Part XII

HISTORY OF NEO-LATIN STUDIES
Preliminary Remarks

The statutes of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies (IANLS) define ‘Neo-Latin’ as ‘writings in Latin since the beginnings of Humanism’. The Companion to Neo-Latin Studies specifies that it is concerned with ‘all writings in Latin since the dawn of humanism in Italy from about 1300 AD, viz. the age of Dante and Petrarch, down to our own time’. The field of Neo-Latin studies thus embraces a massive corpus of sources produced in a large variety of different geographical, political, and cultural contexts during a period of more than seven hundred years. Since the sole criterion is the language in which the sources are written, the diversified landscape of Neo-Latin includes the poetical output of Italian Renaissance authors, sixteenth-century religious polemics by protagonists of the German Reformation, seventeenth-century tracts by French and English scientists, autobiographies written in Latin by eighteenth-century authors from Guinea or China, nineteenth-century doctoral dissertations from Sweden, Latin poetry about the First World War or the Prague Spring, and Latin translations of Winnie-the-Pooh, the Harry Potter series, and Patrick Süskind’s Das Parfum.

Neo-Latin studies have therefore been compared in the past to ‘a house with many different rooms’, or, if not a ‘roomy mansion’, then at least ‘a camping-site, where scholars from varying backgrounds might set up their tents temporarily’, since the field focusses on texts of importance for the study of literature, linguistics, classical scholarship, art history, and the spoken or sung parts of it. For example, the weekly digest of world news, called Nuntii Latini and broadcast on Finnish radio since 1989, would not belong to the field of Neo-Latin studies, but its written version does.

It is interesting to note that, at least according to a strict observance of the IANLS statutes, Neo-Latin includes all writings produced by practitioners of so-called living Latin (i.e. the movement to keep Latin alive as a vehicle for contemporary communication and poetic expression; cf. Wilfried Stroh, ‘Lebendig Latein’, in Der neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike, Rezeptions- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte, vol. 15/1, ed. by Manfred Landfester, H. Cancik, and H. Schneider (Stuttgart – Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2001), cols. 92-99) but not the spoken or sung parts of it. For example, the weekly digest of world news, called Nuntii Latini and broadcast on Finnish radio since 1989, would not belong to the field of Neo-Latin studies, but its written version does.

music, theology, philosophy, law, the history of science, pedagogy, and much more. Acknowledging this diversity, the present contribution nevertheless focuses on Neo-Latin scholarship per se (devoted explicitly and/or exclusively to post-mediaeval Latin written sources), as opposed to Neo-Latin scholarship per accidens (dealing with Neo-Latin sources more or less fortuitously, e.g. a biographical study of a seventeenth-century scientist that is based on Latin source material).

Neo-Latin sources are sometimes categorised chronologically as belonging to a ‘classical period’ (fifteenth and sixteenth centuries), a ‘later period’, or ‘contemporary work’. This division is problematic, not only because of the use of ‘classical’, which might create confusion, but also because the suggested periodisation does not include the sources from the fourteenth century, which—at least according to the ‘official’ IANLS definition—also belong to the field of Neo-Latin studies. Perhaps it would therefore be better to speak of a ‘humanist (or Renaissance) era’ (roughly the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, during which Neo-Latin is distinguished from mediaeval Latin by its observance of ancient grammar and vocabulary), a ‘later period’ (roughly the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries), and the era of ‘living Latin’ (twentieth and twenty-first centuries). However, the following history of scholarship devoted to Neo-Latin sources (regardless of their time of production, although it must be said that the large majority of available scholarship focuses on the humanist/Renaissance era) is organised around certain key moments in the history of Neo-Latin studies, namely the introduction of the term ‘Neo-Latin’ at the end of the eighteenth century, the boom of Neo-Latin studies after the Second World War, and the growing interest in methodological questions since the dawn of the new millennium.

___

6 See the chapter ‘Neo-Latin’ in The Year’s Work in Modern Language Studies, prepared in recent years by Dirk Sacré and Jan Papy.


Renaissance authors edited and reflected on the Latin writings of their immediate predecessors and their contemporaries, and one could therefore argue that the field of Neo-Latin is as old as the texts it studies. Already in the late fourteenth century, ‘editions’ (with or without annotations) and anthologies of prominent Latin authors, such as Petrarck (1304-1374), would circulate in manuscript. Biographical information about the same authors would be provided by works like De vita et moribus domini Francisci Petracchi de Florentia by Giovanni Boccaccio (1313-1375). This practice continued during the following centuries with the publication of the work of individual Neo-Latin authors (with or without their consent), such as the posthumous editions of Jacopo Sannazaro (1456-1530) or Janus Secundus (1511-1536); the production of anthologies including the work of several authors, like the Roman Coryciana (1524); biographical collections, such as the Elogia virorum litteris illustrium of Paolo Giovio (1483-1552); or individual biographies, like the six (!) surviving Vitae sketching the life of the humanist Rudolph Agricola (1444-1485). Other works offered early surveys of Neo-Latin literature, as is the case with the Commentaria epistolarum conficiendarum of Heinrich Bebel (1472-1518) or the Poetices libri septem of Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484-1558), which not only treat ancient authors, but also list noteworthy writers from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and the first half of the sixteenth century. An early example of a commentary on a Neo-Latin text is provided by Jodocus Badius Ascensius (1462-1635) commenting on the Eclogues of Baptista Mantuanus (1448-1516), whereas an early critique of fifteenth-century humanist Latin is available in the dialogue De hominibus
doctis by Paolo Cortesi (1465-1510), and an early example of the teaching of Neo-Latin literature is found in the introductory course by Juan Luis Vives (1492/1493-1540) on the Convivio of Francisco Filefio (1398-1481).

