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Abstract

This dissertation examines the scholarly career of the Flemish humanist, Abraham Ortelius (1527-1598), in the context of the network of scholars and professionals with whom he collaborated at different points in his life. My thesis is that the collaborative approach to scholarship employed by Ortelius can only be fully understood through detailed reconstruction of the social, political and cultural options open to him, and in particular that his cultivation of the notion of “friendship” among his peers through the compilation of a “friendship album” is the key to understanding the rationale behind his scholarly interests and methods.

The first chapter demonstrates that Ortelius’ atlas, the *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*, was conceived as a humanist historical guide intended to inaugurate a continuous collaborative process by centralising information in an accessible form that could be adapted continually as new contributions were received. The second chapter argues that Ortelius’ atlas project can not be interpreted as an expression of the ideas of the secretive mystical group, the Family of Love, and that Ortelius’ religious position was developed in opposition to increasing religious factionalism, and thus his prime concern seems to have been to live an ethical life that was not compromised by allegiance. The third chapter explores Ortelius’ secular ideals, examining the process of compilation of his friendship album through detailed codociological and prosopographical research. The album displays a strikingly self-conscious promotion of the *vita contemplativa*, celebrating friendship as the key to cultivating and preserving learned civilisation. The final chapter analyses Ortelius’ antiquarian and philological writings and collaborative projects to demonstrate how the co-operative ethos expressed in his friendship album found concrete expression both in his interaction with other scholars and in his research methodology. The thesis concludes with the argument that Ortelius’ scholarly achievements were cumulative as well as collaborative and that in immersing himself in pragmatic problem solving he evaded most of the categories through which early modern scholars are normally judged, with the underlying continuity to his career being a suspicion of conjecture and a determination to advance scholarship, and thus civilisation, through a rigorous return to the sources.
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"Learning is the child of hard work, humanity is the child of learning, and friendship is the child of humanity" – so claimed the philologist and Professor of Law, Ludovic Carrion, in an inscription that he contributed in 1575 to the friendship album of the geographer Abraham Ortelius.\(^1\) Further research reveals that he was not a particularly close friend of Ortelius, and by 1582 he had earned the chagrin of two other contributors to the album, the philologists Justus Lipsius and Andreas Schottus, who were both much closer to Ortelius.\(^2\) Yet his inscription was more permanent than the friendship it celebrated; it remains in the album, pithily expressing an idea that was commonplace among the scholars of the sixteenth century: that the study of ancient texts was a virtuous activity pursued by humane individuals whose common culture was the essence of civilisation. In this instance it is clear that there is some degree of dissonance between the ideal expressed by Carrion and the reality of the friendships that he cultivated and then lost; however, it would be inaccurate to conclude that the ideal was unrelated to, or must be considered apart from, actual friendships. By expressing his ideal through the contribution of an inscription to Ortelius' album, Carrion performed an act of friendship that constituted the ideal, just as someone standing at an altar beside their fiancé enacts their marriage by saying "I do".

Ortelius' album, and its relation to his network of friends as a whole, poses many problems of this kind. It is only one example of the fashion for keeping friendship albums that was widespread among scholars during the sixteenth century, and the fashion itself was only one facet of the wider celebration of learned friendship among humanists. These albums provide the historian with crucial evidence of the character, formation and integration of friendship networks in the sixteenth century. Yet even one network of friends can provide material for a lifetime's research; thus, without arguing that this particular group has any compelling claims to exemplarity, I have chosen to focus on the network of friends around Ortelius as a means of examining the relationship between scholarly practice and the ideals of friendship and collaboration. Among these scholars the extent of collaboration is as remarkable as

\(^1\) Ortelius, *Album amicorum*, f.45.
\(^2\) *ILE* 82 04 11, 82 05 00, 82 05 14E, 82 08 05, 82 11 11G, 82 11 11LE; Hessels, *Abrahaei Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 113.
its transgression of political and religious boundaries, thus I have found it necessary to consider its intellectual activity within the context of an examination of the nature of the network itself.

The first difficulty in analysing a network is deciding who belongs. There are always networks within networks, and larger contexts to consider; for this reason I have deliberately avoided using the term "friendship circle", which overstates the coherence and exclusivity of the group. Although my study began with the friendship album, a core text that seemed to offer a clear list of network members, it quickly became apparent that there were varying degrees of familiarity among the contributors, some of whom knew each other intimately, while others had never met and scarcely knew of one another's existence. The common connection was of course the owner of the album, Ortelius; yet initial research into his life suggested that his network of friends, colleagues and associates was only partially and somewhat haphazardly represented by his album. Further, it was only by delving into the details of his life and work that sense could be made of some of the inscriptions or of the relationship of the contributor to Ortelius. Through his correspondence and published works, I began to realise the extent of his collaborative scholarly interactions, and I began to suspect that the album was an unusually explicit articulation of the ideals behind these projects. However, several methodological concerns could not be dismissed. First, the published works of Ortelius and his friends were often more readily explicable in terms of the history of the disciplines to which they contributed than in terms of Ortelius' private life. Ortelius' own writings seemed to build logically upon one another and to respond directly to gaps in the intellectual and commercial market. To discuss them simply as instances of friendship or collaboration would have been to misrepresent their intellectual and cultural origins, and to misunderstand the nature of the common problems facing scholars in the sixteenth century (the scarcity of resources, the impurity of texts and manuscripts) and the political and social circumstances that drew them together and apart. Second, using acquaintance with Ortelius as the criterion for deciding whether to consider an individual's contribution to the network risked overlooking the substantial and extensive activities of figures who may have been marginal from his perspective but central to the lives of his friends; worse, it risked presenting Ortelius as the centre of the universe of scholarly activity in which his friends and associates
were engaged. Third, the extant remains of the networks in which Ortelius was involved are fragmentary, but in the works of some recent historians the lacuna seemed imaginatively more rich than the remains. Paradoxically, some of the most detailed and precise studies of networks seemed particularly prone to build edifices on the sands of circumstantial evidence. The danger of imposing a false coherence on the activities of diffuse groups seemed to magnify the problem of focusing on Ortelius, the danger of turning him from touchstone to keystone. In response to all of these concerns, I have tried to frame him in the tessera of his life, to depict him drawing projects together from the resources at his disposal, cultivating common interests with friends and associates, and opting for silence when not certain of his ground. Unlike many who propounded the humanist ideal of learned friendship, Ortelius appears particularly consistent in his scholarly interests, and enthusiastically disinterested in his scholarly collaborations; yet his professed ability to adopt the invisibility of Gyges’ ring to guard his beliefs and motives renders him a curiously convenient slate on which to read the inscriptions of others. Although one friend, Coornhert, became irritated by Ortelius’ refusal to expound his beliefs openly, labelling him a “worthless wasp”, his religious reticence made him accessible to all and thus a convenient nodal point for information and collaboration. Because he was able to bring together in his album and life a religiously and politically diverse selection of the leading humanists of his day, his interactions with his colleagues are interesting and his cultivation of an ideal of friendship with them is all the more striking.

No-one has yet written a book-length academic biography of Ortelius, though one is much needed and sufficient sources are available. Modern efforts in that direction began with an article by the great librarian and scholar P.A. Tiele, who provided a bibliographical description of Ortelius’ atlas, and a more modest but enduring article by P. Génard in 1880 that documented the information relating to Ortelius’ life that can be recovered from the archives of the Museum Plantin-Moretus, the Antwerp town archives, and the state archives in Brussels. Less auspiciously, in the same year

3 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 229.
the curator of the Museum Plantin-Moretus in Antwerp, Max Rooses, published an article claiming that Ortelius and the printer Christopher Plantin were key members of a secret mystical group, the Family of Love, an argument that I examine and reject in chapter two. The study of Ortelius’ life was set on a firm footing in 1887 by Joannes Hessels, who edited the papers of the London-Dutch church, the first volume of which contained the bulk of Ortelius’ extant correspondence. Then, in 1895, Wauwermans published a two-volume study of sixteenth-century Flemish cartography, claiming that it formed a coherent school of which Ortelius was a key practitioner. He also contributed a lengthy entry on Ortelius for the Belgian dictionary of national biography, which contains much useful information, though littered with speculation and inaccuracies. Wauwermans and Hessels both accepted Rooses’ claim that Ortelius was a member of the Family of Love; however, his orthodoxy was asserted by F. Van Ortroy in a savage rejection of Wauwermans’ thesis that there existed a “school” of Antwerp or Flemish cartography in the sixteenth century. Van Ortroy introduced a new degree of precision to the history of Flemish-Dutch cartography, producing among other works the beginnings of a complete bibliography of Ortelius’ maps, and his work was complemented by the research of Brandmair into the sources of the maps. At the same time Jan Denucé was completing the work of his predecessor as curator of the Museum Plantin-Moretus, Max Rooses, by editing the volumes of Plantin’s correspondence, which contains much information both directly and indirectly relevant to Ortelius’ life. He also foraged in the archives of the print shop to produce an invaluable edition of the financial and business records of Plantin’s dealings with Ortelius and other geographers. Thus by the end of the First World War much of the archival material relating to Ortelius’ life and work had been

---

made accessible in print, and the two major focuses of scholarly interest in him were well established – his maps and his religious beliefs.

The major contribution in the inter-war years was the wholesale improvement of the work of Van Ortroy and Brandmair by Leo Bagrow, representative of the new direction in which he took the history of cartography.\textsuperscript{14} In 1926, W. Verduyn produced a thesis about Ortelius’ cousin, the historian Emanuel van Meteren, which contained much pertinent information and acute source criticism, and opened the way to an awareness of Ortelius’ role in historical studies by charting his contributions to his cousin’s work.\textsuperscript{15} This line of research was given further impetus in 1937 by Theodore Chotzen, who analysed the connections between Ortelius and the Welsh antiquarian Humphrey Lhuyd.\textsuperscript{16}

Since the Second World War a large number of scholars have approached the study of Ortelius from a range of different perspectives. A brief but seminal article by René Boumans in 1952 added some sophistication to the debate about Ortelius’ supposed membership of the Family of Love; Boumans claimed that he remained a Catholic but was strongly influenced by Christian Stoicism as well as the spiritualism of the Family of Love.\textsuperscript{17} Two years later a condensed version of the article was printed in translation in the \textit{Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes}, introducing the topic to an international audience of scholars trained in the techniques of Aby Warburg and his followers. Over the course of the next thirty years a series of articles and books ranging across art history, literary history, and religious history reinforced the impression that Ortelius, Plantin, and all those around them, were members of the Family of Love. The cautious conclusions of Boumans were swallowed by the far-reaching claims of B. Rekers, whose study of Benito Arias Montanus depicted an intellectual ferment of familism (constituting membership and promulgation of the ideas of the Family of Love) that was politically tied to the fortunes of the Spanish

---

\textsuperscript{15} W.B. Verduyn, \textit{Emanuel van Meteren: bijdrage tot de kennis van zijn leven, zijn tijd, en het ontstaan van zijn geschiedwerk}, The Hague, 1926.
Brilliant exposés of cultural networks in the Low Countries, by eminent scholars such as Francis Yates and Jan van Dorsten, unfortunately extended these claims on account of a predilection for the occult and hermetic, and a methodological weakness that favoured the accumulation of circumstantial evidence at the expense of cautious exploration of detail. Concurrently, scholarship on the Family of Love itself began to increase in sophistication, if not in caution, with the application of new bibliographical techniques and more thorough examination of the core texts of the group; this culminated in a series of publications in 1981 that retained many of the earlier claims but tempered by a more thorough and rounded understanding of the intellectual history of the period.

More source material was made available in 1969 by the publication of a facsimile edition of Ortelius’ *Album amicorum*, translated and edited by a panel with Jean Puraye at its head. To some extent this was a missed opportunity – the black-and-white reproductions obscured some of the detail in the text, and an almost total lack of codicological description of the manuscript has allowed scholars to draw false conclusions about the character and collection of the album. Further, the transcription, translation and notes were sloppy, containing many errors, most of which, fortunately, are not of great moment, though the overall misrepresentation of the manuscript is.

Studies in the history of cartography were largely unaffected by these developments, in part because of the technical focus of the research, but also due to homegrown familiarity with the complex characters and motivations circulating around Plantin’s

---

print-shop, as wonderfully encapsulated by Leon Voet in his monumental study of the business. In the 1960s the dominant presence in the history of Dutch cartography, Cornelius Koeman, produced both a brief biography of Ortelius, attached to a facsimile of the atlas, and a sharp assessment of his cartographic oeuvre within the context of the history of the science. His contribution was seminal in that it emphasised the lack of cartographic originality in Ortelius’ work, opening the way to consideration of him as a professional humanist or merchant tradesman. His work was greatly enhanced by the scholarly studies of Günter Schilder and R.A. Skelton. More recently Rodney Shirley, Peter van der Krogt, Marcel van den Broecke and Peter Meurer have extended in depth the knowledge of Ortelius’ maps and sources with extremely precise scholarship pursued to exacting standards.

A separate development in the field of art history has seen the growth of an increasingly detailed understanding of Ortelius’ engagement with the artistic milieu around him. Walter Melion has argued that he was in fact a key figure in the promotion of a self-conscious culture of Flemish art, and his claims have been borne out by the studies of Thomas da Costa Kauffman and Matt Kavaler.

The quatercentenary of Ortelius’ death, in 1998, was the occasion of several publications that drew together many of the recent trends in scholarship. Cartographic scholarship was best represented by Abraham Ortelius and the First

Atlas, while more interpretative historical scholarship focused on Ortelius' ideas and friendships in *Abraham Ortelius (1527-1598), cartograaf en humanist*. The diligent studies of Dirck Imhof in the archives of the Museum Plantin-Moretus were drawn together for the publication of an exhibition catalogue, *Abraham Ortelius: De wereld in kaart en de eerste atlas*. The combination of these three books provides an excellent introduction to Ortelian scholarship, from carto-bibliographies to art history and speculative religious history. The various contributions also made clear the need for an integrated study of Ortelius' antiquarian and historical pursuits, as well as the limitations brought by the continued lack of a critical biography.

The same year saw the publication of the first ever monograph on Ortelius, Giorgio Mangani's *Il “mondo” di Abramo Ortelio*. Mangani sets out to show that there is an underlying core of spiritualist eirenicism animating the intellectual out-put of Ortelius and many of his associates, including Galle, Hogenberg, Plantin, Mylius, and Montano. He argues that the ideas in this milieu are characterised by a blend of Stoicism and the late-familist teachings of Hendrik Jansen van Barrefelt – thus far *pace* Rekers, Hamilton and Van Dorsten. He proceeds to integrate this account with broad analyses of the culture of curiosity and emblemata in the Renaissance, attempting to show, through a process of associative synthesis, that everything from the occult to new developments in bibliography percolated into the spiritualist Stoicism of Ortelius' milieu. Mangani slips confidently between the “world” he sees around Ortelius and the world as seen by Ortelius, presenting a dizzying blur of cause and effect that intimates coherence at the expense of nuance. This work has not yet found an audience among Ortelian scholars, perhaps because its focus is tangential to the concerns of cartographic historians and its breadth of scope has proved difficult for cultural historians to digest. Although several articles published since have shown some similarity of concerns, their approach has been through detailed historical

---


reconstruction and thus has had little recourse to Mangani’s sweeping narrative. More pertinently, in recent years a reaction has set in against the claims made for familism and eirenicism in the culture of the Low Countries. Paul Valkema Blouw has shown how detailed attention to the relevant archival and bibliographical material calls into question the claim that Plantin had anything other than commercial interest in the Family of Love, while the microscopic attention to manuscripts in the articles of Jeanine de Landtsheer has undermined much of the textual basis for identification of familist networks – her labours in editing and publishing the correspondence of Lipsius have also made available further source material relating to Ortelius and his milieu. Mangani’s argument may have come a generation too late to convince.

