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Lectures on Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*

The Class Notes of a 16th-Century Paris Schoolboy

BY ANN M. BLAIR

The history of education, of its changing goals and methods, materials and social contexts, offers a fascinating study at the intersection of intellectual, social and institutional history. In setting the context for and then analyzing an unusual source recently acquired by the Rare Books Division of the Princeton University Library, I hope to recapture something of the experience of a Paris schoolboy in 1570–1571, as he took notes in class on his teacher’s discussion of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, Book I.

Some aspects of Renaissance education, in 16th-century Paris in particular, are already well known. The humanist project, however elusive of precise definition, characteristically involved educational reforms at the preparatory level emphasizing grammar and rhetoric in the ancient languages at the expense of the once predominant logic. At the University of Paris, the collèges, which had served since the Middle Ages to provide elementary education in grammar (and financial support when necessary) to students in the arts faculty, proved an ideal breeding ground for the new propædeutic curricula. From the late 15th century the collèges began to offer their own teaching, notably in the humanistic fields. This development was officially

---

1 I would like to thank Professor Anthony T. Grafton for suggesting and seeing me through this project. I am grateful to Lisa Jardine, Carol Quillen and Nancy Sarris for helpful advice, and to Stephen Ferguson of the Princeton University Library for making it possible in the first place.

2 Ovid, *Metamorphosen liber primus cui doctissima Lactantii accesserunt argumenta, cum annotationibus Longilii longe utilissimis* (Paris: Denys du Pré, 1570). Princeton Ex PN173.R56. All references to this work will be made by folio number only, with “r” for recto and “v” for verso.


4 A few of the best known collèges were also allowed to teach philosophy and the
sanctioned by the university in 1594 when grammar teachers were finally granted the full privileges of university membership.\textsuperscript{5}

The humanist educational theory first developed in the private schools of Italy, such as that of Guarino of Verona, was transmitted to Northern Europe primarily by the writings of Erasmus, the internationally renowned Dutch humanist.\textsuperscript{6} In France, Guillaume Budé helped the spread of humanist ideals not only through his writings but also through his position as counsellor to King Francis I. Despite personal tensions between Budé and Erasmus, both worked to undermine the old Scholastic university program by changing the curriculum at the source of university recruitment, the schools.\textsuperscript{7} The collège thus became the crucial locus of humanist reform and as such gained a prominence of its own, providing what we would call a secondary education between the small and little-known elementary schools and the arts faculty of the university on which it increasingly encroached.

As Greek instruction was introduced only gradually to the Paris collèges after about 1550, the primary goal of the humanist curriculum at the collège was to impart the linguistic and cultural knowledge required for a mastery of Latin eloquence. In returning to the ancient manuals of grammar and rhetoric of Cicero and Quintilian, and assigning only purely classical texts, the educators intended to “steep” the child “in a cultural discipline derived from the ancient world” which he would then share with an international community of well-educated men and women.\textsuperscript{8} In the Erasmian program typical of Northern humanism this education in “humane letters” was intended to be an education in virtue as well, and the child’s behavior could indeed be carefully monitored given the development of boarding facilities at the collèges beginning late in the 15th century.\textsuperscript{9} According to Erasmus this acquisition of classical culture was a necessary part of the education of a good Christian.\textsuperscript{10}

Many collèges, especially in the provinces, left records of their regulations and assigned curricula,\textsuperscript{11} and these archives have been the major source exploited by historians for writing the history of education in the collèges. From these sources we learn for example that the early 16th century saw the introduction of successive and clearly delineated classes (ordines), varying in number from collège to collège, but regularly covering certain material with pupils of a given level and age.\textsuperscript{12} Most collèges had at least six classes devoted to grammar before the final or “first” class, which studied rhetoric. Pupils were not generally accepted under age ten and probably progressed normally through the ranks in five to seven years.\textsuperscript{13} Although essential for institutional history, these sources are limited in what they can tell us about what actually happened in the classroom. Regulations are often repeated precisely because what they condemn is common practice; on the other hand, they can also be kept on the books long after the conditions they describe have lost their significance. Official curricula may not in fact be adopted by individual teachers, and when they are, teachers, then as now, struggle and often fail to finish them in the time allotted.

There is a different kind of source, however, that takes us more directly into the classroom and has recently begun to be explored: the collection (sammelband) of printed school texts with student annotations. Such sources are rarely extant, given the constant use to which they were subjected, and conversely many of those which survive are not consistently annotated. The Princeton Library is thus especially fortunate to own two excellent examples of this genre.\textsuperscript{14}

---

\textsuperscript{5} McConica, “The Fate of Erasmian Humanism,” p. 47.
\textsuperscript{6} Codina Mir, Aux sources de la pédagogie, p. 77. On the diversity of sources that he used see his p. xvi.
\textsuperscript{7} On the novelty of this concept, see Codina Mir, Aux sources de la pédagogie, pp. 99-100.
\textsuperscript{8} On the difficulty of preventing pupils, especially of noble or royal families, from entering before age ten, see Gustave Dupont-Ferrier, Du Collège de Clermont au Lycée Louis-le-Grand, 3 vols. (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1921-1925), Vol. 1, p. 68.
\textsuperscript{9} The other one (Princeton Ex PA 616x026, 1550), carefully annotated by a student in the classes of the Ramist lecturer Claude Mignault, has been studied by Anthony T. Grafton, “Recent Acquisitions,” Princeton University Library Chronicle, Vol. 41, No. 1 (Autumn 1979), pp. 75-78, which includes a reproduction of one page; and “Teacher, Text and Pupil in the Renaissance Class-Room: A Case Study from a Parisian College,”

\textsuperscript{10} Codina Mir, Aux sources de la pédagogie, pp. 55-56.
\textsuperscript{11} McConica, “The Fate of Erasmian Humanism,” p. 41.
\textsuperscript{12} Codina Mir, Aux sources de la pédagogie, pp. 56-59.
particular the most recently acquired volume far surpasses most in the diligence and clarity with which its student owner maintained it. Bound together in one volume are 14 separate works printed in Paris between 1551 and 1570, predominantly by Denys du Pré and Thomas Brumen, who specialized in school editions: Ringelberg, Rhetorica; a compendium of Quintilian’s Institutio oratoria, Books II, III, and V; Cicero, De optimo genere oratorum, Pro M. Marcello oratio, In M. Antonium Philippica nona, Pro lege Manilia, Pro Q. Ligario, and Post reditum in Senatu oratio; Ovid, Metamorphoses I, and selected Elegies; Virgil Aeneid II; L. Florus, De gestis Romanorum IV; Pliny the Younger, De vivis illustribus; and a compendium of Jean Despautère’s De syllaburum quantitate. All but Cicero’s Pro Marcello are annotated by the same student owner, in the margins and on additional interleaved folios.

This volume is a model of its genre. Interleaved irregularly throughout the volume are blank pages, of a heavier weight than the paper used by the printer, especially designed to carry student notes. Each page, whether blank or printed, has been painstakingly ruled in red to mark off the space reserved for annotations; the annotations themselves, usually in an italic hand, are regular and legible, without an ink blotch and with hardly any words crossed out. At the bottom of many pages the notes taper elegantly in a V or end with a pen flourish. One can still detect a certain familiar student weariness in places: As the task wore on, the regularity of the hand and of the ink pressure sometimes deteriorated; or, facing a deadline, teacher and student failed to finish a text — the notes thus stop abruptly, even in mid-sentence, before the end of the text. In some places our student paused to add a subscription, a favorite saying or amusing proverb, often in French. In these moments of relaxed attention, especially when writing in the vernacular, his hand often shifted to a different style, a more characteristically French cursive, less elegant and less legible to us. This is also the hand in which he wrote his interlinear paraphrase in the poetic texts, which must have been taken down in great haste. This French cursive thus seems to be the style of comfort for this particular boy, which he used when necessary under time pressure or when taking a break from careful work. On the other hand he used the italic cursive for his flourishes and frontispiece, as well as for most marginal notes, which were probably copied over from the notes he had taken directly in class, possibly in the French cursive.

Our student was one Pierre Guyon. His name appears on the binding, on the handmade “frontispiece” to the collection and more or less fancifully throughout the volume. Pierre Guyon tells us nothing about himself, although we can assume that he came from a well-to-do family. The volume is bound in French calf, while other school notebooks were often merely bound in cured skin, and is personalized with a gilt engraving of his name and his two favorite mottoes, which are repeated amid the notes as well: in labore quies or en labeur mon repas (in work is my rest) and virescit vulnere virtus (courage grows with the wound). Both are expressions of worthy sentiments known to have been adopted as personal devices by noble families and high clergy in France and Britain. Although all the collèges admitted a

---

18 For more on the interlinear paraphrase, see below.
9 I deduce that the student copied over his notes at leisure after class because of the fairly frequent instances of tapered paragraphs, which require knowing in advance the precise number of words to arrange. There are some marginal annotations in what I have called the French cursive, in texts where there are very few annotations altogether (Cicero’s De optimo genere oratorum, Ovid’s Elegies and Despautère’s De quantitate) and at the beginning of two heavily annotated works, Cicero’s Post reditum in Senatu and the Aeneid. In the latter two cases the hand turns to italic after a few pages. These French cursive notes still seem to have been copied over after class, since they also display occasional tapering.
20 See for example the other collections of annotated school texts in the Princeton Library mentioned in note 14.
21 These mottoes are reported in Henri Taisson, Dictionnaire des devises ecclésiastiques (Paris: Émile Lechevalier, 1907), pp. 91, 222; and in Laurent Uredar et al., Mottoes (Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Co., 1986), pp. 155, 430 and 812. In labore quies was the motto of Robert, cardinal de Lenoncourt and bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne, Metz,

few poor scholarship students, most pupils paid their way. The best-
studied of the Paris collèges, the Collège de Clermont, for example,
catered primarily to children of the nobility and the bourgeoisie,
more than half of whom came from the Paris area. As the young
Guyon did not become notable enough to be included in any bi-
ographical dictionaries, who he was, where he came from and what
he subsequently did with his education can unfortunately only be matter
for speculation at this point.

Dates at least are fairly certain, since the annotations themselves
provide them at regular intervals. Guyon began this class in 1570,
according to the opening subscription. One other text, Cicero’s Post
reditum in senatu oratio, was annotated in 1570, while Cicero’s Philippi-
ca nona seems to have been read over the year break, as its open-
ing subscription is dated 1570 and its closing annotation was made in
1571. All of the other dated texts were read in 1571; in particular
Guyon finished, “praise be to the Lord,” Ringelberg’s Rhétorica on
May 8, Cicero’s Pro lege Manilia on May 14 and the Aeneid Book II on
June 1, 1571. Without knowing whether some texts were read con-
currently with others, and if so which ones, any conclusions about the
actual progress of the course are tenuous. Indeed although the
school year in Paris generally began on October 8, the day of Saint
Rémy, the pupils did not always spend what we would consider a
full academic year in the same class.

Guyon specifies in two places that he was in the third class at the
Collège de Lisieux in Paris under the regent Louis Godebert of Pi-

Embrun and archbishop of Arles, who died in 1561 (Tausin, p. 94). Virtus salutia virtus was used by Antoine Duprat, chancellor of France under Francis I, archbishop of Sens and bishop of Albi and Meaux, who died in 1535 (Tausin p. 292). The alliterative phrase was quoted by Nonius Marcellus from the Annals of the Roman poet Furius Antias and was also the motto of a number of British noble families, for example of David Count of Mansfield (1573-1628) (Udang et al., Mottoes, p. 135, 182). On the theory of devices in this period and their use, especially by the nobility, for expressing “permanent or temporary personae,” see Daniel S. Russell, The Emblem and Device in France (Lexington, Kentucky: French Forum, 1985), for example p. 74. Since they are so widespread, these expressions do not seem to be identifiable with a particular family or geographical region that could shed light on Pierre Guyon.

