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Preface

The present catalogue is devoted to the thought of the Renaissance and its sources. In this context, sources should be taken in a twofold sense. It means both the ancient sources of learning upon which the original thought of the Renaissance is based and the sources upon which our knowledge of Renaissance thought is based, the classics of the historiography of Renaissance thought (see Section II).

By Renaissance thought, we mean primarily Renaissance philosophy, albeit in a broad sense, including the Humanist movement, the Aristotelian tradition, and Renaissance Platonism. The label of Renaissance philosophy also covers fields that we would not categorize as philosophy today, such as science, medicine, politics, linguistics, and sociology.

We have, however, not included any books solely relating to the fields of Religion, Art, Poetry, Natural History, and Cartography, of which we have several important Renaissance printings in stock (see www.lynge.com). The focus of this present catalogue is on works that have been determinative for the formation and development of the philosophical thought that is peculiar to the Renaissance.

The present catalogue is obviously not an exhaustive list of works and editions formative for Renaissance thought, but we believe that it reflects the intellectual wealth and diversity of the Renaissance period. It also reflects our main fields of interest: important books within Science, Philosophy, and the History of Ideas.

Of all the books in the present catalogue, it is true that they are highly important editions of works that have been of seminal importance to the development of Renaissance thought and to our understanding of this previously neglected period in which the formats of modern culture, modern thought, and modern man were cast.

Maria Girsel
Herman H.J. Lynge & Søn A/S
November 2012
A PUBLICATION THAT CHANGED THE FACE OF RENAISSANCE PHILOSOPHY

ALEXANDER OF APHRODISIAS

_Enarratio de anima ex aristotelis institutione. interprete Hieronymo donato Patriotio Veneto._ [Alexander of Aphrodisias’s commentary on Aristotle’s De Anima, translated by Girolamo Donato].

(Brixiae (Brescia), Bernardinus de Misintis, 1495, [on colophon]). 4to. Contemporary full vellum w. some wear, handwritten title on spine. First leaf a bit darkened, first 6 leaves w. neat repair to upper right corner, far from affecting text, last few leaves w. some brown spots, otherwise only occasional and not heavy brownspsotting. Some near cont. marginal annotations, some shaved. Last end-papers renewed. Pasted down front end-paper w. long inscription in Italian, quoting from Giovio about Pomponazzi and his use of Aphrodisias’ text (ab. 1800). A neat and solid copy. Large woodcut opening initial, capital spaces throughout. 91 leaves (of 92, −lacking first blank).

DKK 105,000.00 / EURO 14,000.00

The exceedingly scarce first edition of Alexander of Aphrodisias’ hugely influential commentary on Aristotle’s “De Anima”; the enormously important first printing of Girolamo Donato’s (1457—1511) translation from the Greek, which came to influence almost all original philosophy of the Renaissance with its hugely controversial exposition of the impossibility of the immortality of the individual soul, interpreted from Aristotle’s “De Anima” — “On the Soul” — one of the most influential and commented on philosophical works of all times.

If one question is to be pointed out as the main philosophical one of the Renaissance, it is that of the soul’s relation to reason or intelligence. “This was the question of his (Pomponazzi’s) time. “Anima” and “Intellectus” were then the watchwords of the schools: their relation, or the nature of “anima intellective”, was the point round which discussion moved and on which was invoked the authority of Averroes, Alexander or St Thomas. When the audiences in the Italian class-rooms called out “Quid de anima?” this was the subject which they desired to hear treated.” (Douglas, p. 74). And if the new interpretation of Aristotle that affected all of Renaissance philosophy had one representative authority, it was Alexander of Aphrodisias. “Pour couvrir cette tendance nouvelle, un nouveau nom était nécessaire: On trouva celui d’Alexandre d’Aphrodisias. Désormais Averroès ne régnera plus seul…” (Renan, Averroes, p. 282). “L’immortalité, en effet, était, vers 1500, le problème autour duquel s’agitait l’esprit philosphique en Italie…” (Renan, p. 283).

The publication of this present work, the first edition of Alexander’s commentary, was of the utmost importance to Renaissance philosophy, religion, scholarship and learning, and it greatly influenced the path of Aristotelian scholarship as well as almost all original philosophy within this period. Alexander came to influence all reading of Aristotle in the Renaissance,—a period, in which the “De Anima”—like it had done earlier in the Middle Ages—occupied the central role within the field of philosophy; —few other works have been so commented on and been of such importance to theology, philosophy, psychology and natural sciences in general. The work re-evoked a great interest in the sort of philosophy that was not primarily connected to logic, and it was the cause of the greatest and most heated controversies due to the obvious consequences its doctrines could have for the Church.

“With reference to those works of Aristotle which were and remained the center of instruction in logic and natural philosophy, the most important changes derived from the fact that the works of the ancient Greek
commentators became completely available in Latin between the late fifteenth and the end of the sixteenth centuries and were more and more used to balance the interpretations of the medieval Arabic and Latin commentators. The Middle Ages had known their works only in a very limited selection or through quotations in Averroes. Ermolao Barbaro’s complete translation of Themistius and Girolamo Donato’s version of Alexander’s “De Anima” were among the most important ones in a long line of others. When modern historians speak of Alexandrianism as a current within Renaissance Aristotelianism that was opposed to Averroism, they are justified in part by the fact that the Greek commentators, that is Alexander and also Themistius, Simplicius, and many others, were increasingly drawn upon for the exposition of Aristotle. In a more particular sense, Alexander’s specific notion that the human soul was mortal received more attention from the Aristotelian philosophers.” (Kristeller, Renaissance Thought and its sources, 1979, p. 45).

“The group of innovating “Alexandrists” who appear at the end of the century derive their name from Alexander of Aphrodisias, the best of the Greek commentators on Aristotle, whom they studied and cited; … but the Averroists had likewise cited Alexander; his views they found discussed by the commentator himself. … And we find strong Humanistic interests. Whereas before the “Physica” had been the center of attention, now it is the “De Anima” and the interpretation of human nature that awaken controversy. Like the Platonists, the Aristotelians began discussing God, freedom, and immortality in relation to the individual soul, but, unlike them, they arrived through Aristotle at naturalistic conclusions.” (Randall in: Cassirer, Kristeller and Randall, The Renaissance Philosophy of Man, 1956, p. 260).

“Of his (Alexander’s) interpretations of Aristotle (either in formal commentaries or in other writings), two are particularly famous… Alexander interprets a most difficult aspect of Aristotle’s psychology in his “On the Soul”, Book III, chapters 4 and 5… The most conspicuous result of this theory is the denial of any kind of personal immortality… The assertion or the denial of the correctness of Alexander’s interpretation of Aristotle and, even more, the correctness of the doctrine (denial of personal immortality) became one of the great controversies of the Middle Ages and early modern times.” (D.S.B. I: pp. 117–18).

The Christian commentators of Aristotle’s “On the Soul” naturally expounded an interpretation of the question of the immortality of the soul that coincided with the religious Christian doctrines of the periods. “Meanwhile, in the second century CE, Alexander of Aphrodisias wrote commentaries on “De anima” that were to conflict with Christian teaching on the soul, and, in the twelfth century, Averroes proposed another line of interpretation that was equally offensive. Beginning in the thirteenth century, scholastic philosophers and theologians in Paris and elsewhere debated this question hotly and often… After the early fourteenth century the controversy simmered, but then it boiled over again at Padua in the late fifteenth century, when Pomponazzi was a student.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, Renaissance Philosophy, 1992, pp. 106–7).

Alexander provided a mean between the purely material and the abstract intellect, and he made a place for reason and intellect. With the aid of Alexander—reading the exact edition that we have here, namely the very first printed version of the groundbreaking work—, Pomponazzi, “The last Scholastic and the first man of the Enlightenment”, was the one to solve the main problem of the Renaissance. He agreed that Aquinas had sufficiently refuted Averroës’ doctrine of the unity of all intellect, but he did not agree that there was a plurality of intellects, rather that the human soul was mortal, —also the rational faculty,— a doctrine that of course greatly disturbed the Church. “For this interpretation he appealed to Alexander of Aphrodisias, who identifies the active mortal intellect with the divine mind and declares the individual reason of each man to be mortal. (Note 1: Pomponazzi, who was ignorant of Greek (as were many of the most important scholars of the Renaissance), doubtless used the translation of Alexander “peri psyches”, by Girolamo Donato of Venice (Brescia, 1495) ). To escape from the imputation of heterodoxy, he distinguished between two orders of truth, the philosophical and the theological…” (Sandy II:p. 110).
It is a curious but generally accepted conception that with the rise of the Renaissance came the fall of Aristotle. Whether this is actually true can be disputed, but it is a fact that with the recovery of many lost works of ancient literature, the widening of the range of classical studies and the renewed interest in Plato, Aristotle was no longer the sole authority on a huge number of fields. That this should mean a total ignorance of the teachings of Aristotle must be considered somewhat of a myth (though a very frequently repeated one), and in fact with the grand humanists of the late 15th and early 16th century, the study of Aristotle fits perfectly with the broader comprehension of scholarship. The great humanists like Ficino, Pico and Pomponazzi had not forgotten about Aristotle, and the revival of learning did not mean the neglect of the prince of philosophers. On the contrary, with the appreciation of the knowledge of Greek and the invention of the printing, works were being translated and printed like never before, which meant that the greatest of the humanists, many of whom did not themselves know Greek, could be acquainted with the Greek texts of Aristotle and the Greek commentaries of “The Commentator”, Alexander, in Latin translation. And thus this first printing of the interpretation of the greatest of all commentators of one of the most influential works in the history of philosophy comes to live and comes to influence an entire generation of philosophers, humanists and thinkers.

The “De Anima” became one of the most studied texts of all times, and it hugely influenced late 15th and early 16th century philosophy, theology and thought in general. “Although the ancient commentators on Aristotle left a much larger literature than that surviving from Aristotle himself, only a few of their commentaries were known to the medieval West. In the four decades after 1490, the interpretations of Alexander, Themistius,
Ammonius, Philoponus, Simplicius, and other Greek commentators were added to the familiar views of Averroes, Albert and Thomas, thus stimulating new solutions to Aristotelian problems."

"Equally important for the continued growth of the Peripatetic synthesis was the recovery and diffusion of the Greek commentaries on Aristotle. These treatises, about ten times longer than the works they discuss, were written by pagans and Christians, Platonists and Peripatetics in late antiquity, between the second and seventh centuries in the Greek world of the Eastern Mediterranean, and then again in twelfth-century Byzantium. The most important of the two dozen commentators were Alexander of Aphrodisias, Ammonius, Simplicius, Themistius and John Philoponus. Of these five, only Alexander and Themistius were Aristotelians..." (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 68).

"Alexandre d’Aphrodisias peut être considéré comme le premier auteur de l’immense importance que la théorie du troisième livre de l’Ame acquit dans les dernières siècles de la philosophie grecque, et Durant tout le moyen âge." (Renan, p. 99).

Graesse I: 69: "Cette traduction, qui diffère de la précédente, a été réimprimée plusieurs fois, p. ex.: s. l. 1500. in-fol. Venet. 1502. 1514. 1538. in 8vo. Basil. 1535. in 8vo.”
FORMING THE MODERN EUROPEAN DEVELOPMENT OF MATHEMATICS

ARCHIMEDES OF SYRACUSE. + EUTOCIUS OF ASCALON

Opera, quæ quidem extant, omnia, multis iam seculis desiderata, atque à quàm paucissimis hactenus uisa, cunctæ primiûm & Graecis & Latine in lucem edita. Quorum Catalogum uersa pagina reperies. Adiecta quoque sunt Eutocii Ascalonitae in eosdem Archimedis Libros Commentaria, item Graecè & Latinè, nuquam antea excusa. [i.e. Archimedes’ Opera, both the Greek and the Latin text + Eutocius of Ascalon’s commentary, in both Greek and Latin].

Basel, Johannes Hervagius, 1544. Folio. (30,5 x 21 cm.). A very handsome set of both volumes, the Latin being in a very nice a bit later full vellum binding with visible bands and handwritten title to spine, the Greek being in an excellently executed recent binding to match, in all making up a very desirable and lovely set.

[Greek part:] (8), 139; (4), 65, (3) pp. incl. the last blank. Many woodcut diagrams throughout, and a fine woodcut initial to each section. Title-page with 2 small stamps, and a stamp on verso of title-page. The first 4 leaves very lightly browned, occasionally very light marginal browning. One leaf with loss of a small portion of lower right corner, no loss of text. Otherwise very nice and clean.

[Latin part:] (8), 163, (1); 68, (4) pp. Many woodcut diagrams throughout, and a fine woodcut intial to each section. Title-page with old ex-libris-inscription: “Dom. prof. Rom. Soc. Jesu. Catal. miseris. Bibliot. Comun.” in neat hand. The first ab. 6 leaves with a dampstain to lower blank corner, not affecting text. A bit of brownsotpping throughout, mostly very light, and mostly marginal. The Eutochius-section (last 68 pp.) with a bit more brownsotpping. This section is marked with an old vellum-strip, indicating where it begins. All in all very nice.

DKK 260,000.00 / EURO 34,900.00

The seminal editio princeps of Archimedes’ Opera, constituting the first edition of the original Greek text and the first edition of the Latin text, as well as the first printing of Eutocius’ highly important commentaries, also in both Greek and Latin. The magnificent Archedian princeps constitutes a Renaissance magnum opus that profoundly influenced the development of mathematical thought as well as the Renaissance and early modern concepts and understanding of the universe. It is in the present publication that we find the first printed statement of the Heliocentric world picture.

“[i]t was not until the late sixteenth century, then increasingly in the seventeenth, that Archimedes’ mathematical work began to have formative influence on the development of mathematics.

Of exceptional significance for the beginnings of this modern European inheritance and handing-on of the Archimedes legacy were the first edition ("editio princeps"), in 1544, of an almost complete Greek and Latin Archimedes text based on Codex A, with Latin text by Jacob Cremona”. (Grattan-Guinness, p. 183)

Both parts, i.e. both the Greek and Latin, were printed by Hervagius in Basle, 1544. The edition is edited by Thomas Geschauff, also called Venatorius. Including the Greek text as well as the Latin translation of both Archimedes’ text and the highly important commentaries of Eutocios of Ascalon (ab. 500 A.D.), this publication is a cornerstone in the history of Western thought, marking the beginning of the Archimedean renaissance.
No incunable-edition of the work of Archimedes appeared, and the present edition is only preceded by small Latin selections from his works in 1503 and 1543.

Archimedes, by Plinius called “the God of mathematics”, is arguably the greatest mathematician, physicist and engineer of ancient times and one of the greatest geniuses of all times. “There is no one individual whose work epitomizes the character of the Alexandrian age so well as Archimedes (287—212 B.C), the greatest mathematician in antiquity”. (Morris Kline). “He gave birth to the calculus of the infinite conceived and brought to perfection successively by Kepler, Cavalieri, Fermat, Leibnitz, and Newton.” (Chasles).

With the commentaries of Eutocius, Renaissance thinkers read and understood the works of the Great Archimedes, and one dare say that these commentaries influenced the Renaissance as much as Archimedes’ work itself. Had it not been for Eutocius’ commentaries, we might not have extant all that we have of Aristotle, and it is no coincidence that these commentaries have followed almost all editions of Archimedes ever since their first appearance in print, in 1544.

“The accompanying commentaries by Eutocius, still extant, had an effect on the history of mathematics. They contain not only cross-references to Greek geometry, but also exhaustive comments on Archimedes’ calculation of circles. It was these that opened an early door to Archimedes’ work and then, centuries later, influenced the work of Western scholars such as Niclas of Cusa, Leonardo da Vinci, the Abbot Francesco Maurolico and Niccolò Tartaglia.” (Grattan-Guinness p. 181).

Eutocius’ commentaries are of seminal importance to the history of mathematics, his “examples of long multiplication in his commentary on the “Measurement of a Circle” are the best available evidence of the way in which the Greek handled such operations, and he preserves solutions of mathematical problems by the earlier Greek geometers that are sometimes the sole evidence for their existence and are therefore of major importance for the historian of mathematics.

It is through Eutocius that we have a valuable collection of solutions by Greek geometers of the problem of finding two mean proportions to two given straight lines…” (D.S.B. IV:489).

“All the books by Archimedes on which Eutocius commented have survived, and his elucidations may have contributed to their survival. […] His commentaries on Archimedes were translated into Latin along with the parent works of William of Moerbeke in 1269. The commentaries have usually been printed with the editions of Archimedes and Apollonius and have never been printed separately.” (D.S.B. IV:491).

The influence of Archimedes’ work can hardly be over-estimated. He was the first to formulate what can genuinely be called physical laws: “Law of the Lever” and “Law of floating bodies.” — in fact, from all of physics before Simon Stevin (1548—1650), the only “basic” achievements which have textbook status nowadays are the two laws by Archimedes.” (Salomon Bochner).

In Mechanics, he worked out the principles of the subject, and he was the first to apply geometry to physical science. In geometry, his works consist in the main of original investigations, beginning where Euclid left off. In fact, he performed what is equivalent to integration, in finding the area of a parabolic segment, and of a spiral, the surface and volume of a sphere and a segment etc. He also invented the whole science of Hydrastatics.

“This represents a sum of mathematical achievements unsurpassed by any man in the world’s history” (Thomas Heath)—“There was hardly a field of mathematics (including approximation mathematics and numerical analysis) to which he did not contribute something exceptionally ingenious and original. His work in higher mathematics was almost two thousand years ahead of his time and was fully appreciated only in the nineteenth century.” (Cornelius Lanczos).
Among the 7 works contained in the Archimedian Princeps we have also the famous “Sand Reckoner” (Psammites, Arenarius) dedicated to King Gelon, in which an extremely large number is introduced in arithmetic. “How many grains of sand could the whole universe hold?” — a work which also contains THE FIRST PRINTED STATEMENT of the Heliocentric world picture, the COPERNICAN THEORY OF THE UNIVERSE with the sun in the centre and the planets and the earth revolving around it, a theory first put forward by Aristarchus in a lost work and here (in the “Sand Reckoner”) referred to by Archimedes: “Aristarchus brought out a book consisting of certain hypotheses, wherein it appears, as a consequence of the assumptions made, that the universe is many times greater than the “universe” just mentioned (the common conception). His hypotheses are that the fixed stars and the sun remain unmoved, that the earth revolves about the sun in the circumference of a circle, the sun lying in the middle of the orbit, and that the fixed stars, situated about the same centre as the sun, is so great that the circle in which he supposes the earth to revolve bears a proportion to the distance of the fixed stars as the centre of the sphere bears to its surface” (Heath’s translation). — “The Sand Reckoner” (De arenae numero, Psammites, Arenarius) had also not been printed before.

Smith, Rara Arithmetica p. 227 — Dibner, Heralds..No 137 — Printing and the Mind of Man No 72 — Sparrow, Milestones of Science No 9 — Adams A — 1531 — Stillwell No 140 (both Greek and Latin translation).
FIRST FULL FRENCH TRANSLATIONS OF ARISTOTLE’S POLITICS & PLATO’S REPUBLIC

ARISTOTE [ARISTOTLE, ARISTOTELES] + PLATON [PLATO]


Paris, Chez Ambroise Drouart, 1600. Folio. Bound in one contemporary full limp vellum binding with a bit of spotting and soiling. Contemporary owner’s name torn out of top margin of first title-page. Faint damp stain to two first leaves and a light dampstain to last ab. 40 leaves of the Plato, getting heavier on the last five index-leaves. A bit of occasional minor light brownsplotting. All in all a very attractive copy, with good margins. Roman and Italic letter, and some Greek. Title-pages printed in red and black and with large woodcut printer’s devices. Woodcut head- and tail-pieces and numerous beautiful woodcut initials. (24), 499, (41, -tables) pp. + (8), 420, (10, -table) pp.

Extremely scarce first editions of the important first complete French translations of the Politics of Aristotle and the Republic of Plato. We have not been able to locate any earlier printings of the two works in any bibliographies, nor have we been able to find any in the library databases, but it seems that Bibliothèque nationale du France owns a copy of at least the Aristotle with a title-page stating 1599, also Paris by Drouart. We thus assume that this is the same printing, but with a variant title-page.

Both of these monumental works are translated by Louis Le Roy (or Leroy), the great classical scholar, and have his learned an important commentaries, including additions and amendments by Louis Morel, who published the work with Drouart. For many many years this first complete translation in to French was considered by far the best and it exercised a tremendous influence on 17th century French thought.

Louis Le Roy (ab.1510—1577) was a famous French humanist scholar and professor of Greek at the Collège Royal in 1572. He used his own magnificent translations of Plato and Aristotle in his voluminous political and historical writings; his masterwork “De la vicissitude ou variété des choses en l’univers”, 1576, is considered a pioneering work on cyclical change in cultural history. He had previously published parts of his translation of both Aristotle’s Politics and Plato’s Republic, before his death, but only smaller sections. In the dedication in Aristotle, dated 1576, Le Roy states his intention of completing his translation of Plato’s Republic and, provided that his health holds, to add a commentary that would help the understanding of the text. When he died, he left a number of finished works behind that had never been printed, among them his monumental full translations of Aristotle’s Politics and Plato’s Republic, which the scholarly printer Frederic Morel completed. It took more that 20 years, however, to bring the printing of them to fruition. The Republic is augmented with a translation of Plato’s Phaedon.

GENERATION AND CORRUPTION – A MAIN RENAISSANCE TRANSLATION

ARISTOTELES [ARISTOTLE]

De ortu et interitu libri duo, Iochimo Periono interprete: per Nicolaum Grouchium correcti & emendati. [Generatione et corruptione].

Lutetiae [Paris], ex officina Michaelis Vascosani [Michel de Vascosan], 1552. 4to. Recent stiff paper binding w. cords showing at spine. A nice and charming copy. 72 pp.

DKK 18,500.00 / EURO 2,500.00

First edition of Joachim Perion’s famous Latin Ciceronian translation of Aristotle’s hugely important work “On Generation and Corruption”, also known in Latin as “De generatione et corruptione”. The translation is corrected and revised by Montaigne’s tutor, Nicolas de Grouchy, and it is probably this humanistic Renaissance version of Aristotle’s work that Montaigne has studied.

The French Renaissance scholar, philosopher and translator, Joachim Périon (1499—1559) counts as one of the most eminent of Renaissance Aristotelians and one of the major actors in the development of Aristotelian thought; together with names such as George of Trebizond, Lefèvre d’Etaples, Pomponazzi, Zabarella etc., Périon was one of the most influential Aristotelians of the Renaissance. The great Aristotelians of the era differed much from each other in their Aristotelianism, though, and not all agreed that Périon’s novel attempt to find a Ciceronian equivalent for everything that Aristotle had said was the right way to go about the Aristotelian texts; as Copenhaver and Schmitt put it “Some disparities among disciples of the Stagirite reflected strong commitments by contemporaries or near contemporaries to incompatible methods – Pomponazzi and Périon, for example, who were only a generation apart; Périon meant his Ciceronian translations of Aristotle to displace the crabbed Latin that Pomponazzi found indispensible.” (Renaissance Philosophy, 2002, p. 61).

The sixteenth century of Europe with its Renaissance humanism faced a time of scholarly change that revolutionized all most all aspects of learning, not least that of philosophy. Many historians throughout the years have argued that with the emergence of the Renaissance and especially Renaissance humanism, Aristotelian philosophy became less and less important; this frequently quoted conception must be said to rest on a misunderstanding, however. It is, on the contrary, a fact that for the grand humanists of the late 15th and 16th centuries the revival of learning was by no means in opposition to the continued teachings of the works of Aristotle. On the contrary, due to the recent appreciation of the knowledge of Greek and the invention of printing, works were being translated and printed like never before, which meant that the greatest of the humanists, many of whom did not themselves know Greek, could be acquainted with the Greek texts of Aristotle.

It is at the peak of this humanism that we find the many important translations in different styles of the works of Aristotle. “In the sixteenth century, more than fifty scholars from various parts of Europe produced nearly 200 Latin translations of over forty texts ascribed to Aristotle. The most productive of the fifteenth-century translators were the Byzantines George of Trebizond and Johannes Argyropulos, who each completed ten texts, but in the sixteenth century the Frenchman Joachim Périon challenges even the prolific William of Moerbeke by turning more than twenty works into Ciceronian Latin... Variations in translation served variations of audience, and the audience changed with time as it was educated by new accomplishments in translation.” (The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy, p. 77). In fact, Périon stands in the midst of
the decades that produces the first humanist Latin translations of Greek texts in print, and with his opposition to the classical Latin medieval translations and outspoken Ciceronian style, he is one of the most radically humanist translators of the Aristotelian texts.

Périon’s style is eminently exemplified in the translation of the title which he has chosen for the present work, the elegant and stylish “De ortu et interitu” instead of the more clumsy but perfectly correct “De generatione et corruptione”.

Nicolas de Grouchy (1510—1572), who later got into a feud with Périon, served as the corrector and reviser of the present translation of Aristotle’s important treatise on substantial change, in which he introduces his four causes and four elements and thus his atomic theory. De Grouchy was the controversial private tutor to the young Montaigne at the Collège du Guyenne, and his corrections are of great importance, especially because he did not fully approve of Périon’s strictly Ciceronian approach to the translations of Aristotle.
THE STANDARD INTERPRETATION OF ARISTOTLE’S “ORGANON” – WITH A FABULOUS PROVENANCE


Morgiis, Guillelmus Laimarus, 1584. Small folio. Beautiful, contemporary (dated 1590) blindstamped, ornamented full pigskin binding, with the portrait of Emperor Maximilian II (1527 – 1576) — King of Bohemia and King of the Romans (King of Germany) from 1562, King of Hungary and Croatia from 1563, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation from 1564 until his death — to the middle of front board, and the portrait of August Duke of Saxony (Herzog zu Sachsen) (1526 – 1586), also known as Augustus and Father August, to the middle of back board — both portraits surrounded by richly blindstamped ornamental borders. Raised bands to richly ornamented spine. Slight wear to extremities, and corners a bit bumped, otherwise beautifully kept. Some leaves with a bit a light brownsplotting. A magnificent, beautiful copy. With a neat 7-line presentation-inscription (no names mentioned), followed by a 9-line presentation-inscription from the Hungarian (Bishop?) Thomas Balasz to the well-known German Renaissance philologist, mathematician, and philosopher Erasmus Schmidt (“Erasmo Fabricio”) to back free end-paper. With many, very neatly written, professional, scholarly notes to front end-papers and to text, presumably by Erasmus Schmidt. An owner’s (Alberto Grawerg) inscription to pasted-down end-paper, dated 1st of April 1597, in the then Hungarian city of Kosice (Latin: Cassouia). Woodcut ornamental title-border, woodcut vignettes, woodcut initials, numerous woodcut illustrations and diagrams in the text. Greek-Latin parallel-text. (8), 831, (1) pp.

DKK 85,000.00 / EURO 11,400.00

A wonderful copy, with a highly important provenance (belonging to the famous Renaissance scholar Erasmus Schmidt), of the very rare first edition of Julius Pace’s seminal “Organon”-edition, which was the standard-edition of the logical texts of Aristotle throughout more than a century, running through at least 11 editions before 1624. Pace’s version of the text, in Greek-Latin parallels, and with Pace’s inspired commentaries and interpretations, profoundly influenced Renaissance thought, determining the course of the Organon-interpretation throughout this period and inspiring much original philosophical thought. Pace’s interpretation of Aristotle’s logical works — arguably the most influential collection of works the history of Western thought — not only changed the face of Renaissance thought, it has remained the authoritative reading of Aristotle’s “Organon” to this day and is still considered the most important and authoritative reading of the texts. As Ross puts it in the Preface to his translation of the logical works (the standard Oxford-edition): “My chief authority in matters of interpretation has been Pacius”. (“The Works of Aristotle Translated into English Under the Editorship of W.D. Ross. Volume I”. Oxford University Press). To this day, a proper study of Aristotle’s “Organon” — and Porphyrios’ “Isagoge” — is still unthinkable without references to Pace, his rendering of the text, and his interpretations of it. The famous “Porphyrian Tree” or “arbor porphyriana”, which has gone down in history as a standard presentation of the basis of Aristotle’s thought, was presented by Porphyrios in his “Isagoge”, which since Antiquity has accompanied Aristotle’s “Ornanon” as an introduction thereof. The
standard presentation of this tree is that of Pace in the present edition, on p. 9. It is that rendering of it, with occasional slight alterations, which has remained standard ever since 1584.

That which we ever since Antiquity have called the “Organon” comprises the logical works of Aristotle: 1. Categories, 2. On Interpretation, 3. Prior Analytics, 4. Posterior Analytics, 5. Topics, 6. On Sophistical Refutations—which ever since late Antiquity/early Middle Ages have been accompanied by Porphyrios’ (233/34-ca. 310) “Isagoge”, his introduction to Aristotle’s “Categories”. During the Renaissance, all editions of Aristotle’s “Organon” also comprised Porphyrios’ “Isagoge”, which was seen as necessary for the understanding of Aristotle’s logic.

Aristotle’s logic has played a seminal role in the history of Western thought. No other collection of writings has had an impact on the history of philosophy that comes close to the “Organon”, an impact that remains pivotal to this day. “Aristotle’s logic, especially his theory of the syllogism, has had an unparalleled influence on the history of Western thought.” (SEP).

From Antiquity, the earlier middle ages had inherited Boethius’ translation of the two first treatises of Aristotle’s “Organon”, along with Porphyrios’ “Isagoge”. These works formed the basis for logical study and teaching until the end of the 11th century. Only during the 12th and 13th centuries, were Aristotle’s writings—along with those of the Arabic and some of the Greek commentators—translated into Latin. When the medieval universities reached their full development during the thirteenth century, Aristotle’s works were adapted as the standard textbooks for all philosophical disciplines—thus modern terms for many philosophical and scientific disciplines correspond to the titles of Aristotle’s works (e.g. Ethics, Physics, Metaphysics). Through Aristotle’s works, the West thus acquired, not only the specific problems and ideas that were being dealt with at the universities, but also the terminology used to describe and discuss them and the systematic framework within which all relevant problems should and could be treated. But come the Renaissance, we see a clear change in the use of Aristotle’s works. We here witness something other than a mere continuation of the late medieval Aristotelianism. The Humanists began supplying new translations of Aristotle’s works and translated all the Greek commentators of Aristotle, many of them for the first time. And thus, a tendency to emphasize the original Greek Aristotle developed, a tendency that became pivotal for the development of modern thought—the development of modern science and modern philosophy is inextricably linked with the Renaissance Humanist editions of Aristotle’s works in Greek (with Latin parallel-text). The “Organon”, Aristotle’s seminal logical writings, occupies a central position within the Aristotelian body of writing and thus within the development of Western thought. Certain Humanist versions of the Greek text and the Latin translations, as well as the interpretations of them, thus came to play a seminal role in the trajectory of Renaissance and modern though, Pace’s “Organon”-edition presumably being THE most important and influential edition ever to have appeared.

“The medieval traditions of logical writing survived well into the sixteenth century particularly at Paris and at the Spanish universities, though with considerable internal changes. Treatises on sophisms and on proofs of terms ceased to be written; whereas there was a sudden flurry of activity concerned with the various divisions of terms and with the opposition of propositions, i.e. the logical relations between different kinds of categorical proposition. These internal changes were not, however, sufficient to keep the tradition alive, and after about 1530 not only did new writing on the specifically medieval contributions to logic cease, but the publication of medieval logicians virtually ceased. The main exceptions were the logical commentaries by (or attributed to) such authors as Thomas Aquinas and John Duns Scotus, which found a place in their “Opera Omnia”, and which benefited from a revived interest in the great medieval metaphysicians.