In the last five years several new Ortelian scholars have appeared. Joost Depuydt addressed the need for a broader cultural study of Ortelius’ antiquarian humanism with articles focusing on his friendship with Lipsius and on the friendship network as a whole. Unfortunately he has not yet had the opportunity to build on these beginnings, though the eventual publication of his research on Ortelius’ unpublished correspondence would be welcomed. Likewise eagerly anticipated is the work of Elisabeth Neumann, whose doctoral thesis (in preparation at the University of Toronto) on sixteenth-century artistic depictions of the four continents has led her to specialise in Ortelian studies. Earlier this year Tine Meganck completed a thesis in Princeton, also focusing on antiquarianism in Ortelius’ work and milieu. Drawing upon her training as an art historian, she has emphasised the visual techniques used by


Ortelius to study artefacts, placing him in the tradition of Renaissance antiquarians who worked outside the purely textual mode normally associated with humanist scholarship. The works and ideas of these scholars have produced a stimulating environment in which to study Ortelius, and have combined to underline his importance beyond the sphere of cartographical scholarship and ill-focused debates about the extent and significance of the Family of Love. Ortelius the humanist is now a figure both heralded and increasingly understood.

The study of humanism as a cultural movement is a vast field containing several simultaneous and competing historiographical traditions. Most pertinent to my concerns in this thesis has been the debate about antiquarianism versus textual scholarship. Since Momigliano lamented the lack of a history of antiquarianism, and set the parameters for future research, much has changed. He claimed that in the sixteenth century there were no historians who sought to rewrite the history of Classical antiquity, only antiquarians who sought to illustrate or clarify the works of the ancients by topical studies. Yet he also emphasises the reliance of antiquarians on material evidence rather than textual sources, a characteristic that hardly befits the philological research that animated much of the sixteenth-century humanist engagement with the past. The latter has been extensively explored by one of Momigliano’s intellectual heirs, Anthony Grafton, whose account of a humanist book culture saturated in topical reading practices and the personal agendas of competing individuals has been a key point of departure for this study. I have sought to explore the ways in which Ortelius’ geographical interests were formed within, and contributed to, the bibliographical, antiquarian and philological methods of sixteenth-century humanist culture.

The most pervasive concern within humanist culture in the later sixteenth century was not the discovery of new texts nor the discovery of new lands; it was the developing fragmentation, and potential disintegration, of Christendom. Many

humanists retreated from the increasingly polemical and destructive religious debates of their day into an escapist realm of secular scholarship and civil erudition. It is too easy to follow them in their path and miss the unfolding religious contours that buffeted and shaped the course of their lives. Ortelius masterfully side-stepped the confessional imperatives that sought to limit his travel, activities and acquaintance, but much of the effort of his life and work was expended in this balletic feat of evasion. I have therefore had to take cognizance of a much broader current of religious history than the limited debates about familism or Flemish spiritualism. Most recently, religious historians have occupied themselves with the question of confessionalisation: when did it occur? whom did it affect? was it top-down or bottom-up, or both? This paradigm attempts to draw together under a sociological perspective the formation of the modern state, the institutionalisation of religious confessions, and the incremental process of social disciplining. In its most extreme form, "confessionalisation" is an attempt to account for the onset of modernity through analysis of the fusion of secular and religious interests in the burgeoning proto-capitalist states of Europe. As such, it reconstructs upon the foundational approaches of Weber and Durkheim a response to the issue of religious confessions raised by Zeeden through a sophisticated re-reading of Oestreich and Elias. The resulting "structural-functionalist" paradigm is an unwieldy but provocative and productive hermeneutic for exploring some of the characteristic features of early-modern Europe.

Yet the cast of confessionalisation was forged for the German Empire at the turn of the seventeenth century; translation of the paradigm to other regional studies has proved enduringly problematic. Those writings that have focused on the Low

Countries have emphasised a later period than that under consideration here. Historiography of the Low Countries has for many decades been concerned with urban and provincial particularism. For the Netherlands this has raised intractable questions about the formation of the new state, the origin of centralising pressures, and the extent of religious freedom throughout the seventeenth century. Attempts to pursue more wide-ranging interpretations of Dutch culture have found ill-favour (notably Simon Schama), while Dutch historians have begun to reconstitute thorny debates about toleration in the Dutch Republic, setting detailed accounts of individuals within the whirlpool of confessional pressures and instability. Within this context J.J. Woltjer’s insistence on sensitivity to local pressures, vacillation, and micro-reconstruction of the varying options available to individuals at different times, has had a pervasive influence, both more generally and also specifically on my project.

Belgian historiography of religion has followed a somewhat different course, drawing upon a French tradition of scholarship about the Catholic reformation as transplanted through the work of Johan Decavele. The discussion has been greatly advanced by detailed reconstructions of the legal institutions of the Low Countries and their ability to implement reformation. Yet Belgium also has benefitted from a growing number of micro-historical studies that have explored the minutiae of religious life in a carefully reconstructed social context, demonstrating the creativity of individuals in adapting to circumstances and in forming their own conceptual frameworks out of the

40 See the collection of articles in J.J. Woltjer, Tussen Vrijheidstrijd en Burgeroorlog: over de Nederlandsse Opstand 1535-1580, Amsterdam, 1994; and also Woltjer’s seminal study Friesland in Hervormingstijd, Leiden, 1962.
building-blocks presented by their cultural milieu. The methodological implications of this approach have been outlined and adroitly implemented by the Dutch historian Willem Frijhoff — it is only by reconstructing in detail the options available to individuals that we can understand the decisions they took and the manner in which they appropriated elements of their culture to their own ends. The question of confessionalisation, then, has come to seem something of a simplification at a micro-level: it presents a retrospective view of the options without accounting for the contingent creativity of individual answers.

The most pervasive trend in recent scholarship that has explored the intellectual make-up of humanists caught by the polarising forces of confessionalisation has been the study of Neostoicism. Offering a less idealistic and more clearly defined category for analysis than eirenicism, Neostoicism has come to be seen as the governing ethos of northern-European humanism at the turn of the seventeenth century, particularly in the Low Countries in the circles around both Lipsius, who expressly promoted the study of Stoical writers, and William of Orange. Part of the attraction of such scholarship is that it has been seen as an opportunity to revise and build upon the debate about individualism in the Renaissance, arguing that Neostoicism promoted a new awareness of the self, and thus allowing scholars to relate their work to the great and competing theses of Burkhardt and Baron. While it would be tempting to place the celebration of friendship within this context, just as it can certainly be helpfully interpreted through Neostoical ideas, I have found it essential to maintain close scrutiny of the variations between the ethical and intellectual positions of individuals that has explored the intellectual make-up of humanists caught by the polarising forces of confessionalisation has been the study of Neostoicism. Offering a less idealistic and more clearly defined category for analysis than eirenicism, Neostoicism has come to be seen as the governing ethos of northern-European humanism at the turn of the seventeenth century, particularly in the Low Countries in the circles around both Lipsius, who expressly promoted the study of Stoical writers, and William of Orange. Part of the attraction of such scholarship is that it has been seen as an opportunity to revise and build upon the debate about individualism in the Renaissance, arguing that Neostoicism promoted a new awareness of the self, and thus allowing scholars to relate their work to the great and competing theses of Burkhardt and Baron. While it would be tempting to place the celebration of friendship within this context, just as it can certainly be helpfully interpreted through Neostoical ideas, I have found it essential to maintain close scrutiny of the variations between the ethical and intellectual positions of individuals that has explored the intellectual make-up of humanists caught by the polarising forces of confessionalisation has been the study of Neostoicism. Offering a less idealistic and more clearly defined category for analysis than eirenicism, Neostoicism has come to be seen as the governing ethos of northern-European humanism at the turn of the seventeenth century, particularly in the Low Countries in the circles around both Lipsius, who expressly promoted the study of Stoical writers, and William of Orange. Part of the attraction of such scholarship is that it has been seen as an opportunity to revise and build upon the debate about individualism in the Renaissance, arguing that Neostoicism promoted a new awareness of the self, and thus allowing scholars to relate their work to the great and competing theses of Burkhardt and Baron. While it would be tempting to place the celebration of friendship within this context, just as it can certainly be helpfully interpreted through Neostoical ideas, I have found it essential to maintain close scrutiny of the variations between the ethical and intellectual positions of individuals that has explored the intellectual make-up of humanists caught by the polarising forces of confessionalisation has been the study of Neostoicism. Offering a less idealistic and more clearly defined category for analysis than eirenicism, Neostoicism has come to be seen as the governing ethos of northern-European humanism at the turn of the seventeenth century, particularly in the Low Countries in the circles around both Lipsius, who expressly promoted the study of Stoical writers, and William of Orange. Part of the attraction of such scholarship is that it has been seen as an opportunity to revise and build upon the debate about individualism in the Renaissance, arguing that Neostoicism promoted a new awareness of the self, and thus allowing scholars to relate their work to the great and competing theses of Burkhardt and Baron. While it would be tempting to place the celebration of friendship within this context, just as it can certainly be helpfully interpreted through Neostoical ideas, I have found it essential to maintain close scrutiny of the variations between the ethical and intellectual positions of individuals.
in the networks that I have studied. Further, the research of scholars such as Peter Burke has demonstrated that the concept of “friendship” in the sixteenth century covered a range of social and philosophical meanings; thus I have attempted to take the practices of friendship as I have found them, rather than translating them into an interpretative framework of intersubjectivity that suggests a false coherence in relationships and ideas that were often ad hoc or context-specific.47

The Polish historian and philosopher of science, Ludwik Fleck, has argued that the history of ideas often progresses through the shared methodological innovations of small circles of friends (what Fleck calls a Denkkollektiv) which establish behavioural and conceptual patterns that are spread through wider networks.48 While I think that Fleck may well be right, I have chosen to document the formation and interaction within such a group, rather than trying prematurely to insert it within a teleological account of scholarship, science, or individualism.

Many of the sources for this study have been mentioned already. For Ortelius himself, I have tried wherever possible to consult extant manuscripts rather than relying on the published editions of his correspondence and friendship album. Several excellent editions of Ortelius’ published works now exist; I have consulted them, but have largely preferred to work with the endlessly varying individual copies of the sixteenth century because reliance upon standardised editions can obscure the flexibility and complexity of the print market, and thus may misrepresent the author’s relationship with his readers.49 The edition of letters produced by Hessels is invaluable, but it contains errors of transcription and mis-datings, as well as little by way of textual annotation (and notable mistakes in what annotation there is). Since Hessels produced his edition, the collection has been dispersed across Europe and North America; the whereabouts of some pieces is still unknown, though the Royal Library in The Hague has reassembled the majority of the collection. Still more crucial is the existence of over one hundred other letters that can be found in archives and libraries across Europe; these have been systematically studied by Joost Depuydt,

but he has not yet made public the results of his research. Some of the uncollected correspondence has appeared in print; notably the correspondence between Ortelius and Lipsius, and twenty-four letters to Clusius (in two separate publications), but also the letters to Camden contained in the British Library, which were included in the seventeenth-century edition of Camden’s letters, and numerous miscellaneous items that formed prefatory or dedicatory epistles in the scholarly texts of the sixteenth century. The majority of manuscript letters can be found in the archives of Leiden University. Particularly important is the collection of letters written to Bonaventura Vulcanius, a preliminary transcription of which I have attached as an appendix. Other items are contained in the archives of the Museum Plantin-Moretus, in the Royal Library in Brussels, and in the British Library. Yet to understand correspondence means appreciating that it was not bi-lateral; I have read as widely as possible the correspondence of Ortelius’ friends, both to one another, and to other acquaintances.

The remainder of my sources for this study has been the printed books of the sixteenth century. I have read as widely as my linguistic abilities have permitted me, and I have attempted to regard every copy of each book as an individual piece of evidence, looking for marginal annotation and marks of ownership. I have also relied heavily upon the book catalogues of the Frankfurt fair and later reconstructions of printers’ output in order to gain greater knowledge of the market context for book publication in the sixteenth century. Ortelius’ atlas is peculiarly carefully crafted to the contours of that market, varying copy by copy to the tastes of the purchaser. Much that I have learned of the book and the project that it represents has been drawn from copies across Europe and North America.

Several features of my presentation of this material require comment. First, with regard to quotations – unless otherwise noted, the translations in the body of the text are my own. I have normally provided the original in footnotes; however, ambiguous and poetical expressions are quoted in the body of my text, thus the citation style appears to vary from chapter to chapter due to the different types of material under

consideration. As regards text quoted from the *Album amicorum* and the *Itinerarium*, I have often judged it sufficient to cite the relevant passages according to the pagination of the widely-available editions by Puraye and Schmitt-Ott. Several other texts seemed to me worth reproducing as appendices due to their centrality within my argument, namely the prefaces to the *Theatrum* and the *Thesaurus*, and the text of Ortelius’ letters to Vulcanius. In the latter case a scholarly edition is merited; however, to produce one would amount to another whole thesis, as the task of integrating it with other related sets of correspondence is a considerable one. I have opted merely for reproduction of the bare text so that the reader may have ready access to the context of my quotations. A similar motive has induced me to reproduce the prefatory material to De Jode’s atlas, which otherwise is not easily accessible. I have also included as an appendix a register of the contributions to the *Album amicorum*, in order to correct some of the errors of the facsimile edition and to obviate some of the difficulties of reading the detailed codicological analysis in chapter three.

In my reliance upon a return to and critical re-evaluation of the sources I have attempted to enhance the work of the scholars who have gone before me, building upon their labours while chiseling away at the misrepresentations that have developed from insufficiency of detail or blunt interpretation. I have departed from their works in my exploration of the previously untapped resources of Ortelius’ unedited correspondence and his philological work, while also contributing to the rapidly-growing field of non-cartographic Ortelian studies, attempting to draw together disparate sources and to create a coherent holistic perspective on his life and work. I have tried to structure my chapters in such a way that material recurs throughout in a successively layered analysis. It has been my goal to draw together a broad range of sources and perspectives without losing either focus or coherence with regard to the core material, through which means I hope also to have contributed substantial detail to the broad canvas of sixteenth-century humanist scholarship.

The atlas is what Ortelius is known for, and it occupied much of his intellectual energy over the course of his life; as such, it was the obvious starting point for my thesis. My first chapter describes the design of the first edition of the atlas by exploring its construction as a book – the indices and prefatory texts as much as the
maps. I argue that the atlas was not merely augmented in response to unprecedented popularity, but rather designed to be a work-in-progress that would centralise geographical information compiled around Europe. It was fashioned to appeal to the learned student of history as much as to the curious armchair traveller. The *Theatrum* was a work of learning, primarily focused on Europe and the historical character of its regions. I argue that the historical information was designed as much for the merchant and traveller as for the student, condensing in the manner of a commonplace book a cultural framework of understanding that readers could draw upon as they encountered unfamiliar places or names on their journeys or in their conversations. I conclude that the creation of such a work relied upon a collaborative approach to scholarship that was represented as humane and yet that was commonly lacking in a scholarly world fragmented by wars and human folly.

In my second chapter I explore the personal religious context for Ortelius’ promotion of his collaborative project, examining and ultimately rejecting the common claim that Ortelius’ was a member of the Family of Love, and therefore arguing that an alternative explanation must be found for his approach to interpersonal relationships. I suggest that Ortelius’ own comments do not provide sufficient evidence to reach detailed conclusions about his religious beliefs, but that his position within the religious debates of his time is relatively clear. Stranded in an increasingly polarised religious climate, Ortelius opted for silence and the cultivation of personal virtue, rather than attempting to reform others. His religious and political comments suggest a frustrated, isolated but forbearing figure not inclined to trust the uncertainties of the world.

My third chapter returns to the theme of collaboration, having rejected the explanation of Ortelius’ ethics through reference to the Family of Love. I therefore seek a secular account of his cultivation of a network of associates who signed his album to celebrate friendship. I examine the fashion for collecting such albums in the sixteenth century, and pursue a detailed codicological study to establish the idiosyncrasies of Ortelius’ album. I argue that it shows an unusual degree of group self-consciousness, celebrating the idea of group celebration, and yet it was compiled across diverse networks almost sporadically and apparently not under the close supervision of Ortelius himself. I therefore suggest that the album stems from a common
identification with humanism as virtue, that it deliberately cultivates non-controversial ideas, but also that it appeals to values inherent in the republic of letters that promoted compromise for the sake of learning, civility for the sake of civilisation. I argue that the friendship networks of Ortelius and his colleagues were characterised in many ways by practices of friendship based on these values.

