

The role of classical, medieval, and Renaissance lexicography in the development of neo-Latin: some examples from the Latin works of Marcus Marulus

Johann Ramminger

Many studies concerning the reception of Perotti's encyclopedic dictionary of Latin, the *Cornu copiae*, have looked at the dissemination of its contents by trying to identify traces in the œuvre of various humanists.¹ This approach has allowed us to get nearer to an understanding of the importance of Perotti's work by scrutinizing exemplary cases of his reception. Its disadvantage is that the focus on one particular source and strand of reception automatically (over)emphasizes its importance and neglects the fact that a Latin text will usually have been formulated under a multitude of influences. This study will use an inverse perspective and look at the question of reception from a recipient's point of view.

The present study focuses on the humanist Marcus Marulus, often called *Delmata*, i. e. from Dalmatia, or *Spalatensis*, from the Croatian town Split, where he spent his life. Marko Marulić (1450–1524) came from a patrician family, his father was a notary and himself a man of literary interests. During Marulus' lifetime Split was in the dominion of the Serenissima, nevertheless he does not seem to have attended the Venetian university at Padova, studying only with Italian humanists teaching in Split itself. There he spent his life, administering the family fortune, travelling to Italy occasionally, and pursuing his studies. He was not only the writer of a collection of epigrams, but also of an epic *Davidias* in Latin, and a *Judita*, the first epic in Croatian. Amongst his writings there are also works concerning Christian ethics, such as *De institutione bene uiuendi per exempla sanctorum*, written in imitation of Valerius Maximus, and the *Euangelistarium* containing moral examples from the Old and New Testament. Especially the *De institutione* had a notable fortune in the sixteenth century; it was amongst others a favorite book of the English king Henry VIII, whose copy with his marginal notes is today in the British Library.² Marulus also left a commonplace book, the so-called *Repertorium*, containing his excerpts from a long series of pagan and Christian authors under headings ordered alphabetically, which he compiled over several decades.³

We know from the two extant catalogues of Marulus's library⁴ that he had at his disposal the cutting edge lexicographical scholarship of his day, such as Valla's *Elegantiae*⁵, Tortelli's *De orthographia*, Giuniano Maio's *De priscorum proprietate verborum* (first printed 1475), and Perotti's *Cornu copiae* (first printed 1489). He also possessed copies of Nonius and Festus, Varro's *De lingua Latina*, and Servius' Vergil-commentaries, as well as medieval works such as Isidorus' *Etymologiae* and the *Doctrinale* of Alexander de Villa Dei. The *Repertorium* is another important source for his scholarship. It contains explicit

¹ See J.-L. Charlet, *Niccolò Perotti, humanist du Quattrocento: bibliographie critique*, Acta of the congress "Niccolò Perotti. Un umanista romano del secondo Quattrocento" at the Istituto Storico per il Medioevo & Danish Academy in Rome, 4–5. 6. 2009, «Renaissanceforum» 7 (2011), forthcoming.

² See A. Clarke, *Henry VIII and Marko Marulić's Evangelistarium*, «Colloquia Maruliana» 29 (2011), forthcoming.

³ I will quote the works of Marulus from the *Collected Works of Marko Marulić* (Split): *Euangelistarium*, ed. B. Glavičić, 1985; *De institutione bene uiuendi per exempla sanctorum*, ed. B. Glavičić, 1986–7; *Repertorium*, ed. B. Glavičić, 1998–2000.

⁴ See B. Lučin, *Studia humanitatis u Marulićevoj knjižnici* [*The Studia humanitatis in Marulic's Library*], «Colloquia Maruliana» 6 (1997), pp. 169–203.

⁵ as well as a *compendium elegantiarum Valle* (by Bonaccorso da Pisa?), Lučin, *Studia*, cit., pp. 175. 177.

references to a large number of both Latin and Greek writers (e. g. Strabo, Thucydides, Plutarch, in humanist translations); among them Gellius features prominently.

