excerpt

CULTURAL ENCOUNTER AND IDENTITY IN THE NEO-LATIN WORLD

EDITED BY

CAMILLA HORSTER AND MARIANNE PADE

EDIZIONI QUASAR

ROMA MMXX

excerpt

Analecta Romana Instituti Danici – Supplementum LIV
Accademia di Danimarca, via Omero, 18, I – 00197 Rome

© 2020 Edizioni Quasar di Severino Tognon srl, Roma
ISBN 978-88-5491-033-1

This publication was supported by
the Carlsberg Foundation, the Danish Council for Independent Research
and C.F. Rasks Legat.

Cover: Albrecht Dürer's 1502 woodcut illustrates the idea of the *translatio studii* that is so central to this volume. It shows *Philosophia* sitting on a throne, surrounded by medallions with portraits of wise men from many ages and parts of the world: Ptolemy, Plato, Cicero and Vergil (in one) and Albert the Great. The poem above her says: "The Greeks call me *sophia*, the Romans *sapientia*,/ the Egyptians and the Chaldaeans invented me, the Greeks wrote me down,/ the Romans translated (or transmitted) and the Germans developed me" (from Conrad Celtis, *Amores*, Nurenberg, 1502, f. avir; source Wikimedia commons).

Printed in Italy by Logo s.r.l., Borgoricco (PD)

excerpt

Contents

excerpt

excerpt

The Latin of the German Reformation and the Heritage of Quattrocento Humanism

Johann Ramminger

οὐδεν τοῦ λόγου προὐργιαίτερον –
nothing is more important than language
(Melanchthon 1520; MBW 79)

Abstract
The norms of Latin developed by Italian humanists in the Quattrocento came to be the framework sustaining the Latin of the German Reformation. Even in the midst of their rejection of the Church of Rome, Protestant writers unwaveringly recognised the importance of the earlier Italian environment for the development of the German intellectual – and linguistic – landscape which led up to the Reformation. Where the humanists had philologically restored ancient texts that were valued in their own right, confessional writers used the philological methods of the Quattrocento to penetrate to the 'real' meaning of sacred texts which had been buried under an avalanche of meaningless new interpretive terminology that prevented the faithful from gaining insights important for their salvation. Just like the humanists before them, Protestant confessional writers were averse to the linguistic innovations of medieval scholastic philosophy; they used the same reasoning to identify and roll back language changes that were not part of 'classical' Latin. Nevertheless confessional Latin teems with innovative lexical features. One area of innovation was the names of the new confessions themselves, often coined by adversaries so as to delegitimise their adherents. Thus, confessional Latin came to diverge significantly from its humanist ancestor: humanists measured the attractiveness of their Latin in relationship to the classical authors, emulating them or rejecting (some of) them, whereas for confessional writers, the relationship to the classical authors came second, after a concern for universal communicability: Latin was on its way to becoming the unifying *koinê* of interfaith and international communication, understood (in Melanchthon's words) "everywhere and by all," allowing the expression of a common 'European mindset' connecting a continent that was split politically and ideologically.

Theoretical premises
Bernd Moeller famously wrote in 1959: "Without humanism, no reformation."[1] This often quoted statement covers a multitude of points of contact between the two, among which the following will focus on one: the application of philological – or more precisely lexical – parameters of Latin developed in Italian Quattrocento humanism in the textual culture of the German Reformation.[2] We will look at how the humanist project of controlled language change (with Classical Latin as the point of reference) continued in the texts of the German Reformation.

Mapping the path of the reception of humanist ideas by Reformation authors, I would like to emphasise two complementary aspects of the transfer from Italy to Germany and from humanism to Reformation. The first regards the long-term reception of Italian humanism, beginning in the 1450s, which thoroughly modified the intellectual landscape in Germany. Even

1. Moeller 1959, 59.
2. I am much indebted to Cummings 2002 and McGrath 2004, 34–66.

excerpt

if full-blown German humanism under Maximilian I insisted that its intellectual profile was distinct from its Italian forbears (see Susanna de Beer's contribution in this volume), there was at least one area where continuity was not questioned: the application of the philological methods developed by the Italian humanists concerning language analysis and textual work on sources. Eventually, as many German humanists of the early sixteenth century were touched by the increasing confessional saturation of the intellectual climate, they brought their methodologies to bear on the new problems. On the Protestant side alone, writers as diverse as the *praeceptor Germaniae* Melanchthon, the Swiss reformer Vadian, or the Anabaptist Johannes Denk all had a humanist education (some, like the poet laureate Vadian, had even had a notable humanist career); they were imbued with the tenets of Italian humanism, filtered through the societal and intellectual framework of German humanism.

Secondly, despite the proclaimed *translatio artium* from Italy to Germany – the German claim, that is, that the liberal arts had migrated from Italy to Germany – and the flaunted new independence, German intellectuals from the early sixteenth century onwards remained in contact with the Italian scene: new Italian writings could with – relative – ease be acquired in print from Italy or were (re)printed north of the Alps. The continuing reception left its traces in confessional writing in numerous mentions of Lorenzo Valla and Angelo Poliziano, and – both from direct use and later from intermediary sources – of Niccolò Perotti's *Cornu copiae*.[3] In this context of continuing influence, the achievements of the Quattrocento philological culture of Italian humanism came to exert a profound – if often unacknowledged – role in confessional text production.

Confessionalisation

The Reformation – or rather the religious and societal changes of the sixteenth century – has since the 1980s been discussed under the paradigm of "confessionalisation."[4] In its "strong" version, confessionalisation theory insisted on a close connection between the development of religious and political authority and emphasised the "imposition of social discipline" in the process. From the 1990s onwards, confessionalisation theory came under criticism, as attention was drawn to social phenomena which either had not or could not become confessionalised at all.[5] This gave rise to a "weak theory of confessionalisation" which "simply defines confessionalisation as the process of rivalry and emulation by which the religions […] built group cohesion and identity."[6] Besides Church and state authorities, it allowed for a wider variety of community structures as bearers of the development. Importantly, it recognised the role of the individual in the process (in the form of "self-confessionalisation").[7] It will be this "weak" form of the theory that will form the basis of the following.

There have been disagreements about the time frame of the "Age of Confessionalisation" (especially about its end, which does not concern us here). Most research takes the Peace of Augsburg (1555) as the starting point.[8] Wolfgang Reinhard, one of the fathers of confessionalisation theory, went as far back as the 1520s, labelling the very first period of the Reformation (1517–1525) a "spontaneous 'Evangelical Movement.'"[9] In Latin, confessionalised phenomena appear from early on. To catch the initial stages, the following inquiry will focus on the period starting with Luther's *Theses* and ending with Melanchthon's death (1517–1560).

Reinhard identified seven mechanisms of confessionalisation, of which the last – the regulation of language to achieve confessional conformity – is the topic of the present paper. Reinhard gave two examples of this: one concerning the preference for specific types of first names depending on confession (which in Calvinist Geneva was regulated by the authorities, so that the example thus supports "strong" confession-

3. A copy is in 1518 owned by the Dominican convent in Sélestat and used by Bucer, see Bvcer *ep* 2. We also have mentions of Perotti in Luther, Melanchthon and Calvin. Erasmus is of course a frequent user.
4. An overview of the debate can be found in Lotz-Heuman 2013.
5. Lotz-Heumann 2013, 49; Schindling 1997.
6. Benedict 2001, 313.
7. Schmidt 1997.
8. Schilling 1992; Oelke 1996.
9. See Lotz-Heumann 2013, 37; Reinhard 1989, 390.

excerpt

alisation theory), the second the naming conventions of the confessions themselves (which will be explored below). "But there is still much research to be done in that field; we in fact do not know very much about how 'confessionalisation' changed patterns of everyday life such as language."[10] This assertion of Reinhard's has often been repeated verbatim, but the situation has not changed much thirty years later.

Reinhard did not focus on a particular language, because the Reformation(s) flourished in a multilingual environment. Since theologians on all sides inherited a large corpus of doctrinal writing in Latin, produced large amounts themselves, communicated internally and across confessional and national divides in Latin (even if often by adversarial statements), and crucially had had a Latin education (though not necessarily a humanist one), Latin has here been chosen as a focus for inquiry into how the development of confessional language identities played out in different areas of confessional communication.

Thus this paper will focus on lexical change in Early Modern Latin.[11] At the centre will be Martin Luther and Philipp Melanchthon: the former, the master communicator of the Reformation, who changed the parameters of Latin and vernacular discourse more and faster than anyone before him; the latter, the theoretician of communication, who devised a sustainable framework for the pastoral tasks of the new denomination(s). The debt owed by both these figures to humanism has been recognised by previous research.[12] Nevertheless, neither their own Latin nor their influence on the Latin of their contemporaries has been the object of much attention. In the following, their Latin will be analysed in the context of other Protestant writing and the Catholic reaction to it.

When we speak about language change in Early Modern Latin, we go against a widely held assumption that with the loss of first language-speakers at the end of antiquity Latin also lost the capacity for change – other than deterioration – or evolution.[13] The reasoning underlying this notion may be that "when linguists say 'language change' they often mean 'sound change' or, at the most, 'morphological change.'"[14] Obviously, such a focus is better suited to explain the comprehensive changes of German in the Early Modern period than those affecting Latin at the same time.[15] Still, Latin at this time was undergoing considerable lexical development.[16] The rapidly evolving social realities of the Reformation provided an environment rich in possibilities for the formation of neologisms as well as semantic shifts or expansions, and the framework developed by the Italian humanists of the preceding century came to bear fruit in a textual culture very different from its origins.

Linguists have distinguished between innovation and lexical change, where the latter is the generalised form of the former.[17] This distinction will not be emphasised in the following for two reasons. The first is a practical one: we still have only a very partial knowledge of written Latin in Early Modern Europe. Also, spoken Latin, still a significant factor in the period discussed here, is largely irrecoverable. Thus some innovations may have been much more broadly disseminated (thus leading to lexical change) than we realise. Secondly, some innovations

10. Reinhard 1989, 395, similarly already Reinhard 1983, 267. For German see Breuer 1995, 170sq.
11. "Early Modern" Latin is here used in analogy to the terminology of historical research. It allows us to emphasise the widespread integration of Latin within most domains of Early Modern history (though decreasing in the seventeenth century). See Scott 2015, 1–21 (although he conspicuously fails to take into account Latin as an early modern phenomenon; see p. 21).
12. For humanism and Reformation in general: Mertens 1998; for Melanchthon: Maurer 1961; Maurer 1996; Rhein 1996; the contributions in Binder 1998, esp. Strohm 1998 and Effe 1998; some comments on older literature in Sperl 1959, 9–10 n. 1. For Luther: Schmidt 1883. Concerning Luther's Latin: Löfstedt 1983/2000; Löfstedt 1985.
13. An often quoted statement is from Baugh & Cable 2002, 2: "Classical Latin is a dead language because it has not changed for nearly 2,000 years" (to make the statement more poignant, in quotations the first word is often left off). Bizarrely, the authors continue: "The change that is constantly going on in a living language can be most easily seen in the vocabulary", a sentence that apparently has been mentally detached from the preceding one by the authors as well as by readers.
14. Blank 1999, 84.
15. As is emphasised by e.g. Korenjak 2016, 11. It should be added that in respect to both phonology and morphology, Early Modern Latin in manuscript sources and/or sources closer to orality was considerably more unstable than sanitised modern editions suggest. See e.g. BAV, Vat. lat. 2962 (Mussato's *De gestis Italorum* VIII–XIV ed. Padrin 1903) or the countless Latin inventories of the Italian renaissance.
16. For the terminology meaning change/semantic change/lexical change see Koch 2016, 23.
17. E. g. Milroy 2003 (discussing examples of phonological change).

excerpt

had an astonishingly uneven fortuna, and thus would need to be discussed within a larger time frame than is possible here; furthermore, many were conditioned by contact with other European languages – an aspect that can only be touched upon incidentally.

My analysis of confessional language change will use a three-pronged approach adapted from the work of microhistorians within social history. First, I shall be "asking large questions in small spaces," as a favourite phrase of microhistorians goes, specifically the question given in the title of this paper: What was the impact of the Italian humanists' language planning on those parts of Latin in the sixteenth century which are confessionally determined?[18] Secondly, I will focus on small linguistic phenomena, mostly single words, as markers of the confessionalisation of Latin. And thirdly, I will focus on the agency of individual authors (or its absence) within the process of change. I will contextualise these observations by connecting them to metadiscourse on language and confessional speech in texts by confessional writers and on Latin more generally by earlier humanists.[19]

In general, when phonological or morphological language change is charted, the micro-changes leading to a macro-change are hardly ever connected with specific names. Lexical change, too, has generally been understood as change from below the level of social awareness, an invisible-hand process borne by people who have no intention of changing language *per se*, but just want to communicate effectively or follow the norms of their social group etc.[20] By contrast, Renaissance Latin writers habitually insisted on individual agency in lexical change, both by equating norms with authors (Cicero) and by relying on specific authorities as mediators of these norms (Valla, Perotti). Reformation writers retained this approach; as a logical conclusion their leading thinkers – in addition to producing authoritative texts – also exerted, as we shall see, a strong influence on the direction of language change. This is "change by design" and partially corresponds to what Labov in respect to phonological changes called "change from above": the success of the changes depends on the prestige of the innovators, and initial adoption is a highly conscious process. Yet even within this controlled environment, invisible-hand processes continued to play an important role. They had been recognised as such (*'avant la lettre'*) by humanist theoreticians who had also scrutinised their permissibility.[21] The interaction between invisible-hand processes and changes by design in confessional Latin will be a major point of observation in this paper.

