The Bees' Honey:
Remarks on Students as Agents of Knowledge in Renaissance Europe Through the Case of Simon Clüver (1540–1598)*

Valentina Lepri
Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw

Abstract

This article argues that the notebooks produced by students during their stay abroad can become precious documentary evidence of early modern knowledge creation and organization. From the second half of the fifteenth century an unprecedented availability of paper led students to take notes freely on anything they considered useful or interesting for their education and, more generally, for their future. The case study of the notebooks belonging to a student from Danzig who stayed in Wittenberg in the 1560s, will show how the multi-text documents produced by students contribute to a better understanding of both their educational needs and their original reworking of academic knowledge.

Key Words

Knowledge, education, notebooks, paper, early modernity.

Introduction

Early modern studies of knowledge production have traditionally focused on academic teaching to the neglect of students. Although the student does appear in studies on student migration, there is a tendency to investigate young people historically only as learning subjects, able at best to provide indirect information about their teachers, often well-known humanists or scientists. This article's aim is to reverse the viewpoint from the academics to the traveling students. Were the

* This research has been possible thanks to the ERC Consolidator Grant n. 864542, « From East to West, and Back Again: Student Travel and Transcultural Knowledge Production in Renaissance Europe (*c.* 1470–*c.* 1620) ». I wish to thank my colleagues Danilo Facca and Gábor Farkas Kiss for their useful comments and my anonymous reviewers for their valuable suggestions.

students who crossed Europe during the Renaissance to attend the most renowned universities only beneficiaries of academic knowledge, or did they actively participate in its production? Were they mere witnesses to the creation of the knowledge of their time or protagonists too? This article offers some reflections on the subject and the current state of scholarship by presenting a case study focused on a student from Danzig attending the University of Wittenberg in the 1560s.

As consistent as studies on student migration during the Renaissance have been, the phenomenon of migration itself can be grouped into two areas of research. The first focuses on the itineraries of students and on the cultural, socio-political, religious, and economic reasons behind their mobility. Investigations are often nationally based, observing migration along precise north-south, east-west trajectories.[1] The other research area focuses, instead, on the destination of students, reconstructing their academic life in both institutional and informal environments.[2]A common ground of investigation for the studies described so far are enrollment records, programs, and educational reports, in which young travelers are evaluated on a statistical basis and generally considered according to group belonging, such as study disciplines and geographic provenance. Evaluated in numbers and through institutional sources, students clearly appear to be passive subjects in the process of creation and transmission of the study disciplines. Yet if one looks more closely at the surviving archival sources, students too left evidence of their university experience upon completion of their studies.

In the second half of the fifteenth century, some extraordinary historical circumstances profoundly transformed students' habits. During this period, the unprecedented availability of paper allowed individual students to produce a large number of documents. In all European learning institutions since the Middle Ages, academic lectures were prepared by teachers and transcribed by professional copyists into units called *pecie*, from the name of the file obtained by folding a whole parchment into square parts. One of the most studied documents by historians and codicologists, *pecie* were sold to students according to rates set by

[1] See Hilde De Ridder Symoens, « La migration académique des hommes et des idées en Europe », *CRE – Information*, 62/2 (1983), p. 59–80; Jacques Verger, « La *peregrinatio* accademica », in Gian Paolo Brizzi, Jacques Verger (eds.), *Le università dell'Europa. Gli uomini e i luoghi secc. XII–XVIII*, Silvana, Milan 1993, p. 107–135.

[2] Exemplary in this regard are the studies of Cynthia Klestinec focusing on the faculty of medicine at Padua: « Medical Education in Padua: Students, Faculty and Facilities », in Ole Peter Grell, Andrew Cunningham, Jon Arrizabalaga (eds.), *Centres of Medical Excellence? Medical Travel and Education in Europe, 1500–1789*, Ashgate, Farnham 2010, p. 193–220.

the universities within a system that was not revised for centuries.[3] The spread of paper determined the decline of this practice because students, with easy access to this relatively inexpensive medium, could personally transcribe the content of their lessons along with anything else they deemed useful for their future. These documents were their personal notebooks and contained fragments of scientific treatises, letters, poems, speeches, drawings, and more. As one would expect, we rarely find them preserved in the archives of the universities they attended because students took their treasure trove of knowledge home with them. Instead, they abound in the libraries of the places where they spent their later careers, often becoming a tool for their professional activities.

Philologists and historians of literature have illustrated the crisis of the *pecia* and its reverberation in students' lives.[4] In some cases it has been pointed out that the students' notebooks are an x-ray of the literary tastes of their creators, and can be used to better understand the spread of Humanism in Europe.[5] Still, studies of students' opinions of academic disciplines are rare, and even rarer is the attempt to measure a student's contribution to the history of knowledge. In cases where the surviving notes of a particular scientist or thinker have been exploited, predominantly in the fields of the history of science and philosophy, it is to trace his intellectual development. The notebooks of Isaac Newton, John Locke, Francis Bacon, just to name a few well-known examples, contribute to an understanding of the evolution of their thought and doctrines.

Already a decade has passed since Ann Blair, one of the most thoughtful scholars of the phenomenon, asserted that « the history of note-taking has only

---

[3] Jean Destrez, *La pecia dans les manuscrits universitaires du XIII^e^ et du XIV^e^ siècle*, Éditions Jacques Vautrain, Paris 1935; Graham Pollard, « The *pecia* System in the Medieval Universities », in Malcolm Beckwith Parkes, Andrew George Watson (eds.), *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries*, Scolar Press, London 1978, p. 145–161; Giovanna Murano, *Opere diffuse per 'exemplar' e pecia*, Brepols, Turnhout 2005.

[4] Luciano Gargan, « '*Dum eram studens Padue*'. Studenti-copisti a Padova nel Tre e Quattrocento », in *Libri e maestri tra Medioevo e Umanesimo*, Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Umanistici, Messina 2011 (1st ed. 2001), p. 557–577.

[5] Pioneering are the studies of Ludwig Bertalot, « Humanistisches Studienheft eines Nürnberger Scholaren aus Pavia (1460) », in Paul Oskar Kristeller (ed.), *Studien zum italienischen und deutschen Humanismus*, 2 vol., Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 1975, p. 83–161. See also Agostino Sottili, *Studenti tedeschi e Umanesimo italiano nell'Università di Padova durante il Quattrocento*, Antenore, Padua 1971; Annalisa Belloni, *Professori giuristi a Padova nel secolo XV, Profili bio-bibliografici e cattedre*, Klostermann, Frankfurt 1986; Tiziana Pesenti, *Professori e promotori di medicina nello Studio di Padova dal 1405 al 1509*, Lint, Padua 1984; Jürgen Miethke (ed.), *Das Publikum politischer Theorie im 14. Jahrhundert*, Oldenbourg Verlag, München 1992; Vincenzo Colli (ed.), *Juristische Buchproduktion im Mittelalter*, V. Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main 2002 (Studien zur europäischen Rechtsgeschichte, 155); Marie-Dominique Couzinet, *Pierre Ramus et la critique du pédantisme. Philosophie, humanisme et culture scolaire au XVI^e^ siècle*, Honoré Champion, Paris 2015; Fabio Forner, « Le miscellanee universitarie e la loro diffusione oltralpe », *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome - Moyen Âge,* 128/1 (2016), p. 71–83.

begun to be written ».[6] The notebooks produced by students, particularly those crisscrossing Europe, have not yet received the attention that deserve. In recent years, the attention of scholars is gradually focusing on the contribution of Renaissance students working in particular in the archives of the most important institutions of the time.[7] In addition to this, some of the current research focuses on the 17th century, seeing a close methodical relationship between notetaking and the scientific revolution.[8] Although student migrations were intense throughout the 16th century, this period remains largely unexplored, as are the numerous documents of minor figures that abound in archives and libraries.