Lexis rather than syntax was the touchstone of imitation for the humanists themselves, as McLaughlin in his recent book on *Literary Imitation in the Italian Renaissance* has emphasized.⁶ In the following I shall analyse one specific lexical phenomenon: the transfer of words from the lexicographic and antiquarian literature (a clearcut separation between the two is often not possible) of antiquity, the Middle Ages and the Renaissance into the works of Marulus; I will try to map the itinerary of some words from their first known occurrence in antiquity to the Latin of humanism, identify intermediary stations and thus reconstruct a particular feature of Marulus' Latin, its extent and function. I will focus on rare words: not only are they a convenient marker for the kind of language development we are looking for; also the 'excavation' of rare words from classical authors was in itself an important humanist strategy of language enrichment.

illuuiosus

My first example concerns the word *illuuiosus*, which Marulus uses in the *Euangelistarium*, when he defines false humility as the behaviour of those who

cilicio se tegunt, nudis pedibus ambulant, horridi, inculti, squalentes, illuuiosi, inter loquendum suspirant, ingemiscunt, fatentur se esse peccatores, crebro ad orandum procumbunt (cover themselves with rough cloth, walk with naked feet, are shaggy, filthy, dirty, foul, and sigh while they are speaking, lament and admit that they are sinners, and continuously fall down to pray). (*Euangelistarium* 6. 25)

Illuuiosus is not a word habitually used by classical authors – we know only one example –,⁷ but its meaning is clear: it is derived from *illuuius*, 'dirt', and designates an unwashed state. Words in *-osus* generally indicate a habit, repeated behaviour, habit, etc., but this is not an absolute rule, and the synonyms Marulus uses in the passage quoted indicate that for him it just means 'dirty'.

Given the scarce attestation and assuming that Marulus did not invent *illuuiosus* himself⁸, we can be fairly sure about the ultimate source. The word is used by Nonius in the explanation of *taeter*: "Taetrum dicitur inluuiosum, faetidum" (*taeter* means 'dirty', 'foul', *De compendiosa doctrina* p. 413 M.). Since Nonius uses it to explain another word, we would expect that it was current at least in the Latin of his time, but this can hardly have been the case. No example is known at present either before Nonius or afterwards until the word resurfaces in the late fifteenth century.

Since *illuuiosus* is not a lemma in Nonius, an otherwise reliable channel of transmission is not functioning: the word is absent from medieval as well as humanist dictionaries, most notably from Giuniano Maio and Niccolò Perotti, both of whom customarily excerpt the lemmata of Nonius.

⁶ See M. L. McLaughlin, *Literary Imitation in the Italian Renaissance. The Theory and Practice of Literary Imitation in Italy from Dante to Bembo*, Oxford 1995, p. 5. Intertextuality on a syntactic level has recently been discussed by L. Schøsler, *Intended and unintended linguistic intertextuality illustrated mainly by Montaigne, Rabelais, and Calvin*, paper delivered at the Colloquium "Intertextuality" at the Danish Academy in Rome 13.–14. 1. 2011, unpublished (I thank L. Schøsler for access to the ms.); C. Horster, *Lorenzo Vallas anvendelse af konjunktiv – om tidernes indbyrdes relationer i nylatinske ledsætninger*, unpublished master's thesis, Aarhus Universitet 2011; ead., *Perotti's syntax*, in Acta of the congress "Niccolò Perotti. Un umanista romano del secondo Quattrocento" at the Istituto Storico per il Medioevo & Danish Academy in Rome, 4–5. 6. 2009, «Renæssanceforum» 7 (2011), forthcoming.

⁷ *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Leipzig 1900–, VII. 1 col. 401. 58, s. v. *illuuiosum* (Haffter).

⁸ He uses *illuuius* once, in *Evangelistarium* 5. 7.

The earliest humanist example is from Ermolao Barbaro's famous letter to Pico della Mirandola from 1486:

quemadmodum oratio luxu diffluens atque fracta, sic squarosa, illuuiosa, lutulenta, sordida grauitatem et maiestatem philosophiae comminuunt (just as speech with a loose and piecemeal structure caused by exaggerated ornamentation diminishes the weighty majesty of philosophy, so does one which is scurfy, foul, filthy, and sordid).⁹

Barbaro applies *illuuiosus* metaphorically: 'dirty language' is bad style, barbaric words, and bad grammar. He ridicules the claim of philosophy to a sober and arid style with his choice of luxuriant synonyms: *lutulentus* is a Horatian word for the 'sordid' style of Lucilius, *squar(r)osus* is a hapax from a quotation of Lucilius preserved in Festus (i. e. the epitome of Paulus Diaconus), and of course *illuuiosus* itself is a rarity from Nonius. Thus within the textual strategy of belittling the philosophers' style, these words carried important messages. The allusion to Horace – which would not have been lost on the educated reader¹⁰ – implied (without having to say so) that the criticized works were longwinded, obscure, and not well thought through, the two others made fun of the presumed simplicity of philosophical writing through their ostentatious rarity.

