The Reception of Annius of Viterbo's Forgeries: The *Antiquities* in Renaissance France

MARIAN ROTHSTEIN, *Carthage College*

Annius of Viterbo's 1498 "Antiquitatum Variarum Volumina XVII" ("Antiquities"), created to enhance the reputation of his native Viterbo, was a collection of spurious texts and commentary attributed to early Near Eastern authors of whom only fragments survive. Quickly spotted as spuria, they nonetheless flourished in France. This essay traces the use of Annius's forgeries by Jean Lemaire de Belges, for whose "Illustrations" they were seminal; mid-sixteenth-century historians followed Lemaire's lead. The "Antiquities" captivated Guillaume Postel and Guy Le Fèvre de la Boderie. They supported a history grounded on chronology, etymology, and genealogy, becoming essential to proofs of the glory and antiquity of France.

INTRODUCTION

GIOVANNI NANNI (1432–1502), a Dominican perhaps better known by the Latinized version of his name, Annius Viterbiensis, produced a collection purporting to be newly recovered ancient Near Eastern texts accompanied by an elaborate commentary. His aim was to celebrate his native Viterbo and its region, Etruria, the land of the pre-Roman Etruscans. For this purpose, he created a collection of Near Eastern sources whose authors were earlier, and hence more venerable, than Greek or Roman ones that they might then reasonably be expected to supersede.[1] In the decades following its first appearance in 1498, this collection of spurious chronicles, the *Antiquities*, took on considerable importance, surprisingly not in the Italy they had been created to glorify, but across the Alps in France, where they soon became an essential and irresistible tool, refining or redefining the glory of France and celebrating its roots in the most

[1] Since the title of Annius's collection varies from edition to edition, for convenience and brevity I use the English *Antiquities* throughout. In passing, it is worth noting that the word *antiquitates*—distinct from a history (expected to be strictly chronological)—implied a study of antiquity focused broadly on origins. See Feldman, 232. Annius's readers may have been sensitive to this appeal as the discussion below of etymology and its relation to origins suggests. All translations in this article are the author's unless otherwise noted.

Renaissance Quarterly 71 (2018): 580–609

distant past. It is that process this article will explore. The *Antiquities*'s relevance to France was first demonstrated by Jean Lemaire de Belges (1473–1525) in his *Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye* (Illustrations of Gaul and singularities of Troy, 1511–13), which at once established and popularized Annius and his collection as a source permitting French roots to be traced back not only to Troy but further, to biblical times, to the survivors of the Flood repopulating the earth. In the last quarter of the century, Annius's spuria were harnessed to a similar but not identical aim in the *Galliade* (1578) of Guy Le Fèvre de la Boderie (1541–98), where they proved vital to its thesis that all learning, having started in Gaul, would return to the place of its birth. The *Antiquities*'s strong relevance to France is not immediately obvious. Indeed, Annius, had he lived to see it, would probably have been equally surprised and distressed to find that he had provided the wherewithal for this shift in focus over the Alps from Etruria to France.

The editio princeps of the *Antiquities* rightly insists on the importance of Annius's commentary, the opening word of the title: *Commentaria Fratris Joannis Annii Viterbiensis super Opera Diversorum Auctorum de Antiquitatibus Loquentium* (Commentary of Brother Giovanni Annius of Viterbo on the works of various authors of antiquity, 1498).[2] The many posthumous editions' titles vary considerably, none ever again according such primacy to the commentary. Indeed, some editions appeared entirely without Annius's commentary, printing only the spurious chronicles in a much shorter, hence cheaper, volume. Some editions include only some of the spurious texts; the order in which they appear also varies. Annius's work has been well studied.[3] Anthony Grafton's masterful work contextualizes Annius's work as spurious and examines its reception by contemporary humanists. Walter Stephens's invaluable work explores the literary and theological reverbera-

[2] The collection of texts included: Myrsilius Lesbius, *Liber de origine Italiae et Tyrrhenorum* (Book of the origins of Italians and Etruscans); Marcus Porcius Cato, *Fragmenta ex libris originum gentium* (Fragments of the books of the origin of peoples); Archilochus, *Liber de temporibus* (Book about chronology); Metasthenes Persa, *De judicio temporum* (On judging chronology); Philonis *Breviarium de temporibus* (Guide to chronology); Xenophon, *De aequivocis* (On ambiguity); Quintus Fabius Pictor, *De aureo saeculo et de origine urbis Romae, ejusque descriptione* (On the Golden Age and the origin of the city of Rome); C. Sempronius Tuditanus, *De divisione Italiae* (On the demarcations of Italy); Antonius Pius, *Itinerarium* (Travels); Berosus Babylonius, *Antiquitatum lib. V* (Five books of antiquities); Manethon Aegyptii, *Liber de regibus Aegyptiorum* (Book of the kings of the Egyptians); *Decretum Desiderii regis Italiae* (The Decretals of Desiderius, king of Italy). Some editions, e.g., Josse Bade (Paris, 1512, 1515), also included Annius's work on the history of Spain and his *De chronographia etrusca* (On the chronology of the Etruscans). Many omit the commentary. Berosus, the earliest and the most enticing of the spuria, is almost always included and sometimes, as in the Paris, 1509, printed alone.

[3] See Tigerstedt; Goez.

tions of Annius's production. My focus in this essay is on the career of Annius's spuria in France, the claims and connections they made possible, and the nature of their sturdy resistance to learned attacks.

First, some basic facts about this collection of forgeries. The *Antiquities* included what Annius claimed to be newly recovered ancient chronicles, of which the most important were those putatively by Berosus the Chaldean, librarian of Babylon; the chronicles were then continued by the Egyptian Manethon and Xenophon.[4] These are especially important as they add directly to the spare outline Genesis provides of the repopulation of the world after the Flood, since the emphasis there was naturally on events in biblical lands. Annius's spuria added a wealth of information concerning European history. In extending the story of the repopulation of the earth from the Near East into Europe, they provided a multitude of details making it possible to anchor the genealogies of various noble families in a past far earlier than anyone dreamed possible. Although some genuine fragments of these authors have been preserved as quotations or paraphrases in surviving ancient authorities like Josephus, all references below to authors in Annius's collection should be understood as Pseudo-Berosus, Pseudo-Manethon, et al.[5]

Annius's extensive commentary was initially crucial to his project as it brought familiar and real ancient authorities to bear on what these texts had to say—either to corroborate or to dispute their evidence. In either case, as Grafton points out, the commentary cleverly makes the texts (presented as being newly discovered) all the more convincing by connecting them to names and ideas already familiar to learned readers: "The most ambitious forger imaginable, then, the one who seeks to reorient his contemporaries' mental maps of a whole sector of the past, must apparently depict many familiar landmarks even when he insists that he is not doing so. And most literary forgery, like artistic forgery, is not creation from whole cloth but the production of free imitation, close pastiche, or a rococo frame to set off genuine fragments in a new way. Nothing else would make sense or carry conviction."[6] When it included Annius's commentary, the layout of the *Antiquities*

[4] The Xenophon intended is Pseudo-Xenophon. The full text of Berosus in Latin is in Stephens, 1989, 113–17, 339–43. Asher, 191–233, includes dual-language texts of both Berosus and Manethon as an appendix.

[5] The exceptions are Propertius and Metasthenes. Exceptionally, the Propertius text included in the collection is genuine. The opposite deviation is true for Metasthenes: not only the text, but the very existence of this ancient authority appears to have been invented out of whole cloth. Ironically, this text contains what Grafton, 1990, 105, points out became a major guiding principle for careful Renaissance historians.

[6] Grafton, 1990, 62. Grafton cites, for example, Annius's affirmation that the *Antiquities* contradicted both Herodotus and Thucydides, presented as proof that the Greeks were liars. Ibid., 60.

created a volume that resembled a glossed bible of the period, with form echoing sense, as the purportedly newly recovered chronicles continued historical information found in the Bible. Taken as a whole, the *Antiquities* grounded a seamless narrative from Noah's postdiluvian repopulation of the Mediterranean and beyond, moving through suppositious Chaldean, Egyptian, and other king lists more complete than any previously known, until it reconnected with cannonical accounts at the time of Desiderius, king of the Lombards, routed by Charlemagne in 774.[7]

The appearance in France of several editions of the *Antiquities* stripped of the commentary suggests that printers judged that much of its potential audience had already been enticed by the reputation of the spurious voices themselves. Overall, its publication history is a measure of the *Antiquities*'s success; on closer examination, it reveals the forces prompting interest in Annius's work.[8] By the end of the sixteenth century there had been about two dozen Latin editions.[9] In France, one finds an astonishing flurry of folio and quarto editions of parts or all of the collection (some without the commentary), printed in Paris in 1509, 1510, 1511, 1512, and 1515 and continued around the midcentury with four additional smaller-format editions in 1552, 1554, 1555, and 1560 in Lyon.[10] French interest in Annius flourished despite the Florentine humanist Petrus Crinitus (1475–1507) flagging the *Antiquities*, only five years after their appearance, as spurious in terms that suggest that already then Crinitus was not alone among learned contemporaries who doubted its authenticity.[11] Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples (1455–1536) expressed reservations in his 1506 edition of Aristotle's *Politics*. In his 1522 commentary on Augustine's *City of God* (book 18), Juan Luis Vives (1492–1540) also declared the collection to be a forg-

[7] Stephens, 2013, 280.

[8] Given that incunabula editions tended to consist of 200–400 copies, the preservation rate of 1498 editio princeps is striking. According to the Incunabula Short Title Catalogue there are known copies in 122 libraries: see http://data.cerl.org/istc/ia00748000. Counting multiple copies held by some institutions, the Gesamtkatalogue der Wiegendrücke gives the total as 138 surviving copies: see http://www.gesamtkatalogderwiegendrucke.de/docs/GW02015.htm.

[9] Stephens, 1989, 344–45 (appendix 2), lists editions he was able to consult containing all or part of the *Antiquities*. Their printing history in France and in the empire is in strong contrast to Italy where no edition appears between 1498 and a 1543 Venetian translation of Berosus in a volume also containing Trojan histories.