The continuum between Italian Humanism and German Reformation

Confessional writers were aware of and took pride in their connection with Italian Quattrocento humanism. This is evident from the occasional reconstructions of literary history found in German writers. A relatively sophisticated version is given by Bullinger's *Of True and False Learning* (*Von warer und falscher leer*, 1527): "Also Latin […] began to wake up, roused by Lorenzo Valla, afterwards by Niccolò Perotti, Ermolao Barbaro, Angelo Poliziano, Filippo Beroaldo."[22] Bullinger notes the contribution of humanism to the study of scripture, starting with Valla's *Collatio Novi Testamenti*, and emphasizes the former importance of Italy for students of Latin and Greek: "For some time students from everywhere, also from Germany, travelled to Italy, and learned Greek and Latin well in Bologna, Ferrara and Milan. From then on we have seen learned men of distinction, such as John Reuchlin and Erasmus of Rotterdam, in Germany."

Implicitely, Bullinger made the point that by the early sixteenth century Germany was no longer dependent on Italy for its language learning. As early as 1520, Erasmus had insisted that Latin writers in Germany were at the same level as the rest of the Latinate world when he angrily

18. The quotation is taken from the title of Davis 2014. See also Magnússon 2017; Magnússon & Szijártó 2013, 5. Explicit microhistorical approaches have not been used much in linguistics, but see e.g. Klippi 2013.
19. On the role of humanist metadiscourse in the dissemination of Italian humanism, see den Haan 2016.
20. Koch 2016, 27. "Change from above/below" is the well-known framework developed by Labov 2001, 272–274 *et ad indicem*: for "micro-/macro-change" see Traugott & Trousdale 2010; for "invisible-hand processes" see Keller 1994.
21. E.g. Biondo Flavio's famous onomasiological dissection of the cannon/*bombarda* (see Ramminger 2014, 22).
22. This and the following quotation are translated from Staedtke 1962, 32 and 34.

excerpt

defended himself against the accusation that he was the secret author of the more elegant Latin writings published under the name of Luther, "as if there were in Wittenberg a lack of people who can write Latin, let alone in the rest of Germany."[23] For Pirckheimer, humanist, politician, and early sympathiser with the Lutheran reform, there was a clear linguistic connection between the emancipation of German humanism from Italy and that of the evangelical movement from Rome. He expressed this in a text in the form of a letter, written supposedly by a cleric living in Rome and privy to the innermost dispositions of the *Curia*:

> Also it irritates us in Rome, that – as we hear – the Germans dedicate themselves to the letters, that there emerge many men knowledgeable in Greek and Latin letters, and that more of these are laymen than clerics. We shall in time try to counteract this vice and in particular save sophistry which complains that it is being expelled; with its tricks we shall turn the Holy Scriptures to our advantage and profit. It will suit us much better if the Germans as of old celebrate the rites of Bacchus rather than those of Apollo, if they are blind with open eyes, if they lack all knowledge, rather than scoff at us impudently, even if rightly, with the help of letters.[24]

This was satire (and vaguely reminiscent of the Latin of the Obscure Men).[25] But in its irony it captured a mood among the Italians that their leadership in Latin language and literature was no longer undisputed. Thus in 1522 the Italian Tommaso Radini tries to belittle Melanchthon's Latin by comparing him unfavorably to Jacopo Sadoleto, "the most eloquent amongst the wise and the wisest amongst the eloquent"; the latter's *dialogi* would show – upon their imminent publication – "that the leaders of literary culture are still in Rome, and those with interest in the letters are going to imitate and follow them rather than surpass ten Melanchthons."[26]

Aiming to be "the most eloquent" (*eloquentissimus*) was not, I believe, among the literary aspirations of Protestant writers. For them *eloquentia* was a complex value that morphed all too easily into *garrulitas* (loquaciousness, Melanchthon CR 17, p. 709, 1524). As the Saxon preacher Nicolaus Hausmann observes after listening in the company of Luther to a fellow preacher's sermon – in Wittenberg, no less – (1538): "He is eloquent and impressively develops [his topics], but I am afraid that this is ostentatious verbal froth, as Augustin says in *On Christian Teaching*."[27] The rejection of eloquence as a goal in itself remained an important aspect of Protestant rhetoric, in Latin as well as any other language used in preaching (the sermon mentioned here was likely delivered in German). Thus the Danish theologian Hemmingsen (*De methodis*, 1555) admonished the prospective preacher to remain "on this side of loquaciousness" (*citra garrulitatem*) and avoid the sophistic method of "covering the truth in darkness and deceive guileless people" (*ueritati tenebras offundendi, et homines incautos decipiendi*). Rather, Hemmingsen preferred the socalled didascalic genre of rhetoric introduced by Melanchthon: it was important to avoid the appearance of eloquence and deliver one's sermon "in plain and accessible speech" (*plana et populari oratione*).[28]

---

23. "Quasi vero desint Vuittenbergae qui possint Latine scribere: ne quid dicam de reliqua Germania", Erasmvs *ep* 1167 (1520).
24. "Sed et hoc nos Romae male habet, quod audimus Germanos litteris incumbere ac multos ibi emergere viros latinis ac grecis litteris doctos pluresque laicos quam clericos. Curabimus et huic vicio cum tempore occurrere maximeque sophisticam, quae se expelli conqueritur, salvare, ut ipsius strophis sacras litteras ad utilitatem et questum nostrum torqueamus. Satius enim nobis erit Germanos prisco more Bacho quam Apollini sacra facere ac apertis oculis cecutire omniques doctrina carere quam litterarum ope nobis tam impudenter quamvis vere illudere", Pirckheimer *ep* 743, Addenda vol. VII p. 472–473 (1520).
25. e. g. nos male habet, curabimus vicio occurrere, cum tempore.
26. "[…] brevi dialogos videbis a Iacobo Sadoleto compositos, viro certe inter eruditos eloquentissimo, inter eloquentes eruditissimo, inter utrosque pientissimo, in quibus ita Philosophiam defendit, ut […] Romae etiam bonarum litterarum duces esse cognoscamus, quos studiosi omnes imitari et sequi malint quam vel decem superare Melanchthones", Rhadinvs *c Melanchthon* p. 118. According to Lauchert 1912, 196 n. 1 and Berti 1973, 39–40, the work announced here is the *De laudibus philosophiae* published only much later, in 1538.
27. "facundus quidem est et potens ad amplificandum, sed timeo esse spumeum verborum ambitum, vt Augustinus dicit De doctrina christiana", *Helt ep* 184 (1538). The reference is to Avg. *doctr. Christ*. 4, 84 (ed. W. M. Green) = 4, 14, 31 (ed. Martin-Daur): "illa suavitas […] qua […] fragilia bona spumeo verborum ambitu ornantur". The phrase "ostentatious verbal froth" is from Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana* ed. and transl. by R. P. H. Green, Oxford 1995, 235.
28. The references are to Hemmingsen *method* sig. I8v (praeface to bk. II), E5r (*De methodo sophistica*), L4r (*De genere didascalico*). For the didascalic genre, see Mack 2011, 114 and *ad indicem*; Leiner 2013; Stegmann 2014 with the comments by Wriedt 2017, 94–95; for Hemmingsen, see Schwarz Lausten 2013; Glebe-Møller 1979–1984.

excerpt

Luther in a famous letter to Eobanus Hessus considered the contribution of humanism to the Reformation essential; the humanists had, like so many John the Baptists, prepared the way by a "growth and flowering of languages and letters."[29] For himself, though, he seems to have enjoyed the *persona* of the man of limited erudition, and as late as 1544 took pride in the professed simplicity of his Latin: "As you can see, I am only moderately proficient in Latin, as I have spent my life in the barbaric company of scholastic theologians."[30]

No language for compromise: the retreat of 'Catholic Latin'

The disdain for the language of scholasticism expressed by Luther in this quotation mirrors its absolute rejection by Protestant writers. Recent scholarship, especially by Ann Moss, has provided fine analyses of this phenomenon (Moss's "Latin Language Turn").[31] Here I would like to show how this Protestant intransigence seeped into everyday communication. Our material is a memorandum for internal use written in Rome by the sometime papal legate to Germany, Jerome Aleander, in 1523:

> In the work that we are in the course of writing with considerable ambition, about Lutheranism in general as well as in detail, we shall (as is fitting) pay much attention to the style, unless we put forward a proof by quoting the bare testimony of others. On the other hand, in the writings at hand, which we dictated to our secretary as an advisory report, we spoke to the point not idly or without attention; still, as far as it concerns the choice of words, we used just what came to the mouth [a phrase taken from Cicero's letters to Atticus]. Here it did not seem worth the trouble to avoid altogether those words which are barbarous and gothic, but the only ones accepted for many centuries by the discipline of theology and the all around defiled majesty of the Roman legal language.[32]

The key term for our stylistic analysis is the word *goticus* ("vocabula barbara et gottica"). That the Goths had been responsible for the decay of Latin in late antiquity was a commonplace in humanist literature already put forward by Flavio Biondo in 1435 and repeated happily by others, even if the reasons and manner of decay varied.[33] The invasion of the Goths itself was documented for the Latin reader by Bruni's Latin version of Procopius's *Gothic war* (1441).[34] It was Lorenzo Valla who a few years later used *goticus* metaphorically for the Latin of medieval literature (preface to *Elegantiae* III):

> [Is there any discipline more important than civil law?] Is it, to begin here, the law of the popes, that they call canonical, which is for a large part Gothic? Or the books of the philosophers, that not even the Goths or Vandals would understand? […] Or those of the grammarians, whose aim seems to have been to un-teach the Latin language? Or, finally, the books of the teachers of rhetoric, of which there are many in circulation up to our times, that teach nothing else but to speak Gothic?[35]

The metaphor *goticus* – "written in medieval Latin" – enjoys popularity for a short period of time with transalpine writers. Lefèvre d'Étaples (1496) diagnoses that after the Goths had dealt a blow to Latin literature, letters as a whole "had suffered something Gothic"; symptomatic of the malaise is for him the terminology of medieval philosophy.[36] An otherwise unknown

29. "surgentibus et florentibus linguis et literis", Lvther *ep* 596 (1523).
30. "Mihi, ut videtis, Latinae linguae modicus est usus, qui in barbarie scholasticorum doctorum aetatem consumsi", Lvther *ep* 4041 (1544).
31. See Moss 2003.
32. "In eo opere, quod de re Lutherana tam in universum, quam speciatim maiore studio componimus, maior item (ut par est) elocutionis ratio a nobis habetur: nisi forte sicubi faciendo fidei causa aliorum nuda testimonia qualiacumque in medium sunt proferenda. In his vero, quae consilii in modum, pro re quidem non omnino ignaviter nec somniculose, quantum vero ad verba attinet, ut quidquid in buccam venit, ministro a manu dictavimus, non visum fuit operae precium, ea penitus vocabula aspernari, quae quamvis barbara et gottica, sola tamen ferme iam tot saeculis et theologica schola et corrupta ubique Romani fori maiestas agnoscit", Aleander mai. *doc ed*. *Kalkoff* vii p. 109. I am not sure that the translation of *Romani fori maiestas* is correct. Possibly the Latin text contains some kind of error.
33. See Celenza 2009.
34. The preface to Giuliano Cesarini from 1441 was published by Baron in Bruni Aretino 1928, 147–149.
35. "An, ut hinc incipiam, ius Pontificum, quod canonicum vocant, quod ex maxima parte Gotthicum est? An Philosophorum libri, qui ne a Gotthis quidem, aut Vandalis intelligerentur? […] An Grammaticorum quorum propositum videtur fuisse, ut linguam Latinam dedocerent? An denique Rhetoricorum, qui ad hanc usque aetatem plurimi circunferebantur, nihil aliud docentes nisi Gotthice dicere?" Valla-L *eleg* 3 *praef* Moreda p. 292. See Fubini 1961, 546 about the "gothic" metaphor in Valla.
36. "A Gotica enim illa dudum Latinorum litteris illata plaga, bonae litterae omnes nescio quid Goticum passae sunt. […] Ut ergo quae ad peregrinas vulgaresque litteras

excerpt

Parisian, Claudius Largus (1498), happily announced the removal of the "Gothic pollution" from Latin in a poem accompanying Clichtove's edition of Negri's *Grammar*.[37] Some years later, the Spaniard Alfonso Segura drew attention back to Valla, who "forced the Gothic language into exile."[38] Turning eastward, Heinrich Bebel in 1503 condemned a series of verbs which "are through and through barbaric and Gothic and unworthy to be admitted in the field of Latin."[39] Beatus Rhenanus (1512), formerly a student of Lefèvre, in a letter to him deplores the Latinity of the translation of Gregory of Nyssa's *De homine* by Burgundio of Pisa (d. 1193),[40] "everywhere rife with worse than Gothic abuses of language."[41] Concerning the same edition, the Nuremberg humanist Johannes Cono, who had assumed responsibility for the new Latin text of the *De homine*, proclaimed it unworthy that a text "flowing with Attic charm should be covered by a flood of foreign and Gothic barbarity." Certainly the text deserved the eloquence of a Livy or the gravity of an Ambrose rather than "this horrible-sounding and Gothic way of speaking."[42] Only a year later, Martin Dorpius (1513) issued a call to arms to "separate the Gothic words from the Latin ones and those that bear the stamp of Rome."[43] Protestant writers were quick to turn the metaphor towards the medieval roots of Catholic teaching. Wolfgang Capito (1518) wished only to be a waymarker on a path away from the "harsh terrain of Gothic doctrine";[44] Bugenhagen (1518) warned against the "Scotic [i. e. by Duns Scotus], so as not to say Gothic sophistry."[45] Bullinger (1538) emphasises the damage to language. The blame for the decay of letters and religion could be laid squarely at the door of medieval monks and canons: "At the same time, real learning began to be neglected, the study of languages was abandoned and Gothic barbarity started to enter together with the barbarians."[46] To give a vernacular example, Rabelais's Gargantua in his letter to his son considers the period preceding the invention of print "tenebreux et sentant l'infelicité et calamite des Gothz, qui avoient mis a destruction toute bonne literature" (tenebrous and smack[ing] of the infelicity and calamity of the Goths, who had put to destruction all good literature, *Pantagruel* ch. 8, 1532).[47]

If we now return to Aleanders's suggestion that *vocabula* […] *barbara et gottica* might be allowed for internal use at the curia, but "of course" not for a wider audience, we see that it represents a complete surrender to the demands of humanist style so successfully promoted by Protestant writers. What Northern humanists and their Protestant followers had for decades denounced as barbaric, even the Catholics themselves now found "Gothic". Their traditional way of speaking had become an embarrassment, suitable only for communications that their opponents had absolutely no chance of reading.

