. Anno salutis generis humani .M.D. XXII. atque Patavii in Francisci quemadmodum ipse praescripsit sepultus."<sup>79</sup> He certainly had the age of his subject in error, but there is a pathos about this entry that conveys the utter loneliness and sadness of Christophe de Longueil during the closing days of his life. What a pity that a man whose career seemed destined to virtually unlimited success should end in such distress and loneliness!

1. Delaruelle, Répertoire, pp. 61-62, item 34. Cf., ch. vi, and nn. 106-107, as well as ch. iii, n. 49.

2. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 1, cf., ch. ii, n. 3.

3. Becker, Longueil, p. 19; Cartwright, Isabella d'Este, II, 16; Pastor, History of the Popes, VIII, 228; cf., chs. i, n. 4, and iii, nn. 58 and 61.

4. Sandys, Harvard Lectures, p. 160, cf., ch. iii, n. 57; Allen, Erasmī Epistolarum, III, 472, cf., ch. iii, n. 42.

5. Cf., ch. iii, and n. 9.

6. Sandys, Harvard Lectures, pp. 160-161. Also cf., Jovius, Elogia, p. 145, which reads, ". . . adeo dissimulata ingenij professione, vt rubro pileo, & astricta penula semi Germani militis habitum mentiretur, quippè cui mens erat auidè peregrinanti priscae felicitatis monumenta spectare, scrutari ingenia, Bibliothecas excutere, atque illud demum eruditae censurae iudicium, quod frustra alibi, quā sub Romano coelo quaeritur, certius, atque liquidius adipisci, sed intranti gymnasium, & acutè disputanti, non insulsi literarum professores, celeriter, & comiter personam detraxerunt, ita, vt mox honestissimi ciues Romani Flaminius, . . ." Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 46, mentions Jovius in his discussion and identifies him thus: "e il falso amico, Paolo Giovio." For the bibliographic entry concerning Jovius, cf., ch. iii, n. 9.

7. Jovius, Elogia, p. 145. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 6, says that this story is so preposterous that it does not bring honor to the acumen of Jovius for having transmitted it. Becker, Longueil, p. 19, is equally as severe in his judgment when he writes, "In Rom erschien er nach der boshaf-ten Schilderung von Paulus Jovius in der Tracht eines deutschen Rittersmanns mit rotem Filzhut und enganliegendem Koller."

8. Gnoli, Un giudizio, pp. 6-7; also cf., his "Appendix I," pp. 99-118, passim.

9. Longueil, Opera, Junta, II, 14, fol. 100a. Cf., ch. i, n. i, as well as ch. vi, and nn. 21-26.

10. Ibid., I, 14, fol. 75a. The date to this letter is undisputed as 31 August 1520, in accordance with the entry "Ex urbe Patauio pridie Cal. Septembr.," fol. 74b.

11. Delaruelle, Répertoire, pp. 84-86. Also cf., Becker, Longueil, pp. 19-20, and n. 1, as well as chs. v, and n. 94, and vi, and n. 106.

12. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 8, n. 2. Also cf., Simar, Longueil, p. 53, and nn. 1-2, as well as p. 183, where it is dated 31 October 1518, although Becker, Longueil, p. 20, n. 2, says it is 20 October 1518. Cf., ch. i, n. 2, for bibliographic information on Simar's work.

13. Becker, Longueil, p. 20; also cf., Simar, Longueil, p. 53.

14. Garanderie, "Les Relations d'Érasme avec Paris," pp. 49-53, suggests that there was a difference of opinion between Longueil and Ruzé over Erasmus. Perhaps the patron of Longueil decided that he would be well advised to ease away from his support since Longueil was at best a tempestuous and haughty scholar with an insatiable appetite and great ambition. This is indicated specifically in a letter from Longueil to Jacques Lucas dated 29 January 1519. The text of this last-named letter is found in "Appendix I."

15. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 7, and n. 3, states that Jovius has confused the situation by saying that Longueil was the guest of Flaminio (son) instead of Giulio (father).

16. Mellini, "Accusatio in Longolium," fol. 10b, as indicated in ch. ii, n. 10. Also cf., Gnoli, Un giudizio, "Appendix I," p. 107.

17. Gnoli, Un giudizio, pp. 8-9.

18. Ibid., "Appendix II," p. 125.

19. Mellini, "Accusatio in Longolium," item 2, fol. 7a.

20. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 11b.

21. Becker, Longueil, p. 20, holds this last position. Cf., ch. ii, and nn. 10-17, for a discussion of the various editions of Longueil's "Defense Orations" and the role of Gnoli in establishing their significance as well as the times of their appearance.

22. Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Perduellionis Rei Posterioris Diei Defensio," fol. 33a. There are some slight divergences between this text and that in Mellini, "Accusatio in Longolium," item 3, fol. 41a-b. Moreover, at points the text is not clear in the Junta edition. Most of the changes that appear are alterations of adjectives from comparatives to superlatives. Later in the oration, Longueil lists even more names than he does in this reference, and as Gnoli, Un giudizio, pp. 44-46, indicates, the list changes as time passes. One erroneous reading appears in the term "Gemanum," which should read "Germanum."

23. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 10.

24. Ibid., p. 11.

25. Cf., ch. vii, and nn. 45-49. Pastor, History of the Popes, VIII, 228, accepts the erroneous 1508 date for this oration, whereas Simar, Longueil, p. 15, says it was either 1508 or 1509.

26. Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 11b. Also cf., Melini, "Accusatio in Longolium," item 2, fol. 7a, which has several textual variations, including a reference to Longueil's coming from Paris, "Lutecia" [sic, it should read "Luteciam"]. Even the text used by Gnoli, Un giudizio, "Appendix I," p. 125, omits this reference to Paris.

27. Longueil, Codex Ottobonianus Lat. 1517, "Oratio apologetica," fols. 44a-185b; cf., ch. i, and n. 21.

28. Cf., Gnoli, Un giudizio, "Appendix II, p. 142, who wrongly gives his name as Ghiberti.

29. Ibid., p. 18.

30. Becker, Longueil, pp. 23-24, who follows Gnoli, Un giudizio, passim.

31. Cian, "Due Brevi de Leone X," esp. pp. 378-385; cf., ch. i, and n. 25.

32. Becker, Longueil, p. 22, and n. 1; cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Vita," fol. 6a; and Gnoli, Un giudizio, "Appendix II," p. 160, although the text differs from Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 43b.

33. Longueil had kept contact with Jean de Pins, who was the ambassador to Venice for the King of France when Longueil arrived in Italy in 1516. In March 1517, Longueil wrote a letter to Leo X on behalf of Pins. Simar, Longueil, p. 190, item 70, says that it was written for F. Lerouge, but Pins, "Jean de Pins," p. 184, n. 4, refutes him. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, I, 34, fol. 85b-86a, as well as ch. i, n. 3.

34. Becker, Longueil, p. 23.

35. Ibid., p. 24, and n. 3.

36. Cartwright, Isabella d'Este, II, 167. This is Cartwright's translation of the letter. Cf., "Appendix K," infra, where Castiglione got Longueil's name wrong. He wrote Longonio instead of Longolio or Longolius.

37. Becker, Longueil, p. 24. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, fols. 21b and 33a, as well as Gnoli, Un giudizio, "Appendix II," p. 153.

38. Pastor, History of the Popes, VIII, 230, although Longueil, Opera, Junta, fols. 9a and 26b, called both his orations "Perduellionis . . . Defensio," as did Mellini; cf., Gnoli, Un giudizio, "Appendix I," p. 99, and "Appendix II," p. 121.

39. Sandys, Harvard Lectures, p. 161.

40. Cartwright, Isabella d'Este, II, 56. This description does not appear in the text of "Appendix K," but that text does indicate that Longueil might have been thrown out a window. Also cf., Gnoli, Un giudizio, pp. 40-41, where Cartwright seems to have gotten her information about the tumult, stones, effigy, dagger and flames.

41. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, V, 2, fol. 154b, which says, "Tu vero qui Romae Populum Romanum stantem in te ac propriè armatum contempseris, sustinueris, fregeris, neque interea timoris signum ullum edideris, aut vocem emiseric, ab illo nunc non solum fracto, sed etiam ad tuas partes traducto, in urbe minime turbulenta Patauio tibi esse timendum duces."

42. Cf., ch. ii, and nn. 10-17, for a discussion of these orations as well as the "Accusatio in Longolium," by Mellini.

43. Becker, Longueil, p. 25. Also cf., Cartwright, Isabella d'Este, II, 56-57.

44. Cf., "Appendix L," infra, where the Archdeacon, like Castiglione, uses the wrong form Longonio, as indicated supra, n. 36.

45. Pastor, History of the Popes, VIII, 229-230.

46. Sanuto, I Diarii, XXVII, item 157, cols. 272-274; cf., ch. vi, n. 52.

47. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 11.

48. Cf., "Appendix I," as well as chs. ii, and n. 42, iv, n. 9, and vi, and nn. 57-59. On the Cortese letter, cf., supra, n. 12.

49. Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, III, 473; cf., ch. i, n. 3.



50. Cf., "Appendix J," as well as chs. ii, n. 43, v, n. 102, and vi, and nn. 106-107.

51. Cf., ch. vi, and n. 111.

52. Garanderie, "Les Relations d'Érasme avec Paris," p. 49.

53. Ibid., pp. 52-53.

54. Cf., ch. iii, and nn. 50-53, as well as Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, III, 472-473. Also cf., Renaudet, who says Erasmus is scornful, Études Érasmiennes (1521-1529), pp. 292-294, and his Érasme et l'Italie, pp. 202-204; cf., ch. iii, nn. 95 and 97.

55. Pins, "Jean de Pins," pp. 183-189; cf., ch. vi, and nn. 1, 2 and 9.

56. Cartwright, Isabella d'Este, II, 57.

57. Longueil, Opera, Junta, V, 15, fol. 163.

58. Cartwright, Isabella d'Este, II, 58. Also cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 26, fols. 146a-149b, as well as the discussion supra, ch. vi, and nn. 65-67.

59. Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 26. Cf., ch. vi, and nn. 65-67, on the error in the Junta edition text.

60. Longueil, Opera, Junta, I, 1-2, fol. 65a-b. The dates of all relevant correspondence are tabulated infra, "Appendix M."

61. Cf., ch. vi, discussion and nn. 1-4.

62. Longueil, Opera, Junta, V, 2, fol. 154b.

63. Pins, "Jean de Pins," p. 186.

64. Cf., ch. vi, discussion and Pins, "Jean de Pins," pp. 185-186.

65. Pastor, History of the Popes, VIII, 233. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Vita," fol. 5a-b, II, 17, fol. 102b, and "Ad Luterianos," fol. 44a, as well as ch. ii, passim.

66. Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Ad Luterianos," fols. 44a-64b. Also cf., ch. ii, discussion and nn. 18-20.

67. Pins, "Jean de Pins," p. 186.

68. Longueil, Opera, Junta, V, 6, fols. 158b [sic, it should read 157]-158a. Also cf., Simar, Longueil, p. 90, and Pins, "Jean de Pins," pp. 187-188, as well as ch. vi, discussion and nn. 86-88.

69. Cf., ch. vi, discussion and n. 1, as well as ch. v discussion, and Parks, "Did Pole Write the 'Vita Longolii'?" pp. 275-285, with regard to the authorship of the "Vita." Also cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Vita," fol. 8a, and the discussion supra, chs. iii, and n. 71, and iv, discussion and nn. 74-110.

70. Cf., ch. vi, discussion and nn. 3, 87-91.

71. Cf., ch. vi, discussion and n. 77.

72. Pins, "Jean de Pins," pp. 186-187.

73. Cf., ch. vi, discussion and n. 4.

74. Pins, "Jean de Pins," p. 189.

75. Cartwright, Isabella d'Este, II, 58. Also cf., ch. vi, discussion and n. 103.

76. Pastor, History of the Popes, VIII, 233, brackets supplied.

77. Longueil, Opera, Junta, I, 10, fol. 71.

78. Cf., ch. i, and n. 17.

79. Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Vita," fol. 8a.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Reference Works

Baudier, J. (ed.). Bibliographie Lyonnaise: Recherches sur les imprimeurs, libraires, relieurs et fondateurs de lettres de Lyon au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Sixième série. Paris: A Picard et fils, 1904.

\_\_\_\_\_. Bibliographie Lyonnaise: Recherches sur les imprimeurs, libraires, relieurs et fondateurs de Lyon au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Huitième série. Lyon: 1910.

Bruxelles. Bibliotheque Royale de Belgique. Catalogue General Auteurs.

Cappelli, Adriano. Lexicon Abbreviaturarum Dizionario di Abbreviature Latine ed Italiane usate nelle carte e codici specialmente de medio-evo riprodotte con oltre 14000 segni incisi. Seconda edizione completamente rifatta. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli, 1912.

Città del Vaticano. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Index Codicum Bibliothecae Ottobonianae.

\_\_\_\_\_. Inventari Mss. Latin Bib. Vat. 2142.

\_\_\_\_\_. Registri Vaticani.

Cosenza, Mario Emilio. Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300-1800. 5 vols. Second edition revised and enlarged. Boston: G. K. Hall and Co., 1962.

\_\_\_\_\_. Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Printers and Foreign Printers in Italy from the Introduction of the Art of Printing into Italy to 1800. Boston: G. K. Hall and Co., 1968.

Coxe, O. H. Bodleian Library Catalogues, Vol. I: Greek Manuscripts. Reprinted with corrections from the edition of 1853. Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1969.

Coxe, O. H. Bodleian Library Quarto Catalogues. Oxford: Bodleian Library, n. d.

Delaruelle, M. L. "Nicole Bérault: Notes biographiques suivies d'un appendice sur plusieurs de ses publications," Le Musée Belge, XIII, 3-4 (1909), 253-312.

Dublin. Trinity College Library. Catalogue of Books.

Eubel, Conradum. Hierarchia Catholica Medii Aevi sive Summorum Pontificum, S. R. E. Cardinalium, Ecclesiarum Antistitum Series ab anno 1431 usque ad annum 1503 perducta, e documentis tabularii praesertim vaticani collecta, digesta, edita. Regensburg: Monasterii, 1901.

Flower, Barbara, and Rosenbaum, Elisabeth (compiler and editor). Indices, Vol. XII of Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami. Edited by P. S. Allen, H. M. Allen, and H. W. Garrod. 12 vols. Oxonii: Clarendoniano, 1906-1958.

Gerlo, Aloïs. Bibliographie de l'Humanisme Belge. Bruxelles: Presses Universitaires de Bruxelles, 1965.

Grotefend, H. Taschenbuch der Zeitrechnung des Deutschen Mittelalters und der Neuzeit. Fünfte auflage. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1922.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar (compiler). Iter Italicum: A Finding List of Uncatalogued or Incompletely Catalogued Manuscripts of the Renaissance in Italian and Other Libraries. 2 vols. London: Warburg Institute, 1963, 1967.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Latin Manuscript Books Before 1600: A Bibliography of Printed Catalogues of Extant Collections," Traditio: Studies in Ancient and Medieval History, Thought and Religion, VI (1948), 227-317.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Latin Manuscript Books Before 1600: Part II: A Tentative List of Unpublished Inventories of Imperfectly Catalogued Extant Collections," Traditio: Studies in Ancient and Medieval History, Thought and Religion, IX (1953), 393-418.

\_\_\_\_\_. Latin Manuscript Books Before 1600: A List of the Printed Catalogues and Unpublished Inventories of Extant Collections. New edition, revised. New York: Fordham University Press, 1960.

Lonchamp, F.-C. Manuel du Bibliophile Français (1470-1920).  
2 vols. Paris: Librairie des Bibliophiles, 1927.

London. General Manuscript Catalogue. London: British  
Museum, [1962].

Mazzatinti, G[iuseppe] (ed.). Inventari dei Manoscritti  
delle Biblioteche d'Italia. 87 vols. Forlì: Casa  
Luigi Bordandini, 1890-1967.

Paris. Archives Nationales. Répertoire Numérique des Ar-  
chives du Parlement de Paris. Serie X. Paris: [1910].

\_\_\_\_\_. Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. Catalogue méthodique  
de la section Belles-Lettres. Ancien fonds. Tome 7.

\_\_\_\_\_. Bibliothèque Mazarine. Catalogue Général Auteurs.

\_\_\_\_\_. Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue Général Au-  
teurs. Paris: [1930].

\_\_\_\_\_. Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue Général des  
Manuscripts Latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale.

Potthast, August. Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke des  
Europäischen Mittelalters bis 1500. 2 vols. Berlin:  
W. Weber, 1896.

[Priscianensis, Francisci]. Dictionarum Ciceronianum Fran-  
cisci Priscianensis, In quo omnia vocabula Ciceron-  
iana leguntur atque Italice explicantur. Opus ad  
Latini sermonis intelligentiam, atque ad ejus incor-  
ruptam integritatem servandam accommodatum, adoles-  
centibusque utilissimum. Nuperrimè per Rev. Presb.  
Sylvestrum Ferrarium Titanensem multis mendis pur-  
gatum. Venetia: Antonius Bortolius, 1717.

Record, P. D. A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts  
in the Bodleian Library at Oxford which have not  
hitherto been catalogued in the Quarto Series. Ox-  
ford: Clarendon Press, 1953.

Schottenloher, Karl (ed.). Bibliographie zur Deutschen Ges-  
chichte im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung 1517-1585.  
5 vols. Leipzig: Karl W. Hiersemann, 1933-1939.

Sorbelli, Albano (ed.). Inventari de Manoscritti delle Bib-  
lioteche d'Italia, Vol. LVI: Roma. Forlì: Casa  
editrice Luigi Bordandini, 1934.

\_\_\_\_\_. Inventari dei Manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'I-  
talia, Vol. XLVI: Udine. Forlì: Casa editrice Lu-  
igi Bordandini, 1931.

Manuscripts

Città del Vaticano. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Archivio Segreto Vaticano. Leonis X. Secr. an. 1 ad 8.

\_\_\_\_\_. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Codex Barbarinus Latinus 1868.

\_\_\_\_\_. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Codex Ottonianus Latini 1517.

\_\_\_\_\_. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Codex Vat. Lat. 3364.

\_\_\_\_\_. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Codex Vat. Lat. 3370.

Cremona. Biblioteca Governativa. Fondo Civico. Aa. 6. 26. cart. XVI.III.

Firenze. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale. Fondo Magliabechiano VIII, 1302, misc., XVI-XVIII.

\_\_\_\_\_. Biblioteca Riccardiana. Ms. 896 (S. II, n<sup>o</sup> 24).

Milano. Biblioteca Ambrosiana. G. 33 inf. cart. XVI.

\_\_\_\_\_. Biblioteca Ambrosiana. S. Q. D. III, 15.

Oxford. Bodleian Library. [Arch. Seld. B. 17].

\_\_\_\_\_. Bodleian Library. [Arch. Seld. B. 19].

\_\_\_\_\_. Bodleian Library. Codices Miscellanei 92 Auct. f. 3. 18.

\_\_\_\_\_. Bodleian Library. Ms. D'Orvil 412.

Paris. Archives Nationales. Registres du Parlement de Paris, X<sup>1</sup>a 1517.

Trento. Biblioteca Comunale di Trento. Ms. 4959, cart. XVI.

Udine. Biblioteca Comunale "Vincenzo Joppa." Augusti Vatis 43.

Printed Sources

Allen, P. S., Allen, H. M., and Garrod, H. W. (eds.). Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami: Denovo Recognitum et Auctum. 12 vols. Oxonii: Clarendoniano, 1906-1958.

Antiochenus, Vettius Valens. Anthologia Astrologies: Libri Octo. N. p., n. d.

Aulotte, R[obert]. "Une Rivalité d'Humanistes: Érasme et Longueuil, Traducteurs de Plutarque," Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance: Travaux et Documents, XXX (1968), 549-573.

Becker, Ph[ilipp] Aug[ust]. Aus Frankreichs Frührenaissance, Kritische Skizzen. München: Max Kellner, 1927.

Bembus, Petrus. Epistolae Petri Bembi Cardinalis et Patricii Veneti Libri XVI. Argentorati, 1611.

\_\_\_\_\_. Petri Bembi Epistolarum Leonis Decimi Pont. Max. Nomine Scriptarum Libri XVI. Lugdunum: Haeredes Simon Vincenti, 1538.

\_\_\_\_\_. Petri Bembi Epistolarum Leonis Decimi Pont. Max. Nomine Scriptarum Libri XVI. Lugdunum: Theobaldus Paganus, 1540.

\_\_\_\_\_. Opera Omnia P. Bembi. Venetia, 1729.

Brutus, Joannes Michael (ed.). Christophori Longolii Epistolarum Libri IIII. Bartholomaei item Ricci de Imitatione Libri Tres. A Io. Michaeli Bruto emendati. Lugdunum: Haerdes Seb. Gryphum, 1563.

\_\_\_\_\_. Christophori Longolii Epistolarum Libri IIII. Tullianae Videlicet Eloquentiae ad Unquem Expressa Imago. Doctorum Item Aliquot Epistolarum ad Eundem Longolium, Liber I. Bartholomaei Item Ricci de Imitatione Libri Tres. A Ioan. Michaeli Bruto Emendati. Quibus Ejusdem Vita, per Quendam Ipsius Studiosissimum Conscripta, est Praemissa. Basilea: Eusebium Episcopium & Nic. Fr. Haeredes, 1580.

Buchlerus, Joannes. Laconicarum Epistolarum Thesaurus Bipartitus Prior Latinorum Alter Graecorum, Breviores, Easdemque Argutas, Jucundas, & Politulas Continet Epistolas. Opera M. Jonnis Buchleri à Gladbach, Collectus & Digestus. Colonia: Bernardi Gualther, 1606.

- Budé, Guillaume. G. Budaei. Consiliarii Regii. Supplicumque Libellorum in Regia Magistri Epistolarum Latinarum Lib. V. Annotationibusque a diectis in singulas fere epistolas. GRAECARUM ITEM LIB. I. BASILII item Magni Epistola de Vita in solitudine agenda, per Budaeum latina facta. Basilea: Jod. Badium Ascensium, [1531].
- Bunel, Pierre. Familiares Aliquot Epistolae cura ac Dili-gentia Caroli Stephani. Paris, 1551.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Manuzio, Paolo (eds.). Petri Bunelli, Galli, Praeceptoris, & Pauli Manutii, Itali, Discipuli, Epistolae Ciceroniano Stylo Scriptae. Aliorum Gall-orum Pariter et Italarum Epistolae Eodem Stylo Scripta. [Paris or Geneva?]: Henri Estienne, 1581.
- Carducci, Giosue. Le Vite Dei Dogi de Marin Sanudo e Cura di Giovanni Monticolo. Città di Castello, 1900.
- Casalis, Jo. Baptista. Epistolae, Orationes, libelli sup-[p]lices, et alia id generis. N. p., 1603.
- Cian, Vittorio, "Domenico Gnoli. — Un Giudizio de lesa ro-manita sotto Leone X, aggiuntevi le orazioni di Celso Mellini e di Cristoforo Longolio. — Roma, tip. della Camera dei Deputati, 1891 (8<sup>o</sup>, pp. 165," Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana, XIX (1891), 151-158.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Due Brevi de Leone X in favore de Christoforo Longolio," Giornale Storico della Letteratura Ital-iana, XIX (1892), 373-388.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. M. Tul. Cicer. Epistolarum Famil-iarum Libri XVI. Ex. Christophori Longolij Elo-quentiis. Oratoris Castigationibus Recogniti: Quam Antehac Multo Etiam a Mendis Curiosius Adserti. Colonia Agrippina: Petrus Horst, 1564.
- \_\_\_\_\_. M. T. C. Epistolarum, ut Vocant, Familiarum Lib. XVI. Summorum Virorum Industria, Exemplarium cum Veterum, tum Recentiorum Collatione, Restituti. [Francofordia: Haeredes Chri. Egen.], 1570.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Opera Rhetorica: Orationia et Forensia. Paris: Jehan Petit, 1511.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Orationes. Paris: Jehan Petit, 1511.



Clericus, J. (ed.). Erasmi Opera Omnia Emendatiora et Auctiora. 10 vols. Lugdunum Batavum, 1703-1706.

Cortesius, Gregorius. Gregorii Cortesii Mutinensis, S. R. Ecclesiae Presb. Cardinalis. Epistolarum Familiarum Liber. Eiusdem Tractatus adversus negantem B. Petrum Apostolum fuisse Romae, ad Adrianum VI. Pont. Max. DUPLICI ANNEXO INDICE: Quorum alter, nomina eorum, ad quos Epistolae missae sunt; reliquus verò, scitu digniora complectitur. Venetia: Franciscum Franciscum Senensem, 1573.

Credonius, Claudius (ed.). Claudij Credonij, Colenaei, in Graecas Budaei Epistolas Annotationes, Familiares Inprimis & juventuti Graecarum studio flagranti, non inutiles futurae. Parisijs: Michaëlis Gado-laei, 1579.

Delaruelle, L[ouis] (ed.). Répertoire Analytique et Chronologique de la Correspondance de Guillaume Budé. Toulouse et Paris, 1907.

Dolet, Étienne. Staphani Doleti Dialogus, De Imitatione Ciceroniana, Adversus Desiderium Erasmus Roterdamum, pro Christophoro Longolio. Lugdunum: Sab. Gryphium, 1535.

---

. De Imitatione Ciceroniana Adversus Floridum Sabinum pro Christophoro Longolio. Lugdunum: 1540.

Duchesne, Franciscus (ed.). Historiae Francorum Scriptores, a Philippo Augusto Regeusque ad R. Philippi IV. dicti Pulchri Tempora, quorum plurimi nunc primum ex verijs Codicibus MSS. in lucem prodeunt: alij verò auctiores & emendatiores. Cum Epistolis Regum, Pontificum, Ducum, Abbatum, & alijs veteribus rerum Francicarum monumentis. Tomus V. Lutetiae Parisiorum: Gabrieli Cramoisy, 1649.

Erasmus, Desiderius, of Rotterdam. Ciceronianus: Or a Dialogue on the Best Style of Speaking. Translated by Izora Scott, with an Introduction by Paul Monroe. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1908.

---

. The Colloquies of Erasmus. Trans. by Craig R. Thompson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Euclid. Opera. Venice, 1505.

Firmicus, Julius, et al. Astronomical Tracts. N. p., 1499.

Foscarini, Jacopo Vincenzo. Ragguagli Sulla Vita e Sulle Opere di Marin Sanuto detto il Juniore Veneto Patri-  
zioso e Cronista Prege Volissimo de Secoli XV, XVI.  
Institolati dall' Amicizia di Uno Straniero al Nobile  
Jacopo Vincenzo Foscarini Opere Divisa in Tre Parti.  
Venezia: Tipografia di Alvisopoli, 1837-1838.

Friedlander, E., and Malagola, C. (eds.). Acta Nationis  
Germanicae Universitatis Bononiensis. Berlin, 1887.

Gnoli, D[omenico]. Un giudizio de Lesa Romanità Sotto Leone  
X: Aggiuntevi le Orazioni de Celso Mellini e di  
Cristoforo Longolio. Roma: Camera dei Deputati,  
1891. Appendices I and II.

Goldschmidt, E. Ph. "De Longueil's Letter on His Adventure  
in Switzerland, 1513," Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et  
Renaissance: Travaux et Documents, XII (1960), 163-  
182.

Grauff, Frider. Andr. Christ. (ed.). Epistolae Petri Bun-  
elli, Pauli Manutii, Christophori Longolii, Petri  
Bembi, Jacobi Sadoleti, Aonii Palearii Verulani Par-  
tim Selectae Partim Integrae. Brevem Narrationem de  
VV. DD. Vitis Praemiss. Annotatione Perpetua in  
Bunelli Epistolas Instruxit et Indicem Duplicem  
Adiecit. Bern: Curia Rhaet., 1581.

Guicciardini, Francesco. The History of Italy. Translated,  
edited, with notes and an Introduction by Sidney  
Alexander. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969.

Hysagoge, Joannitii, et al. Medical Tracts. Venice: Pet-  
rus Bergomensis, 1507.

Jovius, Paulus. Elogia Virorum Literis Illustrum. Bas-  
ilea, 1577.

\_\_\_\_\_. Elogia Doctorum Virorum ab Avorum Memoria Pub-  
licatis Ingenii Monumentis Illustrum. Antverpia:  
Joan. Bellarum, 1557.

\_\_\_\_\_. Elogia Doctorum Virorum ab Avorum Memoria Pub-  
licatis Ingenii Monumentis Illustrum. Antverpia:  
Joan. Bellarum, 1571.

[Longueil, Christophe de]. Christophori Longolii Civis Ro-  
mani Perduellionis Rei Defensiones Duae. Veneti:  
n. d. [1518?].

[Longueil, Christophe de]. Christophori Longolii Civis Romani Perduellionis Rei Defensiones Duae. Veneti: Aldus, [1518].

\_\_\_\_\_. Christophori Longolii Civis Romani Perduellionis Rei Defensiones Duae. Veneti: Aldus, [1518].

\_\_\_\_\_. Christophori Longolii civis Ro. Perduellionis Rei Defensio. Ro[ma], 1519.

\_\_\_\_\_. Christophori Longolii Civis Romani Perduellionis Rei Defensiones Duae. [Basilea]: Jodocus Badius, 1520.

\_\_\_\_\_. Christophori Longolii, Civis Romani, Tulliana Eloquentia, & Scientiarum Varietate Excellentissimi, Epistolae Quae Exstant Omnes Accessit, Eiusdem Vita, cum Bartolomaei Ricciij de Imitatione Libris III. Colonia: Munatiana, 1620.

\_\_\_\_\_. Christophori Longolii de Suis Infortunijs Epistola, Ut in primis Elegans, Ita & Affectum Plena, Adeo, Ut Vel Silici Lachrymas Excutere Possit. Hactenus Nusquam Excusa. Huic Accedit Eiusdem De Laudibus Iurisprudencia Oratio Habita Valentie, cum a D. Decio Prolytharum Ornamentis Insignetur. Bituriges: Joannes Garnerius, 1533.

\_\_\_\_\_. Habes Lector Christophori Longolii Epistolarum Libros Quatuor. Tullianae scilicet Eloquentiae ad Unquem Expressam Imaginem. Item. Pet. Bembi, Iac. Sadoleti, Gul. Budaei, D. Eras. Epistolarum ad Eundem Longolium, Librum Unum. Ad haec Eiusdem vitam, per quendam ipsius studiosissimum conscriptam. Omnia in usum simul ac gratiam studiosorum non castigatius modo, sed & locupletius quam ante hac excusa. Basilea: Joannes Valderus, 1533.

\_\_\_\_\_. Christophori Longolii Epistolarum Libri IIII. Tullianae Videlicet Eloquentiae ad Unquem Expressa Imago. Item Pet. Bembi, Iac. Sadoleti, Gul. Budaei, Des. Eras. Epistolarum ad eundem Longolium, Liber I. Ad Haec Eiusdem vita, per quendam ipsius Studiosissimum Conscripta. Omnia in Usum Simul ac Gratiam Studiosorum non Castigatius Modom, sed & Locupletius quam ante hac Excusa. Basilea: Joannes Valderus, 1540.

\_\_\_\_\_. Christophori Longolii Epistolarum libri IIII. Tullianae videlicet eloquentiae ad unquem expressa imago. Doctorum Item Aliquot Epistolarum ad eundem Longolium, liber I. Quibus eiusdem vita, per quendam ipsius studiosissimum conscripta, est praemissa. Basilea: Nic. Episcopium, 1558.

[Longueil, Christophe de]. Christophori Longolii Epistolarum libri IIII. Tullianae videlicet eloquentiae ad unquem expressa imago. Doctorum Item Aliquot Epistolarum ad eundem Longolium, Liber I. Quibus eiusdem vita, per quandam ipsius studiosissimum conscripta, est praemissa. Basilea: Nic. Episcopium, 1562/63.

