Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum
142 2022

Neo-Latin Verse Satire, ca. 1500-1800
An Ethical Approach

Sari Kivistö

Societas Scientiarum Fennica
The Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters

Neo-Latin Verse Satire, ca. 1500-1800

An Ethical Approach

Societas Scientiarum Fennica

The Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters

Address: Pohjoinen Makasiinikatu 7 A 6, FI – 00130 Helsinki
In Swedish:
Finska Vetenskaps-Societeten, Norra Magasinsgatan 7 A 6, FI – 00130 Helsingfors
In Finnish:
Suomen Tiedeseura, Pohjoinen Makasiinikatu 7 A 6, FI – 00130 Helsinki

Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum

The series, founded in 1923, publishes monographs or other studies on antiquity and its tradition.

Editor:
Prof. Mika Kajava
Address: Department of Languages, P. O. Box 24, FI – 00014 University of Helsinki.

Requests for Exchange:
Exchange Centre for Scientific Literature, Snellmaninkatu 13, FI – 00170 Helsinki, or at the Secretary of the Society.

Distribution and Sale:
Tiedekirja, Snellmaninkatu 13, FI – 00170 Helsinki; tiedekirja@tsv.fi, www.tsv.fi.

Other series published by the Society:
Commentationes Physico-Mathematicae
Commentationes Scientiarum Socialium
Bidrag till kännedom av Finlands natur och folk
The History of Learning and Science in Finland 1828-1918
Årsbok – Vuosikirja (Yearbook), serie A sarja
Sphinx (Årsbok – Vuosikirja, serie B sarja)

Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum
142 2022

Neo-Latin Verse Satire, ca. 1500-1800

An Ethical Approach

Sari Kivistö

Societas Scientiarum Fennica

The Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters

Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum
is part of the publishing cooperation between
the Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters and
the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters

This book has received a subsidy granted by the Ministry of Education and Culture
distributed by the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies

ISSN 0069-6587 (print)
ISSN 2736-9374 (online)
ISBN 978-951-653-486-5 (print)
ISBN 978-951-653-487-2 (online)
DOI https://doi.org/10.54572/ssc.233

Layout by Vesa Vahtikari

Copyright © 2022 by
Societas Scientiarum Fennica

Printed by Grano Oy, Vaasa 2022

Contents

Introduction: *Sermones* on *Mores* 1

Chapter 1. Programmatic Beginnings: Justifying Satirical Indignation 21

Chapter 2. Fathers and Sons: Satirical Tutorials on Life 49

Chapter 3. How to Be Calm: Ethical Reflections on Poverty and Tranquillity of Mind 89

Chapter 4. Cures and Incurables: Medical Satire 121

Chapter 5. Prophetic Floods: Post-Edenic Reality in Religious Satire 153

Chapter 6. Satirical Exemplarity and the Affective Language of Moral Monuments 201

Chapter 7. Leaving the Countryside: Ironic Lessons on Contentment 237

Conclusions on the Limits of Satire 261

Bibliography 269

Index nominum 289

Introduction: *Sermones* on *Mores*

In his sixth satire, the Italian poet Lodovico Sergardi (Quintus Sectanus, 1664-1726) justifies his attack on a specific literary foe, Gian Vincenzo Gravina (1667-1718), by imagining a future scene in which Sergardi's satires are studied at school and a schoolmaster extols them for exposing Gravina's (Philodemus's) sinful behaviour. The language of warning is notable in this act of poetic justification:

> *His ubi flagitiis Phylodemum vidit ovantem*
> *Sectanus, totamque afflari crimine Romam,*
> *Exarsit virtutis amans, et moris honesti*
> *Publicus assertor, nobisque exempla reliquit,*
> *Quo plectenda modo Calabri dementia cordis,*
> *Si novus exiret tradux Phylodemus ab Orco*.[1]

> When Sectanus saw Philodemus exulting in these shameful things and all Rome affected by his crimes, the lover of virtue and public advocate of good morals was seething, and he left us examples of how the Calabrian's folly must be punished if Philodemus is to escape, a new vine, from Hell.[2]

The passage summarises the satirist's good intentions and his useful role in moral education when warning about vicious characters, so that future generations could learn to recognise the features that indicate moral flaws. Although the quotation is clearly ironic – the satirist justifies his malevolence by appealing to his educational and beneficial intentions – we know that the three Roman verse satirists Horace, Persius and Juvenal were popular school texts in the Middle Ages, and the passage nicely illustrates how satire continued to have influence in the classroom and ethical instruction for centuries.[3]

---

[1] Sectanus 1698: VI, xliv. The first edition of Sergardi's fourteen satires appeared in 1694 with the title *Q. Sectani Satyrae ad Phylodemum* and was frequently reprinted. I have consulted the edition printed by Johann Selliba at Cologne in 1698 which includes sixteen satires, and the later edition printed in Lucca in 1783. On Sergardi's satires, see Citroni Marchetti 1976; Pepin 1996; Campanelli 2021: 11-17. Sergardi's satires also appeared in the Italian language, and they have been published as a modern edition by Amedeo Quondam (*Le satire*, Ravenna, 1976); see also Quondam 1969.

[2] Sergardi 1994: 6, p. 52 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin).

[3] For example, Hermann von dem Busche (1468-1534), a German humanist writer, travelled across Europe lecturing at canonical schools at Osnabruck, Bremen, and Hamburg, and reciting Persius; these lectures were listened to with great avidity by the audiences which consisted of teachers, students, and

Within the framework of reading satire as ethical instruction in poetic form, this book aims to give a thematically focused examination of the still largely unstudied literary history of neo-Latin verse satire written ca. 1500-1800.[4] Satire is one of the key genres in European literature with a long history since Antiquity. While Roman verse satire has been thoroughly studied over the years, neo-Latin verse satire has received less scholarly attention. There are already concise handbook articles on neo-Latin satire and substantial papers on individual satirists and cultural areas, but what is missing is a book-length overview of neo-Latin verse satire, its main themes, and its most important representatives.[5] This book does not aim to provide a comprehensive historical coverage of the tradition, but it will offer a close reading of some original ethical criticism spotted amidst the more conventional didactic and moralistic tone that characterises much of formal verse satire.

Satirical ridicule can be observed in many literary genres from Menippean satires – written in prosimetrum – to epigrammatic poetry, but the focus in this book is on formal verse satires which were greatly indebted to Horace, Persius, and Juvenal.[6] Critics have usually emphasised the great complexity of satire's

---

rectors. See Hermann Hamelmann, *Opera genealogico-historica de Westphalia et Saxonia inferiori*, 1711, p. 292.

[4] Neo-Latin satires have been written as late as in the 1960s (Harry Schnur, *Satyrae IV*) and 1970s (Josef Eberle, *Echo perennis: Elegiae, Satirae, Didactica cum versione Germanica*, 1970); see IJsewijn 1976: 42. Eberle also experimented with other metres than hexameter (IJsewijn & Sacré 1998: 70). For twentieth-century satire, see also Iacobus Ioannes Hartmannus's (1851-1924) poem *Vita: satira* which was written 'against war, mass tourism and the exploitation of workers' (IJsewijn & Sacré 1998: 72).

[5] IJsewijn 1975: 190-191 gives three specific reasons why the genre is not very well known: firstly, many poems are hidden in larger collections of Latin poetry; secondly, the poems are usually time- and place-bound and therefore hardly understandable unless the reader is familiar with the historical context; and thirdly, the works are not often easily available outside the author's country and its libraries. Digital databases (and Google Books) have facilitated access to the texts, but not all sources are yet available online. For short overviews of neo-Latin (verse) satire, see, e.g., IJsewijn 1976; De Smet 2015; Marsh 2014; Porter 2014 (prose satire); Kivistö 2017. Marsh 2014 and Kühlmann 1992: 16 n. 47 note that we are still lacking a comprehensive study on this genre. Important article collections on (neo-)Latin satire include the volumes edited by Haye & Schnoor 2008 and De Smet 1994. For a concise overview of humanist neo-Latin satire with many additional names, see also Ramos 2002: 180-194. Unfortunately, I have not had the chance to see D.A. Porter's unpublished doctoral dissertation 'Neo-Latin Formal Verse Satire from 1420 to 1616' (Cambridge, 2014).

[6] Menippean satire is an important genre, but its examination is beyond the scope of this work. For Menippean satire in the early modern period, see especially De Smet 1996.

generic boundaries, but a fairly simple definition is sufficient for the purposes of this book. Neo-Latin verse satires were usually written in dactylic hexameters.[7] In addition to the characteristic hexameter form, formal verse satires can be identified by their titles. The collections are often titled satires (*satyrae*)[8] or conversations (*sermones*), deriving their name from the nomenclature Horace used for his own satires and their ethical topics.[9] The boundaries between verse satire and other forms, such as verse epistle, were fluid, and satires were often also written in

[7] There are some exceptions to this poetic rule. For example, Federico Nomi's (1703) last satire was written in iambic trimeters, but such experiments are rather rare. For the difficulty of defining satire and its generic limits, see, e.g., IJsewijn 1975: 192-193; Porter 2014. IJsewijn 1975: 192 notes that, for example, the Czech Michael Pieczkonides wrote his *Satyrarum liber* (ca. 1622) entirely in elegiac distichs, whereas there were others who used medieval rhyming verse. William Major (b. 1698) also wrote his four satires in elegiac distichs. The short anonymous *Satyra Batavica* (1670) also experimented with metre. Satirical ridicule was found in prose works and epigrams, but in my reading the formal variety of the genre is not highlighted; instead, the works are linked by their ethical content.

[8] The etymology of satire was first discussed by the fourth-century grammarian Diomedes in his *Ars grammatica*. According to him, the noun *satura* derives either from the noun *satyrus* ('satyr') or from the adjective *satur* ('full'), which was used to refer to an abundant plate, a type of sausage stuffed with many ingredients, and a law containing many regulations (*lex satura* or *lex per saturam*). All three connote fullness and abundance. See Diomedes, *Ars grammatica*, Heinrich Keil (ed.), *Grammatici Latini* (I, 485-486). Before coming to denote a literary genre with certain characteristics that we understand as 'satiric', the word was also used in the sense of 'a collection of miscellaneous poems'. In the early modern period, the word 'satyra' or 'satura' also referred to a miscellany reminding us from the old Roman usage; on the concept of mixture, see, e.g., Renner 2014: 384-389. The term was often used in the titles of miscellaneous medical observations and dissertations; on medical miscellanies as 'satires', see Kivistö 2007: 87. The etymology of satire is discussed, for example, in Knoche 1957; van Rooy 1965; Morgan 2005.

[9] However, in the Middle Ages these terms were used more freely to refer to poems that were written in other metres as well (De Smet 2015: 200). De Smet 2015: 201 also notes that some texts which were entitled satires (not Menippean satires) were written in prose (e.g., Antonio Cerri's *Satyrarum scholasticarum centuriae duae* from 1607 consisted of miscellaneous tales and critical remarks in prose; see Cerri 1607). Other prose satires include, for example, such anonymous works as *Satyrae seriae* (London, 1640), *Satyra Manneiana in Jejunos quosdam Philologos* (Amsterdam, 1650), and the poet and physician Vincent Fabricius's (1612-1667) *Satyra, Pransus paratus, In Poetas, & eorum Contemptores* which was published in Amsterdam in 1638 and discusses the value of poetry. Another controversial prose satire, *Satyra in Eubulum Theosdatum Sarckmasium* (Hohenelbe, 1669), was written by Philipp Andreas Oldenburger (1617-1678). Nicolas Chorier's (1612-1692) *Aloisiae Sigeae Toletanae satyra sotadica de arcanis amoris et veneris* was printed either in Birmingham or Paris in 1770 'in some press', *ex typis Nonnullius*; this satire is also written in prose, and in a dialogue form it deals with erotic love.

an epistolary form in the Horatian tradition. Ingrid De Smet has noted that several of Francesco Filelfo's (1398-1481) early satires were poetic letters.[10] In addition to some individual epistles in satirical collections – such as Umbritius Cantianus's (a pseudonym for Jabez Earle, ca. 1673-1768) epistle on the death of his friend[11] – perhaps the most extensive collection of satirical epistles was written by the statesman and chancellor Michel de L'Hospital (1507-1573) whose large posthumous volume *Epistolarum seu sermonum libri sex* (Paris, 1585) combines these two genres.[12] The letter form had its connections to philosophy and, although as a rule I am more interested in the ethical content of satires than in form, I will also discuss some recurring formal features. Some verse satires were also written in a dialogue form: for example, William King's *Sermo pedestris* (London, 1739) was a hexameter dialogue directed against stage censorship.[13]

Satires are preoccupied with certain topics and typical 'event-shapes', moral transgressions, and their consequences recurring in history, which form the tradition of the genre and reflect a preoccupation not only with present sin but also its historical recurrence.[14] As will be noted in the following chapters, neo-Latin satirical criticism was strongly influenced by tradition, inheriting from classical and medieval Latin satire its hexameter form; numerous phrases, themes, and complaints; a preoccupation with greed, luxury, and the corruption of power; and a marked interest in the poetics of satire and satirical freedom. In the manner of their predecessors, neo-Latin satirists claimed that their writing was founded on an impulse to virtue, and the association of satirical writing with moral therapy was commonplace.[15]

In his seminal article on neo-Latin satire, Jozef IJsewijn claims that, in addition to moralising on human vices in general, the neo-Latin verse satirists

---

[10] De Smet 2015: 206. On the epistolary form in (prose) satires, see also Kivistö 2002.

[11] See Cantianus 1729: *De Morte*.

[12] The collection opens with an address to the Roman muses. L'Hospital's Latin poetry has been praised for its unpretending simplicity and clarity of diction. For a modern edition of L'Hospital's Latin poetry (*Carmina*), see the volumes I and II (published in 2014 and 2017, respectively) edited and translated by Perrine Galand-Willemen, Loris Petris, and David Amherdt (Droz).

[13] King 1739. King (1685-1763) was a scholar, poet and orator who wrote in Latin and in English. Other Latin satires that benefited from the dialogue form include, for example, John or Herbert Randolph's *Commercium ad Mare Australe* ('The South Sea Trade', 1720) that has been considered an attack on the South Sea Bubble. A poem of the same name is also attributed to John Alleyn (1695-1730) from Barbados and translated into English by John Gilmore.

[14] Cf. Trompf 1979: 159 on the idea of historical recurrence in the Biblical tradition.

[15] On satirical therapy, see Kivistö 2009.

were particularly interested in literary, religious, and medical issues.[16] During the early modern period, philosophical attitudes rooted in classical material were combined with Christianity, both thematically and in allusive blends of classical and Biblical material. While only a few themes may be said to be entirely new in neo-Latin satire, the religious upheavals of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation prompted particularly large quantities of satiric verse, and neo-Latin satires also continued to be developed in such new contexts as the Pontifical Academy of Arcadia, an association of poets and scholars founded in 1690.[17] Moreover, the social prominence of doctors and lawyers made them – alongside prominent clergymen – new targets for satirical attack. Furthermore, the deceptive theatre of court life, perverse political leaders, and the miseries of war gained new prominence in the early modern period.

IJsewijn has proposed that some poems entitled satires were in fact didactic poems and should be included in the extensive repertoire of large philosophical poems written in Latin rather than classical satires following Roman examples.[18] However, one of my main arguments in this book is that satires were in fact often philosophical poems focusing on ethical content, and here, too, they relied on the example of their Roman predecessors. I will explore how satirical poems were concerned with ethical issues and how they grew into large philosophical poems by using playful, prescriptive, and evaluative moral rhetoric.

How, then, do the literary means of satirical ethics differ from other ethical poetry? One of the most obvious differences is that satires often promote a

[16] IJsewijn 1976: 44; see also IJsewijn & Sacré 1998: 67-73. IJsewijn's 1976: 51-55 bibliography of neo-Latin satires has been very helpful in identifying some crucial texts.

[17] On Italian and Latin satires written in Arcadia, see Campanelli 2021, who has edited a selection of neo-Latin poetry written there. The collection is compiled from the three volumes of *Arcadum carmina* that appeared in 1721, 1756, and 1768. Campanelli's edition includes several individual satires (*sermones*) written by the members of Arcadia, including Pietro Paolo Marcolini's (1689-1758) *Sermo*, Fabio Devoti's *De Romana architectura sermo* (1757), Giovanni Battista Casti's (1723-1803) *De modicarum urbium incommodis sermo*, *De pace inter Europaeos Principes constituta sermo* and *Sermo*, and Carlo Ingami's *Sermo ad Diodorum Romam relicturum*. From among the Latin satirists discussed in the present book, Lodovico Sergardi, Federico Nomi, Bernardo Guglielmini, and Carlo d'Aquino were all members of the Academy. Sergardi became a member in 1691 and was known as Licone Trachio. Campanelli shows us that Sergardi's influence on the satirical tradition in Arcadia was notable. Nomi became a member with the pastoral name Cerifone Nedeatide in 1703, which also marked the publication of his satires (Campanelli 2021: 9). d'Aquino adopted the name Alcone Sirio, and Guglielmini was known as Dalgo Metimneo. For the Accademia, see also Baragetti 2012.

[18] IJsewijn 1975: 192-193. In this article he explores neo-Latin satire in Eastern Europe.

negatively coded morality. Satire is rightly regarded as a destructive form, and negative examples have a fundamental role in the satirical construction of values. Throughout the book I will discuss the importance of negative knowledge for satirical instruction and its poetics of errors and knowing what *not* to do. Educational scholars have claimed that literary warnings can be just as effective as genuine experience in creating a sensation of injustice or an emotional consciousness of wicked behaviour.[19] One crucial aspect of negative knowledge is that it is concerned with limiting human action, and this prohibitive gesture is realised by using ethical or religious language. I argue that satirical criticism is one form of negative knowledge that nurtures the idea of learning from mistakes. This approach is also motivated by the new relevance of satirical techniques in contemporary justice work and online satire in which the expressive and emotive forms of punishment have become common tools offering material for new research on shame cultures. Our contemporary online shaming culture has given a renewed relevance to the old satirical mechanisms of identifying wrongdoings based on a satirical sense of justice that often takes the form of naming and shaming moral offenders. Focusing on verbal punishment and the restrictive struggle against vices, satire fills abstract rules and prohibitions with concrete content.

However, in addition to analysing some Reformation satires from this topical perspective of naming and shaming, I will also suggest that satire does not merely work on negative morality covering prohibitions and prescriptions against harm. Satires can also address duties and obligations that belong to positive rather than negative morality. I will investigate satires as moral reflections concerned with the ideals and values that people should strive towards in the future. Satire has generally been regarded as a backward-looking and nostalgic genre which longs for the good old days and idealises the past as a time of great innocence.[20] While examining a handful of satires which yearn for the lost ideal, this book will also stress the progressive perspective of the genre. Satire asks how human beings ought to be as grown-ups. By describing wickedness, satire encourages its readers to think about their future lives and what values they want to follow in their adulthood, treating humans as temporal beings who are in the process of changing – especially in the case of youths. This method of self-examination can be an open-ended process, and human life can develop in unpredictable directions,

[19] For learning from mistakes and negative knowledge in modern educational psychology, see Oser 2005.

[20] Cf. Hor. *Ars poetica* 173: *laudator temporis acti*.

even in such pattern-oriented genres as satire. While satirical targets are often recast as monsters beyond any redemption in religious satires, a more optimistic tone is notable in satires that focus on educational issues. They rely on morally motivated corrective humour that uses wit to ridicule vices and display the intent of shaming individuals into improvement.[21] Much literary satire has traditionally been engaged in decrying social ills, but neo-Latin verse satire is much more concerned with individual rather than societal-level morality. Horace's influence may be crucial here: Sergio Yona, for example, maintains that Horace's satires were 'largely introspective' and 'about his persona's mental health'.[22]

This ethical goal has also been persistently rejected in favour of satirical playfulness and provocation. For example, in his reintroduction to satire, Dustin Griffin criticises the interpretation of satire's moral seriousness and stresses instead the complexity, playfulness, and ambiguity of the best satire as an attempt to move away from the genre's previous moral centrality. With reference to eighteenth-century satirical theory, Griffin argues 'it is striking that, in an age capable of intense and subtle moral reasoning, the moral defence of satire is presented in such crude terms, as if the satirist were offering elementary lessons in distinguishing good from evil, combatting vice and regulating passion, to an audience of moral infants'.[23] While it is topical to stress the playfulness and moral uncertainty of the best satire, one has to note – as Griffin himself also aptly does – that the educative and moral mission was crucial to Renaissance humanism and such major scholars as Erasmus of Rotterdam, who was the most important figure in the Renaissance's theory and practice of education and who urged his readers to improve their ethical judgement and actions.[24] Notably, Erasmus counted his morally charged fictions, such as the satirical *Encomium Moriae*, among his educational writings.[25] Renaissance scholars took the didactic quality of literature seriously, blending usefulness with sweetness and both instructing and delighting the reader.[26]

---

[21] On corrective humour, see Ruch & Heintz 2016.

[22] Yona 2018: 4. However, as Nussbaum 1994: 11 notes in the case of Hellenistic philosophy, its 'focus on the inner world does not exclude, but in fact leads directly to, a focus on the ills of society', because social conditions shape thought and emotion.

[23] Griffin 1994: 26.

[24] Griffin 1994: 56.

[25] Parrish 2010: 603 n. 2 (with reference to Rummel 2006). Erasmus is considered here a satirist in a broad sense, not a writer of formal verse satire.

[26] Moul 2017: 180.

In what follows, I will first briefly discuss the early Italian tradition and then introduce the main outline of the book.

The early Italian tradition

Neo-Latin hexameter satires were first written in fifteenth-century Italy and then in almost every European country by a handful of writers.[27] Francesco Filelfo's exceptionally large and influential corpus of satires, *Satirarum hecatostichon decades decem* – ten books, 100 satires, and ca. 10,000 lines symmetrically arranged – first appeared in Milan in 1476 and later in Venice in 1502 and Paris in 1518.[28] Filelfo became professor of eloquence at Padua in the age of eighteen but was soon invited to Venice. From 1429 Filelfo worked as a teacher in Florence and soon started to write his satires, but with the political upheavals caused by the return of Cosimo de' Medici from his eleven months of exile Filelfo and many patrician oligarchs were forced to leave the city in 1434. Filelfo moved first to Siena and then to Milan. Scott W. Blanchard has read Filelfo's works as a response to the Florentine political crisis.[29] According to numerous anecdotes about Filelfo's life, he would dispute on the most trivial points of grammar and enjoyed disputing over syllables.

Advocating an ethical reform Filelfo denounced the human capacity for self-delusion and errors, and he returned again and again to the supreme importance of self-cultivation. In his apologetic satire IV.10, Filelfo refers to the double function of satire: its task is to attack vice and praise virtue.[30] Filelfo claims to punish his adversaries in the same manner as God punishes sinners. He underlines the truth-telling function of his verses that abound with brief moral sayings, such

[27] On the history of (both vernacular and Latin) verse satire in Italy, see the articles in Alfano 2015 (on the early neo-Latin humanist tradition, such as Filelfo, Strozzi, and Augurelli, see esp. 101-117; the collection also includes articles on vernacular verse satire in other countries and even in the lyrics of Bob Dylan and Frank Zappa); Simons 2013b; De Smet 2015: 202; Ramos 2002: 181-183; Pozuelo 1994; Cian 1954.

[28] Filelfo 1502 (the first satires were written in ca. 1428-29; Fiaschi 2000: 149). On Filelfo's life and his satires, see Oliver 1949; Blanchard 2007 (stressing Filelfo's interest in Cynical philosophy and its cosmopolitan identity); Fiaschi 2000 (on the circulation of Filelfo's satires); Ludwig 2008 (with a brief summary of all the satires). A modern edition of his satires is *Satyrae* (ed. Silvia Fiaschi, vol. 1, Rome, 2005). For Filelfo as a writer of invectives, see Marsh 2019.

[29] Blanchard 2007.

[30] Filelfo 1502: IV.10 (*satyrae vis inclyta iuxta / Invehit in vitium, virtutem laudibus effert*).

as 'always hold God before your eyes' (*sit Deus ante oculos semper*),[31] 'not money but a beautiful virtue makes human beings happy' (*Non et enim nummi, sed virtus pulchra beatos / efficit*),[32] and 'die content with what you have' (*Atque tuo contentus obi*).[33] Numerous phrases praise the supreme value of virtue (e.g., 'Virtue alone will win illustrious praise', *Sola quidem virtus illustri laude triumphat*)[34] and contentment (e.g., 'Nature rejoices at the use of few modest dishes', *Nam paucis natura cibis ac vilibus uti / Laetatur*). This understanding of satire's didactic usefulness was characteristic of the fifteenth century and persisted throughout the history of the genre. Filelfo's satires also include numbers of panegyrical poems extolling virtuous behaviour and persons who were taken as moral paragons.[35]

Other important early Italian writers of verse satire include the Venetian patrician Gregorio Correr (ca. 1409-1469), who published his praised *Liber satyrarum* in the 1430s in Venice. In his first programmatic satire written before his 22nd birthday and dedicated to his famous teacher Vittorino da Feltre (1378-1446) from Mantua, Correr explains his reasons for writing satire. His six poems denounce such typical satirical vices as avarice.[36] Another recurring ethical topic was the fear of death that was discussed by Correr in his fourth satire in which he persuades his friend not to be afraid of dying (*Ad amicum nimis timidum mortis mortem non esse fortibus viris terrori. Satyra quarta*). According to Berrigan, Correr contrasts here the brave example of Socrates with that of a Sardus who was only obsessed with his possessions, as well as other men seeking to take advantage of the property of orphans.[37]

The Florentine Lorenzo Lippi da Colle (1442-1485), who wrote five hexameter satires and whose collection was completed in 1485, explicitly

[31] Filelfo 1502: I.2.

[32] Filelfo 1502: I.3.

[33] Filelfo 1502: III.6.

[34] Filelfo 1502: III.8.

[35] Simons 2013a: 130; Pagrot 1961: 61; Blanchard 2007: 1120-30.

[36] Correr 1991. Correr's six satires deal with the following issues: his reasons for writing satire (1), avarice (2), how trivial shortcomings tend to grow into severe vices and lead to great ones (3), fear of death (4), language use (5), and a dialogue with Davus a slave (6; the poem is an imitation of Hor. *Sat*. 2.7). On Correr and his satires, see, e.g., Berrigan 1973 (with a modern edition of the six satires); Traina 1997. For Gaspare Tribraco (Tribrachus) of Modena (1439-ca. 1471) and his nine satires in *Satirarum liber*, see Tribraco 1972.

[37] Berrigan 1973: 11.

mentions the Roman satirists as his predecessors.[38] In the preface to his satires Lippi appeals to the recreative effects of the genre that brings tranquillity of mind:

> *Quae dum vitia effulminat, perturbationes radicitus evellit, et artificiosa numerorum et pedum structura ad virtutem nos cohortatur, et virtutis utilitatem, pulchritudinem atque honestatem laudibus efferendo in medium adducit sinceram illam beatitudinem, et sedatam animi tranquillitatem … ingenerat.*[39]
>
> By eliminating vices and uprooting perturbations and with its artful structure of numbers and metres satire guides us toward virtue, and praising the utility, beauty and honesty of virtue it brings genuine happiness and tranquillity of mind.

Lippi argues that the most important gift that literature can offer to its readers is a peaceful mind, and satire alone is able to mobilise such an improvement. In his third satire devoted to moderation, Lippi describes how ambition and other desires torment human beings, and he advises them to follow nature as their guide and be content with little. Lippi's satires asserted the importance of tranquillity and the role of satire in decreasing anxiety and pain. Several early Italian satirists such as Tito Vespasiano Strozzi (1424-1505) from Ferrara[40] and Giovanni Aurelio Augurelli (1456-1534) called their poems *sermones* in the sense of mild and free conversations (*carmina sermonis sensus imitantia puri*, 'poems imitating pure

---

[38] For Lippi's five satires, *Satyrae V ad Laurentium Medicem*, see Lippi 1978; IJsewijn 1978; Haye 2001; Simons 2013a: 126-127; Pagrot 1961: 55. Lippi was a pupil of Marsilio Ficino, and later in 1473 he became professor of rhetoric at Pisa. Lippi's five satires were dedicated to Lorenzo de' Medici, although an early draft of the second satire was first devoted to Federigo da Montefeltro (IJsewijn 1978: 19-20). The poems dealt with wicked people and bad poets (satire 1), defended the moral value of literature (2; the poet here also praises Lorenzo de' Medici as an outstanding humanist who knows how to spend his time well by studying poetry), recommended frugal living (3), warned of hubris and transgressions (4), and advised readers to choose their tasks according to their skills (5) (see also Haye 2001; IJsewijn 1978: 40-43).

[39] Lippi 1978: Prooemium, p. 21.

[40] Strozzi's four satires in *Sermonum liber* were published posthumously in 1513 together with his son's, Ercole Strozzi's, poetry; they both wrote in Latin. In his fourth satire, Strozzi claims that he is not stimulated by the example of satyrs or the Cynics; rather, his satires are playful (*ludens*) in tone. Strozzi's four poems were called conversations, which reflect their milder and pleasant Horatian style. See Strozzi 1530. A modern edition of Strozzi's satires, *Tito Vespasiano Strozzi, Oeuvres satiriques*, is edited by Béatrice Charlet-Mesdjian in 2016.

conversations').[41] Later the term also referred to Christian sermons that guided men towards the good life and better behaviour, and which were less aggressive in tone.[42] It is also essential for this work to note that the word *sermo* is an anagram of the word *mores* (or vice versa), meaning manners, morals, and character.

The Neapolitan Giano Anisio (1465-1540), for his part, was a learned humanist from Naples who travelled widely in Italy and actively networked with important men of his age. He participated in the activities of the Accademia Pontaniana, a learned society of scholars founded in Naples in 1458. The individual poems of Anisio's large collection of satires – six books written in the Horatian style – are addressed to his friends and acquaintances, as was the habit in many early collections published in Italy. In his third book, Anisio dedicated satires to Pope Leo X and Julius II as well as to several cardinals, such as Pompeo Colonna and Girolamo Seripando. The first satire of Anisio's book four is addressed to Christ. Other addressees include Anisio's contemporary poets such as Jacopo Sannazaro, the grammarian Pietro Summonte, some relatives, and, for example, a book (*Ad librum*).[43]

These early neo-Latin satirists often used military metaphors to describe their verses. In the manner of Lucilius and Juvenal, they attacked their targets with a sword in hand[44] and lashed their enemies with harsh Juvenalian invectives, stressing their moral intentions and aiming to reveal the truth beneath the facade. Correr claims in his first satire that he is opting for a style that 'defends an unarmed man with a sword', and Lippi, burning with anger,

---

[41] Augurelli 1505: I.1. Augurelli's elegant Latin poems, *Carmina*, were published in Verona in 1491 and Venice in 1505. His main work was a didactic poem on alchemy and the art of making gold, *Chrysopoeia* (1515). Augurelli's two books of satires (*Sermonum libri I-II*, 1505) were Horatian in tone and did not include aggression (also Simons 2013a: 140). Augurelli aims to expel worries and evoke joy and 'light laughter' (*levis risus*, *sat*. I.1). His satires deal with the right and wrong purposes of life (I.2), human worries (I.3-4), ridiculous literary circles (I.6), prosopopoeia (I.7), etc. The second book exhorts, e.g., to shake off worries after much distress (II.3) and retreat to the countryside (II.5). Human worries are discussed in several satires (e.g., II.6), including different forms of love (II.7). Augurelli names several of his satires as exhortations (*adhortatio*) or complaints (*querela*). For Augurelli's satires, see Thurn 2008.

[42] Simons 2013a: 142 n. 56.

[43] See Anisio 1531: 53-55 (Leo), 59-60 (Julius), 74-76 (Christ). Anisio's satires, *Iani Anysii Satyrae, ad Pompeium Columnam Cardinalem*, contained six books and some fifty satires; see De Smet 2015: 202-203. He assumed the classical Latin name of Janus Anysius.

[44] Juv. 1.165-167; also quoted in Simons 2013a: 128. Cf. Hor. *Sat*. 2.1.39-40. For Filelfo's military metaphors (*ensis, gladius*), see Ludwig 2008: 217.

raises his sword against vices.[45] In my reading, I will not focus so much on the virulent invectives, offensive rhetoric, or satirical criticism of individual vices than on those virtues – such as piety, justice, and peacefulness – that satire seeks to promote through its ethical instruction and moral critique.[46]

Outline of the book

Although I will occasionally refer to the early Italian satirists whose influence on the tradition is undoubtedly crucial, I am primarily concerned with the subsequent satirical tradition that flourished in different European countries in the early modern period between ca. 1500-1800.[47] I have divided the book into a few thematic categories that reflect the main moral issues discussed in satires. Admittedly, this means some inevitable jumping from one context or century to another, but what I hope to achieve is to draw connections between satires written in different times and help to build a broader view of the genre's persistent ethical themes.

In Chapter 1, I will provide a preliminary introduction to the authors discussed later in this book and explain how neo-Latin authors inherited one of the distinctive features of Roman verse satire, namely, meta-poetical commentary on the poet's reasons for writing satire.[48] Neo-Latin poets followed Horace, who in his programmatic satires 1.4 and 2.1 defends the castigating function of his work and justifies it against accusations of malice and attacks that the satirist possesses low motives. In the manner of Horace, the later satirists explain their benign intentions and stress that the ethical utility of their humorous verses is far removed from real malevolence and destruction. Accordingly, neo-Latin satirists such as the German playwright and theologian Thomas Naogeorg (Kirchmair, 1508-1563) and the Groningen-based physician and poet Gerard Nicolaas Heerkens (1726-1801) commented on their personal motives for writing satire. They provided excuses and moral justifications for their bitter poetry and praised

[45] Correr 1991: I.46-47 (*defendat inermem / ut gladius*); Lippi 1978: I.10 (*nudato protinus ense*).

[46] On early modern invective satires and their violent rhetoric, see, e.g., Simons 2013b; Marsh 2019 (on Filelfo).

[47] Several important collections of satires were also published in Italy in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. This period produced the collections by Quintus Sectanus, Federico Nomi, and Carlo d'Aquino, among others.

[48] Cf. Pozuelo 1994 who notes that 'meta-arguments' referring to the writing of satire were common both in Roman verse satire and in the early Italian tradition.

its great benefits for humanity and private and public morals. I will study some epistolary prefaces, programmatic satires, and opening poems in which the satirists introduced their work to their readers.[49] They announced that they relied on borrowed thoughts and directed their readers to moral frameworks familiar from the authorial voices of Roman verse satire and the Bible. Neo-Latin satirists did not tend to challenge the assumptions of previous satirists or religious writers; they adapted and reinterpreted former ideas and phrases in a new context while emphasising their good intentions, thereby warding off any criticism that might push their audiences to reject their verses as merely hostile. They also criticised bad poetry and their contemporary literary tastes that nurtured mere verse-makers, as the early Dutch satirist Petrus Montanus (1468-1507) put it in his first satire on poets (*De poetis*).

Satires typically thematise education by giving ethical advice about what is right and wrong to youths in those stages of life when the problems of conduct are tormenting them and when they are in the process of self-construction. Chapter 2 focuses more deeply on the satirical rhetoric of didacticism and ethical advice that was meant to stimulate moral thinking and educate the addressee to make morally justified choices in life. I will explore evaluative language and the scenes of upbringing that satire offers to its allegedly young readers for instruction. This tradition was greatly influenced, firstly, by Horace, who frequently referred to his father as an educator and himself as the recipient of his father's teachings, and, secondly, by Erasmus of Rotterdam's advice treatises for young boys and Christian princes that played out the role of humanist as adviser.[50] Much neo-Latin satire can be read as a playful and critical educational tool similar to the moral education used by Horace's father to shape his son 'into a honest man when he was a child'.[51] Using explicit moral terms and binary oppositions of good and evil, the satirical verses were equally concerned to form an individual and caution boys about ambition, pretence, beautiful but fraudulent women, and other potential moral dangers. Following satirical advice, young rulers were expected to learn political wisdom and clemency by being deterred from vice through the immoral examples of satirical characters. For example, the early Dutch historian and philologist Lambertus Hortensius of Montfoort (ca. 1500-1574) studied

---

[49] For the discursive role of the preface, see the interesting discussion in Sussman 1978: 51-58 (on Seneca).

[50] Hampton 1990: 48 considers Erasmus's *Enchiridion militis Christiani* and *Institutio principis Christiani* his principal writings on exemplarity.

[51] Marchesi 2001: 4.

educational issues in his second satire, and Eilhard Lubinus (Eilert Lübben, 1565-1621), a professor of poetics and theology and a cartographer at Rostock, wrote satirical declamations on barbarism and presented them to the university audience at Rostock. I will especially explore the satires of the French-Italian poet Bernardo Guglielmini (Guillemin, 1693-1769) whose *Sermonum libri tres* ('Three Books of Sermons', Rome, 1742) were addressed to Pope Benedict XIV and gave young men moral lessons in the different duties of life.

Chapter 3 will examine satire in terms of its philosophical content and goals. Satires encourage their readers to engage in ethical self-examination by attacking vices and ignorance and promoting the value of self-sufficiency, freedom of speech, tranquillity, and peaceful living. Both the ancient Cynics and the Stoics acquired the reputation of being frank preachers against the immoral. For example, the magistrate Petrus Scholirius from Antwerp (Pieter Scholier, 1582-1635), who had studied philosophy at Louvain, published his eleven satires, *Sermonum familiarium libri tres* ('Three Books of Familiar Sermons') in the 1620s assembled under the title Diogenes Cynicus. Scholirius devoted his third book to the defence of Diogenes and his thinking, and in the extensive edition and commentary by Albert Le Roy (1683), the satirist is portrayed between the goddess of wisdom, Athena, and the scornful Cynic.[52] In the Stoic manner, the satirists stress the value of virtue above all other human qualities. The importance of self-knowledge in making progress towards virtue is represented as the most precious property that human beings can possess. I will look at satires that explicitly comment on such major philosophical figures as Diogenes or schools such as the Stoics that offered ethical advice on well-being. Several of the satires focus on primarily philosophical topics, such as frugal living and voluntary poverty, which were praised by various satirists from the Spanish humanist Jaime Juan Falcó (1522-1594) to the French poets Marc-Antoine Muret (Muretus, 1526-1585) and Jean de Saint-Geniès (Johannes Sangenesius, 1607-1663) from Avignon. Other favourite issues included the tranquillity of mind, immortality of the human soul, and death. Such satire was not always simple moral labelling; it often came close to moral reflection that did not consist of explicit instruction.[53] Ethical reflection provided an important stimulus for the Ghent humanist Jan van Havre (Johannes Havraeus, 1551-1625), whose three satires entitled *Arx virtutis sive de vera animi tranquillitate* ('The Fortress of Virtue or on the True Tranquillity of Mind', 1627) adopt a Stoic position and form important poetical documents on the satirical defence of virtuous and good living.

---

[52] De Smet 2015: 203. On Scholirius's life, see his *vita* in Scholirius 1683.

[53] Griffin 1994: 26.

Chapter 4 turns to medical satires that examine the moral condition of their patient.[54] In comparing ethics with medicine in his *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle notes that doctors cure individuals, and as in moral philosophy, the medical arguments in the neo-Latin satires studied here concern the health of the individual, not primarily the community.[55] These satires are moral exhortations to individual patients, and the cure is not to be sought from the outside, but through the patient's own moral improvement. As Cicero also put it when describing philosophy as the medical art of the soul, 'We must endeavour with all our resources and strength to become capable of doctoring ourselves'.[56] Due to the alleged corporeality of the soul, the relationship between medicine and philosophy is not simply a decorative stylistic device in Stoic thinking; rather, good advice and learning is thought quite literally to advance moral and physical health as well.[57] I will briefly examine early modern understandings of satire as a healing instruction and consider how the satirists such as the Italian presbyter Federico Nomi (1633-1705) use medical language to define their salubrious task. While some satires attack incompetent quacks, others praise wise doctors for their friendship and trustworthiness in cases of emergency. The medical satires of the Jesuit satirist Jacob Balde (1604-1668) are original texts in this sense. They represent Christian Neo-Stoicism, which had become a prominent mode of thinking in the Baroque period, but Balde always preserved his characteristic irony in his discussions of the good life.

Classical traditions provided a wide range of literary conventions for neo-Latin satire. However, satirists did not write exclusively under the influence of Roman verse satire; rhetorical techniques and imageries were also found in biblical poetry, especially during the Renaissance and Reformation periods, which both involved a return to textual origins. In Chapter 5, I will explore how religious satirists in the Low Countries and in Germany associated themselves with thundering prophets, apostles, and church fathers, who were fitted into the tradition of satirical moral censure. The satirists discussed in Chapter 5 on satirical prophecies include Gerard Geldenhouwer of Nijmegen (Gerardus Noviomagus, 1482-1542), a learned divine, whose *Satyrae octo ad Verae Religionis cultores* ('Eight satires addressed to the worshipers of true religion') appeared in Louvain in 1515, and Eilhard Lubinus's satirical declamations that prophesied the end of the world.

---

[54] Chapter 4 is partly based on my previous work on medical analogy in Latin satire; see Kivistö 2009.

[55] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1097a. Cf. Nussbaum 1994: 65.

[56] Cic. *Tusc.* 3.3.6.

[57] See, e.g., Tieleman 2003: 144-147.

Biblical poetry is often indispensable for grasping Reformation satire. The religious convulsions of the Reformation gave rise to conditions which were particularly conducive to satirical laughter and (rather serious-minded) anti-clerical humour, especially in sixteenth-century Germany. Catholics and Protestants attacked each other with increasing ferocity, and the Reformers shared the satirical conception of the fundamentally sinful nature of human beings. The second half of Chapter 5 will show how in Germany, Thomas Naogeorg, in his large and important collection titled *Satyrarum libri quinque* ('Five Books of Satires', 1555), defends the didactic-moralistic usefulness of satirical criticism (*utile ac necessarium*).[58] The majority of Naogeorg's satires deal with religious issues and such topical questions as iconoclasm. One key feature of Naogeorg's religious satires is their prophetic tone and biblical setting, as if the Old Testament events were taking place before the poet's eyes and he had the utmost sense of urgency in delivering his work. The writer seemed to have a special access to biblical wisdom. Using scriptural language, the poems deliver the urgent judgement of an experienced person who sees what others do not see, although this ability to know the truth may not come directly from divine forces or any privileged channel but instead originate from the pressures of life. Naogeorg's prophetic style includes severe castigation of the addressed community. Nicodemus Frischlin (1547-1590) directly developed Naogeorg's thoughts and frequently used biblical tales to reinforce his moral criticism and personal invectives. In contrast to pagan myths, stories from the Bible were placed in a moral perspective and had moral explanations.[59] Like Naogeorg before him, Frischlin drew parallels between current affairs and previous biblical stories by depicting and interpreting his perceptions of the vicious world with images and contrasts familiar from the Hebrew Scriptures. Immoderation and immorality incurred trouble or punishment in both contexts. Therefore, Reformation satirists infused a heavily biblical atmosphere in their poems, and the borrowing of whole scenes and tales from the Old Testament were intended to invoke its world, giving the tale a special satirical meaning.

The satires rely on an ideal moral world that is used to measure the actual one and its shortcomings. Chapter 6 concerns this ideal norm and positive morality, which often came from examples worthy of imitation. Examples were typically used in rhetoric and historiography to entertain and teach audiences. Renaissance

[58] Naogeorg 1555: p. 15. Naogeorg's satires were reprinted in 1612 in Jan Gruter's *Delitiae poetarum Germanorum* 4, 997 ff.

[59] Duyndam 2008: 240 (referring to Girard).

humanists were enthusiastic about Plutarch's biographies of ancient heroes, and their histories devote considerable attention to moral portraits of leading political or religious figures acting as a stimulus to virtuous action.[60] The value of individual examples was also understood in satirical writing, since praise and blame were traditionally thought to be efficient in moral training. The satirical understanding of particularity was exemplary: every event and all individual acts were potentially negative or (occasionally also) positive moral examples. Usually, the satires concentrate on negative exemplarity – that is, on censuring vices, showing things as they 'really' are, and favouring wicked examples to deter the reader from vice. However, there were some important exceptions to this poetic rule: some satires praise moral good and allude to positive figures worthy of respect and imitation. As Mendell has noted, the word *vitium* (vice) appears in Horace's satires and epistles numerous times (32 and 12, respectively), but also the word *virtus* (virtue) is used 30 times in his epistles and 17 times in the satires.[61] This view – that Horace's epistles in particular are concerned with the love of virtue – was common in the Middle Ages. As Udo Kindermann has noted, scholars such as John of Salisbury and Bernard of Utrecht took the role of satire seriously in the high Middle Ages,[62] and, following Horace, they underlined that satire concentrated not only on vituperation or ridicule but also on praising virtues such as modesty. In his edition of Horace's satires from 1503, the French humanist printer and commentator Jodocus Badius Ascensius (1462-ca.1535), who published editions and commentaries of the Roman satirists, proposes that Horace's aim in his satires was to remove vices from the human mind, whereas in his epistles he taught virtue and honesty.[63]

Accordingly, the positive norm was either openly stated or at least secretly motivating neo-Latin satirical discourse.[64] Occasionally satires also present explicit hortatory models for imitation by praising selected historical figures as ideals. Their virtues specify accepted moral behaviour and are promoted as

[60] For a brief introduction to examples and anti-examples in history, see, Burke 2011. On the use of examples in antiquity, see Roller 2018; Langlands 2018; on examples in Renaissance rhetoric and literature, see esp. Hampton 1990; Lyons 1989.

[61] Mendell 1920: 150.

[62] Kinderman 1978: 41-43, 69.

[63] See Simons 2013a: 134; Kindermann 1978: 43 on similar medieval views. Badius also referred to Saint Paul's epistles as a parallel case to Horace's satires.

[64] Cf. Kindermann 1978: 72 quoting Walter de Châtillon: *munus et officium nil scribens ipse docebo* ('I teach tasks and duties without writing about them').

ideals worth emulating. Studying the satires of the poets Bernardo Guglielmini and Lodovico Sergardi – whose eulogies also had their Juvenalian xenophobic impulses –, and more briefly such Italian Jesuit poets as Carlo d'Aquino (1654-1737) and Stefano Antonio Morcelli (1737-1822), I will present some positive moral examples eulogised in their neo-Latin verses, including Pope Benedict XIV, who was one of the elevating figures the satirists approved of for his promotion of piety, the arts, and scientific learning in Rome. This approach is supported by current claims about the 'virtue gap' in chiefly negatively oriented humour research that should also draw attention to the morally good that was, however, a double-edged weapon in satires.[65]

Chapter 7 deals with the ethically relevant motif of leaving Rome and hating the city. After Horace (e.g., *Sat.* 2.2), it became customary in satire to advocate the virtues of simple living in the countryside and, in the manner of the wise peasant Ofellus, to make a virtue out of necessity. Simplicity was a traditional Roman ideal familiar from such Republican heroes as Cincinnatus, who was upheld as an epitome representing the virtuous Republican past and its ideal of poverty.[66] The attitude of lost past innocence, contentment, and moderation was contrasted with the current excess and decline of the city famously denounced by Umbricius in Juvenal's satire 3, in which the protagonist decides to escape the corrupt city and flee its vicious life to the countryside. Chapter 7 explores these contrastive motifs of rural contentment and leaving the city in neo-Latin satires that argue in favour of rural simplicity, seek the perfect life in the moral purity of the countryside, and defend the ideal of contentment. I will investigate in more detail the satires of two poets from different periods, namely, the Croatian 'Horace', Junije Restić (Junius Restius or Džono Rastic, 1755-1814), and the English eighteenth-century Presbyterian priest, Umbritius Cantianus, in order to trace how the ancient nostalgic topos of a pastoral retreat took some novel turns in its neo-Latin framework in which the pastoral world is criticised as an unrealistic image that never existed. To my knowledge Cantianus's poem is one of the few examples in Britain that directly imitated Juvenal's third satire in Latin. Moreover, the satirists claimed that Rome was no longer the Rome of the old days. While some authors describe how they had departed the city to concentrate on a simple life or lament the loss of the virtuous past, for others Rome had with the advent of Christianity gained a new moral purity. The vicious Rome is identified with the pagan times, whereas the new virtuous Rome was founded

[65] On the virtue gap, see Ruch & Heintz 2016.

[66] See Osborne 2006: 13 (on Cincinnatus, see Cic. *Sen.* 56).

on its powerful position as the capital of the Catholic church. In the idealised view of Christianity, the once corrupt Rome now corresponded to such ideals of Christian culture as simplicity and brotherhood. The motif of the decline of the city thus gained new significance in Christian satire. The final chapter will wrap up the Horatian lessons on how to live a good life, also noting its limits.

***

A few caveats may be in order before I embark on my discussion of the issues in the following chapters. I am not making any attempt at an all-embracing treatment of all neo-Latin satirists in this book; instead, I will focus on some central comprehensive collections of satires written, for example, in the Low Countries,[67] Germany, and Italy. IJsewijn notes that although satirical poetry was also written in Eastern Europe, it was probably less popular there for political or religious reasons than in some other countries such as Italy or the Netherlands.[68] I will also occasionally discuss individual poems which were perhaps more often written for simply polemical or entertaining purposes. I am not following chronological or national developments of satire in different countries or comparing neo-Latin texts with those written in national tongues.[69] I understand that my thematic and descriptive approach may be disappointing to some readers who would perhaps expect a more chronological or analytical approach, and my methods are not primarily historical or philological; instead, I will emphasise rhetorical contents drawing attention to the continuity of some persistent ethical themes, educational situations and recurring satirical forms in the poems. Genre research has its limitations, and it tends to highlight similarities rather than differences. At the same time, however, by creating connections between texts it can make individual poems understandable as part of a broader generic tradition. Throughout the book, my focus is on intra-textual aspects and close reading of individual passages and less well-known texts which I hope to make more accessible to modern readers.

---

[67] According to De Smet 2015: 203 the region was characterised by 'a particularly strong humanist interest in moral literature'. Laureys 2008: 307 notes that, unlike in Germany, in the Low Countries neo-Latin satire was not personal or offensive in nature but focused on questions of practical philosophy and moral teachings.

[68] IJsewijn 1975: 193.

[69] On the parallel developments of neo-Latin and vernacular satires, see Pagrot 1961; Hess 1971; De Smet 2015: 210. On German verse satire (esp. during the Baroque period), see Freund 1972.

In the Latin citations, I have standardised the texts by resolving all the abbreviations and digraphs. I have not included accents that are sometimes used in the texts to mark out certain grammatical forms, but I have retained some 'unclassical' spellings in the poems. The punctuation also often differs from modern punctuation. For clarity, I have distinguished between 'u' and 'v' and 'j' becomes 'i' in the word beginnings, and I have decided to expand the ampersand symbol to 'et'.[70] For personal names, I have used the name preferred in previous research literature, although these practices often vary between Latin and vernacular forms. Translations from Latin are mine unless otherwise indicated, and many of the examples are translated here from Latin into English for the first time.

The collections of the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel have been of great help in identifying individual poems. I am grateful to the Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters for supporting my archival work. I would also like to thank all those who have supported my writing with their comments or otherwise, especially Mika Kajava, Victoria Moul, Kirill Thompson, Hannu Riikonen, Päivi Mehtonen, Tiina Käkelä, Ville Vuolanto, Vesa Vahtikari (for the layout), Tatu Pajula (for research assistance in the early stages of the research), Siru Strömberg (for drawing up the *index nominum*), and Sami Pihlström.

[70] On the editing of neo-Latin texts, see, e.g., the reflections on their editorial principles and practices by Sarah Knight and Stefan Tilg in the *Oxford Handbook of Neo-Latin* (2015: 7-8).

Chapter 1
Programmatic Beginnings: Justifying Satirical Indignation

In his programmatic satire 1.4, Horace famously appealed to his benign intentions of presenting the truth with a laugh. He stressed that real malevolence and backbiting were alien to his humorous and entertaining verses that helped him to improve his life.[1] Horace also announced his sources of inspiration in his satires 1.4 and 2.1; he was following the famous examples of the Greek comic writers and Lucilius in the marking of evils. Horace's programmatic satires, Persius' and Juvenal's first poems[2] and their key passages were influential models for neo-Latin verse satirists as defenses of the genre and the satirical persona.[3] It became customary for collections of verse satire to begin with a defence of the genre based on both moral utility and literary precedent. The opening poems began with apologies which dismissed the traditional image of the satirist as a malicious scandalmonger. The pattern included a pronouncement of the satirist's high purposes and an expressed awareness of the famous literary parentage.[4] Obscene and abusive passages, as well as subjects not usually considered suitable for poetry, were justified by the poet's claim to censure vice and love virtue, and by appealing to previous authorities, satirists made acceptable their interest in such allegedly frivolous literary activity.

Satirists expressed their desire to alter the reality they represented and restore a moral governance over human affairs. They did not merely describe the world as they saw it – or reveal what was in their view the accurate truth about the world – but they also described their own emotional reactions and expressed their moral indignation at the moral transgressions of others. They claimed that it was natural to get angry at people's moral mistakes ('who, I say, is there who carefully observes the conduct of this age and abstains from anger?'),[5] even if anger would be turned against themselves. For example, Jan van Havre, a Dutch satirist, asserts his uncompromising poetic freedom: 'No anger or faces sneering with menacing

---

[1] Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.78-103, 135.

[2] Juv. 1.79 (*Si natura negat, facit indignatio versum*).

[3] For Persius' programmatic satires, see Bramble 1974.

[4] See Bramble 1974: 16.

[5] Muret 2006: 55 (trans. Kirk M. Summers).

contempt can deter me from speaking the truth and protecting justice' (*Non irae, torvi vultus, fastusque minaces, / Impedient me vera loqui, iustumque tueri*).[6] He follows the idea of *parrhesia*, speaking aloud what he has in mind, not hiding anything and making his point manifestly clear. In his studies on fearless speech, Michel Foucault has stressed that those who used *parrhesia* in Antiquity made their opinions and mind completely clear to other people; they sensed it as their duty to speak the truth despite the dangers involved in such outspokenness.[7]

Seneca already noted that anger was caused by 'the spectacle of prosperous vice and successful crime', but he insisted that the wise man must restrain his anger, whereas Juvenal and later satirists maintained that they must express their outrage by writing satire.[8] Although in the Stoic view anger was a passion that should be removed completely – and many neo-Latin satirists adhered loosely to the principles of Neo-Stoicism –, indignation was considered a justified objection to moral decay and requiring rational judgement of the moral condition of the world.[9] Thus, satirists were in this sense closer to the Aristotelian understanding of emotions that as such were not regarded as bad, but they were regarded good or bad according to the situation and what was ethically appropriate to the prevailing moral conditions.[10] Satirical indignation was presented as an affective state that did not disrupt human rationality; instead, it reflected the satirist's ethically appropriate reaction to and a justified judgement of the moral state of the world. The satirist maintained that it was right to react emotionally to false beliefs and psychopathological problems.

In addition to philosophical backgrounds, the emotional scale of the satires was influenced by classical rhetoric in which indignation was an entirely appropriate emotion in persuading an audience to one's side.[11] Cicero wrote in his *De inventione* that 'indignation is a kind of speech by which the effect produced is,

[6] Havraeus 1627: II, p. 30; van Havre 2014: 2.89-90.

[7] Foucault 2001: 11-20. For *parrhesia* in the early modern (political) context (particularly in England), see, e.g., Colclough 1999.

[8] Cf. Seneca, *De ira* (2.7-9); Highet 1949: 261. The Frisian humanist Rudolph Agricola (1444-1485) explains in his treatise on dialectical invention and its chapter on emotions, that the Roman satirists all had their individual styles: Horace was playful, Persius more serious and philosophical, and Juvenal left the impression of being indignant and angry. See Agricola 1539: III Cap. II; cf. Tournoy 1998: 77.

[9] On the moral emotion of indignation and satirical emotions in general, see Kivistö 2009: 47-54.

[10] On emotions in Antiquity, see Braund & Gill 1997.

[11] Webb 1997: 120. Cf. *Rhet. Herenn*. 4.15.22: 'If we use Apostrophe in its proper place, sparingly, and when the importance of the subject seems to demand it, we shall instill in the hearer as much indignation as we desire' (trans. Harry Caplan).

that great hatred is excited against a man'.[12] The emotional content was efficient in achieving persuasion, and it was frequently used in satires in convincing one's audience about the moral flaws of humankind and making them respond accordingly. Indignation was excited to awaken hatred against human vices in the audience. But while ancient forensic orators often tried to demonstrate that the crime under discussion is exceptional and foreign to the nature of man, satires, in contrast, usually argued that the vices under consideration were common and reflected the savage state of humans. Therefore, the satirical campaign against vices should concern all human beings.

Bodily indignation

In response to potentially hostile reactions, neo-Latin satirists defended their poetic practice by providing moral and epistemological justifications for their verses. Satirists declared that writing satire was essentially a morally guided behavior that aimed to prevent and overcome individual and social shortcomings. In their ethical pessimism, satirists usually saw the contemporary world as the worst of times when all men were thieves, whereas they themselves were fearless advocates of justice. When the court of justice was not functioning justly, one could only rely on the incorruptible verdict of the satirist.

It was typical to assert that satirical punishment relied on the sense of fairness, sometimes almost on divine retribution. The negative mode of judgement was linked with the expressed feeling of injustice. To give an example of this satirical 'justice work', Marc-Antoine Muret, a famous French humanist and an early neo-Latin satirist, wrote in his first satire (in his *Iuvenilia*, 1552) that civic leaders enrich themselves and nobody cares for the poor:

> *Audisne haec inquam, magni pater Herculis? audis?*
> *Audisne, an dormis, an nectaris ebrius haustu,*
> *Exerces positis genialia tempora curis?*
> *Non aliter nostri. …*[13]

[12] Cicero, *De inventione* 1.53 (trans. C.D. Yonge).

[13] Muret 1757: I.37-40. Muret's works were collected and appeared in Verona in 1727; they were reprinted several times and he was much admired for this Latin style. His *Iuvenilia*, which first appeared in 1552, were also reprinted in Latin and French in 1682. On Muret's satires, see, e.g., Simons 2015. For Muret's edition of Seneca, see Kraye 2005.

Do you hear these things, father of great Hercules, do you hear them?
Are you listening, or are you asleep, or drunk from a draft of nectar,
and having set aside your cares spend your time in ease?
That's how our leaders are.[14]

The poet articulated his outrage at a vicious action as a duty needed in an age when the social justice system – and even the supreme god – were ineffectual or insufficient to recognise vices. Verbal markers of anger included repeated questions addressed to those in power. No one forced the satirist to speak the truth, but he felt it as his duty to help people to listen to those in need (as well as the loud satirical instructions) and identify wrongdoings.[15] In his second satire, Muret exclaims that his liver is split by black bile when thinking about the deceptive appearances of pretenders in high places, foul businessmen, hypocritical priests, and other wicked people of his age who are like lions, stuffing their bellies with the fat of innocent people:

Res caret illa modo; genera ipsa evolvere longum est.
Stupra, doli, fraudes, periuria, furta, rapinae,
Crimina erant olim; nostro sunt tempore lusus,
Quos pueri teneris meditantur ab unguibus et quos
Ipse docet natos genitor materque puellas.
Venimus ad summum.[16]

There is no end to that: The list of the types of crimes themselves is long.
Foul behaviour, deceits, cheating, perjury, thefts, seizures
these were once crimes. Nowadays they are games
that kids contemplate from their earliest days,
passed down from dad to boys and mom to girls.
We have come to the end.[17]

The quote embodies the usual apocalyptic rhetoric of satires and a list of grievances that emphasises the number of current evils. The poet longs for sincerity under deceptive disguises:

---

[14] Muret 2006: 55, 57 (trans. Kirk M. Summers).

[15] Cf. Foucault 2001: 19.

[16] Muret 1757: II.49-54.

[17] Muret 2006: 61 (trans. Kirk M. Summers).

… abicite ergo
Hunc fucum, et vultu ruite in scelus omne retecto.
Hoc ego larvarum scelus exitialiter odi.[18]

… Strip off the make-up,
rush into every misdeed without the mask.
I hate to death this kind of masquerading.[19]

A similar unmasking trend characterised all satire with its sincere ethos of systematically searching for 'deception and self-deception and the uncovering of underlying truth'.[20] Satires relied on the belief that 'beneath the appearance of every human phenomenon there lies concealed a discrepant actuality and that intellectual, practical, and (not least) moral advantage is to be gained by forcibly bringing it to light'.[21] The main argument was that society or at least certain individuals had lost their integrity and the task of satire was the effort of unmasking, of laying bare the principles of insincerity and role-playing.

The satirists often described the impulse for writing satire in physical terms: frauds and the lack of trust made them poets, who suffered almost physically from what they considered injustice. The physical effects of indignation and anger typically involved the accumulation of black bile which made the reluctant poet speak. For example, Muret describes how the blood around his liver seethes and is about to burst unless he releases his anger through writing satire: 'For a long time now the bile has been seething in my swollen liver, and I fear that it will burst, unless I follow you, native of Aurunca, and imbue my tender pages with a biting song'.[22] This bodily reaction reflects his righteous mind that could not accept injustice.

---

[18] Muret 1757: II.45-47.

[19] Muret 2006: 61 (trans. Kirk M. Summers).

[20] Trilling 1972: 141 (quoting Henri F. Ellenberger on Freud's thought), who discusses here sincerity in general. The unmasking trend covers seventeenth-century French moralists, Schopenhauer, Marx, Ibsen, and Nietzsche, but satirists as a group could also be added to the list of notable figures loving sincerity. Freud's phrase 'We are all ill' (quoted in Trilling 1972: 143) does not much differ from the satirical world view.

[21] Trilling 1972: 142.

[22] Muret 2006: 55 (trans. Summers); Muret 1757: I.1-3 (*Iamdudum tumido mihi bilis in hepate fervet, / Et rumpi metuo, nisi te, Auruncane, secutus, / Inficiam tenues mordaci carmine chartas*). Auruncanus refers to the inventor of poetical satire, Lucilius, who was born at Aurunca. Cf. 2.43 (*bile iecur vitrea diffinditur*, 'my liver is split by clear bile').

Similar bodily reactions were described by other satirists. The early Dutch historian and philologist Lambertus Hortensius of Montfoort, who was for years the principal of the school in Naarden, claims that his satires have a strong ethical aspect despite their aggressive tone. The poet says that he must speak aloud, since unjust deeds fill his heart and stomach with black bile and force him to take up his pen (*pectus amara / bile tumens stomachoque, acceptae iniuria fraudis*).[23] The word 'stomach' was frequently used in Antiquity to describe indignation and frustration through the metaphor of physical reaction; it was often used as an introductory and comic device.[24] Uncontrollable and irrepressible indignation generated by the vicious environment that had urged Juvenal to speak also commanded Hortensius to write so that he might help his age to improve its morals. The effect of indignation is twofold: the poet expresses his feelings of indignation when confronting the corrupt world, and thus performs sincerity as an author. His anger is presented as a natural reaction to human flaws and false beliefs. At the same time, expressing a critical attitude towards moral iniquities, his indignation is evaluative language that tries to stimulate ethical reflection in his readers so that they would learn to detest vice and favor virtue in their lives.

In their own words, satirists did not wish to promote negative emotions as valuable moral or educational resources, and the emotions of envy or greed were unanimously condemned as moral vices. However, justified anger and offensiveness were accepted as morally responsive ways of reacting to the world in decline. Although anger and indignation suggested a negative and aggressive evaluation of human beings, these feelings were not considered morally blameworthy in satirical writers but upright reactions to corruption and having an epistemic goal of revealing the truth. In their own view, satirists were angry at the right persons and their justified anger testified their sincere and affective engagement with the moral principles. The rhetoric of indignation authorised their writing, because it meant that they felt annoyed by the grief of good men, vices in general, or more specifically by the success of those who do not deserve

[23] Hortensius 1552: VI (C2). Lambertus Hortensius's eight satires were published at Utrecht in 1552, and Horace was their primary model (Tournoy 1998: 82). His satires were presented as a gift (*munus*) to the nobleman Theodor van Zuylen. A second book of eight satires survives as a manuscript (De Smet 2015: 203). Hortensius also wrote a series of historical works on the Utrecht wars, the Anabaptist movement, and other issues (see briefly, Marsh 2014). It has been stated that his real name is unknown, and he adopted the name Hortensius because his father was a gardener, or their family name referred to gardening.

[24] See Hoffer 2007: 88 on *stomachus* in Cicero's letters. Hoffer notes that the word encapsulates Cicero's 'sense of indignation at political events combined with impotence and suppression' and indigestion is here 'an ailment of frustrated aggression redirected against the self'.

their prosperity. Satire described people who had succeeded unfairly and was a reaction against such injustice. As if in a courtroom, indignation was intended to arouse justified and virtuous moral anger among the audience against the guilty.

Sometimes satirists themselves had to face the courtroom. As Kirk M. Summers, a modern editor of Muret's poems, argues, Muret shared the humanist conviction that literature should not be written or read merely for the sake of pleasure and delight; instead, it had the capability of improving and ennobling the human mind.[25] While in his poems Muret promoted his high morality and the edifying effects of literature, in practice his life course took a different direction – or his classical views clashed with Christian morality, as Summers puts it. In the late 1540s, Muret still tutored Montaigne in Bordeaux,[26] and in 1552 lectured on Catullus to large audiences in Paris, including his friend Ronsard and other members of the Pléiade group. His collection *Iuvenilia* also appeared in Paris this year. But his glory did not last long. Summers notes how at the height of his career, Muret was accused of heresy and homosexual relations – 'penchants antiphysiques' – and locked in the Châtelet de Paris. Although he was released with the help of his friends and fled to Toulouse, he continued his illicit relations with young boys and male students who were in his tutorship. He was condemned to be burned in effigy but managed to escape again and moved to Venice. Muret continued his career in Italy and eventually became professor of moral philosophy in Rome, appointed to his position by Pope Pius IV, and lectured on philosophical and literary texts.[27] Thus, although in his satires Muret preached the utter decline of morals and condemned 'the damned age of sin', his own life contained elements that made him a moral iconoclast against his will.

Pious anger

Satire was a difficult genre to accept, especially in religious circles, because it described vices, had frequent recourse to verbal harshness, and expressed strong negative feelings of indignation on the part of the poet. Johann Christian Koch (1678-1738), a priest of Lenz, was one of the numerous later critics of the genre. In his critical observations on satire (*Observatio XLI*, *De Satyra e Re Literaria*

[25] Summers in Muret 2006: xv.

[26] Kraye 2005: 308. De Smet 2015: 204 notes that Etienne de la Boétie dedicated one long verse satire to his friend Montaigne. On La Boétie's satire, see, e.g., Lenders 2012.

[27] Summers in Muret 2006: xvi-xxiv; Kraye 2005: 309.

eliminanda, printed in *Miscellanea Lipsiensia* II, 1716), Koch claims that there are several reasons for excluding satire from the Christian Republic of Letters. According to his definition, satire is the itch of some disdainful minds to blame their fellow human beings for wrongdoing; they puff themselves up and make others look ridiculous.[28]

Koch's list of the immoral features of satire is extensive: Firstly, satire sins against the Ten Commandments by dismissing the love and fear of God and not loving its neighbor. Secondly, satire does not follow the example of Christ and the apostles who devoted their lives to correcting human vices. Nothing suggests that satirical irony has as salutary an effect as their teachings, despite the alleged ethical intentions of satirical poets. Furthermore, Christ did not mock but mourned the wickedness of humanity. Thirdly, the goal of satire is unfruitful because its sole purpose is to deride its target. Fourthly, the effects of satire are harmful because in the manner of the devil it creates disagreement and conflicts in society. Fifthly, instead of curing human beings, satire only exacerbates their condition and makes people desperate and suicidal. Sixthly, satirists themselves often end their lives in unhappiness and misery. Seventhly, while the truth should be the only goal of intellectual work satirists often prevent the truth from being told and uphold false opinions. Koch concludes that satire does not deserve its place in the Republic of Letters; instead, it should be sent away as useless and harmful.[29]

However, such accusations could be dismissed by appealing to religious and even divine motivation. Religious motivation for satire was common in the Middle Ages, and this argument was still used to legitimate neo-Latin satire. Although Saint Paul had warned against filthy language and condemned men who caused envy and other railings by futile arguing,[30] there were other Christian voices who were regarded as models for satirical confrontation. Francesco Filelfo, for instance, in his first satire, calls for God as his patron who takes supreme

[28] Koch redefines Daniel Heinsius's definition of satire here.

[29] Koch 1716. However, in the same volume Johann Georg Kuntschke argues in favour of the usefulness and need of satire. In his view, satire is useful in three ways. Firstly, it reveals the nature of man and has more life and power than any precept of moral philosophy. Secondly, satire helps people to recognise their vices. Sinners are lost in a swamp of vices and surrounded by dangerous crocodiles, but they are saved by following the footpath of virtue pointed out by the satirist. Thirdly, in moral philosophy wisdom is presented in a tedious and soporific style, whereas in satires truth and reproach are persuasive as they are sweetened with wit. Kuntschke defines satire as practical philosophy. See Kuntschke 1716 (*Quid de Satyris sentiendum?*, 'What should we think about satires?').

[30] St. Paul, 1. Tim. 6:4.

care of human morals, rewards virtue and punishes sin. Following the divine inspirer, the poet aims to improve people's moral life and guide them towards virtue 'by singing of non-fictitious issues' (*non ficta canentem*).[31] After Filelfo, the early Italian satirist Lorenzo Lippi calls satire a divine genre (*divinum genus*) which aims to uproot vices and passions, regulate human behaviour, recognise virtue, and increase the tranquillity of mind. This was in his view a divine task which was at the same time useful and admirable in promoting the beauty and honesty of virtue.[32] Udo Kindermann has noted that the discussion on satire highlighted its moral usefulness already in the Middle Ages when Latin literature was mainly written by the clergy. Satire was justified by stressing that it displayed a contempt of the world and aimed to replace misplaced values with virtues.[33] Likewise, Filelfo and Lippi both gave a Christian legitimation to their poetic moral castigation. Other early Italian satirists such as Giovanni Michele Alberto Carrara (1438-1490) also emphasised virtue, Christian charity, and neighbor love as crucial elements of satires.[34]

Reformation satire was a distinct strand within the tradition and relied on the homiletic understanding of satires as popular preaching against the ungodly. Reformation satirists adopted the strategies of Christian preachers integrating blame to their salubrious verses and engaging in effective rhetorical strategies familiar from moral theology. The editor Jodocus Badius Ascensius placed his understanding of satire under the legitimacy of a Christian homily that allowed him to see satire's Juvenalian vehemence ethically acceptable.[35] One notable figure who stands prominently out in this tradition is the Protestant pamphleteer Thomas Naogeorg, who in his *Satyrarum libri quinque* (1555) defends his frank censure of abuses even in matters pertaining to religion. In his dedicatory epistle to the young margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach, Georg Friedrich, Naogeorg declares himself the first German satirist to follow the example of his Roman predecessors and Filelfo,[36] although he disdains their obscenity and their habit

[31] Filelfo 1502: I.1 (see also Simons 2013a: 132); Pagrot 1961: 61. See also, e.g., Filelfo 1502: VII.5.

[32] Lippi 1978: Prooemium, p. 21 (*Quapropter, cum tantam satyrae praestantiam, tantam excellentiam, tantam denique utilitatem animadverterem, ausus et ego hoc poematis divinum genus tentare, quamvis post Iuvenalem, Persium, Flaccum modestius fuisset fortasse silere*); see also Simons 2013a: 132.

[33] Kindermann 1978: 68-69, 74.

[34] Simons 2013a: 139. Carrara's fifteen satires are called *Sermones obiurgatorii* ('Reproving sermons'). According to Marsh (2014), the individual poems dealt with different groups of people (obscene poets, scurrilous countrymen, unjust lawyers, etc.).

[35] On Badius's views of satire, see, e.g., Duhl 2013: 60-62.

[36] Cf. Horace (*Sat.* 1.4.6, 57; 1.10) who announced Lucilius as his immediate precursor.

of naming names.[37] While acknowledging his debt to his ancient inspirers and declaring a continuity between their work (*Fuerunt sane qui ante me scripserunt*, 'There were others who wrote before me'), Naogeorg kept a similar distance to the Roman satirists as Horace did to his predecessor Lucilius, whose satires were, in his view, rough and unpolished. Naogeorg notes that by saying the truth aloud he was able to hurt his audiences, but he claims that no one should take offence at his verses, since, unlike the older poets, his words do not involve personal attacks against his contemporaries; instead, he censures vicious action in general. Referring to Saint Paul's epistles to the Colossians (3.8) and its rules for holy living, Naogeorg argues that one should avoid filthy communication and put off all obscenities.

Naogeorg's apologetic purpose was to praise true piety and Evangelic doctrine by ridiculing men who declined to follow Christ. This attitude suggested that his verses had benevolent and corrective intentions. His main inspirers were not found in the pagan tradition, however, but in the Bible. Although satire was according to Quintilian an all-Roman genre, neo-Latin satirists followed the humanistic urge of returning to the sources which included both ancient classical and Biblical or Patristic texts. In neo-Latin satire, we can perceive the Erasmian revival of the idea of 'baptising the classics' that Erasmus derived from Jerome and Augustine.[38] In England, for example, Thomas Drant, an Archdeacon of Lewes in the sixteenth century, published his translation of a selection of Horace's satires together with Jeremiah's lamentations.[39] Neo-Latin satires were typically Christian satires deeply rooted in the classical traditions, Christian apologetics, and prophets, taking what was considered useful from pagan literature and embellishing this tradition with a Christian worldview.[40]

Accordingly, in his dedication to Georg Friedrich, Naogeorg argues that if his intention to strengthen faith is disrespectful and if his poems are considered malicious, then:

> *Hieronymus, Cyprianus, Chrysostomus atque alii ecclesiastici scriptores, immo etiam omnes prophetae et apostoli, Christusque ipse maledicus existimetur. Quoties*

---

[37] Naogeorg 1555: p. 4.

[38] Parrish 2010: 591; Boyle 1981.

[39] The translation appeared in 1566 with the title 'A MEDICINABLE Morall, that is, the two Bookes of Horace's Satyres'. The edition was also prefaced with the motto *Antidoti salutaris amaror*. See Randolph 1941: 143; Pagrot 1961: 81.

[40] On the development of Christian satire in Late Antiquity, see Sogno 2012.

> *enim prophetae invehuntur in idolorum cultores, in impios sacerdotes et prophetas, in tyrannicos avarosque principum mores, in corrupta perversaque vulgi studia, vitiaque multitudinis vel privatorum? Quoties apostoli, et D. praesertim Paulus, acerbe reprehendunt pseudoapostolos, antichristos, seductores, impostores, atque etiam fidei desertores? Nonne tales appellant stultos, canes, ventres, mendaces, inimicos crucis Christi, diaboli denique filios et mancipia, atque aliis nominibus multis? Christus servator noster, nonne vehementer fulminat in scribas et Pharisaeos, subinde hypocritas appellans, sepulchra dealbata, caecos, ducesque caecorum: illorumque impietatem perversitatemque palam traducit, depingit, illisque exprobrat? Non est hoc maledicentia, nec conviciandi vel libido vel morbus: sed admonitio, sed correctio, zelusque pro domo regnoque Dei.*[41]
>
> Jerome, Cyprian, Chrysostom, and other religious authors, all prophets, apostles, and Christ himself should be considered equally malevolent characters. Didn't the prophets often attack the worshippers of false idols, impious priests and prophets, tyrannical and greedy princes, corrupted and perverse activities of the crowd, vices of the multitude or of individuals? Didn't the apostles and St. Paul in particular severely reproach pseudo-apostles, anti-Christs, seducers, impostors, and others who rejected faith? Didn't they call them stupid, dogs, stomachs, liars, enemies of the Holy Cross, sons and servants of the devil, and other abusive names? Didn't even Christ the Saviour speak harshly to some of the scribes and Pharisees, calling them in his stinging rebukes hypocrites, whitewashed tombs, blind men and blind guides, and exposing their impiety and perversity to the public by reproaching it? This activity should not be considered slander or a sick desire for abuse, but as exhortation and correction and zeal to protect God's temple and reign.

Wrestling with his satirical vocation Naogeorg assures that his morally corrective verses rely on the tradition of best Christian satire. Indignation is justified by appealing to Christian authority and the gravity of the issue.[42] Naogeorg identifies church fathers, apostles, prophets, and Christ as primary models for his pious and voluntary anger, claiming that human vices were a great anxiety to Christian authorities. Jerome was the first important figure who

[41] Naogeorg 1555: pp. 6-7.

[42] Cf. Cicero who discusses indignation in his *De inventione* and argues that the emotion could be aroused, for example, by referring to authorities (1.53; Webb 1997: 124).

had been outspoken before him in the name of truth.[43] In his letters, Jerome illuminated his concept of satire and was aware of its retaliatory power. He called himself the first Christian satiric writer in prose and relentlessly attacked the corrupt society of his age.[44] Jerome argued that he omitted personal names and avoided mentioning his targets – this attitude has been interpreted to be due to his Christianity.[45] Naogeorg imitated Jerome's habit of distancing himself from the personal attacks of classical satire.

However, Naogeorg does not decline from pointing out the faults and sins of human beings that in his view needed to be corrected. The white tombs in particular are a powerful image; the tombs look beautiful on the outside, but are full of the bones of the dead, just as hypocrites are full of wickedness on the inside (cf. Matt. 23). Following Isaiah (58:1), who admonishes that one should cry aloud and lift one's voice like a trumpet, Naogeorg claims in his programmatic statement that, amidst the ubiquity of crimes and impiety, his poetic condemnation of vices is a truthful, necessary, sincere, and honest activity, even a duty. While Horace justified his satire against the charge of malice by arguing that his verses were not motivated by backbiting or real malice, Naogeorg in contrast makes clear that following the example of biblical writers his action *is* in fact inspired by justified anger and guided by his sincerity and good will: 'How could a sincere religious doctor or writer *not* feel hatred for those who oppose Christ and *not* express it in his words, deeds, and writings?' (*Quomodo potest Evangelii doctor aut scriptor sincerus non odisse Christi adversarios idque profiteri vel verbis vel factis vel scriptis?*).[46] Similar performed sincerity was characteristic of ancient *parrhesiastes* who always told their opinion and believed that it was also the truth.[47]

Naogeorg maintains that his satire is socially beneficial even when its outspokenness feels unpleasant. In the manner of Old Testament prophets – who were trumpets of God – he identifies himself as an instrument for spreading in the world prophetic truths, just like Isaiah states that the Lord had made his 'mouth like a sharpened sword' (49:2). Following his understanding of satire Naogeorg

[43] Naogeorg 1555: p. 5 (*Hieronymo auctore*). On Jerome, see Sogno 2012: 365; Wiesen 1964. As Wiesen has shown, Christian apologetics such as Jerome used satiric techniques to attack pagans and the decadent manners of their age.

[44] Sogno 2012: 378. On Jerome's statement of being a satirical writer in prose, see his epistle 40.2 and Kindermann 1978: 23.

[45] Sogno 2012: 368, 380, 383 (on Jerome denying his malevolence). Jerome was an important model already for Erasmus.

[46] Naogeorg 1555: p. 13.

[47] Foucault 2001: 14.

argues that outspokenness and hostility are acceptable and necessary reactions to moral lapses, because a writer who does not condemn sinners in practice is useless and adulatory – a mute dog, according to Isaiah (56:10), capable of barking but preferring sleeping and slumber to using its voice, or like someone caring only about his full stomach. The poet's experienced feeling of indignation was meant to underline that he was not indifferent about the moral state of the world and by attacking vice was acting responsibly.

The above-quoted passage from Naogeorg's dedication aims to entitle verbal aggression, and its frequent value-words are also meant to arouse similar emotional reactions in the young prince. The dedication identifies sincerity as its ethos and, through its inspired state of mind and verbal attacks on omnipresent sins (their frequency is underlined by such words of quantity as *tot* and *tantus*), commands the virtues of justice, constancy, and piety to its adolescent reader in an age that the poet calls the most turbulent of all centuries. Naogeorg's satire thus took the responsibility of upbringing the young prince to true piety and moral life; his main adversaries were those who opposed Christ.

Naogeorg's first satire also participates in the tradition of programmatic opening poems by appealing to the example of biblical writers. In his words, the Bible was an important source of satirical criticism, because it opened with a satirical note, first castigating Adam's deeds and Cain's fratricide, and soon also describing how furious God drowned the whole sinful world. Naogeorg constantly notes the effectiveness of historical and biblical examples in educating his young readers towards the path of virtue. In his satire 2.4, he stresses that the world was evil from the very beginning, as was testified by the Genesis. Although satires often complain that their own age was the worst of all times, in fact vices and sins have always been there.