It should be added that the "Gothic" metaphor in the North had a rather short shelf-life, since it collided with the growing interest among German humanists in Germanic prehistory and its

---

pertineant agnoscatis, haec imprimis esse cognoscite: Suppositiones, Ampliationes, Restrictiones, Appellationes, Exponibilia, Insolubilia, Obligationes", Lefèvre *praef* 13 p. 39 (1496).

37. "Gothica detersit Latia contagia lingua, | Romano docuit rectius ore loqui", *Lefevre praef* 19 p. 90 (1498).
38. "Laurentio Vallae; quo suo saeculo meram sinceramque patriae linguam restituens barbariem, quae altius increverat, Gothicamque linguam pepulit et in exilium proscripsit eo vivente nunquam amplius redituram", Segvra *Marineus fam* 6.2 p. 377 (Caesaraugustae [= Saragoza] 1508).
39. "verba sunt penitus barbara et Gotthica nec digna quae in Latini sermonis campo admittantur", *Commentaria epistolarum conficiendarum*, Strassburg 1503, fol. LXXXI^{r} (*De abusione linguae latinae*).
40. The attribution is wrong; it is Nemesius of Emesa's *De natura hominis*; see Brown Wicher 1986; Rice 1962.
41. "tam nobilem authorem ineptissimis et plus quam Gothicis dicendi abusionibus undique scatentem, tam foeda barbarie deturpatum", Rhenanvs *ep* 24 (letter of dedication to Jacobus Favre, Basle 1 March 1512).
42. "indignum arbitratus tam doctam tamque praeclaram tanti viri philosophiam, Attico lepore defluentem, peregrina Gothicaque barbarie offundi", Cono *Rhenanus ep* 25 p. 45 (letter of dedication, Basle, 7 March 1512), "[…] ut Gregorium Nyssenum suo decore Attico incedentem vel Liviana eloquentia aut Ambrosiana gravitate imperatoriae maiestati potius quam Sarmatica sua eloquentia horridula et incompta", *ibid*. p. 47.
43. "annon summo acerrimo que iudicio opus est, quo Gothicas dictiones a Latinis et Romana moneta percussis secernamus", Dorpivs *or* 3 (*Oratio in laudem omnium artium*, 1513).
44. "inter salebras gotticae disciplinae", Capito *ep* 11 (preface to *Hebraicae institutiones*, 1518).
45. "non in Scoticas, pene dixerim Gothicas, argutiunculas", Bvgenhagen *Pomerania* 3.1 p. 97 (1518).
46. "Simul enim et eruditio iusta negligi, et linguarum studia relinqui Gotticaque barbaries unà cum Barbaris irrumpere coeperunt", Bvllinger *script auth* fol. 105v (1538).
47. Quoted from Conley 2016, 58.

excerpt

positive reappraisal. Already Conrad Peutinger in 1515 absolved the Goths from blame for the decay of Latin; Latin language and Latin order had already collapsed before their arrival.[48] The Goths appear not only to be rehabilitated, but entirely appreciated by Beatus Rhenanus: "Ours are the triumphs of the Goths, Vandals and Francs."[49] The late example in Calvin's criticism of the degrees of the Council of Trent (1547) that "smack of the Gothic tyranny of the Roman See" uses "Gothic" metaphorically, but about the despotic regiment of the Church of Rome in general, not its linguistic traditions in particular.[50]

Language change and new words

Much of Melanchthon's approach to language circulated around two pairs of concepts, *proprietas sermonis/perspicuitas* and *novitas sermonis/ambiguitas*. *Proprietas* is a protean term which for the purposes of this paper is understood as the "real", i.e. original or classical meaning of a word or a text;[51] its use results in *perspicuitas*, "clarity" of expression. Opposed to *proprietas* is *novitas sermonis*, "newness", the use of words and concepts not belonging to the classical state of a language (mostly chronologically defined), i.e. lexical shift or extension, which leads to *ambiguitas*, "equivocation, ambiguity" and prevents correct understanding. Within this vast topic I would like to focus on two connected aspects: first, how Protestant writers used *novitas sermonis*, lexical shift, to shape a confessional idiom, and second, how – without endangering *perspicuitas* – a writer could fashion a distinctive voice within the confessional conformity of expression.

Melanchthon defined the relationship between *clarity* on the one hand and *ambiguity* due to *newness* or *foreignness* (i.e. new words of whatever provenience which are therefore foreign in reference to the classical state of Latin) on the other in his *Elementa rhetorices* of 1539:

> Since therefore clarity earns the biggest praise in speaking, first of all one has to have at one's disposal a rich vocabulary which expresses things without ambiguity in a precise way. In one's speech one has to avoid foreignness; that license to invent new speech – which is used in schools without moderation – should not ever be admitted by us.[52]

According to Melanchthon, it was after Quintilian that "everybody invented new words as they wanted."[53] This was a long-standing complaint of humanists; in the early sixteenth century Paolo Cortesi, the Ciceronian famous for his controversy with Poliziano, had decried *verborum pariendorum … licentiam* through which (medieval) philosophers had violated the limits of the classical lexicon.[54] Melanchthon concurred wholeheartedly. There was simply no need for all the words invented later: "all known things can be expressed by known words with a precise meaning."[55] New words are initially void of meaning (*vocabula nova nihil significantia*), and thus lead to obscurity and nonsense. "New words are put together to deceive the uninformed," since "who understands those who

48. "Scripserunt autem Iornandes et Paulus non florentibus Italiae rebus, sed eo tempore, quo Latialis lingua una cum rebus ipsis iam interierat", Pevtinger *ep* 157 (preface to the edition of Iordanes).
49. "Nostri enim sunt Gotthorum, Vandalorum Francorumque triumphi", Rhenanvs *ep* 282 (= *Origines Gothicae*, 1531). I would like to thank Karen Skovgaard Petersen who emphasised this point in the discussion after my paper. See e.g. Dekker 1999, 39–41 (Gothicism in the Low Countries); Söderberg 1896 (Council of Basel 1434); generally Svennung 1967; Johannesson 1991 (sixteenth-century Sweden); Kliger 1947.
50. "gothicam romanae sedis tyrannidem redolent", Calvin CR 35 (Opera 7) p. 428 (*Acta Synodi Tridentinae cum antidoto*, 1547).
51. The seminal discussion about *proprietas verborum* is in the preface of Adriano Castellesi's often reprinted *De modis latine loquendi* from 1515. Melanchthon was familiar with Castellesi's work, see e.g. CR 20, 357 (*Syntaxis*, version of 1529).
52. "Itaque cum summam laudem in dicendo habeat perspicuitas, in primis adsit copia proprii sermonis, qui res sine ambiguitate, signate exprimat. Fugienda est in sermone peregrinitas, et illam licentiam gignendi novum sermonem, nullo modo permittamus nobis, qua in scholis immodice utuntur", Melanchthon *rhet* p. 174–176.
53. "Licentia vero sequentis aetatis post Quintilianum, nequaquam imitanda est, qua fingebat quisque nova vocabula pro libidine", Melanchthon CR 16, 859 (*In Ciceronis Partitiones oratorias commentarius*, 1545). On Melanchthon's criticism of the Church Fathers' lack of *perspicuitas* see Fraenkel 1961, 324–325.
54. "Sunt enim multi philosophi qui cum facultatem uerborum faciendorum uoluntariam esse opinentur nihiloque minus eis in pariendo licere quam priscis illis licitum fuerit arbitrentur; negant quicquam esse causae cur uerborum pariendorum licentiam priscorum angustiis praefiniri uelint", Paulus Cortesius, *Quattuor libri sententiarum*, Romae: s.p. 1504 (Praefatio), quoted from a different edition by Celenza 2017, 380 n. 33. See Moss 2003, 65.
55. "Quia notae res omnes verbis exponi notis et significantibus possunt". For Melanchthon's use of *verbum significans* (without acc.) = "word with a precise meaning" see e.g. *rhet* p. 26 and p. 172.

excerpt

have developed a kind of newspeak (*novum sermonis genus*), such as Thomas [Aquinas], [Duns] Scotus, and such people?"[56]

Theologians had been exposed to that kind of criticism by humanists ever since Bruni began his fight against medieval translations of Aristotle more than a hundred years earlier, and the interference of humanists in theology was a staple complaint of "professional" theologians for nearly as long. Thus it was a small triumph for the papal legate Stanislaus Hosius when he could report in 1561 that despite this ostentatious aversion to the linguistic patterns of scholasticism, Protestant writers had begun to use a word like *ubiquitas*, complete with attributes like *localis*, *repletiva*, *personalis*.[57] Absolute consistency could not be expected in the fractured landscape of Protestant theology, and Hosius would have been even more delighted had he known that the Debrecen confession, written a year later mostly by Péter Melius (Péter Méliusz Juhász, *Confessio Catholica Debrecinensis*), used the neologism *essenter*: "[Pater noster] ubique praesens essenter, potenter,"[58] thus reviving the scholastic custom of forming (thoroughly unclassical) present participle forms of *esse*.

Still, as Valla and other humanists had earlier stated, "new things need new words." Melanchthon grudgingly admitted that the structure of the empire had changed since the time of Cicero, religion had changed as well, and "therefore new circumstances now and then need new words."[59]

New religions, new words

One area where the confessional adversaries needed new words was the naming conventions of the emerging denominations themselves. One obvious pattern was formations in *-anus*, which could designate any identifiable group, based on geographic origin, doctrinal adherence, or party affiliation; thus "Lutheranus" was often used in official Catholic writings as unmarked designation of the opponent (even including Calvinists).[60] Polemical writers on both sides, however, wanted more than just lexical convenience, and a great deal of ingenuity was used in forming names which could delegitimise the opponent. The most popular inherited model was the formation in *-ista*. Originally this had been a Greek model of word formation, with loanwords in Latin such as *sophista*, *psalmista* or *euangelista*. The Latin Church fathers expanded this model to doctrinal deviation, naming sects after their founder (*Donatistae*) or a key doctrine (*phantasiastae*); this was extended eventually to philosophical doctrines, such as the *Thomistae* and *Scotistae*, and political affiliation (*papalistae*, the papal party at the Council of Constance), not necessarily with derogatory intent.[61] Still, disparagement was never far from the surface, as when the French humanist Gauguin complained in 1472 to his teacher Fichet that his and Fichet's enemies called him a *fichetista* for his supposedly unreasonable adherence to his teacher.[62] Italian humanist lexicography simply ignored that area of Latin;[63] neither Valla nor Perotti have anything to say about it. Only the early German humanist lexicographers explicitly discouraged the use of such words, except for loans from the Greek.[64] The long lists of "deprecated" words attest the popularity of the *ista* model in German Latin. Despite the prohi-

56. "[…] etiamsi nova vocabula finguntur ad fallendos imperitos", Melanchthon WAusw V p. 312 (*Commentarii in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos*, 1532). – "Quis enim intelligit istos, qui genuerunt nouum quoddam sermonis genus, quales sunt, Thomas, Scotus, et similes", *rhet* p. 284. Melanchthon's concerns were echoed in Protestant school education; cf. a letter by the Strasbourg educator Johannes Sturm of 1565: "Imprimis vero aetatis nostrae nova ista licentia vitanda est, et haec nova verborum farrago, sine delectu, sine observatione antiquitatis, imo absque aurium ullo iudicio" (Especially, our time has to avoid that new unrestrained attitude, and that mass of new words, without selectivity, without regard to antiquity, even without any regard to [*how they sound in*] the ears; Vormbaum 1860, 731).
57. Hosivs-St *nunt pap Germ* II 1 p. 231, 1561.
58. Müller 1903, 363 (*Erlauthaler Bekenntnis*).
59. "Quare propter rerum novitatem interdum verbis novis uti convenit", Melanchthon *rhet* p. 176.
60. Or Zwinglians and Zwingli himself: "Also wil ich nit, das mich die Bäpstler luterisch nennind; denn ich die leer Christi nit vom Luter gelernt hab, sunder uß dem selbswort gottes", Zwingli CR 89 p. 149 (*Ußlegen und gründ der schlußreden oder articklen* [*Auslegung und Begründung der Thesen oder Artikel*] no. 18, 1523); in the Latin translation of Leo Iudae: "ut Papistae me Lutheranum adpellitent", *op* I fol. 38^{v} (*Opus articulorum sive conclusionum Huldrychi Zuinglii, ab ipso quidem vernacula lingua conscriptum, nunc verò per Leonem Iudae latinitati donatum*, 1535).
61. This account follows *grosso modo* Worstbrock 1977/2005.
62. See NLW s.v.
63. For *humanista*, where there are both examples of doctrinal affiliation (to the *studia humaniora*) and derogatory intent, see Ramminger 2007.
64. Bebel, *Commentaria epistolarum conficiendarum*, Argentorati 1503, fol. 150r, s.v. *sta* (VD16 B 1172 and B 1164). VD16 lists seven further editions, the last one in 1516. See Ramminger 2007, 7.

excerpt

bitions, it had a dazzling success in confessional writers, who used it mostly to put the opponent semantically on the defensive.