In my last chapter I trace the development of Ortelius' involvement in the world of learning to show the twin trajectories of his own career advancement and his sponsorship of the careers or projects of others. I argue that Ortelius' antiquarian studies must be taken seriously for the increasing depth of philological sophistication that they demonstrate, and that they were fundamental to his intellectual make-up as a humanist. His pursuit of antiquarian studies was at least as early as his geographical work, and the two have much more in common than has previously been realised. I examine the development of the antiquarian writings, tracing the evidence of a developing onomastic project that was at least the equal in scope and achievement to his atlas. I show the extent of Ortelius' collaboration through the book trade, arguing that his contacts with other scholars were neither altruistic nor self-seeking, but part of a multi-faceted engagement with the practicalities of historical scholarship. I conclude that Ortelius reveals himself as less combative than most, extremely good at drawing others into collaboration and maintaining their friendship throughout, but above all a practical and devoted, if not brilliant, humanist scholar, who pursued civility as an ideal and as an operative value to negotiate the day-to-day obstacles besetting the republic of letters and civilisation itself.
The Theatrum Orbis Terrarum (1570), the first modern atlas of the world, secured Abraham Ortelius' position in history. The idea for the creation of a systematic and comprehensive map collection has been attributed to purely commercial motives. Cartographic historians have described Ortelius as an innovative entrepreneur, expressing reserve about his scientific ability and emphasising the commercial setting in which his ideas were developed. Indeed, many historians have asserted that the famous cartographer Gerard Mercator suggested the idea of creating an atlas to Ortelius, following the claim made by Mercator's first biographer, Walter Ghim. In this chapter I will reconstruct the historical context of the atlas, assessing the internal bibliographical evidence for the reasons behind its compilation, considering it in the light of the contemporary publishing market and geographical community, and evaluating the originality of its contribution within that context. While the Theatrum has long been the primary focus of Ortelius studies, I will show that the nature of the book itself creates the necessity to move beyond this text to explore the wider humanist interests of Ortelius. The Theatrum was a monumental achievement and is rightly the starting point for any study of Ortelius, but it is not enough by itself for understanding Ortelius' character or scholarly oeuvre. Conversely, detailed evaluation of Ortelius' other scholarly activities sheds new light on his geographical works; thus I will present a revised perspective on the Theatrum, demonstrating why it was such an important scholarly work, despite its having been crafted in several ways to appeal to popular tastes.


2 Ghim's biography was included in the 1595 edition of Mercator's Atlas sive cosmographicae meditationes de fabrica mundi et fabricati figura, Duisburg, 1595. A German translation is available: Hans-Heinrich Geske, "Die Vita Mercatoris des Walter Ghim wiedergegeben und übersetzt", Duisburger Forschungen, 6 (1962), 244-276.
The *Theatrum* has been judged by cartographic historians to be the first modern world atlas because it consists of a selection of maps representing contemporary knowledge of regions from all parts of the globe, uniform in size and bound in book form; yet it has never been thoroughly studied as a book, other than in terms of pure bibliographical analysis.\(^3\) If the atlas is to be seen as a coherent whole, presumably interpretation ought to begin with its world map, which occurs at the front of the book and presents a synoptic perspective. In the case of the *Theatrum*, the world map evolved over time in successive editions and thus it is helpful to begin with its final form and to read it like a palimpsest backwards towards the original. The final state of Ortelius' world map appeared first in 1592 in the eighth augmented edition of the *Theatrum*. This map, dated 1587, contains no significant alteration from the geography of its predecessor, designed in 1586, but it is altered in overall design.\(^4\) Elegantly set in a strapwork frame with four medallions containing quotations from Cicero and Seneca, the map is both aesthetically enhanced and provided with a philosophical context. It was not included in the Spanish edition of the *Theatrum* produced in 1588, nor in the German one of 1591, rather both of these editions contained the 1586 map. That Ortelius kept his new, more scholarly presentation for the next Latin edition of his book, in 1592, is not surprising given that the quotations were engraved in Latin and referred to Classical sources. Thus, the 1587 map of the world is an excellent introduction to the development of the *Theatrum* as a Latin work, in which language it was first published and found its widest distribution.

The two previous world maps in the *Theatrum* were framed by a clouded background suggesting the universe beyond the terrestrial part of the globe. Below the map itself is a quotation from Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*: "How can human affairs seem important to one who perceives all eternity and the vastness of the world?"\(^5\) The quotation is designed to reflect Ortelius' piety and humility, traits frequently mentioned by his contemporaries. The context of the original quotation is a discussion as to

---


whether the wise man can be free from all disturbance of the soul. Cicero defends the Stoical theory of the suppression of the passions in counterdistinction to the Aristotelian view that equanimity is a mean between extremes of passions. Ortelius’ allusion to Stoical ideas, particularly as mediated by Cicero, is typical of the period immediately prior to the renewal and popularisation of Stoical doctrine by Ortelius’ close comrade Justus Lipsius, most famously in his De Constantia. Stoical ideas, the gradual revival of which was co-extensive with the spread of humanism in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, acquired sudden and striking popularity among intellectuals in France and the Netherlands as civil wars created an unaccommodating environment in which to pursue learning – Lipsius’ contribution was to add scholarly and stylistic brilliance to a trend already well established.6

Ortelius’ quotation is apt. The reader is encouraged to contemplate the magnificence of the created world as a whole rather than becoming attached to daily vicissitudes and cares. Thus the quotation promotes contemplative use of the map, rather than emphasising its geographical value. A map drawn in this scale was of no practical use to mariners and contained little information relevant to merchants. It is decorative in the manner of the large multi-sheet wall maps of the period, but it was also a scientific contribution to the advancement of geographical knowledge, revealing up-to-date information about the Soloman Islands, Nova Zemla, and the western coast of South America.7 Perhaps above all it was an expression of the prowess of sixteenth-century learning, extending the range of knowledge over the entire globe. Ortelius’ stated sense of humility before the vastness of creation does not conflict with this pride in learning; rather, the combination was common among geographers and natural


philosophers of the period. Yet the addition of four further quotations from Classical authors in the 1587 edition of the map requires further scrutiny.

In the top left medallion Ortelius has placed a quotation from Cicero's *Dream of Scipio*: "Men were created according to this law, that they should watch over this globe which is called the earth and which you see in the middle of this temple." This work was extremely popular throughout the middle ages and the early modern period and would have been an obvious choice for Ortelius. The fragment quoted occurs at the point at which Scipio sees his father as evidence that life after death is the true life and that earthly existence is in fact death. Scipio desires to die instantly to enter true life but is countered by the argument that the earth is man's ordained place. Men must remain on earth and raise their minds to the heavens in order to ensure access to the true life after death. This sentiment chimes well with Christian piety and in particular with Ortelius' motto, "contemno et orno, mente, manu" [I scorn and adorn with mind and hand], which indicates the balance he attempted to maintain between the Christian Stoic's *contemptus mundi* and the humanist artist's commitment to celebrating the world. While the quotation as it exists on the border of the map highlights man's place in the world, the context would have been familiar to readers as a reference to abstraction from the material concerns of the world and to contemplation of divine glory and providence.

In the top right medallion is another quotation from Cicero, this time taken from the *De Natura Deorum*: "The horse exists for riding, the ox for ploughing, the dog for hunting and keeping watch; man's place, however, is to contemplate the universe." This comes from the character Balbus' exposition of Stoical natural philosophy, in

---


9 "Homines hac lege sunt generati, qui tuarentur illum globum, quem in hoc templo medium vides, quae terra dicitur." Cicero, *De Republica*, 6.15.


which Chrysippus is cited rejecting Epicureanism. The context is an argument that only universal Nature can attain perfection and is, as a consequence, virtuous, rational and divine. Ortelius once again chooses a quotation that focuses on man’s relation to the world, repeating that his role is contemplative.

In the bottom right, a medallion contains a quotation from Seneca’s *Epistles*: “I wish that the whole of philosophy could be revealed to us, just as the entire shape of the universe comes into sight.” This letter to Lucilius treats of the divisions of philosophy and their value. The quotation suggests a deliberately philosophical motivation to Ortelius’ cartography as an extension of his belief that the world is rational. This does not in itself mean that Ortelius had an explicit philosophical agenda, since declarations of the intellectual and moral value of geography were quite common in cosmo logical and cartographic works.

At the bottom left is a quotation from Seneca’s *Naturae Quaestiones*: “This is that point which is divided by sword and fire among so many nations. How ridiculous are the goals of mortals!” Found in the preface to Seneca’s natural philosophical encyclopaedia, this is a moralising comment on the pettiness of human passions and affairs from the perspective of the grandness of nature as a whole. Once again, Ortelius’ message is that earthly cares should be dropped in consideration of the ‘bigger picture.’

Ortelius was a cartographer, not a philosopher. At no stage in his career did he enter into public debates over the nature or form of the cosmos, nor did he argue for any particular philosophical school. In the sixteenth century Seneca and Cicero were two

---


16 Though in his *Mythologia Ethica* (1579) Arnold Freitag presents Ortelius and Andreas Ximenius with a selection of teachings: “qui Stoae veteri ac virtutum scholae impense favetis”. 
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of the most widely read and admired Classical authors, valued in part for their eclectic syntheses of other philosophical traditions.\textsuperscript{17} Ortelius chose his quotations to be appropriate to the map they surround. With the exception of the \textit{Dream of Scipio}, he cites Seneca and Cicero in cases where they are presenting Stoical arguments. However, it would be unwise to construct a philosophical position from the quotations selected, other than a rejection of Epicurean metaphysics, which had very few adherents in the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{18} Nonetheless, the quotations do allow Ortelius to be placed among the artisan and professional humanists flourishing in the Netherlands at this time – while Ortelius’ piety shows through, it comes in the form of Classical rather than specifically Christian texts; though this is not unusual, it is evidence of humanist orientation.\textsuperscript{19} The fact that Ortelius placed these texts around his world map, replacing the traditional and much more widespread representation of the winds among clouds, is what is most significant.\textsuperscript{20} Cosmology and mythology both give way almost entirely to ornamental but learned Classicism.

Still more significant is that these citations of Stoical ideas were inserted around the 1587 edition of the world map – that is, immediately after Lipsius’ publication of his popular literary evocation of Stoicism, his \textit{De Constantia}, which appeared in 1584. In later chapters it will become clear that Ortelius’ interest in Stoical ideas did not stem from acquaintance with the works of Lipsius, rather it preceded the latter’s study of the topic, but it is hard to resist the suspicion that Ortelius was here foregrounding Stoicism with an eye to its increased popularity in the wake of Lipsius’ popularising publication. While none of Ortelius’ quotations appear in the \textit{De Constantia} (though their source texts are cited), the sense of warfare exposing the folly of human

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{18}] See B. Copenhaver & C. Schmitt, \textit{Renaissance Philosophy}, 196-209.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
attachment to transient things such as personal belongings or place of residence is the same.\textsuperscript{21}

The geographical content of the map provides further insight into the world of the author. In 1564 Ortelius had chosen to use a heart-shaped projection for his wall map of the world, but the oval projection adopted for the \textit{Theatrum} maps was more widely used during the sixteenth century, with the zero meridian passing through the Canary Islands following Classical precedent.\textsuperscript{22} A number of errors reveal the state of contemporary geographical knowledge. While Europe, Africa and Asia are mapped in detail and broadly reliably, indicating the impact of trade and the Portuguese voyages of discovery, America is greatly distorted. The east-west dimensions of North America are greatly overestimated, reflecting lack of knowledge of the region, though it should also be noted that the Mediterranean too is stretched longitudinally, indicating technical problems of measurement that would only be solved fully in the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{23} Most striking is the representation of “Terra Australis Nondum Cognita”, occupying roughly one quarter of the surface of the earth. This is a relatively standard misrepresentation revealing the limits of geographical knowledge during the period.

The 1570 version of the world map was absolutely up-to-date, relying on the groundbreaking wall map published the previous year by Ortelius’ close friend and illustrious colleague Gerard Mercator. The 1586 and 1587 maps were not substantially changed, except to incorporate more detailed findings regarding the shape of South America and the discovery of the Solomon Islands. This information probably came through the sources used by Ortelius’ compatriot Petrus Plancius in preparing a world map that he

\textsuperscript{21} Justus Lipsius, \textit{De Constantia}, 1584. Lipsius makes frequent use of Cicero and Seneca, among many other Classical sources, but he does not cite the specific passages used by Ortelius, indeed he does not cite Cicero’s \textit{Republica} at all.

\textsuperscript{22} See Shirley, \textit{The Mapping of the World}. The most famous double-cordiform projection of the sixteenth century was Oronce Fine’s \textit{Nova et integra universi orbis descriptio}, 1531. Giorgio Mangani rather hastily allows the double cordiform projection of the 1564 map to stand for what he sees as Ortelius’ religious and philosophical beliefs about the world without demonstrating the relation of its (purportedly) mystical perspective to the maps that Ortelius preferred to include in his \textit{Theatrum}: Mangani, \textit{Il “mondo” di Abramo Ortelio: misticismo, geografia e collezionismo del Rinascimento dei Paesi Bassi}, Modena, 1998, 247-67; his argument draws on the research by George Kish, “The cosmographic heart: cordiform maps of the sixteenth century”, \textit{Imago Mundi}, XIX (1965), 13-21.

published in 1592. Modern sources gradually became the basis of geographical knowledge over the course of the sixteenth century as cartographic practice moved from adaptation of Classical maps towards entirely original mapping, but it is not true to say that Classical geography was entirely left behind. Authors such as Herodotus were still cited favourably with regard to explanations of phenomena, while Ptolemy remained a central text for study with regard to mathematical cosmology and cartography. While it was accepted that the knowledge of the ancients was limited in its extent, there was still a strong belief that they were reliable in the majority of cases and merely needed to be correctly understood.

Although most of Ortelius' maps ultimately drew upon a small number of the most reliable sources, during the process of composition he had to consider a much wider pool. Cartography was a commercial industry and hence rivalries could limit access to information and texts. While Ortelius was certainly involved in the day-to-day intrigues of information-gathering he seems largely to have remained above accusations of foul play from rivals or contemporaries, perhaps due to his conscientious referencing: the Theatrum contained an extensive list of the sources that he had used during the compilation of the work. Thus, for example, the 1570 edition contains reference to thirteen world maps familiar to the author, which can thus be regarded as influences on the world map in the atlas. Further references to Classical authorities are given on the reverse of the map itself, while historians of cartography have identified a number of other possible influences, for example Ortelius' own 1564 world map. By the time that the 1595 Latin edition was published, containing a total of 147 maps, the potential for omitting references must have been huge. In the final edition before his death, Ortelius included 183 names of modern geographers in the

---


'Catalogus Auctorum' appended to the atlas, which is still a crucial resource for historians.27

Such collaboration was fundamental to Ortelius' attempt to create a synoptic description of the world. Cartography was among the first of the early modern disciplines to be thoroughly transformed by empirical research, but in an age of continuous exploration and geographical study of unfamiliar territories it was impossible to learn all the basics of geography from a textbook.28 What was taught in universities came under the rubric of mathematics or was discussed during historical reading in the quadrivium. Students might study Ptolemy's *Almagest* or his *Geography*, Sacrobosco's *De Sphaera Mundi* or Apian's *Liber Cosmographicus* for the mathematical techniques required in cosmography or cartography; Herodotus, Strabo or the encyclopaedists might be read for ethnographic and historical interest while studying the Classical languages.29 However, the cartographer learnt his trade properly outside a university context. Even a scientific and mathematical innovator like Mercator learnt his trade under the private tuition of Gemma Frisius, rather than in the University of Louvain where Frisius lectured in medicine.30 The production of maps, globes and geographical instruments was a craft, or series of crafts, which required training in a workshop. Likewise, gathering knowledge required some experience of travelling and familiarity with the techniques of using instruments to determine locality and relational distances.31

---


Yet no cartographer could be everywhere and thus the skills of humanist scholarship were essential for leading practitioners. Ortelius was in many ways simply an editor and compiler of other people’s work; his correspondence is filled with references to circulated manuscripts, travel accounts and maps. Courteous relations had to be established and maintained with foreign scholars and it was essential to gain their respect and trust before they would share their knowledge. Contributors of maps and topographical detail were often amateur enthusiasts and dilettantes whose information could be either excellent or unreliable. Local knowledge was essential. Without the prevailing humanist ideal of a republic of letters pursuing the disinterested advancement of learning for the universal good of culture it would have been impossible for a figure such as Ortelius to centralise current geographical knowledge in a single reference work. Fulfilling this role required an international circle of learned correspondents, familiarity with the techniques and Classical texts of geography, and philological expertise to pick through the minefield of misattributions and incorrect names. Thus Ortelius’ studies in cartography almost inevitably drew him into the humanist milieu in Antwerp and beyond. What is striking about Ortelius’ world map of 1587 is that humanism is brought into the foreground in the strapwork decoration and Classical quotations; in other words, the map is not just founded upon humanist studies by the author or his sources, it is a strikingly classicising humanist text in its own right.