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, this activity increased further, leading to an even wider spectrum of anthologies, which were frequently devoted to Neo-Latin authors from a particular literary circle, religious order, or country—including several collections entitled Delitiae (poetarum Italarum, Germanorum, Gallorum, Belgicorum, Scotorum, Hungaricorum, etc.)—or focussing on a particular genre, such as the Elegantiiores praes- tantium virorum satyrae (1655) or the Poemata didascalica (1749). Reference works treating the life and work of Neo-Latin authors include the Bibliotheca mediae et infimae Latinitatis initiated by Johannes Albertus Fabricius (1668-1736), and several collections organised around a geographical criterion, such as the Athenae Batavae of Johannes Meursius (1579-1639), the Athenae Belgicae of Franciscus Sweertius (1567-1629), and the Bibliotheca scriptorum Mediolanensis of Philippus Argellatus (1685-1755). We also find biographical studies devoted to a single Neo-Latin author that were published independently, such as The Life of Erasmus by the antiquary Samuel Knight (1677/1678-1746). During the same period, several monumental editions of prominent Neo-Latin authors came from the presses as well. Examples include the Opera omnia of Justus Lipsius (1547-1606), first published in Lyon in 1613, and in a more trustworthy version in Antwerp in 1637; the edition of Desiderius Erasmus (1469?-1536) by Jean Le Clerc (1657-1736), printed in Leiden in 1703; and the 1789 edition of the works of Marc Antoine Muret (1526-1585) by the classical scholar David Ruhnken (1723-1798).8

Most of the earliest examples of Neo-Latin studies mentioned above treat Neo-Latin as a form of contemporary literature and/or as a continuation of classical Latin. The field of Neo-Latin studies, in other words, was not clearly identified, demarcated, or named—which would only happen at the end of the eighteenth century with the definition of the term 'Neo-Latin'.9 The words 'neulatinein' and 'neulatinesisch' were used in eighteenth-century German to refer to post-classical forms of the language;10 the earliest traced occurrence of the term to denote a separate phase in Latin literature is found in the Neulateinische Chrestomathie (1795) of Ernst Gottlob Klose (1766-1818), who was professor at the Königlichen Ritterakademie in Liegnitz (now Legnica, in southwestern Poland). The book in question is an anthology of anecdotes, stories, letters, and other Latin texts written by a diverse selection of authors, including Angelo Poliziano (1454-1494), Aldus Manutius (1449-1515), Erasmus, Augerius Gislenius Busbequius (1522-1592), and Tiberius Hemsterhuis (1685-1766). Its title may have inspired the German-born Johann Dominicus Fuss (1782-1860), who was a professor of Latin literature at the University of Liège, to coin the Latin word 'neo-latinus' in his Dissertatio de linguae Latinae ... usu, deque poesi et poetis neo-latinis (1822).11

The process of defining Neo-Latin studies took place at a time when Latin had lost its linguistic dominance in basically all cultural, political, and academic contexts, and the value of the study and teaching of post-classical Latin texts was

8 Additional examples of Neo-Latin studies in the period c.1300-1795 are listed in Don Cameron Allen, ‘Latin Literature’, Modern Language Quarterly, 2.3 (1941: i.e. a special issue devoted to a survey of Renaissance studies), 403-420; Jozef IJsewijn and Dirk Sacré, Companion to Neo-Latin Studies. Part II: Literary, Linguistic, Philological and Editorial Questions (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1998) Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 41.


10 Examples are found in the Magazin für die neue Historie und Geographie of 1773 (p. 507) and the supplements to the Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung vom Jahre 1785 (fünfter Band), printed in 1787 (p. 248).

