

LATE MEDIEVAL AND  
EARLY MODERN STUDIES, 27

# THE EUROPEAN CONTEXTS OF RAMISM



Edited by  
Sarah Knight and Emma Annette Wilson

BREPOLS

THE EUROPEAN CONTEXTS  
OF RAMISM

LATE MEDIEVAL AND EARLY  
MODERN STUDIES

*Editorial Board:*

Ian Moulton, Chair, *Arizona State University*  
Frederick Kiefer, *University of Arizona*  
Markus Cruse, *Arizona State University*  
Catherine Kovesi, *University of Melbourne*  
Charles Zika, *University of Melbourne*

*Advisory Board:*

Susan Broomhall, *University of Western Australia*  
Megan Cassidy-Welch, *University of Queensland*  
Albrecht Classen, *University of Arizona*  
Robert W. Gaston, *University of Melbourne*  
John Griffiths, *Monash University*  
Anthony Gully, *Arizona State University*  
Paul Salzman, *La Trobe University*  
Anne Scott, *Northern Arizona University*  
Juliann Vitullo, *Arizona State University*  
Emil Volek, *Arizona State University*  
Retha Warnicke, *Arizona State University*

THE EUROPEAN CONTEXTS  
OF RAMISM

Edited by Sarah Knight and  
Emma Annette Wilson



BREPOLS

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

© 2019, **Brepols Publishers n.v., Turnhout, Belgium.**

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

D/2019/0095/5  
ISBN 978-2-503-57499-8  
E-ISBN 978-2-503-57501-8  
DOI 10.1484/M.LMEMS-EB.5.112910  
ISSN 2406-5463  
E-ISSN 2406-5471

Printed in the EU on acid-free paper.

## CONTENTS

Notes on Contributors	vii
List of Illustrations	xi
Introduction	1
SARAH KNIGHT AND EMMA ANNETTE WILSON	
Ramus and Humanist Pedagogy in the Language Arts	15
JUDITH RICE HENDERSON	
Ramus and Agricola	67
MARC VAN DER POEL	
The International Nature of Britannic Ramism	109
EMMA ANNETTE WILSON	
Ramus and the Teaching of Mathematics	133
ISABELLE PANTIN	
Teacher, Rival, Martyr: Ramus in French Literature and Thought	153
SARAH KNIGHT	
'Reduced to Order' and 'Just for Show'? Ramus, Print, and Visual Aesthetics	187
RAPHAEL HALLETT	
Ramism in Scandinavia	217
GUNNAR HARÐARSON	

The Reception and Influence of Ramism in Iberia ALFONSO MARTÍN-JIMÉNEZ	255
Hungarian and Transylvanian Ramism GÁBOR KECSKEMÉTI	285
Select Bibliography	331
Index	339

## THE RECEPTION AND INFLUENCE OF RAMISM IN IBERIA

Alfonso Martín-Jiménez

The ideas of Petrus Ramus and Omer Talon exerted a considerable influence in Spain from the second half of the sixteenth century onwards. Petrus Ramus reordered the disciplines that made up the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic), a process which in Spain had both followers and detractors. Other Spanish authors had previously expressed the need for such a reform during the Middle Ages: for instance, the Mallorcan Ramón Llull (c. 1232–c. 1315), a professor in Montpellier and Paris, was the author of various treatises on rhetoric that anticipated several of the humanist ideas that would emerge during the European Renaissance. In his work entitled *Libre d'Evast e Blanquerna* (1238),<sup>1</sup> Llull described the order in which he believed the disciplines should be studied, proposing that students should begin with grammar, before moving on to dialectic and finally rhetoric.<sup>2</sup> In addition, Llull considered that the orator's task should be limited to *elocutio*, as he believed that orators should glean the contents of their discourse from other disciplines. In this sense, rhetoric should be limited to the embellishment of words, associated with *elocutio*.<sup>3</sup>

Years later, in his work entitled *De inventione dialectica* (1539), Rudolf Agricola (Roelof Huysmann) (1443–1485), a humanist from the northern

<sup>1</sup> Llull, *Llibre d'Evast e Blanquerna*, ed. by Galmés.

<sup>2</sup> See Verdú, *La retórica española*, pp. 19–21; and Vega, *Ramón Llull y el secreto de la vida*.

<sup>3</sup> Verdú, *La retórica española*, p. 21.

---

Alfonso Martín-Jiménez is Professor of Literary Theory and Comparative Literature at the University of Valladolid, Spain.

---



Low Countries, proposed a new order for the *trivium*, transferring *inventio* and *dispositio* — traditionally included within the discipline of rhetoric — to dialectic, although he only completed half of his proposal, by including *inventio* — but not *dispositio* — in dialectic.<sup>4</sup> Another Spanish author, Juan Luis Vives (1493–1540) of Valencia, completed the process of limiting the scope of rhetoric. He based his work not only on the ideas of Agricola but also on those put forward by Ramón Llull during the medieval period. In *De disciplinis* (1531) and *De ratione dicendi* (1532), Vives defended the same order for teaching the *trivium* proposed by Llull, and, like him, also related rhetoric to *elocutio*; Vives stated that grammar should be studied before dialectic (consisting, in his view, of *inventio* and *dispositio*), then finally rhetoric, which should be limited to *elocutio*.<sup>5</sup>

Petrus Ramus consolidated the reorganization of the *trivium*, by transferring *inventio* and *dispositio* to dialectic and confining rhetoric to *elocutio* and *actio* or *pronuntiatio*. He established a course of study at the Collège de Presles in Paris based on the teaching of grammar, followed by rhetoric and lastly dialectic. Ramus placed considerable emphasis on the importance of *exercitatio* — the practical teaching of the composition and interpretation of texts — and drew up a dichotomic system that would successively teach the *analysis*, or interpretation of traditional texts, and the *genesis*, or production of texts, which should be based on the results of the prior analysis. The *analysis* included the successive operations of *auditio* and *lectio*, which consisted of listening to the teachings of the master, followed by the reading and interpretation of the work, while the *genesis* included both *scriptio* and *dictio*, namely exercises in composition that were first written and then read aloud.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> See Florescu, *La rhétorique et la néorhétorique*, p. 111; Albaladejo, *Retórica*, p. 35; Clérico, 'Ramisme et post-ramisme', p. 56; Cogan, 'Rodolphus Agricola and the Semantic Revolutions of the History of Invention'; and Mack, *Renaissance Argument*. See also van der Poel's article in this volume.

<sup>5</sup> Martí, *La preceptiva retórica*, pp. 224–28; Verdú, *La retórica española*, pp. 220–43; García Berrio, *Formación de la Teoría Literaria moderna*, p. 27; Vasoli, *La dialettica e la retorica dell'Umanesimo*, pp. 214–46; and Albaladejo, 'Retórica y *elocutio*: Juan Luis Vives'. Vives did not consider either *actio* or *pronuntiatio* to be essential elements of rhetoric, as the orator also writes the discourse and can communicate without the need to resort to gestures. Ramus would also preserve *elocutio* and *actio* or *pronuntiatio* in rhetoric.

<sup>6</sup> See Ramus, *Pro philosophica disciplina oratio* (1550), in Ramus and Talon, *Ceuvres diverses*, a facsimile reproduction of *Petri Rami professoris regii et Audomari Talaei collectanea: Praefationes, Epistolae, Orationes* (Paris, 1577), pp. 307–401. For further discussion of this system, see Garin, *L'educazione in Europa 1400–1600*; Ong, *Ramus*, p. 150; Sharratt, 'Petrus Ramus and the Reform of the University'; and Merino-Jerez, *La pedagogía*, pp. 31–32.

As numerous studies have shown,<sup>7</sup> Ramus's ideas had a major impact in Spain during the second half of the sixteenth century.

In Paris, in 1543, Petrus Ramus published his *Dialecticae institutiones* and *Aristotelicae animadversiones*, in which he launched an attack on Aristotle. That same year, the Portuguese jurist and humanist Antoine de Gouveia (c. 1505–1560) responded to these claims, publishing *Pro Aristotele responsio adversus Petri Rami calumnias* (Response in Aristotle's defence against Petrus Ramus's calumnies) in Paris.<sup>8</sup> These works soon reached Spain, and several Spanish students attended the lessons taught by Ramus in Paris, echoing the controversy surrounding his ideas. In the light of this, Ramus and his ideas were the object of both frequent attack and fervent defence in Spain.<sup>9</sup> Ramus's name and arguments both for and against his ideas first began to appear in Spanish rhetorical treatises around the year 1552. However, Ramus's religious ideas were declared heretical by the Council of Trent, and this condemnation was extended to all his works. Following the end of the Council of Trent in 1563 and the growth of the Counter-Reformation, the Spanish Inquisition attempted to stem the influence of Ramus's ideas, not least because Ramus had declared himself a Protestant in 1562 and aligned himself with the faction led by the Prince of Condé in 1567. In 1568, the Spanish Inquisition ordered the destruction of all Ramus's writings on grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, and arithmetic,<sup>10</sup> a measure which prevented his later works from reaching Spain. Yet, despite the risks involved, a number of Spanish authors continued to harbour Ramist ideas, although they tended to base their work on the pre-1568 writings of Ramus and often did not mention his name.

<sup>7</sup> These studies include Llorente, 'Una investigación'; Asensio, 'El ramismo y la crítica textual'; López Grigera, 'Corrientes y generaciones en la retórica del siglo XVI en España'; Merino, *La pedagogía*; Merino Jerez, 'Numerus en la *Rhetorica* del Brocense'; Martín-Jiménez, 'Rhetoric, Dialectic and Literature in the work of Francisco Sánchez, *El Brocense*'; Martín-Jiménez, 'La literatura en los tratados retóricos españoles del siglo XVI'; Martín-Jiménez, *Retórica y literatura*; Martín-Jiménez, 'La retórica clásica al servicio de la predicación'; Martín-Jiménez, 'Ramus et l'Université espagnole'; Martín-Jiménez, 'La persecución inquisitorial del ramismo en la España de la segunda mitad del siglo XVI'; Martín-Jiménez, 'La importancia de la *pronuntiatio* en la *Retórica eclesiástica* (1576) de fray Luis de Granada'; Moisan, 'Les rhétoriques de Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas et le système ramiste'; Luján Atienza, *Retóricas españolas*; Sharratt, 'Ramus 2000', pp. 450–53; Fernández López, 'Rhetorical Theory'; Martínez Falero, 'La teoría de la *inventio* en Antonio Lull'; and Martínez Falero, *Gramática, Retórica y Dialéctica*.

<sup>8</sup> On rhetoric in Renaissance Portugal, see Fernandes Pereira, *Retórica e Eloquência em Portugal na época do Renascimento*.

