1. Putting the text back in paratext

One of the more fruitful cross-overs between modern literary theory and Neo-Latin Studies has been the exploration of the notion ‘paratext’, coined by the structuralist theorist Gérard Genette (° 1930) to denote those elements of text that accompany the main text, for instance the author’s name, a book title, a preface, dedication, illustrations, etcetera. Genette’s theoretical project has been characterized as transtextual in nature, i.e. focussing on ‘everything that brings it [i.e. the text] in relations with other texts’, with his notion of the paratext being the completion of these transtextual poetics. Indeed, the paratext is per definition transtextual: its fundamental functionality lies in its preliminary character that causes this text to always veer away from itself and point towards the main text. This transtextual perspective has accordingly determined the reception of the concept of paratext in Neo-Latin Studies. Accordingly studies that adopt the Genettean perspective use paratexts to discover the context of the texts they surround and therefore discuss the historico-political, socio-economical, cultural and other factors that they refer to. At the same time, such studies say rather little about the paratext itself. Indeed, it seems an inherent paradox in the Genettean approach that the recuperation of the previously neglected paratext results not in attention for the paratext itself, but for what it might teach one about the main text and its context.

Through a study of nine Neo-Latin dedicatory epistles, written by the humanist scholar Justus Lipsius (1547-1606), this paper will try to emphasize the textual rather than the transtextual dimension of the paratext. In doing so, it is in essence not un-Genettean. For one,
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3 Genette, Paratexts, p. xvii.


Genette himself stressed that ‘the paratext is itself a text: if it is not the text, it is already some text’, so it deserves a close-reading of its own. Secondly, by studying the textual dimension of the paratext, we are by no means discarding its transtextual relevance. Indeed, the nature and the effect of the (para)text is unchanged, its illocutionary force, as Genette would put it, is still the same. A paratext is ipso facto heteronymous and auxiliary, and therefore always refers to the main text. Moreover, since the addressee of a dedication is always ambiguous — for both the dedicatee and the reader are included in its communicative process — the message of the dedication necessarily transcends its own boundaries (author – dedicatee), thus always connecting the paratext to its broader context.

It is clear why the modern critic has not been immediately prone to study the textual aspect of paratexts. Especially Neo-Latin paratexts, such as liminary poetry or dedicatory epistles, invariably strike one as very stereotypical qua language and quite predictable qua thought, making them hard to interpret on a poetical and functional level. Indeed, because of their hackneyed clichés and empty rhetoric modern scholars (even editors) often skip them, dismissing their annoyingly sugar-coated style and blatantly obvious contents as rather uninteresting, or give in to the aforementioned transtextual reflex. Therefore, the goal of this textual study is first to reaffirm the poetics and functionality of these stereotypical texts, and second to propose a new hermeneutic approach to them that might penetrate their meaning on a deeper level.

2. Poetics and functionality of topicality

To explain how the stereotypical language and predictable contents of Neo-Latin paratexts can be understood as vital for the poeticality and function of these texts, we have to be aware that as modern readers we are heavily predisposed by the eighteenth-century revolutionary poetology of expressive originality. The essence of Early Modern literariness, however, was imitation, which it inherited and recuperated from classical literature. Indeed, ancient rhetorical theory affirmed mimesis or imitatio of great works of art (together with exercitatio) as the common way to develop rhetorical faculty (facultas) and with it the virtuous mastery of the art of speaking well (ars dicendi). Now a large part of this imitative literary technique was reserved for the study and use of topoi, which were originally a category of argumentative inventio, as ‘places to find arguments’ (the Greek τόπος literally meaning ‘place’). In this way, competitive (but not psittacine) imitation was the undercurrent of both ancient literary practice and criticism.
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7 Genette, Paratexts, p. 7 (= Id., Seuils, p. 12).
11 Cp. Mary S. Lewis, Introduction: The Dedication as Paratext, in Bossuyt e.a. (eds), "Cui dono lepidum novum libellum?", p. 5.
13 See Ibid., § 260 and § 373.
14 Ibid., § 1144, referring to Quint. inst. 10, 2, 4 and 10, 2, 10.
In this way, it is clear that for highly imitative texts such as Neo-Latin dedications these topoi – which we understand as fixed clichés or mental and linguistic schemata, a broad interpretation of the phenomenon proposed by Ernst Curtius – have to be understood as the formative typological structure for these texts. Indeed, this structure, or topicality, constitutes the necessary stylistic and argumentative dimension – Jakobson’s code or Even-Zohar’s repertoire – that envelops the whole message which is sent to the reader. Without the aesthetics and rhetoric of topicality, a text such as a dedicatory letter would be lost upon an Early Modern audience. It would simply refuse both its contents and form because these would be unrecognized, yes unrecognizable, as literary utterances.

Another aspect of topicality is its importance for the functionality of paratexts. Indeed, if the modern reader finds these texts predictable and rather superfluous on account of their topical language, we have to insist that is precisely topicality which allows the dedicatory letter to succeed in its most important communicative function. Genette himself has argued that the essential functionality of dedications resides in their performative dimension. In other words, the function of any dedication is the proclamation itself that this book is dedicated to so-and-so, and in that its whole function is exhausted. Now, it is through the use of such commonplaces as the reasons for dedicating a work to a patronus, in short through the dedicatory topicality, that an author can most readily have his dedicatory text do what it is meant to do: to dedicate a work to someone. In this way, the stereotypical structure, argument and form of the dedication furnishes the essential presentational language that typically – indeed topically – characterizes dedications and without which the dedication could not perform what it is meant to perform.

In the context of this performative aspect, the other main topicality that these texts show besides the dedicatory, namely the panegyric or epideictic topicality, fulfils a double role. On the one hand, it has an auxiliary function with regards to the dedicatory topoi. For, as Genette points out, both dedication and epideixis are closely linked, since the dedicatory epistle was nothing short of a source of income for the Early Modern writer, thus easily soliciting an element of praise of the dedicatee. On the other hand, epideictic topicality also has a psychological function since praise, especially the constant, even excessive praise of dedications, not only represents the dedicatees as an example of virtue, but also puts a kind of mirror in front of them, inviting them to reflect on how much they really confirm to this virtuous image (Fürstenspiegel).

