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Before he produced editions of Catullus and Tacitus, wrote a commentary on Ronsard, or delivered orations as a diplomat of the Vatican, Marc-Antoine Muret (1526–1585) composed Latin elegies, poetic epistles, satires, odes, and epigrams. These *nugae*, or “trifles,” as such pieces are often called, he published in a volume simply entitled *Iuvenilia*, along with the play *Iulius Caesar*. The latter I have not included in the present volume for reasons explained below. The rest, however, were in want of a modern edition, in particular, one that collated the first edition with subsequent printings to reconstruct the author's original manuscript as sent to the publisher. Here, of course, I am treading on dangerous ground, for, one might ask, what if the first printer reproduced Muret's manuscript exactly as he found it? And surely Muret himself proofed the galleys, as we would term them, before the press run. Even so, I have seen numerous first editions of neo-Latin poetry with errata sheets attached to the end, corrections that soon found their way into succeeding editions. Muret’s *Iuvenilia* did not have such an errata sheet, perhaps as a result of the troubles he was then finding himself in at Paris, troubles that soon landed him in prison. Later editions do show a few variations, however, but without explanation as to their source. Are these conjectures that clean up some obvious problems, or are they derived from corrections found in the margins of Muret’s own copy? At any rate, the changes are few, so that it was an easy enough task to bring all the editions together to make some gentle corrections to the first edition as it was printed. In essence, then, what the reader will find here is the Paris edition of 1552 with a few alterations that are duly documented by an apparatus criticus.

An important backdrop to this book has been Virginie Leroux’s 2000 dissertation, directed by René Martin at Paris III and entitled *Les Iuvenilia de Marc-Antoine Muret (1552): édition, traduction, commentaire*. Currently, Dr. Leroux is revising this dissertation for publication with Librairie Droz in Geneva. One may reasonably question why, in light of that pending edition, my own edition is even needed. There is more than one justification. Dr. Leroux is not translating into English, but into French, and while admirably she translates much more precisely and carefully than Moret did four hundred years ago, the problem remains: the *Iuvenilia* has never been turned into English for English readers. Additionally, a second commentary will benefit
everyone. Although from the beginning I corresponded with Dr. Leroux and saw bits and pieces of her commentary along the way, I only saw a complete copy of her dissertation after I had finished the task to which I had committed myself. In other words, we wrote our commentaries independently of one another, thus offering the reader two distinct perspectives to compare. In the end, however, I did obtain a copy of her dissertation and could myself compare my ideas with hers. In cases where I have added her observations to my own finished work, I have duly given her the credit in the text. This is particularly true, or frequent, I should say, when it comes to the identification of some obscure individuals named in the text. The reader will notice as well that Leroux emphasizes what I do not, and vice versa, that we often diverge in our approach to the text and reach differing interpretive conclusions. I consider this a bonus, a beginning of the attempt to come to grips with what Muret meant and wanted to convey, if indeed he even wanted to convey only one thing. No one scholar can hold all the keys in this regard.

With this said, I think the incredulous reader will still want to see some examples of how and where Leroux and I diverge. One obvious example occurs in regard to *epig.* 15. In lines 3–4 of that poem, Leroux gives the following text and translation:

```
Pande, agedum, lasciva. Quid, o, quidnam oculis illud,
Quo mea versantur corda, supercilium?
```

Allons, coquine, laisse-les voir. Pourquoi, o pourquoi sur tes yeux,
ce sourcil provoquant les tourments de mon coeur?

She notes, with apparent puzzlement, that Charles Dejob in his biography on Muret has translated these lines as follows: “Pourquoi, o pourquoi cacher ce sourcil dont les mouvements agitent mon coeur!” The key lies in Dejob’s word *cacher.* What, in Muret’s lines, does this word translate? In fact, an error was introduced by Leroux herself when she accidentally replaced Muret’s *occulis* with her own *oculis,* and then found herself without a main verb. Thus in English this is to be rendered as follows:

```
Come, open them, naughty girl. Why are you hiding that
brow, wherein my heart dwells?
```

Perhaps it is not fair to ferret out mistakes that may not make it into the published edition. The first epigram addressed to Julius Caesar Scaliger permits us to trace real differences in our approaches, both in the translation and in the commentary. The first two lines read as follows:
In tenues numeros, primi monumenta furoris,
Quo mea non simplex corda subegit Amor . . .

Leroux translates these lines in this way:

Sur mes modestes vers, témoignages de la première passion
par laquelle le perfide Amour assujettit mon coeur . . .

The *perfide* stands as her rendering of the rather odd *non simplex* describing *Amor*, and, long before I saw Leroux’s choice, my own inclination was to translate it with some English equivalent to *perfide* too. But when I encountered a similar phrase at *epig.* 32.3, I began to doubt my own translation. There Muret writes *geminus Cupido*, which led me to think of Eros and Anteros, as well as Ovid’s phrase, *geminorum mater Amorum* (*Fast.* 4.1). This *geminus*, then, seems to stand behind *non simplex* as the positive expression, or, if you will, the obverse of the litotes. In fact, we find in the ancient writers mention of, not just two Erotes, but many, sometimes even thousands (e.g., Prop. 2.2). Thus I have opted to translate *non simplex Amor* as “the band of Erotes,” which is an option that Leroux herself entertains as a possibility in her commentary: “Ou ‘où des Amours multiples ont entrainé mon coeur.’”

At the end of the same poem, Muret concludes with the following line:

*Dux olim, et princeps: nunc mihi paene Deus.*

The translation is obvious, and on that Dr. Leroux and I do not disagree. In the commentary, however, we take a different approach. She believes that Muret is playing on the identification of *dux* Julius Caesar and Julius Caesar Scaliger. The idea is interesting, since it can be said of the former that he was a general, a ruler, and then, in his apotheosis as a comet, a god. Yet, nothing else in the epigram itself leads us to think of Julius Caesar. To the contrary, if Muret were introducing Julius Caesar here, he would at the same time be insulting Scaliger, since he would be attaching honor to him that he had only earned through his namesake, not by virtue of his own accomplishments. Further, in no other epigram of Muret that is addressed to Scaliger do we discern even the remotest hint of a play on the name of the Roman leader. It is more pertinent, therefore, to ask by what accomplishments Scaliger himself has earned the titles *dux, princeps,* and *Deus.* Indeed, Scaliger does claim to belong to a family who ruled for a time over Verona (*princeps*), and he did serve as an officer in the Battle of Ravenna (*dux*). That he deserved the title *Deus,* Muret asserts over and over again in other epigrams.
Many more examples of our divergences could be mentioned. In *epig.* 2, the phrase in line 7, *aeterna dammentur ut omnia nocte,* is handled by Leroux in this way: “sinon, qu’ils soient, comme tout, condamnés à une nuit sans fin.” But since here we are dealing with a hyperbaton not uncommon to poetry, this should be taken as a purpose clause correlated to the one in line 5 (*Ut tibi si . . .*). Both are introduced by the *iussa subire* in line 4. Therefore, I have translated the line, “[but if not,] that they might all be condemned to an eternal night of death.” In *epig.* 22, Leroux and I have a different interpretation of the ending. The reader can decide whether her explanation of *philosophos* as “one who absorbs without understanding,” or my own as “lover of void.” I frankly do not think the poem suggests that Caliantheus has absorbed the material but merely failed to understand it. Rather, he loves the empty show. For *epig.* 25, I believe that the reader will look for some comment on the pun with which the poem ends: *Quod se frigibus unicus repertis, / Multa pascere glande perseverat.* Leroux points to the parallel in Cicero’s *Orator,* from which Muret definitely borrowed: *Quae est autem in hominibus tanta perversitas, ut inventis frigibus glande vescantur?* But how does this borrowing explain the pun? No comment is offered. Given the portrayal of the subject of this epigram elsewhere in Muret’s poetry, however, we should not be surprised that this is actually a tasteless sexual metaphor, drawn from Mart. 12.75.3: *pastas glande natis habet Secundus.*

This is not meant to be a review of Leroux’s dissertation. Her work is thoroughly researched and dense, and will provide the scholarly reader with a wealth of information. Instead, I mean to justify the present volume in light of her work by demonstrating that they are not a duplication of one another.

The same can be said for the German translation and “edition” of D. Schmitz published in 1995, but for a radically different reason. Leroux herself has dismissed Schmitz’s work as flawed in many ways, and with her I must concur. The translations frequently do not reflect the Latin; the commentary is superficial and full of gaffes; and the text depends on only one later edition, that of Frotscher. For this reason, I have almost never referred to it (Leroux does, at times, but he is hardly worth refuting), even though I have read it through.

Now another decision must be defended, namely, why I did not include the play *Julius Caesar* along with the poems, even though it was part of the first edition. In the final analysis, my rationale boils down to the fact that I have no compelling interest in theater during this period and no special background in it to allow me to make a useful contribution. The reader would gain more by going to the editions of Blanchard (1995) and Lemarque (1998) listed in the bibliography. Both have translations and the former includes a commentary. Much is to be gained also from reading Bloemendal’s article in
Recreating Ancient History. Anything that I could produce here would simply be redundant and derivative.