[10] This count collapses editions appearing the same year in the same format and the same place, with at least one printer in common. The count is nearly doubled if one counts as separate editions those works that have an additional printer as a variant. I have neither collated, compared, nor consulted the great majority of these editions.

[11] Petrus Crinitus (Riccio), *De Honesta Disciplina* (1504): editions in Paris in 1508, 1510, 1511, 1513, 1520, 1525, etc., were contemporaneous with interest in Annius. See Crinitus, 1955, 460.

ery.[12] These works were widely read. The Alsatian humanist Beatus Rhenanus (1485–1547) similarly rejected the authenticity of Annius's collection in his *De Rerum Germanicarum* (German matters, 1531),[13] and in the succeeding decades so too did the Spanish Dominican Melchor Cano (1509–60), the Portuguese Franciscan Gasper Barreiros (1515–74), and Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609).[14] The list of humanists who denounced Annius can be taken as an outline of the broad and learned readership attracted to the *Antiquities* only to be disappointed. However well-founded or learned these objections were, they seem to have had a limited effect on the success and afterlife of Annius's texts. It is worth noting that while many editions of the *Antiquities* were printed in France, the bulk of the objections came from outside its borders.[15]

ANNIUS IN FRANCE

Given the political and historical complexities of examining the distant past, the word (and the idea) *France* is often doubled by *Gaul*, an echo of Caesar perhaps, which was appealing despite the fact that it had no contemporary political referent—or, I would argue, for that very reason. It is often used by Lemaire and many others in texts seeking an elastic term extending beyond the political borders of France, generally to include other French-speaking territories. At its greatest extension, *Gaul* may indicate lands covering most of Western Europe (Spain and Italy south of Lombardy excepted). It was a flexible term redolent of past glory. That is the sense in which its use here should be understood, and the context in which Annius's spuria were welcomed in early modern Gaul.[16] The rapid succession of

[12] Cited from Grafton, 1991, 94.

[13] Rhenanus's university education was in Paris where he may have come across the *Antiquities* while working with Le Fèvre d'Etaples.

[14] These attacks, especially Cano's, which were based on common sense and available authorities, should have convinced any reader, for while Annius's texts urged trusting the "annals" of ancient civilizations, Josephus points out that there was no such tradition for Rome, let alone Greece or earlier cultures. Cano also points to the improbability of Berosus's knowing about Spain, unknown to the Greeks, then still in the yet unexplored West. See, Grafton, 1990, 111. Julius Justus Scaliger was among the few Frenchmen who rejected the *Antiquities*. He was perhaps insulated from nationalist, Gaulish currents by the fact that he was a Protestant and lived for the last thirteen years of his life in Leiden. See Grafton, 1975.

[15] Stephens, 1989, 173–75, examines the effects of Gaulish patriotism demonstrated in an exchange of letters between the Lyonnais Symphorien Champier and the Italian Jerome of Pavia; Jerome evokes all the detractors of Annius, but Champier seems unable to consider absorbing the Italian's objections—too much is at stake.

[16] *Gaul* as a term englobing both Franks and Celts is an evident preoccupation behind any number of other works: Aneau's 1560 "histoire fabuleuse," *Alector ou le coq* (evoking the con-

Parisian editions of the *Antiquities* suggests they found eager buyers, and that France had become especially fertile ground for Annius's concoctions. Despite their creator's original pro-Etruscan intentions, they also contained a treasure trove of information well suited to respond to specific, current Gaulish political needs and to the long-held French desire to anchor its history in the distant past.

The flurry of editions in 1509–15 may have been further stimulated by specific political circumstances: the continued Italian wars in which the French hoped to conquer territories beyond the Alps that they believed to be theirs by inheritance and, during the same period, a clash over papal authority between Louis XII of France and Pope Julius II. The pope, who dreamed of being remembered as Pope Giulio Cesare, coveted worldly conquests.[17] The king's response was support for the position that councils of the church had power superior to the pope's. The Council of Pisa was convened to depose the pope. In response, the pope promptly moved to excommunicate all those associated with it. This dispute helped focus interest in France on the superiority of native, Gallican traditions. Here, Annius provided an invaluable addition, a narrative displacing Greece and Rome from the traditional *translatio studii et imperii*, making it possible instead to trace the path of both power and learning after the Flood from the Hebrews through Egypt and the Near East to the Gauls.[18] Although the pope soon vanquished the conciliarists, the French inclination to compete with both contemporary Italy and ancient Rome flourished and was made manifest in multiple domains. Spelling reformers sought to free French of the marks of Latin etymology—for example, by replacing *scavoir* with *savoir*, *nepveu* with *neveu*. Henri Estienne's (1528–98) *Conformité du langage françois avec le grec* (Resemblance of the French language to Greek, 1565) denied the Latin roots of French, a position shared by others, including Guillaume Postel.[19] French jurists like François Hotman (1524–90)

---

nection between Gaul and the Latin *gallus*—rooster); François Hotman's *Franco-Gallia* (first ed. 1573 with roots in the 1560s); Ramus's *De Moribus Veterum Gallorum* uses Annius, an influence reflected in the later editions of his *Grammar* where *Gaulois* replaced *François*.

[17] See Stephens, 1984, 85.

[18] Jean Lemaire de Belges, as he was the first, was also the primary operator reformatting Annius's texts to support a Gaulish agenda. Not coincidentally, Lemaire was, at the same time, the author of the pro-conciliar *Traité de la différence des schismes et des conciles* (Treatise on the difference between schisms and councils, 1511).

[19] In his *De Originibus seu de Hebraicae Lingua* (On the origins or the Hebrew language, 1538) Postel traced the journey of Noah and his descendants to clarify linguistic relationships, all languages having a common origin in Hebrew. "Postel's work contributed to the general linguistic orientation of many who followed him in addressing the diversity of language, and more specifically those who linked French to Greek": Wilkinson, 107n45. The same sentiment is expressed by others in passing: Geoffroy Tory; François Hotman; Joachim Du Bellay, 157–62 (*Deffense* 2.9).

and Charles Du Moulin (1500–66) declared that Roman law had no standing in France, a land that had never been directly ruled by Rome. Others seeking French autochthonous laws in the archives also discovered long-lost French literary antiquities, proving unexpectedly that France had a vernacular literary tradition predating Italy's. In this vein, Claude Fauchet (1530–1602) published long-forgotten, recovered, and accurately dated extracts in his *Recueil de l'origine de la langue et poésie françoise, ryme et romans; plus Les noms et sommaire des oeuvres de CXXVII. poetes françois, vivans avant l'an M.CCC* (Collection of the origin of French language, poetry, rhymes, and romans; plus the names and a summary of the works of 127 French poets living before 1400, 1581). In it he considers texts written in what he calls Gaulois-Romain, Gallois, Wallon, or Gallon, suggesting the usefulness and breadth of Gaulois before finally adding François-Germain to englobe also the Germanic languages of Gaul.

Gaul replaces *France* as another marker of competition with Italy or Roman antiquity, as the descriptor of an idea encompassing Frenchness that extends beyond political borders.[20] Hotman's *Franco-Gallia* / *La Gaule françoise* (1574) combs the texts of real Roman authors (Caesar, Strabo, Ammianus Marcellinus, et al.) for evidence of pre-Roman (which in this context means Gaulish) culture, another way of declaring Gaul free of Roman hegemony. Although it is outside the domain of history, the burden of Barthélémy Aneau's *Alector, histoire fabuleuse* (Alector, a fabricated story, 1560) continues these themes. A common mind-set links Lemaire, Aneau, and Postel: the author of *Alector* is obliged to have the same confidence in the Gaulish myths authenticated by pseudo-Berosus and pseudo-Manethon as Lemaire and Postel as his novel in all its complexity depends on this connection.[21]

National pride had long fueled interest in a pre-Roman past couched in claims of Trojan origins whose roots extended to the mid-twelfth-century *Roman de Brut* (Story of Brut) and even earlier, to the seventh-century *Chronicle of Fredegar* or the eighth-century *Liber historiae Francorum* (Book of the history of the Franks). Annius's claimed discoveries allowed this theme to flourish anew. The *Antiquities*, originally intended to redound to the glory of Viterbo, was, on examination, easily applicable to France. It was invaluable to Lemaire in constructing his magnum opus, the *Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troye*. Lemaire's work, in turn, was crucial to the afterlife of the *Antiquities*: for some it became an intermediary source; its success stimulated others to con-

[20] Ozouf documents how *Gaule*, from Lemaire on, has been a politically loaded term.

[21] Fontaine, 501. Aneau's prefatory epistle is appended to the modern edition of Aneau, 2:830–34. Aneau also translated Josephus's *Contra Apionem*, which contains most of the extant passages of the real Berosus.

sult Annius's collection directly. After mid-century, claims of Trojan origins tended to lose their grip as history. By the 1572 preface to the *Franciade*, Pierre de Ronsard (1524–85) was careful to explain his recourse to Trojan origins as a metaphor for French antiquity and glory, making a relatively new distinction between poetry, demanding only verisimilitude, and history, from which direct truth was to be expected.[22] Etienne Pasquier (1529–1615) in his *Recherches de la France* (Examinations of France, 1560–1621) denounced Trojan origins as nonsense. But historiography does not proceed in a linear fashion; the prestige of Troy had not yet been laid to rest.[23] Thanks in part to Annius, it flourished still in the work of Postel (1510–81) and his disciple Guy Le Fèvre de la Boderie in the last quarter of the century.

Faced with what seems to many (now as then) the evident and obvious fictions of Annius's collection, one is struck by how many intelligent people based their work on these texts despite the fact that they had been greeted almost from the start with learned arguments attacking their veracity. Annius's commentary's clever use of genuine authorities may have reassured readers at the brink of doubt. In the last analysis, it would seem that many people, however learned, convinced themselves to trust (or to accept provisionally) what they needed to bolster their own arguments. Erasmus, Luther, and Calvin all turned to Annius for specific points, although without enthusiasm. On more worldly matters Pierre de la Ramée (Petrus Ramus, 1515–72) and Barthélémy Aneau (ca. 1510–61), among many others, consulted the *Antiquities* directly (although neither was fully committed either to Annius or Troy).[24] That they were unwilling to declare Annius's collection simply spurious was most likely caused by the realization that to do so would have required relinquishing the tidy connections to the prestige of the past it alone made possible.