\[\text{15} \text{ Definition from Gero von Wilpert, } \text{Sachwörterbuch der Literatur, } \text{Kröners Taschenausgaben, 231, Stuttgart:} \text{ Kröner, 1969}, \text{ s.v.} \text{ topos (‘feste Clichés oder Denk- und Ausdruckschema’).} \]
\[\text{16} \text{ Ernst Robert Curtius, } \text{Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter, Bern: Francke, 1967} \text{ (first edition 1948). For the Stationen der Forschungsgeschichte in current topos-research, see Thomas Shirren, Einleitung, in Id. – Gert Ueding (eds), } \text{Topik und Rhetorik. Ein interdisziplinäres Symposium, Rhetorik-Forschungen, 13, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2000, pp. xv-xx.} \]
\[\text{17} \text{ A rich, if somewhat difficult and condense, introduction on especially modern Toposforschung can be found in Schirren, Einleitung, in Id. – Gert Ueding (eds), } \text{Topik und Rhetorik, pp. xiii-xxxi (with bibliography on p. xxxi). For classical topics, see e.g. Michael C. Leff, } \text{The Topics of Argumentative Invention in Latin Rhetorical Theory from Cicero to Boethius, Rhetorica, 1/1 (1983), 23-44.} \]
\[\text{18} \text{ Cf. Itamar Even-Zohar, } \text{The ‘Literary System’, Poetics Today, 11/1 (Spring 1990), pp. 27-44 (esp. 39-43).} \]
\[\text{19} \text{ Genette, Paratexts, pp. 135-136 (= Id., Seuils, pp. 126-127).} \]
\[\text{20} \text{ Cf. Genette, Paratexts, pp. 119-122 (= Id., Seuils, pp. 112-114).} \]
3. Hermeneutics of topicality

This interpretation of the poetics and functionality of the paratext’s topicality is in line with recent research in other fields that has taken care to reaffirm the functionality of all forms of cliché within the literary and social stratum. Indeed, through the characteristic recognisability of the topoi, an author can position himself within a socio-cultural tradition, and conversely the reader can understand his practice as part of a literary and social habitus. The main focus of this paper is, however, not a rhetorical reassessment of a corpus of Neo-Latin paratexts, but a new hermeneutical approach to them. Taking to heart some views from poststructuralist criticism, it seems that by distinguishing the topical structure in these texts not all interpretative possibilities have been exhausted. Indeed, while texts might seem to be shaped as off-prints of a general structure, they always contain elements which resist such superimposed hierarchies or interpretatory schemes. Indeed, however refined our description of the typology and topicality of Lipsius’s dedications, there will always be elements present which cannot be fitted into this frame. In other words, however high the degree of topicality, there will always be an element of ectopicality.

Consequently, through a thorough analysis of the topicality of a text – and I use the word here in an etymological sense (ἀναλυέω = ‘to disentangle’) – we will be able to tease out elements of ectopicality. Such a ‘negative’ reading of topicality can then be used as a hermeneutics of topicality, as the awareness of ectopicality allows us to interpret topical texts in a novel, perhaps more fruitful way. For, one of the effects of the stereotypical language and contents of topicality is that it seems to lull the modern reader into a kind of hermeneutic catatonia, not being able to see the wood (of meaning) for the trees (of commonplaces), as it were. A hermeneutical reading of topicality, however, might be able to bypass this obstacle as it might bring the modern critic closer to the reading experience of the original audience of these texts. As stated above, for a humanist public, which was accustomed to the topicality of dedications and imitational poetics, these texts represented a genre of literary writing that was accepted as the norm. In this way, it is not unimaginable that an interpretatory reflex similar to our hypothesized hermeneutics of topicality occurred in the mind of the Early Modern reader. It seems only natural that in dedicatory paratexts the occurrence of ectopical elements would rouse special attention for the habitual reader of these highly topical and therefore predictable texts. In this way, the hermeneutical reading of topicality might be able to highlight certain elements in the paratext that might otherwise remain unnoticed, thus possibly drawing our attention to crucial points of interpretation of the paratext, and eventually the main text.

23 Although one can see similarities in the title, this contribution has nothing in common with Wolfgang Neuber, Topik als Lektüremodell. Zur frühneuzeitlichen Praxis der Texterschließung durch Marginalien – am Beispiel einiger Drucke von Hans Stadens Warhaftiger Historia, in Schirren – Ueding (eds), Topik und Rhetorik, pp. 177-197.
4. Justus Lipsius’s dedications to the House of Habsburg

A suitable corpus for testing this hermeneutical approach can be found in Justus Lipsius’s dedicatory letters to members of the House of Habsburg. Although there are sixteen such letters I have chosen nine as a homogeneous corpus to work with since these show a high degree of topicality and are all dedicated to prominent members of contemporary politics:

(1) Electa I (1580), dedicated to Archduke (and future Holy Roman Emperor) Matthias of Austria (1557-1619);
(2) De Militia Romana (1595), dedicated to the future King Philip III (1578-1621);
(3) Poliorcetica (1596), dedicated to Ernest of Bavaria (1554-1612), Archbishop of Cologne and Prince-Bishop of Liège;
(4) Admiranda sive De Magnitudine Romana (1598), dedicated to Archduke Albert VII of Austria (1559-1621), soon to be wedded to Isabella Clara Eugenia of Spain (1566-1633), daughter of Philip II (1527-1598);
(5) Dissertatiuncula apud Principes (1600), dedicated to the Archdukes and Governors of the Netherlands, Albert and Isabella;
(6) De bibliothecis syntagma (1602), dedicated to Charles III of Croÿ (1560-1612), Seigneur de Croÿ, Duke of Aarschot, Prince of Chimay and Count of Beaumont, and since 1599 Member of the Order of the Golden Fleece;
(7) Diva Sichemiensis sive Aspricollis (1605), dedicated to Isabella of Spain;
(8) Lovanium (1605), dedicated to Charles of Croÿ;
(9) Monita et exempla politica (1605), dedicated to Albert of Austria.

5. A hermeneutical reading

For my research I have made meticulous close-readings of these nine letters in order to analyse their topicality. Two such close-readings (viz. Electa and Lovanium) and the topical structure of this corpus have been added in appendix to this paper. In this section I offer only a synthetical account of the hermeneutical reading of the nine Lipsian paratexts and do not describe the topicality in detail, which would per definition be a rather repetitive exercise.

5.1. Electa (1590)

In this first work, a collection of notes on textual criticism and cultural history, Lipsius uses the dedicatory topos of the link between him and his dedicatee, consequently embarking upon an encomium of Matthias of Austria that mainly contains the topos of praise of character and
of descent (forefathers, parents, family, …). This is an element that all dedications to the
House of Habsburg have in common. Time and again Lipsius uses the element of their long
and famous descents as a starting point to praise the deeds (either past, present or future) of
his dedicatees.\textsuperscript{26} We will return to this point at a later stage in this paper.
Yet for all its topicality, there is also a clear ectopical issue in the text. When discussing his
and his country’s link with Matthias, Lipsius digresses away from traditional encomiastic
rhetoric and deplores his and the so-called Belgians’ fate.