The law student Simon Clüver (1540–1598) is among them. Three of his notebooks are preserved in the library of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Gdańsk.[9] Produced during his studies at the University of Wittenberg between 1559 and 1565, the notes show several of the young man's interests, some directly related to teaching and others less so. His notebooks are undoubtedly useful sources for the history of culture, but when looking at his notes, his effort at choosing, memorizing, and ordering the transcribed information also emerges. Lessons and fragments of texts are the result of his selection, guided by study interests and curiosity. The information considered most important is also accompanied by notes of various kinds intended to deepen understanding and aid memory. Finally, the notes are given a spatial order on the page and in the collection, which suggests an attempt to build a conceptual hierarchy among the various pieces of transcribed information. In other words, there is a level of original reworking of knowledge waiting to be explored.

I. *A Problem of Method: How to Track Down Notebooks*

The lack of studies on the 16th century around minor figures is a direct consequence of the difficulty in analyzing resources such as students' notebooks. If they have not been taken into consideration thus far, it is mainly because of the problem of unearthing them in the archives and reading them properly.

---

6 Ann Blair, « The Rise of Note-Taking in Early Modern Europe », *Intellectual History Review*, 20/3 (2010), p. 303–316: 316; see also Frederic Lawrence Holmes, Jürgen Renn, Hans-Jorg Rheinberger (eds.), *Reworking the Bench. Research Notebooks in the History of Science*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht 2003; Ursula Klein, « Paper Tools in Experimental Cultures. The Case of Berzelian Formulae », *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 32 (2001), p. 265–312.

7 In this very regard, particularly active is the group of scholars at the University of Louvain, such as Jan Papy, Christoph Geudens, and Raf Van Rooij, with their publications on student notes on logic.

8 Richard Yeo, *Notebooks, English Virtuosi, and Early Modern Science*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 2014.

9 MSS 2182 (1559), 2257 (1563–1564), 2355 (1563–1565).

They are usually multi-text manuscripts, i.e., anthologies originally designed by their creators to contain many texts, among which the lecture notes obviously stand out. In European archives, there is an abundance of miscellaneous manuscripts which, in turn, are made up of independent units. Defined as 'composite' by philologists, they are collections of texts that were gathered at different times. In the case of a student's notebooks this may have happened at the hands of a later possessor, e.g., an heir or collector, or during his lifetime. This is the case of Clüver too. The Gdańsk library preserves six different notebooks that the author probably had personally bound, three relating to his studies, two preserving notes on his later legal activity, and one collecting letters and political and diplomatic speeches.[10]

More frequently, archivists and librarians are the ones who over the course of decades and centuries bind documents of different origin following criteria such as theme, chronology, geographical affinity, or most often, size. Therefore, it is not uncommon for notebooks to be hidden inside macro-collections, or we find them catalogued in a generic and extremely varied way when they have been preserved bound on their own. We can, for example, find them under the name of *silva rerum*, *miscellanea*, *annotationes*, *fragmenta*, *prolegomena philosophica* (or *medicinae*, or *theologiae*), *scripta*, and so on. Being included in larger collections or, when independent, having creative titles, are the main reasons for their inaccessibility and oblivion.

In order to navigate through the varied way in which students' notebooks have been catalogued over the centuries, it is undoubtedly helpful to know that the bibliographical record nearly always indicates the existence of lecture notes within the collection, and often the name of the teacher or the course appears as well.[11] However, the main compass for identifying a notebook in the archives and reconstructing its content in its entirety are its material features and, in particular, the paper on which it is written.

In the second half of the 15th century, the new technology of printing had a domino effect on all those industrial and economic sectors involved in the printing process, giving a boost to various manufacturing activities. One thinks, for example, the growth of the jewellery sector in the service of creating movable type. However, the productive activity enjoying the greatest impetus from typography was that of paper, seen for example in the exponential growth of its effects in the university environment. The paper industry is the constitutive basis for the revolution in students' habits, as they experienced the autonomy to create their own set of knowledge thanks to a sufficiently available and economical

[10] MSS 1756, 1859 and MS 1625.

[11] The first codicological description of the students' notebooks is by Lucia Gualdo Rosa, « Censimento dei codici dell'epistolario di Leonardo Bruni, I », in *Manoscritti delle biblioteche non italiane*, Instituto Storico per il Medio Evo, Rome 1993, p. xvi–xviii.

source. The printed book, especially in the first fifty years after its invention, was not a product accessible to everyone.[12] Moreover, even for the wealthier students who could purchase volumes, it was still useful to transcribe into one's notes only what one considered most important in a text, such as a chapter, a paragraph, or even just a quote of a few words.

Paper was the spark that ignited socio-cultural change in academic communities; however, for researchers today it is also the tool of choice for accurately observing that change. In order to sustain an exploding business, paper mills had to impose rules on themselves and in a European dimension of competition they had to be recognizable. Their product, to use a contemporary term, had to be as traceable as possible. If publishers indicated their own typographic mark on the title page of their books, the paper industry, similarly, impressed a mark on the sheets, which makes it possible to trace the producer and the period in which a certain stock was produced. This is how the use of the watermark was born and spread in the first era of modernity, with the characteristic symbol that every paper mill inserted in the paper changing periodically.

Watermark analysis is a tool commonly used in Renaissance book studies to establish the volumes' place and date of printing, most commonly banned books, where such information is missing.[13] To support this field of research, there are impressive surveys of all the watermarks used in Europe in the early modern period, where each watermark is provided with data on the paper mill that adopted it and the period of its use.[14] For the study of manuscripts, on the other hand, the use of watermarks is still scarce, despite encouraging results of its application. Its usefulness is evident, for example, in the analysis of medieval monastic codices, in the study of some extra-European manuscript traditions, and in reconstructing the chronology of the activity of historical figures, as in the case of the dating of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart's scores.[15]

For the study of students' notebooks, the identification of the watermark has an important double function. On the one hand, it provides information about

[12] See PETER PARSHALL, « Introduction: The Modern Historiography of Early Printmaking », in PETER PARSHALL (ed.), *The Woodcut in Fifteenth-Century Europe*, Yale University Press, New Haven 2009, p. 9–16.

[13] JOHN BIDWELL, « The Study of Paper as Evidence, Artefact and Commodity », in PETER DAVISON (ed.), *The Book Encompassed. Studies in Twentieth-century Bibliography*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1992, p. 69–82; NEIL HARRIS, *Paper and Watermarks as Bibliographical Evidence*, Institut d'Histoire du Livre, Lyon 2017.

[14] CHARLES-MOÏSE BRIQUET, *Les filigranes: dictionnaire historique des marques du papier dès leur apparition vers 1282 jusqu'en 1600*, 4 vol., A. Jullien, Genève 1907; GERHARD PICCARD, *Die Wasserzeichenkartei im Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart*, 17 vol., Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 1961–1997. In this essay I am using the online versions contained in webite *The Bernstein Consortium. The Memory of Paper*.