11 Although the various translations of ‘Neulatinein’ cause no confusion in most languages, it is worthy of note that in Italian (and sometimes in French), the term ‘le lingue neolatine’ (or ‘les langues néolatines’) can instead refer to the Romance languages.
put into question. In response to this, authors such as Ernst Gottlob Klose, Johann Dominicus Fuss, and the Englishman Walter Savage Landor (1775-1864) wrote apologetic works defending their interest in post-medieval Latin literature and the continued use of Latin as a language for contemporary communication and expression, and in doing so, developed a terminology to describe and promote their preferred field, which they saw as a contribution, rather than a threat to classical scholarship. We also find a renewed scholarly interest in Neo-Latin sources during the second half of the nineteenth century amongst scholars from disciplines other than Latin philology, stimulated by groundbreaking studies of Renaissance culture, such as Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums oder das erste Jahrhundert des Humanismus by Georg Voigt (1827-1891) and Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien by Jacob Burckhardt (1818-1897). The Latin literature of the age was treated as a separate entity in Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance by Eduard Norden (1868-1941), and by Alexander Baumgartner (1841-1910), who included a chapter about ‘Die lateinische Literatur der Neuzeit’ in his history of world literature and who treated Renaissance authors such as Johannes Reuchlin (1455-1522) and Guillaume Budé (1467-1540), as well as Pope Leo XIII (1878-1903), famous for his Latin poetry.

This growing interest led to critical editions of Neo-Latin texts (for instance in the series Bibliotheca scriptorum latinorum recentioris aetatis produced by Teubner) and the publication of biographies of prominent Neo-Latin authors, such as Petrarch, Erasmus, and Thomas More (1478-1535). Other monographs focussed on particular genres, such as Les colloques scolaires du XVIe siècle et leurs auteurs (1480-1570) by Jean Adolphe Massebieau (1840-1904), Forschungen und Texte zur frühhumanistischen Komödie by Ernst Buteler (1885-1960), or Das Jesuitendrama in den Ländern deutscher Zunge vom Anfange (1555) bis zum Hochbarock (1665) by Johannes Müller (1864-1949). Also noteworthy are the histories of Neo-Latin literature in certain regions, such as Della poesia latina in Germania durante il rinascimento by Guido Mana- corda (1879-1965), the multi-volume Geschichte der neulateinischen Literatur Deutschlands im sechzehnten Jahrhundert of Georg Ellinger (1859-1939), and Musae Anglicanae: A History of Anglo-Latin Poetry, 1500-1925 by Leicester Bradner (1899-1989).

During the first half of the twentieth century, a number of new book series devoted to Neo-Latin texts were established. In 1928 Henry De Vocht (1878-1962), professor of English at the University of Leuven, founded Humanistica Lovaniensia, a series of monographs on Renaissance humanism, which included studies and editions of Neo-Latin authors (especially those from the Low Countries). The Bibliotheca scriptorum medii recentisque aevorum, founded by László Juhász (1905-1970) in 1930, published mediaeval and Neo-Latin texts from 1930 to 1946 (and was re-established in 1976). In Italy, we find the Nuova collezione di testi umanistici inediti o rari, established in 1939 by Giovanni Gentile (1875-1944) and Augusto Mancini (1875-1957). The first American text series for Renaissance Latin works was Studies in the Renaissance Pastoral, which was established by Wilfred P. Mustard (1864-1932) and was discontinued after only five volumes. Other important editorial projects concern the correspondence of luminaries from the Renaissance and early modern period, such as Eneas Silvius Piccolomini (1405-1464), Konrad Celtis (1459-1508), Konrad Peutinger (1465-1547), and Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1560). The most prestigious of these enterprises is the critical edition of the Opus Epistolarium of Erasmus initiated

---


13 Ernst Klose, Neulateinische Christomathie (1795), quoted according to the review in the Neue allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek, 25 (1796), 179: ‘Sie soll die Lektüre der alten Classiker nicht verdrängen, sondern vielmehr befördern’.

---

14 Cf. micropædia article on ‘Pioneers of Neo-Latin Studies’. 
by Percy Stafford Allen (1869-1933), which has been labelled the finest achievement of a single scholar in recent European learning.15 Another catalyst driving Neo-Latin scholarship was the foundation of a number of journals devoted to mediaeval and Renaissance studies which also publish articles devoted to Neo-Latin texts, authors, and genres, such as the Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et la Renaissance (in the beginning simply called Humanisme et Renaissance), established in 1934 by Eugénie Droz (1893-1976) and Abel Lefranc (1863-1952), and Medievalia et Humanistica, founded by S. Harrison Thomson (1895-1975) in 1943.