After Naogeorg, the most important collection of satirical invectives in Germany was written by the fiery satirist Nicodemus Frischlin who wrote in 1567-1568 eight relentless satires against a Catholic convert, Jacob Rabus (Jakob Rabe, ca. 1546-1596).[48] In his preface to his satires, Frischlin claims that his satirical response is a duty inspired by the untruths presented in Rabus's public

[48] Frischlin was a controversial figure in his times. According to his biographers, his progress in studies was rapid and he already knew to compose poems in Latin and Greek before his thirteenth birthday. He was twenty years old when he was appointed a professor at Tübingen. Later in his career, Frischlin wrote popular Latin comedies, poetry, and *facetiae*, and he published commentaries on classical authors (Aristophanes, Callimachus, Horace) and, in 1582, a paraphrase of Persius. Horace's and Persius' styles and phrases strongly affected Frischlin's satires, even to the extent that he adopted whole passages nearly unaltered from the Roman authors for his own polemics. On Frischlin's satires, see below, Ch. 5.

declaration on religious issues and the Lutherans. The poet is stimulated to this task by his sense of truth and by friends:

> *Quam cum paulo penitius inspexissem, diutius me continere, ut non potui, ita nec debui. … impium hoc opus in manus discutiendum consumpsi, plurimis ad hoc me instigandis amicis, quibus ultro operam meam recusare nolui….*[49]
>
> As I became a little more familiar with his speech, I realized I could not and should not restrain myself any longer… I took the godless oration into my hands for closer examination, inspired by many of my friends from whom I no longer wanted to deny this work of mine….

Frischlin describes how he decided to speak aloud to reveal the false opinions that Rabus had presented in his scornful public oration. Frischlin underlines that although some readers consider satire an impudent and abusive genre (*petulans et maledicum*), his poetic response is not motivated by envy and everything is truthfully and frankly presented (*omnia vere, candideque semota omni invidia a me dicta esse*). His aim is to defend the dignity of the divine truth against false accusations. In addition to appealing to his truthfulness and pious intentions, Frischlin also defends his fierce style with reference to his Christian predecessors and in his third satire reproduces a similar apology as the one found in Naogeorg. Frischlin leans on Saint Paul, who bitterly attacked pseudo-prophets, antichrists, and imposters, and on Christ himself, who angered against the hypocrisy of the Pharisees, thereby affording a precedent for Christian satire.[50]

In his preface, Frischlin thus responds to potential accusations against his violently abusive language by asserting that he is not motivated by envy or malice; instead, he speaks truthfully and sincerely about his subject.[51] This rhetorical technique is known as *anteoccupatio* (anticipation or prevention). Framing his satires as a rational enterprise, he claims that his aim is not to offend but to defend the word of God against Rabus and other Jesuit calumniators who profaned sacred words. In his view, it was honesty to speak out and avenge desecration, as he was at the same time speaking for God and claiming moral justification. In the manner

---

[49] Frischlin 1612: Praefatio, 3.

[50] Frischlin 1612 (cf. Matt. 23:13-33); Simons 2013a: 138; Laureys 2013.

[51] Frischlin 1612: Praefatio, 4-5 (*Quid magis aequum, aut liberum est, quam haec eadem in ipsum, eiusque similes Hypocritas, vere et sine calumnia regerere? … nullas hic contineri contumelias, nullas calumnias … sed omnia vere, candideque semota omni invidia a me dicta esse).*

of the Old Testament prophets, the satirist's pious anger was not in his own words an irrational or uncontrollable personal outrage. It was a deliberate and morally impelled reaction to man's vicious conduct akin to the prophetic defence of the justice of God.[52] Frischlin appealed to his pious feelings and the importance of truth and true religion that he wished to defend in his debasing verses.

Augustinian apologies

As has already been shown above, many neo-Latin satirists claimed that their writing was founded on an impulse to virtue. One notable poet in this sense was Bernardo Guglielmini, a Roman poet from the Piarist order, who published his *Sermonum libri tres* ('Three Books of Sermons') in Rome in 1742. His twenty-four didactic satires were Horatian in tone and addressed to Pope Benedict XIV, who was an influential patron of ecclesiastical and other scholarship. The poems were officially accepted by the church: the letter of approval attached to the collection confirmed that the poems were both pure and delightful, free of libellous content, and entirely suitable for forming the manners of adolescents (*multaque in iis ad efformandos adolescentum mores accommodatissima*).[53]

In the preface to his poems, Guglielmini distances his poems even from the gentler satirical tradition of Horace and prefers to call them nocturnal studies of morals and character (*Sermones, vel si mavis, lucubrationes de Moribus, Carminibus comprehensas*).[54] He defends his unusual interest in poetry and appeals to the example of biblical prophets who, inspired by the divine spirit, expressed their teachings in verse. He underlines the moral usefulness of his poetry: 'Read these verses without any fear and if you find anything good there, I hope you will use it to your advantage and also enjoy it' (*Lege igitur absque metu ullo, et siquid boni inveneris, eo velim utaris plurimum, atque etiam perfruaris*).[55] The same message was stressed in his two epigraphs.[56] The first quotation from Horace's satires (1.4.39-44) announces that the writer exempts himself from the number of real poets, since his style is closer to prose (*sermones*) and he does not deserve the title of the poet that should be preserved to 'divine souls' (*mens divinior*)

[52] Cf. Jemielity 1992: 48.

[53] Guglielmini 1742: xiii.

[54] Guglielmini 1742: xi.

[55] Guglielmini 1742: xi.

[56] Guglielmini 1742: xvi.

alone. The opening quotations connect Guglielmini's verses to the authoritative satiric tradition and serve as a conventional formula of modesty. The word 'divine' no longer refers to an ancient soul inspired by the pagan Muses, but to the divine spirit. The second epigraph from Martial's epigrams (10.33) states that the poet aims to spare persons and condemn crimes. The epigraphs suggest that Guglielmini's satires have benevolent intentions; they entail some understanding of human weaknesses and refrain from aggression.

Guglielmini's first poem (*De Malis Satyrae*, 1.1) continues with the programmatic tone: it indicates the corrective and didactic aims of the collection, offers fictitious examples to teach virtue (*conficta exempla docendi / virtutem causa*),[57] and stresses the absence of personal malice (*parcere personis*).[58] The poet claims that as a responsible religious person he criticises vices but refuses to violate individuals. Therefore, the collection is entitled *Sermones* which means conversations between two friends who are personally present and discussing together. The present tense of the conversation (*ad praesentes habiti sunt*)[59] and the colloquial tone keep the discussion open and exclude backbiting. The verses are horrified by the satyr's shadow – indicating evil – and aim to profit everyone and the youth, in particular (*prodesse laborant / Cunctis, puberibus praesertim*).[60] Guglielmini reminds his readers that the names of the interlocutors – such as Faustus, Bassus or Sanctonicus – are entirely fictitious. But although the examples are fictitious, this does not diminish the truth value of his verses: fiction can also describe real phenomena.

As his poetic and moral model Guglielmini mentions 'a writer from the Golden Age more famous than Juvenal', namely Augustine, who disclosed his own youthful errors in a lucid style and did not hide his mistakes, including thefts, perfidy, and youthful love affairs. Guglielmini directly encourages his readers to manage their feelings of shame and expose their weaknesses to the public, because this exposure is conducive to moral development:

Augustine, sequi tua si vestigia quisquam
Audet, et ulcisci sua coram admissa fatendo,
Plaudemus, quod nostra quoque Heroes ferat aetas,

[57] Guglielmini 1742: I.1, p. 3.

[58] Guglielmini 1742: I.1, p. 1.

[59] Guglielmini 1742: I.1, p. 2 n. a.

[60] Guglielmini 1742: I.1, p. 2.

Et peccati odio superari posse pudorem
Nunc quoque demonstret … [61]

Augustine, if anyone dares to follow in your
footsteps and publicly confess his crimes,
we thank him for showing us that our time can also give birth to heroes
and the anger against sin can
even today be stronger than shame …

Knowing that Augustine attacked against his own previous self Guglielmini imitates his confessional style in which his love of virtue is stronger than his sense of shame. Satirical instruction was meant to help the addressee to perceive his old habits and develop towards a new and better self. Guglielmini advises his reader to accept shame to overcome immoral action. This reminds us that satire did not work towards moral growth merely with the help of exemplary moral behaviors; the feelings of shame and indignation were equally important in preventing vicious behavior and serving moral judgement. In satire 3.3, warning against hypocrisy, Guglielmini suggests that everybody should first judge themselves and start with self-examination for nobody was free from sin. The feeling of shame was crucial in moral reflection. In satire 2.4, Guglielmini argues that *pudor* ('shame') is the most beautiful of colors.

Against useless verse-makers

Satirical authors explained their poetic conduct by describing those choices and principles that governed their poetic activity. One way to justify one's own literary activity was to compare the usefulness of satires with the uselessness of other forms of poetry. The distinction between good and bad poetry was frequently evoked in early sixteenth-century humanist polemics and even earlier, for example, by Gregorio Correr, Lorenzo Lippi, and other fifteenth-century Italian poets.[62]

In the Low Countries, Petrus Montanus wrote the earliest collection of formal verse satire in which he provides good examples of invectives against the

[61] Guglielmini 1742: I.1, p. 5.

[62] Ramos 2002: 181-184. See Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.117 (*scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim*) and Juvenal 1.1-18.

failings of vain scribblers who are unable to compose useful poetry.[63] Montanus's satire *De poetis* ('On poets') distinguishes between divine poets and mere verse-makers (*versificatores*). He claims that real talent cannot be bought with money and condemns bad poets who settled in Germany to compose useless verses:

Quilibet esse potest dives, non esse Poeta.
Descripsisse pedes, non est fecisse poema.
Versificatores nomen, famamque Poetae
Non habeant: Longe est numen praesentius illis,
Qui divina canunt cum maiestate stupenda,
Supra hominem longe, miro se carmine vincunt,
Quis Deus inspirat …[64]

Anyone can be rich but not a poet.
Describing metrical feet does not mean writing a poem.
Verse-makers do not deserve the name or fame of a poet.
The deity is much more present to those,
who sing divine songs with awesome majesty,
and with their miraculous verses win a place high above the humans
inspired by God …

According to Montanus, composing true poetry is a task requiring divine inspiration: abandoning worldly things, the poet is captivated at night by visions of Neptune's trident and Pallas' shield. The true poet is humble and peaceful, whereas bad poets flatter princes and are adored by the crowd, though without merit.[65] Montanus drew heavily on classical and Christian writers, and, in the manner of his admired Italian Renaissance humanist Marsilio Ficino, was

[63] Montanus 1529. Montanus has been called the first neo-Latin humanist satirist in the Low Countries, because he was the first to publish an entire volume of satires. Montanus wrote twelve (De Smet 2015: 203, in fact eleven) verse satires that appeared in different editions between 1501 (six satires, Zwolle) and 1529 (four satires, Strasbourg). According to Tournoy (1998: 81; see also Tournoy 1994), Montanus was much indebted to Persius, as was his follower Gerard Geldenhouwer, who first published Montanus's satires and then his own collection of eight satires (*Gerardi Noviomagi Satyrae octo ad Verae Religionis cultores*) in Louvain in 1515. On Geldenhouwer, see below, Ch. 5.

[64] Montanus 1529: I.

[65] Montanus 1529: I. Elsewhere Montanus extolled Persius but counted Francesco Filelfo among versifiers whose satires were sordid and scurrilous and rather taught vice than condemned it (Tournoy 1998: 87).

fascinated by reconciling Platonism with Christianity.[66] In his view, poetry should be ethically useful and offer moral guidance to its readers; this was also the main justification of satirical poets for their own poetical activity in general.[67]

Satirical writing often took the form of attack on useless poetry, obviously in contrast to the usefulness of satirical criticism of sins and vices. In the first of his 26 satires, Naogeorg complains that the world is full of scribblers who are obsessed by a futile desire to write enormous books with no concern beyond that of personal advancement. In the manner of Juvenal's first lines, Naogeorg asks why he should remain merely a listener amidst such fervent book industry, when everyone from women to artisans want to publish something. The poet deplores the number of translations, eristic writings, and vernacular works that all demonstrate the ubiquity of the itch to write. It seems that he has been labouring in his heart for a longer time and now announces his inner thoughts publicly, asking the Juvenalian question of 'should I alone remain silent among the many?' (*Inter ego multos adeo solus ne quiescam?*).[68] His mind is attuned to satire and inspired by the pedestrian muse.

Some of Naogeorg's poems censure poets who ridicule their fellowmen without having any other goal than provoking laughter or offence. Here Naogeorg makes a subtle distinction between satirical verses and mere buffoonery. His satire 3.2 denounces poetic impertinence and the malevolent tendency to find fault in everyone and to disseminate rumours about their neighbours to champion in the art of invective. To mock such groundless self-confidence and everyday nastiness Naogeorg describes how a backbiting professor of law has the ridiculous habit of adding the word *omnino* to every sentence; the buffoon always makes the same mistake, just like the musician mentioned by Horace (*Ars* 355-356),

[66] Tournoy 1998: 88.

[67] William Major (b. 1698) was another satirical poet originally from the Low Countries; he wrote four satirical poems in elegiac distichs (*Satyrae*, 1735). His first programmatic satire is noteworthy here, because it was written against poetasters and the itch of scribbling. His other satires dealt with fame (*Fama*, 2), avarice (*Utere sorte tua*, 3), and despondency concerning future events (*Futurum quaere, nec quaere*, 4). The latter poem deals with people's way of looking to the future and worrying about future accidents. The poet states that the pain of Thetis would have been much lighter if she had not known the fate of his son Achilles in advance. The poet also refers to animals that live only for the present moment; the cows focus on grazing without worrying about their future starvation or winter floods. Major's four satires were translated into English verse in 1743 and published in London. Another verse satire dealing with bad poets was titled *Satira in Poetastros O-c---enses* (London, 1702). This anonymous poem included the same epigraph from Horace's epistles (2.1.117) as Major's collection (*scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim*).

[68] Naogeorg 1555: I.1, p. 21; Juv. 1.1 (*Semper ego auditor tantum?*)

who always plays on the same string and is therefore laughed at by everyone.[69] In Naogeorg's view, learned men falsely regard themselves as infallible and 'wiser than Solomon, as if they were born from the brains of Zeus, like Athene' (*Solus nempe sapis, Salomone peritior ipso, / Et Iovis excisus seu docta Minerva cerebro*).[70] Consequently, their poetry is mere superficial adulation and technical mastery without any salubrious, critical content.

Persius had shown in his first satire that the decadence in poetry reflected the general decline in morals.[71] Neo-Latin satirists employed the same analogy in their condemnation of contemporary poetry and in defending their own poetic efforts. The first satire of Naogeorg's second book functioned as a poetic self-defence: even though the poet is not crowned *poeta laureatus* by the emperor, the poet has his own ruler in the heavens. He scorns verse-makers who sooth their ungrateful patrons' ears (*ingratorum mulcemus versibus aures*)[72] and flatter princes and papists to acquire fame and privileges. They pretend fear that brings them money and extol impious crimes as brave deeds (*Impia tu laudare potes, verumque lucroso / dissimulare metu*).[73] Directly accusing his contemporary poets of adulation, Naogeorg observes that the laurel wreath is easy to achieve, since applause costs the patron nothing. Naogeorg contrasts the alleged truthfulness of his own poetry with the adulatory practices of his colleagues, who do not confirm piety or destroy impiety. Naogeorg also ridicules the obscure style with which poets trick their unlearned audiences and conceal their lack of talent and wisdom. Writing in the humanist tradition and praising the clarity of diction, Naogeorg advises that poems should be 'clearer than the water in the fountain, the Venetian glass, pure crystal or the fire of amber' (*fontana clarior unda, / vitro lucidior Veneto, et tenui cristallo / purior, electro quoque pellucentior omni*).[74] Only mad poets write so obscurely that no one understands them or needs an oracle to solve their riddles.[75]

While attacking his contemporary writers for their alleged ambition and selfishness, Naogeorg defends his own satirical verses as moral activity that discloses iniquities and is devoted to the salubrious goal of defending the study

[69] Naogeorg 1555: III.2, p. 110.

[70] Naogeorg 1555: IV.5, p. 173.

[71] See Bramble 1974: 17.

[72] Naogeorg 1555: II.1, p. 60. For the importance of ears in Persius and Latin verse satire, see Kivistö 2009: 120 (with further references).

[73] Naogeorg 1555: II.1, p. 58.

[74] Naogeorg 1555: II.1, p. 60.

[75] On scholastic obscurity, see Kivistö 2002: 78-109.

of Christian truth. For him, there is only one patron, Christ, whom the poets should praise in their verses. Therefore, carefully selected reading material is an important issue in the education of his young prince reader who should learn to read books that promote Christian virtues – among these texts, the Bible was of course prominent. The third satire of the second book (2.3) describes how while reading pagan authors men have lost touch with the life of Christ. Vilifying the Christian doctrine, they allow the word of God to become sordid and sophistic darkness enter their reading rooms. The traditional humanistic charge of scholastic obscurity is here redirected at humanistic education and ancient rhetoric that should not overcome the deeds of Christ. Naogeorg complains that even theologians, absorbed in the reading of papal documents, are unable to describe Christ's life in any detail.

Contemporary poets were often ridiculed in satires, and Caspar von Barth's (1587-1658) satires were stylistically noteworthy in dealing with this topic. Barth was a voluminous German poet whose *Satirarum liber unus* (Hanau, 1612) made a ferocious assault upon pompous verse-makers and their groundless fame.[76] Barth's versatile, strongly mannerist satires lash out at his contemporary poets as vile bubbles, mere ghosts, and skins lacking blood and moisture. Their minds are full of lead, and in the place of a heart they have a mushroom (*Plumbea mens istis, pro corde in pectore fungus*).[77] Their itchy bodies are full of pus that reflects their mental confusion, and when touched, their sick limbs release the virus into the world (*Tangere si poscas, tot pus virusque cavernis / exsilit*).[78] Barth mocks poetic apes who imitate manly gestures and, dressed in the cothurnus, take a few trembling steps with their bowed legs (*Cruribus incurvis rectos implere cothurnos, / bestia decipitur*).[79] He argues that all the humans have long ears, the traditional image of fools, or other animal features.[80] Barth ends his colorful satires (1.5) with an exhortation to surgeons to tear out the malady from the sick generation and burn their flesh with fire.

In attacking their contemporary poets, satirists also dealt with the limits of free speech. The importance of poetic liberty was underscored, for example, by Petrus Scholirius, a satirical poet and nobleman from Antwerp (1582-1635),

[76] Barth 1612; on Barth's another satirical work, *Zodiacus vitae Christianae* (1623), see Kühlmann 2016: 77-81. For Barth's life and works, see Hoffmeister 1931.

[77] Barth 1612: I.1.198.

[78] Barth 1612: I.1.272–3.

[79] Barth 1612: I.3.26–7.

[80] Barth 1612: I.3.71.

whose eleven satires, *Sermonum familiarium libri tres* ('Three Books of Familiar Sermons'), first appeared in the 1620s and then in Albert Le Roy's detailed edition of 1683 in Antwerp (Hermopolis). Scholirius's satires were Horatian in style and refrained from personal invective.[81] The 1683 edition was reviewed in *Acta eruditorum* in 1684, and the journal issue also included his biography. Scholirius lived in Italy for several years, and the review highlighted the influence of his six years in Italy on his poetic career. The review proposed that in his travels the poet was able to observe human manners and read ancient literature that together with the inspiring surroundings had considerable impact on his thinking and writing. The editor Le Roy describes how immensely he enjoyed his work on the manuscript, eagerly turning the pages and annotating the poems. The edition also includes praises of the poet by other famous men, such as Erycius Puteanus (1574-1646), a professor of *belles lettres* at Louvain, who in his letter from 1623 to Scholirius extolls his elegance, wit, and vigor. Puteanus compares the poet to a philosopher and sends his own verses as a gift in return noting how much inferior they are in style to Scholirius's satirical poetry. In another letter from 1627, Puteanus remarks that Scholirius's satirical style involves the sense of seeing so that the corruption is placed before the eyes. The first satires of Scholirius from 1623 are directed against the ecclesiastical censorship of the university of Louvain and defend poetical liberty.[82] In his first satire, dedicated to the Muses, the poet frequently asks whether he should remain silent or speak aloud. At the end of his poem, Apollo appears and advises the poet to limit his freedom of speech and always preserve his pious tone when talking about the monarch (*de Principe relligiose*).[83]

Other satirists dealing explicitly with poetry included, for example, the Milanese Jesuit and professor of rhetoric in Rome, Carlo d'Aquino (1654-1737), who wrote twelve verse satires (*Satyrae XII*, 1703) and learned dissertations on the military art; he also translated Dante's *Divina Commedia* into Latin. In his satires, d'Aquino addresses the problems of poetic vocation (X), bad poets, their animosity and poverty (XI), and poetic liberty, obscenity, and divine inspiration (XII). In his satire ten, d'Aquino compares poetic creation to madness:

[81] Tournoy 1998: 82.

[82] IJsewijn 1976: 45.

[83] Scholirius 1683: I.I.117; the relevant passage is also quoted in Tournoy 1998: 82 n. 34. The editor explains in the footnote to Scholirius that the word 'religious' means that the poet should write respectfully and cautiously about the monarch, as if he were talking about religion. On Scholirius, see below Ch 3.

… malesana cupido
Scribendi carmen cunctis resonabile saeclis,
Ambitio praeceps primaeque ferocia laudis
Cogit ad Anticyram multos migrare Poetas.[84]

… the insane desire to
write a poem that resonates through all the centuries,
hasty ambition, and the greed of the poets for praise
force many of them to move to Anticyra.

Hellebore that grew on the island of Anticyra was used to treat mental illness, and the insane were said to require a treatment with this drug. While Horace (*Sat.* 2.3.82) suggested that the biggest dose of hellebore should be reserved for the greedy, who should perhaps receive the whole of Anticyra's output, d'Aquino, for his part, notes that especially ambitious poets should be treated with hellebore. Satire XI also includes an interesting passage on the art of criticism.[85] The poet shows how a serious censor marks errors in a manuscript with small pieces of wax, little stars, and asterisks, and imprints his nail-marks on the pages. He storms around denouncing poetry and claiming that it is crammed with the Annals of Volusius[86] and rusticities. His scratch-marks and corrections fill the margins so that the book becomes an *opistographus*, a volume short of breath and covered by writing within and even on the backside.[87] D'Aquino's collection ends with an authoritative rephrase from Augustine, underlining that all poets should disdain fame.

[84] On hellebore, see Aquino 1703: X, 286 n. 9; 283 n. 6. See also Persius 3.63; Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.83.

[85] Another Italian Jesuit, Giovanni Lorenzo Lucchesini (1638-1716), addresses the same topic in his satire on the harsh critics of poetry (*In criticos poetarum censores satyra*). Lucchesini's satires appeared in his *Specimen didascalici carminis et satyrae* ('A Piece of Didactic Poetry and Satires', Rome, 1672). Other satires in the collection were directed against the stone-throwers (*In lapidatores*) and the antemeridian worries of a young man (discussed below, Ch. 2).

[86] Cf. Catullus 36.1.

[87] Aquino 1703: XI, 302 (*opistographos suffocaritque libellos*). According to another satirist, Heerkens, critics were particularly nasty and empty-headed creatures who were swollen by black bile and ready to declare war on the smallest of grammatical errors. Heerkens 1758: VI.170-175 (174: *bile tument*).

Heerkens's pseudonymous poetry

Satires were frequently published using playful pseudonyms, ambiguous initials, or other ways of manipulating naming conventions either to protect the author or just for humour. As Leonard Feinberg has noted, in a society that punishes its critics it was sensible to conceal one's identity, but sometimes satirists used pseudonyms just because writing comic texts was considered futile.[88] Sometimes the use of pseudonyms was an intertextual play with the earlier satirical tradition. For example, Lodovico Sergardi published his satires under the pseudonym Quintus Sectanus. As Ronald E. Pepin, a translator of Sergardi's satires, explains, the first part of the name, Quintus, refers to Horace's *praenomen* and sets Sergardi as the fifth famous satirist immediately after his four Roman predecessors, whereas the family name Sectanus was derived from the verb *sequi*, to follow.[89] Likewise, Codro Urceo (Antonius Codrus Urceus, 1446-1500), an Italian humanist poet, had given himself the name Codrus referring to the poor poet in Juvenal's third satire.[90]

One good example of the practice of using a pseudonym was the physician and poet Gerard Nicolaas Heerkens from Groningen who published his satires under the Latinised form of his name, Marius Curillus. As Yasmin Haskell has perceived in her studies on Heerkens's life, throughout his career Heerkens referred to his own life in his poems by using pseudonyms.[91] He also secretly alluded to the literary establishment of his age, and his youthful satirical debut in Groningen was a sensation that caused a full-scale pamphlet war and forced the young poet to move to Leiden.[92] Heerkens's seven verse satires (*Satyrae*, 1758) were addressed to the Italian physician, Count Francesco Roncalli Parolino (1692-1763).[93] Satirical therapy was a recurring theme in the poems, and Heerkens who later graduated as a doctor frequently also refers to the figure of a physician in his youthful verses. He calls for doctors to feel the poetic vein and assess whether a dose of hellebore

[88] Feinberg 2006: 100.

[89] Pepin in Sergardi 1994: 3.

[90] Juv. 3.203-10. On the pseudonym Codrus, see also Simons 2009a: 167.

[91] Haskell 2013: 39.

[92] Haskell 2013: 6 (on Heerkens as a satirist, see esp. 39-70). Heerkens travelled widely in Europe and, according to the biographer Chalmers, at Rome was elected a member of the Arcadia and according to their usual practice adopted a Latin name there (Curillo Carcidico), but his satires had already previously appeared under the Latinised form of his name.

[93] Heerkens's first four satires were written in 1746, the sixth and the seventh in 1751. The edition of 1758 contains sixteen satires.

is needed to cure the patient.[94] In his third satire, the poet describes how he himself is cured (*sanabo*) by the Muses and becomes a physician. In the manner of Horace's and Juvenal's first satires Heerkens comments on his personal motives for writing, and his feelings of despair and impotence in this demanding task. Heerkens's first satire has an emphatic first-person voice which evokes Juvenal's opening lines, asking whether 'I will always have to look insane and unable to free myself from the grip of the siren-like Muses and writing poetry' (*Semper ego insanus videar, numquamne poetis / me potero eximere, et sirenes spernere Musas*?).[95] In addition to expressing his frustration about the iniquity of the surrounding world and its literary circles, the poet ridicules his own senseless efforts at writing, which he compares to a madness that would require a gigantic dose of hellebore to cure. Heerkens remarks in his second satire that at his home country writing poetry is useless (*inutile*), and fame does not ensure happiness, since a famous poet has to face the gradual decline of applause, or he gets used to his continued success to the extent that he resembles an old circus horse that no longer cares to prick up his ears to any sound. Heerkens complains that some of his songs have received only 'little favour'.[96]

Heerkens builds his own poetics in relation to other contemporary poets. He attacks his fellow citizens and contemporary poets, lashing his targets with his scourge – although he assures that his muse is unarmed, whereas his enemy is fully equipped.[97] In his third satire, Heerkens stresses that his verses are not inspired by anger or malice (*non odium aut livor*);[98] instead, being anxious about the glory of his country, he hopes that his homeland would not be left to insane people. Horace is evoked here as the primary example of this patriotic effort; Horace stressed the thoroughly Roman and traditional nature of his upbringing and as a homegrown local fellow always preserved something of the rural modesty

[94] Heerkens 1758: I.89-90 (*O medici tundenda poetica vena est / An iuvet helleboro miserum depellere morbum?*). It was rather common for early modern physicians to write Latin poetry. Heerkens was one of the figures who combined these two careers. Famous physicians who are also known as writers include Fracastoro and Rabelais. See Engelhardt 1992: 45. In France, the sixteenth-century physician Bonaventure Grangier also wrote occasional satirical poetry (De Smet 2015: 204); see his *Satyra in perfidam chirurgorum quorumdam a medicis defectionem* (1577). Johann Nicolaus Furich (1602-1633) was a physician and a poet, who published four short verse satires among his miscellaneous poems in Strasbourg in 1624. As IJsewijn 1976: 48 has mentioned, in his third satire Janus Dousa (1545-1604), a curator of Leiden University, defended his friend and a physician against his colleagues who ridiculed his habit of writing verses.

[95] Heerkens 1758: I.1-2.

[96] Quoted in Haskell 2013: 6.

[97] Heerkens 1758: II.148-9 (*in hostem currat inermis / Armatum mea Musa*).

[98] Heerkens 1758: III.11.

and ancient traditions.[99] In his fourth satire, Heerkens argues that no book is entirely bad:

Nullum habeas librum, tam prave tam male factum
Plinius edixit, qui non profecerit, uti
Recte si noris, prior et rectissimus usus
Exigit ornatum. Nitidus liber et bene comptus
Sollicitat lectorem, invitat et allicit, et sunt
Quos tamen utilitas quos, nec reverentia movit,
Qui libris utuntur, uti Muscovia servis.[100]

There is no book so badly composed,
as Plinius declared, [101] that it was completely useless,
if you just know how to use it, since its previous right use adorns it.
A shining and polished volume attracts, invites, and lures its reader,
and yet there are those who are not moved by usefulness or awe
and who use books like Muscovy slaves.

In his sixth satire, Heerkens assures that writing satire is serious business (*Seria res Satyras componere*),[102] and he would rather die unknown than acquire a great name by smearing men's reputations or raging passionately against his enemies. Heerkens uses images of humoral pathology in a satirical context: he would rather burn his laurels and lyres than spend his life in such miserable malice aroused by black bile and phlegm. Heerkens also evokes an image of a ploughman who while cultivating a barren land is not depressed by his hard work; instead, he becomes miserable only if he loses his confidence in the justice of life. There is no use for the fanaticism of the flagellators, Heerkens argues, since there is a softer way to promote virtue and beatitude than through harsh castigation. This tactful and impassionate attitude was evident in Heerkens's approval of the Aristotelian social virtue of *eutrapelia* or wittiness mentioned in his sixth satire. For Heerkens, moderate jesting was suited to castigating human vices, while a poet should avoid excessive joking and low buffoonery, which fiercely attack everyone

[99] Hor. *Sat*. 1.4.117; Yona 2015: 229.

[100] Heerkens 1758: IV.102-108.

[101] Cf. Pliny, *Epistles* 3.5: 'there never was a book so bad that it was not good in some passage or another' (trans. J.B. Firth).

[102] Heerkens 1758: VI.10.

without discrimination.[103] Despite these seemingly tactful words, one purpose of Heerkens's moral instruction was to prevent his presumably untalented fellow writers from creating poetry.[104]

In this chapter, I have dealt with the programmatic form that had its own conventions to justify the poet's choice of genre; the programmatic form was clearly indebted to Roman verse satire and its emotional narratives about the justification of satirical ridicule. Satirists also reshaped their self-portraits according to biblical models and clung to the continuum of righteous Christian figures in their writings. One important theme in the prefaces and opening poems was to defend one's own writing as a useful action and ridicule other literary forms as useless. Programmatic poems thus intertwine the voice and emotions of the individual poet into a long literary and religious tradition; at the same time, satirists often distance themselves from the evils and fellow poets of their time. With this rhetoric, the satirists create their own traditional community and settle into a long temporal continuum with their presumably righteous predecessors.

[103] Cf. Horace's satires 1.4.81-103 and 1.10.7, in which he expressed very similar views.

[104] The list of satirical poets who criticised the state of their contemporary poetry also included the learned Italian humanist poet Pierio Valeriano (1477-1558), who wrote a long satire on the bad condition of poetry and studies, *Sermo de studiorum conditione* (1509). Furthermore, Jaime Juan Falcó's second satire was devoted to bad poets (*In malos poetas*, 1600). Guglielmini defended moderation in the study of poetry in his satire 2.1; and Johannes Saint-Geniès wrote in his seventh satire (in *Poemata*, Paris, 1654) suspiciously about the poetic career which often resulted in sleepless nights, isolation, slovenliness, and poverty.

Chapter 2
Fathers and Sons: Satirical Tutorials on Life

School lessons were famously present in Horace's first satire, in which the poet describes how teachers offer biscuits to children while giving them elementary instruction in the alphabet and philosophical systems: '… what harm can there be in presenting the truth with a laugh, as teachers sometimes give their children biscuits to coax them into learning their A B C?'[1] Horace here announces that his satires expose truth with laughter, and they are sweetened with wit just as teachers offer treats to children in order to coax them to learn. The sweetening refers to verbal humour, a colloquial tone, and fictitious examples used to illustrate ethical issues. The sweetening is used so that the addressee does not recognise the bitterness of satirical admonishment. Lambertus Hortensius, who studied literary and educational issues in his *Satyrae VIII* (1552), describes the taste of his poetry in similar terms: his satirical poems taste salty and bitter, but this flavor indicates that his verses are both pleasing and salubrious to his addressee.[2]

By exposing human vices, satires fulfil their critical pedagogical goal, which is the prevention and overcoming of vicious behaviour. The teacher-student constellation was part of the rhetoric of didactic poetry.[3] Satirists displayed their didactic intent openly by announcing their wish to instruct their audiences and presenting their guidance by using such devices as repetition, idealised exaggeration, simple binary oppositions, and a strong evaluative speaker.[4] By using these rhetorical means, the poet creates a moral world that seems to have clear values and truths. Didactic discourses often assume a passive, childlike reader who is the addressee of moral instruction. The reader is not expected to be active in judging the validity of the speaker's claims; instead, the reader's role is unconditionally and straightforwardly to believe and accept what the speaker says. Sergio Yona has observed that in the Epicurean tradition, the frankness of the speaker was a pedagogical, corrective tool that was useful in teaching small

---

[1] Hor. *Sat*. 1.1.24-26 (*quamquam ridentem dicere verum / quid vetat? ut pueris olim dant crustula blandi /doctores, elementa velint ut discere prima*; trans. Niall Rudd).

[2] Hortensius 1552: Praefatio (*salsius quodque et magis acre poema, palato / Hoc sapidum magis esse tuo solet, atque salubre*).

[3] On didactic poetry and its criteria, see Volk 2002.

[4] See Newsom 2003: 18 (on didacticism).

children and preventing vicious behaviour.[5] The speaker in satires often adopts an authoritative tone, delivering his instructions in a clear, corrective discourse that can easily be followed even by children. Seneca already noted in his epistles that truth was more easily understood by children if presented in poetic garb.[6]

In this chapter, I will suggest that verse satire is a character-oriented genre in which the ideas of growth and development are crucial. The genre examines what human beings are and what they ought to be, and it aims to influence individual processes of development by inculcating the love of virtue. The centrality of ethical instruction did not necessarily mean that the satires would simply reaffirm traditional moral certainties or offer clear-cut messages to their readers. Instead of communicating conventional morality or persuading the reader to adopt formulaic precepts, many satires can be read as free moral reflections or genuine inquiries trying to articulate those moral standards against which deviations are measured. Sometimes their moral reflections rely on simple bipolar patterns, but occasionally satire's moral wisdom is tentative and ambiguous. As Dustin Griffin has noted, in taking the form of an inquiry, the poet explores morality and reflects on his free moral musings instead of delivering ready-made truths.[7] In what follows, I will consider both satire's evident didacticism and its occasional dialogic and exploratory nature. I will specifically focus on explicit instructional content, the teacher-pupil setting, the satirist's paternal persona, and the didactic vocabulary used in the ethical guidance.

Family relations

Didacticism was often socially represented in satires by referring to hierarchical family relations. Roman morality was handed down from father to son, and this moral tradition was famously illustrated by Horace in his satires and epistles in which the main concern was how to live rightly (*recte vivere*).[8] Emily Gowers, among others, has noted that Horace's didactic package describes his Roman upbringing and includes fathers and sons, sexual adventures, and other issues of

[5] Yona 2015: 244. Cf. Philodemus' *Peri parrhesias*, 'On frank criticism'; Foucault 2001: 109-114. For Philodemus' influence on Horace, see Yona 2018.

[6] Sen. *Epist.* 108.10; cf. Atherton 1998: xii.

[7] Griffin 1994: 39-42.

[8] See, e.g., Hor. *Epist.* 1.2.41; Mayer 2005; Morrison 2007 who explores the didactic mode in Horace's epistles and notes that the epistles frequently employ imperatival expressions and communicate instructions.

coming of age and growing up. Horace frequently refers to his splendid father (*pater optimus*)[9] who had instilled contentment and modest habits in his son. His father's moral training had warned him about girls and exhorted him to preserve family resources. Horace posits his father as the primary figure behind his moral instruction and good intentions as a satirist.[10] Horace's gentle and well-meaning father was conspicuously different from the angry and severe fathers of old comedy, but in both literary traditions the father figure and the father-son relationship were important. Gowers has stated that Horace's father stems from old comedy just like the son descends from his rustic father.[11] Following his father's lessons, Horace learned moral purity and developed into a social, gentle satirist who differed from the harsh criticism of old comedy. Horace's poetry resembled his father's teachings to the extent that he learned to become a gentleman both in his habits and in his verses following his father's instructions.

Horace's self was famously humble and self-deflating. He justified his own life rhetorically in his verses, presenting himself as an incorruptible man from the countryside who had not learned the tricks of the city. His satires depict how he had come to society and, according to Gowers, replayed the same act of emergence again and again.[12] Gowers calls Horace's satires a formation story of the poet's entrance to society and the preservation of his rural modesty while progressing in his career. From among the neo-Latin satirists, Sergardi rhetorically appealed to his virtuous childhood and his upright ancestors whose spirit flowed in his veins: 'My parents taught me good morals and public duties from a tender age in life. I grew in this knowledge'.[13]

---

[9] Hor. *Sat*. 1.4.105.

[10] Gowers 2003: 70; see also Freudenburg 1993 (esp. Ch. 1).

[11] Gowers 2003: 72; Yona 2018: 129-133.

[12] Gowers 2003: 61.

[13] Sergardi 1994: 75 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin); Sectanus 1698: lxv (*… a tenera aetate docuere Parentes. / Artibus in crevi*). Sometimes similar family relations were built on authorship. Giulio Cesare Cordara (1704-1785), a Jesuit from the Academy of Arcadia, imitated Sergardi's satires and attacking his contemporary literary taste published his own collection as Sergardi's pretended son Lucius Sectanus, 'Quinti filius'. The title of Cordara's collection is *L. Sectani Q. fil. de tota Graeculorum de huius aetatis litteratura ad Gaium Salmorium sermones quattuor* (1737); see also Pepin in Sergardi 1994: 8. The word *Graeculus* ('Greekling') referred to those members of the Academy who imitated Greek literature (including Sergardi's primary target Gravina), whereas Sergardi and Cordara considered themselves moderns who followed Roman models (Pepin in Sergardi 1994: 8). For the term *Graeculus*, see also Cic. *Pis.* 70 (*ut Graeculum, ut adsentatorem*); Yona 2018: 54. On Cordara and his satires, see Campanelli 2021: 281-331 (including a modern edition and an Italian translation of his poem *In fatuos numerorum divinatores sermo*); also Ramos 2002: 228; Marsh 2014 who notes that the four poems were followed by a fifth in 1738 and a sixth in 1742.

The Horatian father-son relationship was frequently evoked in neo-Latin satirical poetry.[14] In the manner of Horace, neo-Latin satirists presented an artificially constructed self in their satires and appealed to their own fatherly education. One poet who played out an autobiographical game in his writings was the physician Gerard Nicolaas Heerkens. In the preface to his poems, Heerkens appeals to his young age that has inspired him to write his playful verses, and he seems to use his youthfulness as an excuse with his possible harsher critics. He calls himself *puer Curillus* ('the boy Curillus') who is less than twenty years old, impudent and talkative.[15] Giving space to his innocent childhood, Heerkens depicts his first trembling steps in his career as a poet. The father-figure is introduced in Heerkens's first satire, which describes his youthful efforts of writing satire, but Heerkens seemed to have a far more difficult relationship with his father compared to Horace. While Horace's gentle father had taught his son frugal living and modesty as the guiding principles in life, Heerkens's father, in contrast, was mad about his son's intentions to become a poet and 'had a fear about the Muses'.[16] In the third line of his first satire, the poet announces that he was engaged in writing poetry against his father's will (*Usque Patris monitis obtundimur, usque querelis*!).[17] The barking father prohibited his versification and resembled the angry and severe father figures of Greek comedy. Raging at his son's pagan (*ethnicus*) mentality, he feared that his disobedient son would start to adore the Muses instead of Christ, since 'poets had different gods'; the whole family was desperate over his sudden poetic madness. Such inter-generational conflicts and negative and authoritarian father-figures were familiar from Terentian drama. Furthermore, old wives pointed at him in the streets because of his unusual poetic talent, and Heerkens imagined himself becoming famous in the eyes of the suburban residents. In an imaginary scene, the poet wanders across the fields absorbed in reading when a simple ploughman perceives him and, stopping his ox, says to his fellows that the young man seems to be a sage.[18]

---

[14] See also Knight 2017: 60-61. Sometimes the Horatian phrase *pater optimus* was used in satires simply to refer to God, but at times it preserved its personal meaning.

[15] Heerkens 1758: Prologus. Other satirists also noted that they had been composing satires from boyhood. See De Smet 2015: 202 on Giano Anisio, who also boasted that he was the first poet to reintroduce verse satire in Italy since Antiquity.

[16] Quoted in Haskell 2013: 6 n. 15.

[17] Heerkens 1758: I.3.

[18] On the word 'sage' (*sapiens*) in Horace's father's discourse, see Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.115-116. Horace's father here distinguishes his practical and simple teaching from the more sophisticated advice given by a sage.

Later in the satire, Heerkens ironically denounces his vain hopes of being crowned ‘the second Horace’ or regarded as the equal of Alexander Pope or Nicolas Boileau.[19] Musing on his desire for fame, Heerkens wonders why some critics proclaimed that no good poets were born north of the Alps, ‘in the land of swine’,[20] and doubts whether his little verses and ensuing fame had created anything other than envy and anger.[21] As Haskell notes, the fictional *praeceptor* in the poem, Crispinus, who is introduced here as a friend of the poet’s father, is a proverbial wordy moraliser in Horace’s satire 1.4; he advises the poet to come to his senses and to focus on the more profitable study of law instead of spending his best years on frivolities.[22] Heerkens’s satires were thus shaped according to Horace’s educational and self-referential designs; he presented himself as a rebellious son who pursued a literary career against his conservative father’s will.

The paternal persona

Scenes of upbringing recur in many neo-Latin satires in which the poet exploits the resources afforded by the poetic persona. Often the poetic voice adopts a paternal persona and makes claims to self-imposed authority in passing on some experience or knowledge to the young addressee. As an example of such moral lessons, we can refer to Francesco Filelfo’s early satires in which he ‘plays Polonius’, as Oliver puts it, to his eldest son, counselling him in the following manner:

> *Nate Mari vita mihi carior una voluptas*
> *spesque patri. Praecepta sequi si nostra Philelphe*
> *perges, te magnum reddes nobisque tibique*
> *illustremque virum. Debes parere parenti*
> *et puer et natus, namque omnia cernere nondum*
> *quae tibi conducant certe potes*.[23]

[19] For English imitations of Roman satire (including Pope), see Kupersmith 2007.

[20] Heerkens 1758: I.101-103.

[21] On envy of satire, see also Francesco Nicolaus’s (Nicolai, 1687-1776) first satire in his *Carmina* (Naples, 1772), which includes two satires (*sermones*). For Nicolai and his satires, see Campanelli 2021: 95-117 (including a modern edition of Nicolai’s first satire).

[22] Heerkens 1758: I.42-46; on Crispinus, see Haskell 2013: 40.

[23] Filelfo 1502: VI.1.

> Marius Philelphus, my son, dearer to me than life, your father's unique hope and joy, if you persevere in following my precepts, you will repay both yourself and me by becoming a great and illustrious man. As a child and a son you should obey your parent, for you cannot yet discern with certainty everything that will profit you.[24]

Oliver has called Filelfo's satire 'a commonplace system of morality'[25] because of its traditional ethical norms. Filelfo advises his son to obey the admonishing father; to seek God, piety, and the beauty of the mind; to devote himself to virtue; to shun evil company; and to 'never let the Morning Star find [him] stretched out in the sluggish blankets of [his] bed'.[26]

Like Filelfo, many neo-Latin satires direct their internal addressees in various ways and identify their addressees, if not as children, at least as young boys and adolescents who are still tender-minded recipients of satirical instruction.[27] It was expected that the young addressees would obtain new moral qualities by reading the verses. For example, Muret devotes his second satire on hypocrisy to a young man called Daniel (Daniel Schleicher, one of Muret's young students and apparently also an object of his affection) who was not yet tainted by the damned age of sin.[28] Muret's two verse satires appear in his collection *Iuvenilia* (1553), implying the poet's young age and youthful immaturity,[29] but also suggesting that satirical moral judgement was meant to regulate youthful moral behaviour. According to the opening of the second satire, the young Daniel had already surpassed all men in the blessings of the mind, but he was still developing and searching for the right path in life:

---

[24] Translated in Oliver 1949: 32-34.

[25] Oliver 1949: 34.

[26] Oliver 1949: 33.

[27] See Yona 2015: 245, referring to Horace's phrases *teneros animos* (1.4.128) and *formabat* (121). On didacticism, see also Knight 2017. Likewise, Naogeorg's satires have an explicit adolescent addressee, the future Margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach, and Guglielmini's satires – to be discussed more thoroughly below – are addressed to young men whose minds are still being formed.

[28] Summers (in Muret 2006: 59) identifies the addressee as Daniel Schleicher of Ulm and notes (204-205) that Muret also dedicated one of his affectionate odes to Schleicher.

[29] Knight 2017: 64. The title of the collection also has an apologetic tone, referring to the playfulness of the genre and its juvenile games; see Summers 2004 (on the title *Iuvenilia* as a poetic tag). The German satirist Caspar von Barth also published a collection called *Juvenilia* in Wittenberg in 1607; it contained his youthful poems. One cannot avoid thinking that the name of Muret's collection might also reflect the author's conception of Greek love in which an erotic and an educational relationship overlapped.

Tu legito haec, Daniel, primaeque a flore iuventae
Disce quot humana lateant sub imagine pestes.[30]

I ask you Daniel whom the contagion of this age has not yet perverted,
to read these things and learn from a tender young age
how many plagues lie hidden beneath the human form.[31]

The poet believed that literature could teach men to live well. Using a direct address, a grammatical imperative (*disce*), and other second-person directive forms, the poet immediately sets the tone of communicating instructions. Placing himself in a position of superior knowledge, he positions the young addressee as the recipient of his advice.

The instructive situation was also visible in the second edition of Petrus Montanus's early satires that included letters exchanged between Montanus and his editor, Gerard Geldenhouwer of Nijmegen. As Gilbert Tournoy notes, the first letter addressed by Geldenhouwer to Montanus describes his meeting with a young man – *adulescens*, identified as the humanist Gerard Listrius (1498-1546), a former student of Montanus (*discipulus*) – who was now asking for advice in matters pertaining to proper reading material.[32] The letter described a learning situation that was to become very typical in neo-Latin satires, namely that of a senior poet advising a younger man in his worries.[33]

Many satires highlighted the poet's family relationships and placed their didactic performance in a family context. A paternal persona was carefully cultivated by Jean de Saint-Geniès in his eight satires (in *Poemata*, Paris, 1654), which are personal poetic tutorials helping young addressees in puzzling situations.[34] The poet appeals to the long tradition of the genre that had inspired

[30] Muret 1757: II, 13-14.

[31] Muret 2006: 59 (trans. Kirk M. Summers).

[32] Tournoy 1998: 84, 90.

[33] In his written reply to Geldenhouwer, Montanus characterises satire as a conversational genre that proceeds as a dialogue but without 'naming names' (*dialogicos procedens sed tacitis personis*; see Tournoy 1998: 86, 92). Montanus also noted that there was always more unsaid in satires than what was explicitly stated. Montanus stressed the philosophical quality of his verses, which imitated the richness of thought characteristic of Plato's dialogues. Quoted in Tournoy 1998: 87-88.

[34] Saint-Geniès's satires were addressed to the cardinal Francesco Barberini who was a significant patron of the arts, and Saint-Geniès was also a friend of such eminent men as Richelieu and Balzac. See Sangenesius 1654: Epistola. Saint-Geniès's poems were praised for their clarity, modesty and uprightness that were also ethical valuations.

him to writing and hopes that the recipient will find his verses pleasing. Saint-Geniès opens his third satire by saying that his verses were written as a response to his brother's question of the discipline of life:

In vitae disciplina quis tempore nostro
Doctus, et in rebus solers dicatur agendis,
Scire cupis; quis sit qui laudes possidet istas,
Frater, ut hunc vites, non ut sectere docebo.[35]

Who would have learned to live in our own time so that
he could be called an expert in the art of living?
You want to know who could be praised for this skill.
Brother, I teach you to avoid, not seek, this skill.

The quote emphasises the words of instruction and the cautionary function of satire, which teaches to avoid mistakes, and one of the mistakes is the hope that one could easily grow into a professional in the art of living. In his strikingly self-referential lines, the poet undertakes the task of informing his younger brother about the different duties of life. In his seventh satire, the poet exploits an authoritative persona, transferring knowledge to his younger brother Franciscus after the death of their biological father:

FRATERNI vinclo non sum contentus amoris:
Personam mihi suscepi, Francisce, parentis.
Hoc mihi majori natu ius morte reliquit
Festina genitor nobis communis ademptus:
Nec male visus ad huc partes gessisse paternas
Sum mihi. Te prima finxi rexique iuventa,
Iuvi ope, correxi monitis, hortatibus ursi.[36]

I am not content with the bond of mere brotherly love;
Franciscus, I have taken on a parental role.
This right was given to me as an older brother
by our common father, who suddenly passed away.
I think that so far I have not entirely failed in my paternal duties.

[35] Sangenesius 1654: III, p. 63.

[36] Sangenesius 1654: VII, p. 82.

> I have shaped and guided you in your early youth.
> I have helped you with my resources, corrected with my advice, and encouraged you with my exhortations.

Being full of instructive verbs and gestures of parental care, the passage indicates the superior knowledge of the speaker. Self-presentation was part of the didactic process and presupposed an access to authority. The poet boasts that he had taken his parental role (*persona ... parentis*) seriously and succeeded well in his task, taking care of his little brother's upbringing. The comparison between brotherly love and fatherly love stems from the Gospels, in which Christ, comparing these two affections, stated that brotherly love meant loving one's neighbour as one loved oneself, whereas fatherly love required that one loved one's fellow mortals in the manner of Christ.

One task the poet took up here was to teach his brother how to properly cultivate the art of the Muses so that it also included moral education.[37] If the reader expects some guidance here towards a poetic career, she will be disappointed. Saint-Geniès's older brother underlines that an enthusiastic poetic career could seriously damage one's well-being, since it would most likely result in utter poverty and the negligence of one's physical appearance. Furthermore, excessive reading would probably ruin a young man's nerves and fill his head with such nonsense – *farrago* – that it would become hard to distinguish between useful and useless knowledge. The poet ironically concludes that it is important to be moderate also in matters pertaining to literary studies, since a strong dose of medicament might kill the patient. The idea was that the addressee grew, changed, and developed as a result of the satirical verses. There is self-irony in the quote, for Juvenal used the word *farrago*[38] of his miscellaneous verses, and by alluding to Juvenal the poet here seems to derisively reject the satirist's career as well.

The moral positioning of the speaker is often seemingly clear and consistent in satires. As Alvin Kernan has put it, the satirist often has a clear-cut understanding of good and evil. He usually retains his monolithic certainty in matters pertaining to vices and virtues.[39] However, sometimes the moral norms are not entirely clear, and the rhetoric of instruction is ironic – as above in Saint-Geniès's subtle ironic allusions – or dialogical, so the satire is constructed in the form of a conversation in which the young addressee defends his life choices, and the tutor-poet tries

[37] Sangenesius 1654: VII, p. 82.

[38] Juv. 1.86.

[39] Griffin 1994: 35 citing Alvin Kernan's *Cankered Muse*.

to convince him that his future plans are not entirely satisfactory. For example, Guglielmini's satires – to be discussed below – are good examples of a colloquial tone including dramatic episodes of quoted conversations which brought two discussants into the poem. Constructing the voices of concrete others, these discussions are internal debates on vital moral issues in which the satirist reports the imagined voice of the pupil, for example, by using the phrase *inquis* ('you say') and quoting his counterarguments. For example, in Guglielmini's satire I.2 the addressee Faustus appeals to his rich father in solving his financial problems (*Meus, inquis, habet ditissimus … pater*), and in satire I.8 Quintus is annoyed by the poet's didactic recommendations of studying poetry (*quid has mihi consulis artes, inquis*). The relationship between the discussants is hierarchical, but the narrative is not entirely monological: the speaker is a senior adviser addressing his words to a young man whose questions and objections are voiced and reported in the text. The second-person narration makes use of the addressee's point of view, mimetically evoking and mediating his internal opinions, thought processes, and experiences.

The dialogue form serves didactic purposes here, reproducing the oral teaching situation or resembling a philosophical or Socratic investigative method of discussing the art of living. At the same time, it reminds the discussants of the fact that the moral human character grows in a social process and develops in interaction with others. Different voices are introduced in the text and their differing viewpoints engage in a dialogue that is sometimes left open in order to avoid narrow critique or firm conclusions. Rather than offering dogmatic certainty, the result of this rhetorical strategy is an examination of moral practices that young men often had to confront in their youthful years. Satires characteristically include numbers of questions, responses, agreement, and exclamations that can be merely rhetorical, of course, but occasionally they reflect genuine and affective deliberation that marks an open-ended moral inquiry rather than a fixed moral position. For example, Guglielmini's satires include over 200 question marks, and such short rhetorical questions as *Quid multa?* ('Why say more?'), *Miraris?* ('Are you surprised?'), *Quis crederet?* ('Who would believe?'), *Negas?* ('Do you deny?'), *Rides?* ('Amusing?'), and so on. These questions underline the ubiquity of vice and invite the reader to join the emotive discourse of indignation. Being rhetorical questions, they are assertions rather than genuine questions meant to be answered, and they invite agreement rather than objection, but at the same time the overall conversational mode reminds one of the fact that human life is always embedded in a social context and is inherently dialogical in character; we need the ongoing social discourse around us in order to become ourselves.

Erasmus on education

Verse satire has always been to a large extent about learning to distinguish between simple right and wrong. The rudimentary lessons in Horace teach one how to be content with limited resources and to appreciate one's humble origins.[40] Yona has drawn attention to the Epicurean contents of Horace's upbringing visible especially in his emphasis on practical ethics. Horace's father offered practical advice on what to avoid and what to choose by observing individual virtues and vices, and this model is repeated in Horace's poetics, which offer moral correction through concrete, useful advice in order to preserve ancient mores. Yona notes how Horace's father communicated his lessons by referring to observations, visions, and perceptions so that the moral instruction was always delivered in a visual and concrete manner resembling the 'empirical morality' of the Cynics. The father was the origin of Horace's unadorned speech and moral vocabulary, which consist of words of honesty and dishonesty, among others.[41] One should note the importance of the father not only to Horace's own development, but also to the lively tone of his satires. In addition to family relations, a child's first reading materials, animal fables, are famously represented in Horace's poems. They belong to the didactic repertoire that offers simple cautionary tales about grasshoppers and ants.

Neo-Latin satirists relied in educational rhetoric on Horace, but also on Erasmus of Rotterdam's humanism that was highly influential in educational discussions during the Renaissance. The theme of education is notable, for example, in Naogeorg's satire 2.3 which is essentially a eulogy of Erasmus, who is praised for supporting the study of literature and the Gospels. Naogeorg extolled Erasmus's Christian humanism that had an important educational impact; his edition of the New Testament was a landmark achievement that helped people to improve their manners and benefited several future generations. Naogeorg praises Erasmus as an exemplary figure (*exemplar studii*) worth imitating; he offered a guide to life by advancing education and literature.[42] Naogeorg's satire 1.5 continues with the theme of education by offering three different paths to

---

[40] Gowers 2003: 69. Horace described his own instruction in arithmetic and geometry and spoke sarcastically about Roman elementary education.

[41] Yona 2015: 234-236; for a thorough account of Horace's Epicurean ethics, see Yona 2018 (on 'empirical morality', see 142).

[42] Naogeorg stresses that Erasmus did not invent a new school; instead, he restored the original church giving new life to old monuments that had fallen to ruins.

career success.[43] These paths mark opposing norms and values, and the reader has to decide which alternative to choose. Firstly, Naogeorg taunts the wishes of a young man to become a priest without any effort, as if he were a prophet who received his wisdom directly from the heavens. Old examples of quick success included biblical fishermen who had become masters of holy languages effortlessly through the divine breath alone (*caelesti flatu*). This passage parodies the biblical account of apostolic speaking in tongues (Acts 2:4). However, since the heavens had fallen silent and cold for contemporary men (*plane frigent caelestia nobis*), one had to work harder to acquire knowledge. The second arduous option was to study Latinity and the seven liberal arts, but this laborious path of education could be avoided by the third possibility (*via facilis*), namely by consulting German compendia, translations, and excerpts. Commenting on the fragmentation of university education, Naogeorg's satire gives ironic advice to his reader about how to avoid hard work and proceed without much effort in conducting important ecclesiastic duties. Using ironic images of life choices and ridiculing the impatient reader's wishes for quick success, the poet implies that pain and industriousness rather than the shortest way advances true education and moral progress. While Reformers usually maintained that sacred texts should be translated into vernacular languages for the benefit of the largely illiterate people, Naogeorg criticised this development as a vulgarisation of knowledge and spoke for the importance of classical languages.[44]

Erasmus's humanism focused on practical and ethical instruction that had a religious basis and represented a practically oriented form of piety whose aim was to cultivate Christian virtue. To achieve this goal, Erasmus stressed the importance of early childhood education, the avoidance of coercion and fear, and the cultivation of play instead. From early childhood, human beings start to develop and need firm guidance from their caregivers. Erasmus constantly upheld the moral dimension of education so that the major goal of education was the development of virtue and good character. Erika Rummel considers Erasmus's educational philosophy to be optimistic, since he strongly believed in the power of instruction which by disseminating right knowledge could lead people to a virtuous life. He maintained that every child had potential waiting to be realised and deserved to become fully human.[45]

[43] On this poem, see Kühlmann 2016: 24-26.

[44] On the Latin and vernacular traditions in Naogeorg's satires, see Hess 1971: 31; on this satire, see ibid. 362-365.

[45] Rummel 2006: 34.

The virtues were not innate but learned. Erasmus noted the importance of the question of what it means to be human, and in his influential educational treatise *De pueris instituendis* (1529), he focuses on moral training. Erasmus addresses much of his exhortations to parents, who should not neglect the upbringing of their children. He stresses parental obligations imposed by nature and God, and remarks that parents should take good care of their children at an early age, since while still in early infancy, they are naturally flexible and exceptionally receptive to upbringing and influence, just like puppies are responsive to their master's will. Erasmus frequently compares children to animals and brutes, and evoking the metaphor of soft wax, he illustrates how the young mind is still empty and untouched: a child's mind is open to the parents' advice and readily trained, and it is easy to imprint figures on it. In Erasmus's view, there should be a moral dimension to all instruction, since children are inclined equally to good and evil, and they need firm guidance and parental scaffolding so that they grow up different from mindless brutes and do not degenerate into monstrous bestiality.[46] This upbringing should include the philosophy of Christ so that following what is true and good reflects Christian humanism.

In his *De pueris instituendis*, Erasmus uses a wealth of animal comparisons to make his point regarding the importance of liberal and moral education clearer. He maintains that morally illustrative fables and comparisons are an efficient way of teaching morals to children and highlight the importance of moral education to their parents as well. The core idea in education was to distinguish children from animals and to come as close as possible to the divine. He notes that it is absurd to have a well-trained dog in the household, if the son lacks moral and intellectual instruction. Erasmus illustrates the difference between humans and other creatures, saying that 'trees perhaps come into existence as trees once and for all … and horses are born as horses … but man certainly is not born, but made man'.[47] In his view, a primitive and uneducated man is not a human being, but a wild animal, since a mere physical shape is not enough to categorise someone as human – otherwise statues would also be included as humans. Erasmian humanism maintained a clear hierarchical distinction between the humans and brute animals who followed their natural instincts, whereas human beings should obey the faculty of reason given to them alone. It is important to note that the father figure is again decisive here: a father who does not take

[46] See also Rummel 2006: 34 who noted that Erasmus's sentiments echoed Pico della Mirandola's (1463-1494) similar views on human dignity.

[47] Erasmus, *De pueris instituendis*, p. 304 (trans. Beert C. Verstraete); see also Kivistö 2002: 28.

good care of his son's education is not himself entitled to be included among the humans.

Erasmus also uses other embodied metaphors and conceptualised comparisons to clarify human nature. In addition to animals, these images include prodigies and monsters, such as in the story of Circe, in which Odysseus' men are turned into swine and other creatures and their human minds are enclosed within animal bodies. It was even more horrifying to perceive a bestial mind in a human figure. Erasmus notes that she-bears used to lick their cubs into shape, and humans should behave accordingly by shaping the minds of children when they are still agile and prone to intellectual and moral moulding; otherwise, one would have a monster instead of a human being in the family. Erasmus calls uneducated children shapeless lumps that should be given a human form through culture and education. Above all, they should be taught virtue, and this should happen at an early stage when they are still naturally flexible, receptive, and easier to bend in any direction by the teacher. While frequently using animal comparisons to make his point, Erasmus also openly praises the efficiency of visual images and animal fables in persuasion. He notes that adults could also derive great benefit from such stories. Erasmus also evokes the Horatian commonplace of the benefits of honey whenever one has to prepare a bitter drink for a patient and persuade him to swallow it.

Lubinus's didactic declamations

Displaying the content before one's eyes as if through pictures was a method that was later advocated by many satirists. As will be noted later in this chapter, the Erasmian images of upbringing were frequently used by neo-Latin satirists but let me first briefly refer to another important classical scholar and satirist, namely the learned Protestant theologian and philosopher from Rostock, Eilhard Lubinus. He was known as a typical Renaissance man who thought in the Erasmian manner that the basis of education lies in the mastery of vivid language; interested in language learning, he published a trilingual New Testament.[48] In its substantial preface, Lubinus presents some novel ideas on good language teaching and proposes an empirical approach to learning so that the acquisition of grammar and the Latin tongue should involve all the senses:

[48] See Wheeler 2013: Ch. 13 (on Lubinus). Lubinus was appointed professor of poetry in 1595 and he took the divinity chair at Rostock in 1605.

> … as Naturalists know very well, there can be nothing in the understanding, which is not before in the sense. And as that which hath been in the sense is more notable, or even more ridiculous, so it strikes or stamps the imagination more strongly, and imprints its forme upon the very memory more inwardly …[49]

He proposes that vocabulary could be more easily learned by seeing pictures so that children could perceive the things before their eyes:[50] 'Four-footed living Creatures, creeping Things, Fishes, and Birds, which can neither be gotten, nor live well in these parts, ought to be painted'.[51] Lubinus suggests that books should also include brief and perspicuous sentences which children would easily comprehend and read with pleasure. Horace already noted in his satires that his father had used moral maxims in his teaching, since they were easy and quick to remember. In the same way, satirists have frequently used *sententiae*, brief maxims and sharp moral sayings to deter boys from immoral action.[52] Lubinus recommends the use of theological aphorisms and notable phrases taken, for example, from the Old Testament, such as 'Creavit Deus hominem ad imaginem suam, God created man after His own image; Non est bonum hominum solum esse, It is not good for man to be alone; Pulvis, et in pulverem revereris. Dust thou art, and into dust thou shalt return'.[53] Lubinus gives a long list of memorable sentences from the Bible, Latin authors, and the common life of men that would help children learn the Latin language. Similar sentences were also used in satires as utterances of traditional wisdom meant to persuade the reader to move to the correct action. These new methods were needed, Lubinus argues, because most pupils hated schools, regarding them as 'houses of corrections, scourging places, or mere whipping posts'.[54] Lubinus claims: '… this teaching of Children is used as a medicine of mindes to unwilling and forced Scholars by their Masters whom they fly and hatefully

[49] Lubinus 1614: 19. All translations to Lubinus's preface are from the early edition by Samuel Hartlib.

[50] Wheeler 2013: 69.

[51] Lubinus 1614: 22-23.

[52] In this context, it should be noted that emblems extracted from Horace's poetry were extremely popular in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Philipp von Zesen's *Moralia Horatiana* appeared in 1656 and included 113 copper drawings which summarised Horace's ethics in pictures and words. The epigraph attached to the first image was *Naturam Minerva perficit*, and the following images consisted of illustrations of similar brief moral sayings (e.g., *Educatio mores facit, Animus purgandus, Vitium fugere virtus est*, etc.). See Mauser 2000: 129.

[53] Lubinus 1614: 35.

[54] Lubinus 1614: 8.

abhor. A sick person is scarce ever restored to his health by a Physician whom he hates'.[55]

Lubinus put his theoretical views on education into practice in his three verse declamations that he delivered at Rostock between the years 1602 and 1618; these were published as *Declamationes satyricae tres* in 1618 ('Three Satirical Declamations').[56] His biographers note that he was an acclaimed orator, and his large oeuvre also includes volumes on the Roman satirists. Declamation was a literary showpiece that was orally presented to a university audience; early modern satirists often also recited their poems orally to learned audiences.[57] In his three declamatory satires Lubinus describes the portents of his own age in terms of education and school teaching approaching the issue in a vivid satirical style and setting the corruption of education before the eyes. Lubinus opens his first declamation from 1602 with a Juvenalian remark: 'Should I speak or remain silent?' Lubinus's specific targets in his first satire are the ignorant learned, who never live as they teach. He depicts the sins of academics who care only for their personal obsessions, with no real self-knowledge:

> *Quid te scire iuvat tot tanta scientiae et artis,*
> *Si nihil in melius tot rerum proficis usu?*
> *GRAMMATICI errores memorant patientis Ulyssis,*
> *Atque ipsi in vita et factis rationis aberrant*
> *A regione procul . . .*
> *Quid te porro iuvat geometram illa arte profunda*
> *Metiri terras et agros, cum dividere aeque*
> *Non possis cum fratre tuo, atque nepote propinquo*.[58]

[55] Lubinus 1614: 8.

[56] Lubinus 1618. Lubinus's declamations are available online at http://mateo.uni-mannheim.de/camena/lubin1/te01.html. Lubinus was also known for his editions of the Roman verse satirists (Juvenal in 1603 at Hanau; Horace in 1599 at Rostock); in fact, many Neo-Latin satirists edited Roman verse satire. Juvenal's satires were strongly indebted to rhetorical declamations (see De Decker 1913).

[57] Satires were sometimes delivered as speeches at university festivals. For example, Albert Wichgreve (1575-1619), who published a satirical oration in favour of small people (*Oratio pro Mikranthrôpois sive homullis*, Rostock 1599; see Kivistö 2009: Ch. 5), also delivered a satirical speech on an old woman (*Satura in vetullam*) in Rostock in 1599. This satire ridiculed an old woman by comparing her with cattle (*vitulos, vaccas, taurosque bovesque*, A2) and complained about the subverted and vicious world. As for another example on satirical speeches, Porter 2016: 90 notes that the polyhistor and poet Simon Sten (1540-1619) published under the name Achilles Clavigerus a satire against a Catholic theologian named Johann Faber and recited his pamphlets publicly in Heidelberg prior to their publication.

[58] Lubinus 1618: I, 015-016 (the Arabic numbers refer to the image number on the Camena website).

> What's the use of learning so many sciences and arts,
> if all that knowledge does not improve your character?
> The grammarians recount patient Ulysses' errors,
> but err in their own lives and deeds further and further away
> from the land of reason …
> What's the use of you, a surveyor, knowing how to skilfully
> measure lands and fields when you fail to divide them justly
> with your brother and your close grandson?

Virtue and self-knowledge are fundamental, since without them human knowledge is useless. The language of usefulness is noteworthy here; the poet's rhetorical questions point to everyday moral dilemmas in which theoretical knowledge may be useless, if it is not supported by solid moral principles. Like Seneca, Augustine, and many other moralists before him, Lubinus claims that attention should be turned from measuring the world to man and his morality, and this is something that satires could do as a literary genre.

Lubinus was highly sceptical of the future of the academy, since in his view school education was in the grip of barbarism – a popular satirical and anti-scholastic topic in German humanism, which promoted literature and language studies.[59] In the second satire, directed against 'academic pests', the ruinous state of the university is illustrated with an image of a glorious but collapsing building. The palace of current education had an impressive front and its roof ascended to the heavens, but since it was not built on the firm foundation of solid education, the luxurious building did not last, but came down in ruins (*vastam trahat … ruinam*).[60] Relying on the tradition of German university satire, Lubinus disapproved of students who in their groundless self-confidence failed to learn anything, and he censured severe schoolmasters and pedantic pedagogues who taught with strict rules and, armed with cruel whips, were more formidable than ancient tyrants or executioners, making pupils tremble with fear. Children were educated through an authoritative discourse, and aggressive teachers (*carnifices*, butchers) used corporal punishment.[61] Instruments of chastisement typically included the cane (*ferula*, applied to the hands) and the cat (*flagellum*, applied to the shoulders).[62] This was very different from the ideal Horatian teaching

[59] See Kivistö 2002: Ch. 2 (with further references); Rummel 2006: Ch. 2.

[60] Lubinus 1618: II, 040.

[61] Lubinus 1618: I, 020 (*carnificemque magistrum et ludum carnificinam*).

[62] Poynton 1934: 9. Cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.119-120.

method that aimed to shape the child into a decent human being by using mild instruction and concrete examples and avoiding authoritative and abstract discourses. Erasmus and Lubinus both condemn corporal punishment in their educational writings and stress that instead of fear and hate children should love their teachers as if they were their parents.[63] Lubinus's satires on barbarism can be interpreted as reflecting his love of learning, and thus it is possible to see a genuine positive motivation behind his harsh declamations.

Lubinus's satires describe human corruption in a visual and immediate manner, offering sensual involvement in the form of verbal indignation. The richness and vividness of details characterise much of the satirical poetry that was presented as if as evidence based on the poet's own perceptions and sensations.[64] Being concerned about the collapsing state of education, Lubinus depicts the academic world in a state of corruption and evokes the already familiar image of the swine of Circe who, beneath their beastly appearance, still had a human soul, whereas the only human feature left in his fellow men was their human face:

> *Dum tandem impietas inferni immanis Erinnys*
> *Transmutet paulatim homines non impia Circe*
> *Ut quondam in porcos socios mutavit Ulyssis …*
> *Nil homini reliqui quibus est, nisi vultus et oris*
> *Effigies, at mens stygii est truculenta Draconis*.[65]

> Until at last their savage impiety resembling the furies of the Underworld
> gradually transforms human beings (into animals), not impious Circe, who
> once transformed Ulysses' men into swine …
> There is nothing left of a human being except for an image of
> the face, but the ferocious mind belongs to the Stygian serpent.

Lubinus argues that the beastly character hiding under the human skin could only be humanised with the help of education and morally uplifting literature. As grammatical rules and vocabulary are more easily learned when presented in the form of visual images, in his satires Lubinus also presents things to the senses and works with them through visual examples. It was an old rhetorical principle that, in order to make one's orations successful, things absent should be presented to

[63] Wheeler 2013: 67.

[64] Such vividness was also characteristic of the Epicurean thinking; see Atherton 1998: xii.

[65] Lubinus 1618: II, 031.

the imagination vividly and distinctly as if they were occurring simultaneously and not at a distance. The audience must be made eyewitnesses and become thoroughly engaged with the events. Placing sin visually before the eyes, Lubinus adopts expressions from Roman satire, including pathological ulcers and putrid filth swelling inside the body, and in the manner of Persius, he pulls old biases out from his patient's lungs.[66] But unlike his classical predecessors who deplored human ignorance in general, Lubinus concentrates on the ignorance of the schoolmen. I will return to Lubinus's apocalyptic rhetoric in Chapter 5.

On the school context

Processing visually the horrible consequences of sin, Lubinus's declamations make clear that satire is an instructive genre that attacks the monstrosity and barbarism of his age. Other neo-Latin satires also depicted the school context, deriding the severe and punitive teaching methods of fearsome teachers who used threats and physical punishments as their primary teaching strategies.[67] In his *Satyrae VIII* (1552), Lambertus Hortensius dedicates his second satire to educational issues recalling the good old days when wise parents took care of the cultivation of their children to make them similar to their fathers (*patrum similes*), whereas in his corrupt age parents neglected the important task of upbringing. Hortensius deploys expressions which were to become conventional in satires, emphasising the importance of forming the still flexible minds of young boys (*formaretur ab annis / Ipse puer teneris*)[68] and employing images of sculpting. Comparing in the Erasmian manner the still rude young mind to clay and wax tablet, he stresses the need to imprint civilised manners in the young mind, which was as yet untouched and uncorrupted by vice:

> *Naturam formare rudem atque absolvere cunctis*
> *Virtutum numeris …*
> *Ingenium veluti esse lutum ceramque tenacem*
> *Credere par, nam si quid formae impresseris haeret.*[69]

[66] Lubinus 1618: II, 042 (*dum iuvenes avias tibi de pulmone revello*); p. 045 (*numquam sanabile vulnus*); cf. Pers. 5.92.

[67] See Kivistö 2014: 150-152.

[68] Hortensius 1552: II.

[69] Hortensius 1552: II. Cf. VII (*Trade cui ingenium foelix, studiisque coacti / Haud quaquam, ingeniumque tenax,*

> To form rude nature and complete its
> numerous virtues …
> The human mind is believed to be like clay and tenacious wax,
> retaining the form that you imprint on it.

The characteristic verbs of forming (*formare*) and impressing (*imprimere*) are in frequent use here. Evoking the austerity of fathers, Hortensius claimed that in his barbaric age, uncivilised parents gave their children to crude schoolmasters (such as the legendary Roman flogger Orbilius, familiar from Horace's epistle)[70] who did not instruct them in good manners or virtue but relied on punishment in shaping children's thoughts. The bad example of ignorant adults (*stultorum exempla parentum*) corrupted the children's manners – just like wool once stained with the wrong colour is impossible to cleanse afterwards and a freshly made clay pot retains the flavour of the first dishes it contains for a long time.[71]

The German poet and mathematician Johann Lauremberg (1590-1658) is noteworthy here, because he specifically commented on the teaching methods of his time. Lauremberg's satire on the corruption of education and poetry (*Satyra elegantissima, qua rerum bonarum abusus et vitia quaedam saeculi perstringuntur*) was first published in 1636 and later in the polymath German Daniel Georg Morhof's (1639-1691) edition in 1684.[72] When Morhof edited Lauremberg's verse satire in 1684, he summarised his reading experience as follows:

> *E quibus ut ego mirificam voluptatem ceperam … et cum magna animi delectatione non perlecta, sed devorata. … Ad gustum tuum erunt hae deliciae, fatuo atque insipido palato non apponendae. Nam vel sale et aceto, quo ulcera seculi tangit, ingenio salivam movet Satyra. Eruditis certe crambe haec vel centies recocta sapit.*

---

ceraeve lutove / Adsimile, ut capiat quancunque impresseris Artem). There is also an interesting link to sincerity – the favourite virtue of satirists – in this wax image, since some etymologies suggest that the word sincere comes from the Latin words *sine cera*, without wax, implying an object that has not yet been patched up with wax (see Trilling 1972: 12). Hortensius here also notes that an unlearned mind was like a mushroom and incapable of being improved (*Discere nil valuit fungus*).

[70] Hor. *Epist*. 2.1.71.

[71] Hortensius 1552: II (*Haud facile eluimus primos quos pura colores / Lana bibit, servatque diu nova testa saporem / Quo primum est infecta, annos et durat in omnes*). Cf. Hor. *Epist*. 1.2.69-70 ('A jar retains for years the smell with which it was tinged when new', trans. Niall Rudd) and 54 ('When a jar is unclean, whatever you fill it with soon goes sour', trans. Niall Rudd); Scholirius 1683: III.11.205 (*Crede mihi, primos sibi testa reservat odores*).

[72] For Lauremberg's life, see Daae 1884; for a description of the contents of this satire, see esp. 28-39, and for a modern edition of the satire, see the appendix in ibid. For Lauremberg's humour, see Peter 1967 (noting the satirist's conservative attitudes, contemporary criticism, and stylistic devices).

> *Rudes et inficeti homines abesse ab his sacris debent. … Nihil vero hac Satyra in illa mordacitate suavius: nihil convenientius. Si tempora, quibus scripta est, cum nostris conferas, non est ovo ovum similius.*[73]
>
> I have had the wonderful pleasure of reading these verses … and I have not only read them through with great pleasure but have utterly devoured them. … You will find these gourmet flavours tasty; they are not meant for tasteless and insipid palates. The poet uses salt and vinegar to touch the wounds of the century and stirs his reader's saliva with his wit. Learned readers will enjoy this cabbage even if it was re-cooked a hundred times. Rude and crude people should stay away from these sacred verses. … Nothing is sweeter than the bite of this satire; nothing is more apt. If you compare those days when the poem was composed to our own time, well, nothing looks as much like an egg as another egg.[74]

Morhof sent the poem as a gift to his humanist friend Peter Axen (1635-1707); it was a sign of his affection, but the dedication also nicely captures the taste of its readers. Satires were written for a small circle of friends and learned audiences who savoured the satirical display of wit and erudition. Eating 'reheated cabbage' was a constant pleasure and enjoyment that was shared between friends who wrote, exchanged, read, and edited satires, and in so doing kept Latin satire alive for centuries.[75]

In his poem, Lauremberg complains the state of education at this own University of Sorø, Denmark, where he taught mathematics in his later years. The poem includes traditional satirical elements and themes, such as the medical commonplace of satire as bitter and salty medicine; in Lauremberg's view, bad poets covered their pathological ulcers with laurel wreaths. The poet feels sick when reading his contemporary poetry (*quotque ciet vomitus, cum tales haurio versus*). One of his major complaints also concerns the fashionable influence of French on all things.[76] Violent teaching methods are discussed in the latter part

[73] Morhof in his dedication in Lauremberg 1684.

[74] Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 5.11.30.

[75] One might argue that the reader of satire also has a similar passion for sameness as children: they are not looking for new experiences or unexpectedness, but safe reiteration of the same enjoyment of the critique against vices that has previously been provided by dozens of satires.

[76] This topic (and French merchants in particular) was also discussed by the Dutch humanist Kempo Thessaliensis (ca. 1480-1530) in his verse satire *De dolis Gallorum satyra* (in *Carmina et epigrammata*, 1500); see Tournoy 1994: 99.

of the poem, when the poet describes how children are subjected to physical punishments at monstrous schools (*monstra scholarum*).[77] Lauremberg's poem thus represents a typical school-critical view and calls for a reform of teaching methods by exaggerating the harsh atmosphere of the classroom.

Guglielmini's conversational and imperative moods

The Erasmian ideas of formation were put into poetic practice by many humanist satirists, who believed that the moral character emerged in adolescence and was to a large extent a product of education. One notable figure to highlight the importance of education throughout his satires was the Piarist poet Bernardo Guglielmini, whose satires in *Sermonum libri tres* (1742) give young men moral lessons in the different duties of life.[78] Guglielmini had presented his verses orally in Roman Academies, which were gradually changing from private papal schools to public institutions. The collection was addressed to Pope Benedict XIV; Guglielmini praised the pope for his duties in censoring manners, establishing laws, and punishing the wicked. The pope was an example of moral integrity and such admirable virtues as constancy, fortitude, restraint, vigilance, and labour – a model student who already possessed all the virtues that the poet aimed to promote.[79]

The first satire of the second book explicitly comments on the educational task of the Piarists, the first educational order of the Catholic church established in 1622 and exclusively devoted to the free schooling of poor youths.[80] In his poem, the poet followed the example of P. Paulinus, a teacher of eloquence in a Piarist school, whose orations the poet praises and he explicitly mentions that he is addressing his words to young men who are 'feeling a poetical vein'.[81] The Piarists

[77] Lauremberg 1684. Lauremberg also wrote satires in German using the pseudonym Hans Willmsen L. Rost. On his German satires, see Daae 1884: 43-60.

[78] Guglielmini's life and works have been briefly described in Horányi 1809: 63-65; Campanelli 2021: 121-129. Campanelli notes that Guglielmini was not originally from Italy but from the city of Besançon in France. Guglielmini's satires were reprinted in Bratislava (Breslau) in 1755 and Hungary in 1780. According to the title of the Bratislava edition, it also contains new satires by the same poet.

[79] On the image of Pope Benedict XIV in Guglielmini's satires, see below Ch. 6.

[80] See Guglielmini 1742: II.1, p. 46 (*Nos etenim ratio vitae praefecit alendis / Ingeniis iuvenum*). On the Piarists, see Grendler 2006: Ch. VII; Sangalli 2012. Grendler (253) notes that the first school of the order was established in Rome in 1597, and the Piarists became a religious order in 1617.