<sup>9</sup> Asensio, 'El ramismo y la crítica textual', pp. 55–56.

<sup>10</sup> Asensio, 'El ramismo y la crítica textual', pp. 59–63.

### *The First Appearance of Ramism in Rhetorical Treatises*<sup>14</sup>

We will now go on to examine the first treatises of rhetoric published in Spain during the second half of the sixteenth century that display the influence of Ramist ideas. In 1548, Alfonso García Matamoros (d. 1572), a priest and professor at the University of Alcalá, argued against the ideas of Ramus in his work entitled *De ratione dicendi libri duo*, claiming that dialectic was useless.<sup>11</sup> From 1552 onwards, several Spanish authors who had studied under Ramus and Talon in Paris began to spread Ramist doctrines at the University of Valencia.<sup>12</sup> In 1552, Pedro Juan Núñez, who would go on to teach at Valencia, Zaragoza, and Barcelona, published his *Institutiones oratoriae*, a work based on Talon's (1510–1562) teaching which is the first Spanish study of rhetoric with a clear Ramist influence.<sup>13</sup> In 1554, Núñez published a second work, *De causis obscuritatis dialectica*, in which he discussed the Ramist system of *exercitatio*, based on the *analysis* and later *genesis* of texts, although he posited that the *genesis* should be prior to the *analysis*, as he claimed that it was only possible to analyse texts that had been previously created.<sup>14</sup>

In 1554, another writer that had studied in Paris under Ramus and Talon, the Valencia-born Fadrique Furió Ceriol (1532–1592), published *Institutionum rhetoricarum libri tres*, a work which adopts a critical perspective which differentiates him from Ramism. Although he suggests a deterioration in rhetoric when set against the main writers of antiquity (Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian), he does not concur with Ramus. Furió considers that the main parts of rhetoric are not *elocutio* and *pronuntiatio*, as did Ramus, but rather *dispositio* and *elocutio*. For Furió, the fact that the orator must seek debate does not mean that *inventio* is part of rhetoric, in the same way that the other doctrines used in the construction of discourse, such as grammar or history, are not either. Dialectical *dispositio*, on the other hand, is different from rhetorical *dispositio*, and *memoria* and *pronuntiatio* have nothing to do with discourse. Thus, rhetoric consists of *elocutio*, or the doctrine of figures, and *dispositio*, which tries to order arguments and position the figures in the most appropriate manner to the matter in hand.

<sup>11</sup> Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 124–25; Martí, *La preceptiva retórica*, pp. 144–49; García Berrio, *Formación de la Teoría Literaria moderna*, pp. 35–37; and Alburquerque García, *El arte de hablar en público*.

<sup>12</sup> Luján Atienza, *Retóricas españolas*, pp. 213–50.

<sup>13</sup> Luján Atienza, *Retóricas españolas*, pp. 27–23, 213. See also Grau Codina, 'Las retóricas de Pedro Juan Núñez'; Rico, *La retórica española*, p. 160; López Grigera, *La retórica en la España*, p. 81.

<sup>14</sup> Asensio, 'El ramismo y la crítica textual', p. 55; Merino, *La pedagogía*, pp. 236–41.

If the first two books of Furió's *Institutiones rhetoricae* are devoted, respectively, to *elocutio* and *dispositio*, that is, to the only two parts considered constituents of rhetoric, the third book addresses *exercitatio*. Here a practical system of Ramist influence is suggested, although with significant original contributions, and he devotes a final chapter to the presentation of vices that must be avoided in composition. In Furió's opinion, practice is essential to complement learning, since natural ability or the mastery of rules are of no use if one does not practise sufficiently. In *exercitatio*, Furió distinguishes between different types of procedures — *effectio* and *censura*, dealing, respectively, with the composition and interpretation of texts. These are also based on the system of Ramist *analysis* and *genesis*, although their order of use is changed from that suggested by Ramus, as Pedro Juan Núñez had previously done. In addition to placing the composition or *effectio* before the interpretation or *censura*, Furió shows his preference for *scriptio* over *dictio*, something which also separates him from Ramist ideas. According to Furió, as a consequence, the learner must begin with frequent *imitatio* of the virtues of the classics, until a personal style is acquired which allows for the composition of texts exclusively through the precepts of the rhetorical treatise.<sup>15</sup>

In 1558, Antonio Lull, a descendant of Ramón Lull, published *De oratione libri septem*, which shows a certain Ramist influence. Lull's work, as the title itself states,<sup>16</sup> tries primarily to present the ideas of Hermogenes, representing one of the great systematizations of this author in the European Renaissance.<sup>17</sup> Lull offers a clear and precise definition of the different disciplines: grammar allows men to understand themselves; dialectic to weigh truths and untruths; rhetoric to persuade and move the spirits; and poetics to cause pleasure, with either plausible or implausible themes. When distinguishing between dialectic and rhetoric, based on the fact that the first should prove the truth or untruth of affirmations, and the second should convince more than demonstrate, Lull maintains the difference between demonstration and reasoning that the Ramists had eliminated. In addition, he considers the five traditional parts of

<sup>15</sup> Martí, *La preceptiva retórica*, pp. 42–61; Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 120–23; García Berrio, *Formación de la Teoría Literaria moderna*, pp. 44–46; Luján Atienza, *Retóricas españolas*, pp. 20–21, 213–50; Artaza, *El 'ars narrandi'*, pp. 136–37, 216; Merino, *La pedagogía*, pp. 56–57, pp. 122–26; and Martín-Jiménez, 'La literatura', pp. 15–16.

<sup>16</sup> Lull, *De oratione libri septem*.

<sup>17</sup> See Patterson, *Hermogenes and the Renaissance*, p. 18; López, *La retórica en la España*, pp. 79–81.

rhetoric, although, also influenced by general Ramist tendencies, he is only concerned with *inventio*, *dispositio*, and *elocutio*, leaving out *memoria* and *pronuntiatio*.<sup>18</sup> Book VII of *De oratione libri septem* follows the Ramist theory of *exercitatio*, and, in accordance with Ramus's dual system of *analysis* and *genesis*, Lull considered two types of exercises: *studium*, or the analysis of texts based on the rhetoric precepts; and the *imitatio* of previously selected models, also based on the rules of rhetoric for the purpose of composition.<sup>19</sup>

Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas (1523–1600), known as 'El Brocense' because he was born in Brozas, Cáceres, and a professor at the University of Salamanca, was probably the Spanish author who adhered most closely to Ramus's ideas. Despite the fact that in the first version of *De arte dicendi*, published in 1556,<sup>20</sup> he expressed his unwillingness to limit rhetoric to the *elocutio* posited by Ramus, a second version of this work, which appeared in 1558, revealed a greater proximity to Ramist thinking. In the Prologue, El Brocense claimed that he had followed Talon's ideas in composing the section on *elocutio*,<sup>21</sup> and although he preserved the classical five parts of rhetoric, he also announced his intention to discuss at a future date the Ramist shift from *inventio* and *dispositio* to dialectic. He also used the Ramist doctrine of *methodus* to construct the section on *dispositio*.<sup>22</sup> This second version of *De arte dicendi* was accompanied by a manual on textual analysis entitled *De auctoribus interpretandis sive de exercitatione*, based on the ideas of text interpretation outlined by Agricola and Melanchthon (1497–1560) and further developed by the followers of Ramus.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>18</sup> See Martí, *La preceptiva retórica*, pp. 131–36; Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 152–53; García Berrio, *Formación de la Teoría Literaria moderna*, pp. 48–52, 60–68; Merino, *La pedagogía*, p. 58 and Martín-Jiménez, 'La literatura', pp. 18–21.

<sup>19</sup> Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 152–53; Martín-Jiménez, 'La literatura', pp. 18–21; Martínez Falero, 'La teoría de la *inventio* en Antonio Lull', p. 382; Martínez Falero, *Gramática, Retórica y Dialéctica*, p. 99.

<sup>20</sup> Merino, *La pedagogía*, pp. 68–69, 135–39.

<sup>21</sup> El Brocense fails to make a specific reference to this later work, which is in fact Talon's *Rhetorica*, published in 1548 (see Merino, 'Numerus'; Moisan, 'Les rhétoriques'; and Martín-Jiménez, *Retórica y literatura*, pp. 93–99). James J. Murphy claims that although the 1548 *Rhetorica* is officially attributed to Talon, it was in fact the work of Ramus himself (see Murphy, 'The relation between Omer Talon's *Institutiones Oratoriae* (1545) and the *Rhetorica* (1548) attributed to him').

<sup>22</sup> Merino, *La pedagogía*, p. 135; Martín-Jiménez, *Retórica y literatura*, p. 79.

<sup>23</sup> Asensio, 'El ramismo y la crítica textual', p. 62; Merino, *La pedagogía*, pp. 254–314; Martín-Jiménez, *Retórica y literatura*, pp. 107–17.

### *Ramism and the Inquisition at the University of Salamanca*

The Inquisition detected a clear Ramist influence in the writings of El Brocense and other professors at the University of Salamanca, where, from 1558 onwards, Ramus and his ideas were the object of frequent debate. This debate probably reached its height between 1560 and 1562, prior to the end of the Council of Trent in 1563.<sup>24</sup> Considerable evidence exists of the heated discussions surrounding Ramus's ideas that took place in the University of Salamanca. At that time, Salamanca, one of Spain's greatest and most prestigious universities, maintained close associations with the University of Paris, as it was customary that some members of the University of Salamanca completed their studies in Paris. The works in which Ramus attacked Aristotle (*Aristotelicae animadversiones*, 1543) or Cicero (*Brutinae quaestiones in Oratorem Ciceronis*, 1547), as well as the counter-attacks from Antonoine de Gouveia, Joachim de Périon (1499–1559), Jacques Charpentier, and Adrien Turnèbe (1512–1565), exerted considerable influence on the professors at Salamanca, who were involved in frequent heated discussions on Ramism throughout the late 1550s and early 1560s.

Several scholars from the University of Salamanca showed their clear opposition to Ramus's ideas. One such critic was Diego Salvador de Murcia, who, in a poem entitled 'In Petrum Ramus Veromandum. Trimetri Iambici' (included in his 1558 work *Iacobo Salvatoris Murgensis Poetica*), launched a vicious attack on Ramus. De Murcia directed numerous insults at Ramus and accused him of seeking personal fame by slandering Aristotle, comparing him with Herostratus, who set fire to the temple of Diana in Ephesus with the sole purpose of becoming famous: 'Ut qui impius comussit seden publicam, | sic sic putas venire in ora gentium | istis tuis sine fine morsiunculis?' (Just like the one who set fire to the sanctuary, | do you intend to be the talk of the people | with those endless attacks of yours?).<sup>25</sup>

That same year, the Portuguese physician and philosopher Luis de Lemos (1533–c. 1600) spoke of his initial enthusiasm and subsequent disappointment on finding a version of Ramus's 1556 work *Aristotelicae animadversiones*, which he considered to be full of errors and overly complex interpretations. Eugenio Asensio includes the words that Luis de Lemos writes in *Paradoxorum dialecticorum libri duo*:

<sup>24</sup> Asensio, 'El ramismo ya la crítica textual', p. 65.