Protestants used the *papista* (a word dating from the Great Schism) to put down their opponents,[65] and found themselves under labels like "Lutherista" and "Martinista". There were many similar formations later, often coined by Protestant writers to denounce doctrinal impurity within their own ranks. The rich terminology thus developed offered a point of attack to Catholic writers, who liked to compose lists of subdivisions of Protestant doctrine to lay bare its intrinsic inanity.[66] The names of the denominations themselves pointed to the doctrinal invalidity of these creeds, as the Catholic theologian Bellarmino pointed out: "Since now some are called Martinists or Lutherans, some Zwinglians, some Calvinists, etc. On the other hand nobody has ever named us after a specific man; clearly ours is the true Church."[67]

As word formations go, these were rather unsophisticated. There were also some semantically more ambitious attempts to ridicule dogmatic differences with the same model. I would like to draw attention to one word which 'switched sides' in the fight between the confessions, the word *priapista*. Already in 1520 Luther had located the *priapi* in the *pantheon impietatis* that was Rome.[68] *Priapista* was coined by him in German to emphasise the moral bankruptcy of the Church of Rome (*Against the Falsely So-Called Spiritual Estate of the Pope and the Bishops*, 1522):[69]

> […] so that one might call the pope not *pope*, but *Priapus*, and the papists not *papists*, but *priapists*.[70]

But immediately things went wrong semantically. In 1523 the Catholic controversialist Hieronymus Emser flat out rejected Luther's polemic (*Against the Falsely Called Ecclesiast*):[71]

> [*Luther*] turns the papists into priapists, the priests into stupid gapers, the princes into fops, humans into asses, and St Peter's letter into magic.[72]

Emser thus accused Luther both of subverting political authority and of turning scripture into superstition. From there it was only a small step to turning the term against the Protestants, taking aim at the marriage of their priests. The Augustinian friar and Luther's former teacher, Bartholomaeus Arnoldi, was the first to speak

65. Worstbrock 1977/2005, 346.
66. "Sunt enim Lutherani, sunt Carolstadiani, sunt Anabaptistarum monstra varia, sunt Iconomachi, sunt Antinomi, sunt Osiandrini, sunt Suvenckfeldiani, sunt Davidici, sunt Mennonitae, sunt Illyricani, sunt Adiaphoristae, sunt Maioristae, sunt Stancariani, sunt Sacramentarii, Zwingliani, Calvinistae, & Hugonotae, sunt Servettiani, sunt Trinitarii, sunt Apostolici, sunt Libertini, sunt Sanguinarii", Eder-G *mall* sig. ***4r (1580). "Philippus cum Philippistis; Brentius ubiquista cum Brentianis ubiquistis, Maior cum Maioristis; Adiaphoristae cum Adiaphoristis, | Stancarus cum Stancaristis, Osiander cum Osiandristis", Gretser *exercit* p. 36–37 (1604). A visual translation of the same argument is in the famous broadsheet *Anatomia M. Lutheri*, first published with a Latin explanation by the Ingolstadt Jesuit Jacobus Vitellius (Wittel) in 1567 (USTC 752388), see Oelke 1996; a short description of the context also in Pettegree 2013, 123–124. A reproduction with readable text can be found at URL: bavarikon.de/object/KVC-LUT-0000000000022968. The *Brettiades* ('son of Bretten') named in the explanatory text is of course Melanchthon, called after his hometown, not the reformer Johannes Brenz (wrongly Grell & Cunningham 1993, 2). Another example of *Brettiades*, from 1577, is quoted by Ludwig 2001, 49 n. 148.
67. "Iam ergo si nunc dicuntur alii Martinistae, vel Lutherani, alii Zwingliani, alii Calvinistae, &c. nos autem ab aliquo certo homine nemo unquam vocavit, constat nostram solùm esse veram Ecclesiam", Bellarmino *disp* I,2 p. 220 (1586).
68. Lvther praef Prierias epit p. 147.
69. Engl. translation of the title from Creasman 2012, 70 *Wider den falsch genannten geistlichen Stand des Papsts und der Bischöfe*; cf. WA 10.2 p. 93 sqq. for the printing history of the German and Latin editions. Luther's German text had an astonishing distribution, with many reprints already in 1522; the Latin text is printed in 1523 and 1524; the editions say nothing about the translator – if not Luther himself, it might even have been Melanchthon, who gave the German version its definitive form. Luther is certain as the inventor of the word, since our passage is also contained in the Oxford fragment of the very first and otherwise lost version, which Luther had written at the Wartburg, but was dissuaded from publishing by Spalatin and Capito.
70. "das man den Bapst nit Bapst ßondernn Priapus und die Papisten nit Papisten ßondernn Priapisten billich nennen moecht", WA 10.2 p. 122 (1522). The same term appears in the Latin version published the next year: "Quare et Papa non Papa, sed Priapus, et Papistae non Papistae, sed Priapistae merito appellarentur", Lvther *op* II fol. 315r (*Adversus falso nominatum ordinem episcoporum*, 1523).
71. The date of Emser's pamphlet suggests that he reacted to the German, not the Latin version of Luther's booklet. Emser's text was for a large part ready in January 1523, with some additions during printing, which was finished after April of the same year (see Laube & Weiß 1997, 456–483: 456).
72. "[*Luther*] macht auß papisten priapisten, auß pfaffen maulaffen, auß fursten gecken, auß menschen eßel unnd auß Sant Peters epistel eyn tzauberey", *Wider den falsch genanntem Ecclesiasten*, Laube & Weiß 1997, 467.

excerpt

about the *priapista*[*e*] *impudentissim*[*i*] in 1523, by which he meant the runaway monks (*exiticii monachi*, 1524).[73] The Cologne professor of theology Hochstraten (1524) drew attention to the fact that his adversaries worshipped in the *synagoga priapistica* of Venus and Priapus. In 1525 Eck marvelled at the *priapistae Lutherani* who sold their devilish slavery as the freedom of the Gospel to their followers. Such was the success of the new word that the Danish Dominican Helgesen (Paulus Helie) anointed Luther as *protopriapista* and the Danish reformer Hans Tausen as "the first of the priapists in the North" when he married in 1527.[74] Luther did not continue to use his invention, and it rarely turns up subsequently in Protestant texts.

A semantic advantage enjoyed by the Church of Rome (*ecclesia Romana*) was the attribute *Romanus*, associating it with the city that had given the Roman empire its name and in the later Quattrocento could again lay claim to the cultural leadership of the Occident. German humanists had long promoted an ideology intended to neutralise this intellectual hegemony under the umbrella term of a new *translatio artium*. As Johannes Santritter, a Southern German active in the Venetian printing business, saw it in 1492, both Italy and Germany had lost Latin after the Gothic wars. Using the semantic ambiguity of *Romanus,* he expresses the hope that "our" *imperium Romanum* will soon regain the *lingua Romana* which is its *propria lingua*.[75] This semantic matrix was adopted by Protestant writers, spearheaded by Luther; they tried to undo the semantic 'union' of Roman city and Roman Church by inventing a new word for the members of the latter: *Romanista*.

The term seems to have started as a private moniker of Luther's for "those in Rome". We find the first attestation in a note Luther wrote to himself during the negotiations with Miltitz early in January 1519:[76] a topic of these negotiations was the primacy of the Pope, and Luther may have coined "Romanist" to emphasise the geographical limits of the Roman Church's authority. As the note is in German, it may well reflect the way Luther referred to his adversaries in private conversations, where his *famulus* Johannes Lonicer might have picked it up.[77] Lonicer used it as one in a vast arsenal of insults when he got the chance to attack a Leipzig adversary of his master, the Franciscan Augustinus Alveld, public lector of divinity at the university – or *lictor* (police officer), as Lonicer joked. Conceptually, *Romanista* was not important for Lonicer, though he somewhat clumsily tried his hand at a definition, based on Christ's "he who is not with me is against me": A Romanist was somebody (such as Alveld) who claimed that "with me" no longer meant 'with Christ' but 'with the Pope', and consequently believed that the spiritual community of Christ and all believers applied

73. "nisi quotidie suggesta publica haec sonarent et vulgarent per priapistas impudentissimos (-issimus *Buckwater 1998*)", Arnoldi, *Sermo de matrimonio* (13 July 1523, printed September 1523, Buckwater 1998, 164). – "Priapistae sunt exiticii monachi et larvales: cum sibi adherentibus evangelicis predicatoribus", Arnoldi, *Sermo de sancta cruce* (printed 23 June 1524, Buckwater 1998, 181), sig.Blr.
74. "qui cum alios despectiue uocent sophistas et papistas, se docent esse priapistas", Arnoldi-B *matrim sacerd* p. 152 (1523). "Quis ergo non ridebit quod de Sophistis dicitur, quibus Priapistae imputant quod caelibatui volunt addictos esse sacerdotes", Arnoldi-B *fals proph* sig. G2^{v}. "Qua re mea sententia, qui alios – ut estis impudentissimi – Papistas dicitis, non imerito Priapisticum nomen et vos agnoscere debetis", Hochstraten *ven sanct* sig.b3^{v} (1524). "Veneris et dei Priapi in synagoga priapistica sacrificulis et cultoribus", Hochstraten *ven sanct* sig.f4^{r}. "in priapistis Lutheranis", Eck *enchir* p. 130 (1525). "Lutherum prothopriapistam", Helgesen *varia* p. 173. "magister Ioannes Taussøn, omnium priapistarum in Dacia primus, duxit uxorem", Helgesen *chron* p. 108. For Hans Tausen see Schwarz Lausten & Andersen 1979–1984; a short overview in Schwarz Lausten 1990, 94–95.
75. "Excultiori eloquio ferme ad hec tempora caruimus: quod post Gotticum bellum: quo tempore barbaries vigere incepit: ipsa parens lingue latine Italia suamet [!] sermone nedum Germanie caruerant. Sed hec rerum regina oratio spero non diu fore quod apud nostros cumulatissime erit: vt nostrum imperium Romanum propria lingua non careat: et lingua Romana letetur suo imperio iungi" (More or less up to our time we lack a more elegant form of speech, because after the Gothic war, when barbary became strong, even Italy, the parent of Latin, and even more so Germany, lacked its language. I hope that it will not be long before eloquence, the queen of all things, will attain perfection in our country as well. Our Roman empire shall not long be deprived of the language which is its own. The Roman language shall rejoice in rejoining its own empire; Santritter *praef astron* fol. A3^{r} (1492), trad. partially from Jensen 1996, 65).
76. "Da mir nun dazumal Gelegenheit und billige Ursach geben war, der Romanisten Geiz anzutasten, hab ich dieselbe nicht wollen vorüber gehen lassen, und das, so vorhin gedruckt, und hernach folgen wird, wider den Ablaß lassen ausgehen", Luther 1856, 9–10: 10 (a bullet point list for his negotiations with Miltitz, 4 or 5 January 1519). Modernised text in Luther 1951, 89.
77. He was generally attuned to the voice of his master; a marker is his use of the otherwise exclusively "Lutheran" creation, *bissepties*.

excerpt

only to Rome.[78] Despite its peripherality within Lonicer's text, *Romanista* figures prominently on the title page (*Contra Romanistam fratrem Augustinum Alueldensem* […]). In this we may recognise the hand of Luther, who had also supplied his *famulus* with notes and monitored the work's progress. It was finished at the beginning of June 1520. In the early months of 1520 Luther read Valla's declamation about the *Donatio Constantini* in Hutten's second edition of 1519.[79] The reading of this humanist *tour de force* contributed to a hardening of Luther's rejection of the papal authority. Now Luther himself now began to use the term *Romanista* in earnest. The first object of his scorn was the Roman Dominican controversialist, Sylvester Prierias.