The main changes in the teaching and writing of logic during the sixteenth century were due to the impact of humanism. First, commentaries on Aristotle came to display a totally new style of writing. One reason for this
was the influence of new translations of Aristotle, and new attitudes to the Greek text. Another reason was the publication of the Greek commentators on Aristotle’s logic, Alexander, Themistius, Ammonius, Philoponus and Simplicius. A third reason was the new emphasis on Averroes, which expressed itself in the great Aristotle-Averroes edition of 1550—1552. The effects of these new factors can be seen in the commentaries on individual works of the “Organon” by such Italians as Agostino Nifo (1473—1546) and Jacopo Zabarella (1533—1589), the latter of whom offered a particularly influential account of scientific method. They can also be seen in the “Organon” edition of Giulio Pace (1550—1635), which was first published in 1584 and contained the Greek text side-by-side with a new translation which was designed not only to read well but also to capture the philosophical significance of Aristotle’s words.” (Raul Corazzon, “History of Renaissance and Modern Logic from 1400 to Stuart Mill”).

“No editor better understood the nature of this Treatise of Aristotle than Julius Pacius, who was the preceptor of Casaubon, and profoundly skilled in all the arcane of the Peripatetic philosophy, in both the Greek and Latin tongues.” (Dibdin I: 318)

Giulio Pace of Beriga (or Julius Pace/Pacius) (1550—1635) was a famous Italian Aristotelian scholar and jurist. He was born in Vicenza and studied law and philosophy in Padua. He was inspired by the Reformation and put on trial by the Inquisition. Therefore he had to flee Italy and escaped, first to Geneva, thereafter to Germany. While in Heidelberg, he converted to Protestantism. He was highly respected as an academic and was widely known for his deep knowledge and understanding of Aristotle, whom he became famous for translating. He was elected public professor in Geneva, where he taught for ten years (1575—1585). The next ten years he spent teaching law at the University of Heidelberg (where he got into different conflicts, especially with the philosophical faculty for giving private tuition in the controversial Ramist logic). After Heidelberg, he taught at different universities throughout Europe, including Hungary, where he was also well known, especially for his 1584-edition of Aristotle’s “Organon”, which played a definitive role in Aristotle-scholarship and philosophy in general throughout all of Europe.

Pace may have met Thomas Balasz during his stay in Hungary.

The presentation-inscription (in Latin) is from the Hungarian citizen, who is presumably a Bishop: “Thomas Balassz transylvanus Clauoiiopolita-/nus, natione Hungarus, suo Dno benevuolo/- uti fratri dilectissimo suffiscationum/ grati animi scribebat, Erasmo Frabrizio/ Rectori Schola Cassouiensis, professor mor suauitatem […]”. Fabrizio is the Humanist Latinization of Schmied/Schmidt, thus, “Erasmo Frabrizio” is the Latin Humanist version of Erasmus Schmidt.

THE GERMAN RENAISSANCE HUMANIST PHILOLOGIST, MATHEMATICIAN, AND PHILOSOPHER ERASMUS SCHMIDT (1570—1637) was famous as a learned scholar with an immense understanding of Greek philosophical and scientific literature. He was one of the last of “the German Hellinists”, who learned the Greek language and literature after the Melanchtonian model and spirit. He wrote a number of noted treatises and works, most famously a carefully commented edition of Pindar’s poems and fragments with a Latin translation. He also made an edition of the poems of Hesiod that turned out to be very influential and was used as the standard version for many years. He wrote a large number of influential works of classical philology, and he played an important role, not only in the interpretation of classical and post-classical texts, but also in the exposition and interpretation of grammar and language.

Erasmus Schmidt was born in Delitzsch and died in Wittenberg, where he was “rector” of the Wittenberg Academy at two times in his life. After having been taught in the public school, at the age of 14 or 15, he was sent to the Landesgymnasium in Schulpforrta, where he was taught by, among others, Sethus Calvisius. He
was so skilled that he received an electoral stipend and in 1590 enrolled at the University of Wittenberg. Here he studied philosophy and graduated in 1593, after which time he gave private tuition in Greek language and mathematics, earning a great reputation, which caused him to be put forth as the successor for the professorship of Petrus Otto. Jöstel himself, however, was given the professorship, and due to this rejection, he left Germany and went to Hungary, where he became an educator (paedagoge). It is here that he was given the present, wonderfully bound copy of Pace’s “Organon”-edition, which he seems to have annotated extensively and devoted a lot of attention. Erasmus Schmidt stayed in Hungary until 1597, which fits perfectly with the last owner’s inscription to the pasted-down back end-paper, which is dated 1st of April 1597. Schmidt got a position as assistant professor at the philosophical faculty in Wittenberg from the 1st of May 1597, and has presumably left Hungary about a month earlier, at which time “Alberto Grawerg” has presumably been given the present copy.

Dibdin I:318; Adams A:1866.
THE POLITICAL EDUCATION OF THE THEATRE AUDIENCE

BETULIUS, XYSTUS (SIXT BIRCK el. BIRCKUS)

Susanna. Comoedia tragica.

Augsburg, Philippus Ulhardus, 1537. Small 8vo. Unbound, with the original cords. First two quires loose (in their entirety). Faint dampstaining throughout. A nice copy. Large woodcut vignette (the German double-eagle) to title-page. (46 ff. + final blank).

DKK 21,000.00 / EURO 2,800.00

Exceedingly scarce first Latin edition (being the first edition thus) of Sixt Birck’s important and greatly influential political and religious Reformation drama, his highly interesting and original version of the Susanna legend.

When living in Basel and working as a rector there (1530—34), the German dramatist and later Augsburg-rector Sixt Birck, or Xystus Betelius, (1501—1554) had been asked by the town council to write a religious play. Protestant town councils of the period took an especially active role in determining the theatrical repertory of their cities, so that the local stage at times became an extension of council policy. This did not please Birck, who had wanted to write a political play, but nonetheless he composed the first version of his first play, the famous “Susanna” (a later so frequently used theme of Reformation plays—with no less than 16 dramatizations in Germany alone from 1490 till 1627), which thus appeared in German in 1532. However, after having moved back to his home town Augsburg in 1534, he began writing his Latin-language version “Susanna”, which appeared in 1537. In this, perhaps the most important edition of the work, Birck chastised the council for having required of him a religious drama instead of the political play that he would have preferred. The Latin version had thus become a much more politically oriented work, and the main goals of this Latin play seem to have been 1) to politically educate the audience, 2) to combine religion and politics in a sensible way, 3) to erect a model for how a Protestant republic should be governed, and finally 4) to create a genre of dramas to be played by school students. This Latin version is often considered a work in its own, as it differs so much in content from the German version.

Unlike the German version of the play, the Latin version was written for Birck’s students in Augsburg. And as such, “Susanna” in Latin, printed in 1537 is considered the first play within the tradition of the German “shool dramas”, and Birck is considered the father of this tradition, which later established itself as a distinct branch within the “Jesuit theatre”.

Apart from this stylistic fact, the play sets out to create a model for the government of a Protestant republic, and with this aim in mind, Birck puts an entirely new focus on the Susanna-figure, which is very different from the classical account of her. Instead of focusing on Susanna’a chastity, Birck focuses on how her case was handled by the local magistrates and council, and at the same time he dramatically recreates the contemporary legal procedures. Completely untraditionally, he portrays Sussana’s absolute faith in the law and her right to appeal, which guarantees that she will be given a fair trial. At the end, though, the drama changes from a mainly political point of view to a strictly religious one. “The “Susanna” of Sixt Birck or Xystus Betelius is chiefly remarkable for the extreme elaboration of its picture of the trial of the heroine, in which the respectable members of the court, who are extremely numerous, distinguish themselves by giving their judgment dead against Susanna, in great individual detail…” (Saintsbury George, The Earlier Renaissance, p. 341).
“The paradox in Protestant thought between man’s fallen nature and his educability was more apparent in Sixt Birck’s two Susanna plays (German, 1532; Latin, 1537). In these works, the theological significance of Birck’s religious plot contradicted the sociopolitical lessons he had incorporated into his plays. The discrepancy was especially evident in the Latin drama where Birck developed his ideas about sociopolitical function of theater” (Parente, Religious Drama and the Humanist Tradition, p. 91). In this Latin version, Birck thus heavily criticized contemporary theatre (and contemporary dramatists such as Gnaphaeus and Crocus) for ignoring political subjects, and he expressed his wish to combine religion and politics in a way that the audience would understand, at the same time as he adapted the Susanna story to fit the emphases of the Reformation (also with regards to women and their behavior).

“The German playwright Sixt Birck (1501—1554) produced two treatments of the Susanna story around the mid-sixteenth century. In fact, Paul F. Casey claims that Birck’s first Susanna play, written 1531/32 was the “first version of the Susanna theme during the Reformation period.” ... as Casey notes, the play was not just for Birck’s students. Rather, “the drama was intended for public performance with the aim of bringing to the people the newly revised classical form of the drama in the vernacular”, which... was entirely in keeping with the Humanist emphases... He translated and slightly revised his earlier play into Latin in 1537/8 explicitly for his students to perform. The Latin version of Birck’s drama begins with a prefatory letter to the Augsburg Senate in which Birck makes a point of discussing the importance of state sponsored schooling for boys in a “Christian state”, as opposed to the situation of the “Papists”. “ (Clanton, “The Good the Bold, and the Beautiful: The Story of Susanna”, p. 146).

The German version appeared in Basel (Thomas Wolf) in 1532, and this the first Latin version appeared in Augsburg (Philippus Ulhardus) in 1537. They are both of the utmost scarcity. In 1538 two other editions of the Latin version appeared, and it was printed again several times during the 16th century.

It was through the Latin version that the work became famous and through that version that it exercised its great influence (it inspired numerous plays of this sort), and it was frequently played at theaters (e.g. the Danish translator of the work—it appeared in print in Danish in 1578 but had been translated before that—had seen the play two times, while he was studying in Leipzig, once at the City Hall and once at the “Paulinerkollegium”).

Brunet, I:834.
BODIN, JEAN

Les six livres de la république.

Paris, Chez Iacques du Puys, 1577. Folio. Bound in a nice 18th century half calf with marbled paper over boards. Single gilt lines and gilt title to spine. Top corner of front board bumped and a small tear to upper front hinge and lower back hinge, otherwise very nice. Repair to one leaf (a ii), otherwise Internally very nice and clean. Old owner’s inscription to title-page. Large title-woodcut. Woodcut initials and vignettes. (8), (765—paginated 1-519 + 552-797 — pp. 519 and 552 being recto and verso of the same leaf, i.e. nothing missing), (1), (54, — Table des matieres) pp.

DKK 48,000.00 / EURO 6,500.00

The rare second edition of Bodin’s seminal main work, in which “sovereignty” is defined and treated extensively for the first time. “Bodin’s “statement of sovereignty” is the first systematic one in modern European philosophy, and thus deserves a landmark status.” (SEP). The work is also the first to coin the term “Political Science”; it occupies a central place in European political thought and immensely influenced all thinkers on the subject throughout centuries. “… for the next three centuries the political thought of the West will be preoccupied with these ideas, with a new theory of the State and with the concept of Sovereignty.” (Catlin, A History of the Political Philosophers, 1950, p. 207).

The extremely scarce first edition, first issue of the “Six Books of the Republic” appeared in 1576 and bears this date on the title-page, a second issue of the first edition also appeared, like this second edition bearing the year 1577 on the title-page. All three appeared in Paris and were published by Du Puys. The work immediately became very popular, and numerous editions appeared already in the 16th century. Later in 1577 an unauthorized edition of the work appeared, printed in Geneva; in 1583 seven editions seem to have appeared. The early folio-editions are all scarce.

The French lawyer and political philosopher, Jean Bodin (1530—1596) wrote his main work, “Les six livres de la république” during the French Wars of Religion, when French Catholics and Protestants were fighting each other. He sees that the only real way to hold a community together and solve conflicts like the ones going on at the time is by establishing a supreme authority. There must be a ruling power which is unrestricted, but at the same time, it cannot be a power that is free to disregard all laws. Inspired by Aristotle’s “Politics”, Bodin now solves the problem of order though the definition of a concept that unites the rulers and the ruled in one body politic, one unitary political society, that is placed above any other human law and that defines human law; he can now define the concept of sovereignty without having to allow a ruler to neglect otherwise present laws and regulations. The sovereign body is necessarily unrestricted; it is bound by natural and divine law, but no human law can touch it or contest it; within its territory, it is the single authority. Bodin’s Sovereign also has the power to legislate, and thus, he not only overrules the common law that had been prevailing in most sovereign states, he has also created a theoretical foundation for monarchy.

With this seminal work, the single most important political work of the French Renaissance, the work that came to influence all Western political thought for centuries, Bodin had earned himself the reputation of being the founder of the science of the state.

“The “Six Books of the Republic” went through many editions in the author’s lifetime and after, and had an immense influence all over Europe. It is, in effect, the first modern attempt to create a complete system of
political science. Its basis was the “Politics” of Aristotle, and it was through Bodin that Aristotle’s work came to exercise influence on modern political thinking which has made him the father of modern democracy. Bodin was not content merely to reproduce his master, however; he added considerably from his own experience. Although like most sixteenth-century writers he approved of absolute government, he demanded its control by constitutional laws, in which respect he foreshadowed the development during the seventeenth century of the “social contract”. Thus Bodin was the first to set out clearly the argument round which most political discussion centred in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, that law is merely an expression of the sovereign will, but that where this reposes in an absolute monarch, it must be mitigated by a customary or natural law. When the lawgiver’s law becomes unjust, it ceases to be valid and must be resisted.” (Printing and the Mind of Man p. 58).

Adams B2234; Brunet I:1025; Graesse I:460; PMM 94(a) (first issue, 1576).
CULTURAL NON-CONFORMITY OF THE RENAISSANCE

BOETHIUS, MALIUS SEVERINUS

Della consolatione de la filosofia. Tradotto da Cosimo Bartoli gentil’huomo fiorentino.


DKK 20,000.00 / EURO 2,700.00

Scarce first edition of famous Renaissance Humanist Cosimo Bartoli’s seminal translation into Italian of Boethius’ milestone work, one of the most influential and widely read works throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Bartoli’s translation, which was preferred by several lecturers at the academy (e.g. Serafini), marks a turning point for the Florentine Academy and the beginning of the cultural non-conformity of the Italian Humanists connected hereto. The work constitutes a great collaboration between the famous, widely respected and learned Humanist polymath Bartoli and the important Renaissance printer Torrentino, whose fame rests mainly upon the works by Humanists of the Florentine academy that he published from the middle of the 16th century in Florence. Furthermore, the translation constitutes an important insight into the principles of linguistics and the importance of language to the dissemination of learning in the Renaissance.

“The Flemish printer Laurens Lenaerts van der Beke, or Lorenzo Torrentino as he was known in Florence, had set up business in the city in 1547 with the title of “impressore ducale”, providing an official outlet for academic writings and a convenient focus for ducal surveillance of the printed word.” (Bryce, p. 167). As the foremost printer for the Academists, he soon became the centre of a feud between two of the most prominent members of the Academy, namely Domenichi and Bartoli. When in May 1748 he published Giovio’s Latin biographies, he included three dedications, e.g. one by Pier Vittori to Cosimo I. This was obviously done in order to make the Duke notice him, his printing career being new as it was. The idea of including dedications to and from prominent Florentines was quickly followed, and when Bartoli published his first work with Torrentino, he followed his lead. Unfortunately for him, so did Lodovico Domenichi, who published a translation of the same work with the same printer, at about the same time, beating him to the press with a few months. Domenichi had only just come to Florence that same year, from Venice, but equipped with an introduction from the illustrious Pietro Arentino to Cosimo I. This was, of course, a blow to Bartoli. But the real feud comes two years later, when Bartoli published his most important work, his great translation of Boethius’ “De Consolatione”, and Domenichi turns out to publish a translation of the same work, also by Torrentino. It is Bartoli, who comes out on top, however, as it is his translation that becomes the standard version at the Academy.

For Bartoli, the dissemination of knowledge is of great importance, which is why he had undertaken to translate into the vernacular Bothius’s “Consolation of Philosophy”, “a highly personal and original work imbued with Stoic and Neoplatonic conceptions that has continued to impress its readers to the present day”. (Kristeller, p. 226). But, Bartoli points out, the language in which this is done is of the utmost importance. He feels that the quality (or lack thereof) of the “volgare” employed by many contemporary translators is a big problem. Bartoli “reminds us of that other major issue which, along with the debate over Latin and the vernacular, looms so large in the history of the Italian language, namely the “questione della lingua”. In this, Bartoli’s linguistic position, scarcely surprisingly for someone of his generation and origins, was that of Florentine modernism. In other words, in the company of such men as Gelli, Giambullari and Lenzoni, he can be expected to oppose proponents of the “italianità” of the literary language of the peninsula (Trissino and Muzio), stressing
instead its continuing “fiorentinità”, the superiority of modern Florentine to, let us say, the Florentine of the Trecento (Bembo), and the superiority, too, of modern Florentine to all other Italian vernaculars, with the related conclusion that the final arbiters of the language can only be native Florentine speakers such as themselves. To Bartoli, therefore, Domenichi as a non-Florentine was linguistically suspect, a potential despoiler of that linguistic purity”. (Bryce, p. 169). The emphasis on that linguistic purity is stressed in the dedication to the Prince of Salerno in the present work. The Prince will find here, in his Boethius-translation, a purity of the language, not mixed with other languages, quite unlike other translations.

Cosimo Bartoli (1503—72) was an important Florentine diplomat, mathematician, philologist, philosopher, and Humanist, generally remembered as a prominent Renaissance polymath, whose works were widely noted at the time. He is most famous for his Florentine translation of Boethius’ main work and for his musical theories, most notably his original comparison of sculptors and musicians, with Donatello and Ockeghem seen as precursors of Michelangelo and Josquin, and his encomium of Verdelot, called the greatest composer after Josquin, to which is added the name of Arcadelt who “faithfully trod in the footsteps of Verdelot”. Curiously, any student of Boethius will remember the role of music in the “De Consolatione”, being the temporary balm that soothes the sadness.

Bartoli was a prominent member of the Florentine Academy, established by Cosimo I de Medici in the 1540’ies as part of a programme of cultural renovation. In the decades prior to Cosimo’s accession to power, the Florentine printing press had been in decline. The quality and the quantity of the books produced has suffered greatly as a result of the city’s political crisis. The events that occurred during the siege of the city and the fall of the Last Republic in 1530 had caused the leading literati of the hitherto flourishing Renaissance centre of learning to flee to more stable and peaceful cities. Only with Cosimo’s programme of cultural renovation, most notably with establishment of the Florentine Academy, that the situation improved. The restoration of the Florentine printing industry clearly reflects these developments.

When in 1547 the impoverished printer Doni, who had returned to Florence after Cosimo’s accession to power, but who could not make ends meet and published works of poor quality, Cosimo had to find another printer to replace him. His choice fell upon a hitherto unknown printer from Brabant, known under his Italian name Lorenzo Torrentino. The contract made between Cosimo and Torrentino clearly reflects the purpose of the Academy and Cosimo’s visions for Florence as a centre of classical learning. The dissemination of knowledge was a clear aim for the Florentine Academy. “In accordance with the terms of the agreement, Torrentino had to set up a workshop within eight months, equipped with two presses containing six Latin and three Greek alphabets, together with a staff of printers, editors, and proof-readers. In addition he had to establish a means
of selling books that could be controlled by the regime, and he was to submit a bound copy of every work that came off his press for censorship. […]” (Zanrè, p. 23).

“Torrentino played a fundamental role in the programme of the cultural development and promotion of the Tuscan language that was instituted by the Academy with the full support of Cosimo I. The success of this policy can be seen in the considerable number of volumes written in the “volgare” that were published by the ducal printer. Not surprisingly, given the exclusive nature of his employment, Torrentino was more or less restricted to producing works that were penned by members of the Fiorentina; in the course of fifteen years, he published Sixty-one titles associated with them. Of these, thirty-nine were no more than simple transcriptions of academic lectures. […] Bartoli’s vernacular translations of Alberti’s “De Re Aedificatoria” (1550) and Boethius’ “De Consolatione Philosophiae” (1552) also came off Torrentino’s presses.

The texts that have been cited so far reflect the specific mission of the Academy to promote “lingua volgare”, by producing works written in contemporary Tuscan and by translating Latin and Greek classics into the vernacular. The Fiorentina’s economic dimension was recalled in the many historical biographies published by Torrentino.” (Zanrè, pp. 23—25).

As a philosopher Boethius (480—ca. 525) stands tall in the middle between Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Time-wise he clearly belongs to late Antiquity, but he is a Christian and he writes in Latin. Still being a Christian, he also comes to represent the actual centre of a tradition that goes directly back to Plotinus and thereby indirectly back to Plato and Aristotle.

Boethius was imprisoned and later executed, accused of treason against the gothic regime as well as of sorcery, though he himself claims that it was caused by his political activity, where he as a court official defended the weak; caused by his uprightness, his enemies were too many. The most plausible explanation is that Theoderic doubted the loyalty of the Roman aristocracy and thereby especially the frank Boethius.

While in prison, Boethius wrote this his main work, which is without a doubt the most widely read, commented and influential of his works. The work is atypical for the time and is written as a philosophical conversation between Boethius himself and the goddess of Philosophy. Though always a Christian, in this work he is first and foremost a philosopher, which is why there are many allusions to pagan neo-platonism, however during the Middle Ages all passages of this work were very popularly interpreted in accordance with Christianity. Few people have been of so seminal character to Medieval and Renaisance philosophy and religion as Boethius; perhaps only Aristotle himself and Augustine were more influential and important. Few books were so widely read during the Middle Ages as the Consolation of Philosophy, and virtually no book has been as major a source of ancient philosophy in the early Middle Ages and consequently the Renaissance as this one. As well of being of great textbook value this work has inspired and influenced numerous religious, philosophical and literary writers. “For some writers, such as the Middle English poet, Chauser, the “Consolation” seems to have provided a model for writing about serious issues in a way which presupposes no commitment to Christianity, a philosophical precedent for the use of pagan setting in a literary fiction.” (John Marenbon, Medieval Philosophy, 1998, p. 24).

With the death of Boethius came also the end of ancient tradition of philosophy in the Latin West, though through his writings, the influence of this philosophical tradition was preserved during the Middle Ages and through to the Renaissance and early modern times.

Adams: B-2299.
Scarce first translation into French of Giordano Bruno’s seminal “Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast”, being the first part of any of Bruno’s works to be translated into French and presumably the second translation of any of Bruno’s works into any language, only preceded by the equally scarce first translation into English of the same work (1713). “The Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast” constitutes one of Bruno’s main works and that of his works which proved to be most influential throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, profoundly affecting both science, philosophy and religion, as it “turns to social ethics and religious reform, but in a cosmic setting”. (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 301).

Bruno’s world-view as presented in the “Spaccio” cannot but have appealed directly to the French thinkers of the 18th century, when the first part of any of Bruno’s works thus appears in French for the first time. The Enlightenment thinkers of 18th century France must have found much resonance with the extreme and provocative views held by the — until then — overlooked Renaissance thinker, who was burned on the stake due to his non-conformist views. “Magic, pantheism, idolatory, demonolatory, apostasy — just these few outrages from the long list in the “Spaccio” would have been enough to anger the authorities, but there were more besides: Bruno doubted immortality, taught metempsychosis, recommended free-thinking, deserted positive for natural religion, criticized the Bible, defamed the Jews, slandered the Protestants, betrayed the Catholics, and condemned civil government besides.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 302). — Bruno’s thoughts as expressed in the “Spaccio” doe not leave those of a Voltaire far behind.

Bruno’s works, the first editions of which are all of the utmost scarcity, were not reprinted in their time, and new editions of them did not begin appearing until the 19th century. For three centuries his works had been hidden away in libraries, where only few people had access to them. Thus, as important as his teachings were, thinkers of the ages to come were largely reliant on more or less reliable renderings and reproductions of his thoughts. The first translations of his works thus proved to be of seminal importance to the spreading of his ideas.

As Jacobi states in the preface to the second edition of his “Letters on Spinoza...” (1785), “This strange man was born, one knows not in which year, in Nola, in the Kingdom of Naples; and died on February 17th 1600 in Rome on the stake. With great diligence Brucker has been gathering information on him, but in spite of that has only been able to deliver fragments [not in translation]. For a long time his works were, partly neglected due to their obscurity, partly not respected due to the prejudice against the new opinions and thoughts expressed in them, and partly loathed and suppressed due to the dangerous teachings they could contain. On these grounds, the current scarcity of his works is easily understood. Brucker could only get to see the work “De
Minimo”, La Croce only had the book “De Immenso et Innumerabilibus” in front of him, or at least he only provides excerpts from this [also not in translation], as Heumann does only from the “Physical Theorems” [also small fragments, not in translation];” (pp. (VII)-VIII—own translation from the German).

“Bruno’s most representative work, “Spaccio de la bestia trionfante” (The Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast), published in an atmosphere of secrecy in 1584 and never referred to as anything but blasphemous for more than a century, was singled out by the church tribunal at the summation of his final trial. That is hardly surprising because the book is a daring indictment of the corruption of the social and religious institutions of his day. The “triumphant beast” signifies the reign of multifarious vices. Cast in the form of allegorical dialogues, Bruno’s work presents the deliberations of the Greek gods who have assembled to banish from the heavens the constellations that remind them of their evil deeds. The crisis facing Jove, the aging father of the gods, is symbolic of the crisis in a Renaissance world profoundly disturbed by new religious, philosophical, and scientific ideas.” (From Arthur D. Imerti’s 1964 translation of the work into English).

“Bruno, who had already used geometric diagrams and philosophical terms to present an infinite universe, now wrote a dialogue in which he transformed the cosmos by transforming its imagery. He called it “The Triumphant Beast”, a phrase that brought to mind the book of Revelation […] Unlike most of his contemporaries, who
gave the universe about six thousand years of existence since creation, the Nolan philosopher had already proclaimed that it was infinitely old; in “The Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast”, he insists that the universe holds cultures and memories that have come and gone and will come and go again.” (Rowland, pp. 164-65).

Giordano Bruno was born in Nola in Southern Italy in 1548, and entered the Dominical order in Naples at the age of 18. While pursuing theological studies, he also thoroughly studied the ancient philosophers and began doubting some of the teachings of the Catholic Church. When he was in Rome in 1576, these doubts became known to the authorities of his order, and an indictment for heresy was prepared against him. Before he could be arrested, he escaped and began a long journey which took him to many European countries, among these England, where his most important works are published, until in 1592 he was denounced to the Inquisition and arrested. In 1593 he was taken to Rome, imprisoned, and subjected to a 6 year long trial. He firmly refused to recant his philosophical opinions, and in 1600 he was condemned for heresy, sentenced to death, and burned alive.

“Bruno burned for philosophy; he was killed for moral, physical, and metaphysical views that terrified and angered authorities.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 315).

Salvestrini: 112


See also:
STANDARD WORK ON COINAGE—THE FIRST OF ITS KIND

BUDELIUS, R. [RENÉ BUDEL]

De monetis et re numaria libri duo. Quorum primus artem cudendae monetae, secundus vero quaestionum monetariarum decisiones continet.

Coloniae, Ioannem Gymnicum, 1591. 4to. Bound in a contemporary embossed full vellum binding. Spine with a bit of discolouring; marks from a removed paper title-label. Contemporary handwriting to second front free end-paper and to top of title-page. Internally very fine and clean. (76), 798 pp. (As usual with the typopgraphical errors: pp. 139, 234, 267,353, 685, 768 are numbered as 339, 202, 263, 343, 645, 778. These errors are to be found in all published copies. See Einaudi 737).

DKK 20,000.00 / EURO 2,700.00

Scarce first edition of one of the earliest—and most important—works on coinage, dealing with weight and measure, as well as the value and devaluation of money. Apart from the seminal original contribution of Budel, this extensive work contains 29 contributions by earlier philosophers and theologians on the subject,—“a compilation of almost every earlier treatise on the subject”—which, in a true Renaissance spirit, makes it the very first compilation in economic history. ""De Monetis et re numaria" remained the standard work on the subject for almost two centuries". (Nussbaum, A Note on the Idea of World Money).

During the Renaissance, international banking saw a rise, which eventually resulted in a demand for one uniform European coinage. Budelius’ thesis can be read as an ideological response to this demand, as he argued for precisely that: a unified market with one universal coinage. In this sense, his work anticipates by several hundred years many of the economic thoughts presented by the Classical economists during the second half of 18th century.

Budelius discusses the metallic view and the abuse of adulteration and falsification, and then attempts an exposition of how money may be coined in the most practical way. He then goes on to deal with the problem of how a debtor will meet his obligations if the coinage has been debased since the time the debt was contracted or the loan received. He maintaned that the same bullion value must be repaid although the coin may be depreciated—a view that was generally accepted at the time.

The third part of the work consists of a “compilation of almost every earlier treatise on the subject. In nearly all of them, the central problem is the same as the one discussed in the second book of Budelius’ work”. (Mariana ,The political economy of Juan de Mariana).

The general thesis of Budelius’ work is that the trading partners should seek to use only one currency and that the law of coinage and money’s “natural state” (an early reference to how money behave in the market) should be unified. In the period of the Cologne War, Germany had several different currencies and laws in relation to coinage and minting of coins. This not only restrained the domestic trade in Germany, it also lead to armed conflict which again resulted in a more fragmented economy. Budelius’s work can be read as an attempt to unify Germany (and the rest of Europe) under one currency, which also would serve the purpose of stabilizing the highly volatile curriencies during this period: “The widely cited Rene Budel (1591) held it “to be indubitable that a Prince in the midst of costly wars, and therefore in great necessity, can order that money be made out of leather, bark, salt, or any material he wants, if he is careful to repair the loss inflicted thereby on the community with good and better money”. (Cambridge Companion to Economic Thought).
In the sense of unifying Europe under one currency, Budelius separates himself from not only Medieval monetary thinkers, but from his contemporary mercantilists as well: “The medieval literature on money is characterized by nascent nationalism, with the imagery of the body applied to the kingdom, and of money as the blood moving through its parts. Nicole Oresme’s De Moneta pointed out that if money is accumulated in the king’s treasury and withdrawn from circulation, it constitutes an abscess in the body.” (Cambridge Companion to Economic Thought).

His comments represent the synthesis of two traditions, one uncovering the theoretical possibility of fiat money, the other uncovering its practical usefulness, as means of raising revenues in emergencies, from examples taken from history. Budelius cites examples of copper petty coinage in Germany and the Low countries, and gives examples of siege money. From Maastricht in 1579 (copper), Vienna in 1529 (lead), tin in Neuss, and even paper siege money in Leyden in 1574. He then writes: “I hold this to be indubitable, as I recall a little earlier, that a Prince in the midst of costly wars, and therefore in great necessity, can order that money be made out of leather, bark, salt, or any material he wants, if he is careful to repair the loss inflicted thereby on the community with good and better money.” The insights of Budel about token money were to be tested by some experiments in the coming years and were carried further by important theorists in the Renaissance and later.

Budelius (1530—91), was a practitioner, a jurist by training, who worked as diplomat for the archbishop of Cologne, and later as mint-master in Westphalia for the duke of Bavaria. This is reflected in his practical and empirical approach to the economic challenges the Renaissance society was subjected to, unlike the more often seen theoretical and moral approach.

Goldsmith 254; Mattioli 451; Einaudi 737; Adams 3153.
THE GREATEST ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF RENAISSANCE SCIENCE

CARDANUS [CARDANO], HIERONYMUS [GIROLAMO]

*Offenbarung der Natur unnd Natürlicher dingen auch mancherley subtiler würckungen Darinn kunstlich die art und eigenschaft des gantzen umbkreyss der welt, beyde himmelischer und elementischer Spheren angezeigt werden, Auch der Cometen, dess gestirns, metallen, Gesteinen, unnd einfluss würckungen. Mitt sampt den Pfalnzungen… Thiere und Menschen…Feiiwis, künsten unnd handtwercken…etc. etc. Alles durch Heinrich Pantaleon…..zu güten Teütcher nation, ganz fleissig und auff das treüwlichest verteuetscher.*

Basel, (Heinrich Petri, 1559). Folio. Contemporary full richly blindstamped pigskin binding over wooden boards. Elaborately illustrated inner and outer roll-borders to boards, with saints and apostles. Remains of brass clasps to boards. Four raised bands to spine. Lower compartment of spine with a crack in leather, but overall a very good, sturdy, and tight copy in a lovely contemporary German typical Renaissance binding. Title-page with a large woodcut medaillon portrait of the author. Old owner’s inscriptions to title-page (dated 1645). A (mostly very light) dampstain to upper corners and the last ab. 100 leaves also with a small dampstain in outer margin, minor and mainly marginal brownsots. Numerous small woodcuts and line drawings in the text, illustrating astronomy, mechanics, physics, technology, botany, mineralogy, alchemy, etc. (52), 934, (2) pp. (last leaf recto with printer and year – verso with woodcut printer’s device).