<sup>25</sup> Cited by Asensio, 'El ramismo y la crítica textual', p. 60.

In superioribus [...] diebus [...] typographum rogavi en aliquid dialecticae novi haberet. *Animadversiones* Petri Rami nunc denuo ab eodem cognias, respondit. Audito Rami nomine statim advolo.

(A few days ago [...] I asked the printer if he had anything new dealing with Dialectic. He responded with *Animadversiones*, by Petrus Ramus, revised and expanded by the writer [i.e. the version printed by Wechel at Paris in 1556]. When hearing the name Ramus, I jumped at the opportunity).

De Lemos goes on to add that he ‘with great pleasure leafed through the comments and scoured through chapters, devouring everything rather than actually reading it. My God, so many errors, such a convoluted interpretation, such distorted quotes, if there even were any. I took the book home, I started to read slower [...] Nothing I found was noteworthy, the whole thing was riddled with errors.’<sup>26</sup>

*Paradoxorum dialecticorum libri duo* is an imaginary dialogue with Ramus, and includes an attack on Pedro Juan Núñez (who, as we have seen, was educated under Ramus’s supervision), and in particular on Omer Talon and Ramus himself, whom he calls ignorant and foolish. Lemos refutes the doctrines regarding *methodus*, the creation and application of which he attributed to Aristotle, and condemns the Ramist trend of limiting rhetoric to *elocutio*. Lemos’s work also includes a prefatory letter by Diego Salvador de Murcia, censuring the 1556 French version of Ramus’s *Dialectique*, claiming that, if the poets’ verses at the beginning were eliminated, the French author’s contribution would be reduced to nothing.<sup>27</sup> Despite this harsh criticism, Ramus’s ideas received favourable reactions not only from El Brocense and other Salamanca professors but also from other Spanish universities, as proved by the fact that, in 1568, the Spanish Inquisition ordered the removal of Ramus’s works not only in Salamanca but also in Valladolid and Seville, and probably, although there is no documentary evidence to this effect, in other cities around Spain.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>26</sup> *Paradoxorum dialecticorum*, fol. 84r; quoted by Asensio, ‘El ramismo ya la crítica textual’, p. 60.

<sup>27</sup> Asensio, ‘El ramismo ya la crítica textual’, pp. 59–61.

<sup>28</sup> The members of the Inquisition in Spain removed all the works by Ramus they could find (the documents are held in the Archivo Histórico Nacional, Madrid, *Inquisición*, Legajo 2944). In Valladolid, on 22 July 1568, Commissioner Francisco Sancho, in his response before the members of the Council, lists the works by Ramus which had been removed, covering dialectic, Greek and Latin grammar, rhetoric, arithmetic, and philosophy, as well as *Aristotelicae animadversiones* and *Brutinae quaestiones*. The Inquisition Commissioner also insists that no works have been found by Ramus on Scriptures or Theology (see Pinta Llorente, ‘Una investigación’, p. 236).

The Spanish Inquisition failed to find any religious works by Ramus that could be used to support the claim that he was a heretic,<sup>29</sup> but nonetheless insisted on transferring his ideas — particularly those related to philosophy and dialectic — into religious contexts, claiming that they contravened orthodox beliefs.<sup>30</sup> In 1568, in three meetings, on May 13th, 22nd, and 25th, the Inquisition, led by Francisco Sancho, carried out an investigation at the University of Salamanca to determine which professors either supported Ramus's ideas or corresponded with him, taking statements from ten Salamanca professors: Miguel Venegas, León de Castro, Juan Escrivano, El Brocense, Pedro Chacón (1526–1581), Navarro, Gaspar de Grajal (1530–1575), Fuentidueñas, Martín Martínez de Cantalapiedra (1510–1579), and Francisco Sánchez (c. 1550–1623). Most of them taught in the Faculty of Arts, and they were asked whether they knew, had seen or heard of 'Pedro Ramos' (referred to as a 'Professor of Rhetoric and Latin from Paris' or a 'Professor of Rhetoric at the University of Paris'); whether they owned any of his works; their opinion of his thoughts and ideas, with particular reference to religion; and whether they corresponded with Ramus or knew anyone who did.<sup>31</sup>

Some of the Salamanca professors who were interrogated, especially León de Castro, Professor of Greek, and two other teachers who had met Ramus in Paris — the Jesuit Miguel Venegas and Master Navarro, a Professor of Eloquence — expressed their open hostility to Ramus and his followers, drawing attention to their heretical ideas. All the other professors that were questioned, members of the circle of friends of El Brocense and Friar Luis de León, were forced to admit that they agreed with several of Ramus's ideas, although they stressed that this did not extend to his religious views. The choice of subjects in the interrogation process was most probably based on suspicions that they had Ramist tendencies or, in the case of Ramus's detractors, on the hope that they would betray other professors. The investigation also further implies that Ramus's books and ideas had had a widespread impact at Salamanca, generating both supporters and openly hostile enemies.

<sup>29</sup> Asensio points out that Ramus's only book on religion, *Commentariorum de religione christiana libri quattuor*, was not published until four years after his death, in 1576 (Asensio, 'El ramismo ya la crítica textual', p. 65), and was therefore not known in Spain.

<sup>30</sup> Pinta Llorente, 'Una investigación', p. 235; Merino, *La pedagogía*, p. 163.

<sup>31</sup> Miguel de la Pinta Llorente found the text relating to this investigation: see his 'Una investigación'; see also Martín-Jiménez, 'La persecución', and Asensio, 'El ramismo ya la crítica textual'.



Several of those called before the Inquisition had actually met Ramus in Paris. Miguel Venegas, aged thirty-nine, claimed that he had taught for a time at a Jesuit school there, where he had met Ramus, frequently attending his classes. Venegas believed that Ramus was a heretic, a leader of heretics, and friend of the Princes of France, known Huguenots and Calvinists. Venegas also claimed that Ramus openly criticized the Pope and the Roman Catholic Church in his classes, adding that he proffered special treatment to all those Spanish heretics travelling to Paris, including those that had been punished by the Inquisition, and stated that he had heard many learned men declare that Ramus had committed philosophical heresy by writing against the ideas of Aristotle, and also against the faith, by teaching and writing against Christ. He later went on to add that, while in Paris, he had often heard that many Spanish authors were friendly with Ramus and followed his teachings, especially in matters of philosophy and faith, and although he was unable to specify exactly whom, he supposed that they were all scholars of philosophy and the humanities. He claimed to have heard Ramus's followers boasting that many people in Spain corresponded with him, thereby confirming the Inquisition's suspicions, whose investigation was essentially aimed at determining whether any of the professors at the University of Salamanca exchanged letters with Ramus. In addition, Venegas stated that a catechism of Ramus's heresies was said to be circulating around Paris, and accused him of leading the conspiracy against the Jesuits in Paris, and referred to the debate between Ramus and Charpentier regarding the *methodus* doctrine, adding that both had taught at the same time in the same faculty, and that Jacques Charpentier often quoted a verse by Virgil when referring to Ramus — 'Junoni infernae dictus sacer' (said to be sacred to Juno of the underworld) — (*Aeneid*, vi. l. 138) — in allusion to the diabolical nature of his heresy.<sup>32</sup>

Master Navarro, aged fifty-five, Professor of Eloquence at Salamanca, declared that he had met Ramus more than thirty years previously, when he was a teacher at the Bellova School in Paris — at the time Ramus, born in 1515, would have been around twenty-three years of age — and that he had competed with Ramus for a Chair in Eloquence and Rhetoric at the University of Paris. Navarro claimed that Ramus was fond of anything new and had been reprimanded for writing against Aristotle, adding that although they had had no contact for many years, he was sure that Ramus would continue to be both reckless and dangerous. Gaspar de Grajal, aged thirty-eight, a master of theology and replacement professor for the Chair

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Knight's discussion in this volume (p. 000) of Du Bellay's satire of Ramus, which also invokes the moment in *Aeneid*, VI where Aeneas uses an 'aureus ramus' ('golden bough'; l. 137) to enter the underworld.

of Biblical Studies at the University of Salamanca, also claimed to have attended Ramus's lessons in Rhetoric and Cicero at the Cambray school (Paris) and to have read several of his works. However, unlike Venegas and Navarro, he did not have a poor opinion of him, as he had never heard him speak against the Catholic faith or had not read anything against Catholicism in Ramus's works. Grajal admitted that Ramus's ideas had numerous Spanish followers in Paris, all from Aragon and Valencia, and recalled the dispute between Ramus and the Portuguese Antonio Gouveia over Aristotle: Navarro declared that Gouveia had been a fellow student on the arts course, and had openly challenged Ramus. He also claimed to have heard that Petrus Ramus had been condemned for recklessness.

None of the other deponents knew Ramus in person, but had instead assimilated his ideas through reading his works. Most of the witnesses agreed that Ramus had a large following in Salamanca, and the testimonies established two key focal points of Ramism: the Oviedo School in the city of Salamanca and the then young Juan de Almeida (1530–1573), who at the time of the Inquisition's investigation had been appointed Vice-Chancellor of the university. León de Castro, a fifty-seven-year-old Professor of Greek, gave the names of several professors who followed the ideas of Ramus and regularly met at Juan de Almeida's home: Sebastián Pérez (Professor of Arts, d. 1593), Friar Luis de León (1527/1528–1591, poet and Professor of Sacred Scripture), Pedro Chacón (Professor of Greek), El Brocense (Professor of Rhetoric), and Juan Escribano (Professor of Greek). He also claimed that he had personally attended many of those meetings, together with the deceased Martín Vicente, with the intention of refuting Ramist ideas, because, although Ramus was a renowned teacher and excellent master of rhetoric and Latin, he considered his attacks on Aristotle and Cicero to be totally inappropriate; by extension, Ramus's religious doctrines, of which León de Castro had no knowledge, would undoubtedly be equally incorrect. Three of the professors named by León de Castro were interrogated during the course of the investigation: Juan Escribano, El Brocense, and Pedro Chacón, tutor and master of Juan de Almeida, all aged forty.