[22] This should be contrasted to the regular pairing of "poètes et historians" or "poètes et orateurs" in use among Lemaire and his contemporaries. It replaces the argument familiar from Boccaccio's *Genealogia* (books 14–15) that poetry conveyed truths veiled by fable: see Boccaccio. Without denying poetry's access to truths, Ronsard, 3–4, can declare it to be distinct from history.

[23] See Asher, esp. 9–43 (chapter 1, "The Idea of Trojan Origins"), which summarizes the major works connecting Gaul and Troy. See also Dubois, esp. 41–87 (chapter 2, "L'épanouissement de la mystique nationale").

[24] Ramus. Ramus's use of Annius is cautious in that whenever possible he turns as well to more familiar, generally Roman, sources to corroborate the information he reports from Berosus or Xenophon. See Meerhoff, 77; also Desan. Demaizière, 292, proposes that Ramus's use of Annius "permet de cultiver un mythe celto-gallique qui nous affranchit en partie de l'antiquité gréco-latine" ("permits the celto-gallic myth to be shaped to free us to some degree from Greco-Roman antiquity").

CHRONOLOGY, ETYMOLOGY, AND GENEALOGY IN THE HISTORIAN'S TOOLBOX

For many patriotic French writers, the *Antiquities* offered unique means of dealing with open questions vital to French cultural and political prestige. The information it contained was powerful because it wove together three fundamental notions understood as underlying historical exposition: chronology, etymology, and genealogy. The first and last are already prominent threads in the Genesis account leading up to and immediately following the Flood. Etymology, although obscured by translation, is also present there. It will be useful to consider each of the three in turn.

Chronology remained, as it had been for the ancients, the backbone of historical thought.[25] Careful linear chronology made it possible to compare cultures and so to move from lists (annals) to causes (history). It was also important for establishing the start of something—the first to do, to find, or to make—which was understood to be endowed with special qualities.[26] In the Judeo-Christian world, the Bible was a primary, but not always coherent source of chronological data for the early period described in Genesis. In his *Chronicon* (ca. 325), Eusebius (260–340 CE) added comparative dating across nine ancient kingdoms, supplementing the biblical account. The *Chronicon* was still without mention of Troy and left other looming gaps that could be filled using the material Annius provided, which finally offered unbroken links between the time of the Flood and the historical present. These included details that were welcome in the Kingdom of France, in Burgundy, and in Hapsburg realms, where royal houses claimed Trojan origins traced back to Hector's less-well-documented son Francus or to Priam's cousin Bavo. In France, as the status of Troy moved from history toward myth, early Frankish, Celtic, and Gaulish leaders acquired increasing importance, and here too Annius helped to complete the chronological picture, placing newly discovered/recovered events into a known, familiar timeline of ancient kingdoms.

Etymology was another major item in the historian's tool kit, giving insight into *vis verbi* (the power of words); revealing the true nature of great men, cities, and foundations of the past; and constituting an essential attraction of the forged texts' otherwise incomprehensible staying power and charm. It is actively present in the Bible for those who know Hebrew and are able to receive the messages contained in biblical names: Adam (formed from the earth / mud), Cain (acquisition), Abel (exhalation), Enoch (teacher), to offer a few examples. In translation, the etymological information contained in proper nouns becomes

[25] See Grafton, 1975.

[26] Rothstein, 1990a.

invisible. The central authorities here were Jerome on Hebrew names (*Liber de Nominibus Hebraicis*) and Isidore of Seville's *Etymologies*, of which there were over 100 printed editions between 1472 and 1600.[27] The *Etymologies* purports to demonstrate the origins of things, but it is a mistake to assume that this is inherently historical. For Isidore, as for the sixteenth century, much of the strength of the argument from etymology derived from the understanding that it was ahistorical, out of time, and in the realm of the kind of eternal truths that Adam voices when he gives all living things their names (Genesis 2:20). "Isidore's etymology is not historical. It is neither diachronic nor synchronic, rather it is achronic. . . . *Origo* should not automatically be understood in a temporal sense. 'The matter from which the world was made preceded those things made with it by its origin, but not temporally (*origine non tempore*)' (*Sententiae* I, 8, 6). . . . The connection between a word and its 'origin' is atemporal."[28] This is what Le Fèvre de la Boderie means when he explains that because Noah was able to remember the names Adam gave things after the Flood, he was thereby able to restore to the regions of the earth their true and proper names, names that laid forth the essence of their nature and thereby had the further property of relieving the lands of the sterility caused by the Flood.[29] Etymology might finally best be understood as a tool for revealing essence.

The functions of genealogy are not unrelated to those of etymology. Here too essence is at stake. Tracing a royal line's ancestry declared its legitimacy and, just as important, revealed the stuff of which it was made. French kings' descent from Trojan nobility offered a guarantee that their bloodlines transmitted the right stuff to them, as can be seen in Homeric accounts, in Virgil, and in the many other tales transmitting the Trojans' heroic deeds. More mundane genealogical connections were important in large part because they too were understood to contain the same guide to the assessment of the essence of a person's moral character.

Chronology, etymology, and genealogy together form a distinctive feature of Renaissance historiography. As Christopher Ligota remarks, a preoccupation with explaining how things came to be and consequently what they truly are shapes the *Antiquities*: "though the ancient texts Annius invented have a story to tell, their function, as the commentaries make clear, is as much to

[27] Isidore knew and used Jerome's work, offering his own as a kind of continuation. Both were crucial in the chain of etymologies used by Annius and his followers.

[28] I am citing here an article by Jacques Elfassi, "The Etymologies," written to appear in Brill's *Companion to Isidore of Seville*, forthcoming at the time of writing and communicated to me in private correspondence with the author.

[29] Le Fèvre, 207 (*Galliade* 1.651–56). In what follows, references to Guy Le Fèvre de la Boderie will be shortened to Le Fèvre for convenience.

show why the story is true as to tell it, that is, to unfold the story as a demonstration of its veracity."[30] Annius was joined in this habit of interpretation by his contemporaries, many of whom were happy to apply the method to other texts as well. The truths etymology unveiled were received as serious and important. Postel, redefining what etymology had to offer, coined the related term *emitology*, based on the Hebrew *emet* (truth). His cabalistic eye noted that the word *emet*, אמת, is composed of the first, middle, and last letters of the Hebrew alphabet, declaring its mystically inclusive nature. History understood in these terms, while apparently recounting the past in an orderly chronological way, has just as much to say about the present and the future: inasmuch as genealogy and etymology instruct us about the essence of the things examined, they reveal what they were, what they are in the authorial audience's present, and what is to be expected of them going forward.

LES ILLUSTRATIONS DE GAULE ET SINGULARITEZ DE TROYE

Chronology, etymology, and genealogy structure Jean Lemaire de Belges's masterwork, large portions of which rely on the *Antiquities*, especially on Annius's commentary and on the spurious Berosus, Manethon, and Xenophon—understood as voices from the distant past making longed-for truths accessible.[31] The *Illustrations* was much read and frequently reprinted: the Universal Short Title Catalogue lists eighty-one printings of one or more volumes of this three-volume work in the four decades spanning 1511–49. Lemaire assured the success of the *Antiquities* in French-speaking lands by transmitting a broad outline of what he found there (selected to reflect Gaulish interests) or by drawing Annius's collection to the attention of readers interested in French roots.[32]

Lemaire had begun his project well before he had any contact with Annius's treasure trove of early chronicles. He makes a point of telling readers that he began working on the *Illustrations* in 1500.[33] In the summer of 1508 as also two years earlier, in 1506, he had been sent to Rome on specific diplomatic missions for his patron, Margaret of Austria (1480–1530), regent of the Netherlands for

[30] Ligota, 45.

[31] Rothstein, 1990b.

[32] The *Illustrations* were an intermediary source for Gilles Corrozet, Jean Bouchet, and Joachim Du Bellay, among others. Belleforest attacks the *Illustrations*, suggesting that he knew it. See Asher, esp. 19, 26, 52.

[33] Lemaire, 1882–85, 1:4. References below are to this late nineteenth-century edition, based on Jean de Tournes's 1549 Lyon edition, the last in the sixteenth century. Volume 1 contains book 1 of *Illustrations*; books 2–3 are in volume 2.

her nephew, the Emperor Charles V; it was likely during one of these trips that Lemaire came upon Annius's collection.[34] In February 1508—that is, before his second trip to Rome—the working title had become the "Singularitez de Troye et de Turcquie," strongly suggesting that he had not yet begun incorporating Annius's chronicles into his own project.[35] On 20 July 1509 he was granted a *privilège* protecting his intellectual property for three years—for a work now called the "Singularitez de Troye et Illustrations de Gaule." Applying for this royal protection suggests that he intended to publish it almost immediately, the better to profit from the period covered by the *privilège*.[36] The new title telegraphs that change was underway, yet Troy retains pride of place. By the time the first volume finally appeared nearly two years later, in May 1511, the position of the two title elements, *Troye* and *Gaule*, were reversed, definitively giving Gaul pride of place in the *Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. In book 3, first published in 1513, Lemaire returns to his discovery of the *Antiquities*, telling readers, "I will be so bold as to claim without arrogance that I was the first to discover [Manethon] when I came upon the works of the aforesaid commentator [Annius] in Rome."[37] In 1513, Lemaire is still eager to mention Manethon, as elsewhere Berosus or Xenophon, while he now carefully avoids referring to Annius by name as he had done freely two years earlier. The latter

[34] Jodogne, 437, inclines to 1506; Abelard, 219, to 1508. In either case, the discovery likely changed the nature of the final product more radically than Lemaire's change of patron. Jodogne, 437, suggests that Lemaire may have interested Josse Bade in the *Antiquities*, which he published twice in 1512 and twice in 1515. Stephens, 1989, 143, proposes that Lemaire might have discovered Annius in Paris as late as 1509 when Josse Bade could have introduced Lemaire to the work. Jean de Gourmont printed the Berosus text, without commentary, in Paris, 1509. Although its title does not mention Annius, it points to Berosus's casting light on Genesis: *De antiquitatibus seu defloratio Caldaica, cum figuris et ipsius eleganti vita, libris Geneseos perutilis* (About antiquities or Chaldean discoveries with images and a life, most useful to the books of Genesis). The 1510 and 1511 Paris editions issued by Geoffroy de Marnef contain only twenty-eight folios, including the text of Berosus and of Manethon (treated as an appendix to Berosus) and several others of Annius's creations. Lemaire clearly had access to a more complete text of the *Antiquities* with commentary since he quotes both commentary (with and without acknowledgment) as well as the spuria relevant to his project.

