ACTA CONVENTUS NEO-LATINI TORONTONENSIS

Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies

Toronto 8 August to 13 August 1988

EDITED BY

ALEXANDER DALZELL
CHARLES FANTAZZI
RICHARD J. SCHOECK

MEDIEVAL & RENAISSANCE TEXTS & STUDIES
Binghamton, New York
1991

A generous grant from Pegasus Limited for the Advancement
of Neo-Latin Studies has helped meet publication costs of this book.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies (7th : 1988 : Toronto, Ont.)
Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Torontonensis : proceedings of the seventh International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies : Toronto, 8 August to 13 August, 1988 / edited by Alexander Dalzell, Charles Fantazzi, Richard J. Schoeck.
p. cm. – (Medieval & Renaissance texts & studies ; v. 86)
Includes index.
ISBN 0-86698-098-9
1. Latin literature, Medieval and modern–History and criticism–Congresses. 2. Latin philology, Medieval and modern–Congresses. 3. Learning and scholarship–History–Congresses. 4. Civilization, Medieval–Congresses. 5. Renaissance–Congresses. 6. Classicism–Congresses. 7. Humanists–Congresses. I. Dalzell, Alexander. II. Fantazzi, Charles. III. Schoeck, Richard J. IV. Title. V. Series.
PA8002.I57 1988
470–dc20 91-15986
CIP

This book is made to last.
It is set in Baskerville, smythe-sewn
and printed on acid-free paper
to library specifications

Printed in the United States of America

Humanist Poetry and Its Classical Models: A Collection from the Court of Emperor Maximilian I

JOHANN RAMMINGER

The *Complurium eruditorum uatum carmina ad magnificum uirum D. Blasium Hoelcelium sacri Caesaris Maximiliani consiliarium Moecenatem eorum precipuum* (hereafter CBH) were edited in late summer or early fall of the year 1518 in Augsburg during the Imperial Diet by Petrus Bonomus, then Bishop of Trieste, formerly secretary of the emperor.[1] Our anthology comprises letters and poems by politicians and intellectuals connected with the court of Maximilian I; besides Bonomus and Hölzel they include, e.g., Sbruglio, Muzio, Peutinger, Celtis, Stabius, Bartholini and Cuspinian. The earliest of the pieces go back to the 1490s, the latest were composed for the publication.[2] Most of the contributors are the

---

[1] I used the copy in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich. For the bibliographical data see Stephan Füssel, *Riccardus Bartholinus Perusinus: Humanistische Panegyrik am Hofe Kaiser Maximilians I.*, Saecula Spiritalia, 16 (Baden-Baden, 1987), 229.

[2] Composed for the edition were, e.g., Sbrulius' poem *Ad lectorem* (al^v), the prose letters of Bonomus to Hölzel ($a2^r$), Peutinger to Bonomus ($a2^r$), and Ricius *ad lectorem* ($a3^r$), Mucius' *carmen Isagogicon* ($a4^r$–$a4^v$) and Spiegel's poem in praise of the book (il^v–$i2^r$). For the others there is little evidence. Bonomus's remarks in the introductory letter suggest that the original collection was quite old, but had been augmented by him with some pieces of later dates; this is borne out by the evidence of the poems themselves. One poem mentions the death of Frederick III (in 1493, the poem by M. Transsilvanus, $c3^v$–$d1^r$). In 1518, Celtis had been dead for ten years, Bebel died in the spring or summer of 1518 (see Wilfried Barner *et al.*, eds., Introduction to: *Heinrich Bebel, Comoedia de optimo studio iuvenum; Über die beste Art des Studiums für junge Leute* [Stuttgart, 1982], p. 168 and n. 176). If the end of Bartholini's ode *Sed mecum . . . fran-*

ones we usually find involved in the literary projects of the Imperial court.[3] No fewer than eight of the twenty-one contributors had by the time of the publication been crowned poet laureate by Maximilian.[4]

At first glance there seems to be little which distinguishes our collection from countless similar products of the early sixteenth century. Extravagant praise, formulated in the most commonplace phrases, can be found over and over again in the poetry of that age, and hardly any of the poems published is outstanding as a poetical achievement. The CBH represent the average quality of this type of poetical production at Maximilian's court. Nevertheless our collection occupies a special place in the history of German humanist literature. As it was printed only a few months before Maximilian's death, it represents a last synthesis of the literary aspirations of the Imperial court, especially since Luther's theses had been published the year before and soon were to change the German political and literary scene entirely.