"Finito libro sit laus [sic] et gloria Christo."


cardy. We know that at Clermont the sixth and lowest class was devoted to the study of Latin declensions, the fifth to tenses and the fourth to syntax so that the task of the third class was to “perfect” this knowledge of grammar and to begin the study of “quantity” or scansion. The second class was then devoted to poetry and the first and final class to rhetoric. Although none of the specific Latin texts assigned at Clermont to implement the grammatical lessons of the third class are identical with Guyon’s list, the presence of Despauvère’s standard manual on quantity suggests that the basic curriculum for the third class may have been similar at Lisieux. It focused on works of prose to be studied “grammatically,” but also introduced the material of the second class in exposing the pupils to what was probably their first taste of Latin poetry, Ovid and Virgil, and further announced the curriculum of the final class by presenting Ringelberg’s textbook on rhetoric.

We know nothing about Louis Godebert except that Guyon’s notes were taken in his class, presumably under some form of dictation. According to what is known about common practice at the collège,

Godebert probably held class for two hours each morning and afternoon. Most of the session would have been devoted to his praelection, or commentary on the assigned text and its author, on which the students took notes like Guyon’s. The students would be responsible for reciting this material when quizzed by their peers or masters either during quasiones at the end of class, or in the reparationes common at mealtime, or at the beginning of the next class in the exercise of redditio. Although the curriculum also included exercises in oral and written composition, it was the praelectiones which transmitted the elements of classical Latinity and ancient culture considered necessary to achieve eloquence. Beyond the knowledge itself considered essential to an understanding of a given text, the master’s commentary also transmitted tacit assumptions and conclusions about the nature of an ancient text and the kind of approach considered appropriate in this period. Thanks to the Princeton collection we can see in the case of Ovid’s Metamorphoses Book I, among others, precisely what kind of commentary was copied and studied with such diligence, although many questions about the practical, physical and social setting of these lessons still cannot be answered.

In addition to the prominent status in Latin literature which Ovid’s works retain today, “no Latin poet was more familiar to the reading public of Renaissance France, or better loved, than Ovid.” Indeed the 16th-century editions of Ovid numbered more than 300, while his closest competitors, Horace and Virgil, were the object of approximately 90 and 100 editions respectively. The Metamorphoses were the best-known and most admired of Ovid’s works. They did not incur moral strictures as Ovid’s love poetry did, and offered, in addition to the classical lore common also to the Fasti for example, some discussions of deeper topics such as the origin and nature of the world, particularly in Books I and XV. In fact these first and last,
more philosophical, books of the Metamorphoses are, along with the speeches of Ajax and Ulysses excerpted from Book XIII, the only ones to be printed separately, specifically for use in schools, during the French Renaissance. This preference for passages presenting the classical account of the creation of the world in Book I or the speech of Pythagoras in Book XV attests to the fact that Ovid was studied not only for his poetic abilities, but was especially valued as a source for ancient philosophy, a basic knowledge of which was required as part of the classical culture that was to be mastered in the humanist school curriculum.

As the first part of a work on changes in the natural world, Book I of the Metamorphoses begins with the changes involved in the creation of the world from chaos, the appearance of the four elements and of man. After describing how Jupiter in anger turned the impious Lycaon into a wolf and caused the destruction of all men save two by a flood, the book then tells of the repopulation of the earth by the stones that Deucalion and Pyrrha, the two survivors, threw over their shoulders. In these passages Ovid addresses issues central to ancient philosophers from the Pre-Socratics on. The book then ends with the stories of Daphne, Io and Argus which are more characteristic of the rest of the work.

Already in Antiquity the Metamorphoses were read for their descriptions of nature and appreciated for their causal accounts of change. Heavy use of passages from Ovid is evident in most Medieval encyclopedias from Isidore of Seville to Vincent of Beauvais, while more specialized works on topics in natural history and natural philosophy in the 12th and 13th centuries, for example by Albertus Magnus and John Saccrosbosc, have also been shown to quote from Ovid. The most common presentation of the Metamorphoses in the Middle Ages, however, stressed its moral, not its natural lessons. The genre of Pierre Bérenger’s Ovide moralisé, popular in the vernacular as well as in Latin, provided for each fable, summarized rather than quoted from Ovid’s text, a number of different allegorical interpretations, each with a clear moral message.

Some early 16th-century commentators, like the Lyonnais Dominican Peter Lavinius, continued in Bersuire’s vein to use allegory for drawing morals from the Metamorphoses, in particular by establishing parallels with the Old Testament. For example, in Lavinius’ analysis Deucalion represents Noah, who also founded a new race as sole survivor from the old race. Lavinius approached the pagan text as a Christian commentator, applying to the Metamorphoses the same rules of exegesis as he did to the Bible. Other commentators, influenced rather by the humanist movement, like Raphael Regius in the late 15th century, abandoned the allegorical and typological approaches in favor of a study which focused more on the text itself and strove to encapsulate all ancient knowledge, as well as some moral conclusions of relevance to contemporaries.

Until the 1530s most editions of the Metamorphoses included a printed commentary which often dwindled the text, confining it to a small section at the center of the page. Amid this profusion, re-editions of Bersuire’s Ovide moralisé coexisted alongside editions which sported commentaries by both Regius and Lavinius, or those of Regius supplemented by annotations of lesser-known humanist commentators such as Micyllus. Although there are clear differences between the approaches of Lavinius and Regius, the “schools” they represented were not so sharply opposed that a single reader could not find both approaches interesting at the same time. On the contrary it seems that publishers welcomed the accumulation of different commentaries in one edition; the more commentators they could boast on the title page, the better.

By the 1530s, however, publishers had discovered the new and delightfully stable market of college students whose teachers preferred to use plain editions of the text to which they would add their own oral commentary in class. Although some of Ovid’s lesser-known works were still the object of printed commentary, no editions of the Metamorphoses with full commentary were published in France after

---

35 See Moss, Ovid in Renaissance France, pp. 66-79. The speeches of Ajax and Ulysses are among the texts in the Princeton Manuscript Ex 2897.302.092, for example.
36 Daphne was turned into a tree when she asked to be saved from the hot pursuit of Apollo; I o was turned into a heifer after Jupiter had taken her as his lover and was finally restored to her original nymph form once Argus, her many-eyed guardian, had been turned into a harmless peacock.
37 Including Hrabanus Maurus, Alexander Neckham, Hugh of Saint Victor, Thomas de Cantimpré and Brunetto Latini, for example.
38 Simone Vairre, La surse d'Ovide dans la littérature scientifique des XIIe et XIIIe siècles (Poitiers: Centre d’Études Supérieures de Civilisation Médiévale, 1966).
39 See Moss, Ovid in Renaissance France, pp. 23-27.
41 Moss, Ovid in Renaissance France, pp. 29-30.
By the late 16th century the editions of the *Metamorphoses*, almost exclusively designed for school children, had evolved again, to include specially expurgated editions favored by Jesuit teachers, and "rhetorical" editions which emphasized variant readings and figures of speech.43 The edition provided to Guyon, possibly on the basis of an order placed with the publisher by Godebert,44 is characteristic of the middle phase of the 16th century. The text is complete; in fact, it includes two additional lines which are not retained in modern editions.45 It is also quite plain; although the title page proclaims that the text includes the "most learned arguments of Lactantius" and annotations by Longolius which are "by far the most useful," these actually amount to very little. Every few pages the poem is interrupted by a paragraph of prose attributed, probably spuriously, to the late-Antique Christian writer Lactantius, which summarizes the coming section. These are consistently ignored, as Godebert provides his own summaries of the poem at the beginning of new sections, often repetitive of the printed ones.

Longolius, an influential French humanist of the early 16th century,46 provides terse printed comments in the margin which are similarly both ignored and reproduced. Frequently offering in a single word the topic of a particular passage, these notes are useful first of all for finding one's place in a text which otherwise is rarely demarcated. They also address, although much more briefly, many of the same concerns as Godebert's notes: the type of argument used, for example *a consequentibus* (f. 4v); Greek terms and quotations of relevance as parallels to or sources for the Latin text; comparisons with other Latin authors. Longolius calls attention to metre as well, noting a *spondaticus*, for example (f. 4v). Guyon does not seem to have paid any attention to these notes, often duplicating their content in the margin in a fuller form with no reference to them.

What Pierre Guyon and his classmates would learn from their reading of Ovid, indeed what they would learn to imitate as the proper method of commentary on an ancient text, was thus entirely dependent on how master Godebert had them fill their margins.

As was common practice,47 Godebert probably began his lessons on Ovid and other poets by providing a word-by-word paraphrase of each verse. Guyon has written above each word of the printed text a Latin alternative, simple synonym or more complex paraphrase, in a minuscule hand.48 French was generally forbidden in all aspects of college life, including meals, and use of the vernacular entailed well-determined punishment.49 Latin was taught primarily in Latin, at least, we can be sure, by the time a student reached this advanced level.50 The paraphrase was thus no doubt in part designed to insure that the pupil understood the text word by word, although unusual terms such as *lucus* or *muscus* would also be explained in more detail in the margin.51 But the exercise, which provided synonyms for simple as well as difficult words (indeed often offering more unusual words to "explain" obvious ones), can also be understood as training for the student's writing skills, teaching him to vary his vocabulary and to serve as his own thesaurus.52

44 Moss, *Ovid in Renaissance France*, pp. 49-51.
46 Between lines 547 and 548: "Quae fecit ut laeder, mutando perde figuram"; and between the middle of line 700 and the middle of line 701: "... tibi nubere nympha volens! Votis cede dei... ."
48 For the first line "In nova corpora / Hert / animus / mutatus / dicere / Formas" the paraphrase runs: "in novas effigies et species / ididerat / mens / mea / convertas / explicare, ididerat / figurarum et imaginum, cum rerum fata personarum." (f. 1v.)
49 Cf. *muscus*, f. 8v (for the complete passage, see note 57), and *lucus* on the interleaved folio facing f. 6r: "Luce: lucus proprio significat sylvam ... in qua quoniam sol minime lucaret, et antefrasim lucus nominatur." (Lucus properly denotes a forest or grove to which, because very little sun shines [lucaret] through, the name lucus was given by antithesis.)
50 From the ink patterns on a few pages annotated in red rather than the usual brown ink, it seems that the class did not annotate the text line-by-line or sentence-by-sentence immediately after paraphrasing it. Rather the paraphrase would run ahead over about 18 lines before the class returned to comment in detail on the lines they had just covered. In other words when Guyon picked up his red ink, the first passage he paraphrased was 18 lines ahead of the first word he commented on in the margin, and similarly when he returned to brown ink a few pages later, the paraphrase "turned brown" 18 lines before the commentary did (ff. 5-7). In the last few pages of the text,
The commentary was clearly the focus of the lesson. The higher faculties at the university had long since developed a tradition of textual commentary which usually involved an overall discussion of the author, his work and its literary genre, an analysis of specific words and expressions of interest for their origin, meaning or rhetorical nature, comparison with other passages in the canon of ancient literature and finally "moral and philosophical conclusions." This format was easily adapted to the curriculum of the collèges and indeed by mid-century had become the hallmark of the modus parisiensis.53 Within this broad outline, Godebert could turn for ideas on the content of his comments to the printed commentaries available since the beginning of the century and reprinted in later editions, although not in France. The most important of these were the commentaries by Lavinus and Regius mentioned above.

Godebert's commentary follows the text closely. Guyon has usually lightly crossed out each word or phrase to be discussed in the margin.54 Unlike Lavinus, whose commentary begins with a broad and abstract discussion of different creation accounts, Godebert's notes focus on specifics. Although Godebert rarely copies him exactly, Regius seems his most likely model. As Regius does, Godebert comments on individual words, figures of speech, strategies of argument or contextual and philosophical details relevant to a particular expression or passage. Each comment constitutes a self-contained bit of information which Godebert does not attempt to relate to a broader discussion of the text of any particular area of knowledge. The text thus serves less as an object of study for its own sake than as the occasion for the transmission of whatever facts about the ancient world can be associated with it to enhance the student's mastery of classical culture. The comments range from the traditional trivium of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic, to facts of geography, classical literature or mythology, and natural science.