Juan Escribano declared that he had read several of Ramus's works but had failed to find any attacks on the Catholic faith, although he had heard Master Venegas claim that he was a heretic and friend of all things new. He also claimed that Sacramena, the former Vice-Chancellor of the *Colegio Trilingüe* (Trilingual College) of the University of Salamanca, and the graduate Francisco Sánchez, head of Latin at the same institution, were followers of Ramus's doctrines. In his response, El Brocense stated that he had often heard mention of Ramus and admitted to having read and even to owning some of his works, including *Animadversiones in Aristotelem*, the *Logic* or *Dialectic*, works on Latin texts, such as that on Virgil's *Georgics*, and several *Orationes*, the titles of which he was unable to recall. El Brocense

also gave the date of publication of the most recent works by Ramus he had read, explaining that the last one to reach him had been written more than twelve years previously, and claiming he had no knowledge of any other, more recent works that Ramus may have published. El Brocense's mention of works written by Ramus twelve years ago, that is, in 1556, probably refers to *Dialecticae libri duo Audomari Talaei praelectionibus illustrati*, written around that time.<sup>33</sup> We know that Ramus's works were definitely the object of persecution from 1568 onwards, but they may well also have suffered some form of censure following the end of the Council of Trent in 1563. Indeed, this may explain why El Brocense declared in 1568 that the last work by Ramus he had heard of dated back to 1556.

Furthermore, although Ramus made considerable changes to the latest versions of his dialectical works, knowledge of the final evolution of his thought could not have been widespread in Spain. Nelly Bruyère has established five phases in the evolution of Ramus's work: prior to September 1543; September 1543; between 1546 and 1554; 1555 to 1565; and 1565 to 1572. According to Bruyère's classification, several of Ramus's dialectical treatises of this fifth and final phase would fail to spread in Spain. These included *Dialectica libri duo* (1572); the posthumous French *Dialectique* (1576), which Bruyère argues is based more on the 1572 *Dialectica* than on the 1556 *Dialectique*; the 1569, 1572, and 1573 editions of the *Dialecticae libri duo Audomari Talaei praelectionibus illustrati* (the first version dates back to 1556), which underwent major modifications in comparison with the 1556 version that El Brocense appears to refer to during the Inquisition's investigation; and the *Scholarum dialecticarum libri xx*, published in 1569.<sup>34</sup>

When questioned about Ramus's supporters, El Brocense mentioned Master Lielmo, Sebastián Pérez, Friar Luis de León, and Pedro Chacón, claiming that both he and they adhered strongly to Ramus's doctrines in Latin, logic, and philosophy. When asked his opinion of Ramus's religious ideas, El Brocense replied that he had not seen anything in any of his works that referred to either religion or the Catholic faith, adding that he had claims and denials of Ramus's heresy all in the course of a single day. El Brocense is the only professor who admitted to having written to Ramus. He stated that he was aware of Ramus's grammar, that he himself had later published another grammar contradicting some of the grammatical ideas posited by the French author, and that some four years earlier (around 1564), he had sent this grammar book together with a handwritten note that read 'Franciscus Sanctius

<sup>33</sup> The Latin translation was published a year later than the French *Dialectique*: see Bruyère, *Méthode et dialectique*, p. 5.

<sup>34</sup> Bruyère, *Méthode et dialectique*, pp. 5–37.

Brocensis Petro Ramo dono mittit' (Francisco Sánchez el Brocense dedicates it to Petrus Ramus), but had not included a letter or any other message, and was uncertain as to whether it had eventually reached Ramus's hands. In other words, El Brocense sent Ramus a copy of the first edition of his *Minerva*, published in 1562. It can therefore be assumed that the Inquisition suspected El Brocense of being the prime suspect for corresponding with Ramus, although he claimed he had received no reply, and the statements of the other professors failed to place the blame squarely on his shoulders. The fact that El Brocense himself admitted to writing his grammar after reading one by Ramus reveals the degree of influence exerted by the Ramist grammar on the first edition of *Minerva*. As Geneviève Clérico suggests,<sup>35</sup> Ramus had organized grammar according to a binary model parallel to that of dialectic, so that morphology and grammatical syntax had their correlation in dialectical *inventio* and *dispositio*: the formal marks would play a similar role in grammar to that of the *loci* of *inventio*, while syntax would correspond to the organization of the elements inherent in *dispositio*. Ramus's binary arrangement led to innovations in the treatment of syntax, but ultimately it was El Brocense rather than Ramus who went on to renew theories of syntax.

The fourth book of El Brocense's *Minerva* is devoted to the study of figures and foregrounds its author's ideas about ellipsis. Numerous linguistic contradictions between *ratio* and *usus* are identified, that is to say, between the logical and expected structure of sentences; in addition, he understands the individual production of the speakers, and the figures of construction as mechanisms which alter the 'regular structure' (*debita constructio*) of the sentence. Thus, ellipsis favours *brevitas*, which all languages tend to do, when omitting in linguistic use some element of the sentence demanded by its logical–grammatical structure. In El Brocense's theory of ellipsis, the influence of Rudolf Agricola and Philipp Melanchthon's method of textual analysis is observed, as developed by Ramist writers who based textual interpretation on the search for the syllogism or series of dialectic syllogisms making up the logical and deep structure of the text. In El Brocense's view, such writers do not usually express in their entirety the syllogisms on which the work's logical structure rests, but rather eliminate or hide some of their premises; it is then the critic's job to reconstruct the whole of the syllogism or group of syllogisms that support the text's *quaestio* or central theme. El Brocense also attaches great importance to clarifying syllogisms which make up the logical structure of the texts; he does not limit this to the textual analysis of poets and orators, but also seeks a parallel in grammar. If the authors do not usually explain all the premises of the syllogisms,

<sup>35</sup> See Clérico, 'Ramisme et postramisme' and Clérico, 'Introduction', pp. 62–64.

adhering to the principle of *economy* suggested by Melanchthon, the speakers make use of ellipsis to favour *brevitas*, characteristic of all languages.<sup>36</sup>

Besides El Brocense, Pedro Chacón also admitted to having read Ramus's logical and philosophical works, although he hastened to add that he had found no indications of heresy. Chacón also stated that the graduate Alonso de Covarrubias (1488–1570), a judge in the Courts of Granada who had participated in the Council of Trent, had written to him while in Trent, warning him that Ramus was suspected of not being a Catholic, and since that date Chacón had not read any more of his works. He also confirmed that several former students of the Oviedo School, including Sebastián Pérez, Doctor Lielmo, and Friar Luis de León, had articulated their support for Ramus, and that El Brocense seemed to admire Ramus's grammar books before it was known that he had become a Protestant. Martín Martínez de Cantalapiedra, aged fifty, who had a master's in Theology and was Professor of Hebrew at Salamanca, claimed that his only knowledge of Ramus was through his students' discussions, and that he had never read any of his works, although he had seen them in bookshops. In turn, Master Francisco Sánchez, a forty-four-year-old Professor of Latin, admitted to having heard of Ramus and having read several of his works, but had not found any attacks there on the Catholic faith, although he had heard that Ramus was practically a heretic, and had also heard of El Brocense's inclination for his works. Master Fuentidueñas, the Canon of Penitence of the Church of Salamanca, aged forty, referred to the attacks made by Joachim de Périon against Ramus's ideas, declaring that he had heard of Ramus and, many years previously, had read his works against Aristotle and Cicero and the response by Périon. Fuentidueñas claimed that he had been unaware that Ramus was a Protestant when he read these works, and consequently failed to notice whether they contained anti-Catholic elements; but if that had indeed been the case, Ramus's enemy, Périon, would have reported this seditious aspect. Such comments from Fuentidueñas and others clearly indicate that the Salamanca professors were fully aware of the controversy surrounding Ramus's works, and while some of them maintained a fairly overt affinity with Ramus, the French author's detractors resorted to the ideas of Charpentier, Gouveia, or Périon in order to consolidate their position.

In sum, practically all the Salamanca professors interrogated during the Inquisition's 1568 investigation admitted to having read some of Ramus's works on logic, philosophy, or Latin, and many made specific mention of his *Animadversiones* against Aristotle and his comments on Cicero's *Orator* and Virgil's *Georgics*.

<sup>36</sup> See Martín-Jiménez, *Retórica y literatura*, pp. 54–60.

They all agreed that none of these works represented an attack on the Catholic faith. Some — such as Juan Escribano, Navarro, and Fuentidueñas — insisted that Ramus had been free from suspicion at the time they had read his works, and that they had ceased to read them as soon as they learnt that he was a Protestant. It can therefore be concluded that, as news spread in Spain of Ramus's Protestantism, awareness grew of the dangers involved in reading his works and supporting his ideas, which undoubtedly limited his influence. It is highly likely that following the end of the Council of Trent in 1563, Ramus's works were subject to increasing censorship. Furthermore, the fact that El Brocense, who was clearly interested in Ramus's ideas, declared that the last Ramist work he had read dated back to 1556, indicates that the most influential Ramist works in Spain were published before that date.

### *Ramism and Post-Inquisitorial Rhetorical Treatises*

In 1565, several years before the start of this investigation, the Jesuit priest Cipriano Suárez (1524–1593) had published his *De arte rhetorica*, intended as a teaching guide for Jesuit schools, in which he defended the five classical parts of rhetoric and opposed the arguments for reform.<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, in 1567, Juan Lorenzo Palmireno (1524–1579), a rhetorician and Professor of Latin in Zaragoza and Valencia, published a *Rhetorica* in which he claimed to be familiar with the work of Furió Ceriol and the Ramist doctrines, although his work discusses only traditional rhetorical thinking based on the ideas of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian.<sup>38</sup> Andrés Sempere's *Methodus oratoria*, published in 1568, also conforms to traditional rhetorical theory,<sup>39</sup> and, in 1569, Benito Arias Montano (1527–1598), friend of Friar Luis de León and chaplain to Philip II, published his *Rhetoricorum libri III*, in which he claimed, as Ramus had done before him, that dialectic provided the orator with ideas and force for his discourse, and therefore Montano transferred *inventio* to the category of dialectic, considering *elocutio* to be an intrinsic part of rhetoric. In 1570, Alfonso García Matamoros published *De tribus dicendi generibus*, in which he criticized Ramus's ideas (as he also had in his earlier work *De ratione dicendi libri duo*, of 1548), lamenting the fact that Vives, whose ingenuity he admired, should

<sup>37</sup> Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 212–16; Artaza, *El 'ars narrandi'*, pp. 140–41.

<sup>38</sup> Merino, *La pedagogía*, pp. 127–29; Luján Atienza, *Retóricas españolas*, pp. 22–24, 65–211.