---

cicus | | *Vates plectra feret* (b2^{v}, vv. 42 f.) alludes to Celtis (see n. 26 below), it, too, would predate Celtis' death in 1508 and presumably belong to the years 1504–1506, when Bartolini was in Germany (for biographical details see Füssel, pp. 36–37). Gadius' marriage poem (e1^{r}–e3^{r}) may be dated to 1511, Celtis' *Carnorum preses quod factus ... es* (d4^{r}–d4^{v}) and other poems can be referred to the time of Hölzel's appointment in Carinthia. Further poems dated by Jan-Dirk Müller, *Gedechtnus: Literatur und Hofgesellschaft um Maximilian I,* Forschungen zur Geschichte der älteren deutschen Literatur, 2 (München, 1982) 261, 303 n. 67, and 373 n. 47.

[3] We catch a glimpse of their daily life in a letter by I. Spiegel to Erasmus of 31 Aug. 1518, written in Augsburg (Allen, no. 863), in which he writes about an oration delivered by Erasmus Vitellius at the diet on Aug. 22: *Aderant enim viri non pauci, tum exquisite docti tum in iudicando naris emunctissime, Antistes Tergestinus* [=Bonomus], *Peutingerus, Huttenus, Bartholinus, Spalatinus, et Stabius ille in nullo doctrine genere non versatus* ... An earlier production similar to ours, but on a smaller scale, had been the *Episodia sodalitatis Danubianae ad Conradum Celten, dum a Norico gymnasio ad Viennam Pannoniae concesserat,* 18 short poems printed in Vienna around 1497; among the contibutors we find Cuspinianus, Stabius, Ulsenius, and the *duo Bonomi.* The poems are published in Kurt Adel, ed., *Conradi Celtis quae Vindobonae prelo subicienda curavit opuscula* (Leipzig, 1966), 6–11.

[4] Celtis (1487), Cuspinianus (1493), Bebel (1501), Stabius (1502/3 by Celtis), Sibutus (1505), Sbrulius (1513), Ursinus (1517), Bartholini (1517). A lacuna may be the absence of another poet laureate: Vadian (crowned in 1514). On May 1st, he was still in Vienna, in Sept. 1518 he had been in St. Gallen for some time (cf. his dedicatory letter to Konrad Grebel: Conradin Bonorand and Heinz Haffter, eds., *Die Dedikationsepisteln von und an Vadian,* Vadian-Studien, Untersuchungen und Texte. Herausgegeben vom Historischen Verein des Kantons St. Gallen, 11 [St. Gallen, 1983], p. 131 no. 30; Bernhard Milt, *Vadian als Arzt,* Vadian-Studien, 6 [St. Gallen, 1959], 42). The most probable reason for his absence is that he simply was not acquainted very well with Hölzel (cf. Conradin Bonorand, *Vadians Weg vom Humanismus zur Reformation und seine Vorträge über die Apostelgeschichte 1523,* Vadian-Studien, 7 [St. Gallen, 1962], 56.

The purpose of the publication is discussed in the introductory pieces. The poems will secure *immortalitas* for the patron and his generous deeds. They show Hölzel's *precipuam, et prope diuinam ... modestiam, probitatem, eruditionem, prudentiam, summamque benignitatem* (Ricius, a3^{r}). They praise him as being a famous poet and are by famous poets themselves (Sbrulius, a1^{v}, vv. 1–2). They will be frequently read by Hölzel's friends (*sub doctorum uirorum oculos crebro reuocanda, et mihi et cęteris amicis, futura communia*, Peutinger, a2^{v}), reminding them of the love they felt for their patron (the poems are *amoris gratissima pignora*, Peutinger, a2^{v}).

We lack several facts which would be important for an evaluation of Hölzel's position in respect to our collection. E. g., who organized the publication? Was it Bonomus? Or Hölzel? Was the latter involved in the publication in any way? Why had Bonomus this sudden urge to collect poems about Hölzel which had been neglected for years? Some of the poems which had been sent to Hölzel singly must have been known to him previously.[5] Had he collected any or all of them already?[6]

That our collection should be addressed to an Imperial counsellor, is

---

[5] In the Augsburg municipal library there is a single printed sheet with some epigrams by Celtis. The poet seems to have sent it to literary acquaintances; the preserved copy has a handwritten dedication: *Domino Blasio Patrono et Prefecto ꝟario nostro semper memorando Conradus Celtis at amicis oñibus nostris Aulicis mittit.* We may imagine a similar use for some of our poems (cf. Ulsenius, f 3^{r}: *Vlsenius pridem medicus nunc carmina mittit*; Gadius, f 1^{r}: *A me missa brevis tibi venit Epistola*). The Celtis print has been published by Dieter Wuttke, "Eine unbekannter Einblattdruck mit Celtis-Epigrammen zu Ehren der Schultzheiligen von Österreich," *Arcadia* 3 (1968):195–200.