Godebert's first task is to explain unusual terms and expressions.

---

53 Codex Mir, Aux sources de la pédagogie, p. 119.
54 This practice is particularly helpful when reading the notes over after they have been written down, especially since Guyon's marginal notes do not always run in parallel with the text. For example the notes on f. 83r apply to the text on f. 10r.
For *cornua Phoebe* (the horns of the moon), Guyon has written: “Diana or the moon is called Phoebe after the name of her brother Phoebus, that is the sun, as its waxes and wanes each month in its circle its extremities are called horns because of their appearance and resemblance [to horns] and for this reason the Egyptians are accustomed to offer a cow in sacrifice to the moon, which they worship by the name of Isis.” In geography, in a gloss of the “Nabathean kingdom,” Goyon learns that Ovid “defines the oriental region by the places that surround it, as both the Persian and the Nabathean kingdoms neighbor it, and from that part of the sky in which the sun begins to appear. Indeed Nabat was the son of Ishmael who moved to this region with his eleven brothers and inhabited it, whence it is called Nabatea as Josephus writes in the Antiquities of the Jews.” The lessons in natural history include a description of *muscus*, or moss, as “a humble herb with small leaves which usually grows in humid and watery places and has a heavy odor.”

Godebert occasionally ventures an etymology. *Caetum*, or sky, is “that region of the world which is above the four elements and is called *coelum* either because it is covered (*celata*) with planets and stars as if with gems, or because it is concave, indeed the Greeks say *koilos* for concave, or because it hides (*celet*) and contains all things here below.” This interest in widening the student’s classical vocabulary is probably what should be considered “grammatical” about the curriculum. Godebert never discusses concrete issues of grammatical agreement or syntax, nor does scansion make an appearance even in the form of marks over the verses. The “perfection of grammar” to which the third class was in principle devoted was clearly more sophisticated than the term might initially suggest to us.

Although rhetoric was the specific assignment only of the most advanced class of the *collège*, Godebert and his colleagues teaching the lower classes were clearly attentive to training their students from early on to recognize figures of speech. Godebert regularly calls attention to synecdoches, metonymies, periphrasis, and cases of proso-popoeia without further ado, as if the students were already familiar with these terms. On the other hand, Godebert defines *hypallage* as he points to the semantic inversion of the first verse, as well as hyperbole, which must have been new to the pupils. More elaborately, Godebert explains why Ovid’s description of the silver age as “worse than” the golden age is an improper use of terms: “This is a catachresis. For the comparison is made with the golden age which was quite devoid of wickedness; thus when he says ‘worse’ he means ‘less excellent.’” Godebert also points to a “short anakephaleosis, that is a summary of all those things that he [Ovid] has presented generally until now on the distinction of chaos into the four elements.” Although most of the figures of speech that Godebert mentions appear in Regius’ commentary, these last two do not.

Godebert ventures further into the art of persuasion, discussing the strategies of Ovid’s arguments and occasionally borrowing a term from dialectic, as if to foreshadow the student’s future classes. Thus

56 "Cornua Phoebe: Diana sive luna de nomine fratris sui Phoebi, id est solis Phoebe dicta est, haerere unoque mense in circulum crescare atque decrescere consuevit eius vero extremitates o speciem eumque simuladinem cornua sunt appellata et idcirco Aegyptii vaccam in sacrificiis et aferre solent Isidis nomine collentes." (f. 4v.) Regius also tells of this Egyptian custom.


58 "Squealabent musco: muscus est herba humidis exiguorum foliorum quae in locis humidis et aquosis nasci solet, cuius gravis est odor." (Interleafed folio facing f. 8v.)

59 "Coelum: Ea mundi regio quae quatuor elementa super est eminens coelum vocatur, vel quia syderibus et stellis tantum gennmis celata sit, vel quia sit concava, graeci enim koilos concavum vocant vel quia haec omnia inferiorea cele et continent." (f. 2r.)

60 "Nova corpora: Hipallage id est Oratio inverso rerum ordine complexa, naturalis enim ordo postulat ut ut dicetur corpora in novas formas mutata sint." (f. 2r.)

61 Goyon writes “hiperbore” the first time (f. 5v.), although he later spells it “hiperbole” (f. 8v).

62 "Deterior: Catachresis fit enim comparatio cuius una tamen omnis nequitiae expris fuit, itaque, cum deteriorem dict minus praestantem significavit." (Interleafed folio facing f. 5r.)

63 "Sic ubi elogistam: Breviss est anakephaleosis, id est complexio eorum omnium quam haec adversus generatorem de distinctione chaos, in quatuor elementa proculit." (First interleafed folio facing f. 3r.)

64 The relationship of rhetoric and dialectic in this period is well known to be laden with tensions and ambiguities. Although different humanists sought to emphasize the importance of one or the other field, dialectic in principle dealt with modes of reasoning, in particular syllogisms, while rhetoric described and taught to emulate ancient tactics in persuasion. Godebert is concerned here with the latter project, although his remark about Ovid’s “argument from effects” is evidence for the introduction of once strictly dialectical terms into rhetorical analysis. For more on dialectic in this period see Wilhelm Risse, *Die Logik der Rhetorik* 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Friedrich Fromm, 1984). On the place and context of rhetoric see Kees Meerhoff, *Rhetorique et politique au XVIe siècle en France* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986), and articles in Peter Sharratt, ed., *French Renaissance Studies 1540-1570* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1976).
Ovid's conclusion that the invention of shipping was the greatest evil of the iron age rests on an "argument from effects," Guyon writes.64 Godebert also comments that "Ovid exaggerates the unhappy and miserable condition of the iron age and that war raged at this time among men, to which the love of gold above all inflamed them."65 Likewise by describing dolphins swimming amid the forests, Godebert notes that Ovid "exaggerates the calamity of the flood with respect to the transformation of nature; indeed dolphins usually live in the water, not in forests."66

Finally, Godebert remarks that Ovid's details in the description of his metamorphoses serve to make them more believable. Thus Ovid "describes the true metamorphosis and transformation of Daphne into a laurel tree by adding the distribution of the different parts of her body which changed into the parts of the tree."67 Similarly "in order to make the transformation into men of the stones thrown by Deucalion and Pyrrha more probable, [Ovid] explains by name the way in which all the parts of the stones were changed into other similar parts, thus the humid and earthy parts into flesh, the harder and more solid parts into bones."68 Godebert presents these detailed descriptions by Ovid as a tactic in persuasion.

These different types of commentary reveal how Godebert's teaching was embedded in a curriculum focused on grammar, rhetoric and, in later classes, dialectic—a system in which Godebert himself had presumably been trained.69 The "grammatical" and rhetorical comments in particular were virtually de rigueur for any pedagogical presentation in this period and indeed remain so today. But the Metamorphoses were not simply studied for what they added to a student's range of vocabulary and of figures of speech. Ovid's text offered if not direct cultural information about the ancient world, then at least a wealth of opportunities for Godebert to improve his pupils' knowledge of ancient culture with his own digressions and additions. The tone of these philosophical and contextual comments varies. Sometimes Godebert sounds thoroughly detached, even alienated, from the ancient beliefs he describes, as in the case of religious beliefs in particular; at other times Godebert presents the tenets of classical natural philosophy without clearly distinguishing whether they are to be understood merely as glosses on Ovid's cultural background or as true statements about the world, or as both.

Godebert's contextual notes attempt to place Ovid in ancient thought or literature by comparing him with other authors. In his introductory paragraph about the author and his work, Godebert reveals not only what he believes to be the source of Ovid's work, but also one of the sources of his own commentary. Copying almost directly from a printed commentary by Micilus, a minor figure who added annotations to those of Regius in a 1565 edition of the Metamorphoses from Venice,70 Godebert had his pupils write: "As Virgil followed Homer, Hesiod and Theocritus, and Horace followed Pindar, thus here also Ovid followed the ancient Greek Parthenius Scius [Parthenius of Chios] who had earlier written a work with this same argument.71"

70 "Quo quidem opere exemplum Parthenii Chii poetae imitatus dictit, qui idem argumentum iam antea Graeco poema tractasse furtur. Sic et Virgilii, Homeri, Hesiodum et Theocritum: Horatii Pindarum: Valerii Apollonium itemque aliis imitati sunt." Ovid, Metamorphoseon libri XV. . . Regio epistola . . . cum novis Jacobi Micilii . . . additionibus (Venice: Gryphius, 1565), in "Jacobi Micilii annotatio" facing p. 1. Although Micilus' commentary was never printed in France, the similarity is so striking as to suggest a direct borrowing. The collèges indeed maintained libraries not only for their students, but also for their teachers and researchers which, at their largest perhaps, at Clermont, could reach 18,000 volumes by the late 16th century. See Dupont-Ferrier, Du collège de Clermont, p. 199.

71 "Ut Virgilii Homerum, Hesiodum, Teocritum [sic] et Horatii Pindarum, ita hic quoque Ovidii Parthenii Sciei Graecum poetan clarissimum qui eiusdem argumenti opus antea contextuerat imitatus [sic] est his quodcumque libris." (Folio facing f. 2r.) The poet in question is no doubt Parthenius, born in Nicea in the first century B.C. and author of a work entitled Metamorphoses which like his other works is extant only in fragments. He is thought to have influenced Cornelius Gallus and Virgil, with no mention of Ovid in this context, however (Der Kleine Pauly). Godebert makes no further reference to him in his commentary.
After finding Ovid a respectable Greek antecedent, Godebert notes ancient thinkers who corroborate many of the specifics of his account and generally rounds off his student's classical culture by mentioning any other relevant ancient source. He comments for example that Ovid “attributes the creation of the whole world to God as first author, which he calls excellent nature here and which Plato called ‘spirit,’ an opinion Virgil followed in Aeneid VI” from which Godebert then quotes. Likewise Ovid’s portrayal of the evils of the iron age is confirmed by Horace who also sees in the construction of ships the cause of great evil. Godebert turns for confirmation of Ovid’s description of the unevenness of the weather in the iron age to Hippocrates: The poet “calls the autumns unequal because of the inconstant nature now of summer, now of winter, between which autumn is placed, and in addition because it is clear that sometimes the fall is contracted in cold and other times it is dissipated in heat, which Hippocrates writes in Aphorisms III determines the outcome of many illnesses.”

On the origin of agriculture and domesticity, Godebert points to some controversy. Thus Virgil said that Ceres first taught men agriculture, while Tibullus claimed that Osiris had. Similarly Godebert notes a dispute concerning the origin of houses: “Because of the excessive inclemency of the weather during the silver age men were forced to build houses so that they could be safe from its attacks; in any case there is a controversy over the period in which this first started, indeed many historians, among whom Eutropius, write that when Saturn came to Italy from Greece, he taught those uncivilized populations to build houses and cultivate the land, while before then they had lived in caves and huts thatched with leaves and branches.”

I have found none of these exact discussions in earlier commentators, although both Lavinius and Regius frequently refer to other ancient writers. These are the contributions most likely to be Godebert’s own.

The tone of these comments is entirely matter-of-fact, as Godebert himself does not take positions on Ovid’s statements, but merely infuses his pupil of what “the poet says” and of what others have said on the same subject. Godebert offers much of his summary of Ovid’s text in a similar spirit, with the sole concern of clarifying the meaning of the text and no interest in its intrinsic truth-value. It is thus with detachment that Godebert explains, for example, under the rubric of Peneus the river-god, that “the Ancients believed that some divinity lived in the rivers and for this reason worshipped them religiously.” Similarly Godebert notes that “it was established by custom among the Ancients that before sacrificing to the gods they would wash themselves with water and would thus believe themselves to be cleansed of all vices and guilt.” This is no doubt useful information for understanding the text, but it is presented with a clear awareness.