[35] See Jodogne, 404. On the varying titles, see Abelard; on the significance of the shifting titles, Rothstein, 1990b, 596–99.

[36] The *privilège* was granted to Lemaire himself (rather than the printer as was customary) for three years, presumably from the date it was accorded, 20 July 1509. See: http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k840405q/f11.

[37] Lemaire, 1882–85, 2:268: "Je m'ose bien vanter sans arrogance avoir esté le premier inventeur [de Manethon] quand j'euz recouvré les œuvres dudit commentateur [Annius] à Rome."

is generally, as in the passage just quoted, simply "le commentateur" ("the author of the commentary").

Despite the silent recognition of growing doubts connected with Annius's name, coming upon the *Antiquities* constituted a serendipitous case of just-in-time delivery, vital to the construction of what became the final state of Lemaire's broadly nationalist-Gaulish *Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye* in its final form. The information Lemaire found in the *Antiquities* was what enabled him to put Gaul first in the final title—the place earlier given Troy—and what contributed mightily to the success of the work. Other major changes in Lemaire's situation were taking place during this time as well. Since about 1504, he had been in the employ of Margaret of Austria who became regent of the Netherlands the year following.[38] Shortly after dedicating book 1 of the *Illustrations* to her, he came to work instead for the court of France, dedicating book 2 to Claude de France in 1512, then the presumptive future dauphine, and book 3 the next year to her mother, Anne de Bretagne, queen of France. The term *Gaule* served as a useful cover, bringing all three of these patrons under a single tent.

The new material the *Antiquities* provided allowed the *Illustrations* to be profoundly restructured, turning it from something primarily genealogical and focused on Troy, intended to furnish "all princes ruling today in Western nations" with a common Trojan past, into something with stronger genealogical and chronological foundations and a more pungent political message about Gaulish claims to superiority.[39] Once he had access to the *Antiquities*, Lemaire was able to present an unbroken genealogy of rulers from Noah to the fifteenth century, documenting his patrons' ties to Troy on the way. The better to accomplish this, he made some changes in Annius's texts, purposefully shifting its center of gravity from Italy to Gaul.[40] References to Gaul, Celts, or Druids are plucked like so many raisins from the *Antiquities* and put to work in the *Illustrations.* The case of Comerus Gallus may serve as an example. Throughout the French text elaborating on Annian materials, the syllable *gal* is a heavily charged marker pointing to Gaul. In his book 5, Berosus reports that Comerus Gallus placed his colonies in the kingdom that

[38] For an outline of Lemaire's career, see Jodogne, 83–88.

[39] Lemaire, 1882–85, 1:4: "Tous les princes qui dominent aujourd'huy sur les nations occidentales."

[40] Stephens, 1989, 145, terms the *Antiquities* stripped of Annius's commentary an "expurgated" version, by which he seems to mean stripped of the potentially inconvenient commentary. While it is the case that the commentary elaborates the case for the greatness of Etruria, this is well prepared by the spurious texts themselves. After the appearance of the *Illustrations*, the *Antiquities* with commentary were published several times in France. Stephens elsewhere recognizes the usefulness of parts of the commentary for Lemaire's ends: e.g., ibid, 147.

afterward was called Italy, and named his region after his own name.[41] Surely this cries out to be interpreted in Lemaire's sense. Indeed, a bit later in book 5, in the section devoted to Jupiter Belus, Berosus himself responds to the etymological hint contained in Comerus Gallus's name, declaring a connection between Gaul and the descendants of Comerus Gallus, while earlier, in his fourth book, Berosus had localized Comerus Gallus in Italy.[42] Lemaire gathered up such references and built on them to create a coherent account marked by etymology as the naturally ordained passage of Comerus Gallus from Italy to Gaul, his rightful home.

In the same spirit, Berosus mentions the existence of a Galatea with whom Hercules of Libya fathered Galates, whom he then left to be king of the Celts.[43] The commentary places his royal seat in Annius's Viterbo. In the *Illustrations*, while this is loyally reported, Hercules is pointedly married to Galatea, and the main event is the crowning of Hercules's son, whom Lemaire calls Galateus, king of Gaul, "with a great public show and splendid majesty."[44] The telling syllable, *gal*, once again guides the tale: King Galateus, son of the "trespreux" ("most valiant") Hercules—who is himself the son of Isis and Osiris, grandson of Cam, great-grandson of Noah—is the source of the name Gaul.

Before his discovery of Annius, Lemaire's book must have begun with the material now in chapter 18, familiarly known as the "Roman de Pâris," based largely on Boccaccio's *De Genealogia Deorum Gentilium* and Ovid's *Heroides*. Using the new information furnished by the *Antiquities*, Lemaire wrote what became the first eighteen chapters of book 1 and essentially all of book 3. The change of perspective that the new material imposed on Lemaire and on his project is most strongly felt at the point where the Annian-inspired conception abuts the old *roman*, chapters 17–19 of book 1. Using chronology to tie disparate events together in the chronicle tradition, chapter 17 describes King Paris, eighteenth king of the Gauls, contemporary of Tros, son of Erichthonius in Troy. Tros is the grandfather of Laomedon (father of Priam) and of Anchises (father of Aeneas). Genealogy and chronology are the drivers of this material. Lemaire cites Boccaccio's *Genealogia* as the primary authority for the Trojan material and the *Antiquities*'s Archilochus and Manethon for contemporary events in Gaul. Chapter 18, still in chronicle mode, takes us to the next generation. The sylla-

[41] "Comerus Gallus posuit colonias suas in regno: quod post Italia dicta est. Et regionem suam a suo nomine cognamanavit" ("Comerus Gallus placed his colonies in the kingdom which afterwards was called Italy, and named his region afer his own name"). For convenience, I cite here the transcription of Berosus provided by Asher, 204. The English translation is also Asher's: ibid., 205.

[42] It should be recalled that Gaul, broadly understood, included large portions of what we (like Annius) think of as Northern Italy.

[43] Asher, 220–21.

[44] Lemaire, 1882–85, 1:74: "À Grand triomphe et merveilleuse pompe."

ble *gal* again recurs regularly, etymology bespeaking meaningful connections: King Namnes in Gaul is the son of Galates the younger, according to Manethon; his conquests extended to Poland (Galicia, as Lemaire reminds his readers), Russia, Prussia, and Turkey (where, again, there were Galatians, as witnessed by the Epistles of Paul). Writing systems also connect the two because it was the Gauls who brought Greek letters to the Phoenicians and thence to the Greeks, as Annius's Xenophon attests. The text paraphrases or cites various Annian authorities in Latin. Namnes was the contemporary of Laomedon. The latter's story allows Lemaire to inveigh against "Greek lies and fictions" or "lying Greeks filled with empty words."[45] Combining genealogy and etymology, he cites Manethon, who reports that Gaulish King Namnes was the founder of Nantes.[46] His son Rhemus would build Rheims "in our Belgian Gaul, at the place where the most Christian Kings of France are consecrated and take their crown."[47] Turning then from etymology to chronology, Lemaire confirms that Rhemus and Priam were indeed contemporaries.

As chapter 18 brings us to the time of the Trojan War, the focus moves from Gaul to Troy, although Lemaire promises the two threads of narration will be reconnected with the return of the Trojan diaspora to Gaul in book 3. This is the bridge between the new text facilitated by Annius and the older Trojan stratum of Lemaire's project. Although Bavo, Priam's cousin and founder of Bavais, is mentioned in passing in chapter 19, what follows is now dependent on another set of authorities: Boccaccio again, but then Servius (indirectly, in fact, since Boccaccio cites him), Diodorus Siculus, Dares, Jacques de Guise (d. 1398), Filippo Beroaldo (1453–1505), and Virgil, with a nod to Homer. There is a pause for chronological triangulation: Priam's reconstruction of Troy occurred 257 years after its foundation by Dardanus, 1,187 years after the Flood, 1,130 years before the birth of Christ, and 2,843 years after the creation of Adam. Chapter 19 ends in a flurry of genealogical details concerning the great families of Troy, concluding with a formulaic promise of continuity familiar to any reader of fifteenth- or sixteenth-century *romans*: "As we will see in what follows. But we are silent until the tale turns again to them; and will now focus on young Paris."[48] And so—with a sharp change in style from the reporting of relationships (genealogy), names

[45] Ibid., 1:115: "Grecz pleins de mensonge et de vaniloquence"; "menteries et fictions Grecques."

[46] Ibid..

[47] Ibid., 1:116: "En nostre Gaule Belgique, là où les treschrestiens Roys de France sont consacrez et prennent leur couronne."

[48] Ibid., 1:116; ibid., 1:125: "Comme on verra cy apres. Mais de ce nous tairons nous, juques à ce que le conte s'adressera à les ramentevoir: et dirons principalement de lenfant Paris."

(etymology), and dates (chronology) to the gorgeous prose poetry that marks the rest of book 1 and continues though most of book 2—begins the "Roman de Pâris."