[81] Guglielmini 1742: II.1, p. 46 (*Scribo Iuventuti, cui vena Poetica cordi*).

had adopted Renaissance humanist pedagogical methods and recommended rewards rather than punishment. Religious education and teaching good morals were important in the curriculum, which included academic subjects, Latin, and arithmetic, and other disciplines, both humanistic and practical, needed in commercial or other careers. As Paul Grendler has noted, the Pious School was unique in offering students an opportunity to learn a Latin curriculum that prepared boys for leading roles in society and practical knowledge that trained them for the world of work and crossing traditional social divisions.[82]

In Guglielmini's satires, the moral training of youths covers various interpersonal relations and social obligations, including marriage and public life. Satire is a genre that like comedy focuses on the individual in society, as Thomas Jemielity has put it, whereas in tragedy the focus is on individual as individual.[83] Most of Guglielmini's satires are addressed to young men in a 'Sapphic situation', leaving the school and considering different future vocations. Presenting motivational conflicts involved in such life situations, Guglielmini describes, for example, how a senior figure teaches his pupil the high value of religious studies compared with other professions. Preparing boys to earn a living, the Piarists taught subjects needed in different careers, both practical and theoretical. We could note here the influence of Cicero's *De officiis*, which was read in the Pious Schools in the highest class.[84] Cicero's work, which was written in the form of a letter to his son, is frequently mentioned in the footnotes to Guglielmini's poems, which themselves give guidance in the duties of life. The emphasis on duties and obligations reminds one of Cicero's idea of the importance of social virtues and sociability as being even more important than individual learning.

Imitating Cicero, who expounded his conception of moral obligations in his work, Guglielmini addresses public behaviour and the best way to live. The first book includes poems on the duties of young men in general (1.2-3, *De officiis adolescentium*) and specifically in relation to marriage (1.5, *De officiis conjugum*), military service (1.6, *De officiis militum*), and court life (1.7, *De officiis aulicolarum*). The third satire (1.3), addressed to a fictitious freshman called Faustus, argues in favour of religious and judicial studies and against ambition. Ethics is posited as the primary guide to life in his satire 1.4 (*De ethica officiorum magistra*), which also advocates philosophical studies instead of studying the secrets of nature. While considering the different circumstances of life, the poet notes that it is important

[82] Grendler 2006: 260-261.

[83] Jemielity 2006: 23.

[84] Grendler 2006: 259.

to find a chaste and honest wife (1.5), and in the context of court life, the crucial virtue is patience in receiving orders and obeying the master's will (1.7). At stake here is sociability and the correct behaviour in particular circumstances or roles.[85] Patience helps to preserve some autonomy even in demanding court life.[86]

Openly announcing his pedagogic goal in the dedication, Guglielmini points out that his satires are a moral guide specifically meant to educate young men (*ad erudiendam Iuventutem*).[87] Signalling his didactic thrust, the poet assigns himself the task of a mentor who guides the addressee towards the goal of ideal humanity, which meant the full realisation of human potentiality. In satire 1.2, the poet-tutor declares himself a friend who offers his advice as a gift to a young man who is about to leave school and enter social life:

FAUSTE, mihi a teneris genitor quem credidit annis
Formandum studiis et moribus, haec quoque dicta
Accipe quondam a te poscentis plura magistri,
Munere nunc solum veri fungentis amici.[88]

Faustus, whom your father entrusted to my tutorship in your early years,
so that I would shape you in your studies and manners, take these words
of your teacher who once demanded much more from you,
but who now plays only the role of a true friend.

Addressing his student, the tutor-poet underlines his affected stance and experience that allows him to talk with authority, just like Horace in his epistles offers himself as a friend to Albius, for instance, or urges his readers to avoid extreme tendencies in life.[89] Similar moral exhortations were common in Proverbs, in which the mentor addresses an inexperienced young man, giving him lessons for life. Praising the innate good qualities of the young man, Guglielmini describes his personal formation with reference to the concrete acts of forming

[85] Cf. Seneca's epistles (e.g., 94) in which he also prescribed how one should act towards his wife or children.

[86] We could say that a patient servant adopts an 'other-oriented' attitude by being attuned to the signals from other court servants and the master, but without becoming a non-self that would merely repeat the will of the others as 'a reiterated impersonation'. The term 'reiterated impersonation' is used on 'other-directed' vs. 'inner-directed' personalities in Trilling 1972: 66.

[87] Guglielmini 1742: vii.

[88] Guglielmini 1742: I.2, p. 6.

[89] On Horace's didacticism, see McCarter 2015.

a human being while the boy is still in his tender years. The young man is made of the finest clay by God, who imbues him with many virtues (*ingenti Divorum munere fictus / es meliore luto*).[90]

The conventional image of a journey familiar from the later *Bildungsroman* is present, as the outer world is described as a vast and tumultuous sea that the young man is now free to confront (*liber nunc abibis*).[91] Metaphors of the journey and physical movement up and down characterise growing and life, while difficulties and vices are described as impediments to travel. In a physical journey, it is not enough to know exotic destinations and places. The most important lesson to learn is another common imperative, namely, to know oneself and dissociate oneself from others. To be at home with oneself is paramount, since a person who is everywhere had 'hay on his horn' (*faenum habet in cornu, longe fuge*).[92] The passage alludes to Horace's satire (1.4.34), which ridicules dangerous fellows who have no respect for anyone.

One interesting piece of instruction in satire 1.6 deals with the issue of desirable and avoidable futures. It describes how Marcellus's mother and girlfriend decry the young man's military ambitions. Like many adolescents, Marcellus dreams of glorious deeds. Bored of reading mute books, he desires physical action instead. Marcellus is motivated to undertake military service, but the poet warns him of the unpleasant reality of war, which did not resemble Homer's heroic world or amusing soldier life familiar from ancient comedies. Thereby, he underlines the naïve attitude of the addressee who had not yet understood the realities of life, having so far learned life lessons from books alone. The poet voices the invented opinions and counterarguments of the unexperienced addressee who dreams of a glorious and ascetic life as a warrior, drinking water from rivers when thirsty and never complaining. Marcellus claims that life is equally dangerous in the city, where people die infamously in symposia; this notion is followed by a quotation on a glutton's death from Persius' third satire (3.100-105) in the footnotes. The poet describes the plight of a soldier in less than flattering language, reminding his young opponent that although his body is vigorous, nature has given him something more valuable, namely the faculty of reason, without which physical strength is useless. In a footnote, the author refers to the Roman lawyer Alfenus

[90] Guglielmini 1742: I.2, p. 6. The expression *meliore luto* ('of a better clay') derives from Juvenal (14.35) and refers to the work of Prometheus. See also Scholirius 1683: I.3.166 (*de meliore luto formati*), referring to noble ancestors.

[91] Guglielmini 1742: I.2, p. 7. A useful account of *Bildungsroman* is, for example, Trites 2014.

[92] Guglielmini 1742: I.2, p. 8.

Varus, familiar from Horace's satires (1.3.130), who remained a cobbler even after throwing all his tools away; every man has his own strengths. The debate on Marcellus's future life is thus conducted through intertextual tools and references to previous satirical literature.

Adopting a personal style and directly engaging his reader, Guglielmini creates an intimate framework in the poems as if they were conversations between friends. He offers easy and brief lessons on avoiding vicious people (*Quos igitur fugias homines sermone docebo / Te facili atque brevi*)[93] and uses a singular second-person address in the opening lines, as if his poems are intimate epistles (e.g., *Salve*, *Fauste*, *iterum*).[94] Making extensive use of allocution and second-person pronouns throughout the poems, the poet establishes a personal intimate setting akin to an epistolary and conversational style. Epistles were notably regarded as conversations between absent friends, and, although they created a bond between the discussants, they also emphasised the separation and distance between the friends. The second-person pronoun functions to create a dynamic prescriptive effect and helps to achieve goals or regulate behaviour.

As Katharina Volk has explained the didactic situation, 'in the larger communication process between actual author and audience, the figure of the intra-textual addressee or student can play the role of a foil, with whom the readers or listeners can either identify or from whom they can distance themselves'.[95] The second-person form is essential for the normative tone of satire, allowing the poet to direct his instruction to young men. In addition to this immediate life situation, the poetic 'you' assumed a generic function: addressing the reader of the verses as 'you' the poet involves the real reader within the discussion, inviting her active participation and identification with the addressee, who becomes a generic person – anyone in need of ethical advice. The addressed reader is expected to implement the poet's instructions in her own life.[96] Guglielmini uses many different internal addressees in his collection which might also suggest the wider applicability of his ethical lessons.[97]

One notable grammatical feature in Guglielmini's poems is the imperative mood. The poet frequently uses an imperative (such as *disce*, 'learn') or other

[93] Guglielmini 1742: I.2, p. 8.

[94] Guglielmini 1742: I.3, p. 12.

[95] Volk 2002: 38.

[96] On the use of second-person imperatives and other second-person forms of instruction in Latin prose writings (on agriculture), see Hine 2011.

[97] Cf. Morrison 2007: 128 with reference to Horace's epistles.

second-person verb forms, such as *debes* with an infinitive, while telling the addressee what to do and stressing his moral responsibility.[98] Likewise, *iubeo* ('I command'), *moneo* ('I advise'), and other similar expressions are used in the context of expressing bindingness.[99] In satire 2.1, for example, the poet admonishes (*admoneo*) adolescents with the discernible voice of a teacher:

> *Admoneo iuvenes scriptor, quod voce magister*
> *Saepius admonui.*[100]
>
> I advise young people as a writer – as I have more often advised them
> in a teacher's voice.

This passage is reminiscent of Seneca's precepts to his philosophical audiences while exhorting them towards particular action.[101] Active and direct imperatives include a clear reference to a person who is expected to perform some act or learn to think in a certain manner on the basis of the poet-teacher's instruction. The second-person singular future tense is also common: *Miles eris* (you will become a soldier), repeated in satire 1.6, ironically voices the young man's dreams of becoming a military hero. The imperative mode foregrounds the future perspective; all action is taking place in the future which the poet tries to redirect toward a certain ethically responsible conclusion.[102] The directive forms highlight the satirical task of expressing orders, proposals, or advice, and posit the poet as the source of the obligation to the addressee. The second-person narration, the frequent use of imperatives, and the future tense all serve as persuasive tools in negotiating the various ethical possibilities of life.

Satire can thus be regarded as a future-oriented genre commenting on those ethical goals that its readers should bear in mind. This is not unlike, for instance,

---

[98] See, e.g., Guglielmini 1742: I.6 (*Disce ubi vel densare manum … Disce quid addiderint antiquo tempora bello*); 1.7 (*Disce docendus adhuc quod monstrant bruta*); 1.8 (*mores componere disce per artes*); 1.7 (*debes audire iterum*, etc.).

[99] See, e.g., Guglielmini 1742: I.7 (*At caveas, moneo*).

[100] Guglielmini 1742: II.1, p. 48.

[101] On Seneca's use of *admoneo* and other preceptive verbs, see Roller 2016: 132.

[102] Imperative expressions communicate an instruction and together with a future tense built a didactic structure to the poems that forms a command or a request. On the variety of imperative forms in Latin didactic poetry, see Gibson 1998. These expressions range from active ordinary imperatives directly addressing the reader (*da*, 'give') to third-person active subjunctives (*det*, 'let her give') and numerous passive and impersonal forms using third-person passive subjunctives (*detur*, 'let be given') or gerundives (*dandum est*, 'ought to be given').

Seneca's epistles, in which the philosopher gives *praecepta* and recommends some particular course of action to his morally immature readers. As Matthew Roller has noted, Seneca also employs deontic language – imperatives, futures, and other hortatory word forms – in order to help the addressee identify proper action in a given situation.[103] Seneca's philosophical language presents its teachings as reminders and warnings, and as Roller interprets his rhetoric in the programmatic Epistle 94, the authorial audience consists here, too, of beginners who are still taking their first steps on the path of moral knowledge, whereas the authorial voice belongs to an experienced teacher who directs his precepts to his inexperienced audience, judging their actions on a moral scale.[104] Seneca's moral epistles and Guglielmini's satires share the idea of preceptive philosophy, the same senior teacher figure, and similar young audiences as the addressees of the author's precepts of living. Among the similarities between these two discourses are also the acts of witnessing, judging, norm-setting, and norm-following, which Roller identifies as the crucial stages of exemplary discourse (to be discussed later in Chapter 6).[105]

Embodied pictures of upbringing

As was noted above, animal comparisons marking an undergoing of the required transformation into adulthood were familiar from the Erasmian rhetoric of education. They were images that readers readily understood. Animal comparisons and other analogies are frequently used to illustrate how human beings differ from animals by being always open to change and reorientation.[106] Guglielmini's animal metaphors include, for example, restless horses, scapegoats, and the well-known Aesopian fable of a bird with borrowed feathers (1.7): a crow dressed in the colourful feathers of other birds stands for pride, ostentation, and a lack

[103] Roller 2016: 132.

[104] Roller 2016: 133 n. 9 interestingly notes that Seneca's image of the *preceptor* in his epistle 94 recalls Horace's father (*Sat.* 1.4.103-129) who was shaping his son through precepts.

[105] Cf. Roller 2016: 141.

[106] Lambertus Hortensius was especially fond of animal comparisons. For him, teaching a reluctant child is like training a camel to dance (1552: VII), and he compared unlearned voices with the cackling of the geese (1552: II). In addition to dancing camels and gaggling geese, we meet allegorical and cautionary animals such as chimpanzees wearing gilded clothes (alluding to hypocrisy), mute fish (fish were proverbial for their taciturnity), performing bears (pleasing their masters), and parrots which learn to imitate human voices when their stomach is empty (*docuit venter*, VII).

of self-knowledge. The fable is used to teach the addressee Narcissus to be true to himself and denounce borrowed glory as ridiculous.[107] Although animals are usually distinguished from humans in growth stories, many virtues could also be learned from the brutes, including taciturnity, which was useful in court life.[108] The idea is that if animals can learn all kinds of tricks, human beings should also be able to make some progress; however, satirists typically claim that while bears and wild boars – the most ferocious of animals – learn to obey their masters, human beings refuse to obey their reason.[109]

The Erasmian idea of moulding a human being out of a brute child recurs throughout Guglielmini's collection. The poet frequently warns about the dangers of failed instruction, as the result might be a natural monster lacking any sign of cultured humanity. One young boy is compared to a monster in his reluctance to study; his stubborn refusal to educate himself results in an inhuman form:

… Tibi enim solum est cacoethes
Te ostentare, oculos cunctorum et vertere in unum.
Vertimus, ARTEMIDORE, sed ut vertisse solemus,
Quum monstrant hominem bino cum corpore et uno
Vertice, vel quatuor manibus, vel duplice naso.
Denique te ut monstrum aspicimus, cui humana figura est
Exterius formosa, atque omnibus integra membris.
Sed pars illa Deo similis, mens conscia veri,
Quae facit una hominem, pars in te perdidit illa,
ARTEMIDORE, decus, meliorem perdidit in te
Dotem animi; curva est, enormis, proxima brutis.[110]

… Your constant illness is the desire to
show up and be the only centre of everybody's attention.
We have turned our eyes to you, Artemidorus, but in the same way as we turn

[107] Guglielmini 1742: II.4, p. 61. In satire 2.4, a garrulous schoolboy is compared to a parrot that mimicked human voices without any reasonable content, as if they were new American words. On *psittacus*, see also Scholirius 1683: I.3.140.

[108] Guglielmini 1742: I.7, p. 38 (*Disce docendus adhuc quod monstrant bruta; silendum est*).

[109] Cf. Scholirius 1683: III.X, p. 353. In satire 2.6, Guglielmini refers to a distant past when men grazed along with animals in the fields without using their gift of reason. The recurring emphasis on the capacity for reason could also be due to Cicero's *De officiis*, in which the author distinguishes humans from brute creatures, noting that in contrast to animals, all humans are endowed with reason (1.107).

[110] Guglielmini 1742: II.4, p. 63.

> to look at a human being
> who is pointed at because he has two bodies but only one
> skull, or four hands or a double nose.
> Thereafter, we behold you as a monster with a human figure
> beautiful on the outside and all the limbs intact.
> But the part that resembles God, the truthful mind
> that alone makes a human being, loses its beauty in you,
> Artemidorus, it loses its accomplishment in you,
> it is curved, irregular, and resembles the brutes.

The deformity of an uncultivated mind made visible in the Erasmian style here emphasised the edifying and humanising function of studies and contrasted human beings with negatively evaluated inhuman creatures.[111]

In Guglielmini's satires, the images of embodiment and categorisation are intertwined, as the poet describes growth and development metaphorically. The addressee of the collection, Pope Benedict XIV, was interested in studying the human body, and the frequency of bodily metaphors in the text might reflect his interests. In addition, they were commonplace images in the rhetoric of education in which human lives were metaphorically sculpted like statues in order to create a polished product. As Irene E. Harvey later put it in her studies on exemplarity, the sculptor brought out 'from the marble the figure already there, latent though perceptible'.[112] This reminds one of the postmodern idea of the self that is not given to human beings but is created like a personal work of art.

Guglielmini's satire 1.8 is noteworthy in this respect, since it is devoted to the idea of God as the supreme artist who had made human beings in his own image and thus given them the most beautiful form one could imagine. The addressee of the poem is Quintus, a young man who desires to become rich, but the poet encourages him to cultivate the arts of architecture, painting, and sculpture instead, since these arts were favoured by the principal architect of all, God. This human propensity is already visible in very young children, who build houses out of bricks and stones and draw pictures of horses or newly discovered objects. The seed of artistic creativity is sown by God, who had fashioned man out of clay:

---

[111] In student humour, it was common to compare students to brute and untamed animals or monsters; physical deformities mirrored the confusion of the mind. See Kivistö 2009: 158-66.

[112] Harvey 2002: 124.

… Dehinc mirabile coepit
Sculptor opus. Docilem fingens manus abdita limum
Condidit humanos artus vultumque decorum,
Ossaque cum nervis haerentia, cumque micanti
Iunctas arteria venas, tenuissima pellis
Quas tegit objectas oculis tamen atque videndas.
Hoc primum est, opifex quod castigavit ad unguem,
Hoc tibi, Praxiteles, tibi magne Lysippe, imitandum
Hoc dedit exemplar fictor Deus ante Prometheum.[113]

… Hence the Sculptor began
his miraculous work. His invisible hand started to form a piece of tractable clay
and created human limbs and beautiful appearance,
connected the bones to the nerves and
the veins to the vibrating arteries, adding the finest skin
with which he covered all the parts still visible to the eye.
This is the first work of art that the artisan carefully crafted against his finger,
this is a model for you, Praxiteles, and for you, great Lysippus, to imitate,
this example was given to you by God the artist before Prometheus.

The emphatic anaphora 'Hoc' underlines the work of the supreme model who had envisioned a human being as an artistic object. After moulding the body, the divine sculptor added beautiful colours to his creation, and then inhabited it with the inner image of God (*intus imago*). With reference to Seneca's moral epistles (31.11), the poet notes that this inner image – which for Seneca was the upright human soul – was God, who had made his settlement and home in the human flesh. The conclusion was that by His own example, God had advised men to become artists (*Nos Deus esse Artifices voluit*).[114]

In satire 2.8, Guglielmini stresses the difficulty of carving the human figure. A priest who aimed to sculpt from wood the image of a god quickly blunted his knife scraping at the hard material, and it was particularly troublesome to carve the head:

[113] Guglielmini 1742: I.8, p. 42.

[114] Guglielmini 1742: I.8, p. 43. The poet notes that this advice was followed, for example, by Pope Clement XII, who had decorated the Vatican with beautiful art. While in the Roman times the Capitol was filled with the riches of the world acquired by military conquests, now it abounded with edifying artworks and a famous collection of statues that Clement XII had purchased. The contrast to old Rome (*Prisca Roma*) and the earlier pagan era (*vetus aetas*) is notable here. See also Guglielmini III.4, and Ch. 6 below.

Nos ipsi sumus obliquae, SANCTONICE, pruni,
Nodosaeque; sacrum quemque ut redigamur ad usum,
Multo opus est ferro, multaque bipenne, recidat
Quae trunci vitia, et ramos abscindat inanes.[115]

We are, Sanctonicus, like leaning, knotty plum trees,
and to be suitable to sacred use,
a heavy iron and an axe are necessary to cut off
the defects of the trunk and all worthless branches.

Human beings are like hard wood, full of knots and laborious to sculpt. The poet notes that parents should be as observant as any painter or sculptor when forming the young mind. The satirist himself here participates in the working, crafting, and shaping of a human being while advising his young readers on how to redirect their lives and reorient themselves towards a moral life that would preserve the values of piety and other virtues. At the same time, the addressee becomes an active agent and an artist of his own life in the sense of being capable of shaping his character at will.

In addition to animal and artistic comparisons, the cultivation of the young person's personality is depicted with metaphors of plant cultivation. As Victoria Moul has shown, in didactic poetry it was common to compare young students with plants or farm livestock and to borrow phrases of personal instruction from ancient poetry.[116] These images often stemmed from Vergil's *Georgics*, in which he, for example, refers to the effective training of a reluctant young horse.[117] Internal or spiritual character growth means cultivating the adolescent, as if he was a plant, to his full potential as a human being. In Guglielmini's poem, the infant receives the human form and overcomes his ignorance by learning, just as plants have been shaped by civilisation. Growth involves change in the early years when the seeds of virtue (*semina virtutum*) are sown. Moral improvement results from the education received in the early stages of life, just like fruits result from the maturation of youthful flowers (*omnis enim iuvenum sapientia flos est / herbaque*).[118] People witnessed growth in plants and animals, and a similar

[115] Guglielmini 1742: II.8, p. 82.

[116] Moul 2017: 189.

[117] Moul 2017: 192 *et passim*; Verg., *Georgica* 209ff.

[118] Guglielmini 1742: I.2, p. 10.

development was to be expected in children.[119] The poet also compared his teachings to the seeds of learning sown and planted in the early learning days that later ripened into an abundant harvest.

Guglielmini's second book of satires contains more poems on education: on studying poetry (2.1), the virtue of *mediocritas* (2.2), methods of studying (2.3), the infertile mind (2.4), difficulties in love that result in a sick and pallid appearance (2.5), laziness in housework (2.6), and other vices such as ostentation in matters of learning (2.7) and false probity (2.8). Often the focus is on money. Coming from poor households, the young boys who attended the Piarist schools often dreamed of a profitable career and riches, while poets were doomed to chronic poverty. In poem 2.1, Guglielmini claims that he does not wish them to become poets; instead, he inculcates the study of poetry because it is for a human being like a colour for objects or clothes for the perfect human soul, adorning it with beautiful qualities. Books are discussed in satire 2.3, in which the poet recommends to the addressee Marcus selected reading material conducive to piety and good morals.[120] Using the metaphors of food and nourishment, the poet notes that it was better to select some healthy reading material than to devour everything, since diverse dishes make the stomach uneasy. The human mind was like a stomach which, if wrongly nourished, would grow weak and diseased:

Hoc est dicta tibi exemplo sententia. Mens est
Ut stomachus quidam, libri quaedam esca: adolescens
Qui sapit, et properat studiorum attingere metam,
Seligit auctores, et pectore digerit imo
Tres quatuorve bonos. Parvis sapientia nata est
Principiis, sensim et reperit dialectica verum.[121]

These words are given to you as an example. The human mind is
like the stomach, and books are like food: a young man
who is wise and hurries to taste literary studies,
should select three or four good authors and fully

[119] Guglielmini 1742 : I.7, p. 32 (*docui nam semina rerum / Te, sparsique levi* …). In satire II.4, Guglielmini reproached the unlearned mind that was contaminated by a bad seed.

[120] This satire is edited and translated into Italian in Campanelli 2021: 130-139. The poem is included in the second volume of *Arcadum carmina* (Rome, 1756: 81-84) which also includes Guglielmini's poems *De nativitate Domini elegia* (73-76) and *De Sancto Petro Apostolorum Principe sermo* (76-81).

[121] Guglielmini 1742: II.3, p. 56; Campanelli 2021: 132 (identifying the use of classical phrases in the poem).

digest them in his heart. Wisdom is about small
beginnings, and dialectic reaches the truth slowly.

Images of physical illness were usually interpreted as illnesses of the mind in satires.[122] Guglielmini also compares human vices to poisons and viruses to which no one was immune.[123] The poet stresses that one should study to become religious rather than learned or philosophical. As Sarah Knight has observed, the relationship between poetry and upbringing belonged to the favourite issues discussed in early modern education, since studying poetry could destabilise the young mind unless carefully guided. Many Renaissance humanists and poets were eager to discuss how young men should study poetry or other issues. Knight shows us how such humanists as Nicolas Bourbon, George Buchanan, Erasmus of Rotterdam, and others wrote about the tutor's important influence in early education and highlighted the role of schools or teachers in the formation of character.[124]

Although satires often place great emphasis on individual morality and responsibility, Guglielmini stresses the role of parental care in moulding the young mind. We have already noted that, in his second satire, Lambertus Hortensius chastises contemporary parents for neglecting the upbringing of their children; during the good old days, parents formed their children according to the image of their fathers (*patrum similes*).[125] Horace's father had also ensured that his son received a proper schooling and protected him from moral corruption. In satire 3.2, Guglielmini addresses parents who neglect the cultivation of their children. In the manner of Erasmus's declamation on the education of children, the poet advises parents to fully focus on their children and instruct them on all valuable subjects. Fathers who perform their parental role merely by using a loud voice are mistaken, since the young boy easily closes his ears to all counsel. Adhering to the moral value of education, the poet claims that early nourishment is crucial, since morals are not innate in the child; instead, they are imbibed in the milk of the mother; as if circulating in the veins, the example of virtue gradually nourishes and strengthens the whole body:

---

[122] Kivistö 2009 and Ch. 4 below.

[123] Medical imagery was used, e.g., in Guglielmini 1742: III.3.

[124] Knight 2017.

[125] Hortensius 1552: II.

Ergo haud nascuntur mores, sed lacte bibuntur
Cum tepido, venisque fluunt, intrantque medullas,
Primo molle cibo quando coalescere corpus
Incipit.[126]

Thus, character is not innate, but imbibed in warm breast milk,
and it flows into the veins, penetrating the inner parts,
when the body begins to coalesce with the help of first soft nourishment.

The passage refers to Aulus Gellius, who in his discourse on the philosopher Favorinus, claims that 'in forming character the disposition of the nurse and the quality of the milk play a great part; for the milk, although imbued from the beginning with the material of the father's seed, forms the infant offspring from the body and mind of the mother'.[127] Erasmus also refers to the quality of the breast milk, claiming that those children who had imbibed evil along with their mother's milk were insensitive to good,[128] and if one chooses to use a wet-nurse, she must be a woman of good morals so that her milk is untainted.[129] Guglielmini relies on Gellius in particular, also using the agricultural image of the seed here to describe the potencies of human beings: when a seed is sown and grown out it should become a plant, but an infertile seed produces only something of its own kind.[130] The image of the seed is frequently used in Erasmus's treatise, in which he argues that 'the mind will bear good fruit if it is sown with good seeds, but if it is neglected it will be grown over with weeds that must shortly be pulled up'.[131] In the manner of Erasmus, the poet claims that adults often take good care of their household animals, carefully brushing, washing, and feeding them, while their children are less esteemed. John Chrysostom's *Homilies* (59) also blame fathers who discipline their horses with much attention and subject them to immediate training when they are still tender to lose their wild nature, but overlook the

[126] Guglielmini 1742: III.2, p. 92. The passage also referred to Juvenal 6.239-240 (*scilicet expectas ut tradat mater honestos / atque alios mores quam quos habet?* 'You don't really expect a mother to pass on respectable behaviour, so different from her own, do you?'; trans. Susanna Morton Braund).

[127] Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 12.1.20 (trans. J.C. Rolfe).

[128] Erasmus 1985: 308; see also Rummel 2006: 35.

[129] Erasmus 1985: 315.

[130] Cf. Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 12.1.14: 'Therefore it is believed not without reason that, just as the power and nature of the seed are able to form likenesses of body and mind, so the qualities and properties of the milk have the same effect' (trans. J.C. Rolfe).

[131] Erasmus 1985: 343 (trans. Beert C. Verstraete).

upbringing of their children. With reference to this passage, Guglielmini argues that people take better care of horses and asses than of their own children.[132]

False fronts and true reflections

Before concluding this chapter, I would like to draw attention to one common satirical technique that reflects the virtue of sincerity. Learning from meaningful contrasts is one crucial feature in satires, and one way to reveal human weaknesses is to look under the surface: in satires, external appearances and first impressions are always deceptive and conceal vices underneath their splendour.[133] Satires succumbed to the idea of traditional morality that was also visible in the body; satirists taught that one should be less concerned with moulding the outer surface and more with improving inner moral character.

The Roman Jesuit Giovanni Lorenzo Lucchesini (1638-1716) addresses this topic in his satire on the forenoon worries of a useless adolescent (*In antemeridianas improbi iuvenis curas satyra*, 1672).[134] The young man awakens after passing out from heavy drinking. After slumbering half the day, he starts his morning activities, which are ironically presented as a heroic battle and Herculean task that require enormous efforts and labours. Borrowing expressions from epic poetry, the poet calls for the Muses' aid to help him describe the forthcoming battle as the young man engages in tending and pampering his body.[135] First, the young man has to choose fashionable clothes and then curl his hair according to the latest trend. Contrasting the outer appearance with inner qualities, the poet notes that while the forefront of the building shines, the inner rooms are shady, and Ganymede was the most beautiful of mortals only from the outside.

Many vices lay beneath, and the contrast between the human mind and the exterior appearance is crucial in judging moral qualities. Lucchesini uses the image of the mirror to illustrate this contrast. In church, the young man looks for mirrors to comb his hair, worshipping his looks as if they are sacred (*Dum formam*

---

[132] Quoting Juvenal (13.144) he also claims that only worthless birds are hatched from unlucky eggs. Cf. Lubinus 1618: I who argued that parents neglected the education of their children who were like sheep without a shepherd, and cats and dogs took greater care of their cubs than human beings.

[133] On the satirical imagery of 'false surface and inner corruption', see Bramble 1974: 153-154 (with reference to Persius 1.49-50; Sen. *Epist*. 115.9).

[134] Lucchesini 1672.

[135] Cf. Hor. *Epist*. 1.2.29-30.

ille suam, ceu sacrum idolon, adorat).[136] The young man is called a consultor of mirrors (*speculi consultor*),[137] but, although he constantly looks in the mirror to observe himself, he fails to see his true image. The mirror mentioned in the poem is a favourite metaphor of satirists, who holding up a mirror to vicious society or individual vices enable human beings to see their moral status more clearly.[138] The mirror metaphor reduces the satirist's responsibility for his words and gives the impression that the poems reflect things as they are. Satirical mirrors usually present only negative examples, and the reflecting function is subordinated to correction, but in the poem the young man fails to use the mirror for introspection that would lead to his moral purification; instead, he focuses solely on the surface and fails to inspect and correct himself. Compared to the later epitome of the sincere man – Goethe's Werther, whose sincerity is expressed in his unchanging mode of dress[139] – the young man also changes his costume all the time without caring about the image of his true self or constancy of mind.

Later in the satire, Lucchesini also mentions Diogenes, who carrying a lamp during the day, sought out an honest human being:

Iamque satis Iuvenem prima in cute vidimus: intus
Formam hominis latitantem nunc sapiens Domiporta[140]
Diogenes quaerit, laternam adhibetque diurnam
O si admota forent Iuvenum specularia cordi
Queis possent animi spectari impune colores:
Ingenii vernans utrum splendescat imago,
Sitque animo pulcher, vultus qui flore superbit.[141]

---

[136] Lucchesini 1672: 42.

[137] Lucchesini 1672: 42. On the image of the mirror in moral discourse, see Hindermann 2016 who notes that the mirror was a gendered image: it symbolises vanity and femininity in a man and was therefore often used in satirical criticism (e.g., Juv. 2.99-103). The mirror of life was also a familiar analogy in Greek popular philosophy; see Freudenburg 1993: 35.

[138] Cf. Falco 1600: II (*Quaeramus speculum, quo vera tuentis imago / Apparere queat*; 'Let us find a mirror on which we could see a reflection of our true image'). On the mirror image in satires, see Grabes 2009: 99 *et passim*; he notes that satire often took the form of an exposing or unmaking mirror and the mirror was a favourite image of satires until the late sixteenth century.

[139] On Werther and his singular dark blue coat, see Trilling 1972: 52.

[140] Domiporta means literally 'house-carrying' and refers to Diogenes' knapsack which has been taken as a metonym for the Cynic *autarkeia* (self-sufficiency).

[141] Lucchesini 1672: 43-44; cf. Persius 3.30 (*in cute novi*). On Diogenes, see Scholirius 1683 and below Ch. 3.

> We have seen enough of this young man from the outside; inside,
> wise Diogenes Domiporta is searching for a human figure hiding there and
> carries a lantern in bright daylight.
> Oh, if only we could view young hearts with a mirror
> that would safely reflect the colours of their souls and
> show us whether the blooming image of their character is shining and
> the soul as beautiful as their flourishing appearance promises.

The word *imago* is noteworthy here: while the young man's face is superb, the first impression is a mere masquerade, since on closer inspection, the face forms a showy betraying surface concealing a soul full of furrows and scars. This was one of the most common satirical observations: the vices were hidden under the skin. Masks, costuming, and cosmetics were disdained since they concealed one's true nature; in religious satire they were demonic attributes. The human face is not born but made, and it reflects the moral quality of the individual. While criticising misplaced values, the poem also reflects the growing emphasis placed on individuality; the youth nurtures a new sense of the self that could be cherished for its own sake rather than being notable for having achieved something of value.

The contrast between outward splendour and inner weakness is an ethical commonplace in satires. A parodical version of this satirical topos is the poem entitled *Satyra in adolescentes formae studiosos* ('Satire against young men engaged with appearance', 1789) by Johannes Baptista Premlechner (1731-1789), an Austrian historian and neo-Latin poet. While in ethical works, the word *forma* often alludes to the human form that embodies moral goodness, Premlechner understands the word literally here. The poet was devastated by the strange feminine forms and fashions (*femineos mores*) that had filled the streets of his hometown, Vienna: half-men (*semiviri*) were dressed in women's clothes, girls were disguised as men, and the streets were full of young people wearing peacock's feathers and furs as if they were lions. This short satire participated in the discussion of what form people wanted their lives to have. The conservative poet complained that people should be less concerned with their appearance and more with their souls.[142] Its argument was linked to the perpetual concern of satire with the moral state of the human soul and its vanity. It interpreted the satirical

[142] Premlechner 1789: 129 (*Faciem queis cura colendi est / Nulla animum*). The blurring of gender norms (effeminacy, cross-dressing) is a rich comical and satirical topos; see Bramble 1974: 41-44 on homosexuality and effeminacy in Persius' and Juvenal's satires.

commonplace in a parodical manner, focusing on the latest trends in fashion. The self should be committed to the archaic virtues of honesty and sincerity, which were challenged, for example, by social mobility in the changing society. To give another example, one long verse satire – that cannot be studied here in more detail – criticising fashion and vanity was entitled *Curii Censorii Satira Vestispica* (Christling, 1610). The pseudonym referred to Philip Frenking, a Polish student, who attacked the evil of luxury and the use of gorgeous and fashionable clothes. The poem mocks people's desire to hide their humanity and wear wild fur. A typical phrase states that 'the girl is a peacock' (*Pavo puella adeo est*). The poem criticises people's vanity and implements the idea familiar from Horace's *Epistles* (1.16.45) that a person is often shameful and rotten on the inside even though he or she looks specious on the outside.[143]

Later the Swiss neo-Latin poet Petrus Esseiva (1823-1899) also participated in the ironic discourse of chastisement in his satire *Ad iuvenem satira* ('A satire against a young man', 1872). Typical satirical virtues are subverted in the poem which ironically advocates the skill in taking advantage of circumstances and nurturing the surface. The poet advises that his addressee should rather learn to make an impression on the crowd than become truly learned. The poet argues that the Horatian virtues of rural modesty and paternal advice no longer help anyone (*laudata modestia cunctis / nulli adiuta iacet*); what is now needed is impudence and arrogance.[144] Internal virtues are useless, because people esteem outward appearances (*neque enim res perspicit intus, / Sed specie vulgus semper captatur inani*).[145] The rhetoric of inside and outside is subverted here; the poet underlines that it is useless to cultivate inner qualities, since what matters is the outward splendour of impressions. While satirists usually boast that their verses are read only by a handful of learned readers, the poet now advises that one should be ambitious and look for big audiences. Esseiva defends traditional elitism in his ironic proposals underlining the lasting value of modesty and virtue.

In sum, neo-Latin verse satires are in many ways concerned with the personal and moral growth of their young addressees. In their effort to prevent moral mistakes, satires are devoted to disclosing them in detail so that readers would learn from what was wrong to understand the right. Satirists also seem to have a genuine concern for the moral maturity of the youth. Young minds are depicted as plants or sculptures that are carefully cultivated and shaped by

[143] Frenking studied in German universities and settled in Königsberg where he passed away in 1628.

[144] Esseiva 1872: 4.

[145] Esseiva 1872: 4.

the poet. However, the educational situation is often ironic and embedded in intertextual references to the previous satirical tradition and the Erasmian images of education. Satires offer playful instruction to aid their adolescent addressees improve their self-perception in an age when they are experiencing a transition from childhood into adulthood and maturity. Satire thus engages its adolescent readers to critically consider their choices in life using playful and vivid language.

Chapter 3
How to Be Calm: Ethical Reflections on Poverty and Tranquillity of Mind

After Horace, formal verse satires have traditionally been regarded as bitter but healthy moral instruction, and satirists have assigned themselves the task of educating their readers by exposing human errors. In his influential book on Horatian satire, *De satyra Horatiana libri duo* (1612, extended edition 1629), the famous Dutch scholar Daniel Heinsius (1580-1655) defined satire as the purging of sins and vices:

> *Satyra est poesis, sine actionum serie, ad purgandos hominum animos inventa, in qua vitia humana, ignorantia, ac errores, tum quae ex utrisque proveniunt, in singulis, partim dramatico, partim simplici, partim mixto ex utroque genere dicendi, occulte utplurimum ac figurate, perstringuntur; sicut humili ac familiari, ita acri partim ac dicaci, partim urbano ac iocoso constans sermone. quibus odium, indignatio movetur, aut risus.*[1]
>
> Satire is a type of poetry without a sequence of actions. It was invented to cleanse individual human minds of vices, ignorance, and errors as well as their consequences. It uses representation that is sometimes dramatic, sometimes simply narrative, sometimes consisting of both of these manners of representation. It often presents its criticism indirectly under a veil, using figurative language. Its style is low and ordinary, sometimes sharp and biting, sometimes witty and playful. It elicits hatred, indignation, or laughter.

Renaissance poetics and humanist commentaries on Roman satire recognised the close connection between moral philosophy and satirical writing. In his commentary on Persius (1605), Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614) argues that Roman satire consists of two main principles: moral doctrine and wit.[2] Satire differs from

---

[1] Heinsius 1629: 54. Among the treatises by later followers, *Liber de satyrae Latinae natura & ratione* (1744) by Giovanni Antonio Volpi (1686-1766), an Italian writer and professor of literature at Padova, is particularly illuminating about the purifying goals of satire. Volpi based his writing almost word for word on Heinsius, taking Heinsius's definition of satire as his starting point, but extending the discussion and adding some lucid remarks of his own. On satirical catharsis, see Kivistö 2009: 41-47.

[2] Casaubon also composed an influential treatise on Greek satirical poetry and Roman satire, *De satyrica*

other poetry in using humour to condemn vices and recommend virtues. Satire not only sets out to heal the moral and emotional life of readers by attacking their appetites and passions, but also to cure their intellect of ignorance and foolishness through ridicule. It aims at the overall perfection of the soul, and thus the two fields of moral discourse seem to share the same interests.

Philosophical enterprise was essentially pedagogical in antiquity, and satire was intimately connected to this understanding of popular moral philosophy from its very beginning. According to Mendell, it was widely recognised that Lucilius put into poetic form the popular teachings of Cynic philosophy in Rome.[3] It is also a commonplace view that philosophy played a significant role in Menippean satire, and the Cynic Menippus was a founding figure of the genre challenging the values of his times. In his footsteps, Varro's satirical fragments frequently display philosophical concerns.

The presence of ethical thought was also notable in verse satires that aimed to improve the lives of their addressees and readers. Satires used features and forms which were distinctly philosophical: satire borrowed wit and the diatribe form with its short oral discussions from Diogenes and his followers, the epistolary genre from Epicurus and his school, and the conversational tone and the dramatic setting from Plato's dialogues.[4] The Stoics were largely concerned with attacking vices, and the Stoic predilection for negations was another feature that connected satire to Stoicism. As a discourse of negations the Stoic moral philosophy was often constructed in the form of warnings that told pupils what to avoid in order to become virtuous.[5] Rather than describing virtue, Stoic philosophy advised its readers on what should *not* be done or hoped for. Aiming to eliminate evil both the Cynics and the Stoics held virtue as the only genuine good.

Graecorum poesi & Romanorum satira libri duo (1605). For the distribution of these two works, see De Smet 2019. Other early modern scholars who connected satire with philosophy included, for example, Johannes Antonius Campano (d. 1477), Johannes Murmellius (d. 1517) and other scholars who appreciated especially Persius' work. On the theoretical views of verse satire, see esp. Pagrot 1961; Kivistö 2009: Ch. 1.

[3] Mendell 1920: 142-143; on the relationships between Latin satire and philosophy in Antiquity, see Mayer 2005.

[4] Mendell 1920: 151-155. The diatribe form referred to a conversational discourse on moral terms; on Horace's 'diatribe satires' (1.1-4), see Freudenburg 1993: 9 *et passim*. Diatribe was characterised by its indignant tone, and it often also made use of a fictitious and provocative interlocutor who raises objections from an opponent's viewpoint (see Kennedy 1999; Freudenburg 1993: 9). The same technique is familiar from neo-Latin satires. As Freudenburg (12) notes, the term *sermo* has often been associated with the Greek diatribe which also imitated a free conversation on popular philosophical themes.

[5] Lohmeier 1981: 96.

While Persius was famously a Stoic, Horace was more ambiguous in his philosophical thinking. He generally favoured modified Stoicism, for example, in his defiance of Fortune, but disapproved of their extreme views and had his Epicurean moments with an emphasis on the moderate enjoyment of life.[6] In his satires and epistles, Horace addressed such questions as the philosophic mean and the advantages of the simple life, attacking the vices of avarice, ambition, extravagant living, and gluttony.[7] Horace typically drew attention to philosophical discourses among the elite at Rome, but his attitude to philosophizing was often parodical; his satires frequently ridiculed intellectual endeavors, not least his own. In the Middle Ages, Horace and Juvenal were often known by the cognomen *ethicus* or ethical writers.[8] Persius was preferred by the Church Fathers, Augustine, and Jerome; a world dominated by Christianity appreciated his Stoic moral ideas.[9]

Many neo-Latin authors of satire associated their work with Seneca's Stoicism and his moral epistles, which were concerned with spiritual guidance and the questions of emerging from vice and moving towards virtue. In their educative tendency the epistles also dramatised individual moral education.[10] Satire shared with Seneca the care about the pains of human existence by aiming to offer Stoic precepts for moral reform, cure, and consolation to all kinds of ills, although satirical consolation was often ironical or at least not to be taken entirely seriously.[11] In some of his moral epistles Seneca also discussed the relationship between poverty, money, and virtue, which was repeatedly addressed in satires, arguing that 'it is not the man who has too little, but the man who craves more, that is poor'. Seneca stated that the proper limit to wealth was, 'first, to have what is necessary, and, second, to have what is enough'.[12] In his view, poverty was free from care and therefore he suggested that 'if you wish to have leisure for your mind, either be a poor man, or resemble a poor man. Study cannot be helpful

[6] On Horace's philosophical views, see, e.g., Morford 2002: Ch. 5; for his Epicureanism, see esp. Yona 2018.

[7] I will return to the Horatian doctrine of contentment and simplicity of life in Ch. 7.

[8] Heinsius 1629: 18; Mendell 1920: 139; Kindermann 1978: 41, 68-69. Highet 1949 notes that Juvenal has also been considered a Stoic, but his knowledge of philosophy was rather limited at least in his first satires and he more frequently denounces the Stoics than praises them.

[9] Tournoy 1998: 75.

[10] On Seneca's epistles as dramatised moral education, see Schafer 2011.

[11] Satirical collections also included consolations that belonged to prescriptive philosophy in ancient times. Satires were written as philosophical and literary consolations aiming in the Stoic manner to extirpate grief. One subtext for these satires was Juvenal's satire 13 that was an ironic consolation. On Juvenal, see Braund 1997.

[12] Sen. *Epist.* 1.2.6 (trans. Richard M. Gummere).

unless you take pains to live simply; and living simply is voluntary poverty'.[13] Seneca stressed that poverty is not a burden, whereas the desire for money was condemned together with other passions, since it enslaved man and his reason. (Seneca himself owned huge fortunes.)

It seems safe to suggest that satire was a form of practical moral philosophy that aimed at ethical guidance, but it also had its own literary features that distinguished it from Seneca's Stoicism and other forms of general ethical instruction. In what follows, I will elucidate a handful of texts and arguments presented in favour of such philosophical issues as voluntary poverty and tranquility of mind in satirical literature. My discussion will sum up *how* satirical arguments stressed that virtue should be valued above riches and other vicissitudes of life.

Voluntary poverty

Our contemporary critics from environmentalists to downshifters have promoted simple living, criticised conspicuous consumption and demanded limits to economic growth. One demand often presented to individual consumers has been that people should change their lifestyles, for example, by reducing consumption. The ideas of downshifting and simple living have gained increasing popularity in western industrialised countries over the past decades. The main principles of downshifting are 'slowing down the pace of life', 'spending time meaningfully', and 'removing unnecessary possessions'. The main goal of downshifting is to reach more satisfying meaning in life by redefining life in non-material terms, whereas the advocates of simple living often also have wider political aims. People have also criticised downshifting on the basis that it is something that only wealthy people can do.[14]

Similar criticism of life-style choices can be detected both in ancient Greece and Rome and in neo-Latin satire. In general, involuntary poverty was one of the major societal and economic problems afflicting the classical Greeks, for whom poverty was a shameful condition that left people dependent on others' will and made them prone to criminal conduct. As the tragedian Euripides

[13] Sen. *Epist.* 1.17.5 (trans. Richard M. Gummere).

[14] Cf. *The Independent* 15 Feb 1998 ('Slow down, don't move out'). This section on voluntary poverty is partly based on my paper 'Downshifters and advocates of simple living in ancient Greece and Rome', which was published in the proceedings of the conference 'The Importance of Classics Education: Contemporary Issues, Classical Insights, East and West' held at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences (IHS), National Taiwan University, in 2012.

put it, poverty is a disease that through need teaches men to act in evil ways.[15] However, some writers and philosophers defended the usefulness of poverty. They did not address poverty as a political matter or a social problem, which would have required political measures, but approached poverty as an ethical issue, claiming that poverty was not a real cause of evil but, on closer examination, a blessing in disguise. Living simply was built on the idea of voluntary poverty. Ancient philosophers from Democritus and Plato to Epicurus spoke for the value of poverty in forming individual moral character which, when developed, was beneficial to the whole society. In this sense poverty did not mean hand-to-mouth penury; instead, it was voluntary choosing to live modestly and contrasted with the extreme wealth of the higher classes.[16] The criticism of luxurious living was also common in Roman political discourse and frequently presented by Roman moralists in general.

Ancient philosophers questioned the blessings of money and referred to the poverty of the rich, who were never satisfied with the fortunes they owned. Money was often discussed in negative terms and with reference to insatiability, power, and injustice. For example, the Greek historian Herodotus argued that coinage was born in Lydia during the reign of the first tyrant Gyges, and hence the concept of tyranny was associated in the minds of the Greeks with minting. Marc Shell, a literary scholar who has studied the economy of literature, has observed that 'As coinage was associated with the Lydians, so too was political tyranny',[17] and 'those states in which money was not introduced (Sparta and Thessaly, for example) did not develop tyrannies'.[18] The Greeks thus recognised the interconnections between these two new cultural and political forms of power.

Ancient philosophers reacted to the golden tyranny of money and several of their arguments were constructed to protect men against the vicissitudes of life. In the Stoic view, neither poverty nor illness could affect a man who possessed virtue and who was able to transcend the body's trivial demands. Poverty and diseases were regarded as external or accidental features of human life that could not harm the balanced inner self of the wise human being who was indifferent to fortune and transcended both pleasure and pain. His attitude secured his freedom, since he was no longer enslaved by their tyranny, but mastered them and himself.[19]

[15] *Electra* 375-6; McCreight 2008: 89 n. 2.

[16] For the concept of *paupertas*, see McCreight 2008: 93; Prell 1997, 44-49. See also Meyer 1915.

[17] Shell 1978 :12.

[18] Shell 1978: 13 n. 9.

[19] Cf. Seneca, *De vita beata* 4.4-5, where he argues that man should despise the accidents of fortune, delight in

Moreover, virtue was made manifest in its dealings with such circumstances as sickness, pain, or poverty, when men could present courage, heroic endurance of pain and self-control in difficult situations. The Stoics maintained that 'the wise man alone is rich' and his happiness never depended on the Fortune, since the wise man was self-sufficient in his rational virtue. Many philosophical arguments were constructed against the hostile power of Fortune, a ruling deity of the Hellenistic world.[20] At the same time, the argument of fortune was not only a Stoic issue but also a commonplace in declamatory schools.[21]

In the neo-Latin context, the tyranny of fortune was addressed, for example, by the Polish nobleman Antoni Poninski who published his *Sarmatides* (1741) – referring to the ancient Sarmatians – under the pseudonym Johann Maximilian Krolikiewicz.[22] His twelve satires deal with such major issues as nature (I), religion (II), and education (III), and he praises the simplicity and sincerity of nature that everybody should follow. One notes three satires specifically dealing with different tyrannies – the tyrannies of female love (V), honor (VI, ridiculing duelling), and fortune and false hope (VII). Poninski describes fortune as an arbitrary force whose favours are taken as facts and who destroys human lives simply for play and pleasure. Hope, for its part, makes us cherish sweet illusions about the future and causes a Tantalian thirst that can never be satisfied:

---

what he has and take pleasure in virtue; and ibid., *De consolatione ad Marciam* 10.1.

[20] Desmond 2006: 8. On the vicissitudes of fortune, see also Poggio Bracciolini's (1380-1459) *Historia de varietate fortunae* which was an important subtext for later early modern writers on the topic.

[21] De Decker 1913: 38. De Decker (21-22) notes, referring to Seneca the Elder's *Controversiae*, I Praef. 23, that commonplace philosophical arguments and judicial themes in declamatory schools included debates about the change of times, fortune, wealth, and cruelty, all of which were also addressed in many neo-Latin satires.

[22] Poninski 1741. His poems are briefly mentioned in De Smet 2015: 205; Ramos 2002: 227; IJsewijn 1975: 192 who notes that, although the poems are written in hexameters, they resemble didactic poetry rather than classical satire. Poninski lived at Poznan and was influenced by Enlightenment views. For neo-Latin satire in Eastern Europe, see IJsewijn 1975, who, in addition to Poninski, mentions such names as the minor Polish author Joachim Bilscius (Bielski, 1540-1599) and his patriotic poem *Satyra in quendam Dantiscanum* (1577) defending Poland against some poet from Danzig who had disseminated vilifying verses of the King of Poland around Germany; Damianus Benessa's (1477-1539) *Sermonum liber* which is found in the Franciscan library in Zagreb (and available as a manuscript in Dubrovnik); the Slavic humanist and satirist Bohuslaus Hassensteinius (Bohuslaw Lobkowitz von Hassenstein, 1462-1510) who wrote about the moral corruption of his country in his satirical poem *Ad sanctum Venceslaum satira, in qua mores procerum, nobilium et popularium patriae suae reprehendit* (a typical phrase here is that 'everyone is captivated by luxury and ambition'), and Michael Abel who published his satires *Musae undecimae seu ineptae versificatoriae delibatio* in Prague in 1591. IJsewijn claims that the satires in Eastern Europe seem to focus on three main themes: general moralizing on the wicked world; Horatian descriptions of the author's life, and literary topics (such as unqualified critics).

> *Quidnam spes aliud? Quam mentis febris acuta,*
> *Quae causando sitim, variisque iocando figuris,*
> *Eventurarum torquetur imagine rerum;*
> *Non tamen autem animum saturat, vel sponte quiescit.*[23]
>
> What else is hope than an acute fever of the mind
> which by raising a thirst and playing with various figures
> torments the mind with the image of forthcoming things,
> but never satisfies the soul or stops spontaneously.

According to the poet, hope was a home of many pains; he suggested that everyone should cut the thread of vain hope. The satires from ten to twelve on friendship and court life are missing from the collection; according to the marginal comment, they were stolen, which underlines the unpredictable effects of fortune on life.

Philosophers often argued that richness very frequently failed to satisfy the rich man. Apuleius, a second-century Roman orator and philosopher, was one famous writer to criticise the blessings of money. He presented his ideas in his *Apology*, a rhetorical self-defense speech, which in chapter 18 contains a long digression on philosophical poverty. The speaker here gives an elaborate encomium of the virtues of poverty, basing his argument on Greek philosophers and mentioning several exemplary figures from the Roman past. Apuleius argues that 'poverty has long been the handmaid of philosophy', and he continues: 'Count over all the greatest crimes recorded in the history of mankind, you will find no poor man among their guilty authors'.[24] According to Apuleius, poverty was the first founder of all cities and the first discoverer of all the arts.[25]

The ideal of the simple past played an important role in Roman political discourse in general. Roman historians praised the rustic past to celebrate the former Republican times and to criticise the moral decay of the Imperial period. From the middle Republic onwards, the Romans developed the image of a virtuous and hard-working poor who was busy on his farm,[26] and the positive evaluation of poverty started to figure in rhetorical schools and Roman

---

[23] Poninski 1741: VII, Cap. II, 176.

[24] Apuleius, *Apology* 18.2-4 (trans. H.E. Butler).

[25] Apuleius 18.6 (trans. H.E. Butler); McCreight 2008: 94-95.

[26] Osborne 2006: 13.

historiography. The discourse of the corrupting power of wealth was well represented, for example, in Sallust's *Catiline*.[27] Stories were told of the hard-working heroes of the past. The exemplary figures of the early Roman frugality mentioned by Apuleius included Roman generals, politicians, and writers who became famous despite being poor.[28] Among them was the Roman consul Publicola, a man who drove out the Kings. Another canonical example of the Republican Roman virtue was Cincinnatus, an early military leader whose celebrated frugality was based on modest living on his small farm. The Roman Senate appointed him dictator to settle the controversies with the Sabines. After having performed his duties, Cincinnatus gave up the command of his army and returned to his plough. Cincinnatus represented a magnanimous character who earned his reputation by virtue alone. He was mentioned as a symbol of purity in Persius' first satire (1.69-75) and later in neo-Latin works, such as Jan van Havre's third satire, in which the moral excellence of the past was linked with the countryside through this figure. Cincinnatus also represented an exemplary intervention ready to step forward when Rome was in the need of moral improvement.[29] As Robin Osborne has observed, the poor remained more often a topic for thinking and for rhetorical and literary exercises than a practical social problem to be solved.[30] Satirical authors in Rome argued that the disadvantages poverty caused were far fewer than the benefits she afforded human life.

Collapsing buildings

Following along these philosophical lines, satirical arguments stressed that virtue should be valued above riches and other favors of fortune. The wise man should not allow worldly success to disturb his freedom and tranquility. This was a typical Stoic position: Seneca, for example, warned his reader not to follow the judgement of the many who falsely ascribed positive moral or other value to things that should be considered indifferent. For Seneca, the crowd and the common opinion were erroneous in comparison with the Stoic sage.[31] In Roman

[27] Osborne 2006: 14.

[28] McCreight 2008: 93.

[29] Cf. Langlands 2018: 39.

[30] Osborne 2006: 15.

[31] Cf. Roller 2016: 133.

historiography, the first stages of decay were also manifested in the display of public and private wealth.[32]

This satirical and philosophical commonplace was eagerly adopted by the satirists who did not consider gold and purple merely indifferent but clearly dangerous and condemnable. For them, the unhealthy greed for gain threatened the purity of the soul. A vast majority of satires described the world in terms of negative conditions that did not meet any philosophical standards of simplicity and contentment. Filelfo's satire 8.2 which defends a poor wise man who disdains money-grabbing is an early example of this thinking. The poor man is despised by a rich illiterate who assumes, according to the satirist, that gold coins constitute virtue and happiness:

> *Tu mihi pauperiem probro quasi dedecus ingens*
> *Obiicis, ignarus quam sum te ditior uno.*
> *Ingenii quibus ipse cares bona plurima nobis. …*
> *Plura meis natis linquam, bona gloria verae*
> *Hos virtutis alet. …*
> *Quam facile est nummos sapienti cogere monstrat*
> *Ille Thales qui mox e paupere dives abundat.*[33]

> You throw my poverty in my face as though it were a great disgrace, quite unaware how much wealthier than you I am: my wealth is the treasure of the mind that you lack. … I shall leave more than you as an inheritance to my children: the true glory of real *virtú* will nourish them … How easy it would be for a wise man to get together a heap of money, may be seen from the example of Thales, who was a poor man, but quickly became exceedingly rich.[34]

This statement is followed by a description of a parvenu figure who, enjoying a luxurious dinner, is deaf to the Muses. As Oliver notes, poverty is here understood as a middle state between affluence and want.[35] It equals moderation which Filelfo also recommends in his satire 4.6, in which a greedy person states that money is never enough to cover his needs (*non mihi sufficiunt nummi*).

---

[32] See Trompf 1979: 71 (referring to Cato and Polybius).

[33] Filelfo 1502: VIII.2.

[34] Trans. Oliver 1949: 44.

[35] Oliver 1949: 45.

Eilhard Lubinus was among those neo-Latin satirists who lamented the dominating values of richness and money. He argues in his first satire that neglecting the example of Christ men had 'pious feelings only towards wealth and honours' (*nisi opes et honores / incutiant pietatem*).[36] While such Christian figures as Saint Peter once gave up their former living as fishermen and left their homes to follow Christ, Lubinus's contemporaries followed the command of money and their own interest. Lawyers, for instance, created conflicts instead of resolving them, and judged according to the payment received, rather than truth. The world was unjust, and no punishment was severe enough to match the current crimes:

> *Quae rota, quae furiae, quod saxum sufficit illis,*
> *Qui solem exstinguunt nil dignum luce gerentes?*[37]

> Where to find such wheels of torture, furies, or a rock of Prometheus that would sufficiently punish wrongdoers who quench the sun and whose activities shun the daylight?

While the rich 'take pleasure in the sweat and blood of farm workers, devouring their living bones and sucking the marrows',[38] the poor are forced to live a life worse than that of dogs. Rich men, busy piling up money, have forgotten the shared origin of all humans in nature and in Adam, and are heedless of the vanity of human effort:

> *Non satis est nummos et opes cumulare superbas,*
> *Non satis immensam molem aedificare domorum,*
> *Quae nubi, atque ipsi minitentur acumine caelo,*
> *Tot villas et agros, quantum nec milvus oberret.*
> *Vitae summa brevis, vah! quam cito praeterit huius!*[39]

> (Greedy men) are not content to accumulate money or proud wealth;
> they are not content to build an immense block of houses
> that threatens the clouds on the very top of the sky

[36] Lubinus 1618: I, 008.

[37] Lubinus 1618: I, 010.

[38] Lubinus 1618: I, 011.

[39] Lubinus 1618: I, 014.

> or to own so many villas and fields that not even a kite could wander about them.
> Yet life is so short, oh! How quickly all will perish!

The image of transience became a favourite theme in Baroque satirical poetry, suggesting that everything made by humankind will perish and all men are actors in the Theatre of Death. Many contemporary religious critics contrasted magnificent worldly monuments with the endurance of true glory, which had no need of gigantic, marble memorials. Here the glorious buildings were also implicitly contrasted with Horace's modest Sabine farm by evoking the word *satis* (enough) that was one of the key ethical concepts in Horace's poetry.[40] While Maecenas' gift to Horace was a small farm, the buildings here were not within proper bounds. Horace already noted that a house or a farm or a pile of gold will never soothe a sick and restless soul.[41] The image of the impending ruin also had its origins in Juvenal's third satire which complained about the collapsing houses which were unheard-of in the cool countryside but were a constant pest in the city and did not allow the tenants to sleep safe and sound.[42] Seneca Maior's *Controversies* also sang the same song of the house of cards.[43]

The image of the collapsing building recurred frequently in neo-Latin poetry in moralizing tones: the palace had an impressive front, and its roof was superbly high in the sky, but since it was not built on a firm foundation of virtue, Christian faith or eternity, the luxurious building did not last but came crashing down in ruins. For example, in van Havre's satires – to be discussed below – the architectonic image questioned the value of worldly things, riches and palaces covered with gold and marble, since such monuments collapsed and perished in time, whereas the value of virtue – or God – remained eternal.[44] In the manner of Roman moralists, Naogeorg also denounced the wealthy man who builds impressive private palaces with extensive gardens and birdhouses to satisfy his private pleasures, but never gives money to the poor. In their blindness the rich 'never raise their eyes to the heaven and the stars'.[45] Guglielmini, for his part, invoked the example of Pope Clement XII, a generous patron of artists and

---

[40] See, e.g., Hor. *Epist*. 1.7.16 (*Iam satis est*).

[41] Hor. *Epist*. 1.2.46 (*quod satis est cui contingit, nil amplius optet*).

[42] Juv. 3.7-8 (*lapsus tectorum*), 196 (*pendente ruina*).

[43] Sen. *Contr*. II.1.11-12; De Decker 1913: 37.

[44] Havraeus 1627: III, p. 48; van Havre 2014: 3.243, 251 (*Excelsa turres, auro fulgentia tecta / … in cineres delapsa peribunt*).

[45] Naogeorg 1555: IV.3, p. 168.

the great restorer of Rome, and counselled that, instead of serving their private whims, wealthy men should support the public arts, architecture and sculpture.[46]

Aristophanic motifs

Other elements of ancient literature and thinking also contributed to the later satirical denunciation of greed and money. Naogeorg's satire 4.3 employed the Aristophanean myth of Plutus, the blind god of wealth and a sickly old man, who owing to his blindness was unable to distribute wealth evenly and as a result there was no correlation between possessions and merit.[47] As he could not tell the good from the undeserving, the wicked became rich whereas the good and the just were forced to live in poverty. Offering a mythical explanation for social inequality, Aristophanes described how two Athenians tried to heal the god of his blindness. Entering the scene at this point the personified Poverty claimed that she was the source of every blessing in men's lives, since she compelled men to earn their daily bread, disciplined them and made them hardworking. The poor enjoyed good mental and physical health, whereas the wealthy suffered constantly.[48] Therefore she, Poverty, benefited both the individual and the state. The personified Poverty made a clear distinction between poverty and beggary. Those who were forced to beg owned nothing, whereas the poor man had nothing to spare but he was not falling short; he had the minimum that was required for a sparing living. Thus, poverty was construed here as the virtuous absence of wealth.

In Naogeorg's emphatically Lutheran version of Aristophanes' comic fantasy, the men who worshiped Plutus cared only for their own welfare and success. Refusing to give money to charity they waged wars to prosper. Naogeorg claims that Plutus would shun them if he only could see. They were Catholics, clerics, power-seeking (Protestant) regents, and others interested in riches and splendor. They decorated temples with gold and did not build anything socially useful:

> *Nec sibi, nec patriae, nec cognatis et amicis*
> *Usui. …*

---

[46] Guglielmini 1742: I.8; see also below, Ch. 6.

[47] On the Aristophanic allegory of richness and poverty in literature, see Hertel 1969, who notes (151-152) that Naogeorg also composed a play titled *Mercator* (1540, 'Merchant') which included a personified Profit (*Lucrum*).

[48] Cf. Meyer 1915: 3, 13, 39.

> *Profuse aedificant nullus quae flagitat usus,*
> *Huc illuc magno sumptu frustraque vagantur,*
> *Magnificasque parant vestes, hortosque, nihil qui*
> *Alcinoi cedant hortis, vivaria condunt,*
> *Et leporaria habent, nec eis aviaria desunt.*
> *… at reddere fido*
> *Mercedem famulo tardant, multumque gravantur*
> *Si quid pauperibus dandum …* [49]

> They are not useful to themselves, their country, relatives, or friends…
> They erect lavish buildings which are not needed,
> they wander around using fortunes for nothing,
> they prepare magnificent clothes and gardens not
> inferior to those of Alcinous, and they establish parks
> and places for keeping hares[50] and are not lacking aviaries.
> … but they are slow to pay
> their faithful servant and are greatly oppressed
> if they have to give something to the poor…

The social criticism of the poem calls for a new Christianity interested in the common good and brotherly love instead of the Roman-like luxurious living in the villas. Glittering golden facades and the vainglorious display of pomp fell under the patronage of the devil, but the issue about buildings was not merely symbolic, since in religious reforms former building materials could be reused in iconoclastic ways. As Ulinka Rublack has noted, Zwingli, for instance, developed social policies that implemented his idea of a communal church and in this new atmosphere wooden sculptures of saints could be reused as firewood and elaborate gravestones as building material in order to symbolise the new order.[51] In Naogeorg's poem the value of charity and inward faith were contrasted with the alleged (Catholic) habit of adoring worldly splendour and erecting altars for show. This notion reflected the Protestant inclination to direct religious imagination from Catholic relics and rituals towards inwardness and the aural

[49] Naogeorg 1555: IV.3, p. 165, 167.

[50] On *leporaria*, see Varro, *De re rustica* 3.3.

[51] Rublack 2017: 102; on iconoclasm in Reformation, see Wandel 1999.

presence (the Word) of God in the world.[52] The satire ended with a positive example of a good man, who lived in Christian modesty. He did not live for himself alone (*nempe sibi haud vivit soli*); instead, he divided the gifts of Plutus widely to those in need.[53]

In his satire 5.2, however, Naogeorg reinterprets the satirical commonplace of condemning idolatrous pomp and gold by describing how in the good old times men used their wealth to decorate religious buildings. One important example in the history of sacred architecture was found in old Jerusalem; David and Solomon were both concerned with significant building projects.[54] Naogeorg describes how David initiated and Solomon erected the temple that was floored with cedar and overlaid with gold. Everyone donated gifts for the building. Gift-giving was an important element in the construction of the biblical temple and gathering riches was not condemned but praised as a socially responsible and pious action. While satires usually disapproved of pomp and glamour, here the commonplace was turned around and instead of condemning gold as vainglorious display the poet paradoxically extols biblical generations for decorating temples, churches, and monasteries in a fervor of gift-giving. Solomon is praised as a temple builder in the moral architecture of the poem.

The poem abounds with words of gift (*donare, donum dare*) stressing the reciprocal nature of an exchange that was of mutual benefit to both parties. The poem proceeds by drawing a sharp contrast between the generous back then and the miserly present:

Qui nunc fit quaeso, ut divina humanaque docti
Plerique, atque Evangelium verbumque sonantes
Iugiter, haud solum nil dent templisque Deoque,
Nec curent Evangelium Christique ministros
Quo pacto servent, tueantur, dentque futuris:
Sed spolient etiam sacras radicitus aedes,
Et Christi studeant victum fregisse ministris?
Hoc an amatores Christi, verique putemus?[55]

---

[52] On God's aural presence, see Wandel 1999: 197. For the archangel Michael's 'proto-Protestant' criticism of the holiness of golden altars in Milton's *Paradise Lost*, see King 2001: 170-171.

[53] Other early modern satires described Plutus as a god of gold, who was a friend of deception, offering weapons to bandits in the woods; see Nomi 1703: IV, p. 46.

[54] Trompf 1979: 136.

[55] Naogeorg 1555: V.2, pp. 197-198.

How come, I ask, divinely and humanly learned men
who speak unfailingly the words of the Gospel, don't give anything to churches and God.
They don't care about the Gospel or how they protect the servants of Christ,
they don't support them or give anything for future needs.
But don't they also completely impoverish the churches
and try to prevent the servants of Christ from receiving their share?
Should we really consider these people lovers of Christ and the truth?

The poem was written against Protestant regents and dukes who had converted to Lutheranism and condemned Catholic luxury as external ritualistic practice. The poet suggested that in establishing their seemingly modest cult practices and inward temples of devotion they were in fact motivated by greed and self-interest, not by piety. The poem is a social satire identifying contemporary selfishness as the primary reason for the increasing poverty and unrest in society. By giving money to public buildings and churches Protestant dukes could have prevented wars and robbery; instead, by sanctimoniously appealing to their new iconoclastic faith and the inwardness of true devotion they in fact kept all the riches for themselves.

Religious undertones were also present in the works of Jaime Juan Falcó, a Spanish humanist and mathematician, who in his posthumously published ten satires (in *Opera poetica*, 1600) defended the nobility of the human soul against the corrupting influence of avarice and other vices.[56] In his third Stoic satire (*De praestantia animi*, 'On the pre-eminence of the soul') he contrasts the human soul with the riches. The number of prohibition words implements the negative poetics of satires:

Ergo non aurum, non robur, non genus es tu,
Sed quaedam mentis divinae particula, ob quam
Quid coeleste sumus.[57]

Then, you are not gold, or hard oak, or some species;
instead, you are a small part of the divine spirit that
makes us celestial.

[56] Spain produced some interesting neo-Latin satirists. Francisco Botello de Moraes y Vasconcelos from Spain wrote four imaginative neo-Latin satires (*Satyrae*) in 1739 (see also De Smet 2015: 199). His first programmatic satire justifies his writing; the second praises tranquillity and the poet discusses with Mercury; the third criticises corrupt nobility; and the fourth derides Pyrrhus and extols Spain, among other issues.

[57] Falco 1600: III.

The satire was written against the illusions of life that, like bubbles, did not last. The poem proceeds in a Socratic manner as a dialogue between the satirist and his ignorant discussant (*tu*) who is the recipient of his questions and dialogical teachings. The virtuous soul made human beings beautiful and distinguished them from animals which excelled in many other abilities but did not have a possibility of virtue. Falcó also wrote two satires against gamblers (*In aleatores*) who placed all their hope in this one dream: that their money would increase (*ut magis atque magis, plus plusque pecunia crescat*).[58] The poet suggests that the gamblers ask for more in quantity (*plus*) and in degree (*magis*). They adore their own deity Ludus who did not have any official place in the saints' calendar or among the gods, since he was more interested in the mundane world. Distributing gold arbitrarily and unevenly without any moral principles Ludus competed with other gods and Fortune who acted by chance. In his random and accidental behavior, he did not obey any moral or divine principles and erected new temples (*nova sacra*) and monuments to himself alone.[59] Gamblers and adulterers were stock characters already in Roman rhetorical schools in which the pupil of oratory was expected to learn to denounce gambling.[60] One of the main criticisms here was the gambler's reliance on chance and their worship of riches.

One favourite character type in satires on greed was the miser whose mind was also fixed on wealth. Falcó's first satire warns against greed saying that the miser spends his days worrying about his fortunes and suffers from sleepless nights in the fear of losing everything in a fire. Nevertheless, after his death he can never embrace his riches anymore.[61] In his satire 4.3 on Plutus, Naogeorg evokes an identical image of a miser who buries his gold and guards his treasures as if they were an old virgin denying any approach but refrained from touching her. The miser illustrated figurative enslavement to Horace: due to his enslaving greed and desire the miser lived in constant fear of losing his fortunes and thus was never free. Horace compared the miser to a slave in his epistles (1.16.63) and discussed the alignment of greed and freedom in detail in his satires. In satire 2.7 Horace argued through his slave Davus that only the wise man who is a master of himself

---

[58] Falco 1600: IV.

[59] Falco 1600: IV. Falcó's eighth satire (*In aleatores*) also deals with gamblers and the human greed. His seventh satire (*Imitatio satyrae primae Horatii*) is a prosodic experiment in the Horatian style; each line begins and ends with a monosyllabic (see also De Smet 2015: 204).

[60] See Poynton 1934: 11.

[61] Falco 1600: I.

is free, since he is not affected by the sudden changes of fortune.[62] At the other extreme for Naogeorg (and for Horace) was the spendthrift, who entertained strangers at his luxurious feasts; the wealth of his house was carried off by his mistresses, gamblers, and parasites. Central to the acquisition of tranquility was moderation.[63]

Riches of the mind

Instead of money, satirists constantly urged their readers to seek virtue and spiritual riches. Jean Saint-Geniès's satires exalted the importance of virtue that alone adorned a house and made a human being noble. In the manner of Horace, his first satire was written against greed; he noted approvingly that there were people who despised money and were satisfied with what they possessed. His eighth satire recapitulated the same message; a poor man is not entirely unhappy when compared to a rich man who guards his possessions:

> *Vir eget in mediis, cui mens est sordida, gazis;*
> *Pauperiem toto timet et fugit impiger aevo,*
> *Et patitur: magnos illam fert inter acervos*
> *Quam fugit infoelix, et vitam vivit egentum;*
> *Non aliis, non ipse sibi iucundus. …*[64]
>
> A man whose mind is sordid is continually lacking, even in the midst of treasures.
> He is for his whole life afraid of poverty and relentlessly tries to escape it,
> and he suffers. The unhappy man carries poverty with him
> while trying to avoid it in the middle of the piles of money, living the life of a pauper,
> being unpleasant both to others and himself.

This description resembles the philosophical claim that Apuleius presented in defence of poverty, saying 'for he who desires least will possess most, inasmuch as he who wants but little will have all he wants. The measure of wealth ought

[62] Hor. *Sat.* 2.7.83-88; see also 1.1 (against greed).

[63] As Democritus had already stressed, deficiency and excess produced great movements and made the human soul unstable. Therefore, one should be satisfied with what was at hand and not suffer from wanting more. Democritus' ideas on moderation are quoted, e.g., in McCarter 2015: 120 who also considers their influence on Horace's epistles.

[64] Sangenesius 1654: VIII, p. 92.

therefore not to be the possession of lands and investments, but the very soul of man'.[65] According to Apuleius, man was poor only if he lacked something, and in his view, which was a philosophical commonplace, the rich man was insatiable.[66] Apuleius celebrated the wealth of the poor philosopher, whose satisfaction was based on the absence of needs. One commonplace idea in the rhetoric of virtuous poverty was that men should first study philosophy and only later focus on acquiring money, because if they proceeded the other way around, that is, by getting rich first, they would no longer care to philosophise.[67] Saint-Geniès concluded his eighth satire with a similar emphatic note:

> *Haec reputans tecum non quaeres plura repertis,*
> *Frater, in exigua vives re laetus: abunde*
> *Et super est isto, genitor quodcumque reliquit.*
> *Non tibi divitias possum donare: sed illas*
> *Ex me si disces contemnere, majus habebis*
> *Munus, et immenso longe praestantius auro.*
> *Plus iuvat arte sitim medica qui tollit, et aegri*
> *Ardorem extinguit iecoris, quam pocula multa*
> *Qui praebet, dextra numquam cessante, minister.*[68]

> If you consider my advice you will not search for more than what you already have,
> brother, since you will live a happy life with small possessions; more than
> abundantly is whatever property your parents have left you.
> I cannot give you riches, but if
> you learn from me the lesson of despising them, it is a far more
> precious gift than the greatest number of gold.
> A person who relieves thirst with his medical art and

[65] Apuleius, *Apology* 20. The quotation continues as follows: 'For if avarice make him continually in need of some fresh acquisition and insatiable in his lust for gain, not even mountains of gold will bring him satisfaction, but he will always be begging for more that he may increase what he already possesses. That is the genuine admission of poverty. For poverty consists in the need for fresh acquisition, wealth in the satisfaction springing from the absence of needs'. See Apuleius 20, trans. H. E. Butler.

[66] Cf. Guglielmini (1742: I.8, p. 40) who, quoting Cicero's paradoxes and Seneca's epistle 168, wrote: *Nil deficit illi, / Qui nihil optat, habent Musas et carmina vates, / Id satis est, miseris non sunt satis omnia avaris*.

[67] On the commonplace view that a serious philosopher should despise poverty, see also, e.g., Sen. *Epist*. 20.1; Kraye 2005: 325.

[68] Sangenesius 1654: VIII, pp. 96-97.

extinguishes the ardour of a sick liver is more helpful than a servant
who serves innumerable drinks with his indefatigable hands.

Saint-Geniès suggests that no one should hope for more than she or he already has but be satisfied with a small fortune. The parents had left enough legacy for a frugal living, and the poor poet cannot offer more to his brother, the addressee of the poem, than his advice on the greatness of mind and an exemplary ability to despise riches. Saint-Geniès frequently identifies true richness and freedom with virtue and contentment, but in his seventh satire he also stresses that true wealth should not satisfy only the rich; instead, it should contribute to the relationship between the individual and the world. Although virtue was important for personal development, Saint-Geniès stresses that it should also have social benefits. One should not behave like a rich man who only cares for his own fortunes. Instead, the wealth of the mind should be shared with others:

Maxima pars hominum seruit sibi, dum bona quaerit
Fortunae. … Partem potius peccatur in istam,
Quisque sibi ut caveat soli, nec commoda curet
Alterius. Non sic animi tractare solemus
Divitias; doctas avidus qui suscipit artes
Cogit opes aliis, minimum sibi consulit ipsi.
Hic legit, ut scribat libros, studet alter, ut alta
Verba serat de sede …[69]

Most people only serve themselves while searching for
good fortunes. … But they are mistaken if
they only take care of themselves and do not care about
the condition of the other. The riches of the mind are usually
considered in a different light; someone who avidly attains the knowledge of learned arts
collects wealth for others and least for himself.
One reads to write books, and the other studies to give
speeches from the podium.

Thus, the riches of the mind are true wealth that can never be excessive when the knowledge is shared with others. Saint-Geniès cautions that this principle should be followed not only in theory but also in practice. Learned human beings

[69] Sangenesius 1654: VII, p. 84.

should follow their own rules and let their own behavior set a moral example for students.[70] Saint-Geniès's poems were not only concerned with personal development; they also reflected social awareness and underlined that personal identity and virtue were formed in social interaction with the help of language and other people. For him, social isolation was not a sign of true wisdom.

Tranquility of mind

The Roman Stoics and Seneca were important examples for philosophically orientated neo-Latin verse satire that stressed in the Stoic manner the value of virtue and the importance of self-knowledge. The constancy or steadiness of mind was one philosophical issue in satires. It denoted a state of mind which made a human being independent of any external event. For example, Naogeorg's satires appeared together with his Latin translation of Plutarch's essay on the tranquillity of mind and his edition of Seneca's *De tranquillitate animi*, thereby stressing the parallels between satirical and philosophical instruction.[71] Philosophical satire was not directed against named individuals but found its targets in perennial human weaknesses and vicious habits.

Ethical instruction provided an important stimulus for the Ghent humanist Jan van Havre (Havraeus, 1551-1625) and his three satires entitled *Arx virtutis sive de vera animi tranquillitate* ('The Fortress of Virtue or on the True Tranquillity of Mind', 1627).[72] Seneca's treatise uses medical analogies when discussing the consultation of one's moral and spiritual state. Similarly, in the preface to his satire ('Admonitio ad lectorem') van Havre couches his writing in medical terms, saying that he hastened to fight against a common disease, hoping that men would learn to know themselves with the help of their sickness and pain and allow doctors to medicate their inner ulcers. He assures that all the evils he describes have taken place elsewhere (*alibi vidi, alibi*) and not in his beloved Belgium. Moreover, he

[70] Sangenesius 1654: VII, p. 84.

[71] Naogeorg 1555.

[72] Havraeus 1627; van Havre 2014. The Belgian van Havre was born into a noble family, studied in Italy, spent his youth in France and was sent to a prison in Belgium in 1580 after having criticised the Catholic church. He lived for 74 years, mainly in France and Belgium. On van Havre's satires, see Laureys 2008 who notes that van Havre's satires were characterised by moral seriousness in the manner of Seneca or Justus Lipsius. Although Horace was the main model in the work, the poems did not rely on humour. The author also took part in the Stoicization of Horace's poetry, which was typical of the time.

emphasises the innocence of his own purposes in writing (*scribendi innocentia*).[73] In the opening epigram written by Caspar Gevartius (Gevaert, 1593-1666) from Antwerp's humanist circles, the poet declares that all the ancient wisdom of Epictetus, Plato, Chrysippus, Seneca, and Socrates has been gathered into this book so that people would learn to avoid human errors (*hominum errores*) and live peacefully.[74]

In his first satire, directed at human desires and especially at the desire for money, van Havre notes, like Horace, that human beings are hardly ever satisfied with their lot (*Nemo sua vivit contentus sorte*).[75] Aggravated by their desires, they envy their neighbours, and this burning ambition and inconstancy prevent them from acquiring the tranquillity of mind that was so precious to the Stoic-minded satirists. Since ambition is the enemy of peaceful living, van Havre claims that it is better to decline the pursuit of fame, honours, or riches, which are far less valuable than virtue and a peaceful mind. The Stoic-minded poet underlines that one should drive away such passions as hope, fear, love, and anger. According to van Havre, different professions have their characteristic sins. Soldiers play with death, slaughtering innocent people, and merchants sail over distant seas facing thousands of dangers, lured on by the false glitter of gold.[76] Men are insatiable:

Ecquid habent Reges, nisi solum tegmen et escam?
Haec quoque pauper habet, qui si nihil ambiat ultra,
Atque humili lare tranquille et bene vivere curet.
Quisnam adeo ignarus, qui non hunc esse beatum,
Et mage felicem ducat, quam Sceptra tenentes,
Qui magna ut teneant, semper maiora requirunt?
Divitias multi affectant, paucique fruuntur.
Multis dat fortuna nimis, numquam satis ulli.
Servitium hic splendet, ubi splendet magna potestas.