[6] In his letter to Hölzel Bonomus remarks: *Collectos igitur in unum corpus quosdam nostros illius temporis lusus / et quę deinde ab amicis de te scripta comparare potuimus* (a2^{r}). That might suggest that the CBH are a more or less fortuitous collection of every poem the editor could lay his hands on. This, however, is not so. Some of the contributions were sollicited for the CBH (see n. 2 above). Furthermore, our collection is only a selection from a larger pool of poems to and about Hölzel, some of which were surely known to Bonomus. Of the two poems by Bonomus himself in the oldest part of the cod. Oenipont. 664 only one found its way into the CBH: the first part of the exchange between Bonomus and Hölzel about a girl friend of the latter (c1^{r}, see n. 35 below; the ms. has been edited in part by Antonius Zingerle, *De carminibus latinis saeculi XV. et XVI. ineditis*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philologie, I. Theil [Innsbruck, 1880]). The version of this poem we find in the ms. (fol. 126^{v}: Zingerle, no. 52) is obviously older. A second poem, pleading Hölzel's intervention with the emperor on Bonomus' behalf for a grant of money (fol. 135^{v}), was omitted in the CBH (this poem was overlooked by Zingerle in his discussion of the contents of the ms.: p. XXXIII). More poems dedicated to Hölzel are found in the second part of the same ms. (see Zingerle, pp. XXXIV f.). Another poem is mentioned by Johanna Felmayer, "Blasius Hölzl: Eine markante Persönlichkeit am Hofe Kaiser Maximilians," *Tiroler Heimatblätter*, 37 (1962), 93–104, esp. p. 103 n. 1. See also n. 5 above.

not unusual.[7] Some of the poems simply praise Hölzel in general, but most of them are more specific. Their unifying theme is the hommage to Blasius Hölzel announced in the title: Hölzel is the *maecenas praecipuus* of the poets paying their tribute to him in this volume. This expression refers to a specific rôle: that of a sponsor of literature. The poems make it clear that the "Maecenas" theme is not a thoughtless application of a topos common in the laudatory poetry of the period; it would have been possible to praise a friend amply without it.[8] Rather, the term is used to specify his position in respect to the contributors to our volume.

The rôle of a "Maecenas" is defined in a contemporary document, Ulrich von Hutten's famous letter to Willibald Pirckheimer (written at the same Augsburg diet in 1518),[9] with the following words:

> quibus [principibus] nos magnis passim nominibus applaudimus, Maecenates nonnumquam vel Augustos etiam vocantes, non quod ullae hoc aliquando illorum virtutes mereantur ..., verum spe quadam ad pristinae bonitatis emulationem excitandi.... aliquos iam enim coegimus pudore sui benefacere nobis.

Our poems have been discussed in relation to this text with good reason.[10] Hölzel's munificence towards the poets could not have been

---

[7] Karl Schottenloher, *Die Widmungsvorrede im Buch des 16. Jahrhunderts,* Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte, 76/77 (Münster, 1953), 187–88.

[8] As appears, for example, from the posthumous edition of poems for the court musician Paul Hofhaimer (there, Cardinal Lang is the *maecenas*): *Harmoniae poeticae Pauli Hofheimeri, uiri equestri dignitate insigni* (sic), *ac musici excellentis, quales sub ipsam mortem cecinit, qualesque ante hac nunquam uisae, tum uocibus humanis, tum etiam instrumentis accomodatissimae. Quibus praefixus est libellus plenus doctissimorum uirorum de eodum d. Paulo testimoniis. Vna cum selectis ad hanc rem locis e poetis accommodatioribus, seorsim tum decantandis, tum praelegendis* (Norimbergae apud Iohan. Petreium. Anno M. D. XXXIX). This collection is discussed in my article "Die Biographie Hofhaimers im Spiegel der Widmungsgedichte seiner Odensammlung von 1539 (RISM 1539-26)," paper presented at the symposium "Paul Hofhaimer–Zentren seines Lebens," 23–25 Jan., 1987, Radstadt, Austria; forthcoming in *Hofhaymeriana. Acts of the Symposium,* and in my forthcoming edition of the *Harmoniae poeticae.*

[9] Eduard Böcking, ed., *Vlrichi Hutteni equitis opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia. Ulrichs von Hutten Schriften,* I (Leipzig, 1859), 200.

