

COMMENTING ON A PURGED MODEL
THE *M. VALERII MARTIALIS EPIGRAMMATON*
LIBRI OMNES NOVIS COMMENTARIIS ILLUSTRATI
OF THE JESUIT MATTHÄUS RADER (1602)

Magnus Ulrich Ferber

The ideal type of philological commentary is defined as a collection of annotations on a literary text, which are intended to facilitate understanding of this text.¹

Especially in Renaissance philology this kind of a scientific text was very popular, because commentaries on ancient classics could be considered the one genre that most clearly expresses the humanistic claim that new knowledge can only be acquired through a recourse to antiquity.² It is precisely in a commentary that a humanist can present his ideas in strict connection to an ancient classic. Following this conception, it seems consequent that the ancient text to be commented was regarded as a role model to which the commentator had to submit. But this paper will discuss how a humanistic commentator operates when he classifies the reference text only partially as classical, so that he only comments on parts of the model. In such a case it will be necessary to discuss which gaps result from this proceeding in the commentary, but also which function the commentary can take as a replacement for the whole reference text.

¹ See, for example Norbert Oellers, “Kommentar,” in *Realexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft*, ed. Harald Fricke et al. (Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 2000), 2:302–303.

² See Karl Enenkel, “The Neo-Latin Commentary,” in *Brill’s Encyclopedia of the Neo-Latin World. Macropedia*, ed. Philip Ford (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2014), 207–16.

It is no coincidence that a commentary by a philologist of the Jesuit order³ should serve as an exemplar. It is well known that the central aim of this order, founded in 1540, was to strengthen the Catholic Church after the attacks of the Protestant Reformation, whereby the education of the future elites played a central role. As carriers of the Catholic education system the Jesuits endeavoured to hold on to the general educational standards which were established in the age of Humanism, so that Humanism among all denominations became a central instrument of confessionalization.⁴

As a result, the Jesuit colleges read the ancient classics intensively, above all to improve their own style in the Latin language and to study models for their own literary activity. But this also means that the pupils there were confronted with the moral concepts of Roman antiquity, which could collide with Catholic moral concepts, or just with obscene verses, which were not role models for the contemporary literature. However, a look at the theological controversies⁵ of the time shows that the need for insults and the like was certainly there.

Moreover, the genres comedy and epigram were read with particular reservation. Both genres were actively used by the Jesuits to propagate their own educational goals and religious ideals in a didactic and aesthetically appealing way, in both school theatre and in occasional poems. The Roman comedy authors Terence and Plautus and the epigrammatist Martial, whose verses were sometimes considered to be too obscene for the Jesuits to deal with, were regarded as role models for these genres. Therefore, the central curriculum of the Jesuits, the *Ratio atque institutio studiorum* of 1586, determined that only single parts of Terence and Plautus should be

³ On the history of this Catholic order see Markus Friedrich, *Die Jesuiten. Aufstieg, Niedergang, Neubeginn* (Munich et al.: Piper, 2016).

⁴ On the Catholic confessionalization and the importance of humanistic education in this context see Wolfgang Reinhard, "Was ist katholische Konfessionalisierung?" in *Die katholische Konfessionalisierung. Wissenschaftliches Symposium der Gesellschaft zur Herausgabe des Corpus Catholicorum und des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte 1993*, ed. Wolfgang Reinhard and Heinz Schilling (Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorff 1995), 419–45.

⁵ See Heribert Smolinsky, "Kontroverstheologie," in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, 3rd edition*, ed. Walter Kasper (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1997), 6:333–35.

read, but never whole comedies. Martial was considered surprisingly almost without restriction as a possible school author,⁶ and so from 1590 on the epigrams of Martial were verifiably used in the school lessons of the Jesuits in Southern Germany.⁷

MATTHÄUS RADER AND HIS EDITION OF THE EPIGRAMS BY MARTIAL

In order to have a textbook for Martial, the Augsburg Jesuit Matthäus Rader presented an edition of his epigrams in 1599.⁸ From the beginning of his work on Martial the Jesuit emphasized that it was mainly aimed at school lessons. To Justus Lipsius he wrote in July 27, 1597:

Institui volente maiorum meorum commentari aliquid ad Martialis epigrammata, quod in usum sit gymnasiorum nostrorum ea ratione, ut obscaenis detractis (...) purus putus Martialis praelegatur. Illud ne iuventutis honestas violetur aut offendatur.⁹

With the approval of my superiors, I began with preliminary studies on the epigrams of Martial for the use of our colleges under the condition that, with the deduction of obscenity, the pure and purified Martial will be taught without damaging and attacking the morals of the youth.