[73] Havraeus 1627: pp. 8-9; van Havre 2014: 49. The edition of 1627 that I have consulted includes a preface written in 1625, the satires, a panegyric poem to van Havre written by Gevartius (see Sacré 2004: 374), and the author's biography. For a modern edition with detailed notes by Stéphane Mercier, see van Havre 2014. Sacré observes that Gevartius received several copies of the collection and delivered them to his friends. *Arx virtutis* is the only one of van Havre's longer neo-Latin poems that has survived.

[74] Havraeus 1627: p. 10; van Havre 2014: 43.

[75] van Havre 2014: 1.7. Cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.1-12.

[76] Horace's satire (1.1.5-8) also refers to merchants and soldiers when discussing the futility of envy and dissatisfaction when men long for different ways of life (see also Freudenburg 1993: 22-23).

Quis Cynicum testa clausum non praeferat illi,
Qui satur haud uno plures sibi postulat orbes?[77]

What do kings own except a roof over their heads and some food?
But these things the poor man also possesses, if he wishes for nothing more
than to live peacefully and well in his humble cottage.
Who would be as ignorant as to deny that the poor man is happy
and indeed happier than those holding the reins of power,
since however much wealth they possess, they will always desire more.
Most men strive for riches, but only few enjoy them.
Fortune grants too much to many, but still always less than they all want.
Slavery prevails among those who prevail in power.
Who would not regard the Cynic living in his tub
more fortunate than the man who, dissatisfied with one world, requests more?

The last line of the quotation referred to Alexander the Great who conquered the world. Since human life was short and perishable, van Havre recommended that men should devote their time to virtuous and simple living, whereas riches merely deprived man of his freedom. The happy man retired from the world of soldiers, merchants, and princes was a classical image, whereas merchants in particular were subservient to the power of fortune and prone to greed.[78] The passage also reminds one of Juvenal who, inveighing against greed, prefers Cynic poverty and Epicurean economy in which the little is sufficient.[79] In his first poem van Havre also employs an image of universal blindness, praying for people to be relieved of it and have their eyes opened to realise the mindlessness of the world. The motif of mental blindness recurs in van Havre's satire, identified with specific passions like desire, love, luxury, hunger for gold and for public honour, all of which equal blindness in the sense of losing oneself and misunderstanding the true value of things.[80]

---

[77] Havraeus 1627: I, p. 24; van Havre 2014: 1.300-310. Cf. Martialis 12.10.2 (*Fortuna multis dat nimis, satis nulli*; van Havre 2014: 88 n. 101).

[78] On the happy man ('beatus vir') in literary tradition, see Rostvig 1954: esp. 71-74, 1958; Mack 1969: 100-107; on the stereotypic image of the merchant, see Kivistö 2020 (with further references). On retirement poems and the Horatian farmer who retires from the world of soldiers, merchants, and lawyers to the countryside, see below Ch. 7.

[79] Juv. 14.303-321; Highet 1949: 265.

[80] Havraeus 1627: I, p. 16; van Havre 2014: 1.113-114 (… *caeco velamine adempto, / perspicere his qui terrenis in sordibus haerent*); 1627: 1, p. 19; 2014: 1.191 (*caeca cupido*); 1627: I, p. 20; 2014: 1.201-202 (*luxuries,*

Jan van Havre's second satire focusses on the value of virtue as the most precious property that human beings can have. Echoing Seneca's ideas, van Havre stresses that, instead of serving their bodily senses, everyone should remember the divine origins of their soul and serve God (*sumque ad maiora creatus / Quum sim mancipium mihi corporis*, 'I was born for bigger things in life than being merely a slave to my body').[81] True glory is based on virtue alone, as demonstrated by Arria, the Roman wife whose husband Paetus was condemned to death by the emperor. When Paetus preferred suicide to the emperor's command, Arria stabbed herself in order to encourage her husband. Her words, 'it does not hurt', became proverbial, epitomising the idea that it was better to commit a virtuous suicide than to live a condemnable life. Jan van Havre notes that virtue is a hard thing to practise; it can only be exercised by continuous learning and sweating (*assiduo studio et sudore paratur*).[82]

A man's character was thought to be discernible on his face, which indicated his moral state; in the Juvenalian saying, anguish and pleasure stamp themselves on the visage. On the other hand, satires often also constructed an opposition between the false first appearance and the true inner side of human beings. Jan van Havre expresses this conventional contrast, saying that human minds are remarkably different, and a slow gait and a timid outlook do not necessarily reflect a man's character; on the contrary, such things could well conceal a generous mind and the courage of a lion. The poet borrowed these expressions from Roman verse satire – another Juvenalian saying he uses was *fronti nulla fides,* 'never trust the front' (that is, 'Don't rely on appearances') – and he elaborated on other ancient phrases that had warned of deceptive appearances and secret evils: roses had thorns, serpents hid in the grass, the firm gait could deceive; for many men simulation and pretence were the whole of life.[83] He adopts numerous expressions from Roman satire, including pathological ulcers, guilty pallor and putrid filth swelling inside the body. In van Havre' vision, God blinded the man he wished to destroy.[84]

praedulce malum quo non magis ullum, / Aut hebetans aut obcaecans caligine sensus); 1627: I, p. 20; 2014: 1.210 (*caeci flammas … amoris*); 1627: I, p. 25; 2014: 1.318 (*caecat et urit / exsecranda fames auri, et popularis honoris*).

[81] van Havre 2014: 2.4-5. Cf. Sen. *Epist*. 65.20-21.

[82] Havraeus 1627: II, p. 28; van Havre 2014: 2.51.

[83] Havraeus 1627: II, p. 32; van Havre 2014: 2.157; Juv. 2.8. The cento consists of phrases taken from Juvenal, Vergil, and Cicero. Juvenal insisted in his third satire that a man's countenance should mirror his soul, and no one should maintain outward pretensions; see Wiesen 1963: 463. In his verse satires, Poninski (1741: I, Cap. VIII) also criticises simulation in a passage that abounds with expressions of fallaciousness (*retegere, superficies, apparentia, simulare*, etc.).

[84] Havraeus 1627: II, pp. 26-27; van Havre 2014: 2.27-28 (*obscuratque atra caligine mentem*). Cf. Sen. *Epist.*

Jan van Havre's third satire was directed against war and anger, advocating instead peaceful living, concord, and friendship. Strongly Christian in tone and full of proverbial sayings and life instructions about the value of virtue, good will and reason, the poem emphasises that human beings should not do to others anything that they would not wish to have done to themselves (*Quod tibi non optas fieri, ne feceris ulli*).[85] Referring to Horace's satires, van Havre declares that in their blind self-love, men view their own vices with the eye of a pigeon, but others' shortcomings, with the eye of a hawk.[86] Van Havre suggests that human beings should treat even their enemies gently and not return violence for violence or throw the first stone; instead, patience and friendliness are recommended for solving human disagreements (*patientia vincit*).[87] Here, too, van Havre has recourse to Roman examples, in this case the early Republican leader Cincinnatus, famous for his frugality and modesty, who did his duty but was not interested in power. Other key Stoic and Christian concepts in the third satire include the power of reason and the importance of self-improvement, self-knowledge, and self-sufficiency (*esse suum*) for true freedom. Jan van Havre's poems thus evolve strongly in a moral-philosophical direction, and particularly noteworthy in the collection are its many moral examples and sayings that contain instructions for a good life.

Cynical liberty

Although satires have usually spoken for healthy moderation and plain living without relying on specific philosophical schools or theories, the Cynic-Stoic philosophy furnished the main background of whatever identifiable philosophical content there was in verse satire. Ancient Cynics were another group of philosophers who claimed that the harmfulness of poverty was a mere conventional judgement, based on false opinions and deceptive appearances. The Cynics developed the idea that poverty provided independence and courage; the poor man was free to regulate his own life, and the best and truly important things, such as conversations with friends and the sunlight, were free and could not be bought with money. One of their main mottos was the monetary phrase

122.4 (*Quanto plus tenebrarum in animo est*).

[85] van Havre 2014: 3.34.

[86] Havraeus 1627: III, p. 39; van Havre 2014: 3.42-43. Cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.25-27.

[87] van Havre 2014: 3.64.

about 'defacing the current coin' or altering the imprint on the currency, which for them meant a wider challenge to the conventional rules of behavior; it meant the defacing of custom. The Cynic renunciation of wealth was the basis for their ideal of self-sufficiency and internal freedom.[88]

The Cynics themselves were often well-to-do persons, sons from rich families, who, however, gave up their fortunes and started a new life in poverty. Crates (ca. 300 BC) sold his valuables and distributed the money to his fellow-citizens. According to some sources, he threw his money into the sea. According to another legend, Zeno the Stoic shipwrecked near the coast of Greece, but instead of lamenting his loss of fortunes he was grateful for the accident that stripped him of all his possessions and thus he could devote his life to philosophy. The Cynics maintained that poverty did not prevent happiness. This implied that a social revolution was needless since the achievement of simple living was a personal choice. Thus, the Cynics did not offer any political measures for improving society or for making the living conditions of the poor better. They appealed to individual morality and wanted to challenge conventional customs, values, and authorities, including the enslaving power of money and wealth.

Both the ancient Cynics and the Stoics acquired a reputation as outspoken preachers against the immoral.[89] Diogenes was the main representative of the Cynic school during the Renaissance and after.[90] The magistrate Petrus Scholirius from Antwerp devotes his third book of satires (*Sermonum familiarium libri III*) and its two long poems (satire X, *Pro Diogene Cynico Apologia*, and XI, *Diogenes Cynicus*) to the defence of Diogenes and his thinking.[91] In his tenth satire entitled an apology of Diogenes, the Cynic is introduced as a major castigating figure who demonstrates *parrhesia* and constantly confronts people on the street.[92] The aim of the poem is to explain Diogenes' 'canine art' (*ars canis*) which referred to the Cynical liberty and freedom.[93] The Cynics lived like street dogs: they obtained their food by begging, barked at passersby, and following their nature did publicly things that people often avoided in the public arena.

---

[88] Desmond 2006: 16 *et passim*.

[89] Mendell 1920: 147.

[90] On the mixed legacy of the Cynic movement, see Branham & Goulet-Cazé 1996.

[91] Scholirius has traditionally also been considered the author of a facetiously written book on the culinary art (*Koock-Boeck*), but the authorship has also been contested.

[92] On the concept of *parrhesia*, see Foucault 2001 (on Diogenes and the Cynics, see esp. 115-133).

[93] Scholirius 1683: III.X.90. According to Foucault 2001: 119, the three main types of Cynic *parrhesia* were critical preaching, scandalous behaviour, and provocative dialogue; these all were also notable in satires.

The poet notes that, although usually it did not make sense to bite a giving hand, the Cynics appealed to their independence and indifference; they denounced flatterers and refused to serve anyone. While Aristotle had his dinner when it suited his master Philip of Macedon, Diogenes disdained royal courts and ate where and when he pleased. He did not wave his tail to anyone but barked loudly. Diogenes is acclaimed as a universal moral philosopher, who advises his listeners on moral behavior, demands them to work toward the perfection of their souls, and reproaches their self-delusion and lack of self-knowledge. Diogenes is a paradoxical figure as a teacher of virtue since the Cynics were known for rejecting decorum in their conduct; they went against all decency in their shamelessness and practiced *parrhesia* in public life. They were later criticised as brute beasts who were bad examples for others and constantly threatened the conventions of propriety. However, Scholirius employed Diogenes as an instrument of outspoken satirical criticism and an educator of the soul, seeking to strengthen moral values; thus, Diogenes here saw all other people as beasts except himself.

The preface to the book III argues that each age of man has its own peculiar faults that should be revealed, surgically operated, and burned away. The language is conspicuously medical and one of the remedies for the human disease is a burning caustic soda which Diogenes uses to medicate the wounds of the mind (*caustica moribus adfert, /Atque salutari medicatur vulnera lingua*); it was considered a particularly strong medicine.[94] The eleventh satire deals with education, showing how feeble parents fail to bring up their children. Rather than preaching in a Cynic manner about freedom and the natural way of life, Diogenes here strongly condemns the excessive liberty of youth.[95] This paradox builds an ironic tension between the traditional Cynic lifestyle and Diogenes' criticism of existing moral codes. The preface also cites Justus Lipsius's Stoic philosophy, which underlines that everyone should learn to recognise their faults and mistakes.[96] The Cynic can help in this task by advising his disciples and taking care of their health and sanity; he is like a self-sufficient king who has everything he needs, as Scholirius put it. Diogenes offers a useful protégé for the satirist, since 'under his philosopher's cloak' contemporary events can be explored

[94] Scholirius 1683: III.X.285-286.

[95] The preface also tells that the poet would have discussed other human ages as well, revealing their typical wounds and cancers, if he had not passed away prematurely due to an apoplectic stroke.

[96] Lipsius's neo-Stoic philosophy was well-known in Europe and, for example, his *De constantia* advocated rural happiness that will be discussed below in Ch. 7.

as if they were taking place in ancient Athens, even though the focus is all the time on the poet's own age.[97]

In the first lines of satire XI, the poet relates the famous story of Diogenes who approaches with his lantern looking for a human being in broad daylight but perceiving only bipedal animals. Diogenes argues that we are not innate artists, and without education and art we remain ignorant, rude, and barbaric. Animal metaphors are in frequent use:

Accipe, et ipse homines rationis quaere lucerna.
Invenies homines hominis vix nomine dignos:
Invenies tantae solum vestigia formae.
Sum rigidus? Quacumque voles te verte, videbis
Cornua, rostra, iubas, armos, caudasque torosque:
Percipies fremitus, gannire, rugire, boare.
Tanges cum setis squamas, et frigus et aestum.[98]

Hear, and search for a human being with the lantern of reason.
You will find humans who do not deserve that name.
You will find mere vestiges of their form.
Am I too severe? Wherever you go, turn, and look around and you will see
horns, snouts, manes, animal shoulders, tails, and muscles;
you will hear angry murmur, barking, roaring, bellowing.
You will touch bristles and scales, both chill and heat.

Illuminating his surroundings with the light of reason Diogenes argues that wherever he looks he only sees bestial features, long hairs, and animal muscles. The lantern is a self-referential image; according to Georg Pasch, satire was often compared to a lantern in its capacity of illuminating vices.[99] Later the poet continues his list of animal figures: we are no different than foxes, elephants, lions, and swine, but we must learn to conquer these animal qualities and become humans.[100] Diogenes teaches people to disobey their senses and abandon their

[97] Scholirius 1683: III.X, pp. 313-315.

[98] Scholirius 1683: III.XI.77-83.

[99] Pasch 1707: Cap. III, §6. Cf. Juv. 1.51 *Venusina … lucerna* which refers to Horace's satires and the whole genre.

[100] In his previous poem, Scholirius claims that his age esteems men who are so self-satisfied and arrogant that they are like storks with their heads bent backwards and almost touching their shoulders. Scholirius 1683: III.X,

animal traits, even though he himself as a historical figure was not ashamed of anything natural and questioned all standards of decency and social habits. The behaviour of ancient Diogenes was not necessarily dictated by virtue, but in the poem, he appears as a moral examiner advising his listeners to grow into human beings instead of retaining their animal features.

The core of humanity was one of the main themes in Scholirius's satirical poetry. Scholirius describes how Diogenes presents the question of *Quid sumus?* ('What are we?') to different people:

> *Quid sumus? A. Insanis? Deus est in utroque parente.*
> *D. Salve Divorum soboles. Respondeat alter:*
> *Quid sumus? B. Heroes. D. Muni tua scuta coronis.*
> *Quid sumus? C. Heroum centesimus arbore ramus.*[101]

> What are we? A: Are you insane? God lives in our parents.
> Diogenes: Hail you offspring of God! Let's hear another opinion.
> What are we? B: Heroes. Diogenes: You can decorate your shield with garlands!
> What are we? C: We are the hundredth branch in the tree of heroes.

The repeated question is familiar from Persius' satires (3.67), which depict sin as a disease and underline that the most important thing to learn is the purpose of human existence. The people from parents to young children Diogenes meets on the street give different answers to his question. In their view, human beings are infused with divine blood like heroes and their descendants. Diogenes compares this misunderstanding to the dreams of Scipio[102] and claims that humans are reluctant to perceive their true nature and therefore wrongly see themselves in the light of glory, vanity, and various desires. In his view, the human being is just an empty and worthless bubble (*bulla*) often seen in water; it erupts as quickly as it arises. His aim is to force his audience to recognise their persistent self-delusion and the fact that they are not what they claim to be.

According to the tradition, the Cynics used concise statements and proverbs in their speeches; many of these witty sayings were attributed to Diogenes. Accordingly, Scholirius's satire also offers brief philosophical precepts for self-improvement and avoiding moral diseases, including the famous Delphic

---

p. 332 n. 128 (*Sed, velut hoc aevi, qui sunt in honore supini*).

[101] Scholirius 1683: III.XI.97-100.

[102] For the Dream of Scipio, see Cicero, *De re publica* 6.18-19.

maxim *Gnōthi seauton* ('Know thyself'), which was usually attributed to Chilon, Thales, or Phemonoe,[103] and an obligation to preserve moderation (*Est modus in rebus*).[104] The first maxim is especially important to Diogenes who seeks to show his audience how human beings live in deceptive ignorance of their true nature. His Cynical and satirical frankness opposes flattery which reinforces self-deception and allows human beings to maintain false opinions of their goodness. Since people are their own flatterers, as Foucault has put it, we need a Cynic to show us our true self-image.[105]

Other proverbial forms of wisdom in the poem include the saying about death as a great equaliser and the exhortation to admire nothing (*Nil admirari*); the latter referred to the philosophical tranquillity of mind that was not disturbed by any external factors or circumstances.[106] The saying was attributed to Pythagoras, but it was also familiar from the opening words of Horace's epistle 1.6 and referred to an undesirable dazzlement and perturbation. Diogenes reminds parents and teachers that they should not accuse the stars, the sky, or the wars for the decay of their children; the cause was usually found within, since bad hen hatch bad eggs (*Pone malum corvum, mala nos supponimus ova*).[107] The poem ends playfully: the poet has quenched his thirst by drinking from a salubrious spring and it is time to leave. The setting of the poem is a healthy spa, the waters of which, according to anecdotes, have improved the poet's drowsiness.

On the human soul

By way of concluding this chapter on philosophical satire, we can note that satires also dealt with such philosophical topics as death and the immortality of the human soul. According to Oliver, Filelfo's satires maintained the Socratic argument that death was no evil and he believed in the immortality of the soul.[108] Filelfo briefly examined the nature of the soul in his satire 5.4, concluding that the soul was created by God and making, according to Oliver, an important

[103] Cf. Juv. 11.27 (who argues the maxim had descended from heaven and should be followed in all actions).

[104] Scholirius 1683: III.XI.776; cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.106 (claiming that there is a certain moderation or a proportion in things).

[105] Foucault 2001: 135.

[106] Scholirius 1683: III.XI.301.

[107] Scholirius 1683: III.XI.400.

[108] Oliver 1949: 35.

assumption about the quality of the soul by identifying it with the mind. When Filelfo spoke about the immortality of the soul, he meant the human mind which raised human beings above bestiality and made them immortal. As Oliver puts it, the immortal part of human beings was the thinking mind that could be developed through humanistic education.[109]

In his sixth satire, Petrus Montanus – following Ficino's *Theologia Platonica de immortalitate animorum* – also deals with the immortality of the soul, and in his tenth satire called *De expetenda iusta morte* (printed as the fourth satire in the Strasbourg edition of 1529 with the title *De vita beata*) draws on many philosophical and religious authors from Augustine to Pico della Mirandola. The latter poem contemns death, stressing that human beings should not be afraid of dying because our worldly life is full of misery and subject to the whims of fortune:

Ac omnis vitae humanae fortuna beata,
Est levis, exilis, fragilis, vaga, fluxa, caduca,
Impia, letalis …[110]

But the blessed fortune of our human life
is trivial, feeble, fragile, errant, fluid, fleeting,
impious, lethal …

Montanus describes how the world is consumed and nothing lasts (*cuncta ruent*). Until death the human life is full of labour, as if we were all farmers:

Non ad delitias, nec ad otia stulta creavit
Nos pater omnivolus, sed sudori atque labori
Perpetuo addixit, duro et damnavit aratro.
… multoque labore
Moerores, luctus, cruciatusque usque manere?
O stolidi qui mortis nomen inane timemus
Humani, execranda mali mors omnia soluit,
Vota diu magno frustra sudata labore,
Diraque multiplicis fugimus contagia mortis.[111]

---

[109] Oliver 1949: 36.

[110] Montanus 1529: IV.

[111] Montanus 1529: IV.

> The almighty God did not create us for
> delights or stupid leisure, but for eternal sweat[112]
> and labour, binding us to the hard plough.
> … Are we bound to bear eternally this great labour,
> mourning, sorrow, and torture?
> Oh, how foolish we human beings are when we fear the empty name of death,
> which solves all detested evil, and fulfils
> our desires that we have in vain pursued with hard labour,
> and in every way tried to escape the fearful contagion of death.

Montanus claims that although no one returns from the afterlife to tell of its conditions, several reliable books have convincingly imagined heavenly joys (and some writers have even visited the Underworld, as we will see in the next chapter). While during their lifetime human beings are, like farmers, subject to thirst, hunger, heat and cold, in heaven they are finally freed from their misery. The afterlife is as happy and simple as a shepherd's life in pastoral fiction, so why be afraid?

As we have seen from the poems discussed above, satires often depict earthly misery which is usually caused by other people. In this regard, neo-Latin satire introduced new character types to the satirical tradition: perverse political leaders and the miseries of war became more common targets in early modern verse.[113] Much of neo-Latin satire was written against violence and anger. Montanus's satire *De principibus* ('On princes') censures violence and the cruelty of political leaders, citing the savagery of Herod, Alexander the Great, Constantine, the Langobards, wealthy Asian kings, and even Christian bishops.[114] Constantine who was upheld as an ideal Christian ruler in the Middle Ages executed his wife Fausta and his eldest son Crispus. The Langobards had rulers who called upon their wives to drink wine out of their fathers' skulls. The words *cruor* and *sanguis* (indicating blood) are frequently used when describing the cruelty of the iron age:

> *Fastidit vinum, quia iam sitit iste cruorem,*
> *Tam bibit hunc avidus nunc, quam quondam bibit illud.*[115]

---

112 The eternal sweat in the poem refers to original sin.

113 See, e.g., Robert King's (fl. 1664-1728) verse satire entitled *Satyra Aethiopica* (1647), which criticises the coalitions of power and religion.

114 Montanus 1529: III. The prose preface to the poem enumerating these historical examples was written by Gerard Geldenhouwer. Cf. Anisio's (1531) opening satire *De principe*.

115 Montanus 1529: III.

He despises wine because he is now thirsty for blood.
Now he drinks blood as avidly as he once used to drink wine.

Montanus warns that bad rulers often face a terrible end: if they do not spend the rest of their days in prison, their lives end in suicide or poisoning. The purpose of these tragic atrocities is to teach princes to know themselves (*se ipsos noscere discant*), to recognise the corrupting impact of power, and to encourage them towards humanity and Christian modesty. They should be brothers to each other as much as they were princes. Montanus claims that crimes and misdeeds grow up spontaneously like weeds, but virtue is the result of careful cultivation. He emphasises that virtue does not come easily but requires constant attention and exercise (*Ardua res est esse bonum, et sudanda labore)*. The exemplary kings of the golden age were known for their 'love, moderation, and industry' (*amor, modus atque industria*).[116] Montanus's satires share with moral philosophy the effort to guide the reader towards a good life. A prerequisite for a good life is to put things on the right scale, despise worldly splendour, and see the most important things in their true value.

The starting point for the next chapter is the idea that numerous early modern authors highlighted the close connections between satire, moral philosophy, and medicine. They participated in the moralising discourses of ancient philosophy and Stoic thinking in which the analogy between wise words and medicine was common. By reference to ancient Hellenistic philosophers, who saw philosophy as therapy for the sick mind and the vices that resided either in the reason or the appetites, they attributed the same twofold function to satire.[117] Satirical discourse played a therapeutic role in counteracting vices and ignorance. Satire cured both the intellect and the passions by driving out ignorance and purging the human appetites of bad habits. The object of satirical pharmacy was found in the unhealthy appetites and infirmities of the mind and the reason. I will next consider this analogy of satire and medicine as one of the complex standard features that permeate the genre.

[116] Montanus 1529: III.

[117] On Hellenistic philosophy, see Nussbaum 1994. The analogy between the physical and moral, which was so prominent a part of satire, was already common in ancient medicine and philosophy, which were dominated by the same parallelism. On frankness as medicine in Philodemus of Gadara, see Yona 2018: 106.

Chapter 4
Cures and Incurables: Medical Satire

Throughout history, satirists have employed images of bodily weakness and diseases as indices of the human condition.[1] Among the Roman satirists, Lucilius already declared that 'We see him who is sick in mind showing the mark of it on his body'.[2] Human beings have been represented as ailing patients suffering from physical illnesses that were analogies for mental and moral defects needing improvement and medical care. Satirists have attacked their targets by describing illnesses, and the sinner has been represented as being in the grip of disease, that is, of his sins, vices, and unhealthy appetites. The sources of illnesses were usually found in questionable living habits and moral defects.

In this Chapter, I will take a closer look at this commonplace about satire's therapeutic function. The idea was expressed, for example, by the German theologian and philosopher Georg Pasch (1661-1707) in his work *De variis modis moralia tradendi* (1707) in which he discusses the ability of literature to transmit morals:

> *Sane in multis inter satyram convenit et philosophiam, quae ut perfectio quaedam animi est, et quemadmodum Cicero loquitur, medicina; ita satyra quoque mentis morbo medetur, pellendo scilicet et auferendo ex intellectu ignorantiam, ex voluntate autem et appetitu malitiam.*[3]
>
> Satire and moral philosophy share many common features and one of them is that philosophy is medicine that aims at the perfection of the soul, as Cicero has put it. Satire also medicates the illnesses of the mind, expelling and removing ignorance of the intellect and malice of the will and the appetites.

The prevalence of this analogy, which assumed a constant structure of similarities between satire and medicine, was common and critical statements concerning satire's function, methods and nature were often expressed in medical terms, which did not occur in the case of any other genre. Although the Roman

[1] This chapter partly draws on my previous work on medical analogy in Latin satire; see Kivistö 2009.

[2] Lucilius, 26, *frg.* 678; trans. E.H. Warmington.

[3] Pasch 1707: Caput III ('De ratione tractandi per satyras'), §7. Cf. Pagrot 1961: 24.

satirists emphasised their curative role and identified themselves with doctors, they did not use medical metaphors as persistently as did their later Renaissance colleagues. Mary Randolph has claimed that medical imagery went out of fashion later, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when vices were no longer characterised as ulcers but as ruling passions that needed to be tempered by reason and judgement rather than healed by a physician-satirist.[4] Although rationalistic terminology to a certain extent replaced the physical terms that had been common in earlier Renaissance discussions, the medical task was still widely acknowledged in later neo-Latin verse satire.

Satirical poetics of healing

Antonio Sebastiano Minturno's (c. 1500-1574) Renaissance work *De poeta* (1559) was an early examination which contained a famous passage on the parallel roles of medicine and satire:

> *Vt igitur corporis aegrotationes, ac uulnera medicinae materiam diceres, quod in his illa omnino uertatur, ita morbos animi, in quibus haec Satyrica poesis uersetur, eius facultatis materiam appellemus. Cum autem utraque sanitatem, altera corporis, animi altera sibi ut finem proponat, curat item apposite rebus illa, haec verbis ad sanandum, Amara potione illa quidem, haec vero acerba reprehensione. Quia vero philosophia perturbationum, quibus aegrotat animus, medicina est, philosophusque reprehendit ad uitiorum quoque curationem, intelligat Satyrarum scriptor, non esse officium suae facultatis, quod est philosophiae, de virtutibus agere, ac de rebus, quae his contrario nomine opponuntur. Sed urbane, ac festiue, nec sine stomacho uersibus reprehendere, ad mores emendandos.*[5]

[4] See Randolph 1941: 125-126, 137, 143-145. For the medical imagery in satire in Renaissance poetics, see Deupmann 2002: 84-153 (who discusses satirical therapy in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century German texts); Classen 1976 (on the Baroque imagery); Brummack 1971: 290-292, 304; Pagrot 1961: 81-95 (with brief references to the medical analogy in such English authors as Philip Sidney, Edvard Guilpin, and Thomas Nashe). Interestingly, Deupmann notes how seventeenth-century ethical discussions also used medical language when dealing with sins and their cure.

[5] Minturno 1970: 423-424. The same imagery reappeared in Minturno's Italian treatise *L'Arte poetica* (1563). For the passage on satire, see Classen 1976: 97 n. 109; Pagrot 1961: 74-76. The repeated word 'reprehendere' is notable here: the satirist was associated with 'reprehensor' in the Middle Ages (see Kindermann 1978: 47-55).

> Diseases and ulcers of the body are the province of medicine on which it concentrates, whereas satirical poetry has focused on the diseases of the mind, which can be called its subject matter. Both fields endeavour to improve health, of the body and of the soul, respectively. As the means of cure, the one uses drugs, the other, words; one offers bitter drinks, the other, severe reproof. Philosophy is medicine for disturbed souls and the philosopher takes care of curing vices as well, but unlike the philosopher, the satirist does not deal with virtues, but with issues that are completely the opposite. The satirist wittily, humorously and not without indignation censures vices in verse in order to mend people's manners.

Minturno's views had a strong influence on English Renaissance literature. The idea that satires advocated a homeopathic healing method using purges has been seen as due to his influence.[6] In the use of the medical analogy, Minturno was preceded by the Italian scholar and poet Cristoforo Landino (1424-1504), who in the preface to his commentary on Horace's oeuvre in 1482, refers to the medicinal nature of the author's satires and epistles. Landino notes that Horace called his satires *sermones* in order not to frighten the reader away from their salubrious content. Landino attributes to these *sermones* the philosophical task of purging the human mind of decay and informing men of the best morals (*ad mentes humanas olim labe purgandas et optimis moribus informandas*) and stresses that Horace's doctrine equalled in usefulness the majority of philosophical books. Satirical instruction was needed because most people were in a pathological condition: they were naturally weak-minded and enervated or else wrong education had turned them soft and spineless. According to Landino's diagnosis, the reasoning power of a sick man was effectively dormant or completely buried, and therefore the appetites reigned supreme.[7]

In his lectures on Persius delivered in Florence in 1484-1485, Angelo Poliziano (1454-1494) claims that, due to our sickness and lack of proper self-knowledge, our pathological condition often goes unnoticed by us, as if we were patients whose legs were numb, not aching, and who hence falsely regarded the absence of pain as a sign of health. Poliziano reminds that someone nearing his end hardly felt any pain, but this certainly did not indicate good health. He recalls how surgeons have successfully used iron to resuscitate and reanimate even half-dead people and aroused or restored their forces. Encouraged by this example, men should trust

[6] Pagrot 1961: 75.

[7] Landino 1486: Proemium II and cxvii. Cf. Pagrot 1961: 53.

their minds to satirical doctors who supervised and treated the moral condition. Such doctors completely rooted out all blemishes (*labes*), diseases (*pestis*) and seeds of disorder (*perturbationum semina*) by using the traditional means of iron and fire.[8] Landino recommended the same therapy, defending the satirists from accusations of cruelty by saying that they used fire and iron – the surgical knife – to heal wounds only in the most difficult cases, when other remedies had failed, and it was impossible to avoid having recourse to a physician's care.[9]

From the Italian soil the medical discussions, which defended the usefulness of satire, spread to the North. A very successful poetological treatise was written in the seventeenth century by a Jesuit priest and gymnasium director in Augsburg, Jacobus Pontanus (Jakob Spanmüller, 1542-1626). Pontanus adopts the by-now familiar medical analogy in his *Poeticae institutiones* (1594):[10]

> *Recte etiam fecerit, qui morbos animi satyrae subiecerit, quod in his non secus occupata est, quam medicorum ars in doloribus, vulneribus et aegrotationibus corporum. Proponit utraque sibi sanitatem: sed ista oratione, illa potionibus et herbis. Medicinas ambae aegrotis faciunt amaras, insuaves, et ingratas, secant, urunt, non parcunt.*[11]

> It is reasonable to submit the diseases of the mind to satirical criticism, because the sickness of the mind concerns the art of satire just as pains, ulcers and sick bodies concern the art of medicine. Both these arts propose sanity as their goal. One uses words; the other, mixtures and herbs. Both prepare bitter, unsweetened and distasteful medicines for patients; they operate surgically and burn the flesh, without pity.

---

[8] Politianus 1613: 107: *Ceterum medicinae hanc opem plerique ideo haud imploramus: quod tam gravi animi morbo laboramus, ut ne aegrotare quidem nosmet intelligamus: similes illis, qui torpentia atque obstupefacta membra, vel ob idipsum sana esse arbitrantur: quod praemortua sint, sensusque omnis, dolorisque expertia, quapropter ut medici saepe eiusmodi corporis partibus ferrum adhibent, aut cauterium: quo scilicet vires ipsarum, vel consopitae excitentur, vel fugatae revocentur: ita nos profecto his potissimum hominibus, nostros curandos animos tradere debemus: qui labem, pestemque illorum omnem cunctaque perturbationum semina, seu ferro, et flammis radicitus extirpant. quales scilicet ei potissimum poetae censentur, qui aut Romanam hanc satyram: aut Atheniensem illam veterem comoediam scriptitarunt.*

[9] Landino 1486: cxvii.

[10] The book was used as a schoolbook throughout Europe in the seventeenth century. According to his own words, Pontanus based his poetics on Aristotle, Plutarch, Horace, Scaliger, Viperano, Minturno, Robortello, Vida, Cicero, and Quintilian. On Julius Caesar Scaliger's short satirical poems (*Teretismata*, 'Twitterings'), see De Smet 2015: 204.

[11] Pontanus 1594: 171-172 (Cap. XXXVIII, 'Argumenta, finis, utilitas satyrae').

Several times Pontanus argues that satirists should imitate physicians, especially in the use of bitter but salubrious medicine. Intellectual history has preserved many passages with references to bitter but truthful words as medical potions. Plutarch reminded that at times friends needed to abandon exalting, gladdening, and flattering words and instead have recourse to reproof and frankness. This frankness and speaking the truth (Gr. *parrhesia*) were compared to a bitter and pungent-smelling medical potion mixed of castor, hellebore and a medicinal plant called *polium*, which the patient was made to drink for his benefit.

This therapeutic and persuasive activity had its literary counterpart in satirical admonishment, which also offered bitter medicines for sick souls. The image was seen in Horace's first satire, where teachers offered biscuits to children to coax them to learn.[12] Landino, Minturno and Pontanus all employed the *locus classicus* from Lucretius and Horace, repeating that the sick soul resembled a child who refused to listen to adults' admonishments. The purpose of satirical humour and wit was to sweeten the brim of a glass so that the patient would not recognise the bitterness of an unpleasant medicine before it touched the bottom of his stomach.[13] The bitterness referred to the salubrious content of the words and their biting frankness, useful but at times disturbing and frightening in their satirical language, which vividly portrayed the number and dangerous effects of vices. Pontanus and Pasch both underlined the usefulness (*utilitas*) of satirical criticism. Human sins were identified with chronic physical illnesses that were difficult to cure.

Satirical dietetics

Early modern satirists often presented themselves as physicians, paralleling the therapeutic activity of medical doctors with the role of satirist. The medical properties of books were well known: Horace already wrote in his epistles that 'suppose your heart is inflamed with greed and wretched craving, words and sayings exist by which you can sooth the pain and, to a large extent, get rid of the

[12] Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.25.

[13] Lucretius, *De rerum natura* 1.936-42; Landino 1486: cxvii; Pontanus 1594: 172-173 (Cap. XXXIX, 'Artificium satyrae'). For the pill metaphor, see also Deupmann 2002: 99-102; Pagrot 1961: 53; Nussbaum 1994: 156 (with reference to Lucretius and his understanding of poetry as 'a pleasing sweet surface').

ailment'.[14] The therapeutic effects of laughter were also reflected, for example, in the famous story of Erasmus who while reading the Letters of Obscure Men, a work ridiculing the scholastics, was shaken by such roars of laughter that an abscess in his throat erupted and healed.[15]

The Danish physician Thomas Bartholin (1616-1680), who was well-versed in theology and classical philology, argued that the study of poetry had a great influence on medical doctors. Bartholin combined medicine, literature, and theology in his studies of biblical medicine and medical poets; the latter treatise entitled *De medicis poetis* appeared in 1669.[16] He claims that Horace was familiar with diseases and healing (*In Flacco insignem et morborum et medendi peritiam annotabo*). Bartholin quoted Horace's satire 2.3 in which a doctor is called to arouse the drowsy mind from its deep lethargy. The doctor was a quick thinker and aware of the human being's fundamental avarice, so he ordered a table to be brought in and poured out there some bags of coins to awaken the patient from a coma. Bartholin also notes that Horace knew the best timing for purgation, since he wrote in his *Ars poetica* (302) that he is an unlucky fellow because he is cleansed of black bile in the spring. Bartholin concluded that although Horace was not a physician, he followed doctors' orders in his poetry.[17] Other Roman satirists also had their therapeutic moments; for example, in his satire 15 Juvenal reproaches the Egyptians' unhealthy abstinence from onion.[18]

The medical imagery was frequently used already in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Italy and in the satires of Filelfo, Lippi, and Anisio. For example, Lippi writes in his third satire that people should learn to deal with their weaknesses like a surgeon:

---

[14] Hor. *Epist*. 1.1.33-35 (trans. Niall Rudd); see also Jackson 1930: 303; Heinsius (1629) also highlights this passage in his commentary on Horace (*Animi morbum nemo curat, quia ne sentit quidem; corporis curant omnes, et in isto festinant*).

[15] Kivistö 2002: 196.

[16] Bartholin also wrote a treatise on the diseases of the Bible, *De morbis Biblicis miscellanea medica* (Copenhagen, 1672), which is a miscellany of subjects from the Hebrew Bible, the Talmud, and the New Testament. He deals with issues such as Adams's sleep, Jacob's lameness, Moses' withered hand, Job's malady, and King Asa's arthritis. According to him, Jonah was not swallowed by a whale but a shark. Bartholin's most important medical achievement was the discovery of the lymphatic system; the same discovery was also made by Olaf Rudbeck (1630-1702). Bartholin founded *Acta medica et philosophica Hafniensia*, the third oldest scientific periodical in the world, in 1673. On Bartholin, see Kivistö 2007: 94-95; 2018: 63-64.

[17] Bartholin 1669: 47-48.

[18] Bartholin 1669: 50.

Iam medica resecate manu, meliora probantes.
Expertus veluti medicus quando ulcera curat,
Corruptam scindit carnem, tersoque cruore
Et sanie expressa, subito fomenta reponit
Quae possint longos morbi lenire dolores.[19]

Cut off the sore parts with healing hands, approving better parts.
Like an experienced physician who cures wounds,
first cuts corrupt flesh and then cleanses blood spills,
and when signs of health emerge, he immediately uses warm applications
which can alleviate chronic pain caused by an illness.

Satirists saw a marked resemblance between the two professions, both being free to treat their patients as they pleased, to feed them bitter medicines and to purge them if needed from harmful things. For the medical doctor, the patient's disorder was physical, but for the satirist, it was primarily moral; physical illnesses and pathological findings were symptoms of a moral failure.

As Roswitha Simons has mentioned, the Italian soil also produced satires which were less aggressive in tone and more interested in good living. For example, in his second verse satire written against ignorance, the fifteenth-century humanist Codro Urceo presents a cure against folly, which becomes visible, for example, in the symptoms of lethargy and blindness.[20] The cure aims to correct the patient's lifestyle: it contains instruction for moderation and diet management (*regimen vitae*) and suggests various purgative therapies that are considered useful to everyone (*Corporis haec multum prodest purgatio cunctis*). Codro Urceo explains in detail the physical constituents of vices and their basis

---

[19] Lippi 1978: III.30-34.

[20] According to the early nineteenth-century biographer Alexander Chalmers, in his early years as a teacher in Forlì Codro Urceo lived in a small dark room and was forced to use a candle even in the daylight; by accident his library was set on fire, and he lost some of his valuable papers and temporarily also his mind because of the accident. Later he became a professor and humanist in Bologna where he taught grammar and eloquence for several years combining rhetorical elements with Aristotelian philosophical discussions. Codro Urceo wrote speeches, letters, and poems; his works were edited by Filippo Beroaldo the Younger, and they appeared in Bologna in 1502 and Venice in 1506. The volume also includes *sermones*, but these playful and witty prose orations are not to be confused with his two verse satires, *satyrae*, although the *sermones* also offer delightful insights to the humanist mentalities of his age (for his satire on philology in 'Sermo primus', see Blanchard 1990). For Urceo's life, see Chalmers 1812-17: s.v. Urceus. Urceo's *vita* is published at the end of his works (1506). For Urceo's larger biography, see C. Malagola (1878) *Della vita e delle opere di Antonio Urceo detto Codro*. Bologna.

in the bodily fluids, deeming the present disease of humankind to be incurable. His satire is interesting in its emphasis on the bodily constitution of happiness. In the manner of ancient Epicureans, Urceo seems to maintain that there was a physiological basis in morality: for example, the head must be kept cool enough to protect memory. Healthy bowels are vital to mental health, because the heat of the bowels creates passions:

Passio cur oritur quae graece dicta phrenitis?
Intestinorum mittunt incendia: namque
Ut vapor ascendit cerebri perit humor et ipse
Insipiens fit homo …[21]

Where does the passion called phrenitis in Greek come from?
Fire emanates from the intestines; therefore,
when the heat rises, the brain dehydrates and
the human being becomes foolish …

In Urceo's view, ignorance was based on immoderate living and the imbalance of the body humours. His first verse satire describes the mindlessness of war that was motivated by avarice and cruelty. The poet warns that although people usually think that death releases them from pain, anxiety and worries, there will be more suffering to come unless they learn to live righteously. Urceo also promoted a peaceful life in the countryside for its health benefits.

The traditional satirical confrontation between the internal and the external sometimes also acquired medical dimensions. In satire 3.3, Guglielmini has recourse to the physical imagery of sin, which has found its seat inside the human body:

Humanum est peccare. Lues ab origine nostri
Sanguinis haec fluxit, pervasit et ima nepotum
Viscera, nequidquam et munitas osse medullas.[22]

To err is human. This plague arises from the origins
of our blood, and it has invaded the lowest intestines of our grandchildren and
even the marrows protected in vain by bones.

[21] Urceus 1506: LIX.

[22] Guglielmini 1742: III.3, p. 98.

Here the disease is chronic and clearly refers to original sin (*ab origine*). Guglielmini notes that no one – not even the poet – is free from sin (*Nos vitiis ipsi, qui carpimus omnes, / Non sumus expertes*), and he presents himself as a physician who treats the patient's sore spot to heal him:

> *… Tetigi iam vulnus; amicam*
> *Ne fuge, BASSE, manum. Morbo vexaris eodem*
> *Quo illi ipsi, quibus indignaris. … Numquam*
> *Mitis enim bilem cohibes …*[23]

> I have already touched the wound, don't be afraid
> of a kind hand, Bassus. You suffer from the same disease
> as those you hate. … You never gently
> restrain your bile. …

The poet identifies himself with the authoritative figure of a physician, who gives orders and instructions to his patient suffering from excessive indignation and irritability – a satirical disease.

Therapeutic violence

Even though many satirists are at least seemingly striving to improve their patients' health, it would be misleading to regard this as the whole truth. Even when the satirist's ink was thought to cure, his pen often turned into a cauterizing scalpel or a whip, which inflicted deep scars on the patient's skin. The images of anatomical dissection and purging with laxatives and other drugs were used in characterising satire.[24] Satirical treatment was thought to be painful but beneficial; it was never used merely to ease the pain.

To heal their stubborn patients, some satirists had recourse to symbolic medical violence. Nicodemus Frischlin is an interesting case in point. He argued in his speech on the dignity and utility of poetry, *De dignitate et multiplici utilitate Poeseos* (1568), that poets were doctors of life who marked noble aspirations with white chalk and things to avoid with black carbon. Among Frischlin's eight verse

---

[23] Guglielmini 1742: III.3, p. 99.

[24] Randolph 1941: 144-147. On anatomical dissection as imaginary satirical violence used in Reformation polemics, see Roloff 2007.

satires, the second and the third in particular were composed by imitating Persius and by adopting specific medical phrases from his poems. In the manner of his Roman predecessors, Frischlin dreams of removing the victim's glossy skin and revealing his true and shameful inside.[25] Frischlin also medicates ears and pulls foolishness out of the patient's lungs. Frischlin's second satire includes a talk given by Gluttony describing the luxurious dishes consumed by Rabus, who despises simple, virtuous nourishment. The poem concludes with a typical death scene of a sick glutton, which echoes Persius' fifth satire,[26] but adds an image of a worm that represents an unknown evil within:

> *At tibi cum nodosa olim chiragra trementes*
> *Fregerit articulos, canisque afflixerit aetas:*
> *Vermiculusque tuum mordens arroserit hepar,*
> *Tunc crassos vixisse dies, aevumque pigebit*
> *In tanta scelerum ingluvie transisse relictum*.[27]
>
> But when a stony gout has smashed
> your trembling joints and you have entered the age of the Dog, and
> a little worm has gradually gnawed its way through your liver,
> then you repent of having lived so fatly and having spent your years
> in the middle of the sea of crimes.

Frischlin's therapeutic activities were punishing and not expected to improve the patient's condition. Frischlin asks, why waste effort healing Rabus's intestines when such a patient was made deaf by the Papists' continuous quarrels and unable to hear the satirist's healthy precepts? His skin was completely hardened by his sins and thus prevented the satirist's medicating words from penetrating the inner corners of his sick soul. Frischlin declares that he has abandoned all hope of the victim's sanity (*de Rabi pene salute iam desperatum*) – an expression that contains an obscene pun on Rabus's male member and suggests a potential infection resulting from a venereal disease. The sense of ironic desperation was also reflected in the grammar. In describing his attempts to cure the patient (using verbs like 'try to', 'attempt to'), Frischlin inflects the therapeutic expressions,

---

[25] Cf. Hor. *Sat*. 2.1.64 (*detrahere et pellem*); Bramble 1974: 154.

[26] Persius 5.58-61.

[27] Frischlin 1612: II, p. 16. *Vermiculus* is also known as a disease that drives dogs mad.

writing in the subjunctive form as if expressing an incurable case.[28] Through this means the satirist stresses the uselessness of his healing efforts.

In the third satire, describing how Rabus began to fall ill, Frischlin's diagnosis is based entirely on terms found in Persius' third satire: the body grew weaker, the limbs trembled with pain, sulphurous belches escaped from the patient's throat, and he was short of breath.[29] The characteristic sick paleness was also mentioned as well as his chattering teeth, which the lips had disclosed. Rabus's head was swollen and soaked with drunkenness to the point that his mind was completely darkened. The conclusion is that Rabus is firmer in body than in the soul.[30]

In Italy, the fourteen satires of Lodovico Sergardi – *Q. Sectani Satyrae in Phylodemum* – were equally unconstrained verbal and physical assaults against the jurist Gian Vincenzo Gravina from Naples.[31] Sergardi and Gravina were both active members of the recently founded Pontifical Academy of Arcadia, an association of poets and scholars.[32] In his verses composed in the early 1690s, Sergardi ridicules and assails Gravina's character, his hedonism, insatiable appetite for praise, and popular approval. Sergardi's satires differ from Horace's gentle humour in their relentless attacks on his enemy; Sergardi uses frequent obscene words to denigrate his adversary as physically and morally repulsive.[33] Obscene passages, mundane themes, and the words of abuse are justified as being useful in censuring vices. Sergardi also frequently attacks his target with the help of medical imagery. In his second satire, he suggests that Philodemus needs a strong medical purge, since his accursed body is severely ill. In the third satire, he is informed that Philodemus was cured, but the satirist is convinced that the patient is merely pretending recovery, and therefore he prepares another dose of drugs to be force-fed to the reluctant patient. In his sixth satire and its figurative emasculation, Sergardi dreams of removing Gravina's testicles, and this image is recalled in the ninth satire that imagines how an ugly hernia is slowly but surely devouring Gravina's body and finally causing his death:

---

[28] Frischlin 1612: II (*pellem … detrahere ut possim*, 'if I could only draw back the skin'); cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.64-65. A particularly illuminating passage is the following (also from Frischlin's satire II, p. 13.): *nugas tibi de pulmone revellam, / Aut nitar potius: quia iam tibi cornea fibra est, / Atque Papistarum gerras absurduit auris. / Nec moror: hic quoniam narratur fabula surdo: / Admittar nec ne, subeant mea carmina lumbum, / Aut etiam duro sculpantur viscera nervo … Sed quid opus stupidas mordaci radere vero / auriculas?*

[29] Persius 3.98-103.

[30] Frischlin 1612: III.

[31] Sectanus 1698; Sergardi 1994.

[32] On Arcadia, see Carini 1891; Baragetti 2012; Campanelli 2021.

[33] Pepin in Sergardi 1994: 6.

Foeda tibi nimium ruptis tumet Ernia fibris
irtaque pendentes lambunt crura Enterocelae
ut scrotum nequeat centum tibi fascia vittis
cingere, ni doctos transmittat Nursia cultros
vulnere qui medico vellant ab origine morbum.
Sed quota pars hominis Calabro restaret ademptis
Testiculis?[34]

An ugly hernia swells in your ruptured groin and hangs down, caressing your hairy legs, so that a truss with a hundred bindings can't encompass your scrotum unless Nursia dispatches its trained surgeons to tear out the malady from its source by a healing wound. But how much of a man remains for a Calabrian with his testicles removed?[35]

The ninth satire is entitled in Pepin's English translation as 'An incurable ailment' which refers to the satirist's conclusion that Gravina was beyond cure – and indeed, in his tenth satire, Gravina is gravely ill and lying on his sick bed dictates his last will.[36] Sergardi defends himself against the accusations that his poetry is trivial and obscene. According to the poet, it is difficult to write impressive satire if the object of criticism is as puny as Gravina. It is impossible to wear a lion's skin – which also suggests that the poet does not know how to lie – or demonstrate heroic deeds, if there is no Nemean lion to slay. The poet ironically calls himself 'a gladiator in an empty arena'.[37] In the Roman times, the capital city offered much more inspiring subject-matter for satirical criticism:

O utinam in lucem tunc me mea fata tulissent,
Ad strepitum citharae, cum Princeps histrio Romam
Perdidit, et cupido spectavit lumine flammas …
At nunc in sancta, mores quos fulminet Urbe,
Musa petit frustra. Forsan nec Flaccus haberet

---

[34] Sectanus 1698: VI, lxviii.

[35] Sergardi 1994: 77 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin).

[36] The death of the satirical object and the poet's futile attempts to save him were one recurring theme in the poems. Much later, the Croatian satirist Junije Restić draws similar conclusions and argues that his effort of writing satirical poetry was probably useless, for as long as there are human beings there are certainly also vices described here as serious infectious diseases (*lues*). Like doctors are unable to prevent death, old age, or severe diseases, he is probably unable to cure his contemporary stupidity. Restius 1816: I, p. 5.

[37] Sergardi 1994: 84 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin); Sectanus 1698: X, lxxiv (*vacua gladiator arena*).

> *Hac aetate sales, et semper in ore cachinnos …*
> *Iam Romae … desunt Balnea, Circenses … postquam*
> *Imperium cecidit, nervis execta libido*
> *Palpitat, et putres tendit moritura lacertos.*
> *Quid Romae faciam?*[38]

> Oh, would that I had been born when the actor-emperor destroyed Rome to the strains of his lyre and watched the flames with a greedy eye! … But now in this sacred City my Muse seeks in vain habits at which she might hurl her darts. Perhaps in this day and age even Horace wouldn't have sarcasm and derision ever in his mouth. … In Rome today … there are no baths, there are no circuses … Since the empire fell, lust, now castrated, struggles in agony and holds out its putrefying arms as it dies. / What shall I do at Rome?[39]

With a clever reference to Nero and other Roman emperors the poet here apologizes for his frivolous poetry that could not be improved because there is no inspiring material available to the poet in the city. The Juvenalian question of 'What can I do at Rome' is thus presented here ironically, suggesting that the satirist has nothing more to do in Rome.

Epidemics and odours

An early literary example of the importance of life-saving distance is a hexameter poem entitled *Epistola satyrica contra pestem* (1578, 'A satirical epistle against the plague') by the humanist poet Nathan Chytraeus (1543-1598).[40] Chytraeus was a humanist poet and professor at Rostock who also wrote on the delights of travelling through Europe. His satirical epistle describes how the plague as a mass disease released anarchic tendencies in the social order and disguised people's fundamental selfishness and animalistic natures in the same manner as, for example, Thucydides, who had described the effects of the plague in his *Peloponnesian War*. The poem describes a plague epidemic in Rostock and depicts the changing

[38] Sectanus 1698: X, lxxiv-v.

[39] Sergardi 1994: 84 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin); cf. Juv. 3.41.

[40] Chytraeus's poem is found in Kühlmann 1992 (in Latin and German translation); see also Kemper 1987: 105-117 (on the plague poems). Chytraeus's second epistolary satire dealt with botanics depicting a group hiking in nature (*Epistola II. Botanoscopium*, Rostock, 1579).

behavior of people as the epidemic rages in a German city. The poet himself says that he lives with his family safely staying at home (*totaque domo … manebo*), but from his distant point of view he observes and marvels at the restless movement of the people in the city and the intense atmosphere of the church hall. The attitude of the epistemically privileged speaker characteristic of satires is conspicuously defined by a critical (and moral) distance and satirical detachment that is created between his own position and the outside world. The poem also adopts other forms of narrative distance. The first part of the poem is tinged with humanistic criticism and expressing dissociation reproaches the citizens for declining to the state of the brutes, who neglect not only hygiene – the improvement of which would help them to cope with the epidemic – but also all forms of self-reflection.

The latter part of the poem contains an early critique of theodicy, when the poet states that not even God would wish people just to pray in order to prevent the epidemic; instead, they should work actively to reduce infections and avoid contacts with the sick. Despite the prohibitions, citizens come together without being forced to do so for any compulsive reason or task. In their indifference they do not follow the advice of doctors or take care of their health but gather the bodies of the dead into the church, relying on the power of prayers. The poet ridicules the priest's claims that as the black-winged death approaches the pharmacy would be useless. Instead of empty consolations and passive reliance on fate, the poet advocates the idea of wise action in emergency. Interpreting God's views, the poet states that God expects sacred wisdom (*prudentia sancta*) from people. In accordance with the principle of wisdom, it does not make sense to look for an obvious danger, to jump from a tower in distress if there is a possibility to descend the stairs, or to wade across a river if a bridge or a boat is available. Instead of speeches and prayers, the poet recommends reasonable actions, one of which is to keep distance to other people. The epidemic offers the poet an opportunity for individual and social change. In Chytraeus's poem the inhabitants are exhausted by their monotonous life and fall into a state of indifference, whereas the priest urges the citizens to remain confident of their fate. Chytraeus is not so much criticizing deceitful consolatory speeches that give meaning to suffering, but rather the message of passivity that suggests that nothing is ultimately in the hands of the people.

Epidemics created favourable conditions for testing human morality. The poem records the horrendous sanitary conditions in Rostock, showing how men's civility degenerated in a state of emergency. Chytraeus's poem discloses the discrepancy between ideal humanity and social reality burgeoning with crowds of swine-like men who neglect hygienic practices and carry dead bodies to the

church turning public institutions into graveyards. The climate at Rostock was mild and usually protected its inhabitants from diseases, but now people stopped their ears to all rational judgement:

> *… usque adeo porcis sunt omnia plena,*
> *Excipiasque nisi bipedes, evicero, non tot*
> *Esse homines hic quot porci, numerare licebit,*
> *(Quid rides?) me si dubites tibi dicere verum.*
> *Crede mihi, invenies, teque ipso iudice, multos,*
> *In quis, nil hominis, praeter vocemque oculosque*
> *Agnosces, corpusque illos sine pectore dices.*[41]

> … all places are full of swine,
> at least if you don't exclude bipeds, and I will show you
> that there are fewer humans here than swine,
> (why are you laughing?), count them, if you don't believe me.
> Trust me, you will bear witness to many creatures
> where you will recognise no human features
> other than voice and eyes,
> and you will call them bodies without a soul.

The poet stresses several times that human beings have become mindless and irrational creatures (*communi sine sensu; sine pectore; sine corde*). Plague poems with religious undertones often criticised people's immoderate self-confidence and delusional independence that allured them to believe that they were omnipotent and invulnerable. Disease worked as a theodicist reminder of God's power and human weaknesses, but Chytraeus did not interpret plague as revenge of God (as many Reformation poets would have done); instead, he reproached human irrationality and negligence (*incuria*) in the midst of a crisis and maintained that even God would expect some rationality and action from people to alleviate the difficult situation. Religiosity should not entail inaction and idleness. Although Chytraeus writes in his poem that he is safe at home, several neo-Latin satirists died of the plague, including Lorenzo Lippi, Gerard Geldenhouwer, and Thomas Naogeorg who died in Wiesloch in 1563.

One hexameter poem worth mentioning here is the Spanish writer Juan de Iriarte's (1702-71) delightfully indignant poem on the dirty streets and bad smells

[41] Chytraeus 1578.

of Madrid, *Merdidum Matritense, sive de Matriti sordibus, carmen affectum*.[42] The poet notes that while others praise the city's miraculous sights, his poem celebrates its exceptional and nauseating sordidness. The poet indulges in the epideictic praise of the heaps of excrement that stick to the feet like thick-soled cothurns. He describes the rivers of Madrid which are thick with floating animal bodies and human waste that stinks like the droppings of Cerberus. The poet prays to Apollo for a divine strong-scented balm that would help him to navigate the skunk-smelling streets. The poem abounds with various words of dung and excrement, and the last word of the poem is *cloaca*, 'the sewer'.

Balde's medical Stoicism

The association of satirical writing with moral therapy was a commonplace evoked most famously by the Jesuit poet Jacob Balde (1604-1668) in his large satirical oeuvre. Balde wrote epic, pastoral poems, satires, elegies, and dramas in Latin. According to Chalmers, Balde 'gratified with eagerness those friends who asked him for poetical pieces'.[43] In his *De studio poetico* (1658), Balde defines satire as 'the tutelage of good minds and the bridle of bad; a friend of truth and an enemy of crimes; an uprooter of flattery and a patron of the innocent; a servant of justice'.[44] He claims that although satirists collected their words and expressions from the butcher shop (meaning that their words were harsh and crude), the shop itself was situated in the Roman Forum, and the meal was lavish, consisting of acid tastes, rustic lettuce, oxen meat and sarcasms sprinkled with sweet dew. The flavouring also included a jar of pure salt, vinegar, and mustard.[45] These ingredients – salt and mustard – were often mentioned in medical literature among the purgatives, which were used for inducing a vomit. In his verses Balde congratulated the healthy and the balanced, consoled the afflicted and prescribed remedies for the sick and the weak.[46] When he defended the art of satire in his *De*

[42] Iriarte 1774; IJsewijn & Sacré 1998: 68 n. 6.

[43] Chalmers 1812-17: s.v. Balde. On Balde's oeuvre, see Schäfer 1976; Valentin 1986; Stroh 2004; Freyburger & Lefèvre 2005; Behrens 1986; Sauer 2005 (esp. on Balde's concept of satire); on Balde's medical satires, see Knepper 1904; Classen 1976; Wiegand 1992; Hartkamp 2005; Kivistö 2009.

[44] Balde 1660: 47.

[45] Balde 1660: 47-48.

[46] See Sauer 2005: 17.

studio poetico, he also used the conventional healing verbs of *sanare* and *urere*.[47] Although Balde boasted of the novelty of his method, he expressed the function of his satirical poetry in words that, already in the previous century, had become commonplace.

In the use of satire as moral therapy Balde was again following the example of Horace who offered sweet biscuits to patients and spiced his bitter potion with honey: the playfulness of his verse functioned as an antidote to pain.[48] Comparing his fearless verses to medicine Balde emphasises the healing nature of his satirical poetry in the preface to his *Medicinae Gloria per Satyras XXII* ('The Glory of Medicine in 22 Satires', 1651):

> *Animosum scribendi genus, et nostra fortassis aetate novum exhibeo, affine prorsus et proximum Medicinae, cui litamus; ista corporum morbos tollit, potionibus quidem amaris, sed efficacibus; et, ne respuantur, dulci liquore correctis. Satyra animos intrat, ejectisque vitiis morum temperiem quaerit inducere. Ergo horrida Poesis apparet ac fugienda, nisi scilicet algor Pegasei laticis ex ipsa ungula equi vivacius manantis, ne dentes obstupescant, superfuso melle Heliconio corrigatur*.[49]

> I will exhibit the fearless art of writing that may be something new in our age. It is akin to medicine, which abolishes diseases of the body by using bitter but efficient drinks and seasons them with sweet juices so that they would not be rejected. Satire penetrates the mind and, by removing vices, endeavours to restore the temperance of manners. Therefore, poetry would appear horrid and frightening, unless the vividly running, chill water created by Pegasus' hoofs that easily makes the reader's teeth chatter had a touch of honey obtained from Helicon.

In the first poem of his *Medicinae gloria* Balde proposes that even if he could not heal like Persius, he would still write like Matho, composing lamentations at people's graves.[50] Balde suggests in his *Medicinae gloria* that a sign of the golden

---

[47] Balde 1660: 47.

[48] Balde notes that 'following the example of the author [i.e., Horace] who offered sweet cookies to patients and spiced with the bees' liquor his bitter potion, we also mix in this book such diverse ingredients as absinth and honey, juice and biting vinegar'. Balde 1990: I, 373 (*Illius exemplo, qui aegrotis crustula blanda / Offert, et succos apianis condit amaros: / Nos melimella uno pariterque absinthia Libro / Miscuimus* . . .); cf. Hor. *Sat*. 1.1.25 and 2.4.24; Knepper 1904: 39 n. 1.

[49] Balde 1660: 89; 1990: 369 ('Ad candidum lectorem'). See also Sauer 2005; Wiegand 1992: 252.

[50] Matho is mentioned as an impoverished man, a parasite, or an inept orator in Martial's epigrams (e.g., 7.10)

age when Saturn reigned supreme was that there were no doctors and no need for their profession either, since diseases did not trouble men until Jupiter became an alcoholic; with this god's addiction and his subsequent hangover, the battalions of aches and diseases spread in the world. Consequently, men began to medicate themselves with different exotic drugs, such as asses' ears, whales' sperm, crocodiles' droppings, putrid liquor squeezed out of glow-worms, and frogs' entrails mixed with the rotten viscera of ravens. Balde points out that during the golden age men were satisfied with apples and water – simple and healthy nourishment that not only kept the doctor away, but also reflected men's unspoilt virtue. Modern hydrophobia was a pathological sign.[51] Balde's descriptions presumably derived from Seneca's claim that degeneration manifested itself in the birth of complex and unaccountable diseases resulting from high living.[52]

Balde also derided the incompetence of *simiae medicorum* ('medical apes'),[53] Jewish poisoners[54] and female quacks, who mixed medicines with stoats' brains and foxes' spleens. Inept physicians were popular figures of fun in Renaissance satires, epigrams and *facetiae* collections that condemned the incompetence of quacks or laughed at the scatological techniques used in therapy. Doctor stereotypes were suspected of a myriad of abuses and moral failings, including poisoning, adultery, money-making, lying, and violence. Balde's satires also included praises of famous physicians, such as Jean Fernel (1497-1558) and Andreas Vesalius (1514-1564) and his performance of autopsy; the latter poem was written against the atheists.[55] Balde describes autopsy as a miraculous sight:

Emicat in parvo divina potentia Mundo…
Heic contemplari generis primordia nostri
Ac finem liceat. Quod eris, quod es, atque fuisti,
Hinc discas…

and Juvenal's satires (7.129).

[51] Balde 1660: III, 99; 1990: III, 379. For the poem, see Hartkamp 2005. For hydrophobia, see Balde's *Solatium podagricorum* in 1990: 95 (poem LXVIII).

[52] Sen. *Epist.* 95.15-18.

[53] Balde 1660: 89.

[54] On religious and ethnic minorities in Balde's satires, see Wiegand 2005.

[55] On Fernel, see Balde's *Medicinae gloria*, poem VIII, and on Vesalius, see XII. On the poem on Vesalius, see Wiegand 1992: 260-264. On the images of anatomical dissection in Reformation polemics, see Roloff 2007.

> *Istae sunt latebrae, quas spes, dolor, ira, timores,*
> *Et cum tristitiis habitarunt Gaudia…*[56]
>
> And suddenly a divine power is revealed in a small world …
> Here we are allowed to contemplate the origin and
> purpose of our kind. What you will be, what you are, and what you have been
> you will learn from this…
> These are hiding places inhabited by hope, pain, anger, fears
> and sorrows with joys.

The autopsy allowed the satirist to see inside the human body and examine it as a beautiful seat of the immortal soul (*Nimirum domus est Animae pulcerrima, Corpus*). Balde's poem investigates the human body systematically in the light of anatomical dissection, applying the scientific method to written form. The description imitates in poetic form the anatomical operation made famous by Vesalius, in which the human interior is opened to the public for viewing. At the same time, this is a very satirical act when the real or symbolic body of man is broken down into its parts and opened for the reader to see. The causes of the moral illness are made visible, and the audience gets a horrible emotional experience. The satirist identifies himself with the professor's authoritative figure actively presenting the inner corners of the human body to the public.

Roloff and Grabes have both shown that the concept of anatomy became prevalent precisely in the satirical context in the sixteenth century and acquired moral-critical features.[57] Anatomical dissection, written or depicted in woodcuts, often received violent manifestations in the Reformation period, attacking religious opponents with aggressive images and depicting them as deceased, but Balde's application on the subject is rather gentle and philosophical. Anatomical dissection enables the satirist to search for the human soul in the cavities of the body, to analytically reflect on its miraculous condition as well as human mortality. Anatomy serves satirical purposes by exposing 'the true essence beneath outward appearances' and bringing with it associations of rottenness and punishment.[58] But as Grabes notes, it also involves a sense of healing the diseased member. Grabes remarks that by the end of the sixteenth century the mirror

[56] Balde 1660: XII, 126-127.

[57] Roloff 2007 (discussing, for example, such polemical texts as *De anatomia Antichristi*, 1524); Grabes 2009: 233.

[58] Grabes 2009: 233.

image was replaced by that of anatomy in satires and this replacement involved a fundamental change of attitude towards the object of investigation that was not merely reflected or repeated but actively dissected and dismembered in order to receive knowledge.[59]

Balde wrote satires about many diseases that affected corrupt humankind. Gout was the subject of several satirical texts in the early modern period because it was thought to result from self-indulgent and luxurious living (cf. Juv. 13.96). In his *Solatium podagricorum seu lusus satyricus* ('Consolation for Gout Patients or a Satirical Jest', 1661), Balde mentioned that gout was a painful disease that dressed itself in jewels and refused to eat onions, Pythagorean vegetables, and other rustic and healthy food.[60] However, he praised the disorder as a route to virtue, since the suffering man had the opportunity to disdain his body and aspire to heaven. Balde's words reflect a philosophical commonplace that dismisses pain as an illusion. Balde represented Christian Neo-Stoicism, which had become a prominent mode of thinking in the Baroque period, but he always preserved his characteristic irony in his discussions of the good life.[61] When recording voices of pain in his *Solatium podagricorum*, Balde asserted that complete silence was not required, but mindless yelling reminiscent of madly howling wild boars or bellowing bulls did not suit a wise man, for whom suitable voices of suffering were muffled sighs, murmurs, and whispers:

Cum titillat apex Podagri, da signa dolentis,
Suspira. Tantum feriat ne sidera clamor:
Verbaque confundas summum laedentia Numen.
Ringere. Quis prohibet? Tamen hoc et simia rugis
Iracunda facit. Porrectam contrahe frontem.
Os modice inspica ….[62]

When the peak of gout tickles you, give signs of suffering,
sigh. Your yelling just should not reach the stars and

[59] Grabes 2009: 233.

[60] Balde 1661: III, 76; VII, 79; 1990: III, 63; VII, 65.

[61] Schäfer 1976: 215-218.

[62] Balde 1661: XL, 93; 1990: XL, 79. The mourner's noisy reaction was also ridiculed in Juvenal's satire 13, which Braund (1997: see esp. 74) has studied as an ironic consolation. In the manner of Balde, Petrarch frequently stressed that the wise man should always remain tranquil in the face of loss and suffering and never complain.

> your complaint should not hurt the Almighty.
> Snarl. Who forbids you? Even a monkey wrinkles its face
> when it is angry. Knit your brows.
> Sharpen your mouth a little …

These facial expressions bespoke the patient's self-restraint and dignity in the midst of great turmoil and pain. The screams of pain were a concrete reminder of the Stoic discussions about how human beings should respond to physical pain and suffering and how they can separate themselves from brute beasts. Seneca had advised that there is a certain propriety and moderation to be observed even in the act of grieving.[63]

People may generally assume that a crippling and painful condition was exclusively an evil that impeded happiness and the best possible life. Seneca mentioned three elements – fear of death, physical pain and interruption of pleasure – that were thought to accompany every disease and were considered reasons for great suffering in sick people's lives.[64] However, Seneca also maintained that blindness, crippling or other physical afflictions did not alone render a man unhappy.[65] In his epistle 78 dealing with the healing power of the mind over physical pain, Seneca questioned the negative impact of disease on human life, arguing, for example, that seemingly unfavourable diseases can teach men to perceive the true value of things. He denied the negativity of suffering on the grounds that it was often made endurable when attacks of pain were interrupted and had intervals of rest. Significantly, gout was used here as an example of such a disease. Likewise, Epicurus, who endured a diseased bladder and an ulcerated stomach, claimed that physical pain was not a source of unhappiness, since an intense pain was usually brief and chronic pain could be made endurable.[66] Although disease checked the body's pleasures, in Seneca's words it did not do away with them but excited them and made them more rewarding. Moreover, to do without pleasure was in fact something the good man should aspire to, and the most important pleasures, which were those of the mind, no disease could abolish.[67]

---

[63] Sen. *Epist.* 99.21; Wilson 1997: 58.

[64] Sen. *Epist.* 78.6.

[65] Sen. *Epist.* 92.22. The epistle deals with the happy life.

[66] Sen. *Epist.* 78.7-9; 66.47 (on Epicurus).

[67] Sen. *Epist.* 78.22. For Seneca's concept of pain, see Edwards 1999; Wilson 1997.

Pain and disease were not real evils, as evil was measured in moral terms. Diseases were regarded as external things that could not affect a good human being's capacity to live a good life. As we have already seen above, Seneca repeatedly stressed that the wise man was indifferent to fortune and transcended both pleasure and pain.[68] As Seneca noted, there was room for virtue and courage even on the sick bed, since wrestling bravely with disease was a way to test virtue and prove courage and self-mastery.[69] Enduring suffering and conquering pain were also traditional heroic goals in literary genres such as the epic and in poetry that either lamented the pains caused by disease[70] or extolled them as a sweet and pleasurable experience.[71]

Satires were stimulated by these philosophical thoughts of pain, suffering and disease and were sometimes restatements of the themes of Stoic paradoxes in general, which emphasised the freedom of the human spirit from the environment and worldly bonds. In assessing the effects of disease on the good life, satirists maintained that wealth and health were external goods and insignificant to man's true happiness. Balde wrote his *Solatium podagricorum* entirely in Stoic terms, playfully mixing Stoic consolation with his writing. In his words, he had adopted the Stoic standpoint for the simple reason that the Peripatetic perambulation in the Academia did not suit men with ailing feet. He called his learned and dignified addressees 'Archpodagric heroes', to whom he offered the Archstoics' solid food, not the honey-coated sweets that boys loved.[72] Balde advised patients to despise and laugh at pain and rejoice in the severe condition of man.[73] The inflexibility and defiance characteristic of the Stoics was also evident in his words urging the disease to burn, slash and excruciate the body, meanwhile assuring that the mind would remain unmoved and invincible (*non gemo*): 'A blind fire rages

---

[68] See, e.g., Seneca, *De vita beata* 4.4-5. Cf. *De consolatione ad Marciam* 10.1.

[69] Sen. *Epist.* 78.20-21; 67.4 (on enduring hardships with restraint).

[70] One popular theme in Renaissance elegy was the poet complaining about his sickness ('De se aegrotante'). Such autobiographical poems described the disease and the physical pains experienced by the poet, criticised vanity and man's groundless trust in his own powers, decisions and will only, and reminded of the insecurity of mundane life and the transitoriness of all created things. The tone was resigned, complaining of excruciations and isolation from friends, praying for improvement, or praising and thanking God after the recovery. For this tradition, see Kühlmann 1992: 3. Cf., e.g., the Hungarian poet Janus Pannonius's (1433-1472) elegy 13 ('Conqueritur de aegrotationibus suis, in mense Martio 1466'), reprinted in Schnur 1967: 316-321.

[71] Engelhardt 1992: 38 (with reference to Andreas Gryphius's 'süss der Schmerz' and Petrarch's 'dolendi voluptas').

[72] Balde 1990: XLII, 59.

[73] Balde 1661: XXXVII, 91-92; 1990: XXXVII, 78.

like a tempest inside, but I will not complain. It tears me, but I will not complain. It carves me, but the pain will never force a sigh to burst from my lips'. [74] A Stoic (and an Epicurean) commonplace was also reflected in his words that denied the pain as real or an evil; it was rather merely the image of pain and an opinion originating in the minds of ignorant men.

In consolatory literature, philosophy was usually recommended as an aid to coping with pain.[75] Thus, in Balde's view, the best therapy against gout was Stoic philosophy, and the body should be literally soothed with the wise man's words: 'When the furious ardour penetrates the body, put Cleanthes on your neck, cover your breast with Zeno …, hide Seneca under your pillow, … let your feet rest on Epictetus and let your body be doctored by the Phrygian. If the pain forces you to utter a cry that is not worthy of tranquil ears and if your tongue foams with shameful saliva, cover your face with Speusippus and invest the mouth with hard bits and a Pythagorean bolt, so that an unworthy voice shall not pass from your lips and spoil your immaculate reputation'.[76] The books of learned men were remedies that helped the patient to overcome his grief. In another poem Balde advised the patient to drain Cleanthes' effervescent cup, which contained tonic with a strong taste of sulphur, salt, and old metal.[77] Balde thus advocated a slightly different therapy than Persius, who had suggested the seed of Cleanthes be sown in the patient's scrubbed ears.[78]

Balde often positioned his poems in the satirical subgenre of the mock encomium. Balde praised thinness as a genuine ideal related to his Christian and Stoic worldviews in his verse consolation, *Agathyrsus* (1638, in German 1647). Later he composed an ironic palinode and an apology for obesity, *Antagathyrsus sive apologia pro pinguibus, contra Macros* ('Antagathyrsus or an Apology for Fat People, against Thin People', 1658), giving both these characteristics moral interpretations.[79] Here he extolled being fat as a quality of the gods and a sign of a past golden age when all men were nicely corpulent and there was not a single thin or suffering person on earth. Balde attributed to fat people the virtues of friendliness, reliability, and upright character; besides, the admired poet Horace

---

[74] Balde 1661: LXXXVI, 121; cf. 1990: LXXXVI, 107 (*Estne dolor? (liceat dubitare) an opinio tantum? / Vanaque pro vero conficta doloris imago. / Nempe malum imprudens plebs aestimat esse Podagram*).

[75] Cf. Braund 1997: 75; Erskine 1997: 38.

[76] Balde 1661: XLIII, 94; 1990: XLIII, 80-81.

[77] Balde 1661: LXXXV, 120; 1990: LXXXV, 106.

[78] Persius 5.63-64.

[79] Balde 1660: 189-261; 1990: 299-366.

was known as a plump pig from Epicurus' herd (*Ep*. 1.4.16). Similarly, in his *Vultuosae torvitatis encomium* ('In Praise of the Ugliness of Faces', 1658) Balde discussed the great benefits of looking grim, severe, and even ugly, which in his view suited the poets and other wise men. The work contains 39 poems and portraits on the topic, and it is an extended parodical version of the satirical commonplace that people were rarely beautiful both inside and outside. The ugly physical forms of the famous ancient philosophers bespoke their wisdom and revealed that they despised their bodies and were completely devoted to virtue. Diogenes and other old men were wise, although their faces looked like a ploughed field. Juvenal was one of the furious sages:

> *Quid Iuvenalis? Io novies ter torvus, et asper.*
> *Horridus Eurystheus, ut nubifer Apenninus,*
> *Et vigil enormes rhonchos proflare solebat.*
> *Lurida spirabant per totum absynthia vultum.*[80]
>
> What about Juvenal? Oh, he was nine or ten times fiercer and harsher,
> horrid Eurystheus, like a cloud-bearing Apenninus.
> And he was alert to exhaling enormous snorings.
> His entire face was breathing pale yellow absinth.

The paradoxical encomium is followed by a short discussion on Seneca's epistles on the shortness of life. Balde's large oeuvre also contained a satire on the misuse of tobacco (*Contra abusum tabaci*, 'Against the Abuse of Tobacco', 1657), noticing that smokers smelled worse than the belches of onion-eating workers, seven graves or a herd of a hundred goats.[81] Ironically, Balde himself was known to be addicted to smoking. The smoke was also an image of human life: 'What is human life? … smoke, air, and vapour … What does it mean to live? To eat air…'.[82] The poet confirms these answers as correct (*recte*) and concludes his poem with a premeditation of death and the vanity of human life, bidding farewell to jokes and satires: 'Gradually we will all dissolve like waters in the sea' (*Sensim dilabimur omnes / in mare sicut aquae*).[83]

---

[80] Balde 1660: XVII, 66.

[81] Balde 1660: 160-188; 1990: 438-468. For a modern edition, see Jacob Balde SJ, *Satire wider dem Tabakmissbrauch*, ed. and trans. by Alexander Winkler (Mainz, 2015).

[82] Balde 1660: VI, 164; 1990: VI, 442.

[83] Balde 1660: XXXI, 187; 1990: XXXI, 467. Hess 1971: 89 identifies this poem as a *praemeditatio mortis*.

Balde also wrote on the eclipse of the sun in his *De eclipsi solari* (1662), which consists of a long prose dialogue and a hexameter poem (together ca. 232 pages).[84] It focuses on the eclipse of the sun in August 1654. The solar phenomenon is observed through Balde's satirical telescope (*tubus satyricus*), which is in his view sharper than any other optical instrument. The telescope allowed the satirist to scrutinise (*perlustrare*) human life from a critical distance, representing a very different way of looking than an autopsy drilling into the depths of an individual. The two speakers in the dialogue, Didacus, who is a poet, and Alphonsus, who is a mathematician, have very different views on the meaning of the eclipse and how to interpret the impact of planets on all living things, society, and individuals. Didacus represents a rational position, whereas the mathematician defends astrological knowledge. They discuss how the stars affect people's lives and what is the relationship between destiny and free human will and moral autonomy. The poet also juxtaposes superstition with rationality. The groundless fears created by apocalyptic and astrological discourses are contrasted with the more rational idea that the eclipse does not predict the end of the world. The dialogue is related to many popular literary genres, such as prophesies, astrological and apocalyptic discourses, almanacs, and cosmic voyages. It also mocks the folly of the previous Reformation apocalypticism and its political or religious propaganda that was deliberately used to incite unrest.[85] Balde's satire aims to counteract and suspend cosmic fear by laughing at such groundless intimidation. In this sense, Balde's poem is reminiscent of the Epicurean view that there is nothing to be feared in nature; everything is natural and material. His conclusion is that during the eclipse the sun did not go through any change, whereas the human world was darkened.

Nomi's medical hands

Many neo-Latin satirists refrained entirely from personal attack and asserted that all persons mentioned in their satires were purely fictitious. For example, the Italian satirist and presbyter Federico Nomi's use of traditional comical names,

---

[84] Balde 1662. On this work, see Faller 2005; Kühlmann 2016: 144; Behrens 1986: 111. On the impact of the stars on human beings, see also Poninski (1741: I, Cap. VI) who insists that no one should blame the stars for their misfortunes; the real culprit is the blind human pleasure and our wrong habits that corrupt our manners (*Frustra sideribus vitiumque imponimus Astris /Proclivis non stella movet, sed caeca voluptas, / Et consuetudo dat corruptissima mores*).

[85] On apocalypticism in sixteenth-century Reformation satire, see below, Ch. 5.

such as Curculio, emphasised the alleged impersonality and harmlessness of his writing.[86] Nomi's *Liber satyrarum* ('The Book of Satires', published in 1703, written mostly in the early 1690s) contains, like Juvenal's oeuvre, sixteen satires which are addressed to the intellectual elite of his age, such as his friend G.W. Leibniz, thereby emphasizing that his poetry reflects the tastes of the European intelligentsia. Leibniz wrote a short congratulatory epigrammatic poem in response to Nomi's ninth satire, saying that it was difficult not to write satire (cf. Juv. 1.30), but it was equally difficult to blend useful with bitter elements. In Leibniz's view, Nomi succeeded in both using his 'medical hands' (*medicas … manus*).[87] The medical motif attests to the Horatian tone of Nomi's satires, which also contain many features familiar from Juvenal, including realistic details, misogynistic passages, and the frequent use of exclamations and brief sentences.[88]

In the preface to his first poem which was dated 11 July 1693 and commented on his reasons for writing satire, Nomi claims that there is nothing perfect in his satires, very little good, and most of the material is bad (*nihil optimi videbis, parum boni, plurimum pessimi*).[89] Although this statement can be read as an ironic formula of modesty, it also nicely captures the pessimistic mindset of its author during the reign of Cosimo III, a Grand Duke of Tuscany. Cosimo's long reign has been characterised as an era of utmost decadence, atrocity, and religious fanaticism,[90] but Nomi refrains from naming names; instead, he conceals his criticism under the subtext of classical commonplaces and mythical tales. The opening word of his collection is, however, 'virtue'.