<sup>39</sup> Luján Atienza, *Retóricas españolas*, pp. 25–27, 65–211.

articulate certain ideas later used by Ramus to attack Aristotle, Cicero, or Quintilian. However, despite considering Ramus to be an ungodly man, Matamoros recommended using the concepts of *genesis* and *analysis* to study Cicero, an indication of how influential Ramist ideas were on even those Spanish authors antipathetic to him.<sup>40</sup> In addition, in 1570, Juan Costa y Beltrán (1549–1595), a Professor of Rhetoric in Barcelona, Salamanca and Zaragoza, published *De utraque inventione*, in which he accepted the five traditional parts of rhetoric, although, in a clear reflection of Ramism's growing influence, he also considered *inventio* and *dispositio* to be innate to all men of common sense, while arguing for *elocutio* as the specific task of the orator. With regards to *elocutio*, Costa recommended Omer Talon's *Rhetoric*, as El Brocense had done before him in his *De arte dicendi* (1558), which Costa claimed to have read.<sup>41</sup> In 1573, Juan Lorenzo Palmireno published *De arte dicendi*, in which he posited that reason is a part of dialectic while grammar and rhetoric deal with words. He argued that dialectic addresses *theses* (infinite and universal questions), while rhetoric deals with *hypotheses* (definite and specific questions). Referring to the parts of rhetoric, Palmireno stressed the fact that Vives, Ramus, and Talon limited them to *elocutio*, yet he considered that the other parts — regardless of whether or not they are inherent to rhetoric — are also essential, and therefore opposed the ideas of Vives and the Ramist writers.<sup>42</sup>

The last quarter of the sixteenth century saw the publication of several other important treatises on rhetoric, which reveal how intense the debate regarding Ramus's ideas in Spain still continued to be. In 1576, Friar Luis de Granada published a treatise on ecclesiastical rhetoric entitled *Ecclesiasticae rhetoricae sive de ratione concionandi libri sex*: this attempt to apply the traditional approach to rhetoric to Christian preaching had a widespread impact throughout Europe. This more orthodox work does nonetheless indicate the influence of Ramism and reformation trends: de Granada states that *inventio* and *dispositio* are integral parts of rhetoric, but excludes *memoria* (in his view, *memoria* depends more on nature than on art), placing greater emphasis on *elocutio* and *pronuntiatio*, operations that Ramus limited to rhetoric.<sup>43</sup> Therefore, despite the ban imposed by the Inquisition on Ramus's works in 1568, his influence can still be seen even in those treatises which advocate more orthodox approaches to rhetoric.

<sup>40</sup> Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 127–34; Albuquerque García, *El arte de hablar en público*, p. 12; Asensio, 'El ramismo y la crítica', p. 67.

<sup>41</sup> Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 109–13.

<sup>42</sup> Martí, *La preceptiva retórica*, pp. 189–92; Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 177–80.

<sup>43</sup> Martín-Jiménez, 'La retórica clásica'.

*The Influence of Ramism in the Works of Pedro Juan Núñez and El Brocense*

In 1578, Pedro Juan Núñez published another rhetorical treatise, *Institutiones rhetoricae*, which only contains several of the ideas of his masters Ramus and Talon, but also openly takes up the ideas put forward by Hermogenes.<sup>44</sup> Núñez proposed a highly innovative division of the parts of rhetoric, namely the ‘prolegomena artis rhetoricae’ (prior exercises of the art of rhetoric); *dispositio*; *inventio*; *elocutio*; and the ‘method of prudence’. Within the *prolegomena*, Núñez made a distinction between the orator’s *opera minora* (minor tasks) and *opera maiora* (major tasks). With regard to the *opera minora*, he described fourteen different types of exercises based on Aphthonius’s *Progymnasmata*, translating their names into Spanish (*fabula*, *refutacioncilla*, *confirmacioncilla*, *alabanza*, *vituperio*, and so on), which are useful in constructing the specific parts of discourse. The *opera maiora* include the *orationes* or *declamationes*, which require the initial in-depth reading of the examples provided in the various genres recommended by classical authors, in addition to *auditio* and *lectio* of the writers that have imitated those authors, and finally, *contentio cum veteribus*, in other words, a critique of those points defended by the classical authors and the defence of those they rejected. The *contentio* is the most complex phase, requiring an excellent command of the previous stages too. Núñez bases the ‘method of prudence’ on the Ramist concepts of the *methodus doctrinae* and *methodus prudentiae*, which correspond to *dispositio* in dialectic. The *methodus doctrinae* is a process for creating a text which lays out the issues involved in an orderly manner, ranging from general to more specific considerations and culminating with an example. The *methodus prudentiae* is based on the prudence shown by the orator, who may opt to change certain directives outlined by the *methodus doctrinae* to adapt his discourse to the circumstances of person, topic, time, and place. In accordance with this, Núñez proposed resorting to Hermogenes’s rules regarding the magnitude, clarity, beauty, speed, and naturalness of the sentence, offering advice on to how to create the best effect. As Luis Merino Jerez points out, Núñez’s principal contribution was his decision to exclude the *progymnasmata* and *declamationes* from the *exercitatio*, considering them instead to form part of the art of rhetoric.<sup>45</sup>

In 1579, El Brocense published *Organum dialecticum et rhetoricum*, which was much more innovative than his 1558 *De arte dicendi*: he now fully incorporated

<sup>44</sup> For Hermogenes’s influence on authors such as Antonio Llull, El Brocense, and Núñez, see López Grigera, *La retórica en la España*, pp. 78, 81, 92.

<sup>45</sup> Merino, *La pedagogía*, pp. 94–121, 236–41.



Ramus's ideas, assigning *inventio* and *dispositio* to dialectic and limiting rhetoric to *elocutio* and *pronuntiatio*. El Brocense also expanded considerably on the section on dialectical *inventio*, compared with what he had written in *De arte dicendi*, by including a series of dialectic arguments (*causae, effecta, subiecta, adiuncta, comparata, opposita, diuisiones, definitiones, and testimonia*) similar to those found in Ramus's works on dialectic, such as *Dialecticae institutiones* (1543), *Dialectici commentarii libri tres auctore Audomaro Talaeo* (1546), the French *Dialectique* (1555), and the Latin version of the same work *Dialecticae libri duo Audomari Talaei praelectionibus illustrate* (1556).<sup>46</sup> Indeed, we have seen, during the 1568 Inquisitional investigation at the University of Salamanca, El Brocense declared that the last work he had read by Ramus dated back to 1556, and appears to have referred frequently to the 1556 *Dialecticae libri duo* when writing the section on *inventio* he included in his *Organum dialecticum et rhetoricum*.<sup>47</sup> El Brocense's *Organum* retained the structure of *dispositio* and *elocutio* described in his previous treatise, which had also reflected a clear Ramist influence. We can therefore suggest that his *Organum dialecticum et rhetoricum* is the Spanish treatise written in the second half of the sixteenth century which comes closest to the ideas of Ramus.

In 1587, El Brocense published a new version of *Minerva*: when he had published the first version of this grammar in 1562, he was already familiar with Ramus's grammar, and the later expanded version still reflects striking Ramist influence.<sup>48</sup> Indeed, the theory of ellipsis posited by El Brocense in this new version of *Minerva* was also clearly influenced by the method of textual analysis first put forward by Agricola and Melanchthon and later developed by the Ramists. The theory is based on the search for a syllogism or series of dialectical syllogisms behind the deep, logical structure of the works of poets and orators; according to this theory, authors tend not to express the full syllogism or syllogisms upon which the logical structure of their work is based, but instead choose to eliminate

<sup>46</sup> See Ramus, *Dialectique, 1555: Un manifeste de la Pléiade*, pp. 19–48, which includes a series of dialectical arguments which have much in common with El Brocense's: 'causes et effets, sujets et adjoints, opposés, comparés, raison du nom, distribution, définition, autorités et témoignages' (causes and effects, subjects and assistants, opposed, compared, rationale for the name, distribution, definition, authorities, and testimonials).

<sup>47</sup> Luis Merino Jerez shows that El Brocense's description of *methodus* in *De arte dicendi* (1558) is based on the 1546 *Dialectici commentarii* attributed to Talon: see Merino, *La pedagogía*, pp. 139–65. In the *Organum* (1579), El Brocense wrote considerably more on *inventio* in *De arte dicendi*: he did not fully adhere to any unified version of Ramist dialectic, but he most likely had in his mind the 1556 *Dialecticae libri duo*.

<sup>48</sup> Clérico, 'Ramisme et post-ramisme'; Clérico, 'Introduction', pp. 11–32.

or conceal certain premises, leaving it to the critic to reconstitute to the whole syllogism or series of syllogisms upon which the central theme or issue of the text rests.<sup>49</sup> El Brocense had included this method of textual analysis in *De auctoribus interpretandis* and *Organum dialecticum et rhetoricum*,<sup>50</sup> but now also transferred it to *Minerva* and the field of grammar, distinguishing between grammatical logic and idiomatic usage. Consequently, just as the works of poets and orators contain an underlying rational structure, we can also speak of the rational nature of language; while poets and orators alter the underlying structure of their texts in order not to reveal their artistic devices, speakers also use ellipsis as recourse to brevity in linguistic terms.<sup>51</sup> In this sense, the pressure exerted by the Inquisition did not prevent El Brocense from using Ramist theories to construct the final version of *Minerva*, a work which would later have a tremendous influence on European grammar.

The year 1589 saw the publication of *Rhetorica institutio* by Martín de Segura, a Professor of Rhetoric at the University of Alcalá de Henares. In this work, the author places particular emphasis on Agricola and Ramus's doctrines, claiming that grammar leads to the correction of discourse while dialectic serves to validate its content and rhetoric as a means of adornment.<sup>52</sup> That same year, Juan de Guzmán, a disciple of El Brocense and a professor at Alcalá, published his vernacular *Primera parte de la Rhetorica*, in which he foregrounded the Ramist-inspired 'method of prudence' as used to ensure good compositional style and to promote variety in speech.<sup>53</sup> In 1597, the Salamanca-born Friar Diego de Zúñiga published *Didaci a Stunica eremitaie augustiniani phibisophiae prima pars* in which he defended Ramist ideas by claiming that invention and judgement formed part of dialectic.<sup>54</sup> Consequently, and despite persecution by the Inquisition, Ramus's ideas continued to appear in Spanish rhetorical treatises until the end of the sixteenth century.

<sup>49</sup> For the origins of Ramus's method of textual interpretation, see Meerhoff, 'Melanchton lecteur de Agricola'; Meerhoff, 'Logic and Eloquence'; Meerhoff, 'Rhétorique néolatine et culture vernaculaire'; Meerhoff, 'Imitation'.

<sup>50</sup> Merino, *La pedagogía*, p. 254; Martín-Jiménez, *Retórica y Literatura*, pp. 138–46.

<sup>51</sup> Martín-Jiménez, 'La influencia de Quintiliano en la retórica y la gramática del Brocense'; Martín-Jiménez, *Retórica y Literatura*, pp. 140–41.

<sup>52</sup> Alburquerque García, *El arte de hablar en público*, p. 20.