⁶ See Ladislaus Lukács, ed., *Monumenta paedagogica Societatis Iesu*. vol. 5: *Ratio atque institutio studiorum Societatis Iesu (1586, 1591, 1599)* (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1986), 140, 149, 197.

⁷ See Bernhard Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge im XVI. Jahrhundert* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1907), 248.

⁸ Matthäus Rader, *M. Val. Martialis epigrammaton libri XII omni rerum et verborum obscenitate sublata mendisque plurimis ad optimorum auctorum et exemplarium fidem ex fide castigatis* (Ingolstadt: Adam Sartorius, 1599).

⁹ Alois Schmid, ed., *Bayerische Gelehrtenkorrespondenz*. Part I: *P. Matthäus Rader SJ*. Vol. 1: *1595-1612* (München: C. H. Beck, 1995), 17.

Rader (1561-1634),¹⁰ who was born in South Tyrol, had himself received a Jesuit school education in Innsbruck and joined the order in 1581. As a student of Jakob Pontanus¹¹ he was regarded as a distinguished classical philologist who worked for many years at the Jesuit colleges in Augsburg and Munich. In addition to the epigrams of Martial, he also published a highly regarded school edition of the *Historiae Alexandri Magni* by Quintus Curtius Rufus¹² and he wrote dramas and epigrams himself, although little of these have survived. From 1612 he also worked in Munich as a historian in service for Duke Maximilian I of Bavaria.¹³

The edition of the epigrams of Martial was Rader's first important publication, which he made as a teacher in the free Imperial city of Augsburg. For our question it is interesting that Augsburg was an important battlefield for the Jesuits at this time, because two denominations had existed there since 1555 – and also since 1584 two Latin schools, the Lutheran *Gymnasium bei St. Anna*¹⁴ and the College of the Jesuits.¹⁵ So there were also Lutheran

¹⁰ On his biography and his work see Veronika Lukas, "Rader, Matthäus," in *Frühe Neuzeit in Deutschland 1520-1620. Literaturwissenschaftliches Verfasserlexikon*, ed. Wilhelm Kühlmann et al. (Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2016), 6:175–82.

¹¹ On his biography see Barbara Bauer, "Jacob Pontanus SJ, ein oberdeutscher Lipsius. Ein Augsburger Schulmann zwischen italienischer Renaissancegelehrsamkeit und jesuitischer Dichtungstradition," in *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte* 47 (1984): 77–120.

¹² Matthäus Rader, *Q. Curtii Rufi de rebus ab Alexandro Magno gestis libri octo in capita distincti et synopsisibus argumentisque illustrati* (Munich: Johannes Hertzroy, 1617).

¹³ See Magnus Ulrich Ferber, "Serenitatis electoralis infimus cliens. Der Hofhistoriograph P. Matthäus Rader SJ und Kurfürst Maximilian I. von Bayern," in *Wittelsbacher-Studien. Festgabe für Herzog Franz von Bayern zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. Alois Schmid and Hermann Rumschöttel (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2013), 397–416.

¹⁴ See Karl Köberlin, *Geschichte des Hum. Gymnasiums bei St. Anna von 1531 bis 1931* (Augsburg: 1931).

¹⁵ See Wolfram Baer and Hans Joachim Hecker, ed., *Die Jesuiten und ihre Schule St. Salvator in Augsburg* (Munich: Lipp, 1982).

philologists as direct rivals of Rader in town.¹⁶ Therefore his aim had to be to maintain the philological level of his time so as not to expose himself to the ridicule of his direct competitors.