One of the satirical commonplaces Nomi used was medical language. Bad doctors and their violent methods were condemned by Nomi, who influenced by the tradition compares his verses to strong medicines (*pharmaca potentiora*) which are used to completely eradicate misbehaviours. The sore parts of the body are operated so that healthy limbs would not be affected by the disease.[91] The

---

[86] Nomi 1703: III, p. 32 n. 4 (explaining that the name Curculio taken from Plautus' comedies stood for depraved manners and misanthropic tendencies, *pro homine pravae naturae et infenso humano generi instar Timonis*). The word 'gurgulio' was also used in Persius' satires (4.38) to refer to Alcibiades' private parts. Many of the persons mentioned in Horace's first three satires were also probably entirely fictitious.

[87] Nomi 1703: p. 115.

[88] Citroni Marchetti 1976: 36-37.

[89] Nomi 1703: I, 1. The adjectives of the quotation can also be read as moral terms, illustrating how the negative aspects of life attract satirical authors, who base their moral criticism on the representation of human vice.

[90] Citroni Marchetti 1976: 35.

[91] Nomi 1703: Praefatio (*Pharmaca adhibemus potentiora, ut a radice averruncentur mala*). The poet quotes the Ovidian phrase of 'a wound that can never heal' (*immedicabile vulnus*; Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 10.189). The same

same medical motif recurs in Nomi's first satire, in which he explains how he mixes bitter but salubrious drinks to cure the patient. His motives are benign, as no one enjoys chasing people, but it is pleasurable to discern how people are released from their obliquities.[92] His sixth satire focusses on sadistic quacks, who were more suited to disturbing the dead than healing the living.[93] Nomi borrows several doctor's names, such as Diaulus, Scatophagus ('Excrement-eater'),[94] and Symmachus, from Aristophanes and Martial's epigrams. Martial's Diaulus (1.30, 47), for instance, was a former physician whose professional methods had hardly changed in his new career as an undertaker. Nomi envisages how doctors who specialise in bloodletting leave their patients bleeding to death as highwaymen leave their victims on the side of the road. In Nomi's satire, rich patients are forced to swallow their own gems and jewels, which were prescribed to relieve their condition, but which the greedy doctor then collects from the patients' chamber pots, thus becoming rich through heaps of excrement.[95]

Greed is thus one of the great evils of doctors. A physician called Caldanus is particularly cruel and insensitive: he operates surgically and burns the flesh of his patient laughing and without sensing any pain himself. Kidney stone patients undergo an especially dangerous and painful treatment conducted by a surgeon called Phaedrus:

> *Vesica ex ipsa lapides convellere Phaedrus,*
> *Spondet posse manu, sed quamquam prospera sit sors*
> *Interdum, certe est ars haec laniena virorum;*
> *Forcipe enim primo non carpitur orbita nisu,*
> *Fragmina vel desunt, remanet vel crustula*[96] *circum,*

phrase is used by Cantianus in his satire *Actum fidei*, 1729: 27; Guglielmini 1748: III.1, p. 84 (*nullo medicabile vulnus*); see also Juv. 15.34 (*numquam sanabile vulnus*). The wound was a sign of inflammatory erosion, where healthy material was gradually reduced to rotten and putrefying flesh; see Kivistö 2009: 20-27.

[92] Nomi 1703: I, p. 3 (*Ut medici miscent sua pharmaca rebus amaris / Servando procul a vitiis absinthia prosunt*).

[93] Nomi 1703: VI, p. 77 (*Sunt hodie quidam medicorum nomine vappae … Sunt alii manes apti turbare sepultos*).

[94] In his ironic invective against the vanity and uncertainty of science, *De incertitudine et vanitate scientiarum atque artium*, Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim (1486-1535), a German polymath, notes that Aristophanes called physicians with the name of Scatophagus, because their habit was to taste their patient's excrement in order better judge of the disease.

[95] Nomi 1703: VI, p. 80 (… *aurum / Stercore colligeret de fuso; sic pretiosos / Merdarum cumulos possent excrere Diauli*).

[96] Note the word *crustulum* ('cookie') which Horace (*Sat*. 1.1.25) used when speaking of satire.

Et dolor augetur, ventoque in viscera clauso,
Ut venerosus obit, scroto et turgente necatur.[97]

Phaedrus promised that he could remove the kidney stones
by hand. Even if fortune is sometimes favourable,
surely, the technique amounts to butchering men.
The first attempt conducted by using a forceps was unsuccessful;
some chips and little crusts of the stone remained around the bladder,
and the pain was getting more severe, and air accumulated in the bowels,
so that the poisoned man dies suffering from swollen genitals.

Nomi concludes that in severe diseases doctors must use strong medicines, but with his current age even the strongest medicaments are ineffective.

One of the most interesting pieces in Nomi's satires is his tenth poem *De damnis belli* ('On the bereavements of war'), which sketches human suffering and the horrors of war: trenches flooded with blood, bombs destroying whole towns and the worthlessness of lives of dying young soldiers. A besieged city is better destroyed in a violent attack which is justified by seemingly 'good' ends:

Expugnare cupit natura ac arte reclusa
Oppida Dux aliquis, modo non mora longa supersit,
Laudatur, totae etsi exundent sanguine fossae
et viles animae pereant inhumataque membra:
Venduntur pretio exiguo peditesque, equitesque,
Et praestat disperdi illos, quam spargier aurum.[98]

Some commander wants to conquer naturally disclosed
towns without any delay, and this plan is lauded,
although all the trenches flood with blood
and cheap souls and unburied bodies perish.
Foot soldiers and horsemen are sold at the same small price,
but it is better to let them to be destroyed than lose gold.

The aggression is now more violent than in antiquity, when it was possible to defend oneself with a sword and shield, while now bombs are more horrific

[97] Nomi 1703: VI, p. 84.

[98] Nomi 1703: X, p. 128.

than the Cyclopes, the Laestrygonians, and other primitive man-eating monsters. Dying and starving people are described in vivid detail. When they are offered a piece of bread their teeth are broken in the mouth, and when someone lifts a cup to their lips for drinking they hardly have the strength to swallow. War is an image of an extreme injustice in the poem in which the human voices are stunned by the misery.

Historical physicians

Sometimes doctors not only caused the death of their patient but could end up in the Underworld themselves. In his satire fourteen (sixteen in the Latin edition) Sergardi delineates a portrait of Marcello Malpighi (1628-1694), a famous biologist and personal physician to Pope Innocent XII. Malpighi died of a stroke in 1694, but the poet meets him in the Underworld among the groups of Greek philosophers, Roman satirists, and seventeenth-century scientists:

> *Mille aderant alii, quos inter, funera nuper*
> *Passus et umbra recens, Malpighius, inquit, ab Urbe*
> *Quid, Sectane, refers? Laeta omnia namque supremus*
> *Claviger aetatis non sentit damna, suisque*
> *Viribus innixus, vestris non indiget herbis,*
> *Peoniasque artes, et lubrica pharmaca ridet.*
> *Exarsit, sectoque genas mihi perlinit ovo,*
> *Quod modo de natibus gallinae traxerat, inde*
> *Faeturam ingeniti cupidus dignoscere pulli.*[99]

> A thousand others appeared, and among them was one who had recently died. The newly-deceased spirit of Malpighi said, 'Sectanus, what news do you bring from Rome?' 'All happy tidings! The supreme Bearer of the keys feels no ill effects of his age; relying on his own strengths, he has no need of your herbs. He laughs at healing arts and deceptive drugs.' He grew angry and smeared my cheeks with a broken egg which he had just drawn from the rump of a hen while wishing to observe the natural birth of a chick.[100]

[99] Sectanus 1698: XVI, cxxii.

[100] Sergardi 1994: 125.

The poem draws an amusing picture of the famous physician who gets angry in the Underworld when his expertise is vilified by the Pope. The name Paeonius refers to a god of medicine.[101] This passage was also discussed by Caesar Marescotti, a philosopher and physician at Bonn, in his treatise on smallpox, *De variolis tractatus* (1723), which is written in the form of a dialogue. Marcellus and Camillus discuss dangerous quacks and point out that sometimes it is wiser to avoid doctors because their methods can kill the patient. They have read Sergardi's poem and are amused that the furious physician cannot tolerate a pope who despises his medical art. Marcellus notes that the passage uses poetic freedom: Malpighi was famous for his safe methods and mild remedies.[102] In his poem, Sergardi also ridicules the human fear of dying and the foolish habit of investing money on monumental gravestones and inscriptions; the body cannot escape worms. The poet's visit to the Underworld is described as an instructive experience through which he learns to shun ambition.

Sometimes satirists themselves became patients. One historical anecdote was told of Marc-Antoine Muret's life in the hands of professionals. After the accusations of sodomy brought against him in Paris, the poet fled to Italy but fell ill in Lombardy. He called for a physician, who, according to the biographer Alexander Chalmers, did not understand his case and consulted his colleagues who gathered around the patient:

> As they did not know Muretus, and fancied him too ignorant to understand Latin, they consulted a long time in that language, upon the application of some medicine which was not in the way of regular practice; and agreed at last to try it upon Muretus, saying, "Faciamus periculum in corpore vili;" "Let us make an experiment upon this mean subject." This threat is said to have so far effected a cure, that he paid his host, and set forwards on his journey, as soon as they were withdrawn.[103]

Kirk Summers, in his modern edition of Muret's poetry, also cites the poet's learned reply to the doctors in Latin ('Vilem animam appellas pro qua Christus non dedignatus est mori', 'The expression "mean soul" refers to someone on behalf of whom Christ did not refuse to die').[104]

---

[101] Pepin in Sergardi 1994: 132 n. 15 (cf. Vergil, *Aeneis* 7.769).

[102] Marescotti 1723: 153-154.

[103] Chalmers 1812-17: s.v. Muretus; also quoted in Kraye 2005: 309.

[104] Summers 2006: xx.

Sometimes satires described a good doctor as an exemplary philosopher and friend. Petrus Montanus's satire *De medicis* presents an exemplary physician (*medicorum exemplar*) Antonius, who is thoroughly acquainted with all medical plants, unguents, plasters, pills, scented body powders and cataplasms, and punctiliously calculates the right doses of medicine according to the climate in which the disease occurs:

> *Quod non est aliis, nosse herbarum genus omne,*
> *Quid vetulum valeat, quid fucatumque dolosumque*
> *Unguentum nosti, emplastrum, diapasma, malagma,*
> *Pastillos non ignoras, sunt omnia namque*
> *Nota tibi …* [105]
>
> While it is difficult for others to know all medicinal plants,
> you know the power of old, coloured, and crafty
> ointments, plasters, powdered herbs, cataplasms,
> not ignoring pills; these are all
> known to you…

The language is conspicuously technical here, enumerating different medicaments and underlining Antonius's knowledge over them by repeating the verb *nosti* ('you knew') and its synonyms. Antonius is not only a skilful physician, but also a philosopher and 'a good and wise man, faithful to his firm friends' (*Vir bonus et prudens, certis quoque fidus amicis*).[106] He resembled the ideal doctor and loyal friend described by Horace in his satires (2.3.147) and Seneca in his *De beneficiis* (6.16.4-5), taking personal care of his patient in the name of humanity. Antonius's ideal figure is contrasted with bad physicians, who put patients to death for money and whose murderous skills develop over a lifetime.[107] According to Montanus, an ideal doctor is always truthful in his words, deeds, and heart (*lingua, factisque et pectore verax*).

Thus, the encounter with the physician was sometimes described in a positive existential tone. Guglielmini's collection of satires ended with three poems describing various personal experiences of misfortunes, such as the

[105] Montanus 1529: II. *Diapasma* was medicine produced from dry (scented) powder (cf. Aquino 1703: X, 283 n.7).

[106] Montanus 1529: II.

[107] Montanus 1529: II (*Qui plures occiderit, Ars stat in experientia*).

death of a friend (3.6), serious illness (3.7), and long journey (3.8). In satire 3.7, Guglielmini complains of his injured thigh, which was first painfully operated on by doctors who created a three-finger-wide wound, until his friend, Doctor Jacob Toyon saved his life. In an unusual version of the medical motif, Guglielmini offers an exceptionally realistic account of his own sickness. His style is documentary in its technically detailed account of the turning point of the illness and its symptoms. The patient's slow recovery and his first limping steps around the sickbed after a long period of weakness are almost touching. He also suggests that if the addressee ever becomes seriously ill, he should obtain a rough surgeon because a gentler doctor might kill the patient in his humanity. The poet concludes that if sick men are wise, as ancient philosophers argued, since the illness had taught them patience and the value of well-being, then he prefers to remain ignorant rather than cough with Seneca and ache with Plato.[108] Patience was thus a virtue that could be learned from disease. As a time-sensitive response to hardship patience is not merely passive waiting but a teleological emotion focusing on future. As Cicero put it in his *De inventione*, 'patience is a voluntary and sustained endurance, for the sake of what is honourable or advantageous, of difficult and painful labours'.[109] Patience is endurance due to honesty or utility – the purpose makes patience a moral virtue; there must be some laudable aim in suffering. In satires, however, the benefits of suffering were always described in an ironic and playful light.

In addition to the medical imagery discussed in this chapter, satires also took advantage of many other discourses, the most important of which, especially during the Reformation, was the biblical language. The next chapter discusses how the biblical conception of time and the contemporary critique of satire intertwined in some important verse satires of the Reformation and its aftermath.

---

108 Guglielmini 1742: III.7, p. 124 (*Praestat namque bene, ignorantem multa, valere, / Quam Senecam tussire, vel aegrotare Platonem*).

109 Cicero, *De inventione* 2.54.163 (trans. Charles Duke Yonge) (*Patientia est honestatis aut utilitatis causa rerum arduarum ac difficilium voluntaria ac diuturna perpessio*).

Chapter 5
Prophetic Floods: Post-Edenic Reality in Religious Satire

This chapter argues that many neo-Latin satirists forged a strongly Christian message from elements inherited not only from the Roman satirists and Hellenistic philosophy, but also from the Bible. As David Fishelov has noted, an overwhelming majority of satirical passages in the Bible are in the prophetic books.[1] Chapter 5 takes up the development of religious and Reformation satire in the early modern period and presents the neo-Latin satirist as the cousin of the Hebrew prophet who bases his ethical views on a curious combination of pagan and Christian morality. Satirists identified their works with prophecies against wrongdoing, and the rhetoric of prophecy sheds light on the cautionary and future-oriented aspects of satire that situated the Bible within the context of contemporary religious controversy. Such satire presents the Bible both as a shock weapon and a guide to life that exhorts its readers to take personal moral lessons from the Old Testament myths. As cautionary speech, satire aims to foretell the future and prevent its negative prophecies from happening by teaching men how to improve their manners in due time.

Various prophetic notions and warnings circulated freely during the Reformation. One of the main features of Reformation satire was its broadened scope, as personal failings were accompanied by a satirical commentary on the larger power structures of the Church.[2] An expectation of the Last Judgement brought with it apocalyptic themes and images of monsters. Apocalypticism conceived history as a divinely planned structure that was heading towards a final vindication.[3] The Reformation's sense of the imminent crisis of the present world and its struggle between good and evil provided fertile material for satirical poetics, which involved not so much a sense of expectancy as urgency. The figure of the Antichrist was identified with the pope; as Bernard McGinn has argued, 'Protestant Christianity from the start made identifying the institution of the papacy with Antichrist a fundamental tenet of belief'.[4] Moral failings were

---

[1] Fishelov 1989: 206.

[2] Stopp 1968: 53.

[3] On apocalypticism and Reformation, see Barnes 1988; Stopp 1968.

[4] McGinn 2000: 200-201.

explained not only by human folly but also by the work of the devil, who had invaded the church and was affecting human history.

Such imageries blossomed in satires that were concerned with the salvation of souls; the satires called on sinners to repent before it was too late. Yet another feature of Reformation satire is its harsh polemical tone. The rhetoric of prophecy was used as dissent against religious enemies and predicted their punishment. According to Stopp, in this period men became 'foul-mouthed libellers' and 'great haters' whose *odium theologicum* brought out their worst character when attacking their opponents in theological disputes.[5] Such polemical satire was hardly committed to the pursuit of intellectual truth or moral improvement but aimed at abusive attack, 'a ceremonial slaying', or even 'a continuation of religious repression by other means'.[6]

Favouring direct homiletic appeals to his public, Luther was strongly involved in Reformation satire, which was heedless of sophisticated expressions and passionate for destructive and violent urges, preaching, and warnings. According to Stopp, Luther's method of writing was essentially dialectic in always creating an opponent or a mental counterpart to the discussion.[7] McGinn argues that Luther was 'a deeply medieval figure, obsessed with the devil', the Antichrist, and the end of the world.[8] His influence on the rhetoric of Reformation satire was crucial. Following the Augustinian tradition of considering humans as depraved descendants of Adam and Eve, Luther envisaged the whole of human history in terms of degeneration: his own age was the last and most despicable of them all, and the final cataclysm was near.[9] This view of constant decline and human depravity was also favoured by Reformation satirists, who saw historical events as moving towards a cosmic conflagration following on from human depravity. The Bible was the key to understanding world history, which was nearing the end-time. In what follows, I will examine a handful of religious satires from the Low Countries and Germany by focusing on their prophetic techniques, biblical exegesis, and pious anger, which was believed to promote repentance and true piety.

---

[5] Stopp 1968: 54.

[6] Stopp 1968: 56.

[7] Stopp 1968: 62. On Luther and satire, see also Best 1985.

[8] McGinn 2000: 201.

[9] Trompf 1979: 297; Barnes 1988: 32. Trompf notes that Luther conceived Church history in the light of three phases that passed from the early Christian Golden Age through the Dark Age of the Papacy to the dawn of a new era, the Reformation.

Geldenhouwer's satires on true religion

In the Low Countries, one of the early Latin satirists dealing primarily with religious issues was Gerard Geldenhouwer of Nijmegen, a learned divine, whose *Satyrae octo ad Verae Religionis cultores* ('Eight satires addressed to the worshipers of true religion') appeared in Louvain in 1515.[10] In the manner of Erasmus, Geldenhouwer discussed the obligation of parents to educate their children and drew attention to unlearned instructors. In his view, the primary aim of education is to achieve piety, and following Luther he stressed the importance of the Bible in all human actions.[11] Geldenhouwer's pedagogical thinking is prominent already in his satires relying on humanistic educational ideals and having a strong emphasis on ethical instruction and character building. Geldenhouwer has been considered an epigone of his immediate predecessor and early poetic model, Montanus, but he was not merely a successor; his small-scale satires are genuine poems relying on Christian thinking. Although Geldenhouwer became familiar with Protestantism only later in his life, his Lutheran and humanistic mindset is revealed already in his early poetry, which he wrote when he still belonged to the Augustinians. His biographers have noted that his changing his religion occasioned a dispute between him and Erasmus who apparently disliked his writings.

Geldenhouwer's satires inherited some crucial features from medieval anti-clerical satires and the humanist aversion to ecclesiastical abuses, which he censures in his satires.[12] Geldenhouwer sent copies of his satires to his friends. Martin Dorpius (1485-1525), a learned divine from Louvain, wrote in his letter of 1512 to Geldenhouwer that he enjoyed immensely reading his satires:

[10] Geldenhouwer taught philosophy at Louvain and made friends with Erasmus and other learned men there. He was an important historian, diplomat, and member of the Order of the Holy Cross. Over the years, he served in different courts as a reader and historian. In 1532, he became a professor of history and later of theology at the Lutheran University of Marburg. In addition to editing Petrus Montanus's satires, he wrote, for example, two studies on the history of the Batavians, biographical portraits of notable Dutchmen, two short mirrors for princes, and a pedagogical treatise entitled *Institutio scholae Christianae* (1534). See Bejczy 2000 (with an edition of the *Institutio scholae Christianae* from 1534). Bejczy notes that in this pedagogical work Geldenhouwer had christianised Quintilian's *Institutio* for his purposes of Christian upbringing. For Geldenhouwer's life and religious toleration, see Augustijn 1978; also Marsh 2014.

[11] Nijsten 2004: 117.

[12] Cf. Augustijn 1978: 134 n. 19.

> *Satyrae igitur tuae mihi quidem omni ex parte perplacent; neque offendere quivi, quod mutatum velim. … Amico amice scribo, atque ex animi sententia. Perlegi equidem plus decies satyras tuas, et quoties lectionem iteravi, toties magis placuere*.[13]
>
> Your satires please me in every way, and I could not find anything in the poems that should change. … I write to a friend like a friend and without hiding my true thoughts. I reread your satires more than ten times, and after each reading, they pleased me even more.

Although Dorpius wrote in 1515 against Erasmus's *Praise of Folly*, condemning the work as a satire against all orders, he seems to be more understanding of Geldenhouwer's satires. Although Dorpius admits that the poet criticises his fellow divines, in his view there is nothing in the verses that should be changed; on the contrary, Dorpius's re-reading of them demonstrates his readerly enjoyment and pleasure derived from the poetic details. Dorpius rereads the poem in order to focus his attention to particular sequences that he finds extraordinarily delightful. In his letter to his friend Conrad Vecerius, Geldenhouwer writes that Dorpius's letter should be prefixed to the edition of his satires so that learned men would read his verses more approvingly. Geldenhouwer states that he sends his satires to the recipient as a pledge of his love for him (*has satyras amoris nostri pignus habeto*).[14]

Geldenhouwer's first poem castigates voluptuous friars sunk in vice and corrupted by pride, inebriation, and insane passions.[15] Geldenhouwer contrasts the crumbling and luxurious church and its selfish and materialistic lifestyle with the bygone days of simple living, when the early fathers drank icy water from springs and lived in caves – an image that also recalls the primitive conditions ironically praised by Juvenal at the beginning of his sixth satire.[16] Quoting Persius' first popular lines, Geldenhouwer asks who will read his verses; according to his testimony, even Petrus Montanus's early satires were thrown into the flames by unfavourable readers (*Quis leget haec? nescis proclari tradita flammis / Carmina Montani*).[17] While modestly explaining his reasons for taking up

[13] Geldenhouwer 1515.

[14] Geldenhouwer 1515.

[15] In his study on Reformation satire, Stopp 1968: 53 argues that 'by the end of the fifteenth century the immoral cleric had become a traditional type' and a stock figure not only in satire but also in literature and art more generally.

[16] Geldenhouwer 1515: I; Juv. 6.1-6.

[17] Geldenhouwer 1515: I.3-4; cf. Pers. 1.2 (*Quis leget haec?*); Tournoy 1998: 89.

his pen, he suggests that the time is so corrupt and stubborn that his audience is likely to be small, as only a few readers would appreciate his warnings.[18]

Complaints about the ineffectiveness of criticism and the indifference of the people linked satire to prophetic literature.[19] In the manner of the Hebrew poets Geldenhouwer uses exclamations, packed emotional content, and interjections (*pro pudor*, 'Oh, what a disgrace!') to bemoan the surrounding luxury and immoral practices. The poet identifies himself with preachers who addressed people to get them to change their ways. Interjections also belong to the emotive grammar of lamentations, which mourned someone's death or unhappy loss and expressed a sense of grief and shame elicited by the general corruption violating ethical and Christian norms. As Thomas Jemielity has noted, the sense of shame connoting punishment is pervasive in the Hebrew Scriptures and satire.[20] The references to emotions feed on a collective sense of humiliation and enjoy the power of poetic sanctions by piling disgrace on humans. Geldenhouwer was disappointed with his contemporary church and posited ancient martyrs and fathers as examples, including such illustrious Christians as Cyprian, Antonius, Benedict, Augustine, and Jerome.

Geldenhouwer's second satire describes the passions of Christ and contrasts the blessings of heaven with a human life full of misery:

Rursus quam misera est vita haec, incerta, caduca,
Plena laboribus, iniucunda, superba, malorum
Fautrix, quam tumidant humores, sicca resolvunt,
Escae inflant, macerant ieiunia, morbidat aer,
Dissoluuntque ioci, consumunt tristia, iactant
Divitiae, paupertas deprimit, ipsa iuventus
Extollit, senium incurvat. Tandem furibunda
Omnibus accedit mors et subvertit iniqua
Gaudia, tuncque docet quam sit lutulentia voluptas
Mundi … [21]

Again, this life is so wretched, uncertain, transitory,
full of labour, disagreeable, insolent; a patroness of

[18] Cf. Jeremiah 6.10 in the Old Testament ('Who will listen to me?').

[19] Jemielity 2006: 20.

[20] Jemielity 1992: 22.

[21] Geldenhouwer 1515: II.

> evil, which is swollen by humours, enfeebled by dryness,
> inflated by nourishment, weakened by fasting, made sick by air,
> and dissolved by jokes, consumed by sorrows, made turgid by richness,
> depressed by poverty, extolled by youth, bent down by old age. Finally, frantic
> death comes to everyone and destroys our unfair
> joys, and teaches us how filthy worldly pleasures are…

Registering human miseries in an extensive and manic catalogue which is one of the favourite techniques of satire, the poet exhorts his reader to leave mortal worries behind and cultivate the idea of better times in heaven. The catalogue form, with its items of sin and abundant signs of decadence, creates a sense of the perverted value-system of his day. At the same time the poem is a satirical lamentation deploring the human condition and combines pronounced Christian messages with its criticism. Lamentation as communication does not expect to receive a response; it endlessly deplores the worldly condition and infinitely annihilates its object. The act of judging is prominent in its verbal structure, but the poet does not expect his intense gesture of condemnation to be effective. The lament is a communication that recurs and repeats its message while endlessly leaving the world unchanged. A didactic mode is also on display here, as the poet uses conventional verbs of instruction (the repeated *disce*) to reinforce his goal. The greatest teacher of all is the corrupt world, which makes the human condition manifest.

Geldenhouwer's third satire explains his reasons for writing satire, the primary motivation again being the hypocrisy of the world. Among his poetic models were Lucilius, Persius, Horace, Juvenal, and Montanus. The fourth satire justifies his bitter, poetic language. The poet appeals to the prophet Isaiah, who did not hesitate to condemn the crimes of kings and teach people the truth by using pious words emanating from his pure heart. Cyprian, Bernard, and other saints were examples for Geldenhouwer's poetic truthfulness, but the supreme model was Christ, who was heedless of worldly pleasures and focused on divine gifts.

Contrasting secular and sacred studies, Geldenhouwer's fifth satire ridicules men who are deeply familiar with pagan literature but neglect true learning. Several of Geldenhouwer's satires were written in a dialogue form in which a fictitious interlocutor called Monitor exemplifies a critical audience and presents short counterarguments challenging the poet's position. He gives voice to opposing views, anticipating the reader's reactions, and compelling the poet to justify his harsh style. The opponent again presents brief questions to provoke

the poet into a critical scrutiny of his preferences. While earlier, the interlocutor had teased the poet of his excessive reading of prophetic literature (*Video video tibi multis / Litterulis animum turgere*) and questioned the poet's verbal malice in judging the misdeeds of others and thus doing the same thing himself, here he suggests that there must have been many learned men among the pagans. The poet explains that genuine poets do not write juvenile verses of erotic poetry. Instead, their divine soul makes them true prophets:

> *Ingenium foelix, divinum pectus, et artis*
> *Omne genus vatem faciunt, clarumque poetam,*
> *Despicit is mundi turbas et tristia bella*
> *Is vivitque sibi et musis, pia numina cernit …* [22]

> A blessed disposition, a divine heart, and all kinds of skills
> make a seer and a famous poet;
> he despises worldly crowds and sad wars,
> and he lives for himself and the muses, perceiving holy spirits…

This passage demonstrates the poet's sincerity and speaks for his unfeigned devotion. The exemplary poets protecting the true faith include Moses, David, Solomon, Cyprian, Lactantius, and Iuvencus. Six pagan authors are also included on the list of visionary poets, namely Homer, Plato, Aristotle, Vergil, Lucan, and Persius. While the sixth satire describes a Horatian journey in the Low Countries, praising Montanus and the city of Nijmegen,[23] the seventh extolls true religiosity and complains that people have given themselves up to worldly pleasures, fixing their eyes to the ground. The poet uses simple contrasts, juxtaposing heaven and earth and the outer splendour with the inner blemish. The poem includes a section on the rationale of true Christianity ('Ratio veri Christianismi') meant to remind his fellow friars of the true religion that, following the example of Christ and the church fathers, was modest, god-fearing, forgiving, and primarily interested in the well-being of one's neighbour.

Geldenhouwer's eighth and final satire contrasts secular and sacred vocations. The tone is eminently didactic, as the poet teaches his readers the blessings of eternal life (*Discite ter miseri mortales, discite ubi sit / Vita perennis*). He describes

[22] Geldenhouwer 1515: V.

[23] Geldenhouwer's sixth satire is an imitation of Horace's satire 1.5 ('Iter Brundisinum'); see Laureys 2008: 306 n.17.

how an ordinary young man wasted his years first in futile love affairs and then as a stereotypical merchant travelling across the seas driven by his greed and desire for profit. Forgetting his young love and children, the merchant sought out new lands, as gold gave him strength and confidence. Others became soldiers unafraid of bloodshed, robbing the poor in villages, and in their nihilism denying the afterlife and worldly justice. Those who became wealthy adorned themselves with gold and furs. There seemed to be nothing in the world that would bring peacefulness to human beings. Reading sacred texts and studying wisdom was invigorating, but the greatest stimulant of all was Christ, whom men should follow. Geldenhouwer's satires end with the word 'error': 'The rest that remains is vague, fleeting and perishable worldly joy, the avoidance of which is virtuous and the pursuit of which is the greatest error' (*Caetera sunt vaga, fluxa, caducaque gaudia mundi / Quae fugere, est virtus, amplecti, maximus error*).

Satire as prophecy

It is notable that Geldenhouwer's fourth satire mentions the prophet Isaiah as a distinguished, divinely inspired poet and one of his poetic predecessors satirising ecclesiastical and human corruption:

> *Admonet egregius vates …*
> *… damnat dum crimina regum,*
> *Clama non cesses scelerosae, dicere turbae*
> *Quod verum est …*[24]
>
> The distinguished prophet suggests …
> … when he judges the crimes of kings that
> you should shout aloud and not hold back when declaring to the sinful crowd
> the truth…

This poetic pedigree is related to the satirical intention of describing the large-scale historical corruption of the world, which was also the focus of the Hebrew prophetic books. As several scholars have noted, prophetic literature was a prominent repository of satire in the Old Testament, which displays continuous attacks against the evils of society and proceeds usually as direct

[24] Geldenhouwer 1515: IV. See Isaiah 58.

first-person statements with unflattering things to say about human beings.[25] According to Robert Alter, the principal modes of prophetic poetry are reproof, direct accusation, satire, and the warning of impending disaster that sinners had earned through their actions.[26] The punitive consequences of moral depravity are the focus of both genres. Attacking their targets, the prophets criticise immoral or hypocritical practices of their day and, addressing sinners, warn offenders of their impending destruction.[27] Jeremiah condemns false prophets and the people's departure from righteousness by denouncing their false religious practices.[28] Ezekiel depicts the empty religiosity of his day.[29] Their poetry combines sublime anger with imaginary visions of destruction and redemption.[30]

Isaiah was the greatest satirist among the Old Testament prophets and used several satirical rhetorical techniques.[31] The book of Isaiah condemns idolatry and false religiosity, which were concretely visible in silver and gold. Biblical prophetic literature includes polemical features, and, in the manner of satires, the poets were preachers against human corruption.[32] The prophetic books challenge people to ponder their misdeeds by lamenting their condition and exhorting them to seek a change in their behaviour. Imperative forms exhorting men to stop doing wrong are common in both genres. The poets chided their audience for turning their back on true religiosity and tried to force them to accept better religious and ethical standards. Prophecies and satires share the same visionary scope and moral insight.[33]

---

[25] See, e.g., Alter 1985: 137-162; Fishelov 1989; Jemielity 1991, 1992 and 2006; Patterson 2007: 57-58 (with reference to Jemielity). Fishelov 1989 identified four central satirical strategies in prophetic literature. The first device contrasted sinners' current success with their forthcoming fall; the second was an intensified attention given to the viewpoint of the wicked; the third was a catalogue structure enumerating items of wealth or power and used to reflect the value-system of the target; and finally, the reductive use of animal imagery. Lindvall (2015: 2-3) also noted the close similarity between prophets and satirists who both employed the art of moral confrontation and dealt with the judgement of God attacking idolatry with mockery and righteous, angry wit.

[26] Alter 1985: 141. On prophecy and poetry, see also Kugel 1990.

[27] Patterson 2007: 68-69.

[28] Patterson 2007: 58.

[29] Patterson 2007: 58.

[30] Fishelov 1989: 196.

[31] Lessing 2003: 90.

[32] Petersen 2002: 64 has identified six types of polemical discourse in the book of Isaiah (lawsuit, trial speech, judgement oracle, woe oracle, disputation, and exhortation).

[33] Lessing 2003: 89.

Thomas Jemielity has stated that the Hebrew prophets often adopted typical satirical personas, presenting themselves sometimes as plain-living individuals and herdsmen with simple tastes, or else as innocent child-like figures and eirons baffled by the ubiquity of vice and folly. Above all, they posited themselves as heroic fighters against corruption with a sense of high moral purpose and used images of weaponry and violence.[34] Of these three satirical options, the book of Isaiah represents the third one – moral warfare that prophesies the ravaging of Babylon. The book has also been read as a predictive satirical city-lament in which the rhetoric of satire is prominent.[35] By representing the downfall of Babylon, Isaiah derides its inhabitants for their stupidity and sinfulness. The satirical prophet does not express sympathy or distress before the desolation, but rather bitter scorn and near satisfaction.[36]

While Hebrew prophecy displays the qualities of satire, satire uses prophetic images and patterns as literary devices. Some early modern satires can be read as satirical prophesies, not in the sense of being ironic predictions not to be taken seriously, but as texts that in the manner of prophetic books foretell the forthcoming great fall by using apocalyptic rhetoric. The archetypical claim of the prophetic writer is that he is not speaking in his own voice alone. Instead, he has direct access to godly wisdom; he is a messenger whose lips speak with the voice of divine authority. Likewise, the satirists claimed to be channels to truth with special authority. Prophetic satire appealed to some higher dominion, be it God, the Bible, or some other foundation of knowledge, such as tradition, history, or common sense as the source of accepted wisdom.

Many neo-Latin satirists followed the prophetic example by describing the downward movement of sinners, exulting the colossal fall of the whole human world, or conjuring up the illusionary pleasures of human beings. The idea of the downfall of the world-gone-mad unites these two poetic fields; satire depicted an apocalyptic destruction using images of the universal corruption of a human empire that was doomed to fall. Oracular visions of judgement to come presented harsh indictments to people about their misdeeds and predicted the calamitous fall of humankind. The scenes of the Apocalypse and the Last Judgement were meant to stir fear in the reader and mock humankind for its failures. Prophetic poetry

[34] Jemielity 1991 bases this three-part classification on Maynard Mack's classical work on satirical personas in his 'The Muse of Satire'. Jemielity noted that Amos was a provincial herdsman (38) or an eiron (43), whereas Jeremiah assumed the heroic role (40). On the self-conscious rhetoric of warfare in early Italian neo-Latin satires and invectives, see Simons 2013b.

[35] Lessing 2003.

[36] Lessing 2003: 100.

was also known for its rough handling of its audiences, lashing out at readers, and accusing them of wrong worship.[37] Prophetic poetry has therefore been called Juvenalian in its angry and serious tone.[38] Satires typically had recourse to similar expressions of verbal punishment combined with descriptions of the great decline that was not, however, impending in the future, but currently occurring.

Monstrous and abandoned earth: Lubinus

As critics have noted, the biblical poet could use satire to criticise his present sinful age or announce God's coming judgement as a consequence of immoral behaviour.[39] Following this model, Saint Jerome, for example, frequently castigated his time and lampooned the vices peculiar to his own age.[40] One of his favourite contrasts was the one between the evils of his age and the purity of the times long past; this was also a popular theme in satires and in the Roman schools of declamation.[41] Jerome expressed his bitterness about the faults of his age in his letters and commentaries on the Old Testament prophets. For example, in his commentary on Isaiah, he attacks the ignorance and luxury of the age, basing his criticism of the corrupt society on Isaiah's apocalyptic vision of the destruction of the early city.[42] David S. Wiesen has noted that 'every opportunity offered by a biblical text to mount an attack upon contemporary failings is immediately seized upon'.[43] Later satirists showed the same diligence in condemning the contemporary decline of morality. In their moral understanding of history, inward changes and degeneration caused the major downfalls of institutions or entire empires. Historical events were linked to one another by a higher moral meaning when the consequences of moral excess affected history. Satires imagined how the downfall resulted from human arrogance and hubris in a world that followed a moral order maintained by the principles of retributive justice exercised by the satirists and, as they suggested, by cosmic forces. Satirists presented a world in which punishments were introduced so that the good would be rewarded and the evil punished.

---

[37] Petersen 2002: 31.

[38] Lessing 2003: 92-93.

[39] Patterson 2007: 66.

[40] See Wiesen 1964.

[41] Wiesen 1964: 21.

[42] Wiesen 1964: 59.

[43] Wiesen 1964: 61.

In their ethical pessimism the satirists usually saw the contemporary world as the worst of times. According to satirical moral chronology, the past was revered as a time of virtue that was followed by contemporary degeneration. The ideas of contemporary decadence and retributive justice were often presented in dramatic forms using apocalyptic imagery. In patristic writings, catastrophes such as the Flood or Sodom's destruction speak of 'God's personal control over history'.[44] Satirists were equally keen on destroying evil.

Among the many neo-Latin works dealing with the catastrophic consequences of human misdeeds are Eilhard Lubinus's three long satirical declamations delivered at early seventeenth-century Rostock. Lubinus details the causes for his judgement of contemporary decay. Especially in his first two satires, recited in 1602 and 1615, the poet seems to conceive of himself as a prophetic voice delivering his message to the community and preaching about the chastisement of the wicked.[45] The discourse of chastisement is used to punish the target and assert a position of power on the part of the poet. Previously, we noted how Lubinus describes the collapsing academia and, using the rhetoric of the prophetic lament of destruction, deplores the degeneration of cultural monuments as an image of his age. The palace of academia had fallen into ruins as if touched by a divine hand.[46] Lubinus's satirical ruins offer a panorama of viciousness that describe how amid barbarism, human society is levelled. The movement from success to failure is described in vivid detail: the poet gives prophetic force to his condemnation while yearning for a lost golden age with its frugal living and contrasting sound morality with his own deplorable era (*nostra haec lacrumabilis aetas*) inhabited by demons and anti-Christs.[47] Referring to the ages of humankind, the poet laments that he lives not in the era of gold, silver, bronze, or even iron, but in the era of filth, mud, and monsters that was not comparable to any precious metal (*ultima vivitur aetas / E caeno atque luto nulli aequiparanda metallo*).[48] The satirical tone is one of sadness, outrage and condemnation (*doleo indignorque*), as it was in prophetic literature that also conjured up master images of sun-expelling darkness

---

[44] Trompf 1979: 204.

[45] Lubinus 1618: II, 035 (… *Nobiscum Patres, Moses, sanctique Prophetae, / Et carnem indutus nostram Servator Iesus / Aeterno genitore satus, sancto ore loquuntur* …).

[46] Lubinus 1618: II, 040.

[47] Lubinus 1618: I, 006 (*aevo teterrima nostro*); II, 031 (*Quale tulit monstrum Cacodaemone tetrius ipso / Monstrorum genetrix nostra haec lacrumabilis aetas*).

[48] Lubinus 1618: I, 006. For Lubinus, barbarism was an immense monster and prodigy (II, p. 36); on barbarism, see Kivistö 2002: 42-77.

(*atrasque tenebras*), demons and monsters (*portenta immania saecli*), and violence while foretelling a coming disaster. As Robert Alter has put it, the monitory prophetic poems are 'dominated by images of wasteland, uprooting and burning, darkness, enslavement and humiliation, stripping of garments, divorce and sexual abandoning, earthquake and storm'.[49]

Lubinus's uncompromising satires bear a striking resemblance to prophetic literature in their graphic and grand-scale descriptions of the consequences of human conduct. Under the influence of biblical and epical apocalypticism, Lubinus's satirical history consists of long anticipated conclusions, delivering his prophecy of impending and immense disaster as the final events once foretold by the prophets take place in reality. This was a rhetorical commonplace of the age, and it was typically used to denounce the evils of society. Lubinus was fond of biblical signs of retribution such as darkness and floods, which were thought to be God's way of revealing his truth in the world. Waters figured as a cosmic force controlled by God and used as a punitive agent. Lubinus favoured nature metaphors in executing his judgement and passing his sentence on evildoers. He compares the contemporary barbarism to the time of the Deluge, when men had long floundered in bestiality:

> *Horrida Barbaries cataclysmi iam instar inundans*
> *Omnia …*
> *Una et sola trucis veluti torrentibus undis*
> *Diluvii, immensis traherentur fluctibus huius.*
> *At nunc illa lues Pestis Pandemiae ad instar*
> *Teutonia in tota praelustres Palladis arces*
> *inficit, atque sua lue pestifera inficit omnes …*[50]

> Dreadful barbarism already overflows everything
> like a cataclysm ….
> The rushing savage waves of the deluge and
> immense floods pull you.
> But now the plague has infected like a pandemic
> all the illustrious Palladian fortresses in Germany
> and its pestilential disease poisons everyone …

[49] Alter 1985: 156.

[50] Lubinus 1618: II, 034-035; 043 (*Hinc ea barbaries veluti Cataclysmus inundat / Omnia*).

Lubinus's satirical version of antediluvian degeneracy repeats the history of the biblical Flood, which was preceded by a time of great wickedness. Conveying a sense of global havoc, Lubinus repeatedly employs the image of a great barbaric deluge overpowering every sign of civilisation and culture. A pandemic and an internal plague are also insinuated in every corner of the country. The poet aimed to evoke actual threats as vividly as possible by drawing on the sacred accounts of cosmic catastrophes. In mythical narratives, the flood waters connoted human suffering and were usually sent by deities to destroy civilisations as a punishment for human wickedness; here, the deluge was autochthonous without divine retribution. The punitive and satisfyingly violent aspect was nevertheless there, as people were made to suffer because of their degeneration. The contrast between past and present, the previous happier centuries and the moral decline of Lubinus's own age, is stressed by using the characteristic *at nunc*, which ancient authors such as Juvenal, Seneca, and Ammianus Marcellinus used to introduce their satirical descriptions of present decadence.[51]

The images of the deluge remind one of biblical city-laments in which the poet envisages the destruction of Babylon, Sodom, Sumer, or Nineveh and lamented their decline and total devastation. The city-lament genre compared the havoc to a flood which destroyed houses and ruins, calling for the emotional reactions of weeping and grief and using contrast motifs, comparing the former glory with the present or impending devastation.[52] As Terry Lindvall has observed, for the Hebrew poets, words such as 'rain' and 'teaching' were synonymous, as the words of nature were never merely symbolic but acts that spoke the word of God.[53] One element in city-laments is the departure of the city's leader or the gods:[54]

Horrida barbaries, quae diluvii instar inundans
Imminet, et linguas, artesque, et docta Lycea
Obruet, et Sophian procul hinc, procul inde fugabit.
Quis vetat, et prohibet nostrum? dum publica nemo

---

[51] See Wiesen 1964: 21 n. 5; Sogno 2012: 373. Cf. Juv. 11.120; 14.189. On the argument of the changing times ('De saeculo') in Juvenal's declamatory satires, see De Decker 1913: esp. 34-36. Cf. Hortensius 1552: IV (*Tunc … At nunc*).

[52] On the genre of biblical city-laments, see Lessing 2003: 99-100 (following the work of F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp) and the articles in Bachvarova *et al.* 2016. Typical features of the historical city-lament genre were, for example, destruction, abandonment of the city, the weeping goddess, lamentation, and restoration, but in the satirical lamentations the last element (restoration and the return of the gods) was missing.

[53] Lindvall 2015: 13.

[54] Lessing 2003: 99.

Curat, et intendit privata in commoda quivis
Hesperidum ut serpens, vel Custos velleris aurei.
Mox profugos Sophiae, Themidos, pietatis alumnos
Cernimus hinc, quondam castis habitata Camenis
Palladia, impuris habitanda reliquere porcis.[55]

The dreadful barbarism that overflows like a cataclysm
is threatening and will bury all languages, arts, and schools,
and it will drive Wisdom far away from here and there.
Who among us protests and prevents this from happening? While no one cares
about the common good and only pursues his own private interests,
like a serpent in the garden of the Hesperides, or the guard of the Golden Fleece.
Soon we will find Wisdom, the descendants of Themis and the alumni of piety
fleeing from here, and the Palladium once inhabited by the chaste Muses
is left to dirty swine.

Here the person leaving is the personification of Wisdom, who is forced to abandon the earth when barbarism takes over it. In Lubinus's third declamation, Justice has departed the world and Injustice reigns supreme, carrying the diadem and the sceptre.[56] People had no concern for justice, as Isaiah had also complained,[57] or for the general good, as everyone was devoted to private pleasures. The theme of abandonment shows up in many ways. Elsewhere, Lubinus describes how in the changing times other mythical characters had left behind their previous homes: Astraea, the goddess of justice and innocence, had abandoned the earth already during the Age of Iron and was now followed by another expatriate, namely Piety, the mother of all virtues. Hope, once seated in Pandora's box, had died and the world was dominated by sickness, wars, and famine.[58]

The account relies on ancient epics in which the peaceful virtues have retired and the deities that once inhabited the earth have abandoned it because of human wickedness. Hesiod had described how Modesty had left the earth simultaneously with Justice, and in his account of the ages of mankind, Ovid mentioned how

---

[55] Lubinus 1618: I, 017; cf. II, 068 in which the flooding element is impiety, rather than corrupt education or barbarism (*An non Impietas veluti Cataclismus inundans / Submergat vasti mundi omnia gurgitis alto*).

[56] Lubinus 1618: III, 070.

[57] See Isaiah 1:16-17.

[58] Lubinus 1618: I, 006-007.

Piety was mourning in exile and Astraea was transformed into a celestial sign after her oppression. In Juvenal's sixth satire Justice and Chastity together withdrew to heaven.[59] The Hesiodic (and satirical) understanding of the ages of man was a story about the worsening of the human condition. The rhetoric of desolation was also familiar from prophetic images of devastation, which produced a vision of God's wrath. The account also combined other traditional topics, including the *vanitas* motif, deploring the transience of life, and the *contemptus mundi*, the renouncement of the world.

Prophetic verse was characterised by its vocative elements, and vocal features associated with emphatic speaking such as pompous exclamations and frequent questions were also important in Lubinus's satires, which were first presented orally as declamations at the University of Rostock. Addressing sinners, Lubinus uses rhetorical questions (there are at least 71 question marks and 68 exclamation marks in his declamations) in declaring an impending disaster, because there was no one restraining or prohibiting human hubris. The devastation would be a punishment for the sins of people who now lived in shameful barbarism as swine. The reductive use of animal imagery – Lubinus's declamations abound with sheep, swine, ravens, and other animals and their habits that man should unlearn (*dediscere*) – belong to the repertoire of the biblical poets, who degrade their targets by using similar images.[60]

Other markers of satirical prophetic lamentation include howls of lament (*O cives, quae vos dementia coepit?*, 'Oh citizens, what a madness has taken over you')[61] and shame (*Pro scelus!*, 'Oh, what a crime!'),[62] which are curses in verse intended to mourn and mock human beings. Cries of grief display the poet's attitude and are designed to kindle the reader's emotions by inviting her to join in the mocking. The reversal of the world makes the poet feel physically nauseous (*est stomachum invertens*) in his second satire. In his first declamation, even nature and the city structures cry out lamentations; human beings alone remain silent of their crimes:

> *Sed quid agam, aspiciens, quae bruta aut saxa loquantur*
> *Si taceant homines? …*

---

[59] Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.149-150 (Piety and Astraea); Juv. 6.19-20 (Pudicitia and Astraea).

[60] Fishelov 1989: 203.

[61] Lubinus 1618: I, 017.

[62] Lubinus 1618: III, 074.

Nempe argumento hoc resonant suggesta, theatra,
Et fora …[63]

But what can I do, seeing how the dull stones speak,
if human beings are silent?
Indeed, platforms, theatres, and squares echo this argument.

This technique was also favoured by the city-lament genre, in which the personified roads and gates of the city mourned their destruction.[64] The sense of disgrace signalling a great sorrow became almost overstated. Another stylistic feature Lubinus favours in his rhetoric is repetition, which creates a sense of the totality of the destruction he describes. According to Fishelov, in prophetic literature repetition also had a sarcastic effect, suggesting that the prophet had to repeat again and again his simple instruction to his slow-minded readers.[65] The sense of total doom was familiar from the prophets, who asserted almost identically that everybody cheated their neighbours and never spoke the truth.[66]

The fall of the world is a major organising metaphor in Lubinus's satires, which see a correspondence between moral behaviour and its disastrous consequences, as if a moral order is present within history. Lubinus's apocalyptic tone in the first two declamations is mainly reserved to illustrate the great judgement of academia, while in the third his main concern is impiety. Lubinus's remedy for the impending havoc is proper education and linguistic studies that concretely give human beings a rudder with which to navigate life's vicissitudes.[67] The poet frequently refers to the sword of justice (*Iustitiae enses, ense Dei*) in his punitive poetry,[68] which creates a sense of urgency, stressing that the present is a critical moment and it would be too late to improve one's situation in the future, as the time for change is now (*Crastina vita nimis sera est, hodie INCIPE tandem*).[69] He fixes contemporary decline within a timeless scheme of moral judgement on a cosmic scale: educational decline and godlessness are discussed within

---

[63] Lubinus 1618: I, 006.

[64] Lessing 2003: 100.

[65] Fishelov 1989: 200.

[66] Cf. Jemielity 1991: 38 (quoting Jeremiah 9:1-5).

[67] Lubinus 1618: I, 024-025.

[68] Lubinus 1618: III, 070, 073.

[69] Lubinus 1618: I, 025 (note the block letters which are preceded by the words HOC AGE in the previous line).

the framework of apocalyptic visions and world-shattering images which lead to the eternal flames of Gehenna. The key to escaping the apocalyptic darkness is correct action, which is inseparable from humanistic studies, without which people are unable to appreciate the teachings of the church fathers, Moses, or the prophets.[70] Lubinus's satires demonstrate how satirical writings share crucial features with the prophetic texts. They include abundant numbers of 'difficult ornaments', reflecting divine violent forces and suggesting that the poems are not entirely man-made as there is a larger, cosmic vision in the background.[71] The satirist is the mediating figure delivering the divine message to the sinners.

Other satirists lamenting the state of humanity and progressive degeneration included the Dutch historian Lambertus Hortensius, who, describing the Golden Age and the reign of Saturn in his first satire, contrasts their deep peacefulness (*alta quies*) with his present-day decadence. In the distant past (*olim*), men, worried only about their virtuous mind (*animus rectus*) and avoiding all perfidy, concentrated on the sweet work of gardening, and herding their cattle. Everybody was content with their lot (*sorte sua vixit contentus*)[72] and the land was free of the goddess Eris, envy, and religious struggle. The Golden Age was followed by a worse age, when morals started to decline and brought all crimes along with it; everything was subverted (*fieri contra omnia cernas*).[73] Hortensius frequently evokes the conventional images of barbarism and general corruption as characteristic of his age, when all places were full of examples of perfidy.[74] The turn of the ages and the motif of Piety, once praised by poets and now abandoning the earth, were common images.

Similar images predicting the great fall were familiar from other apocalyptic satires. In Spain, Jaime Juan Falcó refers to the successive ages of man that testified to the general decline. In his fifth satire entitled *De partibus vitae* ('On the Stages of Life'), human life is outlined as a process of gradual decline. After the prosperous and happy years of singing and loving comes the Age of the Ass with all kinds of burdens. The fortieth birthday heralds the beginning of the greedy Age of the Dog, when humans concentrate on guarding their

[70] Lubinus 1618: II, 035. For Gehenna, see ibid. III, 058. On the charge of obscurity in humanist polemics against the Scholasticism, see Kivistö 2002.

[71] On the prophetic books as literature, see Sherwood 2009.

[72] Cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.1-3 (*sibi sortem … contentus vivat*). On the idea of contentment, see below Ch. 7.

[73] Hortensius 1552: I. In his fourth satire, Hortensius described the age of the giants and compared it with his current violent age and its confusion of the tongues.

[74] Hortensius 1552: VI (*Temporibus nostris … perfidiae nusquam desunt exempla*).

possessions. In the final stage, man enters the Age of the Chimpanzee, where man has characteristic deep furrows and is useless for any social activity except for nurturing grandchildren.[75]

Naogeorg's satirical Bible

In the Reformation period, religious struggles played an important role in the re-emergence of anti-clerical satires of hypocrisy and ignorance that had been common in the Middle Ages, but now with more specific – Catholic or Jesuit – targets. Günter Hess has noted that the German Reformation marked the peak in the number of satires.[76] The medieval tradition of *satyra divina* continued to flourish in the Reformation period, which interpreted contemporary events in terms of salvation history and focused on ecclesiastical issues.[77] Hess argues that seeing the world in terms of universality and salvation history – as if the whole world could be seen at one glance – was a medieval relic in Reformation literature.[78] Satirical fiction collected signs of the corrupt world, which was placed on the continuum of human history and the end times.

Thomas Naogeorg's Reformation plays and satires about the vices of the papal Antichrist were important works in transmitting the elements of eschatological expectancy and Antichrist imagery in Reformation society.[79] Naogeorg was first educated in a Dominican cloister in Regensburg, but after his conversion to Protestantism, his ethics were based on Protestant Christology. If earlier verse satires had been either general moral discussions or personal invectives, Naogeorg used them for serious religio-political ends. As Marc Laureys has noted, Naogeorg claimed that he was the first poet in Germany who, relying on the Reformation, adopted the task of the satirist and engaged in Christian and moralising writing within this genre. Naogeorg stated that it was his duty as a satirist to engage in public moral discussion by revealing social grievances and redirecting individuals towards true religion and the teachings of the Gospels.[80] His intention resembled

[75] Falco 1600: V, 60-62.

[76] Hess 1971: 10.

[77] On *satyra divina*, see Hess 1971: 87-89. Divine satire dealt with devils and eschatological issues, and the poet considered himself a *poeta ecclesiasticus*. On Reformation satire, see also Könneker 1991.

[78] Hess 1971: 78.

[79] For a brief account of Naogeorg's life, see Sieveke 1993.

[80] Laureys 2013: 196.

Luther's conviction that the papacy was to be associated with the Antichrist in its opposition to the preaching of the Gospel. Through Luther, this association became a key element in Protestant belief.[81] However, Naogeorg did not write to larger lay audiences but preferred to address his Latin works to humanist circles. His satires combined the Latin learnedness of humanist-minded poets with the Christian tradition of sacred poetry (*sacra poesis*).[82]

Naogeorg is best known for his anti-papist Reformation plays written in Latin, such as *Tragoedia nova Pammachius* (Wittenberg, 1538), which depicts an evil Pope, who is also one of the characters in *Incendia seu Pyrgopolinices* (Wittenberg, 1541).[83] *Pammachius* is a combination of a medieval morality play and a polemical history of the papacy.[84] While examining Reformation anti-papist polemics, Hans-Gert Roloff has noted that the play reflects the poet's didactic optimism about the power of literature to introduce social and religious reforms.[85] Naogeorg endeavoured to educate his audience by seriously discussing the state of the human soul through the fictitious play and its personified figures of good and evil. At the level of the plot, Christ and Satan compete for the soul of the protagonist, Pammachius, who nurtures the dream of becoming a powerful pope who would win a struggle against Emperor Julianus. Pammachius is a complete reversal of Christ, who contrasts his own lifestyle and values with those of Pammachius: the latter is merely interested in increasing his own riches and power. While Christ lived in poverty, Pammachius is the richest bishop in Rome, and while Christ guided human beings towards salvation, Pammachius's goal is to prevent ordinary men from understanding the true purpose of life. Christ's speech summarises the Protestant views of Catholicism, emphasising its diabolical nature and expressing the Protestant intention of illuminating the world by dispelling the darkness of the Catholic Church. The emphasis is on the salvation plan of Protestantism, represented here by means of fiction. Human sins were manifestations of the continued influence of Satan in the world, which becomes a huge literary battlefield between God and Satan. Everything is represented as

---

[81] McGinn 2000: 201-202.

[82] Hess 1971: 75.

[83] On *Pammachius*, see Hübner 1913; Roloff 1980; Michalowsky 1987; Watanabe-O'Kelly 2000: 102.

[84] McGinn 2000: 212 (quoting Klaus Aichele's studies on the Antichrist plays). McGinn notes that the sixteenth century produced several Antichrist dramas which attacked papacy and described the vices of the papal Antichrist; *Pammachius* was the most famous of these works.

[85] Roloff 1980: 750.

being a part of the larger salvation history with its biblical characters, whereas Luther and the Reformation were God's last acts of mercy to humankind.[86]

Naogeorg's 26 verse satires, *Satyrarum libri quinque* ('Five Books of Satires', 1555), are equally interesting pieces dealing with salvation history (*Heilsgeschichte*) and the battle between Christian virtues and the vices of the world. According to Roloff, Naogeorg's verse satires are devoted to three main topics: three of them deal with virtues personified in three historical figures (Erasmus; Albert, Duke of Prussia; and Christoph, Duke of Württemberg), seven examine various episodes of salvation history, and 16 are concerned with the criticism of vices in a contemporary setting.[87] In 1559, Naogeorg also published a satire of ecclesiastical censorship in defence of alleged heretics (*In catalogum haereticorum nuper Romae editum satyra*) and another satire labelling the poet and archbishop Diovanni della Casa as the patron of the Sodomites (*In Ioannem del'la Casa, Archiepiscopum Beneventanum, Sodomiae patronum, satyra*). These anti-papist satires were published in the Basel edition of 1559 together with his long and celebrated satire on the popish kingdom, *Regnum Papisticum* (1553 and 1559, translated into English as *The Popish Kingdome, or reigne of Antichrist* by Barnabe Googe and edited by Robert Charles Hope in 1570), which describes the reign of the Antichrist that Naogeorg again identified as the papal court; the pope is imagined as a monstrous beast originating from the Stygian waters.

Naogeorg's verse satire is strongly Protestant in its flavour, and it gave meaning to contemporary events in the context of a universal drama. Despite their entirely biblical setting, his satires are deeply engaged with topical religious controversy, pairing two different historical moments or mythical and historical times. Naogeorg's satires frequently denounce the papal court by appealing to the Old Testament; for example, poem 1.3 opens with a comment that the first human beings who were expelled from Paradise had to learn agriculture and other human tasks. The poet describes in detail how the first human beings learned to plough and plant. Although their life was full of hard labour, they constantly praised God; this was found to be annoying by Satan and his cohort. Satan is the personified enemy of the early Church who returns to the world in different forms. The analogy between the biblical past and the poet's own times is evoked so that sacred history reflected allegorically the conflicts between the Papists and the Lutherans. Naogeorg's prophetic style does not unfold the coming future, its visions and revelations; rather, it offers access to the biblical past that served

[86] Roloff 1980: 760-763.

[87] Roloff 1987: 372.

as an example of holy living, but it also offers a possibility for an allegorical interpretation in the service of satirical criticism.

Biblical narratives are explained by reference to the poet's own times and the parallel events continued the tradition of reading the Bible figuratively. Accordingly, poem 3.1 describes a cosmic battle between God and Satan in a heavenly setting. It tells of a hubristic angel who revolts against God, with the angel labelling God as a powerful oppressor. The angel gives an elaborate speech to his fellows, complaining of their servitude – such as the obligation to constantly sing – and extolling the value of sweet freedom (*dulcis libertas*). Gathering influence by appealing to the angels' feelings of liberty and sense of power, he promises that together they will defeat God and achieve independence. The angels should unshackle themselves and stop obeying God's rule. Spreading error and disbelief in the current order, the angel volunteers to act as their commander in the revolt. His intense speech is successful in inflaming the audience:

Incenditque animos, ut si quis forte camino
Ingentes cupiens flammas infundat olivum.
Confestim ergo ducem statuunt, regemque salutant.
Coniurant raptim, inque novum dant nomina bellum.[88]

He kindles their minds, like someone who perhaps pours
oil on the furnace to kindle a great fire.
They immediately select him as their leader and hail him as a king.
They hastily join together by oath and enlist for a new kind of war.

The poem is an eschatological version of the war in heaven described in Revelation (12:7-10). It was designed as an allegory of the Catholic church, which had forgotten its original task and turned against the supreme master. The poet suggests that in the manner of the fallen angel, the Papists were thirsty for power and demanded that God should grant some of His power to them. The revolt is of course ultimately unsuccessful, and Satan is cast down to the earth by the archangel Michael.

Satire 4.1 is noteworthy here, because it describes a revolt led by the mythical king Nimrod, who was persuaded by the devil to abandon his life as a hunter and, instead of living a pastoral life in the forests, gathers forces and conquers the world. Sophistry was a demonic attribute; the poem consists of a long speech

[88] Naogeorg 1555: III.1, p. 99.

by the devil, who stirs Nimrod's hidden greed for power. With the help of poor people dissatisfied with their condition, Nimrod assaults villages and burns their huts to the ground. Naogeorg uses elaborate images of fire to substantiate the devastation and Nimrod's burning desire for power that created hell on earth:

Ilicet ingentes rapiunt magalia flammas
Arida, fortuitaque oriens incendia ventus
Nutrit, curriculoque aedes dispergit in omnes,
Atro circumquaque involvens omnia fumo.
Ignibus hinc coelum late, montesque relucent.
Mox fragor insequitur tectorum horrendus, et alti
Casibus afflictorum hominum pecudumque boatus.
Vis flammae multos stratis oppressit in ipsis,
Matres, grandaevosque senes, et pignora cara.[89]

Immediately, huge flames destroy their dry huts,
the rising wind incites occasional fires
that race and scatter all the temples,
enveloping everything in black smoke.
The sky and the mountains glow widely in the flames.
Soon a horrible collapse of the ceilings ensues, and the cries
of injured people and animals rise high from the houses.
The power of the flames crushes many in the collapsed houses,
mothers, old grandparents, and their beloved children.

The passage includes many elements familiar from the city-lament genre and siege narratives, including the noise of the destruction and fallen buildings and the pitiable cries and laments of the oppressed people. Nimrod is clearly an Antichrist figure and a controlling spirit aiming to overcome the will of people, but the poem leaves open the possible historical reference of his mythical character. Roloff argues that the figure is transparent and refers to Catholic regents who conquered lands during the violent uprisings of the Reformation period.[90] The acts of violence in 3.1 and 4.1 could also refer more generally to such popular unrests as the Peasants War, which began in 1524 and saw the princely forces defeating the peasants in a series of violent battles. While Luther condemned the

[89] Naogeorg 1555: IV.1, p. 144.

[90] Roloff 1987: 376.

violence of the peasants' uprising as the devil's work, the insurrections demanding greater religious and political freedom were supported by such radical reforming preachers as Thomas Müntzer, who called for a new order and was considered a spirit of unrest by Luther.[91] During the Peasants revolt and related polemics, it was common to compare Biblical times with contemporary Germany. Pastors commenting on the upheavals referred to the Old Testament passages that urged the Hebrews to release their slaves from servitude[92] and depicted a competition between two kingdoms, those of Christ and the devil.[93] The devil was constantly pictured as creating discord.[94] For Müntzer, the Reformation was a generational anti-establishment movement, and Protestants used to mock Catholicism as the old religion.

In Naogeorg's poem, similar issues are dealt with in a mythical context: Nimrod is supported by the lower social classes – ignoble poor fellows dressed in rags who, tired of servitude, demand more influence and freedom – and the poem also juxtaposes Nimrod's young troops (*iuvenes*) with the older generation (*senes*). Nimrod's identity was unclear even in the Bible, but his moral associations were obvious: according to tradition, he was an archetypal rebel and tyrant who may have been the founder of Babel and a leader of those who built its tower. According to Flavius Josephus, he excited men into a contempt of God. Nimrod's case was thus not unique; it manifested a timeless pattern that recurred throughout history.

Similarly, satire 3.3 describes how Satan was again advancing his course through an eloquent speech while trying to prevent the spread of Christianity after the resurrection of Christ; this satire is prone to a similar allegorical reading of the conflict between the Catholic church and the orthodox Lutherans denouncing the papacy as a movement born of the devil. The satire depicts how Satan tried to persuade the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Essenes, and other learned men to turn against Christ, who was spreading his new doctrine (*doctrina nova*) in Jerusalem and vilifying old religious practices (*religio patrum*). Christ is presented

---

[91] Rublack 2017: 42; McGinn 2000: 213; Kolb 1978: 119-122 (on reactions to Müntzer; for example, Melanchthon depicted him as the devil's tool). On a brief account of Müntzer's life and writings, see Dingel 1993. While Müntzer has traditionally been described by Marxist critics as a hero of class struggle and an ideological leader of the peasants' uprising, Dingel argues that today Müntzer is primarily considered a theologian who adopted a prophetic role to implement his religious policies.

[92] Kolb 1978: 106 (discussing Urbanus Rhegius, an important theologian and humanist during the Reformation, who discussed the concept of Christian freedom and challenged the idea of resurrection).

[93] Kolb 1978: 113.

[94] Kolb 1978: 113 (referring to Johann Eberlin, an ecclesiastical superintendent).

by Satan as a reformer whose new sect would conquer the world.[95] One of the polemical signal words associated with these sects is 'darkness' (*tenebrae*), which symbolises sin, God's absence, and the Papists. Satan ironically foretells that with the new order, doomsday will draw nearer unless the old sects defend their fathers' religion. The new doctrine referred to the novelty of Luther's teachings. Satire 3.5 associates the Papists with Muslims and Jews, whereas the clearly anti-Catholic satire 4.6 mocks the allegedly superstitious rituals and corrupt worship practices of Loreto, a famous Catholic pilgrimage site. For the Reformation satirist, Loreto represented a false postlapsarian belief in idolatrous worship, miracles, and shrines that supported external ritualistic practices. The poet warns about the alleged sanctity of such seemingly holy places that, in his view, lacked spiritual significance.

Notably, Naogeorg never attacks Catholicism alone; his vitriol is also explicitly directed at his hero, Luther, who is the object of two virulent poems (5.3 and 5.5). In these poems, Luther and his orthodox circle in Wittenberg are identified as a new Pope (*novus Papatus*) and a second Rome (*nova Roma*). In satire 5.3, Naogeorg describes how the new papacy expected to be venerated by all and its supporters were so self-satisfied that they believed themselves divine and infallible – as if they alone were capable of interpreting God's word. The poem highlights that while people thought that the papacy could never return to its full vigour, this was a false belief, since humans were always vulnerable to Satan's ploys. Worries and diseases gave him an entrance to the human mind. Satire 5.5, written in dialogue form, criticises Lutherans (represented by the interlocutor Phormio) for self-satisfaction and pride, as if they were impeccable gods. The poet denounces their polemics against radical theologians such as Zwingli, Schwenckfeld, and lay-preachers (or *Schwermers*), who were labelled heretics, 'fanatics', and trouble-makers resisting the ecclesiastical authorities. The Lutherans condemned all alternative views as heretical even without reading their writings. The poem castigates Lutheran pride and appeals for the toleration of all Protestant sects.

Naogeorg took full advantage of the contemporary predilection for memorable myths and tales in his writings, in which even Satan acted according to this word-related culture; Naogeorg frequently described the devil as giving speeches strongly imbued with persuasive and emotional qualities.[96] The

---

[95] King 2001: 176 notes that Protestants often mocked Catholicism as the 'old' religion and used the example of Cain and Abel frequently in this criticism.

[96] On Protestant biblical poetics in (English) seventeenth-century religious lyrics, see the grounding work of

debasement of the rebel angel in satire 3.1 and the war in heaven discussed above could also be interpreted as a parable of revolutionary Protestant movements and a critique of Luther, who was known for his abilities to persuade people and win large audiences through his charismatic speeches. Satan's sophistry in the poem bore a relationship to the Reformation sermon that drew large crowds and was primarily based on popular preaching.[97] In the manner of the fallen angel, Luther was a role model and a spiritual leader for those hoping for change; he was known for the similar rhetoric of Christian liberty in his battle for German sovereignty against Rome.[98] The Protestant reformation was advanced through local revolts and insurrections in which students acted militantly, ordinary people broke into churches, and old shrines and statues were burned or smashed.[99] Luther the rebel was ready to sacrifice himself in the battle against current leaders in the same way as Naogeorg's fallen angel instigated rebelliousness by promising change.

Naogeorg's satires were strongly linked to a sense of the end of the world and fundamental questions about human sinfulness. They conceptualise historical events in terms of the biblical text so that the present and the biblical past are never entirely separate. The Bible afforded a primary literary model and a morally motivated interpretative key to current affairs and vices that were genetically connected to the biblical past. Constant assaults by the devil were a cornerstone of Lutheran thinking and frequently re-enacted in satirical history. Papists were not only compared with the devil's cohorts; they were actually serving the Antichrist and, as representatives of human depravity, were leading humanity towards the final collapse. The mythical narrative gave meaning to contemporary events, connecting them to the moralities of sacred history. When Naogeorg wrote about original sin, this mythical account structured daily events on a cosmic scale, explaining the difference between good and evil. Human history was marked by a struggle with the devil who was not just an imaginary figure but someone constantly affecting the world.

Naogeorg was also interested in biblical beginnings and devoted some satires to Paradise and heaven.[100] One of Naogeorg's longer satires (5.1) envisages

---

Lewalski 1979 who examines the crucial importance of the Bible for a Christian poet.

[97] Cf. Rublack 2017: 70.

[98] Rublack 2017: 27.

[99] Wandel 1999.

[100] Satire 3.4 ponders whether heaven exists as a concrete place and gives evidence for an affirmative answer. Arguing with his imaginary interlocutor, the poet claims that if heaven did not exist, then everything would fall into ancient chaos. The Bible confirmed this notion by frequently referring to the existence of heaven, from its creation in Genesis to the Gospels, which related how Christ arose to the heavens. Heaven was the place that

the beauties of Paradise and universal peace, which were lost when the serpent seduced Eve. Reviving a golden world, this satire on the fall of man is noteworthy as early nature poetry. Over 160 lines, it muses on the perfection of a sacred history when all creatures rejoiced. The poem provides an inventory of paradise by enumerating the different trees, flowers, and (vegetarian) animals that filled the perfect land. Through the lists, the poet generates a sense of abundance and quantifies the peace of Eden. The primeval harmony is understood in a moral sense, preceding the later decline and miserable state that was the target of satirical criticism. Naogeorg paints a picture of the blessed condition that he held as an unattainable example for humankind. According to Roloff, the poet recounts how human beings lost their freedom of will and their subsequent life was inclined towards evil, described by the word 'virus':

Infelixque ambos recti pravique remordet
Cognitio, admissaeque gravantur pondere noxae.
Mox pudor atque metus nati, cordisque dolores.
Nam facti ex iustis iniusti, mortis amarae
Imperio se subdiderant, iraeque Tonantis.
Amissa arbitrii quoque libertate, voluntas
Atque omnis factae vires ad pessima pronae,
Cordisque exitiosum invaserat intima virus.[101]

They both are vexed by the unhappy knowledge of right and wrong,
and burdened by the weight of the damage they allowed to happen.
Soon shame and fear arise, and the pains of heart.
The just become unjust and succumb to the dominion of
bitter death and the anger of God.
After losing their freedom of choice, their will
and all their strength was subjected to evil deeds,
and a deadly virus invaded the intimate corners of their heart.

---

gathered all the hopes of Christians. It is represented in the poem as the reference point of all human wishes, saving them from the blindness of earthly living. Naogeorg 1555: III.4, p. 127 (*Si coelum non est id quod nos dicimus esse, / Unde Deum dicam Iudaeis esse locutum? / Unde Dei gnatum descendisse? unde pluisse / Sulphureas flammas? Vertamus lumina quonam? / Denique quo mentes? quo nos speremus ituros, / Nempe locum certum non demonstraverit ullus.*)

[101] Naogeorg 1555: V.1, pp. 193-194; cf. Roloff 1987: 374.

This was also a formation story of satire, since with the first bite of the forbidden fruit, humans became aware of right and wrong. The fall of man was a prefiguration of the later perverted world that satires analysed. It was Satan's first success in his battle for the human soul, and in the history of satire there were many further victories to come. One of the most salient aspects of Naogeorg's work was his practical intention of bringing men to repentance and true faith through concrete examples of vicious actions. In the manner of the Hebrew poets, Naogeorg wanted to shame his readers into repentance by proclaiming accusations of their misdeeds and warning them of the consequences of their actions. He assumed that repenting human beings took responsibility for their former actions and were able to change their lives.

Acts of iconoclasm

Sometimes Naogeorg also offered positive models for imitation. Advocating Christian devotion and the reading of the Bible in his second satire (1.2) he praises Albert, the Duke of Prussia, who was the first noble ruler to establish Lutheranism as the official state religion. Naogeorg eulogises Albert for not blindly following his foolish ancestors who neglected the Gospels. Albert had learned the Sacred Scriptures and taught their importance to others as well, taking care of his people's spiritual and material welfare. The duke is praised as a representative of 'cancel culture' who refused to repeat the errors of his ancestors and stopped their recurrence by obliterating the statues of former idolatrous worship. Enacting religious reforms, he is compared to the righteous King Hezekiah, who reformed the priesthood in the Hebrew Bible and destroyed religious images used in idolatry, including the bronze serpent wrought by Moses:

> *Sic bonus e regno simulacrorum abstulit Asa*
> *Culturam, quamvis ab avo ac genitore repertam.*
> *Haud est Hezechias maiorum errata secutus*
> *… excelsaque fana*
> *Destruxit, statuas fregit, tuque aeneae serpens,*
> *Per Mosen quamvis in tristi factus eremo,*
> *Quando colebaris sacris et thuris honore,*
> *Fractus es.*[102]

[102] Naogeorg 1555: I.2, p. 29.

> So, the good king Asa abolished the worship of images from the kingdom,
> although he had inherited the practice from his grandfather and father.
> Neither did Hezekiah follow the errors of his ancestors…
> … he destroyed lofty temples and shrines,
> shattered statues, and broke you, too,
> bronze serpent, once created by Moses in the harsh desert
> and worshiped with incense in sacred rituals.

Changing from third-person narrative to second-person singular, the poet here humorously speaks to the famous bronze serpent erected by Moses, which was also associated with the serpent in Paradise. The 'you' form and the face-to-face communication of this episode reinforce the prophetic impression, having a strong sense of the spoken rather than written word. By dismantling false images and shrines, the kings of Judah, such as Asa, Hezekiah, and his successor Manasseh, and much later the noble Duke Albert, eradicated old cult practices (*haud aliter fregit simulacra*) and restored temples to their once forgotten 'pure' form. The biblical figures were carefully chosen here: Hezekiah and Manasseh were known as builders, reformers, and kings who were active in the work of restoration, and therefore they were re-enacted here as foreshadowers of the restoration community.[103] Moreover, they were iconoclasts who completed their reforms by suppressing idolatrous rites and destroying objects of false worship. Iconoclasm was part of the effort of building a new religious system or returning to the true law.[104]

The situation was analogous to Reformation Germany, where the Protestants claimed to return to the origins of true religion by introducing iconoclastic reforms and associating palatial splendour with Romish pomp. The Reformation did not mean innovation or new doctrine; instead, it was conceptualised as a revival and restoration of former purity and the interiority of the biblical word (*verbum*). This goal was often manifest in iconoclastic acts, when ordinary people and supporters of Protestant movements attacked churches with the aim of cleansing them of idolatrous images by smashing crucifixes, sculptures, and panel paintings.[105] The purpose was to show that these public authoritative images and physical religious sites were a vainglorious display under the patronage of Satan and devoid of any sacred power. The Catholic urge to erect altars at holy sites was

---

[103] See Trompf 1979: 137.

[104] On the use of Old Testament kings in Edwardian religious polemics, see Bradshaw 1996.

[105] On iconoclasm, see Wandel 1999.

denounced as wrongheaded, and iconoclasm was conceived of as an act of piety. Accordingly, Albert did not introduce new religious ceremonies; he was praised by Naogeorg for restoring the genuine religion neglected by his predecessors and for not adoring gold and silver but the word of God. In Naogeorg's view, Albert had made right choices in life and, like Hezekiah, although immensely rich, he put his trust in things having spiritual significance, whereas the Catholics in their hypocrisy built glittering temples with golden facades and decorated shrines with jewels. Albert brought along with him an age of happiness, peace, and prosperity that everyone enjoyed. The poem ends in praises and good wishes sung collectively to the duke by the young and the old alike.

Although in world history, the shattering of statues has often signalled destruction and the end times, in satires such iconoclastic acts were also extolled. Naogeorg evokes biblical statue destroyers and former acts of iconoclasm to make his point about the current religious affairs clearer; he emphasises the Lutheran doctrine of inward faith alone. Similar anti-Roman associations pervade other poems, which were concerned with false religion and its contrast to true worship. In his long satire 4.2, Naogeorg describes how, during the Interim period in 1548, people who had previously scattered old religious items and precious altar pieces were now ordered to revive Catholic practices in formerly Protestant areas. In a parodical episode, men carry liturgical objects, candle sticks, crucifixes, censers, and oil lamps back to the church:

Ecce strepunt fabri, pictores, omneque circum
Artificum genus: incumbis, properasque iubesque,
Ceu Babylon foret aedificanda et turris ad astra …
Damnatas iterum ad Missas altaria surgunt,
Peplisque ornantur solitis sculptisque sigillis,
Undique portantur tabulae simulacraque muta,
Parietibusque arisque et celsis rite columnis
Magno figuntur studio, candelabraque longa, crucesque,
Et cum thuribulis volitantia vela parantur.[106]

But look, artisans, painters, and all kinds of craftsmen
start to bustle around; you press, rush and command them,
as if they were building the tower of Babel to the stars…
They are rebuilding altars for the once-abolished Masses and

[106] Naogeorg 1555: IV.2, pp. 147-148.

decorate places with familiar linen and sculpted figurines;
they carry paintings and mute images from everywhere and
eagerly fasten them on the walls, shrines, and high columns with proper ceremonies,
and they prepare long candlesticks and crucifixes,
and incense containers together with flying curtains.

This satire is unambiguously anti-Catholic in denouncing their ceremonies, mute images (*simulacraque muta*), and people who, in embracing the darkness they had previously detested, readopted Catholic rituals discarded by the Lutheran reformers. Roloff has identified the setting as the city of Kempten, which had converted to Protestantism but returned to the Roman church.[107] The poem also refers to savage, primitive rulers (the giants) and periods of turmoil (Babylon) that marked the breakdown of peaceful living.[108]

Naogeorg's aversion to all kinds of orthodox thinking is summarised in his satire 1.4, which defends spiritual freedom and attacks the politico-religious sects and schools that had emerged around the Reformation. Naogeorg ridicules the habit of raising human beings to the status of infallible masters and argues that Christ is the sole authority and human authorities are all necessarily deficient.[109] Echoing the altercating voices of the multitude, the poet produces a vocal image of various competing sects:

Hic prior est, aiunt, hic doctior: at meus ille
Lenior, ast alter, meus est facundior, inquit:
Verior est meus, imo meus, delitigat alter,
Omnia solus habet, nec cuiquam cesserit hilum.[110]

[107] Roloff 1987: 380. Naogeorg moved to Kempten in 1548.

[108] In addition to praising Duke Albert, Naogeorg wrote panegyrics on Erasmus's work on education (2.3; see also above, Ch. 2) and extolled Duke Christoph of Württemberg for reforming education and the administration of the church and being active in building churches and schools (2.5). In these two satires the images of the devil or the Antichrist are not present; instead, the tone is more positive and didactic. Christoph was an example of a virtuous regent and a counterimage to the mythical power-seeking Nimrod mentioned above. Erasmus, unlike Luther, was not motivated by the imagery of the last days and did not believe that people would remain sinners until the very end; on the contrary, he believed that the Bible would offer them ways to live a Christian and virtuous life. On Erasmus compared to Luther, see Rublack 2017: 95.

[109] Cf. Christ in Matt. 23:1-12.

[110] Naogeorg 1555: I.4, p. 46.

> This doctor is superior, they say, this is more learned; but my doctor is
> more moderate; however, another says, my doctor is more eloquent;
> my doctor is more truthful; on the contrary, my doctor is, brawls another.
> He alone has everything in his command, and he is inferior to no one.