[15] ALAN TYSON, *Mozart: studies of the Autograph Scores*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA 1987.

where and when the notebooks were made. University lectures are almost always accompanied by details about the place and date of the course, but if the student transcribes other texts, only the dating of the paper guarantees the reconstruction of the notebook in its entirety, that is, the original units and, consequently, the design of its creator. On the other hand, the watermark also becomes a precious compass with which to orient oneself in the archives, since it allows the researcher to find the notebook within larger collections, the already mentioned 'composite' ones. Some might argue that the paleographic evidence of the hand of the writer would alone ensure its identification, but a high risk of including notes in the notebook that the student recorded after his studies, during his professional career and often gathered by his heirs in a single bound volume, would indeed remain. As has been well said, humanism was « among many things, a world of anthologies », and in the vast sea of miscellaneous documents that it originated, the watermark, indicating the same stock of paper produced in a certain area and period, provides objective criteria for bringing the students' notebooks to light.[16]

II. *Sum Simonis Kluveri nec alterius esse volo*[17]

An analysis of the three notebooks that belonged to the jurist Clüver offers an example of the way in which the new knowledge was selected and ordered. The university notes do not concern lectures or treatises on jurisprudence, the field in which he obtained his academic degree. Instead, each notebook corresponds to specific study interests even though the disciplines all fall within the Arts curriculum. As a prelude to higher studies in law, medicine, and theology, the liberal arts derive from the disciplines of the medieval trivium and quadrivium and in the early modern period include, with some variations depending on the university, grammar, rhetoric and dialectic, natural philosophy, arithmetic, geometry (which includes astronomy), and music theory, the latter absent from Clüver's notebooks.

We have very little information regarding Clüver's life other than the fact that he was born in Gdańsk, studied in Wittenberg, and spent most of his career in Nuremberg where he moved in 1586 after traveling through Holland, France, England, Italy, and Hungary. In the university library in Leiden there are traces of his personal book collection, which is there today because of his grandson who resided there and inherited it. Philipp Clüver (1580–1622) was a well-known figure

[16] Armando Petrucci, « From the Unitary Book to the Miscellany», in Charles M. Radding (ed.), *Writers and Readers in Medieval History. Studies in the History of Written Culture*, Yale University Press, New Haven–London 1995, p. 1–18; originally published as « Dal libro unitario al libro miscellaneo », in Andrea Giardina (ed.), *Società romana e impero tardoantico*, vol. IV: *Tradizione dei classici, trasformazioni della cultura*, Laterza, Bari 1986, p. 173–187.

[17] Quotation from MS 2182, fol. 177r.

in his time, as he was considered the founder of historical geography and it is in the studies dedicated to him where some information about his uncle appears as well.[18]

The internal dating that marks the lessons, the indication of the place and in some cases the name of the teachers, and partially also the paper stocks used for the first two notebooks, MSS 2182 and 2257, confirm that the notes date back to his stay at the University of Wittenberg.[19]

I limit myself here to a brief review of their content in order to devote more space to the last notebook because it presents some characteristics that distinguish it from the previous ones. The oldest of the three, MS 2182, is dated 1559 and opens with a transcription by Clüver of the anonymous treatise *Dispositiones rethorice omnis generis epistolarum*.[20] This is followed by Bernhard Brummer's *Argumenta* with an earlier date, 1554. We find then a selection of letters in German of various content, to which are added Latin translations collected under titles such as *preceptoris*, *meum*, *aliter*.[21] An oration follows an oration of Melanchthon held at the University of Wittenberg, and concluding the notebook is an incomplete transcription of Virgil's *Georgics*.[22]

In the second notebook, MS 2257, we move forward a few years because the notes cover the two-year period of 1563–1564, and the content changes to lecture notes on astronomy and geometry as well as material collected directly during the lectures. The first part of it is filled with lectures on geometry and astronomy by Bartholomäus Schönborn (1530–1585), chair of mathematics from 1560.[23] Clüver is one of his students annotating his commentary on the *Theoricæ novæ planetarum* by Georg von Peuerbach (1423–1461), to whom we owe the rise of observational

[18] On Clüver's library HULSHOFF POL, *The First Century of Leiden University Library*, Brill, Leiden 1975.

[19] There are three watermarks in these two notebooks, but only one (in MS 2182) is clearly identifiable in German-made paper from around 1560, see Piccard on line DE9150-PO-25798.

[20] The work occupies fol. 1–176. The text is initially in German with some additions in Latin, then from fol. 43 to 182 it is in Latin only. See EMIL J. POLAK, *Medieval and Renaissance Letter Treatises and Form Letters*, vol. I: *A Census of Manuscripts Found in Part of Europe*, Brill, Leiden 1993, p. 188.

[21] Fol. 177–287.

[22] The text begins on fol. 284r, is entitled « Philippus Melanthon ad auditorium scholae Vuittebergensis a. 1546 de obitu M.D. Lutheri » and is probably taken from *Historia de vita et actis reverendiss. Viri D. Mart. Lutheri 1549*. The last part of the notebook is occupied by « In Georgica Virgilii M. Casparis Crucigeri Vitemberge », also dated 1559. The author is not Caspar Cruciger (1504–1548), secretary and collaborator of Luther, but certainly his homonymous son who since 1557 was professor of poetry at the *Artistenfakultät* of Wittenberg, where he also lectured on the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid and the *De officiis* di Cicerone. See HEINER LÜCK (ed.), *Martin Luther und seine Universität: Vorträge anlässich des 450. Todestages des Reformators*, Böhlau Verlag, Köln–Weimar–Wein 1998.

[23] « Explicatio theoricarum Georgii purbachii tradita a Bartholomeo Schonborn [...] 23 ottobre 1563 ».

astronomy. This is followed by other notes on the same subject and then on Euclidean geometry.[24]

The handwriting in black ink is hasty, notes and titles are instead in red, while several astronomical images complete the text. These images must have been considered insufficient for the student, who integrated them with a series of additional drawings contained in cartouches. The cartouches are inserted in a regular manner in the folders, having a size much smaller than the mirror of the page. In this way the reading of the text is not interrupted by consultation of the image to which it refers.[25]

The last notebook, MS 2355, which the catalog places chronologically almost contemporary to the second (1563–1565), introduces novelties both in its content and in the way it is assembled, that is, in the physical characteristics of the compilation. It turns out that Clüver in the same period in which he devoted himself to geometry and astronomy also annotated lessons on Aristotelian dialectics, became interested in Horace, and practiced the Italian language. These studies, except for Italian, are consistent with the liberal arts program, yet some clues point to Clüver's extra care in selecting and organizing the documents.

This notebook is different from the other two in that there are printed texts, excerpts and complete, which alternate with the handwritten manuscript sections. It is not exceptional that in the students' notebooks there are also printed editions which are equally useful in analyzing the choices of the writer.[26]

In the beginning we find three printed works all of logical-dialectical content: *Compendiosa institutio in universam dialecticam ex Arist[otele] Rivio aliisque auctoribus recentioribus collecta* by Jean Vernerey (1540–1579) printed in Pavia in 1565;[27] then the *Congestum logicum* by Michał Falkener of Wrocław (*c.* 1460–1534) dated 1504;[28] and *Georgii Pachimerij in universam Aristotelis disserendi artem epitomen* translated by Giovanni Battista Rasario (1517–1578). In the last of these volumes, the title page lacks the bottom part containing the colophon, so there is no information about

[24] *Novæ planetarum, id est septem errantium siderum nec non octavi seu firmamenti*. The other notes are entitled « In theorias planetarum Georgii purbachii [...] 1563 » (fol. 138), « Explicatio primi libri Euclidi » (fol. 238), « De numerandis locorum intervallis in lineis rectis brevis tractatus » (fol. 330).

[25] 150 × 170 mm.

[26] On student's notebook made by manuscript and printed texts, see Alicja Bielak, « A Critical and Distracted Student of Medicine Faculty in Padua. Jan Brożek (1585–1652) and his Notebook », *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* (forthcoming).

[27] *Compendiosa institutio in universam dialecticam ex Arist. Rivio aliisque auctoribus recentioribus collecta*, Jean Vernerey, Ercoliano Bartoli, Pavia 1565, in 4°, there are no manuscript notes.

