

Martin Crusius' Use of the Notes of his Teacher Johannes Sturm

Anja-Silvia Göing

1. Introduction

An analysis of the notes prepared by assistant schoolmaster (and later Tübingen professor of Greek) Martin Crusius during his training at Johannes Sturm's school in Strasbourg, and published in 1556¹, provides insights into the didactic and instructional methods that Johannes Sturm employed with his students at the *Gymnasium illustre*. From 1551 to 1554, when he was 25-28 years of age, Martin Crusius acted in the capacity of both teacher and student at Johannes Sturm's school.² In looking back at this time, Crusius praises Sturm for his elucidations on oratory in particular, indicating that he learned rhetoric from Sturm. Specifically, in the foreword to his questions and scholia on Philipp

¹ This contribution is in reference to the following work: MARTIN CRUSIUS: Martini Crusii Scholia in primam secundam, ac tertiam Virgilii Eclogam Sturmiana, Strasbourg 1556. I thank Anthony T. Grafton for a discussion of the topic and Ulrich Eigler, James Hirstein, and Daniel Gross for introducing me to the intellectual world of Beatus Rhenanus in Sélestat.

² On the life of Martin Crusius, see: HANS WIDMANN: "Crusius, Martinus", in: Historische Kommission bei der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Hrsg.): Neue Deutsche Biographie, Bd. 3, Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1957, 433-434; KARL KLÜPFEL: "Crusius, Martin", in: Historische Kommission bei der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften (Hrsg.): Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie. Bd. 4, Leipzig 1876, 634-635; Website: [http://mdz.bib-bvb.de/digbib/lexika/adb/images/adb004/@ebt-link?target=idmatch\(entityref,adb0040635\)](http://mdz.bib-bvb.de/digbib/lexika/adb/images/adb004/@ebt-link?target=idmatch(entityref,adb0040635)). JOHANN JACOB MOSER: Introduction, in: MARTIN CRUSIUS: Schwäbische Chronick: worinnen zu finden ist, was sich von Erschaffung d. Welt an biß auf d. Jahr 1596 in Schwaben, denen benachbarten Gegenden, auch vieler anderer Orten, zugetragen...; [Swabian Chronicle: in which can be found what has transpired from the creation of the world onward, up to the year 1596 in Swabia, neighboring areas, also many other places...] translated from the Latin, Frankfurt a. Main, Leipzig: Wohler c. 1777. Thomas Wilhelmi has compiled the literature on Crusius up to 2001 in: THOMAS WILHELMI: Sonderband Martin Crusius: Handschriftenverzeichnis und Bibliographie, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2002 (Manuscript Collection of the Tübingen University Library. 2), 261-271; PANAGIOTIS TOUFEXIS cites additional works up to c. 2004: Das Alphabetum vulgaris linguae graecae des deutschen Humanisten Martin Crusius (1526-1607): Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der gesprochenen griechischen Sprache im 16. Jahrhundert. Köln: Romiosini 2005 (Neograeca Medii Aevi. 8), 353-378.

Melanchthon's rhetoric, which he published nine years later (1563) for his students in Tübingen, Crusius remembers his teacher Johannes Sturm with the following words: "As at times the memory of the deeds that we have accomplished in our younger years is pleasing to us by nature: thus dealing with their lessons is now pleasing to me as well. Furthermore, I decided that I must take counsel with myself as to what I had drawn several years prior from the richest of sources on the [rhetoric (Greek)] of the famous man Johannes Sturm, that illustrious teacher: though I believed I possessed that fullness in myself, I felt the well gradually run completely and utterly dry in the fiery works of the other school (as he himself had predicted it to me, <[Greek]>). Scarcely had I wrung any of that most eminent man's elixir from my memory and written it down in those years, but I am vitally refreshed by it now with you all: In this book I wish to share primarily this material with you, but other things as well: in order that I should have a coherent source of memory in that which I had observed: Others may now use it also, if they wish."³ In their chronological sequence, Crusius's notes published for the Strasbourg students, which make explicit reference to the teacher's statements, are both lecture notes and teaching material. Both functions will be given serious consideration here and discussed in context, but the main focus will be on the function of the exemplary lecture notes, the analysis of which, it is hoped, will shed light on the ideas informing Sturm's instructional method. This article thus presents the initial findings of research into school

³ PHILIPP MELANCHTHON, MARTIN CRUSIUS: *Philippi Melanthonis Elementorum Rhetorices Libri duo: Martini Crusii Quaestionibus et Scholijs explicati in Academia Tybingensi. Adiectis Aliquot epistolis et Carminibus, a Rhetorico studio non alienis. Item Rerum atque uerborum, toto Opere memorabilium, copioso Indice*. Basileae, ex officina Oporiniana 1574 (probably dating from 1563, since foreword is dated 1563), p. 4: "Sicut ergo interdum rerum in puerilibus annis tractatarum recordatio natura nos delectat: ita et horum mihi praeceptorum tractatio etiam nunc iucunda est. Ad haec, ipsi me mihi consulere debere iudicaui. quae enim ante complures annos, in clariss. uiri Ioannis STURMII, praeceptoris bene meriti, laetissimis ῥητορείας fontibus hauseram: illa cum abundatura in me putassem, in aestuosis alius scholae laboribus (sicut ipse mihi fore praedixerat, <[Greek]> sensim exaruisse pene cuncta sensi. Quorum cum uix hisce annis, amplissimi uiri, quibus uobiscum uiuens reficior, humorem aliquem recollegissem: praecipua ex eo, et alia, in hunc librum conferre uolui: ut, quae ... obseruassem, coniuncta memoriae causa haberem: quibus etiam alij, si qui uellent, uti possent."

pedagogy and literary education based on the printed Sturmiian *scholia* as edited by Crusius.

The following procedure will be used to differentiate the research question and describe the problem more precisely: first, the different school materials will be scrutinized in order to more exactly define the genre of scholia, and of lecture notes in general. This paper will posit that a certain kind of lecture notes were modeled as scholia in the Strasbourg school. Second, to permit us to go into detail concerning content, one such collection of scholia – that of Martin Crusius, mentioned above – will be examined more closely. The main focus will be on the form this pedagogical material took and its use in the school. Finally, we will consider the question of the integrated *methodus Sturmiiana*, i.e. the specific method the students used to study and which Johannes Sturm and his immediate colleagues used to impart the instructional content to the Strasbourg students.

2. Research report

The secondary literature reveals a certain amount of established knowledge concerning the goals and organization of Johannes Sturm's *Gymnasium illustre*, which set an example for many other newly founded Reformation institutions. Two classic interpretations have followed different approaches in dealing with the pedagogical theory and instructional practice of the Strasbourg *Gymnasium*. The first is the book *Humanistische Hochschule und Freie Reichsstadt: Gymnasium und Akademie in Strassburg 1538-1621* [*Humanistic Higher Education and Free Imperial City: Gymnasium and Academy in Strasbourg 1538-1621*] by Anton Schindling (1977), about the organization of the *Gymnasium illustre* in Strasbourg under schoolmaster Johannes Sturm and his immediate successors, including unparalleled details about the goings-on in the classroom.⁴ The second is an article from 1989 on the *methodus Sturmianae* by

⁴ ANTON SCHINDLING: *Humanistische Hochschule und Freie Reichsstadt. Gymnasium und Akademie in Strassburg 1538-1621*. Wiesbaden: Steiner 1977, 162-236.

Barbara Sher Tinsley,⁵ who six years later published the most important collection of Sturm's educational documents in English translation to date, together with Lewis W. Spitz.⁶ In her 1989 article, Tinsley outlines a few general guidelines to Sturm's pedagogy. The difference between the two scholars' approaches lies in their weighting of Sturm's activities at the *Gymnasium*. While Schindling examines the intertwinement of the *Gymnasium* (and later, the academy) in city politics, seeking reasons for changes to the school's curriculum and infrastructure in the prevailing power dynamics within city government and religious politics, Tinsley is mainly concerned with the didactic prescriptions, which – like Schindling before her – she places within the humanistic tradition. Beyond the description of the curriculum, both point to a preponderance of classroom studies on rhetoric, supported by three methodological pillars: the first is the reading of classical authors, and second is a predominance of methodological considerations – of Ciceronian rhetoric generally, according to Schindling, whereas Tinsley stresses dialectic thinking methods hearkening back to the writings of Rodolphus Agricola and Philipp Melanchthon. The third and most important pillar is memory training. While Schindling focuses his statements on the teaching and curriculum within the individual classes, Tinsley summarizes in just a few paragraphs the program of the *De literarum ludis recte aperiendis liber* of 1538,⁷ which she believes continued to be used in its original form up until 1569. According to the program, the boys are supposed to have read an entire canon of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew works by 14 years of age, beginning with Cicero at age seven and ending with the ability to compose a speech of their own at age 14.⁸ In a similar manner, she sketches Sturm's view of the relation between Christian/moral behavior and classical studies: "Sturm did not distinguish between good learning and good morals in public life, since 'nothing in the nature of

⁵ BARBARA SHER TINSLEY: "Johann's Sturm's Method for Humanistic Pedagogy." In: *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 20, 1, 1989, 23-40.

⁶ LEWIS W. SPITZ, BARBARA SHER TINSLEY: *Johann Sturm on Education*. St. Louis 1995.

⁷ TINSLEY, Johann's Sturm's Method (as in footnote 5), 38.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 27.

things cultivates morality as does the study of letters.’’⁹ According to Tinsley, Sturm’s most important tool for these studies is memory, in order to link words with things. By “memory training,” he especially means vocabulary learning.¹⁰ Tinsley’s analysis leaves many questions unanswered, including the lack of concrete references to case studies of teaching and learning. Nor is it made clear how Sturm deals with the classical authors, and what exactly he means by “morality.” Schindling goes into more detail here by describing Strasbourg’s production of its own textbooks, divided up according to the grade levels and subjects at the school.¹¹ He portrays Sturm’s method as the inculcation of empirical fundamentals in the lower grade levels; word meanings are analyzed and individual turns of phrase extracted from the texts being read. In the ideal scenario – which often did not occur, however – pupils should maintain a “commonplace book” (also known as a *topoi* book or *loci* collection) to study the vocabulary items and building blocks of theory whose meanings had been established in this way. Then, in the rhetoric lessons of the *secunda*, Cicero’s *Partitiones oratoriae* is used to provide a methodical introduction to rhetoric. Finally, in the highest grade levels comes dialectics. Sturm’s *Partitionum dialecticarum libri IV*, which were based on Cicero and Aristotle and influenced by Rodolphus Agricola,¹² were read in the two highest grades. Methodologically speaking, dialectics was to Sturm the “vis atque ratio disserendi,”¹³ i.e. the method of disputation, and thus closely tied to rhetoric. Schindling relates an interesting discovery with regard to these dialectics lessons:¹⁴ according to his findings, rhetoric professor Valentin Erythraeus was “Sturm’s only pupil to take up the idea of the ‘Partitiones oratoriae’ and the ‘Partitiones dialecticae’ in his own publications,” making the knowledge more easily accessible to students by means of published tables. This is a

⁹ Ibid., 28.