Rader decided to purge the epigrams of Martial - and to note this positively on the title page. The Jesuit reports that his edition “omni rerum et verborum oscenitate sublata” (without any obscenity in things and words) in the subtitle. The problem mentioned here, namely that the often coarse jokes in the epigrams of Martial seem little suitable for school lessons, had already arisen in antiquity. Martial himself writes in epigram I,35,1f.:

Versus scribere me parum severos
Nec quos praelegat in schola magister.

I write risqué verses, not the sort a schoolmaster would
dictate on class.¹⁷

But the poet continues in a kind of poetology of the epigram, using the crude joke that joke poems do not work without jokes, and defends himself against his epigrams being literally emasculated in school lessons.¹⁸

However, Rader used exactly this method in his edition: It contains only 1249 of the 1559 epigrams of Martial; 310 (almost

¹⁶ See Magnus Ulrich Ferber, “Cives vestros sine controversia habeo pro Germaniae cultissimis. Zum Verhältnis von Späthumanismus und Konfessionalisierung am Beispiel der bikonfessionellen Reichsstadt Augsburg,” in *Humanismus und Renaissance in Augsburg. Kulturgeschichte einer Stadt zwischen Spätmittelalter und Dreißigjährigem Krieg*, ed. Gernot Michael Müller (Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 2010), 409–20.

¹⁷ David R. Shackleton Bailey trans., *Martial: Epigrams*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014), 1:63.

¹⁸ Mart. I,35,3-5: “Sed hi libelli, / Tamquam coniugibus suis mariti, / Non possunt sine mentula placere.” Shackleton Bailey trans., *Martial*, 1:63,65: “But these little books are like husbands with their wives: they can’t please without a cock.” Mart. I,35,12-14: “Quare deposita severitate / Parcas lusibus et iocis rogamus, / Nec castrare velis meos libellos.” Shackleton Bailey trans., *Martial*, 1:65: “So please put prudery aside and spare my jests and jollities; and don’t try to emasculate my little books.”

20%) are missing,¹⁹ including the one just quoted. A look at the omitted poems makes clear that they mostly have sexual content or use faecal language. Human vices such as drunkenness and adultery are not affected by Rader's censorship, probably because jokes about that can be integrated easily into school lessons as a deterrent example.

THE INTENTIONAL GAPS IN RADER'S COMMENTARY

In 1602 Rader presented a commented edition of his Martial.²⁰ Therein the Jesuit did not have to concern himself with the epigrams he had deleted: Where no text, there also no commentary on this. A first analysis of the book must therefore begin with what is missing in this actually extremely extensive commentary with almost 900 pages in folio. The desired intention of the commentary can be achieved by concealing and not commenting unclassical parts of a classical text. So Rader did not use his commentary to criticize the obscene parts of Martial and he avoids any disagreement with the rejected poems. For example, the reader does not find out why Rader has ignored Mart. I,35, whether every joke used in it is considered obscene by him, or whether the schoolman Rader denies the poet the understanding of which texts can be used in school lessons. Obviously the ancient poet was considered uncriticizable to him. In fact, Rader was sure that he could do Martial justice in this way. In his "Praefatio ad lectorem" he wrote: "Caeterum optima fide cum Martiale actum crede. Ipse purus putus Martialis tibi proponitur et exponitur."²¹ (Furthermore believe that Martial is handled in the best spirit. He himself is presented to you pure and purified.)

As a commentator, Rader takes it for granted to decide which parts of the epigrams are "Ipse purus putus Martialis" without any justification of the grounds on which his authority is based. Rader is thus not concerned with filling assumed gaps in the text, as Glenn

¹⁹ That's why John Patrick Sullivan calls Rader an "unfortunate editor" (see John Patrick Sullivan, *Martial: The Unexpected Classic. A Literary and Historical Study* [Cambridge et al.: Cambridge University Press, 1991], 294).

²⁰ Matthäus Rader, *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton libri omnes novis commentariis multa cura studioque confectis explicati, illustrati* (Ingolstadt: Adam Sartorius, 1602).

²¹ Rader, *Martialis (1602)*, fol. * 3^v.