Despite this growing interest, it is fair to state that Neo-Latin remained ‘the lost Atlantis’ on the map of world literature.16 In 1941, Don Cameron Allen (1903-1972) provided a survey of existing scholarship on Renaissance Latin literature and lamented the lack of editions, translations, and bio-bibliographical studies which would facilitate the writing of much-needed general studies of Neo-Latin drama and prose, the preparation of a Neo-Latin lexicon, the composition of studies focussing on cross-influences between various national traditions of Neo-Latin or between Neo-Latin and vernacular literature, and so much more.17 Allen’s article thus constituted a strong summons for an intensified study of Neo-Latin, albeit in the service of the study of vernacular literatures rather than as a discipline in its own right.18

C. 1944-C. 2000

Most of Allen’s desiderata would be answered during the second half of the twentieth century, which saw an expansive growth in Neo-Latin studies focussing on the Renaissance period (which was Allen’s primary concern), but also paying more and more attention to the later periods as well. A first major step forward was the excellent survey of Neo-Latin literature prepared by Paul Van Tieghem (1871-1948) and printed as a 250-page article in the Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance in 1944 (and later reprinted in book form in 1966). Moreover, the increase in scholarly interest in Neo-Latin is clearly visible in the newly appearing specialised bibliographical overviews. Since 1954, an annual survey entitled Neo-Latin News has been published as a supplement to the journal Seventeenth-Century News.19 Similarly, since 1970 The Year’s Work in Modern Language Studies frequently has included a chapter specifically devoted to Neo-Latin.

The establishment of Neo-Latin studies as an independent academic discipline is further evident from the revival, in 1968, of Humanistica

---


17 Similar observations about the neglected riches of Neo-Latin literature are found in Richard Meister, ‘Bedeutung und Umfang des lateinischen Schrifttums im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit’, Mitteilungen des Vereines Klassischer Philologen in Wien, 10 (1933), 3-35; and Otto Schumann, ‘Die lateinische Literatur als geschichtliche Gesamterscheinung’, Romanische Forschungen, 60 (1947), 605-616; but both provide little information about existing secondary literature in comparison to Allen.


19 One of its first issues, published in Seventeenth-Century News, 12 (1954), 40, also lists four desiderata for Neo-Latin studies (a Neo-Latin dictionary, better bibliographic service, more translations, and a general history of modern Latin literature), and announces that the last of these has been in the making since 1952. This cooperative history of Neo-Latin literature was apparently never finished.
Lovaniensia as an annual journal of Neo-Latin studies by Jozef IJsewijn (1932-1998), who in 1966 created the Seminarium Philologiae Humanisticae, assembling Neo-Latin scholars active at the University of Leuven, and who was appointed professor of Latin at the same university the following year.\textsuperscript{20} In contrast with the aforementioned journals focussing more generally on mediaeval and/or Renaissance studies and new, relevant serials in the same field, such as Italia Medioevale e Umanistica (since 1958), Renaissance Quarterly (since 1967), the Sixteenth-Century Journal (since 1969), and Interpres: rivista di studi quattrocenteschi (since 1978), Humanistica Lovaniensia is entirely devoted to Neo-Latin studies. The journal also contains two important tools for Neo-Latin research: a lexicon of Neo-Latin words, entitled Instrumentum Lxicographicum Neolatinum, published since 1973, and the Instrumentum Bibliographicum Neolatinum (first included in HL in 1974), which is the most comprehensive annual bibliography of Neo-Latin studies, systematically ordered and accompanied by critical notes. The latter provides the clearest proof of the relentless expansion of Neo-Latin studies during the second half of the twentieth century; each year’s ‘harvest’ is many times larger than Allen’s overview of the whole of Neo-Latin scholarship produced before 1941.\textsuperscript{21} The Supplemen
ta Humanistica Lovaniensia, also prepared by members of the Seminarium Philologiae Humanisticae, have taken over the role of the original series founded by Henry De Vocht and since 1978 have published conference proceedings, exhibition catalogues, monographs, and critical text editions. A similar initiative is found at the University of Bonn, where with the arrival of Marc Laureys (b. 1963) in 1997, the chair of mediaeval Latin was expanded to include Neo-Latin. Together with Karl August Neuhausen (b. 1939), Laureys is responsible for the production of Neulateinisches Jahrbuch (first issue in 1999), a journal of Neo-Latin language and literature publishing contributions on Neo-Latin topics followed by book reviews, announcements, and reports of scholarly projects in the field; and its supplement Noctes Neolatinae, a series of editions and monographical studies on Neo-Latin texts and topics.

A number of periodicals founded during the second half of the twentieth century are centred on the life and work of specific Neo-Latin authors, and they sometimes act as the main communication medium of a designated society. Examples include Moreana, the journal of the Amici Thomae Mori that has been published since 1963; the Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook, founded in 1980; and Bruniana & Campanelliana, published since 1995 and devoted to studies concerning Giordano Bruno (1548-1600) and Tommaso Campanella (1568-1639), but also more generally to the high and late Renaissance. Serials devoted to ‘living Latin’, and thus not only studying, but also practising Neo-Latin, should be mentioned in this context as well. The most prominent of these are Latinitas, appearing since 1953; Vox Latina, first published in 1965; and Melissa, a bimonthly journal founded in 1984.\textsuperscript{22} Other initiatives offer book-length studies of Neo-Latin topics or editions and/or translations of Neo-Latin texts. The most prestigious of these is Les Classiques de l’Humanisme, published by Les Belles Lettres under the auspices

\textsuperscript{20} Cf. micropaedia article on ‘Pioneers of Neo-Latin Studies’.