Except for bad fortune in war, we have had bad luck because of many other things: we have been forced to
throw off a royal empire in some sense. In truth, we are burdened not with our legitimate King (people
should only observe the course of things), but with such petty tyrants that claim royal authority.\textsuperscript{27}

This passage is closely related to another, namely where Lipsius in good encomiastic
tradition compares Matthias to a great figure of history, viz. Octavian Augustus, but at the
same time takes care to add that unlike Augustus, Matthias did not seize power through
violence. Together, these two fragments reveal a point of crucial importance about the
paratext. Rather surprisingly for a dedication of a book dealing with a scholarly subject, these
passages allude to contemporary politics. And indeed, we might not immediately realise it,
but his humanist public, including the dedicatee himself, would have immediately understood
that Lipsius is making a clear political statement.

After Juan of Austria had violated the Perpetual Edict (1577) by attacking Namur and
Antwerp, the States General of the rebellious Netherlands had asked Matthias to become
viceroy or governor of the Netherlands in his stead. Matthias accepted but was obviously not
recognized by King Philip II. In this capacity, he was viceroy of the Netherlands for four
years (1577-1581), while Madrid still considered Don Juan, and after his death the Duke of
Parma, viceroy. Now in the above-quoted passages Lipsius – had been living in the Calvinist
Leiden for several years already since moving away from the Catholic Leuven (March 1578)
– Lipsius clearly affirms Matthias as a worthy viceroy (his use of the title \textit{Proregem} in the
first sentence \textit{ipso facto} does so) and as the people’s choice, thus making a manifest political
statement, completely in line with his move to the rebellious Northern Netherlands and with
his well-known dislike of tyranny.\textsuperscript{28}

In this way, it becomes clear how the analysis of this text’s topicality might point the
modern reader towards an aspect that would have definitely grabbed the attention of the
humanist reader. Quite obviously this was also precisely what it was meant to do by Lipsius,
who knew fully well that his readership (the Dutch audience) and especially his immediate
reader (Matthias) would approve of this message! Moreover, this analysis takes us right to the
heart of the matter, revealing the true reason Lipsius saw (or at least wanted to present to his
reader) for dedicating \textit{Electa I} to Matthias.

\subsection*{5.2. De Militia Romana (1595)}

In this treatise on the Roman army and a partial translation of Polybius, Lipsius uses the
dedictory topicality of the link between his subject and the dedicatee, subsequently
developing a praise of the dedicatee Philip III, the future King of Spain, mainly through the
topoi of the merits of his forefathers and his (Spanish) nation. However, in one exceptional
passage we find that Lipsius stresses the fact that Philip III should be his own man, should do

\textsuperscript{26} See especially \textit{De Militia Romana} (1595) or \textit{Poliorcetica} (1596).
\textsuperscript{27} Cf. infra, Appendix, B.
\textsuperscript{28} Cf. Jan Papy, \textit{Politiek en vrijheid onder het Humanistisch mes. Erasmus en Lipsius over tirannenmoord}, in
what is right and not try to go for popularity. \footnote{See esp. ‘Tu utere advocante fortuna, sed ita ut nihil ei debeas, et fecisse eam virtus tua videatur. Absque hac, Princes, magnam famam habere potes, non potes bonam; sed nec firmam aut diuturnam potes, nisi nixa sit eo fulcro. Nam vivos et superstites premere in recte factis etiam Livor aut Invidia potest et plebii sermones; at mortuos, et cum tractu veritas invaleat, splendor ille Famae et Virtutis irradiat, et seria scripta ad memoriam praefers’ and ‘O si mens tibi sit, Princeps (facultas adest, et probae institutioni hoc eo fulcro. Nam vivos et superstites premere in recte factis etiam Livor aut Invidia potest et plebii sermones; at mortuos, et cum tractu veritas invaleat, splendor ille Famae et Virtutis irradiat, et seria scripta ad memoriam praefers’} Here again we see that the topical structure of praise becomes increasingly untied as Lipsius uses imperatives and other instance of the volitive modality, \footnote{Compare Lipsius’s reservations in ILE 98 09 07 M, when rumours of Philip II’s death start circulating (see my “Lacoonicae Caspidis Instar”: The Correspondence of Justus Lipsius: 1598. Critical Edition with Introduction, Annotations and Stylistic Study, 2 vols., Leuven: Unpublished PhD [online available at: http://hdl.handle.net/1979/2616], 2009, 2, 505-506).} which is uncharacteristic for a context of praise, where one usually describes someone’s virtues and merits rather than asking or ordering him or her to do something. This makes clear that Lipsius not so much lauds Philip III here, but admonishes him. Such an attitude clearly reflects Lipsius’s own and the widespread contemporary reservations surrounding the figure of Philip III, who was thought to be something of a \textit{fils à papa} who would never be as firm a ruler as his father. \footnote{I would not go as far as Hugo Peeters, in Gilbert Tournoy – Jan Papy – Jeanine De Landtsheer (eds), \textit{Lipsius en Leuven. Catalogus van de tentoonstelling in de Centrale Bibliotheek te Leuven, 18 september - 17 oktober 1997, Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 13, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997, p. 129 who claims that Lipsius insisted on such an appointment in this dedicatory letter. There is no reference whatsoever to the position of Royal Historiographer in the text.} Indeed his dedication to Philip III appears at the same time primarily a praise of Philip II, and surely Lipsius’s contemporaries will have read his dedication to Philip III in this way. Perhaps it is no coincidence then, that precisely this dedication would be followed by Philip II appointing Lipsius Royal Historiographer. \footnote{Neque ego nolui, fator, sed patriae meae amor aut miseratio, tum et nova cum ea adstructio velut tribunica quadam vi intercesserunt et abesse me a nobis adegerunt, etsi corpore, vix animo seiunctum. Quoties illo ad vos redeo? Quoties sermones et adfectus vestros ruminor? Tuam autem incredibilem in illa altitudine quadam vi intercesserunt et abesse me a vobis adegerunt, etsi corpore, vix animo seiunctum. Quoties illo ad vos redeo? Quoties sermones et adfectus vestros ruminor? Tuam autem incredibilem in illa altitudine} 5.3. \textit{Poliorcetica} (1596)