W. Most defines the work of a commentator,²² but with softening the ambivalence of the original by creating gaps.

Undoubtedly Rader can be accused therefore of wanting to use this form of a purged Martial to strengthen a particular discourse community of Jesuit philologists on Martial, which silences a considerable number of the epigrams. Those who know the poems only from Rader's edition will not gain knowledge of the author's obscenity.

This specific discourse community of the Jesuit scholars can also be found in other forms: Rader himself maintained extensive correspondence beginning from the time he started his work with the epigrams of Martial,²³ but he did not use it to integrate himself into the Republic of Letters of the humanists.²⁴ A striking example is his contact with Justus Lipsius,²⁵ the top scholar of the Later Humanism,²⁶ who sent Rader some of his observations on Martial,²⁷ which Rader also used.²⁸ But the Jesuit failed to correspond with Lipsius and even forgot to send his supporter a specimen copy of his

²² See Glenn W. Most, Preface to *Commentaries – Kommentare*, ed. Glenn W. Most (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1999), xi.

²³ His correspondence is partly edited by Schmid, *Gelehrtenkorrespondenz I* and Alois Schmid ed., *Bayerische Gelehrtenkorrespondenz*, Part I: P. Matthäus Rader SJ. Vol. 2: *Die Korrespondenz mit Marcus Welser 1597-1614* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2009). A completion of this edition is very desirable. First proof of Rader's work on the edition of the epigrams is a letter of the Jesuit Rudolf Mattmann to him, who sent him another commentary on Martial on February 26, 1597 (see Schmid, *Gelehrtenkorrespondenz I*, 9f.). From the time before only three letters to Rader have survived (See Schmid, 1–9).

²⁴ See Ferber, “Cives,” 417.

²⁵ See Alois Schmid, “P. Matthäus Rader SJ und Justus Lipsius. Aus ihrem Briefwechsel,” in *Geschichte in Räumen. Festschrift für Rolf Kießling zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Johannes Burkhardt (Konstanz: UVK, 2006), 261–77.

²⁶ See Marc Laureys, ed., *The World of Justus Lipsius. A Contribution towards his Intellectual Biography* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998).

²⁷ See the letter of Lipsius to Rader from November 29, 1597 edited at Schmid, *Gelehrtenkorrespondenz I*, 24–31.

²⁸ See Schmid, *Gelehrtenkorrespondenz I*, 30f.

commentary, so Lipsius expressly had to order it.²⁹ Moreover, Rader's contact with the Protestant philologists in Augsburg was only indirect, although there were forms of cooperation.³⁰ Thus Rader compared his edition of the epigrams by Martial with a manuscript from the Augsburg City Library,³¹ which was traditionally headed by the Rector of the *Gymnasium bei St. Anna*.

RADER'S PRACTICE OF COMMENTING MARTIAL

Beyond these findings, however, it is also worth taking a closer look at the present commentary in order to grasp the relationship between the Jesuit discourse community and the humanistic Republic of Letters. First of all Rader's practice of commenting Martial shall be examined with an unproblematic example, Mart. I,93. The verses reads as follows:

Fabricio iunctus fido requiescit Aquinus,
Qui prior Elysias gaudet adisse domos.
Ara duplex primi testatur munera pili:
Plus tamen est, titulo quod brevioris legis:
Iunctus uterque sacro laudatae foedere vitae,
Famaque quod raro novit, amicus erat.

Aquinas rests by the side of loyal Fabricius, who is glad to have been first to go to the Elysian dwellings. A double altar attests the rank of Chief Centurion; but what you read in the shorter inscription means more: "Both were united in the sacred bond of an honorable life, and, what fame seldom knows, both were friends."³²

In his edition Rader offers first the text in larger type.³³ In the margin he discusses different readings, in this case "Inscriptum" for "Plus tamen"³⁴ and "Functus" for "Iunctus."³⁵ Below the text there is the

²⁹ See the undated letter of Lipsius to Rader edited at Schmid, *Gelehrtenkorrespondenz I*, 150.

³⁰ Cf. Ferber, "Cives," 419.

³¹ Cf. Rader *Martialis (1602)*, fol. * 3^v.

³² Shackleton Bailey trans., *Martial*, 1:107,109.