Prima Ceres ferro mortales vertere terram instituit. Attamen Tibullus id adscribit Osiris tioris filio egyptiisque regi his versibus: Primus aratra manu solerit fecti Osiris/ Et teneram ferro sollicitavit humum.” (Interleaved folio facing f. 5r.) The quote from Virgil is from Georgias i, line 147 (Loeb edition pp. 90-91). The quote from Tibullus is from Elegies i.7 lines 29-30, as in Albini Tibullus, Carmina libri tres, ed. Chr. G. Heynus (Hildesheim: Olms, 1972), p. 89.

“Et glacies astrica tum primum: Tempore aetatis argentea propem aemiraris aeminentiam coacti fuerunt homines domos aedificare ut a talibus interius securi esse possent: caeterum quo in tempore primum incepter est controversia, multim enim historiographi, inter quos est Eutropius scribunt Saturnum cum in Italiadem et Graciae vnesisset, rudi illi populos rationem Domorum aedificanda cum terraeque colla ducisset cum ante ipsi in speluncis et caulis ex frondibusque velugtisque [sic for vigiltique] contextis habitaret.” (Interleaved folio facing f. 5r.)

“Nunem habitat: Antiqui existimabanti aliquod nomen inesse fluminibus et idcirco ea religioso colabant.” (Interleaved folio facing f. 1r.)

“Inde ubi libato: In more posito erat, apud Antiquos, us priusquam diis sacrificarent aquis esse abluerent quibus omnia sua vita et crimina detegi et obliterari credebant.” (Interleaved folio facing f. 8v.)
of the distance separating an alien ancient world from the world he shared with his pupils.

When Godebert glosses Ovid's statements about the natural world, the object again is to impart information helpful for understanding this and other ancient texts, but in these discussions Godebert is ambiguous as to whether what is true about ancient philosophy also applies to his own time. In his introductory comments Godebert called "Ovid, especially in this first book, not only a poet, but also a philosopher who treats accurately what the ancient philosophers reported in their writings about the first origin of the world, the distinction of the elements, the division of the ages and the arrangement of the world by its creator." Ovid was clearly valued in the collège curriculum as a source for understanding the ancient view of the natural world. Godebert thus follows through Ovid's account of the creation of order from chaos and of the four elements with their different and conflicting qualities as descriptive of the beliefs of the Ancients which must become part of the cultural background of his pupils.

At times, however, Godebert adds a commentary that goes beyond a mere gloss and seems to involve his own beliefs about the natural world. After Ovid's description of the elements and their different qualities Godebert notes: "The earth is the heaviest body. For this reason it occupies the center of the whole world, which is the lowest place of all since it is the furthest removed from the sky in all directions, and because of this the earth is never moved from this position, otherwise it would climb up, which its nature forbids since it would move closer to the sky."

Godebert often presents Ovid's account of the creation as if it were thoroughly reconcilable with his own Christian perspective and therefore true as an objective description of the world. By the late Middle Ages Ovid had already become such a familiar figure for Christian commentators that many no longer struggled with the strangeness of his paganism. Indeed Godebert easily attributes much of Ovid's account to divine providence, a concept that does not appear in the text of the Metamorphoses. Thus for Godebert, Ovid's description of the formation of beings out of chaos is an illustration of the work of divine providence. Or, when Ovid remarks that it is a wonder that the winds which are so powerful do not tear the world apart, Godebert interprets Ovid's rather fearful statements as a praise of God: "The poet praises divine providence thanks to whose arrangement the winds are constituted in different and opposite parts of the air, so that they will not by chance come together and with most powerful gusts blow over the whole world."

In many cases Godebert finds what Ovid says about nature to be true and to correspond with his own beliefs. Where Ovid threatens to contradict other well-established ancient beliefs or Godebert's own Christian views, the pupil is told how the situation should be resolved. In one instance for example, Ovid seems to say that water is the heaviest element, whereas earlier he had said that earth was. Following Regius' commentary here, Godebert explains at some length (and Guyon has noted the passage with a pointing finger in the margin) that "at first view Ovid could seem here to assign the third place among the elements to earth, which however occupies the last place because of its being the heaviest element, but if the matter is examined closely, it will easily appear from Ovid's own words that the third place is given to water, which, says the earth touches on all points of its surface." On the other hand Godebert saved the poet from what might have seemed an embarrassing contradiction; on the other hand he also chose to reconcile Ovid with Aristotelian physics and physics.

79 "In hoc autem potissimum primo libro Ovidius non modo Poetam sed Philosophum quoque agit, accurate enim tractat ex quae ab antiquis Philosophis de primo mundi origine elementorum distinctione, atatu divisione actores denique orbis Ornatu literis prodita fuerunt." (Folio facing f. 2r.)

80 "Nec circonciso: Terra quoniam corpus est gravissimum. Idcirco totius orbis centrum occupat, qui locus est omnium Infimus quoniam unidine ac caelo remississimus est, a quo terra ob eam Causam nunquam movetur aliqui enim ascendere quod natura sua plane repugnat cum propius accederet ac caelum." (F. 2v.)

81 See Allen, The Friar as Critic, p. 87.

82 "Vix ita limitibus discreverat: Secundum metamorphosim id est transformationem explicat ad creationem animalium spectantem cum enim Del providentia omnia elementa inter se distinctissent et unicumque quod naturae erat accommodatum attribuisset postea certis animalium formatis ac Imaginibus eadem exornavit." (f. 3r.)

83 "...vix nunc obstiuir illis [ventis]/ Cum sua quique regant diverso flamino tractu,/ Quin tamen mundum; tanta est discordia fratrum." Ovid, Metamorphoses 1, lines 58-60; in the Loeb edition (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1944), pp. 5-7.

84 "Hic quoque: Divinam providentiam Poeta commendat cuius consilio venti diversi atque oppositis partibus aeris sunt constituti, ne si forte una consent [sic for coeisent] vehementissimis flatusius totam mundi machinam versisses." (Second interleaved folio facing f. 2v.)

85 "Ultima possedit: Videri posset his primo obtinui sive aspectu tertium locum inter elementa terra assignasse, quae tamen prae sua greatate ultimam occuparem sed si exacte res inspiceratur facile apparebit ex verbis Ovidii tertium locum aquae trahit quam dicit terra extremam superficiem omni ex parte contingere." (First interleaved folio facing f. 3r.)
probably also his own beliefs, according to which earth is the heaviest element.

In another instance Godebert took a sharper stand against Ovid’s contradictions both of himself and of what Godebert believed to be the truth. When Ovid offers two accounts for the origin of man, one Promethean and the other divine, Godebert does not try to reconcile them but rather determines that one is true, the other false. Ovid’s story that Prometheus created man from earth and water and gave him a soul from the fire in the sky is “a fable and full of error,” Godebert concludes, while Ovid’s other account, which attributes the creation of man to “God, the author of all things, is certainly in accord with the truth which the Holy Scriptures confirm and prove.”

On certain important issues a mere gloss of the ancient author’s thought cannot suffice without a final judgment of its veracity, even by the grammar master.

While basic religious tenets such as the origin of man constituted precisely the kind of issue on which Godebert felt he had to point out Ovid’s errors, Ovid’s statements about the natural world did not receive such careful attention. It is not surprising that Godebert should note that the earth must reside in the center of the world, without so much as mentioning the Copernican theory (given the impenetrable technicality of Copernicus’ work to a grammar master like Godebert), and the absence of general discussion of a work published less than 30 years earlier is to be expected. What is more startling, however, is the simplicity with which Godebert repeats after Ovid and Ptolomy that “the body of the earth is divided into five parts according to the latitude and longitude, which cosmographers call regions or zones, of all of which the middle one cannot be inhabited by men because of the excessive heat of the sun and therefore is called torrid.”

While Godebert quite reasonably also repeats that the arctic zones are deserted because they are too cold, his comment about the torrid zone betrays a remarkable ignorance of, or in any case a failure to appreciate the significance of, the much better publicized discovery of the New World and its inhabitants nearly 80 years earlier. On this point knowledge of the ancient commonplace about the natural world was all that Godebert sought to convey, without any reference to additional information on the question.

The kind of commentary that Godebert taught his pupil to consider appropriate was a mix of new and old. Some of Godebert’s comments displayed the detached analytical gaze of the humanist whose purpose was to understand the ancient world in full, with its rivers, gods and sacrifices, as a great but alien world. Others drew on the tradition of medieval commentary which by the 16th century could fit Ovid’s account into a Christian setting by introducing divine providence into Ovid’s explanations. Above all, Godebert’s commentary was designed for a curriculum which stressed a mastery of classical Latin and a broad knowledge of ancient culture. Whenever they were vaguely relevant Godebert added references to other ancient texts and expanded on the philosophical beliefs of the ancients, at times adding opinions of his own which seem to hold beyond the level of textual explanation.

Godebert derived the content of his commentary largely from the printed commentaries of Regius and others like Micilus who shared his approach. Godebert follows the text closely, as they did, and reproduces some of their specific remarks, such as Micilus’ account of Ovid’s Greek antecedents or Regius’ discussion of the relative heaviness of water and earth. Godebert probably drew on other sources as well.

---

86 “De rerum natura, libri octo: Quoniam statim post discreta atque separata quatuor elementa, homo orbis cultor et habitator factus est, hic duplicem eius traditionem, unam quae a Deo summo rerum omnium auctor promanavit, quae prorsus cum veritate est consentanea, quam etiam sacrae scripturae probat atque confirmat, alteram quae a Prometeo profluxit qui ex terra atque aqua fluviis aspira hominem ad Dei imaginem prius effinisse et deinde recto igne et caelo illi animam inidisse fertur quae habet et errores plane.” (f. 3v.)

87 See Frederic J. Baumgartner, “Skepticism and French Interest in Copernicanism to 1550,” in Journal for the History of Astronomy, Vol. 17 (1980), 77-88. Baumgartner finds that Copernicanism was first discussed in France in the decade after 1550, especially in circles sympathetic to skepticism. Copernicus was probably introduced in the universities by Peter Ramus, but only after Godebert’s own training had been completed.

88 “Utque duae dextrae: Corpus ipsum terrae securum suam latitudinem et longitudinem in quinque partes dissecat quas sive regiones sive plagas cosmographi nominant earum omniis quae media est propriis nomen solis arduorem ab hominibus habitari non potest quae idcirco torrida vocatur.” (Second interleaved folio facing f. 7v.)

89 In fact the inhabitability of the torrid zone had already been discussed in the Middle Ages and maintained by a number of Islamic authors.
well, in particular for his references to Greek terms. Indeed, while it is plausible that Godber's quotations from Latin writers are based on his own reading, the fact that Guyon's notes on the poem of Isocrates (added at the end of the collection as the only Greek text in the volume) are abandoned after only three lines of Latin paraphrase, and that Guyon's rendering of the Greek alphabet is sometimes mistaken, suggests that Godber was not very comfortable with Greek himself and relied on other, as yet unidentified commentators, for these passages.

Piecing together commentary from different printed sources as well as from his own reading, Godber in turn offered his students a patchwork of information. The college curriculum devoted to the acquisition of Latin eloquence imparted not only a working knowledge of Latin grammar, figures of speech and basic methods of argumentation, but also included an amazing collection of bits of information, ranging from geography to natural science. Although designed as a mere gloss on the classical text, these comments would constitute for many students the only classroom instruction they would receive in fields other than grammar and rhetoric, which alone were formally studied at the college. The rich annotations left by Pierre Guyon in the margins of Ovid's Metamorphoses provide us with an excellent view of the nature of this transmission of knowledge. Centered exclusively on a series of classical texts like Ovid's Metamorphoses, Guyon's college education consisted of an accumulation of his teachers' commentaries. The hope was that in studying the classical texts under the masters' guidance the student would acquire his own skills in Latin composition and the art of persuasion, and that in memorizing the wide-ranging commentary of his teachers he would store up for himself a plentiful supply of copia or subject material to display when appropriate in the exercise of his diligently acquired eloquence.