[10] Jan-Dirk Müller, "Deutsch-lateinische Panegyrik am Kaiserhof und die Entstehung eines neuen höfischen Publikums in Deutschland," in *Europäische Hofkultur im 16. und 17.Jahrhundert: Vorträge und Referate gehalten anläßlich des Kongresses des Wolfenbütteler Arbeitskreises für Renaissanceforschung und des Internationalen Arbeitskreises für Barockliteratur in der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel vom 4. bis 8. September 1979,* ed. August Buck, Georg Kauffmann, Blake Lee Spahr, Conrad Wiedemann, II. Wolfenbütteler Arbeiten zur Barockforschung, 9 (Hamburg, 1981), 133.

praised so highly if it had not been real to some extent. Some poems contain appeals to him for money, pieces of land, and other gifts.[11] One refers to an occasion when Hölzel entertained his "protégés" (if that is what they were) in Linz.[12] The poems frequently contain applications to be received into the group of Hölzel's *amici*.[13] Despite their topical character even these may in some cases have had a factual background, perhaps in connection with the Augsburg *sodalitas litteraria*, of which Hölzel was a member.[14] The poems define the relationship between Hölzel and his poets quite clearly: he gives presents or provides help in practical difficulties. In consequence the poets acclaim him in their works, recompensing him with fame and immortality as a result.[15]

There are considerations which raise some doubts about the picture painted by our poems. Even if most of the contributors were dependent in some way on court patronage, was Hölzel an adequate protector? He had made an impressive career in the Imperial financial administration.[16] But, as we see from the poems, there was one fundamental limitation to his munificence: in most cases he could not satisfy appeals on his own, but only on behalf of the emperor. The poets did not belong to his circle, but

---

[11] M. Transsilvanus: *equum et nummos* (g1^{v}), Celtis: *Si centum numeres mihi ducatos, | | Quos Cęsar mihi largiter dicauit* (c3^{r}, vv. 11–12), Bonomus: *Rex mihi iampridem Pucini tradere turrim | | Pollicitus / moneas is tibi saepe iubet* (b3^{v}), Gadius: *Aurea nam mihi das fulgentia serta smaragdo: | | Et sponsalitium munus habere iubes* (f1^{r}). Another example is provided by Celtis: *Non sat erat / tunicam te tribuisse mihi. | | ... | | Mox scythicas pelles et mollia vellera madros | | Donas* (e3^{v}).

[12] Celtis: *conuiuales epulas et pocula lęta* (c2^{r}, v. 5).

[13] This reception into the circle of Hölzel's 'friends' is the theme of a curious poem by Pinicianus, which purports to describe an edifice Hölzel is having built for himself (d2^{v}–d3^{r}); it is constructed of different kinds of wood (the German for wood is "Holz", a pun on "Hölzel") and is more precious than Solomon's temple or Fugger's house, *nam uariis surgit uatibus ista suis* ("because it consists of so many different poets"). But in the end Hölzel notices the absence of a particular tree, the pine (i.e., Pinicianus), which he immediately takes care to have added to the structure; *sic est cygneis. additus anser aquis* ("so the goose was added to the waters of the swans").

[14] Cf. Hermann Wiesflecker, *Kaiser Maximilian I: Das Reich, Österreich und Europa an der Wende zur Neuzeit*, III (München, 1977), 29. Heinrich Lutz, "Die Sodalitäten im oberdeutschen Humanismus des späten 15. und frühen 16. Jahrhunderts," in *Humanismus im Bildungswesen des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Wolfgang Reinhard, Mitteilung der Kommission für Humanismusforschung, 12 (Weinheim, 1984), 25–60.

[15] Cf. Hieronymous Emser: *Post ego / quum dabitur coelum uidisse serenum. | | Te graviore canam carmine* (f4^{r}, vv. 39–40). A poem by Stabius ends with the following appeal: *Sis Stabio auxilio, ... quem pressat egestas | | Et uersu te ad sydera tollet* (e3^{v}, vv. 11–12).