Lemaire regularly names the sources of his information throughout the *Illustrations*. In the first eighteen chapters of book 1, Berosus the Chaldean, Manethon the Egyptian, and Xenophon are cited so frequently they soon feel as familiar to readers as Jerome or Augustine, who are also cited as sources, although they are generally cited secondhand from Annius's commentary.[49] Annius's name—Frère Jan de Viterbe—does appear from time to time, as well as oblique references to him as "le commentateur."[50] The Trojan emphasis of the rest of books 1 and 2 naturally sidelines the contents of the *Antiquities*. By the publication of book 3 in 1513, when Lemaire was in Paris, he would seem to be reflecting the increasing reservations of humanist circles concerning the *Antiquities*. In the list of authors cited that appears just before chapter 1 of book 3 of the *Illustrations*, Annius is now nowhere to be found, although Berosus and Manethon do still have their place.[51]

Annius's aim, to present Near Eastern civilizations as more venerable and trustworthy than the Greeks or the Romans, found sympathetic ground in Lemaire's anti-Roman sentiments, encouraged by the contemporary political climate.[52] Lemaire's Trojan sympathies further contributed to his negative vision of the Greeks (as destroyers of Troy), again bringing him closer to Annius. Where Annius sought to celebrate Etruscan Viterbo, Lemaire's parallel intent

[49] Jodogne, 429, suggests that, as was common early in the century, some 20 percent of Lemaire's cited sources are derived from Annius, cited secondhand: Diogenes, Eusebius, Macrobius, Moses, Persius, Philo, Propertius, Ptolemy, Sempronius, Tacitus, Tibullus. See also Doutrepont, 13–26.

[50] In the 1512 edition the authorities are identified in the margins. "Frère Jan de Viterbe" appears once or more in the margins of chapters 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18. In the 1513 edition of book 3, authorities are again picked out in the margins where Berosus, Xenophon, and other Annian spuria appear, although "Frère Jan de Viterbe" is no longer mentioned either in the margins or in the list of "acteurs qui sont nommez et alleguez en ce livre" ("authors named or referred to in this book"): Lemaire, 1882–85, 2:233.

[51] See Lemaire, 1882–85, 2:233–34.

[52] See above for the use of the Council of Pisa in the dispute between Louis XII and Julius II. Lemaire participated in this quarrel with a *Traité de la différence des schismes et des conciles* (1511), directed against the pope, printed with the first book of the *Illustrations* in the four editions published between May 1511 and September 1513. See Abelard, 43. The *Traité* appeared independently in 1532, now called *Le Promptuaire des conciles* (Promptuary of councils). Its condemnation by the Sorbonne in 1551 marked the end of editions of Lemaire's works in the sixteenth century, although he continued to be widely read and appreciated.

was to verify and glorify the antiquity of the Gauls. Lemaire's exposition of the multiple etymologies of *Gallus*, the word that will lead to *Gaule*, reproduces information found in the *Antiquities*. So he explains that in Greek *gallus* means "milk white"; in Phrygian, the language of Troy, it designates priests of Cybele, mother of the gods; in Babylonian or Hebrew, it means "on a wave," "surmounting the waves," which leads to ships called *gallères*.[53] Lemaire felt no need to choose among these elements as he perceived them all to be active truths allowing insight into the nature of *Gaul*. He explains that he learned all this from Xenophon's *Aequivoca*, Isidore's *Etymologies*, and Jerome on Hebrew names. Since the latter two are quoted in Annius's commentary and the first is Annius's own creation, the *Antiquities* are very likely Lemaire's single source here. In the same passage we learn that *Gallus* was another name for Noah, also known as Ogyges, whence we are led quickly to Noah's grandson, the biblical Gomer, that is Comerus Gallus, for whom the acknowledged source is Berosus.[54] Annius enabled the roots of Gaul to be traced far deeper into the past than was otherwise possible.

Without the *Antiquities*, the *Illustrations* would have remained a much more limited work, more closely tied to the prose-romance tradition than to history, based on familiar classical and medieval sources like the list of authors cited given at the start of book 2, largely focused on Troy with much weaker scholarly, humanist, or political pretentions. The authority of the *Antiquities* allowed Lemaire's work to transmit a complex message about Gaulish unity and Gaulish superiority: politically, it was designed to help form a united front to the Turkish treat to Christendom, while culturally, it aimed to undermine the prestige of what was inherited from Greece and Rome by replacing it with even older, thereby more prestigeous, Gaulish sources.

The *Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troye* made the *Antiquities* familiar to many. In all probability, the majority of references to Berosus in France can be traced to Lemaire directly or indirectly.[55] A list of such works would include many learned names: Gilles Corrozet's *Antiques erections des Gaules* (Ancient constructions of the Gauls, 1535);[56] Guillaume Du Bellay's *Epitome de l'Antiquité des Gaules et de France* (Summary of the antiquity of Gaul and

[53] Lemaire, 1882–85, 1:16.

[54] Ibid., 1:16–17.

[55] See Stephens, 1989, 176–82.

[56] Corrozet's *Antiques erections*—where Annian texts were likely via Lemaire—continued to appear with additions in Lyon and Paris, republished until the end of the century (n.d., 1575, 1590).

France, written before his death in 1543);[57] Guillaume Le Rouillé's *Recueil de l'antique préexcellence de Gaule et des Gaulois* (Collection of the ancient excellence of Gaul and the Gauls, 1546);[58] Jean Picard's *De Prisca Celtopaedia* (Study of early Celts, 1556); and Robert Ceneau's *Gallica Historia* (1557). All used Annius to prove that the Greeks and the Romans derived their learning from the Gaulish Celts.[59] In addition to the authors named above, many others, including Jean Bouchet, Ramus, and Aneau, while not fully committed either to Annius or to Troy, were unwilling to declare Annius's collection spurious since that would have meant giving up the whole set of connections to the past it alone made possible. Whether the *Illustrations* were the immediate source or the stimulus that led authors to consult the *Antiquities* directly, these works generally shared Lemaire's political inclination to celebrate the grandeur of Gaul, to convince readers that Gaul had been and therefore potentially still was and would continue to be superior to Rome or to Greece.

There is also the case of Rabelais to be considered. It differs from the others in that the connection is more circumstantial. Walter Stephens examines how the satirical genealogical expositions in Rabelais's first two books may have been influenced by Annius and by contemporary reactions to him despite the fact that Rabelais makes no direct mentions of the Dominican or of his spurious

[57] See http://search.lib.virginia.edu/catalog/uva-lib:1074184. The *Epitome* (Paris, 1556, 1587, and 1588) is all that survives of Du Bellay's *Ogdoades*. He was a widely respected soldier and diplomat. Rabelais, 599–603, treats him as so exceptional a hero that his passing was marked by nature herself (*Quart livre* chapters 26–27). Guillaume Du Bellay cites Berosus yet never mentions Annius by name, suggesting that he found the material too useful to treat critically. Hotman, 51 (chapter 4), regrets that Du Bellay, who "should have the first rank among all those who were interested in such things, who was moreover considered one of the finest souls and the most knowledgeable of his time, yet gave himself such latitude in his book on the Antiquities of Gaul and of France that it seems that rather than writing a French history he was attempting tales like *Amadis de Gaule*."

[58] Using Berosus, Le Rouillé purports to show that all Germanic races are Gallic in origin. The book aims to prove that "the Empire of Gaul and the Gauls was better than any other with respect to both arms and learning. That the Romans had no valid sovereignty over them, and that they were thoroughly avenged and recovered their full liberty": Le Rouillé, sig. A4^{r} (prologue). See Asher, 53. See also http://www.bvh.univ-tours.fr/Consult/index.asp?numfiche=138.

[59] See Asher; Stephens, 1989, for other works using Annius, either directly or filtered through Lemaire. Dubois, 49, points out Picard's reliance on etymology as he presents "a pseudo-history that expands and completes the findings of Annius with bits of other authors and above all with etymological fantasies." Dubois would seem to be reading etymology in a more modern sense than the historical one for which I argue here. He does much the same for genealogy, speaking of "maniacal collectors of genealogies": ibid., 123. A modern reader of large sections of the *Illustrations* could be forgiven sympathies with his impatience.

chroniclers.[60] Lemaire himself appears in Rabelais's underworld, presented in terms that are difficult to evaluate.[61] Stephens suggests that Rabelais may have feared that direct mockery of the *Antiquities* would have offended those who found them useful, including his much respected patron, Guillaume Du Bellay, and that perhaps the king himself would have been affronted.[62] At the same time, there is evidence scattered throughout his work strongly suggesting that Rabelais was familiar with Lemaire's *Illustrations*; to know the *Illustrations* implied considerable familiarity with the *Antiquities* even in the absence of direct contact. The Annian creation, Hercules of Libya, is referred to in the "Fanfreluches antidotés" ("Foolish characters and actions") that constitute chapter 2 of *Gargantua*. This Hercules is better developed and considerably more important in the *Illustrations* than in the *Antiquities*, suggesting that the former may have been Rabelais's inspiration for this detail.[63] Despite the many topical political references Rabelais's work contains, he was free to use Annian tropes indirectly and mockingly because his own commitment to humanist principles prevented him from sharing the political commitments to the glorification of Gaul, much less to its superiority to Greece or Rome, that marks those who found firm guiding threads in the *Antiquities* or the *Illustrations*.

ANNIUS IN THE CIRCLE OF POSTEL: THE *GALLIADE* OF GUY LE FÈVRE DE LA BODERIE

While Lemaire was a great poet, good courtier, and moved in humanist circles, he lived at a time when access to Greek in France was extremely rare and access to Hebrew and other semitic languages all but impossible. Starting in the 1540s, there was another wave of interest in Annius's collection that can be traced to the work and the followers of the orientalist and cabalist Guillaume Postel. It is not possible to know if Postel's attention had been drawn to the *Antiquities* by the *Illustrations* or if he had come upon Annius's work independently—or both.[64] He was in any case an uncannily brilliant linguist who spent

[60] Stephens, 1989, 185–338 (chapters 5–7). Ibid., 259, suggests that the episode recounted in *Pantagruel* chapters 23–24 might have been inspired by Annius's interest in both these matters. In these chapters, Pantagruel receives a letter addressed to himself using only the consonants of his name, PNTGRL, whose contents involve a rebus of sorts.