---

32 A good example is the correspondence relating to the publication of the Theatrum, see especially Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii ... Epistulae, nos. 29, 32; 37, 38, 39, and 43. Sebastian Munster, confronting the notion that he ought to survey in person all the lands that he described, remarked that life is too short: Cosmographia, a.v.

33 This varied somewhat by region — the Netherlands and Italy were particularly well served by professionals, whereas detailed and accurate maps of, for example, Spain were few and far between. See C. Koeman, Geschiedenis van de kartografie van Nederland, Alphen aan den Rijn, 1983; and A. Hernando, “The Contribution of Ortelius’ Theatrum to the Geographical Knowledge of Spain”, AOFa, 239-262.


35 Schilder refers to those who took this approach to cartography as “kamergeleerden”, distinguishing them from “caert-schrijvers” who engaged in surveying: see his “De Noordhollandsche Cartografenschool” in the exhibition catalogue, Lucas Jansz. Wagenaer van Enckhuysen: De maritieme kartografie in de Nederlanden in de zestiende en het begin van de zeventiende eeuw, Enkhuizen, 1984, 49.
Having established an initial image of the *Theatrum* as presented through its world map, I want to set out three features of the broad historical context in which Ortelius was working, before I proceed to analyse the contents of the atlas and the specific market for which it was designed. First, I will outline the socio-political background in which Ortelius found himself; second, I will indicate the state of geographical knowledge and practice; and third, I will characterise the printing industry towards which Ortelius' texts were geared. The goal of this section is not to be comprehensive, but to circumvent potential confusions and to highlight formative influences that might otherwise evade detection.

The 1560s, when Ortelius was editing texts for his atlas, was a period of heightened social and political tension in the Low Countries due to the introduction of new centralising religious and fiscal policies by a monarch who was perceived to be insensitive to local needs, preoccupied with other priorities, and intolerant of the pragmatic accommodation that had emerged in local religious affairs. In the monarch's absence a power vacuum allowed the fissuring of the status quo from within on two separate levels: competing factions at court and insurgent religious minorities, mainly Calvinist, at a mercantile and increasingly popular level. The monarch's decision to quell the troubles by force was anticipated by armed insurrection in defence of local liberties. The subsequent period of suppression was as ferocious and thorough as the previous period had been unconstrained. The resurgent rebellion of the 1570s and 1580s forged an irreparable breach in dominion that only gradually exhibited a degree of geographical coherence as individuals, towns and territories shifted allegiance according to pragmatic judgments.36 The impact of these developments on Ortelius' map-project were threefold. At a basic level, it became increasingly difficult for Ortelius to travel to acquire the maps that he needed, to maintain personal or epistolary contact with other scholars, and to evade physical and financial upset in the midst of

---

social unrest. At a second level, local maps drawn with the latest scientific techniques became politically sensitive as figures such as Viglius de Ayatta, Cardinal Granvelle and the Duke of Alva sought and commissioned maps to inform court policy and guide military campaigns, and both Charles V and Philip II also commanded the construction of mathematical instruments. Given the political sensitivity of detailed regional maps, Ortelius had to negotiate for relaxation of censorship on a case by case basis, with the consequence that his personal credentials were scrutinised as frequently as his maps. The shifting contours of authority also seem to have granted his rival, Gerard De Jode, the opportunity to publish a competing atlas drawing heavily upon the previously censored corpus of local maps. At a third level, the perpetual vacillation of political fortunes rendered definitive statements of belief commercially risky; notably, Ortelius' *Theatrum* contained exhortations to piety but an almost total lack of reference to the religious character of the regions it described – compared to the speculative and exotic outlook of the wall maps in the 1560s, the Classicism of the atlas appears austere and reserved.37

In the sixteenth century the corpus of geographical knowledge changed more rapidly than that of any other discipline. The most dramatic changes were wrought by voyages of discovery, but the increased volume of long-distance trade within Europe and mathematical developments in regional mapping also fuelled the seemingly insatiable market appetite for new maps. Yet these maps are too easily misunderstood and inappropriately grouped; each distinct type of map had its own market and uses, often radically different. Navigators used neither atlases nor the printed sheet maps of which they were composed; the maps were too large in scale, inaccurate, and contained little information about currents, winds or sandbanks – co-ordinating them with navigational techniques would have been almost impossible. More practically-oriented portolans and rutters were widely produced, providing detailed and accurate descriptions of coastlines and harbours, and carefully sequenced directions to specific locations, yet

even these were regarded by navigators with suspicion, and those that survive are almost always decorative imitations that were not designed for use. The opposition between cartographers and navigators was often fierce: expertise based on experience was criticised by the learned for lack of scientific rigour, while book learning was mocked in return for its inaccuracy and irrelevance at sea. A similar situation pertains to land travel: channels of trade were well established, and often protected by privileges, but alternate routes when necessary were arranged ad hoc as local knowledge and discussion with other couriers guaranteed the safest route given the most up-to-date information. This is not to say that cartographers, merchants and monarchs might not believe their carefully-wrought maps to be of practical value for travel; indeed, many examples could be cited to suggest that they did, often leading to serious conflicts. Nonetheless, maps of the kind that formed the source for Ortelius’ atlas were bought and read by a literate and economically secure elite who read them in the comfort of their own homes or in the discomfort of travelling convoys; such people did not navigate, and the maps that they bought were primarily designed merely to illustrate the places they visited.38

As regards the printing industry, Ortelius’ relation to it as an author was somewhat unusual. He personally provided the funds for printing the *Theatrum*, at least down to 1588, which allowed him greater control over production and distribution of his book, and earned him the right to reap the profits. Normally the funds for publication came from a patron, from a publisher, or from the printer, often with a smaller contribution from the author. Ortelius’ case is all the more exceptional because the *Theatrum* was one of the most expensive books to produce in its day, consisting of large folio pages and detailed copper-plate engravings. By contrast, the majority of printed maps were published as single sheets in print runs that are almost impossible to determine due to

the poor survival rate of copies, and the prices of individual copies varied greatly depending on the quality and process of production. The printing industry was, in most cities, independent of the guild system; although increasingly ways were found to regulate printers, nevertheless illegal imprints and small businesses slip through the net of historical detection more often than not. It is thus quite possible that the majority of early maps and map printers are not known. In Antwerp the situation was slightly different in that printers were placed under increasing pressure to join the guild of St Luke, particularly if they were printing images. Many of those who worked in the printing industry were artists and engravers who can be traced through the guild. Conversely, a large number of image-printers in Antwerp were directly involved in the map trade, Gerard de Jode being only the most immediate example. Printers and publishers conducted their businesses on a pragmatic basis, evading the law when poor finances required it, printing false dates, names and locations for such purposes or to deceive competitors. What often seems like a bewildering cloud of unrelated activities resolved itself into some coherence in the behaviour of larger firms (particularly the scholarly printer-publishers such as Plantin, Estienne, Birckmann and Aldus), and in the co-operative networks at annual trade fairs. Nonetheless, every copy of an early-modern book was hand-created and individual, thus attention needs to be paid to copy-by-copy variations if a full sense of the printing of a work is to be gained. This is particularly necessary with regard to map collections, which could more easily be rearranged sheet by sheet than a discursive text. Ortelius exploited this situation to customise his atlas for individual readers, producing more or less expensive copies as the occasion suited. Nonetheless, the Theatrum remained one of the most expensive books of the century, a fact which contributed to the high survival rate of copies. The number of people who were able both to read and to buy the book was small, and any consideration of its use or influence must take this into account, as must attempts to reconstruct Ortelius' designs in producing his atlas.39

As we have seen, the world map held pride of place as the first map the reader would see in the atlas, thus its humanist presentation provides a framework within which to read the rest of the atlas, but before doing so it is necessary to be clear about the physical nature of the book, in particular to be sensitive to variations in its physical form in successive editions. The contents of the *Theatrum* are perhaps too well known, having had considerable influence in determining the structure of atlases down to the present day; however, the atlas changed over the course of time as each new edition was published in up-dated and augmented form. These different editions seem geared towards different audiences and hence suggest different motivations.\(^4\) It is therefore important to be aware of possible distinctions between the idea of the atlas as expressed in the first edition, perhaps admitting minor alterations within the first few years, and the intentions suggested by the later versions. The first edition carries an elegant title page executed in copper plate, frequently coloured. A preface and series of laudatory poems lead on to the contents page and a catalogue of geographical authors cited or used during the production of the atlas. The first map is a depiction of the entire globe, followed by maps of each of the four continents. The remainder of the maps follow the Ptolemaic sequence from east to west, presenting a series of regions in greater or lesser detail depending on the information available to Ortelius. Each map takes up a full folio opening, while the reverse sides contain text relating to the map itself or the area depicted. The collection draws to a close with an extended version of one of these texts - a lengthy letter to Ortelius by Humphrey Lhuyd concerning the island of Anglesey and a Roman fort on the north coast of Belgium.\(^4\)

A catalogue of the historical variants in place names concludes the atlas.

What kind of market could this material expect to find? If the target market consisted entirely of middle class merchant tradesmen, particularly those involved in overseas trade, then a number of elements seem inexplicable, such as the catalogues of sources editions of Ortelius' atlas", *The Map Collector*, 70 (1995), 2-8; C. Koeman, "The Chart Trade in Europe from its Origin to Modern Times", *Terrae Incognitae*, 12 (1980), 49-64.\(^4\) The various editions are most comprehensively and accurately described by Peter van der Krogt, "Appendix I" in *AOFA*, 379-82; but see M.P.R. van den Broecke, "Unstable editions of Ortelius' atlas", *The Map Collector*, 70 (1995), 2-8.
and of historical place names. These seem to be aimed at a learned humanist audience, as does much of the material incorporated in the textual descriptions that accompany each map. The first few editions of the atlas were in Latin; subsequently, editions were produced in Flemish, German, French, Spanish, Italian, and English, geared specifically towards mercantile interest in the relevant countries, providing lists of trade goods instead of learned indices, and altering the texts accompanying each map to reflect the interests of mercantile readers. These variations reinforce the impression that the earlier Latin editions were less directly targeted at these groups. A further audience is possible: one made up wealthy nobles and burgesses with an interest in foreign affairs and with the money to spend on an expensive illustrated folio atlas. Indeed, a common suggestion as to Ortelius’ motives in producing the atlas is that he was responding to the request of just such a wealthy burgess. In this case and in the case of the explanation that he was meeting the navigational needs of the merchant trading community, the most important element in the conception of the atlas is deemed to be the reduction of the maps into a uniform size and a portable form in one volume. Presumably if Ortelius’ intended market consisted of learned humanists then his success in their eyes would be expressed in terms of his contribution to learning. Though it is slightly misleading to force a dichotomy between the learned community and the wealthy merchants of Antwerp and surrounding regions, for the present it remains convenient to distinguish between two types of audience reception – one as a tool for following current affairs or judging trade routes, the other as a means to further the cultivation of learning through the study of books.

The series of editions produced by Ortelius helps to reinforce the idea of separate markets for the atlas. As already pointed out, vernacular editions were produced

42 Dirk Imhof has noted in an unpublished conference presentation, given in America, that the text contained in the different language editions varies in style and in the degree of scholarly content. I am grateful to him for drawing my attention to his work on the matter, which is reflected in somewhat scattered form in the exhibition catalogue, for which he was largely responsible, De Wereld in Kaart: Abraham Ortelius, 1527-1598, en de Eerste Atlas, Antwerp, 1998.
43 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii ... Epistulae, no. 330: Johannes Radermacher to Jacob Cool, 25 July, 1603.
44 Schilder makes a similar distinction between “functionele zeekaarten” and “kantoor-kaarten” in his article on “De Noordhollandsche Cartografenschool” in the exhibition catalogue, Lucas Jansz. Wagenaer van Enckhuysen: De maritieme cartografie in de Nederlanden in de zestiende en het begin van de zeventiende eeuw, Enkhuize, 1984, 48.
following the initial Latin editions, often lacking the appendices and containing much less Classical and historical reference in the texts accompanying each map. Thus, the French edition of 1598 and the Spanish editions from 1588 onwards contain different short appendices supplying information on trade routes and products. The text of the vernacular editions can also be stylistically different – for example, the French text is less scientific and more lyrical in tone, suggestive of the imaginative journey the reader is taking in viewing the atlas. These variations tend to confirm the idea that these atlases were aimed at a non-learned readership; and conversely that the elements excluded were aimed at a learned readership. Records from the print shop of Christopher Plantin show that by the end of the decade the book was being issued in variant forms according to the design of the buyer, as was common for such books at the time – coloured or not, bound or not, and so forth. These variations affected the price of the atlas, making it accessible to a wider market, but also the presentational value of the book – it would not adorn a library so well. Perhaps this suggests more functional usage of the book, but not necessarily whether it was for navigational, political or learned use.

The most striking feature of the publication process is the continuous re-editing and updating of the material in the atlas. Ortelius clearly conceived of his book as a work in progress. The preface contains an appeal to the reader to submit more accurate maps or information to the author. As subsequent editions were published the atlas grew to almost double the size, augmented not just in detail but by more and more new maps, to the extent that Ortelius had to issue five major Additamenta as supplements for those who had purchased earlier editions. The catalogues also grew; indeed, the list of historical place names was expanded into a large folio volume published separately as a historical dictionary of geography and chorography, the Thesaurus Geographicus. Likewise, the selection of historical maps was expanded to form a

45 The English edition (1606) is an exception to the vernacular practice, having been translated directly from the Latin and containing all the scholarly appendices.
47 Abraham Ortelius, Thesaurus Geographicus, Antwerp, 1587.
publication in its own right, the *Parergon*.\(^{48}\) Finally, a number of reduced format editions of the atlas were produced, initially by two friends of Ortelius, and subsequently by Ortelius himself, meeting market demand for a still smaller, less expensive, and more convenient version.\(^{49}\)

Two things at least ought to be observed about this publication history. First, the sheer number of editions is impressive and is a measure of the remarkable success of the atlas and its author. The initial print run of the standard five hundred copies was insufficient to meet the demand it immediately created, so that three further editions had to be published within the year. All of these were in Latin. By the time Ortelius died in 1598, at least 34 full editions had appeared, each one enhancing the comprehensiveness of geographical coverage and thus greatly expanding the volume of maps.\(^{50}\) In addition to this, the *Parergon*, *Thesaurus Geographicus*, and the *Epitome* were selling successfully. Five *Additamenta* had also been published and sold. Whatever market Ortelius had in mind, he seems to have underestimated it in the first instance but to have responded very well to the demand as it arose. The financial risk involved may have prohibited producing such an expensive book in larger amounts before the demand was certain. An alternative explanation may be that Ortelius, although aware of the potential demand for his atlas, intended the first edition merely to provoke a response to his call for further information and access to sources. Whatever his expectations of market demand, it is clear from the *Theatrum* preface, and from the later preface to the *Symonymia*, that he envisaged a process of re-editing and re-publication of the atlas, in part hoping for critical and collaborative response from his peers.\(^{51}\)

---

\(^{48}\) Abraham Ortelius, *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum Parergon*, Antwerp, 1592. [Initially appended to the *Theatrum*, also bound separately, augmented version given separate publication in 1624, after Ortelius’ death.]