Einstein in Japan

BY MARIUS B. JANSSEN

The Graphic Arts Collection of Princeton University Library contains an attractive album of Hiroshige's famous woodcuts, "Fifty-Three Stages of the Tōkaidō," scenes along the coastal road from Edo (present Tokyo) to Kyoto. The album, which opens accordion-style, has no colophon or date. The end cover (the page where Westerners could be expected to begin) has a pleasing sketch of Einstein with the dedication "Albert Einstein: In herzliches dankbarkeit;" and, in Japanese, "at Sendai. Taishō 11 [1922], Twelfth month," together with the signature, "Drawn by Ippei." Behind this little album lies an interesting chapter in cultural interchange.

The album shows signs of frequent handling and inspection. One suspects that it was a favorite reminder of the journey the Einsteins took to Japan in the autumn of 1922. It was presented to Albert Einstein on December 3rd by the cartoonist Ippei Okamoto (1866-1948), apparently as memoir of a particularly successful trip to the islands off Matsushima near Sendai, on a day that ended with a jovial dinner which produced additional sketches.

Okamoto began his career as a painter with solid credentials and training, and exhibited several paintings in the Tokyo salon. He then left formal art to become Japan's first, and certainly best-known, political cartoonist for the Asahi newspaper. His wife Kanoko was a well-known novelist, and their son is prominent in Tokyo today as a painter in the abstract style. Okamoto accompanied the Einsteins throughout their trip, and provided sketches for his paper.

Einstein's trip can be followed through a two-volume work that appeared in 1931, written by a science writer, Tsutomo Kaneko, and entitled Einstein Shock. The first volume has the subtitle Taishō Nihon o yurugaseta yonjūsan-nichi kan (Forty-Three Days that Shook Taishō Japan), and the second, Nihon no bunka to shisō e no shōgeki (The Impact
on Japanese Culture and Thought. What follows here is drawn largely from this work, a meticulous and thought-provoking study based on impressive research. The author’s research included a visit to Princeton, and indeed an early illustration in Einstein Shock is of Firestone Library.

For Japanese readers, the “shock” carries memories of the “Nixon shocks” of the 1970s related to changes in exchange rates, embargoes on the export of soybeans to Japan, and the failure to consult on the opening to China. But while those “shocks” contributed to feelings of isolation, the Einstein “shock” was on the contrary a consciousness of sharing fully in the intellectual and cultural currents of the post war world.

※

Einstein and his wife Elsa went to Japan during a period of travel when anti-Semitism in Germany was beginning to weaken his welcome there. He had initially pleaded a commitment to speak at a scientific congress in September as a reason to delay the trip, but he ended by foregoing that because of rumors of possible assassination attempts. Earlier that year, in June, the assassination of Rathenau had shown the venom of rightist violence. By contrast, in 1921, during a visit to the United States, he had been received at the White House and had been given an honorary degree from Princeton. The prophet was full of honor abroad, if not always at home.

The Japan to which Einstein was invited was in the morning glow of what has come to be known as “Taishō democracy,” a period when internationalism, cosmopolitanism, secularism, and democratization seemed to be replacing the parochial claims which a half-century of nation-building had imposed upon the Japanese. For 50 years and more, state and society had affirmed the priority of work “for the sake of the country” to maintain national sovereignty and achieve diplomatic equality. Educational and cultural advances were essential to this mission; foreign advisors and teachers had been recruited throughout the world, generously paid, and gently dismissed as soon as their students could carry on their work at lower cost. Knowledge

1 Kawade shobo, pp. 278, 316.
Walkers on the road from Tokyo, from Ando Hiroshige, *Fifty-Three Stages of the Tōkaidō*. The Graphic Arts Collection, Princeton University Library.

Travelling by sedan chair, from Ando Hiroshige, *Fifty-Three Stages of the Tōkaidō*. The Graphic Arts Collection, Princeton University Library.
was indeed, in the emperor's words, "sought throughout the world," but, in the phrase that followed, "in order to strengthen the foundations of imperial rule."

The effort was not in vain. By 1912, the end of the Meiji period, educational and political institutions were in place, a modern industrial economy was beginning to emerge, and Japan's armed forces had gained victories over imperial China and imperial Russia. Alliance with Great Britain provided the protection of the British navy while Japan built its own, and World War I, in which Japan was on the Allied side and replaced Germany as a power in East Asia, ended with Japan as one of the great powers in the inner councils of the League of Nations. The national goals had been achieved, and so far without threat to the social order. Indeed, civil law supported, and school textbooks lauded, a structure that could be described as a "family-state," one in which a myriad samurai-style, father-dominated pyramids of social order reflected the form of the central structure, presided over by a sovereign whose ancestral origins linked him to the Sun Goddess.

The imperialist world order began to crumble just as Japan secured its membership. Imperial autocracy gave way in China, in Russia, in Austria-Hungary, in Germany, and in Turkey. Japanese returning from abroad brought word of new currents of liberalism, democracy, and individualism. The world was changing rapidly, and Japan would have to continue to change to keep in step. The Meiji generation and its values were passing, and Japan needed to cast off its military culture.

This was most immediately obvious to publishers who had their eyes on an urban, modern readership. The old monthlies were losing their appeal, and a time for innovation was at hand. Terms like "liberation," "new day," and "reconstruction" carried a message of hope.

Into this picture there entered an enterprising publisher named Sanehiko Yamamoto, who launched a new monthly named Kaizō (Reconstruction) in 1919. Its editors focused on social problems: labor, socialism, and democracy. The journal often skirted the edge of what was permissible under censorship, and it frequently had to substitute vacuous symbols for the key phrases in its columns, but that endeared it to its readers and it soon outdistanced more cautious competitors. Leading social critics and activists were welcomed to its columns. It made a specialty of articles by intellectuals like John Dewey, Bertrand Russell, Romain Rolland, H. G. Wells, Bernard Shaw, Hu Shih, and Lu Hsun. The Kaizō Press also sought out books of social significance. It scored its greatest success with Toyohiko Kagawa's graduate of Princeton Theological Seminary, whose novel about his work in the Kobe slums, Nisshin a kōete (Grossing the Line of Death), sold four million copies.

With resources of this order the publisher could pursue larger goals by bringing major figures to Japan. Bertrand Russell, who was lecturing in China, spent a tumultuous period in Japan in the summer of 1921—two weeks capped by a public lecture on "The Reconstruction of Culture" and public discussions with Kagawa, the anarchist Ōsugi Sakae, and other writers. In the spring of 1922 Margaret Sanger came from America, and was permitted to lecture on condition that she not advocate birth control. She chose to focus her month's stay on women's liberation. Einstein was another in this series. In each case, it will be noted, the invitation sought out a major figure who symbolized a turn away from the concern with family and state that had activated the Meiji generation. Public lectures in major cities and articles in Kaizō brought the distinguished visitor to the attention of a large public. Of all the visitors, Einstein, his sponsors knew, was by far the most distinguished, and his contribution to modern thought the most revolutionary and far-reaching.

The invitation to Einstein was extended in Berlin by a Kaizō writer, Kaneko's research shows that the origins of the idea had a longer history. By exhaustive use of letters and memoirs he is able to trace the publisher's inquiries to Japan's most distinguished philosophers as to the significance of Einstein's work, to follow his steps as he sought the help of scientists who had professional and personal contacts with Einstein, and to describe the campaign as it unfolded. What interests Kaneko's reader is the speed with which Einstein indicated his agreement; it involved, after all, ocean journeys of almost three months' duration. Einstein's wife Elsa was far from sure that she wanted to go, but he himself was immediately and positively involved, eager to know more about Japan, and confident of the importance of reaching out to give meaning to the universality of science and culture. The negotiations did not proceed without glitches. The first proposal was phrased in terms of a three-month stay and 2,000 English pounds, only to have a "confirmation" change this sharply downward in both time and money, now expressed in Japanese yen. After
a polite refusal by Einstein, the proposal was revised to restore the original figure. This testifies, if further testimony is needed, to the firmness of Einstein’s interest.

The Einsteins sailed on the Kitano Maru from Marseilles on 8 October 1922, and arrived at Kobe on 17 November. While the ship was on its way, news came that Einstein had received the Nobel Prize for 1921, and those tidings naturally increased Japanese anticipation of the visit. Aboard the vessel were some famous Japanese: Marquis Yoshichika Tokugawa, head of the Owari branch of the former shogunal family, and Viscount Kikujirō Ishii, the highly respected diplomat, at that time ambassador to Paris. At Shanghai a Japanese scientist and his wife boarded the ship to accompany the Einsteins, and by the time the ship reached Kobe reporters were waiting for the first interview.

From 17 November to 29 December 1922, when the Einsteins embarked for Shanghai from Moji, the schedule was a vigorous one. There were lectures on relativity in public lecture halls in every major city and on every major campus. The government paid Einstein honor with a reception given by the Prime Minister at the Akasaka Detached Palace. There were visits to temples, gardens, restaurants, and a travel schedule that extended from Sendai in the north to Tokyo, Nikko, Nagoya, Kyoto, Nara, Osaka, Kobe, Miyajima, Fukuoka, and Moji. Einstein’s journey retraced the road and passed the scenes depicted in the Hiroshige album now at Princeton.

Einstein was virtually a state visitor. At Waseda, ten thousand students greeted him with the school song. As his train proceeded north to Sendai, special stops were necessary so that the crowds gathered at stations along the way could do him honor. Newspapers hailed Einstein with headlines such as “Giant of Science World Arrives!” and “Sparkles Like Brilliant Ray! Doctor E. Giant of Scholarship.” “I’ve never seen anything like this,” Einstein told his friend Morikatsu Inagaki after a tumultuous welcome at Tokyo station; “There was hubbub when I went to the United States, but even that didn’t have this kind of warmth.” This sense of exultation continued throughout the trip. Public lectures were usually scheduled to last from 2:00 to 3:40 in the afternoon, followed by an hour for questions. They were crowded. At some of them, Inagaki interpreted for Einstein, Professor Ishiwa of Sendai at others.

Einstein endeared himself by his simplicity. At the Imperial Hotel in Tokyo, a building of which only one wing had been completed, he thought his quarters much too grand. He watched the fuss around him with quiet humor and patience. He peppered his companions with questions about Japanese beliefs and customs. Most of his hosts had studied in Europe, so that personal communication was no problem. Inagaki, for example, had toured Europe in 1921, married a German woman, and worked for a League of Nations association; from 1924 to 1939 he lived in Germany, and later moved to Canada. Sendai, Professor Ishiwa’s base and one of the most recently established of the institutions Einstein visited, had been designed by its founders as “a second Göttingen.”

The cartoonist Ippei Okamoto recorded Einstein’s trip for his newspaper in a series of sketches that were later published separately in Kaizō. The album of Hiroshige prints with Okamoto’s caricature was probably presented to Einstein after the trip to Matsushima. During the dinner that followed, Okamoto sketched Einstein again. Describing the evening, he later wrote: “I sketched the doctor’s profile. He added a caption. His nose was prominent in my sketch, and after signing the sketch he added an arrow pointing to his nose. Above the A. of his signature he wrote, ‘Albert Einstein, whose nose is a reservoir of thanks.’ The doctor has a wonderful sense of humor. I will always regard that sheet as one of my treasures.”

*

The time came for Einstein to leave Japan, and with it came expressions of regret. Einstein’s gentle banter comes through in a sketch and poem he presented to his sponsor:

Gedrängt das Volk, gespitzt die Ohren
Sie sitzen alle wie verloren
In Sinnen tief, verzückt den Blick
Ergeben in ein hart’ Geschick
Der Einstein an der Tofel steht
Der Predigt rasch von Stapel geht
Und Ishiwa flink und fein,
Schreibt alles in sein Büchlein ein.1

Albert Einstein, 1922

1 “A crowded hall; ears cocked in great elation! They sit immersed in deepest contemplation. With rapture on their faces they wait! In resignation for their fate.” Ein-
The day before his departure Einstein placed a farewell message to the Japanese people in the Osaka Mainichi. During his month in Japan, he wrote, he had experienced a warmth and sincerity of welcome unlike any he had ever known throughout his travels. He had been profoundly impressed by the beauty of Japan — its architecture, nature, arts, and homes. He hoped that the Japanese people would never be infected by European tastes. Sitting on the tatami in his Fukuoka lodging, he was grateful to have experienced Japan at first hand.