[61] See Stephens, 1989, 260–79.

[62] Ibid., 185–338 (chapters 5–7), esp. 251 and 411–12nn70–71.

[63] Rabelais, 37–38 (*Gargantua* 12). Richard Berrong points out similarities between the *Illustrations* (end of book 2) and the start of *Gargantua*.

[64] Lemaire's restructuring of Annius's pro-Etruscan project presented it in a form better tailored to Postel's ends.

the last few decades of his life confined as a madman in the monastery of Saint-Martin des Champs. In religious matters, he was a committed Catholic who also had some startling ideas, which for present purposes can be reduced to the conviction that just as there was one God and one pope, there was also rightly a single secular, universal monarch, the king of France.[65] As they had been for Lemaire, Annius's spuria, especially Berosus, were essential to Postel's project, allowing him to trace the Gaulish lineage of the king of France to Comerus Gallus and his grandfather Noah, universal sovereign after the Flood, whose universal sovereignty would become the birthright of the king of France, as revealed in part through Hebrew etymologies. Postel believed that God had created man and language: like Adam, Hebrew was a divine creation. The direct road from Adam to Noah to Gaul could be traced only with the help of the *Antiquities*.

Like Postel himself, his disciple Guy le Fèvre de la Boderie was an expert in Oriental languages and a student of Christian Kabbalah. Le Fèvre continued Postel's endeavors, providing a Latin translation of a Syriac New Testament (1571) that included a translation of the Syriac text into Hebrew as well as an accompanying *Dictionarium Syro-Chaldaicum* (Syrian-Chaldaic dictionary) published in 1572.[66] He was familiar with Annius's collection and probably also knew Lemaire's *Illustrations*.[67] As some of the material in the *Antiquities* was vital to Postel's worldview so also was it to the construction of Le Fèvre's long poem, *La Galliade*, a celebration of Gaul by way of Hebrew etymology that, as an adept of Kabbalah, he considered to be especially revelatory of the true nature of things. What follows will again be marked by the frequent return to the syllable *gal*, suggestive of Gaul, just as in the *Illustrations*. What Lemaire presents as a linear history carrying Gaulish virtue forward, is for Le Fèvre the triumphant recapture of original virtue. The Hebrew word "Galal, meaning bending back and returning"—always already Gaul—suggests that the word itself contains the promise of return.[68] The subtitle reinforces the idea of circular

[65] On Postel, see Secret; Bouwsma; Kuntz. To this should be added the numerous editions of Postel annotated by Secret, and the list of possible sources of the *Galliade* in Roudaut's invaluable critical edition: Le Fèvre, 645–48. All references below to the *Galliade* (1582) are to this edition. All translations of Le Fèvre are mine.

[66] Translating Syriac to Latin was an exercise in humanist learning; the aim of a Hebrew translation should be understood in the light of Postel's conviction that all the peoples of the book could, should, and would be converted to Christianity—so Jews, for example, should be given access to the Gospels and other Christian texts in languages they could read.

[67] See the *Galliade*'s prefatory material in Le Fèvre, 116 ("Au Roy," lines 109–10), where he, speaking of the second edition of the poem, says he is waiting "Pour faire publier des Illustrations / De Gaule" ("to have the Illustrations of Gaul published"), which it is hard to see as other than a willful echo of Lemaire's title.

[68] Le Fèvre, 154 (*Galliade* 1.20–21): "*Galal*, qui signifie Reployer et retourner."

motion: "la Revolution des Arts et Sciences" (*re-volution* to be understood etymologically, i.e., as revolving, returning).[69] Throughout the poem the author placed marginalia to explain the Hebrew etymology of names, often citing Berosus when he might have depended on his own linguistic skills (e.g., "For *Gallim* means waves of water, and thence, as Berosus bears witness, the Gauls got their name") or to explain *Galliade* 1:100 ("The name of the Gauls taken from the Hebrews").[70] The willful evocation of Berosus in the last quarter of the century suggests the degree to which this spurious chronicle retained its charm even in the face of years of condemnation.

The *Galliade*, written when there was still no single, set French word like *epic* to describe long poems, might best be thought of under the rubric Sebillet proposes: it is a *grand oeuvre*.[71] Progress, being cyclical, has the capacity to restore or revivify the partially effaced powers of the past, or in Postel's terms, its power is *restitutio omnium*, closing the circle.[72] Therefore, the poem is divided into five "Cercles" ("Circles"), stressing the circularity of Gaul's history, starting with the growth of culture and learning after the Flood, now returning to its original glory, and also insisting that, unlike the Homeric epics, the *Galliade* reports historical truth. Its circular construction means that each of its five "Cercles" documents a different aspect of history from Noah to Le Fèvre's present, detailing the recovery of Gaulish glories. Le Fèvre's "Avertissement aux lecteurs" (Foreword) explains this structure, perhaps most clearly felt in the fifth and final circle: "[Poetry] which I have tried to bring by the turning of the ages, tracing (it) among the Hebrews, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, and Italians to the land of our Gauls, where first the ancient Bards . . . furnished it with agreeable and pleasant dwellings, as they did for Music, twin-sister of Poetry. With the aim of showing that Poetry, like the other disciplines, returned, after the course of many centuries, to our Gaul, to their total and complete realization in the very place of their birth."[73] Berosus alone provides the starting point of this virtuous

[69] Ibid., 153.

[70] Ibid., 169 (*Galliade* lines 99–100): "Car גלים Gallim signifie flots des eaux: et de là selon le tesmoignage de Berose furent nommez les Gaulois" ("For *Gallim* means waves in the water; and thence, by the witness of Berosus, the Gauls were named"); "Le surnom de GAULOIS emprunté des Hebrieux" ("The distinguishing name GAULOIS taken from the Hebrews").

[71] Sébillet, 140 (chapter 14).

[72] Roudaut, 73.

[73] Le Fèvre, 153–58 (*La Galliade*, "Avertissement"). Ibid., 157: "[La Poësie] laquelle je me suis efforcé d'amener par le reply des ages, et la deduire des Hebrieux, Egyptiens, Grecs, Latins, et Italiens au sejour de noz Gaules, où premierement les vieux Bardes . . . luy avaient, et à la Musique sa Seur gemelle, donné plaisante et delectable habitations. Afin de monstrer que tant la Poësie, comme les autres disciplines, sont revenues apres le cours de plusieurs Siecles en nostre Gaule prendre leur entier et parfait accomplissement au mesme lieu de leur naissance."

circle and the circular motion is seen as essential: "returned . . . to our Gaul," for their final "realization in their very place of birth."

Galal is followed by *Gallim*, which Le Fèvre (like Annius and Lemaire) translates as "saved from the waters and waves of the Flood whence comes the name of Gaul and the Gaulois."[74] Le Fèvre calls forth a barrage of authorities: "Berose Chaldé, Josephe Hebrieu, Manethon Egyptien, Metasthene ou Megasthene, Bocchus Maure, Timagene, Xenofone aux Equivoques, Mysilius Lesbien, Cato, Solin, Amian Marcellin." This list puts real ancient authors shoulder to shoulder with six of the *Antiquities*'s spuria.[75] It prepares Le Fèvre's contention a few lines later that there were many irreproachable foreign (by which he presumably means ancient but outside the Gaulish tradition) sources available seconding the *Antiquities*, which he admits are considered suspect by some: "If fragments of Berosus and other authors collected and published by Annius of Viterbo are not enough evidence for what I set forth as they are neither recognized nor approved by some of the learned men of our time as legitimate offspring of the fathers whose name and family resemblance they bear, still, there will be other most convincing and irreproachable foreign witnesses for our cause; so that it should not seem that, writing verse, I wished to tell folk-tales and jokes, as if I sought to create a dance [*galliarde*] to pass the time pleasantly rather than writing a *Galliade* to shed light and glory on our shared fatherland."[76]

For Le Fèvre in 1578, when the *Galliade* first appeared, Annius's spuria remained indispensable. Sufficiently so that he, unlike what can be seen in the last book of the *Illustrations*, does not hesitate to name Annius himself. The

[74] Le Fèvre, 154 ("Avertissement"): "Sauvez des flots et ondes du Deluge dont est emprunté le nom de Gaule et des Gaulois."

[75] Le Fèvre's list offers an amusing, learned correction as he suggests that the real Megasthenes might be what Annius intended when he speaks of Metasthenes, as the spurius name was understandably otherwise unfamiliar to Le Fèvre. Timagenes's *History of the Gauls* is known from citations in Ammianus Marcellinus; both names figure here. Bocchus Maure is presumably Lucius Cornelius Bocchus, who lived in Roman Spain; Gaius Julius Solinus is author of a second-century CE *Polyhistor* that does mention Gaul in passing.

[76] Le Fèvre, 155 ("Avertissement"): "Que si le Fragments de Berose, et autres Autheurs ensemble receuillis. et mis en lumiere par Annius de Viterbe, ne font assez ample foy de mon dire, pour n'estrereconnus ny approuvez par aucuns des doctes de notre temps, pour enfans legitimes des Peres dont ils portent le nom et les marques sur le front: si est-ce qu'il nous restera encor assez d'autres tesmoins estrangers tressuffisans et non reprochables au reconnaissance de nostre cause: afin qu'il ne semple que poëtisant j'aye seulement voulu conter des bourdes et plaisanteries, comme si j'avoye plustost voulu sonner une Gaillarde, qu'escrire une Galliade, pour servir de risee et de passetemps, plustost que pour illustrer nostre commune patrie."

second edition, published in 1582, shows no signs of change in this stance. The questionable source was counterbalanced by Le Fèvre's own unquestionable learning and the high stakes. His project simply cannot do without the *Antiquities*; no other source fills the gap between the information provided by Genesis and the earliest accounts of Gaul to be gleaned from the sparse references to Druids, bards, and Celts in Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Caesar, Pomponius Mela, Pliny, and a few others.[77] Threads of continuity are found in ancient authors like Josephus where much of what survives of the real Berosus and some of Manethon is preserved, but these all pale in comparison to the riches Annius provided.