\(^{50}\) Peter van der Krogt, “The Editions of Ortelius’ *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* and *Epitome*,” *AOFA*, 379-382.

\(^{51}\) I have included the preface to the *Theatrum* as an appendix; in the preface to the *Symonymia* Ortelius describes the provisional character of the onomastic index in the first editions of the *Theatrum*, an account that is lent credence by the index’s evolution over the course of the first three years, for which see chapter four.
The second interesting feature of the publication history is that it shows the gradual separation of the different elements that constituted the first edition of the atlas. As each part of the book expanded it was published separately. This reinforces the idea that the first edition had more than one potential audience. Ortelius' commercial success may have been largely due to creating a product in a flexible format that could harness separate interests. Thus, when assessing the initial idea of the atlas it is important to bear in mind that it had a number of possible uses and functions, and that these became more distinct as the book developed through successive editions.

Considerable debate has taken place as to what distinguishes the *Theatrum* from previous publications of maps in book format.\(^{52}\) Ptolemy's *Geographia* was the key Classical source on map construction and geographical knowledge. However, the first printed edition of 1475 contained none of the 27 maps in the manuscript versions. This was rectified two years later in the Bologna edition of 1477, illustrated with copper-plate prints. Subsequent editions of the *Geographia* sometimes contained maps, sometimes not, the decision probably usually being based upon expense. Copper plate etching and reproduction was a costly and time-consuming process, becoming even more so as maps became more detailed in the course of the sixteenth century. The geographical knowledge contained in the text and maps of Ptolemy's *Geographia* rapidly became dated in the age of discovery. In response to this, new editions were augmented with recent works incorporating the new world or depicting European regions in greater detail, the so-called *tabulae modernae*. By 1561 an edition by Girolamo Ruscelli was published in Venice containing as many as 64 new maps. Thus it is important to note first that the nature of geographical knowledge in the sixteenth century leant itself to a process of revision and augmentation of earlier editions, so that Ortelius' practice in his *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* is unusual only in so far as the new editions are produced by the same author in rapid succession as the same work. Secondly, the idea of devoting a book entirely to the publication of modern maps can

---

be seen as an obvious development prefigured by the editions of Ptolemy’s *Geographia*.

A range of other types of geographical publication are also suggestive of the later atlas format. Italian authors, notably Antonio Lafreri, led the way in the collation of already separately published maps in made-to-order editions. Similarly the Italian *Isolarii*, or island books, often provided extensive geographical coverage, though more often than not largely focused upon the mediterranean region. Books with images of towns or urban maps were also quite common, the most famous example being Hartmann Schedel’s *Liber Chronicarum*, or *Nuremberg Chronicle*, from 1493. From the point of view of genre history, what distinguishes the *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* of Ortelius is that its primary content is the maps themselves, and that they are arranged systematically. The book was clearly conceived as a unified work designed to give a holistic depiction of the known world.

In his introduction to the facsimile edition of the *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*, published in 1964, Cornelius Koeman comments that, “Without the success of his atlas ... [Abraham Ortelius] would probably have ranked historically as a figure of little importance among the great names of Flemish culture, since his other achievements in the cartographic field, although not without merits, show no signs of originality and were far from unique.” Viewed from the perspective of the history of cartography, the *Theatrum* can be seen as original only in overall design. The maps are well-edited and aesthetically pleasing but not always the best geographic representations available. Though the standard is generally high, Ortelius lacked the scientific rigour and technical mastery of his contemporary and friend, Gerard Mercator. This has led historians to argue that Ortelius’ significance lies in “a further intensification of the

---

53 For these editions of Ptolemy see the bibliography. The publication history as presented here follows that outlined by P. van der Krogt, “The *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*: The First Atlas?”, *AOFA*, 55-78. See also Paul Schnabel, *Text und Karten des Ptolemaeus*, Leipzig, 1938.


professionalisation of the geographer and the commodification of his products."\(^{57}\)

While such assessments are strongly supported by scientific evaluation of Ortelius’ cartographic output, depictions of him as the self-styled “safe shop-keeper” of sixteenth century geography do not reflect the extremely high esteem in which he was held by contemporaries.\(^{58}\)

Debates about originality, rather than a detailed analysis of the market, have tended to dominate literature about the atlas’ publication. Yet Ortelius was not simply a pioneering cartographer at the head of a learned tradition, he was a merchant trading among competitors and a humanist collaborating with colleagues. While the success of his book brought it to the attention of an international market, and although Ortelius used sources from all over Europe during the compilation of his work, it is necessary to interpret the publication in the context of its immediate contemporaries, local printing conditions, and its influence on the local market, rather than merely through the perspective of scientific development or generic form.

During the sixteenth century the centre for cartographical publishing gradually shifted from Venice to Antwerp.\(^{59}\) The reasons for this were largely economic. With the opening of trade routes to the west and the development of long distance travel by sea, the geographical position of Venice no longer guaranteed it primacy in trade with Asia and Africa. For the Portuguese trying to market the fruits of their overseas discoveries, Antwerp was ideally placed to receive their cargoes and to transport them onwards to the trade fairs in Frankfurt and elsewhere.\(^{60}\) As Antwerp’s prosperity grew

\(^{57}\) Jerry Brotton, *Trading Territories*, 175.


it became the obvious distribution centre for other trade as well. As the seat of the Habsburg Empire, Spain became closely linked economically and culturally with the Netherlands, where Charles V was born. By the 1570s a huge proportion of the staple Spanish wool was being shipped to Flemish cloth manufacturers through Antwerp. Geographical position had long ago ensured that this was also the case for English trade, a fact that was reinforced by the perpetual antagonism between England and France. Even the Hanse trading towns along the Baltic coast exploited Antwerp’s burgeoning trade networks. All of this ensured a flourishing cosmopolitan environment and extensive communication networks by land and sea. Both of these features were prerequisites for a cartographic centre. What eventually ensured Flemish dominance in map making was the presence of highly skilled craftsmen and humanist scholars in Antwerp. Burgundian culture in the region was bound up with the development of an artisan class in the major towns, while the invention of printing was quickly adopted and exploited, so that the Netherlands became one of the Europe’s main centres for the production and distribution of books. The presence of an imperial court in Brussels from the 1520s onwards had a huge impact on the surrounding regions. The Netherlands was at the centre of economic and cultural cross-currents. Antwerp became one of the cultural capitals of Europe, built upon its artisan expertise, its printing industry, and its wealth.

Ortelius was based in Antwerp all his life and amassed considerable wealth through business there. In his early teens he seems to have inherited his father’s business in curiosities. Any old coins, maps, books, and strange natural or artificial objects that came his way could be sold to the curious-minded intelligentsia in the Netherlands, or could be brought to the trade fair in Frankfurt. At the age of twenty Ortelius entered the guild of St Luke as an illustrator of maps. This is the first evidence of his move to

---


exploit the flourishing geographical market. Membership of the artists guild allowed him to buy poor quality or plain maps and illustrate them to enhance their market value. Soon Ortelius had international connections and extensive knowledge of the cartographic world.

Pre-eminence in the area of geographic discovery in this period was undoubtedly held by the Portuguese and the Spanish; however, neither country was ideally suited to the distribution of that knowledge through print. While the Portuguese produced some of the more important early maps to transform the cartographic world picture, it was the gradual and intermittent transmission of their knowledge to the humanist printing centres in Italy and the Empire that allowed for the development of a commercial geographical industry. Thus Venice and Strasbourg were key centres of map printing in the early sixteenth century. The political situations in Italy and the Empire ensured that the development of cartography spread to rival city states and ducal territories, occasionally supported by local universities. Hence, although Ortelius did maintain links with the Iberian peninsula, most of his contacts came from travels to Italy through imperial territories. A glance at his Catalogus Auctorum reveals that the three main sources for cartographic information during the sixteenth century were Italy, Germany and the Netherlands.

The extent to which rivalries limited the flow of information between these regions is difficult to determine. The circulation of published maps was widespread, and, as I will show in subsequent chapters, scholars often interacted on an international scale, allowing access to manuscripts and information about current projects. Nonetheless, the picture is frequently less attractive. Voyages of discovery were funded either by merchants, who jealously guarded ideas and information about new trade routes, or by governments that were keen to do likewise, and that sometimes also sought to colonise

63 For the social context in which the guild was operating during this period see: Jan van der Stock, *Printing Images in Antwerp*, Rotterdam, 1998; and Riggs & Silver, eds., *Graven Images: The Rise of Professional Printmakers in Antwerp and Haarlem 1540-1640*, Evanston/Illinois, 1993.
64 Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii ... Epistulae*, nos. 10, 11 and 15.
new territories. In such circumstances secrecy could be of paramount importance. Exploration was big business and control of information meant power and money. In practice this also meant that agents were in place to provide valuable gossip. Consultation with scholars in the field could also mean that news spread, though rarely early enough to give a real edge to competitors. Scholars were not above participating in the seamier side of geographical business. Intellectual theft was common as discoveries were claimed by frauds or new information provided without reference to the source. Cartographers could also become entangled in political debates or be required to tread carefully around the sensitivities of those in power. Ortelius was no exception and his atlas frequently bears witness to its construction from contributions that were ideologically committed. His maps, supplemented by information from his correspondence, reveal a scholar keenly observing the mercantile, political and intellectual world around him, often relying on inside information and learned gossip. Chary of intellectual theft, he protected his rights through attaining three separate privileges to print the maps in his atlas - in the Netherlands, in the Empire, and in the dominions of Philip of Spain. Ortelius' economic success was not just the result of being in the right place at the right time. He was an astute businessman who continually evaded the pitfalls of political and commercial affairs that affected his competitors.

The business side of cartography did not preclude other interests. The resurgence of geographical studies in the sixteenth century had its origins in humanist rediscovery of

---


68 For example, see Brotton’s account of the response to Portuguese voyages of discovery in *Trading Territories: Mapping the Early Modern World*; and Antonio Rumeu de Armas, *El Tratado de Tordesillas*, Madrid, 1992.

69 As indicated by Ortelius in his preface ‘Ad lectorem’ in the *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*. For some pertinent examples see G. Schilder, “The cartographical relationships between Italy and the Low Countries in the sixteenth century”, *The Map Collector*, 17 (1981), 2-8.


71 See his letters to Mercator in M. van Durme, ed., *Correspondence Mercatorienne*, Antwerp, 1959. Note also Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii ... Epistulae*, nos., 67 and 99; and Vulcanius Correspondence (which I have attached as an appendix) 93 01 01 and 97 12 02.
the Classics and intellectual curiosity as much as in the Portuguese and Spanish discoveries. Many of the most talented map makers of the period were not seeking to make a living through cartography. Indeed, a large number of land maps were drawn by humanist antiquarians with an interest in their local environs. It was not simply the ‘New World’ that needed to be mapped reliably, Europe was substantially remapped using the latest cartographic techniques and accumulating more and more reliable detail, often with a political agenda such as securing a territory from attack, re-arranging the local infrastructure, or investigating property titles and re-settlement possibilities. Religious interests could also influence cartography. A dedication to God’s creation spurred Protestant scholars to promote schools of cartography in Germany, while roving humanists such as Guillaume Postel found esoteric significance in the act of mapping, reuniting God’s divided creation through mathematical and cosmographical studies, or through opening the ‘book of nature’. Such concerns could overlap with humanist ambitions to create an ecumenical republic of letters that would transcend political and territorial divisions. The travels of humanists from place to place, mapping as they went, were an essential conduit for the advancement of geographical knowledge.

Although the market for maps was a lucrative one, due to the rapid growth and assimilation of new material it did not favour the production of standard reference works. Maps sold well as loose sheets, as book illustrations, or as large scale wall decorations, but they had a short sales life. Even a ground-breaking new map could

72 Randles, *The Unmaking of the Medieval Christian Cosmos 1500-1760.*
73 See, for example, S. Mendyk, *Speculum Britanniae: Regional Study, Antiquarianism and Science in Britain to 1700,* Toronto, 1989.
become dated within two or three years.\textsuperscript{77} The maps themselves reflected this problem. Often an area would contain a cartouche with text to the effect that the region had not yet been properly explored, or a more explicit invitation for others to do so. Such disclaimers were common and cultivated an air of both the integrity and the authority of the cartographer, trying to create a favourable audience for future maps, as well as simply entertaining the imaginative reader.\textsuperscript{78} However, if even individual maps quickly became dated, how would a book-length collection fare? Maps took a long time to draw, engrave and print; by the time an entire collection could be constructed the first of its parts could be out of date. This was not merely an issue with regard to territories in the New World; new and more reliable information about areas of Europe was constantly becoming available as cartographers corrected one another’s errors and attained more detailed local descriptions of territories.

Much of Ortelius’ achievement consisted in finding a solution to the problem of creating a reference work for this material. Instead of publishing a book that claimed to be definitive, he produced a collection of the most reliable recent maps, and invited the reader to contribute more information and more maps so that the work could be continually updated, thus creating a book that would centralise the processing of information rather than exhausting the subject. This is quite significant in terms of the history of printing, because Ortelius used the typographic process to create flexibility rather than permanency.\textsuperscript{79} When individual maps became dated, either the copper plate could be emended or the folio could be removed and replaced with a better version. Further, both the printer and the purchaser could determine when and in what way to bind the book, and it is notable that extant atlases exhibit a large degree of variation in this, with the consequence that it is extremely difficult to attain clarity in identifying separate editions. Maps from earlier editions often appear alongside newer material

(whether due to the preference of the purchaser or economising on the part of the printer), and close attention to the state of the maps reveals that they constantly underwent alteration both for aesthetic and scientific reason. Thus, alongside the addition of new maps, new editions often contained significant revisions of older ones. Instead of creating a monumental depiction of the immutable globe, as suggested in much contemporary and more recent rhetoric, Ortelius exploited the potential of the printing industry to produce and disseminate multiple copies so that as many people as possible had access to his work in its latest form and could contribute to its evolution. The more people who saw it, the more who might collaborate. He did not expect competitors to steal his idea because he knew that it would take years and a great deal of scholarly co-operation to produce a comparable number of copper plate maps, as well as a great deal of money. Thus, instead of other cartographers wanting to rival his publication, they would want to be included in it. To that end he ensured that he carefully referenced the source for each map, and included a catalogue of leading cartographers to advertise the importance of contributors, who were listed alongside the great names of the past such as Ptolemy and Strabo. Conversely, it was of great importance to Ortelius that the modern contributors were themselves respected figures whose names would lend authority to his work, as is clear from his letter to the renowned botanist, Clusius, written on 14 October, 1569, immediately prior to publication of the *Theatrum*.

Scientific developments were a crucial component of the transformation of cartography in the sixteenth century. Mathematical advances in Florence in the fifteenth century soon spread northward, notably with the work of Regiomontanus in Nuremberg, which then became a key centre for mathematical studies and instrument making. This represented fixity has been challenged by Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*, Chicago, 1998.

---


82 “Inserere cogito catalogum auctorum, qui hactenus tabulas geographicas descripsunt, et ediderunt. Eamque catalogum libentissime tuo nomine augerem, ornaremque, si tua venia fieri posset. Et quare non posset? Nam titulus, cum tu verus sis auctor, omnino verus est”: Leiden, Codex Vulcanianus 101.
tradition was passed on to the Netherlands by Peter Apian. Apian’s Cosmographicus Liber, published in 1524, became the standard guide to cosmographical and cartographical practice, largely through the celebrated edition produced by Reiner Gemma Frisius in Antwerp in 1529. This edition was augmented with ‘pop-up’ models of geographical instruments and with two essays by Frisius. The significance of this work and the influence of Frisius’ mathematical cartography are difficult to overestimate. Twenty-four editions of this book were produced in the sixteenth century, a testament to its popularity and success in a period of the rapid advancement of mathematical knowledge. Still more important was the direct influence of Frisius on the following generation. Frisius lectured in medicine in Louvain during Gerard Mercator’s period of study there. Mercator was at that stage intending to pursue theological studies, however, he left Louvain and seems to have received private instruction from Frisius in mathematics and instrument making, perhaps for up to three years. The two men collaborated in the construction of a terrestrial globe in 1537 and Mercator seems to have been engaged in a workshop set up by Frisius in Louvain in the 1530s. When Mercator left Louvain in 1552, on account of religion, the workshop was taken over by Frisius’ nephew Gualterus Arsenius and continued to produce high quality and beautiful mathematical instruments long after Frisius’ death in 1555. Although this was a productive moment to begin a geographical career in Antwerp, it does not appear that Ortelius was directly involved with the Louvain workshop, though it seems likely that he would have been known to them and may have traded in their products. During a visit to the Netherlands in 1548 and 1549 the English scholar John Dee spent considerable time with the scholars at the workshop in Louvain, particularly with Mercator. It was two years later before he met Ortelius in Antwerp.