\textsuperscript{22} For an overview and discussion of Latin periodicals, see Dirk Sacré, ‘Le latin vivant: les périodiques latins’, Les études classiques, 56 (1988), 91-104.
of the Association Guillaume Budé, which offers annotated bilingual Latin-French editions (since 1954) of a vast corpus of Neo-Latin authors, thus mirroring the famous Collection des Universités de France of classical Greek and Latin texts. Other noteworthy series of editions and/or studies include the Humanistische Bibliothek, published under the auspices of the Seminar für Geistesgeschichte und Philosophie der Renaissance in Munich since 1967, the Cartege umanistici produced at the Istituto Nazionale di studi sul Rinascimento in Florence since 1984, the Bibliotheca Neolatina (first volume in 1988), the Colección Humanistas Españoles from the University of León (first volume in 1990), Humanismo y pervivencia del Mundo Clásico (i.e. a series of conferences started in 1990, followed by the publication of the conference proceedings), the Hamburger Beiträge zur Neulateinischen Philologie established by Walther Ludwig (b. 1929) in 1997, the Bibliotheca Litteratis Novae founded by Jan Waszink (b. 1969) in 1998, and the Renaissance Latin Poetry by Ian D. McFarlane (1915-2002).

During the second half of the twentieth century, enormous advances were made in locating, identifying, and cataloguing Neo-Latin sources. The most important impetus impulse to this was given by Paul Oskar Kristeller (1905-1999), who instigated two long-term scholarly enterprises, opening up numerous new horizons for Neo-Latin studies. He not only acted as the first editor of the Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum, a survey and study of mediaeval and Renaissance Latin translations and commentaries of which the first volume appeared in 1960, but was also the author of the Iter Italicum, a finding list of uncatalogued or incompletely catalogued texts written by Renaissance humanists and surviving in manuscript depositories around the world, appearing in six volumes between 1963 and 1992. Bio-bibliographical reference works, such as the Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300-1800 by Mario E. Cosenza (1880-1966), several volumes of Bibliographie de l’humanisme des anciens Pays-Bas initiated by Aloïs Gerlo (1915-1998), or the Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation by Peter G. Bietenholz (b. 1933) and Thomas B. Deutscher (b. 1949), were also important steps in facilitating Neo-Latin research, as was the production of Neo-Latin dictionaries, such as the Lexique de la prose latine de la Renaissance (1994; revised and expanded edition in 2006) of René Hoven (1922-2010). Moreover, a number of international projects have helped to open up the field of Neo-Latin studies. Examples include the

23 Concerning these two comprehensive series of Erasmus’s works, commonly referred to as ASD and CWE, see James K. McConica, ‘Erasmus in Amsterdam and Toronto’, in Editing Texts from the Age of Erasmus.

24 Cf. micropaedia article on ‘Pioneers of Neo-Latin Studies’. 

Nordic Neo-Latin Project, which ran from 1987 until 1991 and grouped Latinists from Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden together in their efforts to create a database of Neo-Latin printed books from or about the Nordic countries, and the Europa Humanistica project, a network of researchers in Europe and South America initiated in the 1990s by the Section de l’humanisme of the Parisian Institut de recherche et d’histoire des textes, aiming to produce a multi-volume bibliographic and documentary inventory of European humanists and their editions of Greek and Latin texts.

An important turning point in the history of Neo-Latin studies was the first International Congress for Neo-Latin Studies, convened in Leuven in August 1971, which brought together more than two hundred participants hailing from nineteen countries in Europe, America, and Australia. This enthusiasm led to the establishment of an International Association for Neo-Latin Studies at a second conference held in Amsterdam two years later. The founding officers of the IANLS were Jozef IJsewijn (president), Richard J. Schoeck (1920-2008, first vice president), Jean-Claude Margolin (1923-2013, second vice president), Pierre Tuynman (secretary), and Eckhard Kessler (b. 1938, treasurer). The first statutes of the association were ratified at the 1976 conference in Tours and—apart from providing a concrete, albeit very broad, definition of Neo-Latin studies—define the aims and purposes of the IANLS as follows: 1) to promote interest in Neo-Latin and the advancement of Neo-Latin studies; 2) to make accessible to all members, by means of publications to be approved by the association, information of common interest, especially concerning the teaching of and research in Neo-Latin in colleges and universities, institutes, and other centres of learning; 3) to hold international congresses at regular intervals; 4) to promote, wherever possible, the publication of research and texts in Neo-Latin and related fields; and 5) to promote the teaching of Neo-Latin at all appropriate levels of education.