Prierias, after several other works, had in 1519 published his *Epithoma responsionis ad Lutherum*, which reached Luther at the beginning of June 1520. Given the inferiority of the work, Luther felt that the best way to refute it was simply to republish it. Prierias was a *graecobarbarus et latinococus* (a barbarian in Greek and a kitchen Latinist).[80] Luther wrote an afterword to the work to make sure that the readers understood that it had been written by an "organ of Satan" behind whom stood the "Romanists who have long ago gone insane in their impious fury".[81] In October, Luther contrasted the Church fathers and the *Romanistae* (6 October 1520, *De captivitate Babylonica*),[82] and in this period he uses his invention with great frequency both in Latin and in German.[83] A letter written by Luther to Melanchthon from his hide-out at the Wartburg merits mention, because it contrasts the *Romanistae* with the *evangelista* Melanchthon to whom the letter is addressed.[84]

Luther always preferred the cudgel to the scalpel when dealing in insults, and was not for a second reined in by the finesse of Lonicer's definition. For him, Romanists were everybody connected to the Church whose centre was in Rome and who – one is tempted to add 'naturally' – lacked the most elementary language competence (Luther thus offers a parallel to Valla's objections regarding the Latinity of the *Constitutum*).[85] At the end of the decennium, Luther explicitly distinguished between the genuine *Romani* and Rome's lesser offspring, the *Romanistae*:

> In spirit the apostle saw that from Rome and the Romans there would rise some Romanists – they are not worthy of the name "Romans" – who […] would submerge and extinguish all pious doctrine of faith and spirit.[86]

The spread of the word attests to Luther's overwhelming impact on the agenda of the confessional debate and the explosive speed with which he reshaped Latin (and German): Melanchthon some weeks later sneered at the "Ro-

78. "illud Christi… 'qui non est mecum, contra me est', ad Romam ducit…, vt pronomen 'mecum' significet hic non Christum, qui tunc loquebatur, sed papam vt nunc glossatur, ita vt si sis cum Christo et omnibus fidelibus, tamen contrarius es Christo, nisi cum Alueldio Romanista sis, vt communio ista spiritalis quae cum Christo habetur, omnibusque fidelibus, iterum soli conueniat Romae", Lonicer-I *c Alveld* sig.B4^{v}.
79. See Fried 2007, 31–32; Whitford 2008. Hutten was, *pace* Whitford, not the first editor; the *editio princeps* was from 1506 (VD16 V 227); contrary to de Grazia's assertion (de Grazia 2010, 25), there is also a substantial earlier *fortuna*, attested by twenty-five mss. (see Setz 1976, 17–39). Hutten also published what claimed to be a translation of the *Constitutum* from a Greek text by Bartolomeo Picerno dedicated to pope Julius II, only to reject the claim of a Greek original as an obvious fiction by some *asinus* in his preface to Valla (edited in Hutten 1859–1862, I, 150). For Picerno see Fuhrmann 1968, 39 ad n. 58.
80. Since he had used *epithoma* instead of the "correct" epitome/ἐπιτομή, WABr 297 to Spalatin, [7 June?] 1520. *Epithoma* is the spelling of the original print Perugia 1519 (Tavuzzi 1997, 135). Luther's reprint of 1520 has epitoma (without "h') in the title. *Latinocoquus* ("kitchen latinist") is an allusion to what may or may not have been a misprint in the title of Frobenius's edition of Prierias's *Dialogus in praesumptuosas Martini Lutheri conclusiones de potestate papae* of 1518 (*magiri* [cook] for *magistri Sacri Palatii*), which gave Luther great joy (see Lauchert 1912, 21).
81. "Romanistae iam dudum furore impietatis suae insanientes", Lvther WA 6, 347 (June 1520).
82. "legimus in Cypriano, qui unus contra omnes Romanistas satis potens est", Lvther *capt Babyl* p. 506.
83. See WA Index p. 304. For *romanista* Lepp 1908, 9–10 (only German examples 67–69).
84. "Scripsit Romanista quidam Galeritae Moguntinensi […]", MBW 139 (12 May 1521; the *galerita* is Albrecht von Brandenburg, the letter referred to is not known); Luther's letter is addressed to "Philippo Melanthoni, evangelistae Vittembergensis ecclesiae".
85. "[…] das diszer Romanist das Abece schir kan bisz auff das B" (that this romanist knows the alphabet throughout, at least to the letter *B*; Lvther WA 6 p. 290, *Von dem Bapstum zu Rome widder den hochberumpten Romanisten zu Leiptzck*, 1520).
86. "In spiritu enim vidit Apostolus, e Roma et e Romanis, Romanistas quosdam (neque enim digni sunt Romanorum nomine) exorituros, qui […] omnem […] piam doctrinam fidei et spiritus submergerent extinguerent", WABibel V p. 632 (*Praefatio in epistolam Pauli ad Romanos*, 1529).

excerpt

manist muck" (before 3 August 1520), and Hutten in a letter from 11 September 1520 mocked the greed of "that holiest senate of Romanists."[87] The term reached Erasmus at the latest in October of the same year in the letter of a correspondent (though he, steering clear of confessional controversy, never used it).[88] Towards the end of 1520 Petrus Francisci uses it in a letter to Luther (*Luther ep* 364). In January 1521 we have the first example in a vernacular.[89] In May 1521 J. Fevynus speaks of the *conventiculum Romanistarum* (an equivalent to Hutten's *Romanistarum senatus*) in a letter to Cranevelt written in Bruges.[90] In June of the same year Michael Hummelberg, the Southern German humanist and sympathiser with Luther, explained that it was not to be wondered at that the *Romanistae* at the Diet of Worms had been able to impose upon the Emperor: "at his age he lacks the experience to understand and defend himself from the wiles of the Romists" (Hummelberg coins the Greek *Rômistês*, thus giving the new word a veneer of linguistic respectability).[91] In the following period the term was adopted by many Protestant writers: by Bucer in 1521, Justus Jonas in 1522, and belatedly in 1539 by Bullinger.[92] All – with the exception of Melanchthon – used it repeatedly. Pirckheimer, disgusted by both sides, noted in a letter in 1527 that the evangelical preachers of Nuremberg had picked up Romanist excuses for their licentious conduct.[93] Even a Catholic bishop like Johannes Dantiscus used it to complain about a Roman barfly who attempted to deprive him of an ecclesiastical benefice with Romanist wiles (*technis Romanistis*, 1532).[94]

The lexical aggressiveness of Protestant polemics could conveniently be turned against them, as by Cochlaeus when he formulated the Catholic response to the text that was to become the Augsburg Confession presented by the Protestants at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530. Melanchthon in a letter to the papal legate, Campeggi, had suggested a peaceful coexistence of congregations with different rites.[95] This was illusory, Cochlaeus objected. The Protestant side obviously had not considered the possible repercussions of permitting the Eucharist under the forms of both bread and wine carefully enough. Among a host of other problems such as slobbering, wine intolerance and simple scarcity of wine, the divisions within communities would also be increased:

> There would be a division into parties with different names: abolishing or erasing the name of Christ, the ones would be called Romanists or *Romanensiens*, the others *chalice-folk*, *Lutherans* or *Lutheriscs*.[96]

Cochlaeus's sanctimonious preoccupation with the rising incivility in confessionally divided communities has an interesting subtext. His choice of terms first of all implies that it was the Protestants who had started the name-calling (since *Romanista* and *Romanensis* were the preferred terms of Luther and Melanchthon respectively). Secondly, it was only to be expected that the Catholics would reply in kind, and "naturally" with a term associated with the long fight of the Church against heresy. The Evangelicals would be identified with the Hussites: a common designation of the Hussite Utraquists, the heretics whose founder had been burnt at

87. "Videmus non esse aurum in Germania, nec argentum pene; siquod reliquum vero est, ipsum avarissime ad se trahit novis cottidie inventis artibus ille sanctissimus Romanistarum senatus", Hvtten *ep* 189 (to the Elector Frederic of Saxony, 1520). "Romanistarum feces nihil metuimus: Si Deus pro nobis, quis contra nos?" Melanchthon *ep* 88 (1520).
88. *Erasmus ep* 1154 from Artlebus of Boskowitz, supreme captain of Moravia and a follower of Luther. The letter is dated by the editor Allen "<c. October? 1520>".
89. "darumb appellieren wir von dir vbelberichten oder betrognen von Romanisten zu dir wol von vnß vnderwiset vnd bericht zu werden", Eberlin von Günzburg 1896–1903, I, 9, and Hutten 1859–1862, II, 103 l. 34 (January 1521). Further examples from Eberlin in Lepp 1908, 67.
90. Fevynvs *Cranevelt-F ep* 54.
91. "per aetatem adhuc simplicior est, quam ut τῶν Ῥωμίστων astum dolumque intelligere vel cavere possit", Hvmmelberg-M *Blaurer ep* 33 (14 June 1521).
92. "Romanistarum […] diabolica cupiditas", Ionas *ep* 74 (to Capito). "ô impudentissimi Romanistae", Bvllinger *in epist* p. 530 (1539).
93. "Ad pristinas enim Romanistarum confugiunt excusationes asserentes non tam vitam suam quam sermonem esse considerandum" (they take refuge in the old excuses of the Romanists that one should not look at their life so much as their sermons, Pirckheimer *ep* 1124 BW 6 p. 381, 1527).
94. Dantiscvs *ep* 861 (1532).
95. MBW 953 (edited without Cochlaeus's comments).
96. "foret discrepatio inter partes discretaque vocabula, vt expuncto aut obliterato Christi nomine hi Romanistae aut Romanenses, illi calixtini aut Lutherani seu Lutherisci nominarentur", Cochlaevs *resp Mel August* fol. 20^{v} (1530).

excerpt

the stake at the Council of Constance, was *calixtinus* (from *calix*, "chalice").[97] Cochlaeus thus perpetuated, under the guise of decrying it, an accusation by Catholics already put into words by Eck at the Leipzig Debate as early as 1519, namely that the Lutherans propagated Hussite heresy. *Luthericus* is another attempt to denormalise the *Lutherani* semantically. Rather quixotically, it seems to have been formed after *basiliscus*, the poisonous serpent mentioned in the Psalms (90, 13) and a common metaphor for "heretic". The new word, invented by Cochlaeus in the 1520s, never gained traction although he used it repeatedly in his polemical writing; probably its semantic message was too convoluted.

On the Catholic side, Johannes Eck tried to neutralise *Romanista* by co-opting it (1542):

> So little do I reject the label *papista*, as they call the Catholics with contempt, that I have dedicated the *Apologies* to Our Holiest Lord [the Pope] and to the Holy College [of Cardinals], so that they can see that I do not scorn the label of *Romanensis* or *Romanista*.[98]

In the same vein Luther – again combining *papista* and *Romanus* – in 1520 also invented *papanus*. None of Luther's contemporaries took it up; but, strangely enough, it had a long-lasting fortune from the 1570s onwards.

A bigger problem than these ephemeral creations were the basic designations of the confessions. The Catholics retained *catholicus* ('universal', already in antiquity denoting also doctrinal orthodoxy) and Protestant attempts to dislodge this simply failed.

The opponents of the Catholics annexed the label *evangelicus*, which formerly had signified only anything that "had to do with the Gospel or the Christian religion", but was now shifting to designating those who considered the gospel the sole source of doctrine.[99] The new metonymy goes back to the early days of the Reformation and has no known creator. Already in 1522 Melanchthon mentions those "who call themselves partially Lutherans, partially evangelicals".[100] With many writers there was, as it seems, a slight unease on account of the semantic ambiguity – not every "evangelical" prince had much to do with the Gospel.[101] At least initially, the metonymy was also used outside Protestant circles. Besides Arnoldi (quoted above, n. 72), there is also Erasmus, who in 1525 in a letter to Natalis Beda talked about "those evangelicals, as they are called".[102] Johannes a Lasco, at that point still Catholic, writes in 1528 about "their faith, which they call evangelical",[103] and even the opening speech of the mayor of Hamburg in a disputation of 1528 mentions "the new preachers who call themselves evangelical".[104] In 1532 the German mystic Landsperger warned his soul not to be deceived by those who were ensnared by an evil spirit and "called themselves evangelicals".[105]

Characteristic of the confusing semantic situation created by the competing labels is a comment by the future Emperor Maximilian II in a conversation with the papal legate Stanislaus Hosius in 1560:

> He [Maximilian] continued this conversation [by recounting] that somebody had once brought up the fact that he did not openly declare whether he was a papist (*papista*) or a Lutheran; he had answered that he was neither a papist nor, as they called themselves, an evangelical (*evangelicus*), but a Christian.[106]

97. An illuminating discussion of the passage is in Honée 1972, 32.
98. "adeo non recuso papistae nomen, quo Catholicos contemptim appellant, ut 'Apologias' Sanctissimo Domino Nostro ac sacro collegio nuncupaverim, ut aperte videant me non dedignare Romanensium aut Romanistarum nomen", Eck *ep* 394.
99. ThLL V,2 col. 997.25–998.3 s. v. euangelicus. – "Euangelicus" as opposed to the activities of the Catholic Church was from the beginning a core concept of Reformation writing, see Luther's 65th thesis "Igitur thesauri Euangelici rhetia sunt, quibus olim piscabantur viros divitiarum". The next step is probably to be seen in the Leipzig disputation between Luther and Eck in 1519, where Luther still treats *catholicus / evangelicus / Christianissimus* as synonymous.
100. "ii se partim Lutheranos, partim evangelicos vocant", MBW 236.
101. cf. "vocavit ad sese nostros tres principes, quos evangelicos vocant", Brenz *Melanchthon ep* 729 (1530).
102. "isti […] Euangelici […], vt vocant", *ep* 1581.
103. "fidem illorum, ut ipsi vocant, evangelicam", *Acta Tomiciana* X no. 448 p. 432. – Witzel (*ep* sig.C1^{v}) in 1531 rejected the "new Church […] which all call evangelical" (noua Ecclesia […], quam uulgo Euangelicam uocant).
104. This of course assumes that Hamelmann in his *Historia ecclesiastica* (1587) preserved the nucleus of the original wording of the mayor's speech (Hamelmann *hist* II p. 964).
105. "neque ab iis maligno spiritu seductis – qui se evangelicos vocant – falli te sinas", Lansperger *phar* fol. 39^{v} (1532).
106. "tum excepit ille, quendam aliquando secum egisse, quod non se satis declararet, papista ne esset an Luteranus;

excerpt

How much of the phrase related in Latin by Hosius is from Maximilian or from Hosius himself (esp. the "ut ipsi vocant"), cannot be disentangled; but the story comes with an interpretive history which emphasises the conflicting nuances contained in the semantic field *Lutheranus*/*Euangelicus*, as opposed to *papista*, and it was bitter for Hosius to hear that the future Emperor followed a Lutheran notion that classified both as sub-genres of *Christianus*. In the conversation with Maximilian, Hosius could not bring himself to let this pass without comment, but since, as he himself says, he had already acquired a reputation at court for being argumentative, he confined himself to contradicting the main point, just mumbling that being a *Christianus* was *re ipsa* being a *papista*.