While Dee’s desire to meet Ortelius suggests that the latter must have been quite well-known even at this early stage in his career, and although it also implies that Ortelius must from then on have had a good indirect link with Mercator, the two cartographers are normally said to have met for the first time at the Frankfurt book fair four years later.\(^8^7\)

It is not clear at what stage Ortelius decided to focus his energies on cartographic studies, but by 1550 he was involved enough to prompt the visit by Dee. It may have been his friendship with Mercator after 1554 that led him to consider publishing his own maps. Nonetheless, it was ten years before the first one appeared. In 1564 Ortelius produced a wall map of the world through the publishing house of Gerard de Jode.\(^8^8\) The map reveals reliance on Classical authors and Marco Polo, supplemented by some recent sources. This is an impressive first work, both geographically and aesthetically, reinforcing the impression that Ortelius was not entirely new to the field. While in some regions he failed to adopt the most reliable information available, the author’s sensitivity to market interest in scientific curiosities and opportunities for further exploration shines through in the remarks included in cartouches, commenting on meteorological phenomena and on limits to geographical knowledge.\(^8^9\) In 1564 Ortelius was no beginner, he was already an accomplished cartographer.

Ortelius may well have felt that the 1550s provided a natural opening in the market for geographical works with the deaths of Peter Apian and Sebastian Munster in 1552, and of Frisius and Oronce Finaeus in 1555. Mercator remained the most eminent figure in cartography, but he had left the Netherlands in 1552 and was, at any rate, a colleague and friend. During these years Ortelius travelled to the trade fair in Frankfurt on a number of occasions, and in 1560 he travelled to France in the company of Mercator.

---


\(^8^8\) Abraham Ortelius, *Nova totius terrarum orbis iuxta neotericorum traditiones descriptio*, Antwerp, 1564.
Filips Galle, Frans Hogenberg and Jan Sadeleer, on which occasion they inscribed their names on the elevated stone of Poitiers. Galle, Hogenberg and Sadeleer were artists and humanists, and it is probable that they were travelling with Ortelius to trade in curiosities and artefacts, rather than for any geographical purpose. The two former in particular remained close friends and collaborators with Ortelius for many years and gained considerable reputations in their own right. Hence the evidence would suggest that by the time Ortelius came to produce his first map in 1564 he was already an established figure in the humanist milieu of the southern Netherlands.

The field of professional cartography in the Netherlands in the 1550s and 1560s was among the most advanced and prestigious in Europe. It is important to understand how Ortelius fitted among his contemporaries, bearing in mind the comparatively small size of the intellectual community of the period, and its convergence around key centres such as print shops and book fairs. Nonetheless, in time of war neighbouring cities could seem far distant and correspondence could be lost or intercepted by mistrustful authorities; hence it is not safe to assume that individuals knew of their peers' work-in-progress, and it was often the case that they could not even find copies of printed maps. Ortelius was well placed on the grapevine of professional rumour, being closely involved with the printing industry, particularly Plantin. In a letter to Vulcanius on 9 June, 1593, he revealed the advantages of his situation. Vulcanius had asked about a Spanish author of a work on the cities of Spain; Ortelius did not know of any and suspected that Vulcanius meant a work by the Flemish cartographer Henricus Cock, who was currently employed at the court of Philip II. Ortelius only knew of the work because he had seen a draft sent to Plantin in preparation for printing several years previously, probably in 1587 when Plantin and Ortelius were repeatedly in contact with Cock about publication of a Spanish edition of the Theatrum. Cock's

89 For discussion of the map and its sources see G. Schilder, “The Wall Maps by Abraham Ortelius”, AOFa, 95-105.
90 Peter van der Krogt, “The Elevated Stone of Poitiers”, AOFa, 53-54.
91 For further treatment of Ortelius’ early humanist activities and connections see chapter four.
92 “De auctore Hispano qui scripserit de Civitatibus Hispaniae nihil vidi. Esse autem quidam Gorchumensis nomine Henricus Coquus apud Regem nostrum e numero satellitum (artzierv vulgo) qui tale opus iam diu prae manibus habuit lingua Latina, cuius specimen ante paucos annos miserat ad Plantinum”: Vulcanius Correspondence, 93 06 09; See Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii ... Epistulae, no.
father had been an extremely important figure in the arts and the printing industry at Antwerp in the middle decades of the century, frequently working with Plantin, who exported his prints to France and Spain and provided him with the works of French ornamentalists. This trade relationship continued when Cock's widow inherited the business in 1571, and then when it passed into the hands of Cock's former pupil, Ortelius' and Plantin's close friend Philip Galle. Thus, despite the younger Cock's absence in Spain in 1593, Ortelius was able to inform Vulcanius about his work-in-progress because of a long-standing connection between Ortelius, the Cock family and Christopher Plantin's printing business.

Within the compact confines of the geographical and artistic publishing market in the Low Countries one might expect to see rivalries, feuds, or at the very least evidence of virulent competition. While this did occur, and I will discuss several examples below, more striking is the evidence of significant co-ordination of interests and collaboration among the leading figures. On the one hand, the intermediary role of the guild of St Luke may have functioned effectively to smooth over many disputes before they became irreconcilable; on the other hand, the oligarchical character of the guild ensured the protection of the privileges of the major artists and printers at the expense of smaller operators whose presence in historical record is, as a result, lesser - that is to say, vested interests secured the dominance of a few larger operators. In support of this suggestion may be cited three details from the career of Christopher Plantin: his formation of a partnership with four leading merchants from 1563-67 in order to re-establish his business after two years out of operation; his securing of the role of prototypographer, with the concomitant authority to grant licences to other printers; and his establishment, after initial friction, of an amicable and co-operative relationship

150; and Rooses & Denucé, Correspondance de Christophe Plantin, vol. 8/9, nos. 1231, 1262 and 1272.


94 Numerous examples of feuds, rivalries and struggles are discussed, in relation to an earlier period, by Jan van der Stock, Printing Images in Antwerp, Rotterdam, 1998; and further material can be found in the records of the guild of St Luke: P. Rombouts, and T. van Lerius, eds., De Liggeren en andere historische archieven der Antwerpsche Sint Lucasgilde, [reprint], The Hague, 1961.
with his major rival, Willem Silvius. Practical necessity is the key to the print market: the large number of small operators who went in and out of business in the sixteenth century, often selling pirate editions or cheap, unauthorised prints, makes it clear that a pragmatic approach to one's competitors - sharing type ornaments, fonts, and distribution networks - brought more stable economic returns. Cut-throat practices were used, but for the major firms like those of Plantin, Birckmann and Silvius, a certain degree of co-operation was in their common interest.

As regards the geographers and artists who produced texts for publication, I will focus only on those who might be considered Ortelius' local commercial rivals. Mercator has already been mentioned. He attained pre-eminence among the cartographers in the Low Countries based on the consistency with which he produced highly accurate and mathematically innovative maps and globes. Ortelius' contemporaneous celebrity does not appear to have caused rivalry with Mercator, who praised the *Theatrum* in a letter that was then included in subsequent editions of the atlas. They appear to have maintained friendship, or at least a working relationship, throughout their lives.

While it is often commented that Mercator's *Atlas* superceded the *Theatrum*, the authors never treated one another as competitors. No evidence exists to support the claim by Mercator's biographer, Walter Ghim, that the great cartographer suggested the idea of an atlas to Ortelius, though it is probable that the two men communicated about the matter. Rather, the *Theatrum* and the *Atlas* were quite different in design, scope and indeed material. Although a key goal of Mercator's project was mapping the globe accurately and systematically, this was part of a larger plan to re-establish the scientific basis of cartography and to create a holistic representation of the earth and its history as a manifestation of God's creative design. This was to be presented both textually and visually in the form of a pan-historical cosmography, compared to which

---


96 Evidence of the interaction of these firms is scattered throughout the pages of Voet's, *The Golden Compasses* and Rooses' and Denucé's, *Correspondance de Christophe Plantin*. See also Denucé's *Oud-nederlandsche Kaartmakers in Betrekking met Plantijn*, reprinted in Amsterdam, 1964, 253-64.

97 See Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii ... *Epistulae*, nos., 32, 38 and 99, and other references passim; also M. Van Durme, ed., *Correspondence Mercatorienne*, Antwerp, 1959, passim; and A. Ortelius,
the design of the *Theatrum* seems conservative in scale. Inevitably the sheer scope of Mercator’s projected work delayed its appearance; indeed, it was only completed posthumously. By the time Mercator had enough maps ready to produce a work that would supercede the *Theatrum* in terms of geographical quality both men were nearing the end of their lives and were secure in fortune and reputation. It is not surprising, therefore, that they seem to have collaborated with no regard for competition.

Aside from the cosmographical dimension of Mercator’s *Atlas*, a clear distinction can be made between the type of mathematical cartography that he pursued and Ortelius’ own humanist editorial practice. After Ortelius’ death, there was some debate among his friends about the extent of his expertise in mathematical studies. He was often referred to as *mathematicus*, but this may be because cartography was broadly conceived of as a mathematical art, rather than because he had particular expertise in that aspect of it. Ortelius himself recounted having spent a late night in Luxembourg discussing mathematics with the Count of Mansfeld, and his extant correspondence includes a request that he find a mathematical tutor for an associate of the Hungarian humanist Andreus Dudith. As a humanist working in the field of cartography, Ortelius would have been expected to keep up-to-date on the latest developments in mathematics, but his maps provide no evidence that he was capable of bringing about such developments himself. If his friend Joannes Radermacher is to be believed, he taught Ortelius the mathematics required for the innovative double-cordiform projection of Oronce Fine, which Ortelius used in his first published map in 1564, and how to retain the proportions of a map accurately while reducing its size for convenience of publication. There is no reason to doubt this account, since mathematical precision in the reproduction of maps would not previously have been essential to Ortelius’ trade, and if he was trained as an artist on or prior to his entry


into the guild of St Luke, he would have learnt how to do straightforward mathematical transformations, but not to translate from one projection to another. 100

One of the characteristic features of mid-century cartography in the Low Countries was the development of surveying using triangulation, with the result that the region was one of the first to be mapped with mathematical precision. The pioneer in this practice during the 1530s and 1540s was Jacob van Deventer, who produced a number of maps of regions in the Low Countries. These were accurate and remained in use for many years, some having been re-printed in later geographical works, including Ortelius' Theatrum. Before Philip II left the Low Countries in 1559 he commissioned Van Deventer to map the entire Habsburg Netherlands, resulting in the publication of further maps over the following decade. During the 1550s the brothers Jean and Jacques Surhon were producing similar maps of the neighbouring regions in France and Flanders. The combined work of these two projects created a rich stock of maps that would be drawn upon by later cartographers. 101 Ortelius was familiar with this material and used it often, though occasionally limited by the political sensitivity of the material. It is worth noting that Ortelius' own early wall maps were different in kind, being focused on areas under exploration rather than local territories. These early maps also made no use of triangulation, which was impossible on long sea journeys beyond sight of land. Thus, during his early career, Ortelius was not in competition with Jacob van Deventer and the Surhons, and the Theatrum, when it appeared, was more of a tribute than a challenge to their works. The same can be said of Christian Sgrooten, who was appointed royal cartographer by Philip II in 1557. Sgrooten published a series of maps in the 1560s including an impressive map of

99 Ortelius, Itinerarium per nonnullas Galliae Belgicae Partes, Antwerp, 1584, paragraphs 212-15 (all citations of this work refer to the edition published in 2000 by Klaus Schmitt-Ott); Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii ... Epistulae, nos. 114.


Germania depicting the areas of settlement of early tribes.102 No correspondence between him and Ortelius is known of, but he is included in the Catalogus Auctorum, leaving no grounds for speculation about rivalry between the two men. What is particularly significant about the work of these contemporary cartographers in terms of the market that Ortelius was entering is that their detailed mapping of the Low Countries, using the latest cartographic techniques and equipment, created a stock of quality maps that Ortelius could draw upon. Perhaps more fundamentally, their work inaugurated a process of cartographic revision, not of terra incognita, but of their own European locale. Given that the majority of Ortelius’ own maps, and all his onomastic studies, were focused on European geography, it is perhaps more apt to find in these works the immediate context for his Theatrum than in the popular accounts of the New World. Yet his early wall maps have a more exotic flavour, reflecting the fact that the economic basis of the market for maps was curiosity about newly discovered lands. Only a select few cartographers received commissions from royalty; rather than compete with them, Ortelius found a means to reproduce their maps to mutual advantage.

Two examples exist of disputes involving Ortelius. The second is less complex and can be dealt with first. In 1572 Ortelius received a letter from the English lawyer and editor of Pomponius Mela, Gulielmus Soonus, protesting the latter’s innocence of charges that he had stolen from Ortelius the idea of providing a lexicon of variant geographical names.103 Soonus claims to attribute the blame for this misunderstanding rather to misrepresentation than to Ortelius. In fact, Soonus was clearly guilty of plagiarism, having appended to his edition of Mela a list entitled “Nova incolae”, which was little more than a copy of the index in the Theatrum.104 It is not clear how Soonus expected his theft to escape detection, given that Ortelius’ collaborator in compiling the Catalogus Auctorum, Arnold Mylius, was the Antwerp factor of the Birckmann firm, which published Soonus’ book in Cologne. Nonetheless, nothing more is known about the affair. Several years later, in 1575, Soonus contributed a depiction of his

102 See the discussions of Sgrooten in Lloyd A Brown’s, The Story of Maps, and R.V. Tooley’s Maps and Mapmakers, London, 1970. Analysis of his maps can be found in C. Koeman, Atlantes Neerlandici, Amsterdam, 1969; and in Schilder’s Monumenta Cartographica Neerlandica.
103 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii ... Epistulae, no. 41.
104 G. Soonus, Gulielmi Sooni auditor, sive Pomponius Mela disputator, de situ orbis, Cologne, 1572.
home university town, Cambridge, to the *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* of Ortelius’ German colleagues Braun and Hogenberg – thus clearly he had not fallen from the favour of some of the continental geographers closest to Ortelius.¹⁰⁵

By contrast, historians have assumed that another major local cartographer of the period, Gerard de Jode, had an acute rivalry with Ortelius.¹⁰⁶ In 1564 Ortelius and De Jode had collaborated on the publication of a wall-map of the world. It is possible that at that stage Ortelius already intended to publish a map-collection – a preparation period of six years is not improbable for such a large and expensive work. It is not known whether De Jode had yet conceived of, or proceeded far with, his rival publication. There is no evidence of his involvement in the publication of Ortelius’ maps of Egypt (1565), Asia (1567), or Spain (1569), and it has been assumed that a disagreement must have occurred between the two men. For his own atlas Ortelius had acquired royal privileges, which forbade publication by anyone else for ten years, that is, until 1579. However, in 1573 De Jode attained an ecclesiastical imprimatur, which referred to “a geography of the whole German empire”. This would later form the second part of his atlas, but it is not clear whether at this stage he intended to produce a comprehensive geography of the world. In February 1575 Ortelius referred to the planned publication of De Jode’s *Speculum*, and in the same year, De Jode attained an imperial privilege for the publication of a full atlas under that name. It was another two years before he acquired a royal privilege from Brussels, in 1577. The dedicatory letter was not written until the following year, in February 1578, and it was a further year before the master printer and book dealer, Christopher Plantin, purchased two copies. It has been speculated, on the basis of Ortelius’ letter in 1576, which states that the *Speculum* had failed to gain a royal imprimatur, that Ortelius used his influential connections to impede the publication of De Jode’s work. Further, De


Jode is not mentioned in the *Catalogus Auctorum* of Ortelius, and he returned the favour by omitting Ortelius from his own catalogue.107

Because of these circumstances and hypotheses, it has become accepted that there was a feud or significant rivalry between the two men; however, there is no contemporary reference to confirm this. The publisher Plantin sustained relations with both men, though he was closer to Ortelius, and the two geographers must frequently have crossed paths in the crowded but compact trading centres and humanist retreats of Antwerp. Perhaps Ortelius, the more astute businessman, won the race to compile and publish an atlas, then saturated the market with editions of his work, so that by the time De Jode’s *Speculum Orbis Terrarum* reached the booksellers in 1579 it failed to sell. No re-edition of De Jode’s atlas was produced until after his death, when his son Cornelius published an augmented version in 1593. The atlas seems to have been well-received but De Jode appears to have been unable to break Ortelius’ hold on the market. There was certainly no significant decrease in demand for the *Theatrum*, judging by the continued production of new editions, and it is impossible to substantiate the hypothesis of Jan Denucé, who cites a payment of 265 florins by Ortelius to De Jode in 1588 as a bribe to delay the appearance of a second edition of the *Speculum*.108 Certainly if a feud had existed it appears to have been resolved. The following year (1589), in a letter to his English colleague William Camden, Ortelius recommended the services of the van Deuticum brothers, who were closely associated with the workshop of De Jode and had engraved most of the maps in the *Speculum Orbis Terrarum*.109 In fact it is as possible that Ortelius’ payment to De Jode in 1588 was a contribution towards production of a revised edition of the *Speculum Orbis Terrarum*, which appeared five years later (during which interim Gerard de Jode died) – a suggestion that has no more either for or against it than Denucé’s hypothesis.