26 A complete list of these acts is available on the IANLS website (http://www.ianls.org, accessed 12 May 2011).

27 See, for example, Joachim Klawski, Thomas Morus, Utopia. Ein Versuch, das Werk für die Schullektüre zur erschliessen’, in Impulse für die lateinische Lektüre. Von Terenz bis Thomas Morus, ed. by Heinrich Krefeld (Frankfurt on Main: Hirschgraben, 1979), pp. 269-291, and the special issue of Der Altsprachliche Unterricht (27.6) published in 1984 which was devoted to ‘Neulateinische Literatur im Lateinunterricht’. The same concern is also present in another special issue of the same journal that appeared two years later, entitled ‘Zur Lektüre mittel- und neulateinischer Texte’.


University of Cambridge (where the Cambridge Society For Neo-Latin Studies has been active since 1991) and University College Cork (which has housed a Centre for Neo-Latin Studies since 1999). Apart from these initiatives connected with specific academic institutions, we also find a number of national societies of Neo-Latin studies, which are open to non-academics as well. Examples include the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies (formed in 1983), the Nederlands Neolatinistenverband (since 1989) in the Netherlands, Orbis Neolatinus, Vlaamse Vereniging voor de studie van Humanisme en Neolatijn (since 1995) in the Flemish part of Belgium, the Deutsche Neulateinische Gesellschaft (since 1998), and the Société Française d’Études Néo-latines (founded in 1998) and replaced by La Société Française d’Études Médio- et Néo-Latines in 2006). In the field of ‘living Latin’, mention should be made of the international Academia Latinitati Fovendae, established in 1967.

Another defining moment in the history of Neo-Latin studies was the publication of Jozef IJsewijn’s Companion of Neo-Latin Studies in 1977, serving a twofold goal as a guide for beginners interested in Renaissance, baroque, and modern Latin works, and as a compendium of factual and bibliographic information for scholars already working in Neo-Latin studies or related disciplines. The book evidently filled a long-felt lacuna, and was soon out of print. Moreover, the enormous growth of Neo-Latin studies in the following decades soon called for an expanded edition. The first part of the second entirely rewritten version of the Companion was printed in 1990 and consists of a comprehensive history of Neo-Latin writings arranged according to geographical and cultural areas. A second part, written by Jozef IJsewijn and Dirk Sacré (b. 1957) and focussing on literary, linguistic, philological, and editorial questions, appeared in 1998 and attempts to cover all relevant literary forms and genres of Neo-Latin literature, followed by a discussion of the features of Neo-Latin vocabulary, syntax, style, prosody, and metre, and of the history of Neo-Latin studies.

The state of Neo-Latin studies at the end of the twentieth century was treated by Walther Ludwig in a handbook for Latin philology. Ludwig gives a valuable overview from the Renaissance until 1997 and discusses several phases and genres in Neo-Latin literature. Furthermore, he argues that Neo-Latin texts are a sound and sensible topic of research for Latinists, but also calls for interdisciplinary collaborations, since Neo-Latin texts need to be studied in their historical and cultural context.

**Recent Developments**

The specialised bibliographies mentioned above clearly testify to the fact that Neo-Latin studies have continued to flourish in recent years. Most of the Neo-Latin book series and journals are continued, and a number of new initiatives were undertaken. Recently founded journals relevant to Neo-Latin studies include Calamus Renascens: Revista de humanismo y tradición clásica (first issue in 2000), Les Cahiers de l’Humanisme (first issue in 2000), Silva: Estudios de humanismo y tradición clásica (first issue in 2002), Camoenae Hungaricae (first issue in 2004), and Camenae (published online since 2007), but it has to be said that not all of them have a stable output. An interesting initiative in the field of ‘living Latin’ is Vates: The Journal of New Latin Poetry, appearing online since 2010 and including not only newly written Latin verse, but also articles on Neo-Latin poetry. The last two examples further illustrate a noteworthy development, namely the growing presence of Neo-Latin on the World Wide Web since the end of the twentieth century. A number of important research tools which first appeared in print have been made available in electronic format (such as Kristeller’s Iter Italicum, or the list of Latin place names called Orbis Latinus), whereas others were specifically prepared for the Internet, such as the Neulateinische Wortliste of Johann Ramminger, the Bibliographical Aid to the Study of Renaissance Latin Texts by Marc van der Poel (b. 1957), and the above-mentioned Database of Nordic Neo-Latin Literature. Moreover, the Analytical

---

29 Ludwig, ‘Die neuzzeitliche lateinische Literatur seit der Renaissance’. 
Bibliography of On-line Neo-Latin Texts prepared by Dana F. Sutton (b. 1942) illustrates that more and more Neo-Latin texts are being made available online, either in the form of a digital reproduction of the original printing or in the form of a modern transcription/edition.30

A particularly appealing depository in this context is CAMENA—Latin Texts of Early Modern Europe, hosted by the German department of Heidelberg University in cooperation with the University of Mannheim.