---

. Christophori Longolii Epistolarum Libri IIII. Tullianae videlicet eloquentiae ad unquem expressa imago. Doctorum Item Aliquot Epistolarum ad eundem Longolium, Liber I. Quibus eiusdem vita, per quandam ipsius studiosissimum conscripta, est praemissa. Basilea: Eusebium Episcop. & Nicolai fratris haeredes, 1570.

---

. Christophori Longolii Epistolarum Lib. IIII. Tullianae Videlicet Eloquentiae ad Unquem Expressa Imago. Doctorum Item Aliquot Epistolarum ad Eundem Longolium, Lib. I. Quibus Eiusdem Vita, Per Quendam Ipsius Studiosissimum Conscripta, est Praemissa. Colonia Agrippina: Petrus Horst, 1591.

---

. Chr. Longolii Epistolae Selectae. Item P. Bembi et I. Sadoleti Aliquot ad Eum Epistolae. N. d.

---

. Christophori Longolii Lucubrationes Orationes III. Epistolarum IIII. His Appensus Epistolarum Pet. Bembi, & Iac. Sadoleti liber I. Una Cum Vita Eiusdem Longolii ab Ipsius Amicissimo Quodam Exarata. Lugdunum: Seb. Gryphium, 1542.

---

. Christophori Longolii Orationes Duae Pro Defensione Sua ab Lese Maiestatis Crimine, Longe Exactiori quam Ante Iudicio Perscriptae, atque ex Ipsius Authoris Sententia in Lucem Editae. Oratio Una ad Luterianos. Eiusdem Epistolarum Libri Quatuor. Epistolarum Bembi & Sadoleti Liber Unae. Quibus Omnibus praeponetur Ipsius Longolii Vita Perdocte atque Eleganter ab Ipsius Amicissimo Quodam Exarata. Parrhisius: Jodocus Badius, 1526.

---

. Christophori Longolii Orationes Duae Pro Defensione Sua ab Lesae Maiestatis Crimine, Longe Exactiori quam Ante Iudicio Perscriptae, Atque ex Ipsius Authoris Sententia in Lucem Editae. Oratio Una ad Luterianos. Eiusdem Epistolarum Libri Quatuor. Epistolarum Bembi & Sadoleti Liber Unus. Quibus Omnibus Praeponetur Ipsius Longolii Vita, Perdocte Atque Eleganter ab Ipsius Amicissimo Quodam Exarata. Parrhisius: Jodocus Badius, 1530.

[Longueil, Christophe de]. Christophori Longolii Orationes Duae Pro Defensione Sua ab Lesae Maiestatis Crimine, Longe Exactiori quam Ante Iudicio Perscriptae, Atque ex Ipsius Authoris Sententia in Lucem Editae. Oratio Una ad Luterianos. Eiusdem Epistolarum Libri Quatuor. Epistolarum Bembi & Sadoleti Liber Unus, Quibus Omnibus Praeponetur Ipsius Longolii Vita Perdocte atque Eleganter ab Ipsius Amicissimo Quodam Exarata. Parrhisius: Jodocus Badius et Joannis Roigny, 1533.

---

. Christophori Longolii Orationes Duae Pro Defensione Sua in Crimen Laesae Maiestatis, Longe Exactiori quam ante Iudicio Perscriptae, ac Nunc Primum ex Ipsius Auctoris Sententia in Lucem Editae. Item Oratio una ad Luterianos Eiusdem Epistolarum Libri Quatuor. Epistolarum Bembi & Sadoleti Liber Unus. Ad Haec Longolii Vita Perdocte Quidem Atque Eleganter per Quendam Ipsius Amicissimum Conscripta. Omnia in Usus Simul ac Gratiam Studiosorum non Castigatius Modò, sed & haec Locuplatius quam ante hac Excusa. Venetia, 1539.

---

. Christophori Longolii Orationes duae pro defensione sua in crimen lesae maiestatis, longe exactiori quam ante iudicio perscriptae, ac nunc primum ex ipsius authoris sententia in lucem editae. Oratio una ad Luterianos Eiusdem epistolarum libri quatuor. Epistolarum Bembi & Sadoleti liber unus. Longolij vita perdocte quidem atque eleganter ab ipsius amicissimo quodam exarata. Florentia: Haeredes Philippi Juntae, 1524.

---

. Christofori Longuolii Parisiensis Oratio De laudibus divi Ludovici, Atque Francorum, habita Pyctavij in Coenobio Fratrum minorum. Parisiis: Henricum Stephanum, 1510.

---

. Christofori Longuolii Parisiensis Orationes duae: una de laudibus divi Ludovici: atque Francorum. Alia in prefatione enarrationis duodetricesimi libri Pandectarum juris civilis: habite quidem Pyctavii. Parisiis: Petrus Gromorus, 1510/20.

---

. Christophori Longuolii Parrhissien. civis Romani per duellionis rei defensiones duae. Parrhisius: Jehan Petit, [1520].

---

. Christophori Longolii viri doctissimi ad Luterianos iam damnatos oratio, omnibus numeris absoluta. Colonia: Joannes Gymnicus, 1529.

[Longueil, Christophe de]. Christophori Longolii Viri (iudicio quidem Budaei, Erasmi, Sadoleti, Bembi, Multorumque Aliorum) Doctissimi ad Lutheranos Oratio. Psalmo 54. Praecipita Domine & Divide Linguas Corum, Quoniam Vidi Iniquitatem & Contradictionem in Civitate. Colonia: Melchioris Mouesianus, 1545/46.

\_\_\_\_\_. Clarissimi orationis bonarum artium cultoris [.] Ac juris & legum doctoris locupletissimi Hac nostra tempestate memoris eloquutone Triumque linguarum peritia singularis Ac illustrissimi principis angulismensis aulici. D. [Christ]ofori alongolio panegyricus. In Civilis sapientie laudem Dum prolytharum infulis Apud delphinates In florenti & famoso valentino gynnasio. Per magnificum senatorem. D. Philippum decium donaretur. Duo separatim ad invicem cujus libet facultatis excellentionibus facile apperit nulla earum nedum excellere. Sed nec sibi: coequari Talentum inter eas omnes. & istam esse delectum. qualis inter continentia & contenta solet adhiberi. Et hac velut vicaria dei opera fungente omnes in hoc seculo egere neccessario Reliquis vero contingenter. Valentiae, 1514.

Longolius, Gilbertus. Lexicon Graecolatinum Praeter Omneis Omnium Hactenus Accessiones, Novu Supra Mille Vocabulorum Auctario Iam Recens Locupletatum. Coloniae: Ioannis Prael, 1533.

[Manuzio, Aldo]. Epistolae Clarorum Virorum Quamplurimis Selectae ad Indicandum Nostrorum Temporum Eloquentiam. Venetia: Aldus Manutius, 1556.

Meursius, Joannes. Aristoxenus. Nicomachus. Alypius. Auctores Musices Antiquissimi, Hactenus non editi. 1611.

Muratori, L. A. (ed.). Rerum Italicorum Scriptores. Vol. XXII, Part IV: Le Vite Dei Dogi de Marin Sanudo a Cura di Giovanni Monticolo. Città di Castello, 1900.

Osorius, Hieronymus. Hieronimi Osorii Episc. Sylvensis de religione Lib. III. In Gualterum Haddonum Anglum: supplicum libellorum Magist. Apud Elizabetham Angliae Reginam. Eiusdem ad ipsam Elisabetham epistola. Editio Quinta. Accessit Christophori Longolij ad Luter. eiusdem argumenti oratio cum INDICE. Copiosissimo. Coloniae: Gosium Cholinum, 1585.

Osorius, Hieronymus. Hieronymi Osorii Episc. Sylvensis de religione Lib. III. In Gualterum Haddonum Anglum: supplicum libellorum Magist. Apud Elizabetham Anglicae Reginam. Eiusdem ad ipsam Elisabetham epistola. Editio Quinta. Accessit Christophori Longolij ad Luther. eiusdem argumenti oratio cum INDICE copiosissimo. Treveris: Emundum Hatott, 1585.

---

. Hieronymi Osorii Episc. Sylvensis de Religione Lib. III. Apud Elizabetham Anglicae Reginam. Eiusdem ad Ipsam Elisabetham Epistola. Editio Sexta. Accessit Christophori Longolij ad Luther. Eiusdem Argumenti Oratio cum INDICE Copiosissimo. Colonia: Gosium Cholinum, 1588.

---

. Hieronymi Osorii Episc. Sylvensis de Religione Lib. III. In Gualterum Haddonum Anglum: Supplicum Libellorum Magist. Apud Elizabetham Anglicae Reginam. Eiusdem ad Ipsam Elisabetham Epistola. Editio Sexta. Accessit Christophori Longolij ad Luther. Eiusdem Argumenti Oratio cum INDICE Copiosissimo. Colonia: Petrum Horst, 1589.

---

. Hieronymi Osorii Episcopi Sylvensis in Gualterum Haddonum Anglum, de Religione Libri Tres. Eiusdem Epistola Ad Elisabetham Angliae Reginam. Editio Tertia, Prioribus Emendatior. Accessit Recens Christophori Longolii, Oratoris Eloquentissimi, non dissimilis Argumenti Oratio. Dilinga: Sebaldus Mayer, 1576.

Phillips, Margaret Mann. The 'Adages' of Erasmus: A Study with Translations. Cambridge: University Press, 1964.

Plinius, Caius Secundus. Caii Plynii Secundi Naturalis Historie Libri. xxxvij nuper studiose recogniti, atque impressi Adjectis varijs Antonij Sabellici, Raphaelis Volaterrani, Beroaldi, Erasmi, Budel, Longolij adnotationibus, quibus Mundi historia locis plerisque vel restituitur, vel illustratur. Lutetia: Regnault Chaudiere, 1516.

Pole, Reginald. Epistolarum Reginaldi Poli S. R. E. Cardinalis Et Aliorum ad Ipsum Pars. I. Quae Scriptas Complectitur ab Anno MDXX. Usque ad An. MDXXXVI. Scilicet A Primo Reg. Poli Patavium Adventu usque ad delatum ei a Paulo III. Cardinalatum. Promittuntur Animadversiones in Epist. Jo: Georg. Schelhornii, Vita Cardinalis Poli, & Quaedam Hujus Scripta, atque Diatriba ad Easdem Epistolas. Brixia: Joannes-Maria Rizzardi, 1774.

- Sadoletus, Jacobus. Jacobi Sadoleti, S. R. E. Cardinalis Epistolae Quotquot Extant Proprio Nomiae Scriptae nunc Primum Duplo Auctiores in Lucem Editae. Roma: Generosus Salomonius, 1760-67.
- Sanuto, Marin. I Diarii di Marino Sanuto. 58 volumes in 35. Venezia: F. Visentini, 1879-1903.
- Scott, Izora. Controversies over the Imitation of Cicero as a Model for Style and Some Phases of their Influence on the Schools of the Renaissance. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1910.
- Sede, S. (ed.), Il Diario di Leone X di Paride de Grassi Maestro delle Cerimonie Pontificie. Roma, 1884.
- Tigurinus, Iosias Simlerus. Bibliotheca Instituta et Collecta Primum a Conrado Gesnero Deinde in Epitomen Redacta & Novorum Librorum Accessione Locupletata, Iam Vero Postremo Recognita, & in Duplum post Priores Editiones Aucta, per Iosiam Simlerum Tigurinum. Tiguri: Christophorum Froschovarum, 1574.
- Verrepaeus, Simonis. Selectiores Epistolae Clarorum Virorum, In Usum Scholarum in Tres Libros Digestae, Opera Simonis Verrepaei. Epistolarum Auctores Indicat Versa Pagina. His Accessit Breuissima de Epistolis Latine Conscribendis Isagoge, eodem Auctore. Dilinga: Sebaldus Mayer, 1573.
- Virorum Qui Superiori Nostroque Seculo Eruditione et Doctrina Illustres Atque Memorabiles Fuerunt, Vitae. Lamprimum in Hoc Volumen Collectae. Frankfort: Christianus Egenolphus, 1536.

#### Books

- Andrea, Valerio. Bibliotheca Belgica. Louvain, 1643.
- Artz, Frederick B. Renaissance Humanism 1300-1550. Oberlin, Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 1966.
- Bainton, Roland H. Erasmus of Christendom. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.
- Baldwin, Charles Sears. Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice: Classicism in the Rhetoric and Poetry of Italy, France, and England 1400-1600. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939.



- Bataillon, Marcel. Érasme et l'Espagne: Recherches sur l'Histoire Spirituelle du XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle. Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1937.
- Becker, Ph[ilipp] Aug[ust]. Christophle de Longueil, Sein Leben und Sein Briefwechsel. Bonn: Kurt Schroeder, 1924.
- Beyschlag, Frederic Jacob. Sylloge Variorum Opusculorum: Tomus I. Fasciculos I. II. III. IV. V. ab Annis M. DCC. XXVII.- M. DCC. XXXVIII: M. DCC. XXIX. Editos, Complexus Cum Indice Triplici. Tomi I, Fasciculus I. Halae Sverorum: Georgius Mich. Mayer, 1727.
- Biron, Reginald, and Barennes, Jean. Un Prince Anglais, Cardinal-Légat au XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle Réginald Pole. Paris: Librairie Générale Catholique, [1922].
- Bouwsma, William J. The Interpretation of Renaissance Humanism. 2d. ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, Service Center for Teachers of History, 1966.
- Cartwright, Julia (Mrs. Ady). Isabella d'Este Marchioness of Mantua 1474-1539: A Study of the Renaissance. 2 vols., 2d. ed. London: John Murray, 1903.
- Coates, Willson H., White, Hayden V., and Schapiro, I. Salwyn. The Emergence of Liberal Humanism: An Intellectual History of Europe. Vol. I: From the Italian Renaissance to the French Revolution. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.
- Dannenfeld, Karl H. (ed.). The Renaissance: Medieval or Modern? Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1959.
- Davies, R. Trevor. The Golden Century of Spain, 1501-1621. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Elton, G. R. (ed.). The New Cambridge Modern History. Vol. II: The Reformation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962.
- Ferguson, Wallace K. Europe in Transition 1300-1520. Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Renaissance in Historical Thought: Five Centuries of Interpretation. Cambridge, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1948.
- \_\_\_\_\_, et al. Facets of the Renaissance. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963.

- Foppens, Joannis Franciscus. Bibliotheca Belgica. sive Virorum in Belgio Vita, Scriptisque Illustrium Catalogus, Librorumque Nomenclatura Continens Scriptores à Clariss. Viris Valerio Andrea, Auberto Miraeo, Francisco Sweertio, Allisque, Recensitos, Usque ad Annum M D C LXXX. Tomus Primus. Bruxelles: Petrum Foppens, 1739.
- Gambaro, Angiolo. Erasmus, Il Ciceroniano o dello Stile Migliore. Brescia: La Scuola Editrice, 1965.
- Garin, Eugenio. Italian Humanism, Philosophy, and Civic Life in the Renaissance. Trans. by Peter Munz. New York: Oxford, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Science and Civic Life in the Italian Renaissance. Trans. by Peter Munz. New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1969.
- Gasquet, [F. A.] Cardinal. Reginald Pole and His Early Friends. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1927.
- Geanakoplos, D. J. Greek Scholars in Venice. Cambridge, Mass., 1962
- Gnoli, D[omenico]. Un Giudizio de Lesa Romanità Sotto Leone X: Aggiuntevi le Orazioni de Celso Mellini e di Cristoforo Longolio. Roma: Camera dei Deputati, 1891.
- Grimm, Harold J. The Reformation Era 1500-1650. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954, 1965.
- Haile, Martin. Life of Reginald Pole. London: Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1910.
- Hallam, Henry. Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries. 4 vols. Boston: William Veazie, 1866.
- Hauréau, Bartholomaeus. Gallia Christiana in Provincias Ecclesiasticas Distributa. Vol. XIV. Paris, 1856.
- Hays, Deny (ed.). The Renaissance Debate. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Helton, Tinsley (ed.). The Renaissance: A Reconsideration of the Theories and Interpretations of the Age. Madison, Wisc.: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.

- Hermannus, Christophorus Augustus (ed.). Elogia Doctorum in Gallia Virorum qui Nostra Patrumque Memoria Flo-  
uerunt, editio nova et auctior juxta exemplar Par-  
isiensis. Isenac: Boetiana, 1722.
- Huizinga, Johan. Erasmus and the Age of Reformation, with  
a Selection from the Letters of Erasmus. Harper  
Torchbooks. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers,  
1957.
- Johnson, A. H. Europe in the Sixteenth Century, 1494-1598.  
Vol. IV of Periods of European History. 9 vols.  
edited by Arthur Hassall. 7th ed. London: Riv-  
ingtons, 1964.
- Kristeller, Paul Oskar. Renaissance Thought. 2 vols. Har-  
per Torchbooks. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers,  
1961, 1965.
- Lenient, Ch. De Ciceroniano Bello apud Recentiores. Paris,  
1885.
- Lockyer, Roger. Tudor and Stuart Britain, 1471-1714. New  
York: St. Martin's Press, 1964.
- Mattingly, Garrett. Renaissance Diplomacy. Peregrine Books.  
Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1955.
- Mesnard, P. Le Commerce Epistolaire Comme Expression Soci-  
ale de l'Individualisme Humaniste. Bruxelles: Col-  
loque de Bruxelles, 1965.
- Michel, Gerard. "Études sur le Ciceronianus d'Érasme, avec  
une Editione Critique." Unpublished thesis, Univer-  
sity of Paris, 1954.
- Miraeus, Aubertus. Elogia Belgica sive Illustrium Belg.  
Scriptorum. Antwerp, 1609.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Elogia Illustrium Belgii Scriptorum, Qui vel Ec-  
clesiam Dei Propugnarunt, vel Disciplinas Illustra-  
runt. Centuria Decadibus Distincta. Bibliotheca  
Auberti Miraei Canonici Antverp. Antverpia: Joan-  
nus Bellerus, 1602.
- Miscellanea Lipsiensia, ad Incrementum Rei Litterariae Ed-  
ita. Tomus VIII. Lipsia: Haeredum Lanckisianum,  
1718.
- Mitchell, Bonner. Rome in the High Renaissance: The Age  
of Leo X. Norman, Okla.: The University of Okla-  
homa Press, 1973.

- Molza, Franciscus Maria. Delle Poesie Volgari e Latine di Francesco Maria Molza Corrette, Illustrate, ed Accresciute Volume Secondo Contenente le cose Inedite, e gli Opuscoli di Tarquinia Molza Nipote dell' Autore. Bergamo: Pietro Lancellotti, 1750.
- Moreri, Louis. Le grand dictionnaire historique, ou le mélange curieux de l'histoire sacrée et profane. huitième édition où l'on a mis le supplément dans le même ordre Alphabetique, corrigé les fautes censurées dans le dictionnaire Critique de Mr. Bayle, & grand nombre d'autres, & ajouté quantité d'Articles & de Remarques importantes. Tome troisième. 1698.
- Mountford, James (ed.). 'Bradley's Arnold' Latin Prose Composition, Edited and Revised with an Appendix on Continuous Prose Composition. New York: David McKay, 1938.
- Neve, Timothy. Animadversions upon Mr Phillip's History of the Life of Reginald Pole. Oxford, 1746.
- Nicéron, R. P. Memoires Pour Servir a l'Histoire des Hommes Illustres dans la Republique des lettres. Tome XVII. Paris: Briasson, 1732.
- Nolhac, Pierre de. Érasme et l'Italie. Paris: Les Cahiers de Paris, 1925.
- Norden, E. Die Antike Kunstprosa, vom 6. Jahrh. v. Chr. bis in d. Zeit. d. Renaissance. 2 vols. Berlin, 1898.
- Paravicini, Vincent. Vincentii Paravinci, Conrect. Gymn. Bas. Singularis de Viris Eruditiones Claris. Centuria Tres. Aliis Fortem Secularis, Speciminis loco, Praemissae. Basilea: Thurnisiorum Fratrum, 1713.
- Parkes, M. B. English Cursive Book Hands, 1250-1500. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Parks, George B. The English Traveler to Italy. Vol. I: The Middle Ages (to 1525). Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1954.
- Pastor, Ludwig. The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages. 36 vols., edited by Ralph Francis Kerr. London: Kegan Paul, 1891-195?.
- Prescott, William H. History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella the Catholic. 3 vols. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & co., 1871.

- Phillip, [Thomas]. The History of the Life of Reginald Pole. 2 vols., second ed. London, 1767.
- Phillips, Margaret Mann. Erasmus and the Northern Renaissance. New York: Collier Books, 1965.
- Pollard, A[ibert] F. Wolsey: Church and State in Sixteenth-century England. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966.
- Potter, G. R. (ed.). The New Cambridge Modern History. Vol. I: The Renaissance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- Ralph, Philip Lee. The Renaissance Perspective. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973.
- Randall, John Herman, Jr. The Making of the Modern Mind. Revised ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1936.
- Rashdall, Hastings. The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages. 2d. ed. 3 vols. Oxford, 1936.
- Reedijk, C. (ed.). The Poems of Desiderius Erasmus. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1956.
- Renaudet, Augustin. Érasme et l'Italie. Genève: Librairie E. Droz, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Études Érasmiennes (1521-1529). Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1939.
- Ridley, Gloucester. A Review of Mr. Phillip's History of the Life of Reginald Pole. London, 1766.
- Roersch, Alphonse. Érasme. Deuxième éd. Mons et Frameries: Union des Imprimeries, 1938.
- Roscoe-Bossi, G. Vita e Pontificato de Leone X. Milano: Sonzogno, 1816.
- Sabbadini, Remigio. Storia del Ciceronianismo e di Altre Questioni Letterarie nell' età della Rinascenza. Torino: Ermanno Loescher, 1885.
- Sammarthanus, Scaevola. Elogia Doctorum in Gallia Virorum qui Nostra Patrumque Memoria Floruerunt, editio nova et auctior juxta exemplar Parisiensis. Jenae: Ernestum Claudium Bailliar, 1696.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Elogia Gallorum Saeculo XVI. Doctrina Illustrum. N. p., 1633.

- Sandys, J[ohn] E. A History of Classical Scholarship. Vol. II: From the Revival of Learning to the end of the Eighteenth Century (in Italy, France, England, and the Netherlands). Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1908.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Harvard Lectures on the Revival of Learning. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1905.
- Schenk, W. Reginald Pole Cardinal of England. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1950.
- Schevill, Ferdinand. The Medici. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1949.
- Simar, Th[éophile]. Christophe de Longueil Humaniste (1488-1522). Louvain: Bureaux de Recueil, 1911.
- Spitz, Lewis W. The Renaissance and Reformation Movements. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1971.
- Sweertius, Franciscus. Athenae Belgicae sive Nomenclator Infer. Germaniae Scriptorum qui Disciplinas Philologicas, Philosophicas, Theologicas, Juridicas, Medicas et Musicas Illustrarunt. Antverpia: Gulielmum A Tungris, 1628.
- Thompson, Edward Maunde, A Handbook of Greek and Latin Paleography. Chicago: Argonaut, Inc., Publishers, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. An Introduction to Greek and Latin Paleography. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912.
- Thomson, S, Harrison. Europe in Renaissance and Reformation. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963.
- Toffanin, G[iuseppi]. A History of Humanism. Trans. by Elio Gianturco. New York: Las Americas Publishing Company, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Il Cinquencento. Milano: F. Vallardi, 1929.
- Valese, G. L'Umanesimo al Primo Cinquencento: Da Cristoforo Longolio al Ciceronianus de Erasmo. I: Le Parole et le Idee (1959).
- Vitae Selectorum Aliquot Virorum Qui Doctrini, Dignitate, aut Pietate Inclaruere. London: Georgium Wells, 1704.
- Weiss, Roberto. The Spread of Italian Humanism. London, 1964.

Woodward, W. H. Studies in Education during the Age of the Renaissance. Cambridge, 1906.

Zielinski, Th. Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1908.

Molho, Anthony, and Tedeschi, John A. (eds.). Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hans Baron. DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 1971.

### Articles

Aulotte, Robert. "Études sur l'Influence de Plutarque au Seizième Siècle," Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance: Travaux et Documents, XXI (1959), 606-612.

Baron, Hans. "Cicero and the Roman Civic Spirit in the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXII, no. 1 (April, 1938), 72-97.

Boussard, Jacques. "L'Université d'Orléans et l'Humanisme au Debut au XVI<sup>e</sup> S.," Humanisme et Renaissance, V (1938), 209-230.

Ferguson, Wallace K. "Humanist Views of the Renaissance," The American Historical Review, XLV, no. 1 (October, 1939), 1-28.

Garanderis, M. -M. de la. "Les Relations d'Érasme avec Paris au Temps de Son Séjour aux Pays-Bas Méridionaux (1516-1521)," Scrinium Erasmianum. Vol. I. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969, 29-53.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Recueils Parisiens de Lettres d'Érasme," Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance: Travaux et Documents, XXXI (1969), 449-465.

Gray, Hanna H. "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence," The Journal of the History of Ideas, XXIV, no. 3 (October-December, 1963), 497-514.

Hay, Denys, and Hall, A. R. "Intellectual Tendencies," The Reformation. Edited by G. R. Elton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962, 259-413.

Kopf, Hermann. "Christophorus Longolius," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, LV, nos. 3-4 (1936), 634-649.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. "Humanism and Scholasticism in the Italian Renaissance," Byzantion, XVII (1944-45), 346-374.

Lebegue, R. "Selections de Travail, Humanisme," Humanisme et Renaissance, II (1935), 186-192.

"Longueil (Christophe de)," Dictionnaire Universel, Historique, Critique et Bibliographique. Neuvième édition. Tome X: Leak-Melf. Paris, 1810, 212a-b.

"Longueil (Christophe de)," Le Grande Encyclopédie Inventaire Raisonné des Sciences, des Lettres et des Arts Par Une Société de Savants et de Gens de Lettres. Tome Vingt-deuxième: Lemot-Manzoni. Paris: H. Lamirault et Cie, [1895-96], 532-533.

[Louisy, Ernest Poiree?]. "Longueil (Christophe de)," Nouvelle Biographie Générale Depuis les Temps les Plus Reculés Jusqu' à nos Jours, Avec les Renseignements Bibliographiques et l'indication des Sources à Consulter. Tome Trente et Unième: Leu-Louis-Napoléon. Paris: Firmin Didot Freres, 1853-66, cols. 586-87.

Parks, George B. "Did Pole Write the 'Vita Longolii'?" Renaissance Quarterly, XXVI, no. 3 (1973), 274-285.

Pins, Comte Jean de. "Jean de Pins et Longueil," Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance: Travaux et Documents, XII (1950), 183-189.

Pollard, Albert Frederick. "Pole, Reginald (1500-1558)," Dictionary of National Biography. Vol. XVI: Pocock-Robins. Oxford: University Press, 35a-57a.

Randall, John Herman, Jr. "The Development of Scientific Method in the School of Padua," Journal of the History of Ideas, I (1940), 177-206.

Roersch, L[ouis]. "Longueil (Christophe de)," Biographie Nationale Publiée par l'Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-arts de Belgique. Tome Douzième: Les-Ly. Bruxelles: Bruylant-Christophe & Cie, 1892-93, cols. 349-359.

Saulnier, Verdun L. "Longueil (Christophe de)," Dictionnaire des Lettres Francaises: Le Seizieme Siecle. Edited by George Grénte. Paris: Artheme Fayard, 1951, 460.

Setton, Kenneth M. "Pope Leo X and the Turkish Peril," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, CXIII, no. 6 (Dec. 15, 1969), 367-424.



- Simar, Th[éophile]. "Christophe de Longueil Humaniste (1488-1522)," Le Musée Belge: Revue de Philologie Classique, XIII, nos. 3-4, XIV, ans XV (1909-1911), 157-206, 65-110, and 87-205.
- Tof[fanni], G[iuseppi]. "Longueil, Christophe de," Enciclopedia Italiana de scienze, lettere ed arti. Vol. XXL: Leu-Malb. Roma: Institutio della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1934-42.
- Weiss, R[oberto]. "Learning and Education in Western Europe from 1470 to 1520." The Renaissance. Edited by G. R. Potter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964, 95-126.