My aim with this edition is to supply a reliable text and up-to-date translation of Muret’s poetry for the nonspecialist. In the term “nonspecialist” I include a) those who study the Renaissance but whose proficiency in Latin is weak or nonexistent, and b) classical scholars who are interested in the Nachleben of ancient literature but who lack experience in reading neo-Latin texts. The commentary is meant to aid in the interpretation of the poems particularly in light of classical literature, though ample attention is given throughout to Muret’s contemporaries writing in Latin. The commentary is tied to the Latin text instead of the English text because, more often than not, it is the precise provenance and meaning of some Latin phrase that is in view. I have not wanted the critical apparatus to become cumbersome and unwieldy, filled with tangential bits of information, since the state of the text does not require it. For this reason I have not included obvious misprints from the various editions, nor have I detailed punctuation and orthographic variances. For example, it is not necessary in the preface to note that the 1579 edition has *Comes hortari* when the 1553 has *Comes valde hortari*. Nor is it necessary to linger over the almost endless permutations of punctuation that exhibit themselves throughout the various editions. Conventions change, so that what once made sense in the context of the Renaissance is largely useless to us today. In fact, in this edition I have updated the punctuation within the Latin text itself to reflect modern norms. On both issues of punctuation and orthography I have explained my *modus operandi* in more detail below in “Orthography and Punctuation.”

Finally, I want to acknowledge the generous help I received from a number of sources. As always, the Newberry Library of Chicago is a gold mine of information and hard-to-find texts. I am grateful to the staff there who went out of their way to accommodate me and help me track down *minutiae* hidden away in corners of the library. Also, my thanks go out to Bruce Swann, Special Collections and Classics librarian at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, who assisted me in certain quests for documents and data along the way. And, to be sure, I have relied heavily on the comments and advice of the anonymous referees for The Ohio State University Press and owe them a debt of gratitude for steering me in the right direction many times over.
Marc-Antoine Muret (1526–1585) exemplifies the essence of French Renaissance humanism. A master of Latin and student of Classical antiquity, he not only engaged in the recovery and exposition of ancient texts, he also actively employed the old genres and skills in the contemporary ecclesiastical and public spheres. He wrote Latin poetry, both sacred and profane, delivered public orations in Latin, and lectured in various schools throughout France and Italy on authors as diverse as Catullus and Tacitus and on topics as varied as Greek philosophy and Roman law. His list of friends, acquaintances, teachers, and students reads like a *Who’s Who* of the period. He twice received counsel from the elder Scaliger at Agen and at Poitiers participated in a poetry contest judged by Jean Salmon Macrin. At Limoges, he knew Jean Dorat and Joachim du Bellay. Pierre Ronsard and Montaigne attended his lectures at various times, and Ronsard corresponded with him throughout his life. Denys Lambin, the great commentator of Lucretius, befriended him until their odd falling out in 1559. At Paris, he crossed paths with George Buchanan, Claude Goudimel, François le Duchat, Étienne Jodelle, and other well-known poets, printers, musicians, and intellectuals active there. At Venice he knew Paulus Manutius, who helped him to publish some of his books. Through his association with Ippolito d’Este, Cardinal of Ferrara, Muret came to the circle of Pope Pius V. And like many humanists of the day, he faced the turmoil that was fueled when classical world views clashed with Christian piety. Charged with heresy and sodomy, he was nearly burned at the stake while at Toulouse. Lambin, his old friend, would later accuse him of plagiarism for his *Variae Lectiones*. At Rome he was forbidden to lecture on certain subjects, such as Law and Plato. Despite the scandal and turbulence, in 1576 he received his Holy Orders, a humanist turned minister of the Church, and in that capacity he spent the rest of his life.

Muret’s outlook and style, his way of reading ancient texts and putting them into practice, the odd *contaminatio* of Christian piety and classicizing humanism, the almost religious enthusiasm for learning and living, mark him as fairly typical among intellectual elites of the period. For him, antiquity not only provided the tools for rhetoric and elegant expression, but was the means to explore ethical
questions as well, on a level rivaling that of the Scriptures. In an oration delivered in 1573 as his inaugural lecture on Plato, for example, Muret expresses the hope that God will favor his examination of the civic *sumnum bonum* in Plato’s *Republic* and the individual *sumnum bonum* in Cicero’s *De finibus*, an enterprise that he describes as *utiles* and *honestum*. To this he adds a remarkable assertion about the capacity of ancient learning to guide human lives:

> Primum igitur istis Graecae linguae osoribus ita responsum volo, omnem elegantem doctrinam, omnem cognitionem dignam hominis ingenui studio, uno verbo, quicquid usquam est politiorum disciplinarum, nullis aliis, quam Graecorum libris ac literis, contineri.1

First, I wish to respond to those who hate the Greek language by saying this: Every elegant doctrine, all knowledge worthy to be studied by a freeborn man; in short, whatever at all belongs to the polite disciplines, is contained nowhere else but in the books and literature of the Greeks.

*All* knowledge (*omnem cognitionem*) worth pursuing? It is no wonder that Muret fell into disfavor with the Church from time to time. In October of 1554, shortly after the publication of the *Iuvenilia*, Muret was in Venice extolling the same humanist manifesto in another public oration, this time in praise of classical literature. Arguing that literature is a necessary precursor to virtue and the foundation of a flourishing State, he speaks of its ability to entice readers with its pleasurable form to fill themselves with healthy precepts:

> . . . non tantum bene dicendi, verum etiam bene vivendi commonstrant vias: excitant in animis nostris igniculos gloriae: quantus sit in virtute splendor, quanta in vitii deformitas, edocent: quae qui semel bene penitus imbibent, ii nunquam non postea et vitii turpitudinem omni studio refugient, et officii honestatisque rationem rebus aliis omnibus anteponent.2

They show us the paths, not only of speaking well, but also of living well. They quicken in our souls flashes of glory. They teach how much splendor lies in virtue, how much ugliness in vice. Whoever imbibes their doctrines deeply and completely will ever after flee from the shamefulness of vice and place above all a devotion to duty and goodness.

---

2. Ibid., I: 18.
The path to living well starts with the ancient authors, who ignite “flashes of glory” in our souls. Literature, he adds, has its own kind of voluptas and oblectatio. It imitates the alluring power of Venus and Cupid, the most powerful of the gods, to draw the reader away from sensual temptations into the vestal world of Minerva, just as once Orpheus used his enchanting songs to turn the Argonauts from the delicate songs of the Sirens back to the thoughts of virtue. The artifice of literature, therefore, its rhetoric and charms, the sounds and fabulous nature of it, merely counter the artifice of sensuality, fighting fire with fire, as we say.

Thus we have a guide for understanding the Iuvenilia here at hand. Although we cannot deny that this poetry reflects the typical schoolboy exercises deemed necessary for teaching style, Muret never condones literature for the sake of literature, delight for the sake of delight. Instead, the present work was born out of his humanist convictions that literature should ennoble the human spirit and “inflame the soul with a zeal for excellence.” If that does not seem the case at first glance, we can blame it on the competition with Venus.

Muret and his work must be put into a historical context. He was born on April 12, 1526, in the town that bears his name near Limoges. We do not know enough about his early years or his intellectual formation, except that much of what he knew was self-taught, as he was “stimulated to study by domestic examples.” The fields of philosophy and jurisprudence drew him from the earliest age, but it was in rhetoric that the young Muret naturally excelled, so much so that Montaigne would later call him “le meilleur orateur du temps.” Much doubt has been cast on the traditional chronologies of Muret’s early years, at least up until 1547, when we can definitely place him in Bordeaux. In general, the biographers have tended to reconstruct the humanist’s early years as follows: We first find him already a professor in 1544 in the college of Auch at age eighteen, where he composed the Latin tragedy Julius Caesar, a production of which Montaigne himself supposedly played a part in later at Bordeaux. Then, after a brief teaching stint at Villeneuve-d’Agen in 1545, and possibly a short excursion to Paris, he made his way to Poitiers to teach in the college of Sainte-Marthe there. Finally, in 1547 he

---

3. Ibid.: “. . . aut animum praeclararum rerum studio ascendere . . .” Muret’s practical prescription for the training of the youth as expressed in his De via ac ratione tradendarum disciplinarum (On Instructional Methodology) has been analyzed and put into historical context by P. Sharratt (see bibliography). He observes that Muret believed “the teacher of literature should strive for encyclopedic knowledge,” and resisted the segregating of disciplines. He also sees in Muret an insistence on the usefulness of the study of literature for creating well-informed, moral leaders.
4. According to his 2nd discourse, 1554.
5. Essay 1, 26.
went to Bordeaux, with the recommendation of Julius-Caesar Scaliger, where he spent the next four years teaching at Collège de Guyenne, until he left in 1551 for Paris.

R. Trinquet has cast serious doubt on this canonical early chronology. All of it appears to stem from a mistake that Joseph Scaliger, the son of Julius-Caesar Scaliger, made in a polemical work published in 1608 at Leiden. In that work, *Confutatio stultissimae Burdonum fabulae*, Scaliger explicitly asserts that at age eighteen Muret was teaching Cicero and Terence at the college in Auch. But he appears to have made a mistake in his old age, by transcribing the date M.D.XL.V.III as M.D.XL.IIII from the first edition of the *Julius Caesar*, an edition that is now completely lost to us. From that mistake, he began to calculate the age of Muret to fit other events of his early days. In reality, Muret likely spent only part of 1547 and 1548 at Bordeaux, not four years, during which time he tutored Montaigne, and afterwards went to Auch (for the first time) to teach for about three years. While there, he published his *Julius Caesar* (1549), along with some eclogues for the Cardinal d’Armagnac.