Le Fèvre's defense of Berosus continues the tradition of Postel, who "saw classical Greek and Roman culture as a perversion of an earlier Near Eastern revelation, best entrusted in his own day to the virtuous Gauls; he condemned Romulus as a descendant of Ham who had tried to extirpate the virtuous laws and customs established in Italy by Noah, also known as Janus."[78] Postel's position is extensively set forth in his work tracing the passage of knowledge from West to East, from Gaul to Asia: *Histoire memorable des expéditions depuys le Deluge faictes par les Gauloys ou Françoys depuis la France jusque en Asie* (Memorable history of explorations from France as far as Asia conducted by the Gauls or French since the Flood, 1552). In his *Tresor des propheties de ce monde* (Thesaurus of prophesies of this world, 1556), Postel offers the strongest possible condemnation of his critics, i.e., those who reject Berosus are atheists: "Although the text of Berosus the Chaldean is incomplete and little esteemed by atheists and enemies of Moses, nonetheless, as it has already been approved by innumerable men and authors very learned in all sorts of disciplines and languages, I grant him the credit that any faithful author ought to be given."[79]

The *Galliade* is most dependent on the *Antiquities* in the "Premier Cercle." Focused on astronomy and history, it surveys Gaulish culture starting with Noah, his son Japhet, and his grandson Comerus Gallus, now rendered in French simply as "Gomer le Gaulois."[80] These divinely appointed survivors of the Flood restored humanity and human learning to the empty earth. Le Fèvre associates the Renaissance with "le grand ROY FRANÇOIS [King Fran-

[77] See Roudaut, 103. Le Fèvre reassures doubters by tracing (based on Annius) the colonies of the seventy-two descendants of Noah, their virtues clarified by etymology and astrology.

[78] Grafton, 1990, 108

[79] Le Fèvre, 70n5, where Roudaut cites Postel's *Thrésor* (Thesaurus): Postel, 1969, 67: "Combien que Berose Calde ne soit entier, et que par les atheistes ou ennemis de Moyse soit peu estimé, neantmoins pour estre desja approuvé par innumerables hommes et auteurs tres doctes en toute sorte de doctrines et langues, je luy porte la foy que doibt havoir quelquonque fidel autheur."

[80] Le Fèvre, 175 (*Galliade* 1.179).

çois I]" closing the circle as "notable men . . . began to restore learning in Gaul" leading to those who revived learning in contemporary Gaul.[81]

Writing six decades or more after Lemaire, Le Fèvre had easier access to printed books and was less likely to rely directly on Annius's commentary and the authorities reproduced there.[82] His relative independence does very little to change the importance of the spuria themselves, especially Annius's Berosus, as Roudaut's invaluable notes certify. It alone allows him to show, for example, that Noah established learning on the Janiculum in Rome, named after Noah who was also known as Janus, derived from the Hebrew word for *wine*, of which Noah was the inventor. Annius's commentary is peppered with Hebrew references, attributed to talmudists; he is assumed to have had local Jewish informants, although it seems clear his own command of Hebrew was minimal. In the hands of a competent Hebraicist and cabalist, these nuggets of Hebrew take on new importance. Le Fèvre, convinced that Hebrew was God's language, was inclined to interpret Hebrew etymologies cabalistically, as revelatory of divine truths.[83] Noah explained the secrets of astronomy and taught his progeny:

> To call upon the Angels in the name of the Lord.
> From town to town by famous vows
> Fill them with good will for his sons and grandsons:
> And in total silence draw from the towns' names
> The spirit [message] of the name, by the mystical learning
> Of holy letters traced by God's finger
> On the Tablet of the Spirit, Hebrew Kabbalah.[84]

Le Fèvre adds a marginal note starting with the Hebrew transcription קבלה (Kabbalah), before explaining: "Kabbalah means Tradition and Reception: it

[81] Ibid., 155: "Hommes de marque . . . commercerent de restaurer les bonnes lettres en Gaule." See also ibid., 271–74 (*Galliade* 1.1817–78).

[82] There are exceptions, as, for example, *Galliade* 1.200, where the etymology of *Pyrenees*, credited in the margin to Diodorus Siculus, probably comes from Annius's commentary (ibid., 176n200) and similarly *Galliade* 1.583, where Le Fèvre's mention of Servius also probably comes via Annius as he had that text at hand.

[83] "Langue de Dieu": ibid., 173 (*Galliade* 1.135).

[84] Ibid., 172 (*Galliade* 1.146–52): "Au nom de l'Eternel d'évoquer les Genies / De cite en cité, et par celebres vœux / Les rendre bien-veuillans à ses fils et neveux: / Et du nom des Citez extraire en tout silence / Du Genie le nom, par l'obscure science / Des characteres saints tracez du doigt de Dieu / Au Tableau de l'Esprit, Caballe de l'Hébrieu." *Genies* should be understood as angels, as Roudaut explains in ibid., 172, note to line 146 (*Galliade* 1). Illustrating the power of etymology, Annius, as well as Postel (perhaps echoing the Viterban), explains that knowing a city's true/secret name allowed it to be vanquished without a blow. See ibid., 172–73, notes to lines 149–52 (*Galliade* 1).

is the Acroamatic science of hearing."[85] Annius's commentary speaks in passing of Kabbalah, associating it with Etruscan wisdom. In Le Fèvre's rendition, this becomes Gaulish wisdom. And in the same sense, Berosus's declaration that "Italiam tenuit Gomerus Gallus" ("Gomerus Gallus ruled Italy") now marks an early stage of Gaulish hegemony totally unintended by its Viterban creator.[86] To all this, Le Fèvre adds in the margin the notion of acroamatic learning. The term usually refers to esoteric knowledge transmitted orally, as Aristotle is said to have reserved special learning intended only for his disciples, distinct from the exoteric doctrines he declaimed in public. Students of Christian Kabbalah applied this idea in a sense especially suited to Hebrew where words are normally written without vowels. Only by what Le Fèvre terms an *obscure science*—that is, knowledge of the sacred tongue—can the initiated "extraire en tout silence" ("silently extract") the real meaning of a written word, which can be spoken only by those who already know it, those who are able to supply the missing sounds of the unwritten vowels.[87] Cabalistic secrets, that is, arcane learning, are important both in the text, where the words *secret* and *mystère* appear with some frequency, and in the marginalia underscoring cabalistic etymologies by reproducing Hebrew words in Hebrew font without indication of vowels, then explaining their meaning. Earlier, in addition to having two faces, Janus is also "the father with two voices, or rather two manners": one to write and one to speak, or, alternately, a sacred writing system (Hebrew) and a worldly one (Greek).[88] Le Fèvre repeats what Annius claims to have taken from Jewish contacts, expanding it and turning it to his own ends.

All learning, having been saved from the Flood, is shown to have had Gaulish origins: "Therefore our ancient Gauls, not the Egyptiens / Of Mathematics, and ancient arts / Are the first inventors."[89] The Greeks in turn learned from the Gaulish Druids (based on Annius's commentary on Berosus), a *translatio studii* traceable only using the *Antiquities.*[90] Mathematics has a special place in Le Fèvre's estimation, associated with astronomy/astrology, suspended between science and theology. It was Samothes Dis, the first king of Gaul, who transmitted knowledge of mathematics and astronomy, antediluvian knowledge coming from Noah himself:

[85] Ibid., 173 (marginal comment): "Cabalah signifie Tradition et Reception: c'est la Science Acroamatique ou de l'ouye."

[86] Berosus's text, cited in ibid., 175, note to lines 179–80 (*Galliade* 1).

[87] Ibid., 172–73 (*Galliade* l.149–50).

[88] Ibid., 248 (*Galliade* 1.1328–29): "Le pere de deux voix, ou bien de deux usages."

[89] Ibid., 261 (*Galliade* 1.1585–87): "Doncques nos vieux Gaulois, non les Egiptiens / De la Mathematique, et des arts anciens / Sont premiers inventeurs."

[90] Ibid., 262 (*Galliade* 1.1600), evokes "les sages Semnotées," repeating the name Annius uses for druids, as earlier ibid., note to line 1594.

> Samothes (Dis) King of our Province
> Who is the Author and the Prince of the Prince of Arts
> Mathematics, placed in union
> Over truth not opinion.[91]

From Samothes, this learning passed to Pythagoras, later to Plato's *Timaeus*, pure knowledge again moving from Gaul to Greece.[92] Le Fèvre concludes,

> The Arts that Dis brought to life in Gaul long ago:
> Dis, who taught them the ancient letters
> Most closely drawn by the Phoenicians:
> Long after, Cadmus brought sixteen of them
> To Greece, which he took and borrowed.
> For although he came from ancient Phoenicia,
> The letters resembled those of Gaul
> More than Phoenicians, and Caesar in his day
> Saw them still in use by our people.
> As in our day, we have seen the return
> Of the use and secrets of mystical letters
> Of the ancient Phoenicians, both letters and secrets
> That the Greeks learned from us, not we from the Greeks.
> In this way, over the years, this finely wrought Script
> Born in Gaul, has returned to Gaul.[93]

And so, learning is once again flourishing in Gaul where it began, closing the first "Cercle."

[91] Ibid., 264 (*Galliade* 1.1647–50): "C'est doncque Samothes Roy de nostre Province / Qui du Prince des Arts est l'Autheur et le Prince, / De la Mathematique assise en union / Dessus la verité, non sur l'opinion." According to Annius, Samothes was the brother of Gomer and Tubal, sons of Japhet, the latter two named in Genesis: ibid., 176, note to line 195 (*Galliade* 1).