In the next work, a treatise on war-machinery, Lipsius again stresses the link between his topic and his dedicatee and the other topoi of the reasons for his dedication, but mainly embarks on a massive topical praise of Ernest of Bavaria’s \textit{gens}, covering over forty-five lines in the modern edition, where he traces his family history from the time of Attila onwards. Two elements, however, fall outside of this clearly marked structure: a passage where Lipsius expresses his love of Liège \footnote{Et quamquam fator pleurae ex ipsis [sc. Mechanica et Poliorcetica] aboluit iam aut desita unico invento fulmineae nostrae bombardae (lombardam Annales superiores dicunt), tamen et quaedam usum etiam nunc habent aut habere certe possunt, si quis rimabitur, et illum sine controversia fructum donant intelligere res antiquas. Qui mihi maxime in oculis, professione, instituto, sed et recenti a regia benignitate titulo, facto ad Historias vetrices novasque illustrandas aut scribendas”.} and one where he expounds upon his firm belief in the value of historiography. \footnote{Tu utere (…)’ (cf. supra) and ‘Tu succede, sed sero (pietas tua hoc postulat) et illum atque illos nobis rede, quorum sanguinem et partem praefers’ and ‘O si mens tibi sit, Princeps (facultas adest, et probae institutioni hoc debes, ut intellegas), si mens, dico, sit vagandi per eorum annales et gesta, quos flores virtutum colligas, quae quo} Both are important for the interpretation of the paratext. The first is an
obvious wink to Lipsius’s reader, Ernest of Bavaria, who was Prince-Bishop of Liège, while the second reveals a fundamental aspect of Lipsius’s intellectual attitude. As is well-known in the Lipsian studies, Lipsius’s historical-antiquarian research, in which De Militia Romana and Poliorcetica were originally conceived as parts of a comprehensive project under the name of Fax Historica, is especially motivated from his views on the didactic and moral value of the study of ancient history. Here again we clearly see how the educated humanist audience will undoubtedly have read past Lipsius’s commonplace praise of the gens Austriaca to discover the true emphasis of Lipsius’s dedication: his humanist mission through the propagation and furthering of historiography. Moreover, this example shows how the hermeneutics of topicality can reveal different aspects according to the double readership of a dedication (cf. supra), i.e. the immediate reader (dedicatee) and the larger readership (public).

5.4. Admiranda Romana (1598)

Unsurprisingly, the analyse of the topicality of our next publication, another historical-antiquarian treatise, this one on the greatness of Rome, also reveals Lipsius’s humanist engagement towards historiography. This dedication opens with a veritable ectopical excursus. Before presenting his work to Albert of Austria with the known dedicatory topics and embarking on a classically structured epideixis of Albert’s (with the topoi of origin, virtues, deeds, comparison to great historical figures, etcetera), Lipsius opens with a large section on the fruit of historiography. History, Lipsius insists, teaches us above all the transience of all worldly empires and possessions. Once more, the reader will clearly understand Lipsius’s reasons for his historiographical interest to be his main point of the text, even if the ensuing encomium of the dedicatee, Albert of Austria, takes up much more space of the dedication.

5.5. Dissertatiuncula apud Principes (1600)

Continuing his attention for the newly appointed Archduke Albert and his wife Isabella, Lipsius pronounced his Dissertatiuncula apud Principes for the couple, and obviously dedicated the published version, which appeared together with an edition of Pliny’s Panegyricus, to them. Besides a high degree of topicality, including a high degree of humilitas affecta about this small book (for which he consciously uses diminutives like
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35 See e.g. Peeters, De briefwisseling van Justus Lipsius in het jaar 1596, 1, xlvi-xlvii.
36 This is also the reason why I have objected to (in my mind) overly ideological and propagandistic readings of the work (see my Justus Lipsius’s Admiranda (1598) and the Officina Plantiniana. Mixing Otium with Negotium, in Jeanine De Landtsheer – Pierre Delsaerdt (eds), “Iam illustravit omnia”. Justus Lipsius als lievelingsauteur van het Plantijnse Huis, Antwerp: Vereniging van Antwerpse Bibliofielen, 2006 [= De Gulden Passer, 84], 159-176 (p. 163).
38 For Lipsius’s general relationship with the Archdukes, and an excellent analysis of his particular speech act in the Dissertationiuncula, see Van Houdt, Justus Lipsius and the Archdukes Albert and Isabella, pp. 405-432.
39 Et a me quidem, res parva est; splendorem tamen a vobis habet (…) Nec id quidem magnum opus, tamen, ut in exiguum saepe tabulam orbit et regionum magnitudo aut varietas includitur, sic in hunc libellum quidquid ad munus aut decus veri principatus’ (this and other quotations from the dedicatio of Dissertationiuncula are from from ILE XIII, 00 04 12 = Iusti Lipsi Epistolae. Pars XII: 1600, quam curavit edendum Jan Papy, Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten, 2000, pp. 140-142).
libellus of munusculum), we find that the ectopical dimension of this paratext is a small, but interesting meta-panegyric utterance:

Pliny praises his lord Trajan, he does not give him advice, that’s true, but it is also fitting with Princes to have them recognize through such flattering the good they do and what others should be doing.\(^{40}\)

This sentence goes right to the problematic nature of *Dissertatiuncula apud Principes*, which as an almost purely panegyric publication, must have made his intellectual ethics look quite suspicious for the humanist reader. Yet, completely as Pliny had done in his *Panegyricus*\(^{41}\), Lipsius obviously tried to legitimize his own flattery, which was unavoidable considering the question for the *lectiuncula* came from the Archdukes themselves. Accordingly, this is the main message Lipsius wanted to convey with this dedication: even though he is in no position to refuse this blatant act of flattery, he does so in good classical tradition and with a (self-professed) clear humanist conscience.\(^{42}\) In this case, we see that the analysis of topicality reveals an element of meaning which is only meant for the humanist readership of this paratext (Lipsius’s colleagues, friends, admirers, ...) and not for his immediate readers, Albert and Isabella. This undoubtedly explains why the analysis has only highlighted one sentence, i.e. to make this questioning of panegyric literature not too obvious, and a rather complex reasoning which presupposes training in the classics, i.e. to somewhat shield his less knowledgeable readers (among whom the Archdukes?) from the message.\(^{43}\)

5.6. *De Bibliothecis Syntagma* (1602)

At first sight Lipsius’s dedication of his treatise on ancient libraries seems extremely topical, linking the dedicatee, Charles of Croÿ to the subject and praising his character, but especially his efforts for the city of Leuven and the propagation of the arts. In this context Lipsius even likens him to Lucius Licinius Lucullus (c.118-57 B.C.), a skilful Roman general, who patroned many building projects and turned one of his estates into a library. Lipsius then goes on to expound on this comparison:

Do not be offended, Illustrious Prince, when I compare you with him. He was truly one of few and great men. When he was young he was famous for his victories in war, and when he grew older, he turned to a quiet life and to himself. I mean he exercised his mind and studied the arts and he spent his wealth on the amusement and needs of present and future generations. He furnished the most important example of a library in Rome; he had scholars in his company, at his table, in his house; he built the palaces and garden places that the most important Romans would later deem worthy to use and enjoy.\(^{44}\)

\(^{40}\) ‘Laudat suum Traianum, non monet, fatoer, sed hoc quoque decorum apud Principes, ut sub blando eo titulo et boni quae faciunt recognoscant, et alii quae facere deberent cognoscant’.