The passage is the stylistic opposite of Marulus; none of the synonyms for 'dirty' in our passage suggests an elevated style. On the contrary, the others, *horridus* and *incultus*, are everyday words, suitable for the description of the triviality of the uncouth behaviour of hypocritical Christians. Thus the fact that *illuuiosus* was a rarity not necessarily implied elevated style. On the contrary, the humanist retained the low-key tone of the definition in Nonius. We will return to this phenomenon with some of the following examples.

For the sake of completeness we add that the word remains rare after Pico and Marulus. I have found only three more examples, the first from the *De baptismo paruulorum*, a work written in 1523 against Martin Luther by Johannes Cochlaeus (1479–1552), the second in a speech by Léger Du Chesne delivered in 1580, in a series of synonyms, the third from Francesco Maria Guazzo, in the *Compendium maleficarum*, from 1608, again in a series of synonyms.¹¹

expauidus

A word which Marulus used no less than nine times, both in prose and in epic poetry, is *expauidus*, 'being afraid'. He usually applied it to people (once *expauido ore*)¹², with *ex-* as an intensifying particle. A typical example is:

Mulieres expauidae in terram corruunt, mortem sibi timentes (Terrified, the women fell to earth, fearing for their lives). (*Institutio* II p. 565)

Remarkably, there is no other neo-Latin writer who ever uses the word, even though it came from a reputable classical source, the *Noctes Atticae*. The text from Gellius goes as follows (my emphasis):

Ad hanc (*i. Laidem hetaeram*) ille Demosthenes clanculum adit et, ut sui copiam faceret, petit. At Lais μυρία δραχμάς, id est decem drachmarum milia poposcit [...]

⁹ E. Barbaro, *Epistolae, Orationes et Carmina*, ed. V. Branca, Firenze 1943, no. 81, vol. I p. 105.

¹⁰ See a similar allusion in Sabellicus' *De reparatione* about the poor style of Flavio Biondo; M. Sabellico, *De latinae linguae reparatione*, ed. G. Bottari, Messina 1999, p.118.

¹¹ See J. Ramminger, *Neulateinische Wortliste. Ein Wörterbuch des Lateinischen von Petrarca bis 1700*, 2003–, s. v. *illuuiosus* (URL: www.neulatein.de).

¹² *Davidias* 1. 101 "Hec dicente deo Samuel stetit ore trementi | Expauidoque diu".

Tali petulantia mulieris atque pecuniae magnitudine **ictus expavidusque** Demosthenes auertitur et discedens “ego” inquit “poenitere tanti non emo”. Sed Graeca ipsa, quae fertur dixisse, lepidiora sunt: οὐκ ὄνοῦμαι, inquit, μυρίων δραχμῶν μεταμέλειαν, i. non emo centum sestertiis poenitere (Demosthenes secretly went to the prostitute Lais and asked her to make herself available to him. Lais, however, asked ten thousand drachmas. [...] Demosthenes, **struck and frightened** by the impudence of the woman and the enormity of the sum, turned away and said in leaving: “I am not going to buy my remorse so expensively”. But the Greek words he supposedly said are wittier: “I won’t buy a ten-thousand-drachma-change of mind”). (1. 8. 5–6)¹³

The episode, understandably popular because it combined a salacious adventure with a fine moral, was quoted amongst others by Erasmus in the *Adagia*,¹⁴ Ravisius Textor in the *De mulieribus claris*, and by Niccolò Perotti in the *Cornu copiae*. The passage from Perotti is especially interesting for us, because it illustrates the opposite stylistic ideals of the two humanists. Perotti, in a discussion of notable call-girls of antiquity, paraphrases the frustrating story of Lais and Demosthenes at length; the conclusion is as follows (my emphasis):