Instead of choosing one human master as an idol, Naogeorg advises his reader to become familiar with a diversity of books. Borrowing a famous apian image from the poetics of imitation and Seneca's moral epistles (84), Naogeorg argues that it is wise to pick useful sentences from everything one reads, just like the bees are not content to imbibe from just one flower but collect the ingredients required for making honey from a diversity of plants. Different authors have different strengths: Cicero excels in eloquence, Vergil in verses, and Pythagoras in numbers. Naogeorg argues that, in the manner of the bees, the reader should not be content with one writer alone but should obtain his learning from a varied course of reading. One should not despise any previous effort, and by studying different authors one would acquire fuller knowledge. Another image used here is that of a symphony; as a 'polyphonic' form, it acquires its beauty from the diversity of instruments and simultaneity of more than one sound, whereas a musician who always repeats the same note is ridiculous. The poet refuses to obey any human authority (*addictus nulli*),[111] since for him the only uncontested master is God.

Although satire and prophecy were both public modes of speaking, they also spoke to the private individual, aiming to improve his inner condition and personal religious life. Satire was akin to Reformation religious lyrics, which explored the human relationship with God, spiritual freedom, the moral state of the soul, and hopes of salvation.[112] In the end, Naogeorg's satires rely on optimistic thinking by assuming that humans can also choose virtue in the post-Edenic reality.

Frischlin's satirical exegesis

Reformation satire was uncompromising in its understanding of truth, which was closely tied to Christian doctrine. A famous example of polemic religious

---

[111] Naogeorg 1515: I.4, p. 46 (*Addictus nulli, nullique innixus ubique)*, 48 (*Addictus nulli, nullamque per omnia laudans*). Cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1.1.14 (*nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri*); the phrase is also quoted in Frischlin's second satire.

[112] On the elements of Protestant religious lyrics, see Lewalski 1979: 13 *et passim*.

satire from the Reformation period is the work of the Tübingen poet Nicodemus Frischlin, whose eight relentless satires, *Satyrae octo*, against the Catholic convert Jacob Rabus were written in 1567-1568, when he was a student at Tübingen.[113] After converting to Roman Catholicism, Rabus joined the Jesuit order, stirring Frischlin to compose his collection of scripturally based invectives.[114] The satires appeared posthumously in 1607 in Gera when both the poet and his main target had already passed away. In Laureys's estimation the satires were primarily addressed to the professors of the University of Tübingen, and there is no indication that they would have circulated widely as individual poems before their posthumous publication. Although the poems were originally deployed for invective purposes and religious-political engagement, they were probably later read in a more abstract and universalizing way. While Frischlin was a later representative of Renaissance humanism interested in learned classical themes, we must note that he was also a Reformation poet and an apocalyptic thinker who relied on the expectation of the last days and was attuned to the signs that God used to communicate his wrath.

On the title page of his satires, the poet quotes the Book of Revelation (14:8) and its chapters on the three angelic messages in which the second angel referred to the fall of the city of Babylon and the third proclaimed that anyone suspected of idolatry would have to face God's fury. Babylon was frequently identified with the city of Rome as the papal seat in Reformation satire.[115] This association had a long history: Saint Jerome had compared the worldliness of his contemporary age to Babylon in his letters and anticipated Rome's collapse, calling the city the second Babylon, as did Augustine, who also called Babylon the 'first Rome'.[116] Preaching the coming of a severe chastisement, Frischlin's opening announces that the end is near and foreshadows Rabus's violent destruction should he continue his evildoing. The poet notes that the day of judgement will not come without warning and offenders must suffer profoundly for their crimes. As a prophetic voice whose intention was to imitate heavenly utterances, the poet exposed vices and produced punishments in verse, not unlike those stemming from the divine sense of justice.

---

[113] For Frischlin's controversial life, see Strauss 1856; Bebermeyer 1967: 49-79; Wheelis 1974; Schade 1993; on his satires (esp. satire 2), see Laureys 2013. Bebermeyer also studies Heinrich Bebel (ca. 1472-1518), a humanist poet from Tübingen, who published a Latin satire against the corruption of his times (*Satyricum carmen H. Bebelii Iustingensis in nefandos nostrae tempestatis mores, et contra detractores pessimos*).

[114] Porter 2016: 90 notes that Rabe was also the target of Johann Fischart's *Nachtrab oder Nebelkräh* (1570).

[115] See Stopp 1968: 60.

[116] Wiesen 1964: 26 (for Rome as Babylon, see Jerome's Letter 45.6); Trompf 1979: 223 (on Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 18.2.22).

The research literature has not so far explicitly recognised the fact that the Bible afforded a rich context to discuss contemporary polemics in Frischlin's satires, which include numerous biblical references underlining the moral and didactic mission of his poetry. Frischlin considered himself a public preacher to the extent that the Chancellor of Tübingen once reminded him that he was a poet and not a prophet.[117] Rabus's conversion back to true religion was Frischlin's main goal so that his foe would be restored to his senses and not be consumed in the flames of Gehenna, as he altruistically puts it at the end of his collection. Frischlin apologises for his offences by appealing to his good intentions of instructing, amending, and reforming his target.[118] As Laureys has pointed out, Frischlin's religiosity in his satires is not so much about private inner piety but book learning that combined pagan and Christian poetry to justify its teachings.[119] The poems participated in an unbroken theological discussion fighting against the forces of the Antichrist. In his pious anger, Frischlin interpreted historical events in the light of salvation history and the Apocalypse that brought all events under the same gigantic narrative stretching from time's beginning to its end.[120] As Stopp has put it, in Reformation satire 'the mystical world-picture and the satirical method coalesced'[121] and Reformation readers interpreted contemporary events through the lens of the Bible. Both Naogeorg's and Frischlin's satires are examples of the simultaneity of times and of the Reformation principle advising readers 'to take the figures of Old and New Testament narratives as exempla, showing them how to behave and what to avoid'.[122] Like Saint Jerome much earlier (or the entire New Testament), Frischlin re-enacted Old Testament events and applied their moral principles to his own age in a highly vivid manner.[123]

In his first satire, Frischlin describes how Rabus was tempted by the devil and his fall is comparable to the first fall of man. Frischlin asserts that anger, hatred, and swords (*ira, odium, gladius*) are the chief weapons of the papacy, and Rome is full of parasites. Invoking Christ in his second satire, Frischlin assures that his own hands are unaccustomed to weapons and he had never attacked anyone, but now he was forced to take up his pen, since Rabus's soul under his gown was

---

[117] Laureys 2013: 196 n. 36.

[118] On satirical offensiveness and its excuses, see also Jemielity 1992: 40-41.

[119] Laureys 2013: 204.

[120] Cf. Hampton 1990: 13.

[121] Stopp 1968: 60. On satirical works taken seriously as theological discourse, see also Porter 2016.

[122] Carpenter 2016: 18.

[123] On Jerome, see Wiesen 1964: 54.

sordid and shameful.[124] In the third satire, Frischlin gives an extensive review of Rabus's life course, comparing him to Absalom, who had rebelled against his father David.[125] Identifying himself with a public preacher, Frischlin followed the moral principles pronounced by Naogeorg in his preface to his own work.[126] By rephrasing Naogeorg's views of religious satire, Frischlin's apology appeals to the same biblical models:

> *… Quid Paulus? acerbe*
> *Pseudoprophetarum numquid consortia carpit?*
> *Nunc Antichristos, impostoresque salutat,*
> *Nunc seductores famoso nomine dicit,*
> *Mox desertores fidei vocat, increpat, urget. …*
> *Christus et in Scribas irato fulminat ore,*
> *Acriter objurgat Pharisaeae crimina gentis.*[127]
>
> What about Saint Paul? Surely, he doesn't
> slander bitterly the consortium of pseudoprophets?
> Now he salutes them as Antichrists and impostors,
> now he calls them with the notorious name of seducers,
> soon he names them as forsakers of faith, protests and complains…
> Christ also attacks furiously against the scribes and
> vehemently chastises the crimes of the Pharisees.

Equating his verses with righteous anger, the poet adopts divine judicial authority, punishing the wrongdoer Rabus in the name of justice and affirming the connection between suffering and punishment. As in the Bible, suffering is exemplary here: natural catastrophes and individual physical harms are punishments for sinfulness and read as warnings to others of the consequences of evildoing.[128] The passage also includes a conventional reference to the Antichrist identified with the papal court.[129]

---

[124] Laureys 2013 identifies abundant quotations from and allusions to Roman satire in Frischlin's second satire that was pieced together from their verses.

[125] 2 Sam. 15-16.

[126] On Frischlin's debt to Naogeorg, see Laureys 2013: 196.

[127] Frischlin 1612: III, p. 20.

[128] Cf. Jemielity 1992: 38.

[129] On the figure of the Antichrist in Reformation literature, art, and thinking, see McGinn 2000: Ch. 8.

Frischlin's fourth satire describes true faith in contrast to Catholicism. Exhorting his readers to listen to his verses – using a formulaic imperative *audi*, listen – the poet enumerates the signs of true religion. The first criterion is the purity of the word, while the self-deifying and self-deluding papists are like mad dogs neglecting the Sacred Scriptures. Engaging in a fictitious dispute with his adversary, the poet suggests that according to Rabus, the pope is comparable to Moses, who was once appointed by God to settle people's disputes and who was then advised to choose capable men as leaders and to act as judges. Opposing Rabus's views, the poet maintains that the old Judaic law should no longer govern Christians and people should act only from godly law. Christ had expelled the previous darkness and was now the highest priest, giving full meaning to life. The poem includes attacks on friars, accusing them of ignorance and contrasting them with artisans who were devoted to the true meaning and simplicity of the Bible. The last sections of the poem remind Rabus of his forthcoming judgement and compare the pope and his servants to the tyrants of the soul (*Psychotyranni*). The fifth satire deals with different schisms and heresies in the church, and the sixth responds to accusations presented about the novelties of the Lutheran doctrine on matrimony and other issues.

Interpretative memory was crucial in the act of censuring contemporary events and persons. Frischlin's understanding of history followed the scheme of salvation history, which saw all the events in the Bible as directly linked and significant to the story of redemption. In the manner of salvation history, he associated his contemporary events with the grand chain of redemptive activity of God, and biblical evildoers were satirically identified with his contemporary men. History was religious history combining the contemporary with the mythical events of the Bible that served as an interpretative background for satirical criticism. Biblical scenes were placed against sixteenth-century events so that the first fall of man and the machinations of the devil recurred in Reformation history. The papacy was constantly represented as one of the major inventions of the devil, and the pope was identified with the anti-Christ.[130]

[130] On the identification of Antichrist and the pope in Protestant polemics, see McGinn 2000: 208-13; Stopp 1968: 59-60 (with reference to Lucas Cranach who placed the papal tiara on the beast of the Apocalypse in his illustrations to the Book of Revelation in 1522).

Rewriting the story of Cain and Abel

It was common to draw plots and characters from the Bible in Reformation biblical drama. Another popular technique was to write poetic paraphrases of the Old Testament books for lay audiences and other people.[131] For example, William Hog (Gulielmus Hogaeus, ca. 1655-1702) from Scotland wrote a satirical paraphrase of the Book of Ecclesiastes entitled *Satyra sacra in vanitatem mundi et rerum humanarum sive paraphrasis in Ecclesiasten poetica* ('Sacred satire on the vanity of the world and human affairs, or a poetic paraphrase of Ecclesiastes', 1685). Hog had previously experimented with a Latin translation of the Book of Job (*Paraphrasis in Jobum poetica*, 1682) and now turned to another biblical text in order to critique his time and give lessons on the good life to his readers. Ecclesiastes was a fertile text for this purpose owing to its emphasis on the meaninglessness of life in a world full of injustice. In his preface, Hog asserts that he does not aim at castigation, but in the manner of physicians, he diagnoses diseases and offers remedies (*medicamenta, salubria consilia*) for inevitable human afflictions so that the patient can enjoy life irrespective of fears for the future.[132] Ecclesiastes is a suitable poem for direct paraphrasing by a satirist, because it is full of irony about the senselessness of life.[133]

Frischlin participated in the same tradition of Christianising classical heritage (or vice versa) by writing biblical plays in Latin cast in the style of Roman comedy, but he also used the sacred past to promote moral insight in his satires.[134] The seventh satire is an interesting example of this technique. Basically, the satirical lamentation is addressed to Rabus's respected father, Ludwig, a Protestant pastor, and it derives sacred episodes from the Bible to criticise the younger Rabus.[135]

[131] For the genre of paraphrase, see Ferrer & Mantero 2006. Prose paraphrases were also written of Horace's satires. Martin Brasch (1565-1601), a poet and professor of logic at Rostock since 1593, published in 1598 his *Satyrae primae Horatianae, quae est de vitiis hominum usitatissimis paraphrasis oratoria insertis singulis Poetae verbis*. He is following here the example of his learned colleague, Eilhard Lubinus, who had previously explained and interpreted Persius' satires in the same manner. Brasch explains that he has written the paraphrases for his own pleasure; the genre also nicely captures in his view the main contents of Horace's poem. Brasch's paraphrase is followed by three short epigrammatic poems defending satire.

[132] Hogaeus 1685: Ad Lectorem.

[133] Cf. Jemielity 2006: 26.

[134] On classical imitation in Frischlin's biblical drama, see Price 1990.

[135] In his third satire Frischlin also refers to the senior Rabus as an admirable figure, whereas his ungrateful son refused to obey his teachings. It can be assumed that Ludwig Rabus is not the target of Frischlin's satires here, since the poet underlines that Ludwig did his best to educate his stubborn son, but of course the poems can also be read ironically so that the father is equally criticised here.

Describing Rabus's unsuccessful education, the poet notes that sons often bring their parents great trouble. This statement is supported by numerous biblical examples, such as the furious Cain and his descendant Lamech, who disappointed their fathers (in Lamech's case, Noah). Attributing satirical relevance to biblical tales and post-Edenic figures, the poet deplores the disgrace brought by the first of them, namely Cain, who first encountered the possibility of morally flawed choices and murdered his younger brother:

> *O scelus! O patrem deflentem funera gnati!*
> *O gemitum matris! frustratum crimine pectus:*
> *Spem vanam: o sanctum veniens ex aethere semen*
> *Promissum!*[136]

> Oh, what a crime! Woe to the father who weeps over the death of his son!
> Oh, mother's pain! Her heart is deceived by the crime,
> all hope is vain, oh, the holy promised seed descending from the heavens.

Favouring Old Testament subjects, the poet also presents other episodes from Genesis that involved conflicts between brothers. He deplores Esau's life, which brought sorrow to his parents. The rape of Dinah and its subsequent vengeance by her brothers eventually became a great shame to their father Jacob, as did the rebellion of Absalom to David, Absalom's father. In his direct retelling of biblical tales, Frischlin is less concerned with the obvious unfairness of Esau's life in terms of human morality and allows his readers to engage with these biblical figures only as blameworthy characters. Readers are invited to imagine their transgressive deeds and learn ethical lessons from their failures. The poem is a vivid example of how the Bible could be used to illustrate not so much matters of faith, but moral education.

The strong emotional content of the poem is also noteworthy. Biblical scholars noted that before the first fall, moral behaviour came naturally, but controlling one's emotions was a new responsibility for Cain, who failed to manage his disappointment. Rather than regaining self-esteem through self-improvement, he turned to violence against his brother. As Chaya Greenberger has put it:

> Cain and Abel grow up in a post-Eden reality. After Eve and Adam partake of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, human nature undergoes critical change.

[136] Frischlin 1612: VII, p. 60.

> Human choices are no longer based upon right or wrong in an objective sense, but involve subjectivity – what is pleasing or beneficial from the vantage point of human emotion and desire. This opens up the possibility for morally flawed choices. Cain was the first to be challenged by this new reality.[137]

Frischlin's poem recounts stories that play out this human propensity for evil and describe how after the fall, human choices were determined by subjective emotions and desires manifested in Cain's perplexed figure. Emotions were also crucial in the story of Joseph and his brothers in Genesis 37, which is rather straightforwardly repeated from the Bible in Frischlin's seventh satire, but by giving more space to the description of the emotions that were left in the background in the Bible. Compressing the main plot into a couple of lines, the poem describes how Joseph's malevolent brothers sold him into slavery to Ishmaelite merchants and took his ornate robe, dipped it in blood, and let their father understand that Joseph had been killed by ferocious animals:

O dolor! O fletus! soboles carissima Ioseph
Niliacos in agros bis deno venditur asse:
Fratrumque impietas commissa nefaria celat
Annosum patrem, tunicam monstratque cruentam
Filioli multo commento sanguine tinctam,
Tanquam praeda foret morsu discerpta ferarum.[138]

Oh, this pain! Oh, these tears! The beloved child Joseph
is sold to the fields of Nile for twenty silver coins;
the impiety of his brothers conceals their nefarious crime
from their old father, who shows the blood-stained tunic
of his little son coloured by much fictitious blood,
as if he had been torn to pieces by wild animals.

Being concerned with the emotive scene of the father's tears, the passage reminds one of the ancient orators and tragic writers who had a strong impact on their audiences as they used bloody clothes and other striking details to support their speeches and plays. If the picture of another's misfortunes was faint, it did not exert any influence on the audience, who remained indifferent. Appeal to the

[137] Greenberger 2016: 116.

[138] Frischlin 1612: VII, p. 62.

senses was important because emotions were best evoked that way. The idea of sorrow arose when the signs of sorrow were presented to the audience, inviting them to participate in the affections of despair, weeping, and sighing. To evoke emotions in his readers, Frischlin also needed to show his audience external signs of emotion.[139] Stopp argues that Reformation satire did not usually generate its internal emotions but was dependent on the surrounding climate of opinions.[140] It needed enthusiasm on the part of its audience to succeed, but there were of course also several rhetorical means to explicitly stir the emotions.

The representation of emotions was an important and multifaceted tool in Frischlin's ethical persuasion. Expressing laments and deep sighs, the poet anticipates the sounds of the end of the world; its endless sighing and weeping awaited Rabus should he refuse to take responsibility for his actions. Frischlin inserts exclamations and interjections (*O dolor! O fletus*, 'Oh, what a distress! Oh, these tears!') into his poem while mourning the misfortunes produced by reckless sons, thereby conveying a sense of shame, sorrow, and despair, and exposing the audience to emotive reactions. Frischlin's rhetoric appeals to public disapproval by its ridicule and feeds on a sense of shame with its biblical examples. The emotive language creates the possibility for the audience to participate in the symbolic community outraged by Rabus's crimes and unite against him.[141] Operating with distinctly emotional language, the satirist delivers penalties of shame not unlike our contemporary online shaming delivers its moral retribution and creates social positions for the participants. Playing upon emotions, the satirist directs his audience to emotionally align with his opinions and participate in the public shaming of the satirical victim. Shaming had positive meanings in the satirical justice practices and its techniques of punishment. According to Jemielity, satires were often posited in a shame-oriented culture in which wrong-doing was expected to lead to humiliation and social rejection.[142] The practice of shaming is comparable to the rise of restorative justice practices in contemporary criminal justice, which works on the fundamentally satirical principle that offenders must be made to feel guilt for their actions.[143] Frischlin's public shaming was meant

[139] According to Webb (1997: 20), the emotions most frequently mentioned in the Latin rhetorical treatises in connection with vividness were pity and indignation.

[140] Stopp 1968: 57.

[141] The central theme of sons could be metaphorically understood as referring to people in general, as it did in the Bible. On the filial metaphor in prophetic poetry, see Alter 1985: 144-145.

[142] Jemielity 1992: 26.

[143] On naming, shaming and criminal justice in contemporary culture, see Kohm 2009.

to build consciousness in his target, who would be improved only by admitting his sins. The poem closes by relating that the poet – exhausted by the number of negative examples – offers constant prayers to heaven that God would help people, directing them back to the true love they had lost.

Frischlin used biblical characters as prefigurations of recurring negative characteristics and vices in history. In addition to serving satirical criticism, they reinforced the cultural memory of biblical morality, making some key figures from the past religious history present for contemporary readers. Christianity saw meaning in history, and for the religious satirists, history was always meaningfully repeating significant patterns from the sacred past. Frischlin's understanding of history reflected the continued relevance of the sacred time in interpreting daily affairs. Reading Rabus's life from an apocalyptic perspective, Frischlin connected his character and deeds to the previous evildoers of the Bible. The typical satirical story involved a description of the origin of evil that affected humankind and was connected to the poet's reality. As Clifford Davidson has argued in his studies on the cultural memory of the Bible, in remembering the sacred narrative and locating oneself in its eternal setting means that one finds a place in the scheme of sacred time between Creation (and the fall of man) and the Last Judgement.[144] These turning points established limits to human history, placing its events on the eternal timeline between origins and conclusions. All human lives were measured along these sacred timelines. According to Davidson, sacred time was temporality that existed as if contemporary for its participants, making even the last day present.[145]

The story of Cain and Abel was particularly important to satirists, since the murder of Abel by Cain illustrated the moral division of human beings into the good and the bad. It was a founding story that introduced a moral perspective in the Bible, which unlike pagan myths, placed events in a moral framework.[146] The theme was dualistic: Abel became the symbol of passive innocence and simplicity, whereas Cain was a suitable target of satirical criticism in his selfishness and active violence. Cain was a major figure in the history of evil, and he became the prototype of present sin, a predecessor to all later exemplary malefactors, just like there were numerous re-enactments of new Sodoms or new Pharaohs in later history.[147] In his studies on the history of Cain stories, Ricardo J. Quinones

[144] Davidson 2016: 341.

[145] Davidson 2016: 348.

[146] This point has been made by René Girard and, for example, by Duyndam 2008.

[147] Trompf 1979 : 306.

has called Cain the primary Christian exemplum of the continuity of evil.[148] On the other hand, Cain's murder of Abel also typified the conflict between the true and false churches in Reformation propaganda. This view was based on Augustine's notion that the cities of God and Satan originated with these two brothers.[149] This historical divide structured the whole of human history along similar lines, including the followers of the true church and those of the false. As Hoffmann has noted, the Bible's fraternal narrative usually seemed to predict victory for the younger brother much in the same way as in France the reformed minority aimed to replace the unreformed majority.[150] The story of Cain and Abel appeared repeatedly in literature and religious controversy in the Reformation period to portray different struggling parties. According to Brieger, the myth dealt with both the religious relationship between God and Cain and the human relationship between Cain and Abel.[151] Brieger states that the myth had two central motifs according to its two narrative priorities: a sacrifice to God (*Opfer*) and a murder of brother (*Brudermord*).[152] Satires focused on the latter narrative and the human side – Cain's frustration and anger. Cain represented human weakness: his sacrifice was not worthy of God, and he was unable to control his feelings of anger.

Before Frischlin, Naogeorg had already been preoccupied with the moral quality of the Cain and Abel story in his long dramatic satire 2.2. Hess called this satire an epyllion, a miniature epic that diversified the tradition of the genre.[153] First, Naogeorg approaches the topic of righteous action by stressing the importance of education in making moral progress. He describes how the brothers were carefully instructed by their father, but Cain stubbornly refused to listen to his teachings. Being constantly discontent, self-interested, and grumbling about everything, Cain manifested the sins which were to become fundamental in Christian morality discourse. Cain's thoughts are meticulously illustrated in the poem, in which he deplored the injustice he received and described how anger gradually grew in his mind. Cain expected a good harvest,

[148] Quinones 1991: 6.

[149] King 2001: 175; Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 15.1-8.

[150] Hoffmann 2017: 118.

[151] Brieger 1934. Brieger studies different forms of the myth in German poetry from the Reformation period onwards. He focuses on religious, pedagogical, and human moments in the post-biblical tradition of the myth.

[152] Brieger 1934: 1.

[153] Hess 1971: 75, 390. Hess argues that Naogeorg's habit of combining small forms (such as laudations and short epics) to his satires was the influence of Filelfo.

but his labours of ploughing and planting were never blessed when first drought and then a tempest consumed everything he had sown. A long section describes how nature prophetically gathered its forces, black clouds accumulated in the sky, and enormous waters fell from the mountains, devastating Cain's fields and crops. This apocalyptic episode is meant to drive home God's intervention in the world of humanity. The natural havoc was purposeful and meant to teach obedience and patience to Cain, but the pupil was not receptive to nature's cosmic lessons. Focusing on psychological motivation, Naogeorg allows Cain to deplore his vain hopes and frequent disappointments, thereby illustrating his inner motivation for his wrong choices. When his land bore no fruit and God refused to accept his offerings, Cain felt humiliated, which stirred his anger not only against his brother but against God. His emotional tensions and conflicts are described in forcefully physical terms:

Tum vero toto perfusus felle Cainus,
Irae succumbit, torva ardent lumina fronte,
Labra terit, spumamque movet sub dentibus albam,
Pallenti facies fit tota simillima buxo,
Et manibus pedibusque tremit, praecordia dulci
Ulciscendi aestu, caedisque cupidine fervent.[154]

Then imbued completely with bile Cain
succumbs to anger, his eyes burn in his grim face,
he rubs his lips, having white foam on his teeth,
his face turns pale like boxwood leaves,
and his hands and feet tremble, his diaphragm
seethes with the sweet desire for revenge and murder.

Giving voice to Cain's experience of anger and despair and describing his tears, the poem acknowledges the moral ambiguity of the story, allowing the reader to perceive Cain's pain. In Naogeorg's version, the curse comes first, as the ground never yields its crops for Cain and no reason is given for this barrenness or for God's arbitrary choice of Abel's offering over Cain's. Cain is a Job-like figure who was unduly tested by God, just like God showed Job his modest place in the universe at the end of the book. One of the teachings of the poem is that there is no understandable moral order in the world, and human beings just need to

[154] Naogeorg 1555: II.2, p. 72.

accept their lot. Job and Cain both refused to accept this condition; they started to fight against the unjust forces around them, but eventually individual freedom was set against the overwhelming power of necessity crushing the individual agent. Naogeorg's poem does not end in narratorial explanations about the grim consequences of the action. It is all about the moral struggle, but it does not explicitly determine what is right and wrong. The poem simply concludes with the violent and dramatic act of fratricide, with the earth reluctantly imbibing the blood of the innocent brother and Cain never learning to master his desires.

For Naogeorg, the Cain and Abel narrative offered an exemplary tale to illustrate the human quest for dignity and the mismanagement of unexpected rejection. The unmerited suffering, despair, and persecution familiar from Cain's story were part of the fate of God's people in Reformation thinking; Christ's people were thought to suffer as He did and find comfort in His sufferings.[155] For Naogeorg, Cain did not represent any historical target, but all human beings, who are fundamentally sinful. It bespoke of Naogeorg's re-enactment view of history, which is crucial to the educative poetics of his satires: a past vicious action is repeated later in the actions of others. Believing that the past teaches lessons for the present, satirists used examples to warn their readers about copying poor habits, since they would not escape the recurrence of punishment either. Frischlin's interpretation of the Cain and Abel episode was more straightforward and subject to his personal polemics. His version of the story is not marked by the moral struggle typical to humans, but by personal invective.

It is notable that Cain's anger is directed against God, bringing a third party to the theme. Father figures are significant in the story's later versions. The relationship between the father and son and the issue of filial obedience were favourite topics in Reformation drama. As Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly has noted in her history of German literature, 'obedience to one's father, discipline in early life and avoidance of bad company are held up as essential virtues' in Reformation plays.[156] Frischlin's biblical father figures are usually positively valued, whereas their reckless sons often enter into a secret pact with the devil. The difference between fathers and sons was one historical scheme Frischlin used to condemn Rabus, but bad sons were also contrasted with Christ as the son of God. Frischlin's extensive oration on the country life, *De vita rustica*, originally given in 1578 in Tübingen and meant to be used as an introduction to his paraphrases of Vergil's pastoral poetry, also drew on similar material from the Bible. Strongly arguing

[155] Kolb 1978: 114.

[156] Watanabe-O'Kelly 2000: 104.

in favour of education, the poet claims the good fathers Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were all farmers, whereas their godless sons, such as Cain and Nimrod, became city-builders and established power structures.[157] This contrast is notable and references the decadence of the rural nobility, whereas true virtue lay in the hands of the peasantry. This statement was considered politically revolutionary in Frischlin's times, because the Peasant Wars were recent.[158] The biographer Chalmers notes that in his oration Frischlin compared modern courtiers with ancient husbandmen and mentioned that some of them had degenerated from the simple virtues of their ancestors; as a result, Frischlin could no longer continue his former life and he moved to the remote town of Laubach.[159] On a deeper level, the oration also had universal relevance, as it claims that moral worth should not be based on extrinsic factors, such as power or material goods, but on self-amendment.

In Frischlin's satirical poetry, Rabus repeats the sinful acts of old biblical evildoers. This did not mean, however, that Rabus's moral responsibility had disappeared or that he lacked the ability to set things right. Although the events of former biblical history seemed to recur in Rabus's doings, the satirist suggests that Rabus should amend his religious life, stop the eternal recurrence of evil, and change the course of his personal history. Humans are obliged to choose their moral path, although the task is notoriously difficult. Frischlin's satires were active instruments of historical religious debate, but they were also promoting universal satirical moral criticism and its double message of salvation that came by self-improvement and true faith. The frequency of biblical examples in Frischlin's satires reflects the overwhelming Reformation emphasis on the bibliocentric world and the written word. With the new focus on the Scriptures, Biblical poetics became a crucial component of Reformation literature.[160] The widespread use of biblical episodes may also be due to the public interest in Bible-reading during the Reformation, when the increased focus on the ethical implications of biblical stories guided authors to adopt ethically relevant passages from the Scriptures.[161] Readers were advised to 'actively seek in the Scriptures examples of how they should live their own lives in the world'.[162] Accordingly, Frischlin was not only

[157] Frischlin 1580; Schade 1993: 618.

[158] Wheelis 1974: 44; Kühlmann 2016: 38-39.

[159] Chalmers 1812-17: s.v. Frischlin.

[160] See Lewalski 1979: 6-8.

[161] On Bible-reading and biblical drama during the Reformation, see Carpenter 2016.

[162] Carpenter 2016: 18 comments on the mid-seventeenth century situation in England that can, however,

promoting Rabus's religious reform and participating in Reformation polemics on true faith. Writing in the tradition of Latin satire, he also suggested his readers go back to the Bible and use its exemplars as a guide to life, thereby encouraging readerly reflection on behaviour and ethics with the help of the Scriptures. Engaging with the ethical implications of the Old Testament subjects, the poet offers his readers ethical advice with the help of biblical teachings. At the same time, the poems are relentless attacks and invectives against their target. This situation leaves a very divisive picture of the poet, and the supposedly ethically motivated project did not help the poet: Frischlin was known as a polemical person whose furious writings, alleged depraved morals and reckless life led him into numerous conflicts and forced him to move several times; he eventually died in Hohenurach in 1590 when trying to escape from prison.

Other religious satirists from the same sixteenth-century period include Hannard van Gameren (Hannardus Gamerius, 1545-1574), a humanist poet and professor of Greek at Ingolstadt, who also appealed to the biblical models of his verses (*Satyrae duae*, 1568), challenging the Lutherans and defending the doctrines of the Catholic church.[163] The Reformation theologian Johannes Pollius (1490-1562), for his part, published four religious satires entitled *Ecclesiastomoria* (ca. 1540) in which he attacks human folly and ignorance in an ecclesiastical context and reproaches the common people (*vulgus*) for being prone to errors and deceit.[164] In his fluent but conservative verses, Pollius exalts the old church that was modest and did not adore gold, whereas in his own age men wear a double skin, hiding their true cunning nature. The first satire is full of verbs characteristic of this genre, emphasizing ignorance (*nescire*), lying (*mentiri*), collapse (*cadere*), confusion (*turbare*), error (*errare*), dissimulation (*simulare*), and other words depicting contemporary and papal decay. The second patriotic satire is addressed to Germany which is transformed from the once barbaric land into a flourishing country that nurtures arts and true religion. This poem, in turn, emphasizes the words of splendor (*scintillare, splendescere*), elevation (*exaltare*), excellence (*praecellere*), and success (*vincere*). The third poem is addressed to Pompilianus, whose grim appearance is marvelled by the poet. He concludes that his previously

---

mutatis mutandis, be applied to the German context.

[163] See Porter 2016 who studies Gamerius's ten satires that appeared in different editions between 1564-1572; however, according to De Smet 2015: 204 Gamerius supported the Lutherans' cause in his two satires. Kaspar Stiblin (1526-ca. 1563) was another satirist and philologist from Würzburg whose *Satyra in sicarios* (1562) belongs to the tradition of Christian invectives and abounds with images of evil spirit, darkness, monsters, and impending nemesis; on this poem, see Kofler 2016.

[164] Pollius 1540.

happy friend is probably depressed by contemporary decay, religious controversy, and writers fighting each other, and he urges his friend to seek comfort and delight in religion and its miracles. The fourth satire (*De paupertate non aspernanda pijs*) points out the great blessings of poverty and underlines that pious human beings should not despise hardship. The poet recalls many cautionary tales from the Old Testament and Persian kings who have devastated lands to satisfy their needs. Words of scarcity are repeated in the poem but in a laudatory sense: unlike greedy kings, poverty does not turn against anyone (*Nullum paupertas decepit, praedia nulli / eripuit)*.[165] The poet depicts a small garden that furnishes flowers, herbs, and green vegetables and is more than enough for a virtuous soul – especially if it also provides decent wine, Westphalian bread, and tasty smoked ham.

Religious satire thus employed temporal correspondences and reduplications in its narrative. In the context of religious satire, we have also already noticed that the persuasive power of negative – and sometimes even positive – examples is significant. The next chapter, therefore, focuses in more detail on the significance of examples in the moral critique of verse satires. How did the individual examples transcend their own historical particularity and represent the general nature of moral deeds?

[165] Pollius 1540: 67.

Chapter 6
Satirical Exemplarity and the Affective Language of Moral Monuments

Examples, in the sense of actions and persons represented as worth imitating, were traditionally used in pedagogy when raising children.[1] In the manner of his father, Horace and other satirists after him, have stressed practical instruction and vividly described vicious examples that the addressee was expected to learn to avoid. Yona saw in this finger-pointing method and character portrayal some resemblance to Cynical empirical morality.[2] He also referred to Plutarch's treatise *On the education of children*, which identifies the use of examples (*paradeigmata*) as an effective method of moral upbringing and not merely for epideictic use.[3] Renaissance humanists favoured images and examples in persuasion and models of action in their pedagogy.[4] As Eilhard Lubinus puts it in his educational writings, virtuous actions should not be prescribed to children. Instead, they should be shown and demonstrated to them as images rather than by precepts or rules so that the virtuous deeds would be deeply imprinted upon their minds.[5]

Images and examples were helpful discursive tools in education, since they were entertaining, moving, and instructive. In rhetoric, examples were used to clarify a statement,[6] and they could be drawn from the greater or lesser, which concurred with the aims of praise and blame. In historiography, they were used as guides to life, and this use comes close to the power of examples in satires. Examples were written for entertainment, but also for supporting moral generalisation and offering unchanging and normative models for human conduct while clarifying vice or virtue. As Peter Burke later put it, 'the advantage

---

[1] Juan Luis Vives wrote in his treatise on education (*De tradendis disciplinis*, IV, Cap. IV) that 'imitation … is the fashioning of a certain thing in accordance with a proposed model' (trans. Foster Watson; *Imitatio porro effictio est rei alicuius ad exemplar propositum*…).

[2] Yona 2015: 234.

[3] Yona 2015: 245.

[4] Two classic works on examples in Renaissance and early modern periods are Hampton 1990; Lyons 1989. Hampton 1990: 13 n. 21 refers to Vives's *De disciplinis* in which he stated that in moral philosophy examples were more useful than precepts.

[5] See also Pasch 1707: Cap. V, §V ('Exempla plus valent praeceptis').

[6] See *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (4.3.5).

of the concrete example was that it appealed to the emotions and so acted as a greater stimulus to virtuous action than a general precept'.[7] Irene E. Harvey has outlined the productive rather than merely representative value of examples as follows:

> The capacity for this engraving is itself equated with the capacity to learn – to be open to examples, indeed, to see examples *as* examples. What this entails is to see beyond the act of the other to its possibility for me as my act in some future situation. This act as example becomes pregnant with my future possibility. What I see in this case is not simply the act of the other, but with it, insofar as I see it as an example, I see myself doing the 'same' thing.[8]

Exemplary stories could also be used to communicate ethical ambiguities and debates, but in neo-Latin satires the use of *exempla* provided instances of moral value and models for righteous or vicious action. In the manner of Roman satirists and Renaissance humanists, the neo-Latin satirists used examples for normative purposes and provided models of conduct for imitation based on the conviction that literature can persuade people to engage in ethical praxis.[9] Satirists believed that moral progress was developed through moral warnings and examples supported by emotional involvement and such moral emotions as indignation, anger, or, in positive cases, admiration and joy, which the poet evoked his readers to feel. As an evaluative discourse, satire framed its teaching with an implicit and explicit use of moral paragons to deter readers from vice or to teach them virtue. Examples were based on the idea that there was some universal moral value in particularities, in stories and persons that could be used in moral teaching and applied in a new historical situation.[10] In the following I will discuss in a little more detail the functions of negative and positive exemplarity in satires before moving on to the actual texts.

---

[7] Burke 2011: 49.

[8] Harvey 2002: 123.

[9] As Roller 2018: 14 has noted, Roman exemplarity privileged concrete deeds over abstract rules; satire was in this sense indeed 'wholly ours', a completely Roman genre, as Quintilian once put it (*Satura quidem tota nostra est*; 10.1.93).

[10] On exemplarity and particularity, see Lowrie & Lüdemann 2015.

Negative exemplarity

Having a moral dimension, satirical examples could be either negative or positive. Negative *exempla* had both intrinsic and instrumental value in satires. They constituted the main bulk of the abusive poetic text and were crucial to its entertaining ends. Satirists filled their verse prohibitions with a series of rich and colourful descriptions of moral decline and such negative type characters as gluttons or misers. In addition to entertaining, negative moral patterns served as warnings of things to come, as was noted in the previous chapter on prophetic satires. The value of negative models drawn from the contrary in satirical pedagogy was clear: some individuals, such as Naogeorg's Cain, Nimrod, etc., were turned into cautionary embodiments of behaviours to be avoided. By using the rhetoric of dissuasion (*dehortatio*), the satirist's aim was to discourage his readers from repeating the negative models' inept actions. In his treatise on the various methods of teaching ethics, Georg Pasch notes the value of negative exemplarity when he writes:

> *Paradigmaticus seu Exemplaris docendi modus ille dicitur, quo praecepta moralia, omnesque ad virtutes et vitia pertinentes doctrinae, luculentis exemplis vel ad imitandum, vel fugiendum propositis, illustrantur.*[11]

> We call such a way of teaching paradigmatic or exemplary in which moral precepts and all doctrines related to virtues and vices are illustrated with brilliant examples either to be imitated or avoided.

Pasch specifically underlines that cautionary examples should be taken from history and also from the Sacred Scriptures and church history.

However, satires did not look for warning examples in history but focused on the present. Negative examples were connected with the poet's own empirical experiences of the world and were drawn – the poet suggested – from real life, which was often contrasted with ancestral virtue and the moral excellence of an earlier time. Negative examples were socially and morally closer to the recipient than positive paradigms, which could be more abstract values or distant princes, popes, and saints who were perfect in all respects.[12] Guglielmini noted that examples drawn from the familiar present are more efficient in upbringing than

[11] Pasch 1707: Cap. V, §I.

[12] On the ideal prince as a paragon of virtue, see Nijsten 2004: Ch. 4.

distant images (*hos exempla domestica scalpunt / Valdius externis*).[13] Following this principle, in his satire 1.2 Guglielmini delivers the tale of a once promising and beautiful young boy whom the poet had personally known (*novi ego*) but who had lost his moral integrity.[14] The poet acts as a deeply involved moral tutor, talking with the authority of his knowledge while describing the young man as overly impatient, like a restless horse in a stable, ready to run away from the school. Eventually, the boy did run off, and, devoting himself to a lascivious life, ruined his health so that when he was later encountered on the street, his appearance was unrecognisable. Dramatising the endless possibilities of life available to the individual within a particular situation, the poem stresses that one must choose carefully which path to follow.

The cautionary example functions as an incentive to the young reader to ponder the direction of his life and the kind of future self he should either pursue or learn to avoid. Such disapproved-of examples were important tools in satirical educational work. The satirist was an eyewitness who spoke from experience and gave evidence – not from the past but from the present – of what he had seen, but always imposing his own interpretative voice on the material he presented. The young man became significant in the satirical storytelling, not as an individual or in his particularity, but because he was a statistical example typical of a series of ill-advised youngsters and stood for many similar cases occurring in history. Satirical examples were intertextual and reiterative in this sense, as they gestured towards previous and future similar cases, both in satires and in historical reality. Lyons calls iterativity one of the main characteristics of example: a single instance 'stands for many similar cases' and 'one stated instance alludes to a whole network of such instances' so that 'the term *iterative* describes the way a condensed textual statement stands for an extensive historical repetition of similar events'.[15]

The significance of the examples in satires was also statistical in another sense. The number of warning examples testified to the perversion of the world and created credibility for satirical narration. According to the satirical rhetoric of the ubiquity of madness, human mistakes and negative figures were perceived everywhere, and they were not merely hypothetical cases. Real-life negative examples were dangerous, since their behaviour was contagious,[16] but the poet was

[13] Guglielmini 1742: II.1, p. 46.

[14] The satirist tells here 'what is true because he *knows* that it *is* true', as Foucault (2001: 14) put it when talking about *parrhesiastes*.

[15] Lyons 1989: 26.

[16] Guglielmini 1742: III.2, p. 95 (*mole trahentis / Exempli rueremus in omnia*).

confident that the excessive and detailed representation of vice would be efficient in preventive moral education. This claim about general decline was proved by appealing to a multiplicity of particular cases that together formed a general rule or a pattern about the degenerate world. In the satirical world, persons displaying virtue were rare, whereas negative examples were abundant and omnipresent, offering complete proof of the moral quality of the world and perceived on a daily basis. This emphasis on an everyday experience complemented the usual characteristic of exemplary discourse emphasising the rarity of virtue.[17]

At the same time, negative paradigms were used as a means of reaching some morally desirable end. Warning their readers not to become like these vicious people, satires were executing negative poetics or negative education. According to this principle of negativity, the moral rule was shown by describing its opposite form and its violation supported by such moral emotions as indignation.[18] As Fritz Oser has described the effects of negative knowledge, 'morality grows through the experience of moral negativity and through the emotions related to it'.[19] By displaying vice through action, the negative examples provided models by contrast rather than by similarity – something not to be imitated but shunned. Inscribed in the moral memory of readers, negative examples were meant to become a part of their moral comprehension and lead to a moral consciousness of wickedness that would then guide their action in life and lead to a developmental change. Negative examples served the function of learning from fictitious mistakes by providing knowledge about them without any need to have personal experience of vices. Negative examples were reminders of the horrendous consequences of vicious action, thus steering readers away from committing similar prohibited action in their own lives. Satires could even be seen in this sense as being optimistic: what had happened before did not necessarily have to happen again.

Example of conscious trickery

Satires often had objects of criticism that formed strong negative examples. A good example of this technique is Sergardi's first satire, which introduces his literary foe when the poet, on his way to a sacred grove, encounters an opinionated babbler who instructs him on all possible topics related to the precepts of living. The

[17] On rarity as an exemplary quality, see Lyons 1989: 32.

[18] On the concept of negative moral knowledge, see Oser 2005. On negative education, see Eggers 2007.

[19] Oser 2005: 134.

satire is modelled upon Horace's satire 1.9, in which Horace, on his morning walk, encounters a stubborn intellectual and a typical flatterer who is impossible to flee. Here, the pest is Sergardi's main target, Gravina (called Philodemus in the poem), who is introduced to the reader in the first lines of the collection as a fellow who interrupted the poet's idle contemplation:

Ibam forte sacri nemoris visurus Asylum,
Arcadiae nuper quo concessere Camenae
Unanimes. Longo pertaesum calle salutat
A laeva Philodemus, homo mihi nomine tantum
Notus … [20]

By chance I was going to see Arcadia's sacred grove, the refuge where the harmonious Muses had recently retired, and I was wearied by the long mountain path. On my left, Philodemus, a man known to me only by name, greeted me …[21]

Unflattering nicknames were commonly used in *ad hominem* attacks, and accordingly Gravina was called here Philodemus, a friend of the people, which referred to his alleged habit of advancing his career through flattery and adulation.[22] Sergardi depicts his main opponent as a verbose impostor whose ethical precepts about making friends by flattery for profit are tedious and annoying. In addition to a commentary on personal relations, the passage reflects the changing society. Philodemus is a satirical self-help figure who manipulates values and teaches others how to improve their social make-up and adopt a profitable lifestyle: to 'learn certain civic precepts of life, and now wisely use them with a pure soul'.[23] Philodemus compares himself to a sculptor, an image already familiar from the educational discourse, and boasts of being able to form 'nymphs

[20] Sectanus 1698: I, v.

[21] Sergardi 1994: 15 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin). Cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.1-4. (*Ibam forte via sacra, sicut meus est mos, nescio quid meditans nugarum, totus in illis: accurrit quidam notus mihi nomine tantum arreptaque manu…*; 'I happened to be strolling on Sacred Way, going over in my mind some piece of nonsense, as I often do, and completely absorbed, when suddenly a fellow whom I knew only by name dashed up and seized me by hand'. Trans. Niall Rudd.)

[22] For Gravina, see, for example, Baragetti 2012: 47-54. The name Philodemus also reminds one of Philodemus of Gadara, who also wrote on flattery; see Yona 2018: 54-57. On Horace's satire 1.9 and its example of reprehensible behavior, see ibid., 190-200.

[23] Sergardi 1994: 17 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin).

from hard marble'.[24] Promising sacred wisdom that will ultimately be rewarded, Philodemus instructs his fellows to enter the social market by developing skills needed in social interaction to make themselves attractive in human relations and perform well in the scholarly community. Offering advice on self-fashioning and choosing one's social destiny, Philodemus gives precepts to his fellow social climbers on how to take the right steps in making progress in society and rising from obscurity to wealth and fame. These precepts are presented as the steps that help one find the path to success.

In Philodemus's figure, the archaic love of virtue and honesty are replaced by flattery and role-playing, which could be read as signalling the new social mobility wherein people aimed to fulfil their social desires, rise above their initial station, and proceed in society. Philodemus provides not so much the techniques of self-management or self-control as those of making an impression on other people by guile. It was not a quest for the self that was at stake here, as it was in moral philosophy and traditional moral satire; instead, he stresses the rhetorical impression a person makes on other people in order to achieve some good for himself, moulding himself to suit another. The primary techniques of staged appearance and simulation that Philodemus promotes include flattery of the rich by soothing words, covert acts, and false friendship. This dishonest self-change is not aimed at the individual self-improvement nurtured by satirists but at worldly success that is a perverted goal in the satirical discourse of sincerity. Philodemus's guidance is interpersonal and not merely centred on the process of forming self-identity. It is not a 'therapy of desire' – to quote Martha Nussbaum's view of Hellenistic philosophy – but a social endeavour interested in human relationships. However, the problem from the satirist's point of view is that the suggested means of forming relationships are deeply fallacious, utilitarian, and misleading. Philodemus teaches people how to become hypocrites and to learn to play their parts, and this modern social reality with its counterfeits is disapproved of by the satirist.[25]

Philodemus is depicted as a modern spiritual guide also in Sergardi's eighth satire, in which Philodemus again offers precepts and examples to his followers, advising them on how to seem learned and virtuous and being equally useful for laughter and instruction. The emphasis is not on finding one's true character but

[24] Sergardi 1994: 17 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin).

[25] While in the end of his poem Horace was saved by Apollo, here the poet is rescued by feigning diarrhea. The parodical situation is multilayered here: Horace parodied the *Iliad* (20.443) in which Apollo saved Hector, while Sergardi relies here on Horace's version. The poem also contains other parodies: Philodemus's speech is in fact a parody on Lucretius' *De rerum natura* and its passage on the fear of gods (also noted by Pepin in Sergardi 1994: 19 n. 4).

once again on the profitable lifestyle and related appearances: it is good enough to appear to be a poet, act with a shadow of virtue, speak cunningly, and use learned Greek words in order to impress the right people. Facts are of little importance to him. Philodemus's practical instruction on surviving and succeeding in a social climate could even be honest, but it is nevertheless the opposite of the ethos of satire, which aims to dismantle appearances and disguises.

In satire eleven, Philodemus is described as a man who has a bad influence on youthful morals. The satirist, whose own poems were accused of obscenity, ironically attacks Philodemus for using filthy language as a sign of his decadence. While in ancient Rome, people swore in the name of Castor or Hercules, now the genitals took this role in Philodemus's vocabulary:

> *Cum Brutus iugulum laceraret Caesaris, ille,*
> *Tu quoque mi fili, non inguen dixit, et hirtos,*
> *Testiculos. … Prolue mores,*
> *Roma, tuos. …*
> *Cerne, Quirinali spirant qui monte Colossi,*
> *Audacique manu cogunt ad frena iugales,*
> *Abscondunt populo praeputia, Daedala quamvis*
> *Dextera Praxitelis nudos formaverit; ergo*
> *Major erit sensus, truncisque modestia saxis,*
> *Quam tibi?*[26]

> When Brutus was cutting Caesar's throat for the defense of freedom, the latter said 'You too, My Son?', not 'dick!' and 'hairy balls!'. … Oh Rome, cleanse your ways! … Look at the immense statues on the Quirinal hill which seem to be alive and to rein in their horses with a bold hand: they conceal their foreskins from the people, although the skillful hand of Praxiteles carved them naked. Then will there be greater sense and modesty in mutilated stones than in you?[27]

In the quote, attention is drawn to the language of concealment and disclosure, which is important to satire, as the task of a satirist is usually to reveal the hidden evils of men. The poet ironically condemns Philodemus's corrupting influence on the young, whose spirit is polluted by his shameful words. Sergardi's

[26] Sectanus 1698: XI, xc-xci.

[27] Sergardi 1994: 97 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin).

satires are permeated with images taken from the streets and buildings of Rome, and here the image of statues is noteworthy, reminding one of the educational discourses in which the moulding of a human being is expressed with the image of a sculpture.[28]

Positive exemplarity

Negative exemplarity in general has been less studied than positive exemplarity, but in the satirical context, positivity is in fact equally interesting because upright examples seem to be intuitively out of place in this genre. The value of edifying ideals as a pedagogical method is less clear in satires, which are usually identified with vituperation, ridicule, and criticism. Although satirical blame was derived from its opposite and ideal, noble actions and positive morality were generally known only indirectly through the negative and the immoral. However, sometimes satires also explicitly recommended certain virtues in order to help their readers act according to such moral reflections. Guglielmini wrote that he relied on his personal experience and had also invented some imaginary examples in order to teach virtue (*conficta exempla / Docendi virtutem causa*).[29] In satire 1.5, Guglielmini advises a young patrician to follow the example of his ancestors and consult their mute portraits, which were displayed in halls and offered advice on living.[30] This exhortation was reminiscent of the Roman moral conception of the exemplary nature of the ancestors (*mos maiorum*) and reconnected the addressee to the chain of previous generations that secured his moral identity.

Expressions such as love of virtue, path of virtue, rarity of virtue, and ancient virtue, among others, belonged to Guglielmini's typical moral vocabulary, which was meant to construct a morally demanding situation. The language of virtue served satirical moral education by illustrating the moral norm that people should try to attain in their lives. As Udo Kindermann has pointed out, satire in the High Middle Ages was often discussed in terms of its positive content

[28] The cautionary conclusion is also noteworthy here: … *non est tibi credere tutum / Crescentes annos: Procul hinc pueri, o procul este / Virgineae, coeli non ultima portio, mentes* (Sectanus 1698 : XI, xcii); 'It's not safe to entrust his growing years to you. Away, Boys, get far away from here! O virgin hearts, not the least portion of heaven, get far away!' (Sergardi 1994: 98, trans. Ronald E. Pepin).

[29] Guglielmini 1742: I.1, p. 3.

[30] Guglielmini 1742: I.5, p. 24 (*Ne longum faciam, majorum exempla tuorum / Consule: nam pictos horum longo ordine vultus / Aspicis, et tecum muto licet ore loquentes / Hortantesque sequi* …).

directly promoting virtue.[31] Bernard of Utrecht, Conrad of Hirsau, and other medieval commentators noted that satires praised virtues and exhorted their readers towards piety by describing virtuous action and presenting them to the imagination vividly, as if the events took place within view. Joachim Vadian (1484-1551), an early humanist, argues in his literary history, *De poetica et carminis ratione* (1518), that satire is an abusive genre (*carmen maledicum*) that lauds virtue and reproaches vice (*virtutis laude et viciorum repudio*).[32] This double technique was continued, for example, in Naogeorg's verses, which include praise of rulers (*laudatio*) under the heading of satire.

The notion of virtue thus played a central role in several neo-Latin satires that explored moral issues through exemplary tales and their morally charged protagonists.[33] For example, many Filelfo's satires were in fact sincere panegyrics, which makes it worth asking why positive examples and panegyrics were important to the satirical rhetoric of blame, in which virtues were usually replaced by vices and virtuous actions with misdemeanours. An understanding of how satire generated ideals of conduct requires an investigation of its relationship with praise, as praise and blame were two sides of the same coin. Satire fed on the panegyric because it participated in the pedagogical effort of trying to separate good role models from the bad. All events and historical figures could be regarded as examples on this scale, potentially speaking of other occurrences and persons beyond themselves. The use of examples served the purpose of persuading the reader to undertake appropriate ethical actions.

In conservative satirical poetics, positive ethical norms were usually found in the past, in the good old days, or in a golden age when there were no vices on earth. Republican Rome offered many specimens of modesty and probity, which was contrasted with the corruption of Imperial Rome. The good old times and their heroes were regarded as a standard that moral learners should follow in their efforts towards a better life. Such examples were offered to readers as models they should seek out in the future. At the same time, they underscored the current corruption and were tempered by a typical satirical belief that the world was in decline. They worked as educational tools with which readers could develop a better sense of morality in their own lives. The timeless value of ancient models for action was a

[31] Kindermann 1978: 41-43.

[32] Vadian 1518: 26; Agricola 1539: III Cap. II (*ut mores vitamque emendent et reprehendant vitia*), cf. Hess 1971: 75.

[33] On exemplarism as a branch of virtue theory in contemporary philosophy, see Zagzebski 2010. On morally charged protagonists as a core element in exemplary tales, see Langlands 2018: 29-30.

favourite tool of Renaissance humanists and remained a generic feature in satires throughout the centuries. The encomium was a moral and social duty for the satirist, who aimed to encourage and incite his readers to imitate a model of virtue.

However, in addition to such republican heroes as Cincinnatus and other legendary figures, who were known for being satisfied with their lot and living in modesty, neo-Latin satires also introduced new objects of adoration unfamiliar from ancient literature and history but found in the contemporary world. For example, in satire 2.8, Guglielmini asserts that it was easy to narrate old histories and use them in teaching, but it was much more difficult to manifest virtue in deeds. In his collection, several poems are devoted to the praise of the contemporary popes, who had benefited the common good with their reforms and construction work. This is an interesting turn in the history of satire, considering the unambiguously negative view of the papacy in Reformation satire. Having their seat in Rome, the popes were now described as leaders who changed the once corrupt city and reformed it into a Christian community that was closer to paradise than any other human community on earth. The papal Rome was thus contrasted with the old satirical image of Rome as a seat of corruption and spectacle of decadence that had stirred Juvenal's anger. As will be shown in Chapter 7, several neo-Latin satirists claimed that it was no longer necessary to flee Rome in the footsteps of Juvenal's Umbricius, since the city was changed, and the old pagan corruption was replaced by a new piety and justice that was now firmly in the hands of the papacy. In Reformation and anti-Catholic satire, the image of the city was of course very different; Protestant satirists such as Naogeorg and Frischlin attacked Catholic wealth and relied on the old image of pagan Rome, using it as a historical image of corruption that was reborn in the Catholic Church. However, for Catholic satirists, the popes offered new guides for action.

Moral examples were believed to be important in serving virtue, moral change, and education, especially among the troubled youth who were thought to easily engage in prohibited conduct. However, the rhetoric of exemplarity also included judgements that would be somewhat suspicious from our present perspective. The rhetoric of exemplarity highlighted unity over diversity and sameness over difference by implying that one could find models from history with which to develop one's own moral conduct. While it has been noted in modern research that seeing moral exceptionality could also elicit negative emotions, such as envy that one might feel toward an overpowering moral hero or shame of one's own modest achievement, satirical poetics usually relied on the assumption of the

positive rather than negative effects of moral eulogies.[34] The purpose of satirical eulogies was also sometimes adulatory, when satirists sought favour from their addressees and patrons by describing their virtues.[35] IJsewijn and Sacré have noted that poems praising a country, a city, or a princely palace were a favourite means of expressing a poet's gratitude.[36] Guglielmini's satires apparently also justified the rule of the pope, and Sergardi cooperated with the pontifical curia throughout his life, praising its good government.[37] Although the modern reader might expect satire to aim at describing reality or to take a subversive attitude towards those in power, this was not necessarily the case in neo-Latin satire.

It is important to note that the use of *exempla* in satires was part of their philosophical content.[38] The discourse of exemplarity was a characteristic feature of everyday Roman ethics and also enabled satire's moral usefulness. Seneca's Stoic philosophy frequently used and commented on the use of historical examples in the service of moral argumentation.[39] In addition to exemplarity, we could also talk about the commonplace, which has been defined as 'the meeting-place of the community', a place in which 'each of us finds himself as well as the others', which 'belongs to everybody' and which is 'the presence of everybody in me'.[40] Examples and commonplaces both obey the logic of generality by involving an act that makes the particularity of the self adhere to the general. Matthew Roller, who has examined Seneca's habit of deploying everyday Roman exemplarity in his philosophical prose works, has noted that in addition to providing models for moral action, *exempla* were also critically assessed by Seneca, who warned his readers about relying too automatically on the common models that the crowd upheld as its heroes. According to Roller, the discourse of exemplarity in Rome included stages that proceeded from the public performance of some action to its recognition by the community, who then evaluated the action on the scale of good and bad, giving

[34] On the positive value of negative emotions such as envy or shame, see Vaccarezza & Niccoli 2019; also Pernot 2015: 113 on envy in front of overwhelming superiority.

[35] Haye 2001: 94 notes that the social status and economic dependence of the poets influenced the panegyrical content of their poems; this feature was already evident in the poems of Horace.

[36] IJsewijn & Sacré 1998: 46, referring to the *laudes urbium* genre.

[37] Citroni Marchetti 1976: 45, 51.

[38] For a good discussion on exemplarity and epistemology, see Ruchatz *et al.* 2007.

[39] Roller 2016; also Langlands 2018: 102-109.

[40] Trilling 1972: 103 (quoting Sartre). Trilling notes that this condition frustrates all human efforts to authenticity.

it some moral value in relation to the common good.[41] The community was an audience that performed the acts of witnessing and judging the action and imbued it with moral significance so that it received normative force. Commemorating the act and its performer, the primary audience then delivered its judgement forward to further audiences so that it became a part of the shared cultural memory of the society.[42] Roller argues that individual actions and their performers received their exemplary status in the community through this process, so that finally even those who were temporarily or spatially distant from the original context of the virtuous action could learn to accept the deed as normative and to use it as a moral standard in evaluating 'other performances they witness'.[43]

In what follows, I will point out how in neo-Latin satires notable deeds and figures carried with them recognised moral norms and ideals that were used in satires either as models of imitation or as warning examples that one should avoid. They were used in the drawing of moral standards and judging human performance as good or bad. I will specifically analyse some objects of neo-Latin satirical panegyrics produced in Italy. Orators had always praised emperors, notable figures, and cities such as Rome and its monuments,[44] but I will examine in closer detail the role of epideictic rhetoric in satires that aimed to reinforce adherence of readers to accepted moral – and papal – values. Erasmus had already expressed some doubts about the usefulness of pagan models for Christian education, and the Christian tradition had its own biblical role models.[45] In seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Rome, this notion was again crucial when satirists such as Sergardi or Guglielmini contrasted their age with the previous pagan times and found embodiments of virtue in their own times and the Christian world.[46] Rather than exploring the past as a source for ethical guidance, they extolled contemporary popes as paragons of virtue.

---

[41] Roller 2016: 130; for Roller's model of Roman exemplarity (from action through evaluation and commemoration to norm-setting), see also ibid. 2018: 4-8.

[42] Roller 2016: 130.

[43] Roller 2016: 131.

[44] In addition to Rome, other cities and areas were also praised in satires; for example, Scholirius (1683) lauded the region of Brabant in his satire I.III and Italy in satire II.VII (*Italia paradisus terrestris*, 'Italy, a paradise on earth'); Geldenhouwer (1515) praised the city of Nijmegen in his sixth satire.

[45] Burke 2011: 56 (referring to Erasmus's *Institutio principis Christiani*); Hampton 1990: 54.

[46] Other panegyrical satires include, for example, Lippi's second satire (praising Lorenzo de' Medici; see Haye 2001: 94), Naogeorg's satires I.5 (praising Albert the Duke of Prussia), II.3 (Erasmus), II.5 (Christoph the Duke of Württemberg), and Lubinus's third satirical declamation from 1618 entitled *Parentatio anniversaria, memoriae Udalrici Magni, principis Megalopolitani*; see also Marsh 2014.

Sergardi's moral monuments

A eulogistic treatment of Rome was one theme in neo-Latin satire printed in Italy. Roman historians, such as Ammianus Marcellinus, had written about Rome as the home of every virtue and praised it as a city that will exist as long as men live,[47] but their works also contained satirical passages attacking the vicious inhabitants of the declining city. Neo-Latin satirists inherited these competing images of Rome and recorded the re-emergence of the once fallen city under the regime of enlightened Christian popes. Accordingly, Lodovico Sergardi's ninth satire takes up the praise of Pope Innocent XII – known in history as *Pater pauperum* – who is represented in terms of charity and various public accomplishments. Although in a satirical framework, popes were typically addressed as the targets of pasquinades and brief lampoons,[48] they were also influential patrons whose favour was invaluable to poets.

Praise of the pope forms a long digression in Sergardi's ninth poem, which celebrates Innocent XII as the greatest ruler of the world and glorifies his gifts and offices to the public good that brought normative change to Rome (*Facta, quibus praesens Aetas, et Roma superbit;* 'your deeds, in which the present age and Rome take pride').[49] With his reign, virtue had returned to the eternal city of Rome, now being more powerful than money. Invoking the pope's decree against nepotism and legal reforms, Sergardi notes that in terms of justice, the rich man was no longer invincible and correct values had been restored to Rome. While people had previously wrongly ascribed positive value to the venal purple thread, its colour had now faded and lost its political power. The pope was greatly admired by all. Sergardi's attitude towards public opinion was markedly dissimilar to that of elitist Roman satire, which usually despised adulation, the multitude, and the judgement of the many. The poet did not contradict the crowd but sang along with it in praise of the Holy Father. Extolling the pope for taking care of the poor and having given them better conditions, the poet calls for the communal voice to join the collective eulogy (*Miramur grandia Facta, / Et Regno majorem Animum, longaeque futurum / Aetati exemplar*; 'We marvel at your mighty deeds, at your spirit greater than your realm, at your example for distant ages to come!').[50] The audience is described here as being stunned and awestruck

[47] Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae* 16.10.13 and 14.6.3.

[48] See, e.g., Limentani 1961: 329-331.

[49] Sectanus 1698: IX, lxiii; Sergardi 1994: 74 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin).

[50] Sectanus 1698: IX, lxiv; Sergardi 1994: 74 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin).

by the presence of the exceptional individual. The poet outlines the collective agency by letting the group speak as a whole and in a unison characteristic of rhetorical songs and hymns inviting communality. Using the first-person plural form the poet promotes social cohesion, aiming to define the group's dominating perspective and suggesting a common thought that was expected to become generally true. The quoted passage epitomises the rhetorical act of engaging audiences in confirming and reinforcing its crucial values through the communal performance of praise.

In Catholic satires, popes were not objects of criticism; instead, they were praised as personified images of perfection and embodiments of virtue. Their splendid external appearances did not conceal vices, as outer splendour usually did in Reformation satire, but rather exemplary deeds. Papal splendour was thus an exception in satirical poetics, which usually maintained that vices lay beneath gilded and showy external appearances. In the case of certain popes, gold could even display a moral virtue that was celebrated in monuments inviting admiration and imitation. Another notable element in Sergardi's ninth poem is the notion that the pope had made significant improvements in the field of architecture by constructing harbours and aqueducts. The epideictic genus had traditionally lauded humans, but also inanimate objects, recently completed buildings, or monuments in their inauguration.[51] In praising objects, the encomium was transferred to their creator and the person whose performance had made them possible.[52] Accordingly, the pope's commissioning of an aqueduct was not merely a material advancement; it was staged as a spectacle of his power and virtue. It signalled the triumph of papal values and celebrated the person who had enabled the reconstruction work. Virtue was visible in such political actions, and persons could be morally judged according to their acts, which were manifestations of their virtues. The lauded papal constructions did not merely serve as architectural wonders, because they had more practical goals and public utility. Sergardi's textual exemplary tales thus include morally charged protagonists who furnish concrete examples of their power. Their actions were interpreted as admirable precisely because the primary valuable commitment was to the wider community.[53]

One feature in this moral discourse was that Sergardi resorted to the already familiar image of glorious but collapsing buildings to describe worldliness and

[51] See Pernot 2015: 27.

[52] Pernot 2015: 48.

[53] Cf. Langlands 2018: 33.

the ruinous state of human efforts. Describing the passage of time in his sixth satire, Sergardi imagines how:

> *Porticus Agrippae male nititur alta columnis,*
> *Balneaque, et Thermas, latii monumenta decoris,*
> *Lactucae insultant, betae, laetique coronant*
> *Cauliculi, et statuas rumpit caprificus equestres.*
> *At nos ruderibus priscum, senioque iuvabit*
> *Sermonem eruere, et cineres coluisse sepulchri?*[54]

> The lofty portico of Agrippa rests badly on its columns, and lettuce springs up around the baths and hot springs; beet and copious cabbages surround the monuments of Roman glory, and the wild fig-tree bursts through the equestrian statues. But will it please us to rescue our ancient language from the rubble and decay, and to honour the ashes in the tomb?[55]

While in humanist poetry, ruins had been 'a source of nostalgic reflection on the transitoriness of earthly glory',[56] Sergardi's ruins serve his satirical critique. Saint Jerome had favoured the same image of Roman ruins while describing the corruption of pagan culture that was taking place in his own age. In his letter 107.1, he writes that 'the gilded Capitoline is filthy, all the temples of Rome are covered with soot and cobwebs',[57] and his condemnation of the condition of society is expressed in diagnostic terms similar to the later satirists, who claimed that regimes could collapse on account of their moral unworthiness. His attack on the Roman habit of erecting grandiose buildings also recalls Seneca's reproach of luxury.[58] Jerome and Seneca both use the images of buildings with moral significance and symbols of vain magnificence.[59] The moral outrage was constantly formed and guided by the literary tradition of castigating urban vices. Sergardi here describes a process in which nature covers all Roman monuments

---

[54] Sectanus 1698: VI, xxxvii.

[55] Sergardi 1994: VI, 47 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin).

[56] IJsewijn & Sacré 1998: 51. They note that ruin poems were also used to compare the old and the new, e.g., in the Italian poet Ianus Vitalis's (1485-1560) twin poems 'Roma prisca' and 'Roma instaurata'.

[57] Wiesen 1964: 21.

[58] See, e.g., Sen. *Epist.* 90.43 (reproaching his contemporary houses which are as big as cities and cause great anxiety to their dwellers).

[59] Wiesen 1964: 33.

(*monumenta decoris*), which represent the moral condition of the culture. This gradual change also underlined the decline of classical cultures and languages in general – and the genre of satire (*sermo* in the quoted passage) – and the growth of a new vernacular era. Sergardi had a personal interest here, since his obscene Latin invectives had received some criticism; he announces that he will abandon his former lofty Latin and publish his new verses in Italian. Commenting on the theme of permanence and transitoriness at many different levels Sergardi ends his sixth satire with an ironic echo of Horace, who in his ode (3.30) boasts that his poetry is a monument more permanent than bronze and loftier than the peaks of the regal pyramids: 'Inscribe these things on marble, Paetus, so they won't be lost. But now the hour is late. Go home. Soon you'll hear the rest'.[60] Thus, while describing the gradual obliteration of ancient moral monuments, Sergardi also evokes his own poetic principles.

The story about the new Christian and pontifical Rome built with the stones of the old pagan city was a poetical commonplace.[61] Recalling the topic in his thirteenth satire, Sergardi again praises the reforms and public works of Pope Innocent XII in Rome.[62] The pope's masterpiece was the new Court of Justice, a building open to everyone. Other new buildings, harbours, and clean streets are also mentioned as deeds that the pope left as his testament to the world. Rome is the focal point of the satire from the very beginning:

Roma domus fiet, sed quae migrare Quirites
Non cogit Vejos. Ingenti Curia tecto
Nascitur, et centum late spectanda fenestris;
Informes senio, lucrique cupidine leges
Excipit alta sinu, sordesque abstergere frontis
Imperiosa iubet. Captivae rostra Carinae,
Actiaci monumenta freti, nec postibus altis
Aenea ter victi pendent simulacra Tyranni.
Sed titulis magnas imples melioribus aedes
Sancte Pater, communis Amor, nostrique cadentis

---

[60] Sergardi 1994: VI, 52 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin). The poem also ends in an emphatically didactic note: *cras cetera disces* (tomorrow you will learn the rest). On the commonplace of ever-lasting fame and poetic monuments, see Kivistö 2018: Ch. 11.

[61] See, e.g., the Jesuit poet Tarquinio Galluzzi's (1574-1649) poem 'In urbem novam' ('To the new Rome') in Mertz 1989: 190-191.

[62] This satire in number 13 in Pepin's English translation, but number 14 in the Latin edition of 1698 that I have used.

Votum Aevi. O utinam longos mansura per annos
Tegula sollicitos defendat ab imbre Clientes,
Conservetque tuo de nomine Curia nomen?[63]

Rome will be your home, but one which doesn't force the citizens of Veio to move away.[64] The Court of Justice arises, widely esteemed for its vast roof and hundred windows. This noble place receives in its midst laws now deformed by old age and greed for gain, and it bids them wipe away the filth from their faces. On its great doorposts hang no beaks of captured ships, memorials of the Actian Strait, nor bronze effigies of the thrice-conquered tyrant, but you fill its mighty halls with greater glory, Holy Father, Love of all and Promise of our crumbling age. Oh, may its roof which will last for many years shelter anxious clients from the storm, and may this Court take its name from your name.[65]

Satirists extracted ethical messages from all possible events. The rhetoric of 'cancel culture' was strongly present in this passage, casting down pagan memorials (*monumenta*) and images (*simulacra Tyranni*, 'images of the tyrant') that stood for pagan misdeeds, and praising the emergence of an era of new justice, when the poor and the rich differed in name alone, the judges were no longer bribed, and 'there is no less trust in thin rags'. Interrogating the moral quality of earlier historical monoliths, Sergardi no longer supports the morality of ancient Rome and its practices of greed represented by high buildings. Instead, more important is the new moral principle and order which obliterates the old world:

… Addere Coelo
Culmina, et Augustae superare Palatia Romae,
Mente tua minus est opus, et quo crescere fastos
Ipse vetas …
Exulet hinc Aurum, nec circum pulpita vultus
Erigat Argentum. Periit decus omne metalli
Flexanimi, et casus iam serva pecunia plorat.[66]

---

[63] Sectanus 1698: XIV, cviii.

[64] Pepin explains (1994: 119 n. 1) that this reference means that the new court of justice is not very large and does not spill over into the suburbs of Rome.

[65] Sergardi 1994: XIII, 113 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin).

[66] Sectanus 1698: XIV, cix.

> In your mind it's not necessary to raise lofty buildings to the sky and to exceed the palaces of imperial Rome. In this way you forbid pride to grow. … Let gold be exiled from here, let silver not show its face around the bench; all the beauty of precious metals has perished, and money, now a slave, bewails its overthrow.[67]

The quotation emphasises the verbs of adding, exceeding, and growing that reflect pagan hubris but can never reach heaven. The pope raising the eternal city to a new level of (spiritual) splendour was a conventional topic in panegyrics. In the satirical context, its specific task was to serve as a moral argument and assert a new Christian morality and an era that followed the age of metals. The papal example was used to underline the sense of moral distance from the pagan past, when the old Rome was still standing, as ancient precedents were no longer relevant to the present.

The splendour of the city and its shining new art marvelled at by the audience (*miramur, videant*) testified to the change of times and the new era of justice; the old pompous monuments and dirt of ancient Rome were concretely obliterated from the text and the city, and the new moral order based on Christianity relied on love and charity. As the poet states, 'the public code shines with the dust wiped away' and the legal procedures 'breath fresh air again' (*respirant meliorem animam*).[68] Sergardi returns to the same topic in his satire XVIII (included, for example, in the later edition of 1783 printed in Lucca) which was composed in praise of Pope Clement XI, who succeeded Pope Innocent XII in 1700.[69] Sergardi mentions the restoration of the Pantheon and Raphael's paintings in the Vatican among the pope's major achievements. The pope had renewed the splendor of the city, and everything was now shining with cleanliness. The buildings were purified and restored, better days were dawning, and the air was cleaner than ever: *Cuncta nitent, meliorque dies et purior aura / Ventilat immensas aedes urbemque secundam*.[70] The second city mentioned in the quote is of course the Vatican. The poet describes how statues, although otherwise silent and rigid, now lauded their restorer and the new patron by name (*Ut sileant rigeantque, vocant te marmora patrem / Auctoremque novae*).[71]

---

[67] Sergardi 1994: XIII, 114 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin).

[68] Sergardi 1994: XIII, 114 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin); Sectanus 1698: XIV, cix.

[69] This satire was called panegyrical in the Lucca edition (*Habes uno in carmine duo inter se maxime diversa, satyram et panegyrim*; 1783: 306, also quoted in Citroni Marchetti 1976: 45 n. 39).

[70] Sergardi 1783: XVIII, 84-85.

[71] Sergardi 1783: XVIII, 94-95.

In ancient times, the memorials that celebrated Roman values, military achievements, and the community were related to battlefields and the Forum. However, in Sergardi's satires, the fragments of the empire are retold. Recognising differences between historical periods and expressing them through architectural renewals, Sergardi juxtaposes two separated spots of time on the same geographical site.[72] The moral significance of architectural glories remains, and the space persists through the change of times, as the poet brings into focus the contrasts between ancient and later times. Reinterpreting ancient martial memorials and wiping the dust away from old laws, the poet no longer supports such values as pagan military prowess. The high buildings that once sustained the Roman community are now removed from the city and replaced by new architecture, as the power of gold is replaced by the new order of justice and charity. This obliteration is a vigorous rhetorical act of modifying old moral values. The poet excavates layers of meaning from the ancient public art and its remains, which function as a synecdoche for the changing moral state. The poet does not lament the cultural loss of the remains of old Rome but celebrates its new life as a city that was refounded and renovated in the hands of Christian rulers.

Patriotism was a foundational element among the Roman exemplary virtues and in tales that emphasised one's duties towards the fatherland.[73] Writing in this ancient tradition, Sergardi notes that the pope manifested the virtues of piety and patriotism in serving the wider community of the new Rome. The pre-eminence of Rome was a favourite topic in ancient exemplary tales that placed the city 'at the centre of the moral universe'.[74] However, the qualities that made Rome great again were now firmly founded on Christian virtues. Glorifying the architectural and moral imprint of the pope on the city, the poet repeats his former invitation to collectively celebrate these deeds: 'We marvel especially that you surpass brilliant deeds with even greater deeds' (*miramur, splendida facta / Vincere te factis majoribus*).[75] Alluding to the feelings of attraction, wonder, amazement, and even envy (on the part of neighbours, foreigners, or remote descendants), Sergardi describes the affective effects of the papal construction work. At the same time, the purging of the dirty streets might contain an allusion to the renewed satirical poetics in the sense that the Horatian walking muse (*musa pedestris*) was now

[72] On history as monuments, see Palmeri 1990: 81 (with reference to Gibbon).

[73] Langlands 2018: 34.

[74] Langlands 2018: 36.

[75] Sergardi 1994: XIII, 114 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin); Sectanus 1698: XIV, cix.

wearing new clothes, 'free from the squalor of the dirty City, and clean sandals'.[76] The metaphor of dung that sticks to the legs on the streets can be read as a reinterpretation of the motif that describes the path of virtue now purged of its former pagan moral flaws.

Ironically, this edifying passage in the thirteenth satire is followed by a long Antisemitic digression that bore resemblance to Juvenal's xenophobic reactions against the Greeks, Egyptians, and Jews, whom he condemned as rich upstarts and former slaves who were taking over Rome.[77] Xenophobic reactions responded to the presence of undesired foreigners in one's own country or city, expressing contempt, anger, or fear about this 'invasion'. Displaying disdain for his targets, Sergardi's satires contain similar gestures of banishment: his verses were meant to drive his opponent Gravina and other people away from his dear Arcadia and Rome. Using the well-known formula *ite procul*, which was in ancient times used in religious ceremonies to expel anyone who might be impure or profane, the poet wishes to drive away corrupt lawyers who make a shameful profit[78] or took bribes, as well as the Jews, who had entered (the verb *penetrare* is obscenely allusive) the thresholds of local noblemen, invading their dwellings and seducing their wives.

The verbal expressions of expulsion[79] are harsh and scornful, containing straightforward invectives against Jewish manliness, culture, and religion, and ridiculing foolish Romans (mainly women) for admiring foreign goods and customs. The poet undermines his own stance with some self-irony, saying that he is slaughtering petty flies and gnats. Still, the passage on the Jews is clearly xenophobic and is driven by the desire to preserve the city as Roman. The passage is not merely a digression amidst the general lamentation on the decline of morality in Rome, but it is crucial to the general patriotic tone of the poem focusing on Roman reforms, extolling its supreme merit, and identifying Rome as home in the very first line (*Roma domus fiet*). Sergardi is here also overwriting Suetonius, whose Life of Nero (39) refers to the phrase *Roma domus fiet* ('Rome is becoming one house') when describing Nero's *Domus aurea*, another magnificent testimony to the Roman corruption extending over the city.

Matthew Roller has shown that monuments had an interesting link to the mechanisms of discursive exemplarity. As Roller has nicely put it, one of

---

[76] Sergardi 1994: XIII, 115 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin); cf. Hor. *Sat*. 2.6.17.

[77] Cf. Juv. 3.58-115 on the Greeks; Pepin in Sergardi 1994: 120 n. 22.

[78] Sectanus 1698: XIV, cviii (*Ite procul socii rixarum*).

[79] Cf. Sectanus 1698: XIV, cix (*exulet hinc Aurum*, 'let gold be exiled from here').

the phases in exemplary discourse was that the performer of the virtuous deed was 'commemorated via one or more monuments, and thus made available to "secondary" audiences that may be distant in space or time'.[80] This monument could be 'any sign capable of summoning the deed and its ascribed value to conscious recollection: an honorific statue or name, a building, a toponym, a wound or other bodily marking, a narrative, a ritual, a theatrical performance, and the like'.[81] Judging human deeds on a moral scale meant that virtues (or vices) were ascribed to these actions and commemorated through memorials inviting imitation.

Sergardi's satires perform similar acts of discursive commemoration by describing how popes created new monuments in the city of Rome to celebrate the new Christian reign. In Sergardi's normative discourse, these constructions serve as signs of papal and Christian virtue, summoning forth the deed and ascribing it to the collective memory of the community. While satires were usually suspicious of monumental art, criticising it as connoting display and greed, Sergardi contrasts the old columns and palaces breathing the spirit of imperial power with the new papal properties, which reversed old evaluations and served virtue rather than vice. The audience was expected to learn good moral conduct by marvelling at papal monuments and accepting the papal rule as normative through these new memorials. Sergardi concretely invites his readerly audience to emotively engage in admiring the miracle of the buildings. Even if papal perfection far exceeded the moral possibilities of the normal individual, the pope's triumphalist deeds could still serve as the utmost norm used in judging and assessing human conduct. The monuments thus supported moral learning by reminding one of virtue that is always perceptible by observing property as a concretisation and sedimentation of virtue. Thus, registering in stone the moral succession of times, Sergardi created new literary memorials to papal deeds that he evaluated as exemplary. Although the rhetoric of monuments was sempiternal, its contents were renewed.

Against the pagan gods

Satirists like Sergardi were active agents in the process of moral retelling by modifying the received tale, bringing new elements to it, and establishing new literary monuments for their contemporary heroes. One interesting case of a

[80] Roller 2016: 130.