¹⁰ Ibid., 36.

¹¹ SCHINDLING, *Humanistische Hochschule* (as in footnote 4), 162-377.

¹² Ibid., 199.

¹³ Ibid., 201.

¹⁴ Ibid., 205.

singular glimpse into the relations between Sturm and his many pupils with respect to a curriculum they worked out and developed in collaboration.

Since the classic studies by Cesare Vasoli (1966)¹⁵ on Sturmian dialectics and philosophy, two research publications have made the main recent contributions to elaborating on Sturm's classroom methodology. First, Ann Moss (1996) examined Johannes Sturm's school guidelines for clues as to how the classical writings were dealt with.¹⁶ Second, Véronique Montagne (2001) analyzed a textbook on dialectics in the context of rhetoric, which drew on Johannes Sturm's publications on dialectics and was published for the Strasbourg pupils in 1561 by Valentin Erythraeus, himself one of Sturm's most well-known pupils.¹⁷ Both of them bring to light new findings with regard to epitomization, excerption, and memorization. In her groundbreaking work on the use and prevalence of *topoi* collections in the early modern period, Moss traces the origination and spread of the so-called *commonplace*, *topoi*, or *loci* book, an individually prepared collection of quotations arranged under rubrics, originally designed for school pupils to study with in the 15th and 16th centuries, but then also used outside of school contexts by scholars themselves in the 17th century for structuring knowledge. From her careful reading of Johannes Sturm's pedagogical text *De literarum ludis recte aperiendis liber* (1538), she concludes that Johannes Sturm had this *topoi* book (which she had recognized and classified as such all over Europe) in mind as a matter of course for his students at every point throughout the curriculum. As such, she goes beyond the findings of Charles Schmidt (1855) and Anton Schindling (1977), who had already noted Sturm's

¹⁵ CESARE VASOLI: "Ricerche sulle Dialettiche del Cinquecento. III. Sturm, Melantone e il Problema del Metodo." In: *Rivista critica di Storia della Filosofia*, 21, 1966, 123-177.

¹⁶ ANN MOSS: *Printed Commonplace-Books and the structuring of Renaissance Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1996, 134-186, in particular pp. 147-159. The most recent literature: WILLIAM H. SHERMAN: *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

¹⁷ VÉRONIQUE MONTAGNE: "Jean Sturm et Valentin Erythraeus ou l'élaboration méthodique d'une topique dialectique." In: *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 3, 2001, 477-509.

methodology of the *copia*, or the collecting of quotations and vocabulary items,¹⁸ in that she reveals the Europe-wide distribution and tradition of this form, first in the school context and then among scholars as well. She cites many quotations that unequivocally attest to Sturm's approach. However, in terms of content, she does not give any indications as to the relationship between rubrics and school readings. Finally, Véronique Montagne carries out an in-depth dialectical study, investigating how the classics were dealt with on the basis of an example in dialectics. An important clue comes as a byproduct of the example chosen by Montagne of a table used during lessons as an explanatory and mnemonic aid. Her discussion makes it possible to surmise, for the first time, that Sturm provided students with a systematically structured introduction to questions of *decorum*, or dignified behavior in communicative situations, thus suggesting a moral/ethical backdrop for rhetoric.¹⁹ Montagne analyzes one of the tables that Valentin Erythraeus prepared according to Sturm's lectures or publications. She then compares it with Sturm's own statements in the corresponding textbooks that he had written about dialectics and published since 1536. Like Schindling, she does not delve further into the interaction between Sturm the teacher and Erythraeus the pupil. On a formal level, her conclusion is that Sturm implemented mnemonic aids such as schemata²⁰ in his classroom teaching (and not that Erythraeus, in using the table format, had taken a completely novel, facilitative route, as Schindling²¹ suggests). In terms of content, she concludes that Sturm recognized a great richness of variation in the classification of *decorum*, which, according to Montagne, he had taken from Cicero's work *De officiis*. The Sturmiian scheme applies different prescriptive ideals to the discourse of different conversation partners:²²

¹⁸ CHARLES SCHMIDT: *La vie et les travaux de Jean Sturm*. Strasbourg 1855, 248-250; SCHINDLING, Humanistische Hochschule (as in footnote 4), 184-186.

¹⁹ MONTAGNE, Jean Sturm et Valentin Erythraeus (as in footnote 17), 501-505.

²⁰ Ibid., 478-483.

²¹ SCHINDLING, Humanistische Hochschule (as in footnote 4), 205.

²² JOHANNES STURM: *Joannis Sturmii Partitionum dialecticarum libri IIII, emendatici et aucti*, Strasbourg, J. Rihelium, 1571, 220v-221v. MONTAGNE, Jean Sturm et Valentin Erythraeus (as in footnote 17), 479, translates this part into French as follows: "... et elles se distinguent alors à nouveau en deux ensembles: en

“... & hi rursus in duas diuisi sunt partes: aut enim amici de re aliqua diuersas habent opiniones, ut Crassus & Antonius in libris de Oratore: aut adversarii sunt, et uitae professione inter se remoti, ut Socrates & Polus apud Platonem in Gorgia. Propter hanc uarietatem rerum & personarum in dialogis & sermonibus alia nascitur orationis diuersitas: [...] Personae etiam aliam uarietatem habent: nam uel docti omnes sunt, qui inter se collunquuntur: uel sunt indociti: uel mixti ex utrisque, primum & postremum genus saepe usurpatur, medium numquam nisi in ridiculis & iocis est adhibendum. Deinde uel senes sunt omnes qui colloquuntur: uel omnes adolescentes: uel admixti senibus sunt adolescentes, aut mediae aetatis uiri. Item, uel colloquuntur inter se qui dignitate praediti sunt, aut ornati diuitiis, uel homines tenues & pauperes, uel hi inter se sunt commixti.”

The question of the theory behind the *methodus sturmiana*, which together with further elaborations in the “Partitiones dialecticae,” has been unquestioningly assumed to form a homogeneous basis for his classroom practices since the beginnings of the research on Sturm’s pedagogy with Charles Schmidt (1855),²³ has led, elsewhere in this volume, to a

effet, soit il s'agit d'amis, dont les opinions divergent à propos d'une chose quelconque, comme Crassus et Antoine dans les livres du *De oratore*; soit il s'agit d'adversaires, que leur choix de vie éloigne les uns des autres, comme Socrate et Polus dans le Gorgias de Platon. À cause de cette variété de matières et de personnes dans les dialogues et dans les discours, il naît encore une autre diversité au sujet des propos. Les personnes connaissent encore une autre variété: en effet, ou ce sont des doctes qui parlent ensemble, ou ce sont des ignorants; ou l'assemblée est un mélange de ces deux catégories. On utilise souvent le premier et le dernier de ces genres, le second n'est jamais employé, sauf dans les jeux et les bouffonneries. Ensuite, ou ce sont des anciens qui s'entretiennent, ou ce sont tous des jeunes, ou le groupe est: un mélange de ces deux catégories, ou ce sont des hommes d'âge moyen. De plus, ou les interlocuteurs sont dotés d'un certain prestige, ou ils sont pourvus de biens, ou ce sont des hommes faibles et pauvres, ou il s'agit d'un mélange de ces catégories.”

²³ SCHMIDT, La vie et les travaux (as in footnote 18), 290. MARETTA D. NIKOLAO: *Sprache als Welterschliessung und Sprache als Norm. Überlegungen zu R. Agricola und J. Sturm*. Dissertation. Neuried: Hieronymus 1984, 93-94: “Sturm’s partitioning method, which has also been called the methodus sturmiana”... <94:> “meanwhile, it still needs to be pointed out that neither Sturm nor his pupils, who often invoked the *methodus Sturmiana*, ever further elucidated it as a method.” The author assumes that the

new appraisal of Johannes Sturm's "De imitatione," among other things. Without going into greater detail here, it should be pointed out that even in this brief outline of the secondary literature, three completely different methods have already been mentioned: they are the *topoi* collection, which requires collecting and organizing; the question of the interplay between dialectics and rhetoric; and finally a way of meeting school objectives that also contain a moral component, which is demonstrated in only a fragmentary way by the systematization of *decorum*. If we then juxtapose this with the collaborations between Sturm and his teachers and students, which can be reconstructed in a variety of ways with the help of publications created for the school lessons, it all lends support to the hypothesis to be advanced here: namely, that a detailed study would most likely lay to rest the notion of a homogeneous methodology, both in the pedagogical as well as in the moral/didactic domain, in favor of a model that stresses an interplay between various methods that were developed and applied in the course of classroom lessons. In the following sections, the question of knowledge transmission will now be investigated with respect to just one genre, the scholia.

3. Printed materials for Sturm's school from Strasbourg presses: the concept of the *scholia* genre

In the 16th century, the free imperial city of Strasbourg²⁴ was one of the foremost centers of book production in the German-speaking world. This is attested to by the 6406 entries

methodus consisted in a combination of Cicero's "Partitiones oratoriae" with his "Partitiones dialecticae" in the lessons of the last two grade levels at the *Gymnasium* (Ibid., 94).