³³ Rader, *Martialis (1602)*, 142.

³⁴ Mart. I,93,3.

³⁵ Mart. I,93,4.

commentary in a smaller font, which is introduced with lemmata. Rader explains in his technical commentary the officer rank “munera pili” mentioned in the text³⁶ with references to an ancient source³⁷ and the current literature, here to a work of Justus Lipsius just mentioned.³⁸ Then Rader explores the meaning of the epigram, which places friendship higher than any military rank. At this point he comments on historical facts and uses the epigrams as a source for the ancient world. He follows the current development of Late Humanistic philology, which increasingly understood itself as a historical discipline.³⁹ Accordingly, references to the style and rhetoric of Martial are rare in Rader’s commentary. He also often quotes his humanistic precursors, especially when he discusses the right reading of rare verbs or the right interpretation of the point of an epigram. In this way Rader behaves like a humanistic scholar.

The fact that we are dealing here with a purged version of Martial can only be seen from the numbers given: Above the text there is number 75. That is the epigram in Rader's count. At the margin there is the right number. Experts recognize here that Rader has intervened in the text and can compare his commentary with other works on Martial that do not have to come from the Jesuit discourse community and show the usual counting.

The case of Mart. VII,10 about a blasphemer who only cares about the problems of other people, but not about his own, is different. Rader emphasizes in the commentary that the point of the poem is that the poet must not blaspheme about the blasphemer either.⁴⁰ What the reader does not learn is the fact that Rader has simply omitted the first four verses⁴¹ without this becoming

³⁶ Mart. I,93,3.

³⁷ Polybios, *Historiae*.

³⁸ Justus Lipsius, *De militia Romana* (Antwerp: Christoph Plantinus, 1596).

³⁹ See Anthony Grafton, “Renaissance Readers and Ancient Texts: Comments on Some Commentaries,” *Renaissance Quarterly*, no. 38 (1985): 615–49 (630).

⁴⁰ Rader, *Martialis* (1602), 447.

⁴¹ Mart. VII,10,1-4: “Pedicatur Eros, fellat Linus: Ole, quid ad te / De cute quid faciant ille vel ille sua? / Centenis futuit Matho milibus: Ole, quid ad te? / Non tu propterea sed Matho pauper erit.” Shackleton Bailey trans., *Martial*, 2:79: “Eros is sodomized, Linus sucks. What’s it to you, Olus, what either one of them does with his

comprehensible to the reader in any way. The poem remains understandable through the intervention and the inexperienced reader does not even know that he is not looking at the original epigram of Martial. This procedure, however, remains the exception for Rader: This becomes clear, for example, in Rader's commentary on Mart. XII,59,⁴² in which Martial complains about the numerous kisses you have to endure on your return after a long absence. Here two verses are omitted,⁴³ which Rader also characterizes by asterisks (even if once in the wrong place), although the epigram remains understandable without these verses.

According to his scale for suppressing verses it is clear that Rader has to stroke out the verse “Fellatorque recensque cunnilingus”⁴⁴ describing two of the kissers. In his rather concise commentary, Rader therefore does not summarize the content of the epigram quite correctly, but has to trivialize it, since he cannot use the somewhat disgusting punch line.⁴⁵ In the margin Rader also communicates his observation that it is above all poor people who kiss the homecomer,⁴⁶ while the verses that Rader does not criticize are about people practicing professions in which they often have to get dirty. Perhaps it is his intention to deny the reader from the outset the thought that there might be other reasons mentioned in this epigram why the kissers are dirty. Rader also discusses in his commentary whether the mentioned fifteen-year absence of the lyrical ego⁴⁷ should be understood autobiographically (which Rader

own skin? Matho fornicates for a hundred thousand. What's it to you, Olus? You won't be a pauper on that account, Matho will.”

⁴² Rader, *Martialis* (1602), 751.

⁴³ Mart. XII,59,3 and 10.

⁴⁴ Mart. XII,59,10. Shackleton Bailey trans., *Martial*, 3:139: “and the sucker and the licker fresh from his cunt.”