[81] Roller 2016: 130.

religious satire commenting on pagan religiosity in Rome is Carlo d'Aquino's twelve satires (*Satyrae XII*, 1703) against the worship of pagan gods (satires 1-4). D'Aquino was a Jesuit poet and professor of rhetoric at Rome. The tradition of attacking pagan gods was initiated by Arnobius, an early Christian apologist, whose second book of the treatise *Adversus nationes* (*Against the Pagans*) ridicules the specialisation of the Roman gods – including the obscenity of the fertility gods – and pagan rites.[82] The topic also became a favourite subject of jokes in Christian literature.[83] In his *Divinae institutiones* (*Divine Institutions*), Arnobius' pupil Lactantius ridicules the images of the pagan gods and the dedications and offerings to them as superstitious.[84] Setting paganism and Christianity as antagonistic oppositions in his first satire, d'Aquino mocks the worship of old gods and pagan rituals, and praises the beauty of Catholic cathedrals. The poet insists that he is attacking pagan gods instead of people because they demonstrated the same vices as humans, and he wants to refrain from personal malice. In his view, the famous statues made by Praxiteles or Phidias were mere mute images and stones which did not entail spiritual power. While Persius criticises the presence of gold in temples in his second satire,[85] d'Aquino does not condemn the beauty of the churches if the beauty indicates piety; in his view, religious images could be filled with divine presence, but the most important thing is the piety of souls.[86]

D'Aquino's second satire reproaches the multitude of pagan gods and the inability of Jupiter to save his temple on the Capitoline hill from being destroyed by fire in 83 BC. Much more powerful was Pope Leo who had succeeded in saving the city from Attila. According to tradition, the ruler of the Huns was heading for Rome, but as the result of his negotiations with Leo, he decided to withdraw, although the surroundings were already devastated. The content of Leo's discourse with Attila is unknown, but, although completely unarmed, Leo prevented Rome from being burned. The event is described in the satire by referring to the questions posed by the stupefied audience and underlining the miraculous turn: *Rogitant, Quae tanta potentia, dictis? / Tot peditum vexilla trahens cur cedat inermi?* ('They wonder why his words were so powerful? Why he who

[82] Sogno 2012: 369.

[83] Sogno 2012: 369.

[84] Sogno 2012: 370.

[85] Pers. 2.70 (*dicite, pontifices, in sancto quid facit aurum?*, 'Tell me, you men of god, what use is gold in a church?'; trans. Niall Rudd).

[86] Aquino 1703: I, p. 19 (*Templa sed … / Intererit minimum regali ponere sumptu, / Si pietas, quantum quae surgunt marmora, friget*).

had so many soldiers around him withdrew in front of an unarmed man?').[87] This happened, in the satirist's words, with the help of Saint Peter, whose numinous figure was seen behind the pope.[88] The poet himself was an eyewitness here (*visa mihi facies*, 'I saw a face'), emphasising his authority and the credibility of the story. The poem ends in praise of Pope Clement XI.

In his fourth satire, d'Aquino derides the ailing Jupiter's headache when Minerva was born from his forehead, and he mocks the Roman habit of adoring and associating snakes with the god of medicine. D'Aquino also denounces supernatural beliefs and astrology (satires 8-9), which represented an incitement to idolatry, bad curiosity, and superstition to those (theologians) who, for example, denied the impact of the stars on human affairs.

Another interesting Italian Jesuit in this sense was Stefano Antonio Morcelli (1737-1822), who wrote two books of satires (*Sermonum libri II*, Rome, 1784). Morcelli mentions, for example, the poet and archbishop Giovanni della Casa (1503-1556) as his predecessor in writing Horatian poetry.[89] In his preface, the poet notes that his poetry was written in a timespan of over 20 years, and while going through his manuscripts he decided to burn most of his work, donate some of the poems to children and save a few that seemed worth preserving:

> … *enimvero quum relegere instituissem … sic amare coepi, ut non tam rejiciendos, quam comendos esse judicarem*.[90]

> When I started reading them again … I started loving them, so that instead of rejecting the poems I decided to allow them to be polished.

Several of the individual satires had already appeared previously, and they had been well received. The first book deals with typical philosophical issues, such as the immortality of the human soul (I.1) and tranquillity of mind (I.2), but what is perhaps more original at this stage in literary history is the second book dealing with epigraphy and the elevating impact of Roman public art. Morcelli was also known as an epigraphist and archaeologist, and this professional background is

---

[87] Aquino 1703: II, p. 65.

[88] Aquino 1703: II, p. 65.

[89] Thomas Naogeorg wrote a verse satire against Giovanni della Casa accusing the archbishop of sodomy. The poem was entitled *In Ioannem del'la Casa, Archiepiscopum Beneventanum, Sodomiae patronum, satyra*, and it is attached to the Basel edition of Naogeorg's *Regnum Papisticum*.

[90] Morcelli 1784: Prooemium, xii.

visible in his satires on Roman monuments (II.5), inscriptions (II.6), and the rediscovered tomb of the Scipios (II.9) – the poet mourns that the sanctity of their grave has been broken.

Guglielmini's sincere and normative popes

Exemplary tales often raised a lone, morally charged hero above the community.[91] The notion of great men has always been seminal for the story of cultural or religious rebirth in history.[92] Guglielmini also studied virtue and vice with the help of the actions of great men, whose lives were converted into a moral spectacle. Some of Guglielmini's satires are eminently concerned with papal virtue, which was considered the greatest fulfilment of human nature; it was an unusual disruption of what humans were normally capable of doing. Guglielmini's third book includes two panegyrical poems on the popes Benedict XIV (3.1) and Clement XII (3.4; see also 1.8), and one on the Pontifical Academy of Arcadia (3.5). The whole collection is dedicated to Benedict XIV, whose outstanding character is firmly asserted already in the preface to the satires:

> *In Te enim perfectum, idemque efficacissimum exemplar continentiae, laboris, vigilantiae, Virtutumque omnium non Roma solum, non Italia, ſed univerſus Orbis suspicit, amat, admiratur.*[93]
>
> In You not only Rome or Italy but the whole universe admires, loves and respects a perfect and most powerful example of restraint, labour, vigilance, and all possible virtues.

Praising the virtues and good character of Benedict XIV, who reigned as pope in 1740-1758, Guglielmini sets him as a monumental figure and morally homogenous embodiment of virtue whom all human beings should imitate. The dedication already shows several features characteristic of epideictic speech, including superlatives and arguments from uniqueness, as the pope was clearly and completely a unique and outstanding character.[94] Benedict XIV was known

[91] Langlands 2018: 29-31.

[92] Trompf 1979: 244.

[93] Guglielmini 1742: x.

[94] Cf. Pernot 2015: 88 who claims that the principal methods of amplification include superlatives and

as a philosophical pope of the Enlightenment, who supported modern scientific culture and the arts, conversing with learned men and renovating such classical and Christian monuments as the Colosseum and Santa Maria Maggiore.[95] He introduced many social reforms and emphasised the social utility and charity of the Catholic church. Notable authors dedicated works to him, most famously Voltaire, whose *Le fanatisme, ou Mahomet le prophète* (first performed in 1741) was probably a veiled critique of Catholic intolerance towards Jews and Protestants. The praise of the pope in Guglielmini's poem still testified to the prophetic expectation of an angelic pope who would restore the world.

According to Lyons, one crucial feature of example was that a person who displayed exemplary virtue was somehow exceptional and rare; he displayed unusual and atypical virtue.[96] Guglielmini's poem was part of a satirical education framed as the development of the self through the active imitation of role models. Although the task was impossible, because the exceptionality of the models made them superior to ordinary human beings, the reader was influenced by divine examples which provided an opportunity for ethical inquiry. In the poem, Pope Benedict represents the ideal – a level of perfection that was hardly possible for a human being to achieve, since he had acquired these qualities through the imitation of God. His reign seemed to capture the utopian norms of life, including order, peace, and justice. The rhetorical structure of Guglielmini's eulogy is not unlike Dio Chrysostom's orations, in which he praises the virtues of the true king, who had acquired his good character by imitating Zeus.[97] The pope did not merely illustrate virtue; instead, he became a supreme model to be followed and adored.

The pope seemed to have some virtues that were especially apt to be praised by a satirist. The qualities that made a good human being included sincerity and splendour of mind (*sinceritas, animi nitor*). Guglielmini's satire 3.1 highlights Benedict's habit of castigating simulation and frauds caused by ambition and avarice. At the beginning of his poem, Guglielmini lists probity and religiosity among the chief virtues that had accompanied the pope from his early childhood, but what impresses him most is the rare virtue of sincerity or truthfulness:

---

arguments from uniqueness or authority.

[95] On Benedict XIV, see Rosa 2014 (emphasizing the pope's ambivalent character and his conservative turn in 1750); Messbarger et al. 2016.

[96] Lyons 1989: 32.

[97] On Dio's speeches, see van Nuffelen 2011.

> *Me movet, atque rapit Virtus hoc tempore rara:*
> *Nempe animi nitor ille oculis manifestus et ore,*
> *Illa tenax veri sententia, quae Tibi in omni*
> *Constitit officio …*[98]
>
> I am moved and excited by a virtue that is rare in our times,
> namely the splendour of the soul manifest in the eyes and countenance,
> that firm determination to truth that guides You
> in all your duties…

Sincerity is here the primary moral quality of the pope, referring primarily to his openness to the public. Lionel Trilling, in his studies on sincerity and authenticity, has defined the current use of sincerity as meaning 'a congruence between avowal and actual feeling',[99] whereas in the past the concept was largely metaphorical, referring to a life that was morally sound and pure, and it soon came to mean the absence of pretence and dissimulation.[100] For Trilling, the concept of sincerity is always tied to role-playing in the sense that it is an expression of sincerity to the public and requires 'a rhetoric of avowal, the demonstration of single-minded innocence through attitude and posture'.[101] It did not so much refer to the state of being true to oneself – that would in Trilling's terms be authenticity – but to others. However, in satires sincerity was not role-playing but signalled honesty, meaning that there was no subterfuge in one's intentions. Sincerity was posited as an ideal of supreme importance in moral life. It was an archetypal ideal of the human being or the best self, and it became one's life task to try to capture this ideal.[102]

Satirists always noted the possibility that this best self was hard to find and actually the less virtuous self – which may not be in harmony with the public morality – was probably more truly one's own. However, the pope was of course an exception since he was free from defects. One could presumably be sincerely insincere and vicious, but evil human beings in that sense were not the most common targets of satire. Instead, satires usually aimed to reveal dissimulation and the true face behind the mask. Sincerity as a virtue thus meant that in a person

---

[98] Guglielmini 1742: XIII.1, p. 84.

[99] Trilling 1972: 2.

[100] Trilling 1972: 13.

[101] Trilling 1972: 70.

[102] On the best self, see Trilling 1972: 5.

there was no trace of being false and a human being avoided all falsehoods to others (*nec quemquam fallere novit*, 'he did not know how to deceive anyone').[103] In this understanding, the moral end was at the same time 'a public end', as Trilling puts it.[104]

In Guglielmini's satire, sincerity is related to the pope's esteem and repute among the people as he had properly fulfilled his public role. We do not hear anything about the pope's authenticity in the sense of being true to himself. Instead, his sincerity is realised in public action and means here a congruence between his words and deeds. The poet concludes that the pope seemed to have sincere intentions in his role as a pope and he claimed to abolish dissimulators from the church and other institutions. Sincerity was related to the pope's social circumstance so that there was no sign of artifice in his entirely public character. However, as we have no access to his inner thoughts, we cannot decide whether his inner motivation was equally clean and pure as his public image. Therefore, we are unable to assess the pope's honesty since he might just play his role carefully and skilfully without revealing its fictitious elements. Guglielmini's words to the pope could even be read as normative instructions: by describing the pope's unusual capacity for avoiding frauds, the poet might in fact advise him to avoid certain things in his conduct.

Nevertheless, in representing Benedict as an outstanding moral figure, Guglielmini compares him to a god (*Deo similem*) in his exemplarity, which shone against the general corruption of the age dominated by deceptive words. The poet frames ambition as containing within it the deceptiveness that urged men to conceal their true mind and utter words that helped them to achieve their goals. The rhetoric of dissimulation contains here such terms as feigned faces (*fingere vultus*), painted speeches (*pingere sermones*), and inverted words (*verborum invertere sensum*) that lacked virtue and truthfulness. Comparing fraud with a virus (*pestis*), the poet insists that it corrupts the air and insinuates itself in every speech and into the human intestines, leaving no place – be they homes or temples – untouched. The pope alone stood against this corruption by focusing on the right things in life – that is, true piety that was not disturbed by the papal crown, long lines of adulators, or happiness amidst the golden palaces. All this richness was secondary and meaningless to Benedict, who concentrated on true religion and the common good. Such a man, the poet concludes, did not step aside from the right path of virtue, even if the whole world was broken.

[103] Guglielmini 1742: III.1, p. 84.

[104] Trilling 1972: 9.

In satire 3.4, Guglielmini glorifies Benedict's immediate predecessor, Pope Clement XII as another earthly equivalent of god (*Parque Diis Superis, Deus alter*) and an embodiment of perfection whose virtue shone like a star leading lesser souls towards virtue. The tale begins with the story of Titan, who made the first human being. Taking a handful of divine breath, he first made the human soul capable of containing virtues and a resemblance of god. Then he moulded the human body out of humid soil, adding dissected animal parts that brought along weaknesses, such as desire and fear. In this act of creation, the Titan was not entirely even, since some humans he made of better clay and did not allow animal elements to have their seat in the breast. These men were heroes, who differed from the human crowd in their extraordinary capacity for virtue. Needless to say, Clement belonged to the class of heroes who showed exceptional signs of virtue already in childhood. Guglielmini describes his native city and origin, his ancestors among the prominent families, and favourable family details that testified to his reliance on a long chain of virtue. In the grammar of praise, the centre of the speech is devoted to moral qualities that became visible in education already in early childhood and played a crucial role in defining the person.[105] As Pernot puts it, 'education is received from outside, but the profit the child gains from it, the way he distinguishes himself from his peers, gives evidence of his intellectual and moral qualities'.[106]

Accordingly, one notable passage in the poem is a humorous scene from Clement's early upbringing. It describes the attempts of Clement's father to direct his son towards a military career, along with the suggestions of Clement's mother to choose a different path. The dramatised passage deserves to be quoted in full, since it includes noteworthy expressions of instruction and exemplarity:

Tum pater ostendit clypeos hastasque sagittasque
Et veterum monumenta ducum, qui vulnera passi,
Dum patriam servant, inimica vel oppida cingunt.
Victores ostendit avos, fusa agmina narrat
Attonito simili, Martisque accendit amorem,
Et tenero iam laus in pectore bellica fervet.
At fulvum infantem retrahens subturbida mater,
Ne mea vita, inquit, ne lux mea, amaveris istos
Tam saevos vultus indutaque pectora ferro.

[105] Pernot 2015: 33.

[106] Pernot 2015: 34.

Hoc potius. Placidas frontes atque ora verenda
Pontificum monstrat, quorum pars splenduit ostro,
Splendet et evectus super aethera plurimus ordo.[107]

Then the father shows shields, spears, and arrows,
and the monuments of old generals who were wounded
when serving their fatherland and besieging enemy towns.
He shows victorious ancestors, and tells about defeated troops
to his fascinated audience, and he kindles his love of War.
And his son's tender heart already seethes with martial glory.
But drawing back her tawny son a worried mother says,
no, my life, no, my light, do not admire those
cruel faces and hearts dressed in iron.
Look here instead. She shows the gentle and admirable faces
of bishops and popes, a part of whom shone purple,
shining as a group and elevated towards the skies.

This passage demonstrates how values were taught in satires by using polarities, comparisons, and conflicting opinions. The quotation focuses on the crucial moment of life when the parents disagreed about the future career of the young Clement and pointed out the different paths to virtue. Many exemplary tales included a specified internal audience, and accordingly the son is posited here as a recipient of his parents' differing instructions and is forced to decide which national monument he should esteem the highest. Military virtues and prowess were embedded in the martial statues he is advised to marvel at when his father underlines the valorous and admirable deeds of former warriors. Clement's mother, for her part, turns his gaze to the row of pontifical statues gleaming in the sun (the words of splendour are repeated in the quote). The passage includes repeated negative purpose clauses (*ne… ne…*) that Horace also frequently used in his practical ethics.[108] This dramatised scene of upbringing with its morally valuative viewing[109] is in fact rather humorous with the parents' overt demonstrative acts and its competing secular and religious heroes supporting the exemplary rhetoric.

[107] Guglielmini 1742: III.4, p. 105.

[108] See Yona 2018: 138.

[109] Roller 2018: 6 n. 7 talks about the moral gaze in Roman culture.

The monuments were commemorated and represented as signs that summoned up deeds and their ascribed values, and the quotation includes expressions referring to the evaluative gaze of the audience judging the actions. Immediately before the quote, the son is described as being stupefied by the sight of the inspiring exploits and arms of the ancestral heroes and military leaders. This was again a conventional element in exemplary tales in which the internal audience watched and admired the virtuous deeds and was expected to be inspired by and to learn from the great deeds embodied in the statues.[110] The quoted passage is an epiphanic moment in the pope's childhood, a sudden disclosure that transfigured his daily life and suffused it with significance, crucially illuminating and shaping his future career.[111] This scene suggests that it is the task of educators to point out how exemplary figures had become what they were by choosing the right path. This encouraged the audience of the poem to understand that good moral qualities are not inborn or unattainable but can be achieved. Soon after this passage, the poet appeals to the negative example of the youths who were devoted to curling their hair according to the latest fashion or beautifying their faces with the help of a mirror. They became an index of wasting time on futilities (*perdendi temporis index*).[112]

In satire 3.5, Guglielmini praises not a person but a place, the Pontifical Academy of Arcadia (Accademia degli Arcadi). The Academy was an influential literary community devoted to nurturing poetry and pastoral simplicity. Pope Benedict XIV had been a member in his youth, and the place was important for the popes in increasing their cultural influence. The mission of the Academy was to be socially inclusive and open to both sexes and all social classes.[113] As Paola Giuli has described the motivation of the Academy, it 'adopted the pastoral fiction, not just for stylistic reasons (a taste for simplicity) but also "in order to eliminate any deference to hierarchy or precedence among its members"'.[114] This new policy did not please everyone. Sergardi, who joined the Academy in 1691, objected to the admittance of women, and in 1696 he published a satire against 'the new French custom of mixing the sexes at the gaming table and in conversation'.[115]

[110] On the motif of spectators, see, e.g., Langlands 2018: 25.

[111] On epiphany, see, e.g., Trilling 1972: 89.

[112] Guglielmini 1742: III.4, p.105.

[113] See Giuli 2016; Carini 1891.

[114] Giuli 2016: 318.

[115] Giuli 2016: 319. Sergardi attacked women in his long satire XVII (Sectanus 1698: cxxxiv-cxlvii) which is not included in Pepin's English translation of the first 14 satires.

Otherwise Sergardi's image of the Academy in his ninth satire was rosy – Arcadia approximated paradise on earth. He described its festivities thus:

> *Arcadiae rediere dies, festaeque Kalendae*
> *Musarum. Surgunt viridi subsellia circo*
> *Artifici contexta manu, doctusque Colonus*
> *In calamos iussit subcrescere tonsile buxum,*
> *Et nostrae foliis imitari Insignia Gentis.*
> *Iam reduces Nimphae gaudent, nitidisque Hyacinthis*
> *tempora regali properant redimire sub umbra.*[116]

> The festive days and months of the Muses have returned to Arcadia. Seats constructed by ingenious hands arise in a green circle, and the skilled inhabitant fashions cut boxwood into reed pipes, and with the leaves he imitates the seal of our clan. Now the returning nymphs rejoice, and they hasten to crown their heads with blooming hyacinths under the regal shade.[117]

The description is nostalgic in a way typical of satires and includes many verbs of return (*rediere, reduces*) praising the past. Guglielmini – also a member and known with the pastoral name of Dalgo Metimneo – describes the ideal community in similar terms of moral simplicity and honesty that created an idyllic, archaic world and reflected the unspoiled nature surrounding it. The poet stresses that the place is modest only in appearance. He imagines how Prince Friedrich Christian of Saxony, who was about to visit the place, would probably despise its agrarian surroundings, cattle, and ploughs, but the poet advises him to carefully inspect the minds of the simple inhabitants:

> *Nos intra meliora latent. Concordia nostrae est*
> *Gentis Stemma. Probos ea primum iunxit in unum*
> *Pastores, sumus unde sati, facilesque parentum*
> *Servamus mores. Sincero pectore quisque*
> *Quemque colit …*
> *… Nos continet unus honesti*
> *Limes.*[118]

---

[116] Sectanus 1698: IX, lxii.

[117] Sergardi 1994: 73 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin).

[118] Guglielmini 1742: III.5, p. 110.

Our better parts hide inside. Concord is
the garland of our people. It unites good shepherds,
and we are all planted from it, willing to serve
the customs of our parents. Everybody cultivates each other
in their sincere heart….
… We are held together by the limit of honesty alone.

The Academy's only strict prohibition was to avoid all quarrelling, which would result in exile from the community. The passage alludes to the satirical commonplace of observing the inner qualities of the human being instead of his outer appearance. The poet claims that the prince should pay attention to good qualities, which were more precious than gold and more shining than silver. Honesty and virtue made the community special, not the riches given by blind fortune. The poet compares living in the Academy to the simplicity of the good old days, another commonplace in satires. This was also the political aim of the Academy, which had been established to preserve the old Roman cultural heritage.

Another object of adoration in Guglielmini's poem 3.5 is the Prince himself. It was common for cardinals, the nobility, and patrons to participate in the festive celebrations of the Academy. The invitation speech addressed to a governor who was invited to visit the city was also a traditional epideictic genre.[119] Guglielmini describes how the whole community desired the presence of the prince; it gathered together to celebrate its precious visitor. Special attention was given to the role of the audience and its loud reactions of approval in the festivities. The poet describes how the enthusiastic audience crowds around the celebrated guest, triumphantly accompanying him and singing his praises in unison:

Plausibus et laetis hodie Tibi vocibus omnes
Arcades uno ore, uno animo, uno corde tulerunt.[120]

We Arcadians welcome You today with applause and cheerful singing
with one voice, one mind, and one heart.

The community presents itself in agreement and unity (cf. repeated *uno*), and even the excited poet joins in the singing. The verses offer an opportunity for

[119] Pernot 2015: 54.

[120] Guglielmini 1742: III.5, p. 109.

a 'karaoke' experience while representing outbursts of joy through like-minded, collective singing:

> *Tum laeti repetent io io iuvenesque senesque,*
> *Respondebit io cunctis e vallibus echo.*
> *Nam mos Arcadiae est Heroum dicere gesta,*
> *Et magna stimulos currentibus addere laude.*[121]
>
> Both young and old repeat happily io io,
> and the echo responds io from all the valleys.
> It is our habit in Arcadia to praise the great deeds of heroes
> and stimulate our guests with applause.

The joy becomes almost cosmic when nature (the echo) is used to arouse emotion by repeating the collective experience of approval. The emotion of admiration is notable in the process in which individuals are expected to identify with the exemplars and their moral excellence.[122] Emotions were crucial in epideictic rhetoric; the most frequent emotions included gratitude, joy, but also sadness,[123] which were important in producing an atmosphere of a shared moral community and in adducing the transformative effect. Describing how the audience in complete agreement rejoices and wonders at the visit of the prince, the poet presents an exemplary reaction: he demonstrates how readers should respond to virtue and offers a model reaction they should implement in their own lives. The description of the festivities can be read as a call for communal jubilation. Other positive emotions included joy, gratitude, and elevation, which all contributed to the moral awe the audience was expected to share.

The affections themselves were subject to education through the demonstrative example of the emotional reactions of the audience to the paradigmatically good individual. Examples connected the individual with the wider community while retaining the emphasis on individual morality and moral agency that could, however, never be thoroughly individual but was always fundamentally normative and historical. Using examples, satires defined and justified certain moral values and sometimes also granted currency to new ways of

[121] Guglielmini 1742: III.5, p. 111.

[122] On exemplars identified through the emotion of admiration, see Zagzebski 2010; on the emotions of admiration and wonder related to examples in ancient Rome, see also Langlands 2018: 88-91.

[123] Pernot 2015: 54.

moral thinking. The sense of pleasure and elevated sentiments were also involved when the audience participated in the feast of good morals in their 'moment of shared bliss'.[124] The representation of public ceremonies and rituals was an important discursive strategy to glorify virtuous deeds and define common values.

Guglielmini's poem also participated in the material rhetoric of exemplarity by describing artworks and statues made of the whitest marble and dedicated to the prince. Enumerating several admired sculptors and painters from the community, the poet notes that the paintings of the prince by these artists made him surpass the mythical figures of Narcissus and Adonis in his beauty. In addition to praising the simplicity of pastoral life, the poem celebrates the sophisticated arts and architecture of Arcadia, as the new Vitruviuses were adorning and renovating Rome with new miraculous monuments. The monuments were again a place for a new moral discourse and values. The poem concludes with the motif of vanity, stating that despite their current beauty, even these paintings, statues, and buildings would finally decay, eaten by the envious teeth of time, whereas the value of virtue is permanent and ever-lasting (*Sola hominem Virtus, FRIDERICE, beatum, / Sola immortalem facit*).[125] In the footnote, the editor of the satires added a quotation from *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, stating that all other goods in life depend on the dominion of Fortune, but virtue alone lies in the hands of human beings.[126] This statement also nicely summed up the key ethical message of the satires.

The fundamental position of Rome in the tradition of verse satire has already been briefly discussed above. The whole genre of satire was originally from Rome (if we believe Quintilian), and the city was stratified in many ways in its tradition; Rome was, for example, an archetypal vicious metropolis and the center of the Catholic Church. The opposite of urban life was a simple rural life which allowed the satirist to seek happiness. But how was peasant life represented in satires? Was it always virtuous? How did the traditional contrast between the city and the country change in the later verse satire?

---

[124] On the role of the audience in epideictic rhetoric, see Pernot 2015: 112-113.

[125] Guglielmini 1742: III.5, p. 112.

[126] *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.17: 'All the rules for noble living should be based on virtue, because virtue alone is within her own control, whereas all else is subject to the sway of fortune' (trans. Harry Caplan).

Chapter 7
Leaving the Countryside: Ironic Lessons on Contentment

In Roman verse satire virtue was based on simple living in the countryside, considered the 'virtuous milieu' of the Roman past. Satirists contrasted the duties of city life with the freedom and moderation of country life. Horace praised the virtues of plain living far away from the strain of the city.[1] Referring to his 'own' life Horace presented his early life in the countryside as being crucial for his own moral development. Horace's father's main lesson was that his son should live contentedly and according to their modest background. Horace repeatedly outlined his moral ideals by referring to his father's teachings and explained how through this instruction he learned the principles of conduct that were also visible in his writings. Horace's own actions were revelatory of his rural morality; therefore, he reflected on his own modest behavior while addressing his patron Maecenas or organizing conversations with his friends on his modest farm. His shyness and simple kitchenware both expressed his alleged modesty that was ironically undermined only by his own frequent reminders of this humbleness. Ofellus, the wise peasant in Horace's satire (2.2), who has often been considered a Stoic, was an exemplary uneducated rustic fellow whose virtue was based on simple living.

The praise of rural ease and its paradigmatic lifestyle became a stock theme in Latin literature for centuries.[2] In her studies on the praises of country life in the Baroque period, Anke-Marie Lohmeier has argued that there were four major elements in such praises. Firstly, the countryside was not just a physical place but a way of life far away from the stress of the city. The poet not only described or experienced daily life in the countryside but reflected on its meaning and values in a positive light. The praises of peaceful rural life were non-mimetic moral arguments rather than representations. The second recurring element was distance: rural retirement was characterised by its distance from the social life and

[1] Hor. *Sat.* 2.6. Horace praised country life in his famous Epode 2 ('Beatus ille'). On Horace's contrast between city and country, see Harrison 2007.

[2] The moral excellence of the countryside was also conveyed as a counterexample to the wicked urban life in rhetorical schools in which the contrast between the urban and rural lifestyle was a standard thesis. See Quintilian 2.4.24; Wiesen 1964: 29.

business concerns associated with the city or court, thus providing a safe space to live free of social norms, duties, and demands. Thirdly, the praises of country life did not deal with social order but with private life. As Lohmeier puts it, a retreat to the country was a personal choice that made a human being feel whole and independent. The moral-philosophical background was notable here; the praises of rural life were addressed to individuals and dealt with their personal life choices. Fourthly, the countryside was always inseparably bound with its opposite; the defining structure of the argument was *definitio ex negatione*, defining what rural life is by telling what it is not.[3]

Rural life was impossible to imagine without its counterimage. Lohmeier discusses the praises of rural life as negations that always include their conceptual opposites – city or court life – either explicitly or implicitly between the lines. The city life with its luxury, ambition, and social stress fostered values that the farmer did not share. This contrast between two stereotypical lifestyles also made the topic popular among neo-Latin satirists: rural life with its Stoic- or Cynic-minded virtues of freedom and autarky constituted an ideal way of life for the satirist, but it is equally important to note that the main criticism was directed against the vices and heteronomy of the city. In what follows, I will briefly examine this major Horatian contrast between urban and rural life in neo-Latin satires.

Horace's countryside revisited

The art of living a good life became a favourite topic in neo-Latin satire that advocated rural simplicity as a philosophical and religious ideal. Neo-Latin satirists devoted their poems to the longing for a quiet and peaceful life in their remote farmhouses. Like Horace, they cherished an unrealistically idyllic image of farm life with its gentle cattle and sweet-smelling flowers. The satirical ethics of withdrawal often encompassed social and moral critique. Petrarch's *De vita solitaria* was one notable subtext which in its apology for solitude included satirical criticism of the anxious urban life; as John Barbour notes, Petrarch portrayed the typical city dweller 'as driven by envy, resentment, imitation of the latest fashion, and gratification of sensual appetites'.[4] Satirists frequently announced that solitude was a condition that promoted self-transformation, and virtuous

[3] Lohmeier 1981: 51-56.

[4] Barbour 2004: 45; see also Kristeller 1985: 139; Trinkaus 1979: 71-85.

people sought out remote places where they could concentrate on poetry and other leisurely activities.

This attitude was based on the ancient views of philosophising outside Rome in the leisurely atmosphere of villas and gardens. Cicero's dialogues were famously far removed from people's lives and their conversations took place at his suburban villa in Tusculum. This traditional setting scribed negative moral values to the crowded city and maintained that farming and leisurely life were conducive to philosophical and intellectual pursuit. Ambition and avarice, which were prerequisites for advancing one's career in the city, were easier to avoid in solitude. As Maren-Sofie Rostvig has shown in her studies on the 'happy man' tradition, Horace's main reason for favoring secluded rural life was its peacefulness: happiness depended on internal and external peace, and the best conditions for achieving this quality were in the life of a husbandman.[5]

Withdrawing from their communities and dedicating themselves to their studies, neo-Latin writers sang the praises of rural life and, like Horace, identified themselves with simple peasants, innocent of the corruption of the city. The act of retirement expressed the satirist's dissatisfaction with his times. In his fourth satire, Tito Vespasiano Strozzi, an early Italian satirist, expresses his aversion to city life and prefers rural solitude to urban worries. He has withdrawn to his farm and praises its calming effects:

Prima morae causa est, quod cura liber ab omni
Quae turbare animum, ac per multa negotia possint
Distrahere, huc statui secedere, totus ut essem
Nunc mecum …[6]

The main reason for the delay is my decision to retreat here and live free from any worries
that might disturb my mind, and from many duties that might
confuse my life, to be entirely within myself alone …

Moreover, by extolling the salubrious and relaxing environment the poet also describes his benign poetics which reflects his rural surroundings. The poet maintains that he is a friend of virtue, not fortune. Another early Italian satirist, Giovanni Aurelio Augurelli, exhorts his friend to shake off his urban worries and

[5] Rostvig 1954: 72.

[6] Strozzi 1530: 245.

resort to the country for relaxation: 'everything is joyful here during the day, and everything is pleasant at night' (*Cuncta hic laeta die, sunt grata hic omnia nocte*).[7] In his third satire, Federico Nomi, for his part, calls himself, his father, and his whole ancestry 'poor fellows', who were nourished by mere virtue and love:

Pauper ego, pauper genitor, pauperrima avorum
Semper censa domus; fuit omnibus unus honesti
Semper amor, vitare nefas, maculisque cavere.[8]

I am poor, my father is poor, the house of my ancestors
has always been very poor; our sole purpose was always
to love honesty, avoid misdeeds, and beware disgrace.

Most of Nomi's satires deal with frugal living. In his preface to his satires, Nomi poses moderation (*modus*) between virtues and vices as his ethical ideal. Suggesting an Aristotelian mindset, he states that people easily fall into the other extreme of avarice when trying to avoid prodigality. Nomi's most bitter objurgations in satires five and fourteen are directed against corrupt law courts, where justice depends on wealth. Purple garments protect the elite and delivering justice in mutual confidence the elite replaces reason by will. His fourth dramatic satire deals with an inordinate desire for profit, and his thirteenth defends the ideal of the Horatian 'vivere parvo',[9] the capacity of being content with the supply of one's own lands. Nomi also revives the famous Juvenalian theme of fleeing the corrupted city (*Quid Romae faciam?* 'What can I do at Rome?'),[10] overrun by flatterers who know how to advance their position by lying. The poet identifies himself with a rustic man who has learned simple living:

Me natum non pingue domo, sed vivere parvo
Contenta, dignis genitoribus, atque subinde
Colligere ex agro solitum, quem habuere parentes,
Quem tritavi, et Bacchi calcatis condere ab uvis
Vindemiam, totos bene quae succurrat in annos …[11]

---

[7] Augurelli 1505: II.5.

[8] Nomi 1703: III, p. 31.

[9] Hor. *Sat.* 2.2.1.

[10] Juv. 3.41.

[11] Nomi 1703: XIII, p. 165.

Utque ad me redeam, magnas facientia curas
Moenia non cupio, sperno fastidia Romae;
Serrani in morem parvo contentus agello,
Si modo non quatiat venienti turbine grando,
Vel gravis exundet per ripas impetus amnis.[12]

I was not born in a rich family, but a modest one,
content with little and worthy parents;
it was the habit to gather a harvest from the fields, owned by my parents,
and forefathers, and press from the grapes of Bacchus
wine that was sufficient for the whole year...
As for myself, I don't long for the city walls
which bring mere worries; I despise the fastidiousness of Rome.
Like Cincinnatus, I am happy with a small patch of field,
if only a hailstorm would not suddenly strike the harvest
or a troublesome river flood over the edges.

The idea of contentment is one of the main themes here. The poet is satisfied with the modest crop provided by his family farm, and he strives for a simple life far from the obligations of the city. The same emphasis on frugal living is discerned in Nomi's fifteenth satire, which – owing again to his classical models, such as Horace's satires 2.2 and 2.8 and Juvenal's satire 5 which all have moderation in dining as their concern – censures luxurious meals and exotic ingredients imported from abroad; he notes disapprovingly that no one appreciates a simple portion of meat that looks like meat unless it is served in some imaginative and unidentifiable form. Nomi's ninth, dramatic satire deals with urban traitors and simulators, who conceal their true nature, just as prostitutes smear their ugly faces with cosmetics.[13] Dissimulation and adulation were necessary skills in the city where success depends on the opinion of others and where people are influenced by external forces, whereas satires speak for authenticity and Horatian autarky suspicious of anything socially expected.[14] Nomi attacks learned men, among

[12] Nomi 1703: XIII, p. 167. The name Serranus (from *sero*, to sow) refers to Cincinnatus, who cultivated his small farm himself.

[13] Nomi's eighth satire also dealt with adulators and condemned their behaviour as immoral, whereas his own activity as a satirist was morally motivated.

[14] Cf. Foucault 2001: 120 who notes that for the Cynics *autarkeia* or self-sufficiency was the main condition for human happiness. On self-sufficiency as a dominant classical ideal, see Desmond 2006: 38-40.

others, whose only wish is to become famous and fly above the stars with the help of their pens, without caring about truth or virtue. Satirists present sincerity and authenticity as rare and rebellious virtues that break generally approved social norms.[15]

Likewise, Jean Saint-Geniès's satires from 1654 connect the ethics of contentment explicitly with the rural setting. He notes in his first satire that men who are satisfied with what they have often also avoid the clamour of the city:

Oderunt strepitus et magna murmura turbae;
Musaei latebris gaudent placidoque recessu,
Dulcibus affixi studiis.[16]

They hate the noise and loud roar of the crowds,
they rejoice in the hiding places of the Muses and quiet recesses,
affixed to their sweet studies.

Contentment was one of the key virtuous dispositions that Horace nurtured in his satires and in his epistle 1.14. It includes frugal living and satisfaction with one's modest possessions and humble background. Contentment means satisfaction in life, a mental condition in which one is content with little. Contentment makes the changes of fortune bearable, and it is often seen to facilitate growth and self-improvement. In his satires, epistles and the early Epode 2 ('Beatus ille') Horace famously advocates the cultivation of restraint, simple joys, and intellectual pleasures of rural life.[17] According to the Horatian principle of contentment human beings should be satisfied with what they possess and aspire towards the inner state of freedom, adapting to the external circumstances which were usually beyond their control.[18] As Stephanie McCarter has nicely put it, for Horace the Sabine farm was not just a physical space but a figurative

[15] Cf. Barbour 2004: 151 who (quoting Trilling) notes that 'authenticity is implicitly a polemical concept'.

[16] Sangenesius 1654: I, p. 55. A French satirist who briefly discussed a retreat from the city was the grammarian Pierre Paul Billet (ca. 1640-1715), whose third satire complained about urban vices. His book of satires, *Satyrarum liber unus*, included three poems and was published in 1703. The second poem justified his reasons for writing satire and enumerated intolerable groups of people from greedy merchants to pompous shepherds. The volume of his Latin writings was dedicated to Philip V of Spain. See Billet 1703.

[17] On Epode 2 and its legacy, see Lohmeier 1981; Rostvig 1954: 69-71 *et passim*.

[18] On Horace's ideas of freedom and the countryside, see McCarter 2015.

symbol reflecting his 'desired inner landscape' and expressing his ideal of inner liberty free from the circumstances.[19] Or, as Steven Shapin has stated in his studies on intellectual isolation in seventeenth-century England, solitude was a discursive and symbolic location that rarely meant absolute aloneness. Rather, it meant normatively patterned disengagement from society. It was 'an intensely public pose' expressing 'an evaluation of the society from which the isolate represented himself to be disengaged, so that it always presupposed an audience which understood the evaluation inherent in the discursive pattern'.[20]

Neo-Latin satirists elaborated on these Horatian themes as rhetorical representations of their moral concerns. For example, the Dutch humanist Janus Dousa (1545-1604) tackles the issue of contentment in his first satire with reference to Horace's first satire: 'We always regret everything, and it is hard to find a human being who would be happy with their lot' (*Omnes nostrimet nos poenitet: atque hominem vix / invenias, cui sors placet sua*).[21] Dissatisfaction manifests itself in various desires that breed envy and conflicting motivations. Similarly, Jaime Juan Falcó's first satire illustrates the disturbing effects of envy, when a person admires another's conditions and dislikes his own. This subject is based on Horace's epistle 1.14 in which the steward longs for the games and baths of the city, whereas the poet admires the alluring beauty of the wilderness, and, as Horace puts it, it was not the spirit of the place that made the difference. Horace's epistle concludes that the restless human mind is the real culprit; it never escapes itself, whatever the conditions or locations are (1.14.13, *in culpa est animus, qui se non effugit umquam*).[22] Following this idea Falcó writes:

[19] McCarter 2015: 157.

[20] Shapin 1991: 195. On the idea of solitude, see Barbour 2004; Vickers 1985.

[21] See Dousa I.70-71 in Simons 2009a: 162, and Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.1-3. Dousa's first collection of satirical poetry appeared at Antwerp in 1569 (Tournoy 1998: 82). IJsewijn 1976: 45 has noted that Dousa mixed religious and political issues in his two verse satires in which he warned against making peace with the Spanish governor of the southern Netherlands. On Dousa's first satire, see Simons 2009a (with a German translation), and on the two satires, see ibid. 2009b. Simons notes that Dousa's first satire is full of classical quotations and resembles a textual patchwork (*cento*). The discontent with farm life was also discussed, for example, in Giovanni Antonio Volpi's satire *Ad Hieronymum Dandinum Episcopum Forocorneliensem* published in *Carmina illustrium poetarum Italorum II* (Paris, 1577).

[22] Horace's satire 1.1 also begins with a discussion of dissatisfaction; on the concept of *mempsimoiria* ('discontent with one's lot in life') which had its background in the diatribe tradition, see Freudenburg 1993: 11, 22-23.

Quis non consultus parvum desiderat agrum
Civiles inter fluctus? Sed rusticus urbem
Cum venit ergo vadis, nil urbi comparat amens.[23]

If asked, who would not desire a small field
in the midst of civic disturbances? But when a peasant travels
to the city, in his madness he finds the city superior.

Falcó's satire alludes to Horace's earlier description of human inconsistency; human beings are always dissatisfied with their lot. Adhering to the principle of contentment Falcó finds peacefulness in the countryside:

Rus ego possideo sat magnum, tu regiones
Mille, quid intersit, si nondum percipis, audi.
Nil mihi deest, superest multum tibi parvum et inane
Hoc est discrimen, si natura duce vivas.[24]

In the countryside I have enough field, whereas you own
thousands of acres, but what does it matter if you don't yet see them? Listen.
I don't lack anything, whereas for you even great numbers are little and worthless.
This is the difference, if you live following nature as your guide.

An appeal to the goodness of nature was a popular philosophical idea. The countryside was discussed by using the concept of limit or boundary (*modus*). Falcó's satire was clearly influenced by the Horatian modest lifestyle that never exceeded the limits of nature but remained in the boundaries which his small farm and its harvest offered for his living. As Yona has noted, this understanding of the virtuous life also corresponded to the Epicurean instruction delivered by Torquatus in Cicero's *De finibus* (1.44); the wise man lived contained within the bounds that nature has set.[25]

The moral excellence of the countryside was also conveyed as a counterexample to wicked urban life by Petrus Scholirius.[26] His satire 1.4 on the miseries of his age is devoted to the longing for a reclusive life on his remote farm far away from

[23] Falco 1600: I. The quotation plays with water images (*fluctus, vadum*) which are difficult to translate.

[24] Falco 1600: I.

[25] Yona 2015: 241; 2018: 82.

[26] Scholirius 1683.

the clamorous city of Antwerp and its vices of pride, frauds, and luxury. All these vices arise from the human desire to succeed without delay, work, or merit. The beauties of the countryside include salubrious springs, shady caves, and other pleasures of pastoral life with its green meadows and grass-eating sheep:

> *… Hic pascam armenta, capellas.*
> *Hic spatientur oves curtae; myrtoque, thymoque,*
> *Mille et odoratis distendant floribus armos.*[27]

> I herd here oxen and goats.
> Here small sheep move around eating myrtle and thyme,
> and they are fattened by thousands of sweet-smelling flowers.

The primary virtue is again contentment with small things (*parvis contento*), such as the salubrious waters of natural springs outside the city. It remains for the reader to decide to what extent such an idyllic image can be seriously presented in the context of satires and to what extent it leaves room for ironic interpretation.

Anxious leisure

Rural life was thought to embody the ideal way of living in complete self-sufficiency and freedom compared to the stressful life in the city. However, sometimes satires gave an explicit ironic twist to the traditional dichotomy of these two lifestyles by critically reinterpreting the culturally shared views of the countryside. An early example of this critical re-evaluation were Eobanus Hessus's (1488-1540) eleven eclogues published in his *Bucolicon* in 1509. Hessus's poems dealt with passionate love as a dangerous madness, and they commented satirically on the pastoral dream of simplicity and harmony.[28] The pastoral world in these poems indicates an immature worldview that was challenged by Hessus's satirical travesty of rural simplicity. In his imaginary and ideal farm Horace had a full command of himself, but this very condition of internal freedom was often an illusory cliché in later neo-Latin satires, which suggested that it was impossible to become truly self-determining or reach a pastoral ideal in the real world. In Hessus's poems the

---

[27] Scholirius 1683: I.IV.20-22.

[28] On Hessus's *Bucolicon* as a satire on love-madness, see Vredeveld 1985.

cause of unrest was foolish love, but there were also other reasons for unhappiness in later poetry. In what follows, I will refer to two later examples.

The blessings of the countryside were ironically adapted by the Croatian 'Horace', Junije Restić (Restius, 1755-1814), who wrote 25 satires (in *Carmina*, 1816).[29] IJsewijn notes that Restić's poems were firmly embedded in the Croatian-Venetian cultural area and the everyday life of late eighteenth-century Dubrovnik in particular.[30] Horace's influence is immediately evident in many of his poems. In Restić's eighth satire entitled *Apology* the main theme is the poet's taciturnity. Restić identifies himself with a Horatian rustic figure (*ego inurbanus*) who discusses his career with his patron Maecenas. Maecenas suggests that he should refrain from writing poetry, whereas the poet insists that he cannot sleep unless he can write. The Muses recreate him whenever he suffers from an illness or serious worries.[31]

Noteworthy in this connection, however, is his seventh satire entitled *Agricola*, in which Restić provides a realistic image of farm conditions. Desiring to escape the endless troubles of the city (*missis urbana negotia curis*), the poet retreats from communal temptations to his farm. The poem is addressed to his steward Villicus and closely modelled after Horace's Epistle 1.14, in which the bailiff longs for the city-dweller's life. The urban poet, abhorring the tedious business-concerns of the city, envies the freedom which the peasants cherish in their lives. In the manner of Horace, Restić's poet intends to live on the farm submitting himself to the rhythm of nature and sleeping through the night without interruption when nothing disturbs his harmony:

Rure ego per somnum faciles explevero noctes,
Rure ego nascentis surgam sub lumina solis
Incisurus olus tecum, socioque labore
Succincti pariter pisumque, cicerque seremus,
Et cum caepe fabam, et longos, mea regna, phaselos.
Crescite felici, mea crescite oluscula cura,

---

[29] Restius 1816: 1-170. Restić was not the first neo-Latin satirist in his country. His satires were preceded by the Ragusan poet Damianus Benessa's (1477-1539) *Sermones* which include ten satires (see De Smet 2015: 202; IJsewijn 1975: 191).

[30] IJsewijn 1975: 191, 195.

[31] Restić also refers to his own figure in satire twenty-three, which is addressed to his reader (*Ad lectorem*), claiming that by reading his verses the reader will never come to know the poet. Restić's satires also include playful Romantic poems on rural Bacchanals (9) and Sylvanus's remote dwelling place in the mountains (15).

Atque cibo dominum, somnoque iuvate salubri.
Quid fragor insanae melius mihi conferat urbis?[32]

In the countryside I will sleep easy nights,
In the countryside I will wake up under the first rays of the sun
to cut greens with you, and in common labour
we are ready to seed peas and chickpeas together
and with onion we plant beans, and long kidney beans that are my royal favourites.
Grow happily, grow with my care, my vegetables,
and help your master by providing food and salubrious sleep.
What better could the noise of an insane city offer me?

The repetitive beginning of the quote stresses that the idea of a virtuous country life repeated in history has become an internalized cliché: it maintains that inner peacefulness follows from the harmonious relationship between a human being and his environment. This image is familiar from pastoral myths and, for example, Petrarch's *De vita solitaria*, in which the *otiosus* sleeps well, enjoys bird-singing, goes for walk in woods and reads without interruption enjoying his own company.[33] In his dreams Restić's poet-landlord seeds peas and other plants together with his rustic friend and, anticipating an abundant harvest, wonders what the madness of city life might possibly add to his rural blessings. Maintaining the Horatian antithesis between dependence and freedom he deplores the communal life in terms of envy, malice, and back-biting, while in the country one enjoys firewood, garden, and, above all, superior freedom. Moving to the country marks a transformation of his character and the beginning of a whole new life (*novus in vita mihi nascitur ordo*)[34] resulting in a steady mind. As in Horace's verses, country life is thought to promote self-knowledge and virtue.

While praising the philosophical benefits and inner goods provided by country life, Restić's poet adopts a pseudo-didactic tone. The poet eagerly lectures his addressee Villicus on useful farming based on his reading of agricultural manuals (*Disce ideo nunc a me*, 'Learn now from my saying'). Inspecting the fields, the landlord officiously wonders why, despite his vast reading of agricultural literature, the cabbages and turnips, which in the ancient tradition stood for moral

[32] Restius 1816: VII, p. 47, 10-17.

[33] Panizza 1985: 197; see also Hor. *Epist.* 1.10.18 (*est ubi divellat somnos minus invida cura?*).

[34] Restius 1816: VII, p. 48, 24.

purity, fail to grow or obey any order in the field, and why his long-anticipated life of virtuous farming is turning into a nightmare. Soon the disadvantages of hard rural labour become obvious, and a range of concerns appears in the cultivation of the fields. The culprit is Villicus whose task it was to oversee the farm but who is accused of laziness. The landlord counts all the worries from hailstorms to barrenness that surround the farmer's life. Asking the busy-body to temper his anger, Villicus explains that cabbages can be planted next spring in any order and it was insane to expect a harvest in the middle of summer. Immersed in lecturing the pedantic landlord tells the steward to forget his traditional knowledge and follow the new rule. As a result, the steward leaves both his master and the farm at the end of the poem:

> *Tu tibi habe tua: pro me alium et tibi quaere colonum,*
> *Namque hortis excedo tuis ego. Vive, valeque*.[35]

> You can have it all. And find yourself another farmer, too.
> For indeed I'm leaving your garden. Farewell and live well.

Restić's urban-style acknowledgement of the uncertainty in farming ironizes the previous idealization of the rustic past. The satirical praise of wilderness was ironical already in Horace, as the poet did not need to participate in the hard work that would not allow any leisure. Rustic leisure is an idealized myth that Restić satirically deconstructs here. The landlord's book-learning and bustling behaviour evince his restless urban mentality which is incompatible with his reunification with nature and the ideal tranquility of soul envisaged in pastoral poetry. While for Horace the chief characteristic of a wise man was his possession of inner freedom and rural meditations usually had a calming effect on the passions, the landlord here fails to control his passions.[36] He withdraws to the country to avoid human madness, but merely brings this quality with him without removing vice. Aiming to replace the conventional knowledge of old farmers with his new order he drives away both his steward and the desired freedom associated with the rural setting; there is no return to the simplemindedness of the past.

---

[35] Restius 1816: VII, p. 55, 251-252. The concluding words are significant: Horace used these words when he gave instructions for the pursuit of happiness; see Hor. *Epist.* 1.6.66 (*vive vale*); cf. Scholirius 1683: I.1.6 (*Vive, vale*).

[36] In this sense the poem also resembles Horace's satires in which the poet's own incompetence and moralising are often the main objects of parody; on self-parody in Horace's satires, see Freudenburg 1993: 21-27.

While modern retreat narratives are typically written from a first-person perspective, recording personal observations in the field, satirical retreat poems were often constructed as dialogues between two conflicting points of view. The poems were addressed to urban dwellers who imagined the sweetness of the countryside, and the satirist then disclosed the illusionary nature of this dream. At the same time, Restić's poem illustrates how traditional satirical themes and black-and-white contrasts became less noticeable in the blending of later centuries.

The happy man tradition

Neo-Latin writers repeatedly rehearsed the satirical script of rural solitude, but sometimes viewed it suspiciously. Umbritius Cantianus's (a pseudonym for Jabez Earle, an English dissenting Presbyterian priest, ca. 1676-1768) poem entitled *Rus* ('To the countryside', 1724) was an interesting exercise in satirical illusion breaking.[37] The poem was addressed to Pamphilus Urbanus, whose pseudonym refers to Juvenal's poem 3 and its critique of the urban environment.[38] The biographer Alexander Chalmers explains that Cantianus was educated among the dissenters, participated in their meetings in London for decades and lived a long life without suffering from ill health. He published occasional sermons and a small collection of Latin and English poems.[39] As William Kupersmith has noted, the poem is cast as a persuasion and an act of advising in which the poet attempts to convince his audience of his case.[40] Cantianus first mentions how numerous poets before him have extolled the bliss of retirement and a decision to spend one's last years in the country.[41] This is also Pamphilus's dream of envisioning a permanent retirement on the farm:

[37] The poem was published in Cantianus's small volume on Latin verse (*Poemata*) that came out in London in 1729. The family name Cantianus is Latin for Kent.

[38] Kupersmith 2007: 224.

[39] Chalmers 1812-17: s.v. Earle.

[40] Kupersmith 2007: 224-227 discusses the poem briefly as an example of neo-Latin imitation of Roman satire by an Englishman.

[41] For a nice retirement poem inspired by Horace, see also William Major's poem 'The retirement. An ethic poem' published in London in 1747. On English retirement-poetry (imitating Horace and relying on Stoic and Epicurean thought), see Rostvig 1954; Mack 1969 (on Alexander Pope).

… te subducere turbae
Urbanae quaeris, studiisque incumbere sanctis,
Scriptores versare probos, descendere saepe
In tete, atque animo quascumque evellere spinas
Culturaque augere aeternae semina lucis;
Vivendi causas certus praeferre saluti.[42]

… you seek to escape
the urban crowd and fall into your sacred studies,
meditate good authors, dive deep into yourself,
and remove whatever thorns you have in your mind,
and cultivate the seeds of eternal light;
the reasons for living are surely preferred to health.

The passage includes again a reference to Horace's epistle 1.14 and its act of removing thorns from the mind.[43] It is widely believed, the poet claims, that there are no worries, labour, or vices in the rural shades as if people were still living there in paradise. This was a recurring experience recorded in classical and neo-classical pastoral poetry and many later Horatian imitations, where people typically imagined that rural life was simple and easy. They dreamed of good harvests and happy conditions that inspired a human being to his leisurely work and gave him independence. This image also reflected the Stoic understanding of rural life: a wise man is like a farmer who is self-sufficient and relies on his own strength alone.[44] The superiority of country life was promoted by the bad living conditions of the contemporary city; London was an extremely unhealthy place to live and notorious for its polluted air quality.[45]

In the poem, Pamphilus dreams of enjoying a peaceful retirement, a life without challenges, and a calm mind. In Pamphilus's view, city life is dominated by the obsession of success and exhausting pursuit of wealth. However, Cantianus suggests that people are deceived in their naïve expectations of pastoral life. Reminding his readers of Milton's *Paradise lost* and original sin (*Amissum nescis*

[42] Cantianus 1729: p. 12, 244-249.

[43] Hor. *Epist.* 1.14.4.

[44] On the importance of moral philosophy (esp. Stoicism) for the praises of rural life, see Lohmeier 1981: 87-107. Cf. Nussbaum 1994: 41 who argues that in Hellenistic philosophy the flourishing human life was conceived as a freedom from disturbance.

[45] Rostvig 1954: 62-63.

paradisum, 'Don't you know that the paradise is lost'),[46] the poet underlines that human beings are unable to escape their nature:

> *At nostris oris nunc exulat otium, et alma*
> *Pax, et ubique loci dominantur cura, dolorque:*
> *Quae frustra fugiet, supera qui vescitur aura,*
> *Ut longinqua petat, vel summa cacumina scandat,*
> *Aut subeat sylvas, aut incolat abdita terrae;*
> *Quoquo secedat, nisi se quoque fugerit ipsum*.[47]

> But leisure and sweet peace are now in exile from our shores,
> and worries and pain prevail everywhere.
> A living human being tries in vain to escape them by
> travelling far away or climbing the top of a mountain,
> or hiding in the forest or inhabiting hidden lands;
> wherever he retreats, he is unable to escape himself.

After recognising the inescapable nature of man, the poet sets out to systematically demythologise the rural setting and turns the prevailing myth upside down. First, he notes that rural life is a constant battle (*labor*) that leaves no room for leisure, sweet dreams, or shepherd songs in the shade of mountain trees. Farmers have numerous duties, and they turn up rough soil. There is no place for cultivating idleness when busy with uprooting weeds and worried about hailstorms, floods, heavy rains, dry summers, and thieves. The hard work never ends, and it consumes all the energy that would be needed for leisurely research. Second, the farmer is endlessly restless in controlling the circumstances and consumed by worries (*curae*) about the future, severe illnesses, hard old age, untimely deaths, lightnings, earthquakes, and fires. Recording the horrors and unpleasantness of simple living the poet demonstrates the instability of life and uncertainty about future events; there is no place for a Stoic detachment on the farm. When a farmer tries to avoid famine and frost, his peace of mind suffers from countless worries from stolen animals to failing crops. Cantianus is committed to Horace's Stoic thinking that desire and fear reduce independence everywhere.[48]

[46] Cantianus 1729: p. 2, 16. On satirical criticism in Milton's *Paradise Lost*, see King 2001.

[47] Cantianus 1729: p. 2, 24-29. Cf. Verg. *Aen*. 3.339 (*superatne et vescitur aura*, meaning that someone still enjoys life and health).

[48] On Horace promoting the Stoic detachment, see, e.g., McCarter 2015: 109.

Cantianus's poem suggests that private withdrawal, mental disengagement, and contemplation are mere fantasies; it is impossible to escape the circumstances or to achieve an existence that would be determined by itself alone. Addressing this philosophical question, the country poems challenge the possibility of order, peace, and harmony in the world. Satires in general were skeptical of the possibility of carefree happiness; this visionary norm was impossible to achieve, because there was no access to the world of simplicity or sincerity. Cantianus's poem resembles the latter part of Horace's Epistle 1.7 which also presents a similar contrasting example of farm life. Volteius receives a small farm from his friend Philippus but the farm is a complete reversal of idleness; his goats die of disease, oxen are worked to death, and he is driven to despair.[49] As Horace put it in his epistle (1.16.66), whoever lives in fear will never be free.

Observing his rural neighbors, Cantianus's poet discovers in villagers many of the same evils from drunkenness to envy as in the townspeople. The rustic man is not immune (*immunis*) to human weaknesses, and the countryside does not guarantee probity. The countryside is not even a nonhuman environment that would allow him a physical distance from others. One of the traditional justifications for rural solitude was its healing nature. However, here a beautiful spot that was basically an ideal place for sustaining health is unhealthy. It is surrounded by swamps and swept by strong winds that cause fevers, cough, and itches familiar from the plagues of the city. The human body is unable to avoid illnesses irrespective of its location (*Tu, quocunque loco degas, quocunque recedes, / Nequaquam poteris corpus subducere morbis*). The poet shows that the fondling image of the pastoral landscape and *locus amoenus* with its idealized natural forms, quiet streams, rolling hills, and green pastures is fictitious and untrue. Cows do not moo happily on the banks of a dry river, and a fold does not look sweet when starving in heat. The poet claims that what Pamphilus imagines as a pure, refreshing morning shower is a terrible storm, and instead of hiking the hills you just want to stay inside the cottage. On the last page, the poet challenges the false narrative about country life and contrasts it with reality which makes Pamphilus's attachment to rural conditions seem ridiculous:

Oppida sed fugiam, et loca quaeque frequentia, dices,
Devitans, secreta colam, me devia rura
Accipient, vivam latitans, nec cognitus ulli.
Qualia sed meus hic sibi somnia fingit amicus?

[49] McCarter 2015 (Ch. 5) discusses Horace's Epistle 1.7 in close detail.

Sic te novisti? Quotus est, cui taedia mentem
Non subeant longae solitudinis, et sibi gratus
Esse comes queat ipse diu? Deus ille, quod aiunt,
Aut Daemon fuerit. Qualem te, Pamphile, credis?[50]

But I will escape cities and avoid crowded places, you say,
I will seek secrecy and head towards the remote countryside,
I will live in hiding and known to nobody.
Where do these dreams come from, my friend?
Is this who you think you are? How many people are there
who would not be tired of long loneliness and who could stand
their own company for long? Such a person is either a god or a demon,
as they say. Is that what you think you are, Pamphilus?

Although Pamphilus is looking for a place that would calm his mind, there is no real opportunity to escape pain and evil. As in modern retreat narratives, observing nature here borders on and ends in observing self. A state of total freedom or complete absence is unattainable because it is impossible to flee the human element. The border of observer and observed becomes obscure and, as modern critics have noted, retreat narratives can best be figured as encounters rather than escapes from the human.[51]

Cantianus's poem shows that the countryside is not a carefree place where Pamphilus could retreat to his own leisurely work in isolation and enjoyment, since his peacefulness is constantly disturbed by bad weather, rural worries, and webs of social relationship; his whole being is affected by the existence of others. The naïve expectations of rural independence and complete disengagement are refuted in the text by the lived experience of the satirist whose realistic narrative displaces the townsman's false dreams cut off from reality. The poet underlines Pamphilus's ignorance by frequently using such verbs as *censes* ('you suppose'), *sentis* ('you feel'), *putas* ('you assume'), or *fingis* ('you imagine'). The poem is a satirical counter-version of the pastoral tradition initiated by Vergil and Horace.[52] As Maren-Sofie Rostvig has noted, while the pastoral tradition was based upon

[50] Cantianus 1729: p 14, 286-293.

[51] On retreat narratives in modern fiction, see Roorda 1992. On anti-pastoral, see Westling 2014.

[52] Vergil memorably praised the hard work of the farmer in his *Georgics* 2.458-549 (see also Panizza 1985: 210-214). Cantianus also refers to Vergil and his *Georgics* (1.145-46, 2.401) here ('even your Virgil himself says toil is wretched for farmers', see Kupersmith 2007: 225).

a constant idealization of rural life, the tradition of the happy man (*beatus vir*) followed by Horace involved a more realistic understanding of life according to Stoic principles.[53] Cantianus's poem also subverts the epideictic praise of a region that typically extolled the excellent climate and the piety of the inhabitants.[54]

The conclusion of the poem reflects Cantianus's Stoic mentality that casts doubt on the ethical success of rural isolation alone. Although there were no temptations of the city (such as riches, power, or glory), the change in physical location was not sufficient for moral growth. Cantianus underlines the importance of one's well-prepared mindset, self-knowledge, and self-improvement in moral development: the only possibility to cultivate inner peace is to cultivate one's own mind, which ought to be as steady as possible so that the things beyond control do not disturb it:

> *Nusquam habitare loci requiem, quam quaeris amicam,*
> *Aequus ubi fortisque animus defecerit. Ille*
> *Solus habet, qui sorte sua contentus ad arces*
> *Suspicit aethereas, ad easque aspirat anhelus.*[55]
>
> Nowhere will you find the peaceful and friendly place you are looking for,
> unless your mind is calm and strong. Only he
> can have such a mind, who lives content with his lot and
> looks up to heavenly fortresses breathing upon them.

Cantianus promotes equanimity by borrowing the phrase *animus aequus* (a balanced mind) from Horace's epistles (1.11.30). For Horace, equanimity included indifference to location and enabled a person to find happiness and freedom in any place and even in the middle of a crowded city, as freedom was found within.[56]

---

[53] Rostvig 1954: 7. For the influence of Stoic and Epicurean thought on the happy farmer tradition, see ibid. 46-56. Rostvig illustrates the difference between these two traditions by reference to Horace's second epode and Vergil's fourth eclogue: while Horace's happy farmer knows toil and sweat, Vergil's eclogue depicts rural life as an unrealistically careless ease and basically 'a perpetual garden party' (47) in the Epicurean tradition.

[54] Cf. IJsewijn & Sacré 1998: 47 (on praises of towns and regions).

[55] Cantianus 1729: p. 14, 305-308.

[56] McCarter 2015: 174 who identifies three major points in Horace's epistle 1.11: Equanimity was not produced by location; permanent isolation was undesirable, and equanimity helped to find happiness irrespective the place.

In Cantianus's satire the object of re-evaluation is not merely the way of life in different symbolic settings, but also the attitude of the isolate himself whose mindset – not serving anyone, obeying no necessity – is shown to be fallacious, since a human being is never free from outer forces. Cantianus's satire is thus Christian rather than simply Stoic in tone, underlining the human dependence on faith and fortune. This philosophical conclusion is reached by destroying the visionary norm of the countryside and replacing the rhetoric of praise by that of blame. The satirist aims to represent a truthful report of country life that should replace those false pastoral clichés and poetic dream visions usually attached to the ways the urban mind saw nature. The perceiver's expectations of total rural freedom are rejected as unrealistic and untrue. While isolation and solitude were usually sought with the aim of turning one's back to human vices, satires construed the circumstances so that this aim was never fulfilled, since it was impossible to realize the vision of happiness. The main target of criticism was the deceptive vision of the main character who had turned peasant life into an illusion far removed from reality.

Satire as a genre ruled out illusionary stories of easy living and aimed to act as an awakening helping recognise one's truest self. Satirical poetry was not about nature. It was about human beings and their epistemological falsity that distorted the ways they saw both the world outside, and themselves. The goal was to break illusions even if this meant destroying the utopian dreams of happiness and be fraught with pain. Although neo-Latin verse satirists appealed to personal morality and were usually interested in individual moral improvement, this condition did not necessarily mean that they would have completely turned away from interpersonal relations. The ethical purposes of narrating about solitude did not recommend a condition characterised by the absence of other human beings. While recording a movement from human culture to the state of solitude and isolation in nature, the poems observed that this condition was wishful thinking. It was impossible to travel to the imaginary countryside because human beings brought their evils with them to paradise. Thus, satirical rural poetry was primarily concerned with the ethics of the traveler.

Cantianus also wrote on other issues in his volume of satires. One of his satires deals with the political use of such words as enthusiasm, fanaticism, and other similar labels (*Enthusiasmus sermo*). His poem on the act of faith (*Actum fidei*) denounces those who are striving for nimious austerity and old-fashioned prejudices in religious issues. Cantianus had close connections with early eighteenth-century dissenters, and he probably contributed to such small dissenting periodicals as the *Occasional Paper* which advocated religious liberalism

and free enquiry.[57] In his religious satires, Cantianus is preoccupied with dissent thinking, reflecting concerns about religious liberty for dissenters and railing against those who in their zeal for the church persecute dissenters and neglect clemency and tolerance: *veri causam vi credis agendam / Cum soli fas sit rationi dedere mentem* ('you believe that you can advance the cause of truth by coercion, although it should be a matter of reason alone').[58] Employing traditional medical images Cantianus argues that those who appeal to the common good in justifying their harsh orthodox thinking are like bad doctors mistreating their patients; it is madness to medicate someone who is already healthy or amputate a completely fine leg; suffering does not cure the patient.

Cantianus objected to Anglican authorities who, while considering themselves infallible, attacked the use of reason and entailed the denial of the right for private judgement and religious liberty. Cantianus advises his readers to follow the example of Christ in carrying the cross but not tyrannically imposing it on others' shoulders. Apostles and early church fathers never believed in the power of the sword. Attempting to justify toleration Cantianus argues that men should – like the *agnus Dei* – be easy, gentle, and kind in their judgement. He seems to suggest that salvation is a matter of individual concern, and religious or civil powers should not propagate the gospel by force, compulsion, or persecution. The use of reason, private judgment and individual reading of the Bible are the preferred ways to strengthen faith and religiosity.[59] Cantianus's project was humane: it was crucial to distinguish oneself from the brute with the help of the human spirit (*mens, animus, sensus caelesti tractus ab arce*). His poem about the countryside can also be read allegorically against his preoccupation with religious toleration and bearing in mind the inconvenient situation of many dissenters in the countryside where they were subjected to the will of others.[60]

---

[57] See Thompson 2002.

[58] Cantianus 1729: p. 16.

[59] According to Rostvig, individualism characterised seventeenth-century thinking: 'a firm belief in the powers of the individual to establish his own way of life' and the exercise of one's private judgement (1954: 24-25). This general trend favoured the *beatus vir* tradition in which a human being practised solitary contemplation in privacy. This tradition is still visible in Cantianus's poem, but in a satirically subverted form.

[60] See Bradley 2005. Other hexameter poems in Cantianus's collection were entitled *Clerus satira*, *De morte, V. R. Gulielmi Tongii epistola*, and *Temere querentes*.

Return to Rome

One additional turn in the traditional antithesis between the city and the country was that the motif of fleeing Rome took on religious undertones, when the departure from the flawed city was interpreted in the Christian sense. We have already seen that neo-Latin satirists inherited many techniques from Christian satirists, including, for example, Tertullian's and Jerome's habit of depicting the contrast between the once glorious golden past and the moral decline of the present pagan Rome – a contrast that loosely resembled the Juvenalian nostalgia for the times when Chastity still lingered on earth compared to the morally decadent present.[61] The ethical commonplace of simple living continued in Christianity: Jerome rejected the confusion of Rome in favour of the peaceful countryside in his letters,[62] and in the manner of Juvenal's Umbricius he set out and travelled to Cyprus to leave behind the evils of luxurious Rome.[63]

Although satirists usually associated the corruption of the age with the city life – the city was a place of wealth, greed, and misery – as an urban genre satire needed the city's social context and its maddening crowds where human vices were visible. For example, in Sergardi's satires the city of Rome is one of the main protagonists. Sergardi offers satirical views of Roman customs and street scenes and deals with the idleness of young Romans. In his fifth satire, the poet is suggested that instead of attacking the reputation of one fellow he should declare a war on the excessive city. This suggestion is made by Barrus, one of the fellows met in Roman cafeteria, whose opinion of the city greatly resembles Juvenal's xenophobic attacks on the current success of former slaves who 'recently washed the hooves of mules in the stables'.[64] In satire seven, Sergardi describes the decadence of Rome during the carnival season.[65]

---

[61] See Sogno 2012: 368; Juv. 6.1-2.

[62] Wiesen 1964: 29 (see, e.g., Jerome's Letter 43.3).

[63] Wiesen 1964: 32.

[64] Sergardi 1994: 42 (trans. Ronald E. Pepin).

[65] See also Niccolò Villani (1590-1636), an Italian philologist and poet, who published his two Latin satires (*Nos canimus surdis* and *Satyra dij vestram fidem* containing 531 verses) anonymously; the poems were directed against the corrupt Rome. In his notes to the latter poem, the author writes that he did not know the satires of Persius or Juvenal at all, and that he had read the satires of Horace only at school. In Venice, however, he received a volume of Persius' satires (edited by Casaubon) from his friend Caspar Barlaeus (1584-1648). Inspired by the gift he wrote his own satire on the journey in about twenty days. He gave his satire in return to his friend to thank him.

Occasionally, however, the earlier preference for the moral superiority of the countryside was reformulated and replaced by a shift toward a renewed Christian city. This turn reflected the recurring human dream of the eternal and holy city, one of whose names was Rome.[66] The Bible has been called a story that 'begins with a garden and ends with a city',[67] and on this basis the satirists also began to rethink the image of the city. For example, Guglielmini's third satire (1.3) opens with a reference to Juvenal's third satire in which Umbricius is leaving Rome because he prefers Cumae to the capital city, but then the poem changes direction.[68] Guglielmini's poet abandons the pagan city and enters the new Christian Rome which is no longer the same corrupt city as it was in the age of Juvenal and Umbricius. Rome has become a center of the arts, and the old pagan marbles have collapsed:

Multis Umbricius causis, quas tristis Aquinas
Saepe tibi attonito numeravit, abibat ab Urbe:
Multis te causis hortabor in Urbe morari.
Relligio (sic) mores mutavit, et omnia Sancti
Principis exemplo nota et virtute reguntur.
Non impune datum est peccare, aut nectere fraudes.
Crede, locus meritis non ullus apertior Urbe
Roma, non ullus Roma est doctisque probisque
Utilior.[69]

Umbricius had many reasons to leave the City;
these reasons have been enumerated to your stunning mind by the sad poet from D'Aquino,
However, I urge you to stay in the City for many reasons.
Religion has changed the habits, and everything
is guided by the papal example and his known virtue.
One can no longer sin without punishment, or intrigue.

---

[66] See Mack 1969: 3.

[67] Mack 1969: 3.

[68] See also Carlo Ingami's satire *Sermo ad Diodorum Romam relicturum* (originally from the *Arcadum carmina*). A modern edition is available in Campanelli 2021: 446-457, with an Italian translation. The poet here expresses his sad feelings and mourns when his friend is leaving Rome.

[69] Guglielmini 1742: I.3, p. 12.

> Believe me, no place is more receptive to merit than
> Rome, no place is more useful to the learned and virtuous than Rome.

As there once were many reasons for Umbricius to flee the city, there are now as many reasons for Faustus, the addressee of the poem, to stay, since religion has entirely changed the moral atmosphere of Rome. Everything is now guided by the exemplary virtue of Pope, and sinners are punished according to his divine principles. In consequence, no place is as receptive to virtue as the once corrupt Rome; it is useless to travel elsewhere from the new visionary Rome, which offers everything for the learned and the honorable mind.

Guglielmini also discusses the changed moral state of Rome in his satire 1.4 in which the main theme is the importance of philosophical meditation. The poet argues that if Caesar would return to his old hometown, he would not recognise it as his own:

> *… si quis fortasse rediret*
> *Caesar, ubi sua tecta, suos ubi quaereret hortos,*
> *Balnea, naumachias, turres, templa, amphitheatra?*
> *Rudera nil praeter pavidus spectaret in Urbe*
> *Non Urbem inveniens, non se, non ossa suorum.*[70]

> … if Caesar happened to return one day,
> where would he look for his house, where his gardens,
> baths, sea battles, towers, temples, amphitheatres?
> Frightened, he would see nothing but broken stones in the City,
> without finding the City, without finding himself, without finding the bones of his people.

The poet describes how the city has lost its previous pagan character. The world is constantly changing. The earth and the stone change, and so do the people who are only dust and shadow (*pulvis et umbra*).[71] The poem describes the continuous flow of times: those who were once young are now old and cannot see without the looking-glass. Everybody suffers either from gout, asthma, or hearing impediments. While people are worn like old clothes, the only thing that has remained unchanged is God whose eternal wisdom everyone should rely

[70] Guglielmini 1742: I.4, p. 18.

[71] See Horace, *Carmina* 4.7.16.

on in all circumstances. If in Horace's epistle 1.7 Volteius wanted to return to his former life in the city, because the farm did not provide him happiness, here Guglielmini presents another version of the traditional topos of return: there is no need to resume one's earlier conditions, since the new Rome is suggestive of a final imperishable rule and the Golden Age returned. It promotes all the virtues of the mind, and what was lost is now recovered. The city is a mirror that reflects human nature, and finally, peace is found within, regardless of external circumstances.

Conclusions on the Limits of Satire

The aim of satire to improve the addressee's life is one key to its continued relevance for modern readers. Although the moral function of the genre has dominated satiric theory for centuries, the value of ethical advice has gained new significance in our age with the newly found emphasis on the good life and well-being. The moral wisdom offered by satire is today again significant, since we are constantly in the process of improving our lives, exercising self-control, and idealising images of ourselves. Even simple moral precepts, brief moral sayings, and proverbs (*sententiae*) familiar especially from Persius' satire – and having an influence on later satire – can be appreciated in an age that is used to a similar aphoristic style in self-help literature. Using its own peculiar moral language and negative examples, satire offers practical moral wisdom and aims to answer the eternally perplexing question of 'What shall I do?' that every reader must answer in his or her own life. In addition to the continued relevance of questions related to individual morality, some traditional branches of ethics offer opportunities for topical reinterpretations. For example, the Horatian ethics of contentment have a significant relevance in our age.

The moral content remained crucial in early modern neo-Latin satire, which was essentially playful ethical instruction in verse. Satires reveal the evils of their objects by reflecting them like a mirror, illuminating their vices with a satirical lantern, observing humanity through a satirical telescope from a critical distance, or opening the concealed and shameful ills of people for all to see at a satirical autopsy. In my reading, I have played along with the neo-Latin satirists' lessons and endeavoured to take the satirists at their word by seriously considering their understanding of satire as an interactive moral form. Throughout this book, I have asked what the good life is that neo-Latin verse satire – seriously or ironically – was proposing to its readers through its moral inquiry. I have explored why neo-Latin verse satires are worth studying as ethically significant literature that counsel their readers to perform self-examination and help them to find their way through the moral thicket of life. I have argued that the corrective educational element of satire has been needlessly dismissed or undermined as an old-fashioned and self-evident element that does not deserve further study.

I have drawn attention to the tone and language of satirical moral criticism, which is often formulated with an imperative mood. The satirist approaches his addressee by evaluating his actions and presenting what ought to be done to live an ethical life. The use of imperatives and prohibitions is characteristic of

the satirical ethics compared with, for example, ancient Greek ethical thinking in which the leading notions are not those of obligations but those of virtue, goodness, and happiness.[1] The satirist usually urges his recipient to either stop or improve his current lifestyle. In an ideal world, imperative terms would not be needed; however, in satires moral standards are necessary since the poems construct a situation in which vices and barbarism are either dominant (Lubinus) or contrary motivations are present (Guglielmini). Consequently, it is important to guide the young reader towards a morally sound conclusion. The satires discussed in this book often address young men who were searching for their own paths of development, and there was a deliberative conflict about their future life, which the satirist tried to influence by presenting his views of 'morally imperative' or 'morally wrong'. Satirists formulated their ethical precepts as commandments imposed by an authoritative father-figure and included overt advice and suggestions for youths to act in a certain manner or to avoid doing something forbidden.

Many modern philosophers have objected to such imperative notions in ethical discourse, since it uses 'a bogus air of authority'[2] and creates a mood of 'slave morality'.[3] In Christian satires, ethical standards may be simply based on divine law and the authority of the Bible. Many neo-Latin satires typically base their commandments on a wider range of authorities, including previous satirists, church fathers, and other writers. The commandments were not necessarily always imposed on a person from outside; instead, satirical deliberation was sometimes presented as an internal conversation when the motivations of the young addressees were divided between richness and poetry, or other issues. Usually, the language of duties was predominant compared to more attractive notions such as virtue, but sometimes discussions on virtue replaced the satirical emphasis on duties and obligations when satires became preoccupied with the ethics of virtue.

By introducing conversation partners into the poems, satires at times evince the dialogical method that Mikhail Bakhtin famously describes in his *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. It consists of 'a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices'.[4] Bakhtin announces that a polyphonic novel embodies a dialogic sense of truth that is not comprehended by a single authorial consciousness but requires a plurality of

[1] White 2004: 82 (citing Julia Annas).

[2] White 2004: 85.

[3] White 2004: 85 (citing Nietzsche).

[4] Bakhtin 1999: 6.

consciousnesses which are combined but not merged in the unity of the event. In Bakhtin's view, Menippean satire uses a technique of unmerged pluralistic voices which engage different intersecting perspectives and take up embodied personal qualities. Menippean satire represents a plurality of equally valid consciousnesses that create a dialogic sense of truth. The dialogic form has its philosophical background in Plato's dialogues and in the Socratic thinking that was for Bakhtin one of the main influences behind the later polyphonic novels. While verse satire is often contrasted with its Menippean counterpart and labelled as a monologue form dominated by a single authorial speaker, it can also reproduce conversational methods.[5] Dialogues can be direct reported discourses of partners or interlocutors, or indirect conversations in which the satirist uses second-person narration in order to voice the addressee's inner thoughts from his youthful point of view.

In addition to general moralising and literary topics, neo-Latin verse satirists were particularly interested in philosophical, medical, and religious themes. For example, in ancient Greece and Rome as well as in later neo-Latin satire the praise of poverty contributed to ethical and political discourses and to literary narratives rather than to economic questions. The ethical praises of poverty were addressed to an individual who was expected to pursue virtue as his most important goal. As William Desmond, who has studied the Cynic praise of poverty, has noted, 'throughout Greek history, the most typical economic proposals involve curtailing invidious desires . . .'.[6] If any political actions were suggested, they were related to a more just distribution of wealth. The Cynics simplified their lives as much as possible, for example, by simplifying their diet. They thought that nature provided enough for necessary needs and embraced a voluntary simplicity that was later also extolled by many neo-Latin satirists.

Greed was treated in terms of crossing the moral boundary. In addition to the criticisms discussed above, we can refer to the Jesuit Carlo d'Aquino who illustrated this human propensity for richness with stories about voyages of discovery. In his sixth satire, d'Aquino reminded merchants of the dangers of long-distance commerce. Stories about the abundance of riches and treasures of the New World – mountains of gold and sapphires – allured European merchants

[5] Verse satires were also sometimes presented as conversations or dramatised in space 'internal contradictions and internal stages in the development of a single person - forcing a character to converse with his own double, with the devil, with his alter ego, with his own caricature', as Bakhtin (1999: 28) put it in Dostoevsky's case. On early modern Menippean satire, see De Smet 1996.

[6] Desmond 2006: 5.

who supplied their ships with various vendibles – shoes, socks, trousers, and coats – and travelled to America without understanding the costs of their expenditures. They were ready to risk their lives and souls for gain (*Vitam animamque vovent lucro*). The same theme was continued in his seventh satire warning his friend Ponticus not to take the same wrong step.

The New World was often introduced in the early modern period as an object of human curiosity and appetite for everything that was new; instead of exposing epistemic limits the emphasis here was on the human desire for riches and false trust in one's invulnerability. Lorenzo Lippi already referred to the problems of travelling in his fourth satire, and as IJsewijn also notes, ships, long-distance travelling, and new inventions were often used as symbols for crossing the boundaries set to men by the gods and thus leading to misfortunes.[7] On a general moral level, d'Aquino's warnings were also related to the long discussion of not exceeding one's proper limits. Cicero in his paradoxes (20) had maintained that to sin is like crossing boundary lines, and according to Stoicism all sins were equal and crossing the line was crucial, not how far you went. In the Erasmian concept of piety it was also important to develop an awareness of the limits of human understanding.[8] The point was that humans must learn to accept their limit, as only gods lived a carefree life. It was important to learn to impose limits on ambition and desire, as self-limitation is necessary for a virtuous life. Accordingly, satires often represented ethically excessive modes of life and men who were unable to impose an ending on their desires in different areas of life.[9] Contentment meant having enough for satisfactory life. This advice has some lasting value: no human being is poor who rejects the superfluous and has at their command all the necessities of life, which nature has ordained should be exceedingly small.