**DKK 48,500.00 / EURO 6,000.00**

Scarce first edition thus, being the seminal first German edition of two of Cardanus’ most influential works, under the joint title “Disclosure of Nature and Natural Things…”, constituting the first printing of the first translation into German of any part of Cardanus’ foundational main work “De Subtilitate” (originally published in Latin in 1550), “a rambling miscellany of natural philosophy which eventually grew to twenty-one books and appeared in many reprints and revisions before and after Cardano’s death in 1575” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 308) as well as the first printing of the first German translation of the great sequel to the “De Subtilitate”, namely “De rerum varietate”, (originally published in Latin in 1557), containing the translation of all 17 books in their entirety.

These two works, here presented as en entity for the first time, constitute in their unity the greatest encyclopaedia of Renaissance Science and they greatly influenced scientific thought of the following century. “The two works, written in an elliptical and often obscure Latin, contain a little of everything: from cosmology to the construction of machines; from the usefulness of natural sciences to the evil influence of demons; from the laws of mechanics to cryptoogy. It is a mine of facts, both real and imaginary; of notes of the states of the sciences; of superstition, technology, alchemy, and various branches of the occult. The similarities between the scientific opinions expressed by Cardano in these two works and those of Leonardo da Vinci, at that time unpublished, has led some historians, particularly Pierre Duheim to suppose that Cardano has used Leonardo’s manuscript notes; others insist that the similarity is entirely coincidental. Be that as it may, Cardano must always be credited with having introduced new ideas that inspired new investigations.” (DSB III:66).
It is through his great encyclopaedic endeavors that many of da Vinci’s unpublished ideas are passed on to the likes of Stevin, Galilei and Descartes, but Cardanus not only reported and collected, he himself made important contributions in the fields of mathematics and algebra, mechanics (where he developed and went beyond Leonardo da Vinci’s ideas on the balance and virtual velocities), in chemistry, astronomy, mineralogy, hydrodynamics, etc.

In fact, it seems that there is hardly a scientific field to which Cardanus’ encyclopedic work did not make the most important contributions. As an example, Stillwell lists the “De subtilitate” under no less than three different chapters (Medicine, Natural Science, Physics): “[w]ritten in a popular style and treating a wide range of subjects. Includes a description of a touch-system not unlike Braille, as an aid to the blind, and a suggestion regarding a sign-language for the deaf. According to Garrison, Cardano’s biological concepts tended toward evolution.” (III: 329). “A philosophical discussion of method, tending toward evolution in its biologic concepts. Wightman … speaks of Cardano’s heat as having a “modern” character. The author was a scientist of advanced ideas and varied interests, his writing relating to medicine, physics, natural science, and in particular to mathematics.” (IV:609). “Cardano refers to the electro-magnetic powers of the lodestone, magnetic declination, and electrification by friction. He describes pumps, siphons, the water-screw of Archimedes, and machinery for raising sunken vessels. His concepts regarding heat and various other matters veered towards the modern.” (V:745).

UNITING PLATO AND ARISTOTLE—ATTACKING RAMUS

CHARPENTIER, JACQUES

Platonis cum Aristotele in universa philosophia comparatio. Qua hoc Commentario, in Alcinoi Institutionem ad eiusdem Platonis doctrinam, explicatur (+) Pars posterior Platonicae et Aristotelicae comparisonis in universa Philosophia. Quae de animorum immortalitate, de fato et libero arbitrio disputacionem continet, itemque explicationem eorum, quae ad philosophiam moralem pertinent.


First edition of Charpentier’s famous comparison of Aristotle and Plato—one of the most thorough and important works of its kind—which came to influence the way that the Renaissance viewed the two great thinkers and their works. The work, which is profoundly anti-Ramist and also as such drew great attention, constitutes a fabulous determination of the joint legacy of Aristotle and Plato and is one of the works that best illustrates the nuanced basis of Renaissance scholarship and philosophy.

It is a curious but generally accepted conception that with the rise of the Renaissance came the fall of Aristotle. It is a fact that with the recovery of many lost works of ancient literature, the widening of the range of classical studies and the renewed interest in Plato, Aristotle was no longer the sole authority on a huge number of fields, as he to a certain extent had been viewed during the Middle Ages. That this should mean a total ignorance of the teachings of Aristotle must be considered somewhat of a myth (though a very frequently repeated one), and in fact with the grand humanists of the late 15th and early 16th century, the study of Aristotle fits perfectly with the broader comprehension of scholarship. The idea of nearing the thought of Aristotle to that of Plato and vice-versa is something that understreams much original thought of the Renaissance, and Charpentier’s work, which explicitly and thoroughly compares and reconciles the two great thinkers, gives us a fabulous insight into Renaissance thought, as it is rarely presented.

“It was published at Paris in 1573. Charpentier shows a knowledge of other writers in this tradition, namely Boethius, Bessarion, George Trebizond, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Symphorien Champier, and Fox Morcillo, among others.” (Riccardo Pozzo, “The Impact of Aristotelianism on Modern Philosophy”, p. 20).

Jacques Charpentier (1521–74), Professor of medicine and philosophy, Charles IX’s physician, taught mathematics at the Collège de France and philosophy at the Collège de Bourgogne and was later appointed Rector of the University of Paris. He passionately defended Peripateticism and was renowned for his philosophical and religious intolerance. Despite his remarkable merits he is today perhaps best known for his feud with Petrus Ramus, French humanist and protestant convert with a liberal approach to Aristotelian teaching. In Ramus Charpentier saw the impact of Lorenzo Valla’s criticism or Aristotle: “He thought that with Ramus the true idea of knowledge was in danger of eclipse”, as expressed in the present work. Charpentier is often referred to as a Anti-Ramist due to his many—often fierce and personal—attacks on Ramus’s teaching: “More intellectual provocative were three attacks by Jacques Charpentier. In 1551 as rector of the University Charpentier ruled that because Ramus did not teach the Aristotelian logic required by the statutes, his pupils
could not enjoy the privileges of Paris university students. Rasmus appealed first to the assembly of regents of Philosophy and later to the Parliament of Paris. Before the Parliament Ramus outlined a programme of study in which grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic led first to natural and moral philosophy and later theology or law. He argued that his method of teaching avoided wasting time on scholastic technicalities and produced graduates who were better prepared for practical life. The effectiveness of this speech and the support of his patron helped him to avoid censure and obtain a royal lectureship.” (Mack, A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380—1620, Pp. 153-4).

“by 1565 he was leading opposition to the naming of Jacques Charpentier (no relation), a long-time adversary, to the royal chair of mathematics. Charpentier, who had by then succeeded Ramus as the Cardinal de Lorraine’s protégé and who enjoyed Jesuit support, kept his chair; and Ramus, ever more threatened, in 1567 again fled Paris, taking refuge with the Prince de Condé.” (DSB).
EDITIO PRINCEPS OF DANIELLO’S DANTE-COMMENTARIES

DANTE

Con l’esposizione di M. Bernardino Daniello da Lucca, Sopra la sua Comedia dell’Inferno, del Purgatorio, & del Paradiso; nuouamente stampato; & posto in luce. Con privilegio dell’Illustrissima Signoria di Venetia per anni XX.

Venice, Pietro da Fino, 1568. 4to. Contemporary full vellum binding with five raised bands, gilt title-label and single gilt lines to spine. Binding a bit soiled and with wear to corners, capitals, and raised bands. Inner hinges a bit weak. Woodcut printer’s device to title-page, lovely woodcut initials throughout, large woodcut printer’s device to verso of final leaf, and three full-page engravings depicting Inferno, Purgatorio, and Paradise. A bit of light soiling and brownsplotting, but overall a very nice and clean copy. Neat old owner’s signature to title-page and one page with extensive early hand-written notes to lower margin. (12), 717, (1) pp.

DKK 32,000.00 / EURO 4,300.00
Scarce first edition thus, being the first (and until 1989 only) edition with the important and influential commentaries by Bernardino Daniello, one of the most important Dante-commentators of the Renaissance.

The work is rare and much sought after both due to the excellent commentaries of Daniello and the beautifully executed printing of the work.

Bernardino Daniello da Lucca (ca. 1500—1565) was a famous Renaissance-commentator, who contributed decisively to the reception of several important classic and Medieval texts. Not only do his Dante-commentaries constitute the best and most important of his own works, they are also considered among the most important Dante-commentaries of the Renaissance overall. It is not until recently that the full scope of Daniello’s importance to the Dante-commentary-tradition has been understood, but with the new 1989-edition of the present work, the extent of his influence on the Dante-reception has properly come to light. “While there are a number of late 19th- and early 20th-century editions of Dante’s Trecento and Quattrocento commentaries, the Renaissance commentaries have generally only been available in a few rare book collections. Until now, of the four major Renaissance commentators, only Castelvetro’s 1579 work was available in a more recent edition.” (Deborah Parker, “Bernardino Daniello and the Commentary Tradition”, in: Dante Studies, No. 106, 1988).

Even if Daniello’s Dante-commentaries primarily relate those of his teacher, the highly esteemed Renaissance scholar Trifon Gabriele, there is no doubt as to the importance of these commentaries, be they plagiarized or not. Gabriele’s commentaries and his Dante-teachings have never been published (and are only extant in manuscript-version), and his foundational thoughts on Dante are thus only available through the present edition of Dante, with Daniello’s frequently repeated, quoted, and highly esteemed commentaries.


Adams D:104, Brunet II:504, Graesse II:930.
THE FIRST EUCLID TO BE PRINTED OUTSIDE OF ITALY

EUCLID (EUKLID) OF ALEXANDRIA

Euclidis Megarensis Geometricorum elementorum libri XV. Campani Galli transalpinia in eodem commentariorum libri XV. Theonis Alexandrini...Zamberto interprete...commentariorum libri XIII. Hypsiclis Alexandrini in duos posteriores...Zamberto ...interprete, commentariorum libri II.

Paris, Henrici Stephani (Henri Estienne), (1516). Folio. (30x21 cm.). Bound in a fine recent full vellum. 262 leaves (last leaf I 11, blank). 8 leaves misnumbered. Numerous fine initials in various sizes throughout, numerous diagrams arranged in the broad outer margins. Title-page having the printer’s name crossed out in old ink, leaving a small hole in paper. An ink-spot on title-page. A few small worm-tracts on the first 7 leaves and in inner margins on a few leaves at the end. A tear to one corner repaired. A few marginal repairs. The first 6 books extensively annotated in the margins in a contemporary hand (in Latin), comments and references, and sometimes proposing other ways of representing the problem, sometimes calculations added. In general fine and clean and printed on good, strong paper.

DKK 85,000.00 / EURO 11,400.00
The scarce first edition thus, being the most important edition of the text before the appearance of the Greek editio princeps (1533). The present edition is the first Euclid-edition printed in France, the first printed outside of Italy and the first to contain both Campanus’s and Zamberti’s translations. It was edited by the famous founder of the French humanistic School, Jacques Lefèvre (Jakob Faber Stagulensis), who, in this edition, solved many of the editorial problems of the previously printed editions.

This beautifully printed edition, with the diagrams presented in the margins of the text, became the standard for many following editions.

The work also comprises the proofs of Theon of Alexandria. During the Middle Ages it was thought that the proofs were made by Theon alone and that Euclid himself only formulated the propositions. “The most notable of Theon’s editions is that of Euclid’s “Elements”, which was so influential that it consigned the original text to near oblivion.” (D.S.B. XIII:322).

“The most famous source of Greek geometry is the monumental work of Euclid of Alexandria, called the “Elements” (around 300 B.C). No other book of science had a comparable influence on the intellectual development of mankind. It was a treatise of geometry in thirteen books which included all the fundamental results of scientific geometry up to his time. Euclid did not claim for himself any particular discovery, he was merely a compiler. Yet, in view of the systematic arrangement of the subject matter and the exact logical procedure followed, we cannot doubt that he himself provided a large body of specific formulations and specific auxiliary theorems in his deductions. It is no longer possible to pass judgment on the authorship of much of this material; his book was meant as a textbook of geometry which paid attention to the material, while questions of priority did not enter the discussion.” (Cornelius Lanczos in “Space through the Ages”).
EDITION PRINCEPS OF THE ELEMENTS OF EUCLID &
PROCLUS’ COMMENTARY

EUCLID OF ALEXANDRIA. — PROCLUS — PROKLOS

STOICHEION BIBL. IE’ EK TON THEONOS SYNOUSION. Eis tou autou to proton,
exegematon Proklou bibl. d. (Greek). (Elementa geometriae).

Basel, Johannes Herwegen, 1533. Folio. (323x220 cm). Cont. full blind-tooled calf with a broad
border of ornamental rolls with corner-pieces, inside which an oblique blind-tooled parallelogram
and a rectangular tooled decoration, also with corner-pieces. Professionally rebacked in old style,
w. seven raised bands blindstamped ornamentations to all compartments. Corners professionally
and neatly restored. (12), 268; 115, (1) pp. incl. last page with large woodcut printer’s device.
Numerous woodcut diagrams in the text. The last page of Grynaeus’ foreword with a half-page
note on Euclid, Proclus and Grynaeus in 18th century hand. One contemporary marginal note. First
3 leaves with faint finger-soiling to lower right corner. The text framed throughout by a decorative
but faint ink-border. Verso of title-page with 2 small stamps. Title with woodcut printer’s device.
The first text-page framed with a broad woodcut border, many smaller and larger woodcut initials
throughout. Internally a very fine and clean copy w. wide margins.

DKK 285,000.00 / EURO 38,200.00

The monumental editio princeps of the “Elements” of Euclid, “the greatest mathematical textbook of all times”,
being the first printing of the original Greek text, including the first printing of Proclus’ seminal commentary to
the first book (the so-called “Herwagiana”). The present editio princeps constitutes one of the most important
publications in the history of scientific (and philosophical) thought, and it profoundly influenced Renaissance,
and in turn all modern, thought. The first printing of the original Greek text of the “Elements”, which is edited
by the famous Basel-professor of Greek Simon Gryneaus the elder, served as the basis for all later texts and
translations of the “Elements” until the nineteenth century. Proclus’ seminal commentary to the first book,
which had never been printed before, is considered the earliest contribution to the philosophy of mathematics
and “one of the most valuable documents in ancient philosophy” (Morrow, p. XXXII). It profoundly influenced
Renaissance and modern readings of Euclid’s Elements and is responsible for the role that this magnum opus
came to play during the Renaissance.

It is not until Proclus (ca. 410—485), the great Neoplatonist, applies Plato’s manner of thinking to Greek
geometry that it achieves completion as a real system. His view of mathematics as part of a larger system of
thought was perfectly in tune with the currents of Renaissance thought, and with the commentary of Proclus,
the Renaissance student of Euclid was carried beyond the ostensible boundaries of mathematics into the paths
of cosmological and metaphysical speculation, paving the way for these fields in modern thought.

But Proclus’ commentary is not only of seminal importance to the antique and Renaissance interpretation of
the work, it also provides us with invaluable information regarding geometers and the history of geometry
prior to Euclid. “Its numerous references to the views of Euclid’s predecessors, many of them otherwise
unknown to us, render it an invaluable source for the history of science.” (DSB, pp. 160—61). “These numerous
and sometimes very extended references to opinions and accomplishments of his predecessors, taken together
with the material rescued from Eudemus’s early history of geometry, make Proclus’ “Commentary” a priceless
source of information regarding the geometry of the previous nine or ten centuries.” (Morrow. p. XXVIII).
Yet the value of the matter it contains regarding the foundations of mathematics and geometry in particular is even greater, though less widely recognized." (Morrow, p. XXXII).

Proclus here explains the meaning of "Element" in geometry, he states the theoretical and pedagogical purposes of an elementary treatise, and offers a striking evaluation of the excellence of Euclid’s own work. Furthermore, he famously defends pure mathematics, and geometry in particular, against its critics, and includes an important interpretation of the attitude of Plato, who was often used by these critics, against mathematics. Proclus furthermore raises questions that are absolutely fundamental to the understanding of both Plato and the science of Euclid, namely what the nature of the objects of mathematic enquiry is, and what the validity of the procedures used to handling them are. Posing these absolutely fundamental problems for the first time makes Proclus the first real philosopher of mathematics. “Proclus’ treatise is the only systematic treatise that has come down to us from antiquity dealing with these questions”. (Marrow, p. XXXIII).

Proclus’ commentary, which takes up the second part of the book, pp. 1 – 115, is also known as the “Herwagiana”, named after the printer. Apart from the above-mentioned elements of the commentary, it also constitutes the first criticism of Euclid to question the “Parallel-axiom”,—hereby paving the road to “NON-EUCLIDEAN GEOMETRY”. Proclus was the first commentator to be very explicit about his objection to the Parallel axiom, as he refused to count it among the postulates. To justify his opinion he remarks that the converse (the sum of two angles is less than that of two right angles), is one of the theorems proved by Euclid (Book I. Prop. 17), and he thinks it impossible that a theorem, the converse of which can be proved, is not itself capable of proof. He says: “This (postulate) ought even to be struck out of the postulates altogether; for it is a theorem involving many difficulties, which Ptolemy, in a certain book, set himself to solve, and it requires for the demonstration of it a number of definitions as well as theorems, and the converse of it is actually proved by
Euclid himself as a theorem.”—Proclus’ proof, taking up another axiom, was essentially correct, but he substituted one questionable axiom for another. (Se Bonola: Non-Euclidean Geometry).

It goes without saying that Euclid’s treatise itself, the “Elements” also directly influenced all scientific thought ever since its appearance. The exemplary role of geometry after Euclid enjoyed uncontested supremacy for centuries, until the discovery of non-Euclidean geometry introduced entirely new questions for mathematical thought and forced it to a new interpretation of its own logical structure.

“There are few books that have played a larger part in the thought and education of the Western world than Euclid’s “Elements”. For more than twenty centuries it has been used as an introduction to geometry, and only within the last hundred years has it begun to be supplemented, or supplanted, by more modern textbooks. “This wonderful book”, writes Sir Thomas Heath, “with all its imperfections, which indeed are slight enough when account is taken of the date at which it appeared, is and will doubtless remain the greatest mathematical textbook of all times. Scarcely any other book except the Bible can have been circulated more widely the world over, or been more edited and studied”.” (Morrow, pp. XXI-XXII).

“The most famous source of Greek geometry is the monumental work of Euclid of Alexandria, called the “Elements” (around 300 B.C.). No other book of science had a comparable influence on the intellectual development of mankind. It was a treatise of geometry in thirteen books which included all the fundamental results of scientific geometry up to his time. Euclid did not claim for himself any particular discovery, he was merely a compiler. Yet, in view of the systematic arrangement of the subject matter and the exact logical procedure followed, we cannot doubt that he himself provided a large body of specific formulations and specific auxiliary theorems in his deductions. It is no longer possible to pass judgment on the authorship of much of this material; his book was meant as a textbook of geometry which paid attention to the material, while questions of priority did not enter the discussion” (Cornelius Lanczos in “Space through the Ages”).

THE RAREST AND MOST IMPORTANT EDITION OF THE SYPHILIS-POEM

FRACASTORIUS, HIERONYMUS [GIROLAMO FRACASTORO OF VERONA]

Syphilis, sive morbus gallicus.

Roma, Apud Antonium Bladum Asulanum (on colophon), 1531, mense Septembri. 4to. Sown, uncut and unbound. Title-page and a few other leaves with a bit of minor brownsplotting; overall a very nice and well-preserved copy of this beautifully printed, extremely scarce work. Two quires with loose leaves. Floriated large initial at beginning. [32] ff. (being title-page, 29 ff. text, 1 f. errata, 1 f. blank).

DKK 65,000.00 / EURO 8,700.00

The exceedingly scarce second edition (the “Rome text”) of “[t]he most famous of all medical poems” (Garrison & Morton), the poem which gave to the disease syphilis its name, being the most important edition of the work, the first complete edition (with the two lines of the first book printed for the first time — not found in any other contemporary editions of the work), the only authoritative version of the text to appear contemproarily, and by far the rarest edition — with only four known copies at the time of the official bibliography (Baumgartner and Fulton, 1935) (whereas the first edition from the year before, 1530, was known in 30 copies) — our copy also with the final blank leaf (H4), “not preserved in any copy examined” (Baumgartner & Fulton, p. 38).

“The edition published at Rome (no. 2) in the following year is a finer piece of printing, AND IT IS EVIDENTLY A MUCH RARER WORK SINCE ONLY FOUR COPIES HAVE BEEN TRACED, WHILE AT LEAST 30 COPIES OF THE VERONA EDITION (i.e. the first edition) ARE KNOWN.” (Baumgartner & Fulton, p. 37).

Apart from the work itself being of the greatest impact on the history of medicine, giving to Syphilis its name and epitomizing contemporary knowledge of the illness, and the author being one of the most renowned physicians of the Renaissance, being compared in scope and excellence to Leonardo da Vinci, the present work in the present second edition has yet another feature, apart from its utmost scarcity, which contributes to its excellence; it is printed by the excellent Italian printer Antonio Blado, whose works are scarce and very sought after.

“Textually, as well as typographically, this is the most important edition of Fracastoro’s poem, since, unlike those which follow, it bears evidence of having been supervised by Fracastoro himself, the two lines which had been omitted from Bk. I of the Verona edition being here included (verses 1 and 2 on leaf C2b) in exactly the form in which they were written on the vellum copy of the 1530 edition mentioned above (see end of note)... Among his other achievements in typography Antonio Blado can claim the distinction of having issued the most beautiful edition of Fracastoro’s poem of any of the sixteenth century. The format is larger than that of the Verona edition and the fount of large italic type seems particularly well suited to Fracastoro’s even lined verses. As with the other editions of this period the capitals are in Roman throughout; the ornamental capital (Q) at the beginning of Bk. I is particularly well executed. Bks II and II have spaces at the beginning for an illuminated initial.

THE BOOKS OF ANTONIO BLADO ARE APPARENTLY AS RARE AS THEY ARE EXCELLENT, AND THEY HAVE LONG BEEN SOUGHT AFTER BY ITALIAN COLLECTORS. Blado was born in 1490 at Asloa in northern Italy. In 1515 Blado settled in Rome where he remained until his death in 1567. He was a bold and original printer, who, as Fumagelli points out, almost invariably undertook new things, never reprinting
classics, and only occasionally, as in the case of Fracastoro’s poem, reprinting the work of a contemporary. In 1532 he issued the first edition of Machiavelli’s “Il Principe”, and in 1549 he became official printer to the Papal See…” (Baumgartner & Fulton, p. 39).

“Girolamo Fracastoro (1484—1553), a Veronese of thick-set, hirsute appearance and jovial mien, who practiced in the Lago di Garda region, was at once a physician, poet, physicist, geologist, astronomer, and pathologist, and shares with Leonardo da Vinci the honour of being the first geologist to see fossil remains in the true light (1530). He was also the first scientist to refer to the magnetic poles of the earth (1543). His medical fame rests upon that most celebrated of medical poems, “Syphilis sive Moribus Gallicus (Venice, 1530), which sums up the contemporary dietetic and therapeutic knowledge of the time, recognizes a venereal cause, and gave the disease its present name…” (Garrison, History of Medicine, p. 233).

The magnificent medical poem is about the main character, a young shepherd called “Syphilis”, who induces the people to forsake the Sun God, who in return bestows upon man a new, horrible plague, which Fracastorius names after the shepherd. “It epitomized contemporary knowledge of syphilis, gave to it its present name, and recognized a venereal cause. Fracastorius refers to mercury as a remedy.” (Garrison and Morton).

The work must be described as seminal, and its great influence and importance has continued throughout centuries. As stated in the bibliography by Baumgartner and Fulton, which is devoted exclusively to the poem, “[t]he full extent of the influence exerted by a work which has received such wide recognition cannot be adequately estimated without searching bibliographical analysis”, and thus they have traced 100 editions of
Fracastoro’s Syphilis-poem, including translations into six languages. 18 of these appeared in the 16th century, but it is curious to see, how the work continues to resurface up until the 20th century. Almost 200 years after the work originally appeared, Italy witnessed a great revival of Fracastoro and his poem, and the first Italian translation appeared in 1731, with a preface by the great Enlightenment philosopher Giambattista Vico, and by 1739 five Italian editions had appeared. Another revival of the work took place as late as the 20th century, with four new English translations appearing between 1928 and 1935.

“Le poème de Fracastor sur la Syphilis restera toujours un chef-d’oeuvre, parce que le pinceau est large, l’imagination hardie, la versification harmonieuse, et que le poète agrandit son sujet ingrat en remontant aux cases celestas, en montant la main des Dieux s’appersantissant pour punir la terre; la fiction, surtout, qu’il a imagine pour retrace la découverte du mercure, est un tableau digne des plus grands maîtres.” Achille Chéreau, Le Parnasse medical francais, 1874, p. xv).

Baumgartner & Fulton, A Bibliography of the Poem of Syphilis sive Moribus Gallicus by Girolamo Fracastoro of Verona: no. 2 (our copy follows exactly the collation given here—and also has the final blank leaf mentioned but not found in any of the examined copies).

Garrison and Morton: 2364.

“There is every reason to believe that the first edition of 1530 was personally supervised by Fracastoro as it was passing through the press. The printer, however, omitted two verses in the first book, which have been inserted in manuscript, apparently by Fracastoro himself, in the copy on vellum now preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale. As these two lines are included in the Rome edition of the following year, it is likely that Fracastoro also supervised this, the second edition, and that this should be regarded as the authoritative text, since there is no evidence of textual changes in seven subsequent editions during his life.”
A MAIN WORK OF LINGUISTICS – THE FIRST GREEK WORK PRINTED IN HAGUENAU

HESYCHIOS [HESYCHIUS ALEXANDRINUS].

Lexicon (in Greek). Hesychii Dictionarium.

(On colophon-leaf:) Haguenau, in aedibus Thomae Badensis, 1521). Small folio. Beautiful full calf binding over wooden boards. Recently rebacked. Beautiful blindstamped ornamental borders to boards and remains of clasps, ties missing. A few smaller wormholes to boards, and two drilled holes of ab. the same size to lower part of front board (for a chain?). Ornamented incunable-leaves with red and blue initials used as pasted-down end-papers. Front free end-paper soiled, with neat 19th century inscription (stating editions of the work), and with a beautiful large, engraved armorial book-plate (Collection of Bryan Hall). First leaf with a larger damp-spot to lower part (not affecting any text). Otherwise a very nice copy with only some minor light marginal soiling, a small dampstain to lower inner corner of last ab. 8 leaves, far from affecting text, and a bit of light spotting to a few leaves towards the end. Beautiful large woodcut printer’s device to last leaf. (1 f., 776 columns (i.e. 388 pp/ 194 ff.), (1—colophon) f.

DKK 48,000.00 / EURO 6,500.00

The rare 3rd edition of Hesychios’ extremely important Greek dictionary, one of the most important works of philology and linguistics ever printed, this edition constituting the first Greek work to be printed in the famous Renaissance printing-city of Haguenau/Haguenau (in Alsace).

The first edition of the work was printed by Aldus in Venice in 1514, and in 1520 a re-impression appeared. The present third edition, edited by Marcus Musurus and printed after the edition of 1514 of Aldus Manutius, constitutes the second re-impression of the work, but it is the first to be printed in Haguenau and the first by the notable printer Thomas Anshelm, who had settled in Haguenau in 1516, being the first to seriously rival Henry Gran here. Anshelm is regarded as one of the most important printers of what we now call the Humanist period of the Renaissance. All three editions are rare and important.

Hesychios of Alexandria was a highly important grammarian and lexicographer, whose only surviving work is the present lexicon of unusual and obscure Greek words, the richest of its kind ever. It is assumed that the work was executed by Hesychios during the 5th century. The work is extraordinary in that it constitutes a huge and unique listing of peculiar Greek words and phrases, with explanations and often references to the originator or place of origin. As such, the work is of the greatest value to the both the student of Greek dialects as well as for the ongoing work of restoring the texts of classical authors, for which the present lexicon still an indispensable tool. But Hesychios’ work is not only of the utmost importance to Greek philology, it is also a main work in the study of lost languages and obscure non-Greek dialects (e.g. Thracian and ancient Macedonian). Furthermore, the work was instrumental in the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European, one of the most, if not THE most, important philological tasks ever. Only in the late 18th century did Jones determine the connection between the Indo-European languages, thereby founding comparative philology.

Only a very corrupt manuscript, from the 15th century, of the work survives, and it is this manuscript that Marcus Musurus used as the basis for the first printing of the work by Aldus in 1514. As stated, two re-impressions (with modest corrections) appeared of this Aldus-edition (ours being the second), and since then no complete comparative edition of the manuscript has been published, bestowing on these three scarce early editions a huge importance.
A modern edition of the seminal work has, however, been in intermittent publication since 1953. The editor of the last volume states the following about Hesychios’ Lexicon:

“Hesychius of Alexandria lived in the fifth century A.D. and compiled a dictionary of unusual or difficult Greek words with explanations in Greek. Approximately 51,000 entries make it the richest surviving Greek lexicon compiled until the invention of printing. It is of great importance to Ancient Greek studies because it contains countless words and expressions from poetry, administration, medicine, and so on, that are otherwise unknown or insufficiently explained. In particular, numerous words from the Greek dialects are important, not only for Greek but also for Indo-European philology.

The Lexicon suffered substantial alterations, including abridgements and additions on its way from the author to the only surviving manuscript (fifteenth century). The production of an edition that gives all important information about the manuscript and the work of earlier scholars, as well as meeting modern requirements for the noting of parallels in other lexicographical works, is a slow and difficult task. Marcus Musurus published the first edition in 1514 (reprinted in 1520 and 1521 with modest revisions). There have since been many plans for an edition, but only four were started. Of the four editors, only one, M. Schmidt, lived long enough to finish the work himself. His edition (1858—68) is now completely out of date. A new edition was one of the most urgent requirements in Greek studies already when the German scholar KURT LATTE began preliminary work in the 1920s for the Danish Academy’s Commission for Corpus Lexicographorum Graecorum. The project was severely hampered by the events of 1933-45. Volumes 1-2 were published in 1953 and (posthumously) 1966.” (Peter Allan Hansen, Editor of the final part of the great ongoing project of the new printing of the Hesychius-Lexicon)

“Hesychius, (flourished 5th century ad), author of the most important Greek lexicon known from antiquity, valued as a basic authority for the dialects and vocabularies of ancient inscriptions, poetic text, and the Greek Church Fathers.” (British Encycl.).

Though not of particular fame or importance today, the small city of Haguenau played a dominating role in the late 15th and the first half of the 16th century, then being one of the most important centres of printing. During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries a remarkably large number of books were issued from presses in this small town, located close to Strasbourg. Thomas Anshelm (fl. 1488—1522) is considered perhaps the most eminent of the early Hagenua printers. He established himself as a printer in Basle in 1485 but subsequently worked as a printer in Strasbourg (1488), Pforzheim (1500—1511), Tübingen (1511—1516), and finally Hagenu (1516—1522), having by then developed his printing technique to perfection.

Graesse III:266.
GIOVIO’S FIRST WORK

IOVIUS, PAULUS—PAOLO GIOVIO—JOVIO

De Romanis Piscibus libellus ad Ludovicum Borbonium Cardinalem amplissimum.