Demosthenes [...] mulieris petulantia ac pecuniae magnitudine **obstupefactus** retrocessisse et inter discedendum dixisse οὐκ ὄνοῦμαι μυρίων δραχμῶν μεταμέλειαν. Hoc est: ‘Equidem poenitere decem drachmarum milibus non emo’ (Demosthenes, **astounded** by the impudence of the woman and the enormity of the sum, turned away and said in leaving: “I won’t buy a ten-thousand-drachma-change of mind”, i. e. “I won’t by a remorse for ten thousand drachmas”). (*Cornu copiae* 63. 7 vol. VII p.57)

Perotti introduced a change to which I want to draw attention: when the story arrives at Gellius’ *ictus expavidusque*, Perotti replaces it with *obstupefactus*.¹⁵ We can easily reconstruct why Perotti made this change. There may have been a psychological motive, since surprise seems a more plausible emotion than fright at this point of the story. But there was also a good semantic reason for the change. Earlier in the *Cornu copiae*, Perotti had distinguished between “*pavidus* meaning ‘always afraid’, *pauens* being one who is afraid temporarily or for a specific reason” (*pavidus, semper timens: nam pauens dicitur, qui ad tempus uel ex causa timet; Cornu copiae* 22. 1 vol. VI p. 45). Gellius’ usage of the compound *expavidus* contradicted this explanation, since Demosthenes’ fright clearly was temporary and had a good reason; according to Perotti Demosthenes should, if anything, have been *expauens*. Consequently, since Perotti was not quoting Gellius verbally, but just paraphrased the passage, he brought the Latin in line with the norms he had reconstructed. It may be significant that Perotti in the *Cornu copiae* does not mention any compound of *pavidus*, even though antiquity besides *expavidus* knew *compavidus*, *impavidus*, *perpavidus*, and *praepavidus* (most of whom do not follow the rule established by Perotti).¹⁶

Marulus shows no awareness of the semantic problems identified or constructed by Perotti, when he, in a similar case, introduced the rare *expavidus* into a paraphrase. The

¹³ The text follows Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* (Venetiis: Iohannes de Tridino, 1496), fol. iiiiv, with adjustment of punctuation and Greek accents. The text in the edition Venetiis: Andreas de Paltasichis, 1477, sig. (a6)v, is substantially the same (with a different translation of the second Greek phrase). The modern text is somewhat different, e. g. it does not contain the Latin translations of the Greek.

¹⁴ Erasmus, *Adagia*, 1. 4. 1, see *Adagiorum chiliarum prima*, edd. M. L. van Poll-van den Lisdonk et al., *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami* II-1, Amsterdam etc. 1993, p. 408.

¹⁵ The meaning of *obstupefactus* “was obvious” (notae significationis, *Cornu copiae* 2. 503, vol. II p. 187), as Perotti says elsewhere in the *Cornu copiae*.

¹⁶ It even escaped Perotti’s notice that one compound, *impavidus*, actually occurred in the *Cornu copiae* once in a quotation from Virgil (Aen. 12. 7-8, in *Cornu copiae* 27. 61; vol. VI p. 107).

passage in question is from Valerius Maximus. The original text goes as follows (my emphasis):¹⁷

Sed ut alienigena scrutemur, cum obscurato repente sole inusitatis perfusae tenebris Athenae sollicitudine **angerentur**, interitum sibi caelesti denuntiatione portendi credentes, Pericles processit in medium et quae a praeceptore suo Anaxagora pertinentia ad solis et lunae cursum acceperat disseruit nec ulterius **trepidare** ciues suos uano metu passus est (But to look at foreign examples: when because of an eclipse of the sun and the ensuing darkness Athens was in fright and believed that heaven thus announced its ruin, Pericles stepped forward and set forth what he had learned from his teacher Anaxagoras about the course of sun and moon; thus he stopped the needless anxiety of the citizens.) (8. 11 ext. 1)

The one-sentence paraphrase of Marulus, instead of taking up Valerius Maximus' *angi* or *trepidare*, uses *expavidus*:

Sic et Pericles Athenas solis defectu **expavidas** omni metu liberavit (Thus Pericles freed Athens, frightened by the eclipse of the sun, from its anxiety). (*Repertorium* III p. 274)

Clearly, neither the rarity nor the semantic incongruity (if we accept Perotti's rationale) was a significant factor for Marulus.