It can be said that neo-Latin verse satirists were often strongly influenced by tradition and dealt with the same issues as their ancient and medieval predecessors. Favourite classical themes included greed and luxury as well as articulation on the poetics of satire and satirical freedom. Often satire took the form of philosophical pondering on virtues and vices. Religious reforms and struggles played an important role in the re-emergence of the anti-clerical satire on hypocrisy and ignorance that had been common in the Middle Ages, but now with more specific,

[7] IJsewijn 1978: 43.

[8] Rummel 2006.

[9] Novius in Horace (1.6.42) represented a new man who exceeded his proper limits in speech and in his insufficient verbal restraint.

often Catholic or Jesuit, targets. Protestantism gave prominence to imaginative forms of religion. Reformation satires reflected the centrality of the Scriptures for Reformers and revealed how the Protestants were enchanted by the biblical myths and the figures of the Antichrist, the devil, and other archaic monsters. Satirists placed their contemporary events in the greater narrative of redemption. They structured reality with the help of Christian myth, using flood stories and creation accounts from the Genesis, and the Apocalypse to criticise their own times and contemporary enemies. Satires were set in biblical places and borrowed material from the Scriptures. This was one way to support the biblical truth, reflecting the centrality of the word for the Reformation movement.

Exemplary discourse is one of the most important features of neo-Latin satire, and together with its characteristic didacticism allows us to consider satire as a socially integrative genre. Satirists were constantly occupied with the moral improvement of their readers, usually ridiculing vicious action but sometimes also more straightforwardly teaching virtuous conduct with reference to historical figures worth emulating. Sergardi and Guglielmini extolled virtuous popes and Roman monuments, and thereby constructed an image of an idealised Christian community. They described the participatory festivities of Arcadia in which all men sang in unison and depicted how these local festivities and performances made a powerful emotional impact upon their audiences. As Tim Whitmarsh has aptly noted in his studies on the social contexts of ancient Greek literature, 'topography is never innocent',[10] and this also pertains to satirical eulogies. Satires were not just representations of social disputes or beautiful monuments; instead, by way of these descriptions they helped to imagine and invent communities of virtuous and like-minded men who devoted their lives to piety and poetry. This construction was not inclusive, since it often excluded women, foreigners, and other marginal groups. In his praises of popes, Sergardi extolled their genealogies and described how they invested money on the public buildings. The poems were conscious of the relationship between the pagan past and the Christian present. The architectural splendor of the new Christian Rome articulated its new values, and poets like Sergardi and Guglielmini devoted their books to their papal patrons and accordingly participated in the political act of representing certain values and what was considered to be truly worth praising. Although often identifying themselves with poor farmers or outsiders of their times, satirists engaged in elite perspectives, promoted the dominance of the papal rule, and supported the construction of political, moral, and religious identities of their communities.

[10] Whitmarsh 2004: 173.

Satire also has its limits that reflect its admittedly male-centred and stereotypic moralism. Satires were exchanged between friends who were familiar with the conventions of the genre. Satires were used to consolidate friendship, but they also created boundaries between insiders and outsiders. Writing satire was a patriotic effort that often was suspicious about the Jews or foreigners and thus consolidated social hierarchies. It was also almost exclusively a male affair and we have very few traces of female satirists in the neo-Latin context. Ingrid De Smet mentions that the British natural philosopher Ann Baynard (1672-1697) wrote some biting verses in Latin, but these poems have been lost.[11] In contrast, satires include many misogynistic passages that imitating Juvenal's sixth satire complain about female manners. While authorising his own poetic vocation Naogeorg asks why he should remain merely a listener amidst such fervent book industry, when everyone from women to artisans want to publish something. Nomi's satires include several Juvenalian misogynistic discussions of women. His satire 7 complains about bad female servants, and satire twelve suggests that women's deaths should not be too much bemoaned. In his satire fourteen, Nomi claims that women remain decent if they live in the countryside, but when they move to small towns, they are immediately corrupted.[12] Sergardi attacked women, for example, in his long satire seventeen and wanted them to be excluded from his dear Arcadia which was otherwise characterised as a haven of poets. In Vienna, Premlechner ridiculed gender instability and the mixing of the sexes when men, following the latest fashion, were dressed in women's clothes and their Achillean manhood was hiding under a female dress (*Achilles / Femineo rursus lateat coopertus amictu*).[13] In Poland, Poninski derided the tyranny of female love in his fifth satire, whereas in Germany Balde ridiculed female quacks. Guglielmini gave advise to young men on marriage and the proper qualities of women. Scholirius's sixth satire, although modelled after Juvenal's sixth satire, also deals with female virtue and the happiness of married life; its positive views on the institution of marriage were an exception in the tradition.

Another notable feature in the satires was that the poets did not necessarily live as they taught. Anecdotes and biographical details of their lives have preserved many stories about their difficult temper or other 'vices' that sometimes led them into conflicts with their rival poets or the judicial system; Muret escaped prison and execution, but Frischlin, for example, met an unhappy end while attempting

[11] De Smet 2015: 209.

[12] Nomi 1703: XIV, p. 175; also Citroni Marchetti 1976: 40.

[13] Premlechner 1789: 127.

to escape from prison: ‘by ropes not strong enough to support him, he fell down a prodigious precipice, and was dashed to pieces among the rocks’.[14] Addressing his readers in satire 23, Restić concludes that they will never learn anything about his life by reading his poems for the poems give only a preliminary picture of his thinking – a painting is never but started. One reason for this is also the constant irony that always permeates even the most serious satires. As we read them, we must note that indignation was a comic technique. When the satirist holds up an ironic mirror to reality the image is at once realistic and playful.

[14] Chalmers 1812-17: s.v. Frischlin.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Agricola, Rudolph (1539/1515) *De inventione dialectica*. Cologne.
Anisio, Giano (1531) *Iani Anysii Satyrae, ad Pompeium Columnam Cardinalem*. Naples.
Anon. (1702) *Satira in Poetastros O-c---enses.* London.
Anon. (1670) *Satyra Batavica*. https://diglib.hab.de/drucke/gp-455-19s/start.htm
Anon. (1650) *Satyra Manneiana in Jejunos quosdam Philologos*. Amsterdam.
Anon. (1640) *Satyrae seriae*. London.
Aquino, Caroli de (1703) *Satyrae XII*, in *Carminum Tomus III*. Rome.
Augurelli, Giovanni Aurelio (1505) *Sermonum libri I-II*. Venice.
Balde, Jacob (1660) *Iacobi Balde e Societate Iesu Poematum tomus III, complectens Satyrica*. Cologne. (Includes: *Dissertatio praevia, De studio poetico*; *Vultuosae Torvitatis Encomium*; *Medicinae Gloria per Satyras XXII asserta*; *Satyra contra Abusum Tabaci*; *Antagathyrsus*).
Balde, Jacob (1661) *Solatium Podagricorum*. Munich.
Balde, Jacob (1662) *De eclipse solari*. Munich.
Balde, Jacob (1990) *Opera poetica omnia.* Tom. IV, *Satyrica*. W. Kühlmann & H. Wiegand (eds.) Neudruck der Ausgabe München 1729. Texte der frühen Neuzeit 1. Frankfurt am Main.
Barth, Caspar von (1612) *Satirarum liber unus*. Hanau.
Bartholin, Thomas (1669) *De medicis poetis dissertatio*. Copenhagen.
Bebel, Heinrich (1512) *Satyricum carmen H. Bebelii Iustingensis in nefandos nostrae tempestatis mores, et contra detractores pessimos*, in *Opuscula nova*. Strasbourg.
Bielski, Joachim (1577/1578) *Satyra in quendam Dantiscarum*, in Jan Łasicki, *Clades Dantiscanorum*. Frankfurt.
Billet, Pierre Paul (1703) *Satyrarum liber unus. Opusculorum Miscellaneorum Latino sermone scriptorum pars prima*. Madrid.
Brasch, Martin (1598) *Satyrae primae Horatianae, quae est de vitiis hominum usitatissimis paraphrasis oratoria insertis singulis Poetae verbis*. Rostock.
Cantianus, Umbritius (1729) *Poemata*. London.
Casaubon, Isaac (1605) *Isaaci Casauboni De Satyrica Graecorum poesi, & Romanorum Satira libri duo.* Paris.
Casaubon, Isaac (1780) *Auli Persii Flacci Satyrarum liber, ex recensione Isaaci Casauboni fideliter expressus*. Mannheim.

Censorius, Curius (Philipp Frenking) (1610) *Satira Vestispica*. Christling.
Cerri, Antonio (1607) *Satyrarum scholasticarum centuriae duae*. Rimini.
Chytraeus, Nathan (1578) *Contra pestem epistola satyrica*. Rostock.
Chorier, Nicolas (1770) *Aloisiae Sigeae Toletanae satyra sotadica de arcanis amoris et veneris*. Birmingham or Paris.
Correr, Gregorio (1430/1991) *Liber satyrarum*, in *Opere* I, ed. A. Onorato. Messina.
Curillus, Marius (1758) *Satyrae*. Groningen. See also Heerkens.
Dousa, Janus (1570) *Iani Douzae Satyrae*. Antwerp.
Erasmus, Desiderius (1985) *De Pueris Instituendis*, in *Literary and Educational Writings* 4, ed. J.K. Sowards. Toronto.
Esseiva, Petrus (1872) *Ad Iuvenem satira*. Amsterdam.
Fabricius, Vincent (1638) *Satyra, Pransus paratus, In Poetas, & eorum Contemptores*. Amsterdam.
Falco, Jaime Juan (1600) *Opera poetica*. Madrid.
Filelfo, Francesco (1502) *Francisci Philelphi Satyrarum Hecatostichon*. Venice.
Frischlin, Nicodemus (1568) *Oratio de dignitate et multiplici utilitate poeseos*. Tübingen.
Frischlin, Nikodemus (1578/1580) *Oratio de vita rustica*. Tübingen.
Frischlin, Nikodemus (1612) *Adversus Jacobum Rabum, Novitium Catholicum, Apostatam impiissimum, eiusque Calumnias, quibus sinceriores hoc tempore Theologos plerosque insectatus est: Satyrae Octo*. http://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?PPN780464796
Furich, Johann Nicolaus (1624) *Satyrae*, in *Poemata miscellanea*. Strasbourg.
Geldenhouwer, Gerard (1515) *Gerardi Noviomagi Satyrae octo ad Verae Religionis cultores*. Leuven.
Guglielmini, Bernardus (1742) *Sermonum libri tres*. Rome.
Hassensteinius, Bohuslaus (2006) *Ad sanctum Venceslaum satira, in qua mores procerum, nobilium et popularium patriae suae reprehendit*, in M. Vaculínová (ed.), Bohvslavs Hassensteinivs a Lobkowicz, *Opera poetica*. Leipzig: 23-30. (Also available in his *Farrago poematum*, ed. Thomas Mitis, 1570.)
Havraeus, Joannes (1627) *Arx virtutis*. Antwerp.
Havre, Jan van (2014) *La Citadelle de la vertu ou la véritable tranquillité de l'âme. Arx virtutis sive de vera animi tranquillitate*, ed. Stéphane Mercier. Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, XXXVII. Leuven.
Heerkens, see Curillus, Marius.
Heinsius, Daniel (1629) *Qvintvs Horativs Flaccvs. Accedunt nunc DANIELIS HEINSII De Satyra Horatiana Libri duo, in quibus totum Poetae institutum & genius expenditur.* Leiden.

Hogaeus, Guilielmus (1685) *Satyra sacra in vanitatem mundi et rerum humanarum sive paraphrasis in Ecclesiasten poetica.* London.

Hortensius, Lambertus (1552) *Satyrae VIII*. Utrecht.

Iriarte, Juan de (1774) *Merdidum Matritense, sive de Matriti sordibus, carmen affectum*, in *Obras sueltas de D. Juan de Yriarte*, Vol I. Madrid.

King, Robert (1647) *Satyra Aethiopica*, in *Catena, sive Elegiae quatuor*. London.

King, William (1739) *Sermo pedestris*. London.

Koch, Johann Christian (1716) *Observatio XLI … De Satyra e Re Literaria eliminanda*, *Miscellanea Lipsiensia*, II. Leipzig: 582-614.

Kuntschke, Johann Georg (1716) *Observatio XLII … Quid de Satyris sentiendum?*, *Miscellanea Lipsiensia*, II. Leipzig: 615-620.

Landino, Christoforo (1482/1486) *Horatii Opera*. Venice.

Lauremberg, Johann (1684) *Satyra elegantissima, qua rerum bonarum abusus & vitia quaedam seculi perstringuntur*. Kiel.

L'Hospital, Michel de (1585) *Epistolarum seu sermonum libri sex*. Paris.

Lippi da Colle, Lorenzo (1978) *Satyrae V ad Laurentium Medicem*, ed. J. IJsewijn. *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 27: 18-44.

Lubinus, Eilhardus (1614) *The true and readie way to learne the Latine tongue attested by three excelently learned and approved authours of three nations, viz. Eilhardus Lubinus, a German, Mr. Richard Carew, of Anthony in Cornwall, the French Lord of Montaigne: presented to the unpartiall, both publick and private considerations fo those that seek the advancement of learning in those nations, by Samuel Hartlib*.

Lubinus, Eilhardus (1618) *Declamationes satyricae tres*. Rostock.

Lucchesini, Giovanni Lorenzo (1672) *Specimen didascalici carminis et satyrae*. Rome.

Major, William (1735) *Satyrae quatuor*. London.

Major, William (1743) *Four Satires*. London.

Marescotti, Caesar (1723) *De variolis tractatus.* Bonn.

Mertz, J.J. (1989) *Jesuit Latin Poets of the 17th and 18th Centuries: An Anthology of Neo-Latin Poetry*, eds. J.P. Murphy & J. IJsewijn. Wauconda.

Minturno, Antonio Sebastiano (1970/1559) *De poeta*. Poetiken des Cinquecento, Bd. 5. Munich.

Montanus, Petrus (1529) *Satyrae*. Strasbourg.

Morcelli, Stefano Antonio (1784) *Sermonum libri II*. Rome.

Muret, Marc-Antoine (1552/1757) *Marci Antonii Mureti Juvenilia*. Leiden.

Muret, Marc-Antoine (2006) *The Iuvenilia of Marc-Antoine Muret*, ed. & trans. Kirk M. Summers. Columbus.

Naogeorg, Thomas (1553/2015) *Regnum papisticum*, in Thomas Naogeorg, *Sämtliche Werke*, Bd. 6:1, ed. H.-G. Roloff. Berlin.
Naogeorg, Thomas (1555) *Satyrarum libri quinque priores*. Basel.
Naogeorg, Thomas (1559) *In catalogum haereticorum nuper Romae editum satyra*, in *Regnum Papisticum.* Basel.
Naogeorg, Thomas (1559) *In Ioannem del'la Casa, Archiepiscopum Beneventanum, Sodomiae patronum, satyra,* in *Regnum Papisticum.* Basel.
Nicolaus, Franciscus (1772) *Carmina*. Naples.
Nomi, Federico (1703) *Liber satyrarum sexdecim*. Leiden.
Oldenburger, Philipp Andreas (1669) *Satyra in Eubulum Theosdatum Sarckmasium*. Hohenelbe.
Pasch, Georg (1707) *De variis modis moralia tradendi*. Kiel.
Poliziano, Angelo (1613) *In Persium praelectio*, in *Auli Persii Flacci Satyrae*. Paris.
Pollius, Johannes (1540) *Ioannis Pollii Vvesphali poetae lepidissimi opuscula, piissima & eruditissima, in primis autem nostrae aetati appositissima*. Zurich.
Poninski, Antoni (Johann Maximilian Krolikiewicz) (1741) *Sarmatides seu satyrae.* Warsaw.
Pontanus, Jacobus (1594) *Jacobi Pontani de Societate Jesu Poeticarum institutionum libri tres. Eiusdem tyrocinium poeticum.* Ingolstadt.
Premlechner, Ioannes Baptista (1789) *Lucubrationes poeticae et oratoriae*. Vienna.
Restius, Junius de (1816) *Satyrarum liber*, in *Poemata*. Padua.
Sangenesius, Ioannes (1654) *Poemata*. Paris.
Scholirius, Petrus (1683) *Sermonum familiarium libri III*, ed. Albert le Roy. Antwerp.
Sectanus, Quintus (1698) *Satyrae in Phylodemum*. Cologne. See also Sergardi.
Sergardi, Lodovico (1783) *Ludovici Sergardii antehac Q. Sectani Satyrae*. Lucca.
Sergardi, Lodovico (1994) *The Satires of Lodovico Sergardi*, ed. & trans. Ronald E. Pepin. New York. See also Sectanus.
Stiblin, Kaspar (1562) *Ad reverendiss. et illustrissimum principem, Fridericum D. G. Episcopum Herbipolensem … Satyra in sicarios ac impiissimos latrones….* Dillingen.
Strozzi, Tito Vespasiano (1530) *Titi Vespasiani Strozae Sermonum liber*. Paris.
Tribraco, Gaspare (1972) *Satirarum liber, dedicato al duca Borso d'Este*. Ed. Giuseppe Venturini. Ferrara.
Urceus, Antonius Codrus (1506) *Satyrae*. Venice.
Vadian, Joachim (1518) *De poetica et carminis ratione*. Vienna.
Valeriano, Pierio (1509) *Sermo de studiorum conditione ad Nardinum*. *Praeludia*. Venice.

Vasconcelos, Francisco Botello de Moraes y (1739) *Satyrae*. Salamanca.
Villani, Niccolò (ca. 1629) *Satyra dij vestram fidem*. http://diglib.hab.de/drucke/545-1-quod-1/start.htm
Volpi, Giovanni Antonio (1577) *Ad Hieronymum Dandinum Episcopum Forocorneliensem*, in *Carmina illustrium poetarum Italorum II*. Paris.
Wichgreve, Albert (1599) *Satura in vetullam, ex cujus nomine per Anagrammatismum Ah Vituli mater*. Rostock.

Secondary sources

Alfano, G. (2015) *La satira in versi. Storia di un genere letterario europeo*. Rome.
Alter, R. (1985) *The Art of Biblical Poetry*. New York.
Atherton, C. (ed.) (1998) *Form and Content in Didactic Poetry*. Bari.
Augustijn, C. (1978) 'Gerard Geldenhouwer und die religiöse Toleranz', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 69: 132-156.
Bachvarova, M.R., D. Dutsch & A. Suter (eds.) (2016) *The Fall of Cities in the Mediterranean. Commemoration in Literature, Folk-Song, and Liturgy*. Cambridge.
Bakhtin, M. (1999) *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics.* Minnesota.
Baragetti, S. (2012) *I poeti e l'Accademia. Le 'Rime degli Arcadi' (1716-1781)*. Milan.
Barbour, J.D. (2004) *The Value of Solitude. The Ethics and Spirituality of Aloneness in Autobiography*. Charlottesville.
Barnes, R.B. (1988) *Prophecy and Gnosis. Apocalypticism in the Wake of the Lutheran Reformation*. Stanford.
Bebermeyer, G. (1967/1927) *Tübinger Dichterhumanisten Bebel/Frischlin/Flayder*. Hildesheim.
Becker-Cantarino, B. (ed.) (1985) *Satire in der Frühen Neuzeit*. *Daphnis* 14:4. Amsterdam.
Behrens, D. (1986) 'Jakob Baldes Auffassung von der Satire', in *Jakob Balde und seine Zeit. Akten des Ensisheimer Kolloquiums, 15.–16. Oktober 1982*, ed. J.-M. Valentin. Bern: 109-126.
Bejczy, I. (2000) 'Die Institutio scholae Christianae von Gerard Geldenhouwer. Kritische Ausgabe mit Kommentar', *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 49: 55-87.
Berrigan, J.R. (1973) '*Gregorii Corrarii Veneti Liber Satyrarum*', *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 22: 10-38.
Best, T.W. (1985) 'Luther, Hutten, and Glossarial Satire', in *Satire in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. B. Becker-Cantarino. Amsterdam: 647-671.

Blanchard, W.S. (1990) 'O miseri philologi! Codro Urceo's Satire on Professionalism and Its Context', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 20:1, 91-122.

Blanchard, W.S. (2007) 'Patrician Sages and the Humanist Cynic. Francesco Filelfo and the Ethics of World Citizenship', *Renaissance Quarterly* 60: 1107-69.

Boyle, M.O. (1981) *Christening Pagan Mysteries. Erasmus in Pursuit of Wisdom*. Toronto.

Bradley, J.E. (2005) 'The Public, Parliament and the Protestant Dissenting Deputies, 1732-1740', *Parliamentary History* 24:1, 71-90.

Bradshaw, C. (1996) 'David or Josiah? Old Testament Kings as Exemplars in Edwardian Religious Polemics', in *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe 2, The Later Reformation*, ed. B. Gordon. Brookfield: 77-90.

Bramble, J.C. (1974) *Persius and the Programmatic Satire. A Study in Form and Imagery*. Cambridge.

Branham, R.B. & M.-O. Goulet-Cazé (eds.) (1996) *The Cynics. The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*. Berkeley.

Braund, S.M. & C. Gill (eds.) (1997) *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*. Cambridge.

Brieger, A. (1934) *Kain und Abel in der deutschen Dichtung*. Berlin.

Brummack, J. (1971) 'Zu Begriff und Theorie der Satire', *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 45 (Mai): 275-377.

Burke, P. (2011) 'Exemplarity and Anti-exemplarity in Early Modern Europe', in *The Western Time of Ancient History. Historiographical Encounters with the Greek and Roman Past*, ed. A. Lianeri. Cambridge: 48-59.

Campanelli, M. (2021) *'Eja age dic satyram'. La Musa pedestre nel Bosco Parrasio.* Rome.

Carini, I. (1891) *L'Arcadia dal 1690 al 1890*. Rome.

Carpenter, S. (2016) 'Performing the Scriptures. Biblical Drama after the Reformation', in *Staging Scripture. Biblical Drama, 1350-1600*, ed. P. Happé. Boston: 12-41.

Chalmers, A. (1812-17) *The General Biographical Dictionary*. https://words.fromoldbooks.org/Chalmers-Biography

Cian, V. (1954) *La satira*. Milan.

Citroni Marchetti, S. (1976) 'Le satire latine di Federico Nomi e di Ludovico Sergardi: Aspetti dell'eredità di Giovenale alla fine del '600', *Studi Seicenteschi* XVII: 33-60.

Classen, C.J. (1976) 'Barocke Zeitkritik in antikem Gewande. Bemerkungen zu den medizinischen Satiren des "Teutschen Horatius" Jacob Balde S. J. ', *Daphnis* 5:1, 67-125.

Colclough, D. (1999) '*Parrhesia*: The Rhetoric of Free Speech in Early Modern England', *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 17:2, 177-212.

Daae, L. (1884) *Om humanisten og satirikeren Johan Lauremberg*. Christiania.

Davidson, C. (2016) 'Memory and Remembering. Sacred History and the York Plays', in *Staging Scripture. Biblical Drama, 1350-1600*, ed. P. Happé. Boston: 334-359.

De Decker, J. (1913) *Juvenalis declamans. Étude sur la rhétorique declamatoire dans les satires de Juvénal*. Gand.

De Smet, I. (1996) *Menippean Satire and the Republic of Letters, 1581-1655*. Geneva.

De Smet, I. (2015) 'Satire', in *The Oxford Handbook of Neo-Latin*, eds. S. Knight & S. Tilg. Oxford: 199-214.

De Smet, I. (2019) 'How the Sauce Got to be Better than the Fish: Scholarship and Rivalry in Isaac Casaubon's Studies of Ancient Satire', *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* 4:3, 275-315.

De Smet, R. (ed.) (1994) *La satire humaniste*. *Actes du Colloque international des 31 mars, 1er et 2 avril 1993*. Brussels.

Desmond, W.D. (2006) *The Greek Praise of Poverty. The Origins of Ancient Cynicism*. Notre Dame.

Deupmann, C. (2002) *"Furor satiricus". Verhandlungen über literarische Aggression im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert.* Tübingen.

Dingel, I. (1993) 'Thomas Müntzer', *Deutsche Dichter der frühen Neuzeit (1450-1600). Ihr Leben und Werk*, ed. S. Füssel. Berlin: 389-405.

Duhl, O.A. (2013) 'Poetic Theory and Sense Perception in Jodocus Badius Ascensius's *Stultiferae naues* (1500 0.S.) From *Subitus calor* to *vituperatio*', in *The Art of Arguing in the World of Renaissance Humanism*, eds. M. Laureys & R. Simons. Leuven: 51-68.

Duyndam, J. (2008-09) 'Girard and Levinas, Cain and Abel, Mimesis and the Face', *Contagion: Journal of Violence*, *Mimesis*, *and Culture* 15/16: 237-248.

Edwards, C. (1999) 'The Suffering Body: Philosophy and Pain in Seneca's *Letters*', in *Constructions of the Classical Body*, ed. J.I. Porter. Ann Arbor: 252-268.

Eggers, M. (2007) 'Die Didaktik des schlechten Beispiels und die Antipädagogik Heinrich von Kleists', in *Das Beispiel. Epistemologie des Exemplarischen*, eds. J. Ruchatz, S. Willer & N. Pethes. Berlin: 241-260.

Engelhardt, D. (1992) 'Systematische Überlegungen zum Verhältnis von Medizin und Literatur im Zeitalter des Barock', in *Heilkunde und Krankheitserfahrung in der frühen Neuzeit*, eds. U. Benzenhöfer & W. Kühlmann, Studien am Grenzrain von Literaturgeschichte und Medizingeschichte. Frühe Neuzeit, Bd. 10. Tübingen: 30-54.

Erskine, A. (1997) 'Cicero and the Expression of Grief', in *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, eds. S.M. Braund & C. Gill. Cambridge: 36-47.

Faller, S. (2005) 'Satirisches in Baldes *De eclipsi solari*', in *Balde und die römische Satire / Balde et la satire romaine*, eds. G. Freyburger & E. Lefèvre. Tübingen: 303-326.

Feinberg, L. (2006) *The Satirist*. London.

Ferrer, V. & A. Mantero (eds.) (2006) *Les paraphrases bibliques aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles. Actes du colloque de Bordeaux des 22, 23 et 24 septembre 2004*. Geneva.

Fiaschi, S. (2000) 'Prima e dopo la raccolta. Diffusione e circolazione delle *Satyrae* di Francesco Filelfo', *Medioevo e Rinascimento* 14: 147-165.

Fishelov, D. (1989) 'The Prophet as Satirist', *Prooftexts* 9: 195-211.

Foucault, M. (2001) *Fearless Speech*, ed. J. Pearson. Los Angeles.

Freudenburg, K. (1993) *The Walking Muse. Horace on the Theory of Satire*. Princeton.

Freund, W. (1972) *Die deutsche Verssatire im Zeitalter des Barock*. Düsseldorf.

Freyburger, G. & E. Lefèvre (eds.) (2005) *Balde und die römische Satire / Balde et la satire romaine*. Tübingen.

Gibson, R.K. (1998) 'Didactic Poetry as "Popular" Form: A Study of Imperatival Expressions in Latin Didactic Verse and Prose', in *Form and Content in Didactic Poetry*, ed. C. Atherton. Bari: 67-98.

Giuli, P. (2016) 'Prospero Lambertini and the *Accademia degli Arcadi* (1694–1708), in *Benedict XIV and the Enlightenment. Art, Science, and Spirituality*, eds. R. Messbarger *et al.* Toronto: 315-340.

Gowers, E. (2003) 'Fragments of Autobiography in Horace Satires I', *Classical Antiquity* 22:1; 55-91.

Grabes, H. (1973/2009) *The Mutable Glass. Mirror-imagery in Titles and Texts of the Middle Ages and the English Renaissance*, trans. G. Collier. Cambridge.

Greenberger, C. (2016) 'Cain and Abel: (Mis)managing Rejection and Unmet Expectations', *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 44: 2, 116-124.

Grendler, P. (2006) *Renaissance Education Between Religion and Politics*. Aldershot.

Griffin, D.H. (1994) *Satire. A Critical Reintroduction*. Kentucky.

Hampton, T. (1990) *Writing from History. The Rhetoric of Exemplarity in Renaissance Literature*. Ithaca.

Harrison, S. (2007) 'Town and Country', *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, ed. S. Harrison. Cambridge: 235-247.

Hartkamp, R.F. (2005) 'Heilkunst oder Hexenküche? Jacob Baldes Zeitkritik in der dritten *Satyra de medicinae gloria*', in *Balde und die römische Satire / Balde et la satire romaine*, eds. G. Freyburger & E. Lefèvre. Tübingen: 207-217.

Harvey, I.E. (2002) *Labyrinths of Exemplarity. At the Limits of Deconstruction*. Albany.

Haskell, Y. (2013) *Prescribing Ovid. The Latin Works and Networks of the Enlightened Dr Heerkens*. London.

Haye, T. (2001) 'Die Satire als Balsam für die Seele: Ein Beitrag zum *Libellus satyrarum* des Laurentius Lippius', *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* 3: 81-101.

Haye, T. & F. Schnoor (eds.) (2008) *Epochen der Satire: Traditionslinien einer literarischen Gattung in Antike, Mittelalter und Renaissance*. Göttingen.

Hertel, G. (1969) *Die Allegorie von Reichtum und Armut. Ein aristophanisches Motiv und seine Abwandlungen in der abendländischen Literatur*. Nürnberg.

Hess, G. (1971) *Deutsch-Lateinische Narrenzunft. Studien zum Verhältnis von Volkssprache und Latinität in der satirischen Literatur des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Munich.

Highet, G. (1949) 'The Philosophy of Juvenal', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 80: 254-70.

Hindermann, J. (2016) 'Erkenne dich selbst. Geschlechterdiskurs und Intertextualität in Atrocians Epigramm über den richtigen Gebrauch des Spiegels', in *Le "sel" antique: Epigramme, satire, théâtre et polémique. Leur réception chez les humanistes dans les sources imprimées et manuscrites du Rhin supérieur. / Das "Salz" der Antike: Epigramm, Satire, Theater, Polemik. Ihre Rezeption bei den Humanisten: Drucke und Handschriften am Oberrhein*, eds. M.-L. Freyburger-Galland & H. Harich-Schwarzbauer. Stuttgart: 215-228.

Hine, H.M. (2011) '*Discite … agricolae*'. Modes of Instruction in Latin Prose: Agricultural Writing from Cato to Pliny the Elder', *Classical Quarterly* 61:2, 624-654.

Hoffer, S.E. (2007) 'Cicero's Stomach: Political Indignation and the Use of Repeated Allusive Expressions in Cicero's Correspondence', in *Ancient Letters. Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*, eds. R. Morello & A.D. Morrison. Oxford: 87-106.

Hoffmann, G. (2017) *Reforming French Culture. Satire, Spiritual Alienation, and Connection to Strangers.* Oxford.

Hoffmeister, J. (1931) *Kaspar von Barths Leben, Werke und sein Deutscher Phönix*. Heidelberg.

Horányi, A. (1809) *Scriptores Piarum Scholarum liberaliumque artium magistri, Pars II*. Budapest.

Hübner, A. (1913) 'Studien zu Naogeorg', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 54: 297-338.

IJsewijn, J. (1975) 'Neo-Latin Satire in Eastern Europe', *Živa antika* 25: 190-196.

IJsewijn, J. (1976) 'Neo-Latin satire: *sermo* and *satyra menippea*', in *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 1500–1700*, ed. R.R. Bolgar. Cambridge: 41-55.

IJsewijn, J. (1978) 'Laurentii Lippii Collensis *Satyrae V* ad Laurentium Medicem', *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 27: 18-44.

IJsewijn, J. & D. Sacré (1998) *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, vol. II. Supplementa humanistica Lovaniensia XIV. Leuven.

Jackson, H. (1930) *The Anatomy of Bibliomania*. London.

Jemielity, T. (1991) 'The Prophetic Character. Good, Heroic, and Naïve', *Literature & Theology* 5:1, 37-48.

Jemielity, T. (1992) *Satire and the Hebrew Poets*. Louisville.

Jemielity, T. (2006) 'Ancient Biblical Satire', in *A Companion to Satire. Ancient and Modern*, ed. R. Quintero. Malden: 15-30.

Kemper, H.-G. (1987) *Deutsche Lyrik der frühen Neuzeit.* Bd. 2. *Konfessionalismus*. Tübingen.

Kennedy, K. (1999) 'Cynic Rhetoric. The Ethics and Tactics of Resistance', *Rhetoric Review* 18:1, 26-45.

Kindermann, U. (1978) *Satyra. Die Theorie der Satire im Mittellateinischen. Vorstudie zu einer Gattungsgeschichte*. Nürnberg.

King, J.N. (2001) *Milton and Religious Controversy. Satire and Polemic in Paradise Lost*. Cambridge.

Kivistö, S. (2002) *Creating anti-Eloquence. Epistolae obscurorum virorum and the Humanist Polemics on Style*. Helsinki.

Kivistö, S. (2007) 'G. F. von Franckenau's *Satyra sexta* (1674) on male menstruation and female testicles', in *The Trouble with Ribs: Women, Men and Gender in Early Modern Europe*, eds. A. Korhonen & K. Lowe. COLLeGIUM. Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences, vol. 2. Helsinki: 82-102.

Kivistö, S. (2009) *Medical Analogy in Latin Satire*. Basingstoke.

Kivistö, S. (2014) *The Vices of Learning. Morality and Knowledge at Early Modern Universities.* Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, vol. 48. Leiden.

Kivistö, S. (2017) 'Verse Satire', in *A Guide to Neo-Latin Literature*, ed. V. Moul. Cambridge: 148-162.

Kivistö, S. (2018) *Lucubrationes Neolatinae. Readings of Neo-Latin Dissertations and Satires*. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, vol. 134. Helsinki.

Kivistö, S. (2020) 'Learned Artisans and Merchants in Early Eighteenth-Century Latin Dissertations', in *Early Modern Disputations and Dissertations in an Interdisciplinary and European Context*, eds. M. Friedenthal, H. Marti & R. Seidel. Leiden: 340-363.

Knepper, J. (1904) 'Ein deutscher Jesuit als medizinischer Satiriker. Zum Jubiläum Baldes am 4. Januar 1904', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 2: 38–59.

Knight, S. (2017) 'How the Young Man Should Study Latin Poetry: Neo-Latin Literature and Early Modern Education', in *A Guide to Neo-Latin Literature*, ed. V. Moul. Cambridge: 52-65.

Knight, S. & S. Tilg (eds.) (2015) *The Oxford Handbook of Neo-Latin*. Oxford.

Knoche, U. (1957) *Die römische Satire*. Göttingen.

Kofler, W. (2016) 'Ein oberrheinischer Humanist in Würzburg. Die *Satyra in sicarios* von Kaspar Stiblin', in *Le "sel" antique: Epigramme, satire, théâtre et polémique. Leur réception chez les humanistes dans les sources imprimées et manuscrites du Rhin supérieur. / Das "Salz" der Antike: Epigramm, Satire, Theater, Polemik. Ihre Rezeption bei den Humanisten: Drucke und Handschriften am Oberrhein*, eds. M.-L. Freyburger-Galland & H. Harich-Schwarzbauer. Stuttgart: 237-247.

Kohm, S.A. (2009) 'Naming, Shaming and Criminal Justice. Mass-mediated Humiliation as Entertainment and Punishment', *Crime, Media, Culture: An International Journal* 5:2, 188-205.

Kolb, R. (1978) 'The Theologians and the Peasants. Conservative Evangelical Reactions to the German Peasants Revolt', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 69: 103-131.

Könneker, B. (1991) *Satire im 16. Jahrhundert. Epoche – Werke – Wirkung*. Munich.

Kraye, J. (2005) 'The Humanist as Moral Philosopher: Marc-Antoine Muret's 1585 Edition of Seneca', in *Moral Philosophy on the Threshold of Modernity*, ed. J. Kraye & R. Saarinen. Dordrecht: 307-330.

Kristeller, P.O. (1985) 'The Active and the Contemplative Life in Renaissance Humanism', in *Arbeit – Musse – Meditation: Betrachtungen zur* Vita activa *und* Vita contemplativa, ed. B. Vickers. Zurich: 133-152.

Kugel, J.L. (ed.) (1990) *Poetry and Prophecy. The Beginnings of a Literary Tradition*. Ithaca.

Kühlmann, W. (1992) 'Selbstverständigung im Leiden: Zur Bewältigung von Krankheitserfahrungen im versgebundenen Schrifttum der Frühen Neuzeit. (P. Lotichius Secundus, Nathan Chytraeus, Andreas Gryphius)', in *Heilkunde und Krankheitserfahrung in der frühen Neuzeit*, eds. U. Benzenhöfer & W. Kühlmann, Studien am Grenzrain von Literaturgeschichte und Medizingeschichte. Frühe Neuzeit, Bd. 10. Tübingen: 1-29.

Kühlmann, W. (2016) *Wissen als Poesie. Ein Grundriss zu Formen und Funktionen der frühneuzeitlichen Lehrdichtung im deutschen Kulturraum des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*. Frühe Neuzeit, Bd. 204. Berlin.

Kupersmith, W. (2007) *English Versions of Roman Satire in the Earlier Eighteenth Century*. Newark.

Langlands, R. (2018) *Exemplary Ethics in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge.

Laureys, M. (2008) 'Zur Spätblüte der neulateinischen Satire in den Niederlanden. Johannes Havraeus, Arx virtutis', in *Epochen der Satire: Traditionslinien einer literarischen Gattung in Antike, Mittelalter und Renaissance*, eds. T. Haye & F. Schnoor. Göttingen: 301-316.

Laureys, M. (2013) 'Die Kunst der Verunglimpfung in Nikodemus Frischlins Satiren gegen Jakob Rabus', *The Art of Arguing in the World of Renaissance Humanism*, eds. M. Laureys & R. Simons. Leuven: 187-212.

Laureys, M. & R. Simons (eds.) (2013) *The Art of Arguing in the World of Renaissance Humanism*. Leuven.

Lenders, D. (2012) 'La Satire latine adressée par La Boéthie à Montaigne', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 74.3: 479-503.

Lessing, R. (2003) 'Satire in Isaiah's Tyre Oracles', *JSOT* 28:1, 89-112.

Lewalski, B.K. (1979) *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*. Princeton.

Limentani, U. (1961) *La satira nel Seicento*. Milan.

Lindvall, T. (2015) *God Mocks. A History of Religious Satire from the Hebrew Prophets to Steven Colbert*. New York.

Lohmeier, A.-M. (1981) *Beatus ille. Studien zum ‚Lob des Landlebens' in der Literatur des absolutistischen Zeitalters*. Tübingen.

Lowrie, M. & S. Lüdemann (eds.) (2015) *Exemplarity and Singularity. Thinking through Particulars in Philosophy, Literature, and Law*. London.

Ludwig, W. (2008) 'Die 100 Satiren des Francesco Filelfo', in *Epochen der Satire: Traditionslinien einer literarischen Gattung in Antike, Mittelalter und Renaissance*, eds. T. Haye & F. Schnoor. Göttingen: 191-258.

Lyons, J.D. (1989) *Exemplum. The Rhetoric of Example in Early Modern France and Italy*. Princeton.

Mack, M. (1969) *The Garden and the City. Retirement and Politics in the Later Poetry of Pope, 1731-1743*. Toronto.

Marchesi, S. (2001) 'Sic me formabat puerum: Horace's Satire I.4 and Boccaccio's Defence of the Decameron', *MLN* 116:1, 1-29.

Marsh, D. (2014) 'Satire', *Brill's Encyclopedia of the Neo-Latin World*, eds. P. Ford *et al.* Leiden: 1: 413-23.

Marsh, D. (2019) 'Francesco Filelfo as a Writer of Invective', in *Francesco Filelfo, Man of Letters*, ed. J. de Keyser. Leiden: 174-187.

Mauser, W. (2000) *Konzepte aufgeklärter Lebensführung. Literarische Kultur im frühmodernen Deutschland*. Würzburg.

Mayer, R. (2005) 'Sleeping with the Enemy: Satire and Philosophy', in *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*, ed. K. Freudenburg. Cambridge: 146-159.

McCarter, S. (2015) *Horace Between Freedom and Slavery*: *The First Book of Epistles*. Madison.

McCreight, T.D. (2008) 'The "Riches" of Poverty. Literary Games with Poetry in Apuleius' *Laus paupertatis* (*Apology* 18)', in *Paideia at Play. Learning and Wit in Apuleius*, ed. W. Riess. Groningen: 89-104.

McGinn, B. (2000) *Antichrist. Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil.* New York.

Mendell, C.W. (1920) 'Satire as Popular Philosophy', *Classical Philology* 15:2, 138-157.

Messbarger, R., C.M.S. Johns & P. Gavitt (eds.) (2016) *Benedict XIV and the Enlightenment. Art, Science, and Spirituality.* Toronto.

Meyer, W. (1915) *Laudes inopiae*. Göttingen.

Michalowsky, U. (1987) 'Übersetzung als Mittel Politisch-Religiöser Propaganda. Zwei Deutsche Fassungen der *Tragoedia nova Pammachius* (1538) des Thomas Naogeorg', *Daphnis. Zeitschrift für Mittlere Deutsche Literatur* 16:4, 615-663.

Morford, M. (2002) *The Roman Philosophers*. London.

Morgan, L (2005) 'Satire', in *A Companion to Latin Literature*, ed. S. Harrison. Malden: 174-188.

Morrison, A.D. (2007) 'Didacticism and Epistolarity in Horace's *Epistles* 1', in *Ancient Letters. Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*, eds. R. Morello & A.D. Morrison. Oxford: 107-131.

Moul, V. (2017) 'Didactic Poetry', in *A Guide to Neo-Latin Literature*, ed. V. Moul. Cambridge: 180-199.

Moul, V. (ed.) (2017) *A Guide to Neo-Latin Literature*. Cambridge.

Newsom, C. A. (2003) *The Book of Job. A Contest of Moral Imaginations.* Oxford.

Nijsten, G. (2004) *In the Shadow of Burgundy. The Court of Guelders in the Late Middle Ages*. Cambridge.

Nuffelen, P. v. (2011) *Rethinking the Gods. Philosophical Readings of Religion in the Post-Hellenistic Period*. Cambridge.

Nussbaum, M.C. (1994) *The Therapy of Desire. Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*. Princeton.

Oliver, R.P. (1949) 'The Satires of Filelfo', *Italica* 26:1, 23-46.

Osborne, R. (2006) 'Introduction. Roman Poverty in Context', in *Poverty in the Roman World*, eds. M. Atkins & R. Osborne. Cambridge: 1-20.

Oser, F.K. (2005) 'Negative Morality and the Goals of Moral Education', in *Conflict, Contradiction, and Contrarian Elements in Moral Development and Education*, ed. L. Nucci. New York: 129-153.

Pagrot, L. (1961) *Den klassiska verssatirens teori.* Lund.

Palmeri, F. (1990) *Satire in Narrative. Petronius, Swift, Gibbon, Melville, and Pynchon*. Austin.

Panizza, L. (1985) 'Active and Contemplative in Lorenzo Valla: The Fusion of Opposites', in *Arbeit – Musse – Meditation. Betrachtungen zur Vita activa und Vita contemplativa*, ed. B. Vickers. Zurich: 181-223.

Parrish, J.M. (2010) 'Education, Erasmian Humanism and More's *Utopia*', *Oxford Review of Education* 36:5, 589-605.

Patterson, R.D. (2007) 'Prophetic Satire as a Vehicle for Ethical Instruction', *JETS* 50:1, 47-69.

Pepin, R.N. (1996) 'Lodovico Sergardi and the Roman Satirical Tradition', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 2:4, 555-559.

Pernot, L. (2015) *Epideictic Rhetoric. Questioning the Stakes of Ancient Praise*. Austin.

Peter, K. (1967) *Der Humor in den niederdeutschen Dichtungen Johann Laurembergs. Seine Struktur und Funktion*. Köln.

Petersen, D.L. (2002) *The Prophetic Literature. An Introduction*. Louisville.

Porter, D.A. (2014) 'Neo-Latin Prose Satire', in *Brill's Encyclopedia of the Neo-Latin World*, eds. P. Ford *et al*. Leiden.

Porter, D.A. (2016) 'The Neo-Latin Satires of Hannardus Gamerius as Polemical Theology', in *Themes of Polemical Theology across Early Modern Literary Genres*, eds. S. Zavarský, L.R. Nicholas & A. Riedl. Newcastle upon Tyne: 85-98.

Poynton, J.B. (1934) 'Roman Education', *Greece & Rome* 4:10, 1-12.

Pozuelo, B. (1994) 'Méthodologie pour l'analyse des satires formelles néo-latines', in *La Satire humaniste*, ed. R. De Smet. Brussels: 19-48.

Prell, M. (1997) *Sozialökonomische Untersuchungen zur Armut im antiken Rom. Von den Gracchen bis Kaiser Diokletian*. Stuttgart.

Price, D. (1990) *The Political Dramaturgy of Nicodemus Frischlin. Essays on Humanist Drama in Germany*. Chapel Hill.

Quinones, R.J. (1991) *The Changes of Cain. Violence and Lost Brother in Cain and Abel Literature*. Princeton.

Quondam, A. (1969) 'Le satire di Ludovico Sergardi. Contributo ad una storia della cultura romana tra Sei e Settecento', *La rassegna della letteratura italiana* 73, 2-3: 206-272.

Ramos, M.A.C. (2002) *La Sátira Latina*. Madrid.

Randolph, M.C. (1941) 'The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory: Its Possible Relationships and Implications', *Studies in Philology* 38:2, 125-157.

Renner, B. (2014) 'From *Satura* to *Satyre*: François Rabelais and the Renaissance Appropriation of a Genre', *Renaissance Quarterly* 67: 377-424.

Roller, M. (2016) 'Precept(or) and Example in Seneca', in *Roman Reflections. Studies in Latin Philosophy*, eds. G.D. Williams & K. Volk. Oxford: 129-156.

Roller, M.B. (2018) *Models from the Past in Roman Culture. A World of Exempla*. Cambridge.

Roloff, H.-G. (1980) 'Heilsgeschichte, Weltgeschichte und aktuelle Polemik. Thomas Naogeorg's *Tragoedia nova Pammachius*', *Daphnis. Zeitschrift für Mittlere Deutsche Literatur* 9:4, 743-767.

Roloff, H.-G. (1987) 'Thomas Naogeorg's Satiren', *Daphnis. Zeitschrift für Mittlere Deutsche Literatur* 16:3, 363-385.

Roloff, H.-G. (2007) 'Anatomia satirica', in *Textorten und Textallianzen vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert. Beiträge zum Internationalen Sprachwissenschaftlichen Symposion in Wien 22. bis 24. September 2005*, ed. P. Wiesinger. Berlin: 187-207.

Roorda, R. (1992) *Dramas of solitude: Narratives of Retreat in American Nature Writing*. Albany.

Rosa, M. (2014) 'Pope Benedict XIV (1740-1758). The Ambivalent Enlightener', in *Enlightenment and Catholicism in Europe: A Transnational History,* eds. J.D. Burson & U.L. Lehner. Notre Dame: 41-60.

Rostvig, M.-S. (1954, 1958) *The Happy Man. Studies in the Metamorphoses of a Classical Ideal*. Vols. I-II. Oslo and Oxford.

Rublack, U. (2017) *Reformation Europe*. Cambridge.

Ruch, W. & S. Heintz (2016) 'The Virtue Gap in Humor: Exploring Benevolent and Corrective Humor', *Translational Issues in Psychological Science* 2:1, 35–45.

Ruchatz, J., S. Willer & N. Pethes (eds.) (2007). *Das Beispiel. Epistemologie des Exemplarischen*. Berlin.

Rummel, E. (2006). *Erasmus*. London.

Sacré, D. (2004) 'Grotiana: Iohannes Havraeus, Iohannes Hemelarius, Iustus Rycquius, and Hugo Grotius', *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 53: 371-379.

Sangalli, M. (2012) *Le smanie per l'educatione: gli scolopi a Venezia tra Sei e Settecento*. Rome.

Sauer, C.F. (2005) '*Animosum scribendi genus*. Annäherungen an den Begriff der *Satyra* bei Jacob Balde', in *Balde und die römische Satire / Balde et la satire romaine*, eds. G. Freyburger & E. Lefèvre. Tübingen: 13-24.

Schade, R.E. (1993) 'Philipp Nicodemus Frischlin', in *Deutsche Dichter der frühen Neuzeit (1450-1600). Ihr Leben und Werk*, ed. S. Füssel. Berlin: 613-625.

Schafer, J. (2011) 'Seneca's *Epistulae morales* as Dramatized Education', *Classical Philology* 106: 32-52.

Schnur, H.C. (ed.) (1967) *Lateinische Gedichte deutscher Humanisten*. Stuttgart.

Schäfer, E. (1976) *Deutscher Horaz. Conrad Celtis, Georg Fabricius, Paul Melissus, Jacob Balde. Die Nachwirkung des Horaz in der neulateinischen Dichtung Deutschlands.* Wiesbaden.

Shapin, S. (1991) '"The Mind is Its Own Place": Science and Solitude in Seventeenth-century England', *Science in Context* 4:1, 191-218.

Shell, M. (1978) *The Economy of Literature*. Baltimore.

Sherwood, Y. (2009) 'The Baroque Prophets. An Encounter between the Hebrew Prophets and John Donne', in *Sacred Tropes. Tanakh, New Testament, and Qur'an as Literature and Culture*, ed. R.S. Sabbath. Leiden: 115-140.

Sieveke, F.G. (1993) 'Thomas Naogeorg', in *Deutsche Dichter der frühen Neuzeit (1450-1600). Ihr Leben und Werk*, ed. S. Füssel. Berlin: 477-493.

Simons, R. (2009a) 'Janus Dousa: *Satira* 1 – Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar', *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* 11. Hildesheim: 155-177.

Simons, R. (2009b) 'Ein humanistischer Plagiatstreit und seine Inszenierung. Zu Gestalt und Funktion der ersten beiden Satiren Janus Dousas', in *Ianus Dousa. Neulateinischer Dichter und klassischer Philologe*, eds. E. Lefèvre & E. Schäfer. Tübingen: 69-92.

Simons, R. (2013a) 'Der poetologische Rekurs auf die römischen Vorbilder und das Selbstverständnis humanistischer Satirendichter. Zur Entwicklung des Gattungsverständnisses im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert', in *Norm und Poesie: Zur expliziten und impliziten Poetik in der lateinischen Literatur der Frühen Neuzeit*, eds. R. Simons & B. Hintzen. Berlin: 125-143.

Simons, R. (2013b) 'Waffen der Nemesis, Pfeile der Satire. Gewaltmetaphorik im metapoetischen Diskurs neulateinischer Satiriker', in *The Art of Arguing in the World of Renaissance Humanism*, eds. M. Laureys & R. Simons. Leuven: 27-49.

Simons, R. (2015) 'Die Satirendichtung in den *Iuvenilia* von Marc-Antoine Muret', in *Die neulateinische Dichtung in Frankreich zur Zeit der Pléiade = La Poésie néo-latine en France au temps de la Pléiade*, NeoLatina 19, eds. M.-F. Guipponi-Gineste, W. Kofler, A. Novokhatko & G. Polizzi. Tübingen: 17-36.

Sogno, C. (2012) 'Persius, Juvenal, and the Transformation of Satire in Late Antiquity', in *A Companion to Persius and Juvenal*, eds. S. Braund & J. Osgood. Malden: 363-385.

Stopp, F.J. (1968) 'Reformation Satire in Germany. Nature, Conditions, and Form', *Oxford German Studies* 3: 53-68.

Strauss, D.F. (1856) *Leben und Schriften des Dichters und Philologen Nicodemus Frischlin*. Frankfurt am Main.

Stroh, W. (2004) *Baldeana. Untersuchungen zum Lebenswerk von Bayerns grösstem Dichter,* ed. B.-J. Schröder. Munich.

Summers, K. (2004) 'The Origins of the Title of Muret's *Iuvenilia*', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 10:3, 407-415.

Sussman, L.A. (1978) *The Elder Seneca*. Leiden.

Thompson, A.C. (2002) 'Popery, Politics, and Private Judgement in Early Hanoverian Britain', *The Historical Journal* 45:2, 333-356.

Thurn, N. (2008) 'Die horazische Satire zwischen Augurelli und Ariost', in *Epochen der Satire: Traditionslinien einer literarischen Gattung in Antike, Mittelalter und Renaissance*, eds. T. Haye & F. Schnoor. Göttingen: 259-274.

Tieleman, T. (2003) *Chrysippus' On Affections. Reconstruction and Interpretation*. Philosophia antica, Vol. 94. Leiden.

Tournoy, G. (1994) 'The Beginnings of neo-Latin Satire in the Low Countries', in *La satire humaniste*. *Actes du Colloque international des 31 mars, 1er et 2 avril 1993*, ed. R. De Smet. Brussels: 95-109.

Tournoy, G. (1998) 'Neo-Latin Satire in the Low Countries from an Italian Perspective', in *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Bariensis*, eds. J.F. Alcina *et al*. Tempe: 71-95.

Traina, I. (1997) 'Versi latini di Gregorio Correr. Contributi a un'edizione critica', in *Ut granum sinapis. Essays on Neo-Latin Literature in Honour of Jozef IJsewijn*, eds. G. Tournoy & D. Sacré. Leuven: 14-23.

Trilling, L. (1972) *Sincerity and Authenticity*. Boston.

Trinkaus, C.E. (1979) *The Poet as Philosopher. Petrarch and the Formation of Renaissance Consciousness*. New Haven.
Trites, R. (2014). *Literary Conceptualizations of Growth. Metaphors and Cognition in Adolescent Literature.* Amsterdam.
Trompf, G.W. (1979) *The Idea of Historical Recurrence in Western Thought. From Antiquity to the Reformation*. Berkeley.
Vaccarezza, M.S. & A. Niccoli (2019). 'The Dark Side of the Exceptional: On Moral Exemplars, Character Education, and Negative Emotions', *Journal of Moral Education* 48:3, 332-345.
Valentin, J.-M. (ed.) (1986) *Jakob Balde und seine Zeit. Akten des Ensisheimer Kolloquiums, 15.–16. Oktober 1982.* Bern.
van Rooy, C.A. (1965) *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory*. Leiden.
Vickers, B. (ed.) (1985) *Arbeit – Musse – Meditation. Betrachtungen zur Vita activa und Vita contemplativa*. Zurich.
Volk, K. (2002) *The Poetics of Latin Didactic. Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*. Oxford.
Vredeveld, H. (1985) 'A Neo-Latin Satire on Love-madness: The Third Eclogue of Eobanus Hessus' *Bucolicon* of 1509', in *Satire in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. B. Becker-Cantarino. Amsterdam: 673-719.
Wandel, L.P. (1999) *Voracious Idols & Violent Hands. Iconoclasm in Reformation Zurich, Strasbourg, and Basel*. Cambridge.
Watanabe-O'Kelly, H. (ed.) (2000/1997) *The Cambridge History of German Literature*. Cambridge.
Webb, R. (1997) 'Imagination and the Arousal of the Emotions in Greco-Roman Rhetoric', in *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, eds. S.M. Braund & C. Gill. Cambridge: 112-127.
Westling, L. (2014) 'Pastoral, Anti-Pastoral, and Post-Pastoral', in *The Cambridge Companion to Literature and Environment,* ed. T. Gifford. Cambridge: 17-30.
Wheeler, G. (2013) *Language Teaching Through the Ages*. London.
Wheelis, S.M. (1974) 'Publish and Perish. On the Martyrdom of Philipp Nicodemus Frischlin', *Neophilologus* 58:1, 41-51.
White, N. (2004) *Individual and Conflict in Greek Ethics*. Oxford.
Whitmarsh, T. (2004) *Ancient Greek Literature*. Cambridge.
Wiegand, H. (1992) 'Ad vestras, medici, supplex prosternitur aras. Zu Jakob Baldes Medizinersatiren', in *Heilkunde und Krankheitserfahrung in der frühen Neuzeit*, eds. U. Benzenhöfer & W. Kühlmann, Studien am Grenzrain

von Literaturgeschichte und Medizingeschichte. Frühe Neuzeit, Bd. 10. Tübingen: 247-269.

Wiegand, H. (2005) 'Ethnische und religiöse Minoritäten in den Medizinersatiren Jakob Balde', in *Balde und die römische Satire / Balde et la satire romaine*, eds. G. Freyburger & E. Lefèvre. Tübingen: 151-169. Wiesen, D. (1963) 'Juvenal's Moral Character, an Introduction', *Latomus* 22: 440-71.

Wiesen, D.S. (1964) *St. Jerome as a Satirist. A Study in Christian Latin Thought and Letters.* Ithaca.

Wilson, M. (1997) 'The Subjugation of Grief in Seneca's 'Epistles', in *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, eds. S.M. Braund & C. Gill. Cambridge: 48-67.

Yona, S. (2015) 'Some Epicurean Aspects of Horace's Upbringing in *Satires* 1.4', *Classical Philology* 110: 227-251.

Yona, S. (2018) *Epicurean Ethics in Horace. The Psychology of Satire*. Oxford.

Zagzebski, L. (2010) 'Exemplarist Virtue theory', *Metaphilosophy* 41:1-2, 41-57.

Index nominum

Abel 189, 190, 193-196
Abel, Michael 94 n. 22
Agricola, Rudolph 22 n. 8
Agrippa von Nettesheim, Cornelius 147 n. 94
Albert, Duke of Prussia 173, 180-183
Alexander the Great 110, 119
Alleyn, John 4 n. 13
Ammianus Marcellinus 166, 214
Amos 162 n. 34
Anisio, Giano 11, 52 n. 15, 126
Apuleius 95-96, 105-106
Aristophanes 100, 147
Aristotle 15, 114, 159
Arnobius 223
Arria 111
Asa (of Judah) 126 n. 16, 181
Ascensius, Jodocus Badius 17, 29
Attila 223
Augurelli, Giovanni Aurelio 8 n. 27, 10-11, 239-240
Augustine 30, 35-37, 43, 65, 91, 118, 154, 157, 185, 194
Axen, Peter 69
Balde, Jacob 15, 136-145, 266
Balzac, Honoré de 55 n. 34
Barberini, Francesco 55 n. 34
Barlaeus, Caspar 257 n. 65
Barth, Caspar von 41, 54 n. 29
Bartholin, Thomas 126
Baynard, Ann 266
Bebel, Heinrich 185 n. 113
Benedict XIV 14, 18, 35, 70, 78, 225-231
Benessa, Damianus 94 n. 22, 246 n. 29
Bernard of Utrecht 17, 210
Beroaldo, Filippo (the Younger) 127 n. 20
Billet, Pierre Paul 242 n. 16
Bilscius, Joachim (Bielski) 94 n. 22
Boileau, Nicolas 53
Bourbon, Nicolas 82
Bracciolini, Poggio 94 n. 20
Brasch, Martin 189 n. 131
Buchanan, George 82
Busche, Hermann von dem 1 n. 3
Cain 177 n. 95, 189-197, 203
Campano, Johannes Antonius 90 n. 2
Cantianus, Umbritius (Jabez Earle) 4, 18, 147 n. 91, 249-256
Carrara, Giovanni Michele Alberto 29
Casaubon, Isaac 89-90, 257 n. 65
Casti, Giovanni Battista 5 n. 17
Cerri, Antonio 3 n. 9
Chalmers, Alexander 44 n. 92, 127 n. 20, 136, 150, 197, 249
Châtillon, Walter de 17 n. 64
Chorier, Nicolas 3 n. 9
Christ 11, 28, 30, 31-32, 33, 34, 41, 52, 57, 61, 98, 102-103, 150, 157, 158, 159, 160, 172, 176, 178 n. 100, 183, 186, 187, 188, 196, 256
Christoph, Duke of Württemberg 173, 183 n. 108, 213 n. 46
Chrysippus 109
Chrysostom, Dio 226
Chytraeus, Nathan 133-135
Cicero 15, 22-23, 26 n. 24, 31 n. 42, 71, 77 n. 109, 106 n. 66, 111 n. 83, 116 n. 102, 122, 152, 184, 239, 244, 264
Cincinnatus 18, 96, 112, 211, 241
Cleanthes 143

Clement XI 219, 224
Clement XII 79 n. 114, 99, 225, 229-230
Colonna, Pompeo 11
Conrad of Hirsau 210
Constantine 119
Cordara, Giulio Cesare 51 n. 13
Correr, Gregorio 9, 11-12, 37
Cranach, Lucas 188 n. 130
Crates 113
Cyprian 30-31, 157, 158, 159
Dante 42
D'Aquino, Carlo (pastoral name: Alcone Sirio) 5 n. 17, 12 n. 47, 18, 42-43, 223-224, 263-264
David 102, 159, 187, 190
Della Casa, Giovanni 173, 224
Democritus 93, 105 n. 63
Devoti, Fabio 5 n. 17
Diogenes Cynicus 14, 85-86, 90, 113-117, 144
Dorpius, Martin 155-156
Dousa, Janus 45 n. 94, 243
Drant, Thomas 30
Earle, Jabez (see Cantianus)
Eberlin, Johann 176 n. 94
Epictetus 109, 143
Epicurus 90, 93, 141, 144
Erasmus of Rotterdam 7, 13, 30, 32 n. 45, 59-62, 66, 82, 83, 126, 155-156, 173, 183 n. 108, 213
Esau 190
Esseiva, Petrus 87
Euripides 92-93
Fabricius, Vincent 3 n. 9
Falcó, Jaime Juan 14, 47 n. 104, 85 n. 138, 103-104, 170-171, 243-244
Feltre, Vittorino da 9
Fernel, Jean 138
Ficino, Marsilio 10 n. 38, 38, 118
Filelfo, Francesco 4, 8-9, 11 n. 44, 12 n. 46, 28-29, 38 n. 65, 53-54, 97, 117-118, 126, 194 n. 153, 210
Fischart, Johann 185 n. 114
Fracastoro 45 n. 94
Frenking, Philipp 87
Freud, Sigmund 25 n. 20
Friedrich Christian of Saxony 232-233
Friedrich, Georg 29, 30
Frischlin, Nicodemus 16, 33-35, 129-131, 184-198, 211, 266-267
Furich, Johann Nicolaus 45 n. 94
Galluzzi, Tarquinio 217 n. 61
Gameren, Hannard van (Gamerius, Hannardus) 198
Geldenhouwer, Gerard (Gerardus Noviomagus) 15-16, 38 n. 63, 55, 135, 155-160, 213 n. 44
Gellius, Aulus 83
Gevartius, Caspar (Gevaert) 109
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von 85
Googe, Barnabe 173
Grangier, Bonaventure 45 n. 94
Gravina, Gian Vincenzo (pseud. Philodemus) 1, 51 n. 13, 131-133, 206, 221
Gryphius, Andreas 142 n. 71
Guglielmini, Bernardo (Guillemin; pastoral name: Dalgo Metimneo) 5 n. 17, 14, 18, 35-37, 47 n. 104, 54 n. 27, 58, 70-84, 99-100, 106 n. 66, 128-129, 147 n. 91, 151-152, 203-204, 209, 211, 212, 213, 225-235, 258-260, 262, 265, 266
Hartmannus, Iacobus Ioannes 2 n. 4
Hassensteinius, Bohuslaus (Bohuslaw Lobkowitz von Hassenstein) 94 n. 22

Havraeus, Johannes (see Havre)
Havre, Jan van (Johannes Havraeus) 14, 21-22, 96, 99, 108-112
Heerkens, Gerard Nicolaas (Marius Curillus) 12, 43 n. 87, 44-47, 52-53
Heinsius, Daniel 28 n. 28, 89, 91 n. 8, 126 n. 14
Herodotus 93
Hesiod 167
Hessus, Eobanus 245-246
Hezekiah 180-182
Hog, William (Gulielmus Hogaeus) 189
Homer 73, 159
Hope, Robert Charles 173
Horace 1, 2, 3, 7, 12, 13, 17, 18, 21, 22 n. 8, 26 n. 23, 29 n. 36, 30, 32, 33 n. 48, 35, 39, 43, 44, 45, 47 n. 103, 49, 50-53, 54 n. 27, 59, 63, 64 n. 56, 68, 72, 73, 74, 76 n. 104, 82, 87, 89, 90 n. 4, 91, 99, 104-105, 108 n. 72, 109, 112, 115 n. 99, 117, 123, 125-126, 131, 133, 137, 143, 146 n. 86, 147 n. 96, 151, 158, 159 n. 23, 189 n. 131, 201, 206, 207 n. 25, 212 n. 35, 217, 230, 237-239, 241, 242-244, 245-246, 247, 248, 249 n. 41, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 257 n. 65, 260
Hortensius, Lambertus of Montfoort 13, 26, 49, 67-68, 76 n. 106, 82, 170
Ingami, Carlo 5 n. 17
Innocent XII 149, 214, 217, 219
Iriarte, Juan de 135-136
Isaiah 32-33, 158, 160-163, 167
Jeremiah 30, 157 n. 18, 161, 162 n. 34
Jerome 30-32, 91, 157, 163, 185, 186, 216, 257
Job 126 n. 16, 189, 195-196
John Chrysostom 83
John of Salisbury 17
Joseph 191
Julius II 11
Juvenal 1, 2, 11, 18, 21, 22, 26, 36, 39, 44, 45, 57, 64, 73 n. 90, 83 n. 126, 84 n. 132, 86 n. 142, 91, 99, 110, 111, 126, 138 n. 50, 140 n. 62, 144, 146, 156, 158, 166, 168, 211, 221, 240, 241, 249, 257-258, 266
Kempo Thessaliensis 69 n. 76
King, Robert 119 n. 113
King, William 4
Koch, Johann Christian 27-28
Kuntschke, Johann Georg 28 n. 29
Lactantius 159, 223
Lamech 190
Landino, Cristoforo 123-124, 125
Lauremberg, Johann 68-70
Le Roy, Albert 14, 42
Leibniz, G.W. 146
Leo X 11
L'Hospital, Michel de 4
Lippi da Colle, Lorenzo 9-10, 11-12, 29, 37, 126-127, 135, 213 n. 46, 264
Lipsius, Justus 108 n. 72, 114
Listrius, Gerard 55
Lubinus, Eilhard (Eilert Lübben) 14, 16, 62-67, 84 n. 132, 98, 163-170, 189 n. 131, 201, 213 n. 46, 262
Lucchesini, Giovanni Lorenzo 43 n. 85, 84-86
Lucilius 11, 21, 25 n. 22, 29 n. 36, 30, 90, 121, 158
Lucretius 125, 207 n. 25
Luther, Martin 154-155, 172-173, 175-176, 177-178, 183 n. 108
Maecenas 99, 237, 246

Major, William 3, 39 n. 67, 249 n. 41
Malpighi, Marcello 149-150
Manasseh 181
Marcolini, Pietro Paolo 5 n. 17
Marescotti, Caesar 150
Martial 36, 137 n. 50, 147
Medici, Cosimo de' 8
Medici, Cosimo III de' 146
Medici, Lorenzo de' 10 n. 38, 213 n. 46
Menippus 90
Milton, John 102 n. 52, 250-251
Minturno, Antonio Sebastiano 122-123, 125
Montaigne, Michel de 27
Montanus, Petrus 13, 37-38, 55, 118-120, 151, 155, 156, 158, 159
Montefeltro, Federigo da 10
Morcelli, Stefano Antonio 18, 224
Morhof, Daniel Georg 68-69
Moses 126 n. 16, 159, 170, 180-181, 188
Müntzer, Thomas 176
Muret, Marc-Antoine (Muretus) 14, 21, 23-25, 27, 54-55, 150, 266
Murmellius, Johannes 90 n. 2
Naogeorg, Thomas (Kirchmair) 16, 29-34, 39-41, 54 n. 27, 59-60, 99-102, 104-105, 108, 135, 171-184, 186, 187, 194-196, 203, 210, 211, 213 n. 46, 224 n. 89, 266
Nicolaus, Francesco (Nicolai) 53 n. 21
Nimrod 174-176, 183 n. 108, 197, 203
Nomi, Federico (pastoral name: Cerifone Nedeatide) 3 n. 7, 5 n. 17, 12 n. 47, 15, 102 n. 53, 145-148, 240-241, 266
Oldenburger, Philipp Andreas 3 n. 9
Ovid 146 n. 91, 167
Pannonius, Janus 142 n. 70
Pasch, Georg 115, 121, 125, 201 n. 5, 203
Paul (Saint) 17 n. 63, 28, 30, 31, 34, 187
Persius 1, 2, 21, 22 n. 8, 33 n. 48, 38 n. 63, 38 n. 65, 40, 67, 73, 86 n. 142, 89, 90 n. 2, 91, 96, 116, 123, 130, 131, 137, 143, 146 n. 86, 156, 158, 159, 189 n. 131, 223, 257 n. 65, 261
Peter (Saint) 98, 224
Petrarch 140 n. 62, 142 n. 71, 238, 247
Philip of Macedon 114
Philip V of Spain 242 n. 16
Philodemus of Gadara 50 n. 5, 120 n. 117, 206 n. 22
Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni 61 n. 46, 118
Pieczkonides, Michael 3 n. 7
Pius IV 27
Plato 55 n. 33, 90, 93, 109, 152, 159, 263
Plautus 146 n. 86
Plutarch 17, 108, 125, 201
Poliziano, Angelo 123
Pollius, Johannes 198-199
Poninski, Antoni (pseud. Johann Maximilian Krolikiewicz) 94-95, 111 n. 83, 145 n. 84, 266
Pontanus, Jacobus (Jakob Spanmüller) 124-125
Pope, Alexander 53, 249 n. 41
Premlechner, Johannes Baptista 86-87, 266
Puteanus, Erycius 42
Pythagoras 117, 184
Quintilian 30, 155 n. 10, 202 n. 9, 235
Rabelais, François 45 n. 94
Rabus, Jacob (Jakob Rabe) 33-34, 130-131, 185-190, 192, 193, 196, 197-198
Rabus, Ludwig 189

Randolph, John (Herbert) 4 n. 13
Restius, Junius (Džono Rastic or Junije Restić) 18, 132 n. 36, 246-249, 267
Rhegius, Urbanus 176 n. 92
Roncalli Parolino, Francesco 44
Ronsard, Pierre 27
Rudbeck, Olaf 126 n. 16
Saint-Geniès, Jean de 14, 47 n. 104, 55-57, 105-108, 242
Sangenesius, Johannes (see Saint-Geniès)
Sannazaro, Jacopo 11
Schleicher, Daniel 54
Scholirius, Petrus (Pieter Scholier) 14, 41-42, 113-117, 213 n. 44, 244-245, 266
Schwenckfeld, Kaspar 177
Scipio 116, 225
Sectanus, Quintus (see Sergardi)
Selliba, Johann 1 n. 1
Seneca 13 n. 49, 22, 23 n. 13, 50, 65, 72 n. 85, 75-76, 79, 91-92, 93 n. 19, 96, 108, 109, 111, 138, 141-142, 143, 144, 151, 152, 166, 184, 212, 216
Seneca Maior 94 n. 21, 99
Sergardi, Lodovico (pseud. Quintus Sectanus; pastoral name: Licone Trachio) 1, 5 n. 17, 18, 44, 51, 131-133, 149-150, 205-209, 212, 213, 214-222, 231-232, 257, 265, 266
Seripando, Girolamo 11
Socrates 9, 109
Solomon 40, 102, 159
Sten, Simon 64 n. 57
Stiblin, Kaspar 198 n. 163
Strozzi, Ercole 10 n. 40
Strozzi, Tito Vespasiano 8 n. 27, 10, 239
Suetonius 221
Summonte, Pietro 11
Tertullian 257
Thales 97, 117
Thessaliensis, Kempo (see Kempo)
Thucydides 133
Tribraco, Gaspare (Tribrachus) 9 n. 36
Urceo, Codro (Antonius Codrus Urceus) 44, 127-128
Vadian, Joachim 210
Valeriano, Pierio 47 n. 104
Varro 90
Varus, Alfenus 74
Vasconcelos, Francisco Botello de Moraes y 103 n. 56
Vecerius, Conrad 156
Vergil 80, 184, 196, 253, 254 n. 53
Vesalius, Andreas 138, 139
Villani, Niccolò 257 n. 65
Vitalis, Ianus 216 n. 56
Vives, Juan Luis 201 n. 1
Volpi, Giovanni Antonio 89 n. 1, 243 n. 21
Voltaire 226
Wichgreve, Albert 64 n. 57
Zeno 113, 143
Zesen, Philipp von 63 n. 52
Zuylen, Theodor van 26 n. 23
Zwingli, Huldrych 101, 177

Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum

Vol. 90 (1990)
Solin, Heikki: Namenpaare. Eine Studie zur römischen Namengebung. 1990. 92 p.
Vol. 91 (1990)
Roman Eastern Policy and Other Studies in Roman History, edited by Heikki Solin and Mika Kajava. 1990. 174 p.
Vol. 93 (1991)
Bruun, Christer: The Water Supply of Ancient Rome. A Study of Roman Imperial Administration. 1991. 468 p.
Vol. 94 (1991)
Koskenniemi, Erkki: Der philostrateische Apollonios. 1991. 101 p.
Vol. 95 (1992)
Löfstedt, Leena (ed.): Gratiani Decretum. La traduction en ancient français du Décret de Gratien. Edition critique. Vol. I: Distinctiones. 1992. 213 p.
Vol. 96 (1991)
Forsén, Björn: Lex Licinia Sextia de modo agrorum – fiction or reality? 1991. 88 p.
Vol. 97 (1992)
Salomies, Olli: Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire. 1992. 179 p.
Vol. 99 (1993)
Löfstedt, Leena (ed.): Gratiani Decretum. La traduction en ancient français du Décret de Gratien. Edition critique. Vol. II: Causae 1–14. 1993. 276 p.
Vol. 102 (1994)
Leiwo, Martti: Neapolitana. A Study of Population and Language in Graeco-Roman Naples. 1994. 232 p.
Vol. 103 (1995)
Chydenius, Johan: The Spirituality of Fénelon in his Latin Writings 1700-1712. 1995. 60 p.
Vol. 104 (1995)
Acta colloquii epigraphici Latini Helsingiae 3.–6. sept. 1991 habiti, ediderunt Heikki Solin, Olli Salomies, Uta-Maria Liertz. 1995. 425 p.
Vol. 105 (1996)
Löfstedt, Leena (ed.): Gratiani Decretum. La traduction en ancient français du Décret de Gratien. Edition critique. Vol. III: Causae 15–29. 1996. 275 p.
Vol. 108 (1996)
Mehtonen, Päivi: Old Concepts and New Poetics. Historia, Argumentum, and Fabula in the Twelfth- and Early Thirteenth-Century Latin Poetics of Fiction. 1996. 173 p.
Vol. 109 (1996)
Kuisma, Oiva: Proclus' Defence of Homer. 1996. 157 p.
Vol. 110 (1997)
Löfstedt, Leena (ed.): Gratiani Decretum. La traduction en ancient français du Décret de Gratien. Edition critique. Vol. IV: Causae 30–36 et De Consecratione. 1997. 224 p.
Vol. 111 (1998)
Lampela, Anssi: Rome and the Ptolemies of Egypt. The Development of their Political Relations 273–80 B.C. 1998. 301 p.
Vol. 112 (1998)
Nummenmaa, Tapio: Divine Motions and Human Emotions in the Philebus and in the Laws. Plato's Theory of Physic Powers. 1998. 151 p.
Vol. 113 (1999)
Thesleff, Holger: Studies in Plato's Two-Level Model. 1999. 143 p.
Vol. 114 (1999)
Dimitropoulos, Panagiotis: Untersuchungen zum finalen Genetiv des substantivierten Infinitivs bei Thukydides. 1999. 117 p.
Vol. 115 (2000)
Heinonen, Sirkka: Prometheus Revisited. Human Interaction with Nature through Technology in Seneca, 2000. 232 p.
Vol. 116 (2000)
Lehtonen, Tuomas M. S. & Mehtonen, Päivi (eds.): Historia. The Concept and Genres in the Middle Ages. 2000. 142 p.
Vol. 117 (2001)
Löfstedt, Leena (ed.): Gratiani Decretum. La traduction en ancient français du Décret de Gratien. Edition critique. Vol. dV: Observations et explications. 2001. 482 p.
Vol. 118 (2002)
Kivistö, Sari: Creating Anti-eloquence. Epistolae obscurorum virorum and the Humanist Polemics on Style. 2002. 256 p.
Vol. 119 (2002)
Salmenkivi, Erja: Cartonnage Papyri in Context. New Ptolemaic Documents from Abū Sir al Malaq. 2002. 182 p., 20 plates.
Vol. 120 (2003)
Kuisma, Oiva: Art or Experience. A Study on Plotinus' Aesthetics. 2003. 207 p.

Vol. 121 (2004)
Korhonen, Kalle: Le iscrizioni del Museo civico di Catania. 2004. 418 p.

Vol. 122 1–2 (2007)
Proceedings of the 24th International Congress of Papyrology. Helsinki, 1–7 August, 2004, edited by Jaakko Frösén, Tiina Purola and Erja Salmenkivi. 2007. 1075 p., plates.

Vol. 123 (2007)
Steinby, Christa: The Roman Republican Navy. 2007. 236 p.

Vol. 124 (2009)
Halla-aho, Hilla: The non-literary Latin letters. A study of their syntax and pragmatics. 2009. 190 p.

Vol. 125 (2008)
The Konikovo Gospel (Bibl. Patr. Alex. 268), edited by Jouko Lindstedt, Ljudmil Spasov and Juhani Nuorluoto. 2008. 439 p., 82 plates.

Vol. 126 (2009)
Sipilä, Joonas: The Reorganisation of Provincial Territories in Light of the Imperial Decision-making Process. Later Roman Arabia and Tres Palaestinae as Case Studies. 2009. 328 p.

Vol. 127 (2010)
Saastamoinen, Ari: The Phraseology of Latin Building Inscriptions in Roman North-Africa. 2010. 646 p.

Vol. 128 (2011)
Building Roma Aeterna. Current Research on Roman Mortar and Concrete. Proceedings of the conference, March 27–29, 2008. Editors Åsa Ringbom and Robert L. Hohlfelder, assistant editors Pia Sjöberg and Pia Sonck-Koota. 2011. 260 p.

Vol. 129 (2011)
Eikonopoiia. Digital Imaging of Ancient Textual Heritage. Proceedings of the international conference Helsinki, 28–29, November, 2010, edited by Vesa Vahtikari, Mika Hakkarainen, Antti Nurminen. 2011. 267 p.

Vol. 130 (2013)
Maurizi, Luca: Il cursus honorum senatorio da Augusto a Traiano. Sviluppi formali e stilistici nell'epigrafia latina e greca. 2013. 324 p.

Vol. 131 (2014)
Papyri Turkuenses (P. Turku). Die Papyri im Besitz der Universitätsbibliothek Turku herausgegeben von Heikki Koskenniemi unter Mitwirkung von Erkki Koskenniemi und Johannes Koskenniemi. 2014. 135 p., Tafeln.

Vol. 132 (2015)
Second Sailing: Alternative Perspectives on Plato. Edited by Debra Nails and Harold Tarrant in Collaboration with Mika Kajava and Eero Salmenkivi. 2015. 366 p.

Vol. 133 (2016)
Korkiakangas, Timo: Subject Case in the Latin of Tuscan Charters of the 8th and 9th Centuries. 2016. 276 p.

Vol. 134 (2018)
Kivistö, Sari: *Lucubrationes Neolatinae*. Readings of Neo-Latin Dissertations and Satires. 2018. 244 p.

Vol. 135 (2018)
Buchholz, Matias: Römisches Recht auf Griechisch. Prolegomena zu einer linguistischen Untersuchung der Zusammensetzung und Semantik des byzantinischen prozessrechtlichen Wortschatzes. 2018. 236 p.

Vol. 136 (2019)
Domus Pompeiana M. Lucretii IX 3, 5.24. The Inscriptions, Works of Art and Finds from the Old and New Excavations. Edited by Ria Berg and Ilkka Kuivalainen. 2019. 323 p.

Vol. 137 (2019)
Studi storico-epigrafici sul Lazio antico II. A cura di Heikki Solin. 2019. 168 p.

Vol. 138 (2020)
Meilicha Dôra. Poems and Prose in Greek from Renaissance and Early Modern Europe. Edited by Mika Kajava, Tua Korhonen and Jamie Vesterinen. 2020. 356 p.

Vol. 139 (2020)
Papers on Ancient Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the Ninth International Colloquium on Ancient Greek Linguistics (ICACL 9), 30 August – 1 September 2018, Helsinki. Edited by Martti Leiwo, Marja Vierros & Sonja Dahlgren.

Vol. 140 (2021)
Kuivalainen, Ilkka: The Portrayal of Pompeian Bacchus. 2021. 285 p.

Vol. 141 (2021)
Solin, Heikki: Da Rodolfo Pio ai Farnese. Storia di due collezioni epigrafiche. 2021. 432 p.

ISSN 0069-6587 (print)
ISSN 2736-9374 (online)
ISBN 978-951-653-486-5 (print)
ISBN 978-951-653-487-2 (online)
DOI https://doi.org/10.54572/ssc.233