Apart from the continuation of several large editorial projects initiated during the twentieth century, such as the ASD and CWE editions of Erasmus, and the Classiques de l’Humanisme series, the most important new collection of Neo-Latin texts is undoubtedly the very productive I Tatti Renaissance Library, established in 2001 by James Hankins (b. 1955), professor of history at Harvard University. The series publishes annually several bilingual (Latin-English) editions of major literary, historical, philosophical, and scientific works of the Italian Renaissance. Together with the exhibition ‘The Lost Continent: Neo-Latin Literature and the Rise of Modern European Literatures’, which was held on the occasion of the launch of the I Tatti Renaissance Library, and its often quoted catalogue, the series plays an important part in establishing the importance of Neo-Latin studies within the larger context of Renaissance and in making Neo-Latin texts available to a wide audience all over the world.

Other new initiatives are Palmyrenus. Colección de textos y estudios humanísticos, produced by the Alcalá Instituto de Estudios Humanísticos since 2002; the series Officina Neolatina. Selected Writings from the Neo-Latin World, which was announced at the 2006 IANLS conference and focusses on Neo-Latin texts produced outside of Italy; and the series Pluteus Neolatinus, initiated by Dirk Sacré and devoted to Neo-Latin texts from c. 1750 to c. 1950, of which the first volume appeared in 2010.

Furthermore, the new millennium saw the creation of a number of new research centres, such as the Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Neulateinischen Studien in Innsbruck in 2011; the formation of several new Neo-Latin societies, such as Hungaria Latina—Societas Neolatina Hungariae (founded in 2000) and the (British) Society of Neo-Latin Studies (active since 2005); and the creation of designated academic positions, like the Cassamarca Chair in Latin Humanism at the University of Western Australia, which was taken up by Yasmin Haskell (b. 1968) in 2003. Also noteworthy is the fact that Neo-Latin was recognised as a separate discipline within the Renaissance Society of America in 2006.

The growing attention to Neo-Latin studies has further resulted in the continued presence of the subject in the curricula of schools and universities,31 and the subsequent development of suitable course material, for instance in the form of an online anthology produced by members of the Society for Neo-Latin Studies. Other didactic material was presented at several Colloquia Didactica Neolatina organised at the University of Leuven in 1997, 2002, 2005, 2008, and 2013; a first instalment of this material appeared in print in 2004.32 Recent books intended for the mature student of Latin, such as


as various publications by Mark Walker (b. 1967), frequently include chapters about Neo-Latin topics as well, as do a growing number of publications devoted to the history of Latin from its beginnings to the present—most of which are aimed at a general rather than a purely academic audience, such as Le latin et le politique: Les avatars du latin à travers les âges by Guy Licoppe (b. 1931) or Ad Infinitum: A Biography of Latin by Nicholas Ostler (b. 1952).

One of the most noteworthy recent developments in Neo-Latin studies is the rise of so-called ‘meta-Neo-Latin studies’, which reflect on the epistemological foundations, the theoretical premises, and the methodology of this field of research. Apart from the Companion(s), which offer a very broad definition of Neo-Latin studies in line with the statutes of the IANLS and provide bibliographical and practical rather than methodological or theoretical guidance, there seems to have been relatively little self-analysis amongst Neo-Latin scholars until the turn of the twenty-first century. Admittedly, there is no lack of apologetic articles defending the value of Neo-Latin studies, but few of these actually discuss methodological issues. As a result, Neo-Latin scholars are sometimes perceived as ‘a community of faith instead of a community of scholarship’. In an effort to change this, several efforts have been made in recent years to start up the debate. In 1999, Jürgen Leonhardt (b. 1957) presented seven theses concerning the position of Latin within the humanities. He points out the challenges posed by the declining knowledge of Latin and stresses the need for Latin skills when studying the intellectual history of the early modern period. Leonhardt therefore argues for a professionalisation of the field, a revision of the educational system, and interdisciplinary collaboration. Heinz Hofmann (b. 1944) made two more extensive contributions to the discussion


CHAPTER 66  HISTORY OF NEO-LATIN STUDIES

in 2000.35 The author discusses the reasons that Neo-Latin literature has been recognised as an autonomous literature sui generis and as an academic discipline only during the last decades of the twentieth century. He also discusses the ways in which he would like to see Neo-Latin studies develop further, stressing that the study of Neo-Latin requires a double competence, in the sense that a Neo-Latin scholar needs to unite, in one person, the linguistic skills of a classical scholar and a thorough knowledge of the political, social, religious, and cultural context in which the texts studied were produced. Philip Ford (1949-2013), in an article published in the same year, made a similar plea that Neo-Latin scholars need to have a thorough grounding, both linguistic and literary, in classical literature, while at the same time being well versed in the vernacular literature and contemporary history of the countries on whose authors they are working.36