<sup>53</sup> Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 137–39; Martí, *La preceptiva retórica*, pp. 210–19; García Berrio, *Formación de la Teoría Literaria moderna*, pp. 96–102; Alburquerque, *El arte de hablar en público*, p. 13.

<sup>54</sup> Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 243–45.

### *Inquisitorial Consequences of Ramism*

But even this relatively covert defence of Ramus's ideas would have disastrous consequences for several of his Spanish followers. Although the 1568 investigation did not result in any accusations against the Salamanca professors from the circle of El Brocense and Friar Luis de León, several of those who advocated Ramus's ideas would face subsequent Inquisitional proceedings. The Professors of Hebrew Friar Luis de León, Gaspar de Grajal, and Martín Martínez de Cantalapiedra all defended the need to return to Hebrew sources in order to ensure the correct interpretation of biblical texts, and revealed a number of errors and false statements in the biblical version of the *Vulgata*, earning them the enmity of the Dominican friars, especially León de Castro (who had already declared against Ramus's followers in Salamanca during the 1568 investigation). They were duly reported to the Inquisition and subjected to trials in 1572.<sup>55</sup>

In his comments on the poetry of Garcilaso (c. 1501–1536), published in 1574, El Brocense included a number of translations of Horace by his friend Friar Luis de León, who had been imprisoned following those proceedings and whose name was therefore omitted. Likewise, El Brocense would also choose to omit the name of Ramus in his 1579 work entitled *Organum dialecticum et rhetoricum*, and in the final 1587 version of *Minerva*, despite the fact that both works were largely based on Ramist thought. Yet these precautions would not prevent him from also being subjected to two further Inquisitional proceedings. In 1584, he was called before the Inquisition Court of Valladolid to respond to accusations against his outspoken religious views, particularly his stance against religious images, which turned him into a suspected heretic. On this occasion, El Brocense was only severely reprimanded, but in 1593 he was subjected to further proceedings which stopped shortly afterwards; then in 1600 an order was issued for the examination and seizure of his works. The ageing and ailing El Brocense was detained in his son's home in Valladolid, where he died shortly before sentence was passed.<sup>56</sup> During this period, other writers who sympathized with the ideas of Ramus, such as Benito Arias Montano and Fadrique Furió Ceriol (who, as we have seen, had been a disciple of Ramus in Paris), were also persecuted by the Inquisition,<sup>57</sup> proof that Ramist followers were constant objects of suspicion.

<sup>55</sup> Pinta Llorente, *Procesos inquisitoriales*, pp. xiii–xiv.

<sup>56</sup> Tovar and Pinta Llorente, *Procesos inquisitoriales contra Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas*.

<sup>57</sup> Artaza, *El 'ars narrandi'*, pp. 144–46; Pinta Llorente, *Procesos inquisitoriales*, p. xvii; Luján Atienza, *Retóricas españolas*, p. 21.

### *Jesuit Opposition to Ramism*

Furthermore, and as shown by the testimony of the Jesuit Miguel Venegas, the members of the Society of Jesus, who of course played a key role in the Counter-Reformation, viewed Ramus as an enemy of their cause and therefore strongly opposed Ramist ideas. In their rhetorical treatises, the Jesuits remained true to ancient rhetorical theory (particularly Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian), conserving the five parts of rhetoric and trying to establish a Christian ideal of eloquence which would eliminate the need to study classical authors. While writers such as Luther (1483–1546) and Ramus had defended the use of vernacular languages, the Jesuits banned the use of the vernacular and argued that Latin should be the sole language of scholarship. Between 1586 and 1598, the Jesuits, who enjoyed royal protection, established the *ratio studiorum* (programme of studies) designed to support Counter-Reformation pedagogical aims, and tried to control how grammar was taught at the universities. In those cities where they failed to introduce their teachings into the existing public universities, the Jesuits founded university colleges with lower fees as direct competitors to the universities, a highly successful strategy during the late sixteenth century which ensured that by 1590 they oversaw nine thousand students across sixteen colleges. By the early seventeenth century, the number of colleges had risen to seventy-two, and the Jesuits' growing power and influence prompted reactions from the older universities throughout the first quarter of the seventeenth century. In 1627, for example, the University of Salamanca was the driving force behind a movement which aimed to bring all Spain's public universities together to counteract the Jesuit threat, while the University of Valencia forbade all types of instruction in private schools that did not depend on the university. The Jesuits did not accept the ban, and in 1670 they initiated legal action against the University of Valencia, a cause ultimately decided in favour of the Jesuits.<sup>58</sup> Consequently, during the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Society of Jesus effectively competed against Spain's public universities by providing a type of education clearly opposed to Ramist thought.

We have already discussed the Jesuit Cipriano Suárez's 1562 treatise *De arte rhetorica*, in which he reaffirmed the classical structure of rhetoric and articulated his opposition to Ramism, which served as a teaching guide in Jesuit colleges during the sixteenth century. In 1596, another Jesuit, Father Bartolomé Bravo (1554–1604), published *De arte oratoria*, which compensated for the lack

<sup>58</sup> See Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 57–72.

of practical exercises in Suárez's treatise.<sup>59</sup> Subsequently, throughout the seventeenth century the Jesuits published numerous works on rhetoric designed for use in their own educational institutions.<sup>60</sup> These works attempted to remain faithful to traditional rhetorical concepts, but at the same time emphasized the importance of *elocutio*, *amplificatio*, and practical exercises based on the *Progymnasmata*, revealing some Ramist influence, since Ramus had also stressed the importance of *exercitatio*: some Ramist ideas had obviously become so entrenched that even the Jesuits, despite their intense hostility, eventually adopted them.

### *Ramism in Seventeenth-Century Rhetorical Treatises*

During the seventeenth century, Spanish treatises on rhetoric dedicated to preaching proliferated,<sup>61</sup> while the number of pedagogical treatises on rhetoric authored by university professors fell sharply. However — and despite the influence of the Counter-Reformation — some seventeenth-century university professors did continue to publish treatises that were inspired by Ramism. Around 1602, Bartolomé Jiménez Patón (1569–1640), a Professor of Eloquence at Villanueva de los Infantes, wrote *Artis rhetoricae compendium brevis, ac copiosius quam adhuc*, in which, as Abraham Madroñal has pointed out, he copied many of the sections on rhetoric in El Brocense's *Organum dialecticum et rhetoricum*. Madroñal also comments on another of Jiménez Patón's works from around 1604, the manuscript of which has only recently been discovered, entitled *Instrumento necesario para adquirir todas ciencias y artes* (also known as the *Instrumento dialéctico*), a vernacular work on dialectic which complements *Artis rhetoricae compendium brevis*. As Madroñal explains, this work is essentially a translation of two of El Brocense's works, *De nonnullis Porphirii aliorumque in dialectica erroribus* (1588) and the section on dialectic from *Organum dialecticum et rhetoricum* (1579); in the Prologue, Jiménez Patón announces his intention to make use of El Brocense's works, although he later presents the ideas he translates as his own. If the first book of *Instrumento necesario* is basically a translation of the 1588 work, the second and third books are similar in structure

<sup>59</sup> Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 95–103; Artaza, 'Las retóricas barrocas'.

<sup>60</sup> Rico, *La retórica española*; Martí, *La preceptiva retórica*; Herrero Salgado, *La oratoria sagrada*, pp. 228–48; Artaza, 'Las retóricas barrocas', pp. 46–47 n. 5.

<sup>61</sup> Rico, *La retórica española*; Martí, *La preceptiva retórica*; Herrero Salgado, *La oratoria sagrada*, pp. 228–47; Artaza, 'Las retóricas barrocas', pp. 46–47.

to the first two books of *Organum dialecticum et rhetoricum*. Madroñal assumes that Jiménez Patón was a pupil of El Brocense in Salamanca, and the fact that he failed to have the manuscript of *Instrumento necesario* printed was partly due to the fact that much of it merely translated El Brocense's works, and also because the works he had copied had provoked further hostility among those responsible for the Inquisitional proceedings against El Brocense.<sup>62</sup>

In 1604, Jiménez Patón did publish another of his works entitled *Elocuencia española en arte*, in which he defined rhetoric as the art destined to embellish discourse. This book only refers to *elocutio* and *actio*, since he considered that *inventio* and *dispositio* form part of dialectic. He also included the Ramist division of the *methodus*, differentiating between the methods of doctrine and prudence, thereby indicating that he was influenced by El Brocense's *Organum dialecticum et rhetoricum*. Like El Brocense, he returned to the Ramist distinction between the *methodus doctrinae* and the *methodus prudentiae*, and adopted the division of *elocutio* into the tropes and figures of speech put forward in Talon's *Rhetorica*. And like Ramus and others before him, Jiménez Patón included poetic examples, referring especially to the verses of Lope de Vega (1562–1635) to illustrate the precepts of rhetorical adornment.<sup>63</sup> The powerful influence of El Brocense's works on Jiménez Patón shows that Ramist ideas were still circulating in early seventeenth-century Spain.

In 1607, Baltasar de Céspedes (d. c. 1615), El Brocense's son-in-law and a professor at the University of Salamanca, wrote a *De arte rhetorica* which was never published but circulated widely in manuscript. In this work, Céspedes accepted the five traditional parts of rhetoric but also echoed several of his father-in-law's Ramist ideas, reproducing, for instance, the structure of *inventio* which had appeared in El Brocense's *Organum* and which was based, in turn, as we have seen, on Ramist dialectic. As in Ramist rhetoric, Céspedes also thought that oratorical *numerus* (that is, rhythm based on the alternation of long and short vowels) was one of the figures of *elocutio*; he divided *exercitatio* into *genesis* and *analysis*, and placed particular importance on dialectical analysis and the reduction of an entire discourse into syllogisms, in line with Ramist textual analytical tradition.<sup>64</sup> Furthermore, as Elena Artaza has noted, Céspedes echoed the definition of rhetoric

<sup>62</sup> See Madroñal, *Humanismo y filología en el Siglo de Oro*, pp. 52–55, 142–57.

<sup>63</sup> Asensio, 'El ramismo y la crítica textual', p. 67; Martí, *La preceptiva retórica*, p. 263; Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 148–51; see also Madroñal, *Humanismo y filología*. Elena Artaza notes similarities between the ideas of Jiménez Patón and those of Ramus in the *Rhetoricae distinctiones in Quintilianum* (1549); see Artaza, 'Las retóricas barrocas', pp. 48–49.