This whole story may be a wandering anecdote, since a similar experience is attributed much earlier (1523) to an unidentified *dux Holdstattensis* (here the terminology is *Martinianus* / *papista* / *Christianus*). In this case it caused the duke to write to Luther to inform himself about the latter's religious views.[107] This in turn is preceded by a passage in the *Eckius dedolatus* of 1520, where one of the interlocutors pronounces: "Nec Lutheranus neque Eckianus, sed Christianus sum."[108]

In the end, Catholics could not detach the label *evangelicus* from the Protestants (despite attempts at an alternative such as Nikolaus Ellenbog's *evangelistarius*),[109] even if St. Ignazio suggested fining those "who called the haeretics *evangelici* […], lest the devil rejoice that the enemies of the Gospel and of the cross of Christ should adopt a name contrary to the facts."[110]

Since in many European languages the term "Protestant" is a synonym for "Evangelical", I would like to mention its Latin roots at least *en passant*. Originally it is a political term of the German empire, derived from the legal term *protestatio* (declaration), and specifically from a declaration of the princes in opposition to the Emperor and to the Catholic participants at the Diet of Speyer in 1529.[111] The present participle of *protestari* almost immediately lost the narrow focus on the specific action of 1529, and in a first metonymic step designated those "belonging to the faction that had presented the *protestatio*"; already the recess of the Diet of Augsburg of 1530 talked about the estate of the *protestantes*. In the following years *protestantes* became the customary designation for the "opposition" party in the political/religious conflicts of the empire. Soon the connection with the events of 1529 dimmed, and "Protestant" became synonymous with "evangelical," the meaning we know now, also affected by the shift of the vernacular derivatives of *protestari* from "declare" to "protest".[112] Eventually, in Holberg's *Nils Klim*

---

respondisse autem se, quod nec papista sit nec ut ipsi vocant Evangelicus, verum christianus", Hosivs-St *nunt pap Germ* II 1 p. 155.

107. "Dux Holdstattensis ad Martinum misit literas vt rescribat ei quam primum, quae eius doctrina sit. Causa autem haec fuit. Venerunt duo Franciscani fratres ad principem simplicissime dicentes: Illustrissime princeps eam ob causam venimus vt dicas nobis vtrum papista sis aut Martinianus. Hoc audiens princeps torue inspexit eos dicens: neque papista sum neque Martinianus, sed christianus *vnd dat eyck hundert tausendt tyiffel in dat lyff* [Leib] *phar*, vt eius idiomate vtar, *heffendt eyck odder ich werppe eyck ayin metter* [Messer] *in datt lyff* aut abiundos (sic) aut cultro moriundos dixit. Sic isto facto perritus (sic) ad *Martinum* misit, cui ipse celerrime respondere cogebatur etc.", Joh. Magenbuch an Wolfg. Rychardus, Reichart-W *ep ed*. *Kolde* p. 51–52 (1523).

108. Pirckheimer 1983, 72. See Scharoun 1993. It should be noted that Scharoun does not claim Pirckheimer's authorship for the *Eckius*, despite of what the title of his publication may have suggested to subsequent researchers (e.g. Ebneth 2001). Similar phrases are also in Erasmus: "Germani fremunt in me quod aduerser Luthero; et isthic, vt video, sum Lutheranus? Ita veluti Mercurius quispiam versatilis alius sum hic, alius isthic. Nec technis quorundam, nec pollicitis nec odiis aliorum vnquam perpelli potui, aut potero, vt alius sim quam Christianus", Erasmvs *ep* 1219 (1521), and Luther's *About receiving communion under both kinds* (Von beider Gestalt des Sakraments zu nehmen) from 1522, where he adhorts his readers not to regard themselves as adherents of either Luther or the Pope, but of Christ, who is the one who has redeemed them.

109. "ecce inspiratio, quam [quem *Tavard*] nostrates evangelistarii tollere conantur", Nikolas Ellenbog, *Contra nonnulla dogmata Lutheranorum et aliorum nostri temporis haereticorum* (before 1540), quoted from Tavard 1955, 109.

110. "Qui haereticos evangelicos nominaverit, poenam pecuniariam aliquam subire conveniret, ne gaudeat daemon quod inimici Evangelii et crucis Christi usurpent nomen factis contrarium", letter by S. Ignatius in Canisius *ep* 157 (1554).

111. See Boehmer 1934.

112. For English, the earliest example registered by the *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "protest" under "declaration of disapproval or dissent" (4.a.) is from 1644 (URL: www.oed.com, 20 February 2018). For the verb, the earliest examples are from 1550, 1579 (both from translations) and 1600. In German we read the phrase "protestirende[] stende[]" (protesting estates) from the Reformer Johannes Brenz' letter xxv of 1530 (*Anecdota Brentiana* p. 98). Grimm's examples are all under the "adversarial" meaning (see Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm, Deutsches Wörterbuch s.v. *protestieren* (URL: http://dwb.uni-trier.de, 20 February 2018).

excerpt

(1741), a subterranean traveller through Europe declared: "The European religion is split into two denominations, one the Protestants, the other the Romans."[113]

A style of one's own

An important part of the Italian humanists' search for a linguistic identity had been the study of the style of the authors of antiquity for distinguishing characteristics. That their own style fell short of their expectations or, due to various circumstances, deviated from their classical models had been a topic of discussion as far back as Petrarch's preface to his *Familiares*. A step further went the realisation that a style of one's own might not only be unavoidable, but even desirable. Famously, Poliziano took pride in the distinct quality of his epistolary style, which did not aim at expressing Cicero: "for I am not Cicero; at least, as I believe, I express myself"; the readers, though, may react with perplexity:[114]

> Perhaps someone will come along insisting that these letters are not Ciceronian. To him I shall say […] that, regarding epistolary style, we really need to stop talking about Cicero. Another, by contrast, will fault the very fact that I emulate Cicero. But I shall answer that I wish for nothing more than to catch up with even the shadow of Cicero.[115]

Poliziano did not aspire to win the approval of the 'average' reader, just as he insisted that it was his readers' problem if they did not understand him and refused to adjust his lexical choices towards a less rarefied vocabulary to accommodate them.[116]

We meet the idea that an individual style could be a legitimate characteristic of one's writing again in the sixteenth century. A notable example is Melanchthon. He shared the admiration of many contemporaries for Cicero's style,[117] turning Poliziano's proud declaration of independence into a rejection of his style: "I would prefer the dimmest retracing of Cicero's style to the genuine shape of Politian or Gellius." Nevertheless, he saw his own style as anything but Ciceronian: "My own style is poor and meagre, nothing flowery (*antheron*), all narrow and without juice."[118] Already the insertion of the Greek word for *floridus* alerts us to the fact that this is not the resigned observation of a theologian bemoaning his lack of style, but a self-assured and sophisticated statement of stylistic autonomy (inspired by, among others, Cicero and Quintilian).[119]

Melanchthon's stylistic independence manifests itself in several ways, of which the significant presence of Greek is perhaps the most noticeable. A less obvious characteristic is his refusal to adopt confessional semantic innovations uncritically, even those that otherwise enjoyed wide circulation. An example is *Romanista,* discussed above. The young Melanchthon used the term once when newly coined, probably in a bow to Luther, but never again. If we look at *–ista* formations which Melanchthon did use, it becomes clear why: some of them are words well attested in antiquity, and amongst new formations Melanchthon prefers words that are regularly formed from Greek components (*anabaptista*, *theologista*). Certainly on this point *Romanista* did not qualify. When Melanchthon

113. "Religio Europaea in duas sectas dividitur, alia est Protestantium, alia Romanorum", Holberg *Klim* 13,51.
114. "Non enim sum Cicero. Me tamen – ut opinor – exprimo", *ep* 8, 16 (to Paolo Cortesi, Inc. *Remitto epistolas diligentia*). See Shafer 1998, and the thoughtful chap. 17 in Celenza 2017, esp. 372–383.
115. "Occurret aliquis forsan qui Ciceronianas esse neget: huic ego dicam […] in epistolari stilo silendum prorsus esse de Cicerone. Rursus alius hoc ipsum culpabit, quod aemuler Ciceronem: sed respondebo nihil mihi esse magis in votis quam ut vel umbram Ciceronis assequar", *ep* 1,1, translation from Poliziano 2006, 5, with some changes. A reason for the distant attitude of Poliziano towards Cicero is the latitude of the latter's style, which suggests "that not all of his texts appear to have been written by the same author" (ut non omnia perinde quae scribit, eiusdem prorsus esse autoris uideantur, Poliziano *ep* 5.1 to Bartolommeo Scala, 1492).
116. See Ramminger 2014, 23–24.
117. *rhet* p. 296: "ego uel obscura lineamenta Ciceronis malim, quam natiuam Politiani aut Gellij faciem". The criticism of both Politian and Gellius may be an allusion to a discussion in Gellius of an error in Cicero (*noct. Att.* 15,6,1) which in its turn was a topic of Politian's *Miscellanea* ("errorem […] Ciceronis manifestissimum", *misc* I 53). The passage from Politian was often referred to, e.g. Aldvs *praef* 26 p. 44 (1501/2); Birck *Peutinger ep* 297 (not before 1538). Also otherwise Politian's *Miscellanea* and Gellius are often mentioned together, e.g. Mvtianus *ep* I 117 (1508), Erasmvs *in nov test* p. 62 (*op* VI-5), Vives *praelect Philelph* p. 84 (1514).
118. "Nostra vero oratio exilis et ieiuna est, nihil ἀνθηρὸν, omnia angusta, et sine succo", CR I 680 (from Hartfelder 1889, 313 n. 1).
119. Cf. Cic. *de orat*. 1,218 "quoniam dicendi facultas non debeat esse ieiuna". 3.97 "ne exilis […] sit vestra oratio". Qvint. *inst*. 12,10,58 "tertium [*sc*. *genus dicendi*] […] floridum – namque id ἀνθηρόν appellant – addiderunt".

excerpt

argues polemically against the Church of Rome, instead of *Romanista* he uses *Romanensis*. This was a regular formation, vouched for by Perotti in the *Cornucopiae* (6, 234); if Melanchthon had looked it up in the index of the Aldine *Cornucopiae* of 1513/1517, he would also have found a reference to Festus (in Paulus's *Epitome*). Its polemic value was guaranteed by Luther, who had used it in the postface to Prierias's *Epithome* (the Roman bandits, *Romanensibus Nimbrottis*), and later attested by Eck's plaintive reaction quoted above (see n. 97).

Conclusion:

Language change and agency

In Early Modern confessional Latin (or more specifically Lutheran Latin), lexical change operates in two parallel channels.[120]

First, we have discussed a number of innovations by design: that is, where the innovator is known and enjoys prestige, and the act of innovation is itself part of the communication. By contrast with the microhistorical approach in social history which has inspired me, the agents of these language changes, far from being obscure, are frequently among the leaders in their groups, or prominent in some other way – a prominence which ensured the reception of their works and the diffusion of the language changes they initiated. Innovation and its initial spread were a highly visible process. In a case such as *Romanista,* early users are unequivocally referring to Luther, and with their adoption of the term are expressing their position on one side of the confessional–linguistic divide. On the other hand, the visibility of this process for a linguistically hyper-aware readership triggered or reinforced several obstacles to language change. One of these was a mechanism of norm control. This may have been occasionally at work in the case of the term *Romanista*. Since *-ista* formations were deprecated in Humanist Latin, a sophisticated language user such as Melanchthon seems to have preferred a synonym which conformed to the parameters of Humanist Latin (*Romanensis*). Another obstacle is the possibility of reanalysis, as a conscious process (!), through which a new meaning can be blunted or even turned against its inventor.[121] Such attempts were not always successful (cf. Eck's unconvincing "I *like* being called a Romanist"), but sometimes worked spectacularly well (*priapista*). Once the initial, "design" phase of a language change has passed, further spread will mostly take place below the level of social awareness by means of what can best be described as an invisible-hand process, governed more by a mechanism to establish conformity than by a wish to indicate a position in a controversy – all the more so since successful words will eventually lose their cachet and pass into an unmarked semantic state (see *protestantes* "opposition at the Diet of 1529" > "opposition to the Catholic party in politics" > "one of the religions of Europe").