[28] This is the 1504 edition in 4° of the *Congestum logicum* printed in Cracow by Jan Haller (*c.* 1467–1525) and Caspar Hochfeder (d. *c.* 1517). On Michał Falkener (*c.* 1460–1534) and his work, Ludwik Nowak, *Michael Falkener de Vratislavia, Congestum logicum, Introductonium dialecticae*, Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, Warsaw 1990.

the publisher or the place of printing. However, the typographical mark—two hands holding a scepter with two twisted snakes, two flowers, and four ears of corn—reveals that the printer was Thomas Richard (1547–1568), who worked in Paris and published this text four times around the middle of the 16th century.[29] The manuscript notes that follow the printed texts and that contain a detailed commentary on the last of them, the treatise of Georgius Pachymeres (1242–*c.* 1310), are also of Parisian provenance. The author of the commentary is an unidentified Casparus Sagerius, who in a final note informs the reader that he finished the commentary in September 1567 at the Jesuit College in Paris.[30]

After Sagerius' commentary and a few blank pages, a new manuscript part entitled *Porphyrii quinque vocum brevis expositio [per] Cruschium Parisiis* begins, followed by a printed section in Greek, the Porphyrian *Isagoge* (233–*c*. 305), heavily annotated in Latin. As is known, the *Isagoge* of Plotinus' pupil is an introduction to the *Categories* of Aristotle, so it is not surprising to find the printed *Categories* still in Greek and also annotations in Latin, but only in the initial part immediately following the notebook. [31] Looking at the typographical features of fonts, pagination, and ornaments it is clear that *Isagoge* and *Categories* correspond to the same edition and more precisely they are the first 56 pages of a volume of Aristotle's *Organon* printed in Paris in 1562 by Guillaume Morel.[32]

Moving forward in the notebook, handwritten parts and printed sections keep alternating: *In dialecticae aliquot capita expositiones* precedes an edition of *Q. Horatii Flacci epistolarum libri duo*,[33] that contains marginalia written by a hand other than Clüver's. And further still, there are manuscript lecture notes, some *Prolegomena*, namely, an introduction to the poetic art of Horace, with a date in the margin starting on 12 November 1563, and in this case, too, the handwriting is not that of Clüver.[34] The fact that there is another person behind the composition of his notebook should not be alarming, as it was common practice among students to take notes in place of a colleague in return for some favor, such as a period of hospitality in the colleague's home.[35]

---

29 In 1552, 1554, 1555 and in 1558 in4° format.

30 The commentary covers fol. 2–101 and is mentioned in CHARLES H. LOHR, « Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors Pi-Sm », *Renaissance Quarterly*, 33/4 (Winter, 1980), p. 623–734: 706.

31 Fol. 101. This is followed by blank fol. 101v to 112v, while at fol. 113 begins the commentary text on the *Isagoge*.

32 *Organum Aristotelis. Porphyrii isagoge. Aristotelis categoriae; De interpretatione; Analyticorum priorum libr. II; Analyticorum posteriorum libr. II; Topicorum libr. VIII; Elenchorum sophisticorum libr. II*, apud Guillaume Morel, Paris 1562, 4°. In the USTC (154547), besides this one, only 5 other exemplars are censused, but there is a sixth preserved in the State Library of Lucca.

33 The first begins at fol. 187, while the printed at fol. 215. Horace's work is a Lotter edition, printed in Lyptzk in 1512.

34 Fol. 251–257 are blank and precede the « Prolegomena in Horatium de arte poetica », which begin at fol. 258.

35 See GARGAN, « Dum eram studens Padue », p. 565–566.

In the last portion of the notebook, however, his hand returns and the library catalog describes this section as « exercises in the Italian language ». The passages contain various corrections and terminological variants for the same term, suggesting that they are exercises in translation, but the transcribed material also presents an evident orientation towards ethical teaching.[36] These are historical exempla drawn from various classical authors, for example, passages of Cicero's *Epistulae ad familiares*.[37] Compared to the other manuscript parts of the notebook, here a horizontal line divides one topic from another, while a Latin titling in the margin of the page describes the moral and rhetorical content with key words, such as *Patientia*, *Amicitia*, *Eloquentia popularis*, *Sermo brevis et efficax*, etc. These titles are precisely the ones that make it possible to identify the text of the Italian language exercises. In fact, they correspond in a punctual way to the *Apophthegmata* by Erasmus of Rotterdam that, from the first printed version by Froben from 1531 onwards, often have the same graphic layout that includes the use of short titles in the margins to orient the reader. Among these editions is one produced by Johann Gymnich in 1538, a copy of which Clüver owned and which is the exact one currently for sale on the antiquarian market.[38] Clüver's selection of a number of the texts, including this last one, suggests that he traveled to France and Italy taking classes and also collecting specific documents on that occasion, for example the manuals at the beginning of the notebook.

In this regard, the watermark identification allows for the census of four different paper stocks, from which, however, the three printed texts are excluded, since the watermarks are not clearly identifiable. The first recognizable watermark depicts a capital letter B surmounted by a crown and with an inscription underneath. It is French paper produced in Nancy in the 1560s. It appears in the manuscript commentary on the printed text of Pachymeres that precedes it, continues to appear in subsequent blank pages, in the *Porphyrii quinque vocum brevis expositio*, and, surprisingly, also in the printing of *Isagoge* and *Categories*.[39] Since at the time publishers sold the books unbound, the most likely hypothesis is that the person who purchased the folders containing the two printed chapters also purchased a supply of paper that he used for the two manuscript sections preceding the two chapters in the notebook from the printer.

[36] The Italian part starts at fol. 321v.

[37] CICERO, *Letters to Friends, Volume I: Letters 1–113*, ed. and trans. DAVID ROY SHACKLETON BAILEY, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA 2001, p. 256–257, 56 (I.3).

[38] Clüver's exemplar is now in the sale catalog of Asher rare books and the specific issue is *Apophthegmatum libri octo cum primis frugiferi, denuò vigilanter ab ipos recogniti autore, non sine lucro novae accessionis*, Johann Gymnich I, Cologne 1538, 8°. After Froben, Gymnich is the first to publish the text in eight books whereas the *editio princeps* included six. The volume was formerly part of Clüver's books collection stored in the University Library of Leiden, see POL, *The First Century of Leiden University Library*, p. 414.

[39] BRIQUET, *Les Filigranes*, nr. 8078.

The second watermark instead contains an emblem with a scorpion and corresponds to the next manuscript section that begins on page 187 with the *In dialecticae aliquot capita expositiones*. In this case it is German paper produced around 1560 in the area of Küstrin.[40] The same watermark appears in some parts of Clüver's notebook with the earliest date that contains notes on epistolography. The paper used for the *Prolegomena in Horatium de arte poetica* containing the watermark of the head of a jester is dated 1563 and is German too, from Koblenz.[41] Finally, the Italian translation of Erasmus's work is written on Italian paper; the watermark contains the profile of an angel and is made in the decade between 1562 and 1571 in Salo.[42] The three geographical areas of Germany, France, and Italy are confirmed not only by the paper, but also by information contained in the notebook.

In order to have an overview of the selection made by Clüver to compose his notebook, the ten texts reviewed are repeated in a synthetic manner, distinguishing with italics the printed sections from the manuscript ones:

1. *Compendiosa institutio in universam dialecticam ex Arist. Rivio aliisque auctoribus recentioribus collecta*
2. *Congestum logicum*
3. *Georgii pachimerij in universa Aristotelis disserendi artem epitomen*
4. Comment to Pachymeres' work
5. *Porphyrii quinque vocum brevis expositio [per] Cruschium Parisiis*
6. *Isagoge* and *Categories*
7. *In Dialecticae aliquot capita expositiones*
8. *Q. Horatii Flacci epistolarum libri duo*
9. *Prolegomena in Horatium de arte poetica*
10. *Apophthegmata* in Italian

So far, we find four thematic areas arising from this brief overview of ten texts selected by Clüver: logical-dialectical; rhetorical-stylistic, represented by Horace's texts, which is thematically related to the oldest notebook of the three; ontological, based on Aristotle's *Categories* introduced by Porphyry; and ethical-practical, built on *exempla*.