Einstein's hopes were not fulfilled, and neither were those of his hosts. Japan's turn to "Taisho democracy" proved short-lived; by the decade's end, the militarism that Sanehiko Yamamoto, Kaijo readers, and the intellectuals thought was a thing of the past returned in greater strength than before. By then, many of the writers welcomed to the columns of Kaijo had been hounded into silence, and their causes languished. The magazine itself was ordered to stop publication in 1942. It was revived after the war, but gave up the ghost after a labor dispute in 1955. Viscount Ishii, Einstein's fellow passenger on the Kitano Maru, lost his life in the firestorm started by incendiary bombs in Tokyo in 1945.

Einstein's feeling for Japan may have influenced his heart-felt response to the news that an atomic bomb had been dropped on Hiroshima in August 1945: "And he said, 'Oh weh,' which is a cry of despair whose depth is not conveyed by the translation 'Alas.' "

---

A Democrat in Lincoln's Army
The Civil War Letters of Henry P. Hubbell

BY SIMON P. NEWMAN

The Hubbell Family Papers, catalogued in 1987 and now contained in 56 file boxes, were bequeathed to Princeton by Stewart Brooks Hubbell, Class of 1907. The collection includes letters to, from, and belonging to 18 members of the Hubbell family spanning five generations from 1778 to 1937. At the heart of the collection is the correspondence of Walter Hubbell (1795–1848) and his son Walter S. Hubbell (b. 1823), both of whom practiced law in Canandaigua, New York. *In this essay, Simon P. Newman discusses the changing attitude of a "War Democrat" towards the Civil War.*

More Americans died in the Civil War than in all other American wars combined. But as is so often the case, the ways in which ordinary soldiers perceived, experienced and interpreted the events of those years often eludes us. Our romantic images of cavalier south-

---

1 The author would like to thank Reid Mitchell for his comments and criticisms, and for the loan of the proofs of his forthcoming book. He is also grateful to Martha Hodges, John Wertheimer, Carol Quillen, Laura Mason, Jonathan Elukin, and David Bell for their comments on an earlier version of this paper presented to Princeton's Graduate History Association Colloquium.

2 Perhaps the two most significant letters in the collection were written in the early 1890s, one by and the other in reply to the Reverend Ancil Beach. The letters contain inquiries about and descriptions of the founding of the Mormon religion in the nearby mountains of upstate New York (about 12 miles from Canandaigua), and as such they are quite rare and important.

3 Also included in the collection are letters by George Washington and Robert Morris, and a series of letters between Oliver Phelps and Nathaniel Gorham relating to their purchase of about six million acres of land in upstate New York in 1788, one of the largest land deals in American history (the Hubbells inherited, by marriage, an interest in this deal).

4 There are 20 undated letters from Frances L. Buhler to her cousin Mary S. Hubbell describing plantation life in Louisiana, and seven letters from Confederate Army Captain David Devall (also to his cousin, Mary S. Hubbell) describing his imprisonment at the Union prisoner-of-war camp at Johnson's Island in Ohio.

5 Military casualties in the Civil War exceeded those in all other American wars com-
erners and yankee northerners, young, committed, and doomed, obscure as much as they reveal. John Keegan, in his account of the nature and experience of battle, has drawn attention to this problem, and shown that it is possible to look into the mind of a soldier in almost any battle in history, with a view to asking some fundamental questions: why and how a man would join an army, how he would perceive and interpret the events leading to war, what would it take to destroy his commitment to kill and die for cause and country, and most important, whether his motives and reasoning were the same as those of his government. The recently catalogued correspondence contained in the Hubbell Family Papers includes a set of letters that directly relate to these questions.

Late in 1860 Henry Phelps Hubbell joined the Third Regiment of New York Volunteers. Hubbell was then 33 years old. Born and raised in the small town of Canandaigua in western New York, he had gone on to a business career in New York City. Although he enjoyed a comfortable life, it would appear that Hubbell was never quite as successful in business as other family members. So when thousands of Americans rallied around the flag in the flush of patriotic enthusiasm that immediately preceded the outbreak of war, Henry P. Hubbell was ready, willing, and available to join them.

Throughout the 32 months that he spent in the Union army, Hubbell regularly corresponded with his only surviving brother, Walter S. Hubbell, who was a successful lawyer and judge in their home town. As is often the case, the actual experience of war prompted Hubbell to correspond with his closest relative with far greater regularity than was customary. His letters provide an unusual and fascinating insight into the experiences of a Northern Democrat, a firm supporter of the Union and opponent of secession, who found himself engulfed in a Republican crusade to transform Northern war aims. Hubbell's reactions to the changes in Union policy raise some serious questions about traditional interpretations of how and why the Union fought the Civil War.

The speed with which the secession of the seven states of the Deep South followed news of Abraham Lincoln's election to the presidency is quite remarkable, and this swift reaction gives compelling testimony to the depth and force of Southern sentiment in the fall of 1860. In stark contrast, Northern Republicans and Democrats were covered with confusion, often unwilling to acknowledge what was happening to the Union and unable to come up with a realistic response.

Hubbell's earliest letters reflect the confusion that bedeviled the initial Northern response to secession. Just days before the bombardment of Fort Sumter, he wrote to Walter from New York City.

It is very hard for any one to form an opinion as to what the intention of the Govt. towards the seceded states is to be—there is great activity both in the Army & Navy, but what it is all for, no one seems to know. Some think to blockade the Southern ports, others to prevent Spain annexing St. Domingo. Some assert positively that there is to be no trouble, others quite as strongly that there is. One mans opinion is quite as good as another.

The fall of Fort Sumter in April 1861 dramatically ended this period of indecision and uncertainty, and this was reflected in the tone of Hubbell's next letter to his brother, written 12 days later.

War, war, war is all the talk now—and the determination to sustain the government is very general. All seem to think the South are wrong and must be put down. The great battle field it is thought, will be Washington.

Hubbell's next few letters, written during the spring and summer of 1861, chronicle an extremely busy life. Until his rank and posting were decided upon, Hubbell helped to coordinate the mustering of men from the New York City area into the state army. With enthusiasm for the war rampant, there was no shortage of volunteers, and

---

1 Henry P. Hubbell to Walter S. Hubbell, 5 April 1861, Hubbell Family Papers— Correspondence. Unless otherwise specified, all citations refer to this collection in the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library. Spelling, punctuation, and syntax are as found in the letters.

Hubbell complained about the "crowd of men & business on hand." But he worked hard and willingly for a cause that he clearly believed in.

I make no pretense to more bravery, than the majority of men, and can only say, that I believe it is a just and holy cause I am about to enter upon, and that I shall at all times, to the best of my ability and power, do my full duty to my country and myself.\(^7\)

Noble words, written by a northerner who believed that the federal union was permanent and could not be abandoned at the whim of a member state. It was with these sentiments that he had joined the army.

On 23 August 1861, Hubbell officially received his commission as Lieutenant Colonel of the 3rd Regiment of the New York State Volunteers. The regiment was commanded by Colonel S. M. Alford, and Hubbell was to function as Alford's second-in-command. He joined the regiment at Fort McHenry in Baltimore during the first week of September, 1861; he was to remain with this unit for all of his military service.\(^8\)

Hubbell found himself burdened by much work, as seen in his description of the daily chores of camp life:

As for myself I rise about 5 1/2 O'clock and Superintend the drill of the Companies for an hour & a half — then go to breakfast. at 10 O'clock again we have Battalion drill for about an hour & three quarters, dine at one. at three have another Battalion or Company drill for the same length of time. take supper at 5 and at 6 O'clock, or sundown have a dress parade. Besides the foregoing, there is considerable to be done inside the camp, such as looking after its cleanliness & general government. So you will see I do not have a great deal of time to spare.\(^9\)

During the fall and winter of 1861 there was little in the way of large-scale, organized military engagements. At the first Battle of Bull Run, fought on 21 July 1861, both armies had learned that the war would not be concluded with a short battle, or even a short campaign. Many civilians complained at the months of apparent inactivity that followed the battle, and in early 1862 Hubbell responded to such criticism from his brother:

You, like most others in civil life, complain of the inactivity of our Army. Very naturally too. But it is because you have not the slightest idea of the time & labor necessary to bring a Regt even, to say nothing of a larger army, into the proper training & discipline to useful & effect [sic]. If you will only stop & think, that nearly all our large army of 600,000 men now in the field, were six months ago in civil life, & hardly knew a musket from a cannon, that the Officers too were nearly as ignorant of their duties as the men. of the almost entire absence of arms in this country, and of the necessary preparations & arrangements to support, transport and arm as well as discipline this large body of men, I think you will acknowledge that almost a miracle has been worked by those having the charge.\(^10\)

In the early days of June 1862, Hubbell and his regiment had completed their training and were posted to Camp Arthur in Suffolk, Virginia, which then lay a bare ten miles from Confederate lines.\(^11\) It was there that he heard of Confederate General Robert E. Lee's first major victory over a Northern army in the bloody Seven Days' battles, fought close to Richmond between June 25th and July 1st. In his next letter to Walter, Hubbell dwelt not on the defeat, but rather on Union General George B. McClellan's "masterly retreat to the James river, without the loss of a waggon, and only one gun. All the witnesses of the 6 days fighting, agree that troops never fought better, and that Genl. McC. did all any man could have done, against the forces opposed to him."\(^12\)

In this same letter Hubbell first gave voice to a sentiment that would eventually come to dominate his attitude toward the prosecu-

---

\(^7\) Henry P. Hubbell to Walter S. Hubbell, 22 April 1861.
\(^8\) Henry P. Hubbell to Walter S. Hubbell, 30 May 1861.
\(^9\) Henry P. Hubbell to Walter S. Hubbell, 30 July 1861, and 20 September 1861.
\(^10\) Henry P. Hubbell to Walter S. Hubbell, 20 September 1861.
\(^11\) Henry P. Hubbell to Walter S. Hubbell, 10 January 1862.
\(^12\) Henry P. Hubbell to Walter S. Hubbell, 18 June 1862.
\(^13\) Henry P. Hubbell to Walter S. Hubbell, 6 July 1862.
ever increasing number of complaints about the policies of Lincoln's government. Hubbell's enthusiasm for a war to save the Union had been genuine, as seen in his correspondence of 1861 and the first half of 1862, but the changing nature of the war and its goals did not sit well with his own beliefs and attitudes.

This change in Hubbell's attitude was perhaps best expressed in a short and angry letter that Hubbell wrote to his brother in August of 1862:

I am not sure that it would not be a good thing to have the rebels get possession of Washington however, as it might waken up the north to the fact that we are having a war in earnest, and not merely playing soldier. ... We have got men & means enough in the north to put an end to this war in 90 days, if they would only go at it in earnest and let politics & the nigger alone.15

Hubbell had expressed his own political sentiments in his first scathing reference to "Black Republicanism" in a letter written to his brother five months earlier. This derogatory reference to the policies and priorities of the Lincoln administration appeared with increasing frequency in Hubbell's letters; events in Washington were to change his casual and scattered comments into full-scale attacks.

The most important question raised by Hubbell's increasing dissatisfaction and discontent is one of typicality: Was he unique in his viewpoint, or did he speak for many fellow soldiers and Northern civilians? If we take him at his word, the latter may be true.