[16] A short account of his life is given by Wiesflecker (see n. 14) V (1986), 261–65.

to the emperor's or other courts, as Stabius phrased it: *Qui mihi fautor pius et patronus:* | | *Caesaris qui conciliat fauorem* (dl^{v}, vv. 33–34).

We may pursue this line of thought a little further. The editor Bonomus himself had a social position at court which was clearly equal, if not superior to Hölzel's. He was even sent for when Maximilian was dying. Although he composed poetry, this was only a minor leisure occupation for him. He was not a professional man of letters like, e.g., Bebel or Celtis. He would not even have been interested in benefitting as a poet from Hölzel's patronage. As the introduction gives us to understand, he undertook the edition as an act of friendship for the sake of their old *contubernium*, when they had both been *amanuenses* at court (a2^{r}). In their friendship poetry was hardly more than a secondary issue.

Hutten's reference to the famous patrons of antiquity recommended a norm for the behaviour of a patron. But the ancient model had another, equally important function. It served as a literary standard for poetical descriptions of cases of patronage. As such it determined the literary profile of Hölzel's sponsorship to a large extent.

The term "maecenas" refers to the most prominent literary patron in antiquity,[17] who gave his name to this type of sponsor: C. Cilnius Maecenas, the patron of Horace, Vergil and other poets of Rome's Golden Age.[18] Our poems frequently invoke him and other sponsors known from classical literature. Individual poet-patron relationships varied as widely in antiquity as in the Renaissance, but the essential points of ancient literary patronage can be briefly outlined as follows.[19] The basic framework for personal services and obligations was the concept of

---

[17] In speaking of "patronage in antiquity" I refer to a span of time beginning with Catullus (i.e., the middle of the first century B.C.), and ending with Martial and Juvenal in the middle of the second century A.D. Earlier cases of literary patronage are not sufficiently well documented to influence the picture Renaissance poets had of ancient patronage. Later poetry remained without importance in that respect because of the changes Roman literary production underwent; also the Renaissance held it in low esteem (e.g., Joachim Vadianus, *De poetica et carminis ratione*, ed. Peter Schäffer, I [München, 1973], 50–51. The *De poetica* was first published in 1518).

[18] The way Horace presents his relationship to Maecenas in his poems reflects the development of the relationship itself. See Eckard Lefèvre, "Horaz und Maecenas," in ANRW, 31, 3 (Berlin / New York, 1981), 1987–2029; Gordon Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), 44–51.

[19] My account is based on Peter White, "*Amicitia* and the profession of poetry in early imperial Rome," *JRS* 68 (1978), 74–92; Ludwig Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von August bis zum Ausgang der Antonine*, I, 9th ed. (Leipzig, 1919), 224–32.

amicitia. The term can denote any kind of friendly relationship. *Amicitia* was not necessarily a relationship on equal terms. The "minor friends" (the *amicorum numerus* of Horace, sat. 1, 6, 62) which concern us here were expected to fulfill numerous duties for their sponsor.[20] They were in a way attached to the house of their *dominus*; in some cases they lived there. They were expected to turn up at the *salutatio* in the morning, accompany their "friend" to the forum, to court, even on trips; they might be back at night to collect their *sportula* and could expect an invitation to dinner (even if they were served food of lower quality!). At various occasions they received gifts, which might take the form of a piece of land, a house, or money to meet the requirements of the equestrian census (and to allow them to live off its interest). A poet in the house of a rich 'friend' was not treated any differently from any other *familiaris*. He was expected to produce verses for domestic occasions, sometimes even to extemporize. In his turn the poet could expect a well-to-do *amicus* to sponsor his recitations and generally to further his recognition as a poet. The patron's favourable judgment was vital for the circulation of a book. The main recompense a poet could offer was the promise of eternal fame through his praise. But that was not always taken too seriously by the *dominus*, if we believe the cool assessment of Martial's poetry by Pliny the Younger: "they [Martial's poems] are not likely to last, but he wrote them as if they were" (epist. 3, 21).

The vocabulary the Romans used to describe this sponsorship was curiously imprecise. The word 'client' was obviously felt to be too blunt; understated terms like *amicus* and *amicitia*, *sodalis*, *contubernium*, *familiaris* were preferred;[21] *colere* was the term for the behaviour of the "lesser" friend, *fovere* and *favere* denoted the attitude of the *potior*. The term *patronus* was not applied to this kind of relationship in antiquity.