This as well as the earlier example from Marulus highlight an important aspect of his resurrection of words from antiquity: he does not expect or even want the reader to recognize the source; an allusion to the call-girl story of Gellius would serve no purpose, indeed the association would have been unwelcome in this as well as in most other instances – the state of mind of Demosthenes after his abortive adventure was completely irrelevant within the context of Marulus.

fallaciosus

Considering that rare words or phrases are one of the most convenient markers of intertextual referentiality, it is surprisingly seldom that one of the rare words which Marulus revived reflected the original context even vaguely. One instance where it does is *fallaciosus*:

Facessant igitur a nobis fallaciosae stropharum argutiae enthymemataque dialecticorum. non terrenam scientiam sequimur, sed caelestem (Far from us be the deceptive subtlety of the tricks and conclusions of the logicians. We do not follow earthly, but heavenly science). (*Euangelistarium* 3. 3).

The word had been used fifteen years earlier by Pico della Mirandola (albeit with a slightly different meaning)¹⁸, and I have found one example in Bruno Carthusianus (11th c.)¹⁹; three examples from antiquity are known, one from Apuleius and two from Gellius,²⁰ and it is one of the latter that shows some resemblance to Marulus' (my emphasis):

¹⁷ Valerius Maximus 8.11 ext. 1.

¹⁸ *Adversus astrologiam divinatricem* (1492), ed. E. Garin, Firenze 1946–52, II, p.150 “in praedicendo plus istis fallaciosis somniis utebantur quam stellis et planetis”; *ibid.* p.280 “(astrologi) qui fallaciosis adeo nugis nec possibilibus vacent”.

¹⁹ *Patrologia Latina* vol. 152 col. 542A.

²⁰ *ThLL*, VI. 1 col. 177. 79–82 (Hofmann).

Post deinde usum esse Catonem dicit in eadem oratione argumentis parum honestis et nimis audacibus ac non uiri eius, qui alioqui fuit, sed uaftris ac **fallaciosis** et quasi Graecorum **sophistarum sollertiis** (Afterwards Cato is said to have used dishonest and far-fetched arguments in the same speech, which were ill-suited to the man he was otherwise, but consisted in cunning and shrewd deceptions used by the Greek sophists). (6. 3. 34)

Assuming that Marulus knew the passage in Gellius, there is no need to postulate that Marulus wanted his readers to recall it, but at least if a reader recognized the earlier passage, the association would not add an unsuitable dimension to the text.

praelumbare

The word *praelumbare* offers a more faceted case. The word was used by Nouius,²¹ a writer of farces in the first century b. C., in the following line:

coepit unum quemque praelumbare fustibus (he began to beat [?] everybody with clubs). (Nouius *Atell.* 93)

The fragment leaves the exact meaning of the verb unclear, but the action described in the verse is obviously violent. We know the verse from Nonius, who according to the modern text explains *praelumbare* as “lumbos perfringere” (to break the groin; p. 156 M.). The prefix *prae-* of *praelumbare* thus must be intensifying (‘through and through’), forming a type of compound more usual with adjectives, but not impossible for verbs. Our verse then means: “He started to smash everybody’s groin with a club”. For this type of violence, hopefully a comic hyperbole, we can refer to the Plautinian *lumbifragium*:²² “si me inritassis, hodie lumbifragium hinc auferes” (if you irritate me you can get your loins broken today, *Amph.* 454),²³ and: “fusti defloccabit ... lumbos meos; hac iter faciundumst, nam illac lumbifragiumst obuam” (he will pluck/shear my groin with a club; let’s go this way, because that one leads to the groin-breaking, *Cas.* 968).

Praelumbare lies dormant (aside from an entry in a glossary based on Nonius), until the word resurfaces in Renaissance lexicography. The one to resurrect²⁴ *praelumbare* from oblivion was Giuniano Maio in his *De priscorum proprietate uerborum* (first print Naples 1475):

Praelumbare lumbos praeFRINGERE. Neuius [!] in uindemiatoribus. caepit unumquemque praelumbare fustibus. No(nius) (fol. dd3v)

As we see, the text of Nonius had undergone several changes, one of which was the corruption of *perfringere* to *praeFRINGERE*.²⁵ Perotti has essentially the same text in the *Cornu copiae*:

²¹ *ThLL*, X. 2 col. 697. 22–27 (Gatti).

²² In *Casina* 968 the Ambrosian palimpsest (which has lost the *Amphitruo*) is the only authoritative witness attesting *lumbifragium*; most other mss. and incunables read *lumbifrangium*.