\(^{42}\) At first this seems to go against Van Houdt, *Justus Lipsius and the Archdukes Albert and Isabella*, p. 417: ‘Lipsius did not criticize nor reject the panegyrical role his humanist predecessors ascribed to themselves’. True, he did not reject it, but to say he accepted it unconditionally seems an oversimplification. Indeed, further on in his paper Van Houdt himself (pp. 427-428) argues that Lipsius’s intellectual ethics would not have allowed for servile flattery, and analyses the praise in Lipsius’s *Dissertatiuncula* as ‘avoiding vile flattery’ and ‘strictly functional’ (p. 429).

\(^{43}\) A similar strategy might be employed in *Diva virgo Sichemiensis* (cf. infra).

\(^{44}\) ‘Non indignare, Illustrissime Principes, cum illo componi: vera aestimatione, inter raros magnosque fuit: bellis victoriosis in florentae et celebres: et mox inclinante, id quietem et ad se inclinavit, id est animum et studia coluit, atque opes in praeentium ac posterum selectationem sive usum implebat. Ab illo Bibliothecarum Romae praeceptum exemplum; ab illo eruditi in sermone, mensa, domo habitu; ab illo denique Praetoria et amoenitates structae, quae et Principes rei Romanae postea frui utique aestimarent’. 
In this case, we clearly see how much topicality and ectopicality can be intertwined. Indeed, praise of Lucullus, to whom Charles is compared still equals praise for Charles (epideictic topicality of comparatio, cf. infra), but nevertheless Lipsius seems to leave the laudatio Caroli per se. Again this passage reveals an important point about the whole dedicatory letter. It is probably this element of the text that has caused to scholars to interpret Lipsius’s dedication of his De Bibliothecis syntagma to Charles as an attempt to have Charles take Lucullus’ example to heart and found a library himself to supplement the meagre collection of the university.  

5.7. Diva virgo Sichemiensis sive Aspricollis (1605)

In his devotional treatise on Our Lady of Scherpenheuvel, dedicated to Isabella of Spain, Lipsius again constructs a very topical dedication to and praise of Isabella. In her praise, Lipsius expresses his confidence for the future which Isabella together with her husband Albrecht will make bright and prosperous. The very next sentence, though, somewhat stands out from this topicality, reading:

> These recent Miracles [i.e. that I describe in this book] are already a sign of that, being pious and wise interpreters, and they prove that the benignity of God which was shown so openly and suddenly, is like the dawn of the Sun of Concord and Peace which will soon ensue.

If this is in fact a passage that humanist readers would have noticed as ectopical (which, granted, is not completely unequivocal here), would it go to far to interpret it as Lipsius’s way to try and justify to this audience why he, an internationally respected humanist scholar, should publish a miracle collection from a local cult of the Holy Virgin? In any case, it is a question which many of his contemporaries asked and the reason why Lipsius at a time became the object of harsh criticism from the Protestant side. Could that be because Lipsius’s readers noticed this passage but were not quite satisfied with his ‘explanation’?

5.8. Lovanium (1605)

In the dedication of this history and description of the city of Leuven, stresses the his subject’s link with Charles of Croÿ, praising his character, deeds, beneficia, glorious future, and good judgment in choosing his niece, Dorothy of Croÿ, as his wife to be. Yet after mentioning Charles’s fondness of the Arts and his use of them either for pleasure or for learning, Lipsius includes the following, at first seemingly odd, passage:

> Like Helen, who, in Homer, possessed a drug and gave it to drink, which took away pain and anger and made you forget all evil [= Hom. Od. 4, 221],

---

46 ‘Quo Miracula haec nova pii prudentes interpretes trahunt, et benignitatem Numinis sic palam et subito ostensam, velut auroram esse Solis illius concordiae et pacis mox secutorae’.
48 This occasion (18 December) together with insistence of the States of Brabant to see some fruit of Lipsius’s 1595 appointment as Historiographus Regius was the practical reason for his publishing another historical work (Lipsius – Papy, Leuven, p. 16).
something similar, but more pleasant and more serious is that literature we call ‘Philosophy’.\(^{49}\)

Again it is clear where he put the focus for the humanist reader, including Charles. It is not surprising Lipsius refers to philosophy here, by which he means ‘practical’ philosophy, i.e. ethics and political philosophy.\(^{50}\) Indeed, Lipsius had used passages from Homer’s *Odyssey* in this context before. Lipsius, who had at this time been working on his philosophical research\(^{51}\), – in fact he was even supervising the last stages of printing his 1605 *Seneca* edition at the time he wrote his *Lovanium*\(^{52}\) – after his historical-antiquarian period in the late 1590s\(^{53}\), points out for the educated reader that the use of this city history is what we can learn from the *exempla* of political wisdom or *prudentia*, a key question in practical philosophy, that are present in it.

5.9. *Monita et Exempla Politica* (1605)

In the case of the dedicatory letter to Lipsius illustrative ‘sequel’ to his popular *Politica* (1589), *Monita et Exempla Politica* (1605), again addressed to Albert of Austria,\(^{54}\) there are only two sentences that fall outside of the traditional topicality of dedication and praise. After describing how he dedicates the work to Albert because of him being an example of the political virtues he wishes to describe, Lipsius also touches upon the element of *tutela*, protection from unjust criticism. Lipsius then continues in a somewhat enigmatic way, saying:

> For nothing is asked here by you, just like when we make sacrifices to God and offer him gifts, this happens because of us, not because of him. From our part it is nothing but a duty, which we owe; from your part a benefit, which we receive because you bring honour to the front pages of works with your title only. That is my intention; allow it, MOST SERENE HIGHNESS. And just as you value gold and ivory more if it is skilfully polished by an expert hand, may you value these gems of EXAMPLES, to which my talent and eloquence might (God forgive me) lend some light.\(^{55}\)

First of all, this passage touches upon a core element of paratextual functionality. In it, Lipsius appears to have an instinctive understanding of the performative aspect of the *dedicatio*. As mentioned before, its main function is not to state or describe something, but merely to perform the act of dedicating, therefore also claiming the protection of the dedicatee. By the mere fact that the paratext bears the dedicatee’s name, the function of the dedication is fulfilled. It is telling to see that in a contribution written from speech act theory, where performance is also a key element, Toon Van Houdt also singles out the exact same

\(^{49}\) Cf. infra, Appendix, B.


\(^{51}\) With *Manuductio ad Stoicam philosophiam* and *Physiologiae Stoicorum* in 1604 and his monumental *Seneca* edition in 1605.