Basiliae (Basel), Froben, August 1531. Small 8vo. Very nice later (ab. 1700) full brown morocco, probably Italian, with gilt borders to boards, back richly gilt. Old library-label to lower back, scratch to front-board, white chalk-like staining to back-board. Internally a bit of brownsputting, but overall good condition. Contemporary marginal notes to three pp. Woodcut printer’s device to t-p. and last leaf, a few woodcut initials. 144, (6) pp., 1 f. w. printer’s device. With the ex-libris of Jeffrey Norton.

DKK 30,000.00 / EURO 4,000.00
Very rare Froben-edition of the first work by the Renaissance-historian Paolo Giovio. All early editions of this work are very rare.

Giovio was a gifted philosopher, medic and historian. He was born in 1483 in Come (Lombard) and was as controversial a person as he was an author. He died in 1552 in Florence, and this particular edition is thus printed in his lifetime. Three other editions appeared in his lifetime, all printed in Rome, in 1524, 1527, 1528, but the 1531-edition is the only one by as prominent a printer as Froben.

Giovio was very strategic and succeeded in connecting himself with the Medici-family, especially Giulio Medici, who was later elected Pope (Clement VIII); when he became Pope, Giovio was assigned chambers in the Vatican and in 1528 he was announced Bishop of Nocera. Giovio wrote historical and biographical works and essays; these works are said not to be taken as authorities, but in their entirety and with proper reservation they do have real value, especially because he gives a rich and lively picture of Italy in his own time. He gives indispensable accounts of the manners and lives of the people of Renaissance Italy. As a writer and clergy he played quite a big role in Renaissance Italy.

This his first work is a rarity and plays a special part in his body of writing, as it is neither historical nor biographical. It deals with the types of fish that Romans eat and tells how to prepare them, it is thus of great importance to anyone interested in the lives and customs of the time, and it is sometimes counted among the earliest of cook books. It also provides names of the fish and details of where they can be found, and where the best of each species is most easily found, making it of real value to the ichthyologist; this work is also said to contain the first reference in history to American fish.

The work was translated into Italian in 1560, eight years after the death of Giovio.

THE FIRST EVER TRANSLATION OF BRUNO’S “DE UNO ET CAUSA”...

[JACOBI, FRIEDRICH HEINRICH]. & BRUNO, MENDELSSOHN, ETC.


Breslau, Gottl. Löwe, 1789, 8vo. Very beautiful contemporary red full calf binding with five raised bands and gilt green leather title-label to richly gilt spine. elaborate gilt borders to boards, inside which a “frame” made up of gilt dots, with giltcorner-ornamentations. Edges of boards gilt and inner gilt dentelles. All edges gilt. Minor light brownsotting. Marginal staining to the last leaves. Engraved frontispiece-portrait of Spinoza, engraved title-vignette (double-portrait, of Lessing and Mendelssohn), engraved end-vignette (portrait of Jacobi). Frontispiece, title-page, LI, (1, -errata), 440 pp. Magnificent copy.

DKK 35,000.00 / EURO 4,700.00

First edition thus, being the seminal second edition, the “neue vermehrte Auflage” (new and expanded edition), which has the hugely important 180 pp. of “Beylage” for the first time, which include the first translation into any language of any part of Giordano Bruno’s “de Uno et Causa...” (pp. 261-306) as well as several other pieces of great importance to the “Pantheismusstreit” and to the interpretation of the philosophy of Spinoza and Leibniz, here for the first time in print.

The present translation of Bruno seems to be the earliest translation of any of Bruno’s works into German, and one of the earliest translations of Bruno at all – as far as we can establish, the second, only preceded by an 18th century translation into English of “Spaccio della bestia trionfante. It is with the present edition of Jacobi’s work that the interest in Bruno is founded and with which Bruno is properly introduced to the modern world. Jacobi not only provides what is supposedly the second earliest translation of any of Bruno’s works ever to appear, he also establishes the great influence that Bruno had on two of our greatest thinkers, Spinoza and Leibniz. It is now generally accepted that Spinoza founds his ethical thought upon Bruno and that Lebnitz has taken his concept of the “Monads” from him. It is Jacobi who, with the second edition of his “Letters on Spinoza...”, for the first time ever puts Bruno where he belongs and establishes his position as one of the key figures of modern philosophy and thought.

Bruno’s works, the first editions of which are all of the utmost scarcity, were not reprinted in their time, and new editions of them did not begin appearing until the 19th century. For three centuries his works had been hidden away in libraries, where only few people had access to them. Thus, as important as his teachings were, thinkers of the ages to come were largely reliant on more or less reliable renderings and reproductions of his thoughts. As Jacobi states in the preface to the second edition of his “Letters on Spinoza...”, “There appears in this new edition, under the title of Appendices (“Beylage”), different essays, of which I will here first give an account. The first Appendix is an excerpt from the extremely rare book “De la causa, principio, et Uno”, by Jordan Bruno. This strange man was born, one knows not in which year, in Nola, in the Kingdom of Naples; and died on February 17th 1600 in Rome on the stake. With great diligence Brucker has been gathering information on him, but in spite of that has only been able to deliver fragments [not in translation]. For a long time his works were, partly neglected due to their obscurity, partly not respected due to the prejudice against the new opinions and thoughts expressed in them, and partly loathed and suppressed due to the dangerous teachings they could contain. On these grounds, the current scarcity of his works is easily understood. Brucker could only get to see the work “De Minimo”, La Croce only had the book “De Immenso et Innumerabilibus” in front
of him, or at least he only provides excerpts from this [also not in translation], as Heumann does only from
the “Physical Theorems” [also small fragments, not in translation]; also Bayle had, of Bruno’s metaphysical
works, himself also merely read this work, of which I here provide an excerpt.” (Vorrede, pp. (VII)-VIII—own
translation from the German).

Jacobi continues by stating that although everyone complains about the obscurity of Bruno’s teachings and
thoughts, some of the greatest thinkers, such as Gassendi, Descartes, “and our own Leibnitz” (p. IX) have taken
important parts of their theorems and teachings from him. “I will not discuss this further, and will merely state
as to the great obscurity (“grossen Dunkelheit”) of which people accuse Bruno, that I have found this in neither
his book “de la Causa” nor in “De l’Infinito Universo et Mondi”, of which I will speak implicitly on another
occasion. As to the first book, my readers will be able to judge for themselves from the sample (“Probe”) that I
here present. My excerpt can have become a bit more comprehensible due to the fact that I have only presented
the System of Bruno himself, the “Philosophia Nolana” which he himself calls it, in its continuity… My main
purpose with this excerpt is, by uniting Bruno with Spinoza, at the same time to show and explain the “Summa
of Philosophy” (“Summa der Philosophie”) of “En kai Pan” [in Greek characters—meaning “One and All”].
… It is very difficult to outline “Pantheism” in its broader sense more purely and more beautifully than Bruno
has done.” (Vorrede pp. IX-XI—own translation from the German).

So not only does Jacobi here provide this groundbreaking piece of Bruno’s philosophy in the first translation
ever, and not only does he provide one of the most important interpretations of Spinoza’s philosophy and
establishes the importance of Bruno to much of modern thought, he also presents Bruno as the primary
exponent of “pantheism”, thereby using Bruno to change the trajectory of modern thought and influencing all
philosophy of the decades to come. After the second edition of Jacobi’s “Ueber die Lehre des Spinoza”, no self-
respecting thinker could neglect the teachings of Bruno; he could no longer be written off as having “obscure”
and insignificant teachings, and one could no longer read Spinoza nor Leibnitz without thinking of Bruno. It
is with this edition that the world rediscovers Bruno, never to forget him again.

WITH THE FIRST EDITION OF “UEBER DIE LEHRE DES SPINOZA” (1785), JACOBI BEGINS THE FAMOUS
“PATHEISMUSSTREIT”, which focused attention on the apparent conflict between human freedom and any
systematic, philosophical interpretation of reality.
In 1780, Jacobi (1743—1819), famous for coining the term nihilism, advocating “belief” and “revelation” instead of speculative reason, thereby anticipating much of present-day literature, and for his critique of the Sturm-und-Drang-era, had a conversation with Lessing, in which Lessing stated that the only true philosophy was Spinozism. This led Jacobi to a protracted and serious study of Spinoza’s works. After Lessing’s death, in 1783 Jacobi began a lengthy letter-correspondende with Mendelssohn, a close friend of Lessing, on the philosophy of Spinoza. These letters, with commentaries by Jacobi, are what constitute the first edition of “Ueber die lehre des Spinoza”, as well as the first part of the second edition. The second edition is of much greater importance, however, due to greatly influential Appendices. The work caused great furor and the enmity of the Enlightenment thinkers. Jacobi was ridiculed by his contemporaries for attempting to reintroduce into philosophy belief instead of reason, was seen as an enemy of reason and Enlightenment, as a pietist, and as a Jesuit.

But the publication of the work not only caused great furor in wider philosophical circles, there was also a personal side to the scandal which has made it one of the most debated books of the period:

“Mendelssohn enjoyed, as noted at the outset, a lifelong friendship with G. E. Lessing... Along with Mendelssohn, Lessing embraced the idea of a purely rational religion and would endorse Mendelssohn’s declaration: “My religion recognizes no obligation to resolve doubt other than through rational means; and it commands no mere faith in eternal truths” (Gesammelte Schriften, Volume 3/2, p. 205). To pietists of the day, such declarations were scandalous subterfuges of an Enlightenment project of assimilating religion to natural reason... While Mendelssohn skillfully avoided that confrontation, he found himself reluctantly unable to remain silent when, after Lessing’s death, F. H. Jacobi contended that Lessing embraced Spinoza’s pantheism and thus exemplified the Enlightenment’s supposedly inevitable descent into irreligion.

Following private correspondence with Jacobi on the issue and an extended period when Jacobi (in personal straits at the time) did not respond to his objections, Mendelssohn attempted to set the record straight about Lessing’s Spinozism in “Morning Hours”. Learning of Mendelssohn’s plans incensed Jacobi who expected to be consulted first and who accordingly responded by publishing, without Mendelssohn’s consent, their correspondence—“On the Teaching of Spinoza in Letters to Mr. Moses Mendelssohn”—a month before the publication of “Morning Hours”. Distressed on personal as well as intellectual levels by the controversy over his departed friend’s pantheism, Mendelssohn countered with a hastily composed piece, “To the Friends of Lessing: an Appendix to Mr. Jacobi’s Correspondence on the Teaching of Spinoza”. According to legend, so anxious was Mendelssohn to get the manuscript to the publisher that, forgetting his overcoat on a bitterly cold New Year’s eve, he delivered the manuscript on foot to the publisher. That night he came down with a cold from which he died four days later, prompting his friends to charge Jacobi with responsibility for Mendelssohn’s death.

The sensationalist character of the controversy should not obscure the substance and importance of Mendelssohn’s debate with Jacobi. Jacobi had contended that Spinozism is the only consistent position for a metaphysics based upon reason alone and that the only solution to this metaphysics so detrimental to religion and morality is a leap of faith, that salto mortale that poor Lessing famously refused to make. Mendelssohn counters Jacobi’s first contention by attempting to demonstrate the metaphysical inconsistency of Spinozism. He takes aim at Jacobi’s second contention by demonstrating how the “purified Spinozism” or “refined pantheism” embraced by Lessing is, in the end, only nominally different from theism and thus a threat neither to religion nor to morality.” (SEP).

THE CULMINATION OF LULLISM

ULL, RAIMUNDUS & ALBERTUS MAGNUS

De secretis naturae sive Quinta essentia libri duo. His accesserunt Alberti Magni Summi philosophi, De mineralibus & rebus metallicis Libri quinque. Quae omnia solerti cura repurgata rerum naturae studiosis recens publicata sunt per M. Gualtherum H. Ryff, Argentinensem. Medicum.

(Argentorati (Strassbourg) apud Balthassarum Beck), 1541. Small 8vo. Contemporary full calf binding with brass clasps. Professionally and neatly re-backed. Title-page a bit soiled and three very small holes to first leaf of text, otherwise internally very nice, clean and fresh. Early 20th century book-plate to front free end-paper (depicting Aristotle and Plato and with Greek writing). One full-page and 7 half-page woodcut illustrations in the text. (4), 183, (4—Index) ff.

DKK 78,000.00 / EURO 10,500.00

The very rare first edition edition thus, being the first edition edited by the celebrated Strasbourg physician Walter Hermann Ryff (reprinted in Venice in 1542). The book contains two works: Lull’s “De secretis naturae” and Albert the Great’s “De mineralibus & rebus metallicus”, which is among the authentic writings of the author; both works are of the utmost importance and greatly influenced Renaissance philosophy and science: Lull invented an “art of finding truth” (often in Lullism referred to as “The Art”), which centuries later stimulated Leibnitz’ dream of a universal algebra. Lull applied this to basically all subjects studied at the Medieval Universities. “Lull’s metaphysics worked a revolution in the history of philosophy” (The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy, p. 548).

“The production of pseudo-Lullian alchemical texts culminated at the end of the fourteenth century with an important work, the “Liber de secretis naturae sive de quinta essential”. At that time the formation of this corpus of texts entered a second stage. In the “Liber de secretis naturae” the alchemical practice of the Testamentum becomes linked to the fifth essence of wine, a distillation technique popularized in by Jean de Roquetaillade in 1350. Moreover, its author said on several occasions that he relied on the Testamentum and other alchemical texts, thus recognizing Lull as an alchemist. If the “Liber de secretis naturae sive de quinta essential” seems to be a medical book guided by the thought and the style of Lull, it is also notable for its author’s interest in turning matter into gold, unlike John Roquetaillade who for religious reasons was not mainly interested in such transmutation. It begins with a prologue consisting of a conversation between Lull and a monk, then come the two books paraphrasing Roquetaillade’s De quinta essentia. It ends with a Tertia distinctio devoted to an alchemical application of the Lullian method (alphabets and trees). Even if the “Liber de secretis naturae sive de quinta essential” suffered, like a number of alchemical works, from a very unreliable textual tradition in both manuscript and printed form, it enjoyed great success in the sixteenth century.”

His works on occult philosophy were essential to Renaissance magic. “As the inventor of a method which was to have an immense influence throughout Europe for centuries, Lull is an extremely important figure. Lullism is a precursor of scientific method. Lullian astral medicine developed into Pseudo-Lullian alchemy. The great figures of Renaissance Neoplatonism include Lulliam in their interests, and naturally so since Lullism was the precursor of their ways of thinking. And from the point of history of religion and of religious toleration, surely we admire Lull’s vision in taking advantage of the unique concentration of Christian, Moslem, and Jewish traditions.” (Yates, The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age).
The present work also contributed greatly to what later was to become known as Christian Kabbalah. Living in a region where the Catholic Church was dominant, where a large part of the land was still under heavy influence from Moslem Arabs, and where the Jews made important contributions to the culture, Lull sought to unify all three religions by developing a (natural) philosophy incorporating elements common to all. These rather unorthodox, and to some extent heretical, thoughts were later taken up by the Italian Renaissance philosopher Pico della Mirandola (1463—94). He and many of his contemporaries believed to have discovered in Kabbalah a lost divine revelation that could give the key to understanding both the teachings of Pythagoras, Plato, and the Orphics, as well as the inner secrets of Catholic Christianity. Pico della Mirandola had a considerable amount of Kabbalistic literature translated into Latin by the convert Samuel ben Nissim Abulfaraj.

Raymond Lull (ab. 1232—1315), Majorcan writer, philosopher, memorycian (he was later to become a great source of inspiration for Giordano Bruno), logician, and a Franciscan tertiary. He wrote the first major work of Catalan literature. Recently-surfed manuscripts show him to have anticipated by several centuries prominent work on elections theory. He is sometimes considered a pioneer of computation theory, especially given his influence on Gottfried Leibniz. He is also well known also as a glossator of Roman Law. Lull taught himself Arabic with the help from a slave. As a result, he wrote his “Ars Magna”, which was intended to show the necessary reasons for the Christian faith. To promote his theory and test its effectiveness, he went to Algiers and Tunis. At the age of 82, in 1314, Lull traveled again to North Africa, where an angry crowd of Muslims stoned him in the city of Bougie. Genoese merchants took him back to Mallorca, where he died at home in Palma the following year. Despite the fact that a large corpus of the printed works by Lull are erroneously ascribed to him: “On the whole, we get the impression that the “Testament”, “De secretis naturae seu de quinta essential”, and “Lapidarius” are probably the oldest members of the Lullian alchemical collections” (Thorndyke).

The present Ryff-edition became very popular and later appeared numerous times. It was reprinted already the following year in Venice, 1542, and editions followed in Nürnberg, 1546, Basel, 1561, Köln, 1567, etc. etc.
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THE PROPHET OF A NEW WORLD

MARSILIUS OF PADUA


Neuburgi Danubii, 1545. [Colophon: Neuburg an der Thunaw, bey Hannsen Kilian, 1545]. Small folio. Bound in a near contemporary (dated 1602) full vellum binding with handwritten title to spine. The initials “HVHVS” and the year “1602” in gilt to front board. Blindstamped frame to boards. Vellum cords, and remains of silk ties to boards. A three-line contemporary handwritten inscription to front board, barely legible, presumably an old ower’s inscription, as it seems to end with a signature, and definitely the date “1545”. The binding has been waterdamaged at some point, leaving it a bit soiled and “wavy”, but still solid and fine. Title-page slightly dusty and a dampstain to lower corner throughout (apart from a few pages, very faint), otherwise a very nice and clean copy. A few contemporary marginal annotations. Stamp to verso of title-page: “Burggrafen zu Dohna”. Beautiful illustrated woodcut title-border. Woodcut ornaments to top and bottom of all leaves of the preface, some of those at the top shaved (still leaving large margins down to the text). Woodcut device to verso of last leaf. (12), LXX ff.

DKK 48,000.00 / EURO 6,500.00

Scarce first edition of the highly influential first German translation—of seminal importance to the Protestant Reformation!—of Marsilius of Padua’s groundbreaking “Defensor Pacis”, “one of the most remarkable books in the history of politics” (Figgis, p. 33), “the most thorough and original treatise on the relation of powers written by a medieval analyst” (Watt, p. 416), which “was so exceptional because it had foreshadowed later developments on political thought” (Garnett, p. 2).

The first German edition of the work is of particular importance, considering the immense influence the work had in Germany in the middle of the 16th century, significantly influencing the course of the Protestant Reformation. The “Defensor Pacis”, written in the beginning of the 14th century, was first published in 1522, in Latin, and was put on the Index in 1559. The preface of that edition also bears testimony to the relevance of the work to 16th century Europe, commenting on the contemporary relevance of the book’s anti-papal arguments. In 1535 an English translation appears, and in 1545 the first German edition appears. All three editions are of the utmost scarcity, but one could argue that the first German edition is of the highest importance of the three, carrying a more pressing relevance to the development of Christianity (with the Reformation) that stems from Germany.

“The ideas most dangerous to papal power were those of the “Defender of the Peace”, written in Paris by Marsilio in 1324 and condemned as heretical three years later by Pope John, who also excommunicated William of Ockham in 1326. Most threatening to John was Marsilio’s claim that “Christ left no head of the church”, but the deeper and more broadly subversive element in the “Defender of the Peace” was the principle that political authority comes FROM God THROUGH the people and only then to pope or king. Popular sovereignty, according to Marsilio, is inalienable; subjects who can always dismiss their ruler only delegate
sovereignty, contrary to the view of Aquinas that the consent required of the governed causes them to lose sovereignty. Marsilio moved closer than Thomas both to the political theories that were to accompany vast changes in practical politics during the renaissance and also to Aristotle’s older conception of the “polis” as a human artifact, unprotected by the divine mandate that Augustine saw hovering over the city of man. Jean Gerson and other conciliarists who advocated the solutions worked out at Constance were less radical than Marsilio, whose ideas remained to incite not only the transformations of church government that came with the Reformation but also the greater novelties of political philosophy that emerged from new Renaissance statecraft.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 45).

Almost from the beginning, the book provoked outrage, contributing to its prolonged influence of both politics and theology. In 1343 Clement VI categorized it as “the worst case of heresy he had ever come across. John XXII’s response to the “Defensor pacis” suggests that this was not extravagant hyperbole, but a dispassionate assessment of the perceived threat to the papacy posed by the author.” (Garnett, p. 17).

“Marsilius Of Padua, Italian Marsilio Da Padova (born c. 1280, Padua, Kingdom of Italy-died c. 1343, Munich), Italian political philosopher whose work Defensor pacis (“Defender of the Peace”), one of the most original treatises on political theory produced during the Middle Ages, significantly influenced the modern idea of the state. He has been variously considered a forerunner of the Protestant Reformation and an architect both of the Machiavellian state and of modern democracy.” (Encycl. Britt.).
Although the relevance to the course of the Protestant Reformation is obvious and profound, this is not the only great importance that the book possesses. “Even in the august company of Dante and William of Ockham, there appears to be scholarly consensus on Marsilius’s pre-eminence. […] With Marsilius, he [i.e. Figgis] wrote elsewhere, ‘it is the omnicompetent, universal, all absorbing modern state, the great Leviathan of later teachers … not power divided, but power concentrated and unified’.

This estimate of Marsilius’s significance is also a common one. In 1920 Ephraim Emerton wrote that Marsilius ‘is the herald of a new world, the prophet of a new social order, acutely conscious of his modernness and not afraid to confess it.’ According to one of his modern editors, C.W. Previté-Orton: ‘The glimmer of modernity, often to be seen elsewhere c. 1300, has suddenly given way [in the Defensor pacis] to a transitory daylight’.

‘Like the unfinished statues of Michelangelo, the state [Marsilius] conceives withdraws itself alive from the marble, and seems rather cloaked than shaped by the mass of medieval speculation from which it is hewn’. “ (Garnett, pp. 2-3).

OCLC lists merely two copies outside of Germany (7) and Denmark (1): Yale and Ohio State. The 1522 Latin edition is much more common in library holdings world-wide, and the English edition, of 1535, slightly more so, with 13 copies listed on OCLC.

INTRODUCING THE METHOD OF MATHEMATICAL INDUCTION

MAUROLYCO (MAUROLYCUS MAUROLICO), FRANCISCO


Venice, Franciscum Franciscum Senensem, 1575. 4to. (22,5X16,5 cm.). Bound togerther in one lovely contemporary full calf binding with 6 raised bands. Blindstamped ornamentations to spinecompartments. Blindstamped line-borders inside which a decorative blindstamped ornamental border with blindstamped decoration to inner corners. Elaborate blindstamped ornamental centre-piece to boards. Boards with remains of silk-ties. A bit of wear, mostly to spine, with a few tiny nicks to bands and a small loss of leather at foot of spine. All in all a beautiful and very well-preserved fully contemporary binding with no restorations. Both title-pages with large woodcut printer’s device, as on verso of colophon-leaf in volume 2. (20),285,(1 leaf blank)—(2),(6 = 1 unnumb. and paginated a,b,c,d),175,(1),(18) pp. Illustrated throughout with numerous figures in the text. Internally a fine, clean and wide-margined copy.

At verso of title-page a previous owners name “H.C. Schumacher/ 1808/ Göttingen den 9 Dec”, which is probably the astronomer Hans Christian Schumacher. In 1810 Schumacher was named extraordinary professor of astronomy at the University of Copenhagen; but he did not assume the duties connected with this post until after Thomas Bugge’s death in 1815, serving in the meantime as director of the observatory at Mannheim (1813—1815). In 1817 the Danish government released Schumacher from his duties so that he could take part in the geodetic survey of Schleswig and Holstein.

DKK 125,000.00 / EURO 16,800.00

Scarce first edition of this highly important work by Maurolyco, who was “doubtless, the greatest geometor of the sixteenth century” (Cajori, “History of Mathematics”, p.153), and whom Galileo lists among his teachers. Pascal, in one of his letters, acknowledged him for introducing the “Method of mathematical Induction” (in the present work), a method he himself used in his “Traité du triangle arithmetique” (1665). “The method of mathematical induction… was recognized explicitly by Maurolycus in his ‘Arithmetica’ of 1575, and was used by him to prove, for example, that 1 + 3 + 5 + …. + (2n-1) = n2.” (Morris Kline “Mathematical Thought…”, p. 272).

Francesco Maurolyco (1494—1575), professor of mathematics in Messina, and city engineer, was a highly respected and hugely influential mathematician and astronomer. He allegedly wrote a large number of works, but only a few of them were printed, “although these are enough to show him as an outstanding scholar” (DSB IX:190); his “Opuscula mathematica” counts as one of his most important works, and it hugely influenced the scientific thought of the Renaissance. More specifically, Maurolyco’s “Opuscula mathematica”, which contains the greatest number of Maurolico’s mathematical writings, constitutes a milestone in the history of mathematical thought as well as in astronomy.

From the colophon in volume two it appears that the work lay in manuscript from 1557 to 1575, when it was finally printed for the first time.
The work is in two separate parts, and a second edition of volume two appeared in 1580.


“Among the topics related to mathematics in the *Opuscula* are chronology (the treatise “*Computus ecclesiasticus*”) and gnomonics (in two treatises, both entitled “*De lineis horariis*,” one of which also discusses conics). The work also contains writing on Euclid’s “*Elements*” (for which see also the unpublished Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, manuscript Fonds Latin 7463). Of particular interest, too, is a passage on a correlation between regular polyhedrons, which was commented upon by J.H.T. Müller, and later by Moritz Cantor. […] Maurolico’s work in astronomy includes the first treatise collected in the *Opuscula*, “*De sphaera liber unus*,” in which he criticized Copernicus. In another item of the collection, “*De instrumentis astronomicis*,” Maurolico described the principal astronomical instruments and discussed their theory, use, and history. . . .” (DSB IX:191).

Adams M 919.—Riccardi VIII:38.—Smith “Rara Arithmetica”, pp. 348-50.—Augustus de Morgan “Arithmetical Books”, p. 24 “On the properties of numbers and the doctrine of incommensurables (listing only volume two); a superior work to the mass of those which then treated of similar subjects”.
REVIVING SCEPTICISM—ONE OF THE EARLIEST INTERPRETATIONS OF THE MEANING OF THE DISCOVERY OF AMERICA

PICO DELLA MIRANDOLA, GIOVANNI FRANCESCO [GIANFRANCESCO, GIANFRAN, JOHANNES FRANCISCUS PICUS]

De morte Christi & propria cogitanda libri tres. Eiusdem de studio divinae et humanae philosophiae libri duo.

Bologna: Benedictus Hectoris, 1497. 4to. Early limp vellum (around 1600—1650) with handwritten title to spine. A very fine and clean copy, internally as well as externally. Nice crisp, clean, and fresh pages, with only very light occasional minor brownspotting. A small tear to the last page, not repaired, and no loss. The colouring of the initials has gone through on some versos, but there is no obscuring of text. Handwritten ex libris to the first page (Collegii Parisiensis Societatis, 1688), an early handwritten note to pasted-down front end-paper, as well as a shelf mark, a printed late nineteenth-century Italian bookseller’s description and the small book-label of William Le Queux. Handcoloured blue and red initials, and other capitals touched in yellow. 72 leaves. A lovely copy of a beautiful and charming book.

FROM THE LIBRARY OF WILLIAM LE QUEUX. “William Le Queux was a famous journalist, writer and celebrated novelist, a master of the spy genre, and a vociferous critic of Britain’s weak military defences before the First World War, known at the time and for the next twenty years as “The Great War”.

He is acknowledged as the principal precursor of that famous spy story author of the second half of the twentieth century, namely Ian Fleming.” (for more on WLQ see the William Le Queux-website: http://www.williamlequeux.com/).

DKK 175,000.00 / EURO 23,500.00

Exceedingly scarce first edition of the two highly important works “On Remembering the Death of Christ and Oneself”, which is dedicated to Savonarola in the year before he was condemned and hanged, and “On the Study Divine and Human Philosophy”, being Gianfrancesco Pico’s seminal first philosophical work, in which the foundation for his philosophical theories are laid and which foreshadows the scepticism of his “Examen”, for which he became famous as the first modern Sceptic. The present publication is furthermore the first in which Gianfr. Pico refers to the discovery of America; the work was written merely a couple of years after Columbus’ discovery became known – printed a mere three years after the Columbus Letter – and Pico’s references in the present work constitute one of the first testimonies to the awareness of the meaning and importance of the discovery of the New World and is considered a highly important piece of 15th century Americana.

The present publication is of the utmost importance to Renaissance thought and the development of the modern world. It constitutes one of the earliest testimonies to the general influence of the discovery of America upon contemporary Europe as well as being the first serious attempt we have of reviving the Scepticism of Sextus Empiricus and utilizing it in modern thought, providing a seminal premonition of the exact way that scepticism was to be used ab. 70 years later. Pico also directly influenced the translators of the first printed edition of any of Sextus’ writings (1560’s).
Giovanni Francesco [Gianfrancesco] Pico della Mirandola (1470—1533), not to be confused with his uncle Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463—1494) was a highly important Renaissance thinker and philosopher, who was strongly influenced by the Neoplatonic tradition, but even more so by the preaching of Girolamo Savonarola, whose thought he defended throughout his life.

The first of the two treatises printed here “De morte Christi & propria cogitanda” is the first work that Pico dedicates to Savonarola, the year before his condemnation, and it marks his lifelong devotion to the prophetic Renaissance preacher. As Schill points out, this important treatise was finished at the most three years after Columbus’ discovery of America became known. It is the first treatise in which Pico mentions and treats the seminal discovery, an interest that he was to maintain throughout all of his later writings. Gianfr. Pico was very well connected, not least through the merits of his uncle, and he keeps appearing in close connection with the most important and famous early scholars, historians, publicizers and popularizers of the discovery of America. For instance, he was a close friend and correspondent of Matthaeus Ringmann, the man who gave to America its name. As such, Pico played an important role in the earliest history of the discovery of America, both due to his influential connections and due to his insightful reflections upon this discovery and the meaning it would have and had on man, his relationship to Christ, God, and the Universe.

The work deals with the discovery in the most interesting way, enrolling it in man’s relation to the universe and to God. It is a religious-moral treatise on the duty of man to remember Christ’s death and his own. Gianfr. Pico establishes an inner connection in man with the human nature of Christ and uses the discovery of this new part of the world to express the limitless inner connection of man with Christ.

The effect that the Columbus Letter (1493) had upon the people of the Renaissance — the wondrous astonishment that this discovery affected, although at the time it was merely thought to be a discovery of a continent that had been known since Antiquity, namely Asia — can only properly be understood when reading the earliest sources of this discovery. Pico was among the very first to describe what this discovery meant to man, and his work is an invaluable source to the early history of the discovery of America. He inscribed Columbus’ discovery in Christianity and in man’s inner relation to Christ. He explains how, through unceasing pious contemplation and a true, inner, heartfelt urge, it will be possible for man to obtain an inner connection with Christ. “And it does not even require great effort. It is not about reaching India; not to explore the erithrean shores [...] On the contrary, we are drawn to him by a natural force.” (De morte Christi). “And thus, the younger Pico here appears from the very beginning as a diverse and stimulating character, who does not refrain from weaving in to his pious or learned discussions experiences of daily life and contemporary history as examples and comparisons, and which due to this very fact also becomes an unerring mirror for the true, inner participation of the intellectual upper class of Europe in such events that concern us here.” (Own translation from the German of Schill, p. 20).

Shill provides many further examples of Pico mentioning and using Columbus’ discovery in this his first work and the importance the work thus comes to have on our knowledge of the earliest understanding of the consequences of the discovery. “Even where he doesn’t directly mention the discoveries, suddenly allusions to them appear woven into a biblical or otherwise spiritual quotation, be it involuntary, or be it intentionally, providing a special emotional momentum.” (Own translation from the German of Schill, p. 22).

Just like his uncle, Gianfr. Pico devoted his life to philosophy, but being a follower of Savonarola and having a Christian mission, he made it subject to the Bible. He even depreciated the authority of the philosophers, above all of Aristotle.