## APPENDIX A

### CHRISTOPHORI LONGOLII VITA<sup>1</sup>

Christophorus Longolius Macliniae, nobili Germaniae oppido, honesto splendidoque inter sous loco, natus fuit. Quoniam vero eo vivo, non defuere, qui eum Parisiensem dicerent, libri etiam ab eo scripti hoc titulo circumferrentur, non ab re erit, quae ipse in altera defensionum suarum, errorem hunc librariorum refellens, de patria sua dicit, hoc loco commemorare. Ut deinceps, qui de hac dubitant, ipsi potius Longolio de se, quam alijs credant, eius verba haec sunt. Ego P[atres] C[onscripti] Macliniae natus sum, Macliniae educatus, germanicae linguae, et Caesarum ditionis oppido, cum alijs laudibus multis illustri, tum vero Philippi et Caroli Hispaniae Regum incunabilis percelebri. haec ille. Puer admodum, cum vix annos novem natus esset, parentum studio, et diligentia, Luteciam parisiorum, ut ibi literas disceret, est missus. Neque enim vel id aetatis, propter summam ingenij docilitatem, immaturum censebant, qui in celeberrimo illo literarum domicilio politioribus disciplinis animum excoleret. Celeriter vero omnibus artibus quibus puerilis aetas imbui solet, ita profecit, ut aequales suos

omnes doctrinae laude longe praestaret, ex his autem generosissimum quemque imitandi cupiditate incenderet. Ingenio acri et vehementi praeditus fuit, in quancunque partem se dedisset, atque omnium disciplinarum (quod postea res declarabat) capaci. Quencunque scriptorem sibi legendum proposuisset, eum nunquam ferè de manibus, nisi diligenter ab eo perclectum, dimisit. Neque unquam in eo animadversum est, aut obscuritate scriptoris alicuius, aut prolixitate deteritum, quo minus totum perdisceret, si modo talem putaret, ex quo fructum aliquem capere posset. Cum autem ea quae in antiquorum scriptis tradita essent, celerrime perciperet, tum vero quae abdita fuere nemo maiori facilitate eruit. Atque huic rei testimonio esse possunt multa ab eo pene puero, in C[aij] Plinij de naturali historia libro, scriptoris non ita facilis, et plurimis mendis deformati, ingeniose excogitata et notata, quae postea ipso imprudente, et invito in Gallia fuere edita. Memoria vero tanta fuit, ut ad ea tollenda, quae animo semel insedissent, diuturnitas temporis vix aliquid valeret. De pluribus et varijs rebus saepe interrogatus, de quibus a multis annis nihil legerat, non minus prompte de singulis solitus est respondere, ac si eo die ab eo perlecta fuissent. Cuius rei cum familiariter cum eo viverem in consuetudine quotidiana crebro periculum facere lieuit. Hoc quam in eo magis mirum fuit, quod cum plurima legisset, omnia autem quae graece aut latine scripta essent sibi legenda proponeret, nunquam ferè ad metam semper properanti,

ad eundem scriptorem revertere licuit. Siquando de ijs rebus sermo incideret, quae à diversis et varijs scriptoribus tractata essent, cum res ipsae essent eaedam, ita tamen oratione solebat distinguere, sua verba singulis scriptoribus à quibus ea acceperat referendo, ut non memoriter ea dixisse, in quo saepe offendi solet, sed de scripto pronuntiasse videretur. Quae saepe cum faceret, ita auditorum admirationem incendit, ut eum artificio quodam, non naturali memoriae bono uti existimarent. Ad haec tanta naturae bona doctrinaeque summa adiumenta, eam industriam adhibuit, ut quicquid in literis profecerit, huic penè soli gratia habenda videretur. Ineunte aetate cum earum rerum cognoscendarum magno studio teneretur, quae à philosophis tractantur, amici, qui eum honoratum magis, quam doctum videre cupiebant, verentes, ne talium rerum studium, eum longius ab honorum petitione abduceret, magnopere illi auctores<sup>2</sup> fuere, ne aliud sibi eo tempore, praeter ius civile discendum proponeret. Ex euis enim artis studio affirmabant fore, ut celebriter ad honores, et ad summam gloriam perveniret. Quorum precibus, et hortationibus, cum sibi omnino parendum esse duxisset, sex annos in eo studio ita consumpsit, ut nullis interim alijs literis, praeterquam oratiorijs, quae maxime etiam artem illam vel ornare vel adiuvere existimantur, operam daret. Usus est praeceptore Philippo Decio celebri iuris interprete, qui tum Valentiae in Narbonensi provinci maximo auditorum concursu qui undique ad eum confluebant ius docuit. Eo vero tempore,

ita profecit, ut cum postea ab amicis Lutetiam parisiorum, ut ius ibi exerceret, esset revocatus, cum agendo, tum respondendo, tantam laudem est adeptus, ut vixdum biennium in juris consultorum subellijs versatus, in centumvirale illud consilium, quod antea solis senibus vel certe aetate provectus patebat, aēmodum iuvenis adlegeretur. Quare amicorum voluntati, iam satisfactum putans, tempus ad esse putavit, ut animo etiam suo maiorum rerum cupiditate flagranti morem gereret. Itaque C. Plinium cuius lectioni se totum dicaret, delegit, quem varietate et copia rerum ceteris latinis scriptoribus praestare, ac velut in unius operis compendio quaecunque à philosophis graecis, pluribus et libris et verbis tractata essent mire brevitate collegisse existimavit. Sed cum res ipsae quae quamvis copiose tractatae, per se ipsae difficultatem afferunt, in angustum à Plinio conclusae vix spem aliquam sui intelligendi darent, ibi partim necessitate coactus, quod aliter ea quae ita concise tradebantur intelligere non posset, nisi easdem fusius, apud alios tractatas videret, partim magnitudine et varietate rerum, eum invitante, ut ex uberrimis illis fontibus potius, ex quibus Plinius ipse hausisset, quam ex illa seclusa aquula illarum cognitionem peteret, animum ad maiora erexit, ut eos etiam scriptores videret, à quibus illa Plinij emanasse putabantur. In hac vero sententia cum esset, omnes illi agricolae, omnes ferè medici fuere perdiscendi. Rerum Romanorum et totius antiquitatis memoria diligenter tenenda. Orbis denique ille

disciplinarum, quam ἐγκυκλοπαιδείαν graeci vocant, evolvendus, cum nulla ferè ars sit, cuius non expressa vestigia aliqua apud Plinium reperiantur. Haec vero perficere illi multo fuit difficillimum, presertim graecarum literarum adhuc ignaro et prorsus rudi. Verum nihil horum eum retardavit, ut erat animo semper reluctante difficultatibus, tumque incensus cupiditate, ut philosophorum et aliorum scriptorum mysteria cognosceret. Principio itaque graecis literis, tanto studio tantisque ingenij viribus incubuit, ut nondum se vertente anno sive ad philosophos, sive ad oratores se converteret, ignoratio linguae nusquam eum ab eorum intelligentia excluderet, eodemque temporis intervallo graece etiam ad Gulielmum Budaeum Gallorum doctissimum epistolas saepe mitteret. Pari ergo studio atque industria cum quinquennium in graecis scriptoribus legendis perseverasset, iam lingua ipsa maxime illi familiaris fuit, eademquem opera doctos illos scriptores assidue legendo, uberrimam maximarum rerum cognitionem ex illis hausit. Memor vero ubique cum illos legeret instituti sui, et cuius causa initio tot sibi scriptores evolvendos sumpisset, nihil in his omisit, quod ad pleniorum C. Plinij intelligentiam aliquo modo faceret, quin id diligenter notatum, quo loco et in quo auctore<sup>2</sup> legisset, in Plinij libro scriptum relinqueret. Ut ante omnia subsudua un hac re, quaecunque ex lectione comparari poterant, tentaret, eandem rationem in recentiorum scriptis legendis servavit. Quando vero de stirpium natura, multa Plinius traderet, nonnulla

etiam de piscibus scriberet, rebus à cognitione huius seculi, ita remotis, ut ne nomina quidem intelligantur, non contentus eorum auctoritate,<sup>3</sup> qui aliquid de his scripsere, voluit ipse verba rebus accommodare, hisque diligenter inspectis videre, quo pacto res ipsae cum antiquorum scriptis convenirent. Itaque ea causa illi in Narbonensem provinciam iterum proficiscendi fuit, cum adolescens antea ibi ius civile dididerat, quam quidem stirpium fertilissimam, piscium etiam abundantissimam, propter illius maris vicinitatem, existimavit. In qua quidem peregrinatione librum etiam, quem herbarum historiam appellavit, scripsit. Eam vero partem, in qua Plinius terrarum orbis descriptionem complexus est, diligentissime est persecutus, atque in hoc etiam oculorum iudicio uti voluit, amnesque et sylvas, ac montes, et antiqua oppida, à Plinio descripta, quorum aliqua vestigia manerent, ipse adire, itaque cum adolescens Hispaniam totam peragrasset, adulta iam aetate, Britanniam, Germaniam, Galliam, Italiam emensus est statueratque in orientem proficisci, nisi Turchorum arma, quibus omnia christianis hominibus clausa essent, eum ab hoc consilio deterruissent. Quanquam etiam apud homines nostros peregrinando in magna pericula saepe incidit. Apud Helvetios autem, dum eorum regionem viseret, nihil propius fuit, quam ut interficeretur. Quid vero illi acciderit, et quomodo periculum evitaverit, non erit alienum commemorare, quo magis et industria eius cognoscatur, et animus, qui nullo periculo à rerum dignarum investigatione deterreri potuit.

Profectus est eò cum duobus familiaribus gallis, eo sanè tempore, quo accepta clade apud Mediolanum Helvetij à gallis mexime dissenserunt. Ex comitibus ergo cum in suspicionem venisset, speculandi causa accessisse, pars quaedam cohortis Helvetiorum eos aggressa est. Ibi cum aliquandiu repugnassent, neque pares esse potuissent, unus eorum fuga Rhodanum tranatando, vitam sibi servavit, alter in pugna caesus, ipse gravi vulnere, altero brachio accepto, captus et in carcerem abductus est, ubi triginta ferè dies cum neque medici neque remedij ullius facultas daretur, vulneris dolore magis magisque ingravescente, in summo moerore iacuit, donec casu antistes sedunensis, qui apud Helvetios dignitate et gratia maxime potuit, eo venisset, cuius opem cum Longolius per literas supplex implorasset, ipse casum viri valde miseratus, statim custodia libervit, quam id cuius causa venerat, perfecisset, regionemque totam lustrasset, atque tabellis descriptam secum domum reportasset cuius rei perficiendae maiorem tum facultatem habuit, quam ei Sedunensis auctoritas<sup>4</sup> dabat. Itaque cum in omnibus quae videre cuperet abunde satisfactum esset, illinc in patriam decessit. Sed ut eo de quo inceperam, revertar, hoc eum saepe praedicantem audivi, se quicquid rerum naturae cognitione profecisset, id C. Plinij lectioni acceptum referre, qui in omnibus illi occasionem plura quaerendi et investigandi semper dederat. Oratorijs artibus à puero semper deditus fuit, earum vero summam cognitionem, non artis solum praeceptis, sed multa exercitatione firmaverat.



Declamandique consuetudinem multis iam seculis intermissam, et propè mortuam, qua nihil unquam utilius his, qui oratores evadere cupiunt, inventum fuit, in se ipso primum post in alijs renovavit, cum argumento proposito, saepe in scholis declamando, alios suo exemplo, ut idem facerent, commovit. Genus dicendi ineunte aetate secutus est, quod postea vir factus, valde improbavit. Nam cum adolescens per omnia scriptorum genera vagaretur, neque quenquam unum sibi imitandum proponeret, sed ut ipse de se dicere solebat, tantum in uno quoque notaret, quantum acute aut sententiose dictum esset, eo factum est, ut prudenter semper ferè diceret, quod fuit etiam<sup>5</sup> naturae, oratio vero eius, quae ex verbis undique accerstitis constaret, nullam neque elegantiam, nec venustatem prae se ferret, formamque dicendi inconditam et minime aequabilem redderet. In hoc tamen genere multa scripsit, orationem de laudibus C. Plinij, alteram de laudibus Gallorum. Comparisonem iuris civilis cum re militari, in qua iuris laudes extollit. Commentarios quosdam in ius civile. Historiam herbum. Commentarios in .xi. libros Plinij ab eo admodum adolescente, quo primum tempore Plinium in manus sumpserat, conscriptos, postremum vero omnium, cum iam etiam maiorem elocutionis rationem habere inciperet, quique orationes de laudibus urbis Romae fecit. Quod vero genus scribendi mutaverit, id Petri Bembi consilio, qui eo tempore hac laude eleganter et latine scribendi multum Italibus omnibus praestitit, acceptum referre solitus est. Ille enim cum Longolio

amicissimus esset, multaque eius prudenter quidem scripta, sed inquinatis et corruptos verbis referta videret, dolere se, apud eum saepe testatus est, quod cum à natura et literis ad oratorias artes instructissimus esset, voluntate etiam in eas maxime propensus, negligeret tamen eam partem emendate et latine loquendi quam M[arcus Tullius] Cicero eloquentiae Romanae parens solum et quasi fundamentum<sup>6</sup> oratoris esse indicavit. Unde etiam eloquentia ipsa nomen sumpsisset. Magnopere igitur est cohortatus, ut totam suam dictionem, ad praestantem illam Ciceronis dicendi formam, revocaret, eumque solum ex oratoribus sibi imitandum proponeret. Cuius consilio et auctoritati<sup>7</sup> tantum tribuit, ut quinque annos continuis, ab ea cohortatione, nullum alium auctorem<sup>8</sup> latinum in manibus haberet, nullum legeret, praeter unum Ciceronem, in quo tantum studio industriaque profecit, ut post breve tempus, cum sibi eam legem indixisset, ne alijs, atque à Cicerone sumptis verbis uteretur, ad omnia ferè, quaecunque animo concepisset, exprimenda, abunde ex illo uno verba electa suppeterent. Cumque se totum ad summi illius oratoris imitationem dedisset, sicque toto animo contendisset ut nihil unquam magis, ut perfectam illius scribendi formam animo inclusam haberet, etiam in omnibus quae scripsit ut eodem modo dicere posset, magnopere laboravit. In hanc vero formam scriptae sunt ab eo orationes duae, quibus eorum accusationi respondet, qui eum Romae perduellionis reum egere, una praeterea ad Luterianos oratio, et aliquot epistolae ad amicos.

Reliqua omnia quae scripsit, ipse abolenda censuit, idque ut ita fieret, amicis moriens commendavit. Causam vero totam Luterianam, cuius oppugnationem iussu .X. Leonis Pontificis maximi, à quo etiam commentarij totius causae missi ad eum fuere, suscepit, quinque orationibus complecti statuerit, brevissem perfecisset (excogitatis iam secum, ut ex ipso audieram, quaecunque tali in causa dicenda forent) nisi prima statim absoluta, immatura mors consilium eius praevenisset. Theologiam et eos scriptores, qui de divinis rebus tractant, omni aetate coluit, idque putavit hominis esse christiani, non in senectutem, ut maxima pars hominum facit, hoc studium differre, sed quotidie addiscendo in eo quanquam lentius id fieret, aliquid tamen procedere. Hoc autem modo ipse et graecos et latinos plurimos quos maxime in rerum divinarum explicatione excellere putavit, diligenter evoluit. In his vero literis, et in alijs artibus, tot perlegit, tam multa, tanto iudicio, in tam paucis annis, ea etiam aetate, qua alijs vix maturum iudicium adesse solet, tot interim laboribus ex peregrinationibus exercitus, ut his, qui eum et mores eius non novere, penè incredibile videatur. Sed adjuvabat praeter cetera, quae modo commemoravi, temperantia summa in victu, et in omni vita, ut voluptatibus, quae apud ceteros eius presertim aetatis partem temporis sibi vindicant, nullum omnino tempus daret. Cibi et potus erat parcissimus, mero nunquam, dilutissimo semper utebatur, maxime vero frigidae potu delectabatur, quo etiam saepius usus fuisset,

nisi medici, quod maxime inimicum stomacho dicerent, eum magnopere deterruissent. Somno parum indulgebat, cum plurimum, non amplius<sup>9</sup> sex horas dormiebat. Reliqua genera voluptatum summus ille ardor in studiis literarum ita restinxit, ut nulla prorsus in eo aliarum rerum cupiditas appareret, neque vero ita prorsus studijs deditus erat, ut reliqua omnia, quaecunque in Rep[ublica] Christiana agerentur, tanquam ad se nihil pertinerent, negligeret. Sed cum studijs plurimum tribueret temporis, tum vero quando vel salutis ratio, vel quaevis alia necessitas, eum à studio avocaret, libentissime et diligentissime de his, quae foris agerentur, inquirebat. Quo factum est, ut simul et doctissimus et prudentissimus haberetur, ut neque haec curiositas rerum externarum cognoscendi, quicquam de legitimo studiorum tempore detraheret, nec illa languidiorem ad cetera redderent, aut quicquam de prudentia rerum diminuerent. Sed contra alterum ab altero adiutum hanc pulcherrimam in eo prudentiae et sapientiae coniunctionem effecere. Corporis eatenus rationem habuit, quatenus studijs sufficere posset, quotidieque ante cibum parva pila se exercebat. Quanquam per se laboris apta membrorum compositione patientissimum corpus habuit, et quod multis magnisque laboribus ad omnem patientiam ineunti aetate firmaverat. Quippe qui adolescens laborem etiam militarem fuerat perpessus, milesque Neapolitano bello cum Ludovico Galorum Rege in Italiam venisset, et si à robore militari multum abesset, corpusquem decorum magis habere, quam robustum

videretur. His vero rationibus, ita corpus et animus curavit, ut alterum semper sanum, alterum quam doctissimum, varijsque et multis artibus repletum, haberet. Quantum vero doctrina et eloquentia inter huius seculi scriptores praestiterit, hi demum intelligent, qui pauca ea, quae suo iudicio probata, scripta reliquit, cum aliorum in illo genere scriptis conferent, aut is denique, qui in simili scribendi argumento<sup>10</sup> sui periculum fecerit. Neque vero istis artibus atque virtutibus premia omnino indigna his temporibus tulit, multaque praeclara de eo iudicia principes viri fecere, a Rege Hispaniae Philippo duodeviginti annos natus, sanctoribus illis reconditarum rerum notis, quibus hodie unis omnia propè regnorum arcana committuntur, praefectus. A principibus Pannoniae magno propositio praemio accersitus, ut regem puerum optimis artibus instituendum susciperet. A Ludovico francorum rege multis honoribus affectus, de quibus ille in iudicio cum pro se diceret, adversarijs maxime conditionis obscuritatem obscientibus,<sup>11</sup> commemorare est coactus. Quo tempore regis decretum recitari fecit, a quo ille non unius aut alterius (ut eius verbis utar) suae ditionis urbium, sed universi regni viribus uno edicto est donatus. Sub quod etiam aliud decretum consilij illius centumviralis, quod Luteciae parisiorum cogitur, intulit. In quo illi iurati summo consensu in collegium suum cooptarunt, habiturum in perpetuum ius vitae et necis, ac summam fortunarum omnium potestatem, non in plebem modo, sed in omnes regni procures. Vicesimo vero octavo

aetatis anno civitas ei Romana ultro est oblata, virtutisque et literarum ergo civis factus. Quae res quanquam initio multarum illi turbarum causa fuit, multis clam invidentibus, nonnullis vero nobilissimis viris palam eum oppugnantibus, et virtutibus eius obtrectantibus, inter quos magno periculo est versatus, postea tamen optime cessit, nomenque eius et gloriam magnopere auxit. Nam cum statim post civitatem adeptam in Gallias redire studeret, ut amicos et propinquos, à quibus multos annos adfuerat, viseret, crebrae vero adversariorum eius voces exceptae essent, palam dicentium, se nomen eius delaturos, ea res fecit, ut paulo diutius consilium, profectionis differret, ne si tali tempore urbem relinqueret, non amicos salutandi causa discessisse, sed timore et minis inimicorum perterritum ab urbe aufugisse, videri posset, sed cum diutius mansisset, quam eius rationes paterentur, expectans quorsum obtrectatorum invidia procederet, cum illi inter nihil contra cum nisi convicijs<sup>12</sup> agerent, existimans ulterius eorum indignitatem non progressuram, iter Galliam versus iam diu ad eo deliberatum, est persecutus, relictis tamen apud amicos defensionibus suis scriptis, ut contra omnes conatus adversariorum, si absentia eius aliquam illis occasionem accusandi daret, praesto haberent quod opponerent. Iam tum ex eorum convicijs<sup>12</sup> animo prospiciens, quae maxime obiecturi essent, quibus ille omnibus medicinam fecerat. Cuius sui consilij prudenter excogitati magnum postea fructum et voluptatem cepit. Vix enim Venetias in eo itinere

pervenit, cum ad eum literae amicorum sunt allatae, nunciantes gravissiam accusationem qua statim post discessum eius adversarij sunt usi, et quo pacto consilium de relinquendis defensionibus processisset, accusavit eum nobilis et disertus adolescens Romanus in quo magnam dignitatis suae spem maiores natu Romani collocarant, ad id inductus inimicorum Longolij multis et assiduis precibus, obiecto etiam falsae gloriae splendore, quod patriae laudibus, quas oppugnatas à Longolio esse voluerunt, in huius modi accusatione adesse eum asseverarent. Ita vero acerbè et vehementer, ipso audiente principe Romano, cum multi nobilissimi et clasissimi viri iudicio interessent, egit, ut nonnulli amici Longolij essent, qui de causa obtinenda desperarent, donec amicorum praecipua cura defensiones eius in lucem prodire, quae ita ab omnibus passim probabantur, ut multi dicerent non Longolium civitatis donatione ornatum, sed ipsum, civitatem illis orationibus ornasse, in quibus pristinam dignitatem civitati et vetera sua ornamenta omnia restituisse videbatur. Principi vero ipsi ita placuere, ut oblitus penè quid adversario eius tribuisset, quem paulo ante, nulla magis re alia motus, atque eius in Longolium actione, in familiarium numerum receperat, protinus iuberet, ut diplomata Longolio expedirentur, quibus ratum esset, quod .S.P.Q.R. de cive eum asciscendo decrevisset, praeterea quod ipse de privato aulario ad tuenda studia eius concessisset, atque ad eum ubicunque terrarum esset, deferrentur. Ea tamen lege, ne sedem

studiorum alibi, quam in Italia poneret. Multis praeterea honoribus affecit, nam in palatinum et sacrosanctae lateranensis aulae comitatum sua sponte cooptavit, et in Romani pontificatus scribarum numero esse voluit. Quae cum ad eum perlata essent, cum alia omnia libenter audivit, tum vero conditionem de commoratione sua in Italia non invitus accepit, laetusque in Galliam quasi ex inimicorum dolore triumphum agens, animo statim revertendi est profectus, ubi magno amicorum gaudio exceptus quod nihil tam praeter opinionem eorum, accideret, quam ut eum quem vix salvum in tantis contentionibus arbitrabantur honoribus etiam auctum viderent, magno eum studio apud se retinere contenderunt, pluribus etiam ad manendum premijs et privatim à multis, et publice a rege ipso francorum propositis. Ex privatis autem, qui hoc maxime ab eo contenderunt, Ludovicus Ruzeus parisiensis, cum multa alia, tum vero suburbanum fundum lautum et fructuosum muneri obtulit. Nullam aliam beneficij sui remunerationem, aut operam ab eo expectans, nisi ut urbe illa quasi domicilio studiorum suorum contentus, in Italiam amplius non rediret. Ille vero quanquam Galliam semper non minus caram,<sup>13</sup> quam patriam habuit, existimans non inferiori amoris loco habendam, quae excepit, quam quae genuit, plurimi etiam in hac re amicorum studia aestimaret, tamen cum recordaretur quam fidem X. Leoni Pont. Max. et reliquis amicis de reditu dedisset, ab eo nullis cuiusquam promissis aut precibus deduci potuit. Mirifice vero ipse sua sponte erga Italiam et italos homines



afficiebatur, ut etiam in epistola quadam ad Sadoletum,<sup>14</sup> reditus sui rationem probare volens, cum alias causas attulisset, postremo addit, ideo se redisse, quod ad excitanda fovendaque studiosorum hominum ingenia plurimum confere arbitratus esset, coeli ipsius Italiae clementiam, seque in eo felicem illum et plane divinum Italiae genium sectum. Antequam vero rediret, Britanniam nobilem insulam videre voluit, adductus praeterea fama eorum, quos praeter ceteros illic graecis literis et latinis eruditos, omni liberali et ingenua doctrina pollere audiverat. Cum quibus pluribus diebus iucunde consumptis, quod eorum doctrina ita delectaretur, ut etiam summae admirationi esset, quem admodum saepe eum praedicantem audivi, tantam et tam politam atque excultam doctrinam in illis locis, apud eos homines vel usquam penè terrarum his temporibus, quibus propè omnes elegantiores artes iaceant, potuisse reperiri, ad constitutum sibi in Italiam iter reversus est, Pataviumque venit, quem studijs suis locum accommodatissimum elegit. Quanquam simul ac de eius in Italiam adventu auditum est, populus florentinus non solum in civitatem suam si illic ad instituendam bonis artibus iuventutem se conferret, invitavit, verum etiam vicena quina in annos singulos sestertiorum nummum millia ex aerario publico decrevit. Verum ille recordatus, quae premia ante contempserat, quod nullam otij<sup>15</sup> sui partem alijs vendere voluisset, nulla mercede a suscepta propositiaque sententia potuit avelli. Patavij autem se continuit, sibi et studijs

suis serviens primum in contubernio Stephani<sup>16</sup> Sauli nobilis genuatis, qui literarum causa eo se contulerat optimarum artium etiam ipse studiosissimus. Deinde vero eo in patrim revocato, cum multi nobiles viri (quorum tum patavij propter celebritatem eorum qui literas docuerunt, magna copia fuit) certatim Longolium ad se invitarent, quod eius consuetudinem non honorificam tantum sibi, sed etiam fructuosam fore putabant. Ille in domum Raynoldi Poli nobilis iuvenis Britannii, quem per eos dies Rex Britanniae literarum causa eo miserat, migravit, quo cum coniunctissime literis usque ad extremum vitae diem vixit.<sup>17</sup> Amicitij usus est magnis et illustribus quas illi ubique ferè vel felicitas quaedam eius, vel doctrinae fama conciliaverat. Neque vero in conciliandis amicis felicior, quam in retinendis prudentior habebatur. Quos summa fide observantiaque semper coluit. Quantum vero officio in amicos tribuit, vel extremus ille vitae eius actus facile declaravit. Nam cum gravissime ex febre laboret, ex qua etiam periit eodemque tempore ab Hieronymo Savorniano amico suo, qui tum filium summa spe et indole adolescentem amiserat, literas accepisset, valde miserabiliter de morte filij scriptas,<sup>18</sup> existimans se non aliter officio suo in amicum posse satisfacere, in medijs ipsis doloribus cum gravissime cruciaretur, literas ad eum consolatorias, morbum suum silentio tegens, ne hoc etiam ad amici dolorem, dedit. Quae quidem ut tum scriptae, maxime vim morbi auxisse existimari possent, sic uberrime quo officio in amicos esset

declaravere. Qui ne eo quidem tempore sibi parcere voluit, aut officium intermittere, quo omnes illi libenter remisissent, aut sanè amicus non esset, qui hoc ab eo exigeret, et tum alium consolaretur, cum magis consolatione ipse egeret. Sed ab ea humanitate quam in omni vita erga amicos retinuerat, ne tum quidem dolor corporis et propinqua mortis expectatio potuit eum deducere, aut facere, ut suorum commodorum rationem haberet, qui semper quacunque in re declarare posset, amicorum commoda suis praetulerit. Quo factum est ut carissimos<sup>19</sup> illos, semper firmissimos haberet, idque maxime est expertus, cum absens Romae in iudicium vocaretur. Quo tempore neque adversariorum eius potentia, quae maxima fuit, nec acerba eorum in eum accusatio, quenquam eorum qua amicitia vel consuetudine aliqua, dum Romae esset, coniuncti videbantur, ulla in re flectere potuit. Plurimum vero ex omnibus detulit Iacobo Sadoletto, et P[etro] Bembo viris cum auctoritate<sup>20</sup> et gratia inter eos, qui tum Romae erant, maxime florentibus, tum vero doctrina et omnia politiore humanitate prope singularibus. Quorum opibus et gratia quamdiu Romae fuit, in omnibus rebus est usus. Ut vero alios in se benignos et liberales est expertus, sic omnibus, quos aut opera aut consilio iuvare posset, maxime fuit expositus, praecipue vero his, qui spem aliquam de se vel ingenij vel doctrinae darent. Novi ipse multos quicum a patria absentes et amicorum subsidio destituti, ad eum confugerent, ab eo saepe pecunia sublevatos, cum tamen valde tenues facultates

haberet, et aliorum opibus casus suos sustentaret. Quando vero diutius sumptus tales se ferre non posse sentiret, per amicos omnia egisse ne quid illis deesset, non secus ac si omnia necessitudinis<sup>21</sup> officia sibi cum illis intercessissent, qui neque cognatione neque patria eum contingebant, indole tantum et spe doctrinae ei commendati. Adversus fortunae vulneribus multis, ut in tam paucis vitae annis ictus, nihil unquam aliter, atque virum decuit, tulit. Primum Philippi Regis Hispaniae morte inopinata,<sup>22</sup> ad quem se post amissum utrumque parentem, contulerat, ex quo cum magna sperasset, iamque apud eum gratia supra aetatem auctoritate<sup>23</sup> multum valeret, ille praeter omnium opinionem in Hispania ereptus est. Deinde multis peregrinationibus et molestiis agitato, carceris etiam molestiam et difficultatem est perpesus. Post contentio illa Romae accessit cum potentibus et factiosis adversariis, inter quos cum saepe discrimen vitae adiit, nunquam sine magno periculo versabatur. Extremum vero omnium, quod aliquae ex parte eum attingere videbatur, fuit decimi Leonis Pontificis Maximi mors, in cuius vita omnem spem fortunarum suarum sitam habebat, cuius auctoritatem<sup>24</sup> et promissa sequutus, contra omnium amicorum suorum voluntatem in Italiam redierat. Cum autem neque ad suos honestum reditum, quorum antea promissa spreuerat, neque quo pacto in Italia defuncto iam Leone, qui antea sumptus suppeditabat, otium<sup>25</sup> suum cum dignitate tueri posset, satis videret, haec non nihil eum conturbaverunt. Nusquam tamen se commovit sed

veteribus tantum amicis, quos in Italia habuit, de statu suo per literas admonitis, ille in contubernio, illius nobilis iuvenis Britanni se continuit. Cum vero decem menses post obitum Leonis perpätuo ferè in literis versaretur, constitutum se habere dixit in forum Iulium proficisci, cum ut animum suum curis literarum districtum peregrinatione relaxaret, tum etiam ut eam partem Italiae sibi non satis cognitam videret. Itaque paucos ante dies, quam egredi statuerat, cum nihil omnino incommodae valetudinis sentiret, semotis arbitris multa cum Polo suo, cui semper plurimum tribuit, fertur disputasse, de periculis, de fragilitate, de miseria humanae vitae. Hanc vero tandem summam orationis habuisse, ut quoniam sibi peregrinandum esset, neque ignoraret multa saepe peregrinantibus pericula praeter opinionem, quibus obsisti non posset, intervenire, ut rebus suis, quicquid sibi accideret, provideret, testamentum se velle facere dixit, atque apud eum deponere, flensque penè rogavit, ut siquid sibi adversi accideret, testamenti capita persequeretur, famamque suam et memoriam caram<sup>26</sup> haberet. Atque haec cum magna admiratione illius cui haec commiserat fecit. Quis<sup>27</sup> enim<sup>28</sup> non miraretur quod in proximam provinciam exiturus, optima etiam valetudine, ut et sibi et alijs videbatur praeditus, ea diceret et faceret, quae magis ex vita, quam ex civitate migrantis, videbantur. Verum sive divinatione de propinqua morte sua id faciebat, sive prudentia quadam, quam casus postea divinationem videri fecit. Eodem die, qui profectioni

constitutus est, in gravem et assiduam febrem incidit, ex qua non convaluit, eo etiam tempore cum forte abesset Polus,<sup>29</sup> cui antea res suas omnes crediderat. Quem tamen per literas statim quo statu esset certiolem fecit, nihil de testamento mutans, hoc tantum rogans, ut quemadmodum coràm recepisset, curam et quasi dispensationem rerum suarum acciperet, mortuoque memoriam pie et inviolate praestaret. Quo nuntio<sup>30</sup> tristissimo ille perculsus. Quod eum unice amaret, subito accurrit, multaque cum in spem vitae diceret, eadem etiam medici pollicerentur, nunquam ab eo deduci potuit, quin ea febris finem sibi vitae esset allatura [,] id quod paucos post dies evenit. Antequam vero discederet in divi Francisci familiam voluit adoptari, eiusquem habitu post mortem et templo sepeliri. Obijt xxxiiij aetatis anno .iiij. idus Septembris. Anno salutis generis humani .M.D.XXI. atque Patauij in Francisci quemadmodum ipse praescripsit sepultus.

1. Longueil, Opera, Junta, "Vita," fols. 3a-8a, cf., ch. i, n. 1. Spellings, ligatures, and abbreviations have been modernized.

2. The text reads authores.

3. The text reads authoritate.

4. The text reads authoritas.

5. The text at this point, fol. 5a, is dubious, and the reading supplied is inserted in accordance with later editions of the "Vita" text.

6. The text reads fundametum.

7. The text reads authoritati.

8. The text reads authorem.

9. A comma has been deleted from the text at this point for clarity.

10. The text reads fundametum.

11. The text reads objicientibus.

12. The text reads convitijs.

13. The text reads charam.

14. Cf., infra, "Appendix M," for the materials about which Longueil's biographer refers.

15. The text reads ocij.

16. This appears as lower case in the text.

17. The text reads dixit, although it is corrected in subsequent editions of the "Vita."

18. Cf., infra, "Appendix M," for a tabulation of the correspondence between Longueil and others. This particular item is III, 36.

19. The text reads charissimos.

20. The text reads authoritate.

21. The text reads necessitunis.

22. Cf., supra, chs. iv, v, and vi, for a discussion of these and other chronological matters pertaining to Longueil.

23. The text reads authoritate.
24. The text reads authoritatem.
25. The text reads ocium.
26. The text reads charam.
27. Leslie F. Smith suggests this reading over the text of the "Vita," which reads Quid.
28. The text reads .n..
29. The text has a lower case letter at this point.
30. The text reads nuncio.