At any rate, in 1551 we find Muret in Paris delivering lectures at the Collège du Cardinal Lemoine and the Collège de Boncourt. In 1552 Muret lectured on Catullus to a large audience that included several members of the Pléiade, in particular his friend Ronsard. We can only assume that the commentary on Catullus that Muret produced “in three months” in Italy the following year, after a request by Paulus Manutius, reflects fairly closely the content and style of the lectures. M. Morrison has shown that Ronsard assimilated much material from those lectures and applied them to his own practice of poetry. Clearly, Ronsard knew Catullus well before hearing Muret’s lectures, but without a doubt Muret’s lectures brought Catullus into vogue.

6. Gaullieur (see bibliography below), 230, suggests that certain personality traits, exhibited very noticeably by him while teaching at Bordeaux, eventually brought about his downfall: “Dové de beaucoup d’esprit naturel, il avait la répartie fort vive, et lorsque les écoliers troublaient ses leçons par leurs propos ou leurs polissonneries, il avait l’art de leur imposer silence par quelque mot piquant. Cette promptitude à décocher des traits lui fit, dit-on, beaucoup d’ennemis.”


8. The play was probably written in 1547 (see Blänzendorf), then reworked by Grévin in 1560. Jeffrey Foster’s edition of Grévin’s play (Paris, 1974) includes the Latin text of Muret’s *Caesar* on pp. 103–23. Muret was the first to show the murder of Julius Caesar on the stage. The chorus of his play concentrates, however, not so much on the pros or cons of monarchy, but on the constant cycle of power reversals, or action and reaction, at work in the politics of any given State.

The commentary demonstrates his sensitivity to the text both as a humanist scholar and as a poet. Unlike most other commentators of the time, he occasionally offers aesthetic judgments on Catullus’ poetry (we are told that poem 68 is the most beautiful elegy in the Latin language, primarily on account of its Alexandrian technique), mulls over the choice of vocabulary, and discusses how the meter serves to produce a certain effect. But Muret may have done the most for Catullus’ text by not flinching or allegorizing when he came to difficult passages. On Catullus 16 (*pedicabo et irrumabo* . . .), for example, Muret is matter-of-fact in his interpretation of the poet’s most strikingly obscene lines:

Furius et Aurelius de Catullo, tanquam effeminato, et impudico, ob mollicitiern carminum, senserant. id nunc eis irascitur, negatque, poetarum mores e scriptis spectari oportere. eadem excusatione utitur Ovidius,

Crede mihi, distant mores a carmine nostri.
Vita verecunda est, Musa iocosa mihi.

et Martialis,

Lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba est.

et notum est illud in Voconium,
Lascivus versu, mente pudicus eras.

Furius and Aurelius had felt that Catullus was effeminate and unchaste, because of the softness of his poems. He is angry at them about that, and denies that one can learn the poet’s mores in his writings. Ovid used the same defense: “Believe me, my mores are different from my poetry. My life is modest, my Muse is jocular.” And Martial: “My page is wanton, my life is good.” And that well-known line about Voconius: “You were wanton in verse, chaste in mind.” [Apuleius, *Apol.* 11.3, quoted from Hadrian]

This comment, though far too brief for the demands of the passage (he only comments on *male marem* from the rest of the poem), is fairly remarkable in its historical context, not so much for what he *does* do, but for what he *does not* do.

As he typically does, Muret begins with a summary of the gist of the poem and then follows up with a few explanatory notes on individual phrases or words. One looks in vain here and elsewhere in the commentary for the “flashes of glory” that he promised to ignite when he lectured to the Venetians on the value of classical
literature. The fact that the obscenities in poem 16 are read as an integral part of the poem and not glossed over with the forced moralizing that characterizes his predecessor, Pierio Valeriano, who lectured on Catullus at the University of Rome in the 1520s, suggests that Muret was more interested in technical matters of philology and exegesis than in ethical precepts. It had been Valeriano’s view that the interpreter should edify and instruct his students in matters of virtue through the use of the ancient texts, and furthermore that (and this was typical of the period as well) he should teach his students to draw from authors such as Catullus stylistic tools to imitate in their own writing. Given the oration about morality in ancient literature, one would assume that Muret would applaud Valeriano and want to imitate his style of commentary. He does not. On close inspection, however, Muret is not being inconsistent with his oration, since there we see that the “flashes of glory” stem, not so much from the teacher drawing lessons willy-nilly from a text, but from a direct contact with the text on the part of the reader. His commentary, in fact, assumes that the ability of the classics to edify goes hand in hand with a correct reading and comprehension of the text. That explains why, throughout, Muret is genuinely interested in textual matters and significant philological concerns, and though he often errs, he does strive to explicate a passage as a whole unit rather than as a set of individual words that serve as a conduit for digressions.

Muret’s gaffe in accepting and commenting on the reading *mane mane* at Catullus 10.27 (from Guarino’s version) has been the subject of some ridicule. But one derives a better feel for what Muret was doing by looking at the first few comments on the very same poem:


—*coronatus nitentem* *Malobatris Syrio capillos.*

11. Ibid., 158.
Martialis,

Si sapis, Assyrio semper tibi crinis amomo splendeat.

Plautus Casina,

—unde hic, amabo, unguenta olent? St. oh, peri.

Manufesto miser tenor: cesso caput pallio obtegere?

Varus.] He is talking about Quinctilius Varus Cremonensis, a man renowned in the arts of war and peace, who later was cut down in Germany together with three legions. Ut mihi tum repente visum est,] as much as I could judge from that first glance. Bithynia,] from which I just barely returned, having gone there with the praetor Memmius. nec praetoribus.] I think this passage needs correcting, because they did not used to send more than one praetor into a province. Perhaps he wrote quaestoribus. Cur quisquam caput unctius referet,] Why anyone, because of the profit made in the province, should enhance his lifestyle or his appearance. Once the elegant people used to pour sweet-smelling unquents on their head. Horace: “crowned on their glistening hair with Syrian malobathrum.” Martial: “If you are smart, you hair will always shine with Assyrian balsam.” Plautus in his Casina: “Whence here this strong scent of unguents, pray tell?” Stalino: “Oh dear, I’m undone. Wretch that I am, I’m caught in the act. Am I going to quit rubbing my head with my cloak?”

Obviously, Muret has confused his Varuses, and I know of no modern editor who has accepted his conjecture quaestoribus. Even so, he has offered some useful parallels for the phrase caput unctius and provided a basic explanation of it. He goes on in the commentary to highlight beatiorum in line 17 (he does not entertain the reading beatiorem), and then gloss it with several Latin and Greek passages to show that it means “rich.”

Right or wrong, Muret was teaching Catullus to a packed house and enthusiastic crowds in Paris. DeJob, citing the description of Benci, describes a scene where every nook and cranny was filled with students waiting to hear him, and that the teacher himself had to climb to his chair on the shoulders of the audience. Perhaps even the king and the queen came to hear him lecture.12 But

12. Lazeri (Ruhnken IV: 525) reports this anecdote from Benci’s funeral oration, and though Scaliger had scoffed at it, he gives it some measure of credence.
Muret’s glory in Paris was not long-lived. At the very height of his success, when he was preparing the publication of the *Iuvenilia* and a commentary on the *Amours* of Ronsard, he was accused of “penchants antiphysiques,” which one may presume means he took too much interest in some of his young male students. He was locked in the Chatelet de Paris, where he would have starved himself to death out of despair rather than face an ignominious execution, if not for the intervention of his friends.

After being freed from that prison, Muret fled to Toulouse. There, while beginning to teach on Roman law, he was accused of not having desisted from his former sodomy, this time carrying on, so the charge went, illicit relations with a young boy in his tutorship, by the name Luc-Menge Fremiot (sometimes called “Memmius”). This is the same youth whose two poems appear in editions of the *Iuvenilia* itself, and to whom Muret dedicated with great affection his translation of the *Topica* of Aristotle in 1554. There he speaks of their “common disgrace,” but without admitting to the crime. In fact, Muret’s accusers charged him with both sodomy and heresy—they had concluded he was a Huguenot, perhaps because of his association with Buchanan—and the judges condemned him to be burned at the stake. In the end, they could only burn him (and Fremiot) in effigy. Again with the help of friends, Muret was able to escape, and this time he sought asylum in Italy. In the course of that journey he fell gravely ill while in North Italy (Lombardy). An anecdote has come down that the doctors who were assigned to attend to him thought, because of his tattered clothes (a disguise?), that he was a vagrant. One spoke to the other, “faciamus experimentum in anima vili,” at which point Muret startled them by replying in elegant Latin, “Vilem animam appellas pro qua Christus non dedignatus est mori,” thus escaping once again from imminent torture.

After this harrowing incident, Muret found himself in Venice (at least by May 1554), where he made important contacts. Here he immediately met Paulus Manutius (Paolo Manuzio, 1512–1574), the youngest son of Aldo, who founded the famous press that bears his name. We learn from the preface of Muret’s commentary on Catullus that Manutius shared the enthusiasm for Catullus and encouraged Muret to publish his lecture notes as soon as possible. After some reluctance and brief hesitation, Muret produced them in less than three months: “hoc tamen, quidquid est, trium mensium, aliquanto etiam minore, spatio absolverim.”

---

13. He also composed the poem, “In imaginem M. A. Mureti e vivo expressam,” which appears in some of Ronsard’s editions of poetry.