“His [i.e. Gianfrancesco Pico] uncle and his uncle’s circle of Florentine friends were important influences on the younger Pico, who also continued the older philosopher’s devotion to Savonarola, even after Florence
tired of him in 1498. Gianfrancesco lived longer than his uncle, from 1469 to 1533, but he spent much of his time fighting his relatives to keep the little princedom that he bought from Giovanni in 1491, so his published output of more than thirty works, about a third of them philosophical, is remarkable. Savonarola taught him to exclude reason from religion and to distrust philosophers as infidels, and Gianfrancesco modified the friar’s views mainly by reinforcing them with his greater learning. As early as 1496 [written in 1496, printed in 1497], in one of his first works, “On the Study of Divine and Human Philosophy”, he distinguished divine philosophy, rooted in scripture, from human philosophy based on reason; he denied that Christians need human wisdom, which is as likely to hinder as to help the quest for salvation.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 245).

This seminal treatise, one of his very first productions, and the earliest philosophical one that he wrote, sharply differentiated human philosophy, based on reason, from divine philosophy, based on scripture, and dismissed human and rational philosophy as useless, and perhaps even harmful. It is to those means that Gianfr. Pico, as the first thinker since Antiquity, uses the teachings of Sextus Empiricus. Even the violent condemnation, hanging, and burning of Savonarola in the main square of Florence in 1498 did not prevent Pico from spreading his radical views.

“At the very beginning of the 16th century [recte end of the 15th], Gian Francesco Pico, the nephew of Pico della Mirandola, had predicted the final failure of all attempts at reconciliation of the different philosophical movements. Gian Francesco Pico was a thinker of very considerable stature and a follower of Savonarola. There was a touch of tragedy about his personality. For his life was suspended, as it were, between the scaffold of Savonarola and incessant family feuds — in the course of one of which he was finally killed. No wonder that he borrowed from the scepticism of Sextus Empiricus in order to destroy philosophy to make more room for religion.” (Garin, p. 133).
Gianfr. Pico, a learned scholar and apt reader of classical texts, was the first Renaissance thinker that we know to have seriously studied and used the works of Sextus Empiricus, which were not printed until the 1560’ies, causing a revolution in Renaissance thinking. “The printing of Sextus in the 1560s opened a new era in the history of scepticism, which had begun in the late fourth century BCE with the teachings of Pyrrho of Elis. […] Before the Estienne and Hervet editions, Sextus seems to have had only two serious students, Gianfrancesco Pico at the turn of the century and Francesco Robortello about fifty years later.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, pp. 240-41).

“No significant use of Pyrrhonian ideas prior to the printing of Sextus’ “Hypotyposes” has turned up, except for that of Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola […] His writings may seem isolated from the main development of modern skepticism that began with the publication of the Latin translations and modernized formulation of ancient scepticism offered by Michel de Montaigne. However, they represent a most curious use of skepticism that reappears in the early seventeenth century with Joseph Mede and John Dury and the followers of Jacob Boehme and in the early eighteenth century in the writings of the Chevalier Ramsay, the first patron of David Hume, to fortify or justify prophetic knowledge.” (Popkin, p. 20).

Gianfr. Pico develops his sceptical arguments to their fullest extent in his “Examen” (1520), which is considered his main work. However, the foundation of all these ideas are laid in the present work, which must be considered, not only his first philosophical treatise and the beginning of all of his philosophy, but also one of, if not the, earliest printed testimonies to the use of scepticism and a premonition of the role that skepticism came to play in Renaissance thought, primarily after the first printings of Sextus in the 1560’ies.


In the writings of his last years (1492—94) Giovanni Pico, Gianfr. Pico’s famous uncle, known as the “Phoenix of his age”, had moved closer to the views of Savonarola and became a follower of Savonarola’s religious reform movement just before his death. Gianfr. Pico was heavily influenced both by his uncle and by Savonarola, with whom he became involved in 1492, being attracted to his ideas and probably also by the anti-intellectual tendencies of the movement. Thus, in the middle of the 1490’ies, at the very beginning of his career, Gianfr. was clearly resolved to discredit all of the philosophical tradition of pagan antiquity. “Gianfrancesco Pico’s first writing on philosophy [i.e. De Studio Divinae & Humanae], completed during Savonarola’s period as spiritual leader of Florentine democracy, sought to delineate the difference between (true) Christian knowledge and pagan and non-Christian opinions.[…] Pico’s later attitudes apparently held the seeds of the antiphilosophy developed by his nephew.” (Popkin, pp. 20-21). “Pico was visited by Johannes Reuchlin in 1490 and showed him his kabbalistic materials. His nephew, Gianfrancesco Pico, already a disciple of Savonarola, was making the views of Sextus Empiricus available in Latin and also became involved with Reuchlin.” (Popkin, 25).
“As the only Greek Pyrrhonian sceptic whose works survived, he [Sextus Empiricus] came to have a dramatic role in the formation of modern thought. The historical accident of the rediscovery of his works at precisely the moment when the sceptical problem of the criterion had been raised gave the ideas of Sextus a sudden and greater prominence than they had ever before or were ever to have again. Thus, Sextus, a recently discovered oddity, metamorphosed into “le divin Sexte”, who, by the end of the seventeenth century, was regarded as the father of modern philosophy. Moreover, in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the effect of his thoughts upon the problem of the criterion stimulated a quest for certainty that gave rise to the new rationalism of René Descartes and the “constructive skepticism” of Pierre Gassendi and Martin Mersenne.” (Popkin, p. 18).

“The revival of ancient philosophy was particularly dramatic in the case of scepticism. This critical and antidogmatic way of thinking was quite important in Antiquity, but in the Middle Ages its influence faded […] when the works of Sextus and Diogenes were recovered and read alongside texts as familiar as Cicero’s “Academia”, a new energy stirred in philosophy; by Montaigne’s time, scepticism was powerful enough to become a major force in the Renaissance heritage prepared for Descartes and his successors.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, pp. 17-18).

But not only in being the first serious attempt that we have of reviving the Scepticism of Sextus Empiricus, was Gianfr. Pico’s work on divine and human philosophy of great importance to the development of Renaissance thought. The entire foundation upon which the work is based—a sharp differentiation between human philosophy (reason) and divine philosophy (scripture)—comes to play a dominant role in the development of 16th century Renaissance thought.

The work, “dedicated to Alberto Pio of Carpi, shows certain indications of Savonarola’s influence and gives us the first glimpse of Pico’s unfavourable attitude toward secular philosophy, a viewpoint which will be developed in greater detail in his “Examen Vanitatis”, published in 1520. (Schmitt, p. 50).

“Throughout the early modern period, from Ficino and Pico to Newton and Leibniz, such convictions [of the unity of truth) supported a pattern of historiography that could never have emerged without the humanists, even though it did not preserve their fame for modern times. Other myths of classicism and Christianity outlived the fable of ancient theology because they conflicted less flagrantly with the findings of history.

The purpose of the ancient theology was to sanctify learning by connecting it with a still more ancient source of gentile wisdom that reinforces sacred revelation. Rather than baptize the heathens as Ficono or the older Pico wished, some early modern critics damned them, and one of the most aggressive thinkers of this school was the younger Pico. He saw an impassable gulf between Christian and pagan belief where his uncle had tried to build bridges.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 337).

BMC VI:843; Goff: P644;
See:
THE FIRST PUBLIC INTRODUCTION OF GREEK SCEPTICISM TO THE MODERN WORLD

PICO DELLA MIRANDOLA, GIOVANNI FRANCESCO [GIANFRANCESCO, GIANFRAN, JOHANNES FRANCISCUS PICUS]

Examen vanitatis doctrinae gentium, et veritatis christianae disciplinae, distinctum in libros sex, quorum tres omnem philosophorum sectam universim, reliqui aristoteleam et aristotelis armis particulatim impugnant. Ubicunque autem Christiania et asseritur et celebratur disciplina.

Mirandulae, Ioannes Maciochius Bundenius, 1520 (on colophon). [Mirandola, Mazzocchi]. Small folio. Contemporary full vellum binding with handwritten title to spine. Author written in contemporary hand to lower edge. Binding professionally restored, at lower part of spine, edges of boards, and corners of back board. Free end-papers renewed. First leaf restored, with lower blank part supplied in later paper—no loss of text! This lower part was blank on both recto and verso. A bit of soiling to upper part of this leaf, as well as two old owner’s inscriptions. First few leaves a bit browned, not heavily. Otherwise only light scattered browning. Some small marginal wormholes to inner and lower blank margins, far from affecting text. All in all very fine, nice, and clean. Woodcut device to final leaf. (6), 208 ff.

DKK 65,000.00 / EURO 8,700.00

The seminal first edition of Gianfrancesco Pico’s main work, the work which publicly introduces Greek scepticism to the modern world (i.e. the Reniassance) for the first time and thus comes to play a seminal role in the development of modern thought. With this work, Pico becomes the first modern thinker to specifically use the theories of Sextus Empiricus, foreshadowing the great “Sceptical Revolution” of the later Renaissance as well as the ideas of later modern thinkers such as Montesquieu. The “Examen” furthermore introduces other important critiques of Aristotle that were not generally known at the time (and works that had not yet been published) as well as a completely new sort of attack upon the theories of Aristotle that come to play an important role in later Renaissance Aristotle scholarship.

“But his “Examen Vanitatis Doctrinae Gentium et Veritatis Disciplinae Christianae” is not only a criticism of human knowledge which can, as has been done, be compared with Montaigne. It is also a wholesale destruction of the whole world of human values, of that “regnum hominis” so dear to the Renaissance. And as such, it inclines one to think that it anticipated Pascal. […]” (Garin, p. 135)

The “Examen” is considered foundational in “anti-pagan” historiography of thought, “a work that deserves special attention here as the earliest example of an “anti-pagan” reaction in the Renaissance historiography of thought, and as the first in a line of publications preparing the way for the anti-apologists of the seventeenth century. …” (Hanegraaff, “Esotericism and the Academy: Rejected Knowledge in Western Culture”, p. 81).

It is due to this work that Gianfr. Pico is now remembered as “the first modern sceptic”.

“Joining the sceptical arguments of Sextus, which he quoted and used liberally, to Savonarola’s negative view of natural knowledge, he presented the first text since antiquity utilizing Pyrrhonism, using it to illuminate knowledge by faith!” (Popkin, p. 24).
Gianfr. Pico, a learned scholar and apt reader of classical texts, was the first Renaissance thinker that we know to have seriously studied and used the works of Sextus Empiricus, which were not printed until the 1560’ies, causing a revolution in Renaissance thinking. “No discovery of the Renaissance remains livelier in modern philosophy than scepticism”. (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 338). “The revived skepticism of Sextus Empiricus was the strongest single agent of disbelief”. (ibid., p. 346).

“The printing of Sextus in the 1560s opened a new era in the history of scepticism, which had begun in the late fourth century BCE with the teachings of Pyrrho of Elis. [...] Before the Estienne and Hervet editions, Sextus seems to have had only two serious students, Gianfrancesco Pico at the turn of the century and Francesco Robortello about fifty years later.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, pp. 240-41).

“No significant use of Pyrrhonian ideas prior to the printing of Sextus’ “Hypotyposes” [in the 1560’ies] has turned up, except for that of Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola”. (Popkin, p. 19).

Giovanni Francesco [Gianfrancesco] Pico della Mirandola (1470—1533), not to be confused with his uncle Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463—1494) was a highly important Renaissance thinker and philosopher, who was strongly influenced by the Neoplatonic tradition, but even more so by the preaching of Girolamo Savonarola, whose thought he defended throughout his life.

Just like his uncle, Gianfr. Pico devoted his life to philosophy, but being a follower of Savonarola and having a Christian mission, he made it subject to the Bible. He even depreciated the authority of the philosophers, above all of Aristotle.

It is in the “Examen”, Gianfr. Pico’s main work, that his sceptical arguments are developed to their fullest extent, and it is here that he not only discusses at length Pyrrhonism, based on Sextus’ “Hypotyposes” (which were only published more than 40 years later), and deals in detail with Sextus’ “Adversus Mathematicos” (also only published more than 40 years later), propounding his own ideas and attacking Aristotle, he also provides lengthy “summaries” of Sextus’ texts, which seem more like actual translations than interpretations or paraphrases.

As Charles Schmitt also shows, the younger Pico must have read Sextus in a Greek manuscript, as the texts of Sextus were not printed before the 1560’ies, when the Hervet- and the Estienne-editions appear, causing what we would call “The Sceptical Revolution of the Renaissance”, a turning point in the history of modern thought. Apparently, Gianfr. Pico used a codex that belonged to Giorgio Antonio Vespucci. It was during an enforced exile around 1510 that Gianfr. Pico set to work on his “Examen Vanitatis Doctrinae Gentium”, which was published for the first time in 1520 and dedicated to Pope Leo X. The work was printed in a small edition by an obscure press in his own little principality at Mirandola, which explains its scarcity.

In the “Examen” “Pico introduced the actual sceptical arguments of Sextus Empiricus, plus some newer additions, in order to demolish all philosophical views, especially those of Aristotle, and to show that only Christian knowledge, as stated in the Scriptures, is true and certain.” (Popkin, pp. 20-21). But although he here carefully set forth the ancient sceptical criticisms of sensory knowledge claims and of the rational criteria that let us judge what is true and false, it is important to remember that he did not as such advocate scepticism, rather, he used it for his own means. Using the ancient sceptical arguments as ammunition to undermine the confidence in natural knowledge, his aim was to lead people to see that the only real and reliable knowledge is revealed knowledge. He denounces all pagan philosophical claims, attacks Aristotle’s theory of knowledge with the arguments of Sextus, all the time regarding Christianity as immune to sceptical infection, because it does not depend upon the dogmatic philosophies that Sextus had refuted.
In his use of Sceptical arguments, Gianfr. Pico was not only doing something completely new in a Renaissance setting (i.e. reviving and using sceptical arguments at all), he was doing something completely new as such. The original Pyrrhonian formulations were primarily directed against Stoic and Epicurean theories of knowledge, and traditionally they were not directed towards the all-overshadowing dominating theories of Aristotle. As such, Gianfr. Pico makes Aristotelianism more of an empirical theory than it was traditionally viewed, and also in this did the “Examen” come to have groundbreaking influence. He furthermore introduces several critiques of Aristotelianism that were not generally known at the time, such as that of Hasdai Crecas (15th century Jewish Spanish thinker), whose work had not yet been published and which only existed in Jewish manuscript, as well as that of the late Hellenistic commentator John Philoponous, who later came to play an important role in Renaissance readings of Aristotle.

“As early as 1496 [originally printed 1497], in one of his first works, “On the Study of Divine and Human Philosophy”, he distinguished divine philosophy, rooted in scripture, from human philosophy based on reason; he denied that Christians need human wisdom, which is as likely to hinder as to help the quest for salvation. By 1514 he had completed a longer and sterner work, “The Weighing of Empty Pagan Learning against True Christian Doctrine, Divided into Six Books, of Which Three Oppose the whole Sect of Philosophers in General, while the Others Attack the Aristotelian Sect Particularly, and with Aristotelian Weapons, but Christian Teaching is Asserted and Celebrated throughout the Whole”. As its title suggests, the “Examen”, published in 1520, hardened Pico’s hostility to pagan philosophy. Just when Luther was making the Bible the sole rule of faith, Pico discredited every source of knowledge except scripture and condemned all attempts to find truth elsewhere as “vanitas”, emptiness; profane knowledge is at best a distraction from the work of salvation, as some of the greatest Fathers had taught. Pico’s purpose was sincerely religious and only incidentally philosophical; much of Renaissance scepticism remained true to his pious motives, though they were not fully appreciated for forty years after he wrote. By demolishing secular thought, Pico hoped to empty the human mind of reason and make a clear channel for God’s grace; man’s only intellectual security lay in church authority. Convinced
of Christianity’s unique value, he turned his uncle’s eirenic learning to contrary purposes, working skillfully with Greek manuscripts to make his humanism a potent weapon against religious error. […]  
Pico devoted most of his first three books to reproducing the arguments of Sextus Empiricus against the various schools of ancient philosophy; in Books IV and V he turned scepticism against Aristotle. His extensive borrowings from Sextus often come closer to translation than paraphrase or analysis, and his choices are therapeutic rather than theoretical. Aristotle had to go because he was the chief source of secular contagion among the faithful, and Sextus was the best medicine available. Pico regarded Christianity itself as immune to sceptical infection because it does not depend on the dogmatic philosophies that Sextus had refuted. […]” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, pp. 245-46).

The “Examen” marks a turning-point in the history of Renaissance thought and the development of modern philosophy. The importance of the revival of scepticism can hardly be over-estimated, and Gianfr. Pico’s use of the sceptical arguments which he utilizes in the “Examen” would prove to be highly important and influential. But the revival that Gianfr. Pico is thus responsible for, not only comes to serve his own purpose, as history will prove, the sword is two-edged.

Claiming in the “Examen” that “the works assigned to Aristotle were doubtfully authentic; his sense-based epistemology could not produce reliable data; his doctrines, often presented with deliberate obscurity, had been disputed by opponents and followers alike and had been criticized by Christian theologians; even Aristotle himself was uncertain about some of them. Aristotelian philosophy, the pinnacle of human wisdom, was therefore shown to be constructed on the shakiest of foundations. Christian dogma, by contrast, was built on the bedrock of divine authority and therefore could not be undermined by the sceptical critique. Or so he believed, unaware that scepticism, which he had revived as an ally of Christianity, would eventually become a powerful weapon in the hands of its enemies.” (Jill Kraye: “Two Cultures: Scholasticism and Humanism in the Early Renaissance”, in: The Philosophy of the Italian Renaissance).

“Defended by ancient philosophers such as Sextus Empiricus, refuted by Augustine (De civitate dei (11,26): “Even if I am mistaken, I exist”; a clear anticipation of Descartes’ cogito), Scepticism was revived in the Middle Ages by Nicholas of Autrecourt (whose works were burned by papal order in 1347). By the Renaissance, this tendency came to be linked with fideism (Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola, Erasmus, Montaigne, Gassendi, Daniel Huet, and Pierre Bayle, to name but a few), leading, in one way or another, to its modern culmination in Hume.” (Black Swans, the Brain, and Philosophy as a Way of Life : Pierre Hadot and Nassim Taleb on Ancient Scepticism).

“Gianfrancesco’s most important philosophical work, probably written sometime after 1510 and published in 1520, was “Examen vanitatis doctrinae gentium”, which is especially important because it marks the first serious attempt to adapt the Pyrrhonist (radically skeptical) philosophical ideas of the Hellenistic philosopher Sextus Empiricus to contemporary intellectual discourse.” (Charles G. Nauert: “Historical Dictionary of Renaissance”, 2004).


Adams P:1156.
EDITIO PRINCEPS OF PLOTINUS’ ENNEADS

PLOTIN (PLOTINOS, PLOTINUS)


Basiliae (Basel), ad Perneam Lecythum (on colophon: Ex Officina Petri Perniae), 1580. Small folio. Contemporary full vellum with remains of cloth ties to boards. Inner hinges a bit weak, but not loosening. Binding tight. A bit of overall soiling. Some wormholes to inner boards. A few marginal wormholes. One wormhole affecting a very small part of index, about one letter on each of the pages affected. Old owner’s name cut away from title-page, not affecting text nor woodcut. Faint marginal waterstaining throughout, only very lightly touching text at some places. Free endpapers and verso of last leaf (blank) soiled, otherwise internally nice and clean. Large woodcut title-vignette, large woodcut vignette after text but before index, large woodcut end-vignette. Large woodcut portrait on verso of alfa6 (Ficino), beautiful woodcut initials. Greek and Latin parallel-text. (36), 771, (1), (42, -Index), (2) pp.

DKK 85,000.00 / EURO 11,400.00

The very rare editio princeps of Plotinus’ hugely influential “Enneads”, the sum up of the foundation of Neoplatonism, being the first printing of the original Greek text of the “Enneads”, accompanied by Ficino’s Latin translation.
During the Renaissance a profound interest in the teachings of Neoplatonism emerged, centered and focusing on Plotinus and his “Enneads”. Neoplatonism came to hugely influence Renaissance philosophy, science, humanism, and theology, and much Renaissance thought stemmed directly from the reading of Plotinus, making the editio princeps of this text one of the foundational works for the development of modern thought.

“The Renaissance… recognized no deep divide between Plato’s teachings and those of the Neoplatonists. This blurring of categories was particularly momentous for the fifteenth century when an immense Neoplatonic literature—several times the size of the Platonic corpus—also became known. A primary task of translation for Ficino was the “Enneads” of Plotinus, one of the subtlest and most penetrating philosophical works of late antiquity and one that played a major role in the destiny of Renaissance Platonism.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, Renaissance Philosophy, p. 15).

Plotinus (204—270) “may justly be regarded as the true founder of Neo-Platonism, in so far as he perpetuated its principles in a written form” (Sandys, I:343). In the class-room of Plotinus a new and original approach was taken to the interpretations of the later Platonic and Aristotelian commentators; these groundbreaking new ideas and interpretations have been preserved as the “Enneads”, the magnum opus of Neoplatonism, divided in to six groups of nine books. It is Plotinus’ student, Porphyry (ca. 233-301-5) that we have to thank for the preservation of these founding books of Neoplatonism.

Neoplatonism is a term invented in the 18th century for a school of religious and mystical philosophy, which was founded in the third century and which dominated down to the end of Antiquity in the sixth century, when the Emperor Justinian closed the Neoplatonic Academy (529). Neoplatonic teaching revolved around a renewed study of the teachings of Plato that were now combined with the doctrines of other schools of Greek philosophy. The school called itself Platonic, but modern historians named it “Neoplatonic” in order to emphasize its differences from Plato. Plato’s dialogues were the main philosophical authority, but Plotinus, Ammnius and the other Neoplatonists attempted to fit all of Plato’s scattered doctrines into a coherent system and to incorporate other Stoic and Aristotelian ideas into this, thus creating a comprehensive synthesis of Greek thought. As such, Neoplatonism came to dominate the final phase of ancient philosophy and bequeathed its heritage to subsequent ages. Neoplatonism must be considered the only really original product of Greek philosophy in the third century, and after having been neglected during the Middle Ages, this original philosophical direction was re-discovered in the Renaissance, the philosophy of which came to be hugely dominated by it.

As the actual founder of Neoplatonism, Plotinus, in his “Enneads”, added to the genuine Platonic elements a more explicit emphasis on a hierarchical universe, which consists of several levels, beginning with the transcendental One. Plotinus’ original idea of the supreme “One” that is totally transcendent, which contains no division, multiplicity or distinction and which is prior to and different from everything that exists came to bridge the gap between progressive Christian and Gnostic ideas and traditional Platonic philosophy. Ficino himself had tried to Christianize the original doctrines of Plato, but in spite of this it was obvious that Plotinus’ “Enneads”, with the hypostases of the One, Soul and Mind, posed a better resolution to the problems of Trinitarian theology. The common grounds of the Christians and the Neoplatonists meant that Plotinus’ work may be said to have influenced 16th century thought more profoundly than the actual writings of Plato himself. Plato in the Neoplatonic version was perfectly suited for 16th and 17th century Europe.

With much of Renaissance Platonism thus rendered through Plotinus, the “Enneads” came to profoundly influence not only Renaissance philosophy and theology, but also art and science of the 16th and 17th centuries; “Of even greater interest is the impact of Renaissance Platonism upon sciences… in medicine, astrological and alchemical theories exercised a good deal of influence during that time… yet the main impact of Platonism, as might be expected, was felt in mathematical sciences, which had been most cultivated and respected by Plato
and his followers.” (Kristeller, Renaissance Thought and its Sources, pp. 62-63). Much knowledge of Plato in the Renaissance was rendered through especially Plotinus and Ficino, and the publication of this editio princeps of the Greek text of Plotinus incorporating Ficino’s translation of it must be said to have been of the utmost importance to the development of late Renaissance thought, philosophy and science.

Platonism had of course also earlier played an enormous rôle in philosophy and thought in general, but with the publication of the original Platonic texts and the translations of them, the intellectual world changed, and the influence of the availability of the original texts must not be overlooked.

The scarce edition princeps was based upon four manuscripts. Brunet calls determines it very rare: “Première édition, assez rare”.

Sandys II:105; Graesse 5:352; Brunet IV:727; Adams P:1597
POMPONAZZI, PIETRO (PETRUS POMPONATIUS)

De naturalium effectuum causis, sive de Incantationibus, Opus abstrusioris philosophiae plenum, & brevissimis historiis illustratum atque ante annox XXXV compositum, nunc primum uerò in lucem fideliter editum. Adiectis breuibus scholijs à Gulielmo Grataro lo Physico Bergomate. Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas. [i.e. De Incantationibus].

Basel, [Per Henrichum Petri, 1556—on colophon]. An absolutely lovely copy of the exceedingly scarce first edition, first printing, of one of the most influential and important works in the history of modern thought. A work that has for a long time been overlooked due to the gross neglect of the history of Renaissance philosophy, but which has nonetheless been seminal to the development of scientific and philosophical thought from the 16th century and onwards. With a purely naturalistic and immanent view of the natural process, Pomponazzi here frees man’s thought from the bounds of religion and provides modern thinkers and scientists with pure empiricism and naturalism.

“Er will das “Wissen” and die Stelle des “Glaubens” stellen” – “die “dämonische” Kausalität des Glaubens weicht der Kausalität der Wissenschaft” (Cassirer, p. 110—111).

8vo. Contemporary full limp vellum, with vellum cords to hinges. Remains of vellum ties to boards. A bit of brownspotting, but all in all a lovely, completely unrestored copy in its first binding. Five large woodcut initials and large woodcut printer’s device to verso of last leaf. (16), 349, (3).

“Pomponazzi’s thought and reputation were extremely influential in the centuries after his death. Even before it was printed, his treatise “On incantations” circulated widely in manuscript among philosophers, physicians and early modern naturalists (see Zanier 1975). Due to his mortalist theory of the soul, 17th-century “free thinkers” regarded Pomponazzi as one of their own, portraying him as an atheist (see Kristeller 1968; Paganini 1985). Enlightenment thinkers of the 18th century pushed to extremes his distinction between natural reason and faith, while 19th-century positivists, such as Ernest Renan and Roberto Ardigò, saw in Pomponazzi a forerunner of their own beliefs and a champion of naturalism and empiricism.” (SEP).

DKK 245,000.00 / EURO 32,800.00

Exceedingly scarce first edition of Pomponazzi’s seminal “De Incantationibus”, perhaps the most original work of natural philosophy of the Renaissance and arguably the first work of what comes to be the Enlightenment. The work, which is one of Pomponazzi’s most important productions (along with his treatise on the immortality of the soul), constitutes a forerunner of Naturalism and Empiricism and could be considered the first true Enlightenment work ever, causing Pomponazzi, our greatest Renaissance philosopher, to be generally considered “The last Scholastic and the first man of the Enlightenment” (Sandy, Randall, Kristeller). The appeal to experience is the main concern of the work, and its strict and completely novel way of treating the subject matter resulted in a hitherto unattained elevated position of philosophy in the Latin West, providing to philosophy a new method that remains dominant to this day and without which we would scarcely be able to imagine modern philosophy. Proclaiming the victory of philosophy over religion, the “de Incantationibus” changed the entire history of philosophy—philosophy being to Pomponazzi the supreme truth and the final judge of all phenomena.
“Pomponazzi’s conclusion [in the “De Incantationibus] results from a dramatic change in method which in turn is based on a profoundly new attitude toward philosophical inquiry. Medieval theologians and philosophers as well as most Renaissance thinkers were content to limit the role of reason in nature because they sincerely believed that the Christian God intervened in the natural order to create miraculous occurrences. As we have seen, this belief prevented their scientific convictions from destroying Christian doctrine by exempting central Biblical miracles from natural process. Even those who held that Christian revelation and Aristotelian science were irreconcilable maintained a sincere fideism which allowed each universe to remain intact, each standing separate from the other. But once Pomponazzi applied the critical method of Aristotelian science to all religious phenomena, Christian miracles were engulfed by the processes of nature. Absorbed by the “usual course of nature”, the miracle could no longer be the product of divine fiat. Indeed Christianity itself became merely another historical event, taking its place within the recurring cycles of nature, and destined to have a temporal career within the eternal flow of time.” (Pine, p. 273).

“De Incantationibus” constitutes one of the single most important works of the Renaissance. Bringing everything in the world under the general laws of nature, the history of religion as well as all other facts in experience, “De Incantationibus” gives us, for the first time in the history of philosophy an outline of a philosophy of nature and of religion, an outline that came to be seminal in the history of philosophy and science throughout the following centuries. With the main aim of the work being to determine the fact that there is no such thing as “supernatural”, no magic, no omens, no witchcraft, no divine intervention, no apparitions, etc., etc.—all marvelous events and powers observed in experience or recorded in history have their natural, scientific explanation, they are all within the scope of principles common to all nature—it is no wonder that it was placed on the index of forbidden books immediately upon its publication, as the only of Pomponazzi’s works ever. The analysis of the history of religions and the theory of the nature and use of prayer that Pomponazzi here develops is hugely interesting and so far ahead of its time that one hardly believes it. E.g. the notion that religious doctrines all aim, through fables and myths (which he disproves), to preserve the social order rather than to discover the truth, is not something you will find in any other work of the Middle Ages or the Renaissance. “[H]e brings the whole phenomena of religious history—the changes of religious belief, and the phases of thaumaturgic power—under certain universal laws of nature. Of these facts as of all others, he suggests, there is a natural and a rational explanation; in them the powers that are at work in all nature are still operative; and they are subject to the laws and conditions that govern nature generally—the laws of change, of development, of growth and decay, and transformation in decay.” (Douglas, p. 299).

“In regard to the religious issue, I have tried to show that he makes a claim for the absolute truth of philosophy and relegates religion to the purely practical function of controlling the masses. Religious doctrines contain a kind of truth because they can persuade men to act so as to preserve the social order. But religious doctrine has social value rather than speculative veracity. […] rational truth is the only truth. It is really compatible only with complete disbelief. And I think that this is the statement that Pomponazzi makes. The only doctrines that he accepts are those of philosophy. Philosophy rejects the personal Christian God acting within history and eliminates the miracles of religion. Philosophy reduces to the absurd the notion of a life after death. And finally philosophy destroys revelation itself by viewing it as the product of heavenly forces rather than the act of divine will.” (Pine, pp. 34-35).

The work was originally written in 1520, but was not published in Pomponazzi’s life-time. It circulated in manuscript form, however, and was also as such widely noted. In 1552, 27 years after Pomponazzi’s death, the manuscript was brought to Basel by Pomponazzi’s student Guglielmo Gratarolo, who had had to flee Italy due to his anti-religious views. Here, in Basel, he had the book printed for the first time, with a foreword written by himself, in 1556. This was the very first time that the book was published, as it had also not been included in the standard edition of Pomponazzi’s collected works, published at Venice the year after his death, 1525—presumably due to its dangerous and revolutionary views.
In his preface, Gratarolo expresses fear that someone may think him either over curious or less Christian for publishing this book. He furthermore explains that he had purchased the manuscript 20 years earlier and brought it with him North when leaving Italy 6 years previously. “Granting, however, that there may be something in the work which does not entirely square with Christianity, Gratarolo thinks that it should not be suppressed or withheld from the scholarly public, since it contains more solid physics and abstruse philosophy than do many huge commentaries of certain authors taken together.” (Thorndyke, V, p. 99-100).

Come the Renaissance, the idea of eliminating demons and angels and attempts at a showdown with magical transformations and the like were not completely novel in themselves. Much scientific thinking of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance carried such beliefs that had in some form or other been current for a long time. But up until Pomponazzi’s treatise, these ideas had always been surrounded by hesitance and a clear aim at still protecting the miraculous nature of Christianity itself, not leading the theories forward and not letting them bear any relevance. “Let us pause here a moment to estimate the place of this radical treatise [i.e. “De Incantationibus”] in the history of European rationalism. […] It was Pomponazzi’s achievement to go beyond these earlier hesitations and qualifications, particularly in regard to the astrological determination of religious belief. By dramatic shifts of emphasis and the extension of certain ideas to their logical limits, Pomponazzi utterly transformed the context in which these earlier views occurred. In their newly radicalized form, they challenged the supremacy of revelation by elevating philosophy to a position hitherto unattained in the Latin West”. (Pine, p. 268).