APPENDIX B

CHRISTOPHORUS LONGUOLIUS

ILLUSTRISSIMO VALESII DUCI ET

ANGOLISMAE COMITI FRANCISCO VALESIO,

Sa. Di. aeternam.<sup>1</sup>

Doluit mihi non semel illustrissime princeps quod cum rerum gestarum magnitudine Romanorum gloriam franca virtus haud dubie superaret/<sup>2</sup>vel certe aequaret, una tamen in re illis cedere videamur, ut non totidem Franci sanguinis latia eloquentia spectati reges reperiantur quot illi nobis Caesares objiciunt. Caeterum quom subit plurimum referre quis patrij sermonis an exoticae linguae peritiam sibi vendicet, nihil praeterea querendum puto quum tot, nescio an etiam plures Francorum reges gallica facundia nobilitaverit quot Romani imperatores latina eloquentia floruerunt. Cur enim pluris fecere<sup>3</sup> Romanum suo vernaculo sermone disertum quam Francum gallica elegantia conspicuum, Sed turpe (ut ille ait) nescire latine, Turpe profecto Italici nostratibus minime non magis hercle quam si persice nesciant aut/Cantabrice

vel Romani ipsi Gallice, Verum multa latine exprimes ad que Francus sermo haereat, ita est. Sed et plurima nobis scite dicuntur que si<sup>4</sup> Romane enuncies insulsissima euadent quum etiam neque parum multa Francus<sup>5</sup> proprio reddat nomine, que Romanus non nisi circumlocutione interpretabitur. Quod si nos eloquij inopes calumniabuntur citra latini sermonis commercium fatebor nonnihil quidem verborum apud nos trallaticium esse, sed quod usu factum sit promiscuum/immo longi temporis praescriptione nostrum. Sic enim Romanos ipsos Sardoas et Hispanas/atque adeo Gallicas imprimis dictiones usurpasse legimus, quum ceteris temere vocabulis precario utantur/ea scilicet a Grecis passim mendicantes atque dum sua tantum legunt cetera imprudentius nescias an impudentius aspernantur quod et in Atheniensibus Anacharsis Scythia philosophus olim notauit quom ab eo attici sermonis puritatem ambitiosius requirerent. Ego inquit apud Athenienses soloecismo labor Athenienses apud Scythas. Et cum haud ita multi Caesarum graecam linguam a Latina<sup>6</sup> nullam praeterea aliam calluerint innumeri sane Franci principes occurrunt, qui paucis nationibus per interpretem loquerentur plurimis per seipsos responderent quorum e numero sat retulisse fuerit Clodoucum Chilpericum/Clotarium/Dagobertum/Pipinum/Carolus magnum/Ludovicum pium et Robertum. Mirantur/et illi a philosophiae studijs suum Adrianum/et merito quidem, ut etiam universum pene orbem peragrauerit. Mihi autem ut Francis<sup>7</sup> omnibus in te gloriari licebat, qui etiam nun ephaebus ac

vix biennio pubertatem supergressus in cosmographia omnimodaque historia tantum profecisti, ut immensum sit quod a te gallia tota expectat.<sup>8</sup> Hic ut dicitur inter saxum et sacrum haereo. Nam si illa vel delibavero quae inte omnes demirantur blandiri dicar, sin tacvero invidere. Ceterum cum illa tam vera sint quam rara et inexpectata hac in tantilla aetate et regia fortuna vixque apud posteros fidem habitura malo adulationis nota inuri falso, quam invidentiae macula quovismodo respergi. Nam qui (ut illus os probum regiumque eximiae frontis decus sileatur) te uno nobilior? cui in Augusto Francorum stemmate proximus a Christianissimo nostro principe gradus asseritur. Qui ex aequalibus atque adeo paulum aetate superioribus procerior/robustior? Qui eques deterior? Quis in decursionibus bellatior/in militari meditatione ferocior/in contubernio mitior? Quis non unius gentis annalium peritior? Quis in describendo terrarum orbe promptior/in inquirendo sagacior<sup>9</sup>/in retinendo tenacior?<sup>10</sup> Nec me putes velim in amplissimo laudum taurum campo orationem nunc exercere. Maius id omnino est quam ut vel a me praestari vel epistolari angustia coherceri queat.<sup>11</sup> Sed quis in eos/qui quantulocumque eruditionis nomine censurentur te uno facilior, benignior? quod mihi non pridem periclitari licuit quando a te accersitus usque ad ruborem civiliter sum acceptus, principalique mensa dignatus, exin tam crebris philosophiae acroamatis exercitus, tam multiplici historiarum narratione exilaratus, tam vario coeli terrarumque tractu circumactus, ut tum mihi

liquido consisterit Francorum<sup>12</sup> regnum dei optimi maximi favore niti qui te ita nasci, ita demum instituti voluisset, ut secundum Aegyptiorum morem summa potentia cum maxima sapientia in te aliquando coiret. Quid hic rubore perfunderis? quid ad generosae tuae indolis memoriam erubescis? tam certe assentari nescio quam res ipsa detractat. Cognouit haec multo ante omnia prudentissimus Rex noster Ludovicus qui ne ut Augustus Caesar sub lentis maxillis populum suum dimitteret, ne ut Adrianus imperator in caducum parietem inclinaret, te unum (ne uxorium quidem nihilque minus quam matrimonium cogitantem) sibi generum delegit, cui Claudiam unicam filiam multorum regnorum haeredem desponsaret non sane propter opum tuarum principatuumque amplitudinem et maximam in quam adulescis spem.<sup>13</sup> Vix enim tibi per haec Archidux Carolus cesserit qui has nuptias dudum ambivit, sed ob numeris omnibus absolutas copris, animique tui dotes. Prionde quum de te apud omnes tanta sit expectatio quanta vel esse potest super illo quem omnium mulierum prudentissima, eademque pientissima princeps Lodovica Allobrox<sup>14</sup> mater tua ab incunabulis patre orbatum educauit/instituit/ornauit, vel esse debet de eo quem sacratissimus noster princeps ac magnus Galliarum consensus Carolo illi austrio iam multis regibus imperij amplitudine praetulit, sisque mihi semper visus secundum nominis tui etymum Francorum glorias studiosissimus. Panegyricum quem de laudibus divi Ludovici atque Francae gentis nuper habui tibi nuncupandum<sup>15</sup> existimavi, in quo Francorum, neque non

Romanorum gesta ita contulimus ut promptum sit, etiam vernaculis tuis iudicare utra natio bellicis rebus religione ac eruditione praestiterit. Etenim tam Gallicis quem Latinis<sup>16</sup> verbis eum ad te mitto ut tibi liberum sit et integrum vel Francicum<sup>17</sup>/vel Romanum evolvere. Ideo autem Francos Romanis composui quod una illorum gloria ceterarum gentium fulgorem praestringere videbatur. Ne me facturum operae precium rebar licet reliquorum mortalium luminibus probassem Francos obstruxisse nisi porro et Romanum nomen eos vel aequasse vel superasse palam facerem. Et quia summa orationis historica fide constat, rerum potius veritatem quam ipsorum verborum nitorem aut elocutionis pompam aestimabis. Non hic etiam crebros Rhetorum colores, sed germanam illam sarctam tectamque gestorum narrationem polliceor tam frequenter Italica invidia lacerandam quam saepe Francos Romanis superiores evasisse legend. Nam universos Italos in Romanum nomen abivisse Strabo auctor est, sed cum haec tuis auspicijs in publicum prodeat, cur a canino dente timeat, nihil est hinc veritate illinc tui nominis maiestate armata. Vale.

Pyctavi Nonis Septembris. Anno domini millesimo quingentesimo decimo.

1. Longueil, Oratio de Laudibus divi Ludovici, 1510, fols. a, ij (2a-3b), as cited supra, ch. ii, n. 2, and Longueil, Orationes Duae, 1510/1520, fol. ij, a-b, as indicated supra, ch. ii, n. 3. The person to whom this letter was written was the sixteen-year-old Duke Francis of Valois, later Francis I, cf., ch. vii, and nn. 48-50. The text utilized for this transcription is the 1510 publication with emendations from the 1520 edition. Spellings, ligatures, and abbreviations have been modernized according to the principles set forth in "Appendix A."

2. This break in the text and similar typesetter's marks follow those in the text of Jehan Granion of 1510.

3. The text reads feceri.

4. The text of 1510 is quite obscure at this point, but that of 1520 indicates the reading as adopted.

5. Lower case in the 1520 text.

6. Lower case in the 1520 text.

7. Lower case in the 1520 text.

8. No punctuation occurs in the 1510 text.

9. The text reads sagatior.

10. The text reads tenatior.

11. The 1510 text has a comma at this point.

12. Lower case in both texts.

13. The 1510 text has a comma at this point.

14. This is Louise of Savoy (1476-1531), who became regent of France during the absence of her son, Francis I, when he went on expeditions in 1515 and 1524-26. She and Margaret of Austria signed the treaty of Cambrai (1529), the Ladies' Peace (Paix des Dames).

15. The 1520 text reads nuncpandam.

16. Lower case in the 1520 text.

17. Lower case in the 1520 text.

APPENDIX C

IACOBUS RENALDUS TURONENSIS

FACUNDISSIMO ORATORI ATQUE EXIMO

PHILOSOPHO ET JURISCONSULTO

CHRISTOFORO LONGUOLIO. S. D.<sup>1</sup>

Orationem tuam et ambrosia suaviorem/<sup>2</sup>et ipsa venere  
venustiolem transcurri facundissime Christofore. Incredibile  
dictu est, quantum voluptatis attulerit. Addit certeris ali-  
quid pronuntiatio, Tibi scribenti pronuntiationis absentia  
nihil detrahit, Sic namque ad libellam omnia delectissimis  
verbis numerisque complexus es. Ut quom legerem fulem illud  
quo in divi Francisci aede orans/frequentissimum atque erudi-  
tissimum caetum in admirationem et stuporem egisti, denueo  
exaudire/et ti dicentem illosque modestissimos atque aptis-  
simos gestus in rem praesentem animos auditorum ducentes in-  
tueri viderer. In ea (quia iudicium meum requiris) divini  
primum numinis/licet novam in hoc scripti genere/laudabilem<sup>3</sup>  
tamen et a posteris imitabilem invocationem valde commendavi.  
Qua<sup>4</sup> non a gentili modo vanitate abhorrere, sed Christianae

quoque fidei observantissimus argueris. Excellentem porro et eximiam verborum sententiarumque copiam, Argumentorum impetum, dispositionis lumen haud mediocriter admiratus sum,<sup>5</sup> Imprimis autem delectavit tersissimus candor et puritas per omnia membre diffusa, mirisque modis recrearunt perbellae insertae generis utriusque figure, quibus velut nitidis quibusdam gemmis variegata splendescit. Nec sane levis subito admiratio, quom solum solo, duces ducibus compares, quum Galliam Romae/immo toti Italiae preferendam. Romanos armis/eruditione/religione nostris multo inferiores fuisse et esse ostenderes, quom<sup>6</sup> vetustatem regum Galliae,<sup>7</sup> magnitudinem rerum foris domique gestarum: expeditiones transmarinas/religionis causa susceptas: bella varia olim gesta, in ipsa etiam Italia pro dignitate summorum antistitum conservanda, quum antiquitatem nominis/nobilitatem gentis/reges temere omnes regumque nomina (donec divi Ludovici tempore contigeris, necnon ipsius Ludovici mores imperium sanctitatem) brevissime et appositissime recenseres. Sed qua gratia? quibus ingenij viribus quo contentionis ardore Francorum originem/pueritiam/adulescentiam et iuventam paribus vitae Romanorum gradibus contulisti. Vincimus profecto hac in parte vetustatem, multitudine enim historiarum, varietate dicendi, sententiarum ac verborum pondere veteres absque omni contentione subactos credo. Et citra omnem adulationem loquor, etiamnum totus obstupeo, dum animo reputo/quibus hausta fontibus, per quos deducta campos/ut non copia illa quidem, sed mundatio effusissima



esse videatur. Est haud dubiae usquequaque illustris/distincta/aperta/nunquam confunderis, omnia tentas/omnia pervestigas/semper acer/semper pugnax quom<sup>8</sup> contendis, ut conseri bellum non oratio haberi videatur. Alta<sup>9</sup> illustre, pressa iucunde/magnifica gloriose, omnia splendide politeque scripta. Nihil candidius, nihil ornatius, nihil locupletius, infinitum esset omnia prosequi. Illud<sup>11</sup> ut semel<sup>12</sup> finiam censeo, post Tullianam aetatem omnes quicumque benedicendi virtutem habuere,<sup>13</sup> abs te una oratione historiarum congerie, sententiarum delectu, vi argumentorum, schematum venustate, nitore verborum, haud obscure superatos. Vale.

1. Longueil, Oratio de Laudibus divi Ludovici, 1510, fols. [23b-24a], as cited supra, ch. ii, n. 2, and Longueil, Orationes Duae, 1510/1520, fol. 9b, as indicated supra, ch. ii, n. 3. The text utilized in this transcription is the 1510 publication with emendations from the 1520 edition. Spellings, ligatures, and abbreviations have been modernized according to the principles set forth in "Appendix A." At this particular juncture in the text of the 1510 publication a comma is printed, whereas a period appears in the 1520 text.

2. This break in the text and similar typesetter's marks follow those of the text of Jehan Granion of 1510.

3. The text reads laudalem in the 1520 edition.

4. Printed in lower case in both texts.

5. The 1510 text reads admiratussum.

6. The 1520 text reads quum.

7. Printed in lower case in the 1510 text.

8. The 1520 text reads quum.

9. Printed in lower case in both texts.

10. Printed in lower case in both texts.

11. Printed in lower case in both texts.

12. Both texts read semet.

13. The 1510 text reads habuaere.

## APPENDIX D

### CHRISTOFORUS LONGUOLIUS

IOANNI BALAEONIO BELOVACENSI.<sup>1</sup>

Utinam te deus aliquis hic stitisset postridie Dionysij sollemnitatem,<sup>2</sup> vidisses quam difficile mihi sertamen cum imperitia fuerit, immo (ni fallo) mihi militasses ad propulsandam quorundam perditorum vim atque iniuriam. Hoc quia spectaculo frui vel potius proelio esse non potuisti (hinc fugatus illa fatali destillatione/quae Europam nedum Galliam hoc autumno exercuit) rem tibi paucis digeram/simul ut reduci amico congratuleris/simul ut intelligas etiam timidissimos desperatione fieri audacissimos, atque adeo gloriosi illius Terentiani militis aemulos. Moris est Pyctavi sexto Idus Octobris ludum quotennis aperire/quem Cereales vindemialesque feriae claudunt. Hoc die quum et ego bonorum omnium adhortatione/praeterque (ut ita dicam) doctorum imperio duodetricesimum Pandectarum librum iuris civilis auspicerer ecce turbulenta vasconum cohors me ipso in pulpito strictis ensibus obsedit, suggestum assertura uni suorum commilitionum quem ea ipsa hora (nempe a meridie altera)

iureconsultorum placita enarrare solitum vociferabatur. Steti nonnihil defixus quum rei novitate tum facinoris immanitate, mecum reputans quem huic tumultui fortuna exitum daretum daret. At illi omnis morae impatientes competitorem meum/cum altero cohortalium audacissimo/pulpitum statim ascendere iubent me inde exturbaturos ni ultro cederem. Ego cui ne graphium quidem aderat tot ensibus impar consilium<sup>3</sup> sub manu coepi utile futurum/nisi inermis fuisset Subeuntibus enim obviam processi, non (ut rebantur) cathedram deserturus, sed occupaturus loci angustias. Nam uno tantum patet aidtu/et eo perquam maligno scalarum gradibus utrinque patientibus, ut facile sit vel calcis ictu ab uno multos praecipitari. Id tamen auxiliij genus ne periclitarer infestis assecuti sunt mucronibus, quos nisi celeri regressu vitassem/mihi in vestigio cadendum erat. Ita superata loci difficultate/dum verbis de industria moras necto, sperans quae astabat multitudinem rei indignitate motam mihi auxilio affuturam exclamans ex siccarijs alter, quid (inquit) verbis opus est? velis nolis hinc facesses aut occumbes, et condicto me vestis lacinia arripiens restitantiem deorsum trahabat, quum loci oportunitate admonitus, illos enim praeire/me sequi angustiae cogeant/utrumque per scalarum praecipitia resupinavi, non quod horum ruina profligari hostes existimarem, sed quod arbitrarer tam insigni facinore/optimum quemque mihi suppetiatum iri/tametsi nihil quiritabam, nos circumstantibus plus minus sexcentis auditoribus, an potius

iniqui certaminis spectatoribus? At sibi quisque timere de-  
mentiae imputaturi/si quis in ferrum nudus ruisset. Ergo  
et voce et manu bono me esse animo iubere sceleratam illam  
manum minis insectari. Ceterum ea adhortatio/neque vascones  
ab incepto deterrebat/quando furibundum alium properantem  
aspicio/pudendam commilitionum suorum ruinam vel sanguine meo  
redimere. Hic mihi animi dubio/hostemne praestolarer an  
aversa suggesti parte desilirem? fors arma dedit, venerunt  
enim in manu tria digestorum volumina/enormi ponderis (quae  
infortiata appellant) et primum quidem (meum id erat) tanto  
impetu in subeuntem immisi ut ille vindice mox indigverit/  
qui tam minaci vultu suos ulturus modo properebat. Quartus  
me sibi destinarat victimam, sed et hic altero codice ictus  
nihilo foeliciore eventu ceteris dimicavit. Defunctus vide-  
bar omni periculo/quum mihi novus metus iniectus est ab alio  
quem inter primos percipitaveram. Nam dum totus in oppug-  
nantium conatus feror, dum obsidentum minis sollicitor, dum  
amicorum adhortationibus distingor, dum tumultuantium mul-  
titudine perturbor, hic clam obrepserat, iamque pulpiti lab-  
rum (voti fere compos) appraehenderat/quum tertio volumine  
ingeminatis ictibus digitos eius omnes elisi, atque ita prae-  
ter omnium expectationem/cesserunt arma togae adeo ut me vi-  
cisse, immo vivere postea demirarer, paulo ante securus vic-  
toriae/dum vel effugerem/vel honeste caderem. Sed enim hoc  
praestitit studiosa iuventus, quae periculo nostro tandem  
excita/et obsessores et oppugnatores meos non ut ante

convicijs, sed lateribus et subselliorum fragmentis eminus impetivit, ita ut telorum multitudine obruti/armisque Vascones mulctati turpissima sibi fuga consulere coacti, nihil praeter vulnera et publicum odium lucrifecerint. Nam sibi conscijs publico diu abstinuerunt veriti praetoris decretum quo praehendi iubebantur: ut hoc nomine in eso capite anquireretur. Atqui precibus multorum fatigatus, iniuriam illis primum remisi, mox (quod mireris) ut omnes noxae eximerentur impetravi, ut autem cum studiosa iuventute in gratiam redirent teneri non potuit, quare omnes huius gentis professores partim Andegavum/partim Tholosam sese receperunt. Sed quam pulchre hac in parte vicimus, tam parum alibi nobis successit. Etenim quum statuissem in ipso civilium literarum tyrocinio iuresconsultum describere, qualem Papinianum<sup>4</sup> fuisse suspicamur, inopina coniuratorum sedito, hunc ita discerpserit/ut reliquias eius vix reperire nedum agnoscere possis in ea oratione quam impraesentiarum ad te mitto, ut hab eas non solum quid Longuolius tuus in tanto rerum turbine fecerit, sed et quid dixerit. Quod si in ea parum Rhetorisare tibi videbimur, mirere potius ut inimicorum calumnijs ex tempore occurrere potuerimus vix bene levati illo pavore qui fortissimo cuique et vocem eripuisset et sapientiam omnem ex animo (ut ille ait) expectorasset. Certe priusquam ferro decerneretur verbis aliquandiu res concertata fuerat, unde consternatus irarumque plenus suggestum conscenderam/factorus convicium imperitae factioni. Sed et inter orandum non unus

mihi fuit animus/non una mens. Hinc dicturienti argumentum suggererebat iniuria, illinc dicenti obstrepebat ira: ut scholasticis parum inter se conveniebat/ita et ego in diversa rapiebar. Sedata denique seditione, exui quem a principio Appianum vultum induerum atque concioni submisi/tam populariter animos studiosae iuventutis mihi<sup>5</sup> conciliaturus quam eorum benevolentiam ab exordio aucupati neglexeram ut qui improborum iudicium susque deque ferrem, neque apud multitudinem tanquam iudices, sed veluti ad inferiores vel certe inter pares verba haberem. Proinde omnibus dilutis quae mihi sacra illa cohors obiecerat, simulque demonstrata civilium literarum difficultate, quum iam esset studiosa iuventus ad illas capessendas adhortanda, nequiui mihi temperare, quin orationis aculeos intenderem minas deflectendo in coniuratorum suggillationem, licet pro iniuriae atrocitate lenior fuerim (quae enim oratio illorum audiciae par esse potuit? Ceterum haec quum aetatis tum doctrinae mediocritas, licentiores verborum libertatem minime tulisset. Itaque et eorum temeritatem non nisi trallative perstrinxi, et omnium nomenclaturae peperci, tum quod non ignobiles aliquando forent, tum quod multorum vota mihi<sup>5</sup> adhuc suspecta essent, plerisque amicitiam nostram simultantibus, plerisque dissimulantibus. Breviter tumultuariam quidem orationem leges et ipso tumultu nihilo<sup>6</sup> sedatiorem, sed qua (meo iudicio) satis pro tempore arguimus neminem, civilium Pandectarum idoneum esse lectorem, nedum professorem, ab eo qui literarum illum

Encyclopaediam<sup>7</sup> et in gyrum actas omneis invisit disciplinas:  
quod divinarum humanarumque rerum noticiam<sup>8</sup> iusti atque in-  
iusti scientiam Ulpianus appellat. Vale atque me ut soles  
ama. Pyctavi quarto idus Decembris. Anno domini. milles.  
quingentes, decimo.



1. Longueil, Oratio de Laudibus divi Ludovici, 1510, fols. [24b-26a], as cited supra, ch. ii, n. 2, and Longueil, Orationes Duae, 1510/1520, fol. 9b-10a, as indicated supra, ch. ii, n. 3. The text utilized in this transcription is the 1510 publication with emendations from the 1520 edition. Spellings, ligatures, and abbreviations have been modernized according to the principles set forth in "Appendix A."

2. Printed solennitatem in both texts.

3. The text reads concilium.

4. The text reads Papiniouum.

5. The text reads michi.

6. The text reads nichilo.

7. The text reads Encyclopaedian.

8. The text reads notitiam.

## APPENDIX E

CHRISTOPHORUS A LONGOLIO

PETRUM BRISSOUM SALVERE JUBET<sup>1</sup>

Quam sit et inconstans et lubrica rerum humanarum conditio, ut omnia fere desperanda, ut nihil temere sperandum, alias quidem saepe, sed nunquam magis atque his vindemialibus feriis sum expertus: nec reor mortalium quemquam, a conditio aevo, tot ambagiosis fortunae voluminibus implicitum, quot Longolius tuus casum involucris ab hinc trimestre circumventus est. Fingas licet vera esse quae Homerus in Odyssea, in Aeneide Vergilius, de heroum suorum erroribus cecinerunt, cedent mihi tamen, inveniarque multo pluribus (tantillo temporis intervallo) aerumnis defunctus, quam vel Ulysses vel Aeneas decennio. Quod ut facilius capias, simul ut calamitatum mearum tragica scaena spectatus frauris, res altius repetenda erit, historiamque verius quam epistola texenda, modo boni consulas, quas dicam pinguiori minerva, et rudius (quod aiunt) ac planius, ut facilius intelligantur.

Non ignoras mi Brissoe, ut constituerim aliquando Gallias illustrare, tamque exacte atque adeo invidiose

describere, quam eas Mela secure, Strabo defunctorie, Plinius maligne, Dionysius ac Ptolomeus tralative deliniant. Quo nomine abhinc quinqueennium, autumnali potissimum otio, solitus sum aliquam Galliae partem oculis subiicere, quo verius eius situm, oppida, flumina, montes, aliaque plura aut cognitu, aut miraculo digna, etiam exteris nationibus olim repraesentem. Lustraveram anno proximo quicquid pene terrarum inter alpes, mare Narbonense, Rhodanum et Isaram iacet. His feriis libuit invisere Allobroges et Helvetios, eam Galliae partem quae Isara, Rheno, Alpibus, et Iura monte continetur. Cetera, et quia Helvetii bellum nobis indixerant, unde intuitum (ne dicam temerarium) videbatur, citra commeatum<sup>2</sup> in hostico peregrinari, et quia iuxta vulgi proverbium, unus vir nullus vir, delegi mihi hic socios duos Allobroges, Helvetiorum foederatos, qui me per cisalpinos illos tractus comitarentur. Itaque inter nos convenerat, ut ego mutum simularem, ne linguae sono hostibus proderer. Ipsi nativi sermonis commercio, ea sciscitarentur ab Helvetiis, quorum a me occulto admonerentur. Amicis, quos hic mihi conciliaveram, volui haec omnia clam esse, ne furentis martis obice negotium mihi facerent. Praetexui tam intempestivae expeditioni, votum divo Claudio exolvendum, priusquam Parisios repeterem. Digressus hinc sum Idib. Augusti, prius testatus, quid de vestiario, libris, peculioque meo, si quid mihi accidisset, fieri vellem. Rediit quinto Calen. Novembris, cum amicis spem reditus fecissem ad Calen. Septembres.

Non est quod hodoeporicum hic expectes, ut viciatim et oppidatim iter nostrum prosequar. Secreti hoc operis est, cui supremam nunc manum impono. Octavo quam Valentia profecti sumus die, per Viennenses, Gratianopolitanos, Cinarios, Garrocellos et Aemilianos, venimus ad Isarae ortum, princepsque Centronum oppidum, quod alij Musterium, alij (inter quos Antonius pius) Darantasiam dicunt. Hic rogamus incolas, quid de Helvetijs et Alpinis latronibus. Narrant quadraginta milia Helvetiorum in Borgondiam impetum fecisse, grassatorum latroncinijs omneis vias infestari, sed illis maxime praedones insidiari, qui [cum] Francis ad Novariam militassent. Sentiunt enim occulteij corycae cum Helvetijs, nec solum vias obsident, sed et explorant, ecquie Sabatensium Francis faveant. Hic mutamus consilium, et ex Seriphia (ut dicitur) rane, vocalis efficior, ex Gallo Italus, quam in usum, nescio quo fato barbam, capillitiumque summisseram. Placuit in Italiam per Iovis columnam trajcere, et ex augusta praetoria, superatis denuo per Iovis montem Graijs Alpibus, ad Varagros tendere, Helvetijs hunc in modum facile imposituri, tanquam amice gente per eorum fineis, nundinarum gratia, Gabennas<sup>3</sup> peteremus.

Quid multa? Rem verbis contulimus, transmissisque iterum Alpibus Octoduorum descendimus oppidum, nobis quoque ut et Sergio Galbae, et sacrae illi Theobeorum legioni exitiale futurum. Nam dum illic paulo incautius Gallice altercaremur, ultra Lemani lacus ora, per Latrobrigas an per

Caturiges, Gebennas iremus, caupo suspicatus est nos Francos esse. Rem Helvetiorum exploratoribus actutum detulit. Commodum oppido excesseramus, et ecce septem equites, nobis a tergo Germanice exclamant. State, viatores! Ratio itineris vestri Octodurensium triumviris reddenda est. Et cum dicto nos veluti indagine, exertis mucronibus circundant. Ego ignarus quid ijs sibi verbis vellent, ratusque ex aggrediendi modo latrones esse, ensem stringo: faciunt idem et comites. Committitur praelium ut impar, ita breve, sed tum pro numero hominum atrox et cruentum: hostium quatuor gravissime vulnerati, unus comitum meorum adacta in pectus gesa e vestigio occubuit. Alter humerum saucius, Rhodano insiluit, et praeter omnium expectationem, ulteriorem ripam tenuit, sed id tunc me fugit. Ascenderam<sup>4</sup> enim ripam fluvio aversam, equitique inimicam, a qua ubi equus resilvisset, ad extremum deturbatus, pene exciso brachio capior, spoliatusque gladio, penula et viatico, Octodurum indignissime retrahor. Miraris (scio) ut in me suorum commilitonum clade iritati, non sevierint. Ego quoque nunc miror, tunc vero ita stupebam, ut nec ubi, nec qui essem subiret. Crediderim eos mihi pepercisse in poenam dilatumque supplicium, vel ut me in sociorum ultionem excarnificarent, vel ut ex me rescirent, quid tam alieno tempore hostilem regionem peragraremus. Flagrabat etiamnum plebs odio nobilitatis, necdum motus ille resederat, quo rempublicam suam, ab optimatum statu, aut si mavis paucorum factione, in potestatem popularem, paucos ante dies,

mutarant. Arbitrari proinde nos eo exploratum accessisse, habereque nonnihil nummorum ad principes suos, quorum factioni Francum regem subscribere nemo nesciebat.

Tractus eo quo dixi modo, per oppidanorum insultantia mihi ora, in tenebrosissimum carcerem, tandem conijcior. Hic cum nonnihil temporis, semianimis iacuissem subito (malum) percussus fulgore, simul barbarorum circa me frementium murmure excitatus, sentio eodem tempore mihi et crura compedibus a fabro vinciri, et lacerti vulnus [a] chirurgo obligari. Mox Gallice appellatus a triumviro super origine, et peregrinationibus causa, mentitus sum me Sabatiae esse ditione, ex Liguria oriundum, ortum vero Niceae terminali Galliae Italiaeque oppido, proficisci Gebennas commercij gratia, francice locutum, quod is sermo, ut et Italus, nobis in promiscuo usu essent, militum dicto non parvisse quod Helvetice cum potuissent, Varagrice magistratus mandata nobis nunciassent, et grassatorie nos invasissent, non ut debuerant, viatorie praehendissent, existimasse latronibus, non Octodurensium lictoribus resistere. Temere quidem, sed iuste pro libertate, pro vita dimicasse, si quid imprudens admissem, id satis superque expiatum videri, spolijs, vulnere, et captivitate mea, meque<sup>5</sup> (si dijs placeret)<sup>6</sup> crudeli meorum comitum caede, alioqui minus sancte foedus servare, quod cum duce percussissent, quando Sabatenses ab Helvetijs eorumque socijs hostium numero haberentur et alios in captivitatem raperent, alios hostiliter trucidarent. His aut similibus

hanc in sententiam a me peroratis, conversus ad divi Mauricij, ut suspicor, antistitem, triumvir. Audax est, inquit, et veterator hic Francus, sed ponet propediem hos animos, luetque poenas et suae vafricie, et Francorum omnium superbiae, quo dicto abierunt.

Reputa hic tecum mi Brissoe, quot me tam male acceptum, tam male multatum, tam male superare iussum, aegritudines, aegrotationesque sequento bidup vexarint. Abstini potui, cibo, somno, nudus in nuda humo stratus, plorans, lugensque, fortunam meam detestabar: et ut superos alias incusabam, alias votis fatigabam, ita mortem nunc deprecabar, ne mea (ut ille ait) barbaricum conderet ossa solum. Obversantur animo, quicquid unquam Parisijs, Pictavi, Aemoniae et Valentiae mihi placuerat. Principum virorum dignatio, amicorum convictus, aequaliumque cultus, nedum amor, summa libertas, studiorum amoenitas, alta quies, pro quibus carcerem, vincula, servitutem, vulnera, inedia patiebar, quaestiones in horas expectabam, totus in ipsum carnificem imaginabundus, acerbissimumque mortis genus cogitatione praeveniens. Quid enim vel mancipium effectus, tetro in carcere servilitate vinctus, tortorum laniatione addictus, ab ammani, sanguinarioque populo, aliud sperasses?

Tertio die productus in concionem, rogor denuo a triumviro civitatis, quo? et unde? ut eadem accepit quae prius (Nam haud oblitus eram mendacem esse memorem oportere), nec me ausus est absolvere, ut innoxium, reclamantibus ijs qui

me ceperant, identidemque testantibus, reum nunquam in se ultor fassurum, nec damnare ut noxium, quod sibi minime liqueret, foederatus essem, an perduellis. Reddebar me suspectum Francica lingua, virilisque ad quaesita responsio. Praemebat vero, gravi odio vulneratorum debilitatio. Unum mihi patrocinabatur, quod non coniecturis, sed efficacissimis argumentis, res convinci oporteret, nec aliter quaestionibus subijci, quam si legitimis suspicionibus, sola deesset postulorum confessio. Atqui non scripto, aut<sup>7</sup> legitimo, et moribus non legibus introducto iure, Varagri utuntur, meus ut Naso cecinit,

Iura dat hic populis postio modo praetor aratro,

Custoditque suas ipse Senator oves.