Secondly, even in a self-conscious language such as Early Modern Latin, which had extremely effective mechanisms for language control, there were a number of language changes which started from below the level of social awareness, i.e. without a specific, known (at least to the contemporaries) innovator. A case in point is the metonymical use of *euangelicus*, an innovation which caused considerable consternation among elite speakers of Latin on both sides of the confessional divide (who liked to emphasise their "lack of approval" by adding *ut vocant*, "as one says"). Since this usage initially spread through an invisible-hand process, control mechanisms which acted on changes by design were much less effective. The disapproval of the "arbiters" of confessional language

120. Lexical 'change' is used as encompassing change of meaning (shifts of meaning as well as extensions) and new formations. In the cases discussed here the result generally is a polysemy, on a scale from predominance of one meaning to a balanced coexistence of old and new. An example of the former is *priapista*, a new formation meaning 'licentious Catholic priest'. As I have shown, the meaning is practically displaced at once (although not entirely) by the cohyponymy "married [and thus institutionally licentious] Protestant priest'. In the case of semantic extension in Early Modern Latin new and earlier meanings normally coexist (e.g. *traducere*, see Ramminger 2015–2016); in some cases, the continuing polysemy is (at least temporarily) essential to sustain the derived meaning (e.g. *euangelicus* = "having to do with the New Testament" and metonymically "belonging to a religion which emphasises the importance of Holy Scripture over other religious texts"). A framework for all the phenomena discussed here is provided by Blank 2003.

121. For the application of 'reanalysis' to lexical change, see Koch 2016, 29sq. Koch's examples refer to an unconscious process.

excerpt

did not damage its widespread adoption. As we see in retrospect, the identifier "evangelical" became one of the most pervasive designations of the new denomination(s) in Latin as well as in other European languages.

The importance of confessional language design

We have discussed language changes that were confessionally motivated. Language mattered: it irritated the Catholics that the Protestants had claimed the label "evangelicus", and the Protestants smarted under the designation of their denominations as the Church of Venus and Priapus. When Reinhard mentioned language change as one of the areas affected by confessionalisation, he looked for evidence of collusion between state and religion. The language changes we have seen show a different pattern. Mostly they follow the path of self-confessionalisation: new users adopted changes because they were markers of confessional identity, expressing coherence within a group and demarcation from others. The confessionalisation of Latin did not come without contradictions; the aversion against Italian style, for example, did not prevent Melanchthon from considering Italy the *mater studiorum* (see M. Pade's chapter in this volume). The insistence on a rigorous return to the Latin of the sources did not prevent further change, and, just as Italian humanists earlier, the writers of the Confessional Age found that a changed world called for a changed language.

One fundamental change in textual culture preceding the Reformation (and this is a well-worn commonplace) was the vastly increased accessibility of texts. In manuscript culture, texts had on account of their expense and rarity unavoidably been restricted in access. The invention of printing with movable type changed this, and the text producers of the age of confessionalisation were the first to take advantage of the scaled-up economy of information flow. Lutheran text producers were crucial in introducing a facet of the emerging "European mindset" (understood as a bundle of cultural expectations common to in other ways diverse identities): while knowledge mediated by texts (understood in a material sense) had existed as far back as the invention of writing, the expectation was now that knowledge mediated by printed texts (in the first phase religious texts) could and would be widely disseminated.[122] Commonly there are mentioned three prerequisites (or rather corollaries) of increasing information flow based on texts in this period: the availability of large numbers of copies of texts, the increasing alphabetisation of the population, and the use of the vernaculars.

It has attracted less scholarly attention that the increase in information flow was not confined to the vernaculars, but also affected Latin. Humanists had long emphasised that some versions of Latin, notably the specialised Latin of medieval scholasticism, had developed so as to be hardly understandable any more, thus drawing attention to the change and diversification that Latin had undergone since antiquity. With dictionaries and handbooks, they had developed methods to roll back that change. They had unremittingly criticised those groups of language users who resisted their linguistic ideals, advocating for a (more) universally valid language norm. Humanists had long pointed to the special status of Latin, which – unlike other languages – had to be learnt from books. They regarded imitative writing of good or even beautiful Latin as an end in itself. Understanding a text (if it was regularly produced) was the task of those who read it, not those producing it. As we have mentioned in the introduction, printed resources played an important role in the propagation of humanist ideals of Latin in the world of confessional text production. Protestant writers expanded the humanist ideas about language norms. As far as Latin was concerned, they began to adapt it to the new "landscape of plurality" of confessional and post-confessional Europe, an undertaking described as follows by Melanchthon:[123]

> Since in our times we have to learn Latin entirely from books, it is easy to understand that imitation is crucial in this, so that we may acquire a certain kind of language which can be understood everywhere and by people of all ages.[124]

122. This process also played out in public administration, see Hildebrandt 2015, 177–179.
123. The phrase is from Greengrass 2014, 18.
124. "Cum enim hoc tempore tota nobis latina lingua ex libris discenda est, facile iudicari potest in hac parte necessariam esse imitationem, ut certum sermonis genus, quod ubique et omnibus aetatibus intelligi possit nobis comparemus", Melanchthon *rhet* p. 284 (1539).

excerpt

This article has endeavoured to describe the nascent stage of the Latin "which can be understood anywhere," the European koinê of the following period, the language that would allow reliable communication within the "pan-European scholarly culture" of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[125]

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations for authors and works quoted in the *Neulateinische Wortliste* (Ramminger 2003–) are not explained here.

CR: *Corpus Reformatorum*. In: Bretschneider, K. G. *et al*. (eds.) 1834ff. *Corpus Reformatorum* 1–101, Halle (Saale).

MBW: *Melanchthons Briefwechsel*. In: Scheible, H. (ed.) 1991– *Melanchthons Briefwechsel. Kritische und kommentierte Gesamtausgabe. Texte*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt.

ThLL: *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* 1900–, Leipzig *et al*.

WA: *Weimarer Ausgabe*. *Schriften*. In: Knaake, J. K. F. *et al*. (eds.) 1883–2009 *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, 127 vols., Weimar.

WABr: *Weimarer Ausgabe*. *Briefe*. In: Knaake, J. K. F. *et al*. (eds.) 1883–2009 *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, 127 vols., Weimar.

WABibel: *Weimarer Ausgabe*. *Deutsche Bibel*. In: Knaake, J. K. F. *et al*. (eds.) 1883–2009 *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, 127 vols., Weimar.

WAusw: *Melanchthons Werke in Auswahl*. In: Stupperich, R. (ed.) 1951–1975 *Melanchthons Werke in Auswahl* I–VII, Gütersloh.

LITERATURE

Baugh, A. C. & Cable, T.
2002 *A History of the English Language*, 5th ed., London (first ed. 1951).

Benedict, P.
2001 "Confessionalization in France? Critical Reflections and New Evidence". In: Benedict, P. (ed.), *The Faith and Fortunes of France's Huguenots, 1600–85*, (*St Andrews Studies in Reformation History*), Aldershot, 309–325.

Berti, G.
1973 "Saggio introduttivo". In: Radini Tedeschi, T., *Orazione contro Filippo Melantone*, tr. & ed. Ghizzoni, F. (*Storia del cristianesimo* 3), Brescia, 9–54.

Binder, G. (ed.)
1998 *Philipp Melanchthon. Exemplarische Aspekte seines Humanismus*, (*Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium* 32), Trier.

Blank, A.
1999 "Why do new meanings occur? A cognitive typology of the motivations for lexical semantic change". In: Blank, A. & Koch, P. (eds.), *Historical Semantics and Cognition*, (*Cognitive Linguistics Research* 13), Berlin & New York, 61–89.

Blank, A.
2003 "Polysemy in the lexicon and in discourse". In: Nerlich, B. *et al*. (eds.), *Polysemy. Flexible Patterns of Meaning in Mind and Language*, Berlin & New York, 267–293.

Boehmer, J.
1934 "Protestari und protestatio, protestierende Obrigkeiten und protestantische Christen. Zur Würdigung von Sinn und Auswirkung der Protestation(en) des Speierer Reichstags von 1529", *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte. Texte und Untersuchungen* 31, 1–22.

Breuer, D.
1995 "Katholische Konfessionalisierung und poetische Freiheit". In: Reinhard, W. & Schilling, H. (eds.), *Die katholische Konfessionalisierung*: *wissenschaftliches Symposium der Gesellschaft zur Herausgabe des Corpus Catholicorum und des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte 1993*, (*Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte* 198), Münster, 166–183.

Brown Wicher, H.
1986 "Nemesius Emesenus". In: Cranz, F. E. & Brown, V. (eds.), *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum*: *Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries* VI, Washington, D.C., 31–68.

Bruni Aretino, L.
1928 *Humanistisch-philosophische Schriften*, ed. Baron, H., Leipzig.

Buckwalter, S. E.
1998 *Die Priesterehe in Flugschriften der frühen Reformation*, (*Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte* 68), Gütersloh.

Celenza, C.
2009 "End Game: Humanist Latin in the Late Fifteenth Century". In: Maes, Y. & Papy, J. & Verbaal, W. (eds.), *Latinitas Perennis II: Appropriation and Latin Literature*, Leiden, 201–242.

125. I owe the reflection about the later European *koinê* to an unpublished abstract for the congress of IANLS, Albacete/Spain 2018, kindly communicated to me by D. Nodes. The quoted phrase is from McGrath 2004, 183.

excerpt

Celenza, C.
2017 *The* Intellectual World *of the Italian Renaissance*: *Language*, *Philosophy*, *and the Search for Meaning*, Cambridge.

Conley, T.
2016 "The graphic imagination and the printed page". In: Lyons, J. D. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to French Literature*, Cambridge, 52–69.

Creasman, A. F.
2012 *Censorship and Civic Order in Reformation Germany*, *1517–1648*: *'Printed Poison & Evil Talk'*, London & New York.

Cummings, B.
2002 *The Literary Culture of the Reformation*: *Grammar and Grace*, Oxford.

Davis, P. A.
2014 "Asking Large Questions In Small Spaces", *Theatre Survey* 55/1, 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0040557413000501> Website consulted on 9 September, 2017.

de Grazia, M.
2010 "Anachronism". In: Cummings, B. & Simpson, J. (eds.), *Cultural Reformations*: *Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History,* (*Oxford Twenty-First Century Approaches to Literature* 2), Oxford, 13–32.

Dekker, K.
1999 *The Origins of Old Germanic Studies in the Low Countries*, (*Brill's Studies in Intellectual History* 92), Leiden *et al*.

den Haan, A. (ed.)
2016 *The Metadiscourse of Renaissance Humanism*, (*Renæssanceforum* 11). <http://www.renaessanceforum.dk/rf_11_2016.htm>

Eberlin von Günzburg, J.
1896–1903 *Sämtliche Werke*, Halle.

Ebneth, B.
2001 "Pirkheimer, Willibald". In: *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 20, 475–476. <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118594605.html>

Effe, B.
1998 "Philipp Melanchthon: Ein humanistisches Plädoyer für den Bildungswert des Griechischen". In: Binder, G. (ed.), *Philipp Melanchthon*. *Exemplarische Aspekte seines Humanismus*, (*Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium* 32), Trier, 47–102.

Fraenkel, P.
1961 *Testimonia Patrum*. *The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon*, Genève.

Fried, J.
2007 *"Donation of Constantine" and "Constitutum Constantini"*: *The Misinterpretation of a Fiction and its Original Meaning*. *With a contribution by Wolfram Brandes*: *"The Satraps of Constantine"*, Berlin & New York.

Fubini, R.
1961 "La coscienza del latino negli umanisti 'An latina lingua Romanorum esset peculiare idioma'", *Studi Medievali* 2, 505–550.

Fuhrmann, H. (ed.)
1968 *Constitutum Constantini*, (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. *Fontes Iuris Germanici Antiqui in usum scholarum ex Monumentis Germaniae Historicis separatim editi* 10), Hannoverae.

Glebe-Møller, J.
1979–1984 "Niels Hemmingsen". In: *Dansk Biografisk Leksikon*, 3rd ed. <http://denstoredanske.dk/index.php?sideId=291107> Website consulted on 7 May, 2018.

Greengrass, M.
2014 *Christendom Destroyed*. *Europe 1517–1648*, London *et al*.

Grell, P. & Cunningham, A.
1993 "Introduction". In: Grell, P. & Cunningham, A. (eds.), *Medicine and the Reformation*, London, 1–10.

Hartfelder, K.
1889 *Philipp Melanchthon als Praeceptor Germaniae*, Berlin.

Hildebrandt, M.
2015 *Smart Technologies and the End*(*s*) *of Law*: *Novel Entanglements of Law and Technology*, Cheltenham & Northampton.