“[…] Even this brief sketch makes clear that Pomponazzi came at the end of a long scientific tradition which had absorbed, and to some degree, subordinated Aristotelian-Arabic science and astrology to the Christian universe. But if we look at each strand of this tradition, we can see how Pomponazzi carried these concepts to their furthest limits.” (Pine, pp. 268-72).

Pomponazzi clearly sought to explain all miraculous cures, events, etc. through natural powers. All sequences and concoctions which could seem magical or supernatural are within the same framework as other observed sequences and concoctions in nature. We may not be able to explain all of them (although Pomponazzi does attempt in the treatise to provide specific and elaborate natural, physical explanations of a large number of “magical” and “supernatural” events), but that is merely a lack in our intellect or understanding and by no means because these occurrences or events are not governed by nature and the physical laws of nature.

“This whole mode of explanation of the marvelous in nature and history is constantly pitted against the orthodox theory which attributed magic and miracles to the agency of angels or demons. The book “De naturalium Effectuum Causis” is a uniform polemic against that theory, as essentially a vulgar superstition. It is the tendency of the vulgar mind, he says, always to ascribe to diabolic or angelic agency events whose causes it does not understand.” (Douglas, p. 275).

“These fictions are designed to lead us to truth and to instruct the common people who must be led to the good life and turned away from evil just like children, that is to say, by the hope of reward and the fear of punishment; and it is by these vulgar motives that they are led to spiritual knowledge, just as children pass from delicate nourishment to more solid nourishment. Hence it is not far from my concept or from the truth that Plato taught the existence of angels and demons not because he believed in them but because it was his aim to instruct the ignorant.” (Pomponazzi, “De Incantationibus”, 10, pp. 201-202).

In order to understand the monumental accomplishment of Pomponazzi’s “De Incantationibus”, one must realize which tradition he is inscribed in, namely that of Italian Aristotelianism (as opposed mainly to the Renaissance Platonism). It is within this long tradition that he effects a revolution. “In the Italian schools alone the emerging science of nature did not mean a sharp break with reigning theological interests. To them it
came rather as the natural outcome of a sustained and co-operative criticism of Aristotelian ideas. Indeed, that mathematical and mechanical development which by the end of the sixteenth century produced Galileo owes very little to the Platonic revival but received powerful stimulus from the critical Aristotelianism of the Italian universities.” (Ren. Phil. of Man, p. 12).

Pomponazzi stood at a crossroad in the history of Aristotelianism. He still studied the great logicians and natural philosophers of the 14th century, which his Italian humanistic colleagues had given up (focusing instead on “man” and his place in the universe), but at the same time he had a highly original approach to the teachings of Aristotle and a unique uninhibited approach to the nature of the universe, and he responded philosophically to the achievements of humanism, always seeking the truth and the “naturalist” explanation.

Of that critical Aristotelianism which sought to find the true meaning of the works of Aristotle, lay them bare, and develop them further to find the true nature of the universe, to explain how the world functions without any preconceived notions (like the belief in Christ, etc.), Pomponazzi was a forerunner. With his “De Incantationibus”, this “last scholastic and the first man of the Enlightenment” paved the way for the Enlightenment of the centuries to come, for rational free thinking. His quest against the theologians and “his scorn for all comfortable and compromising modernism in religion, and his sober vision of the natural destiny of man” (Randall, p. 268) combined with his refusal to leave the bounds of the Aristotelian tradition, his meticulous use of the medieval method of refutation, and his thorough rationalism, enabled him to revolutionize the Aristotelianism of the 16th century—and indeed the entire trajectory of philosophy of the ages to come—and invoke the period of scientific free-thinking that breaks free of Christian doctrines and which later comes to be the Enlightenment. “Against Pico’s denial of astrology as incompatible with human freedom, he tried to
make an orderly and rational science of the stars, opposed to all superstition—the naturalist’s answer to the
Humanist”. (Randall, p. 277).

“During the twelve decades or so between Pomponazzi’s arrival (1484) and Galileo’s departure in 1610, the
learned community that Shakespeare called “fair Padua, nursery of arts”, achieved a distinction in scientific
and medical studies unmatched elsewhere in Europe. Thus, Pomponazzi’s career in northern Italy brought
him close to the most exciting advances of his time in science and medicine. In keeping with the nature of his
university appointments, he approached Aristotle from a perspective quite distant from Bruni’s humanism or
Lefèvre’s theologizing. […] Pomponazzi’s Aristotelianism developed entirely within the framework of natural
philosophy”. (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 105).

“With this final explanation, Pomponazzi has discovered natural causes for all miraculous events and hence
has eliminated the miracle as a category for understanding the process of nature. […] As we have seen,
Pomponazzi’s theory offers three fundamental natural explanations of events which Christianity ascribes to
the miraculous intervention of angels and demons. […] Here Pomponazzi’s method takes its most radical turn.
Biblical miracles are now also found to have natural causes. Moses, we learn, performed his task by natural
means. The “dead” revived by the prophets were not really dead. And the acts of Christ and the Apostles can
be explained “within natural limits”. ” (Pine, pp. 254-56).

“The histories of other religions record miracles similar to those of Christianity, and Pomponazzi justifies his
frequent citation of historians in a philosophical work as authorities for past natural events of rare occurrence.
Such is the most detailed and carefully worked out, the most plausible and at the same time most sweeping
expression of the doctrine of astrological control over the history and development of religions that I have seen


See also: Kristeller: “Renaissance Thought and its Sources”; “Medieval Aspects of Renaissance Learning”;
“Renaissance Thought II, Papers on Humanism and the Arts”.

FULLER DESCRIPTION AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST-
RENAISSANCE PHYSIOGNOMY

PORTA, GIOVANNI BATTISTA DELLA

De Humana Physiognomonia...Libri IIII: Qvi ab extimis, quæ in hominum corporibus conspiciuntur signis, ita eorum naturas, mores & consilia (egregiis ad viuum expressis Iconibus) demonstrant, ut intimos animi recessus penetrare videantur. Nunc ab innumeris mendis, quibus passim Neapolitana scatebat editio, emendati, primumq; in Germania lucem editi.

Hanoviae (Hannover), G. Antonium, impensis Petri Fischeri Fr. (Frankfurt), 1593. 8vo. (17x12 cm.). Contemporary full vellum. Title with woodcut printer’s device. (16), 534, (55) pp. 2 large woodcut portraits (verso of title-page and verso of last leaf in first quire) and numerous woodcuts in the text, depicting human and animal physiognomies. Title-page a bit soiled and a cut in lower right corner (no loss). 3 leaves in Index repaired in lower right corners with loss of a few letters. Otherwise a fine and well-preserved copy.

DKK 18,500.00 / EURO 2,500.00

The rare second edition (being the first edition printed in Germany) of Porta’s seminal work, the richly and well-illustrated “Physiognomia”, which is considered the founding work on Physiognomy.

Giambattista della Porta was an immensely influential Renaissance thinker, scientist and writer, who contributed greatly to the intellectual era of the Renaissance. His groundbreaking work on physiognomies
was originally printed in Italy in 1586 and was planned to appear in a second edition in Italy in 1593, but his work had attracted the attention of the Inquisition, and the printing of the work was prohibited. Thus the rare second edition appeared in Germany in 1593, and after 1600, numerous more editions of the work began to appear. He published his last work in 1610.

Porta played a seminal role in the development of the academies of the late Renaissance, and he himself established the Accademia dei Segreti (Academia Secretorum Naturae) some time prior to 1580. It met in Porta’s house in Naples, and it was devoted to discussion and study of the secrets of nature. It is thus no surprise that he was examined by the Inquisition—this was probably not only due to his astonishing work on the correspondence between the external form of the body and the internal character of the person (the “Physignomonia”), but also because of the “dangerous” activities of his academy. The academy was thus closed by the Inquisition, and in 1592 all further publication of his works was prohibited. This ban was not lifted until 1598.

His academy was a forerunner of the important “Academia dei Lincei” which was founded in Rome by Federico Cesi in 1603, and which Porta himself joined in 1610. Apart from the founder Cesi, Porta was the most influential member, at least until Galilei joined it in 1611.

In his seminal “De Humana Physiognomia”, Porta sets out to establish a link, in accordance with the prevailing theories of correspondences, between the external form of bodies and the expressions of faces and the psychology of persons by comparing with animal trades. In numerous expressive woodcuts throughout the work, human characters are depicted in comparison with animal counterparts (mammals, birds, etc.).

Though credited with having priority in inventing the telescope (due to book XVII, on refraction, of his “Magiae Naturalis, 1589, and his work on concave and convex lenses, De Refractione, 1593), Porta’s world image was fundamentally a magical one, as was typical of many Renaissance scientists and thinkers (e.g. Pico della Mirandola). His system of spiritualistic metaphysics led him to draw interesting and later influential analogies between plants, animals and men, and he saw the same shapes, humours etc. in organisms that at a first glance are not related. This created the foundation of his main physiognomic work, and in it he draws interesting parallels between human and animal shapes and physiognomies, throughout documenting this with illustrations.

This could perhaps sound as a fanciful work, but in fact he presents a striking and convincing system which should and would not be dismissed.

Porta’s studies in physiognomy became a main inspiration for Johann Kaspar Lavater in the 18th century. “Della Porta preceeded Lavater in attempting to estimate human characters by the features. He was the founder of physiognomy, and this is one of the earliest works on the subject.” (Garrison & Morton).

Giovanni Battista Della Porta, as he was also known, was born around 1535 and died in 1615, which dates him amidst The Scientific Revolution and Reformation. He was an Italian scholar, scientist, natural philosopher and playwright from Naples, who came to influence Renaissance thought in a number of ways.

“His devotion to experiment and his study of mathematics brought him in the 1580’s to the verge of greatness, but he was soon overwhelmed again by the lure of the occult and the marvelous. Perhaps Porta’s most compelling virtue and weakness was this youthful enthusiasm for the things of nature. There is a joy in his studies that not even the fatigue of working on the telescope and parabolic mirrors could diminish.” (DSB XI:98).

PROCLUS DIADOCHUS [PROKLOS, PROCLOS]

Platonic in virtutes morales, ac ciuiles, & partes, facultates que animi Commentarius, nunc primum editus. Raphaele Mambla interprete. Cui Tabellae easdem res ab eodem addite.

Roma, ex Officina Balthasaris Cartularii Perusini [Baldassare Cartolari, Cartolaio, Cartullaria], 1542. Small 8vo. Bound in nice later (19th cent.) marbled boards. Spine with minor wear and a few smaller spots. Four first leaves with a few spots, otherwise very nice and clean. All in all a nice and attractive copy. from the library of Petrus Buoninsegnus, with his book-plate (dated 1814) to inside of front board. (4), 26, (1) ff.

DKK 12,000.00 / EURO 1,600.00
The very rare first, and perhaps only, edition of this work, consisting in extracts of Proclos’ philosophical works in Latin, namely those on Plato, composed by Raphaël Mambla.

Renaissance printings of the philosophical works of the great Greek Neoplatonist Proclos (410-85) (often considered the last great Neoplatonist) are of the utmost scarcity. His greatest contribution lies in his commentaries on Plato’s works, as well as his “Theological Elements”. He developed one of the most elaborate, precise and convincing systems of Neoplatonism, and his influence on Medieval, and later also Renaissance, thought was immense.

Neoplatonism is a term invented in the 18th century for a school of religious and mystical philosophy, which was founded in the third century and dominated down to the end of Antiquity in the sixth century, when the Emperor Justinian closed the Neoplatonic Academy (529). Neoplatonic teaching revolved around a renewed study of the teachings of Plato that were now combined with the doctrines of other schools of Greek philosophy. The school called itself Platonic, but modern historians named it “Neoplatonic” in order to emphasize its differences from Plato. Plato’s dialogues were the main philosophical authority, but Plotinus, Ammnius, Proclus, and the other Neoplatonists attempted to fit all of Plato’s scattered doctrines into a coherent system and to incorporate other Stoic and Aristotelian ideas into this, thus creating a comprehensive synthesis of Greek thought. As such Neoplatonism came to dominate the final phase of ancient philosophy and bequeathed its heritage to subsequent ages. Neoplatonism must be considered the only really original product of Greek philosophy in the third century, and after having been neglected during the Middle Ages, this original philosophical direction was re-discovered in the Renaissance, the philosophy of which came to be hugely dominated by it.

“...In Proclus, one of the last heads of the Athenian school, Neoplatonism attains its most systematic and even schematic perfection. In his “Elements of Theology” and “Platonic Theology” all things and their mutual relations are neatly defined and deduced in their proper place and order; and the concepts of Aristotle’s logic and metaphysics, divested of their specific and concrete reference, are used as elements of a highly abstract and comprehensive ontology. As a commentator, Proclus applied this neat and scholastic system to some of Plato’s dialogues, just as other members of the school applied it to Aristotle. And as the leading philosophy of the period, Neoplatonism supplied practically all later Greek Church Fathers and theologians with their philosophical terms and concepts...” (Kristeller, Renaissance Thought and its Sources, p. 53).

During the Renaissance a special and profound interest in the teachings of Neoplatonism emerged, and the 15th and 16th century Latin translations and editions of the works of Plato and of the Neoplatonists, which made the texts available to Western readers, are of immense importance to the history of Platonism, Neoplatonism, and Western thought in general.

Not in Adams, not in Graesse, not in Brunet.
EDITIO PRINCEPS OF “THE BIBLE OF ASTROLOGY”

PTOLEMAEUS, CLAUDIUS—PTOLEMY


Norimbergae [Nürnberg], (Apud Ioannem Petreium), 1535. 4to. Bound in a beautiful contemporary full blindstamped vellum binding over wooden boards. Boards with blindstamped borders with portraits of Marcus, Johannes, Mattheus, Lucas, inside which large square blindstamped centre-piece with floriated decorations and small portraits. Three raised bands to back. Brass clasps to boards partially preserved. A bit of overall wear and general use. Overall a very nice and tight copy. Internally very nice and clean with only a bit of occasional minor brownspotting and soiling. Two leaves with a spot to outer margin (looks like remain of wax or lacquer), far from affecting text. Last four leaves of Greek text with dampstaining. First leaf of Latin text with coloured initial and a couple of red and green underlinings. Woodcut initials. First ab. 10 leaves of text with neat contemporary annotations in Latin and Greek. (6),59, (4) ff. + 84, (24) ff. (The four leaves in between the Greek and the Latin text being the title page: “Librorum de Iudiciis Astrologicis quatuor, duo priores conuersi in linguam Latinam à Ioachimo Camerario Pabergense. Annotatiunculae in eosdem. Aliquot loci translati de tertio & quarto libro Ptolemaei, per eundem Camerarium.”, two leaves of preface/dedication, dated 1535, one blank).

DKK 150,000.00 / EURO 20,100.00

The very rare first Greek/Latin edition, i.e. the editio princeps of the Greek text and the first edition of Camerarius’ seminal translation into Latin (directly from the Greek), of Ptolemy’s famous textbook of astrology known under the name “Tetrabiblos” or “Quadripartitum”, derived from its four books, the work which “ranks as the Bible of Astrology” (Stillwell) and which Ptolemy himself considered the natural complement to his “Almagest”: “as the latter enables one to predict the positions of the heavenly bodies, so the former expounds the theory of their influences on terrestrial things.” (D.S.B. XI:198). The present edition also contains the editio princeps of the Greek text of the “Karpos”, or “Centiloquium” (because of its 100 aphorisms), erroneously attributed to Ptolemy, as well as Pontano’s famous Latin version of it.

The “Tetrabiblos” is considered one of, if not the, most important surviving ancient texts on astrology, and its impact and influence on this field has been immense. It was by far the most popular astrological work of Antiquity and it also greatly influenced the Islamic world, the Medieval Latin West, and the Renaissance. It was reprinted continuously for centuries, and its great popularity is often attributed to the fact that it is a textbook on the art of astrology itself and a “scientific” defense of it rather than a mere manual instructing lay people on how to practice the art.
“Of Ptolemy’s genuine works the most germane to and significant for our investigation is his “Tetrabiblos”, “Quadripartium”, or four books on the control of human life by the stars... In the “Tetrabiblos” the art of astrology receives sanction and exposition from perhaps the ablest mathematician and closest scientific observer of the day or at least from one who seemed so for succeeding generations. Hence from that time on astrology was able to take shelter from any criticism under the aegis of his authority...” (Thorndike I:111).
As opposed to the “Karpos”, almost all research points to the fact that the “Tetrabiblon” must genuinely be by Ptolemy, and as such, it is to be considered of the greatest importance, not only to astrology, the history and impact of the science, but also to astronomy and to the understanding of the man who wrote one of the most important astronomical works of all times. In the “Tetrabiblos” Ptolemy first discusses the validity of the art of judicial astrology, and the introductory chapters are devoted to defending astrology against charges that it is uncertain and useless. According to Ptolemy, the laws of astronomy are beyond dispute, but the art of predicting human affairs from the movement of the stars should be attacked using more reason than that, and his main argument is that one should not reject the art itself merely because it can be abused, and frequently is, by impostors, or because it is an art not yet fully developed and may be difficult to handle properly. In book I Ptolemy goes on to explain the technical concepts of astrology, in book II, the influences on the earth in general, and in books II and IV, the influences on human life. “Although often dependent on earlier authorities, Ptolemy often develops his own dogma. The discussion in books III and IV is confined to what can be deduced from a man’s horoscope...” (D.S.B. XI:198).

“The great influence of the “Tetrabiblos” is shown not only in medieval Arabic commentaries and Latin translations, but more immediately in the astrological writings of the declining Roman Empire, when such astrologers as Hephaestion of Thebes, Paul of Alexandria, and Julius Firmicus Maternus cite it as a leading authoritative work. Only the opponents of astrology appear to have remained ignorant of the “Tetrabiblos”,
continuing to make criticisms of the art which do not apply to Ptolemy’s presentation of it or which had been specifically answered by him.” (Thorndike I: 115-16).

Camerarius’s translation of the “Tetrabiblon”, here printed for the first time, is probably the most important and influential of the many Latin versions of the text. It is considered the best, most widely used, and most important for the spreading of Ptolemaean astrology in the Renaissance, where this came to play a great role at the universities and beyond. “Melanchton never doubted the scientific accuracy of astrology. For instance, in 1535 Joachim Camerarius’ edition of Ptolemy’s “Tetrabiblos” was warmly received by Melanchton; in the same year he began lecturing on Ptolemy’s work at Wittenberg and stressed the scientific character of the work in his opening address. And in the following year he commented on the second book, beginning with an exhortation to appreciate the philosophical arguments of the first book….” (Stefano Caroti in: Paolo Zambelli edt., “Astrologi hallucinati” Stars and the End of the World in Luther’s Time, 1986, p. 113).

It is widely accepted that it is the present first Greek/Latin-edition, i.e. the editio princeps of the Greek text together with Camerarius’ Latin version of it, that has played the most dominant role in the spreading and interpreting of Ptolemy’s astrology in the Renaissance. Astrology, as derived from Classical Antiquity, with Ptolemy as the greatest exponent of them all, came to play a seminal role in Renaissance understanding of both exact sciences and philosophy, and thus this period witnessed a huge number of discussions and interpretations of astrology in general, but of the astrology of Ptolemy’s “Tetrabiblon” in particular. Many of the main proponents of Ptolemy’s astrology in the Renaissance are known specifically to have owned or read the present Greek/Latin edition and refer to Camerarius’ Latin version and to the original Greek text which had now become available for the first time.
THE PEAK OF RENAISSANCE TECHNOLOGY

RAMELLI, AGOSTINO

Schatzkammer, Mechanischer Künste, des Hoch=und Weitberühmten Capitains, Herrn Augustini de Ramellis, de Masanzana, Königlicher Majestät in Frankreich und Polen vornehmen Ingenieurs Darinnen viel unterschiedene Wunderbare, Kunstreiche Machinæ zubefinden, so man zu Friedens und Kriegesszeiten, in= und ausserhalb Vestungen, Auch sonst hochnützlichen und wol gebrauchen kan...Jetzo...deutsche versetzet, und mit zugehörigen Kupferstücken zum druck befordernt. Durch Henning Groszen den Jüngern.

(Leipzig, henning Groszen, Gedruckt durch Georgium Liger), 1620. Folio. 32x20,5 cm. Bound in a beautiful recent full long-grained red morocco with raised bands, an imitation of a Renaissance-binding. Boards with rectangular blind-tooled line-borders, blind-tooled decorations and corner-pieces. All edges gilt. Title-page with broad engraved title-border. Dedication (4) pp.—Vorrede (12) pp. and 462 pp. of text and last leaf (recto) with large woodcut printer’s device, year, printer, and publisher. Engraved portrait of Ramelli (engraved by Andreas Breitschneider anno 1620 after the original) and 195 engravings (numb. 1-195) of which 14 are on plates, 8 double-page, the others in full-page (except no. 148/49 on one). Engravings in sharp good impressions. Slightly paper-browned and a few scattered brownspots. Old name on bottom of title-page. Dedication-leaves with old underlinings.

DKK 85,000.00 / EURO 11,400.00

First (and only) German edition of Ramelli’s remarkable landmark work of Renaissance technology, which anticipated many devices that were successfully manufactured centuries later. Only two editions of this work were published, the original from 1588 (Paris) with text and explanations in both Italian and French, and this German translation for which the illustrations were re-engraved by Andreas Bretschneider, preserving the details of the illustrations, for which the work is so well known. The German edition is very rare, and both are esteemed and sought after.

The engravings, which are among the most frequently reproduced in scientific and technological literature, depict pump design, mill construction, hydraulic machinery, all manners of derricks, looms, cranes, saws, siege machinery, fortification and foundry equipment. There is also an illustration of an elaborate “book-wheel” or reading machine.

“Another work even more remarkable, in that it anticipated with detailed sketches a number of devices which were successfully manufactured and marketed two or three centuries later, is “Le Diverse et Artificioso Machine del Capitano Agostino Ramelli”, published in Paris in 1588. Ramelli (1530?—90) gained his capacity for service under the Marquis de Marignan, who quite possibly studied under Leonardo da Vinci. The handsome quarto volume contained one hundred and ninety-five full-page illustrations, artistically rendered, and described both in French and Italian.” (Wolf, A History of Science, Technology and Philosophy in the 16th and 17th Centuries, II:539).

Ramelli was a true man of the Renaissance. He was greatly influenced by the increasing importance placed upon mathematics and geometry as an important tool for engineers and artists, and particularly by the writings of Guidobaldo del Monte (1545—1607) and Petrus Ramus (1515—1572). Ramelli’s interest in mathematics is
demonstrated in the preface to his book, “On the excellence of mathematics”, in which he shows the necessary of mathematics to the learning of all liberal arts.

Ramelli was captain of engineers to the kings of France and Poland. His reputation grew and he eventually left France to serve under the Duke of Anjou, later King Henry III.

Dibner, Heralds of Science No 173 (1588-edition); Wellcome No. 5324; Sotheran I: 3882; Klaus Jordan Nr. 3045.
SCALIGER, JULIUS CAESAR. — J.C. BORDONIUS

Exotericarum exercitationum liber quintus decimus de subtilitate, ad Hieronymum Cardanum. In extremo duo sunt indices: priorbreuiusculus, continens sententias nobiliores: alter opulentissimus, penè omnia complectens.

Lutetiae (Paris), Ex officina typographica Michaelis Vascosani, uia Iacobaea, ad insique Fontis, 1557. 4to. Lovely 17th century full calf binding with five raised bands and small gilt ornaments to back. Boards with two blindstamped triple-line borders inside eachother, the inner one with gilt corner-ornaments, gilt centre-pieces. Binding with some wear. Leather overall worn, corners bumped, capitals worn, upper capital with a bit of loss of leather. Strip of about one cm. cut away from top of t-p., no loss of text, old (near contemporary) scribbles and owner’s names crossed out on t-p., near contemporary or a little later handwritten ex libris to top of title-page (“Ex libris Joannis Rebraut”). Contemporary or a little later marginal annotations to some leaves and likewise neat bibliographical inscription to pasted down front endpaper (7 lines, …”Hac Editio…/ est emendatissima et elegantissima.”). Smaller marginal dampstaining to upper corner from leaf Siii onwards, not affecting text. Last about 15 leaves with very minor marginal loss, not affecting text. Internally all in all nice and clean. Illustrated with woodcuts, about 19 larger and smaller woodcut illustrations in the text, depicting diagrams of the earth, how water is created, moon, sun & earth, etc. (8), 476, (1), (59, -indexes), (1, -Privilege du Roi), (1, -colophon, verso blank) pp.

DKK 20,000.00 / EURO 2,700.00

The beautiful and rare first edition of Scaliger’s devastating polemical attack on Cardano’s main work, “De Subtilitate”, which caused one of the most famous of Renaissance disputes and invoked a foundational discussion of the nature of empirical approach to natural sciences and philosophy. The work presents us with numerous interesting attempts at describing and explaining various (natural) phenomena and (philosophical) dilemmas, and it became a highly famous and widely read book that exercised profound influence upon later philosophers, scientists and natural historians. “The “Exotericarum exercitationum” won a celebrity that survived its author’s death. Lipsius, Bacon, and Leibnitz were among its later admirers; and Kepler who read it as a young man, accepted its Averroist doctrine of attributing the movement of each star to a particular intelligence.” (D.S.B. XII:136).

The title of the work indicates that this be the 15th book of Scaliger’s attack on Cardano’s main work “De Subtilitate” — a “rambling miscellany of natural philosophy which eventually grew to twenty-one books and appeared in many reprints and revisions before and after Cardano’s death in 1575” — polemically indicating that there were enough problems with the work to fill another 14 volumes. 14 such volumes were never written, nor planned. “Seldom read but widely cited in its own time and the century following was the “Fifteenth Book of Exoteric Exercises on Subtlety” by Julius Caesar Scaliger, a blast from an admirer of Aristotle bothered by Cardano’s prose as well as his originality and sloppiness; Scaliger’s title implied that there was enough wrong with “De subtilitate” to have filled fourteen other volumes. At one point, Scaliger thought that his attach had literally killed its victim, but it only helped enlarge his reputation, for better or for worse.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 308).
Just as Cardano’s two grand encyclopaedic works, Scaliger’s “Exotericarum” deals with all parts of natural philosophy, and thereby with all subjects that in the Renaissance were accepted as belonging to this discipline, i.e. natural science in general. “In astronomy Scaliger ridiculed Cardano’s stress on the astrological significance of comets; and he denied that the world’s decay is proven because the apse of the sun was thirty-one semidiameters nearer the earth than in Ptolemy’s time. Scaliger also rejected several of Cardano’s beliefs in natural history: that the swan sings at its death; that gems have occult virtues (“a flea has more virtue than all the gems”); that there exist corporeal spirits that eat; that the peacock is ashamed of its ugly legs.” (D.S.B. XII:135).

Due to his realistic and empirical approach to natural sciences and philosophy, Scaliger considered it necessary to attack the likes of Cardano. He considered himself an empirical Averroist, like e.g. Pomponazzi (by whom he is said to have been taught), and like him also primarily based his research and work on experience and observation. This search for truth was closely connected with his disputatious nature, which is what finally led him to this elaborate criticism of Cardano’s “De subtilitate libri XXI”, as it had lead him to attack Erasmus 26 years earlier. However, having received no answer from Cardano, Scaliger believed a false rumor that he had died, and suddenly felt awful having attacked the allegedly dead man;—he thus wrote him a funeral oration, full of repent. Cardano had not died, as it turned out, and he published his reply two years after the death of Scaliger.

Julius Caesar Scaliger (Bordonius) was born in Padua, Italy, in 1484, and died in Agen, France, in 1558. He studied at the University of Padua, where he received the doctorate in artes in 1519, and where he was appointed lecturer in logic the following year,—a post he declined, perhaps in order to study medicine, the doctorate in which he is believed to have obtained as well. In Padua he was taught philosophy by the most prominent of philosophers: Pomponazzi, Marc’ Antonio, Zimara and Nifo. Scaliger himself later received a great reputation throughout Europe, not only as a philosopher, but also as a physician and a natural scientist. He befriended the likes of Ronsard and Rabelais (for a time), and was known by almost all learned Europeans in the Renaissance. It was because of Scaliger that Nostradamus and Rabelais came to Agen. Due to the empirically grounded research, many of the results of Scaliger’s work were considered controversial and heretical;—he was summoned before the Inquisition (but was acquitted), and some of his books were placed on the “Index of Prohibited Books”.
INAUGURATING THE SCEPTICAL REVOLUTION OF THE RENAISSANCE

SEXTUS EMPIRICUS


Anwerpen, Plantin, 1569 [Paris, Martin Le Jeune, 1569 on Colophon]. Small folio. 19th century marbled paper boards. Gilt leather title-label to spine. Wear to extremities and inner front hinge a bit weak. Light dampstain to top and inner margin of first leaves. First two leaves strengthened at inner margin. Small needle-holes to inner margin throughout, from previous stitching/binding. Light scattered brownsplotting. A bit of soiling and old owner’s name to title-page. Woodcut printer’s device to title-page (Plantin), and to the “title-page” (pagination continues through it) of the “Pyrrhoniarum Hypotyposeon” as well as the colophon and the end of the Index (all three Martin Le Jeune); woodcut vignettes and initials at beginning. (8), 583, (1), (30,—Index) pp. Housed in a custom-made dark greu cloth box with gilt leather titles to spine.

DKK 24,000.00 / EURO 3,200.00

The seminal first edition of the work that came to determine the course of much modern thought, one of the single most important printings in the history of Western thought, namely the first edition of the collected works of Sextus Empiricus, being leading French Catholic Humanist Gentian Hervet’s Sextus Empiricus-edition, which consists mainly in the very first appearance in print of Sextus’ hugely influential main work “Adversos Mathematicus” (pp. 1-398), together with the second edition of the “Hypotyposes” (pp. (399)-542) (first edition of the Hyp.: Estienne, 1562, which did not contain any other of Sextus’ writings). The two 16th century editions of Sextus’ works came to inaugurate a new era in the history of Western thought, and caused Sextus to be viewed as “the father of modern philosophy”, profoundly influencing the thought of Bruno, Montaigne, Descartes, and many other pivotal thinkers of the modern era. Between the two editions, Hervet’s complete 1569 one, with the “Adversos Mathematicus” for the first time, is by far the most important, determining the influence of scepticism on modern thought.


“As the only Greek Pyrrhonian sceptic whose works survived, he came to have a dramatic role in the formation of modern thought. The historical accident of the rediscovery of his works at precisely the moment when the skeptical problem of the criterion had been raised gave the ideas of Sextus a sudden and greater prominence than they had ever before or were ever to have again. Thus, Sextus, a recently discovered oddity, metamorphosed into “le divin Sexte”, who, by the end of the seventeenth century, was regarded as the father
of modern philosophy. Moreover, in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the effect of his thoughts upon the problem of the criterion stimulated a quest for certainty that gave rise to the new rationalism of René Descartes and the “constructive skepticism” of Pierre Gassendi and Martin Mersenne.” (Popkin, p. 18).

“The printing of Sextus in the 1560s opened a new era in the history of scepticism, which had begun in the late fourth century BCE with the teachings of Pyrrho of Elis. […] Before the Estienne and Hervet editions, Sextus seems to have had only two serious students, Gianfrancesco Pico at the turn of the century and Francesco Robortello about fifty years later.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, pp. 240-41).

Our knowledge of ancient scepticism comes from Sextus, which is introduced to the Renaissance with the first printings of his works in 1562 and 1569, Hervet’s 1569-edition being by far the most important, not only due to the fact that it is here that Sextus’ main work, “Adversus Mathematicos” appears for the first time, but also due to the influence that Hervet, his interpretation, and his preface came to exercise on the use of skepticism throughout more than a century.