⁴⁵ Rader, *Martialis* (1602), 751: “Detestatur importuna basia hominum luridorum.” Translation: He resists the tiresome kisses of pale people.

⁴⁶ Rader, “Tantum pauperes, ut video, poetam salutarunt.” Translation: As I see, only poor people greet the poet.

⁴⁷ See Mart. XII,59,2: “Post annos modo quindecim reverso.” Shackleton Bailey trans., *Martial*, 3:139: now that you have returned after fifteen years.

denies)⁴⁸ and discusses the correct reading of an otherwise unoccupied Greek loanword.⁴⁹ *Prima facie*, the commentary of the shortened epigram itself proves to be shortened. The commentary here is intended to limit the reader's scope for interpretation.

Very interesting is Rader's reference to a parallel passage in Martial,⁵⁰ because the mentioned epigram Mart. XI,98 cannot be found at all in Rader's edition. The commentator of the purged Martial thus presupposes that his reader has an unpurged Martial in front of him in order to consult the given parallel passage. By the way, the reader could also look up there the verses missing here. The commentary thus links itself beyond the given reference text with the philological expert discussion of the humanists. The Jesuit discourse community thus remains docked to the Republic of Letters, which again expands the scope of interpretation.

This becomes even clearer in another verse in this epigram that Rader omitted: In Mart. XII,59,3 Martial says that you can receive more kisses on your homecoming than the lyrical ego of Catullus from his Lesbia. It is very surprising that this verse is missing, because firstly it is not very obscene and secondly it is very interesting for a philologist as an example for the reception of Catullus in ancient times. However, Rader comments on this non-existent verse by indicating the corresponding verses in Catullus to which Martial alludes here. In the margin he writes: "Vide Catullum: Vivamus mea Lesbia etc."⁵¹ The reader learns here that Martial alludes to Catullus, Carmina 5, where the following verses can be found:

⁴⁸ Rader, *Martialis (1602)*, 751: "Certum tempus pro incerto ponit, nec de se vel te, sed de quocunque." Translation: He sets a certain time for an uncertain one. He is not talking about himself or about you, but about any person.

⁴⁹ Rader, about Mart. XII,59,9: "Vox defioculus recte habet et luscum sonat, cui desit oculus, dexiocus alii legunt, cui dexter tantum oculus sit." Translation: He correctly uses the word *defioculus* in the meaning one-eyed, other people read *dexiocus* for someone, who only has the right eye. Also possible is the reading *dexiochulus* for a man with the gammy right leg.

⁵⁰ Rader, "Huic Germanum est illud lib[ro] 11, ep[igramma] 9[8] ad Bassum." Translation: This epigram is similar to Mart. XI,98.

⁵¹ Rader, *Martialis (1602)*, 751.

Da mi basia mille, deinde centum,
Dein mille altera, dein secunda centum,
Deinde usque altera mille, deinde centum.

Give me a thousand kisses, then a hundred, then another thousand, then a second hundred, then yet another thousand, then a hundred.⁵²

For the connoisseur of Martial, the deleted verse “Quantum Lesbia non dedit Catullo”⁵³ (such as Lesbia never gave Catullus) is thus available again.

Despite all the interventions in the text, Rader maintains philological honesty here - and this may also have been the reason why he refused to replace obscene verses with harmless ones. This would have been easy for him, since the French Jesuit Edmond Auger had published an edition of Martial in which offensive verses were reformulated so that they lost their obscenity.⁵⁴ For example he also replaced the verse about Catullus. It seems that Auger’s Martial was the role model for Rader to decide which verses should be omitted. In fact, Auger’s new verse in this case is very harmless: “Quantum nulla suo nutrix alumno”⁵⁵ (such as a nurse never gave her foster-child). This reading was so common in the Jesuit order that Rader’s student, the eminent playwright Jakob Bidermann (1578-1639),⁵⁶ thought it was a verse of Martial himself,⁵⁷ before his

⁵² Cat. V,7-9.

⁵³ Mart. XII,59,3.

⁵⁴ Edmond Auger, *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammata ab omni rerum obscenitate verborumque turpitudine vindicata* (Antwerp: Christoph Plantinus, 1568).

