

Dirk K. W. van Miert. *Hadrianus Junius (1511–1575): Een humanist uit Hoorn*.

Biografische Reeks Hoorn 1. Hoorn: Publicatiestichting Bas Baltus, 2011. 160 pp. €20. ISBN: 978–90–76385–00–6.

Dirk K. W. van Miert, ed. *The Kaleidoscopic Scholarship of Hadrianus Junius (1511–1575): Northern Humanism at the Dawn of the Dutch Golden Age*.

Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 199. Leiden: Brill, 2011. xii + 320 pp. \$136. ISBN: 978–90–04–20914–5.

When in 1597 Paulus Merula became librarian of the young university of Leiden, he wanted to decorate his library with portraits of not only political figures (like William the Silent) or past professors (like Justus Lipsius), but also of some grand old men of Dutch humanism: Erasmus, Hadrianus Junius, Janus Secundus, and the likes. Merula's plan was quickly brought to fruition, with one exception: the Hoorn-born physician and humanist scholar Hadrianus Junius (1511–75) never adorned the walls of the library (*The Kaleidoscopic Scholarship*, 18–21, 28).

This anecdote is quite telling for the fate that befell Junius's works and intellectual activity. Although he was one of the key figures of Dutch humanism from the start, for some reason he is often forgotten, even in scholarship. Fortunately, the quincentenary of his birth in 2011 remedied this situation with three publications: Nico de Glas's Dutch translation of Junius's *Batavia*, an introductory biography, and a volume of scholarly essays. This review deals with the latter two.

Obviously, both books are radically different. While *The Kaleidoscopic Scholarship* is an academic study in Brill's series on intellectual history, *Hadrianus Junius* is an occasional publication, in Dutch (with an English summary), solicited by the Historical Society of Hoorn, that "does not pretend to be a scholarly biography" (156). Nevertheless, this biography has clearly benefitted from its author's scholarly experience. Despite making no academic claims, it has no small number of

(sometimes highly detailed) footnotes, an ample bibliography, several appendices — featuring, for instance, genealogical information about Junius's family — and an *index nominum*. Moreover, Van Miert also makes an effort to inform his readers about recent trends in intellectual history as a scholarly field, for instance, by explaining why early modern notebooks have received increasing attention (127).

Divided into eleven chronologically ordered chapters, interspersed with numerous, but always pertinent, illustrations, the book offers a wealth of information about all aspects of Junius's life and work, departing from the 426 preserved letters of Junius's correspondence and other primary material. However, Van Miert also takes care to put this information into context for a public of non-experts. One of the ways he does so is by including a number of inlaid pink frames that offer such contextualization. For instance, the reader will be amused to read about some *petit histoire* like Junius's strange treatises on (his) hair or a fungus in the shape of a penis, but will also receive the necessary elements to contextualize this information in two pink frames that interpret these publications as part of the humanist tradition of paradoxical *encomia* and botanical works. In this way, this biography is not only an excellent source of information about Junius, but also a nice introduction into Dutch humanism in general.

Van Miert has a pleasant writing style and his book resonates with pregnant expressions, like when he describes Junius's learned *Batavia* as “a collection of footnotes to a history that remained to be written” (123). However, there is the occasional translation that perhaps stays too close to its original to be easily understood by those unfamiliar with Latin.

Finally, I will not quote the very few misprints I have found, but do correct two minor *lapsus*. First, it is unclear what Van Miert means when he says that the title of doctor was really the only one granted by universities in the Low Countries, baccalaureates and licentiates not being in practice, not even in later times (24). Lipsius, for instance, received the title of *licentiatus utriusque*

iuris from Leuven University on 23 January 1576. Second, Lipsius's controversial *ure, seca* is not a quotation from Seneca (65), but from Cicero (*Phil.* 8, 15), as Lipsius himself dutifully acknowledges in the passage in question (*Politica*, 4, 3).

The second publication, the volume of scholarly essays, consists of eight essays flanked by an introduction and epilogue. The chapters are more or less grouped in couples: Van Miert's introduction and Heesakkers's (translated) inaugural address both aim to situate Junius within his historical and intellectual context; Maas's and de Glas's papers discuss Junius's historical *Batavia*; van Miert's discussion of the *Animadversa* and Heesakkers's essay on Junius's editions of Martial address his philological methodology; Van Hal's discussion of Junius's place in sixteenth-century linguistics stands on itself; and, finally, Wesseling's and Enenkel's essays deal with Junius's *Emblemata*.

All of the papers are of high quality. Some excel in methodology, such as Maas's discussion of the Dutch historiographical canon using Guillory's interpretation of canons in terms of Bourdieu's cultural capital. Other essays are specimens of meticulous philological study, such as Van Hal's piece or Heesakkers's heavily footnoted contribution, although the latter might seem somewhat *des Guten zu viel*, for instance when it cites full dedicational letters, including their trivial details such as deals about ducklings (n94). Still other pieces convey stimulating insights, like Wesseling's coupling of Junius's emblems and Erasmus's adages, or Enenkel's interpretation of Junius's emblem commentary as part of "the emblematic game." Together these papers form a homogeneous book, which is also due to Van Miert's introduction and particularly to his fine epilogue, which identifies and synthesizes the different *filis rouges* running through the other essays. Moreover, the volume contains good cross-references, although there are one or two instances where contributions seem to contradict each other (for example, 230n38 vs 283).

Of course some issues remain debatable, like when Junius's systematic collation of a new manuscript of Martial seems repeatedly presented as proof of his lack in philological method (177–

79, 292), or somewhat unclear, like whether the *Batavia* can be read as a nationalistic document (74–75 vs 84 and 95). In other cases (as the editor predicted, 15) one wishes for another perspective. One such case, identifiable in both publications, is the acknowledgement of humanist literary topicality, which could have contextualized Junius’s outrageous flattery or continuous complaints about his health and detractors in the biography, or in the essays could have explained the fact that Junius shows his dinner companions an apparently inexistent codex of Ammianus (112, which I think is a literary fiction), or the seemingly strange references to “a lovely scent” in the description of Rotterdam (21–22, which I think need to be read figuratively).

The layout of the volume, finally, is impeccable, but some contributions do suffer more from misprints or poor English than others. I have no intention of cavillously citing all these instances, but phrases like “plants . . . did nowhere scent more pervasively than here,” “the torch lighted by Erasmus and Secundus,” or “among a number of enthusiasts . . . I am the only one who” could have been avoided, together with the *lapsus* “Augustan monks” (80) and “Diodorus of Siculus” (99). Some *errata* in the Latin texts that might cloud the sense of the passage are: “eradendumque” (*pro* “eradendumque censeo,” 111), “perfectris” (*pro* “perfectrix,” 125), “medicamentarium” (*pro* “medicamentariam,” 152n42), “perpulivi” (*pro* “perpolivi,” 164), “nomini” (*pro* “nomine,” 20n65), “valet” (*pro* “volet,” 221).

To conclude, we can return to the story of Junius’s Leiden painting. In 1609 Hoorn’s most learned son did finally get his portrait, although it was not painted but etched and published in a collection of portraits of Leiden professors (*The Kaleidoscopic Scholarship*, 182–83). In the end, it was in print that Junius finally got his due — a truth to which the two 2011 publications will add no small amount.

TOM DENEIRE

Huygens ING (KNAW), The Hague