With regard to the Aristotelian manuals that open the notebook, it is striking that Clüver decided to preserve and comment on three exquisite scholastic works of dialectics which were unusual for the academic context of Wittenberg in those

[40] It is the same watermark that also appears in MS 2182, see nota 22.

[41] BRIQUET, *Les Filigranes*, nr.15728.

[42] LEONARDO MAZZOLDI, *Filigrane di cartiere bresciane*, Ateneo di Scienze, Lettere e Arti, Brescia 1990, nr. 147 and BRIQUET, *Les Filigranes*, nr. 622.This watermark lacks a complete definition of its details that would allow a more precise datation.

years. For example, the *Congestum logicum* is a manual based on the works of Peter of Spain devoted to the interpretation of Aristotle's logic.[43] Its author, Falkener, in addition to being a philosopher, theologian, and rector of the Faculty of Arts at the University of Cracow, was indeed a firm Thomist.

If medieval dialectics were focused on refutation, that is, on debate, Renaissance dialectics instead describe an *ars asserendi* that aims to develop and strengthen oratory, that is, the construction of a discourse rich in arguments. Starting from watershed works such as Rudolf Agricola's *De inventione dialectica* (1479), Johannes Sturm's *Partitionum dialecticarum libri* (1539), and Petrus Ramuss' *Dialecticae institutiones* (1543), humanistic manuals on dialectics divide the discipline into theories of *inventio* (which includes *ordo*) and *iudicium*, de facto subordinating the latter to the former. In the second half of the sixteenth century, these kinds of texts were very widespread in Protestant circles, and Wittenberg, the stronghold of the Reformation, was no exception, where Philipp Melanchthon and his followers promoted an anti-scholastic and humanist education.[44]

Despite this, Clüver selected three manuals of dialectics whose main focus was on *iudicium* and on the methods for confutation, and less on *inventio*. He chose to keep for himself treatises that present a medieval approach, the reasons for which one can make several suppositions. A rather trivial one is that he found and collected these works because he was studying far from Wittenberg, as indeed the paper would show. A more intriguing one is the hypothesis that the future lawyer wanted to preserve precisely this type of dialectic because he considered it more useful to the needs of the forum. In court he would certainly have to be able to find arguments and organize them in a topical manner; at the same time, it would also be necessary to be able to refute the opponent's arguments in the hearing.

Isagoge and *Categories*, texts of the so-called medieval *logica vetus*, and which in the geography of the notebook occupy its central part, seem to be the gnoseological framework under which one could ideally order most of the documents. It has a different role than the other printed works in the notebook that expand on aspects of the subject or author in the corresponding notes. Lectures in the form of a commentary on the work Pachymeres, for example, are accompanied by the printed text of the same, and similarly, the epistolary of Horace is added to the lectures on his poetic art.

Instead, the edition of Aristotle in Greek appears as a sort of introduction to the manuals on dialectics in the beginning and a junction between them and the manuscript part that follows, *In dialecticae aliquot capita expositiones*. It is important

[43] On him see Paul W. Knoll, *A Pearl of Powerful Learning: The University of Cracow in the Fifteenth Century*, Brill, Leiden 2016, p. 318–319.

[44] See Lisa Jardine, « Humanism and the Teaching of Logic », in Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, Jan Pinborg (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy from the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100–1600*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge p. 797–807.

to read the manuals in connection with these notes, which, though they do not display the internal dating typical of university lectures, would likely have be a document drafted in the classroom. It is probably a series of lectures held by Abdias Praetorius (1524–1573) teaching at Wittenberg in the 1560s.

The structure of the text organized in questions and answers, as well as some textual correspondences, allow indeed its connection with Praetorius' work *Compendium dialectices praecipua rudimenta continens*, [45] published in 1555 in Magdeburg and again in 1564 in Wittenberg by the printer Johannes Crato (*fl. c.* 1550–1572). Compared to the printed version, the manuscript part of the notebook contains a greater number of Greek terms and the frequent mention of terminology of the astronomical origin, which is like conducting a lecture in person using a reference text to which the teacher or the student adds information. In the current case, the *Compendium dialectices*, in one of the two printed versions, would have served this function. However, the most striking difference between the notebook and Praetorius's printed books are the quotations in the manuscript, where numerous references to Stoic thought on dialectics appear, again marking Clüver's interest in doctrines that were not the center of attention at that time. On the contrary, the study of Stoic dialectic was rather unusual and one has to wait until 1604, with the edition of the *Dialectica Ciceronis* by Adam Burski, to find the first treatment of the topic for educational scope which, in turn, remained a unique case.[46]

The two printed chapters by Porphyry and Aristotle in Greek, on the other hand, fail to clarify Erasmus' presence in the final part of the notebook, and we can only assume that it concludes the notebook in order to cover the ethical practice of education. Overshadowed by the enormous success of the *Adagia*, the *Apophthegmata regum et imperatorum* and the *Apophthegmata Laconica* are both *specula principis*, based on two of Plutarch's works as their main models. Erasmus dedicated his book to the fourteen-year-old William of Cleves, future duke and already dedicatee of *De pueris statim ac liberaliter instituendis*. The text consists of a sequence of ancient lessons followed by a brief explanation of how to apply the example to the contemporary context.

In the dedication letter, it is stated that the choice of this mirrors for princes genre meets the needs of princes who, having little time available for study, require condensed knowledge. Abridgment met with great success in the second half of the sixteenth century and we often find its use in political precepts and *specula principis*. Along with it, however, Erasmus added another reason that the

[45] The section on *definitio* at fol. 197v of the notebook can be compared with page A4r of the volume; similarly on fol. 207 is the title « Liber Secundus De Argumentatione tertia Dialectices parte, id q[ue] praecipue secundum formam eius » which in the volume is on page D2v. I am grateful to Farkas Gábor Kiss who helped me in comparing manuscript and print.

[46] ADAM BURSKI, *Dialectica Ciceronis*, ed. DOROTA PÓŁĆWIARTEK DREMIERRE, Sub Lupa, Warsaw 2020.

genre is most appropriate for students to learn the lessons of moral practice, while also enjoying themselves according to the principle of *miscere utile dulci*. There is evidence that the *Apophthegmata* were used for the education of children and are present in the liberal arts curriculum, but in the context of Clüver's notebook they also have an extra-curricular flavor because they are a partial transcription of the work, and what's more in Italian, certainly uncommon for the university curriculum at Wittenberg.

III. *The Bees and their Honey*

Texts of various genre and topic contained in a student's notebook reveal not only information about the author's biography or the history of his university. The texts themselves become a stimulating ground for an investigation focusing on the dynamic behind their creation and the ordering of one's toolkit of knowledge. In order to understand the logic behind the notebook, one should observe the content of the selected texts, the way they were transcribed (complete or excerpted), their order of succession, their mutual correspondence, as well as quotations, explanations, and comments.