\(^{52}\) Imhof, in Dusoir – De Landtsheer – Imhof (eds), *Justus Lipsius (1547-1606) en het Plantijnse Huis*, p. 165.

\(^{53}\) With publications like *De Cruce* (1593/4), *De Militia Romana* (1595), *Poliorcetica* (1596) and *Admiranda Romana* (1598).

\(^{54}\) Van Houdt, *Justus Lipsius and the Archdukes Albert and Isabella*, pp. 428-429 succinctly discusses this letter of dedication, stressing the largely indirect and implicit praise of the Archdukes it contains, which he sees as ‘one of the most typical features of Lipsius’s letters of dedication to Albert and Isabella’.

\(^{55}\) ‘Neque enim vobis hic aliquid quaeritur: non aliter quam cum Deo sacra facimus, et donum ponimus, nostra id sit, non ipsius caussa. A nobis officium omne est, et debetur; a vobis beneficium. Et hoc ipso accipimus, quod frontes operum sola praescriptione vestra honestatis. Ego eo fine faci; patere, SERENISSIME PRINCEPS. Et sicut aurum aut urbem magis aestimare soletis a solerti manu et arte politum, sic has EXEMPLORVM gemmas, ingenii et eloqui alicia luce (cum Deo dicam) perfusas’ (this and other quotations from the *dedicatio* of *Monita et exempla politica* are from Marijke Janssens, *Collecting Historical Examples for the Prince. Justus Lipsius’s Monita et Exempla Politica* (1605): Edition, Translation, Commentary and Introductory Study of an Early Modern Mirror-for-Princes, 2 vols, Leuven: Unpublished PhD, 2009, 1, 228-229).
passage from this particular dedication as remarkable and ‘typical […] of the language of princely patronage’.56

Yet the most important and striking element is that even though the wording ‘deliberately tries to obscure the very essence of patronage itself – the reciprocal exchange of goods and services between two unequal parties’57, Lipsius still goes on (in Latin much more implicitly with the elliptical [aestima]) to express the expectation that Albert will value and accordingly learn from these monita et exempla. In the whole of the short and very topical dedication this almost paradoxical statement would therefore have been a conspicuous appel to the dedicatee, and the general public, whom Albert knows are reading the same with him.

6. Conclusion

This paper has argued for a reappraisal of the textual dimension of paratexts, focussing on its often lamented topicality. The reasons for this not only reside in the constitutive role this topicality plays in the paratext’s poetics and functionality, but also because an analysis of topicality can lead to a new hermeneutical approach for paratexts. Studying a corpus of nine Neo-Latin dedicatory letters addressed by Justus Lipsius to various members of the House of Habsburg, has shown how a re-reading of their dedicatory and epideictic topicality can be used as a hermeneutic strategy to tease out hitherto unnoticed meanings of these texts which often appear to reveal crucial elements for their interpretation. In the end, I hope that the approach suggested in this paper might perhaps lead to a better understanding of other topically constructed texts, such as the invocation of the Muse in epic poetry or the exordium of an oration. Above all, it might just help us realize that there is more to even the most commonplace of texts, and that we can even use their stereotypical nature to our advantage.
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APPENDIX

A. Dedictory and epideictic topoi of narration, argument and style

As this made more sense from an analytical point of view, I have not specifically distinguished between topoi of dedication and epideixis, but grouped both together in categories of narration, argument and style. Furthermore it is important to remember that, while this Lipsian topicality has much in common with the topics of classical epideictic rhetoric\(^{58}\), and that it bears close resemblance to general Early Modern dedication\(^{59}\), this structure is in fact only a distillation of the *de facto* topicality of epideixis\(^{60}\) and dedication\(^{61}\) as found in our specific corpus. It is not meant as a frame of interpretation of Lipsian dedication in general (although one will find many parallels when comparing it to the complete corpus of Lipsian paratexts), let alone of the genre of Latin dedicatory epistolography. Neither does it claim to analyse all elements of topicality in these texts, just the (main) dedicatory and epideictic elements.\(^{62}\) Finally, it needs to be stressed that only the most topical stylistic features have been detailed.

I. Narrative topoi

A. Introduction (*prooemium*)
   1. presentation of the subject
   2. importance of the subject
   3. reason for dedication
   4. link between subject and *patronus*
   5. link between author and *patronus*

B. Praise (*laudatio*), cf. II

C. (Pseudo-)modesty (*humilitas affecta*)\(^{63}\)
   1. (feigned) incompetence or careless work
   2. contrast between importance of the subject and personal limitations
   3. *paratonomers*\(^{64}\)

---

\(^{58}\) Hence at many places traditional Latin terms from oratorical theory have been added.


\(^{61}\) Based on a close reading of our corpus and on the section *Quomodo* in De Landtsheer, *"Per patronos, non per merita gradus est emergendi"*, pp. 251-268 (pp. 256-261).

\(^{62}\) There are, for instance, epistolographical topoi, such as the formulas of salutation and farewell (on epistolographical topicality, cp. my *An Overlooked Letter in Verse from Nicodemus Frischlin to Justus Lipsius (1 February 1587)*, Lias [2010]. Other topoi include historiographical ones, such as the *historia vitae magistram* commonplace, as found in *De MIlitia Romana*, or cultural ones, such as the idea of Eternal Rome, as found in *Admiranda*.

\(^{63}\) On *humilitas affecta* in general, see Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*, pp. 93-95.

D. Epilogue

II. Argumentative topoi

A. Past elements
   1. origin (genus)
      a) nation (natio), b) fatherland (patria), c) education (educatio), d) forefathers (maiores), e) parents (parentes), f) family (gens)
   2. signs (signa)

B. Present elements
   1. character (animus), i.e. virtues (virtutes) surrounding accomplishments,
      a) strength (fortitudo), b) righteousness (iustitia), c) continence (continentia), d) prudence (prudentia), e) culture (studia humanitatis), f) discipline (disciplina), g) beneficence (beneficentia), h) piety (pietas), …
      b) by describing famous deeds having been done
         a) for the first time (primus), b) against expectation (supra spem aut exspectationem), c) without self-interest (aliena causa)
      d) by comparison with famous characters (comparatio)
      e) by referring to the judgement of others or God
      f) by listing titles
   2. physical elements (corpus)
   3. fortune (fortuna)

C. Future elements
   1. judgement of posterity (iudicium posteritatis)
   2. children (liberi)
   3. example for the future (exemplum posteris traditum)
   4. material accomplishments
   5. immaterial accomplishments
   6. complaint of war (querela pacis) and prayers for help, peace, stability, … (vota)

---

64 Genette employed this term – which literally translates to 'lightning conductors' – to signify the pre-emptive defence against slander and criticism typically found in paratexts, and especially often in Early Modern dedications (cf. Lewis, Introduction: The Dedication as Paratext, p. 6 referring to Genette, Paratexts, p. 192 (sic pro 207) (= Id., Seulx, p. 192)). E.g. De Militia Romana: ‘Vires si pro animo non fuerunt, ignosci postulo, et hunc laborem studio potius mei cultus, quam sui pretio aestimari’; or Monita et exempla politica: ‘Sicut insignia vestra aedibus, Praetoriis, villis appendimus, contra vim aut proterviam, sic nomina haec contra calumniam aut livorem’.