The classical model is obviously the one we find applied in our poems. If we compare Renaissance patronage to its ancient counterpart, we can see some analogies. Sometimes there might be a morning reception to attend, poets might still be attached to the entourage of a nobleman; they would no longer receive money in order to fulfill the requirements of the equestrian census, but perhaps be provided with a position at a court or a living from a piece of land.

The literary application of the classical model to Renaissance conditions, however, posed several problems. In employing the Roman vocabu-

[20] Hor. sat. 2, 6, 42–46.

[21] O. Hey, *TLL*, I, 1907, 77–1908, 1, s.v. *amicus*.

lary the Renaissance poet had to be careful to avoid any disrespect; most of the ancient terms would not have sounded appropriate if applied to a Renaissance prince.[22] Notably the term *amicus* could no longer refer to a dependent position, but solely to that of a peer; terms like *contubernium* and *familiaris* or *sodalis* would have suggested an undue cameraderie. For example, Bartholini could not have described his position at the Salzburg court as a *contubernium* with the Archbishop; significantly enough Bonomus used the term to describe the time when he and Hölzel had been together in Innsbruck, holding similar, inferior court appointments at the beginning of their careers.

Hölzel's situation was hardly analogous to that of his ancient namesake. Both men were politically active, but while Maecenas had an independent social status, Hölzel's depended entirely on his career as a "civil servant." While Maecenas had a vast private fortune at his disposal, Hölzel was a man of mediocre means and could merely administer the funds of the emperor. While Maecenas could compete with the Emperor Augustus as a protector of the arts, Hölzel played an intermediate and secondary part in the network of court patronage of his day. We may conclude that as a sponsor of poets Hölzel was and could only be inadequate, compared not only to the archetype, the *priscus Maecenas* (Ulsenius, f 3^{r}), but also to the other sponsors at court. This must have been clearly evident to his contemporaries, for whom patronage was a vital issue.

On the other hand, the relative weakness of Hölzel's social position made him especially suited to be styled as "Maecenas." I will give two examples from our collection. The first one is a poem by Heinrich Bebel, in which he applies to be received amongst Hölzel's "friends" (d3^{r}–d3^{v}). He begins by praising Hölzel for prudently favouring the poets and gaining immortality, like Maecenas and Messalla. Lately, however, he has been slack in granting favours. Nevertheless he wants a poem, but *Frustra: sum mutus / conticuitque lyra* (v. 10). The poet proceeds to give the reason for his reticence: *non est qui floci pendat homerum: | | Croesus habet laudes: carmina nulla iuuant* (vv. 13–14). With all his fame, a poet has to go hungry: *Carmina sola famem / famam licet addere, praestant* (v. 17). Only if the poet were received *dulces . . . inter amicos* (v. 19) would he be willing to praise Hölzel in return.

---

[22] For the problems of the status of the court poets see Uwe-K. Ketelsen, "Literarische Zentren–Sprachgesellschaften," in *Deutsche Literatur; Eine Sozialgeschichte*, III: *Zwischen Gegenreformation und Frühaufklärung: Späthumanismus, Barock*, ed. Harald Steinhagen (Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1985), 117–37, esp. 129–30.

If this poem had been intended as an appeal for patronage, it would have been formulated in a remarkably ineffective way. If anything, it would have the opposite effect. To insult the prospective patron, who here basically is charged with avarice, would hardly have been an auspicious beginning for a poet-patron relationship. Neither a Renaissance nor an ancient sponsor would have cared to receive such an impertinent poem.

But its humorous tone and circular logic prevent us from taking it literally. The poem fulfills the patron's wish while pretending to deny it.[23] The witty presentation of a hungry poet's thoughts on his art is much more important than its apparent purpose. The poem presupposes the *amicitia* it seems to apply for; but this "friendship" is not the dependent status in the house of a nobleman, but a closer aquaintance on an equal footing. The poem cannot be understood as an appeal for help. Hölzel's Maecenas is no more real than Bebel's hunger or denial of a poem. Obviously Bebel expects not only the average reader, but also Hölzel to be amused by his "jeux d'esprit." We are meant to regard it as a (rather successful) employment of classical topoi (e.g., a phrase lifted from Horace, a wordplay from Cicero),[24] with which the poet pays his friend a subtle compliment by giving him a central position in the poem and thus acknowledging his literary interests.