14. Told by his contemporary Colletet (see bibliography below) and reported by DeJob, 60.
Venice was a tolerant and liberal place at the time, and so would not have been completely inimical to accepting someone suspected of protestant leanings. Even so, Muret's hasty retreat from France had not allowed him to obtain the letters of recommendation or introduction that were normally expected in this era. Thus, when he tried to obtain a public teaching post, he met with some obstacles and resistance. The position itself, which normally would not be open to foreigners in any case, appears to have been a chair of humanities, one of six created by an ordinance of a special council in 1551 to serve inhabitants in some of the more distant quarters of the city. Thanks, however, to the intervention and support of a certain Girolamo Ferri, a member of the commission of public instruction, Muret was allowed to stand for the examination required of candidates who had no previous record of accomplishment (or in Muret's case, no evidence or letters). For the most part, the examination required that Muret compose and deliver a discourse in Latin. The oration delivered appears to be *De laudibus literarum*, and, not surprisingly, one finds there sundry niceties about the value of an education along with much laud and tribute to the Venetians themselves. At any rate, the outcome is clear: Muret held the professorship of humanities from 1555 to 1558.

To this period of his life belongs many of Muret's publications in the press of Manutius. The Catullus commentary in 1554, already mentioned, was followed up with another edition that included the texts of Tibullus and Propertius as well (1558). In rapid succession he published editions of Horace and Terence with notes (1555), three orations on the study of literature (1555), annotated editions of the *Catilinarians* (1556) and the first book of the *Tusculan Disputations* (1557). It was in Venice too that Muret made the acquaintance of Denys Lambin, who was in Italy in the service of Cardinal de Tournon. Lambin came from Rome just to see Muret and Manutius and to discuss scholarly matters. A frank and open friendship developed between them, and Lambin felt comfortable sharing with Muret details about the edition of Horace that he was working on.

In 1557 Ippolito d'Este, Cardinal of Ferrara, began to gather to his patronage several French and Italian savants. Through his agent, Pierre Morin, he negotiated with Muret under what conditions he might be willing to connect himself with him at Ferrara. But Morin was soon to withdraw the offer, when the old charges of indiscretion again surfaced, this time from none other than de Tournon. In early 1558, under obscure circumstances, Muret left Venice and moved to Padua to take up private tutorials there in the houses of the nobility, while the negotiations with

---

15. This is the view of DeJob, 81.
16. Ruhnken, I, 16–24 (Oratio II, October, 1554, at Venice, excerpts of which are quoted above).
the cardinal, though now strained, continued. It would be late 1558, however, after Ippolito’s envoy, the abbot Nichette, interviewed him, and after Lambin and others spoke successfully on his behalf with de Tournon, before he would finally enter the service of the cardinal and come to live in his household.

During his time at Padua, Muret continued to teach and to publish. In 1558 he came out with the first book of the Variae Lectiones, a random collection of observations on a variety of texts. This work, which was the most important achievement of Muret’s career to that point, unfortunately sparked a feud with Lambin. In all sincerity Muret had sent a copy of the Variae to Lambin, pointing out to him that he had mentioned him in several places. Lambin, however, responded in a rather harsh letter with charges of plagiarism and broken confidence. He claimed that the scholia on Horace were stolen from an edition of Horace that he himself was working on and had shared with Muret out of friendship. Within two years after this incident, the rupture between the two old friends was complete. After a trip to Rome at the death of Pope Paul IV, Muret had followed Ippolito to France, with some trepidation, to participate in the Colloquy of Poissy. Ostensibly he was there to keep Antoine de Bourbon in the Catholic fold and to resist the Calvinists (Bèze would always hold a grudge against Muret for his role), but he may have seen this trip as an opportunity to clear his name with his detractors and to meet some old friends. Among these friends, or so he thought, was Lambin. After what appears to have been a cordial meeting, something changed. For reasons that cannot really be explained, Lambin handed over the intimate correspondence between himself and Muret, from their time together in Italy, to Gryphius at Lyons, which the latter published at his press (1561). These letters included not only the charges of plagiarism, but also the details of the charges leveled against Muret during the negotiations with Ippolito. For this cruelty and indiscretion that ultimately lowered his public stature, Muret was never able to forgive Lambin.

In 1563 Muret followed Cardinal Ippolito from France and returned to Rome. Shortly after his arrival, Pope Pius IV appointed Muret professor of Moral Philosophy at the University of Rome (the Studium Sapientiae) with, it is assumed, the consent of Ippolito. This marks the beginning of an entirely new era of Muret’s life, one in which he began to take on an international reputation as a first-rate savant, able to marry eloquence and philosophy in the way Ramus was advocating at the University of Paris. His course on Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics

17. In the 1597 and 1599 (p. 74 v) editions of his poetry, Bèze included a scathing epitaph directed at Muret, in which he calls him a monstum and a cinaedus, who died in a city (Rome) worthy of his impiety.
that he taught from 1563–1567 drew eager listeners and met with great success. It also solidified his fame as an orator. In 1566 and 1567 he was asked to deliver eulogies to Pope Pius V on behalf of Alphonse II d’Estes, Charles IX, and Sigismond of Poland. In 1571 Muret proclaimed a panegyric on the victory of Lepante and earned the title “Roman citizen.” The next year he delivered a funeral oration for Pope Pius V in which he praised him for his harsh dealings with “heretics.” Ippolito, meanwhile, for whom he still worked, continued to entrust his secretary more and more with important ecclesiastical and personal matters on an international scale.

It was during this time that Muret turned to the study of law. He began teaching the Pandects, not with the usual methodology of the day, but more along the lines of his contemporary, the French jurist Jacques Cujas (1522–1590), who interpreted the ancient legal texts with philological tools adapted from the humanists along with a sensitivity to historical development. For the Romans, this was an innovation, though they could look to Alciati for a similar approach, and they dubbed the critical technique practiced by Muret the “French method of teaching” (mos docendi gallicus).

By 1572 Muret faced several new challenges for his career. His unorthodox teaching style and the fame that he was winning from it brought suspicions of general unorthodoxy upon him from jealous peers. Muret had further alienated many of them by his malicious and ironic way of dealing with them. But if there was one area in which Muret was careful, it was in regard to his finances. Perceiving that the end was near for his beloved protector Ippolito d’Este,18 and not knowing what would be his condition after Ippolito’s death, he agreed to step down from the teaching of law, but only after negotiating a significant pay raise. Again Muret found himself teaching literature, or more specifically, rhetoric, a subject with which the cardinals thought he could do the least harm to the students if indeed he was less than orthodox. The cardinals, to judge from Muret’s letters at the time, believed that he was inviting too much free critical thinking among his listeners. Therefore, it was his undogmatic teaching style and his willingness to examine a text without the prejudice of authority that distressed them most.

It would not be long before they had another cause for concern. Muret did not stick to his subject, but quickly and somewhat surreptitiously exchanged the teaching of rhetoric for the teaching of philosophy. He began with Cicero’s philosophical works, in particular the De republica, which he coupled with a study of Plato’s

18. Ippolito did indeed die at the end of 1572, but his heir, Louis d’Este, retained Muret in his house, though in a somewhat diminished status.
Republic. His introduction of Plato into the curriculum and the fact that he was using the Athenian philosopher to comment on the Roman author excited his listeners greatly. This proved too much for the cardinals, however. Muret was hardly trained in theological matters, but here he was quoting the Church Fathers constantly and colliding with matters of theology under the guise of philosophical inquiry. In 1575 they forbade him to teach Greek philosophy, and Muret obeyed.

At the very moment that the cardinals were trying to corral Muret to where he could do the least harm, he was, in fact, on the road to spiritual transformation. Many factors appear to have been at work to bring about the change: In the midst of a rather tumultuous life, he had surrounded himself with students and protectors whose piety had begun to make an impression upon him. In 1575 he published a volume of religious poems and hymns glorifying various saints and feast days of the Church.19 The titles of the poems themselves indicate his religious preoccupations: *In die ascensionis; In Festo corporis Christi; In die Paschae; Commune angelorum; Ad beatissimam virginem, Dei matrem, quae religiosissime colitur in aede Lauretana*; and so on. Many of them echo relevant parts of the mass, which, as his student Benci reports, Muret loved so that often he was induced to tears while celebrating it. In 1576 Muret received Holy Orders.

Over the next few years Muret continued to teach as he had always done, and even had the opportunity at one point to return to Greek when he gave lessons on Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*. Offers for new teaching posts came from Poland and Padua, but the Romans always met the new offers with a pay raise of their own, and so Muret stayed at the Studium Sapientiae. Even so, we see him these days complaining to his many correspondents in both France and Italy that his students were abandoning the study of literature for the study of medicine and law. Weary from the constant struggle and eager to devote himself to his writing, Muret implored the pope to allow him to retire, which the pope granted in November of 1584. Within a year (June of 1585) Muret was dead. His library passed to the Jesuits in Rome, a group where he had found many friends in his latter days, and from there in great part to the Library of Victor-Emmanuel (that is, la Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Roma), where it remains today.20

19. The poems were published at the Aldine Press in Venice as part of a volume of Muret’s collected prose and poetry (Renouard 219: 11); the first separate edition came out of Robert Estienne’s Paris press in 1576.