Honée, E.
1972 "Die theologische Diskussion über den Laienkelch auf dem Augsburger Reichstag 1530: Versuch einer historischen Rekonstruktion", *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis / Dutch Review of Church History* n. s. 53/1, 1–96.

Hutten, U.
1859–1862 *Vlrichi Hutteni equitis Germani opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia. Ulrich von Hutten, Schriften*, ed. Böcking, E., Leipzig.

Jensen, K.
1996 "The humanist reform of Latin and Latin teaching". In: Kray, J. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, Cambridge, 63–81.

Johannesson, K.
1991 *The Renaissance of the Goths in sixteenth-century Sweden*: *Johannes and Olaus Magnus as politicians and historians*, Berkeley *et al*.

Keller, R.
1994 *On language change*. *The invisible hand in language*, tr. Nerlich, B., London & New York (first German edition 1990).

Kliger, S.
1947 "The Gothic revival and the German *Translatio*", *Modern Philology* 45/2, 73–103.

Klippi, C.
2013 "Letters from Gaston B.: A prisoner's voice during the Great War". In: van der Wal, M. J. & Rutten, G. (eds.), *Touching the Past*: *Studies in the historical sociolinguistics of ego-documents*, (*Advances in Historical Sociolinguistics* 1), Amsterdam & Philadelphia, 107–128.

Koch, P.
2016 "Meaning change and semantic shifts". In: Juvonen, P. & Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. (eds.), *The Lexical Typology of Semantic Shifts*, Berlin & Boston, 21–66.

Korenjak, M.
2016 *Geschichte der neulateinischen Literatur*. *Vom Humanismus bis zur Gegenwart*, München.

Labov, W.
2001 *Principles of Linguistic Change Volume 2*: *Social Factors*, (*Language in Society* 29), Maiden, MA & Oxford.

excerpt

Laube, A. & Weiß, U. (eds.)
1997 *Flugschriften gegen die Reformation* (*1518–1524*), Berlin.

Lauchert, F.
1912 *Die italienischen literarischen Gegner Luthers*, (*Janssens Geschichte des deutsche Volkes* 8), Freiburg i. Br.

Leiner, M.
2012 "Genus didascalicum,". In: Ueding, G. (ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, vol. 10, Berlin & Boston, 329–333.

Lepp, F.
1908 *Schlagwörter des Reformationszeitalters*, Leipzig.

Löfstedt, B.
1983/2000 "Notizen eines Latinisten zu Luthers Briefen und Tischreden". In: Löfstedt, B. (ed.), *Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur lateinischen Sprachgeschichte und Philologie*, Stuttgart, 357–379 (first in: *Årsbok af Vetenskapssocieteten i Lund*, 1983, 19–40).

Löfstedt, B.
1985 "Notizen eines Latinisten zu Luthers Predigten", *Årsbok af Vetenskapssocieteten i Lund*, 24–42.

Lotz-Heumann, U.
2013 "Confessionalization". In: Bamji, A. *et al*. (eds.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to the Counter-Reformation*, London & New York, 33–53.

Ludwig, W.
2001 "Musenkult und Gottesdienst – Evangelischer Humanismus der Reformationszeit". In: Ludwig, W. (ed.), *Die Musen im Reformationszeitalter*, (*Schriften der Stiftung Luthergedenkstätten in Sachsen-Anhalt* 1), Leipzig, 9–152.

Luther, M.
1856 *Dr Martin Luthers Briefe, Sendschreiben und Bedenken* … gesammelt, kritisch und historisch bearbeitet von W. M. L. de Wette. Sechster Theil ed. Seidemann, J. K., Berlin.

Luther, M.
1951 *Ausgewählte Werke* Bd. 1 *Aus der Frühzeit der Reformation*, ed. Borcherdt, H. H., München.

Mack, P.
2011 *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380–1620*, Oxford.

Magnússon, S. G.
2017 "The life is never over. Biography as a microhistorical approach". In: Renders, H. *et al*. (eds.), *The Biographical Turn*. *Lives in History*, London & New York, 42–52.

Magnússon, S. G. & Szijártó, I. M.
2013 *What is Microhistory*? *Theory and practice*, London & New York.

Maurer, W.
1961 "Melanchthon als Humanist". In: Elliger, W. (ed.), *Philipp Melanchthon*. *Forschungsbeiträge zur vierhundertsten Wiederkehr seines Todestages dargeboten in Wittenberg 1960*, Göttingen, 116–132.

Maurer, W.
1996 *Der junge Melanchthon zwischen Humanismus und Reformation*. Bd. 1: *Der Humanist*, Göttingen.

McGrath, A. E.
2004 *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation*, 2nd ed., Malden *et al*.

Mertens, D.
1998 "Deutscher Renaissance-Humanismus". In: Stiftung ›Humanismus heute‹ des Landes Baden-Württemberg (ed.), *Humanismus in Europa*. (*Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften* II 103), Heidelberg, 187–210.

Milroy, J.
2003 "On the role of the speaker in language change". In: Hickey, R. (ed.), *Motives for Language Change*, Cambridge, 143–158.

Moeller, B.
1959 "Die deutschen Humanisten und die Anfänge der Reformation", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 70, 46–61.

Moss, A.
2003 *Renaissance Truth and the Latin Language Turn*, Oxford.

Müller, E. F. K. (ed.)
1903 *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche*, Leipzig.

Oelke, H.
1996 "Konfessionelle Bildpropaganda des späten 16. Jahrhunderts – Die Nas-Fischart-Kontroverse", *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 87, 149–200.

Pettegree, A.
2013 "Catholic Pamphleteering". In: Bamji, A. *et al*. (eds.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to the Counter-Reformation*, 109–126.

Pirckheimer, W.
1983 *Eckius dedolatus*. *Der enteckte Eck*, tr. & ed. Holzberg, N., (*Reclams Universalbibliothek* 7993), Stuttgart.

Poliziano, A.
2006, *Letters*, vol. I: Books I–IV, ed. Butler, S., (*itrl* 21), Cambridge, Mass.

Ramminger, J.
2003– *Neulateinische Wortliste*. *Ein Wörterbuch des Lateinischen von Petrarca bis 1700*. <www.neulatein.de>

Ramminger, J.
2007 "'*Nur ein Humanist*…'. Einige neue Beispiele für *humanista* im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert". In: Pade, M. *et al*. (eds.), *Albvm Amicorvm*. *Festskrift til Karsten Friis-Jensen i anledning af hans 60 års fødselsdag / Studies in Honour of Karsten Friis-Jensen on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*, (*Renæssanceforum* 3), *n.p*. <https://www.renaessanceforum.dk/rf_3_2007.htm>

Ramminger, J.
2014 "Neo-Latin: Character and Development". In: Ford, Ph. *et al*. (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopedia of the Neo-Latin World*, (*Renaissance Society of America Texts & Studies Series* 3), Leiden, 21–36.

Ramminger, J.
2015–2016 "Language Change in Humanist Latin: the case of *traducere* (to translate)", *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 40–41, 35–62.

Reinhard, W.
1983 "Zwang zur Konfessionalisierung? Prolegomena zu einer Theorie des konfessionellen Zeitalters", *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 10/3, 257–277.

excerpt

Reinhard, W.
1989 "Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and the Early Modern State: A Reassessment", *The Catholic Historical Review* 75/3, 383–404.

Rhein, S.
1996 "*Italia magistra orbis terrarum*. Melanchthon und der italienische Humanismus". In: Beyer, M. *et al*. (ed.), *Humanismus und Wittenberger Reformation. Festgabe anläßlich des 500. Geburtstages des Praeceptor Germaniae Philipp Melanchthon am 16. Februar 1997*, Leipzig, 367–388.

Rice Jr., E. F.
1962 "The Humanist Idea of Christian Antiquity: Lefèvre d'Étaples and his Circle", *Studies in the Renaissance* 9, 126–160.

Scharoun, M.
1993 "*Nec Lutheranus neque Eckianus, sed christianus sum*. Erwägungen zu Willibald Pirckheimers Stellung in der reformatorischen Bewegung". In: Kerner, H. (ed.), *Humanismus und Theologie in der frühen Neuzeit*, (*Pirckheimer-Jahrbuch* 8), Nürnberg, 107–147.

Schilling, H.
1992 "Confessionalization in the Empire: Religious and Societal Change in Germany between 1555–1620". In: Oberman, H. (ed.), *Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Society*, New York, 205–247.

Schindling, A.
1997 "Konfessionalisierung und Grenzen von Konfessionalisierbarkeit". In: Schindling, A. & Ziegler, W. (eds.), *Die Territorien des Reichs im Zeitalter der Reformation und Konfessionalisierung. Land und Konfession 1500–1650*, Bd. 7: *Bilanz – Forschungsperspektiven – Register*, (*Katholisches Leben und Kirchenreform im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung* 57), Münster, 9–44.

Schmidt, H. R.
1997 "Sozialdisziplinierung? Ein Plädoyer für das Ende des Etatismus in der Konfessionalisierungsforschung", *Historische Zeitschrift* 265/3, 639–682.

Schmidt, O. G.
1883 *Luther's Bekanntschaft mit den alten Classikern*, Leipzig.

Schwarz Lausten, M. & Andersen, O.
1979–1984 "Hans Tausen". In: *Dansk Biografisk Leksikon*, 3rd ed. <http://denstoredanske.dk/index.php?sideId=298173> Website consulted on 7 May, 2018.

Schwarz Lausten, M.
1990 "Weltliche Obrigkeit und Kirche bei König Christian III. von Dänemark (1536–1559). Hintergründe und Folgen". In: Grane, L. & Hørby, K. (eds.), *Die dänische Reformation vor ihrem internationalen Hintergrund. The Danish Reformation against its International Background*, (*Forschungen zur Kirchen-und Dogmengeschichte* 46), Göttingen, 91–110.

Schwarz Lausten, M.
2013 *Niels Hemmingsen storhed og fald*, København.

Scott, H.
2015 "Introduction: 'Early Modern' Europe and the Idea of Early Modernity". In: Scott, H. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern European History, 1350–1750*, volume I: *Peoples and Place*, Oxford, 1–33.

Setz, W. (ed.)
1976 *Lorenzo Valla, De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione*, (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters* 10), Weimar.

Shafer, K.
1998 "The Eclectic Style in Theory and Practice in Angelo Poliziano's Ep. VIII. 16". In: Mehl, J. V. (ed.), *In laudem Caroli: Renaissance and Reformation studies for Charles G. Nauert*, (*Sixteenth-century essays and studies* 49), Kirksville, 23–33.

Söderberg, V.
1896 "Nicolaus Ragvaldis tal i Basel 1434", *Samlaren* 17, 187–195.

Sperl, A.
1959 *Melanchthon zwischen Humanismus und Reformation. Eine Untersuchung über den Wandel des Traditionsverständnisses bei Melanchthon und die damit zusammenhängenden Grundfragen seiner Theologie*, München.

Staedtke, J.
1962 *Die Theologie des jungen Bullinger*, (*Studien zur Dogmengeschichte und systematischen Theologie* 16), Zürich.

Stegmann, A.
2014 "*evangelium pure docetur*. Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis von Lehre und Predigt bei Luther und Melanchthon sowie im Luthertum des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts", *Lutherjahrbuch* 81, 249–302.

Strohm, C.
1998 "Philipp Melanchthon – Reformator und Humanist". In: Binder, G. (ed.) *Philipp Melanchthon. Exemplarische Aspekte seines Humanismus*, (*Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium* 32), Trier, 9–46.

Svennung, J.
1967 *Zur Geschichte des Goticismus*, (*Acta Societatis Literarum Humaniorum Regiae Upsaliensis* 44), Uppsala.

Tavard, G. H.
1955 "A Forgotten Theology of Inspiration: Nikolaus Ellenbog's Refutation of *Scriptura Sola*", *Franciscan Studies* 15/2, 106–122.

Tavuzzi, M. M.
1997 *Prierias: The Life and Works of Silvestro Mazzolini Da Prierio, 1456–1527*, Durham.

Traugott, E. C. & Trousdale, G.
2010 "Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization: How do they intersect?". In: Traugott, E. C. & Trousdale, G. (eds.), *Gradience, Gradualness and Grammaticalization*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, 19–44.

VD16
Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachbereich erschienenen Drucke des 16. Jahrhunderts. <http://www.vd16.de> Website consulted on 7 May, 2018.

Vormbaum, R. (ed.)
1860 *Evangelische Schulordnungen*. Erster Band. *Die evangelischen Schulordnungen des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts*, Gütersloh.

Whitford, D. M.
2008 "The Papal Antichrist: Martin Luther and the Underappreciated Influence of Lorenzo Valla", *Renaissance Quarterly* 61/1, 26–52.

excerpt

Worstbrock, F. J.
1977/2005 "Sophisten, Humanisten, Mediävisten und ihre Wortgenossen". In: Worstbrock, F. J., *Ausgewählte Schriften,* Band 2: *Schriften zur Literatur des Humanismus*, Stuttgart, 339–347.

Wriedt, M.
2017 "Die Hammerschläge von Wittenberg und ihr Widerhall in den deutschen Landen". In: Danz, C. & Tück, J.-H. (eds.), *Martin Luther im Widerstreit der Konfessionen*: *Historische und theologische Perspektiven*, Freiburg *et al.*, 76–108.