65 E.g. De Militia Romana: ‘O expergiscere tu aliquando, adolescens et vegete, et magno PHILIPPO tuo esto magnus ALEXANDER’ or De Bibliothecis Syntagma: ‘Ingenio cum ingenio loci pugnas ac superas, ardua in plana, haec in ardua deducis: sed omnia ad normam et decorem dirigis: alter, ut verbo dicam, Belgcus Lucullus’.

66 E.g. the very elaborate opening formula from Poliorcetica: ‘Serenissimo Principi Ernesto Archiepiscopo et Electori Coloniensi, Episcopo et Principi Leodicensi, Monasteriensi, Hildesheimensi, Frisingensi; Comiti Palatino utriusque Rheni, Ducu utriusque Bavariae, Westfaliae, Angariae, Bullonii; Marchioni Francimontano; Comiti Lossensi, Longiensi, Hornensi; sed et alibi Principi aut Dynastiae; Iustus Lipsius libens merito dedicat consecratique’.

67 E.g. Admiranda: ‘Sed parco dicere, etsi non optare. O dies ille, exorere non laetus solum, sed salutaris Belgis; nec Belgis tantium, sed vicinis; nec vicinis, sed dissitis et quicunque sunt in religione aut orbe Christiano’ or Diva virgo Sicchemiensis: ‘O fiat et exorere! et nobis bonos hos Principes habere et frui fas sit, in tranquillitate temporum; atque decore formosam, qualis olim fuit, ab omni externo decore formosam et florentem’. On this Lipsian theme of peace and its influence on the studia humanitatis, see Van Houdt, Justus Lipsius and the Archdukes Albert and Isabella, pp. 419-423.
III. Stylistic topoi

A. Morphological
1. (for I.C.1-2) use of diminutives (libellus, opusculum, …)

B. Lexical
1. (for I.A.3) titulus ipse, res ipsa, …
2. use of maritime metaphors (ship, sea, waves, etcetera)
3. use of astronomic metaphors
4. image of vicarius Dei (cf. II.b.1.e)

C. Syntactical
1. (for I.A.3) cui iustius dicare
2. (for II.B.1.b, often with II.B.1.c.3-γ) congeries of beneficia publica and privata

B. Two close-readings

1. Electa I (1580)


1. (for I.C.1) use of diminutives
2. (for II.B.1.b, often with II.B.1.c.3-γ) congeries of beneficia publica and privata

68 E.g. Admiranda: ‘Ipse titulos et argumentum palam ad te ducabant’ or Monita et exempla politica: ‘(…) quomodo non istud, quod ipsus titulus ad Te vocat et augustum hoc nomen vult inscribi?’
69 E.g. Admiranda: ‘(…) porro te misit in Belgicam nostram, id est in ipsum mare et Oceanum (ignosce, patria, sic loquenti) dissensionum et turbaminis. Heu qui scriptionem hanc illustrant et insigniunt, ut caea monita et exempla politica inaccessam quamdam lucem ducimur, quod ipse mundi ille rectorem Deum machinam hanc quatit et movet, ipse inconcussus, talis tuus ille genitor, vetus regnandi et securus’. In this context, we should not only point out Lipsius’s general fondness of maritime metaphors (see C – Stylistic Study, in my “Laconicae Caspidae Instar”, 2, 735-889), but should also refer to the image of the Ship of State, that has been a topos in speaking about political affairs since Archaic Greek poetry (see (mainly) Alc. fr. 6 and 208a; Plato Rep. 6 and Hor. C. 1, 14).
70 E.g. Admiranda: ‘Ut igitur, caelum et micantia illa astra cum intuemur, sic ab humana ista MAGNITUDINE ad auctorem illius et fontem, Deum’ or Monita et exempla politica: ‘Rudolfi, Philippi, Maximiliani, Caroli, Ferdinandi, Alphonsi, passim hic memorabuntur e maioribus tuis. Quis scriptionem hanc illustrant et insigniunt, ut caelum stellae’ [Lipsius’s italics].
71 E.g. De Militia Romana: ‘Ut gubernator in magna navi flectit et regit omnia parvo motu – quid ad minuta eo? – ut ipse mundi ille rector Deus machinam hanc quatit et movet, ipse inconcussus, talis tuus ille genitor, vetus regnandi et securus’ or Admiranda: ‘Sicut unus in superis Deus est, qui machinam hanc totam moderatur et temperat, sic in terris velut Curatores et Vicarios quosdam suos constituit, qui in partibus eam tueantur et administrant’. E.g. Admiranda: ‘ROMANIS imperii descriptio cui potus aut iustius deiebat quam Principi e tot ROMANIS Imperatoribus nato?’ or Monita et exempla politica: ‘Sunt enim MONITA POLITICA. Ad quem iustius quam ad Politiae et status nostri rectorem ibunt?’
To the most Serene Prince Matthias of Austria, Viceroy of Belgium. Son of an Emperor, brother of an Emperor.

After you came to this country of Belgium, most Serene Viceroy, I have often wanted to testify of my good will with some sort of gift. Indeed, it seemed my duty to do so. Firstly, because I am no new client of your family, having recently dedicated my Tacitus edition to your father Maximilian, who has attained immortal status. Secondly, because the whole of Belgium is connected to you, and among the Belgians I am. You have been called to the helm of this fatherland and have reached out to us with a helping hand, although many were reluctant. And precisely this, the fact that we have thrown off the yoke of bitter slavery, and that we have not accepted it again once it was thrown down, all good people will confess to be partly your accomplishment. The Fates and that new star that shines, have called you unto great things, things far greater than your age has witnessed, but not greater than your character or fortune. Octavian Augustus took command over the world at the same age you are, with a similarly foreboding star. Yet, this is the difference: the reins of things were not handed over to him, but taken through war. You, the Belgians, have brought in consent, nobility and common men alike, to the heights of this dignity. Nobility through its votes, the common people through their wishes. Belgium that was shaken up until now, has taken refuge in your young bosom. Does that surprise? This is the fate of your family, of your house, that your greatness finds its origin in the preservation of the miserable. In this way, the faltering German state has once made Rudolph, from whom your esteemed family tree originates, emperor. In this way, we Belgians have called upon