I have heard but one expression of opinion by Officers, Regular or Volunteer, in regard to the Presd' Emancipation Proclamation — viz that of disapproval, and fear of its bad effect at the north by causing division.16

Historians have long recognized that the abolitionist policies of radical Republicans at Washington were initially very unpopular with the officers and men of the Union army. However, as the struggle intensified and the number of casualties grew, abolition became a

14 Henry P. Hubbell to Walter S. Hubbell, 6 July 1862.
15 Henry P. Hubbell to Walter S. Hubbell, 14 August 1862.
16 Henry P. Hubbell to Walter S. Hubbell, 2 October 1862.
powerful weapon in what had become a total war against the South. When Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation, tens of thousands of Union soldiers had already died, and in seeking to avenge a friend or a brother, and to win the war, Union soldiers found it increasingly easy to view Southern Blacks as potential allies in the deadly struggle against white southerners.¹⁷

Without doubt, as the war dragged on, abolition did achieve a high level of acceptance as a necessary war measure. But some northerners refused to accept this policy. and these people are often neglected by Civil War historians. Henry P. Hubbell was one such man: With radical Republicans and abolitionists apparently in control of both the government and the army, he rapidly lost heart and prepared to abandon the cause that he had once been prepared to die for. In a fascinating letter written to his brother on 26 January 1865, three weeks after Lincoln signed the formal Emancipation Proclamation, Hubbell announced his intention to quit the army and gave the reasons for his decision:

I for one (and I think it is so with a large portion of the Army) am disgusted with this war & its management. And shall be very glad when my time is out, they will not get me into it again. I did not come out to fight for the nigger or abolition of slavery, much less to make the nigger better than white men, as they are every day becoming in the estimation and treatment of the powers at Washington. I would sooner see every nigger now free, in slavery, than see slavery abolished. And yet the latter seems to be the sole object of the Govt.

I believe that 9/10th of the Army would today if they could, lay down their arms and go home, and positively refuse to have anything more to do with this war, or the principles on which it is now being carried on. While such low lived contemptible scoundrels as Henry Ward Beecher, Dr. Cheever, Horace Greeley, Wendell Phillips,


¹⁸ Following the slim and costly Northern victory at Antietam, Lincoln issued a preliminary proclamation on 22 September 1862. He formally signed the Emancipation Proclamation on 1 January 1863, on which day it took effect.
Charles Sumner, Henry Wilson etc. etc. etc. are allowed to control the actions of the Govt., you may look for nothing but defeat to the U.S. Army. Our officers & soldiers have no heart for carrying on a war on the principles those men and their followers advocate. It is not what they joined the service for, and they will not fight for them. Talk about "honest Old Abe" I believe that he is as big a scoundrel as any of them. Else why not dismiss his present radical & incompetent Cabinet, and rally about him Conservative Union men, men in whom the army & country would have confidence. & adopt a plan for the restoration of the Constitution as it is and the Union as it was. And recall his foolish and useless Emancipation Proclamation. The latter shows of itself he is not honest. He releases the slaves where he has no power, & retains slavery where he has the power to free the slave. . . . I am sick of all this. And the next 3 months will end my connection with the forces of an abolition and disorganizing Govt. I consider Greeley, Beecher & that class of persons, worse enemies today to the U.S. than Jeff Davis and all his followers. They have done more than the latter to break up the Govt. 19

And so, in a sense, they had. The abolition of slavery had fundamentally changed both the government and the nation; whatever the result of the Civil War, the American world would never be quite the same again, a fact which troubled many northerners.

Hubbell's unwillingness "to fight for the nigger or abolishment of slavery" suggests that his growing dissatisfaction with the war objectives of Lincoln's government was fueled by a deep-seated racism. In our enthusiasm for the ground-breaking Emancipation Proclamation and the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments, we often forget that the prevailing scientific, religious and social philosophies of the day were, by our standards, profoundly racist. Even many of those who supported the abolition of slavery did not believe in the equality of the races. Such sentiments were hardly likely to engender among white northerners a willingness to die to free Southern Black slaves, and it is hardly surprising that antidraft riots in Northern cit-

19 Henry P. Hubbell to Walter S. Hubbell, 26 January 1863.

ies occasionally degenerated into forays against the resident Black populations. 20

Nevertheless, when Lieutenant Colonel Henry P. Hubbell formally resigned his commission in the last week of May, 1863, he did so for political rather than racial reasons. This is not to suggest that Hubbell was not a racist, for he was, and his letters include a variety of racial slurs and epithets that make his attitude abundantly clear. However, he never once mentioned the slaves, freedmen, and runaways who flocked to the Union armies. Most letters by Northern soldiers include many references to these Blacks, and the absence of such references in Hubbell's correspondence is quite marked. Since Hubbell seldom neglected to tell his brother exactly what he thought, one is fairly safe in assuming that it was racism which caused Hubbell's

discontent, he would have said so, and would have included negative references to and uncomplimentary descriptions of the Southern slaves he encountered. The letters, journals, and diaries of many other Union soldiers are filled with references of this kind. But Hubbell never mentioned the Southern Blacks he encountered because he did not consider them important; it was not they, *per se*, who bothered him. Rather, it was the politics of Lincoln's government in Washington.\(^2\)

While Hubbell may have been wrong when he complained in 1863 that political decisions were making it impossible for the Union to win the war, his letters serve as a useful reminder that for some northerners, emancipation was an unacceptable addition to Union war aims. For Hubbell and other Northern Democrats like him, the Emancipation Proclamation was deeply offensive, an egregious example of the misuse of executive power for avowedly partisan purposes, and a war measure that blatantly ignored the United States Constitution. As a War Democrat, Hubbell had joined the Union army to preserve the Union and its Constitution, not to subvert it. What many historians seem to have forgotten is that Northern opposition to radical Republicanism could actually run far deeper than a racist sentiment which was gradually subdued by the need to wage total war. The principled opposition of some Democrats to Republican policies stood in the path of emancipation.

Henry P. Hubbell was just such a Democrat, and part of a powerful block of voters. It is worth remembering, perhaps, that the apparently overwhelming victory of Lincoln and the Republicans in 1860 concealed a profound division within the North itself. Lincoln won almost all of his 1,866,000 votes in the Northern states, but Democratic candidate Stephen Douglas won more than 1,883,000 votes from much the same area. The Hubbells were themselves an old Democratic family. Levi Hubbell, uncle of Henry P. and Walter S. Hubbell, was a long-time friend and supporter of Douglas and campaigned for him in Wisconsin.\(^2\) In fact Douglas had been educated at Canandaigua Academy with Levi Hubbell, and had received his initial legal training in the law office of Walter Hubbell, the father of Henry P. and Walter S. Hubbell. The latter had married Mary S. Chapin, whose family was spread all over the Democratic South, and both Henry P. and Walter S. Hubbell were active in the local Democratic party organization in New York state.

The Democrats did not die as a political force during the war; after the election of 1862 the New York Assembly was divided equally, with both the Democrats and the Republicans having 64 seats. In the election of 1864, Democratic candidate George B. McClellan's 1,800,000 votes made him a close second to Lincoln, who secured 2,200,000 votes. In New York state, McClellan received more than 361,000 votes, only 7,000 votes behind Lincoln. One historian has examined the role of Democratic soldiers in and from New York in the campaign, and has suggested that they played a significant role in the Democratic effort.\(^3\)

As other historians have recognized, few Union soldiers and officers actually quit the army because of their opposition to the Emancipation Proclamation and other radical Republican policies.\(^4\) So although Hubbell's sentiments may have been shared by many other northerners, his actions were unusual. Perhaps the fact that he was never actually involved in combat, and thus never personally experienced the horrors of modern warfare, has something to do with this. Those Union soldiers who had fought long and hard on the front lines were more likely to recognize the utility of emancipation as a means of hurting the enemy and bringing victory closer. There is no evidence in the correspondence between Henry and Walter Hubbell to indicate that the former sought to avoid combat, and his patriotic ardor in the early months of the war appears genuine. In 1861 Hubbell would willingly have fought and died for the Union, but in 1863 he was clearly unwilling to do so for Black emancipation.

Hubbell, however, remained true to the political principles that had led him to join the Union army, and his opposition to radical Republicanism never degenerated into disloyalty; his later reactions

\(^{2}\) Mitchell, *Civil War Soldiers* (forthcoming), Chapter Four.

\(^{3}\) There are more than 900 letters in the Princeton collection from Levi Hubbell to his brother Walter and his nephew Walter S. Hubbell. Most of these were written from Milwaukee (Levi moved to the territory of Wisconsin in 1844, joined a law firm, and eventually became Chief Justice of that state's Supreme Court).


to the "glorious news" of General William Tecumseh Sherman's victories, and his description of Lincoln's assassination as "a great calamity for the country at large" well illustrate his continued fidelity to the Union. But his letters remain both interesting and relevant, hinting as they do at the nature and extent of Northern disaffection with the transformed Union cause. They also magnify the achievements of Lincoln and the abolitionists, for these men and women had not only to confront and defeat the South; they also had to defeat a strongly motivated political opposition at home.⁵

⁵ Henry P. Hubbell to Walter S. Hubbell, 18 December 1864, and 17 April 1865.

The Angler as Bibliophile
Princeton’s Kienbusch Collection

BY DALE R. ROYLANCE

There is a remarkable affinity between angling and book collecting. Both have long been regarded as the proper activity of gentlemen, and both are distinguished by their contemplative ways of achieving their goals. Unlike most other sports, fishing demands quiet patience, persistence, and the determined pursuit of a fine catch, all marks of a good book collector.

Carl Otto von Kienbusch, Princeton Class of 1906, pursued his gentlemanly love of fishing right up to his 90th year, even though he was by then blind. He had a lifelong, strong-minded love of both angling and book collecting that came together in the Kienbusch Collection of some 1,500 books, prints, drawings, and paintings which he gave to the Library.

Illustrated books and pictures about fishing have a long history. Many of them are both rare and beautiful; all of the graphic arts—fine printing, the best engraving, even elegant hand binding—have been displayed in fishing books ever since the first one of the genre, Dame Juliana Berner's The Book of St. Albans, was printed in 1496.

The Princeton University Library's collection of sporting books is formidable. It consists of several mutually supportive special collections, including besides the Kienbusch Collection, the Isabelle A. Rockey Memorial Collection of Angling, an endowed collection presented by Kenneth H. Rockey, Class of 1916, consisting of some 2,000 volumes and including 150 rare editions of Izaak Walton's Compleat Angler.

During the long, hot summer of 1988, the Leonard L. Milberg Gallery for the Graphic Arts displayed some of the best of the Library's books and pictures on fishing. A pictorial sampling of the exhibition is offered here.

The marbleized endpapers of the Husbandman’s Recreations display the best of sporting-bibliophile pedigrees. The bookplates of Dean Sage, an early and important bibliographer of fishing books, of Thomas Gosden, fishing bibliophile and binder extraordinary, of David Wagstaff, the collector and donor of Yale’s great sporting book collection, and of Princeton’s own Carl Otto von Kienbusch, trace the distinguished travels of this important book.


This extremely rare incunabulum includes a famous essay, “A treatise of fysshynge wyth an angle,” and the first printed picture of a fisherman. In delightful prose, the writer (said to be the prioress of St. Albans, Dame Juliana Berners) speaks of the superiority of angling over other sports, waxing philosophical on its contemplative benefits. She also tells her readers how to make fishing rods, lines, and hooks. The combination of the practical and spiritual in a single book established in print the long tradition of the proper angler as the gentleman-sportsman so prevalent in books about fishing.

Physician to three Popes, Salvianus was also an ardent ichthyologist, recording in 81 copper engravings all the fish native to Italy. The typography and illustration in his important book are in the best tradition of fine Italian Renaissance printing.


According to Genesis, the oceans were created on the second day, and all manner of water creatures on the fifth. The Biblical priority of fish is reflected in printed science books of the 16th century, where fish were the earliest subjects. Although Belon was a scientific illustrator of fish species, in this woodcut he perpetuates images of legendary sea creatures such as mermen.

Adrian Collaert was an artist of considerable virtuosity. He engraved these album pages for Visscher's work, as well as several other albums full of highly personable fish.