<sup>64</sup> Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 104–08.

given by Ramus in his *Dialecticae institutiones* (1543). He applied Ramist thinking to a series of other subjects, such as the treatment of the *loci a re*, the distinction (depending on the structure of the text) between doctrine and exercise, and the description and the probative use of the *quaestio*.<sup>65</sup>

In 1621, Bartolomé Jiménez Patón published his best-known work, *Mercurius Trimegistus*, in which he addressed questions of religious, Spanish, and Latin eloquence. Jiménez Patón based his work on classical authors and on El Brocense, citing an author clearly influenced both by Ramus and by El Brocense, Baltasar de Céspedes, and, as in his earlier work, *Elocuencia española en arte* (1604), Jiménez Patón divided rhetoric into *elocutio* and *actio* (including *memoria* at the end of the section on *elocutio*). He also incorporated El Brocense's distinction between natural rhythm, based on the orator's ear, and a more artificial rhythm that conforms to a series of rules, and considered that all forms of argumentation are of a dialectical nature.<sup>66</sup> In 1641, Francisco Novella, a Professor of Rhetoric at the University of Valencia, published *Breves rhetoricae institutiones*, in which he defended the traditional parts of rhetoric, placing considerable emphasis on *inventio* and *elocutio*,<sup>67</sup> and articulating his support for the Jesuit order of teaching, as formulated in the verse 'Lingua, tropus, ratio, numerus, sonus, angulus, astra' (language, trope, reason, number, tone, angle, stars).<sup>68</sup> And, in 1648, Agustín de Jesús María, a Professor of Theology at the Complutense University, published *Arte de orar evangélicamente*, in which he claimed to be familiar with the works of El Brocense, while expressing his own preference for Aristotle and Cicero.<sup>69</sup> In 1692, finally, Francisco José de Artiga (1645–1711), a Professor of Mathematics at the University of Huesca, published his *Epítome de la elocuencia española*, which also maintained the five traditional parts of rhetoric but argued that *elocutio* was the most important and that without it *inventio* and *dispositio* would be meaningless, a theory which reflects how Ramist writers reduced rhetoric to *elocutio*.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>65</sup> Artaza, 'Las retóricas barrocas', pp. 49–51.

<sup>66</sup> Martí, *La preceptiva retórica*, pp. 263–70; Rico, *La retórica española*, p. 147; Artaza, 'Las retóricas barrocas', pp. 52–53.

<sup>67</sup> Artaza, 'Las retóricas barrocas', pp. 57–58.

<sup>68</sup> This verse indicates the order outlined by the Jesuits for studying the *trivium* and *quarivium*: see Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 158–59.

<sup>69</sup> Martí, *La preceptiva retórica*, pp. 297–300; Herrero, *La oratoria sagrada*, pp. 233–34.

<sup>70</sup> Rico, *La retórica española*, pp. 86–92; Martí, *La preceptiva retórica*, pp. 306–08; and García Rodríguez, 'Retórica y educación'.

## Conclusions

Ramus's ideas were extremely influential in sixteenth-century Spain, particularly within certain universities such as Alcalá, Valencia, and especially Salamanca. El Brocense, who taught at Salamanca, was both the greatest advocate of Ramus's ideas and the person who contributed most to their dissemination in Spain. The ban imposed on Ramus's works from 1568 onwards, as well as the various Inquisitional proceedings brought against his followers, constituted a major impediment to the spread of Ramism, although several Spanish university professors, especially El Brocense, covertly defended and spread Ramus's ideas. During the second half of the sixteenth century and throughout the seventeenth century, Ramism was also directly opposed by the Jesuits; yet, despite this animosity, it managed to survive across a number of works, such as those by Pedro Juan Núñez (*Institutiones oratoriae; De causis obscuritatis dialectica; Institutiones rhetoricae*), El Brocense (*Minerva; Organum dialecticum et rhetoricum*), and Bartolomé Jiménez Patón (*Artis rhetoricae; Instrumento dialéctico; Elocuencia española en arte; Mercurius Trimegistus*), as well as in the *De arte rhetorica* of Baltasar de Céspedes. Furthermore, following the importance Ramus placed on *elocutio* and *exercitatio*, most Spanish rhetorical treatises during the second half of the sixteenth century and the seventeenth century focused particularly on stylistic considerations and the inclusion of practical exercises. The influence of Ramus's ideas was still evident at Salamanca until the late eighteenth century, as exemplified by the fact that El Brocense's *Organum dialecticum et rhetoricum* remained the university's official textbook until 1771.<sup>71</sup> Finally, an influential seventeenth-century Spanish writer, Gregorio Mayáns y Siscar (1699–1781), despite his support for traditional rhetoric, contributed to the perpetuation of Ramism and the Ramist habit of limiting rhetoric to *elocutio* by bringing out his 1766 edition of the complete works of El Brocense.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>71</sup> See Fernández López, 'Rhetorical Theory', p. 144.

<sup>72</sup> El Brocense, Mayáns y Siscar, *Franciscii Sancti Brocensi Opera Omnia*; see also Albaladejo, 'Retórica y *elocutio*', p. 26.



## Works Cited

### Manuscripts and Archival Documents

- Céspedes, Baltasar de, *De arte rhetorica* (1607). Manuscript. National Library of Spain, shelfmark: Mss 8075 (digitized at: <<https://goo.gl/ce93Q3>>)
- Jiménez Patón, Bartolomé, *Instrumento necesario para el conocimiento de las ciencias y entendimiento de los autores* (c. 1604). Manuscript. Zabálburu Library of Madrid, shelfmark: 73–250

### Primary Sources

- Agricola, Rodolphus, *De inventione dialectica* (Lyon: Denis de Harsy for Simon Vincent, 1539)
- Artiga, Francisco José de, *Epítome de la elocuencia española* (Huesca: Josef Lorenzo de Larumbe, 1692)
- Bravo, Bartolomé, *De arte oratoria* (Medina del Campo: Francisco del Canto, 1596)
- El Brocense [Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas], *De arte dicendi* (Salamanca: Andrea de Portonariis, 1556)
- , *De arte dicendi* (Salamanca: Mathias Gastius, 1558)
- , *De auctoribus interpretandis sive de exercitatione* (Salamanca: Mathias Gastius, 1558)
- , *De nonnullis Porphyrii aliorumque in dialectica erroribus* (Salamanca: Miguel Serano de Vargas, 1588)
- , *Franciscii Sanctii Opera Omnia*, ed. by Gregorio Mayáns y Siscar, 4 vols (Geneva: Fratres de Tournes, 1766)
- , *Minerva, sive causis linguae latinae* (Lyon: Sébastien Gryphe, 1562)
- , *Minerva, sive causis linguae latinae* (Salamanca: Juan Renaut and Andrés Renaut, 1587)
- , *Organum dialecticum et rhetoricum* (Lyon: Antoine Gryphe, 1579)
- Costa y Beltrán, Juan, *De utraque inventione oratoria, et dialectica libellus* (Pamplona: Thomas Poralius Sabundiensis, 1570)
- Furió Ceriol, Fadrique, *Institutionum rhetoricarum libri tres* (Louvain: Stephanus Gualtherus and Joannes Bathenius, 1554)
- Gouveia, Antoine de, *Pro Aristotele responsio adversus Petri Rami calumnias* (Paris: Simon de Colines, 1543)
- Granada, Luis de, *Ecclesiasticae rhetoricae sive de ratione concionandi libri sex* (Lisbon: António Ribeiro expensis João de Espanha, 1576)
- Guzmán, Juan de, *Primera parte de la Rhetorica* (Alcalá de Henares: Juan Íñiguez de Lequerica, 1589)
- Jesús María, Agustín, *Arte de orar evangélicamente* (Cuenca: Salvador de Viader, 1648)
- Jiménez Patón, Bartolomé, *Artis rhetoricae compendium brevis, ac copiosius quam adhuc* (n.d. [c. 1602]; n.p.)
- , *Elocuencia española en arte* (Toledo: Tomás de Guzmán, 1604)
- , *Mercurius Trismegistus* (Baeza: Pedro de la Cuesta, 1621)
- Lemos, Luis de, *Paradoxorum dialecticorum libri duo* (Salamanca: Juan de Junta, 1558)

- LLull, Antonio, *De oratione libri septem. Quibus non modo Hermogenes ipse totus, verum etiam quicquid fere a reliquis Graecis ac Latinis de Arte dicendi traditum est, suis locis aptissime explicatur* (Basel: Henricus Petrus, 1558)
- Llull, Ramón, *Llibre d'Evast e Blanquerna*, ed. by Salvador Galmés, 4 vols (Barcelona: Barcino, 1935–54)
- Matamoros, Alfonso García, *De ratione dicendi libri duo* (Alcalá de Henares: Juan de Brocar, 1548)
- , *De tribus dicendi generibus* (Alcalá de Henares: Andrés de Angulo, 1570)
- Montano, Benito Arias, *Rhetoricorum libri III* (Antwerp: Christophe Plantin, 1569)
- Novella, Francisco, *Breves rhetoricae institutiones* (Valencia: Felipe Mey, 1641)
- Núñez, Pedro Juan, *De causis obscuritatis dialectica* (Valencia: Juan Mey, 1554)
- , *Institutiones oratoriae* (Valencia: Juan Mey, 1552)
- , *Institutiones Rhetoricae* (Barcelona: Pedro Malo, 1578)
- Palmireno, Juan Lorenzo, *De arte dicendi* (Valencia: Pedro de Huete, 1573)
- , *Rhetorica* (Valencia: Juan Mey, 1567)
- Ramus, Petrus, *Aristotelicae animadversions* (Paris: Wechel, 1556)
- , *Brutinae quaestiones in Oratorem Ciceronis* (Paris: Jacques Bogard, 1547)
- , *Dialectique, 1555: Un manifeste de la Pléiade*, ed. by Nelly Bruyère, (Paris: Vrin, 1996)
- , *Dialecticae institutiones* (Paris: Jacques Bogard, 1543)
- Ramus, Petrus, and Omer Talon, *Œuvres diverses* (Geneva: Slatkine, 1971)
- Segura, Martín de, *Rhetorica institutio* (Alcalá de Henares: Juan Íñiguez de Lequerica, 1589)
- Sempere, Andrés, *Methodus oratoria* (Valencia: Juan Mey, 1568)
- Suárez, Cipriano, *De arte rhetorica* (Coimbra: apud Ioannem Barreirum, 1562)
- Vives, Juan Luis, *De disciplinis* (Antwerp: Michael Hillenius Hoochstratanus, 1531)
- , *De ratione dicendi* (Louvain: Rutgerus Rescius voor Bartholomaeus Gravius, 1532)
- Zúñiga, Diego de, *Didaci a Stunica eremitaie augustiniani philosophiae prima pars* (Toledo: Pedro Rodriguez, 1597)