The past few decades of study of Renaissance miscellaneous manuscripts, including those produced by students, has been placing the nature and structure of collections under scrutiny: How should one understand the criterion of text selection and the extent to which it is possible to achieve a more or less coherent system of knowledge? In other words, the scientific book understood as a treatise and a closed product, clearly bounded by premises, digressions, and conclusions, is no longer the exclusive focus of intellectual history. The field of investigation is fruitfully widening to works whose internal structure is not immediately decipherable and whose content seems to have mobile boundaries, not marked by its container, as in the traditional treatise.[47]

To describe the work carried out by students in compiling their notebooks, one should imagine bees flying from flower to flower, a fruitful metaphor adopted by the authors of commonplace books. Employed since classical antiquity, the metaphor has a long history; among its 16th century users we find Erasmus.[48] As students moving from one university to another are reminiscent of the flight of bees from one flower to the next, a closer look at their notebooks reveals not

[47] Domenico De Robertis, « Problemi di filologia delle strutture », in *La critica del testo. Problemi di metodo ed esperienze di lavoro*, Salerno Editrice, Rome 1985, p. 383–401. See in particular Yeo, *Notebooks, English Virtuosi, and Early Modern Science*, and Angus Vine, *Miscellaneous Order. Manuscript Culture and the Early Modern Organization of Knowledge*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2019.

[48] An exhaustive reconstruction of this metaphor's fortune is in Ann Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1996.

pollen but the end product, honey, that is, knowledge tailored to the individual's needs.

If Clüver's probable migration route to academic circles in Germany, France, and perhaps Italy brings to mind the popular metaphor, his notebook is not tout-court a commonplace book. In it there are traces of choices, 'what' a student of the time considered worthy of being remembered, and then the arrangement of his choices; therefore, 'how' he decided to keep the information. The 'what' is not limited to the preference given to a topic, but also includes, as illustrated by the case of the three logic manuals, a specific author, a work, and a certain edition. The 'how', in turn, opens an even wider interpolation because several factors, both internal and external, contribute to influencing the student. Certainly opportunity and curiosity, stimulated respectively by necessity and pleasure, proceed together in their attempt to construct an architecture of the page and the volume, and it is difficult to establish which one prevails over the other. For example, the multilingualism of Clüver's notebooks, where ancient Greek, German, and Italian appear together with Latin, which is predominant, eludes a clear collocation between the useful and the enjoyable. The final section in Italian of the last notebook seems to belong to extra-academic intellectual stimuli.

Among the external influences exerted by the intellectual environment, one can instead point to at least three different macro-models from which a student like Clüver could ideally draw inspiration. For example the consistent production of manuals that provide students with instructions on how to learn methodically should be borne in mind. Erasmus, Juan Luis Vives, and Melanchthon are again among the most influential authors of this didactic genre. In the numerous *De ratione studii* produced in the first decades of the 16th century, a large space is dedicated to techniques for taking notes and the commonplace-book is described as an indispensable tool to support learning.[49] The development of printing and in particular the *mise en page* also played a role. In the printing houses the structure of the book and its parts was being codified. For those students trying to create their book of knowledge, the rearranged layout of the printed page and other various changes exerted a weight.[50]

Overall however, it is the pedagogical model implemented in the university that decisively affected students' work. These students freely creating their

[49] See again Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*, chapter six « Commonplace-Books at School » and Anja-Silvia Goeing, Anthony Grafton, Paul Michel (eds.), *Collectors' Knowledge: What Is Kept, What Is Discarded / Aufbewahren Oder Wegwerfen: Wie Sammler Entscheiden*, Brill, Leiden 2013, especially Anja-Silvia Goeing, « Storing to Know: Konrad Gessner's *De Anima* and the Relationship between Textbooks and Citation Collections in Sixteenth-Century Europe», p. 207–242.

[50] See Karl A. E. Enenkel, Wolfgang Neubne (eds.), *Cognition and the Book: Typologies of Formal Organisation of Knowledge in the Printed Book of the Early Modern Period*, Brill, Leiden 2004.

notebooks were direct witnesses of an intense academic discussion of a theoretical nature around the *ordo* and *methodus* of knowledge, the arrangement and transmission of the disciplines of study. The problem involved all the most important universities of the time, both the centers of a solidly scholastic tradition, such as Padua and Paris, and the schools of Ramist orientation in England and Central Europe, as well as the Reformed universities of the German area, as the university of Luther and Melanchthon attended by Clüver. Debates and intellectual ferment were guided by a general rethinking of the Aristotelian system, until then dominant in the universities, with a common objective to identify simple and effective procedures, applicable to every discipline, for organizing and transmitting knowledge.[51]

Along with the discussion of method, students were also witnessing the rise of humanism as a transformative agent in the university disciplines.[52] Indeed, if the issue of *paideia* in the formation of man had originated in the context of *studia humanitatis* in the fifteenth century, this became a dominant topic of academic debate in the 16th. On the basis of this assessment, the work of the humanists had not been confined to the literary sphere, but rather played a key role in developing modern learning. Humanism extended its influence to the classification of different kinds of knowledge, to the elaboration of the Ramist method adopted in different universities, to the point of carving out a space within the history of science.[53]

In such an articulated scenario that varied depending on the academic environment in which the method was debated, identifying a single model that has influenced the construction of student notebooks makes little sense. Sources of inspiration vary as the context of study changes, including the combination of various systems, if not even ad hoc experimental solutions. In fact, if a student attended several universities, as is often the case, the organization of documents would be inspired by different models such as Ramism, the order developed by Philipp Melanchthon for his theological *Commonplaces* (1521), or the system modeled by Johannes Sturm for his school in Strasbourg.

---

[51] Classical studies are Eugenio Garin, *Educazione in Europa (1400–1600): problemi e programmi*, Laterza, Bari 1957; Neal W. Gilbert, *Renaissance Concepts of Method*, Columbia University Press, New York 1960; Cesare Vasoli, *La dialettica e la retorica dell'Umanesimo. Invenzione e metodo nella cultura del XV e XVI secolo*, Feltrinelli, Milan 1968.

[52] Daniel A. Di Liscia, Eckhard Kessler, Charlotte Methuen (eds.), *Method and Order in Renaissance Philosophy of Nature. The Aristotle Commentary Tradition*, Ashgate, Aldershot 1997, and Howard Hotson, *The Reformation of Common Learning. Post-Ramist Method and the Reception of the New Philosophy, 1618–1670*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2020.

[53] Anthony Grafton, Lisa Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth-and Sixteenth-Century Europe*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA 1986; Anthony Grafton, *Defenders of the Text. The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450–1800*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA 1991.

In Clüver's notes, for example, if we exclude the titling of the *Apophthegmata*, it seems that the system of *loci* left no mark. No part of his notes features a title with a biblical passage and then a descriptive part, yet the system was widely used for teaching at Wittenberg. His notebook also suggests that his author had an interest in a dialectic far removed from humanistic principles and with a focus even on Stoic positions. Not even Ramism seems to have influenced Clüver; tables of synthesis that are often found in the students' notes and that we also find in the printed edition of the *Compendium* of his likely teacher Praetorius are in fact absent from his notebook. In other words, it lacks that process of knowledge visualization that characterizes Ramist thought and underlies its pedagogy.[54]

Yet there is a 'family feeling' present in Clüver's notebooks that links the practices and working methods of Ramism to his notes. The selection and ordering of information always passes through the materiality of the paper on which the student worked by the adding of a printed chapter, handwritten sections, or sometimes inserting a single page or cartouches, as in the notebook containing lessons on astronomy. What appear to be irregularities in the collation actually testify to actions carried out by the creator of the notebook to increase the clarity and organicity of his compendium. It is a type of operation that brings to mind the practice of manipulating the paper, and for the goal of producing and ordering knowledge, at least a couple of well-known examples involving Ramism.[55] In the first French edition of his dialectics, Ramus explained his method with the image of a jar full of pieces of paper containing all the definitions and precepts of a certain discipline to the reader. The purpose of the method is to reorder those papers by giving them their right place: first we look for the general definition of the subject, finding the corresponding sheet, then we extract the sheet from the jar that contains the partition of the subject and put it in the second position, and so on.