²⁴ Among the most important works on the Reformation-era history of Strasbourg are the following: JEAN ROTT: *Investigationes historicae: églises et société au XVIe siècle: gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchen- und Sozialgeschichte*. 2 Bde., Strasbourg: Oberlin, 1986. MARIJN DE KROON, MARC LIENHARD (Hrsg.): *Horizons européens de la Réforme en Alsace=Das Elsass und die Reformation im Europa des XVI. Jahrhunderts: mélanges offerts à Jean Rott pour son 65e anniversaire*. Strasbourg: Librairie Istra 1980 (Publications de la Société savante d'Alsace et des régions de l'est. Grandes Publications. 17). THOMAS ALLAN BRADY, JR: *Ruling class, regime and Reformation at Strasbourg, 1520-1555*. Leiden: Brill 1978 (Studies in medieval and Reformation thought. 22).

with “Strassburg” listed as the place of printing for surviving 16th-century books printed at Strasbourg presses, which a search of the VD 16 database returned on June 05, 2008.²⁵ This number is exceeded only by Basel with 6551, Cologne with 7617, Leipzig with 7707, Nuremberg with 6733, and Wittenberg with 9104 entries. The next highest numbers are found in the cities of Frankfurt with 5698, Augsburg with 5222, and Erfurt with 2634 documented works. Since the database is not yet set up for quantitative analysis, there may be duplicate entries among these search results, which may render the numbers less precise, but does not invalidate the overall trend. With the same methodological caveats, a total of 404 works in the VD 16 (June 5, 2008) include the name of Johannes Sturm, 254 of which were printed in Strasbourg. Since there is only one *commentarius* authored by him²⁶ (a text genre considered to have been a classic form of reading material at schools and academies), the present study inquires into the very heterogeneous genre of “scholia” in order to gain insight into the material taught by Sturm and his teaching method. The latter are textual commentary in the form of reading notes emerging from and created for use within the school, but also independent of that,

²⁵ VD 16: <http://bvba2.bib->

bvba2.bib-bvb.de/V/H8TD98MTBFMAIJBAYF1FEGLLBIUC9DJNNMAVTR1L39P1LH8HFU-

26995?func=file&file_name=search_vd16; Cf. MIRIAM USHER CHRISMAN: *Lay culture, learned culture: books and social change in Strasbourg, 1480-1599*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press 1982, 287-313 (Statistics and classifications of book production in Strasbourg, together with a description of the author’s counting and evaluation methods) and *Idem*: *Bibliography of Strasbourg imprints, 1480-1599*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press 1982. In 1982, the author did not yet have digital database tools at her disposal for counting and comparison like those offered by the digitized VD 16. At the same time, the sheer volume of entries in the latter obscure the view of the individual works. For more in-depth studies, each printing should be checked individually. With respect to classifying the Strasbourg writings, the divisions made by CHRISMAN, *Bibliography...* 1982 are of great value, even though it is possible that not all surviving exemplars have been catalogued: on pages 107-133, she lists the Latin schoolbooks printed in Strasbourg from 1480-1599.

²⁶ AESCHINES, DEMOSTHENES, JOHANNES STURM: *Aeschinis et Demosthenis orationes duae contrariae. Commentariolum Ioannis Sturmij in easdem Hecatommeres*. Strasbourg: Rihel, Wendelin, 1550.

being widely reproduced in printings throughout the German-speaking world.²⁷ The VD 16 lists a confirmed count of 67 Strasbourg printings of the 16th century with the genre designation “scholia.” Fifteen of these works are personally linked to Johannes Sturm as author, editor, or writer of the foreword; and in any event, eight of these fifteen works are explicitly designated as Sturm’s scholia, or in two cases *Scholia Sturmiana*. The latter are the work of the learned philologist (and later historian) Martin Crusius, known in German as “Kraus” or “Krause.”²⁸ They are discussions of Virgil’s *Eclogues* or *Bucolics*²⁹ and Theocritus’ *Idylls*,³⁰ following either Sturm’s lectures or Sturm’s method – the title would suggest both. The title of Crusius’ third collection of scholia citing Sturm – namely, the edition of Demosthenes,³¹ which was printed before the other two works – does not explicitly refer to the fact that he might possibly have made use of Sturmiian scholia. The title “Martini Crusii commentariolum...Sturmianum; Eandem Scholia...” (emphasis mine) intimates that it is his own scholia he is publishing here. And yet he calls this work a “Sturmiian commentary.” He clarifies Sturm’s involvement in this volume by explicitly identifying Johannes Sturm as the author at one place: namely, the translation of an extended passage from the Greek.³² This clear separation of the authors

²⁷ See VD 16: Title keyword index for scholia (June 17, 2008): SCHOLIA: 316 entries, SCHOLIIS: 246 entries; SCHOLIIS: 658 entries. The results are distributed across all German-speaking printing cities.

²⁸ For biographical literature on Martin Crusius, see footnote 2. No discussion of the collaboration between Sturm and Crusius is offered. Concerning Martin Crusius’ lectures on rhetoric in Tübingen, see JEAN-CLAUDE MARGOLIN: “L’enseignement de la rhétorique à l’Université de Tübingen d’après quelques ‘orationes’ de Martin Crusius.” In: MICHAEL ERBE (Hrsg.): *Querdenken: Dissens und Toleranz im Wandel der Geschichte. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Hans R. Guggisberg*. Mannheim: Palatium-Verlag 1996, 363-376. He analyzes Martin Crusius’ voluminous *Diarum*, written from 1596-1606. Accordingly, the young Crusius’ teachings are not discussed.

²⁹ CRUSIUS, Virgilii Eclogam Sturmiana (as in footnote 1).

³⁰ MARTIN CRUSIUS: Martini Crusii scholia in primum Theocriti Idyllion Sturmiana. Strasbourg 1556.

³¹ MARTIN CRUSIUS: Martini Crusii commentariolum in primam Demosthenis Olynthiacam Sturmianum: eiusdem scholia in eandem, et Epitome ex Diodoro Siculo de statu illorum temporum in Graecia. His addita est conuersio Ioan. Sturmii. Argentorati excudebat Blasius Fabricius Chemnicensis. M. D. LIII.

³² Ibid., 18: “IOANNIS STVRMII conuersio.”

is put into perspective in the foreword, inasmuch as he describes how the work came about: in the school, where he had heard Johannes Sturm's lesson on Demosthenes:³³ "To you I come, Theodore and Petrus Gansius: ... You, like myself, are listeners of Sturm, whose school gave birth to this: and you have heard not only Cicero, but also Demosthenes elucidated by him." Interestingly, Crusius's large body of work comprises only three other collections of scholia, including the one that explains Melanchthon's rhetoric, which also relies on Johannes Sturm's teachings, as Crusius writes in the foreword.³⁴ The second work is a collection of scholia on poems and his own speeches (1567), and the third is a political treatise about the state of Greece under Turkish rule (1584).³⁵ Thus, all of his scholia collections except for the "Turcograecia" have to do with Johannes Sturm and the Strasbourg school. This reinforces the thesis that this group of Crusius's scholia collections represent a Strasbourg phenomenon that can be traced back to Sturm's pedagogical practices and commentary.

Since the present contribution is explicitly dedicated to the *Scholia Sturmiana*, neither the edition of Demosthenes nor that of Melanchthon have been included here, though both certainly were implicitly drawn on for comparison. Above all, the comparison will show how reliable the designation *Scholia Sturmiana* is for a certain group of works. Thus, if we draw up an imaginary list leaving out those works which, like Demosthenes and Melanchthon, are scholia but not explicitly *Scholia Sturmiana*, the result is a group of eight works:

³³ Ibid., 6-7: <6> "Ad uos uenio, Theodorice et Petre Gansii:... <7> ...Vos item, ut ego, Sturmij auditores, ex cuius schola ista nata sunt, estis: neque Ciceronem tantum, sed etiam Demosthenem ab illo explicari auditis...."

³⁴ MARTIN CRUSIUS: *Philippi Melanthonis Elementorum Rhetorices Libri duo*: Martini Crvsii Qvaestionibus Explicati, in Academia Tybingensi. [Basel: Oporinus] 1563, 4.

³⁵ MARTIN CRUSIUS: *Martini Crvsii Scholia In Poemata & Orationes suas*. Basel: Oporinus 1567. MARTIN CRUSIUS: *Turcograeciae Libri Octo*: Qvibus Graecorum Statvs Svb Imperio Turcico, in Politia & Ecclesia, Oeconomia & Scholis, iam inde ab amissa Constantinopoli, ad haec usq[ue] tempora, luculenter describitur. Basel: Henricpetri [1584].

- 1556: Martin Crusius: Martini Crusii scholia in primum Theocriti Idyllion Sturmiana.
- 1556: Martin Crusius: Martini Crusii Scholia in primam secundam, ac tertiam Virgilii eclogam Sturmiana.
- 1570: Hermogenes, Johannes Sturm: Hermogenis Tarsensis rhetoris acutissimi, De ratione inueniendi oratoria, libri IIII. Latinitate donati, et Scholis explicati at[que] illustrati a Ioanne Sturmio.
- 1570: Hermogenes, Johannes Sturm: Hermogenis Tarsensis rhetoris acutissimi Partitionum Rhetoricarum liber vnus, qui vulgò de Statibus incipitur, Latinitate donatus, et Scholis explicatus atque illustratus a Ioanne Sturmio.
- 1570: Aristoteles, Johannes Sturm: Aristotelis Rhetoricorum libri III. In Latinum sermonem conuersi, et Scholis breuioribus explicati à Ioanne Sturmio. Nunc primum, in gratiam et usum studiosorum dicendi doctrinae editi.
- 1571: Hermogenes, Johannes Sturm: Hermogenis Tarsensis rhetoris acutissimi, De dicendi generibus siue formis orationum Libri II. Latinitate donati, et scholis explicati atque illustrati, a Ioan. Sturmio.
- 1571: Hermogenes, Johannes Sturm: Hermogenis Tarsensis rhetoris acutissimi, de ratione tractandae grauitatis occultae Liber, Latinitate donatus, et Scholis explicatus atque illustratus a Ioan. Sturmio.
- 1574: Johannes Sturm: Ioannis Sturmi de imitatione oratoria libri tres, cum scholis eiusdem authoris, antea nunquam in lucem editi. [Edited by Valentinus Erythraeus].

The list shows that the scholia named here were written and/or published by various people and treat a wide range of topics within the disciplines of the *trivium*, grammar and rhetoric in particular: they elucidate Theocritus' *Idylls*, Virgil's *Bucolics*, the rhetorical *Imitatio* penned by Sturm himself, the rhetoric of Hermogenes of Tharsos in four books, and finally Aristotle's rhetorical writings. They were written by Martin Crusius (Theocritus and Virgil), Johannes Sturm (Hermogenes, Aristotle), and Valentinus Erythraeus as the editor of Sturm's "De imitatione oratoria." Without exception, the scholia named here were composed during the later years of Johannes Sturm's tenure, in 1556, 1570, 1571 and 1574. The works appearing after 1569 are designated as *schole*, or *schola* in the singular; they are brief commentaries that successively address individual thematic units of the text under discussion. Petrus Ramus also uses this term and form in his works.³⁶

³⁶ PETRUS RAMUS: *Scholae in liberales artes*. Basel 1569.