“The revival of ancient philosophy was particularly dramatic in the case of scepticism. This critical and anti-dogmatic way of thinking was quite important in Antiquity, but in the Middle Ages its influence faded […] when the works of Sextus and Diogenes were recovered and read alongside texts as familiar as Cicero’s “Academia”, a new energy stirred in philosophy; by Montaigne’s time, scepticism was powerful enough to become a major force in the Renaissance heritage prepared for Descartes and his successors.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, pp. 17-18).

Hervet’s seminal Sextus-edition was printed in Paris by bookseller Martin Le Jeune, but part of the edition was taken up by Christopher Plantin and issued in Antwerp under his imprint, explaining the two different imprints of our copy.
“The first printed edition was by Henri Estienne (Stephanus) in 1562 of Sextus’ “Hypotyposes”. A second printed Latin edition of the “Hypotyposes” plus “Adversus Mathematicos” appeared in 1569. The text of the “Hypotyposes is that of Estienne, the translation of “Adversus Mathematicos” was done by French counter-reformer and theologian, Gentian Hervet, from a manuscript that belonged at the time to the Cardinal of Lorraine. The Greek text was not published until 1621 by the Chouet brothers.” (Popkin, p. 18).

“Gentian Hervet (d. 1584) was a committed churchman, who after studies in the universities of Orleans and Paris lived in the household of Reginald Pole, later to became Archbishop of Canterbury and Cardinal, at first in England then—as Pole had, because of the Reformation, to leave England—in Padua, Venice and Rome. Hervet took part with Marcello Cervini (later Pope Marcellus II) in the first sessions of the Council of Trent. He returned to France in 1555 as vicar general to the bishop of Noyon and wrote pamphlets against the Huguenots. In 1561 he entered the service of the Cardinal of Lorraine, Charles de Guise, whom he accompanied to the third period of the Council of Trent (1562-3). In 1564 he took part as canon of the cathedral in the provincial council of Rheims, in which the cardinal published the decrees of the Council of Trent. About the time of his activity in the Council of Trent the focal point of Hervet’s translations shifted. He translated not only the Greek Fathers of the Church, but in addition, under the influence of academic scepticism as represented also by Reginal Pole, Sextus Empiricus’ “Adversus Mathematicos” (Paris, 1569). He had long been active as translator of works connected with the Aristotelian philosophy. During an earlier sojourn in Rome, he published a number of philosophical texts which concerned the controversies surrounding Pietro Pomponazzi. In 1544 he translated into Latin Aristotle’s “De anima”, together with the commentary of Johannes Philoponus. There followed translations of Alexander of Aphrodisias’s “De fato” (1544) and “Quaestiones naturales et morales” (1548) and of Zacharias Scholasticus’s “Ammonius: Dialogus quod mundus non sit Deo coaeternus” (1546). In these works Hervet described those who denied the immortality of the soul as atheists and as opponents of Aristotle and his commentators.” (Lohr, p. 36).

Hervet’s religious outlook came to be determinative for the use of scepticism throughout the following century. He not only gave to the modern world the writings of Sextus, and the only proper knowledge we have of ancient scepticism, he also outlined its importance and usage. During the 1560’ies, Hervet fought intellectually against the encroachments of Calvinism, challenging various Protestants to debate with him and publishing many pamphlets against their views. He saw Sextus’ work as ideal for demolishing this new form of heretical dogmatism, that of the Reformer. If nothing can be known, he insisted, Calvinism cannot be known either.

In the mid-sixteenth century, the Calvinist movement in France grew very rapidly, and within a few years, France was embroiled in a civil war, both militarily and intellectually. “In order to save the citadels of French thought from falling into the hands of the Reformers, strong measures had to be taken. One of these measures was to put Pyrrhonism to work in the service of the Church. The first step taken in this direction was the publication in 1569 of the writing of Sextus Empiricus in Latin by a leading French Catholic, Gentian Hervet, the secretary of the cardinal of Lorraine. As has been mentioned earlier, Hervet, in his preface, boldly wrote that in this treasury of doubts was to be found an answer to the Calvinists. They were trying to theorize about God. By destroying all human claims to rationality through skepticism, Hervet believed that the Calvinist contentions would be destroyed as well. Once one realized the vanity of man’s attempts to understand, the fideistic message that God can only be known by faith, not by reason, would become clear.

The avowed aim by Hervet, to employ Pyrrhonism to undermine the Calvinist theory, and then to advocate Catholicism on a fideistic basis, was to become the explicit or implicit view of many of the chief battlers against the Reformation, in France. By adapting the pattern of argument of the sceptics of the issue at hand, the Counter-Reformers constructed “a new machine of war” to reduce their opponents to “forlorn scepticism” in which they could be sure of nothing. (Popkin, p. 67).
“In his dedicatory epistle [of the present work] to his employer, Hervet said that he had come across a manuscript of Sextus in the cardinal’s library at a time when he was worn out from his Counter-Reform activities and his work on the Church Fathers. He took the manuscript to read as a divertissement while traveling. Then, he reported, when he had read it with unbelievable pleasure, he thought it was a most important work, since it showed that no human knowledge can resist the arguments that can be opposed to it. The only certainty we can have is in God’s Revelation. In Sextus one finds many arguments against the pagans and heretics of the time, who try to measure things by reason and who do not understand because they do not believe. In Sextus one can find a fitting answer to the “nouveaux academiciens” and Calvinists. Scepticism, by controverting all human theories, will cure people from dogmatism, give them humility, and prepare them to accept the doctrine of Christ.

This view of Pyrrhonism, by one of the leaders of French Catholicism, was to set the direction of one of its major influences on the next three-quarters of a century. Shortly after the publication of Sextus, however, one finds signs of it being read for philological reasons and as a source material about ancient philosophy. One such reader was Giordano Bruno, who discussed Pyrrhonism in some of his dialogues. […]” (Popkin, p. 37).

Thus, Hervet’s Sextus-edition came to be determinative for late 16th and 17th century thought, not only being determinative for the fight against the Reformation, but also directly influencing some of the greatest thinkers of the era: Bruno, Montaigne, Descartes, and many, many others, both directly and indirectly.

Montaigne’s knowledge of Sextus stems primarily from Hervet’s edition, which influenced him tremendously. “[h]e [Montaigne] also read the newer material provided by the Latin Sextus, which emerged only ten years before he began to write. Montaigne’s most extensive presentation of scepticism is also his longest essay…” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, 252). “Montaigne, who covered the beams of his study with quotations from Sextus, had his motto—“Que sais-je?”—cast as a medal with the scales on the obverse, to remind him always of the mismeasure between God and mankind and of the need to keep doubting.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 255).

“[a]ncient Scepticism had a number of followers in the renaissance, especially in the sixteenth century, when the writings of Sextus became more widely known. […] Scepticism in matters of religion is by no means incompatible with religious faith, as the example of Augustine may show; consequently this position had many more followers during the sixteenth century than is usually realized. The chief expression of this sceptical ethics is found in some of the essays of Montaigne, and in the writings of his pupil, Pierre Charon.” (Kristeller, p. 36).

Hervet’s edition expresses true philosophical insight, and it was due to his understanding of the texts that Sextus came to exercise the influence that he did upon the coming century.

“In contrast to Estienne’s rather lighthearted promulgation of what was later called “that deadly Pyrrhonic poison”, Gentian Hervet gave similar but more somber reasons for his edition in 1569. Hervet (1499—1584),
secretary of the Cardinal of Lorraine and participant at part of the Council of Trent, linked his work on Sextus with what Gianfrancesco Pico had earlier done. He declared that “just how useful Sextus Empiricus’ commentary can be in upholding dogmas of the Christian religion against outside philosophers, Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola has beautifully taught us in that book in which he upholds Christian philosophy against the dogmas of outside philosophers.” (Popkin, p. 36).

“This leads us to the problem of what, if any, relation there is between the revival of interest in the writings of Sextus Empiricus by Pico della Mirandola and the first Latin editions of the works of Sextus by Henri Estienne and Gentian Hervet. No mention is made of Gianfrancesco in Estienne’s preface to the first of Sextus’ works to be printed in 1562, and there is no clear indication that he knew of Pico’s work. When the larger work against the mathematicians was published seven years later, however, the translator, Gentian Hervet, has the following to say in his preface:

“Just how useful Sextus’ Empiricus’ commentary can be in upholding dogmas of the Christian religion against outside philosophers, Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola has beautifully taught us in that book in which he upholds Christian philosophy against the dogmas of outside philosophers.”

Here perhaps we have a clearer and more accurate evaluation of Pico and his endeavor than we have hitherto encountered. Hervet seems to be one of the few who realized precisely what Pico was getting at. He sees Gianfrancesco as one who has safeguarded the Christian religion against the onslaught of dogmatic philosophers. Hervet believed, as Pico did, that a sceptical attitude toward the various polemics among dogmatic schools of philosophy is the best safeguard for Christianity.” (Schmitt, p. 169).

“Since the Renaissance had to discover or rediscover the tools of philology and history needed for such detective work, the pioneering labours of obscure humanist scholars—Gentian Hervet, who translated sextus, or William Canter, who first published a Greek text of the “Eclogae” of Stobaeus—certainly deserve our memory and admiration. It was they who first edited, organized, translated, printed, and disseminated the philosophical remains of antiquity that succeeding centuries have come to take for granted. If Thales and his successors were the fathers of Western philosophy, the humanist scholars of the Renaissance were the midwives of its rebirth in a classical form.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 18).

ESTABLISHING THE GENRE OF MORAL ORATIONS

SPERONI, SPERONI

_Orationi. Novamente Poste in Luce_.

Venetia, Ruberto Meietti, 1596. (Colophon: In Venetia, 1596, Per Giovani Alberti). 4to. 18th century marbled blue paper binding with traces of wear, especially to spine and extremities. Handwritten paper title-label to spine. A few leaves evenly browned, and some leaves with a damp stain to upper margin, mostly faint. A bit of light brown spotting, but overall a nice and clean copy. Very discreet “stamp” to title-page (“tarquin”) and a handwritten symbol with initials (a cross with A. L. M. F. at the ends) to verso of title-page. Woodcut allegorical title-vignette, woodcut printer’s device to colophon, and large woodcut initial at beginning. A lovely printing. (8), 215, (1). With a preface, in which Speroni’s friend Ingolf Conte de Conti dedicates the work to the Duke of Urbino. (“Di Padoua di 16. Decembre, 1596”).
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The scarce first edition of Speroni’s highly important work of orations, which is responsible for establishing the entire genre of moral orations and for Speroni’s reputation as the first Italian orator.

Sperone Speroni, one of the important cultural figures of the time, known from Torquato Tasso, his pupil, as “Sperone, who possesses fully all the arts and sciences”, counts as the dominant literary figure on the “terraferma” in the generation following Bembo. During the early 1520s Speroni studied with the greatest of the Renaissance philosophers, Pietro Pomponazzi, and by the 1530s had become a major light at Padua, where he became professor of logic and general philosophy. Due to his eminent oration skills and his widely acknowledged and remembered speeches, he became known as the first Italian orator, and as the first modern thinker to incorporate moral themes into his speeches

“Il passait pour le premier orateur de l’Italie… il a réussi dans ses poésies par la grâce et la vivacité, enfin, selon Ginguéné, “son style en prose est un des meilleurs de cd siècle”… il est le premier Italien qui ait traité dans ce genre des questions de morale.” (N.B.G.)

He is widely famed for having helped found and shape the Paduan Accademia degli Infiammati (1540).

The present work contains his 9 famous orations that each in their way came to influence the development of rhetoric, morals and politics of the Renaissance. In his “In morte del Cardinal Pietro Bembo”, he showed that a great literature might be produced if Petrarch were studied and imitated in Italian just as the classics were in Latin, directly influencing the emergence of Petrarch-scholarship.

But the most famous of the orations is probably the controversial “Contra le Cortigiane” [“oratin against the Courtesans”], in which he accuses the courtesan of being a glutton and vain, and taking advantage of the name “corte” (court), which associates her erroneously with the noble and honourable environment of the court. “Oh, diabolic pride! Base prostitute, of which state, and of which subjects are you a mistress?”. His words finally metamorphose her from woman to serpent or half beast and half devil. (See: Paola MalpeZZi Price, “Moderata Fonte: Women and Life in Sixteenth Century Venice”, p. 74).
The collection of his orations in the first printing became highly influential in the late Renaissance and came to determine the development of the art of writing speeches as well as a certain way of presenting philosophy and moral thought to the people.
PAVING THE WAY FOR EMPIRICISM

TELESIO, BERNARDINO [BERNARDINUS TELESIUS]

*De Mari, Liber Unicus. Ad Illustress. Ferdinandum Carrasam Soriani Comitem.*

Napoli, Apud Iosephum Cacchium, 1570. 4to. Bound in 18th century marbled boards. Completely fresh and clean copy. Two small marginal holes to last two leaves, far from affecting text. Good, wide margins. Telesio’s woodcut title-device (a beatiful naked woman, all alone, far from the troubles of the world, illuminated by the sun, surrounded by a border carrying the saying in Greek: “mona moi fila” — presumably depicting the goddess of Truth), and 11 lovely, illustrated woodcut initials. 12 ff.
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The rare first edition of one of Telesio’s smaller scientific treatises, his treatise on the sea, which was based on purely empirical knowledge. The work constituting a corrective to Aristotle and a continuation of his magnum opus on the things of nature, the important second edition of which was printed in the same year, also by Cacchium. The empiricism that Telesio propounds in his novel, empirically based scientific treatises, like the “De Mare”, caused him to be to be considered “the first of the moderns” (Francis Bacon),

“Bernardino Telesio (1509—1588) belongs to a group of independent philosophers of the late Renaissance who left the universities in order to develop philosophical and scientific ideas beyond the restrictions of the Aristotelian-scholastic tradition. Authors in the early modern period referred to these philosophers as ‘novateurs’ and ‘modern’. In contrast to his successors Patrizzi and Campanella, Telesio was a fervent critic of metaphysics and insisted on a purely empiricist approach in natural philosophy—he thus became a forerunner of early modern empiricism. He had a remarkable influence on Tommaso Campanella, Giordano Bruno, Pierre Gassendi, Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes and authors of the clandestine Enlightenment like Guillaume Lamy and Giulio Cesare Vanini.” (SEP).

Telesio was born in Cosenza “and in a sense he opens the long line of philosophers through which the South of Italy has asserted its Greek heritage, a line that links him with Bruno and Campanella, with Vico in the eighteenth century, and with Croce and Gentile in our own time.” (Kristeller, Eight Philosophers, p. 97). He was educated by his uncle, the humanist Antonio Telesio, in Milan and Rome, and he studied philosophy and mathematics at the university of Padua, where he got his doctorate in 1535. He had a great respect for the famous Aristotelian Vicenzo Maggi, with whom he discussed his magnum opus, obtaining his approval before publishing the seminal second version of it in 1570. He was closely connected not only with Maggi, but also with the other leaders of the most intelligent and official Aristotelianism of his age. But Telesio opposes the Aristotelianism of both his own and earlier times, claiming that they all erected arbitrary systems that consisted of a strange mixture of reason and experience. They created their systems without consulting nature, and thus they merely obtained arbitrary ideas of the world.

What separates Telesio and his contemporaries from the great Renaissance thinkers that had gone ahead is not merely the passing of a few decades, but the emergence of a completely different intellectual atmosphere. “The tradition of medieval thought, which was still felt very strongly in the fifteenth century and even at the beginning of the sixteenth, began to recede into the more distant background, and it was now the broad thought and learning of the early Renaissance itself which constituted the tradition by which the new generations of thinkers were shaped, and against which their immediate reactions were directed.” (Kristeller, Eight Philosophers, p. 91). Telesio belongs to a group of thinkers that we call the Renaissance philosophers.
of nature. They are considered a group by themselves, different from the humanists, Platonists, and Aristotelians that we usually group other Renaissance thinkers into. What distinguished these philosophers of nature, however, was not a different subject matter from that of the Aristotelians and the Platonists (of both contemporary and earlier times), but their clear claim to explore the principles of nature in an original and independent way, tearing themselves loose of an established tradition and authority that kept them in binds. They formulated novel theories and freed themselves from the ancient philosophical authorities, especially Aristotle, who had dominated philosophical speculation, not least natural philosophy, for centuries.

Telesio, of course, did not stand alone in this group of bold, original thinkers that we call the Renaissance philosophers of nature, and whose quest it was to make new discoveries and to attain knowledge unaccessible to the ancients, it also included for instance Fracastoro, Cardano, Paracelsus, and Bruno. But Telesio in particular protrudes, as his thought is distinguished by such clarity and coherence, and his ideas anticipate important aspects of later philosophy and science.

“Telesio dedicated his whole life to establishing a new kind of natural philosophy, which can be described as an early defense of empiricism bound together with a rigorous criticism of Aristotelian natural philosophy and Galenic physiology. Telesio blamed both Aristotle and Galen for relying on elaborate reasoning rather than sense perception and empirical research. His fervent attacks against the greatest authorities of the Western philosophical and medical traditions led Francis Bacon to speak of him as “the first of the moderns” (Opera omnia vol. III, 1963, p. 114). He was perhaps the most strident critic of metaphysics in late Renaissance times. It was obviously due to his excellent relationships with popes and clerics that he was not persecuted and was able during his own lifetime to publish his rather heterodox writings, which went on the index shortly after his death.” (SEP).

“Giordano Bruno speaks of the “giudiciosissimo Telesio” in the third dialog of “De la causa”, whilst Francis Bacon based his own speculative philosophy of nature on a blend of Telesian and Paracelsian conceptions (Giachetti Assenza 1980; Rees 1977; 1984). Thomas Hobbes followed Telesio in the rejection of species (Schuhmann 1990; Leijenhorst 1998, p. 116ff.) The physiology of René Descartes in “De homine” shows close similarities to Telesio’s physiological theories as they are presented in “De natura rerum” (Hatfield 1992). Telesio also had some influence on Gassendi and on libertine thinkers (Bianchi 1992.” (SEP).

Adams: T:291.
THE MANIFESTO OF NATURAL PHILOSOPHY—DEFINING “SPACE” FOR THE FIRST TIME PROPER

TELESIO, BERNARDINO [BERNARDINUS TELESIUS]

De Rerum Natura iuxta propria principia, Liber Primus, & Secundus, denuò editi.

Napoli, Apud Iosephum Cacchium, 1570. 4to. Contemporary limp vellum with handwritten title to spine. Remains of old paper-labels to top and bottom of spine. Spine with loss of ab. 3x2 cm. of vellum to middle, not affecting the book block, which is sound and fine underneath. Some soiling to binding, but all in all fine and unrestored, albeit a bit loose. Some brownspotting to title-page (not heavy), otherwise just a bit of scattered brownspotting. All in all internally very nice and clean, and with good, wide margins. Old owner’s name (Juliani Ricci) to front free end-paper and title-page, which also has his inventory number in neat hand: “no/ 634”). Telesio’s woodcut title-device (a beautiful naked woman, all alone, far from the troubles of the world, illuminated by the sun, surrounded by a border carrying the saying in Greek: “mona moi fila”—presumably depicting the goddess of Truth), and numerous lovely, illustrated woodcut initials throughout. 95 ff.
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The rare and important first edition thus, being the much enlarged (by treatises on specific questions of natural philosophy) and revised second edition and the first edition under the canonical title “De Rerum Natura” (clearly referring to Lucretius’s great work), of Telesio’s revolutionizing main work, which established a new kind of natural philosophy and earned him the reputation as “the first of the moderns” (Francis Bacon). The work is a manifesto for natural philosophy emancipated from peripatetic rationalism, expressed clearly in the subtitle to the first book of the work: “the structure of the world and the nature and magnitude of bodies contained in it are not to be sought from reason, as the ancients did; they must be perceived from sensation and treated as being things themselves.” (translation of the Latin of the present work, p. 2). “Taken as a whole, the book is a frontal assault on the foundations of Peripatetic philosophy accompanied by a proposal for replacing Aristotelianism with a system more faithful to nature and experience.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 311).

Telesio’s “De Rerum Natura” constitutes one of the first serious attempts to replace Aristotle’s natural philosophy, and his seminal, novel theory of space and time anticipates Newton’s absolute time and absolute space. It furthermore even seems that it is in the present work that the word “space” (“spatium”) is used for the first time to determine what we now mean by space—thus Telesio has here created an entirely new terminology for one of the single most important phenomena within physics, astronomy, philosophy, etc., giving it a terminological precision that is unprecedented and which has influenced the entire history of science and philosophy.

“[i]n some of his characteristoc theories, Telesio appears as a direct or indirect forerunner of Newton and Locke.” (Kristeller, Eight Philosophers, p. 107).

“Bernardino Telesio (1509—1588) belongs to a group of independent philosophers of the late Renaissance who left the universities in order to develop philosophical and scientific ideas beyond the restrictions of the Aristotelian-scholastic tradition. Authors in the early modern period referred to these philosophers as ‘novateurs’ and ‘modern’. In contrast to his successors Patrizzi and Campanella, Telesio was a fervent critic of metaphysics and insisted on a purely empiricist approach in natural philosophy-he thus became a forerunner
of early modern empiricism. He had a remarkable influence on Tommaso Campanella, Giordano Bruno, Pierre Gassendi, Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes and authors of the clandestine Enlightenment like Guillaume Lamy and Giulio Cesare Vanini.” (SEP).

Telesio was born in Cosenza “and in a sense he opens the long line of philosophers through which the South of Italy has asserted its Greek heritage, a line that links him with Bruno and Campanella, with Vico in the eighteenth century, and with Croce and Gentile in our own time.” (Kristeller, Eight Philosophers, p. 97). He was educated by his uncle, the humanist Antonio Telesio, in Milan and Rome, and he studied philosophy and mathematics at the university of Padua, where he got his doctorate in 1535. He had a great respect for the famous Aristotelian Vicenzo Maggi, with whom he discussed his magnum opus, obtaining his approval before publishing the seminal second version of it in 1570. He was closely connected not only with Maggi, but also with the other leaders of the most intelligent and official Aristotelianism of his age. But Telesio opposes the Aristotelianism of both his own and earlier times, claiming that they all erected arbitrary systems that consisted of a strange mixture of reason and experience. They created their systems without consulting nature, and thus they merely obtained arbitrary ideas of the world.

What separates Telesio and his contemporaries from the great Renaissance thinkers that had gone ahead is not merely the passing of a few decades, but the emergence of a completely different intellectual atmosphere. “The tradition of medieval thought, which was still felt very strongly in the fifteenth century and even at the beginning of the sixteenth, began to recede into the more distant background, and it was now the broad thought and learning of the early Renaissance itself which constituted the tradition by which the new generations of thinkers were shaped, and against which their immediate reactions were directed.” (Kristeller, Eight Philosophers, p. 91). Telesio belongs to a group of thinkers that we call the Renaissance philosophers of nature. They are considered a group by themselves, different from the humanists, Platonists, and Aristotelians that we usually group other Renaissance thinkers into. What distinguished these philosophers of nature, however, was not a different subject matter from that of the Aristotelians and the Platonists (of both contemporary and earlier times), but their clear claim to explore the principles of nature in an original and independent way, tearing themselves loose of an established tradition and authority that kept them in binds. They formulated novel theories and freed themselves from the ancient philosophical authorities, especially Aristotle, who had dominated philosophical speculation, not least natural philosophy, for centuries.

Telesio, of course, did not stand alone in this group of bold, original thinkers that we call the Renaissance philosophers of nature, and whose quest it was to make new discoveries and to attain knowledge unaccessible to the ancients, it also included for instance Fracastoro, Cardano, Paracelsus, and Bruno. But Telesio in particular protrudes, as his thought is distinguished by such clarity and coherence, and his ideas anticipate important aspects of later philosophy and science.

His magnum opus, the extremely influential “De Rerum Natura”, is that which by far best expresses his novel thoughts and that which most profoundly influenced the thought, philosophy, and science of the centuries to come.

“[b]y 1547 his ideas seem to have been in public circulation, and within a few years he was at work on his first treatise “On the Nature of Things According to Their Own Principles”, one of the more incisive titles in Renaissance philosophy and a clear allusion to Lucretius. [...] Pressed by his followers, he published the original two book version of “De rerum natura” [the title of this being “De Natura iuxta propria principia liber”] in 1563 [recte: 1565], having previously testing the soundness of his arguments in conversations with Vincenzo Maggi, a noted Paduan Peripatetic. Another edition followed in 1570; in 1575 Antonio Persio gave public lectures on the Telesian system in Venice, Padua, Bologna, and the south; and in 1586 appeared the
definitive expansion to nine books. The author died two years later in Cosenza.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 310).

In the preface to the work, Telesio rejects Aristotle’s doctrine as being in conflict with the senses, with itself, and with the Scriptures, and he claims that his own doctrine is free from these defects. As we have seen above, in the introduction, or sub-title to the first book, he furthermore insists that unlike his predecessors, he has followed nothing but sense perception and nature. He then proceeds to expound the principles of his natural philosophy, positing heat and cold as the two active principles of all things, and matter as a third, passive, principle. Having developed and applied these principles, he concludes the first work with a very interesting treatment of space and time. After having set forth his own position, he examines and refutes the views of earlier philosophers, especially those of Aristotle, whom he considers superior to all others. “So far as Telesio’s relation to Aristotle is concerned, we must admit that he shows considerable independence, both in his own theories and in his detailed criticism of Aristotle’s views, and this independence is more valuable since it is based not on ignorance, but on a thorough knowledge of the Aristotelian writings, and is accompanied by a genuine respect for the relative merits of Aristotelianism.” (Eight Philosophers, pp. 101-2).

The only sources apart from Aristotle that Telesio quotes at length are medical, i.e. Hippocrates and Galen, from which he got his notions of human physiology. He does, however, draw upon other sources, borrowing notions, though not quoting them (e.g. Fracastoco, the Epicureans, the Stoics, the Neoplatonists, Ficino). “These apparent borrowings from various sources should certainly not be overlooked, but one’s final impression is that in transforming and combining these ideas, and in formulating some important new ones, Telesio was remarkably original. In his cosmology, the role assigned to heat, cold, and matter is chiefly of historical interest, since it is one of the first serious attempts to replace Aristotle’s natural philosophy. We may give him credit, too, for apparently doing away with the sharp distinction between celestial and terrestrial phenomena, which was one of the chief weaknesses of the Aristotelian system. Of greater significance are his theories of the void, and of space and time. His assertion of an empty space was in a sense a return to the position of the ancient atomists, which Aristotle had tried to refute; this position must have been known to Telesio, from Lucretius and also from Aristotle himself, but the evidence on which he based himself was partly new and, so to speak, experimental.
Still more important is his theory of space and time. Whereas Aristotle had defined time as the number or measure of motion, thus making it dependent on motion, Telesio regards time as independent of, and prior to, motion, like an empty spectacle. He thus moves a long step away from Aristotle in the direction of Newton’s absolute time.

In the case of space, the change in conception is even more interesting. The Greek term “Topos”, which we often translate as space has the primary meaning of place, and Aristotle’s theory that the “topos” of the contained body is the limit or border of its containing body makes much better sense when we translate “topos” as place rather than space. Telesio seems to be aware of this ambiguity, for he uses not only the term “locus”, which had been the standard Latin translation of Aristotle’s “topos”, but also “spatium”, which is much more appropriate for his notion of an empty space in which all bodies are contained. Thus he again moves away from Aristotle in the direction of Newton’s absolute space; but, more than this, I am tempted to believe that it was Telesio himself who gave terminological precision to the word “spatium” (space) and substituted it for “locus”, a usage for which I do not know any earlier clear instances”. (Kristeller, Eight Philosophers, pp. 103-4).

Telesio’s theories and entire world-view proved to be extremely influential, and his is considered a forerunner—directly as well as indirectly—of not only Newton and Locke, but also Descartes and Bacon, and a strong direct influence on Bruno, Campanella, and Patrizi.

“Telesio dedicated his whole life to establishing a new kind of natural philosophy, which can be described as an early defense of empiricism bound together with a rigorous criticism of Aristotelian natural philosophy and Galenic physiology. Telesio blamed both Aristotle and Galen for relying on elaborate reasoning rather than sense perception and empirical research. His fervent attacks against the greatest authorities of the Western philosophical and medical traditions led Francis Bacon to speak of him as “the first of the moderns” (Opera omnia vol. III, 1963, p. 114). He was perhaps the most strident critic of metaphysics in late Renaissance times. It was obviously due to his excellent relationships with popes and clerics that he was not persecuted and was able during his own lifetime to publish his rather heterodox writings, which went on the index shortly after his death.” (SEP)

“Giordano Bruno speaks of the “giudicosissimo Telesio” in the third dialog of “De la causa”, whilst Francis Bacon based his own speculative philosophy of nature on a blend of Telesian and Paracelsian conceptions (Giachetti Assenza 1980; Rees 1977; 1984). Thomas Hobbes followed Telesio in the rejection of species (Schuhmann 1990; Leijenhorst 1998, p. 116ff.) The physiology of René Descartes in “De homine” shows close similarities to Telesio’s physiological theories as they are presented in “De natura rerum” (Hatfield 1992). Telesio also had some influence on Gassendi and on libertine thinkers (Bianchi 1992).” (SEP)

“His sense of empirical science, which included progressive ideas on space, vacuum, and other physical topics, grew out of a disenchanted world-view remarkable for its hard-headed clarity.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 314).


D.S.B. XIII:277-80. (“Telesio also introduced concepts of space and time that anticipated the absolute space and time of Newtonian physics”).
THEMISTIUS PERIPATETICUS (THEMISTIOS)
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key text of the Renaissance, “which opened a new period in the interpretation of the Greek philosopher [i.e. Aristotle]” (Lohr, p. 25). The work was partly responsible for the development of Renaissance Aristotelianism and thus Renaissance thought in general. The combination of the fact that we here have the paraphrases by one of the greatest ancient Greek commentators of the key texts of the most significant philosopher of all times, rendered into Latin by perhaps the most significant translator of the period and printed at the most crucial time for the development of early modern thought, makes this one of the most significant philosophical publications of the Renaissance. There can be no doubt as to the influence that the present publication came to have on the development Renaissance philosophy.

“The publication of Barbaro’s translation of Themistius inaugurated a new period in the study of Aristotelian philosophy. In his version of Themistius’ “Paraphrases” we encounter not simply a translation occasioned by contemporary controversies, as was often the case in the Middle Ages. Rather, Barbaro’s version brings together a corpus of the commentaries of Themistius on Aristotelian philosophy: the “Posterior Analytis”, “Physics”, “De anima” and “Parva naturalia”. (Lohr, p. 26).

The first printing of the work appeared in 1480 (the same year stated at the end of each section in the present edition), and in 1499 this second printing appeared. Both printings are of the utmost scarcity and almost impossible to find. After these two incunable-editions, at least 9 new printings appeared before 1560, bearing witness to the great impact of the text, and in 1570 Hieronymus Scotos printed a new edition.

“With reference to those works of Aristotle which were and remained the center of instruction in logic and natural philosophy [i.e. The Posterior Analytics, Physics, etc.], the most important changes derived from the fact that the works of the ancient Greek commentators became completely available in Latin between the late fifteenth and the end of the sixteenth centuries and were more and more used to balance the interpretations of the medieval Arabic and Latin commentators. The Middle ages had known their works only in a very limited selection or through quotations in Averroes. Ermolao Barbaro’s complete translation of Themistius and Girolamo Donato’s version of Alexander’s “De Anima” were among the most important ones in a long line of others. When modern historians speak of Alexandrism as a current within Renaissance Aristotelianism that was opposed to Averroism, they are justified in part by the fact that the Greek commentators, that is, Alexander and also Themistius, Simplicius, and many others, were increasingly drawn upon for the exposition of Aristotle.” (Kristeller, p. 45).