Similarly, but many decades later at the Herborn Academy, one of the major representatives of the so-called second wave of Ramist reception in Germany, Johannes Piscator (1546–1625), used pieces of paper to compile his lexicons. In the funeral oration dedicated to him, he is remembered performing the usual operation of putting sheets of paper cut out from printed works together in alphabetical order. In the Ramist tradition, the description of the ordering of knowledge encompasses a material and practical dimension, as sheets containing content are selected and ordered. What differs is the way of grouping the selected sheets, which can be alphabetical, or based on the etymological and linguistic

[54] WALTER J. ONG S. J., *Ramus, Method and the Decay Dialogue*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA 1958, especially the preface to the paper edition (1983). On Ong's text see also the recent volume of HOTSON, *The Reformation of Common Learning*, Chapter 3.3.

[55] Both examples are drawn from HOWARD HOTSON, *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and Its German Ramifications, 1543–1630*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2007, p. 174.

roots of the words, or a combination of them. This last case happens in the *Encyclopaedia* of another exponent of Herborn's circle, Johann Heinrich Alsted (1588–1638), who started with the alphabetical ordering and then bypassed the etymological origin of the words. As fascinating as the parallels between the organizational schemes proposed for commonplace books and those adopted for student notebooks are, a careful analysis of each case is necessary. Clüver's notebook, for example, presents objective obstacles due to the lack of biographical information that would allow one to venture some hypotheses about the reasons for his operations. In other words, if the student is the bee in the classical metaphor, his action does not end with the collection of pollen. The bounty of his selection makes a new product with some specific peculiarities that make it a new genre.

There are also specific features linked to the discipline studied by the student which exert some influence. Clüver was probably thinking about his future legal activity, choosing what seemed to him to be the most suitable for it. It would be interesting to compare his choices with those of other law students of the time, from which it might emerge that recurring texts or structures are present, as one sees in the notebooks of medical students that are the current focus of important studies.[56]

Despite specificities and differences, the operation from which the notebooks arise could be defined using a well-known expression of the micro-level intellectual organization of knowledge employed by Peter Burke to describe precisely the *Commonplace* system.[57] In this case, it is knowledge that is organized with a personal *topica* adopting a system of internal references, but the micro-level also describes something else: it indicates that the notebook was conceived to meet its own needs, but it was also able to mirror the environment in which it is made.

If a key point in the Renaissance university debate was the medieval school system, by then considered inadequate to organize the amount of new knowledge, a series of studies has also demonstrated the *longue durée* of the Aristotelian tradition in the universities of the time.[58] This field of study is still vital and in

[56] MICHAEL STOLBERG, « Medical Note-Taking in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries », in ALBERTO CEVOLINI (ed.), *Forgetting Machines: Knowledge Management Evolution in Early Modern Europe*, Brill, Leiden 2016, p. 243–264 and his « Teaching Anatomy in Post-Vesalian Padua. An Analysis of Student Notes », *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 48 (2018), p. 61–78.

[57] Well-known expression adopted by Peter Burke in his *Social history of Knowledge: From Gutenberg to Diderot*, Polity Press, Cambridge 2000, p. 95–96.

[58] PAUL OSKAR KRISTELLER, *Renaissance Thought and Its Sources*, ed. MICHAEL MOONEY, Columbia University Press, New York 1979; CHARLES B. SCHMITT, *Aristotle and the Renaissance*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA 1983, FERDINAND EDWARD CRANZ, *A Bibliography of Aristotle Editions 1501–1600*, 2nd ed. (with addenda and revisions) CHARLES B. SCHMITT, V. Koerner, Baden-Baden 1984

recent years has focused on the process of vulgarization of Aristotelian works in the Renaissance period and, in general, on the progressive abandonment of Latin in the teaching of university disciplines.[59] This is a double channel of analysis that integrates the textual examination, with its continuous reworking, with the study of the social context in which a translation is made, a field of investigation shared by both intellectual historians and cultural historians.[60]

The notebooks allow us to read all of these phases again through the students' experience of study and life, giving us a testimony of the ways in which the academic content of the different disciplines were understood and reworked through the filter of culture. In other words, if the debate on scholastic tradition, humanism, and teaching reforms is recognized as the breeding ground for the development of new intellectual models for the elites of early modern Europe, then it is precisely the students who offer an opportunity to observe its early impact and empirical dimensions.

Bibliography

Belloni, Annalisa, *Professori giuristi a Padova nel secolo XV, Profili bio-bibliografici e cattedre*, Klostermann, Frankfurt 1986.

Bertalot, Ludwig, « Humanistisches Studienheft eines Nürnberger Scholaren aus Pavia (1460) », in Paul Oskar Kristeller (ed.), *Studien zum italienischen und deutschen Humanismus*, 2 vol., Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 1975, p. 83–161.

Bianchi, Luca, « Per una storia dell'aristotelismo volgare nel Rinascimento: problemi e prospettive di ricercar », *Bruniana & Campanelliana*, 15 (2009), p. 367–385.

(1st ed. 1971); CHARLES H. LOHR, *Latin Aristotle commentaries,* vol. II: *Renaissance authors*, Leo S. Olschki, Florence 1988.

[59] LUCA BIANCHI, « Per una storia dell'aristotelismo volgare nel Rinascimento: problemi e prospettive di ricercar », *Bruniana & Campanelliana*, 15 (2009), p. 367–385, DAVID LINES, « Beyond Latin in Renaissance Philosophy: A Plea for New Critical Perspectives », *Intellectual History Review*, 25/4 (December 2015), p. 373–389; MARCO SGARBI, « Aristotle and the People. Vernacular Philosophy in Renaissance Italy», *Renaissance & Reformation*, 39 (2016), p. 59–109.

[60] See on this PETER BURKE, RONNIE PO-CHIA HSIA (eds.), *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007, p. 7–38.

Bidwell, John, « The Study of Paper as Evidence, Artefact and Commodity », in Peter Davison (ed.), *The Book Encompassed. Studies in Twentieth-century Bibliography*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1992, p. 69–82.

Blair, Ann, « The Rise of Note-Taking in Early Modern Europe », *Intellectual History Review*, 20/3 (2010), p. 303–316.

Briquet, Charles-Moïse, *Les filigranes: dictionnaire historique des marques du papier dès leur apparition vers 1282 jusqu'en 1600*, 4 vol., A. Jullien, Genève 1907.

Burke, Peter, *Social history of Knowledge: From Gutenberg to Diderot*, Polity Press, Cambridge 2000, p. 95–96.

Burke, Peter, Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia (eds.), *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007, p. 7–38.

Burski, Adam, *Dialectica Ciceronis*, ed. Dorota Półćwiartek Dremierre, Sub Lupa, Warsaw 2020.

Cicero, *Letters to Friends*, vol. I: *Letters 1–113*, ed. and trans. david roy shackleton bailey, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA 2001, p. 256–257.

Cranz, Ferdinand Edward, *A Bibliography of Aristotle Editions 1501–1600*, 2nd ed. (with addenda and revisions) Charles b. Schmitt, V. Koerner, Baden-Baden 1984 (1st ed. 1971).

De Ridder Symoens, Hilde, « La migration académique des hommes et des idées en Europe », CRE – Information, 62/2 (1983), p. 59–80.

De Robertis, Domenico, « Problemi di filologia delle strutture », in *La critica del testo. Problemi di metodo ed esperienze di lavoro*, Salerno Editrice, Rome 1985, p. 383–401.