Scholia always accompany a classical text that was read at the school. They constitute a quite heterogeneous genre, ranging from the running commentary, usually on philosophical works³⁷ to the scholastic lemmata editions – compilations of aphorisms with commentary – for texts used in grammar lessons, which were only rarely published in the German-speaking world, such as Johannes Sturm's *Poeticum*, compiled in multiple volumes for the successive grade levels at the Strasbourg *Gymnasium*.³⁸ As serial comments or annotations on a text, scholia had been a much-used tool for text elucidation dating from classical antiquity, as is manifestly evident in the tradition of Horatian poetics, for example.³⁹ Among the well known scholia from Renaissance times are those

³⁷ Cf. the informative volume by AUGUST BUCK, OTTO HERDING (Eds.): *Der Kommentar in der Renaissance*. Bonn-Bad Godesberg 1975, especially the essays by ROBERT STUPPERICH: *Melanchthons Proverbien-Kommentare*. Ibid., 21-34; MARIE-JOSÉ DESMET-GOETHALS: *Die Verwendung der Kommentare von Badius-Mancinellus, Erasmus und Corderius in der „Disticha Catonis“* – Ausgabe von Livinus Crucius. Ibid., 73-88 and GÜNTER HESS: *Kommentarstruktur und Leser, Das „Lob der Torheit“ des Erasmus von Rotterdam, kommentiert von Gerardus Listrius und Sebastian Franck*. Ibid., 141-166. A text-critical selection of different 16th-century commentaries on Aristotelian writings can be found in the series: CHARLES H. LOHR (Ed.): *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca: versiones Latinae temporis resuscitatarum litterarum*. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog 1990-. DAVID LINES: *Aristotle's 'Ethics' in the Italian Renaissance (ca. 1300-1650): the universities and the problem of moral education*. Leiden: Brill 2002 (*Education and society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*. 13) deals with the genre of the commentary in great detail. However, he concentrates on content-based traditions within the teaching profession rather than on the form of the respective commentary, so that the question of a homogeneous *commentarius* genre remains unanswered.

³⁸ Attested lemmata editions in Strasbourg: JOHANNES STURMIUS: *Poetica, sex volumina. Cum lemmatibus Joannis Sturmij. Sextae Curiae Scholarum Argentinsium*. Strasbourg 1565 (with many reprints); DIONYSIUS CATO: *Disticha Catonis ethica. Una cum Lemmatibus et praefatione Ioannis Sturmij. Scholia Argentinsibus*. Strassburg: Josias Rihel 1565.

³⁹ Cf. e.g. ERNST SCHWEIKERT: *Zur Überlieferung der Horaz-Scholien*. Paderborn: Schöningh 1915 (*Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums*. 8.1), p. 3: Scholia series of a quite specific provenance, which are only associated with “Acron” by name as of the 15th century, had been handed down in the margins of Horace manuscripts “in constantly revised and reworked form” from classical antiquity on up to modernity, functioning as commentary.

of Rodolphus Agricola on dialectics and rhetoric⁴⁰ and those of Erasmus, who literally worked with stacks of numbered manuscript notes, on the new edition of Hieronymus's works.⁴¹ Over a period of several years, Erasmus collected his short and long Hieronymus commentaries on loose, numbered pages, which he later rearranged into a better order. Thus, scholia usually explicate individual passages of an original classical text to be read beforehand. In her manuscript volume *Denkstrukturen und Arbeitstechniken des St. Galler Humanisten Joachim von Watt* [Cognitive structures and working techniques of the St. Gallen humanist Joachim von Watt], Renate Frohne performs a content-analysis of the scholia compiled by the humanist Joachim von Watt, or Vadian, on the new edition of a work by the classical historiographer Pomponius Mela. She quotes one of his statements about the form of the scholia that he himself integrates into his work:⁴² "In this context [referring to a certain statement by Pomponius Mela], I would talk about the origins of the Gauls; I would explain the meaning of Gaulish words/names and their motivations, if I did not see how – against my will – my scholia balloon/swell to the point that someone might think that it is not scholia he has before

⁴⁰ LUTZ CLAREN, JOACHIM HUBER: Rudolf Agricolas Scholien zu Ciceros Rede De lege Manilia: zu Typologie und Verfahren des humanistischen Autorenkommentars. In: WILHELM KÜHLMANN (Hrsg.): Rudolf Agricola: 1444-1485. Protagonist des nordeuropäischen Humanismus, zum 550. Geburtstag. Bern u.a.: Lang 1994, 147-180, summarize on p. 147 "that the exegetical literature of the 15th to the 17th century (scholia, commentaries, enarrations, paraphrases, lectures), ... bibliographically only cursorily examined to date, ... has received only scant attention in the detailed research to date." Based on a detailed analysis, the authors demonstrate how Rodolphus Agricola uses the scholia to apply the older methods of syllogism and *locus* to the Cicero text (cf. *ibid.*, 162).

⁴¹ Cf. FRITZ HUSNER: Die Handschrift der Scholien des Erasmus von Rotterdam zu den Hieronymusbriefen. In: Festschrift Gustav Binz zum 70. Geburtstag am 16. Januar 1935 von Freunden und Fachgenossen dargebracht. Basel: Schwabe 1935, 132-146, here p. 134 on the "*Scholia vetera*."

⁴² RENATE FROHNE: Denkstrukturen und Arbeitstechniken des St. Galler Humanisten Joachim von Watt. Etymon vocabuli sequimur: Etymologien und Namensklärungen in Vadians Scholien zu Pomponius Mela "De chorographia", Basel 1522 (2). Reproduced manuscript. Trogen, Fall 2004, p. 39: "Referrem hoc in loco, quae Gallorum origo, quae nominis ratio, nisi viderem invito mihi extuberare scholia, ut plane non scholia, sed verbosa commentaria cuipiam videri possint. Porro omnia mihi diligentissime reddidisse videtur libro XV Ammianus Marcellinus." (Translation in text: John Stewart via Frohne).

him, but a verbose commentary. It seems to me that, in his 15th book, Ammianus Marcellinus very carefully laid out everything in this regard.” The quotation shows that, in spite of his desire for completeness, Vadian makes a distinction between the scholia commentary and running commentary, i.e., he is guided in his work by a genre concept. However, there is also a rare variant of the scholia form that is not made up of annotations with lemmata at all, but summarizes entire passages in the scholia writer’s own words, thus dispensing with the text by an original author to be read beforehand; this was the case for Konrad Gessner in Zurich, whose *Physicarum Meditationes* was published by his pupil Caspar Wolf in 1586.⁴³ On comparing this work with Sturm’s, it becomes clear that the *Scholia Sturmiana* are text annotations referring to discrete thematic units of the original text. They are not *topoi* or *loci* books, since their text components are not grouped according to rubrics. While Crusius builds his notes around the preceding word-lemmata, the later *scholae* of Johannes Sturm on his work “De imitatione” are constructed like Gessner’s, as paraphrases of entire chapters of the original text printed in the first part, without headwords.

For our assessment of the scholia, an examination of teaching concepts is now in order. The works that were not written by Johannes Sturm himself document the fact that they are making reference to him with the indication “Sturmiana.” They were composed by students of Sturm who worked as assistant teachers or teachers at the Strasbourg school. Michael Toxites writes explicitly in his 1562 edition of Theocritus that the scholia he is publishing are his old school materials, from which he himself had lectured to the students in Strasbourg.⁴⁴ He does not hold forth about how closely these notes are related to those of Sturm. Since they contain no explicit reference in the title, they – like

⁴³ KONRAD GESSNER, CASPAR WOLF: Conradi Gesneri Tigurini Philosophi et Medici Clarissimi, *Physicarum Meditationum, Annotationum & Scholiorum Lib. V. Nunc recens ex variis Gesnerianae diligentiae relictis schedis et libris, studiose collecti, methodice dispositi & conscripti, per Casparvm Wolphvm Tigurinum Medicum*. Zürich: Froschauer 1586.

⁴⁴ MICHAEL TOXITES: *Scholia Micaeli Toxitae Rheti poetae et comitis Palatini Caesarei, in Theocriti Idyllion primum, ex scholis Ioannis Sturmii*. Zürich: Iacobus Gesnerus [1562], refers in the introduction to the year 1551 at Johannes Sturm’s school.

Crusius's Demosthenes – have not been included here in the list of *Scholia Sturmiana*. How might Sturm's students or assistant teachers have acquired their notes? On the one hand, it is conceivable that it was through dictation; but it is also possible that the teacher (that is, Sturm) had circulated pre-written notes, whether inside or outside of the classroom. It was by no means unusual for students to publish their professors' lectures, or even their notes and other teaching materials they had prepared. This practice is already attested at the medieval universities.⁴⁵ Here, dictation of the text was not only taken using various facilitative methods like the writing chorus during individual lecture sections, but it was also passed around among the students for copying, and in some cases even sold. In Strasbourg itself, such a tradition is already documented around 1456 in the *Studium Generale* at the Franciscan convent,⁴⁶ which would serve as the school of Martin Crusius at the beginning of the 16th century. On the other hand, it is conceivable that the students or staff recorded their notes relatively independently in accordance with the *methodus Sturmiana* (used here in a broad sense) or however they saw fit. This would point to a kind of teaching objectives that would not have consisted primarily in taking in the original text, but in working with the classical text in an elucidative fashion. Of all the scholia, only Martin Crusius' Demosthenes provides an answer to this question:⁴⁷ "[...]

⁴⁵ JÜRGEN MIETHKE: Die mittelalterlichen Universitäten und das gesproche Wort. München 1990 (Schriften des historischen Kollegs, Vorträge. 23), p. 19, footnote 18. Cf. ANTHONY GRAFTON, LISA JARDINE: From Humanism to the Humanities. Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press 1986, p. 65 (With reference to personal account by Venice lecturer Paolo Marsi from 1482); ANN BLAIR: Student manuscript and the textbook. In: EMIDIO CAMPI, SIMONE DE ANGELIS, ANJA-SILVIA GOEING, ANTHONY T. GRAFTON (Eds.): Scholarly Knowledge. Textbooks in Early Modern Europe. Genève: Droz, 2008 (in press); JÜRGEN LEONHARDT, CLAUDIA SCHINDLER: Neue Quellen zum Alltag im Hörsaal vor 500 Jahren. Ein Tübinger Forschungsprojekt zur Leipziger Universität. In: Jahrbuch für Historische Bildungsforschung. 13, Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt 2007, 31-56.