“Equally important [as the recovery of Aristotle’s “Mechanics” and “Poetics”] for the continued growth of the Peripatetic synthesis was the recovery and diffusion of the Greek commentaries on Aristotle... The most important of the two dozen commentators were Alexander of Aphrodisias, Ammonius, Simplicius, Themistius, and John Philoponus. Of these five, only Alexander and Themistius were Aristotelians...” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 68).

Already in the Middle Ages, scholars had been aware of and used commentaries on and paraphrases of the key texts of Aristotle, but their knowledge of this was primarily based on some Latin translations and allusions, fragments, and summaries in the writings of the Muslim philosophers, e.g. Averroes. But with the emergence and translations into Latin of the ancient Greek commentators [Alexander and Themistios being the primary ones] and their paraphrases of Aristotle’s texts, the Renaissance came to discover an Aristotle that would influence almost all thought of the period. The ancient Greek commentators not only had a much more thorough knowledge of classical Greek thought than would have been possible for a medieval writer, but they also had access to works that were later lost and through these ancient commentators rediscovered in the Renaissance. By the middle of the 16th century, almost all of these texts had been printed in both Greek and Latin, and these publications were of the utmost importance to the development of almost all Renaissance thought. “Their recovery, publication, and translation took some time, but almost all circulated in Greek and Latin by the
1530’ies. They do not cover all of Aristotle, but several treat such key texts as the “Organon”, the “Physics”, and “De anima”, thus making them useful ammunition in such controversies as the immortality dispute provoked by Pietro Pomponazzi and his colleagues.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 69).

Among the most important texts in this tradition that influenced all thought of the era, were Themistios’ paraphrases of Aristotle’s seminal texts, in particular “De Anima”, “Posterior Analytics”, and Book Lambda (XII) of the “Metaphysics”.

“We possess part of his [Themistios’] early work, his “Paraphrases of Aristotle”, the portion still extant being a somewhat prolix exposition of the “Later Analytics”, the “Physics”, the “De Anima”, and some minor treatises.” His paraphrase of the “Metaphysics”, Book “lambda” [i.e. XII], was translated into Arabic (in century IX), and hence into Hebrew (1255), and Latin (1576).” (Sandys, I:352).

There can be no doubt about the groundbreaking character of Hermolao Barbaro’s translation into Latin of almost all of Themistios’ paraphrases of Aristotelian texts. Not only was Themistios considered one of the most important renderers of Aristotle’s text, but Barbaro was perhaps the most influential translator of the time. His translation of Themistios’ paraphrases came to dominate, directly or indirectly, almost all Aristotelian thought of the high Renaissance (from late 15th century) and he was responsible for many of the most important and influential positions on the seminal question of the immortality of the soul that dominated philosophical thought at the time. “Through the first two-thirds of the fifteenth century, Pomponazzi’s predecessors at Padua seem not to have used the ancient commentators, but philosophers of the next generation – most notably Nicoletto Vernia and Agosto Niño – began to consult them in new translations by Ermolao Barbaro and others. Barbaro’s charge that Averroes had lifted his doctrines of the soul from the commentators surely helped excite interest in them.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt p. 69).

Graesse VII:112 (erroneously stating 1491 in stead of 1499); Brunet V:778; Hain-Copinger: 15464.
THE MOST IMPORTANT PARAPHRASE OF THE UNMOVED MOVER

THEMISTIUS PERIPATETICUS (THEMISTIOS)

Paraphrasis in XII librum Aristotelis de prima Philosophia, Mose Finzio interprete. [i.e. Paraphrase of book Lambda of Aristoytle’s Metaphysics – On the Unmoved and Primary Mover].


DKK 24,000.00 / EURO 3,200.00

The exceedingly scarce first printing of one of the most important paraphrases in the history of philosophy and science, that of Themistios on Book Lambda (Book XII) of Aristotle’s Metaphysics, translated by Moyse Finzio. The present work constitutes perhaps the most important paraphrase of one of the most important chapters in the history of philosophy, science, and religion, that in which Aristotle writes about the Unmoved (and primary) Mover, a chapter of his “Metaphysics” which for millennia has dominated almost all branches of Western thought. Theophrastos’ paraphrase was of seminal importance to the understanding of Aristotle’s concept of the Unmoved Mover in the Renaissance and consequently of the many controversies and debates that it caused. In the Renaissance, not least through Themistios’ paraphrase and Scotum’s first printing of it, Aristotle’s concept of the Unmoved Mover as the first cause of everything in the Universe not only came to dominate much philosophical thought and became a main agent in the quest to unite religion and science (here especially physics and astronomy), it also came to play a dominant role in the emerging understanding of the universe as such.

The present paraphrase by Themistios had early on been translated from the original Greek into Arabic by Abu Bischr Matta, but both the Arabic translation and the original Greek have been lost. All that is known is a Hebrew translation made by Moses Ben Samuel Tibbon around 1255, and it is this translation that Moses Finzius used as the basis for the present Latin translation. It was not until 1558 that Finzius finished the translation and that it appeared for the first time in Latin; it was thus not printed together with the other extant Themistios-paraphrases of Aristotle’s work, translated by Ermolao Barbaro, but appeared on its own in 1558. This original 1558 edition is of the utmost scarcity and is lacking in most bibliographies which erroneously list the 1576-edition as the first.

“With reference to those works of Aristotle which were and remained the center of instruction in logic and natural philosophy [i.e. The Posterior Analytics, Physics, Metaphysics, etc.], the most important changes derived from the fact that the works of the ancient Greek commentators became completely available in Latin between the late fifteenth and the end of the sixteenth centuries and were more and more used to balance the interpretations of the medieval Arabic and Latin commentators. The Middle ages had known their works only in a very limited selection or through quotations in Averroes. Ermolao Barbaro’s complete translation of Themistius and Girolamo Donato’s version of Alexander’s “De Anima” were among the most important ones in a long line of others. When modern historians speak of Alexandrism as a current within Renaissance Aristotelianism that was opposed to Averroism, they are justified in part by the fact that the Greek commentators, that is, Alexander and also Themistius, Simplicius, and many others, were increasingly drawn upon for the exposition of Aristotle.” (Kristeller, p. 45).
“Equally important [as the recovery of Aristotle’s “Mechanics” and “Poetics”] for the continued growth of the Peripatetic synthesis was the recovery and diffusion of the Greek commentaries on Aristotle... The most important of the two dozen commentators were Alexander of Aphrodisias, Ammonius, Simplicius, Themistius, and John Philoponus. Of these five, only Alexander and Themistius were Aristotelians...” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 68)

Already in the Middle Ages, scholars had been aware of and used commentaries on and paraphrases of the key texts of Aristotle, but their knowledge of this was primarily based on some Latin translations and allusions, fragments, and summaries in the writings of the Muslim philosophers, e.g. Averroes. But with the emergence and translations into Latin of the ancient Greek commentators [Alexander and Themistios being the primary ones] and their paraphrases of Aristotle’s texts, the Renaissance came to discover an Aristotle that would influence almost all thought of the period. The ancient Greek commentators not only had a much more thorough knowledge of classical Greek thought than would have been possible for a medieval writer, but they also had access to works that were later lost and through these ancient commentators rediscovered in the Renaissance. By the middle of the 16th century, almost all of these texts had been printed in both Greek and Latin, and these publications were of the utmost importance to the development of almost all Renaissance thought. “Their recovery, publication, and translation took some time, but almost all circulated in Greek and Latin by the 1530’ies. They do not cover all of Aristotle, but several treat such key texts as the “Organon”, the “Physics”, and “De anima”, thus making them useful ammunition in such controversies as the immortality dispute provoked by Pietro Pomponazzi and his colleagues.” (Copenhaver & Schmitt, p. 69).

Among the most important texts in this tradition that influenced all thought of the era, were Themistios’ paraphrases of Aristotle’s seminal texts, in particular “De Anima”, “Posterior Analytics”, and Book Lambda (XII) of the “Metaphysics”.

“We possess part of his [Themistios’] early work, his “Paraphrases of Aristotle”, the portion still extant being a somewhat prolix exposition of the “Later Analytics”, the “Physics”, the “De Anima”, and some minor treatises.” His paraphrase of the “Metaphysics”, Book “lambda” [i.e. XII], was translated into Arabic (in century IX), and hence into Hebrew (1255), and Latin (1576).” (Sandys, I:352).


Not in Graesse (which only has the 1576-edition, also Venice, H. Scotus, the same that Sandys erroneously thinks is the first: “His paraphrase of the “Metaphysics”, Book “lambda” [i.e. XII], was translated into Arabic (in century IX), and hence into Hebrew (1255), and Latin (1576).” (Sandys, I:352).)

Not in Brunet.

Adams: 456.
SKETCHING THE CHARACTER OF MAN

THEOPHRAST. — THEOPHRASTUS, THEOPHRASTOS, TEOFRAST, TEOFRASTOS

(Charakteres – Characters). Libellus continens notas atque descriptiones morum quorundam vitiosorium, conversus in linguam Latinam & annotationibus illustratus a Leonharto Lycio. Ex uito sapiens emendat suum.


DKK 20,000.00 / EURO 2,700.00
Extremely scarce first edition thus, containing all of Theophrastus’ 23 characters in Greek and Latin, being the first edition of Auberius’ excellent Latin translation and first edition with Lycio’s interesting commentaries.

“This very rare edition, which presents us with the Greek text of H. Stephan (Stephanus), contains a new Latin version by Claudius Auberius, who was scarcely twenty years of age when he composed it. The notes are critical and historical; sometimes bold, but always erudite... This version and these notes were republished in Zuinger’s edition of Aristotle’s “Ethics” at Basil. fol. 1582.” (Dibdin II:500).

This version of Theophrastus’ milestone work, the first recorded attempt at systematic character writing, became hugely influential and is still referred to in modern editions of the text, as Auberius’ translation is regarded as one of the best and most important interpretations of the text. Claude Aubery or Claudius Auberius (ca. 1540—1596) was a noted philosopher and medical doctor, professor of Philosophy in Lausanne. He translated several Greek texts into Latin, but is best remembered for his excellent version of Theophrastus’ “Characters”, which was highly influential throughout the Renaissance and which was incorporated into later Renaissance Aristotle-editions as the standard-version of Theophrastus’ text.

Theophrastus (ca. 371—ca. 287 BC), Aristotle’s successor at the Lyceum, and probably the most famous Aristotelian of all times, successfully presided over the Peripatetic School for 36 years and here wrote a number of works. The most famous of them is arguably his great moral opus “The Characters”, which continues to amaze readers to this day. It introduced the “character sketch”, which became the core of the Character as a genre, and as such it influenced the entire literary tradition of the Western world.

The fabulous, very witty, astute, harsh, and insightful characteristics of type characters of the human race have been formative for our understanding of moral virtues and vices and how they come to be expressed in man, for our understanding of human nature in general. It is no wonder that the work became so popular and widely read during the Renaissance, the era of man as the centre of the universe.

“Le texte est le celui de Henri Estienne (insére dans l’édition d’Aristote de 1557), mais dans la version il suit pour la plupart ses propres conjectures” (Graesse 7: 125).
Dibdin II:500, Graesse VII:125.
THE ALDUS-COIN

TITUS VESPASIAN

Roman coin. Denarius.

[Rome, AD 79-80]. 18 mm. diameter. Dolphin entwined around anchor on one side, and Draped bust of Ttitus, turning right on the other side. An excellent, near mint specimen. 3.05 g.

DKK 18,000.00 / EURO 2,400.00

Excellent specimen of the beautiful and rare coin that inspired Aldus Manutius’ famous printer’s device, the dolphin-and-anchor, the most famous logo in the history of book printing and the trademark of the Renaissance. The Aldus coin is the only book—or printing—related ancient coin in existence.

Aldus Manutius, the most famous printer of all times, had been given a copy of the Titus coin, with the dolphin-and-anchor logo on the verso, as a gift by Pietro Bembo. He was extremely taken by the magnificent logo, that in Roman times, by Titus Vespasian, had been used to illustrate the proverb “Festina lente” (“make haste slowly”), and was so inspired by it that he began using it as his printer’s device at the very beginning of the 16th century. Before it appears as his printer’s device for the first time, he used it as an illustration in one of his most magnificent books, Colonna’s “Hypnerotomachia Poliphili”, 1499.

In his “Adagiorum Collectanea”, the collection of classical proverbs that he kept revising throughout his life, Erasmus Roterodamus had composed a lengthy essay on the “festina lente” proverb, which intrigued him immensely. Erasmus traced the motto back to the emperor Titus Vespasian, who had minted a coin with the emblem (i.e. the present coin), and had the rare opportunity to inspect that very coin—namely that which belonged to his printer, Aldus Manutius, who had been given it by the great Italian scholar Pietro Bembo. The second edition of Erasmus’ “Adagiorum Collectanea” was published by Aldus in Venice in 1508, and Erasmus subsequently praises his printer to the skies in the course of explaining “festina lente”.

Erasmus explains the motto as such: “the circle as having neither beginning nor end represents eternity. The anchor, which holds back and ties down the ship and binds it fast, indicates slowness. The dolphin, as the fastest and in its motions most agile of living creatures, expresses speed. If then you skillfully connect these three, they will make up some such principle as “Ever hasten slowly”, and adds that by claiming it as his own (recognizable and marketable) emblem, Aldus gave “fresh celebrity to the same device that was once approved by Vespasian”. Not only is it “most familiar, it is highly popular among all those everywhere in the world to whom sound learning is either familiar or dear.” Erasmus seems to also suggest that the device had perhaps become too popular: “the city of Venice, with its many claims to distinction, has none the less become distinguished through the Aldine press, so much so that any books shipped from Venice to foreign countries immediately find a readier market merely because they bear that city’s imprint.”
And he might have been right. In fact, the Aldine press was so successful and renowned, and Aldus’ printer’s device as taken from the Titus Vespasian coin, so incorporated a symbol of elegant, correct printing and higher learning, that it was imitated by printers all over Europe. By using the dolphin-and-anchor device, other printers, although much inferior, would benefit from the authority and prestige of the Aldine press. In spite of Erasmus’ attempts to make the public aware of this by praising the efforts of Aldus and opposing them to “those common printers who reckon one pitiful gold coin in the way of profit worth more than the whole realm of letters”, publishers kept using the Aldus device for centuries.

The coin is rarely seen is such excellent condition as here.
TOLETUS’ GREAT “DE ANIMA” — COMMENTARY

TOLETUS, FRANCISCUS

Commentaria unà cum Quaestionibus in tres libros Aristotelis De Anima: Nunc primum in lucem editia.

Colobne, Arnoldus Birckmannus, 1576. 4to. Lovely contemporary full richly blindstamped pigskin binding over wooden boards. Raised bands to spine and rich ornaments to boards. With the original brass/leather clasps fully preserved. Spine a bit worn, and with contemporary handwritten title. Lower edge of front board a bit sooted and a black stain to front board. Internally very fine and clean with only very minor occasional browning. A single, small, non-disturbing wormhole from beginning to end. A few old underlinings. Woodcut title-vignette and woodcut initials throughout. (8), 179, (1) pp.

DKK 16,000.00 / EURO 2,100.00

The extremely scarce second edition of Toletus’ hugely important commentary, with the equally important questions, on Aristotle’s “On the Soul”, being one of the most important Renaissance commentaries on one of the most influential and commented on philosophical works of all times. The work was of great importance to late Renaissance thought and the theories presented here widely influenced seventeenth-century scholasticism.

This highly influential and extremely popular work originally appeared in 1575 and was reprinted twenty-two times by 1625. The 1570’s editions of the work are of the utmost scarcity. No auction records have been noted within the last 40 years, the only one being the 1583-edition, which is also the most commonly found in library-holdings; only two copies of the first edition from 1575 are in libraries worldwide, and likewise merely two copies of this second edition. Apart from those four copies, the earliest edition listed by OCLC is that from 1580.

Franciscus Toletus (Francisco de Toledo Herrara) (1532—1596) was a highly important Spanish Jesuit theologian, Biblical exegete and the first Jesuit Cardinal. After receiving a master of arts at Valencia, he studied theology at Salamanca under the famous Domingo de Soto. He was ordained a priest in 1556 and was already teaching philosophy at Salamanca when he became a Jesuit in 1558. In the following year he was sent to Rome where he taught philosophy and then theology, bringing with him the Thomistic outlook emphasized at Salamanca by Francisco de Vitoria and his disciple, Soto. In 1593 he became the first Jesuit cardinal.

Toletus was an independent, clear thinker with a fundamentally Thomistic outlook. In philosophy his most important works were his commentaries on Aristotle’s logic and treatise on the soul, which were widely read and discussed in his time. In these, he drew upon the whole previous scholastic tradition to raise and answer the most important philosophical questions of his time. His works are especially interesting, as he was neither a slavish follower of Aristotle nor limited to defend any medieval scholar of his own community, as were many other commentators of the period. Governed by reason, he respectfully and clearly analyzes the key text of the greatest philosopher of all times and draws out his own philosophical theories.

“Although Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Society (the Jesuits), had established Aristotle as the basic philosophical authority and Thomas as the guide to philosophy as well as theology, the Thomism of the Jesuits turned out to be a rather moderate one, which neither closed the doors on differing positions, such as those of the Scotists and the nominalists in psychology, nor prevented its members from developing new positions of their own. An early example of this attitude was Franciscus Toletus. His commentary on “De anima”, first
published at Cologne in 1575, followed the traditional division of Averroes, but also gave the Greek division of the text into chapters and had the third book begin according to Greek tradition. The authors upon whom Toletus depended were the Latin commentators, especially Thomas, as well as the Greeks and Arabs, with special attention given to Averroes. However rich his commentary, the major philosophical discussion is found in the more than seventy “quaestiones”, which resemble a systematic treatise.” (Schmitt, Skinner, Kessler, “The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy”, p. 511).

If one question is to be pointed out as the main philosophical one of the Renaissance, it is that of the soul’s relation to reason or intelligence. “Anima” and “Intellectus” were then the watchwords of the schools: their relation, or the nature of “anima intellective”, was the point round which discussion moved and on which was invoked the authority of Averroes, Alexander or St Thomas. When the audiences in the Italian class-rooms called out “Quid de anima?” this was the subject which they desired to hear treated.” (Douglas, p. 74).

For Toletus, intellectual abstraction is simply a precision from accidents and a consideration of the substance of anything. In his great “De anima”—commentary, he allowed for a direct intellectual cognition of a singular material thing. And although he thinks it more probable that an agent intellect is necessary, he regards it as probable that there is no agent intellect or that the two intellects distinguished by Aristotle are one and the same. “Toletus followed a Thomistic line, but departed from Thomism in some details. He held that individuals are directly apprehended by the intellect and that the agent intellect is the same power as the possible intellect. He rejected the Thomistic doctrines of the real distinction between essence and existence and of individuation by designated matter; for Toletus individuation results from form.” (Cambr. Dict. of Phil.).
“Having already stated that the basic psychological positions of the church were identical with those of true philosophy, Toletus was less anxious in philosophical argument itself to adhere to the faith and more open to strictly philosophical values. This applied particularly to the problem of immortality. Citing the volitional aspects of the human soul as well as the intellectual ones, he argued that immortality could be demonstrated by natural means, while admitting that Aristotle himself was unclear on the question...” (Schmitt, Skinner, Kessler, “The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy”, p. 511).

Toletus stands at the very centre of 16th century Spanish scholarship and counts as one of the most important Aristotle scholars of this tradition. His works formed the basis of Jesuit teaching in logic until the end of the 1600s.

Only two copies in libraries world-wide (Berlin, Gotha) (and likewise only two of the first, 1575-edition). Not in Adams, which only has the 1581, 1582, 1583, and 1594 editions.
Section II
FOUNDING THE HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE RENAISSANCE – PMM 347

BURCKHARDT, JACOB

Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien.


DKK 9,500.00 / EURO 1,300.00

The scarce first edition of Burckhardt’s main work, the groundbreaking work on the culture of the Renaissance, which helped found the historical study of this previously much overlooked era.

“ “The most penetrating and subtle treatise on the history of civilization”, in Lord Acton’s words, “a mere essay”, as Burckhardt himself called it, “The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy” has, for more than a century, determined the general conception of thirteenth- to fifteenth-century Italy.” (PMM p. 210)
This classic of Renaissance historiography is of the greatest importance to the development of the history of the Renaissance and of history of art and culture in general. More specifically, Burckhardt here establishes the fact that the Renaissance came first in developing the human individuality to the highest degree. He places the earliest signs of “the modern European Spirit” in Florence, which was a great contributing factor to the comprehension of this city as representing one of the highlights of European culture.

The Swiss historian of art and culture, Jacob Christoph Burckhardt (1818—1897), contributed seminally to the historiography of these two fields. He is considered the discoverer of the Renaissance, and with his main work he founded the study of thirteenth- to fifteenth-century Italy and thereby the historical study of the Renaissance, the society of which he dealt with all aspects of.

In general, Burckhardt’s works all constitute an original historical approach to the study of art, culture, social institutions etc.

As a highly respected scholar of Greek civilization, Burckhardt, with his original historiographical approach, was highly admired by Nietzsche, who also attended his lectures. The two kept in contact and corresponded frequently. Like Nietzsche, Burckhardt was a great admirer of Schopenhauer, and he greatly opposed the Hegelian interpretations of history.

“… as in the case of other great historians such as Gibbon, Ranke, Macaulay, no criticism of details can detract from the powerful spell which Burckhardt’s book has exercised upon such widely different writers as Ruskin, Nietzsche and Gobineau, as well as upon innumerable lovers of the most magnificent period of European history.” (PMM).

Printing and the Mind of Man 347.
THE ULTIMATE CLASSIC ON RENAISSANCE PHILOSOPHY

CASSIRER, ERNST

*Individuum und Kosmos in der Philosophie der Renaissance.*

Leipzig u. Berlin, Teubner, 1927. 4to. Contemporary (or a little later) half cloth with gilt title to spine. Slight sunning to upper part of front board. A nice, clean, and solid copy, with wide margins. Illustrated. (10),458 pp. + 2 plates.

**DKK 2,700.00 / EURO 370.00**

The uncommon first edition of Cassirer’s major contribution to Renaissance philosophy, the ultimate classic on the subject, which completely changed the view on intellectual thought of the Renaissance.

Cassirer’s thought-provoking classic investigates the emergence of Renaissance thought in opposition to that of the Middle Ages and becomes the first work to properly focus on the original thought and philosophy that takes place in the Renaissance. It is with this work that Renaissance thought is given a place in the history of philosophy and upon this work that all later writing on the subject is based. It is here that Cassirer propounds
his fundamental insight, at that time completely novel, that in the Renaissance a new, dynamical “Weltgefühl” emerges, a feeling which gave rise to a new systematic and uniform “Philosophy” of the individual. Cassirer understands the Humanism of the Renaissance as a Humanism of Individuality, thus implicitly pointing to the contextual dependence of the Renaissance on Enlightenment. The work is a cornerstone of Renaissance history and is fundamental to students of the history of science and philosophy, political theory, and the history of Reformation and Renaissance thought as such. Cassirer’s “Individuum und Kosmos” “[s]hould be widely used by students of the various literature of political theory.” (John Herman Randall, Jr.).

“This provocative volume, one of the most important interpretive works on the philosophical thought of the Renaissance, has long been regarded as a classic in its field. Ernst Cassirer here examines the changes brewing in the early stages of the Renaissance, tracing the interdependence of philosophy, language, art, and science; the newfound recognition of individual consciousness; and the great thinkers of the period—from da Vinci and Galileo to Pico della Mirandola and Giordano Bruno. The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy discusses the importance of fifteenth-century philosopher Nicholas Cusanus, the concepts of freedom and necessity, and the subject-object problem in Renaissance thought. This fluent translation of a scholarly and penetrating original leaves little impression of an attempt to show that a ‘spirit of the age’ or ‘spiritual essence of the time’ unifies and expresses itself in all aspects of society or culture.” (review of the University of Chicago-edition of 2010).
HEIDEGGER ON HUMANISM

HEIDEGGER, MARTIN

Über den Humanismus.


DKK 750.00 / EURO 100.00

First separate edition of Heidegger’s important work on Humanism, expounding his controversial thoughts on Humanism in general and Humanism as viewed in the Renaissance. The question posed is that of what man is seen from a humanistic point of view.

The work was originally published in “Platons Lehre von der Wahrheit” and later in “Wegmarken” (1967).

“Die vorliegende Schrift ist der für die Veröffentlichung durchgesehene und an einigen Stellen erweiterte text eines Briefes, der im Herbst 1946 an Jean Beaufret (Paris) geschrieben wurde.” (Verso of title-page).

The work is written in the form of a letter, answering Beaufret’s question: “How is it possible to ascribe meaning to the word Humanism?” Heidegger’s answer gives us the essence of his late philosophy. He wishes to show that humanism itself is the cause of the problem that it considers itself the solution to.
MICHELET, J.

*Renaissance. Histoire de France au seizième siècle.*

Paris, 1855. 8vo. Very nice contemporary diced half calf with gilt spine. Cracks to upper and lower hinges, and inner front hinge weak, but overall a very nice copy. A bit of browning and soiling to first and last leaves and dampstaining to inner margin of first ab. 20 leaves. (10), CLX, 334 pp.

DKK 6,800.00 / EURO 900.00

First edition of this seminal work — the third in Michelet’s series of “The History of France” — in which he coins the term “Renaissance” and uses it for the period of the sixteenth century as an historical period in its own right.

The humanists of the period that we now call the Renaissance had a strong sense of being and doing something that was very different from that of the centuries before them; they clearly thought of themselves as living in
and creating a new epoch, re-inventing and re-using the classical Greek and Roman values. Once again they gave birth to the humanistic arts, literature, philosophy, painting, sculpting, etc. It is not a new invention of later times to view this historical epoch as something new and still something different, something worthy of the term “Re-birth”, acknowledging both the source from which inspiration was drawn as well as the achievements of the new era.

Thus, Michelet is not the first to understand what went on in this period, but still he changed our concept of it for ever—he invented the term which has not only determined this period ever since, but which has also been used to explain and understand all that went on in this most crucial period for modern man. It is in the present work by Michelet that he uses for the first time the noun “Renaissance” for this epoch and lets it refer to the discovery of world and of man in the 16th century. He not only lets the term refer to the artistic or scholarly part of the period, he lets it refer to the entire complex of changes that were taking place in this period, and he thus gives birth to the period as that of the mind and spirit of man, instead of just that of painting and learning.

Michelet’s work appeared at a time that allowed for it to exercise the greatest of influence. From the end of the 16th century until the middle of the 18th century, the history of the Renaissance was a field that barely existed. Only with Voltaire was some focus put on this period that we ever since Michelet have called the “Renaissance”. Only with Michelet are we given the vocabulary to sum up this period and to describe it properly and in detail. When he publishes his work in 1855, historians and thinkers are ready to view this period as something in itself and as something worth noticing. That which Michelet thus began is that which Burckhardt takes up in his “Cultur der Renaissance in Italien” (1860), in which “Renaissance” is finally characterized as the birth of modern humanity. Both Michelet and Burckhardt believed that modern, secular man is a product of the “Renaissance”.

“The terms “restauratio” or “restitutio” had been applied by fourteenth-century Italian humanists to the revival of ancient languages and literatures, that of “rinascita” by Ghiberti and Vasari to the new blossoming art and architecture. In the eighteenth century Voltaire and Gibbon first saw the Italian civilization of the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries as an entity and as a determining factor in the whole course of European history. Michelet (324) in 1855 first used the term “renaissance” for this period as an historical epoch in its own right. Burckhardt, an admirer of both Voltaire and Gibbon, supplied the final synthesis.” (Printing and the Mind of Man, p. 211)
COINING “HUMANISM”

NIETHAMMER, F.I.

*Der Streit des Philanthropinismus und Humanismus in der Theorie des Erziehungs-Unterrichts unserer Zeit.*

Jena, Frommann, 1808. 8vo. Contemporary (original?) blue full paper binding with blindstamped title-label to spine. Occasional light brownsplotting throughout. All in all a very nice and fine copy. (6), 359, (1) pp.

**DKK 9,500.00 / EURO 1,300.00**

Scarce first edition of Niethammer’s seminal work, in which he introduces the term “humanism” for a systematically worked out body of thought with its own value structure and becomes the first to apply the word within a conceptual framework, thus profoundly influencing all later research on the humanistic period.

“The term “Humanismus” was coined in 1808 by the German educator, F.J. Niethammer, to express the emphasis on the Greek and Latin classics in secondary education as against the rising demands for a more practical and more scientific training. In this sense, the word was applied by many historians of the nineteenth century to the scholars of the Renaissance, who had also advocated and established the central role of the classics in the curriculum…” (Kristeller, Renaissance Thought and its Sources, pp. 21-22).

Niethammer’s work not only came to determine how we have come to talk of the Renaissance and that essential part of it which we now call “humanism”, it also illustrates how scholars framed the essential values embodied in humanism at the time. It furthermore anticipated the 19th century age of “-isms” and ideology and the attempts at developing more structured and systematic ways of organizing theories and ideas with the purpose of influencing society and its culture.
DISCOVERING RENAISSANCE PHILOSOPHY

RENAN, ERNEST

_Averroes et l’Averroïsme. Essai historique._

Paris, Durand, 1852. 8vo. Bound uncut with the original printed wrappers in a contemporary, or a little later, brown half calf with a bit of wear; leather at capital, hinges and raised bands a bit scraped. Usual brownspotting due to the paper quality. Back wrapper with a few spots and with larger repair to verso. (4), XII, 367 pp.

**DKK 4,500.00 / EURO 600.00**

First edition of Renan’s first book, — the seminal work that placed the study of Renaissance philosophy on the philosophical map and earned Renan a doctorate of letters. This work constitutes the first proper monograph on the great Islamic philosopher, Ibn Rush, also called Averroes, who is considered the greatest commentator on the works of Aristotle, and it is principally because of this work that the great philosopher and scientist is seriously appreciated in Europe today. Besides dealing with Averroes himself, Renan studies the development and different branches of Averroism, focusing on the Jewish, Scholastic and Paduan ones. His focus on the
Paduan Averroism (16th century) in this work meant that Renaissance philosophy was finally given a role of its own in the history of philosophy,—it is with this work that the philosophy of the Renaissance is taken seriously in the study of philosophy.

“Memoirs on semitic languages and on the study of Greek in the Middle Ages were crowned by the Académie in 1848 and 1849 but do not seem to have been published. Renan’s first book, published in 1852, was, in fact, “Averroës et l’Averroïsme” (see 24) which earned him a doctorate of letters.” (PMM 352). Renan has always been admired for his sharp mind, his great abilities and courage, but for the same reasons he was feared by many. “Dès 1852 il signalait dans la préface de son Averroës comme le trait caractéristique du dix-neuvième siècle la substitution de la méthode historique dans toutes les études relatives à l’esprit humain. Cette substitution est légitime; mais elle serait dangereuse si elle allait jusqu’à proscrire la théologie et la métaphysique... “ (N.B.G. (1862) 51:984).

Ernest Renan (1823—1892) was a French philologist, philosopher and historian. His father died when he was aged five, and his mother wanted him to become a priest. Until he was about 16 years old, he was trained by the Church, but due to his investigative and truth-seeking nature as well as his studies (e.g. Hebrew), he was in doubt as to the historical truth of the Scriptures, and with the help of his sister he chose his own path in life. “He studied intensively the languages of the Bible and filled a number of minor academic positions, frequently encountering difficulties because of the heterodoxy and outspokenness of his religious opinions.” (Printing and the Mind of Man 352). In 1840 he began studying philosophy and later philology, in 1847 he took his degree as Agrégé de Philosophie and became master at the Lycée of Vendome. After having returned from a mission to Italy in the year 1850 where he gathered material for his historical-philosophical masterpiece, “Averroës et l’Averroïsme”, he was offered employment at the “Bibliothèque Nationale” (at the manuscript department). In 1861 he was chosen to become professor of Hebrew at the Collège de France, but because the emperor refused to ratify the appointment (inspired by the Clerical party), he was not established in the chair untill 1870. In 1878 he was elected for the Academy. Renan is considered a scholar of the greatest excellence and an impressive writer.
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