---

74 Maximilian II, Holy Roman Emperor, had died on 12 October 1576.
your forefather Maximilian, after Charles the Bold was slain at Nancy, for help in the middle of things. And we called upon him, when he was still a young man. In the past, it has been famously said of the family of the Scipiones that they were born to vanquish Carthage. A similar thing can be said of yours: that it was born to tame the insolent, to relieve the miserable. You see, o great Prince, in what ship we, Belgians, sail, what sea toys with us, and how much the winds that steer us are not our own. Except for bad fortune in war, we have had bad luck because of many other things: we have been forced to throw off a royal empire in some sense. In truth, we are burdened not with our legitimate King (people should only observe the course of things), but with such petty tyrants that claim royal authority. For it has to be said: twelve years ago, when this storm gathered and when our Belgium started swelling with the rest of Gaul, they were sent to the helm; these people, who did not care at all for, I would not say royal dignity, but even for their own dignity, or ours. They had rather have our ship run on to the rocks and the shallows, than put down the sail and change the course slightly to the direction the wind was blowing. And so we have seen the shipwreck that has ensued. Now they have been dispelled from the helm, and you, o most famous of young men, you have come in their place. But I ask you, do not follow their deeds or mindset. Were they feared? You chose to be loved. Did they destroy? You chose to save. Were they violent? You chose to be kind-hearted and in some cases, when you could be forceful, you chose to be persuasive. Were their ears open to slander? Yours are closed, and suspicions and informers will not be feared with you at the helm, only crime and the law will. It is your great happiness that long ago you have immersed yourself, after the example of Augerius Busbequius, in the study of virtue and learning. Now look through the annals of history. I may die if not all realms have perished because of such unforgiving government. The helmsman of a boat does not break those greater and larger waves, but avoids them and steers away. Equally erring is he who breaks those great and fatal movements by force. These should be settled with skill and prudence. And you settle things. Hold that course of clemency that you have embarked upon; and believe what experience teaches: how much more firm the road towards glory and authority is when you are loved by your subjects than when you are feared by them. I do not labour too much to render my gift acceptable for you; I labour more that you would accept my mind, which is, and will forever be, devoted to the genius of your family. 17 September 1579.
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2. Lovanium (1605)²⁵


Ἀλλὰ ἀρχαῖα ἡ μάλλον τῆς παντοτετοιμασμένη, ἢ ἀρχαῖα παντοτετοιμασμένη τῆς ἀρχαιότητος.

To the most Illustrious and Excellent Prince Charles, Duke of Croý and Aarschot, Prince of the Holy Roman Empire, Knight of the Order of the Golden Fleece.

To whom better could I give and dedicate the cities of Leuven and Heverlee that I have described and that I have made better known, even if they were known before, than to you, Illustrious Prince? You know my old bond and the sacrament, so to speak, of my obedience, by which I am linked to you. Yet, the matter itself also

---


²⁶ Hom. *Od.* 4, 221.

²⁷ This passage clearly echoes a previous dedication of Lipsius to Charles of Croý. Cf. *De Bibliothecis Syntagma* (1602): ‘Inter varios autem secessus, Hevriam, Academiace nostrae hoc suburbanum, eligis et eam magnificis, ut dixi, operibus, quid nisi in artium ingeniourumque praeecipe usum, adormas? Audeo dicere. Tua illa aedificia, ambulacra, horti, fontes, arboreta, nobis structa aut sata (…)’.
points in this direction, yes why not say, even this particular moment in time? As for the matter itself: well, look at Leuven. What is that city if not yours through affection and inhabitation? You have inhabited the city once and loved it, and you have drunk there from the Arts, of which you pleasantly reap the fruit, and with which you occupy your free time, or find ease and solace for the sorrows and cares that mar one’s life (as is the case for all human beings). Like Helen, who, in Homer, possessed a drug and gave it to drink, *which took away pain and anger and made you forget all evil*, 76 something similar, but more pleasant and more serious is that literature we call ‘Philosophy’. Those two kinds of literature Leuven, our Helen, gave to you to drink, for which you have to be and are indeed thankful, Even your Heverlee will tell you the same. What works under ground, or on it, have you prepared there or are you preparing? How many buildings, roads, gardens, wells, or places with trees 77 have you built and adorned, to be wondered at for their design and effect? For sure, Leuven and its students, which means the youth of all Europe, are obliged and ascribe their pleasure and delight to the Duke of Croÿ and Aarschot. Great and magnanimous Prince, enjoy this glory and remember for yourself that saying from the great Aristotle: *not he who spends his fortune on himself is noble, but he who does so for the public good*. 78 Others spend money on luxury, banquets, gambling, as are the mores now. You, however, have posterity in mind and you look for hardly anything other in your work than the fruit of others. Therefore I justly offer you this book on Leuven and Heverlee, and I offer it, unless I am mistaken, at a good occasion. Why? It is your wedding, which Belgium receives as its own, with favour and applause, and many at home make best wishes for it, which they testify of with their voices, writings and with gifts. I thought it fitting to do the same, with a testimony that will survive time, to also transfer the memory of this great day to posterity. The woman you are joined with, is of most illustrious lineage, extremely praiseworthy through her mental and physical talents, Dorothy of Croÿ, your niece, and she is joined to you through a bond that only death can break. O happy matrimony! The bloodlines of Kings and Princes go together, and while the sceptres of Hungary flash on both sides, she also adds Jerusalem to the union. 79 Even your fiancée’s name 80 is of such importance! It is a divine gift, great Prince, so receive it thus, and ask God for a cutting and a shoot from this beautiful tree. Look at her father, the most illustrious Prince Charles-Philip, Margrave of Havré, among the most important men in Belgium, wishes the same and his breast is filled with silent hope for future joy. And how say we, your friends? We

---

77 It appears the House of Croÿ claimed descent from Hungarian nobility. Dorothea, or someone in her family, also appears to have had some link with the Holy Land.
80 The name Dorothea is derived from the Greek δωροθέα and θεός, meaning ‘gift from God’ (Lipsius – Papy, Leuven, p. 281).
openly make wishes, double wishes: that you and your family may be unhurt, and that from you two may come forth such offspring as will remind one of the name and glory of their forefathers and will propagate the same on their children and their children’s children. For single people the race is short and there is mortality, but through provenance and continuation they become eternal. May it be so and I shall proclaim in these formal terms:

GOOD LORD AND FERTILITY,
FOR THE FAMILY OF CROŷ,
THROUGH LINEAGE, MERIT AND GLORY ILLUSTRIOUS,
BRING OFFSPRING FOR YEARS TO COME
AND THIS FOR THE COMMON GOOD.

Written and wished for in Leuven, your Excellency’s perpetual client, Justus Lipsius.