⁴⁶ A. BRUCKNER: Schreibschulen der Diözese Lausanne. Genf: Roto Sadag AG 1967 (Scriptoria medii aevi helvetica. 11), p. 97, footnote 53: Studybooks of Jean Joly, which he copied for himself or procured from fellow students during his stay in Strasbourg in the Franciscan Order's *Studium Generale*, 1456-1458.

⁴⁷ CRUSIUS, DEMOSTHENES (as in footnote 31), 3-5: <3> "Rogauit me Blasius Fabricius: ut sibi orationem aliquam Demosthenis cum interpretatione Ioannis Sturmij darem: <4> Principio uero do eam: quae primo loco apud Demosthenem posita est: eamque do ita, ut neque aliquid Sturmianum dedita opera

Blasius Fabricius asked me to give him an oration by Demosthenes with Johannes Sturm's interpretation [...] truly I reproduce the beginning of that [oration] which is placed in the foremost position in Demosthenes. And I transmit it in such a way that I have left out nothing whatsoever of that which has been put into it, coming from Sturm. Nor have I frivolously added any thoughts of my own. This only proved necessary in those places where I could not keep up in writing along with his lecture. However, I have been so restrained in this matter, that I added nothing unless I believed that he had said it himself. Indeed I expected nothing other than that my writing would serve the Greek language and the students of the Demosthenian teachings. I have therefore added separately that which I had either thought of on my own or what I had heard from others and considered proper to include with this oration: [...]."

In what follows, the individual authors will be considered, and a connection will be drawn to Sturmian pedagogy and didactics, or the *methodus Sturmiانا*. This essay will confine itself to a case study of Crusius's edition of the Virgilian *Bucolics*.

4. Analysis of a scholia collection: Virgil's *Eclogues* according to Crusius and Sturm

Martin Crusius sent explications of Virgil's three *Eclogues* to the Strasbourg publisher Blasius Fabricius Chemnicensis from Memmingen, where Crusius served as director of the Latin school after his time in Strasbourg up until 1559, when he went to Tübingen and, within the same year, was appointed to a professorship in Greek language which he would hold until his death in 1607.⁴⁸ Virgil's *Eclogues* or *Bucolics* are, in the original text, poems comprising 63-111 lines each. There are ten poems, and they contain

praetermiserim: neque facile de meo addiderim: nisi necessarium esset: quod, illo docente, scribendo quaedam assequi non potuissem: Ita tamen ea in re liberatati meae moderatus sum: ut nihil adjicerem: nisi mihi ab ipso dictum esse uideretur. Equidem nihil aliud spectavi: nisi ut graecae linguae, et Demostheneae lectionis studiosis prodessem. Itaque adieci separatim: quae uel ipsi mihi uenis <5> sent in mentem: uel ab alijs etiam animaduersa, facere ad istam orationem putassem:...."

⁴⁸ Literature on Martin Crusius' life and works: see footnote 2.

references to each other.⁴⁹ The poems are herdsmen's songs, each presenting a dialogue between either two or three (mostly young) men as well as a monologue. The fourth *Eclogue* received a Christian interpretation in the early Middle Ages.⁵⁰ Crusius does not discuss this one at all, confining himself to an elucidation of the first three songs. The Latin school pupil in Strasbourg would read the *Bucolics* in accordance with the curriculum, which does not give any indication of exactly how many there are nor cite specific songs by number in the *septima*.⁵¹ The secondary student in Strasbourg would start in the beginners' grade level – the *nona*, or ninth grade. This was not the first of five, as in Zurich, and unlike in Zurich, students worked on reading and writing at first. This is an indication of the fact that the pupils did not come from another school where the vernacular had already been practiced, as in Zurich, but rather were starting school here for the first time. The grade levels progressed up to the *prima* of the Latin school, where mainly rhetorical/dialectical works were read.⁵² In Geneva for example, the *Collegium privatum*, which was affiliated with the academy, comprised seven levels, and students there read the *Bucolics* in the *quinta*, as stated in the school regulations of 1559.⁵³ In Zurich, Virgil's *Eclogues* were read in the third grade level of the five-level Latin school. In all of these newly founded Latin schools, Virgil's *Eclogues* or *Bucolics* were the standard material for Latin learners falling anywhere between beginner's and advanced status.⁵⁴

⁴⁹ MICHAEL VON ALBRECHT: *Vergil: Bucolica - Georgica - Aeneis: eine Einführung*. Heidelberg: Winter 2006, 14-37 (for an introduction to analyses of the 10 *Eclogues*), Text edition: PUBLIUS VERGILIUS MARO: *Bucolica/Hirtengedichte*. Lateinischer Text mit Übers. u. Kommentar v. Michael von Albrecht. Stuttgart: Reclam 2001.

⁵⁰ VON ALBRECHT, introduction to Virgil (as in footnote 49), p. 59.

⁵¹ [JOHANNES STURMIUS:] JEAN STURM: *De literarum ludis recte aperiendis liber / De la bonne manière d'ouvrir des écoles de Lettres*. Facsimile Strasbourg 1538, Strasbourg: Presses Universitaires 2007, p. 61 (fol. 15r).

⁵² Strasbourg grade progression: SCHINDLING, Humanistische Hochschule (as in footnote 4), 178-180.

⁵³ *Leges Academiae Geneuensis*. Geneva: Robert Stephanus 1559, 8v.

⁵⁴ Zurich school regulations: StAZ, E II 476, 5r-16v: school regulations of 1559, contemporary copy from Bullinger's Chronicle. Here: 10v.

The book contains a kind of explication of the first three Virgil texts, but not the texts themselves. The title indicates that these notes on Virgil's *Eclogues* are *Scholia Sturmiiana*, i.e., either Sturmiian notes transcribed under Sturm's tutelage or notes composed by Crusius following the Sturmiian technique. An introduction addressed to the publisher Blasius Fabricius reveals that the latter had urgently requested the first text in particular, which was now being presented.⁵⁵

“So accept this *capriole*, which you have asked me to make off with so many times: I see that it is pleasing to you, as is surely fitting for all that is captured in your groves. Truly, friend, I had thought it would be better for you to receive it from that Daphnid whom you understand and who is known throughout the woods, all the way up to the stars. But because you so wish it, I now send [a work] for whose quality I cannot vouch. I have added two additional ones that were found in the same valley but are smaller. All of these you will be able to enjoy as you wish, if it but please the Daphnid. To that place where I was free of the tasks that now govern me, I will return to the hunt, which I once undertook in the Attic woods and heights. In the meantime may you live content there with these, and fare you well.
Memmingen, the 5th of June 1556 (eight days before the Ides of June).”

⁵⁵ CRUSIUS, *Virgilii Eclogam Sturmiiana* (wie Anm. 1), 1r: MARTI // NVS CRVSIVS BLA== SIO FABRICIO CHEM== NICENSI, S. P. D. // ACCIPE igi== tur capreolum, // quem toties à // me abducere // orasti: Iucun== dum enim tibi // esse uideo, ut // certè debet, quicquid in nemori== bus uestris capitur. Verùm, ami== ce, satius esse putassem: te ab i== pso Daphnide, quem nosti in syl== uis hinc usque ad sydera notum, ac // cipere. Nunc, quia sic uis, mitto, qualiscunque est. Adiunxi duos e== tiam alteros, in eadem ualle reper== tos, <v> tos, sed minores. Quibus omnibus, si modò Daphnidi uidebi== tur, arbitrato tuo frui poteris. V== bi occupationibus, quibus nunc distineor, liberatus fuero: redibo ad uenationem, quam aliquando in Atticis saltibus institueram. Interea hisce uiue contentus, ac uale. Memmingae octauo Idus Iunij. M. D. LVI.

The introduction, like the text itself, does not make any explicit reference to the teachings of Johannes Sturm: if it were not for the title, one could not discern that Sturm is involved at all here. The introduction contains allusions to time spent together in the Attic groves, as seen above, without identifying them more specifically. However, even if one makes the a priori assumption that Crusius is referring here to his time with Johannes Sturm in Strasbourg – who could then be equated with the renowned Daphnid – it still is not entirely clear what form of recording and reproduction gave rise to the scholia.

Since the book contains elucidations oriented around the text, it cannot have been the sole teaching resource used during lessons – the original texts are missing. Their absence becomes quite conspicuous when one takes a close look at the scholia: after the first word of each paragraph, which serves as a lemma, an empty space intervenes in the manner of the classic marginal glosses,⁵⁶ followed by an explanation consisting of a sentence or a few words. The headwords preceding the explanation in Crusius's case suggest that his scholia were bound together with Virgil's original text. When Crusius's text is juxtaposed with a Virgilian original text – in this case, the beginning of the third *Eclogue* in the 1556 Strasbourg edition by Joachim Camerarius – the headwords make sense. The underlining (my own) shows the density of the elucidations:

1. Virgil's text in the 1556 edition by Joachim Camerarius (underlining: ASG)⁵⁷

“ECLOGA TERTIA // PALAEMON. // Menalcas Damoetas Palæmon. //

⁵⁶ Cf. e.g. the school notebook of BEATUS RHENANUS: Cahier d'écolier de Beatus Rhenanus à l'École latine de Sélestat. Sélestat, Bibliothèque Humaniste, Manuscript 50, who read Virgil's *Eclogues* at the Latin school of Sélestat in 1498. Here it can be clearly seen how the manuscript is divided up into the main text, interlinear glosses with word meanings, and sometimes translations, and finally, marginal glosses with headwords in the form described above to elucidate the contents of text passages.

⁵⁷ PUBLIUS VERGILIUS MARO, JOACHIM CAMERARIUS, H. EOBANUS HESSUS: P. Virgilii Maronis Bvcolicorum, post omnes omnium aliorum non contemnenda explicatio, perscripta de commentatione Ioachimi Camerarij Pabepergensis, cum indicatione et interpretatione locorum Theocriti, cuius autor est H. Eobanus Hessus. Strasbourg: Blasius Fabricius 1556, 10 r.