My second example is Bartholini's ode *Qui primus ratibus proscidit aequora*, one of the more sophisticated contributions to the collection ($b1^v$–$b2^v$).[25] In a grand adaption of the introductory poem to the first book of Horace's odes he presents himself applying for the patronage of Hölzel. Bartholini defines his goal as a poet by contrasting his profession with three others. He starts with the most different from his own: the merchant sailing perilous seas in his quest for riches (vv. 1–9). The second is the soldier, risking his life like the merchant, but with a different aim: to earn eternal fame through his deeds (vv. 10–15). Similarly lead by the desire for public recognition, are the participants in athletic and literary contests, and the court poets praising noblemen (vv. 16–25). Bartholini's own life is far removed from these. *His* companion has been Calliope, the muse of epic poetry, who despises the rewards of lyrics and avoids the masses (vv. 26–32). The poet will be content to gain the recognition of his

[23] A ploy used several times in our collection (e.g., n. 35 below).

[24] For example, the *fames–fama* wordplay already occurs in Cic. Att. 1, 16, 5. The poem may have been inspired by Theocritus, 16 (I would like to thank Minna Skafte Jensen for the reference).

[25] I am enlarging an interpretation by Füssel, 236–43.

patron. He will then praise his sponsor, and furthermore be joined by another poet (i.e., Celtis, vv. 33–44).[26]

Bartholini's ode is quite Horatian in contents and style. Meter, structure and verbal analogies ensure that the reader will recognize the connection. Horace had found his theme and arrangement in Greek poetry. We might assume that in reusing Horace Bartholini only followed the latter's example. But Horace had thoroughly romanized the Greek model; the poem reflected his own experience and aspirations.[27] If we understand Bartholini's poem as a description of his literary ideals like Horace's, Bartholini's transfer does not seem entirely successful. Such modernization as he attempted, still reflects more of the Roman than of his contemporary world.[28] Without knowledge of the Horatian model Bartholini's poem could not be understood. E.g., Horace's ode referred to the Olympic and Isthmian games. This was not merely an allusion to earlier themes of Greek poetry. Winning these games could still be considered a major achievement in an athlete's or poet's career in Horace's times. When Bartholini's ode mentioned these same games, the reference had an entirely different function. There were no more Isthmian games to be won. The Horatian formula had become a symbol for the cheaper fame accorded by "the masses," which the reader could not understand if he were not familiar with Horace's ode.

While Horace claims his rank as *vates lyricus* on the strength of the subsequent poems, Bartholini proceeded differently: the one poem both formulated the poet's aspirations and was proof of his mastery in what the Renaissance considered the highest standard of lyrical poetry.[29] The speaker of Bartholini's ode is confident of the superior qualities of the poem; the appeal for recognition which had been vital for Horace is now an empty formula. The appreciation and distribution of Bartholini's poetry does not depend on Hölzel's judgement any more than on any other reader's. The privileged position the patron still enjoys in the poem is not a reflection of his actual importance, but the result of the process of imitation.

---

[26] Füssel, 243.

[27] Hans Peter Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz*, I (Darmstadt, 1972), p. 24 n. 9 and p. 25 n. 11; R. G. M. Nisbet and Margaret Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes book I* (Oxford, 1970), p. 5 ad 1.

[28] E.g., the insertion of the *portus Iccius* seems to echo Caesar, Gall. 1, 1, 2.

[29] Eckart Schäfer, *Deutscher Horaz. Conrad Celtis, Georg Fabricius, Paul Melissus, Jacob Balde: Die Nachwirkung des Horaz in der neulateinischen Dichtung Deutschlands* (Wiesbaden, 1976), 1–38 passim.

The poet's "declaration of independence" from the patron's judgement changed the very nature of the relationship between them. The poet was no longer dependent on the patron, while the latter's fame rested entirely on the poetry of the sponsored poets, or so the Renaissance poets assure us, claiming the precedent of antiquity. Without Horace and Vergil Maecenas would be forgotten, without Tibullus Messalla, etc.[30] This concept had already been formulated by Petrarch in the famous speech at his coronation on the Capitol in Rome in 1381.[31] It is expressed in a catalogue of patrons of antiquity given by Gadius:

> Vtque tui similes narrem, quis nomina Galli
> Sciret: Vergilio ni celebrata forent.[32]
> Quis moecenatem: nisi doctus horatius illum
> Cantasset: uarium musa maronis amat.
> Parthenius / priscusque uigent per carmina Marci.[33]
> Et messala tuis culte tibulle modis.
> Statius hos: illos commendat carmine Naso
> Viuit et ingeniis quisquis in orbe fauet.
>
> (d2^{r}, vv. 17–24)

Here the patron has become a requisite in the process of imitation, he is a means to define the poet and his product. In comparing him to Maecenas, the poets compared themselves to Horace, Vergil etc. The comparison indicated their own poetical models. The patron was an essential part of the classical literary pattern; the individual selected for that rôle was virtually immaterial for the execution of the design.