²³ The comic possibilities of *lumbifragium* (formed after *naufragium*, *lembifragium*) are explored by M. Fontaine, *Funny Words in Plautine Comedy*, Oxford 2010, 5, who glosses it as ‘prickwreck’.

²⁴ This is the chronology as it appeared from the point of view of a possible reader. Given the long genesis of Perotti’s *Cornu copiae* the passage in the latter may well have been compiled earlier.

²⁵ Nonii Marcelli *De conpendiosa doctrina libri XX*, ed. W. M. Lindsay, Lipsiae 1903, app. crit. ad l.; e. g. ed. Parma 1480 fol. XLIII^v “praeFRINGERE”.

A ‘lumbus’ [...] praelumbo uerbum [sc. *deriuatur*], quod significat lumbos praeFRINGO.²⁶ Nouius: “Coepit unumquemque praelumbare fustibus”. (Perotti, *Cornu copiae* 42. 26 vol. VI p. 241)

The fact that the meaning of *lumbos praeFRINGERE* was anything but clear did not trouble Renaissance lexicographers. Perotti elsewhere in the *Cornu copiae* stated that *praeFRINGERE* meant ‘ante frangere’ (*Cornu copiae* 51. 11, vol. VII 21), thus admitting both a local and temporal meaning of *prae-*; later Stephanus in the *Thesaurus* of 1531 explained it as ‘prius frangere’ with a temporal meaning.

These explanations could hardly be made to fit our phrase, and thus it will come as no surprise that *praelumbare* was not used in humanist Latin – with one notable exception: the *Institutio* of Marcus Marulus:

Qui [sc. *Dionysius martyr*] iubente Diocletiano fustibus praelumbatus, deinde equuleo suspensus et uirgis caesus, admotis etiam lampadibus miserabiliter ustulatus pro eiulatu clamorem edebat, quo se Christianum esse asseueraret (On Diocletian’s command Denys the martyr was first beaten [?] with clubs, then bound onto a wooden rack and whipped, then also miserably scorched with lamps; instead of wailing, however, he shouted that he was a Christian). (*Institutio* III p. 431)

and again:

Iratus ille [sc. *Decius imperator*] contemptorem suum [*i. Laurentium martyrem*] fustibus praelumbari iussit, laminis candentibus uri, ... sic denique excruciatum super ferrea crate distendi prunisque torreri (In his rage the emperor Decius gave the order to beat [?] his despiser with clubs, scorch him with glowing irons, and after all this torture to extend him on an iron crate and burn him with coal). (*Institutio* III p. 443)

In both passages Marulus uses the phrase ‘fustibus praelumbare’, which shows that he knew not only the definition of Nonius, but also the verse from Nouius/Neuius. Marulus does not offer any clues as to his immediate source for *praelumbare*. Most probably he had excerpted it from Nonius directly, or from Giuniano Maio; it is even, if barely, possible that he has used the *Cornu copiae* at this point. It was initially printed in Venice, first in May 1489, again in May and October 1490 and in May 1492; and assuming that the book-trade within the Serenissima was fairly brisk, it is not impossible that Marulus should have had access to a copy in Split early in the 1490s when he wrote the *Institutio*. Regardless of his source, what Marulus thought the word meant, remains a matter of conjecture. To some degree, the exact meaning must have been irrelevant for him, since – given the rarity of the word and the vagueness of the explanation in the fifteenth century Nonius – he could not expect his readers to understand it. Semantically, it was obviously sufficient that it evoked some kind of violence.

What then is the function of the word? Certainly the description of the martyrdom of the two saints gained nothing by an allusion to Nouius; and it was undesirable that readers would be reminded of the Plautinian *lumbifra(n)gium* and the comic effect intended in early comedy. It seems that Marulus just wanted to phrase the stories in classical Latin, and considered a rare word just as an elegant flourish suitable for a story of martyrdom and Christian heroism. As I have shown elsewhere,²⁷ as a general rule, Marulus chooses rare words for poetry from poetry, words for prose from prose. Crossovers of words from prose into poetry do happen (see *expavidus* above), even if rarely. I have not found any instance of a

²⁶ This is the reading of BAV Urbinas lat. 301 fol. 560r. *Praestringo* of the modern edition is a misprint.