Muret almost never mentioned his juvenile poetry again after its publication, though it continued to draw some notice. Baluze (see bibliography under “Boys”) judged Muret and Dorat to be the best poets to come out of Limoges and cites Scaevula Sammarthanus as saying Muret is “as much like Catullus as Catullus is like himself.” True, Muret picks up some of the vocabulary, meters, and themes of Catullus in his epigrams, but that’s a far cry from being an *alter Catullus*. The epigrams alone look back, not just to Catullus, but to Martial, Ausonius, Italian poets Pontano and Poliziano, Secundus, Bourbon, and Bèze. The elegies and satires imitate Ovid and Juvenal respectively, the odes Horace, but usually with the later influences mixed in as well. In fact, imitation in Muret is never without contamination from a variety of sources. For example, in some poems one finds hints of the influence of the emblematic tradition, if not the hieroglyphic mysticism of Horapollo. Such cabalistic imagery stands behind the following lines in Muret’s ode to Claudius Voesius:

Non sic timenda est, in Libyae iugis
Quae, matre rupta, vipera nascitur.

The “vipera ex utero matris rupto erumpens” was a frequent image among the writers of emblems. They used it sometimes as a metaphor for internal dissension, to talk about punishment and vengeance, or to warn against pernicious talkativeness. It is the last use that Muret borrows as he writes to Voesius about the dangers of hidden calumny. In *epig.* 8 Muret turns to the emblematic imagery of the *Herculeus lapillus* to describe the enticing charm of Marguerite’s tongue. Indeed, just how much of a role the emblematic and hieroglyphic traditions play in Renaissance poetry is a worthy study in and of itself.

**The Juvenilia**

I have already written in some detail elsewhere about the origins of the title of Muret’s poetry (see bibliography below). The appellation itself, *iuvenilia*, does not seem to have been used in its Latin form as a title before Muret, but even so, the word has a long history in poetry. We find in Latin elegiac and epigrammatic poetry, from Roman times to the Renaissance, constant reference to the “poetry of youth,” often standing in contrast to a kind of poetry suitable to be written in old age. The poets characterize the latter poetry as serious, moral, and austere, touching on wars and politics and patriotism. The former is filled with passion and exuberance, concerned not with weighty national issues, but with jokes and...
laughter and erotic affairs. Muret may have had in mind the title of Marot’s work, *L’Adolescence clementine* (1532) which itself looks to Petrarch’s phrase *giovenile errore* in the first poem of the *Canzoniere*. It is clear, though, that Muret perceives *iuvenilia* to be a generic term, and not simply a reference to the period of his life when he composed the poems. In other words, the title was meant to clue the reader to what kind of poetry to expect in the volume.

The genres included in the volume—elegies, satires, epistles, epigrams, and odes—all have classical antecedents and a long Nachleben. For his models in composing these, Muret had many places to which he could turn. He was certainly aware of the Italian neo-Latinists and their way of handling these genres. He also knew the efforts of his fellow countrymen to write in the vernacular. He chose, however, to follow the lead of writers such as Nicolas Bourbon and Théodore de Bèze, who strove to imitate the classical authors directly, with minimal interference from medieval and Italian innovations. Bèze, for example, compiles a list of the ancient authors he was imitating with each genre, with no mention of later influences. In fact, the only elements within his poems that do not hark back directly to antiquity are references to the Church (in particular, criticism of the hypocrisy within the hierarchy), to current events (battles, strange portents, politics, etc.), and to friends. All these elements are found in Muret as well. What is especially striking, however, is the desire for generic purity. Muret’s poems, as do those of Bourbon and Bèze, reveal a particular reading of the genres of antiquity that for us help to fill out the picture of their reception. What the nature of this reading is will best be learned from reading the poems themselves.
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ORTHOGRAPHY AND PUNCTUATION

The correct approach to the editing of Renaissance Latin texts is a subject of endless debate. Some scholars prefer that all spelling and punctuation be left as found in the original edition, arguing that, not only do the words themselves hold significance, but the way they appear on the page do as well. Others favor the adoption of modern conventions in printing to make the texts more accessible to a wider range of readers, both those who have been initiated into the Renaissance modes of writing and those who simply know their Cicero. I have opted for the latter approach, following, mutatis mutandis, the recommendations of a recent essay on the subject.¹ To do otherwise would require certain concessions of uniformity (for example, sometimes Muret writes coelum, sometimes caelum), logical punctuation (no standardized use of punctuation marks is in play during the Renaissance), and the meaning of “Renaissance” itself (what classical author would ever write oci for oti?). And what of diacritical marks? Should abbreviations be expanded? The fact is, no two texts of this period follow the same conventions, or at least no two publishing houses do. Even the early editions of the Iuvenilia themselves exhibit differences of orthography. So in the end, rather than championing an already confused state of affairs, the modern editor should go with what makes sense to the average modern reader. With that said, difficult choices still had to be made. It would have been convenient for the reader, for example, had I included quotation marks in the Latin text. Speakers change from time to time (dialogue is a hallmark of much of Roman poetry), and thus quotation marks would serve to guide the reader. Even so, I have opted out of using them for the simple reason that their presence in the text might delude the reader into thinking that they were part of the original instead of the result of an educated guess (similarly, no one would imagine adding italics to the Latin text). The reader will understand the interpretive nature of quotation marks, however, when they appear in the translation.

Below is a representative list of the orthographical changes I have made to the text. From this list, the reader should be able to extrapolate how the original text

appeared, if so desired. I have strayed once, though only slightly, from my own orthographic standards. In the case of *queis*, I have let the spelling stand rather than convert it to the somewhat confusing *quis*. I note that at times Teubner editions reflect this same editorial choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT OF THE ORIGINAL 1552 ED.</th>
<th>CONVERTED FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camoenae</td>
<td>Camenae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caussas</td>
<td>causas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coelum</td>
<td>caelum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coena</td>
<td>cena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disiicis</td>
<td>discis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fathiscunt</td>
<td>fatiscut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foemina</td>
<td>femina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frenari</td>
<td>frenari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hulceros</td>
<td>ulcers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hyemis</td>
<td>hiemis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hymbre</td>
<td>imbre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imo</td>
<td>immo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iniiciens</td>
<td>iniiciens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacrymas</td>
<td>lacrimas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laeno</td>
<td>leno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letho</td>
<td>leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>littera</td>
<td>littera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>littore</td>
<td>litore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycambaea</td>
<td>Lycambea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obscenius</td>
<td>obscenius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oti</td>
<td>oti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otieris</td>
<td>otieris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pene</td>
<td>paene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IDENTIFIABLE NAMES OF MURET’S CONTEMPORARIES APPEARING IN THE TEXT

Alisius, Stephanus: Étienne Alis, from a politically prominent family of Bordeaux. Muret possibly held a tutorial in his house in early 1548 (?) before he left for Auch. Étienne wrote an introductory sonnet for Boaistuau’s *Histoires prodigieuses* (1560), and so must have had some measure of success. See J. Chomarat, *Marc-Antoine Muret: Commentaires au premier livre des Amours de Ronsard* (Geneva, 1985), xxxii, n.16.

Alsinous, Comes: Nicolas Denisot (1515–1559), satellite to the members of the Pléiade from 1549 on, poet, painter, and musician. His occasional pseudonym, conte d’Alsinois (or comte d’Alsinoys in his 1545 work *Noelz*), was an anagram of his real name, and thus the source of the Latin variation. He is the source of the portrait of Ronsard published in the *Amours* (Ronsard calls him “Alsinois” in his odes). He contributed to the *Tombeau* of Marguerite de Navarre in 1551, and may have painted the portrait of the princess there. Two years later he published *Cantiques du premier avènement de Jésus-Christ, par le comte d’Alsinois*, in which the twelve Olympians hail the birth of Christ (Muret wrote introductory verse for this work). Henri II used him as a spy at Calais, under the pretext of teaching the governor’s children, with the result that Denisot was instrumental in bringing about the recapture of that city in February of 1558. Also in 1558 he published a humanistic and Christian novel in five books under the pseudonym Theodose Valentinian, on which see Véronique Duché-Gavet, “l’Amant resuscité de la mort d’amour, ou comment Nicolas Denisot a écrit son roman,” *Nouvelle revue du XVIe siècle* 19.2 (2001): 33–48; and her edition of the work published in Geneva, 1998; there is also a study by Margaret Harris published in 1966. For general works on Denisot, see C. Jugé, *Nicolas Denisot du Mans (1515–1559)* (Le-Mans-Paris, 1907); J. C. Nash, “The Christian-Humanist Meditation on Man: Denisot, Montaigne, Rabelais, Ronsard, Scève,” *BHR* 54 (1992): 353–71.

1. Dates of birth and death are given when known.
Auratus: See under Jean Dorat.


Bourg, Claude du: Leroux notes that he was a knight, Lord of Guerine, Counselor to the King, Secretary of Finances, Treasurer of France, and ambassador of Charles IX to the Turks. He wrote an Epistle on the interview between the Prince de Condé and the Cardinal de Lorraine that was printed in 1564. He died in 1562.


Cairiechius, François Laccius: The name suggests a Greek heritage, perhaps (Leroux considers Cairiechius to be a nickname meaning “l’homme providentiel”), but his precise identity is unclear.
Coletus Campanus, Claudius: Claude Colet de Rumilly en Champagne, author of L’Oraison de mars aux dames de la Court... plus l’Épistre de l’amoureux de vertu (Paris, 1544 and 1548, the latter revised and corrected, and adding several other minor pieces). He also translated the ninth book of the Spanish romance Amadis de Gaule. Étienne Jodelle addressed a poem to him (“Aux cendres de Claude Colet”) that appears in the Oxford Book of French Verse (1908, 104).