Res eo tandem deducta, ut cum elogio, sub fida custodia, Glarissum mitterer.<sup>8</sup> Illo cum pedes essem iturus, liberarunt me quidem compedibus, sed religatis a tergo manibus, arctissime vinxerunt aliquando prae se, ut iumentum quodpiam agentes. Quot tempestatibus, quot procellis, tam longo difficilique itinere concussus fuerim, cum ab hostibus nunquam fere non temulentis, semper barbaris, semper ob vulneratos commilitiones mihi infestissimis, per inhospita Alpium iuge, loro traherer, tum longe facilius concipies, quam ego explicare aut possim aut velim. Egit mecum secreto inter eundem Rodolphus Verspercus (cui in praedam cesseram) ut reiecta quam mihi assumpseram origine, Franciam profiterer, ne si pertinacius Nicaeam tuerer, magno quaestionis cruciatu



fictitia patria mihi constaret. Se Franco regi diu militasse, et in praetoria cohorte, stipendium triennium fecisse, nihil dum adiecisse spem, quin Helvetij nobiscum in gratiam aliquando redirent, teneri eos Francico auro, nec commissuros ut liberalissimae gentis munificentia, diu fraudarentur. Suspectos esse suis popularibus omneis Maximiliani Austrij successus, ob inexpiabile Suevorum in Helvetios odium. Vereri ne aucto eius imperio, in ipsos omnem belli molem verteret, incassumque tunc ad Francos respicerent, quorum res nunc tam insigniter affligerent. Me<sup>9</sup> sibi crederem nec Francicum genus adeo reformidarem, fore, ut benignius mecum transigeretur, quam si me Nicenum dicerem. Neque enim Helvetijs Francos esse invisos, sed regem haberi exosum, quod annuo stipendio non tam privasset, quam contumeliose fraudasset. Recepi me id facturum, cum ne torquerer, tum ut Rodolphum demererer, quem videbam redemptionis meae precio inhare. Nolvisset me veritate tormentis expressa, exploratorij criminis reum peragi, gnarus, spem quam de me conceperat, mecum ita perituram.

Sexto demum die, Glarissum venimus, unde cum ad Valesum principem Longoliumque nostrum, pro redemptione nostra scripturirem, in foedissimum, mihiq; fere perniciosum certamen incidimus. Adservabat me domestica custodia Rodolphus, cui ea lege traditus fueram, ut me Glarissensium magistratui sistaret, quo etiam nomine elogium, ab Octodurensium triennium viro acceperat. Incertum siquidem adhuc erat hostisne, an etiam explorator, utrum vero foederatus essem. Hoc ut

rescivere eius loci decemviri, mittunt viatores suos, qui me a privatis vinculis abductum, in publica ducerent. Quod ut factum est, omnem spem vitae abieci, ratus versperci odio, nihil me aequi boni a decemviris impetraturum, nec opinione falsus. Triplicarunt<sup>10</sup> enim vincula, et praeter ferreas pedicas ac manicas,<sup>11</sup> anulum<sup>12</sup> etiam collare cervici circumdererunt, meque furfuraceo pane, dietim cibatum, pauxillo aquae potum, in teterrimo hypogeo, dies septem continuere. Rodolphus interea apud populares suos conqueri iniuriam sibi fieri, cui non liceret hostem vincere, et ad redemptionis precium cogere: me ut hostem, non tanquam exploratorem cepisse, moribus apud omnes nationes receptum, ut cui in bello peperceris, hunc tuo iure vel adservices, vel liberes. Privatas huiusmodi captivorum praedas nihil ad Rempublican pertinere magno me sibi constituisse, una et Octoduri,<sup>13</sup> una et eo toto itinere, quo me Glarissum illinc perduxerat: iniquum esse ut ipse sentes excuteret, decemviri praedam potirentur: nisi obviam iretur huic magistratuum licentiae, nobilitatem nuper in ordinem redactam, futurum ad hoc, ut post hac hostibus nunquam parceretur. Erat Rodolphus, ut manu promptus, ita factiosus et potens, nec minore animi, quam corporis vastitate conspicuus. Qua de causa, res ad seditionem nihil obscure spectabat, frementibus multis rapto vivere solitis, nihil spei sibi iam relictum iri, si hostili praedae magistratus manus iniicerent, et de captivis cognoscere pergerent.

His permoti decemviri classico (ut apud eos moris est) concionem advocari iubent, expediriue equuleum, et fidiculas, ut publice liceret, essem dumtaxat hostis, an et explorator quoque. Adducor in medium, praeter coriaceum thoraca, et crurales fascias, cetera nudus, immani vinculorum pondere pedes, manus, ac collum onustus, et luctuoso animi maerore defectus: ut vidi circumdatam armis concionem, ut suspexi tormentorum apparatus, tam truces me titanice intuentium decemvirorum vultus, mestum ita Rodolphum, torvos praeterea omnium in me defixos oculos, ratus non iudicium, sed ad supplicium me raptum, veluti iam torquerer, concidi sic, ut acerrimi odore aceti recreari diu nequierim. Emollivit nonnihil is casus barbarae multitudinis animum, visique sunt omnes mihi condolere praeter decemviros, qui illius Francicum esse commentum, ad ciendam misericordiam interpretabantur.<sup>15</sup>

Ergo iubent me interrogari latine, per eius pagi sacerdotem, iisdem de rebus, super queis Octoduri appellatus fueram. Steti aliquandiu anceps, utrum in priori figmento durarem, an me Parisiensem profiterer: atque ita mecum. Si Nicenum te dixeris, et Rodolphum iritabis, et tibi decemviri minime crediderint, ideoque torquebunt, si (quod cupiunt) Francicum genus agnoveris, suspectior redderis, atrociusque cruciaberis. Sin vero explorandi gratia, to eo profectum audierint, multum diuque excarnificatus, tandem saevissime necaberis: quocunque te verteris, perijsti. Dum circa hos

anfractus<sup>16</sup> aestuarem. Quid haesitas? inquit sacerdos, quaero ex te cuius sis, unde venias, quo tendas. Cave mentiaris, quaestione eruetur, quod ultro fatendum fuerit. Sciunt quidem decemviri qui sis<sup>17</sup> et quid huc veneris, sed volunt concionem eadem ex te audire, quae ab uno comitum tuorum, priusquam expiraret, Rodolphi commitiones accipere. Quem non tam minax denunciatio perculisset? Ego tamen (cui ex desperatione animus creverat) nihil ad ea summissa, sed haud minus quam ille ferociter respondi: mirum mihi videri, si conscij essent eorum quae nunc rogabant, cur in quaestione tempus nequicquam tererent, invulgataque conditione mea, ea de re, ad populum protinus non referrent. Concionem illis potius, ac mihi de me credituram. Subiuxique illa quibus mecum paulo ante ratiocinatus fueram. Ostendo quam iniquo iudicio circumvenirer, cui nec veritas suffragari, nec mendacium praesidio esse posset: eosdem me habere capitis accusatores et iudices, qui me nullis argumentis, nullis testimonijs, nullis testibus impetiturum, tanquam sola confessio mea sententiam moraretur, tormentis subijcerent. Et quia in animum induxeram, praestare, semel cadere, quam semper pendere, nihil me recusare quin testibus staretur, suprema comitas mei verba referentibus. Iurarent, et testarentur, me aequi boni consulturum, quicquid de capite meo decemviri statuissent. Ea cum interpretes populo renunciasset, pars, mei misereri visa est quasi ex innocentia animum sumerem: pars versutiam arguere, ceu ex conscientia moras ambagesque necterem: pars

superbiam damnare, quod ad interrogata respondere, contumaciter recusassem. Iamque explicabantur quaestionis instrumenta, cum ecce, quis credat? ab exercitu literae decimviris redduntur, quibus de foedere cum Francis Divioni initio, certiores fiunt. Tam varis affecit concionem inopinus ille nuntius, ut nihil minus quam de me solliciti, sese domum turmatim reciperent. Alijs foedus tanquam sibi utile et honestum probantibus, alijs contra omnino improbantibus, quod Maximilianus Caesar eo pacto prodi videretur, cui fidem dederant. Se haud prius exercitum ex provincia revocaturos, quam Borgondos ei audientes reddidissent. Ego qui dum recitabantur exercitus literae, in me sententiam ferri arbitrabar. Inter statorum manus, a iudicibus, et maxima populi parte destitutes, existimare primum eam esse plebis secessionem, necem meam improbantis. Mox intuitus et ceteros inde facessentes, concepi spem melioris fortunae, veluti plurium calculo absolutus, aut certe ampliatus.

Apparitores quoque mirabundi, tum quod concio eo modo dissolveretur, tum quod ambigerent, quid de me agendum esset. Intuere alius alium, invicemque rogare, liberandus essem, an custodiendus. Placuit demum in carcerem me reduci, in quo fortunam meam viduam deplorassem, simul et miratus fuisset (nondum enim resciveram, quis me deus ab Orci faucibus eripuisset) venit Glarissum Sedunensis praesul, Ro[manus] Po[n-tificus] Factus es in provincia legatus, quem nostrates Cardinalem Syoneum appellant. Is statim quam accepit Francici

sanguinis hominem adeo literatum (increbuerat huiusmodi nescio quo rumore, apud barbaros de me opinio) ex vinculis causam dicere, petijt a magistratibus, qui ad eum officij gratia accesserant, liceret sibi cum captivo dissertare, quod facilius tenuit, quo iam certius erat Helvatijs et Francis interesse convenire. Simulac reseratis carceris foribus, vidi pone commentariensem, a divinis legati, actum de me putavi, existimans, quod ubi me christiano more expiasset, continuo vel in rotam tollerer, vel laqueo strangularer, vel gladio conciderer, vel flammis objicerer. Ceterum longe<sup>18</sup> aliter, atque mihi persuaseram cessit. Nam ingemiscens calamitatibus meis, pius ille sacerdos. Ne desperes (inquit) si ingenue profiteberis, et originis tuae locum, et peregrinationis causam haud dubie evades. Antes eum ducaris, qui inter Helvetios, ut antistitem, sic etiam eruditione, et auctoritate pollet. Hoc tibi neque dolum malum adessa, neque bonas literas obesse intelligas. Proderit captum fuisse, modo te talem praestes, qualis esse praedicaris. Unaque refert ictum inter Francos et Helvetios foedus: quinuncio factus audentior, statim, omissis commentis, coepi meras itineris mei causas efferre, et timori necessitatique ascribere, quod non eadem Octoduri dixissem.

Ut in legati conspectum ventum est, ex purpura eius, et famulitio, neque non ipsum officiose circumstantibus decemviris, facile conieci, eum supremi ordinis esse antistitem, illumque qui pro Iulio pontifice, adversus Francos exercitum

in Italiam ductasset. Quare veritus, ne et in me quoque, ut in ceteros Francos, infesto esset animo, parum abfuit, quin ad Octodurenses nugas refugerim. Verum spem ex eruditione eius capiens, metuens insuper, ne inficiando poena excresceret, neque simulandum, neque dissimulandum quicquam mihi amplius putavi: atque ita animatus, ad eius, decemvirorumque pedes, suppliciter procidi, obtestans, ut me, aut veluti innocentem tandem liberarent, aut si ex usu eorum ita videretur, tanquam nocentem actutum damnarent. Potuisse me forte, et si non illa<sup>20</sup> ob quam reus agebar causa, supernum supplicium mereri, tot tormenta non potuisse mortem quamlibet modo citam, beneficij<sup>21</sup> loco mihi fore. Carcerem ad continendos, non ad premendos homines repertum: me haud solum teterrimo carcere, sed et gravissimis quoque vinculis diu coercitum<sup>22</sup> longa difficilique inedia maceratum, ab Octoduro, eousque indignissime tractum, quaestionibus terroribus pene exanimatum, catenas adhuc ferre, et carnificis arbitrio obnoxium, foedissimo hypogeo etiamnum incubare. Excruciare me adhaec inenarrabili dolore vulnus, quod laevo bracchio<sup>23</sup> exceperam, nec chirurgum mihi manum admovisse, ex quo illud primum obligarat, ex habitudine mea nihil difficulter colligi, quot malis praemerer, ex conditione appetendam mihi mortem, non vitam, quae in poenam relictam videretur. Helvetios quidem bellum Francis indixisse, scilicet armatis, scilicet militare solitis. Arma mea esse stylum, et pugilares, militiam, literarum otium. Si Helvetiorum hostis dici mererer ut Francus,

esse cur et amicus censeri possem ut Christianus, praestare vinculum quo Christi sanguine conferruminaremur, quo pro duorum regum imperio dissideremus. Alienum omnino videri a Christiana pietate, inter se Barbarorum more, ad internecionem degladiari. Et si di rerum usus aliquando expeteret, parcendum inermibus, et nihil aequae ac belle detestantibus. Quam cupidus essem pacis amator, quam acer belli osor, atque adeo ex conscientia spretor, vel inde argui, quod duobus tantum comitatus asseclis, nudus et securus, Varagrorum fineis intrassem, autumans, pari animi candore, Helvetios me accepturos, qua ego simplicitate eos inviserem: divini iuris [,] non gentium, me habuisse rationem, quod Christi edicto, ne Barbari quidem, nobis hostes essent, tametsi a vera pietate alieni. Constare et ex eo me non agere exploratorem, quod simul Helveticae, simul Sabatensis linguae, rudis, imo expers essem. Italicae vero haud ita gnarus, quoniam facile deprehendi posset, eam mihi peregrinam esse, non vernaculam, debuisse aliqui eum qui explorandi animo, eo accessurus erat, nisi prorsus dementiret, vel Germanicum vel Allobrogicum, vel Transalpinum sermonem callere. Et ut vel quamlibet anticipiti iudiciorum alea tot aerumnis aliquando defungerer, fateri me Parisiensem, quod iusto metu territus, Octoduri dissimularem, ne prius in me hostiliter animadverteretur, quam victorum ira deferbuisset, aequisque auribus peregrinationis meae causas, accipere tum possent. Eas esse tam veras, quam paucis probabiles, modo ex praesenti statu, fidem meam



haud aestimarent. Ergo me eo profectum, cum eruditionis, tum etiam religionis gratia: huius, quia divo Mauricio, qui Octoduri coliter, reus voti eram. Illius, quia prudentiae compendium existimabam, multorum hominum nosse mores, ac multorum gentium lustrasse urbes. Sic me peregrasse reliquam Galliam, sic Germanos, Pannoniam, Moesiam,<sup>24</sup> Illyricum, Italiam, Hispaniam, sic ex melioribus insulis, Cretam, Siciliam, Sardiniam, Baleares, ac Britanniam: minimum timuisse bellorum tumultus, quod nunquam putassem, Helvetios, literis et religioni bellum indixisse. Philosophiae nomen hostibus sacrosanctos praestitisse Pythagoram, Democritum, Solonem, Apollonium, aliosque innumeros sapientiae assertores, quorum licet indolem non referrem, imitabar tamen virtutem: vexasse me quidem alibi haud semel fortunam, sed nunquam immitius, quam in eo Galliae tractu. Ita siquidem vota mea retroisse, ut ab ereptis mihi saevissima morte duobus comitibus, ne autem ab atrocissimo vulnere, in servitutem, carcerem, vincula re-acto, mors mihi desiderium, vita supplicium esset. Invidiosum mihi videri amborum exitium quo furentis in me fortunae tela, adeo tempestive evaserant. Calamitatum mearum hanc esse summam, ut nec mortis quiete recreari, nec maximis vitae doloribus carere possem: viderent qua ratione deum sibi exoratu facilem olim sperarent, si me tot malis fati malignitate circumventum, nullo clementiae genere prosequi statuissent. Habere eos fatentem reum, et se duci patientem, et hostem unum tantum orantem ut Christianum, parcerent

cruciatibus, afficere haud quaquam liceret, tum ob multa, tum ne apud eos plus valvisse hostilis odium nominis, quam Christianae societatis pietas, videretur.

Defixus dudum legatus, vel fidenti oratione, vel miserabili tuo<sup>25</sup> a Longolio fuit: ut ad se redijt, ita respondit, ut diceret, neque iuris esse, neque aequitatis, reos statim, aut absolvere, aut damnare. Quaerendum haud solum, an deliquerint, sed et quibuscum, et quomodo. Magistratus non semper vacare audiundis custodijs, alijs eos urgeri Respublica<sup>26</sup> muneribus, quae multum tum operae,<sup>27</sup> tum temporis desyderarent, me vinctum, non in poenam, sed ad custodiam, eoque modo habitum, quo ubique terrarum capitales rei accipiuntur. Helvetios non de religione, sed belli iure nobiscum contendisse: milites nihil discriminis cognoscere inter abecedarios et literatos. Gentium iure in servitutem promiscue rapi, tam doctos quam indoctos, tam bonos quam malos, Diogenis et Platonis exemplo, quicquid paterer mihi imputandum, qui tam alieno tempore Helvetiorum fineis citra commeatum ingressus essem: debuisse me qui multa videram, plura legeram, consulere, priusquam hosticum attigissem, quid perduellis ab hoste pati soleret: haud Francorum in captivos inhumanitate fortunam meam aequari: nec mentiri fuisse tempus,<sup>28</sup> cum propter iam commissum bellum, tum ob Franci regis largitiones suspectissimum. Proinde nihil mirandum, si me tam adversa tempestate deprehensum, atque on Francici sermonis peritiam suspectum, et diutius, et artius custodivissent.

Arbitrari se quidem me non esse exploratorem. Ceterum idem vulgo haud facile persuasum iri, quando plebs eruditiorum ingenis nunquam apprehenderet, nec literarum gratia peregrinari speraret. Quod Francici nominis odio, in me durius nihil decrevissent, et hoc argumento liquere, quod Francam originem, tum primum essem professus. Nulla arte iniri, nullo ingenio comminisci posse rationem, qua me praeter belli iura, et illegitime captum ostenderem. Hostem hosti succubuisse, victum victori arma tradidisse, pro vita servitutem delegisse, alijs et alijs professionibus, explorationis suspicionem iniecissem. Ceterum multo quam putarem liberalius, mecum decem viros decisuros. Ferrem aequo animo et eius quoque diei vincula, futurum, ut postridie liber abirem. Recreatus tam inopina hominis humanitate, resumpsi quem paulo ante desponderam animum, ac veluti iam solutus, carcerem laetus reperij.

Convenit interea Sedunensis antistes Rodolphum, tenuitque ut spolijs meis contentus, e manu me mitteret. Alioque ex pacto in integrum restituendos veniebam, quemadmodum et Franci Helvetios captivos liberaverant. Misit ad me postridie eiue diei cubicularium suum, et medicum, hunc ut in apostema iam suppurans vulnus, accuratius inspectum procuraret, illum<sup>29</sup> ut me Italico habitu investiret, balneisque lotum, sibi exhiberet. Appetebat prandij hora, cum, advolutus pedibus eiue, veneratus sum hominem, ut Romani Pontificis vicarium, servtoremque meum, cui non tantum vitam accepto referrem, sed et liberatatem quoque, ingenuo<sup>30</sup> ciqve vita

gratiorem: quod superstes, quod incolumis, quod meus essem, quod patriam, quod studia repeterem, eius esse munus. Vix mihi tam durum fuisse capi, quam dulce huius auctoritate<sup>31</sup> liberari. Cum haec et alia huiusmodi fueiori oratione explicuissem, iussit ut bene de se sperarem, et oblitus retro malorum, bono exinde essem animo:<sup>32</sup> non posse me quam quae- rerem prudentiam assequi, nec religiosa peregrinatione superos demereri, nisi multis, gravibusque exantlatis laboribus: semper fuisse, ac fore callosum virtutis iter: quo dicto accubuit, meque vel resistantem convivio adhibuit.

Longum esset singulatim referre, quam me humaniter, tantisper dum vulnus meum ad cicatricem reducebatur acceperit, quot me physicis,<sup>33</sup> quot idem ethicis problematis exercuerit. Est enim vir apprime doctus et disertus, ut qui patriam barbariem politissime (cui operam dedit) ingenio expolivit. Gratam illi consuetudinem nostram fuisse, multis quidem argumentis, sed his potissimum suspicari licet, quod me in familiam suam, magnis pollicitationibus allicere frustra conatus, abeuntem quadraginta Venetis aureis donaverit, praeterquam generosissimo equo, misso etiam puero, qui me Lotobrigum usque deduceret.

Persequutus est me nihilio minori, et haud scio an etiam maiori liberalitate Protonotarius eius Conradus Friburgius, cui mei curam delegaverat, a quoque multa eorum sum edoctus, quae supra retuli. Neque enim per Helveticae linguae ignorance, potui omnia ut observasse, ita notasse.

Donavit me veteribus numismatibus, quae metallicas dicunt aereis 30, argenteis 120, aureis 18, adhaec ense omnium quos hactenus vidi facile optimo, longeque pulcherrimo. Nam praeter aciei eximium temperamentum, deauratumque impendio mucronem, xitraloinum capulum, nemo non miraretur purissimo argento tam adfabre variegatum, ut merito ambigi possit, utrum magis laudanda veniat rara materiei nobilitas, ex atro nitide purpurascens, suavissimumque licet augustum spirans odorem, an docta aurificis, manus, quae tot limbulis, tot flosculis, tot iconculis exagonam, qua manubrium tegitur, laminam celavit, ut et Myroni, et Mentori controversiam fecisse videtur. Accedunt spathae, cultelli tres, cum pugiunculo, eadem arte, eadem materie elaborati. Legati munus cum serico (quod simul dederat) locello ex thoracis humero ita suspendi, ut sinistra ala tegeretur. Protonotarij donum lineae fasciae insutum, ilibus circumdedi, ensem lateri aptavi, equo insilui, atque hunc in modum, veluti Aegyptiorum opibus suffarcinatus, per Aucutieos, Iuram, Sequanos, Nantuates, Ambrones, Segusianos Lugdunum me recepi.

Hae sunt mi Brissoe reciprocae casuum vicissitudines, quibus mihi plus minus decem hebdomadas praestigiatrix fortuna illusit, iusto propemodum volumine, nec sic tamen ex asse commemoratae. Quod a Lugduno Valentiam viae reliquum est, id expedito pediti, alterius diei itinere, partem tu vix<sup>34</sup> credes. Sed vero verius est, tantillo intervallo fortunam atrocioribus me procellis impetijisse, quam tanto

sesquimense apud Helvetios. Enimvero, et quia tu legendo, et ego scribendo usque fatigati sumus, simul et rei gestae celeritati, succincta narratio respondeat, et hanc quoque malorum panegyrim paucis absolvam.

Proficiscebar Valentiam eques, cum me familiarium, quos Lugundi habero, multi admonuere periculorum, quae terra euntes manebant. Grassari namque per Viennensem argum ple-rasque missorum in Borgondiam evocatorum manus, nec ultra ad-ferri frequentia nuncia, quam viatorum a latronibus passim spoliaturum, atque adeo iugulatorum. Compendiosius fore ac tutius, sequando Rhodano Valentiam vehi, quam longis crebris-que itinerum difficultatibus conflictari. Parui, amice Bris-soe [,] minime prudenter consulentibus. Nam paulo post quam navim ascendi, effectus sum ex eorum numero unus (lubet enim tecum garrulorum more nautarum verbis nunc lascivire) quos meque mortuis quidam annumerabat. Subivi id genus discrim-inis, quod adeo semper, sed tum praecipue vitare conatus fueram. Viennae naufragium fecimus, et mersis quinecim con-vectorum, tres solum evasimus, nauclerus nando, alius et ego apprehensis singulorum qui una vehebantur equorum caudis, quibus cum praesentis mortis metu, tenacius haereremus, magna inspectante conclamanteque populi multitudine enatavimus. Propone hic tibi, quaeso, Longolium tuum, a tot exhaustis laboribus post captivitatem, vulnera, carcerem, catenas, et quaestionis tormenta, cum undis de vita dimicantem, capite extantem, reliqua vorticibus absorptum, aegreque iumentum

beneficio emergentam. Emeram Lugduni Ptolemaeos duos recens impressos, unum Romae, Argentorati alterum, ad haec Plotinum Ficino interprete, Lucretium cum enarratione Baptistae Pij, Ovidij Halioticum Turoni pridem repertum, sed Neapoli nuper publicatum, Origenis opera, magna Erasmi adagia, Iulium Firmicum, et Manlium, Cypriani epistolas, Nemesium de natura hominis, Theophrastum de igni, Galenum de heresibus, et eisdem medicines introductorium, Iani Bartoli,<sup>35</sup> Baldi, et omnibus Iasonis magni commentarios. Horum omnium iacturam feci, praeterque chlamydis qua me Sedunensis praesul donarat. Ergo damnatis primae navigationis auctoribus<sup>36</sup> argonautis, nec sine horrore Rhodanum subinde aspiciens, decevi quod reliqui erat itineris, equo perficere, ne secundum Publij Mimographi sententiam, Neptunum improbe accusarem, si naufragium denuo fecissem. Sed certe (quod aiunt) mustelam mecum detuleram, eratque fatale mihi, ut eo trimestri, nec terra, nec aqua tuto peregrinarer, et veluti diris obnoxius, [ex] Charibdi in Scyllam pellerer.

Altero siquidem a naufragio die, cum sub vesperae crepusculum, iter facerem, incidi in illos, quos Rhodano fugeram hodoedocos, permitte mihi graece paulisper nugari quoties exotico sermone res exponi significatius poterit, quam latino. Ab his me asseruit eadem quae me tot periculis eatenus ajiecerat desultoria fortunae levitas. Iam detractus equo, iam spoliatus eram sago, quod Viennae emeram. Item aureis quos ex serica bulga, laevae axillae summiseram.

Excutiebatur tumultuarie pectus, cui sarta vetustis numismatibus fascia suberat, cum auditis venatorum acclamationibus, praedones fugam arripuerunt, a Longolioque tuum semianimum deseruere, dicam, an liberavere? Ita profecto eram territus, et quem iugulo aptarant gladio, attonitus,<sup>37</sup> ut eos prius abijisse, quam abire cognoverim. Obvius mox factus salutaribus illis venatoribus, ut<sup>38</sup> vident me, latronum metu, numero, et audacia, perinde ac si iam imminentes sibi raptores intuiti fuissent, trepide profugerunt.

Timor hic tam alte mihi insederat, ut ea nocte, neque a caupone affirmari, neque esse, neque quiescere porerim. Videbar mihi a dura grassatorum factione adhuc invadi, rapi, prosterni iugulari. Dubitas hic me aut Ulyssis, aut Aeneae aerumnas etiamnum superasse? an non haec potius ficta, quam facta non credentur? an a tot iliadum calamitatibus, relictum novae plagae putares? Invenit tandem fortuna viam, qua de me et aliud quoque trophaeum erigeret. Incendit eadem nocte in quam diverteram cauponam, meque conflagrante imadomus parte, ad praecipitium, per senaculi fenestram coëgit. Prosilij obstruentibus omnia flammis, ambustisque crinibus et barba, nonnihilque luxata eo casu tergoris spina, per medios ignes incendium ruina evasi.

Profectus inde diluculo, veni tandem Valentiam, quam noctu ingressus sum, ne si interdiu, ludibrio forem amicis, quorum sana consilia, abiens flocci feceram. Abstulerant mihi grassatores equum, sagum, tunicam, pretiosum illum ensem,



et pecuniam, incendium vero. ocreas, calcaria, pileum. Eram nudus, sordidus, caput et mentum vesiculatus, vento, pluvia, sole, sudoreque luridus: adhaec defectus, recedentibus intus oculis, prominentibus genis, subsudentibus malis, tremantibus, pallidisque labijs, nigris et osseis manibus, denique larvali cuidem simulacro, quam Christophoro illi a Longolio similior: non me hospes, non contubernalium quispiam agnovit. Etenim praeterquam quod eram, et habitu, et habitudine mihi dissimilimus, quodque tandiu abfeuram, comes ille noster, quem Rhodano dum caperer insiluisse, periculumque evasisse scripsi, hic omnia, ut fit, in maius augendo, retulerat, quae Octoduri nobis contigerant. Inter quae et istud, non ante se sibi fuga consuluisse, quam me, et alium caesos vidisset. Fecerat illi fidem, simul Helvetiorum feritas, simul tam diutina mea absentia, amicorum plerique me iam deplorarent, et extructo cenotaphio, frequentibus oblationibus quas Hebraei, id est missas dicunt, pro me sacrificarant. Supellectilem meam nihil dum distraxerant, quod eos quasi tantorum turbinum praesagus, admonuissem, ut me in quintum mensem expectarent, nisi ad condictum redissem. Ita multo magis periculis defunctus, mihique superstes, posthumo (ut ita apponam) postliminio Valentiam tenui, haesitabundus, infelicior ne essem, quod tot mala incurissem, an felicior, quod evasissem.

Praebuit se mihi fortuna ad extremum usque novercam, praebuit et matrem, quando aureos viginti hic reperi, quos

ad me Longolius noster Calen. Septemb. dederat, nihil me ae-  
que afflixit, atque grassatorum latrocinium, nihil tam recre-  
avit, quam Longolij tempestiva liberalitas, quem caveremus  
peregrinationis admonitus. Incesserat ut levem, quod Scyth-  
arum more palabundua semper errarem. Obiurgaret ut audacem,  
quod tam ancipitem itineris aleam subijsem, quereretur de  
iactura temporis, oblivionis iniuria, pecuniario, vestiario-  
que impendio.

Atqui ut ad calculum peregrinationis meae redeam,  
cum hinc reputo, quibus in me telis, fortuna saevierit, nimi-  
rum totus inhorresco cum illinc revolvo, ut per medios furen-  
tium hostium impetus, propositum tenuerim, ex votoque lus-  
traverim illam Galliae partem, tam priscis recentibusque con-  
ditioribus ignotissimam, quam nostris cladibus hodie nobilis-  
simam, gestio plane, et exulto. Cum autem priscos illos num-  
mos aereos, argenteos, aureosque contemplor, subit illa vetus  
Graecorum paraemia. Nunc bene navigavi cum naufragium feci.  
Intelligo enim fortunam paria fecisse, imo magno foenore ab-  
latum mihi viaticum, restituisse. Nempe pro decem, quos me-  
cum tuleram solaribus aureis, octodecim graviores, et obrysos,  
pro quindecim Francicis solidis, centum ac viginti primae  
argenteos, pro quinque obolis, aereos triginta, totidem Ro-  
m[anorum] Imperatorum numismatibus signatos. Nec tamen in-  
terea nihil studui, nihil perlegi, auctores<sup>39</sup> antea mihi ex-  
tra nomen, cetera ignotos, Thucydidem de bello Peloponnesi-  
aco, Archianum de rebus gestis Alexandri, et Indiae descrip-

tione, Amiani Marcellini historiam, a Nervae principatu, usque ad Valentis interritum. Verum ex uno et triginta, quos ea de re libros reliquit. Tredecim periere, septemdecim, quae adhuc extant volumina, nullius etiamnum<sup>40</sup> chalcographi typis excusa habentur. Fecit horum mihi copiam Iafredus ille Carolus, Insubrium vicecancellarius, et Delphinatus<sup>41</sup> praeses, de cuius eruditione et humanitate alias plura. Iam memoriae mandavi Titulum de Actionib[us] ex quarto Civilium institutionum libro:deliniavi graphice quicquid terrarum inter Alpeis, Iuram, et Rhodanum, Rhenum item, et Massiliense mare iacet. Exploravi Helvetiorum solidudines, urbes, pagos, amnes, mores, vires, aliaque multa, nobis cognitu<sup>42</sup> terribiliora nescio, an iucundiora. Expertus sum, verum illud esse, quod aiunt. Ipse dies quandoque parens, quandoque noverca. Laetum est illud, non esse frugiperdam humanarum literarum umbram, quae me non solum ab hostili manu, verum etiam tam duro tempore adseruit, tam pretiosis muneribus honestavit.