⁵⁵ Auger, 287.

⁵⁶ See Helmut Gier, ed., *Jakob Bidermann und sein "Cenodoxus."* *Der bedeutendste Dramatiker aus dem Jesuitenorden und sein erfolgreichstes Stück* (Regensburg: Schnell+Steiner, 2005).

⁵⁷ See the letter of Bidermann to Rader from February 8, 1598, edited at Schmid, *Gelehrtenkorrespondenz I*, 34–36, here 35: “Deinde quid sentis de illo versu (...) Quantum nulla suo nutrix alumno etc. Equidem semper aliud sensi. Haec tamen idque genus alia dubitare me non sinet amplius faelix tuus labor, ubi lucem aspexerit.” Translation: On this, how do you know that verse Quantum nulla suo nutrix alumno etc.? In fact, I have always known it differently.

teacher could enlighten him. Rader was also advised within the order to use Auger's work as the basis of his own edition,⁵⁸ but he rejected it, because he wanted to have the "Ipse purus putus Martial" as we saw. These discussions within the order show how far the discourse community of Jesuit philologists was already established at this time.

CRITICISM OF RADER'S PROCEDURE AND HIS IMMUNIZATION AGAINST IT

In a second edition of the commentary,⁵⁹ Rader was even prepared to give Martial's obscenity some space in his commentary. A letter from the order-internal censor Rudolf Mattmann to Rader has been preserved, in which he wonders how Rader came to discuss the pederasty of the ancient Cretans in his commentary on Mart. I,65 – the epigram, an elusive pun with figs and hemorrhoids, actually gives no cause for such a reading.⁶⁰ The corresponding passage of his commentary was finally deleted from the manuscript by Rader, so that we also do not know exactly how it was formulated. Obviously Rader was also willing to comment on Martial's obscene elements, if his order would have allowed it. So Rader had to discipline himself while commenting Martial, otherwise the order would do.⁶¹ The purged Martial protected Rader

Your happy work will give me clarity in this and similar questions when it finally appears.

⁵⁸ See the letter of Ferdinand Crenel to Rader from March 11, 1601 edited in Schmid, *Gelehrtenkorrespondenz I*, 165–68.

⁵⁹ Matthäus Rader, *Ad M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton libros omnes plenis commentariis novo studio confectis explicatos, emendatos, illustratos curae secundae* (Ingolstadt: Adam Sartorius, 1611).

⁶⁰ See the letter of Mattmann to Rader from March 27, 1611, edited in Schmid, *Gelehrtenkorrespondenz I*, 542–44, here 542: "Ad epigr[amma] 6[5]. lib[ro] 1 Cum dixi ficus etc.: Ficosam illam disputationem putat nonnemo ut longam et inanem relinquendam. Et quorsum illud de paederastia Cretensium spectat?" Translation: About Mart. I,65: This discussion about the hemorrhoids is considered too long and inappropriate by everyone, and should be omitted. And what does this refer to about the Cretan pederasty?

⁶¹ See Stefan W. Römmelt, "Als ob ich den ganzen Martial kommentiert hätte.' Matthäus Rader SJ, ein problematischer Schulautor und die jesuitische Zensurpraxis in Augsburg um 1600,"

as commentator from being discredited within the order. Rader tried to immunize himself that way. Nevertheless the rumour arose that he had commented on the entire Martial. Just after publishing his commentary, Rader received news from the headquarters of the order in Rome that somebody claimed “Reverentiam Tuam etiam obscaena Martialis epigrammata illustrasse (si tenebrae illustrari possunt), quod neuter nostrum credere potuit.”⁶² (... that Your Reverend had also commented on obscene epigrams (as if the night could be enlightened), what no one of us could believe.)