It is difficult to interpret the information regarding Ortelius and De Jode. Ortelius was not the only major figure missing from De Jode’s catalogue - amazingly Mercator was also omitted, despite being an obvious source for at least one map. Moreover, Franciscus Sweertius commented that De Jode was “dear” to Ortelius. Sweertius, a personal friend of the latter, was responsible for writing a biography of Ortelius and for compiling a collection of laudatory poems on his death. Nonetheless, Sweertius is not always absolutely accurate in his information regarding Ortelius and he is responsible for adding two maps by De Jode to the 1606 edition of the *Theatrum* in English, thus there may be a personal or political agenda involved. Further fragmentary evidence comes in a letter from Johannes Moravus in 1595 that requests information from Ortelius regarding the price of De Jode’s atlas (the second edition). Although the author is unknown to Ortelius, clearly at this stage any quarrel between the two cartographers was not widely known. Whatever the relationship between De Jode and Ortelius, at no stage did it become bitter enough to enter public debate. Perhaps a key to the source of the dispute (if it occurred) is Ortelius’ creation of a new world map in the first edition of his *Theatrum*. Both editions of De Jode’s atlas used the world map that he had published together with Ortelius in 1564, whereas Ortelius rejected this due to the publication of Mercator’s revolutionary world map of 1569, which was a major improvement on its predecessors, and which became the basis for Ortelius’ map a year later. It is possible that professional jealousies aroused by this editorial decision were the basis of a disagreement that resulted in De Jode’s exclusion from Ortelius’ catalogue of authors, and that the frustrated attempts of De Jode to respond by publishing his own atlas merely perpetuated the feud, which continued up to his exclusion of Mercator and Ortelius from his own catalogue of authors. If this is the case (and it should be emphasised that this is conjecture), De Jode was the loser in every way. Part of Ortelius’ achievement in the design of his atlas was to realise that associating prestigious figures with his work would bring it market appeal and make it a focal point for further collaboration. By omitting reference to the two most respected

---

112 Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii ... Epistulae*, no. 326.
113 Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii ... Epistulae*, no. 272.
cartographers of his day, De Jode can not have helped his market chances. The commercial fortunes of the two rival atlases is reflected in the number of extant copies of each work. All told, of circa 7,000 copies of Ortelius’ atlas printed before 1624, about 850 survive. By contrast, there are only about a dozen extant copies of De Jode’s atlas, and scarcely more of his son’s second edition.115 As a result, Ortelius has been widely studied from a number of different perspectives; De Jode is much less well known, as are the few extended studies of him.

What can be deduced about the design and reception of these two atlases from the marketing? In the preface “Ad Lectorem” Ortelius makes a statement of his concerns in producing the atlas that serves both as an introduction to and a ‘sales pitch’ for the Theatrum. He begins with the remark that it is “well-known to all” how important it is to use geography to understand histories. He describes it as “the eye of history” – helping both to interpret the movements of peoples and to remember them longer. The first section of the preface is then taken up by a discussion of the merits of geography as an aid to the study of history and to appreciation of the grandeur of God’s creation. Thus, Ortelius presents his atlas as a contribution to the culture of learning. He confesses that the information provided in his work is available elsewhere, but stresses that the merit of his book is to make the material accessible, affordable, and of convenient size. He goes on to describe the way in which he has used and referenced his sources, then he includes a request that those who are able or keen to do so should provide him with more information about specific areas. Finally, he describes and explains the reasons behind the lay out of the book, which is designed for ease of use.116

The structure of the book supports Ortelius’ claim that its design is as a tool for reading histories – each map is accompanied by a historical and topological discussion of the area depicted, blending ethnography with philology and myth, and the appended

---

116 I have attached a transcription of the Theatrum’s preface as an appendix; all translations given within the text are my own.
carto-bibliographical and toponymic indices provide research tools to guide the student to further study. As stated earlier, the toponymic index grew into a separate publication, a dictionary of geographical place names, and as subsequent editions of the atlas appeared, Ortelius added specifically historical maps, which were also eventually published in a separate volume. The evolution of the atlas over time thus lends credence to Ortelius' original marketing of it as an aid to the reading of histories.

In presenting his work in this way, Ortelius was not aiming at a learned academic audience, rather at a broader humanist milieu that stretched from scholars to nobility and gentry to educated merchants. Contrary to the opinion of one recent historian, Jerry Brotton, Ortelius' phrase "a kind of shop furnished with all the instruments necessarily required for the matter" does not imply that his intentions were purely commercial. His phrase refers to the use of maps in conjunction with the Catalogus Auctorum to provide a gateway to further study of geography or chorography: "if perhaps someone feels anything to be missing ... he will be able to find out where to look for it". Thus Ortelius presented the fruits of his research in terms of the benefits for a humanist, perhaps scholarly, readership. Given that history was a prime focus of Ortelius' studies then it is easy to understand why the idea occurred to include the catalogues and the historical texts accompanying the maps. These were not simply attractive frames to make the package more commercially attractive and versatile, but rather integral parts of the design of the atlas.

Such an interpretation is not intended to deny the importance of popular appeal in the design of the atlas. In his explanation for the descriptive texts accompanying each map Ortelius made explicit reference to the importance of packaging: "it seemed to us that it would have been ungracious to the reader or viewer to see the back of our folios empty and entirely useless". Although this is clearly rhetorical underplaying, given that Ortelius goes on to say how these texts accompany the catalogue of authors, the texts themselves present a mixture of learned allusion and entertaining gossip. For example, in his "Angliae, Scotiae et Hiberniae, Sive Britannicarum Insularum Descriptio", Ortelius devotes a considerable section of the text to an account of the islands by a fifteenth-century Athenian writer, Laonicus Chalcondylas, despite that fact that the author "has evidently written down some absurdities", including the claim that wife-
sharing was common practice among the English. Ortelius explains that his interest in the text stems from the fact that it was written "so long ago and from such a distance"; that is, his interest is historical, presenting the text as a fragment of chorography recovered from the past. Yet in most instances Ortelius merely takes an authoritative contemporary account, drawing particularly heavily on Sebastian Munster's *Cosmographia*, but using specifically commissioned local accounts were possible, as in the description of Silesia by the learned doctor and friend of Ortelius, Joannes Crato. Although the *Theatrum* texts were often entertaining (deliberately so), they are also a repository for extensive references to chorographical descriptions by Classical, medieval and early modern authors, arranged topically by location for the convenience of the reader. Accounts of wondrous phenomena, such as the landscape of Greenland or the cultural curiosities of Russia, should not be construed as mere salesmanship; rather they represent the extent to which the early-modern fascination with 'curiosities' was co-extensive with Classical humanist learning and proto-scientific rationalism.

A useful way to gauge the marketing strategies that Ortelius employed in his atlas is to compare it with the marketing of the earliest rival publication, De Jode's *Speculum Orbis Terrarum*. The text in the book is written by the German physician and mathematician, Daniel Cellarius. Cellarius initially presents the work as a cosmography, thus concerned with the order of the universe and the principles of
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117 A. Ortelius, "Angliae, Scotiae et Hiberniae, Sive Britannicarum Insularum Descriptio", *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*, Antwerp, 1570. Ortelius employed the same principles, perhaps more validly, when he provided extracts from Giraldus Cambrensis (supplied in manuscript by Daniel Rogers) to accompany the 1573 Ireland map: "Hiberniae...nova descriptio". Most readers seem to have ignored Ortelius' reservations and to have responded directly to the text as a supposed authority, particularly after Richard Stanihurst exploited it for his *De rebus gestis in Hibernia*, Antwerp, 1584. The otherwise perceptive Irish historian, Stephen White, even made reference to "inautum Abrahamum Ortelium" as having accepted Giraldus' account: White, *Apologia pro Hibernia adversus Cambri Calumniatas*, 61.


natural philosophy. The texts accompanying the maps follow this bent by focusing on the topological question of the systematic division of each territory by region. Likewise, the title page of De Jode's atlas conveys the cosmological interests of the work, as compared to the politicised classicism of Ortelius' title page. Whereas Ortelius' title page presents personifications of the four continents set against a Classical portico, underlining the theatrical metaphor implicit in the atlas' title, De Jode's title page emphasises the 'scientific' bases of geography in hydrology, horology and astrology, much of the image being filled with the zodiac and hieroglyphs thematically arranged in pyramids descending from the sun and moon. This cosmographical vision of geography is repeated in the text of the *Speculum*. In his prefatory letter, Cellarius alludes to natural philosophical issues such as the generation and corruption of matter, and to explain the scope of his comments he points out that cosmography is a part of geography, and it is the latter whose uses he enumerates in the majority of his dedicatory letter to Philip, Count of Lalaing, and in his address to the reader. In these letters he emphasises the value of geography for merchants and for statesmen, particularly leaders who wish to wage war.

The situation in Antwerp and the Low Countries had changed dramatically since the appearance of Ortelius' atlas eight years previously. The successive wars and troubles in the 1570s damaged the printing industry in Antwerp, but do not seem to have crippled it. The number of printers and publishers was at its peak during this period, as was overall employment in the printing industry, which increased dramatically in these years in comparison both with previous years and with the number of printers and publishers. Output to the Frankfurt book fair was quite resilient, after falling at the caution he refuses to assent to both 'wonders': Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii ... Epistulae*, nos., 164 and 171.

The terms "cosmography", "cosmology", "chorography" and "geography", defined by Strabo, are often used without distinction in the sixteenth century, as noted by G. Strauss, "Topographical-Historical Method in Sixteenth-Century German Scholarship", *Studies in the Renaissance*, 5 (1958), 87-101. However, I use the Strabonian sense of the terms, as did Ortelius, Cellarius, Vulcanius and most of the other subjects of this study.

There is no published study of De Jode's atlas, other than the standard carto-bibliographical descriptions. I have appended transcriptions of the dedicatory texts for ease of consultation. The title pages of Ortelius' and De Jode's atlases are well reproduced by Rodney Shirley, "The Title Pages to the *Theatrum* and *Parergon*", *AOF*, 162 and 165. Ortelius' title page has been analysed by W. Waterschoot, "The title-page of Ortelius' *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*, *Quaerendo*, 9 (1979), 43-68; and it is also investigated by Elisabeth Neumann in her forthcoming Ph.D. diss. at Toronto University.
start of the decade, suffering occasional low years but maintaining a consistent share of
the market. Nonetheless, industrial perseverance should not obscure the impact that
the encircling wars had on the mentality of publishers, and therefore on their books.
De Jode’s *Speculum* is marked by this change in a number of ways, not the least of
which is the dedication of the book to the Count of Lalaing. Written in Flushing in
February 1578, the dedication praises Lalaing for his virtues, which are said to be
evident in his representing the States General in negotiations throughout 1577 and
1578. In this context Cellarius emphasises the value of maps during war and as a
necessary tool for statesmen. He claims that, “those who have not tasted any part of
Geography contribute little to public duties.” Further, he claims that “melancholy and
troubles are driven out” by imaginative engagement with the beautiful regions of the
world.

The idea of geography as an imaginative release from the stresses of civil strife is also
expressed in tributes given to Ortelius by poets of the time. Although it is a literary
topos, it may suggest one type of reading prompted by the atlases. By contrast,
Cellarius’ emphasis is on possible practical uses of the atlas, among which he includes
merchants planning to re-route convoys around trouble spots. In fact, Cellarius’ letters
follow the generic pattern of rhetorical speeches in praise of the disciplines. His own
preference for cosmography over geography slips into the text, while in his treatment
of the uses of the atlas he slips between talking about the uses of individual maps and
the use of map collections. The distinction, however, remains important, and its
occlusion in the text may be deliberate – through the production of vernacular editions,
through the distribution of free copies to prestigious and influential patrons, and
through continually updating his atlas, Ortelius had created and dominated a market.
De Jode’s rival publication, which appears from internal evidence to have been hurried

---

122 Statistics are provided by H. van der Wee, *The Growth of the Antwerp Market and the European
Protestantism in a Commercial Metropolis, 1550-1577*, Johns Hopkins, 1996. For
output to the Frankfurt book fair see Schwetschke, ed., *Codex Nundinarius Germaniae Literate
1564-1846*, Nieuwkoop, 1963. Plantin complained greatly of economic hardship in this period; though his
letters are in part explicable as angling for patronage, there is no doubt that conditions were testing:
Rooses & Denucé, *Correspondance de Christophe Plantin*, vols. 5 and 6, passim.
123 All translations are my own; for the Latin, see my appended transcription of the text.
into print with many errors, stood little chance, and it is not surprising that he tried to
catch an alternative market to Ortelius, emphasising the work as a collection of
accurate maps rather than as a reference book for the study of history. In this regard,
it is odd that the work appears more cosmographical than geographical. De Jode was
not renowned for his learning, as Ortelius was; employing a physician to provide a
learned commentary on the texts may, however, have resulted in the book being pulled
in two opposing directions. Trying to catch a learned audience and a utilitarian
audience with the one work, De Jode may have failed to convince both. Ironically, the
cosmographical work of De Jode and Cellarius, which over-represents Germany,
covers the earth less systematically than Ortelius’ atlas. This too may have been partly
its downfall, since the maps of these regions were particularly sensitive for political
reasons. In the first instance this may have served him well, in that it meant that there
was a corpus of high-quality local maps that Ortelius had not used and that De Jode
could hope to exploit as soon as political tensions eased on the departure of the Duke
of Alva from the Low Countries in 1573. On the other hand, the nature of De Jode’s
material may have been the cause of his slow attainment of printing privileges, rather
than any supposed machinations by Ortelius.