Habes trimestris fere peregrinationes, imo tragoediae, non (ut malvisses) summam, sed adeo verbosam, molestamque seriam, haud minus tumultuarie conditam, quam turbulenter actam. Ceterum, cum historiae fides, non autem ornatus, in primis commendetur, veritatem pro elegantia amplecteris, et quod longioris orationis textus fastidium moverit, id totum condiet, atque adeo discutiet tuus in me amor. Gratulaberis nihilominus et mihi, quod principem amicorum tuorum reducem prius agnoveris, quam tot periculis circumventum. Miscellaneos

doloris ac voluptatis pariet haec tibi lectio affectus, proderitque si non ad aliud, in hoc certe, ut meo periculo, cautius peregrinari discas. Valentiae, pridie Nonas Novembres. Vale.

Millesimo quingentesimo 13.<sup>43</sup>

Longolius homo Brabantus,  
in Gallia educatus.

1. Longueil, De Infortuniis Epistola, 1533, fols. Bla-Ela, cf., ch. ii, and nn. 32 and 33. Paragraph divisions in the following transcription follow those of Becker, Aus Frankreichs Frührenaissance, pp. 10-24, cf. ch. iii, n. 65, although there are some differences between his and those of Goldschmidt, "De Longueil's Letter," pp. 169-183, in his English translation of the same item; cf., ch. i, n. 3. It should be noted that neither of these publications contains the entire text of the Longueil letter to Brisson. Becker, pp. 25-46, offers a German translation of the text which he presented in his chapter, pp. 10-24, following some introductory remarks of his own, pp. 7-9, but there are some omissions in his treatment. Goldschmidt begins his translation with the second paragraph of the transcribed text of the present study. Spelling, ligatures, and abbreviations have been modernized, although internal punctuation marks have been generally retained as close as possible to the source.

2. The text reads commentum.

3. The text reads Gebenuas throughout.

4. Lower case in the text.

5. So it appears in the text. Perhaps it should read atque or meque superstita.

6. A later hand has added a footnote at this juncture. It reads brevi morsorum.

7. The text reads haud.

8. The text reads mitter, although a later hand has correctly supplied the reading as it has been transcribed.

9. Lower case in the text.

10. Lower case in the text.

11. The text reads manticas.

12. The text reads annulum.

13. The text reads Octori.

14. The text reads vobilitater.

15. The text reads inrerpretabantur, although Becker suggests arbitrabantur.

16. The text reads anphractus.

17. The text reads scis.
18. The text reads louge.
19. The text reads autoritate.
20. The text reads illla.
21. The text reads veneficij.
22. A later hand has supplied a comma in the margin, and Becker had incorporated it without comment.
23. The text reads brachio.
24. The text reads Misiam.
25. The text reads tui.
26. The text reads Reipu.
27. The text reads opere.
28. The text reads haud Francorum in captivam inhumanitate fortunam meam mentiri fuisse tempus.
29. The text reads procuraret. Illum,.
30. The text reads ingenio.
31. The text reads autoritate.
32. The text has a period, but the colon is more appropriate.
33. The text reads phiscis.
34. The text reads vis.
35. Lower case in the text.
36. The text reads autoribus.
37. Becker omits the text portion "et quem iugulo apparentant gladio, attonitus."
38. The text reads ubi.
39. The text reads autores.
40. The text reads etiannum.

41. Lower case in the text.

42. The text reads coguitu.

43. This marks the end of Becker's transcription,  
and thus his translation of Longueil's letter to Brisson;  
cf., Becker, Aus Frankreichs Frührenaissance, pp. 24 and 46.

## APPENDIX F

GULIELMUS BUDAEUS

CHRISTOPHORO LONGOLIO S.<sup>1</sup>

Hilaribus ad vesperam literas tuas accepi, cum Iacobi Sadoleti literis ac Petri Bembi, hominum tibi amicissimorum, ut eorum testantur elogia. Hominem vero te felicem, ac benevolentibus Gratijs literarum istarum studium auspiciatum: cui in urbe incolae id contigerit, quod civibus in suis oppidis usu venire non saepe solet, tantorum ut virorum ad unguem absolutorum amorem, suffragationem, patrocinium, tam propensa emerere. Ita autem mihi propitiam detur esse Minervam: ut causam hanc unam satis esse credo, quamobrem domo sese extorrem homo literarum cupientissimus faciat: consuetudine ut uti possit, officiorumque vicissitudine huiusmodi virorum rei literariae principum. Tametsi doctrinae et eloquentiae splendorem, humanitatis, comitatis, ac modestiae peringenuae dignitas et species obscurat ac praeradiat, in utriusque literis elucens mirifice. Ipse dum in Aula versabar, eorum nomen celebrari magnopere intellexi, Principis etiam opinione. Pontificisque epistolarum unam vidi à Sadoleta subscriptam, in qua stylum admiratus sum, ad



decorum attemperatum gravitatis ac dignationis Pontificiae, purum atque latinum. At nunc in ea epistola, quam ad me scripsit, in qua suus ipse totus est Sadoletus, Tullianam phrasin animadverti, parum hac aetate usitatem, characteris prisci non adulteratique exemplum. Certe ad utrunque religiosius posthac, atque cunctantius consultiusquem scribam, qui mihi eruditionis suae documentum luculentum paruo specimine dederunt, scilicet (quod ajunt) leonem ab unguibus. Ad quos tu ipsos (si dijs placet) viam iamiam initurus, equumque prope admissurus, epistolas me expedire, ac velut e penu literaria atque etiam promptuario quodam facundiae promere censuisti, et tandem extudisti: cum etiam tum ipse sarcinas componerem, tumultuarie in villam migraturus. Praediceres igitur, ut lectissimum quodquem bellissimimque huiuscemodi viris apponerem accurate et religiose. Id quod cum non feceris (ut satis meministi) illud saltem mihi cavere ab ipsis non gravabere, quibus tu adeo commendatus es, ne fraudi sit nobis viros eloquentiae primores laccessisse, cum auctoritati tuae tribuere me id volueris, periculumque receperis, nec ipse negare tibi amicitiae munus sustinuerim. Id tu si bona fide mihi accuraueris, Suppraefectum Ruzaeum placatiorem tibi ipsa placabilitate praestabo, epistola privatim elaborata, aut mihi insensum reddam, litemque meam vestrae controversiae faciam. Iam de te hominem coram non semel aggressus sum, inopinatoque adortus: sed in urbem non nisi negocij causa ventito, et hac hyeme morbo mihi iniusto, quem iam annum

hunc quartumdecimum circunfero, nec excutio, conflictatus sum graviter, et ad inertem usque animi deiectionem. Quare solitudinem captare institui, quantum per officia vitae iniunctar licebit, et rei oeconomicae procurationem, quam detrectare nequec. Quod de annotationibus scribis, frustra est, et iocari te suspicor, qui satis nosti (ut opinor) quid mihi sit ea de re animi. Iam id mihi nomem expunctum satis esse confido Alziati fide, qui expromissorem se obtulit, ultro ille quidem et constituto obstrinxit, me tacente, quo scilicet fidem meam solveret. Is cum sit longe me locupletior, praesertim in aere suo meoque simul, (neque enim planè facultates eius nosse licet ex eo genere, quod in manu mihi fuit) cautum sanè mihi pulchre esse confido, neminem eo nomine postea petitrum, eorum quidem certe qui animadverterint, non modo felicem eum fuisse in contrectandis Pandectis Florentinis, et penes se habendis: sed etiam qui industriam eius et solertiam in sarciendis locis, bona fide aestimarint. Nam populo cautum est egregie praedibus ac praedijs, ut dicitur. Praedes appello Paradoxa et Dispunctiones, et alia quae ille velut conductor ac redemptor sartorum ac tectorum iuris tuendorum edidit. Hanc ipse redempturam operis cum vicerit, nihil utique iam ad me pertinet eiusce rei, cuius ipse manceps factus est omnibus (ut opinor) approbantibus, duntaxat qui digni sunt et idonei, quorum nomina sint in albo. Itaque hanc tibi atque omnibus renuncio pollicitationem, quam feceram. Digitum ille sustulit, et conducenti cessisse me

testatus sum. Quid est igitur iam, quod hac de re appelles? abunde est mihi si bona fide mecum egerit, de ijs quidem certe quae à me inchoata utcunque erant, si tamen illa quadrare possunt ab eo instituto: id quod mihi videtur ipse existimasse. Quòd si quibus in locis in speciem opus ipse ex redivivo, quasi novum extruxit: bona fide hoc poscit, ut mea rediviva sint. In his igitur fidem ipse bonam agnoverit, secum ipse aut cum amicis statuatur, ego rem deducere in iudicium hominum non statui. Librum eius Dispunctionum legi, lectione tumultuaria et interrupta: cum nuper in urbe nostra essem ob negotium accitus. Multa praeclare ab eo animadversa et constituta restitutaque mihi visa sunt: idque ipse affirmavi inter homines, qui non satis mentem eius sententiamque capiebant, et ille nonnulla acrius ac felicius deprehendit, quàm explicavit ad captum plurimorum. Librum cum venalem diu non invenissem, utendum ab amico ad paucos dies, atque etiam horas rogavi. Est tamen locus unus in quem incidi lectione subsultante: neque enim seriem ducere vacabat in chartarum evolutione. Locus est (ut meminisse videor) in titulo. Locus certum petatur, libro 12. Pandectarum. Quo in loco cum quindecim mutua vulgo legatur: ipse quindedies sesterium legendum affirmans, ait me (ut verum est) hanc locutionem, centies centena millia sestertium esse interpretatum: seque mecum sentire. Sed ea ab antiqua lectione argumenta in libro meo collegisse: quae si cui calumniari collibuisset, dissolvi facile atque refelli possent: me scilicet ille quidem aut

inscitiae pudendae nota, aut certe negligentiae aspergens, aut inventi auctoritatem<sup>2</sup> elevans. Et ipse tamen locum unum Livij citans, quem non memini, ait se firmissimam columnam operi meo subiecisse, quae me hominem (ut ipse inquit) quamlibet oculatum fugerat. Quo fit, si homini docto credimus, ut inventa illa mea Asse, et rei nummariae reatione constituenda: quae ego magno labore atque animadversione non oscitante, in eum operis titulum haud ipsum paradoxum, construxisse gloribar interdum, et nunc etiam dicere non vereor, levi momento ruitura, et primo quoque impulsu collapsura fuerint, nisi columnam illam adamantinam opera meo homo sanè doctus et ingeniosus obiter affirmavisset. Me miserum si ita est, nec venia certe dignum, nec misericordia, qui tantam operis fiduciam prae me toto in opere tulerim: quod tibi cinibus multis atque impeditis tam leviter fultum sit, ut unica columnella ab Alziato aut alio forte reperta omnibuesque obvia, instar eius fulturae non modo prestare, sed etiam luculenter superare videatur. Unde fit, ut argumentosi mihi operis laus suscepti, quasique inchoati, Alziato probati perfectique debeatur: quippe qui rei compertae argumenta tantum adumbraverim, cum ille veritatis demonstrationem postea expresserit, nutantem rei opinionem confirmarit, operi columnam addiderit, denique (ut dicitur) colophonem commentationi imposuerit: cum interim ineptus ego tanto errore ducerer, ut decem plureisque huiuscemodi columnas, nec deterioris marmoris, nonnullas etiam eiusdem statuisset ac confirmasse operi

iam solido existimarem, nec labefactabiles. Quas omneis sanè vereor, ut ipsi Alziato satis ociose percensere arbitrarique vacauerit, oculis quidem proprijs, non vicarijs. Nam primum vix ei licuit id facere rebus in gravioribus occupato, ut ex ijs quae scripsit, coniectu promptum esse videtur: multiplici enim multaue lectione videmus, et accurata eum occupatum fuisse. At libri de Asse plena iustaque lectio atque animadversio, acrem et multam intentionem poscit. Deinde in superiore loco explicando, in quo operis ipse particulam architectonico oculo mensus est, dilingentiam suam animadversionemque nec mihi unquam probaverit, nec tibi, ut opinor. Sacramento enim justo contendere cum eo non dubitarim, iudicemque ipsi ex numero acrium hominum et peritorum ferre, tu ille eo ipso in loco, quo me modeste quidem et docte, sed tamen utcunque compellauit, et in transitu perstrinxit, tota decempeda lapsus sit: luculento etiam errore decumanoque (quod dicitur) provectus in loco Pandectarum restituendo, quantumque centenarius à millenario distat, tantum ipse abfuerit Alziatus à veritatis investigatione, homo alioquin egregie doctus, stylique facultate et intelligentia rerum praeditus, dignusque mea sententia, quam hic consignatam volui, cui publico consensu emendatio Pandectarum, eiusque disciplinae constitutio mandetur, et in integrum restitutio, ut quidem fieri potest: usque adeo doctrinam mihi industriamque probavit: non etiam magnopere aequitatem in pauculis locis à me ante animadversis et explicatis. Hominem Avenione

vidi eximia sanè comitate gratiosum et amandum, quantum iudicare licuit ex congressu brevissimo. Ad me enim adiit officiose statim atque in urbem veni, contrà quàm decuit omino, nisi mihi ipse antevertisset exhibitione officij super coenam fabulanti cum homine mihi noto, nec satis tum valenti: et postridie matutino proficiscendum mihi fuit: obiter enim illuo veneram digressus à comitatu. Neque vero existimo eum cupiditate malevola provectum, incidisse in mei mentionem (poterat enim si hoc quaesivisset, Annotationum loca non pauca, ut opinor, ad reprehensionem arripere speciosius).<sup>3</sup> Sed cum in Livij auctoritatem<sup>4</sup> incidisset à me intactam: et laudem eam maiorem nomine et Franci hominis et Budaei esse duceret, huius quoque partem vindicare in transcurso voluisse. Usque adeo rara sunt exempla candoris atque aequitatis inter homines gloriae amantissimos, paucosque reperias innocentis et integros in aliena laude contrectanda. Haec ratio cum aliqui ipse animo fatiscerem et languerem, me impulit ut his atque huiusmodi scriptis supersedere statuerem, quae sine Herculis uxore (ut ita dicam) tueri ipsa sese nequeunt. Mihi iam excessit aetas ab ista concertandi contentione: sine qua iacere multis videtur scriptorum opinio, operumque elucubrationum indicatura. In alio vero genere navare operam malim (nisi mihi humanitus ante quid acciderit) in quo totus ipse meus sim, et cum plenius animo meo uberiusque obsequar, tum etiam minus metuum ab oculis fascinantibus: non quod inaudito privilegio sacrosanctam existimationem librorum meorum

esse postule: (neque enim tam aut hebes, aut insolens sum:) sed septum magis puto fore, si ab invidiosis argumentis sty- lum abstinuero. Proinde libera fidem meam, si potes, utcun- que se tibi occasio obtulerit, quam temere obstrinxi, non satis explorata magnitudine rei, perpensisque<sup>5</sup> facultatibus meis. Sin pergis ipse quoque pro more tuo appellare me dur- iusculum, quid ni possim, si velim, summovere te longitemporis praescriptione? Quanquam quis tibi alioquin actionem daturus est adversus hominem qui solum vertit, ac foro iam urbeque cessit. Vidisti enim me ruris incolam cum coenobiarcha Aspro- montano, qui ut valeat ipse etiam atque opto: unus sanè op- timae notae iuvenum, quos haec edidit aetas ad honestatis doctrinaeque praesidium, cuiusmodi homines singularis quae- dam sors geniturae tibi conciliare solet. Scribam (ut opinor) Sadoletum et Bembo, viris ad unguem consummatis et perpolitatis, quorum tantam istam benevolentiam prope est ut tibi invideam. Vale, et accingere primo quoque tempore ad eam contentionem, ut nomen tuum Gallicumque illustres: nec sinas me iam quin- quagenario maiusculum, in ea expectatione tui consenescere, in qua hactenus acquievi. Beasses me de ista bibliotheca Alexandrinae aemula: nisi semifracto animo essem ob hanc flagitiosam valetudinem, quae multas aequat aerumnas. Nam de hospitio beatus mihi videre: propter quod vadimonium deseri vel ad tribunal Cassiani iudicis possit, ut fuit in proverbio. E Marliano nostro, Cinerarium die. Sed Rex lon- gissime hinc abest, et literae ad Legatum Venetorum mittendae,

quare metuebam ne interciderent. Salutabis mihi Egnatium,  
quem miror literis meis non rescripsisse, quas ei redditas  
esse ex thesauro Insubriae Grolierio cognovi, homine Egnatij  
amicissimo, omniumque doctissimorum. vale. καὶ θῆναι οὖν φίλ-  
λων τῶν δε τῶν ζήλον ἀξιωματικῶν. ἔ Marliano nostro, v. cal. Mar.



1. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 318-325; cf., ch. ii, nn. 38-39. Spelling, ligatures and abbreviations have been modernized.

2. The text reads authoritatem.

3. There is no punctuation mark, although Sed is capitalized.

4. The text reads authoritatem.

5. Printed ppensisq; in the text.

## APPENDIX G

GULIELMUS BUDAEUS

CHRISTOPHORO LONGOLIO S.<sup>1</sup>

QUAERIS rationem occupationum mearum? Ea<sup>2</sup> est quam tu satis per te conijcere ipse videre. Ratio vitae insolita, molesta, impedita. Neque enim ignotum est cuiquam, nedum tibi, huiuscemodi vitam esse aulicam: mihi etiam eo difficiliorem, quod ab eo genere maxime abhorre coeperam, destinato quoque proposito et propemodum fixo: si quidem consilii quicquam fixi esse posset homini non sibi iam magis, quàm liberis, quàm familiae, quàm posteritati viventi, et propinquorum auctoritati<sup>3</sup> addicto. Verum casu mihi necopinato excussum propositum est, consiliumque discussum quantumvis meditatatum, nihil minus providenti. Ultro enim accersitus ad duorum Regum conventum memorabilem: (ut mittam imperium regium) non potui eam operam nec debui, non tantum oeconomicae rationi, aut liberorum spei denegare, aut amicorum etiam cognatorumque precibus, sed literatorum quoque causae communi, honorique literarum, quarum nomine atque commendatione haud obscure evocabar. Itaque quum sumptum non contemnendum in

eo munere obeundo fecissem, non aliter servare meum à principe potui, quàm ut contra animi sententiam aere hoc aulico auctorari<sup>4</sup> me sinerem, non illo quidem praesenti, sed in diem (ut assolet) annuam expensitationum formula constituto. Multis deinde consiliorum eventuumque ambagibus perplexe penitusque insinuatus, cum me iam non integri status esse dolerem, alioquin etiam molestiae atque iniquitati in universum aulice conditionis infensus, in pristinum statum asserendi me impetum haud ignauum ceperam. Aula<sup>5</sup> aliquot hebdomadis carui, regustans cum licebat studiosae vitae liberaeque suavitatem. Quum in ea (ut ita dicam) libertatis usurpatione agerem, ecce tibi sub id ipsum tempus in urbem regis adventus, aulam (ut fit) adeo, mihi quod debebatur, ut per occasionem quoquo modo servarem. Ibi<sup>6</sup> mihi objectum et exprobratum cavillabunde, quod homo semianimis umbratilique vitae ineducatus: solem diu perferre laboremquam comitatus non potuissem: deinde literis convicium eam ob causam fieri coeptum, et in haec nostra studia cavilla jactitari, haud dubie ingenia in musarum sanctioribus officinis perpolita nulli usui publice postea esse posse, inerteis illinc homines simul et eruditos evadere: quanquam ne evadere quidem eruditos, qui nulla spe elici possent, non proposita, non in manu posita, in medium ut prodirent specimen industriae facultatumque daturi, quas tanto labore compararent. His atque huiusmodi verbis: simul amicorum meorum jurgiis atque auctoritate<sup>7</sup> adactus, pistrino tandem aulico me reddidi vultuosum iam et contusum:

in quo nunc obrupta penè fronte molam versare multis, ut opinor, videor non modo servilem, sed etiam asinariam: identidem restitans et ingemiscens, nec proficiens hilum: homo sine lare, sine libris, sine consilio satis certo, denique sine spe reconciliandae philologiae: quam nondum ipsam planè placatam à divortio, non paucorum mensium abrupto consilio, et penè praecipiti relinquere mihi contigit. Miserum enimvero te inquis, et malevolentibus fatis genitum, qui hoc consilii ceperis, et hactenus secutus sis: ut te veluti coelo quaesitaque claritate dei jceres, in tenebrasque istas conderes Cimmerias. Verum quid facerem tandem potius? Quum<sup>8</sup> singularis humanitas Principis, ingenio et facundia orisque dignitate visendi, et benignitas planè regia, validum retinaculum animi mei fuerit, cuiuscunque etiam alterius remora haud dubie illecebraque innoxia futura aliorum quoque prorsus evadere contententis et meditati, qui quidem certe meminisset natalium suorum et imaginum: et charitate teneretur uxoris et liberorum: quam prodere ipsam mihi inerter ac destituere videtur, quasique suo se genere stemmateque abdicare: quicunque familiae nomen opera sua virili fraudare non veretur: ut indulgentius ipsi de se mereri genioquam suo vacare<sup>9</sup> possit. Nunc autem tametsi honori haberi doctrinae existimationem ita video, ut jure queri nequeam, aut excusare opinione me, quod ad hoc quidem attinet, fuisse falsum, tamen animus meus sui semper similis, et dulcedine libertatis perfusus, simul inertis huius vitae insolens et

intolerans, in aulae comitatu quasi caveola inclusus identidem circumvolitat, effugium aliquod quaeritans nequicquam, nec inveniens. Nam cum me hinc taedium, inde quietis liberalis desiderium ex aequo penè domum revocent, identidem circumspectans et oberrans eruptionis locum animadvertere nequeo duntaxat honestae et inculpatae, utpote qui omneis transitus oclusos esse poenitentiae sentiam. Quo fit, ut veluti quaedam pudoris atque ignominiae cinctus indagine, exilium consciscere mihi interdum sustineam à musarum contubernio: interdum tanquam fanatico furore instinctus, perfrictam frontem et obduratam impingere in obicem constituam, et claustra perfringere: obvallatamque carcere sic emittere. Etenim vir amice, per philologiae tuae charitatem, quid mihi iam auctor es ut faciam? Num<sup>10</sup> ut animo obsequar, qui in hac angustia ac cessatione aestuat, angoreque tabescit? At patrocinium publicum deseruisse, si id faciam, per inertiam secordiamque dictitabor: siquidem ex quo Principi iam iterum palàm multis hoc verbum non dico ore excidisce, sed mature atque consulte pronunciatum esse pernotuit, uti posteaquam inter seriarum horarum acroamata<sup>11</sup> inclarescere aliquantulum ipsi coepimus: velle se magnopere et cupere literis Latinis, Graecisque sedem stabilem Parisijs statuere, et tanquam fundamenta jacere musei Romani atque Attici: in quo principatus sui memoriam incisam posteritati relicturus est: publicae illico expectationis consensus, speique inde erectae in disquiscentis, ad me doctrinae elegantioris patrocinium

animi destinatione detulit, ad quem etiam eius instituti auctoritatem<sup>12</sup> causamque in primis referebat. Eo fit, ut si digitum (quod aiunt) transversum nunc ab aula discessero, nisi commeandi venia impetrata, inexpiabili utique culpa obstrinxisse me videar, simul apparere Principi desiero, et fervor ille regius et (prope dixerim) entheus intepuerit, aut planè refrixerit, ut falsam fortasse gratiam hactenus iniui spontanei Principis instituti, ob id quod alere et augere enatam divinitus voluntatem accurate enixeque contendere, ita immerita nimirum invidia continuo flagrabo, si, quod ominari nolim, res agitari coepta irrita tandem abierit et evanida. Tenes iam (ut arbitror) rationem non tam consilii mei, (quo in re tumultuaria et praecipiti uti non utique potui) quàm casus improviso oblatus, qui me arctissimo ex amplexu philosophiae rapuit, et in diversum abstulit late expatiaturum, proculque omni diversorio hominum consultorum, qui quidem me securum praestare queant, in gradumque reponere tranquillitatis pristinae et euthymiae. Compose nunc Budaeum in Marliano commentantem, ad quem tu aliquando adijsti iter agens peregre: et eum qui nunc curis insuetis inter curiosos angitur, cuique negotium saepe facessunt hominum genus haud aequissimum literis, ij qui super hospitia mansionatim constituti sunt. Cretarij<sup>13</sup> designatores, quos Graeci appellant ἐπιστάθμους:<sup>14</sup> ut uno verbo absolvam, qui ex gloriae factitandae officina transijt ad vitam ingloriam et nomadicam. Expedi<sup>15</sup> etiam consilium si potes amico in inopia consilij

deprehenso, et tanquam in salebra haerenti vitae porro agendae. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἀποκεκρίσθω πρὸς ἄνδρα σε τῶν ἐμῶν, ὡς οἶμαι, κηδόμενον, συνίεναι τε γλιχόμενον, καὶ καταμαθεῖν πῶς ἔχει τὰ τῆς προαιρέσεως, τῆς ἡμετέρας, τοὺς δ' ἐξαίφνης κεκαινοτομηθῆναι, καὶ παραδόξως ἐπιτετηρεῦσθαι φθασίας, οὗ μὴν δὲ καὶ παραλόγως, τοῦτου μὲν δὴ με τοῦ νεωτερισμοῦ ἀγασθῆναι σε καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους, τοὺς τὰμὰ συγγράμματα ἀνεγνωσκότας, οὐτ' αὐτοῖς ἄγαμαι, οὔτε δι' ὀργῆς ἄγω, πῶς γάρ, ὅσγε οἶδα τὴν τοῦ βίου ἐπιτήδευσιν εἰς τοῦμπαλιν δοκοῦσάν μοι περιελθεῖν τοῖς ὑπ' ἐμοῦ γεγραμμένοις. οὐ μέντοι, καὶ γνῶμην γε σὺ νοοῖς μοι μεταθεμένην ἣν ποτε θεία γε τινὶ τύχῃ κρείττων γένομαι τῆς δουλαγωγούσης με νῦν ἀνάγκης. καὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ τοῦτου γε ἔνεκα μάλιστα' ἂν εἰξαίμην ἀντεξουσίος εἶναι αὐτόν, ἐμᾶντοῦ δ' ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς, ἵν' ἐξῇ μοι ποτε ἐνδείκνυσθαι ὅτι σὸ βουλομένῳ μοι ἦν ταῦτα, οὐδὲ ἐμᾶντῳ.<sup>16</sup> De Legato regio istic agente faciam ex sententia animi tui, non tua modo, sed etiam eius hominis causa, quem novi praeter eximiam iuris doctrinam etiam literarum nostrarum esse amantissimum: faciam autem ita demum, si ita occasio tulerit, ut operam illi tibi quam, qui hoc iubes navare possim, id est, si in rem praesentem aut fortuna me deduxerit, aut eorum consilium, quibus ipse munus suum promendum apposite mandarit. Lazarus homo tibi, mihi, omnibusquam (ut opinor) studiosissimus amicus, iandiu in aula non comparuit: existimo eum studiis se pristinis reddidisse: quare de eo scribere quod ipse poscis non possum, nisi eundem esse semper ipsum, id est ingenio animo et voluntate proba et egregia: ut quidem prae se ferre videtur. Quas flagitas tantopere epistolas cum libello de Contemptu rerum fortuitarum,

statim ad te misissem; si hic venales haberentur, aut inveniri alio modo potuissent: mittam autem primo quoque tempore, nisi interim aliunde habuisse sensero. Gratum est, quod scribis περί τοῦ ἀδελφιδοῦ μου βουδαίου, de quo iam ad te scripsi, et de eius sodali. Quod vero de suppeditatione ἀργυρίου scripsisti οὐδέν δέη σέ γε τοῦτο ποιεῖν. ἔχουσι γάρ ἐν τῇ πόλει τὴν χορηγῶντα πάντα<sup>17</sup> τὰ καθημέραν ἐπιτήρεια. Et Mediolani non leviter viaticatus est meus, à Praetore Mediolanensi amitino suo: non vult autem pater eius pantolabum eum esse, id quidem mihi, ut tibi denunciarem ultro scripsit. ἔρρωσο σὺ. ἔρράσθων δὲ καὶ λόγοι εὐδοκιμοῦντες καὶ παιδεία ἡ ἐρωμένη μοῦ πρό τοῦ. ἴσθι δὲ σὺ πάντοτε ἄγοντά με σχολήν, οὐδέ γε εὐθόμως διακείμενον, πρό τήνδε τὴν ἐπιστολῶν ἀμοιβήν. εἰ καὶ καταπονοσόμενος νῦν εἰμι καὶ σχεδόν τι κατειργασμένος τῷ συχνᾷ ἐπιστεῖλαι πρός τοὺς ἐξαιρέτους, τῶν φίλων καὶ γνωρίμων. Romorantij, postridie Regalium.



1. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 325-330; cf., ch. ii, and nn. 38 and 40. Also cf., G[uillaume] Budé, G. Bvdaei. Consiliarii Regii, Svpplicvmqve Libello- / rvm in Regia Magistri / Epistolarvm Latinarvm Lib. V. / Annotationibusq; adiectis in singulas fere epistolas. / GRAECARVM ITEM LIB. I. / BASILII item Magni Epistola de Vita in solitudine agenda, per Budaeum latina facta (Basilea: Jod. Badi-um, [1531]), fols. LXIVb-LXVIb. Henceforth, this work will be identified as Budé, Epistolarum, 1531.

2. Lower case in the text.

3. The text reads authoritati.

4. The text reads authorari.

5. Lower case in the text.

6. Lower case in the text.

7. The text reads authoritate.

8. Lower case in the text.

9. The text reads vacaro.

10. Lower case in the text.

11. Budé, Epistolarum, 1531, fol. LXVI, n. g., makes the following observation about this reading: "Inter seriatum horarum acroamata. Acroamata dicunt etiam hoies acroamata recitantes aut memoriter dicentes super coenam et prandium Cic. in Ver. Hic quasi festium acroama, ne sine corollario discederet, ibidem convituis spectatibus emblemata avellenda curavit. Seriarum horarum acroamata hic vocat, homines quos princeps adhibere solet cum serias res acturus est, non solum cum oblectari vult fabulamentis.