Dic mihi Dameta, cuium pecus? an Melibœi? M // Non, uerum Aegonis, nuper mihi tradi= D. // dit Aegon. // Infelix ô semper ouis pecus, ipse Neæram Me, // Dum fouet, ac ne me sibi præferat illa, ueretur, // Hic alienus ouis custos bis mulget in hora, // Et succus pecori, et lac subducitur agnis. // Parcius ista uiris tamen objicienda memento. Da // Nouimus et qui te, transuersa tuentibus hircis // Et quo, sed faciles Nymphæ rifere, sacello. //”

2. Commentary: Crusius’ scholia (1556):⁵⁸

<33r>“... *Verisimilis est allegorica interpretatio eorum, // qui putant, hic significari contentionem poetarum. // Nam fuerunt tum Mæuij, Bauij, Menalcæ etc. // inuidi ac maligni poetæ. Dic mihi Damœ=// ta)* Obijcit furtum. Theocritus idyll: <[Greek text]> *Virgilius mutauit perso=// nas, quia non est seruus in imitando, ponens pro Batto et Corydone Damætam et Menalcam. Re=// prehendit Horatius <[Greek text]>: ô imita=// tores seruum pecus. etc. Oportet nos togam Ro // manam adhibere in imitando, non interpretes age=// re. Ideo libertatem esse oportet in imitando. Præ=// terea candorem. Ideo retinet personam Aegonis:// sed eo nomine suauius utitur, quia repetit id: Theo=// critus non repetit. Dic mihi) Interrogatio // <[Greek text]>, tu es fur. Cuium pe=// cus)* Benedicitur, ueteres dixiße, cuius, a, um // *Vs autem male continuatum fußet in carmine, // cuius pecus. Nam sic eßet harmonia perturbata. Si // uero fieret <[Greek text]> aliarum dictionum, conce=// deretur, ut in illo: Et si non aliqua nocißes, mor=// tuus eßes: interponitur Mortuus. Sic semper ui=// tanda est eadem terminatio. Illa uarietas habet <[Greek text]> <33v> Tradidit) Ergo non sum furatus.// Est defensio. Damœtas est Virgilius: non statim // irascitur, sed se defendit: quia nondum est aperta // accusatio. Infelix o semper) Inuidus non // potest diu animum suum celare. Lamentatur, sed // ut inuidus: accusat, ut inimicus: ostendit furtum. // Pecori) Oui. Lac) Quo debebant nutriri. // Accusat irridendo: Timet Aegon, ne ego amem // Neæram. Quatuor facit: accusat, conqueritur, // irridet, auget. Parcius ista uiris tamen) // Damœtas incipit eße* □ *νεγκληματικός. Vir=// gilius obseruat decorum hominum simplicium. Nam // Damœtas non defendit se, sed uicißim accusat. Di=// onysius Halicarnaseus bene dicit, optimum eße, ob=// seruare decorum personarum. Ita Damœtas <[Greek text]>. Est <[Greek text]> carmen. Viris) Scilicet prudentia et robore // animi praeditis. Est emphasis. Qui te) Scili=// cet corruerit. Maius crimen. Tu es mollis, es pa=// thicus et cynædus. Grex etiam est testis tui scele=// ris, et uix potuit ferre. Sacello) Auget à // loco.”*

Because of the explicit textual interdependencies, it is quite probable that this supplementary booklet was meant to be published together with a Virgil text, as was the case with Crusius’ edition of the Greek Demosthenes, for example, which – together with a Latin translation by Sturm himself – was placed before the scholia.⁵⁹ A present-

⁵⁸ CRUSIUS, Virgilii Eclogam Sturmiana (as in footnote 1), 33r-v.

⁵⁹ CRUSIUS, Demosthenes (as in footnote 31).

day anonymous handwritten commenter from the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel even believes that this publication could be seen as a supplement to a Sturm publication that was meant for a textbook volume, with an original text and additional commentaries. The book bears Sturm's name in the title (not that of Crusius), but the text by Sturm that should be here is missing. The claim is that the Crusius text would have stepped in to fill this gap, but without its being bound together with the surviving exemplars.⁶⁰ In light of the current state of research knowledge, it is worth asking whether the type of scholia edition described here might have brought with it a pedagogical innovation. At the end of the 15th century, the scholia commentary was still usually taken up *after* reading the text, as a glance at Beatus Rhenanus's school notebook from 1498 reveals. He had also read Virgil's third *Eclogue* in school, among other things. His text consists of three parts on each page: first, the original text by Virgil, written in continuous form; then the interlinear gloss; and finally, the marginal gloss. While the interlinear gloss explicates words with synonyms, the marginal gloss is concerned much more with interpreting the contents of the text.⁶¹ It would already constitute an innovation if it could be demonstrated that the text and commentary were read simultaneously here. This would present the reader with new tasks, mostly having to do with direct text comprehension. Reading a text would then no longer be mainly a matter of appreciating and memorizing the Latin form, but rather of analytical content interpretation. The clues pointing toward such simultaneous reading are the following: (1) There is no break between Crusius's introduction to the entire text of the third *Eclogue*

⁶⁰ The VD 16 catalog has acknowledged this interpretation as the truth. For the fact that both texts were edited together: the Demosthenes, which Crusius had produced using the same procedure two years before, following Sturm's lectures: CRUSIUS, Demosthenes (as in footnote 31) was at any rate planned and executed by Crusius with the original text, as was the Theocritus, which also appeared as Sturmian scholia during the same year (1556), from the same publisher as the *Eclogues* (CRUSIUS, scholia in primum Theocriti Idyllion Sturmiana (as in footnote 30)).

⁶¹ Isabel SUZEAU: "Un extrait inédit du cahier d'écolier de Beatus Rhenanus, ancien élève de l'école latine de Sélestat sous Crato Hofman." In: JAMES HIRSTEIN (Ed.): *Beatus Rhenanus (1485-1547): lecteur et éditeur des textes anciens: actes du colloque international tenu à Strasbourg et à Sélestat du 13 au 15 novembre 1998*. Turnhout: Brepols 2000, 101-118. Cf.: BEATUS RHENANUS, Cahier d'écolier (as in footnote 55). My thanks go to James Hirstein for the reference to the secondary literature.

and his scholia, which follow immediately after it. This lack of separation suggests it is to be read continuously. (2) The scholia are not divided into two sections for word and sentence meanings, respectively; rather, they are organized chronologically according to the place in the text to which the beginning of the quotation refers. Following this reading, we cannot rule out the possibility that the entries/lemmata were read aloud as sentences by the teacher in those places where it was suitable to complement the text, followed by the explanation. This sort of procedure is implied especially by the first scholia, which are very detailed, each one flowing into the next without a thematic break.

5. The *methodus Sturmiانا*

So are these explanations, philologically referring as they do to words and passages in the text and drawing connections between them, comparable with those of the *methodus Sturmiانا*? An analysis of the explanations shows that they are seldom grammatically motivated, but rather motivated by concerns about style and substance: words and ideas are paraphrased in Latin. I would like to illustrate this with a short sentence from one of these explanations:⁶²

“Parcius ista uiris tamen) // *Damœtas incipit εἶπε* □ *πτεγκληματικός*. *Vir*// *gilius obseruat decorum hominum simplicium*. *Nam* // *Damœtas non defendit se, sed uiciβim accusat*. *Di*// *onysius Halicarnaseus bene dicit, optimum εἶπε, ob*// *seruare decorum personarum*.”

Aside from the use of Greek⁶³ – which draws attention to parallels in Greek authors, Greek stylistics, and above all ties to Virgil’s model in Theocritus – there are tips on proper behavior, or *decorum*, in conversational situations. In terms of content, the word

⁶² CRUSIUS, *Virgilio Eclogam Sturmiانا* (as in footnote 1), 33v.

⁶³ My thanks go to James Hirstein for his help in translating individual Greek words, and to Jean Hursize for discussion as to whether Sturm’s Greek lessons may also have contained an active, spoken Greek component.

decorum occurs in the explanation: here it is stated that Virgil shows regard for the dignity of common people by not having the verbally assaulted interlocutor defend himself, but rather strike back with a verbal counter-attack. Véronique Montagne, in her article on Sturmian dialectics in Erythraeus, details how Sturm derived his system for conversational situations from Cicero's *De officiis*, demanding various kinds of *decorum*, a different way of treating one's conversation partner respectfully. It is dependent on the social status of the interlocutor.⁶⁴ Nowhere else does Virgilian exegesis show such a pronounced emphasis on the keyword *decorum*, which Crusius explicitly writes in the margin. There is a tradition of Virgil exegeses, of which I will only mention two examples that originated in close temporal and spatial proximity, in order to place Crusius within this context. Melanchthon's exegesis of Virgil's third *Eclogue* contains no reference to this kind of systematization.⁶⁵ However, the reader does come across it in Beatus Rhenanus's school notebook. He wrote down Virgil's third *Eclogue* together with interlinear and marginal glosses at school in 1498. The marginal gloss alongside the quotation in question reads:⁶⁶ "Tum credo: // Et rustice et naturaliter respondet, // nam non ante purgat obiecta, // sed alia obicit ut irati solent." Here, the answer is assigned both a social classification and – differently – a psychological disposition, and the appropriateness of the speech is judged. This marginal note refers to the domain of *decorum*, without mentioning the term or carrying out further classifications. It would be highly profitable to further pursue *decorum* as an object of interpretation in the works of Sturm, his pupils, and his contemporaries, in order to precisely determine the implications for social behavior that this group of interpreters of classical writings

⁶⁴ MONTAGNE, Jean Sturm et Valentin Erythraeus (as in footnote 17), 501-505.