Destrez, Jean, *La pecia dans les manuscrits universitaires du XIII^e^ et du XIV^e^ siècle*, Éditions Jacques Vautrain, Paris 1935.

Di Liscia, Daniel A., Eckhard Kessler, Charlotte Methuen (eds.), *Method and Order in Renaissance Philosophy of Nature. The Aristotle Commentary Tradition*, Ashgate, Aldershot 1997.

Enenkel, Karl A. E., Wolfgang Neubne (eds.), *Cognition and the Book: Typologies of Formal Organisation of Knowledge in the Printed Book of the Early Modern Period*, Brill, Leiden 2004.

Forner, Fabio, « Le miscellanee universitarie e la loro diffusione oltralpe », *Mélanges de l'École françaises de Rome - Moyen Âge*, 128/1 (2016), p. 71–83.

Gargan, Luciano, « '*Dum eram studens Padue*'. Studenti-copisti a Padova nel Tre e Quattrocento », in *Libri e maestri tra Medioevo e Umanesimo*, Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Umanistici, Messina 2011 (1st ed. 2001), p. 557–577.

Garin, Eugenio, *Educazione in Europa (1400–1600): Problemi e programmi*, Laterza, Bari 1957.

Gilbert, Neal W., *Renaissance Concepts of Method*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1960.

Vasoli, Cesare, *La dialettica e la retorica dell'Umanesimo. Invenzione e metodo nella cultura del XV e XVI secolo*, Feltrinelli, Milan 1968.

Goeing, Anja-Silvia, Anthony Grafton, Paul Michel (eds.), *Collectors' Knowledge: What Is Kept, What Is Discarded / Aufbewahren Oder Wegwerfen: Wie Sammler Entscheiden*, Brill, Leiden 2013.

— « Storing to Know: Konrad Gessner's *De Anima* and the Relationship between Textbooks and Citation Collections in Sixteenth-Century Europe », in Anja-Silvia Goeing, Anthony Grafton, Paul Michel (eds.), *Collectors' Knowledge: What Is Kept, What Is Discarded / Aufbewahren Oder Wegwerfen: Wie Sammler Entscheiden*, Brill, Leiden 2013, p. 207–242.

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

Grafton, Anthony, Lisa Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA 1986.

Gualdo Rosa, Lucia, « Censimento dei codici dell'epistolario di Leonardo Bruni, I », in *Manoscritti delle biblioteche non italiane*, Instituto Storico per il Medio Evo, Rome 1993, p. XVI–XVIII.

Harris, Neil, *Paper and Watermarks as Bibliographical Evidence*, Institut d'Histoire du Livre, Lyon 2017.

Holmes, Frederic Lawrence, Jürgen Renn, Hans-Jorg Rheinberger (eds.), *Reworking the Bench. Research Notebooks in the History of Science*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht 2003.

Hotson, Howard, *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and Its German Ramifications, 1543–1630*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2007, p. 174.

— *The Reformation of Common Learning. Post-Ramist Method and the Reception of the New Philosophy, 1618–1670*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2020.

Jardine, Lisa, « Humanism and the Teaching of Logic », in Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, Jan Pinborg (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy from the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100–1600*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge p. 797–807.

Klein, Ursula, « Paper Tools in Experimental Cultures. The Case of Berzelian Formulae », *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 32 (2001), p. 265–312.

Klestinec, Cynthia, « Medical Education in Padua: Students, Faculty and Facilities », in Ole Peter Grell, Andrew Cunningham, Jon Arrizabalaga (eds.), *Centres of Medical Excellence? Medical Travel and Education in Europe, 1500–1789*, Ashgate, Farnham 2010, p. 193–220.

Knoll, Paul W., *A Pearl of Powerful Learning: The University of Cracow in the Fifteenth Century*, Brill, Leiden 2016, p. 318–319.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought and Its Sources*, ed. Michael Mooney, Columbia University Press, New York 1979.

Lines, David, « Beyond Latin in Renaissance Philosophy: A Plea for New Critical Perspectives », *Intellectual History Review*, 25/4 (December 2015), p. 373–389.

Lohr Charles H., « Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors Pi-Sm », *Renaissance Quarterly*, 33/4 (Winter, 1980), p. 623–734.

— *Latin Aristotle Commentaries*, vol. II: *Renaissance Authors*, Leo S. Olschki, Florence 1988.

Lück, Heiner (ed.), *Martin Luther und seine Universität: Vorträge anlässich des 450. Todestages des Reformators*, Böhlau Verlag, Köln–Weimar–Wein 1998.

Mazzoldi, Leonardo, *Filigrane di cartiere bresciane*, Ateneo di Scienze, Lettere e Arti, Brescia 1990.

Moss, Ann, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1996.

Murano, Giovanna, *Opere diffuse per 'exemplar' e pecia*, Turnhout, Brepols 2005.

Nowak, Ludwik, *Michael Falkener de Vratislavia, Congestum logicum, Introductonium dialecticae*, Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, Warsaw 1990.

Ong, Walter J., S. J., Ramus, *Method and the Decay Dialogue*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA 1958.

Parshall, Peter, « Introduction: The Modern Historiography of Early Printmaking », in Id. (ed.), *The Woodcut in Fifteenth-Century Europe,* Yale University Press, New Haven 2009, p. 9–16.

Pesenti, Tiziana, *Professori e promotori di medicina nello Studio di Padova dal 1405 al 1509*, Lint, Padua 1984.

Petrucci, Armando, « From the Unitary Book to the Miscellany», in Charles M. Radding (ed.), *Writers and Readers in Medieval History. Studies in the History of Written Culture,* Yale University Press, New Haven–London 1995, p. 1–18; originally published as « Dal libro unitario al libro miscellaneo », in Andrea Giardina (ed.), *Società romana e impero tardoantico*, vol. IV: *Tradizione dei classici, trasformazioni della cultura*, Laterza, Bari 1986, p. 173–187.

Piccard, Gerhard, *Die Wasserzeichenkartei im Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart*, 17 vol., Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 1961–1997.

Pol, Hulshoff, *The First Century of Leiden University Library*, Brill, Leiden 1975.

Polak, Emil J., *Medieval and Renaissance Letter Treatises and Form Letters*, vol. I: *A Census of Manuscripts Found in Part of Europe*, Brill, Leiden 1993.

Pollard, Graham, « The *pecia* System in the Medieval Universities », in Malcolm Beckwith Parkes, Andrew George Watson (eds.), *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries*, Scolar Press, London 1978, p. 145–161.

Schmitt, Charles B., *Aristotle and the Renaissance*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1983.

Sgarbi, Marco, « Aristotle and the People. Vernacular Philosophy in Renaissance Italy », *Renaissance & Reformation*, 39 (2016), p. 59–109.

Stolberg, Michael, « Medical Note-Taking in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries », in Alberto Cevolini (ed.), *Forgetting Machines: Knowledge Management Evolution in Early Modern Europe*, Brill, Leiden 2016, p. 243–264.

Stolberg, Michael, « Teaching Anatomy in Post-Vesalian Padua. An Analysis of Student Notes », *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 48 (2018), p. 61–78.

Tyson, Alan, *Mozart: Studies of the Autograph Scores*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA 1987.

Verger, Jacques, « La *peregrinatio accademica* », in Gian Paolo Brizzi, Jacques Verger (eds.), *Le università dell'Europa. Gli uomini e i luoghi secc. XII–XVIII*, Silvana, Milan 1993, p. 107–135.

Vine, Angus, *Miscellaneous Order. Manuscript Culture and the Early Modern Organization of Knowledge*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2019.

Yeo, Richard, *Notebooks, English Virtuosi, and Early Modern Science*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 2014.