12. The text reads authoritatem.

13. Lower case in the text.

14. This should read ἐπιστάθμοι.

15. Lower case in the text.

16. This transcription has omitted the term συνηδόμενοι.

17. Budé, Epistolarum, 1531, fol. LXVIa, indicates that the word πάντα was dropped from the Longueil text.

## APPENDIX H

### ΓΟΥΛΙΕΑΜΟΣ ΒΟΥΛΑΙΟΣ ΧΡΙ-

στοφόρω Λογγολίφ εἶπράττειν.<sup>1</sup>

ΕΚομισάμην σου τὴν ἐπιστολὴν δευτέρᾳ τοῦτου του μηνὸς Ἰστα-  
μένου. ἐπιδόντος τοῦ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς<sup>2</sup> οἰκίας κοινοβιάρχου τοῦ Βαρτολίνου,  
νεανίσκου γ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν ἀξιεράστου τῆς εὐνοίας ἔνεκα τῆς τε πρὸς σε,  
καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πεπαιδευμένους. ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἰδέας πρῶτον  
ὑπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς ἐπῆλθόν τε καὶ προσεπῆλθον. εἶτ' ἡρέμα δὴ ἐνέγων,  
τοῦτο μὲν, τοῖς γραμμασιν εὐασμενίζων τοῖς σοῖς, καὶ ταῦτα ἑλληνιστὶ  
φθειγγομένοις, τοῦτο δὲ, γλιχόμενος μανθάνειν τὰ περὶ σοῦ. οὐ μέντοι  
οἴκοι ἂν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἔδεξάμην,<sup>3</sup> ἀλλὰ δὲ τὸ ἄστυ σπεύδοντί μοι παρε-  
δόθη, ὅσον τε οὐδέπω εἰς ἑπαυλιν ἐξίσονται, ἐπεὶ παραπτίχ' ἂν ἐγὼ ὑφ'  
ἡδονῆς ἀντεπέστειλα. οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἡνειχόμεν μὴ οὐχὶ σε τοῖς ἴσοις γούν  
γραμμασι παραυτόθεν ἀμείβεσθαι, τὸν γε προκαλούμενον ἐμὲ εἰς τοῦτι τὸ  
πεδίον οὐ δυσηλατώτερον ἐμοί. δι' ἐνάτης δὲ δὴ ἡμέρας εἰς πόλιν  
ἐπανιδὼν, τὰ τε οἴκοι διαθέμενος, καὶ τῶν προὔργου ἀπαλλαγείς, πρὸς  
τοῖς λόγοις αὖ ἡρξάμην εἶναι πάλιν. καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον σχολὴν ἤδη μοι  
ἔχοντι, ὅτου τε ἀρξάμην σκεπτομένων τὰ γράμματά σου πάλιν ἐπιλέξασθαι  
μοι ἐπελθόν, συνηδύμην γε δοῖ εὐθὺς τῆς σπουδῆς τῆσδε ἀναγνοῦς, καὶ τῆς  
ἐπιδόσεως τῆς ἄγαν ἐν παιδείᾳ τῇ ἑλληνικῇ. πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἂν σθένεχαιρον,

ὅς γε σοὶ τῆς προαιρέσεως ταύτης ἐσηγητῆς, σύμβalos,<sup>4</sup> συναινέτης ἐγενό-  
μην; καὶ ἐνθένδε ἀπελθόντι συστατικὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐχαρισάμην πρὸς ἄνδρα  
ὃν μάλιστα συσταθῆναι δὴ ἐπεθύμεις, καὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ τοῦτο προσθεῖην ἂν  
(ἀπεῖν δὲ φόβος) ὅς γε τοῦ τὴν γνησίαν τῶν γραμμάτων σπουδὴν ἐλευθερ-  
οπρεπῶς τε καὶ ὁλοσχερῶς ἐκπονεῖν καθηγητῆς τοῖς σπουδαίοις τοῖς<sup>5</sup> γ' ἔν-  
ταυθα γέγονα. καλοῦ τε τοῦ ἐπιτηδεύματος τοῖς κελτοῖς τοῖς κατ' ἐμὲ  
κατήρξα. οὐδ' ὅτ' ἐνεκά τις ὑπάρξειν εἰς τούπιον προσδοκῆσθαι ἂν, εἴγε  
ἀπο δεχομένων τὰ αὐτῶν σοὶ τε κἄμοι εἶναι περισπούδαστον. ἀμέλει τὸ  
ἐς ἐμὲ, οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν ἂν πιαχωρῆσαιμι, οὐδ' ὑφείμην ἂν οὐδὲν οὐδενὶ  
τῶν σπουδαστῶν, τοῦ μὴ οὐχὶ ἄτεχνῶς τε καὶ ἀφειδῶς τοῦτω τῷ πράγματι  
αὐτὸς προεστῆκεναι<sup>6</sup> δοκεῖν, ἀναποσπαστότερόν τε ἢ συμβῖῶναι καίπερ κε-  
χαρισμένη. σὸ μέγαν τε πόνον ἄρασθαι φῆς, λιπερῇ τε σπουδῇ ἐπιτε-  
τηδευκέναι, σκοπῶν καὶ μεριμνῶν ὅπως χρόνῳ μὲν ὑστερήσας, ἐπιμελεῖα δὲ  
χρησάμενος ὑπερμεγέθει, τοῦς προλαβόντας ὅσον αὐτίκα καταλήψῃ. εἴγε  
τῆς προαιρέσεως τῆς σῆς ὃ φίλε γενναίας τε καὶ ἀξιεπαίνου. καὶ τοι  
τοῦτω γε ἂν τῷ λόγῳ ἴσθι σὸ τὴν ἐμὴν σπουδὴν ἐπιεικῶς ἐπιτετακῶς, οἶδα  
γὰρ οἷ κινδύνου καθέστηκα σοῦ γε δὴ ἀντεπιθυμοῦτός μοι τῆς ἐρωμένης  
ἐμῆς, ἐφ' ἧ περ ἐν τῷ πρὸ τοῦ χρόνῳ ἀγαλλεσθαι λίαν καὶ οὐ μέτρια φρονεῖν  
ἐδόχουν. τί δέ; ἔστιν ὅστις οὐκ ἂν συμφορὰν ὥς μεγίστην τὸ πρᾶγμα  
τοῦτο ποιοῖτο; τῆς εὐκλείας ἀφηρῆσθαι νῦν σχεδὸν τι παρημακῶς, ὅπ' ἄν-  
δρὸς νεοφανοῦς, ἣν ἔτη τοσαῦτα ἀναμφισβητήτως ἐκαρπωσάμην; οὐ μὴν  
ἄλλ' ὥσπερ οἱ γενναϊότατοι τῶν ἀθλητῶν τὴν νίκην οὐκ ἂν ἤδουντο ἀνηρη-  
μένοι, μηδενὸς αὐτοῖς τότε ἀνταυρομένου ἐνδεία τῶν ἀντιπάλων, ἐπεὶ τοι  
τὴν δυνάμιν εὐκταίστερον ἔστιν ὁποιανδήποτε ἐνδείκνυσθαι, ἢ τοῦ γε  
σταδιοῦ λειπανδροῦντος ἀνιδρωτὶ τὸ ἄθλον φέρεσθαι ὥσανεὶ ἐγκαταλελειμ-  
μένον. καὶ οἱ νεανικοὶ δὲ ἀγωνισταὶ καὶ δεινοὶ πληθύνοντες τοῦ σταδίου

φαιδρότερον δήπου διακρίνεται, ὥς ἐνὸν γε τότε αὐτοῖς τὴν ἰσχὴν ἐμπροσθεν  
ἐκπεπονημένην ἀσκεῖν, οὕτω δῆτοι καὶ ἐμαυτῷ συνήδομαι οὐκ ὀλίγους νυνὶ  
μαθὼν εἰς ἐκεῖνο τὸ πέρας κατὰ σπουδὴν ἰεμένους οὐπερ ἔγωγε ἐφικέσθαι,  
ὥς οὐκ οἶδ' εἵτις ἄλλος τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῶν, ὅπερεπεθυμῆσε. ὅθ' γε μὴν ὁ δρο-  
μαῖος, ἄλλοι τε τινὲς τῶν ἐνθάδε, πρὸ τῶν ἐγκυκλίων δηλαδὴ καὶ μετρίως  
ἐχόντων ἐκθορόντες, τὴν σπουδὴν γε τὴν ἐμὴν τῷ ὄντι παροξύνετε, δεδιότος  
δήπου μὴ παρηκολουθηκότων πόθ' ὑμῶν. βραδυτῆτα πολλὴν ὄφλω, ὃ γε πρό-  
τερον αὐτὸς τῶν ὀξέων εἶναι καὶ πρωτεύοντων ὀξέας. οὐ γὰρ ἂν οἶμαι  
καταλάβοιτέ με δραμόντες, μὴ οὐχὶ αὐτίκα δὴ μάλα μετ' αἰσχύνης ἂν ἀπο-  
λιπόντες. ὅμως μέντοι οὐκ ἄγνοεῖν ὑμᾶς δεῖ, μέγα τὸ μεταίχμιον εἶναι  
τὸ διὰ μέσου, ὅπερ ὑμῖν διανυτέρον ἐστίν, εἰ γε οὖν εὐθὺς δραμεῖν του-  
τέρματος ἀπὸ τῆς βαλίδος ἐγνώκατε παρὰ πόδας ὤθεν ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐμοί.  
ἀλλὰ γὰρ φησεῖ τις ἂν ὑμῶν, τίς οὐκ ἂν ἀναδυσοίτο κατ' ἴχνος δοὶ κατα-  
κολουθεῖν, ὅς γε οὐδενὸς ἀκούσας διδασκάλου, οὐδενὶ τε οὐδέποτε πεπλη-  
σιακῆς τῶν ὀπωσοῦν ἐμπεύρων, φεττων δὴ τῇδε κῆκεῖσε ὑπὸ τῆς προθυμίας,<sup>7</sup>  
καὶ περινοσοῦντι ἐοικώς, βραδέως ἄρα καὶ τῶν δὴ διὰ μέσου ἐφικέσθαι,  
μὴ τι δὴ τῶν ἐσθλάτων ἠδυνήθης. ἡμεῖς δὲ οἱ εἰς τοῦ διδασκάλου φοιτῶντες,  
ἢ ἄλλως γέ τυχόντες καθηγεμόνος, τὴν τε τῆς παιδείας μέθοδον ἀνθόντες  
οὐ κατὰ ποδὸς βᾶσιν, οὐδέ γε ὅπως δὴ καὶ τυχόντες ἐπιδιδόντες,<sup>8</sup> ἀλλὰ  
κατὰ τάξιν μὲν, ἄθρόως δὲ τὰ ἐφεξῆς μετιδόντες ἀλλήλων ἐχόμενα, πῆς οὐκ  
ἂν τὸ πλεῖστον τοῦ χρόνου καὶ<sup>9</sup> πόνου κερδήσαιμεν, ἐν οἷς σὺ γε μονάχων  
δεινῶν. οἶμοι<sup>10</sup> κακοδαίμων, οἷαν λῆξιν ἐγὼ περὶ τὰ τῆς φιλολογίας εἴληχα;  
σὺ μὲν τοι πρὸς τῇ διαφέρειν μου τῇ εὐφυίᾳ, καὶ τοῦτο δὴ πλεονεκτεῖς  
πάντων ὑμῶν τῶν ἐνθαδὶ, ὅτι τῶν καθηγησαμένων εὐκορεῖς, καὶ τῶν περι-  
γηγησαμένων δὲ σοὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῖς πάλαι σοφοῖς. βιβλίων τε τῶν βελτίστων  
τυχὼν κατὰ γνῶμην, μηδὲν μηδέπω καταδεῆς μὴδ' ὑποδεῆς γεγονώς, ὥς γε

λόγος νῦν ἐνταῦθα. ἐμὲ δε, τῶν μεν καθημέραν καὶ τῶν πρὸς τὴν χορηγίαν τήνδε τὴν εἰς φιλολογίαν, ἵσως ἂν εὐπορήσῃς που δοκοῦντα, τάλλῃ γε ἡ τέχνη ἡλάττωσεν καὶ τῶν καιρῶν ἡ κατάστασις, ἀποροῦμενον δῆπουθεν πρῶτον μὲν, βιβλίων, εἴτα διδασκάλων. πρὸς δὲ, καὶ συμμαθητιῶντων, ὃ δὴ μέγιστον. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγειν πολλάκις μου ἐπεσχηκέναι τὴν ὁρμὴν, οὐ μόνον τοῦς ἰατροῦς, ἐξώλειαν ἐπαπειλοῦντας εἰμὴ παραχρῆμα μεταησοίμην τὴν δίαίταν, καὶ τῶν βιβλίων ἀφησοίμην. εἶεν, τὴν δὲ δὴ νόσον ἐκείνην, ἃς ἂν εἴποι τις, ἐμοὶ συγγενῇ, συχνά μοι πάντοτε πράγματα, καὶ συνεχῇ παρασοῦσαν, πῶς οἶμαι ἀνακῶμαι με τῆς ὁρμῆς καὶ ἀποσπεῦσαι, ὅσον σὸς οἶόμενον διαπαντὸς τεθνήξασθαι; τιδαί; τῶν φίλων καὶ προσηκόντων τοῦς παῦσαι με ἐπιχειροῦντας τῶν ἐλληνικῶν λόγων σπουδῆς, οὐδὲν πλέον ἔξειν με φάσκοντας ἀπὸ τῆς γνώσεως αὐτῶν, ὀπηνίκα ἐν τοῖς κελτοῖς οὐδέποτε τοῦτων οὐδεὶς λόγος ἔσεσθαι μέλλοι (οὐδὲν ἐμποδὼν οἶμαι γενέσθαι;).<sup>11</sup> τὰ τοίνυν τοῦτου τοῦ ἀγῶνος πρὸ τοῦ μὲν, διαφερόντως ἐμοὶ τε καὶ σοὶ εἶχον. εἰς δὲ τὰ μετὰ τὰτα σκοπούμεν, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ<sup>12</sup> σχεδὸν καθεστῶτα δοκοίη ἂν. καὶ γάρ τοι αὐτὸς δοκεῖν εἶναι τις φθάσας τοῖς πολίταις τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν ἐλληνικῶν λόγων ὁποιατινοῦν ἐπιστήμῃ, ὥσπερ οὐκ ἐσθ' ὅπως εἴθ' ὑπὸ σοῦ ποτὲ παρευδοκιμούμενος, εἴθ' ὑπὸ τοῦ τῶν ἐναγχοῦς ἐπὶ τῷ ἐπιχειρήματι τοῦτω γνωρίμων, οὐκ ἂν ἀμαθίαν ὀφλοίμην, οὕτω τοι καὶ σὺ κινδυνεύεις που τῶν σεμνολόγων ἀκούειν εἶναι καὶ μικρὸν τι πρὸς, εἰ μὴ δι' ἑτοὺς τρίτου δεῖγμά τι καὶ γνώρισμα ἐκδιδόηκ παιδεύσεως οὐ τῆς τυχοῦστος. τοῦτο γὰρ ποιεῖν ἐπίδοξος εἶ, ἐκδοθέντος οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως τοῦ λόγου ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν (τὴν ἡμετέραν).<sup>13</sup> ἄλλως τε καὶ διὰ στόματος ὦν τῇ πόλει ἐπὶ τῇ ἀποδημίᾳ<sup>14</sup> καὶ μεγίστη περί σου ἐλπίδι οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἐπηγερέμην, κατανοεῖς εἴ οἶδ' ὅτι οὐ καλῶς οὐδ' εὐδοκίμως ἂν ἀπαλλάξας τῆς τῶν ἡμετέρων περί σου ὑπολήψεως, μὴ οὐχὶ αὐτὸς ἀττικουργές τι φιλοπόνημα

εἰς τὸ κοινὸν κριτήριον οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν παριστῶν. Ἐγὼ γέ τοι καὶ ταῖς κατ' οἰκονομίαν φροντίσιν ἀπασχολημένος τοῦτ' ἔτος ἤδη δεύτερον, ἐνόησα οὐδ' εὐτυχῆς προσκειμένως ὥς ἡσθόμην, τῶν γραμμάτων τούτων μεταπεποιήσας, ὅμως μέντοι ἐπὶ τὰς πάλαι φροντίδας καθαπερεὶ εἰς τὰς παλαιὰς φάτνας τὸ λεγόμενον, καὶ τὴν ἄγαν σπουδὴν ἐπάνειμι, ἐπὶ πρῶτον ἐγχαρῆση, καθόσον γε δὴ ἀπὸ τῆς εὐημερίας καὶ ἐσσεὶ ἀφεσθαί μοι ἐξεῖται τῶν οἴκοι ἐπιστάσεων, ἣ ὀπρὶς ποτέ τι ἀνεῖναι τῶν ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦτον ἐπιβαλλόντων. ἀντὶ πάντων γε μὴν τῶν πόνων ἐμῶν, τῶν τε οἰχομένων καὶ τῶν εἰσαυθις, δεξαίμην ἔν ἄσμενος, οὐκ ἐλάττω που δόξαν οἰκουρῶν αὐτὸς εὐρεσθαι, τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς πατρίδος ἀποδημησάντων, καὶ τοῖς ὀνομαστοτέτοις τῶν ἑλλήνων ἐπεξενομένων, εὐδόξους τε πόλεις διελθόντων ὥς ἂν οἰκείως ἔχειν μάλιστα πρὸς τὰ μαθήματα εἰδῶσι. τὰ μὲν δὴ ἀμφὶ τοὺς λόγους τοῦτοισι, ἄνωθεν μὲν ἄρα διαπονούμενος ὥς οἶδν τε μάλιστα, αὐτ' ἀτυχῶς ἔντ' ἐπιτυχῶς, φιλοτιμησάμενος δὲ πρὸς οὐδένα, οὐκ ὄντος δῆπουθεν ἐφαμίλλου τοῦ ἀγῶνος τοῦδὲ τῆνικαῦτα παρ' ἡμῖν, τάπῃ τοῦτου ὑπερφιλοτίμως διαγωνιεῖσθαι<sup>15</sup> δοκῶ μοι, ὥς δὴ ἀντεξετασθησόμενος ἤδη πρὸς ὑμᾶς τοσοῦτους ἢ τηλικούτους γε ἄνδρας, ἐναμίλλους δὴ ἐξαίφνης μοι φανέντας πολυχρότου νῦν ἀγῶνος. καὶ μὴν καὶ ἔγωγε τοσαύτην σπουδὴν ἐνθυμούμενος σοῦ τε καὶ τινων ἑλλων τῶν ἐνταῦθα ἑλληνιζόντων, ὀλίγου δέω ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτὸς ἐμαυτοῦ λογιζόμενος, ὥς ἄρα ποτὲ κατ' ἐμοῦ συγκρότημά τι συστάντες πεποιήσθε, ἀμιλλόμενοί μοι δῆθεν περὶ τῆς ὀποσησθήποτε δόξης, μὴ γὰρ δὴ βασκαίνοντές μοι καλλίστης προαιρέσεως. τάχα τοίνυν οὐ ταύτην τὴν ἀμιλλαν αὐτὸς κατὰ σκευὴν μεμελέτηκας, περιττῇ γε τῇ φύσει σοῦ πεποιθὼς, καὶ τῷ ὑπερβαλλόντι τῆς σπουδῆς. ἅμα δὲ καὶ τῇ τῶν αὐθι διδασκάντων ῥαδιουργίᾳ ὥνπερ οὐδ' ὀσημέραι ἀκροώμενός τε καὶ κατὰ γνῶμην αὐτοῖς ἐντυχῶ, τί οὐκ ἔν κατορθώσας. ὥς μὲν οὖν ἐγὼ τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς συνιείς καὶ λογιζόμενος, ἐστήξειν

ὅμως ὀρθῶς καὶ βεβαίως πέπεισμαι ἀνταγωνιζομένων ὑμῶν, οὐκ ἂν εἴποιμι. οὐ γάρ τοι τοῦτο γε πρὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐστὶν ἑαυτὸν ἐγνωκότες. ὥς δὲ προθυμῶς ὁμῶσε χωρήσω ἐπιχειροῦσιν ὑμῖν, οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἀθυμήσας οὐδ' ἀποκαμῶν, οὐδὲ δὴ<sup>16</sup> περαιτοῦμενος ἄχρι τοῦ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐσχάτων ἀποπειρᾶσθαι, εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἂν εὐλαβοίμην. τῶν δὲ δὴ κρατίστων καὶ ἐπικεικῶν ἔργον ἔσται ἀνθρώπων, ὑπενδοῦναι τι καὶ ὑφέσθαι πάντως θανατῶντί<sup>17</sup> μοι, εἴγε μέλλω τῆς τάξεως ἀποστερηθῆσεσθαι, ἣν πρὸ ὑμῶν ἐτάχθην τῶν πολλῶν μεν ψηφισμένων ἐπιψηφισάντων δὲ οὐκ ὀλίγων τῶν ἐν ἀξίωματι. οὔτε μὴν αὖ πάλιν τάληθες οὐκ ἂν φαίην. ἦν γὰρ ὥσπερ μοι παρίσας ὑμῖν ἐπιδοῦναι ἂν τρέπιτοῦτο (ἦδη γὰρ καὶ ἄνευ παιδεύοντος οἶμαι κρατήσειν τῶν χαλεπῶν) καὶ τοσοῦτο ἐμοῦ κρείττονα γιγνόμενον<sup>18</sup> εἰς τὸ ἐπιδὼν ἀεὶ διατελεῖν, ὅσπερ ἂν ὑμεῖς καθήμεραν, κρείττους ὑμῶν αὐτῶν γένησθε, καλῶς μοι καὶ ἐπιτυχῶς ἡγήσομαι τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιτήδευσιν τήνδε φέρεσθαι. ὑμῶν τοίνυν οὐδ' ἂν εἷς φαίη γε ὥς οὐ μέλλω οὐδ' ὁμοίᾳ προθυμίᾳ χρησάμενος, καὶ δὴ ὁμοίως ὑμῖν ἀυξήσεσθαι ἐκ προσαγωγῆς. προτερήσας ἄρα τῇ ἡλικίᾳ ὑμῶν, οὐδενὸς δὲ φιλοπονίᾳ ὕστερος ὢν, οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτου ὑμῶν ζῶν γ' ἀπολελείψομαι. κἂν ἐμοὶ ἐπιβιοῦντες (ἔστω τοῦτο ἐμοῦ γε ἔνεκα) κορβαντέρω που τῆς φήμης τε καὶ παιδείας<sup>19</sup> προβεβηκότες τέχνητε. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν δὴ τοῦτον πεπαίχθω τὸν τρόπον. χαίρειν γὰρ εἰδῶμεν ἐπιστέλλοντες πρὸς φίλους τοιοῦτοις παιγνιδέουσιν. οὐδ' ἂν σε βουλοίμην οὔτε τινὰ τῶν ἐντεθυμένων, ταῦτ' ἐκλαβεῖν ἀναγνόντα ὥς ἐμοὶ ἐσπουδασμένα. πῶς γὰρ ἂν ταῦτα σπουδαιολογησαίμην. ὅς γε τῆς τε συνοικοῦσης καὶ τῶν παίδων παρενοχλοῦντων, οἰκείων τε φροντίδων ἐπαλλήλως προσεπιφουμένων, οὐχ ἔξειν οἶμαι εἰς τὸ ὕστερον ὅπως τῇ μὲν τῇ περὶ τοῦς λόγους σπουδῇ, πῇ δὲ τῇ περὶ τοῦτους δυνάμει θ' ἡδονῇ<sup>20</sup> τε χρῆσομαι. οὐδὲ δὴ ἐστὶ κατ' ἐμὲ, οὐδ' εἰ σχολὴν ἔχοιμι, τοιοῦτοις ἀνταγωνισταῖς ἶσα βαίνειν, τοῖς τῶν ἄκρων καὶ δυσσεφίκτων

μαθημάτων νεανικῶς ἀντεχομένοις. ἄλλως τε μὴ γένοιτό μοι μήδ' ὅστις ἐμοὶ φίλος, ἐν τῇ ἐνδεικτικῇ ταύτῃ τῶν λόγων σπουδῇ,<sup>21</sup> καὶ ἐν τοῖς τῆς γνησίας φιλολογίας προπαιδεύμασι τελέως παρακμᾶσαι μὴ ὅτι γε ἐναποθανεῖν. οἴσθα γὰρ οἶμαι ἐμοῦ ἀκούσας, ὥς εἴ ποτέ μοι ἐκγένηται τὰ περὶ ἐμὲ κατὰ νοῦν εὖ τίθεσθαι, πρὸ πάντων ἂν τιμησαίμην τοῖς ἱεροῖς λόγοις ἐξεῖναι μοι ἐμφιλοσοφεῖν, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μεθεσθαι τῶν εἰς τὰ ἐπίγεια καθηκόντων. σὺ δὲ ᾧ φίλε τῆς φιλοπονίας τῆς ἐπιτηδευθείσης, τῆς τε ἐπιδόσεως τῆς εὖ χωροῦτης ὄναιο. καὶ γὰρ τοι εἰ μὴδὲν ἄλλο, τοῦτο γοῦν ἔγωγε ἀπολελασκέναι ὁδῶ τῆς ἄγαν διαπονθήσεως, οἱ τοῖς ἑλληνικοῖς σταθερῶς ἐμφιλοπονῶν, ὅμων τῶν εἰς κλέος φερομένων ὁρμὴν τοιάντην ἐξανέστησα, διατειναμένων ὅθρυν πρὸς τὸ παρακολουθεῖν ἐμοί, τοσοῦτον γὰρ τοι προκεχωρηκότι, ὅσους δὴ τις τῶν εὖ πρὸς ταῦτα πεφυκότων, οὐδ' ἀπνευστὶ, οὐδ' ἀνιδρωτὶ ἐφίκοιτ' ἂν, οὐδ' ὥς ἂν τόχῃ φιλοτιμησάμενος. ἀτὰρ οὖν θαυμάζω ὅτι ποτ' ἐστὶν ὥς οὐδὲν ὅλως μέμνησαι Ἰάνου τοῦ Λασκάρεως, ὃν πάλαι ποτὲ προσφιλῆ μοι ὑπάρχοντα, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτι νῦν χρεὶ καλεῖν. τοῦτο γὰρ οὐχ ἱκανῶς κατανεύνηκα ἐξ ὧν αὐτὸς ἀντέγραψε τοῖς ὑπ' ἐμοῦ ἐπισταλεῖσιν. ὅμως δ' οὖν οὗτος προσειρήσθω παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐπιμελῶς. ἤκουσα γὰρ τοῦ Βαρμᾶ τοῦ νῦν προεδρεθόντος τῆς πάνυ βουλῆς, σοὶ τε καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς κελτοῖς χεριασθαι, τοῦτον φιλεῖν ὥς ἔχει δυνάμεως. προσειρήσθων δὲ μοι καὶ οἱ χαρῖέστατοι τῶν ὄντων φίλων καὶ καθηγησαμένων σου. ἀμέλει παιδεῖα προσπεπονθὼς ἔγωγε, πρὸς τοὺς εὐγνωμονεστάτους δὴ τῶν σοφῶν ἐβνοϊκῶς διάκειμαι. ὑφ' ὧν ἀντιφιλεῖσθαι περὶ πολλοῦ ποιοίμην ἂν. καίτοι οὐκ ὀλίγοις τῶν ἐνδόξων ἦτοι διὰ λόγων ἐντυχῶν, ἢ διὰ γραμμάτων προσενηνεγμένος, χεῖριν ἐνέγκασθαι πείθω με παρὰ πάντων. ἦν δὲ τάμᾳ καταλεγόμενος, ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις καὶ ἐντιμωτάτοις τῶν κτημάτων τίθεμαι τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ. Ρουζαῖος δ' κοινὸς τῶν καλῶν κάγαθων φίλος, προσαγορεύει σε δι' ἐμοῦ. ἔτι δὲ καὶ Δηλδῖνος,



εἰ καὶ οὗτος ἔχθεται σοι, δεδοκός γε πρὸς σε γράμματα, καὶ μὴ ἀντιλαβὼν  
παρά σου. Ἐβρώσω, πῶανεψιῶνος πέμπτη ἐπὶ δέκα.

1. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 331-342; cf., ch. ii, and nn. 38 and 41. Also cf., Budé, Epistolarum, 1531, fols. 3b-4b, as well as "Appendix F," n. 1. A later printing of this letter, accompanied by a Latin translation of it, is to be found in Claudius Credonius (ed.), Clavdii Credonii, Coleneaei, / in Graecas Bv / daei Epistolas Annotatio- / nes, Familiares Inprimis / & iuventuti Graecarum literarum studio flagranti, non inu- / tiles futurae (Parisiis: Michaëlis Gadolaei, 1579), pp. 24-34. Henceforth, this item will be identified as Budé, Epistolas Annotationes, 1579.

2. This and other ligatures, abbreviations, and contractions have been modernized in accordance with the principles set forth in Sir Edward Maunde Thompson, An Introduction to Greek and Latin Paleography (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912), especially pp. 75-84. Also cf., his A Handbook of Greek and Latin Paleography (Chicago: Argonaut, Inc., 1966).

3. ἔδεξιμην has been supplied.

4. The text reads σύμβολος.

5. Budé, Epistolas Annotationes, 1579, p. 24, places ἐλευθεροπρεπῶς τε καὶ ὀλοχερῶς at this point instead of σπουδαίως as it appears in Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, p. 332.

6. The text reads προσ τετηχέναι.

7. The text lacks the substantive in this clause.

8. Budé, Epistolas Annotationes, 1579, p. 27, reads ἐπιδόντες.

9. Ibid., p. 27, reads τοῦ χρόνου τε καὶ.

10. Ibid., p. 27, reads οἶμι.

11. The parenthetic clause appears in Budé, Epistolas Annotationes, 1579, p. 29, but in no other edition.

12. The text reads ἐν ταύτῃ.

13. The parenthetic expression appears in Budé, Epistolas Annotationes, 1579, but in none of the other editions.

14. Budé, Epistolas Annotationes, 1579, p. 29, inserts τεθρολλημένη.

15. Ibid., p. 30, inserts a more appropriate reading διαγωνισαῖ into the text at this point.

16. This term appears in Budē, Epistolas Annotationes, 1579, but in none of the other editions.

17. The text reads θαναδῶντι.

18. The text reads γινόμενον.

19. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, p. 339, omits the substantive παιδείας, which is supplied by the Budē, Epistolas Annotationes, 1579, p.32, text. The textual reading τε καὶ requires something omitted in the earlier edition.

20. The η is suppressed and the τ is assimilated into the rough breathing of ἡδονή.

21. Budē, Epistolas Annotationes, 1579, p. 33, reads ἐσκήσαι.

## APPENDIX I

### CHRISTOPHORUS LONGOLIUS

JACOBO LUCAE DECANO AURELIANENSI S. D.<sup>1</sup>

Numquam nobis sanè non deerit scribendi argumentum, nisi (ut te olim monui) mutuis id interrogationibus excitemus: quo nomine scripsi ad te haud ita pridem, mihi adeò gratum fore, si plenius ex te intelligerem, cur princeps vester Erasmum Budaeo praetulerit, Germanum Gallo, exterum civi, ignotum familiari. Nam quod ad eruditionem pertinet, non video qua in re Budaeus Erasmo cedat: sive humaniores, sive Christiano dignas homine literas aestimare libeat. Quod vero ad dicendi facultatem pertinet, parem, mea sententia, in tam diverso dicendi genere laudem merentur. Beatissima in ambobus et rerum et verborum copia: sed ita ut alter latius expatiatur, alter angustiore quidem alveo, verum altiore ingentem aquarum vim trahat: fluit ille plenior, hic fertur rapidior. In Budaeo videor mihi agnoscere plus nervorum, sanguinis, spiritus: in Erasmo plus carnis, cutis, coloris: in illo plus diligentiae: in hoc plus facilitatis. Creber ille sententijs, hic facetijs: ille omnia utilitati,

hic plurimum delectationi tribuit. Pugnat Budaeus cura, ingenio, gravitate, dignitate: Erasmus arte, subtilitate, lenitate, iucunditate ad victoriam contendit. Hunc amare possis, illum admirari. Huic favere, parere illi. Profecto ille me violenter cogit, hic suaviter allicit. Ducit alter blanditijs, alter viribus trahit, verborum delectu religiosus, proprietate perspicuus. Si res translationem expostulat, in metaphoris felix, sententijs gravis, figuris varius, summa orationis specie honestus, sublimis, severus, grandiloquus. Contra Erasmus venustus, modestus, popularis, floridus, verborum supellectile dives, compositione simul expeditus, simul expeditus, simul nitidus, frequens exemplis, densus argumentis, gratus salibus. Ille in oratione sua totus quidem semper est, sed tum potissimum tonat, tum fulminat, quum materia temporum nostrorum obiurgationem admittit: hic etiam quum moribus convicium facit, magis instituto suo servire atque dolere videtur, malagmatis, collyrijs, cerotis, et ceteris id genus leniorum medicamentorum remedijs sanitati consulens: ut ille amarulentis quidem illis, sed hac tempestate necessarijs potionibus, sectionibus, cauterijs alte grassantem vim morbi insectatur.

Breviter, si historiam scripturi sint, Budaeus Thucydidem, magis quam Sallustium: Erasmus Livium, quam Herodotum retulerit. Si poema pangendum, hic tragicum et Heroicum quiddam verborum sententiarumque pondere altius intonabit. Ille Comoediam urbanus, Lyricos suavius, elegiam mollius

inspirabit. Assurgit tamen et hic quoque alieno ingenio, suo vero tam difficulter, quàm illa nunquam, etiam si velit, sese demittere queat: alioqui superiores illae virtutes ut neutri desunt, sic in altero magis patent, in altero magis latent: effectu pares, habitu dissimilae, ut haud prorsus aberret quisquis hunc concioni, illum iudicijs natum dixerit: alterum Palladis numine afflatum, alteram Gratiarum choro stipatum.