Bloch's *Ichthyologie* is one of the most elaborate of all color-plate books on fish. Sponsored by Frederick the Great, the encyclopedic work includes 432 finely colored plates. This plate, showing an “Emperor of Japan” fish, is representative of the high level of artistic quality achieved by the German engravers who illustrated the book. Surprisingly, Princeton does not have a complete copy of this important work in any of its remarkable collections on hunting and fishing.


Donovan was a prolific writer and illustrator of important works on British birds, insects, and shells, as well as this multi-volume work on fish. The engravings of fish are brightly colored, and, according to the author's words on the title page, were "purposely made from the specimens in a recent state, and for the most part whilst living."

English natural history is probably one of the best-illustrated in the world, and for ichthyology perhaps the best. Of the many English delineators of fish, Couch was the most thorough. His *History of the Fishes*, with color prints based on his own drawings, was his major work. The Kienbusch Collection has a manuscript of the *History*, and the four-volume printed book embellished with tipped-in photographs of the author. His uncanny resemblance to his favorite subject is unmistakable, even suggesting a favorite device of 19th-century caricature wherein masters come to resemble their pets!

Fish have played a role in the lives of women as well as men. Not only did they clean and cook the catch of the day, as shown in The Accomplished Ladies Delight; they also mastered the rod, as may be seen in the elegant stippled engraved and colored print (left) by Charles Knight (London, 1709), and the dashing portrait drawn on the flyleaf of Trout Fishing in Normandy (overleaf).

Male anglers may be surprised when they first learn of the contributions of female anglers to the bibliography and iconography of fish. Mrs. Bowdich, who illustrated her book with her own original paintings, explained their fine coloring (in which she used silver and gold pigments) in her introduction: "The colours of the Trout change directly after they leave the stream; but I was lucky enough to avail myself of the skill of a friend, who supplied me with a succession of them as I sat on the bank and by which secured the tints in all their delicacy and brightness." Amazingly, Mrs. Bowdich had the patience and interest to hand-illustrate the full edition of nearly 100 copies of her book.

Sir Izaak Walton’s *The Compleat Angler* is one of the great classics of English literature. More than 350 editions have appeared since its first printing in 1653. Some 200 of them are at Princeton, including four of the six editions published during the author’s lifetime. Shown in the exhibition were the first edition of 1653, two 18th-century editions, several modern illustrated editions, and the recent bibliography by Bernard S. Horne. Among the many artistic discoveries to be made in the Kienbusch Angling Collection is a series of 12 watercolors made by John Absolon (1815–1895) for the printed edition of *The Compleat Angler* published by Cotton in 1879. Absolon’s originals include a fine miniature painting after the 17th-century portrait of Walton by Huysmans, and reveal a highly skilled watercolor painter and illustrator.

The Cabinet of Natural History and American Rural Sports. 3 vols. Philadelphia, 1832.

As early as 1732, several American colonists, including Pennsylvania governor Samuel Morris, recognized the beauty and angling abundance of the Schuylkill River. They established a gentlemen's society known as “The Schuylkill Fishing Company,” and set it in a private hunting and fishing retreat on the river near the country estates of William Penn and others. This company of sportsmen flourished there until 1822, when the damming of the Schuylkill at Fair Mount forced them to move farther south, nearer to William Bartram’s famous Botanical Garden.

Among several prints and books recording those halcyon sporting days are An Authentic Historical Memoir of the Schuylkill Fishing Company, in which Charles Fevret de Saint-Mémin’s engraved portrait of Samuel Morris appears; and The Cabinet of Natural History and American Rural Sports, published and illustrated by Thomas Doughty, who became one of the best of the Hudson River landscape painters.

This large genre painting of 1854 by Junius Brutus Stearns (1810–1885) portrays in its glorious American setting (Trenton Falls, New York) three eminent citizens of New York City as angling friends. The figure on the left is Charles Loring Elliott (1818–1868), one of the most popular portrait painters of his day. In the center is Lewis Gaylord Clark (1808–1873), who was a longtime editor of the famous *Knickerbocker Magazine* in New York. One of the founders of the Century Club, he was a friend of Washington Irving and Charles Dickens. The other gentleman-angler is Frederick Swartout Cozzens (1818–1869), author and wine-merchant, and also a founding member of New York's Century Club.

During the past several years, staff have been working on four publications that will appear in print over the next year. Two of them are the results of extensive cataloguing projects, another is the outgrowth of a very successful Library exhibition, and the fourth is one in the series of books coming from the Library's Emblem Project.

Scheduled for delivery to the publisher in November 1988 is the text for a two-volume work tentatively titled *A Guide to Modern Manuscripts in the Princeton University Library*. The first volume will contain descriptions of the nearly 960 separately arranged modern manuscript collections held in the following divisions of the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections: General Manuscripts, Western Americana, Theatre Collection, and the Twentieth-Century Statecraft Collection in the Seeley G. Mudd Manuscript Library. In addition to the descriptions (some of which run to several pages), the volume will be indexed in various ways, including name of collection, subject, and form of material.

At Princeton, as at other large research libraries, "manuscript" is used in a wide sense, meaning archival materials of all sorts, excluding separately printed books. Consequently the *Guide* covers not just papers, but also photographs, prints, and even some drawings. Moreover, "modern" is taken to mean manuscripts produced from about the 16th century to the present. Of course, most of the material is American or English, but the Library in recent years has been adding vigorously to the collections of papers of important contemporary Latin American authors, and these are also included. And not to be overlooked are the occasional other important non-English collections, such as the papers of Eugène de Beauharnais, Napoleon's stepson and Viceroy in Italy.
The second volume of the *Guide* contains summaries of manuscript holdings for more than 14,500 authors, thus enabling the user to see at a glance the range and depth of the Library's collections for a particular person.

The *Guide* represents nearly ten years of work by three full-time staff and numerous part-time staff. The work began in 1979, funded first by a Title II-C grant and then by one from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The *Guide* is based on the database of literary manuscripts in the Library begun by the first team and continued by permanent staff; it is now the Library's on-line catalogue of manuscripts, having nearly 51,000 records for materials in the various collections. The *Guide* will be published by G. K. Hall, Boston.

Another cataloguing project, this one of more modest proportions, is a descriptive catalogue of the *Pamphlets, Song-sheets, and Periodicals of the French Revolutionary Era in the Princeton University Library*. The catalogue consists of more than 2,800 entries covering about 2,200 pamphlets, 400 songs, and more than 100 periodicals. All entries are indexed by author, title, date of publication, and subject. Printing copy is scheduled for delivery to the publisher (Garland Publishing, New York) in February 1989, and it is hoped that the catalogue will be issued during the bicentennial year of the French Revolution. Scholars who have used early drafts of the catalogue praise the very rich holdings of popular songs in the collection, including the early versions of the "Marseillaise," as well as the holdings of periodicals. The catalogue is chiefly the work of Carla Hesse and Laura Mason, who began the work while graduate students in Princeton's Department of History. Ms Hesse is now Assistant Professor of History at Rutgers University; Ms Mason is completing her dissertation under Professor Robert Darnton on songs of the Revolution, having done much of her research in the Princeton collection.

In 1985, Curator of Western Americana Alfred L. Bush, together with Professor Lee Mitchell of the Department of English, mounted a very successful exhibition entitled "The Photograph and the American Indian." As an outgrowth of the extensive research on which the exhibition was based, an illustrated book by the same title will be published by Princeton University Press. The book will have numerous reproductions of photographs from the Princeton collections, as well as important ones from other collections. Commentary is being written by Messrs. Bush and Mitchell.
**FINANCIAL REPORT**

The summary of financial transactions on the Operating Account and on the Publication Fund for 1987–1988 is as follows:

### OPERATING ACCOUNT

#### RECEIPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash balance 1 July 1987</td>
<td>$1,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles G. Stachelberg '20 Fund</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart G. Weekes '23 Fund</td>
<td>19,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>83,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching gifts</td>
<td>1,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions*</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronicle</em> subscriptions and sales</td>
<td>6,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$115,736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DISBURSEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronicle</em></td>
<td>$19,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Newsletter, No. 2</td>
<td>1,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership booklet, 1988</td>
<td>1,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitations, brochures, posters</td>
<td>5,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>23,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptions, dinners, special events</td>
<td>7,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Award</td>
<td>1,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership campaign</td>
<td>2,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>5,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Telephone, photoduplication, etc.**  
724

**Rare Book Department projects**  
6,050

**Friends Book Fund, in memory of Graham D. Mattison '26**  
500

**Total**  
$75,536

Cash balance 30 June 1988  
$40,200

*The contributions received included gifts in memory of two longtime members of the Friends, R. Balfour Daniels, Class of 1922, who died in October 1986, and Joseph R. Strayer, Class of 1925, who died in July 1987.

### PUBLICATION FUND

#### RECEIPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash balance 1 July 1987</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>2,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$9,707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DISBURSEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and mailing</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cash balance 30 June 1988  
$9,223

The exhibition emphasized the visual rather than the textual strength of the angling collection formed by Carl Otto von Kienbusch, Class of 1906. The watercolor, below, by Ogden M. Pleissner (1905–), *Carl Otto von Kienbusch Fishing*, was presented to him “by Friends of his in the Anglers Club of New York. May 6, 1962.”

— DALE R. ROYLANCE

Curator of Graphic Arts

---

**FRIENDS OF THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY**

The Friends of the Princeton University Library, founded in 1956, is an association of individuals interested in book collecting and the graphic arts, and in increasing and making better known the resources of the Princeton University Library. It has secured gifts and bequests and has provided funds for the purchase of rare books, manuscripts, and other material which could not otherwise have been acquired by the Library.

Membership is open to those subscribing annually forty dollars or more. Checks payable to Princeton University Library should be addressed to the Treasurer. Members receive the *Princeton University Library Chronicle* and are invited to participate in meetings and to attend special lectures and exhibitions.

**THE COUNCIL**

Jamie Kamph, Chairman
Joseph J. Felcone, Vice-Chairman
Donald W. Koepp, Vice-Chairman
Edward Naumburg, Jr., Vice-Chairman
William L. Joyce, Secretary
Alexander D. Wainwright, Treasurer

Princeton University Library
One Washington Road, Princeton, New Jersey 08544

1986–1989
Robert J. Barry, Jr.
Nathaniel Burt
Richard W. Cooper
Edward M. Crane, Jr.
Viscountess Eccles
Charles Rhyn Fry
Victor Lange
Richard M. Ludwig
Louise S. Marshall
Baldwin Maull
Leonard L. Milberg
S. Wyman Rolph III
Mary N.C. Spence
Geoffrey Steele
Duane Reed Stuart, Jr.

1987–1990
Douglas F. Baxter
Brook Brower
Henry E. Geistley
Joanna Hitchcock
Alfred H. Howell
Paul M. Ingersoll
Jamie Kamph
Glendon T. Odell
Susan J. Pack
Andrew A. Rose
Charles Ryskamp
William H. Scheide
Frank E. Taplin
Benjamin B. Tregoe
James L.W. West III
Michail Wurtmefeld

1988–1991
Bailey Bishop
John R.B. Brett-Smith
Lawrence Danson
David DaVivier
Joseph J. Felcone
Christopher Forbes
Peter H.B. Frelinghuyzen
P. Randolph Hill
Richard M. Huber
J. Merrill Knapp
MRS. Gerard B. Lambert
John L. Logen
John F. Mason
David A. Robertson, Jr.
Frederic Rosewajtjen, Jr.
Lula L. Schudits

**HONORARY MEMBERS**

Gerald Eades Bentley
Arthur C. Holden
Edward Naumburg, Jr.

**EXECUTIVE AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

Jamie Kamph, Chairman

Joseph J. Felcone
Paul M. Ingersoll
William L. Joyce
Donald W. Koepp
Alexander D. Wainwright

Leonard L. Milberg
Edward Naumburg, Jr.
William H. Scheide
Richard R. Spies

---


---
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