⁶⁵ PUBLIUS VERGILIUS MARO: P. Vergilii Maronis Poemata quae extant omnia. D. Philippi Melanchthonis scholiis illustrata, adiectis figuris egregie depictis, una in Bucolica, singulis vero in singulos Georgicorum et Aeneidos libros, et doctissimorum virorum scholiis ac annotationibus, partim antehac, partim nunc primum publicatis, ut sequens pagella enumerabit. Zurich: Froschauer 1561, p. 7: "Detractio et est Sarcasmos." (Reference to the abovementioned passage at the beginning of the third *Eclogue*)

⁶⁶ BEATUS RHENANUS: Cahier d'écolier (as in footnote 55), 6v.

ascribed to the art of dialogical conversation.⁶⁷ Thus, in this example, following a short grammatical designation, the subject matter is not interpreted empirically straight out of the text, but with the use of pre-established classifiers. As such, this pinpoint analysis shows the way beyond the interpretation of Anton Schindling, who suspected that the rhetoric lessons were empirically prepared following along with the texts being read. The example shows that such lessons did not proceed purely empirically, free of all preconceptions and preconditions, but made use of established technical terms of a highly classificatory and evaluative character. In light of the observations on form, interpolations of Greek, and *decorum*, further examination of scholia from the time prior to the first major *loci communes* collections from the 1560s to the 1580s in Strasbourg promises to be extraordinarily profitable. Such observations lead us into an area we know little about; they point to classroom practices striking a balance between classical texts and modern conceptualization. The proliferation of scholia in Strasbourg renders it plausible that they were part of the pedagogically motivated *methodus Sturmianae*. In these grade levels, the collecting and organizing of *loci communes* did not play a predominant role in classroom activities over and above these printed lecture scripts. Rather, it was the content of the text that stood in the spotlight, imparting an interpretative/conceptual orientation during the early grade levels. Into the rhetorically, and in particular *dialectically* oriented upper grade levels, pupils then brought with them the didactically derived questions and nuggets of knowledge that had sprung from the lessons in the lower grade levels.

6. Summary of results

This article presents initial results of research into school pedagogy and written language training based on printed Sturmian *scholia* as edited by Martin Crusius. The *scholia* were

⁶⁷ On the art of conversation as a subject in early modern schools, see especially: BARBARA MAHLMANN-BAUER: Catholic and protestant textbooks in elementary Latin conversation. Manuals of religious combat or guide to avoiding conflict? In: EMIDIO CAMPI, SIMONE DE ANGELIS, ANJA-SILVIA GOEING, ANTHONY T. GRAFTON (Eds.): *Scholarly Knowledge. Textbooks in Early Modern Europe*. Geneva: Droz, 2008 (in press).

released in print in Strasbourg in 1556. First, the genre of scholia in general was defined, followed by those of the Strasbourg *Gymnasium* during the 16th century in particular. A description of the scholia linked with the name of headmaster Johannes Sturm then brought together a definite count of eight publications. They stem from Martin Crusius, who had composed *Scholia sturmiana*, and from Johannes Sturm himself. Aside from these eight, those works whose forewords suggest a comparable approach serve as a basis for comparison. They are the scholia of Michael Toxites and Crusius' scholia on Demosthenes, which however do not explicitly refer to Sturm in their titles. In order to begin determining the role such scholia collections played within the school, those of Martin Crusius on Virgil were examined more closely.

Peculiarities at the levels of form and content in the beginning of Virgil's third *Eclogue* delineate some issues with regard to teaching methods in Strasbourg: formally, a tendency toward presenting the commentary in a running form with interpolations of original text was observed. They are preceded by headwords that establish the relevance of the scholium to the text. In terms of content, an explicit reference to notions of *decorum* was noted, and thus to dialectical systematizations found at later points in the curriculum. Since the scholia are lecture scripts, it is quite likely that elements of the classroom activities were captured in them.

Discussing notions of conversational self-conduct at this place in Virgil's *Bucolics* was not unprecedented in the Strasbourg area. In 1498, Beatus Rhenanus had already recorded a similar interpretation by his teacher in his school notebook, which he prepared at the Latin school in Sélestat. But the technical term *decorum*, which Crusius/Sturm worked with, is not included at this place in Beatus Rhenanus's notebook. On the other hand, Philipp Melanchthon – whose works were read in Zurich among other places, as suggested by the book used here– steered his interpretation in a different, more stylistic, direction, not taking the herdsmen's simple milieu into consideration. In the next step, it was found that this text passage attests to an intertwining of the grade levels compared to the Strasbourg dialectics textbooks analyzed by Véronique Montagne, although this intertwining is not addressed in Sturm's curriculum. Thus, the pupils in the lower grade

levels were already working with *loci* or technical terms of communicational ethics woven in at appropriate places, which were then systematized and presented in connection with a philosophical/rhetorical theory in the upper grade levels.

7. Bibliography

7.1 Primary literature

AESCHINES, DEMOSTHENES, JOHANNES STURM: Aeschinis et Demosthenis orationes duae contrariae. Commentariolum Ioannis Sturmij in easdem Hecatommeres. Strasbourg : Rihel, Wendelin d.Ä., 1550.

BEATUS RHENANUS: Cahier d'écolier de Beatus Rhenanus à l'École latine de Sélestat. Sélestat, Bibliotheque Humaniste, Manuscript 50.

DIONYSIUS CATO: Disticha moralis cum scholijs Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami, Nürnberg: Petreius 1535.

DIONYSIUS CATO: Disticha Catonis ethica. Una cum Lemmatibus et praefatione Ioannis Sturmij. Scholia Argentinensibus. Strasbourg: Josias Rihel 1565.

MARTIN CRUSIUS: Martini Crusii Commentariolum in primam Demosthenis Olynthiacam Sturmianum. Eiusdem scholia in eandem, et Epitome ex Diodoro Siculo de statu illorum temporum in Graecia. His addita est conuersio Ioan. Sturmii. Demosthenes. Strasbourg 1554.

MARTIN CRUSIUS: Martini Crusii Scholia in primam secundam, ac tertiam Virgilii Eclogam Sturmiana, Strasbourg 1556.

MARTIN CRUSIUS: Martini Crusii scholia in primum Theocriti Idyllion Sturmiana. Strasbourg 1556.

MARTIN CRUSIUS: Philippi Melanthonis Elementorum Rhetorices Libri duo: Martini Crvsii Qvaestionibus Explicati, in Academia Tybingensi. [Basel: Oporinus] 1563.

MARTIN CRUSIUS: Martini Crvsii Scholia In Poemata & Orationes suas. Basel: Oporinus 1567.

MARTIN CRUSIUS: *Tvrcograeciae Libri Octo: Qvibus Graecorum Status Svb Imperio Turcico, in Politia & Ecclesia, Oeconomia & Scholis, iam inde ab amissa Constantinopoli, ad haec usq[ue] tempora, luculenter describitur.* Basel: Henricpetri [1584].

VALENTINUS ERYTHRAEUS: *Tabulae Partitionum oratoriarum Ciceronis et quatuor dialogorum Jo. Sturmii in easdem. Interpositus est ipse dialogus cum scholiis. Adj. Tullianorum Partitionum comment. Phil. Melanthonis et Jo. Camerarii.* Argent. 1560.

KONRAD GESSNER, CASPAR WOLF: *Conradi Gesneri Tigurini Philosophi et Medici Clarissimi, Physicarum Meditationum, Annotationum & Scholiorum Lib. V. Nunc recens ex variis Gesnerianae diligentiae relictis schedis et libris, studiose collecti, methodice dispositi & conscripti, per Casparvm Wolphivm Tigurinum Medicum.* Zürich: Froschauer 1586.

Leges Academiae Geneuensis. Genf: Robert Stephanus 1559.

PHILIPP MELANCHTHON, MARTIN CRUSIUS: *Philippi Melanthonis Elementorum Rhetorices Libri duo: Martini Crusii Quaestionibus et Scholijs explicati in Academia Tybingensi. Adiectis Aliquot epistolis et Carminibus, a Rhetorico studio non alienis. Item Rerum atque uerborum, toto Opere memorabilium, copioso Indice.* Basel: Oporinus 1574.

PETRUS RAMUS: *Scholae in liberales artes.* Basel 1569.

[JOHANNES STURMIUS:] JEAN STURM: *De literarum ludis recte aperiendis liber / De la bonne manière d'ouvrir des écoles de Lettres.* Facsimile Strasbourg 1538, Strasbourg: Presses Universitaires 2007.

JOHANNES STURMIUS: *In Partitiones oratorias Ciceronis, dialogi IV. ab ipso autore emendati et aucti. Acc. libri II de amissa dicendi ratione etc.* Strasbourg 1539.

JOHANNES STURMIUS: *Poetica sex volumina cum lemmatibus Johannis Sturmii in usum scholarum Argentinensium,* Strasbourg 1565.

JOHANNES STURMIUS: *Partitionum dialecticarum libri IIII,* Strasbourg 1566.

JOHANNES STURMIUS: *Joannis Sturmii Partitionum dialecticarum libri IIII, emendatici et aucti.* Strasbourg: J. Rihelium 1571.

JOHANNES STURMIUS: De imitatione oratoria libri III, cum scholis ej. authoris antequam nunquam ed. Strasbourg 1574.

MICHAEL TOXITES: Scholia Micaeli Toxitae Rheti poetae et comitis Palatini Caesarei, in Theocriti Idyllion primum, ex scholis Ioannis Sturmii. Zürich: Iacobus Gesnerus [1562].

PUBLIUS VERGILIUS MARO, JOACHIM CAMERARIUS, H. EOBANUS HESSUS, JOHANNES STURM, MARTIN CRUSIUS: In P. Vergilii Maronis Bucolica. Ioachimi Camerarii Pabeper. post omnes omnium aliorum non contemnenda explicatio. H. Eobani Hessi indicationes & interpretationes locorum Theocriti. Ioannis Sturmii in priores tres Eclogas commentariolus. (Martini Crusii Scholia in primam secundam, ac tertiam Virgilii Eclogam Sturmiana). Strasbourg 1556.

PUBLIUS VERGILIUS MARO: P. Vergilii Maronis Poemata quae extant omnia. D. Philippi Melanchthonis scholiis illustrata, adiectis figuris egregie depictis, una in Bucolica, singulis vero in singulos Georgicorum et Aeneidos libros, et doctissimorum virorum scholiis ac annotationibus, partim antehac, partim nunc primum publicatis, ut sequens pagella enumerabit. Zürich: Froschauer 1561

PUBLIUS VERGILIUS MARO: Bucolica, Georgica et Aeneis. Pera N. Erythraei restituta etc. additis ejusd. scholiis et ind. cum duplici epistola Frid. Sylburgii. Frankfurt 1583.

PUBLIUS VERGILIUS MARO: Bucolica/Hirtengedichte. Lateinischer Text mit Übers. u. Kommentar v. Michael von Albrecht. Stuttgart: Reclam 2001.

Schulordnung Zürich: StAZ, E II 476, 5r-16v: Schulordnung 1559, Manuskript, zeitgenössische Abschrift aus Bullingers Chronik.