Ceterum ut intelligas nihil esse, quod sit ab omni, ut ille ait, parte beatum, aut certe quod omnium stomacho satis possit facere. Audi quid in eis desiderant, qui se aliquod operae precium in re literaria fecisse arbitrantur. Budaeus hoc illis peccare videtur, quod nihil peccet: Erasmus quod vitijs suis faveat. Illum enim dum scrupulosius omnia ad veterum normam exigit, saepe oblitum eorum, quibus scribit, sibi tantum et Musis canere: hunc dum ingenio suo nimis indulget, nihilque putat esse tam vulgare, quod non aliquando in oratione suum sibi locum honeste vindicet, turbidum interim fluere, illum potius nobis significare quid velit quàm dicere: hunc immodica sermonis ubertate, veluti laeto gramine sata strangulare. Illum<sup>5</sup> oratione nunc obliqua verticosum, nunc figurata elatum saepe intumescere: hunc recto nudoquem ducto humiliorem, plerumque humi serpere. Hunc lascivia molliorem, illum austeritate duriorum. Denique alterum doctis mirum in modum posse placere: alterum etiam imperitis, si in tam secunda (ut illorum verbis utar) facundia

modum tenerent, et suo semper freti ingenio, alieno nonnunquam essent disertis, vel iudicio, vel consilio. Nam cum praestare possint quicquid volunt. Par est, inquiunt, ut optima quaeque velint, nec sese ambitiosius nobis venditent: eò res nostras recidisse, ut mature potius iuvandi, quam in-tempestive delectandi simus: pro suscepto operis instituto fideliter docendi, non crebris licentiosissimisque excursio-nibus ambagiose suspendendi: digredi quidem Senecam et Plin-ium, sed alterum parce, alterum raro, nec sic quoque quaesi-to, nec nisi oblato argumento.

Haec critici quorum sententiae quo minus statim sub-scribem, faciunt cum alia multa, tum quod non defuere clari oratores, qui non grammaticos, sed populum eloquentiae iudi-cem statuerint. Esto [.]. Sit<sup>6</sup> porrigendus doctis modo cal-culus, sint soli literarum principes de re in consilium mit-tendi, quisnam amabo aetate dignus, cui tam superba censura iure credatur? Tuebuntur se uterque haud magnis solum ex-emplis, sed etiam validissimis argumentis. Dicent se non perperam scribere, sed illos corrupte iudicare: in orationi-bus suis non nasci, sed ab imperitis spinas afferri: Erasmus se omnium rationem habuisse, Budaeus paucorum theatro con-tentum esse. Itaque ipse nihil decerno, vel ne sutor (ut aiunt) supra crepidam: vel quod apud me paria faciant: hoc est, virtutibus, si qua sunt vicia pensent, atque adeo super-ent. Habent enim plus quod laudem quam quod ignoscam. Illud tantum miror, quod ab initio dicebam. Cur princeps vester

in tanta Budaei probitate, doctrina, eloquentia, Germanum Gallo, exterum civi, ignotum familiari praetulerit.

Nec hoc dico, quod Erasmi fortunae invideam. Studeo nanque homini, si quis mortalium alius, tametsi de facie nunquam mihi viso, idque ob communem patriam (sumus enim eiusdem, ut nosti, et linguae et ditionis) colo autem ob eximias illas animi dotes, quas in eo ita suspicio, ut votorum meorum summa sit, hinc ad annum etiam alterum supra vicesimum, quo me aetate superat, si non illum, quem nunc tenet, saltem proximum eloquentiae gradum attingere. Improbum, inquis, votum: improbum sanè, sed quod nec ipse planè improbet. Ego nec existimationi, nec commodis tanti viri invideo, cuius eloquentia apud me pluris est, quàm totius Galliae opes. Sed in hoc ista scribo, ut si quid habes, actutum me certiore facias, cur semper neglectis Gallorum, nunc primum fastiditis Italorum ingenijs, Germanica tam ambitione assectemini. Vale ex urbe Roma. iiij. Calend. Februarij.



1. Longueil, Habes Lector, pp. 342-346; cf., ch. ii, and nn. 38 and 42. The letter has appeared in several later editions of Longueil's correspondence, as indicated in the discussion supra, ch. ii. Among those publications are Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, pp. 310-314, which is the authority underlying Simar, Longueil, and Becker, Longueil; cf., ch. ii, and nn. 62-66, as well as ch. i, and nn. 2 and 4. Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, III, item 914, pp. 472-476, cf., ch. i, n. 3, has reproduced this letter in a critical edition. The following transcription is based on Longueil's Habes Lector, 1533, with spelling, ligatures, and abbreviations modernized. Paragraph indentations and sentence punctuation have generally follow Allen, although accent markings have been retained.

2. Lower case in the text.
3. Lower case in the text.
4. Lower case in the text.
5. Lower case in the text.
6. The text reads Esto sit.

## APPENDIX J

ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS

CHRISTOPHORO LONGOLIO S. D.<sup>1</sup>

Cum multis nominibus mihi iucunda fuit, eruditissime Longoli, epistola tua, non illa quidem ad me scripta, sed de me: tum hoc praecipus quod mihi renovavit veterem ingenij tui noticiam, ac spem eloquentiae nequaquam vulgaris, quam ante complures annos conceperam ex oratione panegyrica, qua laudes divi Ludovici, ni fallor, Galliarum regis admodum adhuc iuvenis es prosequutus. Epistolam exhibuit Ruzaeus urbis Lutetiae suppraefectus, homo tum eruditus ipse, tum eruditionis alienae mire candidus aestimator. Tantum autem abest, ut aegre feram mihi praeferri Budaeum, ut in illum penè parcus, in me prodigus laudator fuisse videaris. Abunde multum illi tribuit tuus candor, sed quoties hominis dotes prope divinas contemplor, videor mihi videre quiddam maius omni facundia. Mihi verò tantum tribuis, quantum nec agnosco, nec postulo: cui abunde palmarium est ac triumphale, cum viro modis omnibus incomparabili comparari: neque poteris mea quidem sententia, plenius honestare famam Erasmi,

quàm si illum faceres ita posteriorem Budaeo, ut eum non longo intervallo sequeretur. Maiore tamen cum voluptate Budaei laudes legi quàm meas, vel quod illius gloriae sic faueam, ut nullius aequae, vel quod quicquid illi possessionis est honestae, id meum etiam esse ducam: non tantum publica illa Pythagoricorum lege, quae vult inter amicos esse communia omnia, verumetiam peculiari foedere, quod verbis rite conceptis et syngraphis obsignatis inter nos iampridem pepigimus, ne alterutri fas sit inficiari.

Belle tu quidem me mihi depingis, sed haud scio an omnino meis coloribus. Et tamen ad hanc tabulam ipse mihi nonnihil blandior, non quod illi prorsus credam, sed quod iuvet Apellis manu depingi. Porro cum indicas, quid in me desiderent Critici, non minus cepi utilitatis, quàm voluptatis. Quanquam ad quaedam utcunque tergiversari poteram, nisi tuo iudicio tam impense faverem. Nam quod scribis me favere meis vicijs, crede mihi non tam favor est, quàm vel inscitia, vel potius pigritia. Sic sum, nec possum naturam vincere. Effundo verius quàm scribo omnia, ac molestior est recognoscendi quàm cudendi labor. Iam ut in delectu verborum nolim omnino videri indiligens, ita non arbitror congruere ei, qui res serias persuadere cupiat, in affectandis dictionis emblematis esse morosum aut anxium. Neque vero mirabiter eloquentiae nostrae rivum alicubi turbidum fluere ac lulentum, qui cogitarit, per quos auctores<sup>2</sup> decurrat, nimirum sordidos, et impuri sermonis, ut non possit hinc non aliquid

limi ducere. Usu venit hoc non raro summis illis eloquentiae proceribus, ut in Graecorum voluminibus versantes, frequenter imprudentes Graecè<sup>3</sup> loquerentur. Illud haud scio an scribae debeat imputari, quod mihi tribuis immodicam sermonis ubertatem, quae dos nimirum Budaeo peculiaris est. Nam rectus ac nudus orationis ductus, simplici naturae congruit: nec mirum est humilem esse sermonem, cuius humilia sunt omnia, corpus, animus, fortuna. Porro nimis crebras et immodicas digressiones, quas nobis communiter asscribunt Critici (nam sub horum, ni fallor, persona maluisti tuam indicare sententiam) iam mutuis literis uterque alteri obiecerat.

Cum primis autem demiror, qui tibi succurrerit demirari, cur Galliarum princeps Franciscus Germanum Gallo, exterum civi, ignotum familiari praetulerit. Neutrum alteri praetulit rex, sed utrumque alteri studuit coniungere. Neque enim cuiquam suo loco cedendum erat si me in Galliam contulissem. Tantum abest ut Budaeo fuerim offecturus. Quod scribis et ditionem, et patriam, et linguam mihi tecum esse communem, non tam mihi gratulor, quàm huic regioni, quam vehementer gaudeo talibus, hoc est veris semperque duratis ornamentis indies magis ac magis illustrari. Proinde nihil optatius mihi possit accidere, quàm multos exoriri tui similes, qui nobis in hoc laudis stadio, non modo accedant, sed etiam antevertant: et quicquid est hoc nominis, quod mihi mea peperere studia, suo splendore obscurent. Sed tamen agnoscet opinor posteritas, nobisque nonnihil debere se fate-

bitur, quod parum felici seculo, quod his regionibus, in quibus prorsus extinctae fuerant et invisae bonae literae, longum et invidiosum certamen sustinuimus adversus pertinacissimos meliorum studiorum hostes. Sed utcunque de nobis censebit aetas secutura, volupe est interim optimas literas passim feliciter efflorescere. Bene vale Longoli doctissime, et in haec studia, ut coepisti constanter ac feliciter incumbe. Lovanij Calendis April. Anno M. D. XIX.

1. Longueil, Habes Lector, 1533, pp. 346-348; cf., ch. ii, and nn. 38 and 43. The letter has appeared in several later editions of Longueil's correspondence, as indicated in the discussion supra, ch. ii. Among those publications are Longueil, Epistolarum, 1558, pp. 339-342, which is the authority for Simar, Longueil, and Becker, Longueil; cf., ch. ii, and nn. 62-66, as well as ch. i, and nn. 2 and 4. Allen, Erasmi Epistolarum, III, item 935, pp. 520-522, has reproduced this letter in a critical edition; cf., ch. i, n. 3. The following transcription is based on the text of Longueil's Habes Lector, 1533, with spellings, ligatures, and abbreviations modernized. Paragraph indentations follow the Allen edition.

2. The text reads authores.

3. Lower case in the text.

## APPENDIX K

### BALDASSARE CASTIGLIONE

#### TO ISABELLA D'ESTE<sup>1</sup>

. . . A questi dì è venuto a Roma un fiammingho el quale si chiama Longonio,<sup>2</sup> homo, secondo che affermano tutti quelli che lo hanno in pratica, dottissimo. Questo pare che habbia ricerchato da li Conservatori esser fatto cittadino romano, et `egli reuscito. Di poi si è scoperto che già, essendo molto giovane, fece una oratione in laude de Francia e vituperio di Roma, dove dice infinito male de Romani, e prepone in ogni cosa li Francesi alli Romani. Così è saltato su un giovane romano, el quale non ha anchor XX anni, figliolo de M. Mario Melino, e con una lunga oratione e bella e tanto ben recitata quanto dir si possa, ha accusato costui inanti al Papa con tanta efficacia, che deplorando le calamità de Roma e de Romani fece pianger ognuno, e concitando odio contro el reo, commosse tanto li animi delli uditori, che ognuno conferma, se Longonio fosse stato presente e for de la presentia del Papa, sarebbe stato gettato da le finestre o tagliato a pezzi. E il Papa istesso confessa essersi

commosso mirabilmente. Hora se aspetta una oratione bellissima de Longonio in difesa sua, quale pur se reciterà inanti al Papa per bocca d'un altro giovenetto romano, che questo Longonio ha molti fautori e dotti homini, come el Bembo, el Sadoletto, Jo. Batista Casanova, Vescovo Porcharo, Capella e molti altri pur romani, di modo che se sentirà un cumulo de orationi, le quali io porterò o manderò a V. Ex.<sup>3</sup>



1. Gnoli, Un giudizio, p. 54, and n. 1, provide the source for this letter; cf., ch. ii, n. 3. His transcription also provides the basis for the English translation by Julia Cartwright (Mrs. Ady), Isabella D'Este, II, 166-167; cf., ch. iii, and nn. 30 and 61, as well as ch. viii, n. 36. Spelling, ligatures, and abbreviations follow the text of Gnoli.

2. The spelling of various names throughout the text of this letter are at variance with standard usage. The forms follow Gnoli's transcription; cf., supra, ch. viii, and n. 36.

3. Gnoli adds a footnote at this juncture which merits citation: "Questa lettera, esistente nell'archivio Gonzaga a Mantova, mi è stata gentilmente comunicata dal signor Alessandro Luzio."

## APPENDIX L

### L'ARCIDIACONO DI GABBIONETA

A MARIO EQUICOLA<sup>1</sup>

. . . A questi di fu una gran contentione in questa Accademia romana, contra de uno Longonio<sup>2</sup> francese, quale dicano esser molto docto. Alias essendo in Francia scrisse una opera in la quale se sforzò voler preponere francesi a Romani, et cussì fece. Do poi essendo venuto qua et desiderando havere di privilegij de la Accademia, era molto favorito et da N. S. et da molti Car.<sup>li</sup>: et per farsi benevoli questi Romani scripse panilodia (sic), excusandosi che quello haveva scritto de francesi contra Romani era stato per exerciter lo ingegnio per tor una provincia difficillima et quasi impossibile a sustentare. Insurrexit tota Accademia, et qui uno figliolo de m. Mario Milino: qui erit alter Cicero, aetatis XXIIII annorum, fece citar questo Longonio in Capitolio, ad certam diem che dovesse comparir li et a sentire la opinione de l'Accademia de esso: Lui non comparuit in Capitolio. Comparseno tutti et qui questo Milino recitavit orationem contra questo Longonio tanto bella,

tanto elegante, cum tanta eloquentia che ognuno dice che non fu a di nostri mai meglio recitata oratione. Questa oratione era in forma de invectiva et actione contra questo Longonio, consultata cum li primi doctori de Roma, et ea recitata, fu declarato Longonio essere indigno di havere li privilegij de questa Romana Accademia, et qua cum tanti zifoli et crochi romaneschi etiam che fusse absente fu exploso che non fu mai visto la più ignominiosa cosa, poi andorono a N. S. et avanti la S.<sup>ta</sup> S. fu da questo Milino recitata. Le laude infinite et honori dati a questo giovane da N. S. non recensebo. Qual disse queste parole: Lassati pur dir che vole, dite che Longonio rispondi. Cussi el bon Longonio s'è fugito de Roma cum pocho honore. M. Bernardino Capella faceva el bravo et centro millia diavoli più di altri, inanti che se andasse in Capitolio de molti dì mi venne a ritrovare et me disse se credeva che vui fustivi per venir in qua se lui mandasse per vui. Io ge disse: che non, per l'officio nuovamente havuto referendoli ogni cosa. La risposta fu: oh securato mi, non poterò più haver Mario mio, tutto el dì ho gente in casa a mangiar el mio, la sera se parteno e Bernardino resta solo, e Madona sta male. Io lo consolai assai et più che puoti. Credo che la fantasia sua era de farvi qua per opponervi a questo Longonio, perchè dice Capella che vui eravati qua cum lui quando Pomponio impetrò li privilegij de la accademia: et che vui seti membro de la accademia et poi vi voleva ritenere cum lui. Quale è fatto vecchio, ma non de lingua.

Questa lite de questo Longonio e stata una terribile cosa.  
Alla croce de monte Mari li Melini feceno in quella sua vig-  
na una honorata Coena a tutta l'Accademia, m. Mario de Vul-  
terra vescovo de Aquino et m. Camillo Porcaro vescovo di  
Teramo et m. Capella erano li capi et ordinatori, ge era una  
infinità de gioveni docti et alcuni formosi. Ita che Capella  
disse el di sequente che quando la sera fu compagnato a casa  
da molti de questi giovani, el macellaro suo vinico ge disse:  
Messere vi f . . . . vua questi citelli cum questa cademia?  
Del qual ditto assai s' è riso et fu parlato sin in Vaticano.  
A vui et al nostro Calandre tutto mi offro et ric.<sup>o</sup>.

Rome ultimo Junij 1519.

Vr. fr. A. Archidiaconus

Mantuanus.<sup>3</sup>

1. Cian, "Domenico Gnoli," pp. 155-156, contains the source for this letter; cf., chs. iii, and n. 30, and v, n. 106. Spellings, ligatures, and abbreviations follow Cian.

2. The spelling of various names throughout the text of this letter are at variance with standard usage. The forms used follow Cian, who merely adheres to the text of his source. Also cf., ch. viii, and n. 36.

3. Cian has a footnote at this juncture which merits citation: "La lettera, tratta dall'Archivio Gonzaga di Mantova, avrebbe bisogno di alcune illustrazioni, se non me ne dispensassero le notizie sparse dall'A. nel suo lavoro. A me fu comunicata dal Renier, che la rinvenne tra i documenti fornitigli dal Luzio per gli studi su Isabella Gonzaga."

# APPENDIX M

## CHRONOLOGICAL REALIGNMENT

### OF LONGUEIL'S CORRESPONDENCE<sup>1</sup>

Item	Sender	Place	Recipient	Date
App.B	C.Longueil	Poitiers	F.Valois	5 Sep 1510
App.C	J.Renauld	Tours	C.Longueil	-- --- 1510
App.D	C.Longueil	Poitiers	J.Balenio	10 Dec 1510
App.E.	C.Longueil	Valence	P.Brisson	4 Nov 1513
I, 34	F.Lerouge <sup>2</sup>	Venice	Pope Leo X	-- Mar 1517
App.H	G.Budé	Paris	C.Longueil	15 Oct 1518
App.I	C.Longueil	Rome	J.Lucas	29 Jan 1519
App.J	D.Erasmus	Louvain	C.Longueil	1 Apr 1519
App.K	B.Castiglione	Rome	I.d'Este	16 Jun 1519
App.L	A.Gabbioneta	Rome	M.Equicola	30 Jun 1519
V, 15	A.Pazzi	Decimano	G.de'Medici	13 Aug 1519
V, 7	J.Sadoletto	Rome	C.Longueil	8 Sep 1519
V, 8	J.Sadoletto	Rome	C.Longueil	7 Dec 1519
V, 9	J.Sadoletto	Rome	G.Budé	7 Dec 1519
V, 13	J.Sadoletto	Rome	C.Longueil	2 Jan 1520
V, 4	P.Bembo	Venice	G.Budé	4 Jan 1520
V, 14	J.Sadoletto	Rome	C.Longueil	22 Jan 1520
IV, 26	C.Longueil	Venice	J.Sadoletto	31 Jan 1520 <sup>3</sup>
V, 12	J.Sadoletto	Rome	C.Longueil	24 Feb 1520
App.F	G.Budé	Marly	C.Longueil	21, 25 Feb 1520 <sup>4</sup>
I, 1	C.Longueil	Venice	P.Bembo	18 Apr 1520
V, 1	P.Bembo	Rome	C.Longueil	29 May 1520

Item	Sender	Place	Recipient	Date
I, 2	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Bembo	29 May 1520
I,17	C.Longueil	Padua	D.Monachus	29 May 1520
I,18	C.Longueil	Padua	G.Cortese	29 May 1520
I,19	C.Longueil	Padua	A.Grimaldi	29 May 1520
I, 3	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Bembo	10 Jun 1520
II, 7	C.Longueil	Padua	M.Michiel	10 Jun 1520
II,11	C.Longueil	Padua	A.Beazzano	10 Jun 1520
II,12	C.Longueil	Padua	G.Negri	10 Jun 1520
II,13	C.Longueil	Padua	A.Pazzi	10 Jun 1520
I, 4	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Bembo	14 Jul 1520
II, 5	C.Longueil	Padua	J.Sadoletto	14 Jul 1520
I,29	C.Longueil	Padua <sup>5</sup>	L.Massimo	14 Jul 1520 <sup>5</sup>
I,31	C.Longueil	Padua	F.Crisolino	14 Jul 1520
I,20	C.Longueil	Padua	A.Statius	-- Jul 1520
II, 6	C.Longueil	Padua	L.Massimo	1 Aug 1520
I,10	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Bembo	1 Aug 1520
I,11	C.Longueil	Padua	A.Augurelli	19 Aug 1520
V, 2	P.Bembo	Rome	C.Longueil	19 Aug 1520
I,14	C.Longueil	Padua	G.Budé	31 Aug 1520
II,14	C.Longueil	Padua	A.Statius	-- Sep 1520
I,21	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Bembo	16 Sep 1520
II, 3	C.Longueil	Padua	F.Crisolino	16 Sep 1520
II, 4	C.Longueil	Padua	H.Fondulus	16 Sep 1520
I,22	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	27 Sep 1520
I,16	C.Longueil	Padua	F.Molza	30 Sep 1520
I,15	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Bembo	15 Oct 1520
I,25	C.Longueil	Padua	A.Marsilio	2 Nov 1520
I,26	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	2 Nov 1520
I,28	C.Longueil	Padua	B.Sandri	5 Nov 1520
I,39	C.Longueil	Padua	A.Marsilio	24 Nov 1520
I,40	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	24 Nov 1520
I,27	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Bembo	1 Dec 1520
I,24	C.Longueil	Padua	G.Budé	5 Dec 1520

Item	Sender	Place	Recipient	Date
I,32	C.Longueil	Padua	J.Sadoleto	5 Dec 1520
I,33	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Bembo	5 Dec 1520
V,10	J.Sadoleto	Rome	C.Longueil	30 Dec 1520
II, 9	C.Longueil	Padua	V.Rouzerio	2 Jan 1521
App.G	G.Budé	Romorantia	C.Longueil	7 Jan 1521
I,41	C.Longueil	Padua	R.Barme	13 Jan 1521
II, 1	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Bembo	13 Jan 1521
II, 2	C.Longueil	Padua	A.Navagero	14 Jan 1521
II, 8	C.Longueil	Padua	G.Budé	25 Jan 1521
I,30	C.Longueil	Padua	F.Crisolino	5 Feb 1521
V, 3	P.Bembo	Rome	C.Longueil	15 Feb 1521
I,23	C.Longueil	Padua	H.Fondulus	15 Feb 1521 <sup>6</sup>
II,10	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Bembo	24 Feb 1521
I,36	C.Longueil	Venice	S.Sauli	24 Mar 1521
I,35	C.Longueil	Venice	F.Tomarozzo	24 Mar 1521 <sup>7</sup>
I, 5	C.Longueil	Venice	P.Bembo	1 Apr 1521
I, 6	C.Longueil	Venice	F.Crisolino	1 Apr 1521
V, 5	P.Bembo	Rome	G.Budé	6 Apr 1521
V, 6	Pope Leo X	Rome	Francis I	6 Apr 1521
I, 7	C.Longueil	Padua	H.Fondulus	20 Apr 1521
I, 9	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Bembo	20 Apr 1521
II,15	C.Longueil	Padua	M.Gelasiano	27 Apr 1521
I,12	C.Longueil	Padua	H.Alexandrinus	28 Apr 1521
I, 8	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Brisson	1 May 1521
I,13	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	1 May 1521
II,28	C.Longueil	Padua	G.Tomarozzo	-- May 1521
I,37	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Bembo	5 May 1521
II,33	C.Longueil	Padua	T.Linacre	7 May 1521 <sup>8</sup>
I,38	C.Longueil	Venice	F.Tomarozzo	15 May 1521
II,16	C.Longueil	Padua	S.Villeneuve	24 May, 2 Jun <sup>9</sup>
II,17	C.Longueil	Padua	S.Sauli-M.Flam.	12 Jun 1521 <sup>10</sup>
II,19	C.Longueil	Padua	S.Sauli	15 Jun 1521
II,21	C.Longueil	Padua	M.Flaminio	15 Jun 1521



Item	Sender	Place	Recipient	Date
II,29	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Bembo	30 Jun 1521
II,22	C.Longueil	Padua	S.Villeneuve	1 Jul 1521
II,23	C.Longueil	Padua	F.Lerouge	1 Jul 1521
II,24	C.Longueil	Padua	S.Villeneuve	7 Jul 1521
II,25	C.Longueil	Padua	F.Lerouge	13 Jul 1521
II,26	C.Longueil	Padua	S.Villeneuve	22 Jul 1521
II,18	C.Longueil	Padua	S.Sauli	29 Jul 1521
II,20	C.Longueil	Padua	M.Flaminio	29 Jul 1521
II,27	C.Longueil	Padua	S.Villeneuve	8 Aug 1521
II,30	C.Longueil	Venice	F.Tomarozzo	26 Sep 1521
II,31	C.Longueil	Padua	S.Sauli	22 Oct 1521
II,32	C.Longueil	Padua	M.Flaminio	23 Oct 1521
II,34	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	24 Oct 1521
II,35	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	31 Oct 1521
II,37	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	13 Nov 1521.
II,36	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	20 Nov 1521
II,38	C.Longueil	Padua	F.Chieregati	21 Nov 1521
II,39	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	25 Nov 1521
III, 1	C.Longueil	Padua	J.Sadoletto	25 Nov 1521
III, 2	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	2 Dec 1521
III, 3	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	8 Dec 1521
III, 4	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	13 Dec 1521
III, 5	C.Longueil	Padua	J.Sadoletto	13 Dec 1521
III, 6	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	24 Dec 1521
III, 7	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	25 Dec 1521
III, 8	C.Longueil	Padua	A.Marsilio	25 Dec 1521
III, 9	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	8 Jan 1522
III,10	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	12 Jan 1522
III,11	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	19 Jan 1522
III,12	C.Longueil	Padua	S.Sauli	19 Jan 1522
III,13	C.Longueil	Padua	M.Flaminio	19 Jan 1522
III,14	C.Longueil	Padua	G.Egnazio	23 Jan 1522
III,15	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	23 Jan 1522

Item	Sender	Place	Recipient	Date
III,16	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	26 Jan 1522
III,17	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	28 Jan 1522
III,18	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	30 Jan 1522
III,19	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	1 Feb 1522
III,20	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	4 Feb 1522
III,21	C.Longueil	Padua	G.Egnazio	8 Feb 1522
III,22	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Bembo	8 Feb 1522
III,23	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	8 Feb 1522
III,24	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	14 Feb 1522
III,25	C.Longueil	Padua	A.Marsilio	18 Feb 1522
III,26	C.Longueil	Padua	G.Egnazio	18 Feb 1522
III,27	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	18 Feb 1522
III,28	C.Longueil	Padua	M.Castellano	23 Feb 1522
III,29	C.Longueil	Padua	S.Sauli	3 Mar 1522
III,30	C.Longueil	Padua	M.Flaminio	3 Mar 1522
III,31	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	3 Mar 1522
III,32	C.Longueil	Padua	G.Egnazio	5 Mar 1522
III,33	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	5 Mar 1522
III,34	C.Longueil	Padua	R.Barme	-- Mar 1522 <sup>11</sup>
III,35	C.Longueil	Padua	P.Bembo	20 Mar 1522
III,36	C.Longueil	Padua	G.Savorgnano	20 Mar 1522
III,37	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	23 Mar 1522
IV, 1	C.Longueil	Padua	M.Castellano	25 Mar 1522
IV, 2	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	30 Mar 1522
IV, 3	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	7 Apr 1522
IV, 4	C.Longueil	Padua	L.Pomaro	9 Apr 1522
IV, 5	C.Longueil	Padua	F.Deloynes	9 Apr 1522
IV, 6	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	-- Apr 1522 <sup>12</sup>
IV, 7	C.Longueil	Padua	S.Sauli	13 May 1522
IV, 8	C.Longueil	Padua	M.Flaminio	13 May 1522
IV, 9	C.Longueil	Padua	L.Massimo	13 May 1522
IV,10	C.Longueil	Padua	C.Teolo	15 May 1522
IV,11	C.Longueil	Padua	S.Teolo	15 May 1522

Item	Sender	Place	Recipient	Date
IV,12	C.Longueil	Padua	J.Sadoletto	17 May 1522
IV,13	C.Longueil	Padua	M.Castellano	17 May 1522
IV,14	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	17 May 1522
IV,16	C.Longueil	Padua	C.Egidio	29 May 1522
IV,21	C.Longueil	Padua	A.Francini	30 May 1522
IV,15	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	3 Jun 1522
IV,17	C.Longueil	Padua	N.Dragone	16 Jun 1522
IV,19	C.Longueil	Padua	A.Navagero	23 Jun 1522
IV,18	C.Longueil	Padua	G.Machiavelli	25 Jun 1522
IV,20	C.Longueil	Padua	L.Bartolini	26 Jun 1522
IV,22	C.Longueil	Padua	B.Cortona	30 Jun 1522
IV,23	C.Longueil	Padua	N.Dragone	30 Jun 1522
IV,24	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	30 Jun 1522
IV,25	C.Longueil	Padua	F.Bellini	30 Jun 1522
V,11	J.Sadoletto	Rome	C.Longueil	2 Jul 1522
IV,27	C.Longueil	Padua	B.Cortona	17 Jul 1522
IV,28	C.Longueil	Padua	F.Cortona	17 Jul 1522
IV,29	C.Longueil	Padua	N.Dragone	-- Jul 1522 <sup>13</sup>
IV,30	C.Longueil	Padua	J.Sadoletto	30 Jul 1522
IV,31	C.Longueil	Padua	O.Grimaldi	30 Jul 1522
IV,32	C.Longueil	Padua	R.Pole	22 Aug 1522
IV,33	C.Longueil	Padua	R.Pole	25 Aug 1522

1. Cf., discussion supra, chs. v and vi, which treat the chronological discrepancies between Simar, Longueil, "Appendice I," pp. 156-194, and Becker, Longueil, "Zweiter Teil," pp. 68-205, since they provide the basic structure for the arrangement of Longueil's correspondence as indicated in ch.i, and nn. 2 and 4. Where there is no discrepancy, and where the contents of the correspondence confirms their suggested dates, no additional justification has been supplied.

2. Cf., discussion supra, ch. viii, and n. 33. Since the letter appears among those collected for the Longueil, Opera, Junta, it is included here regardless of whether or not Longueil actually penned it.

3. The letter is apparently misdated by the editor of Longueil, Opera, Junta, IV, 26, fol. 149b, as indicated in the discussion supra, chs. 1, and n.1, viii, and n. 59, as well as vi, and nn. 65-67

4. Cf., "Appendix F," supra, pp. 338 and 339.

5. Cf., discussion supra, chs. v, and n. 84, and vi, and nn. 68-72, for the placement of this undated letter into the period of mid-July 1520.

6. Cf., discussion supra, chs. v, and nn. 71-72, and vi, and nn. 83-85, which suggest that this undated letter be placed about 15 February 1521.

7. This letter is dated "Palm Sunday," cf., ch. v, and nn. 32-34.

8. Cf., discussion supra, ch. vi, and nn. 51-53, for the support of the year date of 1521.

9. Cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, fols. 101b and 102a, as well as ch. vi, and n. 47.

10. The recipients of this letter were S. Sauli and M. Flaminio; cf., Longueil, Opera, Junta, fol. 102a.

11. Cf., discussion supra, chs. v, and n. 79, as well as vi, and n. 18, for the dating of this letter in early March, 1522.

12. Cf., discussion supra, ch. v, and n. 22, for the date of early to middle April 1522.

13. Cf., discussion supra, chs. v, and n. 81, as well as vi, and nn. 96 and 102, for suggestions about the date of this letter as after 24 July 1522.