## Secondary Studies

- Albaladejo, Tomás, *Retórica* (Madrid: Síntesis, 1989)
- , 'Retórica y *elocutio*: Juan Luis Vives', *Edad de Oro*, 19 (2000), 9–28
- Alburquerque García, Luis, *El arte de hablar en público: Seis retóricas famosas (Nebrija, Salinas, G. Matamoros, Suárez, Segura y Guzmán)* (Madrid: Visor Libros, 1995)
- Artaza, Elena, *El 'ars narrandi' en el siglo XVI español* (Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto, 1989)
- , 'Las retóricas barrocas (1600–1650). Notas introductorias', in *Estudios de Filología y Retórica en Homenaje a Luisa López Grigera*, ed. by Elena Artaza and others (Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto, 2000), pp. 45–66
- Asensio, Eugenio, 'El ramismo y la crítica textual en el círculo de Luis de León: Carteo del Brocense y Juan de Grial', in *ALR I. Fray Luis de León: Actas de la I Academia Literaria Renacentista*, ed. by Víctor García de la Concha (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 1981), pp. 47–76
- Bruyère, Nelly, *Méthode et dialectique dans l'oeuvre de La Ramée* (Paris: Vrin, 1984)

- Clérico, Geneviève, 'Introduction', in *Franciscus Sanctius: Minerve, ou les causes de la langue latine*, ed. and trans. by Geneviève Clérico (Lille: Presses Universitaires de Lille, 1982), pp. 11–92
- , 'Ramisme et post-ramisme: la répartition des "arts" au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle', *Histoire, Épistémologie, Langage*, 8 (1986), 53–70
- Cogan, Marc, 'Rodolphus Agricola and the Semantic Revolutions of the History of Invention', *Rhetorica*, 2 (1984), 163–94
- Fernandes Pereira, Belmiro, *Retórica e Eloquência em Portugal na época do Renascimento* (Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional-Casa de Moeda, 2012)
- Fernández López, Jorge, 'Rhetorical Theory in Sixteenth-Century Spain: A Critical Survey', *Rhetorica*, 20 (2002), 133–48
- Florescu, Vasile, *La rhétorique et la néorhétorique: Genèse, évolution, perspectives*, trans. by Melania Munteanu (Paris: Société d'édition 'Les Belles Lettres', 1982)
- García Berrio, Antonio, *Formación de la Teoría Literaria moderna*, II (Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1980)
- García Rodríguez, Javier, 'Retórica y educación: El *Epítome de la Elocuencia Española* de Francisco de Artiga (1692)', in *Retóricas y poéticas españolas (siglos XVI–XIX)*, ed. by Isabel Paraíso (Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 2000), pp. 95–148
- Garin, Eugenio, *L'educazione in Europa 1400–1600: Problemi e programmi* (Bari: Laterza, 1976)
- Grau Codina, Ferrán, 'Las retóricas de Pedro Juan Núñez' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Universidad de Valencia, 1995)
- Herrero Salgado, Félix, *La oratoria sagrada en los siglos XVI y XVII*, I (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1996)
- López Grigera, Luisa, 'Corrientes y generaciones en la retórica del siglo XVI en España', in *La retórica en la España del Siglo de Oro* (Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1994), pp. 49–60
- , *La retórica en la España del Siglo de Oro* (Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1994)
- Luján Atienza, Ángel Luis, *Retóricas españolas del siglo XVI: El foco de Valencia* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto de la Lengua Española, 1999)
- Mack, Peter, *Renaissance Argument: Valla and Agricola in the Traditions of Rhetoric and Dialectic* (Leiden: Brill, 1993)
- Madroñal, Abraham, *Humanismo y filología en el Siglo de Oro: En torno a la obra de Bartolomé Jiménez Patón* (Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert, 2009)
- Martí, Antonio, *La preceptiva retórica española en el Siglo de Oro* (Madrid: Gredos, 1972)
- Martín-Jiménez, Alfonso, 'La importancia de la *pronuntiatio* en la *Retórica eclesiástica* (1576) de fray Luis de Granada', in *New Chapters in the History of Rhetoric*, ed. by Laurent Pernot, I (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 551–63
- , 'La influencia de Quintiliano en la retórica y la gramática del Brocense', in *Quintiliano: Historia y Actualidad de la Retórica*, ed. by Tomás Albaladejo, Emilio del Río, and José Antonio Caballero, III (Logroño: Instituto de Estudios Riojanos, 1998), pp. 1405–12

- , 'La literatura en los tratados retóricos españoles del siglo XVI', *Rhetorica*, 15 (1997), 1–39
- , 'La persecución inquisitorial del ramismo en la España de la segunda mitad del siglo XVI', in *Autour de Ramus. II: Le combat*, ed. by Kees Meerhoff, Jean-Claude Moisan, and Michel Magnien (Paris: Champion, 2005), pp. 451–76
- , 'La retórica clásica al servicio de la predicación: *Los seis libros de la retórica eclesiástica* de Fray Luis de Granada', in *Retóricas y poéticas españolas (siglos XVI–XIX)*, ed. by Isabel Paraíso (Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 2000), pp. 11–46
- , 'Ramus et l'Université espagnole', in Kees Meerhoff and Michel Magnien, *Ramus et l'université* (Paris: Éditions Rue d'Ulm, 2004), pp. 131–53
- , *Retórica y literatura en el siglo XVI: el Brocense* (Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 1997)
- , 'Rhetoric, Dialectic and Literature in the work of Francisco Sánchez, El Brocense', *Rhetorica*, 13 (1995), 43–59
- Martínez Falero, Luis, *Gramática, Retórica y Dialéctica en el siglo XVI: La teoría de la inventio de Antonio Llull* (Logroño: Instituto de Estudios Riojanos, 2009)
- , 'La teoría de la *inventio* en Antonio Llull', *Rhetorica*, 19 (2001), 379–402
- Meerhoff, Kees, 'Imitation: Analyse et création textuelles', in *Renaissance Poetics*, ed. by Heinrich F. Plett (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), pp. 114–32
- , 'Logic and Eloquence: A Ramusian Revolution?', *Argumentation*, 5 (1991), pp. 357–75
- , 'Melanchton lecteur de Agricola: Rhétorique et analyse textuelle', *Reforme, Humanisme, Renaissance*, 30 (1990), 5–17
- , 'Rhétorique néolatine et culture vernaculaire: Les analyses textuelles de B. Aneau', *Études littéraires*, 24 (1991–2), 63–85
- Merino-Jerez, Luis, 'Numerus en la *Rhetorica* del Brocense: Evolución, fuentes e implicaciones', in *Humanismo y pervivencia del mundo clásico*, ed. by José María Maestre and Joaquín Pascual Barea, 2 vols (Cádiz: Universidad de Cádiz, 1994), II. 633–42
- , *La pedagogía en la Retórica del Brocense* (Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura, 1992)
- Moisan, Jean Claude, 'Les rhétoriques de Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas et le système ramiste: Étude de *l'elocutio*', in *Autour de Ramus: Texte, théorie, commentaire*, ed. by Kees Meerhoff and Jean-Claude Moisan (Québec: Nuit blanche, 1997), pp. 195–216
- Murphy, James J., 'The relation between Omer Talon's *Institutiones oratoriae* (1545) and the *Rhetorica* (1548) attributed to him', in *Autour de Ramus: Texte, théorie, commentaire*, ed. by Kees Meerhoff and Jean-Claude Moisan (Québec: Nuit blanche, 1997), pp. 37–52
- Ong, Walter, SJ, *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958)
- Patterson, Annabel, *Hermogenes and the Renaissance: Seven Ideas of Style* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970)
- Pinta Llorente, Miguel de la, 'Una investigación inquisitorial sobre Pedro Ramus en Salamanca (Apuntes inéditos para un capítulo de la Historia del Humanismo español)', *Religión y Cultura*, 24 (1933), 234–51

- , *Procesos inquisitoriales contra los catedráticos hebraístas de Salamanca: Gaspar de Grajal, Martínez de Cantalapiedra y Fray Luis de León* (Madrid: Monasterio de El Escorial, 1935)
- Rico Verdú, José, *La retórica española de los siglos XVI y XVII* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1973)
- Sharratt, Peter, 'Petrus Ramus and the Reform of the University: The Divorce of Philosophy and Eloquence?', in *French Renaissance Studies 1540–1570*, ed. by Peter Sharratt (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1976), pp. 4–20
- , 'Ramus 2000', *Rhetorica*, 18 (2000), 399–455
- Tovar, Antonio, y Miguel de la Pinta Llorente, *Procesos inquisitoriales contra Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas* (Madrid: Instituto Antonio de Nebrija, 1941)
- Vasoli, Caesari, *La dialettica e la retorica dell'Umanesimo; 'Invenzione' e 'Metodo' nella cultura dell' XV e XVI secolo* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1968)
- Vega, Amador, *Ramón Llull y el secreto de la vida* (Madrid: Siruela, 2002)

## THE EUROPEAN CONTEXTS OF RAMISM

Pierre de la Ramée or Petrus Ramus (1515-1572) has long been a controversial figure in educational reform and innovation, from the moment of his first public academic statements in the 1530s, to his reception among scholars in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. What is beyond dispute, however, is the vast reach of his influence throughout Europe. Ramus's ideas were disseminated through copious editions and translations of his own textbooks, and in wave after wave of adaptations and re-imaginings of his ideas that swept across the continent.

This volume embarks on a European tour of Ramism, using a wide range of previously unpublished or untranslated archival evidence from throughout the continent to examine the dissemination of Ramus's works and his intellectual influence in geographic and in disciplinary terms. The ten chapters explore the spread of Ramism from his home country of France to Protestant strongholds in Germany, Holland, and Britain, and in the Catholic context of the Iberian peninsula. The book also examines Ramism in the less familiar territories (to most Anglophone readers) of Scandinavia and Hungary, and considers the preceding and contemporary Dutch and German educational reform movements from which Ramus borrowed to forge his own distinctive intellectual method.

## LATE MEDIEVAL AND EARLY MODERN STUDIES

The series covers the historical period in Western and Central Europe from c. 1300 to c. 1650. It concentrates on topics of broad cultural, religious, intellectual, and literary history. The editors are particularly interested in studies that are distinguished by their broad chronological range; their spanning of time periods such as late medieval, Renaissance, Reformation, early modern; their straddling of national borders and historiographies; and their cross-disciplinary approach.



ARIZONA CENTER FOR MEDIEVAL  
AND RENAISSANCE STUDIES



THE UNIVERSITY OF  
MELBOURNE

*Cover image: Title-page from Georg Andreas Fabricius, Thesaurus philosophicus sive Tabulae totius philosophiae systema praeceptis et exemplis artium tam generalium quam specialium cum generalium praxi et historica institutione complectentes (Braunschweig, 1624), Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, shelfmark 121 Quod. 2<sup>o</sup> (1). Reproduced with permission.*

ISBN 978-2-503-57499-8



9 782503 574998