Collaeus, Antoine: Leroux believes this individual could be Antoine Nicolay (d. 1597), about whom Scévole de Sainte-Marthe speaks in his Gallorum doctrina illustrium (Limoges, 1602). His grandfather, once chancellor of Naples, retired in Provence.

Condom, Rudolphe: Professor in the College of Auch where Muret taught. He is mentioned by Du Poey twice in his poem, De collegio Auscitano carmen ad posteritatem, Toulouse, 1551,11.83–84 and 245–48 (for the text see Bénétrix, 184–97): Condomaeanum addam qui non torpere trones, / Coniungens graecis verba latina, sinet (“I will add Condom who, by joining Latin words to Greek ones, does not allow his students to languish”), and Grammatices prius, eloquii fundamina ponunt, / Qui pueros acri sedulitate docent. / Mureto, Lana, Lochiano, ubi Condomioque | Barreriano uti Rivalioque, potes (“First they lay the foundations of grammar, then of eloquence, teaching the boys with great intensity”).


Costecandus, Jean: The epigram of Muret incorrectly transmits the name as “Costeceaudus,” but the correct spelling is known from a dedication in Muret’s 1551 scholia on Terence’s Andria and Eunuch: “M. Antonius Muretus Ioanni Costecando suo, S. P. D.” Writing the dedication from Paris in September 1551, as he notes, Muret speaks of private lessons he gave Jean the previous year (the text is given at Ruhnken, IV, xx). This is the clearest evidence that Muret is already in Paris at that time. Since Jean is described as “absent,” one assumes that Muret taught him while at Bordeaux or early in his stay at Paris.
Cruselius, P.: or Pierre Crouzeil of Limoges, a doctor at Poitiers, who is supposedly responsible for some textual notes on the letters of Cicero to Atticus, which he shared with the Latinist Simon Dubois (or “Bosius”). The following odd tale of his role in the text of Cicero’s letters is given by the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., under the “Cicero” entry:

A similar fate overtook three other MSS. containing the letters to Atticus, independent of the Veroitensis, viz, a mutilated MS. of Books i–vii. discovered by Cardinal Capra in 1409, a Lorsch MS. used by Cratander (C), and a French MS. (Z), generally termed Tornesianus from its owner, Jean de Tournes, a printer of Lyons probably identical with No. 492 in the old Cluny catalogue, used by Turnebus, Lambinus and Bosius. A strange mystification was practiced by the last named, a scholar of singular brilliancy, who claimed to have a mutilated MS. which he called his Decurtatus, bought from a common soldier who had obtained it from a sacked monastery; also to have been furnished by a friend, Pierre Crouzeil, a doctor of Limoges, with variants taken from an old MS. found at Noyon, and entered in the margin of a copy of the Lyons edition. The rough draft of his notes, however, upon books x.–xvi, which afterwards came into the hands of Baluze, is preserved in the Paris library (Lat. 8538 A), in which he continually ascribes different readings to these MSS., the alteration corresponding with a change in his own conjecture. It is, therefore, obvious that he invented the readings in order to strengthen his own corrections. The book, which he termed his Crusellinus, may well be his copy of the Lyons edition of f 545 (number 8665 in the sale-catalogue of Baluze), which is described as *cum notis et emendationibus MSS. inanu eiusdem Bosii.*


Denisotus: See “Alsinous” above.

Dorat, Jean: 1508–1588, from Limoges, sometimes called Auratus or Daurat. He was the spiritual father to many of the French and neo-Latin poets. He was a tutor in the court of Francis I and “Poet Royal” under Charles IX. He did much to bring Greek literature into fashion in France, and his emendations on many of

Homère, Démosthène et Archimède ensemble,
Lymoges a nourri où la vertu s’assemble;
Muret, Dorat, Fayen, trois excellents esprits:
Muret son Démosthène et Dorat son Homère;
Fayen son Archimède ayant sa ville-mère.
Sa province et son plan heureusement compris.

**Flaminio, Marcantonio**: Italian neo-Latin poet (1498–1550) of Serravalle. His life can conveniently be divided between a humanist phase, during which he produced love poetry (*Lusus pastorales*, 1515, part of a larger work, *Carminum libri V*; see the edition of M. Scorsone [Turin, 1992]) and associated with scholars, and a religious phase, during which he worked for the Church and wrote religious verse (*De rebus divinis carmina*, 1551). See C. Maddison, *Marcantonio Flaminio, Poet, Humanist and Reformer* (Chapel Hill, 1965).

**Frémiot, Memmius**: of Dijon, a student of Muret (see *epig*. 25, n. 7). The poems appearing in Gruter’s *Delitiae* (vol. 2, 579–80) are simply those appearing here at the end of the epigrams with an additional poem on Muret’s portrait. The latter is included in editions of Muret’s commentary on Ronsard (see Jacques Chomarat, *Marc-Antoine Muret: Commentaires au premier livre des Amours de Ronsard* [Geneva, 1985], n.p., but immediately preceding Muret’s preface).

**Gouvéa, Antoine de**: or Govéa, a celebrated Portuguese jurist and humanist

---

2. Long title: Joannis Aurati . . . *poematia, hoc est: Poematum libri quinque; Epigrammatum libri tres; Anagrammatum liber unus; Funerum liber unus; Odarum libri duo; Epithalamiorum liber unus; Eclogarum libri duo; Variarum rerum liber unus.*
(1505–1566), whom Muret probably met at Bordeaux. His brother André had served as director of that school for many years, but departed for Portugal in 1547 about the same time as Muret was beginning to make a name for himself there. Antoine’s commentaries on civil law were influential well into the next century. Among other things, he published an edition of Terence’s *Andria* at Lyons in 1541, to which Muret refers several times in his own work on the author; a commentary on Cicero’s letters to Atticus in 1544, and his *Topica* in 1545; and *Opera iuris civilis* at Lyons in 1561. In epig. 2, Muret refers to his *Epigrammatum libri duo* (1539). Govéa’s complete works were published by J. Van Vaassen in 1766. He died in Turin. See E. Caillemer, *Étude sur Antoine de Govéa* (1505–1566) (Paris, 1864); F. Mugnier, *A. Govian, professeur de droit* (1901); Martha Katherine Zeeb, *The Latin Letters of Antonio de Gouvea* (Philadelphia, 1934).

**Jodellus, Stephanus**: Étienne Jodelle (1532–1573). A member of the Pléiade, in 1552 he wrote the first French tragedy, the lyrical *Cléopâtre captive*, which was presented in the court of King Henry II the following year at Rheims. He composed many other verses during his lifetime, which his friends, particularly Charles de la Mothe, collected and published as a single volume in 1574 (*Oeuvres poétiques*). Jodelle resisted the influence of pagan and Petrarchan themes in poetry, and for this reason was at times an independent spirit at odds with members of the Pléiade. See É. Jodelle, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. E. Balmas, 2 vols. (Paris, 1965–68); E. Balmas, *Un Poeta del Rinascimento francese, Étienne Jodelle: la sua vita, il suo tempo* (Florence, 1962).

**Lochianus, Michel**: A professor at the College of Auch where Muret taught. (See note on Rudolphe Condom above.) In the same poem mentioned there, see also ll.99–100: *Me duce, perficiet patriae Lochianus honorem, / Cuius tu cinges, Calliopea, caput.* On p. 128, Bénétrix indicates that, like Vermelianus (below), Lochianus was from Ussel, and that he left behind a short poem (accompanying the longer poem of Du Poey) where Du Poey is said to be to the College of Auch as Homer was to Achilles.

**Lomenius, F. Verus**: François de Loménie, canon of Limoges (see DeJob, 4, n.1). The “Verus” appears to be a reference to his integrity. Leroux notes that he was, as Pierre Crouzeit, a friend of Simeon DuBois and calls attention to a note in Baluze’s copy of the 1552 *Iuvenilia* (now in the BNF), p. 54: *Fuit hic Lomenius / canonicus Ecclesia[e] / Lomovicensis, / amicus etiam / Simeonis Bosii / Praetoris Limo- / vicensis.* One assumes he is related to the F. Gratus Lomenius addressed in epigram 28.
Lomenius, F. Gratus: probably the same person as the previous entry. Leroux believes “Gratus” is a nickname.


Molza, Francesco Maria: Poet from Modena (1489–1544) of Italian and Latin verses. He gained fame for his pastoral La ninfa tiberina (1538). For his Latin works see especially Elegiae et alia, ed. M. Scorsone and Rossana Sodano (Torino, 1999).

Moncaudus, François: of Bordeaux. Little is known of him except that Joseph Scaliger attacked him in a scathing satire and that he wrote scabrous poetry that wasn’t published. See also Scaligerana (2nd ed., Cologne, 1667), 158. Leroux notes a liminary poem of his among the Poésies of Pierre de Brach, also a poet of Bordeaux. Martial Monier also addressed an epigram to him urging him to publish his poetry (Epigrammata, Elegiae et Odae [Bordeaux, 1573], epig. 209).

Montausier, Charles de: Leroux identifies him as belonging to the house of Sainte-Maure, but his precise identity is unknown.