[92] Ibid., 263 (*Galliade* 1.1631)

[93] Ibid., 275 (*Galliade*, 1.1890–1904): "Les Arts que Dis feist naistre en la Gaule jadis: / Dis qui leur enseigna les lettres anciennes / Pourtraites au plus pres sur les Pheniciennes, / Et long temps du depuis Cadmus seize en porta / En Grece, que de nous il print et emprunta. / Car bien qu'alors il vint de la Phenice antique, / Son caractere estoit ressemblant au Gallique / Plus qu'au Phenicien, et Cesar de son temps / En vit encore fleurir l'usage entre nos gents: / Comme du nostre encore, nous avons veu remettre / L'usage et les secrets de la mistique lettre / Des vieux Phéniciens, et lettres et secrets / Qu'eurent les Grecs de nous, et non pas nous des Grecs. / Ainsi au fil des ans ceste Escriture ornee / Qui en Gaule nasquit, en Gaule est retornee." Roudaut cites Pliny, 192 (*Historia Naturalis* 7.56 [elsewhere formatted as 7.57]), reporting that Cadmus invented sixteen (of the twenty-four) letters of the Greek alphabet, in Le Fèvre, 275, note line 893 (*Galliade* 1).

CONCLUSION

What Annius had concocted for the greater glory of Etruria and Viterbo was deliberately repurposed in France. It does not seem possible to ascertain whether Le Fèvre knew Lemaire's *Illustrations* directly; if so, it might have been at most a secondary source or an additional encouragement. What is certain is that both Lemaire and Le Fèvre depended on the *Antiquities* without which neither the *Illustrations* nor the *Galliade* in its final state would have been possible. Their common goal in using Berosus, Manethon, Xenophon, and the accompanying commentaries was above all to glorify Gaul. Lemaire's project aims rather straightforwardly to promote the greatness of his modern Gaul, a concept extending beyond the political divide separating the Kingdom of France and the empire just as his own career did. Only the *Antiquities* allowed him to trace Gaulish ruling families all the way back to Noah, including their requisite passage through Troy, which in the early decades of the sixteenth century was still at the zenith of its charm. Le Fèvre's project, supported by much deeper learning, adds mystical underpinnings composed above all of cabalistic learning. It intends to prove that Gaul was great because it was situated at the end of a chain built of the purest of early learning, transmitted from God to Adam, from Adam to Noah, and thence, after the Flood, most particularly via Japheth, to Noah's grandson Gomerus Gallus / Gomer le Gaulois, whose name is significantly marked by *Gaul*, the land where learning began and to which it returned once again in sixteenth-century France. In the later years of the sixteenth century, when Troy had largely lapsed from historical event into myth, cyclical history, or more exactly in this case circular history, the mission of the *Galliade* still depended as profoundly as had Lemaire on the spurious information provided by Annius of Viterbo. It was too powerful to resist, as if the glow of perceived truth outshone all doubts. Even Le Fèvre's real erudition offered no protection from its siren call, packaging, as it could be seen to do, etymology and genealogy in terms reformulated for the greater glory of Gaul.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abelard, Jacques. *Les Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troye de Jean Lemaire de Belges étude des éditions, genèse de l'œuvre*. Geneva: Droz, 1976.

Aneau, Barthélemy. *Alector*. Ed. Marie-Madeleine Fontaine. Geneva: Droz, 1996.

Annius Viterbiensis [Giovanni Nanni]. *Commentaria Fratris Joannis Annii Viterbiensis super Opera Diversorum Auctorum de Antiquitatibus Loquentium*. Rome: Eucharius Silber, 1498.

———. *Antiquitatum Variarum Volumina XVII*. Paris: Jodocus Badius, 1515. See http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k526066.

Asher, Ronald E. *National Myths in Renaissance France*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993.

Berrong, Richard. "Jean Lemaire de Belges, Dictys of Crete, and Giovanni Boccaccio: Possible Sources for *Gargantua*." *Etudes Rabelaisiennes* 17 (1983): 89–92.

Boccaccio, Giovanni. *Boccaccio on Poetry*. Trans. Charles G. Osgood. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1956.

Bouwsma, William J. *Concordia Mundi: The Career and Thought of Guillaume Postel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Corrozet, Giles. *Les Antiques Erections de Gaules*. Paris, 1535.

Crinitus, Petrus Riccio. *De Honesta Disciplina*. Florence, 1504.

———. *De Honesta Disciplina*. Ed. Carlo Angeleri. Rome: Fratelli Bocca Editori, 1955.

Demaizière, Colette. "Michel de Castelnau, traducteur de Ramus." In *Traduction et adaptation en France à la fin du moyen âge et à la Renaissance*, ed. Charles Bruckner, 283–93. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1997.

Desan, Philippe. "The Platonization of the Gauls or French History according to Ramus." *Argumentation* 5 (1991): 375–86.

Doutrepont, Georges. *Jean Lemaire de Belges et la Renaissance*. Geneva: Droz, 1974.

Du Bellay, Guillaume. *Epitome de l'antiquite des Gaules et de France*. Paris, 1556. See at http://search.lib.virginia.edu/catalog/uva-lib:1074184.

Du Bellay, Joachim. *Deffense et Illustration de la langue françoyse*. Ed. Jean-Charles Monferran. Geneva: Droz, 2001.

Dubois, Claude-Gilbert. *Celtes et Gaulois au XVIe siècle*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1972.

Feldman, Louis H. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Fontaine, Marie-Madeleine. "La Contribution de Bathélemy Aneau à 'l'illustration' de la langue française." In *Lyon et l'illustration de la langue française à la Renaissance*, ed. Gérard Defaux, 481–504. Lyon: ENS Editions, 2003.

Goez, Werner. "Die Anfänge der historischen Methoden-Relexion in de italienischen Renaissance und Ihre Aufnahme in der Geschichtsschreibung des deutschen Humanismus." *Achiv für Kulturgeschichte* 58 (1974): 25–48.

Grafton, Anthony. "Joseph Scaliger and Historical Chronology." *History and Theory* 14 (1975): 158–85.

———. *Forgers and Critics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

———. *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450–1800*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Hotman, François. *Franco-Gallia / La Gaule Française*. Trans. Simon Goulart. Ed. Christiane Frémont. Paris: Presses universitaires d'Aix-Marseille, 1991.

Isidore of Seville. *Etymolgiarum sive Originum*. Ed. W. M. Lindsay. 2 vols. Oxford, 1962.

Jodogne, Pierre. *Jean Lemaire de Belges, écrivain franco-bourguignon*. Brussels: Palais des académies, 1971.

Kuntz, Marion Leathers. *Guillaume Postel, the Prophet of All Things*. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1981.

Le Fèvre de la Boderie, Guy. *La Galliade*. Ed. François Roudaut. Paris: Klincksieck, 1993.

Lemaire de Belges, Jean. *llustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye*. Vols. 1 and 2 of *Oeuvres*, 4 vols. Ed. Jean-August Stecher. Louvain, 1882–85.

———. *Traité de la différence des schismes et des conciles (1511)*. Ed. Jennifer Britnell. Durham: University of Durham Press, 1997.

Le Rouillé, Guillaume. *Le Recueil de l'antique préexcellence de Gaule et des Gaulois*. Poitiers: J. and E. de Marnef, 1546.

Ligota, Christopher R. "Annius of Viterbo and Historical Method." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 50 (1987): 44–56.

Meerhoff, Kees. "La Ramée et Peletier du Mans: Une *Deffence* du 'naturel usage.'" *Nouvelle Revue du seizième siècle* 18.1 (2000): 77–93.

Ozouf, Mona. "Les Gaules de Clermont-Ferrand." *Le Débat* 6 (1980): 93–103.

Pliny [Gaius Plinius Secundus]. *Natural History*. Vol. 3. Ed. and trans. Harris Rackham. London: Heinemann, 1938.

Postel, Guillaume. *De Originibus seu de Hebraicae Lingua*. Paris, 1538.

———. *Histoire memorable des expéditions depuys le Deluge faictes par les Gauloys ou Françoys depuis la France jusque en Asie*. Paris, 1552.

———. *Thrésor des prophéties de l'univers*. Ed. François Secret. Leiden: Nijhoff, 1969.

Rabelais, François. *Oeuvres*. Ed. Mireille Huchon. Paris: Gallimard, 1994.

Ramus, Petrus [Pierre de la Ramée]. *De Moribus Veterum Gallorum*. Paris, 1559.

Ronsard, Pierre de. *La Franciade*. In *Œuvres completes*, vols. XVI[1–2]. Ed. Paul Laumonier. Paris: Didier, 1950–52.

Rothstein, Marian. "Etymology, Genealogy, and the Immutability of Origins." *Renaissance Quarterly* 43.3 (1990a): 332–47.

———. "Jean Lemaire de Belges' *Illustrations Gaule et Siingularitez de Troye*: Politics and Unity." *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 52.3 (1990b): 593–609.

Roudaut, François. *Le Point Centrique*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1992.

Sébillet, Thomas. *Art poétique français*. In *Traités de poétique de la Renaissance*, ed. Francis Goyet, 36–174. Paris: Librairie générale française, 1990.

Secret, François. *Postel revisité: Nouvelles recherches sur Guillaume Postel et son milieu*. Milan: S.É.H.A., 1998.

Stephens, Walter. "De Historia Gigantum: Theological Anthropology before Rabelais." *Traditio* 40 (1984): 43–89.

———. *Giants in Those Days*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.

———. "From Berossos to Berosus Chaldaeus: The Forgeries of Annius of Viterbo and Their Fortune." *The World of Berossos*, *Proceedings of the 4th International Colloquium on the Ancient Near East between Classical and Ancient Oriental Traditions, Hatfield Col-*

lege, Durham 7th–9th July 2010, ed. Johannes Haubold, Giovanni B. Lanfranchi, Robert Rollinger, and John Steele, 277–91. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2013.

Tigerstedt, Eugène Napoleon. "Johanes Annius and *Graecia mendax*." In *Classical Medieval and Renaissance Studies in Honor of Berthold Louis Ullman*, ed. Charles Henderson Jr., 2:293–311. Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1964.

Tory, Geoffroy. *Champs fleury*. Paris, 1529.

Wilkinson, Robert J. *Orientalism, Aramaic and Kabbalah in the Catholic Reformation: The First Printing of the Syriac New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.