²⁷ See J. Rammingner, *Marulus as a neo-Latin writer*, «Colloquia Maruliana» 20 (2011), forthcoming.

poetic word used in prose. *Praelumbare* is no exception: as did his contemporaries, Marulus considered ancient comedy to be written in prose, not in verse.

ronchizare

Even though Perotti's *Cornu copiae* has appeared at the margins of all the examples discussed so far, its influence, if any, has been difficult to pin down. For the first time, Bratislav Lučin has recently succeeded in showing the importance of the *Cornu copiae*, albeit for a late work of Marulus.²⁸ I would like to conclude this paper with a discussion of a word, where the *Cornu copiae* in fact did have a role: *ronchisso*, to snore. This is not a word from classical Latin, and the closest Greek comes is ῥογγάζω and ῥογγαλίζω, words attested in some glossaries.

For brevity's sake I will give the entry from the *Neulateinische Wortliste* (italics in the quotations indicate modern additions):²⁹

r(h)onchisso (-izo), -are – *schnarchen*: MVTIANUS *ep* I 62 p.83 (1506/8) Fac suo iure moreque grunniant, coaxent, ronchissent, rudant, blaterent, balbutiant asini suis barbaris compedibus compediti. MARVLVS *evang* 2,7 Cum crapulati fuerint, graui sopore premuntur, quos ronchizantes non facilius excites quam syluestres ursos aut uitulos marinos. FOLENGO *Bald* 14,292 (*in mg.*) ronfare, ronchizare nil differunt. BOVELLES *diff vulg* p.78 ronfler id est stertere in somni, a roncho vel ronchisso; est enim ronchus stertentis sonus, ronchisso sterto. FITZGEOFFREY *aff* 1,62,1 qui toties rhonchissas naribus uncis.

– *lex.*: PEROTTI *ccopiae* 2,373 quoniam scilicet deridentes naso obstrepunt et quendam ueluti stertentis sonum emittunt, qui ronchus facticio nomine dicitur. ... A quo fit ronchisso, quod est sterto. Plautus: “Cyathissat, dum coenat, dum dormit, ronchissat”. BEROALDO mai. *comm Apul* 1 fol.15^r a quo *roncho* inclinatur uerbum rhonchisso, quod est sterto et naribus insono. Plautus: “Dum dormit Ronchissat”.

The word was first mentioned by none other than Perotti in the *Cornu copiae*, who gave the following straightforward definition: “From *ronchus* is derived *ronchisso*, which means ‘to snore’.” What makes this rather ordinary word fascinating, is that the fine quotation from Plautus given by Perotti, which legitimizes the word as classical, unfortunately is fictitious, probably a concoction by the humanist himself.³⁰ This did not prevent Beroaldo from using it in his widely read Apuleius-commentary of 1500; and if he or any of the lexicographers of the early sixteenth century who continue to quote Plautus had any doubts about the authenticity of the verse, they certainly didn't share them with their readers.³¹ Marulus and other Latin writers – the word was fairly popular from the sixteenth century onwards – could believe that they used a rare classical expression for ‘to snore’, when they in fact used a word perhaps first created in the 1470s by a fellow humanist. We notice that Marulus uses a slightly different spelling (*ronchizo*, all the others use *r(h)onchisso*); either he refashioned the word according to his own stylistic preferences (he generally prefers verbs ending in *-izo* to *-isso*),³² maybe to give it a more pronounced Greek tinge, or he had found the spelling in an as yet unknown source.

²⁸ See B. Lučin, *Implicit sources in Marko Marulić's In epigrammata priscorum commentarius: Niccolò Perotti, Pomponio Leto and others*, «Colloquia Maruliana» 20 (2011), forthcoming.

²⁹ J. Ramminger, *Neulateinische Wortliste*, cit.

³⁰ *Cyathissare*, on the other hand, is at least a Plautinian word, see *ThLL* IV 1581. 64–67 (Mertel).

³¹ Both Calepino and Robert Estienne have an entry ‘ronchisso’ complete with the quotation from Plautus; cp. Ambrosius Calepinus, [*Dictionarium*], Venice 1510, sig. M1^r, Robertus Stephanus, *Dictionarium seu Latinae linguae Thesaurus ... cum Gallica fere interpretatione*, Paris 1531, fol. 793^v.