Another extensive discussion was initiated by Hans Helander (b. 1942) in 2001.37 The author lists some convincing reasons to study Neo-Latin texts, calls for a combination of a diachronic and a synchronic approach, and criticises the focus on belletristic Neo-Latin literature, which is disproportionate to the surviving corpus of Neo-Latin texts. His contribution is followed by a number of comments by prominent Neo-Latin scholars, who stress the vastness of the Neo-Latin field, resulting in a lack
of a fixed identity, focused disciplinary boundaries, or a generally accepted methodology. In response, some of the interventions argue for a more coherent programme of research objectives and for interdisciplinary collaborations, or suggest a distinction between texts in which Latin is only the medium of the message (e.g. scientific works written in Latin because it was the foremost academic language at the time) and texts in which the language is also an end in itself (e.g. Neo-Latin poetry). Several remarks are also made concerning the institutionalisation of Neo-Latin as an academic discipline and the development of new research tools, such as a unified online bibliography.

In 2003 Jürgen Leonhardt indicated that despite the enormous advances made in Neo-Latin scholarship over the past decades, the Neo-Latin corpus was still very much an almost impenetrable forest. He compares the situation of Neo-Latin scholars with that of Italian Renaissance humanists, chasing manuscripts of classical authors, or nineteenth-century archaeologists, excavating ancient sites. This provides scholars with the opportunity and the pleasure of making discoveries, but also holds the danger of them not going any further and failing to determine which texts are important and which are not, thus losing the opportunity to convince scholars from different backgrounds of the importance of Neo-Latin studies. Leonhardt argues for a ‘popularisation’ of Neo-Latin studies, which needs to make sure that students and scholars from backgrounds different from classical studies can easily get acquainted with Neo-Latin. He further advocates a specific research programme which focusses on the creation of a Neo-Latin canon, the production of a general literary history of Neo-Latin, a more careful consideration of Neo-Latin texts against their specific historical and cultural background, and the creation of a more thorough introduction to the tools and methods of Neo-Latin research. A more basic research programme was suggested in 2007 by Nikolaus Thurn (b. 1962), who identified three main tasks for Neo-Latin scholarship in the twenty-first century: 1) to make a larger number of Neo-Latin texts available (e.g. through publication on the Internet); 2) to provide trustworthy translations of these Neo-Latin texts (accepting the fact that few students and scholars have sufficient linguistic skills to deal with the original texts); and 3) to write commentaries on the texts thus edited and translated.

The most recent contribution to the methodological debate was made by Toon Van Hal (b. 1981), who draws an interesting parallel with the historiography of linguistics, a subdiscipline of humanities almost exactly as old as Neo-Latin studies and whose main specialist journals devote many a page to methodological discussions, revealing a less apologetic but more self-critical approach to the field. Van Hal calls for ‘Meta-Neo-Latin Studies’, which ‘should try to find answers on theoretical questions (on the definition, demarcation, subdivision and interdisciplinary connections of Neo-Latin Studies), and should formulate methodological recommendations’ in an effort to avoid having Neo-Latin studies ‘grow into a giant with feet of clay’. The intention of the author is not to prescribe a single stringent theoretical approach to be rigorously applied to all Neo-Latin research, but rather to increase the degree of methodological objectivity by establishing a culture of self-reflection and thus creating an awareness of
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the premises, choices, and limitations of Neo-Latin scholarship.

**Epilogue**

Although Neo-Latin as the object of scholarly scrutiny may have received its name at the end of the eighteenth century, it was not until the second half of the twentieth century that Neo-Latin studies evolved into an independent academic discipline. The establishment of specialised journals and book series, the development of specific research tools, the creation of designated chairs at several European universities, and the foundation of research institutes and societies devoted to Neo-Latin studies have even led to what Walther Ludwig has termed a ‘Neo-Latin revolution’, implying that the expansive growth of Neo-Latin studies since World War II has changed the face of classical as well as Renaissance studies. The confirmation of the importance of Neo-Latin studies for our understanding of the cultural and intellectual history of Europe (and beyond) has nevertheless repeatedly fallen on deaf ears, perhaps because of Neo-Latin's lack of a fixed identity or a sound methodological basis. It remains to be seen whether the recent methodological reflections and new enterprises, such as the present Encyclopaedia for Neo-Latin Studies, will change the face and reputation of the discipline. It is in any case clear that several new developments, such as the ever growing number of Neo-Latin texts available in a modern translation, open up the field to a much larger group of students and scholars who are not always able to work with the original sources. One could say that this results in a split between Neo-Latin studies as an auxiliary science, preparing Neo-Latin texts (e.g. through the production of annotated translations) for further study by scholars from various backgrounds, and Neo-Latin studies *per se*, which do not primarily serve another discipline. In any case, the challenge lying ahead is to ensure that students of Neo-Latin acquire the two-fold competence advocated by Ludwig, Hofmann, Ford, and others, making sure that—despite the general decline of Latin instruction all over the world—ever new generations of scholars possess the skills necessary to edit, translate, and study Neo-Latin texts.
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