7.2 Secondary literature

MICHAEL VON ALBRECHT: *Vergil: Bucolica - Georgica - Aeneis: eine Einführung*. Heidelberg: Winter 2006.

THOMAS ALLAN BRADY, JR: *Ruling class, regime and Reformation at Strasbourg, 1520-1555*. Leiden: Brill 1978 (Studies in medieval and Reformation thought. 22).

ANN BLAIR: "Student manuscript and the textbook." In: Emidio Campi, Simone De Angelis, Anja-Silvia Goeing, Anthony T. Grafton (Eds.): *Scholarly Knowledge. Textbooks in Early Modern Europe*. Genève: Droz, 2008 (in press).

A. BRUCKNER: *Schreibschulen der Diözese Lausanne*. Genf: Roto Sadag AG 1967 (Scriptoria medii aevi helvetica. 11).

AUGUST BUCK, OTTO HERDING (Hrsg.): *Der Kommentar in der Renaissance*. Bonn-Bad Godesberg 1975.

EMIDIO CAMPI, SIMONE DE ANGELIS, ANJA-SILVIA GOEING, ANTHONY T. GRAFTON (Eds.): *Scholarly Knowledge. Textbooks in Early Modern Europe*. Geneva: Droz, 2008 (in press).

MIRIAM USHER CHRISMAN: *Lay culture, learned culture: books and social change in Strasbourg, 1480-1599*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press 1982

MIRIAM USHER CHRISMAN: *Bibliography of Strasbourg imprints, 1480-1599*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press 1982.

MARIE-JOSÉ DESMET-GOETHALS: „Die Verwendung der Kommentare von Badius-Mancinellus, Erasmus und Corderius in der ‚Disticha Catonis‘“ – Ausgabe von Livinus Crucius, in: AUGUST BUCK, OTTO HERDING (Hrsg.): *Der Kommentar in der Renaissance*. Bonn-Bad Godesberg 1975, 73-88.

LUTZ CLAREN, JOACHIM HUBER: „Rudolf Agricolas Scholien zu Ciceros Rede De lege Manilia: zu Typologie und Verfahren des humanistischen Autorenkommentars.“ In: WILHELM KÜHLMANN (Hrsg.): *Rudolf Agricola: 1444-1485. Protagonist des nordeuropäischen Humanismus, zum 550. Geburtstag*. Bern u.a.: Lang 1994, 147-180.

MICHAEL ERBE (Hrsg.): *Querdenken: Dissens und Toleranz im Wandel der Geschichte. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Hans R. Guggisberg*. Mannheim: Palatium-Verlag 1996.

Festschrift Gustav Binz zum 70. Geburtstag am 16. Januar 1935 von Freunden und Fachgenossen dargebracht. Basel: Schwabe 1935.

RENATE FROHNE: Denkstrukturen und Arbeitstechniken des St. Galler Humanisten Joachim von Watt: etymon vocabuli sequimur: Etymologien und Namenserkklärungen in Vadians Scholien zu Pomponius Mela „De chorographia“. Vervielfältigtes Manuskript, Basel 1522, Trogen: R. Frohne 2004.

ANTHONY GRAFTON, LISA JARDINE: *From Humanism to the Humanities. Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press 1986.

GÜNTER HESS: „Kommentarstruktur und Leser, Das ‚Lob der Torheit‘ des Erasmus von Rotterdam,“ kommentiert von Gerardus Listrius und Sebastian Franck, in: AUGUST BUCK, OTTO HERDING (Hrsg.): *Der Kommentar in der Renaissance*. Bonn-Bad Godesberg 1975, 141-166.

JAMES HIRSTEIN (Ed.): *Beatus Rhenanus (1485-1547): lecteur et éditeur des textes anciens: actes du colloque international tenu à Strasbourg et à Sélestat du 13 au 15 novembre 1998*. Turnhout: Brepols 2000.

FRITZ HUSNER: „Die Handschrift der Scholien des Erasmus von Rotterdam zu den Hieronymusbriefen.“ In: *Festschrift Gustav Binz zum 70. Geburtstag am 16. Januar 1935 von Freunden und Fachgenossen dargebracht*. Basel: Schwabe 1935.

MARIJN DE KROON, MARC LIENHARD (Hrsg.): *Horizons européens de la Réforme en Alsace=Das Elsass und die Reformation im Europa des XVI. Jahrhunderts: mélanges offerts à Jean Rott pour son 65e anniversaire*. Strasbourg: Librairie Istra 1980 (Publications de la Société savante d'Alsace et des régions de l'est. Grandes Publications. 17).

WILHELM KÜHLMANN (Hrsg.): *Rudolf Agricola: 1444-1485. Protagonist des nordeuropäischen Humanismus, zum 550. Geburtstag*. Bern u.a.: Lang 1994.

JÜRGEN LEONHARDT, CLAUDIA SCHINDLER: „Neue Quellen zum Alltag im Hörsaal vor 500 Jahren. Ein Tübinger Forschungsprojekt zur Leipziger Universität.“ In: *Jahrbuch für Historische Bildungsforschung*. 13, Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt 2007, 31-56.

DAVID LINES: *Aristotle's 'Ethics' in the Italian Renaissance (ca. 1300-1650): the universities and the problem of moral education*. Leiden: Brill 2002 (Education and society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance. 13).

CHARLES H. LOHR (Ed.): *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca: versiones Latinae temporis resuscitatarum litterarum*. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog 1990-.

BARBARA MAHLMANN-BAUER: "Catholic and protestant textbooks in elementary Latin conversation. Manuals of religious combat or guide to avoiding conflict?" In: EMIDIO CAMPI, SIMONE DE ANGELIS, ANJA-SILVIA GOEING, ANTHONY T. GRAFTON (Eds.): *Scholarly Knowledge. Textbooks in Early Modern Europe*. Geneva: Droz, 2008 (in press).

JEAN-CLAUDE MARGOLIN: "L'enseignement de la rhétorique à l'Université de Tübingen d'après quelques 'orationes' de Martin Crusius." In: MICHAEL ERBE (Hrsg.): *Querdenken: Dissens und Toleranz im Wandel der Geschichte. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Hans R. Guggisberg*. Mannheim: Palatium-Verlag 1996, 363-376.

JÜRGEN MIETHKE: *Die mittelalterlichen Universitäten und das gesprochene Wort*. München 1990 (Schriften des historischen Kollegs, Vorträge. 23).

VERONIQUE MONTAGNE: "Jean Sturm et Valentin Erythraeus ou l'élaboration méthodique d'une topique dialectique," In: *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 3, 2001, 477-509.

JOHANN JACOB MOSER: „Einleitung,“ in: Martin Crusius: *Schwäbische Chronick*: worinnen zu finden ist, was sich von Erschaffung d. Welt an biß auf d. Jahr 1596 in Schwaben, denen benachbarten Gegenden, auch vieler anderer Orten, zugetragen...; aus d. Lat. übersetzt..., Frankfurt a. Main, Leipzig: Wohler ca. 1777.

ANN MOSS: *Printed Commonplace-Books and the structuring of Renaissance Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1996.

MARETTA D. NIKOLAOU: *Sprache als Welterschliessung und Sprache als Norm. Überlegungen zu R. Agricola und J. Sturm*. Dissertation. Neuried: Hieronymus 1984.

JEAN ROTT: *Investigationes historicae: églises et société au XVIe siècle: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchen- und Sozialgeschichte*. 2 Bde., Strasbourg: Oberlin, 1986.

WILLIAM H. SHERMAN: *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England*.

Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

ANTON SCHINDLING: *Humanistische Hochschule und Freie Reichsstadt. Gymnasium und Akademie in Strassburg 1538-1621*. Wiesbaden: Steiner 1977.

CHARLES SCHMIDT: *La vie et les travaux de Jean Sturm*. Strasbourg 1855.

ERNST SCHWEIKERT: *Zur Überlieferung der Horaz-Scholien*. Paderborn 1915 (Studien Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums - Drerup. 8.1)

LEWIS W. SPITZ, BARBARA SHER TINSLEY: *Johann Sturm on Education*. St. Louis 1995.

ISABEL SUZEAU: "Un extrait inédit du cahier d'écolier de Beatus Rhenanus, ancien élève de l'école latine de Sélestat sous Crato Hofman." In: JAMES HIRSTEIN (Ed.): *Beatus Rhenanus (1485-1547): lecteur et éditeur des textes anciens: actes du colloque international tenu à Strasbourg et à Sélestat du 13 au 15 novembre 1998*. Turnhout: Brepols 2000, 101-118.

BARBARA SHER TINSLEY: "Johann's Sturm's Method for Humanistic Pedagogy." In: *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 20, 1, 1989, 23-40.

ROBERT STUPPERICH: "Melanchthons Proverbien-Kommentare," in: AUGUST BUCK, OTTO HERDING (Hrsg.): *Der Kommentar in der Renaissance*. Bonn-Bad Godesberg 1975, 21-34.

PANAGIOTIS TOUFEXIS: *Das Alphabetum vulgaris linguae graecae des deutschen Humanisten Martin Crusius (1526-1607): ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der gesprochenen griechischen Sprache im 16. Jahrhundert*. Köln: Romiosini, 2005 (Neograeca medii aevi. 8).

CESARE VASOLI: "Ricerca sulle Dialettiche del Cinquecento. III. Sturm, Melantone e il Problema del Metodo." In: *Rivista critica di Storia della Filosofia*, 21, 1966, 123-177.

HANS WIDMANN: „Crusius, Martinus,“ in: Historische Kommission bei der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Hrsg.): *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, Bd. 3, Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1957, 433-434.

THOMAS WILHELMI: *Sonderband Martin Crusius: Handschriftenverzeichnis und Bibliographie*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2002 (Manuscript Catalogs of the Tübingen University Library. 2).

7.3 Websites

KARL KLÜPFEL: “Crusius, Martin,” in: Historische Commission bei der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften (Hrsg.): *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, Bd. 4, Leipzig 1876, 634-635: Website: [http://mdz.bib-bvb.de/digbib/lexika/adb/images/adb004/@ebt-link?target=idmatch\(entityref,adb0040635\)](http://mdz.bib-bvb.de/digbib/lexika/adb/images/adb004/@ebt-link?target=idmatch(entityref,adb0040635))

VD 16: http://bvba2.bib-bvb.de/V/H8TD98MTBFMAIJBAYF1FEGLLBIUC9DJNNMAVTR1L39P1LH8HFU-26995?func=file&file_name=search_vd16