Montbasius, Guillelmus: or Guillaume de Montbas. DeJob reports this note in the exemplar of the Iuvenilia in the Bib. Nat., in the hand of Baluze: “Gul. Montbazius, Lectoriensis episcopus vivebat anno 1567. Fuit autem patria Picto, Ortus e Barthonibus (?) qui alio nomine Mombasii dicuntur.” In epigram 29 he is addressed as a “Lectorian Bishop.” This would make him the son of Pierre Bart(h)on (d. 1556), who had served in battles against the Venetians (1509) and Picardie (1513), and whose chateau was burned and pillaged in 1547. Guillaume was bishop of Lectoure and Deputy of State of France at the Council of Trent.

Nicolas de Vienne: Leroux believes he could be the son of Claude de Vienne, Lord of Clervaux, chamberlain of the Emperor Charles V.

Noallius: from the de Noailles family? Otherwise unknown.

Pontanus, Joannes Jovianus: or Giovanni Pontano, Italian humanist and poet (1426–1503), an important figure in the Academy of Naples. In 1505 the Aldine
Press published a posthumous edition of his major poetic works, and then his philosophical works, dialogues, and orations in 1518. His lyric poems influenced the Pléiade. He wrote numerous didactic poems, elegies, hendecasyllabics, and the like, many of them taking as their subject his deep affection for his wife and family. For his biography, see Carol Kidwell, Pontano: Poet and Prime Minister (London, 1991).

**Querculus, Ludovicus**: Louis Chesneau, a barrister and former teacher of Brinon (see above). In 1548 Brinon established for him a life annuity, and then four years later bestowed on him a piece of property at Villiers-Adam.

**Quintius, Pierre**: a colleague of Muret at Auch. Du Poey (see Condom entry above for reference) refers to him in his poem (ll.103–4) in the following way: *Quintius huc veniet, Latiae facundia linguae; / Proderit his aliqua Barrerianus ope.*

**Ronsard, Pierre de**: the well-known French poet (1524–1585) of the Pléiade. Of that group he was by far the most creative and energetic. He befriended Muret in Paris and attended the latter's lectures on Catullus. Although he considered writing in Latin at the beginning of his career, his entire corpus is in the French language. For the best overview of his life and contributions, see I. D. McFarlane, *A Literary History of France: Renaissance France, 1470–1589* (London, 1974), 297–326, with bibliography there. Muret's contemporary commentary on his *Amours* is unique for the time.


**Sannazaro, Jacopo**: Italian poet and humanist (1455–1530) from Naples. He published his influential pastoral romance *Arcadia* in Italian in 1501 (French version by Jean Martin in 1544/6) and *De partu Virginis* in Latin in 1513, which earned him the title of the Christian Vergil. He spent some time in France with Frederick III of Naples during the latter’s exile. *The Major Latin Poems of Sannazaro*, ed. R. Nash (Detroit, 1996); and, Carol Kidwell, *Sannazaro and Arcadia* (London, 1993).
Scaliger, Julius Caesar: also, Jules Cesar de l’Escale de Bordonis, classical scholar (1484–1558), father of the more famous Joseph Scaliger. In 1519 he received his doctorate from the University of Padua. He served as physician to the Bishop Antonio de la Rovera of Agen after moving there at age forty-two. Both Nostradamus and Rabelais studied with him for a time at Agen, and it was there that Muret visited him. In the period from 1531 to 1544 he wrote several treatises defending Ciceronianism against the attacks of Erasmus. In 1561 at Lyons he published his *Poëtice*, a systematic treatment of poetry that ran through many editions. His *Poemata* were published at Geneva in 1574. See V. Hall, Jr., “The life of Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484–1558),” *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, n.s. 40 (1950): 85–170.

Schleicher, Daniel: probably a student of Muret (DeJob, 53), though otherwise unknown. See the note on *Sat. 2*.

Tilius, Janus: Leroux thinks that this could be Jean du Tillet from Angoulême, who became clerk of the Parlement of Paris and died in 1570. He was possibly a student of Muret.

Valesius, Louis: Moret translates the last name as “Valèse,” but with no explanation. Leroux mentions a “Loys de Vallois” as a possibility, a zealous Protestant whom Théodore de Bèze alludes to in a letter, but he does not seem a likely candidate for the circle of Muret.

Vermelianus, Janus: Jan Vermélian d’Ussel, whom Muret knew at the College of Auch. He addressed a short poem to Muret about his tragedy *Julius Caesar*. A translation is given at Bénétrix, 128.
### IDENTIFIABLE NAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No definitive information could be found on the following individuals:</th>
<th>The following names should be considered fictitious:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burge, Claude</td>
<td>Avirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caliantheus, Charles</td>
<td>Collina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callée, Antoine</td>
<td>Crassus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corellius</td>
<td>Galla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crucius, Marius</td>
<td>Gallonius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crucius, Sanso</td>
<td>Gaurus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delian, Jean</td>
<td>Gellia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolaus of Vienna</td>
<td>Grannius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogerie, Anne</td>
<td>Lais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voesie, Claude</td>
<td>Lucius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lygdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marguerite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pamphagus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phyllis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pompilius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ponticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pontilianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rufinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sestius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METERS

For the odes Muret employs only two different metrical schemes. All poems save one are written in Alcaic strophes, a favorite meter of Horace (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.9, etc.). The Alcaic strophe consists of two Alcaic hendecasyllabics followed by one Alcaic enneasyllabic and one Alcaic decasyllabic. The scheme for this meter is as follows:

1–2. ïå /îï/îïå /îð/îïïå
3 ïå /îï/îïå /îï/îïå
4 îïï/îïï/îï/îïå

For example, the first ode begins in this way:

*A urate / gentis / grande de/cus meae
Qui / tensa /docta /filæ légens manu
Saeclis inexpertum vetustis
Ambrosi/o iacis / ōre /nectar.*

In the poem to Ronsard, Muret uses the second Asclepiadean strophe scheme, consisting of three minor Asclepiadeans followed by one glyconic (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.6, 15, 24, 33; 2.12; 3.10, 16; 4.5, 12). These measures are sometimes considered choriambic. The scheme for this meter runs as follows:

1–3. ïïå /îð/î//îïï/îï/î
4 îïå /îð/îï/ïå

For example, the fourth ode begins in this way:

*Ronsarde Aoni/i // pectinis / arbiter
Qui prin/cepis reso/nim // solici/tas ebur
Vento/rumque mi/nas // et cele/res po/tens
Lapsus / sistere / fluminum.*
All the epistles and satires are written in hexameters. The elegies are all elegiac couplets, as one would expect. Throughout the book I have not identified hexameters or elegiac couplets, since they are easily recognized.

Most of the epigrams are elegiac couplets as well, but Muret also uses phalaecian hendecasyllables, one iambic trimeter, and two choliambics (limping iambs or seazons). Respectively, the schemes run as follows:

**Phalaecian hendecasyllables**

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
    - & - & - \\
    - & - & - \\
    - & - & - \\
\end{array}\]

For example, *epig.* 8.3:

\[\text{Aspectuque tui / carere nolunt.}\]

**Iambic trimeter (pure)**

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
    - & - & - \\
    - & - & - \\
    - & - & - \\
\end{array}\]

For example, *epig.* 49.6:

\[\text{Ut fraudet ex/spectatio/ne alios facit.}\]

As is obvious from this example, Muret follows the lead of many Latin writers in allowing for the substitution of a long anceps and the resolution of any long (including the substituted long anceps).

**Choliambic**

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
    \times & - & - \\
    \times & - & - \\
    - & - & - \\
\end{array}\]

Many resolutions are allowed here as well, except for the closing metron, which gives the ‘limping’ effect. An example of the choliambic meter is *epig.* 38.1:

\[\text{Inter Lati/nos forte sic/ubi assedit.}\]

In the latter two, Muret follows the resolution and substitution conventions of Martial rather than Catullus.
1. I have omitted three poems—one each of Buchanan, Jodelle, and Jan Vermélian d’Ussel—that only refer to Muret’s tragedy *Julius Caesar.*
Comes Alsinous Lectori

Vis, Lector, Tragici sonum cothurni,
Vis, Lector, numeros Catullianos,
Vis, Lector, numeros Tibullianos,
Vis, Lector, numeros Horatianos?
En, libro tibi dat Muretus uno.

Ioannis Aurati in M. Antonii Mureti Iuvenilia

Tam bona posse putas cuquam iuvenilia credi
Carmina, digna viro, digna, Murete, sene?
Quae tibi tam tenuis limae solertia rasit,
Quam quod Praxiteles ungue polivit ebur.
Ipse suum titulum nimia liber arte refutat,
Auctorisque annos inficiatur opus.
Tu licet affirmes, licet omnia numina iures,
Contra te facit ars ingeniumque tuum.
Deme igitur titulum libro, vel deme nitorem:
Aetatem nitidus debet habere liber.