³² B. Glavičić, *Marulićev latinski rječnik [Latin dictionary of Marulić]*, Split 1997, has ten lemmata in *-izo*, none in *-isso*.

To conclude: The comparisons we have instituted above have thrown light on some aspects of language enrichment in neo-Latin through the revival of words rarely attested in antiquity. The function of rare words or recognizable phrases to evoke their former context and thus to confer an additional semantic dimension on a text has often been observed. The examples from Marulus show that this is by no means an unavoidable consequence of the transfer. We have quoted a number of cases where a reference to the earlier work (source) would be confusing or even entirely unsuitable (such as the reference in an edifying story of Christian martyrdom to the rowdy action of early comedy). Stylistically, rare words – whether old or newly formed – have from antiquity onwards usually shed a certain lustre over a phrase by reason of their rarity (not always desirable – to wit Cesar’s caution against *verba inusitata*). Regarding rare words from antiquity in neo-Latin, we can still observe this effect (see Barbaro and *lutulentus* above), but it is by no means unavoidable. McLaughlin has drawn attention to Poliziano’s project to restore the richness of Latin with rare words even from late authors like Gellius or Apuleius.³³ As I have shown elsewhere, elegant allusion to the canonical texts of Latin culture was by no means absent from Marulus’ oeuvre,³⁴ and we have discussed one case (*praelumbare*) where rarity indeed seems to be the only reason for inserting a phrase (whose meaning could not even be ascertained!); but in this paper I also have discussed a number of words extracted from lexicographic literature which confirm McLaughlin’s point: Rarity in these cases has lost its stylistic function, and in a reversal of fortune a rare word might again be used frequently (*expavidus*).

We have registered a number of reference works which Marulus used for inspiration. The contemporary reader, less interested in philological analysis, found a Latin characterized by a certain amount of innovation, with the precision imparted on a text by a *mot juste*, in short, a Latin with the elegance expected by its readers. As a contemporary put it, Marulus expressed himself with authority (“*autoritate nititur*”), most fittingly (“*aptissime*”), and in a style which was both clear and elegant (“*dictio plana et suavis*”).³⁵

³³ McLaughlin, *Literary Imitation*, cit., 207.

³⁴ Ramminger, *Marulus as a neo-Latin writer*, cit.

³⁵ From a letter of the French Patristic scholar Jacques de Billy (Jacobus Billius Prunaeus, 1535–1581) to his brother Jean, proposing a French translation of Marulus’ *Euangelistarium*, quoted by Ch. Béné, *La réception del Marulic dans le province du Nord*, in *Études Maruliennes. Le rayonnement européen de l’œuvre de Marc Marule de Split*, Zagreb–Split 1998, pp. 97–106 (reprint from «Colloquia Maruliana» 4 (1995), pp. 49–69): p.102–103. Text of the letter on p.103, doc. 6 (about the *Euangelistarium*): «Opus est pietatis plenum, dictio plana et suavis, nec multum negotii tibi exhibitura. Vbique Scripturae testimonia aptissime proferuntur: id quod in eiusmodi rebus maximi momenti duco». Mutianus Rufus to Henricus Urbanus, 1513 (*Der Briefwechsel des Conradus Mutianus* hg. von Dr. K. Gillert. Erste Hälfte. Geschichtsquellen der Provinz Sachsen, und angrenzender Gebiete. Achtzehnter Band. Halle 1890, n° 259, I pp. 342–343): “Vidi Marulum tuum, carptim legi. Totus est Christianus, piis fabulis et quidem multiugis scatet, utilis est tibi concionaturo. Fac bona toga vestiatur et tandem mihi perlegendum accomoda. Ad colum sessitantes anicule narrant nubilibus puellis eiusmodi fabulas, sed vide, quantum intersit. Anus loquacula garrit agresti susurramine, Marulus latine scit, illa refert audita et plerumque frivola, hic autoritate nititur et Christi eunuchos perducit ad virtutem”. Gillert believes that Mutianus Rufus refers to a work by Michael Tarchaniota Marullus (ibid. p.343 n.1), but since Mutianus characterizes the work as «opus novum exemplorum» (n° 264, Mutianus to Urbanus, 1513: “Paucis ante diebus admonui, ut opus novum exemplorum investires”), there can be little doubt that the work in question is Marcus Marulus’ *Institutio per exempla sanctorum*.