This accounts for the presence of numerous earlier appeals for help in our collection, for which there would otherwise be little reason. Their original purpose was outdated by the time of publication. As a patron Hölzel would have felt flattered by the public display of his generosity only if these requests had actually been granted. But if we take some expostula-

---

[30] Cf. Ursinus: *Quum Moecenatem dederint te numina nobis:* | | *Ni dederint / fuerint inuida, Vergilium* (b1^{v}). Similarly, Horace had already claimed the precedent of Homer's epics (carm. 4, 9, 25–8).

[31] See Carlo Godi, "La 'Collatio laureationis' del Petrarca," *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, 13 (1970), 1–27, esp. 22 (par. 9, 13–16).

[32] The famous *laudes Galli* in Vergil's 10th eclogue.

[33] The patrons of Martial: Ti. Claudius Parthenius (see Martial 4, 45, 2. 4, 78, 8. 5, 6, 2 etc.) and Terentius Priscus (to whom Martial dedicated the 12th book of his epigrams).

tions with Hölzel literally, a number of them had been unsuccessful.[34] Therefore they contributed little to the glory of Hölzel as "Maecenas."

What they did show, however, was Hölzel as one of the "literati" at court engaged in an urbane discourse with each other.[35] The underlying concept is that of a "civitas doctorum," an (albeit invisible) community of intellectuals, which, although geographically dispersed, would unite from time to time in common enterprise. This idea underlies many collections of prose and poetry of that time.[36] The poems praise Hölzel by suggesting that he belongs to that community of intellectuals and shares their ideals, but not exclusively. The same fame is secured by the other contributors still living.[37]

Our considerations do not preclude real sponsorship on Hölzel's part. At a Renaissance court entirely fictive praise of this kind would have been impossible. But reality played a subordinate rôle in the design of our poems. The formative factor was the ancient poetry considered authoritative. The classical prototype was remodelled in several respects to suit the modern circumstances. The result was a synthetic pattern of literary relations between the "literati" on the one side and Hölzel on the other. This pattern had a double layer of significance. The equation: Horace to Maecenas equals modern author to Hölzel suggests that Hölzel would have been incited by these poetic appeals to imitate his ancient counterpart's munificence. We have seen traces of the fact that the parties concerned were well aware that neither of them was (or expected the other to be) a second Maecenas or Horace. The poems represent a type of civilized literary intercourse, in which the participants assumed rôles adapted from Roman literature. These "impersonations" did not need to

---

[34] Cf. Celtis d3^{v} and f3^{v}, Transilvanus f2^{v}.

[35] Hölzel himself is introduced as a poet in an exchange of poems between him and Bonomus about a girlfriend of his (c1^{r}–c1^{v}). Bonomus, asked to praise Hölzel's *puella* in a poem, charges his friend for concealing her and assumes that she is actually not respectable at all. Unless Hölzel produces her, he is not going to make a poem about her: *Non uisam laudare nequit mea musa* (here again the promise—or in this case denial—of a poem is in fact the poem itself). Hölzel's reply speaks about her beauty and ends saying that, *Sit tamen illa licet scortum,* she hides this fact so well that she should be praised for that. Further references to Hölzel's literary efforts are Sbrulius: *Concinit clarum liber hic poetam* (a1^{v}, v. 1); Gadius: *A me missa breuis tibi uenit Epistola, reddis || Litterulas / reddis carmina carminibus* (f1^{r}, vv. 3–4). This is quite congruent with the ancient model, since Maecenas was also a poet (and a bad one at that).

[36] E.g., Reuchlin's *Epistulae clarorum uirorum* or Hofheimer's collection (see n. 8).

[37] "Die Auszeichnungswirkung der Wiedmungsvorrede hob den Dichter ... zu gesteigerter Wertschätzung in der Gesellschaft" (Schottenloher, 195).

(and could not) match the real persons precisely. The recreation of an aspect of ancient Roman culture considered exemplary in Renaissance thought was, however, successful enough to serve its main purpose: the claim to status in the literary community at Maximilian's court and the expression of the literary ideals shared by them.[38]

Thesaurus linguae Latinae, Munich

[38] Müller, "Deutsch-lateinische Panegyrik," 133–40.