Εἰς τὴν βίβλον Μάκρου Ἀντωνίου τοῦ Μουρήτου

Τίς, πόθεν, ὦ Μουρητ᾽, ἔρχῃ νέος Ἰταλίδαισι
Κόσμος αοιδοπόλοις, σῆς ἕνεκ᾽ εὐεπίης
Ἠνίδ᾽ ὅσοι μολπαί σου ἀποστίλβουσιν ἔρωτα,
Πάντοθι παντοίων βριθόμεναι χαρίτων.
Ἠνίδ᾽ ὅσην Κυθέρειαν ἀποπνείουσιν ἀοιδαὶ
Ἀἱ σέο, κηληθμῶν πληρέες ἁβρομελῶν.
Ἦ φλογὶ σῶν μελέων φλογερὰν χάριν ἥψεν,
Ἡ δὲ Κύπρις μελίθρουν ὤπασεν ἁβροσύνην.
Nicolas Denisot to the Reader

Do you want, reader, the sound of the tragic cothurnus,
Do you want, reader, Catullan measures,
Do you want, reader, Tibullan measures,
Do you want, reader, Horatian measures?
Behold, Muret gives them all to you in one book.

A Poem of John Dorat about the Iuvenilia of M.-A. Muret

Do you think, Muret, that anyone can believe that
such good poems, such mature poems, are “juvenile”?
Your perfecting of these has been as subtle and fine
as the ivory Praxiteles polished with his fingernail.
The book itself with its extraordinary art refutes its own title,
and the work belies the years of the author.
Although you insist, although you swear by all the gods,
the art contradicts you, as does your talent.
So remove the title from your book, or remove the gleam:
A book that glistens requires age.

On the Book of Marc-Antoine Muret [a poem of Jean Antoine Baïf]

What sort of glory, Muret, may come to the Italian bards,
and from where, thanks to your sweet-sounding words?
See with how much love your songs do shine,
laden everywhere with all kinds of charms!
See how much Aphrodite your tunes exhale,
overflowing with enchantment and graceful melodies!
Truly by her flame desire has touched the fiery grace of your songs,
and Cypris has made sweet-voiced charm your companion.
In M. Antonium Muretum Iani Antonii Bafii

Seuvisumest tibi dii laudes aequasse virorum,
Haud pudeat Flacci sic cecinisse lyram:
Iulia seu Tragico defleris funera versu,
Marce, Sophocleo tu pede digna tonas:
Seu fers Margaridem lepido super aethera cantu,
Cantas, quo inuideat Lesbia Margaridi.
Quis tibi cedet honos pro tali carmine? cingat
Lauro, hedera, myrto texta corona caput.

Comes Alsinous

Musae, noster amor, meum Muretum,
Vestrum et candidum et optimum Muretum,
Qui vos usque adeo canit canendas,
Qui vos usque adeo colit colendas,
Quo nil cultius elegantiusve,
Quo nil candidius venustiusve,
Seu regum Tragico neces cothurno,
Seu scribat, posita severitate,
Venustas Veneres, iocos, lepores,
Et molles elegos decente versu,
Facundo, lepido, aureoque versu:
Musae, inquam, Aonides, meum Muretum,
Vestrum et candidum et optimum Muretum,
Vatem dicite, et approbate vatem.

2. A proverb taken from Erasmus’ Adagia 1.9.34 (leonem ex unguibus aessimare), where it is attributed variously to Pheidias (Lucian, Herm. 55) or Alcaeus (Plut. Mor. 410c). The sense is that, just as the greatness of a lion can be extrapolated from the claw alone, Muret’s immense talents can be discerned on the basis of this first publication.
Another Poem of Jean Antoine de Baïf, to the Same

This maxim is indicative of what you’ve written, Muret: “You can tell how great the lion’s stature is from the size of his great claws.”

A Poem of Jean Antoine de Baïf about M.-A. Muret

You desired to compare the praises of men to the gods—Horace’s lyre would not be ashamed to have sung like this. You lamented the murder of Caesar in tragic verse—Marcus, you thunder forth measures worthy of Sophocles. You lift Marguerite to the heavens with charming song, and sing so that Lesbia would envy her. What honor should be given you for such poetry? Let a crown woven with laurel, ivy, and myrtle gird your head.

Nicolas Denisot

Heed me, Muses, whom I love—my Muret, your bright and best Muret, who continuously sings of you who are worthy to be sung, who continuously honors you who are worthy of honor, than whom nothing is more cultivated, or more elegant, than whom nothing is more bright or charming, whether he writes about the deaths of kings in tragedy, or, with the seriousness set aside, writes of Venus’ charms, merriment, wit, and soft elegies in fitting verse, in clever, urbane, and golden verse—Aonian Muses, please, proclaim my Muret, your bright and best Muret, a poet, and grant the poet your approval.
In otio negotium.³

Stephani Iodelli Parisini

Caesar, Amor, testudo; movet, delenit, inescat;
   Fletum, elegos, aures; sanguine, melle, sonis.

---

3. According to Leroux, this line is taken from the device of Denisot and appears also among the liminaries of the Amours of Magny (ed. Courbet, Les Amours d’Olivier de Magny: texte original [Paris, 1878], 14) and at the beginning of the Monophile of Étienne Pasquier (ed. Balmas [Milan, 1957], 58).
In leisure, work

A Poem of Étienne Jodelle of Paris

Caesar, Cupid, the lyre; causes, sweetens, entices;
weeping, elegies, ears; with blood, with honey, with sounds.
INDEX

The following list includes only names and subjects of special interest. Modern authors and scholars have been excluded altogether. References to names and subjects are tied only to the English translation of the poems, preface, and the commentary, as well as to the introduction. If reference is made to a theme, motif, or proper name in the poems, the reader should assume that the same is discussed in the commentary and need not be doubly referenced here.

Achilles, 29
Adagia (Erasmus), 4 n2, 10n1, 45, 141, 149, 160, 164
adultery, 55, 59
Aeolus, 45, 71, 93, 139, 152
Aethra, 71, 138
Agen, xiii, xlv, xliv, 145
Alciato, xxiii, xxxv, xxxxi, xxxviii, 64
Alexandrianism, xvii, 42
Alis, Étienne, 105
Alisius, Stephanus. See Alis, Étienne
Alisius, Comtes. See Denisot, Nicolas
Anacreon, 197, 208
androgyne, 50
Aonian pectin, 207
Apella, 95, 152
Apelles, 206
Apollo, 31, 46, 47, 48, 49, 57, 64, 97, 135, 138, 145, 153, 179, 181, 185, 208
apotropaic phrases, 42, 43
Arcadia, 103, 156
Archilochus: attack on Lycambes, 59, 65
Aristotle, xx, xxii, xxiv
Armagnac, Cardinal d’, xvi
Asclepius, 49
Auch, xv–xvi
Augustus, 13, 47, 129
Auratus. See Dorat
Aurora, 69, 111, 138, 139, 162
Aurunca, 55
Ausonius, xxv, 13
Avitus, 107, 160
Bacchus, 42, 109, 152, 163, 185, 197. See also Lyaeus
Baiff, Jean Antoine de, 3, 5, 11, 15, 44, 179, 184–85, 203
Balbus, 55
Baldus de Ubaldis, 39, 51
Baluze, E., xxv
Bellay, Joachim du, xii, xxxiv, 11
Bellerophon, 25
Belus, 181
Benci, F., xix, xxiv
Bèze, Théodore de, xxii, xxv–xxvi, xlv,
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42, 47, 48, 140, 204, 206, 209
Bordeaux, xv–xvi, 29
Boug, 29
Bourbon, Nicolas, xxv–xxvi
Bourg, Claude du, 119, 166
Brinon, Jean de, xliii, 9, 11, 15
Briseis, 29
Brutus, 57, 129, 171–72
Buchanan, George, xiii, xx, 1 n1
Burge, Claude, xlii
cabalistic imagery, xxv
Cairiechius, François Laccius, 101
Caliantheus, Charles, x, 83, 146–47
Callée, Antoine, xlii
Calumny: personified, 193, 206
carpe diem, 43, 141
Castalian spring, 69, 208
Catherine of Alexandria, St., 119, 121, 166–67
Cato, 95, 117, 153, 165, 185
Catullus, xiii, xvi–xx, xxv, 13; castration of Attis (c. 63), 156; inversion of c. 16; laments his brother, 45; language imitated, 141, 150, 156 (c. 45); scorns the old, 44; variation on c. 32; writes naughty poetry
cena. See dinner invitation
Chaos, 101
Charles IX, xxiii
Charon, 31, 48, 81, 131, 145
Chesneau, Louis, 15
Chiron, 31
choragus, 64
Christ, 55, 57, 111
Church Fathers, xxiv
Cicero, xiv, xvi, xxi, xxiii, 131
Clain, 29
Clio, 35
Colet de Rumilly en Champagne, Claude, 99
Coletus Campanus. See Colet de Rumilly
Collaeus, Antoine. See Collet, Antoine
Collège de Boncourt, xvi
Collège de Guyenne, xvi
Collège du Cardinal Lemoine, xvi
College of Sainte-Marthe, xv
Colletet, xx n14
Collina, xlii, 127, 170
Colloquy of Poissy, xxii
Condom, Rudolphe, 83
Connan, François de, 123
Connanus, Franciscus. See Connan, François de
Cordus, 59, 65
Corellius, 103, 157
Corinna, 42, 57, 64
Costecandus, Jean, 101, 156
Costecaudus. See Costecandus
Crassus, 121, 168
Croesus, 99
Crouzeil, Pierre, xli, 31, 48–49
Crucius, Marius, 85, 107
Crucius, Sanso, 115
Cruselius, P. See Crouzeil, Pierre
Cujas, Jacques, xxiii
Cumae, 27
Cupid (Love), ix, 19, 21, 31, 33, 87, 89, 97, 117, 137; band of Erotes, 69; Eros and Anteros, 150
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