On the other hand Rader was also criticized by humanistic scholars. The Spanish philologist Lorenzo Ramirez de Prado made fun of Rader's shortening in his own edition of Martial⁶³ in order to plagiarize his commentary, since it was, after all, at the forefront of research at the time.⁶⁴ About Rader Ramirez de Prado wrote:

Utilis sane homini honestas, qua se gravissimo onere levavit toto suo opere. Nam quoties aliquid subimpudicum offendit, silentio transmittit. Huiusmodi autem epigrammata apud hunc poetam subtiliora et obscuriora sunt. Age, vir honestissime, qui sciebas eas esse inhonestas? Quod legeram, inquis. Cur legisti, vir tantae sanctimoniae, et si legisti, cur nobis invides lectionem?⁶⁵

What is useful to this man, of course, is morality, through which he can avoid the most difficult task in his whole work. For as often as he defends something salacious, he passes it over with silence. But in this way the epigrams are simpler and more incomprehensible. Where do you know, man of honour, that these verses are indecent? You say: Because I read them. Why are you reading such

in *Humanismus und Renaissance in Augsburg. Kulturgeschichte einer Stadt zwischen Spätmittelalter und Dreißigjährigem Krieg*, ed. Gernot Michael Müller (Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 2010), 309–26.

⁶² Letter of Georg Bader to Rader from June 27, 1602, edited in Schmid, *Gelehrtenkorrespondenz I*, 207.

⁶³ Lorenzo Ramirez de Prado, *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammatum libri XV illustrati* (Paris: Michel Sonnius, 1607).

⁶⁴ See Sullivan, *Martial*, 293.

⁶⁵ See Ramirez de Prado, *Martialis*, part 3: *Hypomnemata*, 24.

verses, man of such a big venerability, and if you read them, why do you envy us the reading?

Rader replied to this in the second edition of his commentary just by using obscene and faecal words: “Quis hic loquitur? Christianus an paganus? Egon’ invideam tua tibi Floralia, hoc est tuas cloacas?”⁶⁶ (Who is talking there? A Christian or a pagan? I envy you your Flora’s festival, what is your cesspool?) Here an indirect criticism of Martial is indeed evident, as the ancient poet had asked in epigram I,35,8f. passed over by Rader: “Quis Floralia vestit et stolatum / Permittit meretricibus pudorem?” (Does anybody put clothes on Flora’s festival or allow whores the modesty of the matron’s robe?)⁶⁷

Rader criticizes not the ancient role model itself, but only its contemporary successors, who nevertheless had to take note of Rader's commentary in order to understand the epigrams of Martial. Rader’s “ipse purus putus Martialis” should be a Christian poet. The aforementioned Jakob Bidermann demonstrated how this model could be applied in contemporary literature: His *Epigrammatum libri tres*⁶⁸ consist largely of sacred poems that follow Martial only in their form, but not in their content and style.

CONCLUSION

In summary, Rader used a double strategy in his commentary: On the one hand, he shortened the epigrams of Martial so that they meet requirements of a Latin classic for school lessons in a Jesuit college. On the other hand, his commentary sometimes brings this shortened Martial back to the general standard of classical philology. The commentary thus proves to be a flexible medium through which the hard decision as to which verse is considered suitable and which is not can be cushioned. He recognizably addresses a double audience: on the one hand, pupils who are to be presented with a school-appropriate author, on the other hand, scholars, especially their teachers, who are looking for a compact gathering of the knowledge about Martial. This double strategy naturally also led to a double form of criticism of Rader: As seen, despite all precautions he was suspected within the order of dealing with obscene literature.

⁶⁶ Rader, *Martialis* (1611), fol. A 3^v.

⁶⁷ Shackleton Bailey trans., *Martial*, 1:65.

⁶⁸ Jakob Bidermann, *Epigrammatum libri tres* (Dillingen at Danube: Algeyer, 1620).

Within the Republic of Letters, however, he was accused of not having commented on the whole Martial. But because of the flexibility of his commentary he was able to immunize himself well against these accusations. So Rader's double strategy might also be behind the great success of his commentary, which in the following period up to 1730 had more than twenty editions and was reprinted not only in Southern Germany, but also throughout Europe, at least in its Catholic part, in Cologne, Antwerp, Douai, Krakow and Rome.⁶⁹ As desired by his contemporaries, the Jesuit managed to add a philologically appealing commentary to a shortened edition of the epigrams of Martial.

⁶⁹ See Carlos Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Leuven: Héverlé, 1960), 6:1371–82.