It was presumably Cellarius who compiled the indices to De Jode’s Speculum;
crucially, one of these provides an example of how Cellarius envisaged someone
reading the book. In his texts that accompany each map his interest is largely, as I
have said, in the appropriate division of a territory into regions. Thus, for example, he
describes two or three different systems of distinguishing the areas within Italy, before
proceeding to describe the system he favours. His own choice is often introduced by
some phrase such as “recent authors agree...” Given the importance to him of these
distinctions, it is perhaps not surprising that he compiles two separate indices. The
first is merely an alphabetical table of contents, each map by area; however, the second
is an index of the major regions depicted within the maps but which do not have an
entire map to themselves. In fact, this index is not constructed by reference to the
maps themselves, but rather by following the division of regions specified in the

124 See especially Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii ... Epistulae, nos. 30 and 68; and the contributions of
Janus Dousa and Alexander Graphaeus to Ortelius’ album amicorum: Ortelius, Album, ff. 82-4
(Dousa) and ff. 90-91 (Graphaeus).
accompanying text. Thus, although the index is designed for ease of use, it reinforces Cellarius’ conception of the atlas as representing the symmetry and order of the universe, without being practically geared towards the image of each map. Further, not everywhere is represented proportionally. Thus, Africa receives little attention, whereas each of the three maps of Asia, and the overlapping one of the Ottoman Empire, is extensively indexed.

An unusual copy of De Jode’s atlas, contained in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, suggests that the model of reading represented by Cellarius’ index could be exploited and adapted by readers. This volume is notable for a number of reasons. First, it was catalogued under the name of Cellarius rather than De Jode (a common error of early bibliographers) and had escaped the notice of previous scholars of De Jode’s work. Second, the volume contains a largely intact copy of the extremely rare first edition of De Jode’s atlas interleaved with a collection of Ortelius maps – the second supplement that Ortelius published to update owners of older copies of the atlas once newer augmented versions appeared. This Ortelius supplement was published in 1579, the year that De Jode’s atlas appears to have reached the bookshops. Further, one extra map has been added, the “Germania Inferioris” of Frans Hogenburg, printed in 1578. A third reason for interest in this volume is that the indices of Cellarius have been replaced by a calligraphic manuscript version, the hand dating approximately from the first half of the seventeenth century. It is this manuscript index which is most important here.

The index is written on paper that bears a watermark only known in De Jode maps, and thus the paper is roughly contemporary with the atlas, and indeed was probably bought with it. Whereas Cellarius divided both his indices in two, following De Jode’s division of the atlas into two parts, the reader has collated the two indices relating to each part. Further, the reader has adjusted the index of maps to incorporate the new ones that have been added. More importantly, the index of regions has also been adjusted. Not only does this demonstrate the importance of Cellarius’ index to the reader, but also it shows a willingness to adapt Cellarius’ mode of reading to other
maps and their texts. The reader has expanded Cellarius’ index, but also rearranged the order of maps and numbered them according to his own system.

The Ortelius supplement, which is here interleaved with De Jode’s atlas, appears not to suit the work to which it is added. Many of the maps overlap with those in De Jode’s collection, and there are also a number of Ortelius’ historical maps, one of which announces that the author is adding them as an appendix to the atlas. These maps are interleaved here as if they were contemporary maps, and are indexed as such. I have suggested that Ortelius’ *Theatrum* is more preoccupied with the use of maps for reading history than is De Jode’s *Speculum*; however, it seems that the owner of this combined volume did not see the difference or see it as important. Further, both Cellarius’ index and this particular reader’s rewritten version of it often list a place under its historical rather than contemporary name, and sometimes both. What this reveals is that the owner of this particular volume is as interested in the history and toponymy of places as he is in their geographical position; that even if De Jode’s atlas is less insistent about its use as a historical guide, it remains an important dimension of the work which came out of this collaboration between De Jode and Cellarius, a dimension which allowed it to be read interchangeably with the “eye of history” produced by Ortelius.

While it would be unwise to generalise freely on the basis of the idiosyncratic reading habits of one individual, I have tried to show the ways in which the owner of this interleaved De Jode/Ortelius volume read in a way that matches some of the thought structures reflected within both of the first two modern atlases of the world. Doubtless many other readers read differently; nonetheless, it is important to remember that reading an expensive Latin atlas in the sixteenth century was in itself an intellectual activity. While there is much evidence that people read these atlases as they travelled, and some evidence that merchants read them with an eye to their mercantile activities, it is important to establish in what way they did so. In this regard I would suggest

126 There is no published study of reading practices with regard to early-modern atlases. Isolated examples are scattered throughout works such as E.G.R. Taylor, *Tudor Geography*, 1485-1583, London, 1930; Henry Kamen, *Philip of Spain*, Yale, 1998; Geoffrey Parker, “Philip II, Maps and
that these works are used less as we would use a modern atlas, and more as we would use a tourist guide book. These works link contemporary places with history and, in De Jode’s case, with the divine order of the world. Readers did not use them to navigate the geography of trade and warfare, rather to illuminate it. Thus Ortelius’ atlas project was historical and ethnographic rather than navigational. Only one type of traveller needed to know this kind of information—the learned humanist. The extensive Classical citations in the text allow its use as a mnemonic commonplace book helping the traveller to recall pertinent Classical topoi about his locale with which to litter his learned conversations. For merchants the atlas provided a humanist framework in which to situate the places with which they traded; and for many in the Low Countries atlases provided a form of escapism from wearying local wars. It is no surprise that in the early library catalogues of Trinity College, Dublin, the lists of historical works are filled with travel accounts and map collections. Whoever interleaved Ortelius’ supplement with De Jode’s rival atlas gave physical form to the integration of geography and history in a personal way that is every bit as typical of humanist historical consciousness as Ortelius’ own integration of geography and history in his *Theatrum*.127

Is it possible to identify the market more precisely? In many cases the owners of a copy of an atlas can be identified, either through inscriptions or other means; however, the trail of provenance often ends before it reaches back to the sixteenth century, and no systematic record of early atlas owners has been compiled to date. Assessing readership through the provenance of extant copies of a book contains the methodological pitfall that copies of important bibliophiles are more likely to have survived, hence the evidence presents a distorted view of the wider market. Nonetheless, the high price of the *Theatrum*, and the evidence of purchases mentioned

---


in correspondence and print-shop records, confirm the picture from extant copies: that owners were indeed bibliophiles, including lords, civic church leaders, humanist members of the merchant elite, and scholars. However, the means of acquisition are various. Ortelius sent many free copies to other scholars and to influential noblemen. In many instances this is clearly in expectation of receiving patronage, or similar gifts in return, but it also had the effect of ensuring that Ortelius thoroughly dominated the market – as more influential people were given copies the book became a central authority, and was thus more desirable, and widely advertised by word of mouth. His connections with the printing houses of Northern Europe, which were extensive and wide-ranging, placed him in a particularly good position to ensure broad dissemination of his work. His close friend, the printer-publisher Christopher Plantin, sold many copies in Antwerp, Paris, and Leiden, and delivered copies elsewhere; Ortelius also used his connections with the Birckman firm to distribute the book in Germany and further east; and his contacts with humanists in Italy and Spain also ensured that copies were available there. That the atlas was dedicated to Philip II of Spain served more purposes than merely to earn Ortelius the title “Geographer to the King” (which brought both prestige and money), it also guaranteed ease of distribution throughout the Catholic world without impeding its sale in Protestant Europe.

While most copies of the book were sold through the standard mechanisms of the publishing industry, the importance of gratuitous copies should not be underestimated, particularly given the monetary value of each copy and thus the expense involved – either some return was expected or Ortelius was much wealthier than is known. Unfortunately, given the fragmentary nature of the extant evidence, it is difficult to determine whether, or to what extent, Ortelius’ distribution of free copies was strategic and, if so, what he hoped to gain in each case. An exception in this regard is the first

128 No comprehensive list is yet possible. The core relevant sources are: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii ... Epistulae; Rooses & Denucé, Correspondance de Christophe Plantin; Jan Denucé, Oud-nederlandsche Kaartmakers in Betrekking met Plantijn. Yet no such study could proceed without recourse to the hundreds of surviving copies of the atlas.

129 A good example of Ortelius’ strategic distribution of apparently free copies is in his targeting of Cologne dignitaries: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii ... Epistulae, nos. 35 and 40; see also no. 202.

130 Plantin’s contribution is clear from the records in an Denucé, Oud-nederlandsche Kaartmakers in Betrekking met Plantijn; Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii ... Epistulae, nos. 49, 61, 103, 139, 269, 294, and 307.
Spanish edition of the atlas, published in 1588, which provides a particularly useful insight into the marketing of the work.

In fact the initiative for this publication did not come from Ortelius himself, but from the publisher, Plantin. Ortelius was an unusual author by sixteenth century standards in that he provided funds up front for the *Theatrum* – the Spanish edition was the first exception. Already in January 1587, Plantin was discussing the matter with his patrons and friends in Spain, and he seems to have been trying to smooth the path still earlier, sending a copy of a previous edition of the *Theatrum* to the influential figure at court, Garcia Loaisa. He hoped to dedicate both a Spanish translation of the atlas and Ortelius’ new geographical lexicon, the *Thesaurus Geographicus*, to influential Spaniards at the court of Philip II. Although he never expresses his reason, he was almost certainly trying to ensure that he maintained royal favour after having spent from 1582-1585 in Leiden, the university established by the rebel Dutch Protestants in defiance of Philip’s authority. Throughout his stay in Leiden Plantin had protested his continued orthodoxy in a series of letters to his benefactors in Spain, who however were less influential than earlier in their careers; he insisted that his motives for moving to Leiden were purely commercial and that he had avoided printing heretical works while there, or had done so under duress and as an indication thereof had used a different formula in his typographic address. Wary of the reception of these arguments at the Spanish court, where he knew he had enemies, he seems to have decided to try to curry favour by creating a Spanish edition of the atlas as a testimony of his loyalty, and he sought to dedicate the publication to Philip’s young son by way of tribute. Wooing Spanish sympathies would also have served Ortelius’ purposes well in the mid-1580s because his religious beliefs had been called into doubt during the restoration of Catholicism after the Spanish reconquest of Antwerp, as will be seen in the next chapter. Yet Plantin also had another goal. Since his appointment as “Prototypographer to the King” he had received only a small portion of the money guaranteed for his work, made considerably worse by debts accrued over the disastrous publication of his masterpiece, the Polyglot Bible, which was still dogged by the issue of unorthodoxy. The economic situation in Antwerp had not helped matters,

---

and Plantin had been complaining through his contacts at the Spanish court for much of the past decade that he was seriously in debt, had been forced to sell parts of his business at less than half their value, and had been forced to consider closure on many occasions due to the incessant demands of his creditors. Dedicating two new prestigious works to Spanish patrons was a reminder that he was still working thanklessly on their behalf in the Spanish Netherlands.\textsuperscript{132}

Although Plantin’s idea was astutely conceived, it immediately ran into problems. His friend and patron in Spain, Joannes Moflin, who had been in the process of translating the \textit{Theatrum} into Spanish, died on 9 February 1587. Around the same time he discovered that books printed in Spanish outside the Iberian peninsula were not allowed to enter Spain. He was still not sure whether his dedication of the atlas to the young Spanish prince would be well-received, and he was carefully trying to identify the appropriate patron for the \textit{Thesaurus}.\textsuperscript{133} This seems to have been the first time that he realised that his old protectors at court, Arias Montanus and Cayas, were no longer the best people to forward his cause, or could not do so successfully without backing from others. He focused his attentions on Garcia de Loaisa, to whom he eventually dedicated the \textit{Thesaurus}, and who was close to both the king and the prince. Eventually the problems with the Spanish atlas were resolved and another translator, Balthasar Vincentius, was found. The \textit{Thesaurus} appeared in 1587 with a dedication to Loaisa; the atlas the following year, dedicated to the prince.\textsuperscript{134}

Yet the process of distribution of the atlas, which was central to gaining patronage, had only begun. Over the course of the months subsequent to publication Plantin sent multiple copies to Loaisa, Cayas and Montanus, distributing his work to different members of the court, and making sure that the king received numerous ornamentally bound and illustrated versions. He seems to have identified figures at court

\textsuperscript{132} Plantin’s predicament is made clear in Rooses & Denucé, \textit{Correspondance de Christophe Plantin}, vol. 6, no. 840, and vol. 7, no. 1078, as well as in many other letters to and from Arias Montanus and Cayas. The best account of his difficulties is Leon Voet, \textit{The Golden Compasses}; but see also C. Clair, \textit{Christopher Plantin}, London, 1960, 161-78.

\textsuperscript{133} Rooses & Denucé, \textit{Correspondance de Christophe Plantin}, vol. 8/9, nos. 1210, 1230, 1231 and 1236.

\textsuperscript{134} A. Ortelius, \textit{Thesaurus Geographicus}, 1587; ibid., \textit{Theatro de la Tierra Universal}, 1588. The arrangements with Vincentius are discussed in Rooses & Denucé, \textit{Correspondance de Christophe Plantin}, vol. 8/9, no. 1275.
strategically, although some copies inevitably were sent to friends and established patrons, and he asked friends there to distribute copies to appropriate figures as they saw fit.\textsuperscript{135} Although Plantin received financial return for some of these, the majority of the named recipients seems to have received copies unsolicited.\textsuperscript{136} While this particular edition of the \textit{Theatrum} had a unique political and financial context, and problems specific to the production of Spanish books, the techniques and mechanisms that Plantin used to secure patronage and the maximum possible impact from the publication were not unusual. Distribution of multiple copies at the discretion of trusted friends in influential centres was widespread practice both by publishers and authors.\textsuperscript{137} However, detailed knowledge of the figures involved in this case permits a comparison to be made between the known targets of the publisher and the apparent audience as judged by the character of the edition. Thus, although this edition of the atlas contained none of the scholarly apparatuses included in the Latin texts, substituting instead appendices listing trade routes and products, it is quite clear from the above analysis that the prime target of the edition was the Spanish court, not Spanish merchants. The appeal to mercantile interest with the inclusion of such features was an attempt to kill two birds with one stone, to recuperate some financial or market reward from what was primarily an exercise in securing political and financial patronage at court.

Ortelius' publication of the \textit{Theatrum} was ground-breaking and inevitably there were those who imitated his idea or who realised that parallel markets must exist. A series of works appeared in various countries that may be seen to follow Ortelius' lead in terms of the understanding of market demand for general works of synthesis in the field of geography. Encyclopaedic studies such as Sebastian Munster's \textit{Cosmographia} had long been available, as had monumental works such as the \textit{Liber Chronicorum} of

\textsuperscript{135} Rooses & Denucé, \textit{Correspondance de Christophe Plantin}, vol. 8/9, nos. 1264, 1272, 1376, and 1393.

\textsuperscript{136} For the financial return from the king, Plantin's main target, see ibid., nos. 1424 and 1445.

\textsuperscript{137} The 1588 edition of the atlas was also distributed through the usual networks, such as via Torrentius to influential patrons in Rome; see Delcourt & Hoyoux, \textit{Laevinus Torrentius Correspondance}, vol. 2, letter 577.
Hartmann Schedel in Nuremberg (1493). However, attempts were now made to combine the latest geographic knowledge with ethnographic detail to enhance the scientific knowledge of the globe as a whole through specific studies in the interest of learning. In some respects Ortelius was not the originator of this trend. Philip II had ordered a number of studies of his territories, but these were new research for strategic purposes rather than scholarly works of synthesis aiming to further the cause of learning.

After publication of the *Theatrum* a number of works appeared with similar synthetic designs. Aside from De Jode’s atlas, George Braun produced his *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* (1572), Andre Thevet published his *Cosmographie Universelle* (1575), and in 1584/5 Lucas Wagenaer published his *Sphieghel der Zeevaert*. Regional studies followed in England with Saxton’s *Atlas* (1579) and Camden’s *Britannia* (1586), the former inspired by and the other directly suggested by Ortelius. Likewise in France Michel Bouguereau published his *Theatre Francois* in 1594. By this stage Ortelius was no longer the inspiration - Bouguereau drew heavily upon the first volume of Mercator’s *Atlas*, issued in 1585. On the other hand, there seems to have been no sense in which Ortelius was left behind by these developments. He continually updated his atlas and remained a leading figure in Antwerp up to his death in 1598, keeping in touch with the younger generation of scholars throughout, so far as politics and geography allowed.

The success of Ortelius in dominating the market with his atlas for up to twenty-five years apparently caused very little acrimony. By rigorously referencing his sources throughout the atlas, he rendered complaint and dispute less likely, and he worked towards making inclusion in the *Catalogus Auctorum* a matter of some prestige for younger cartographers so that the *Theatrum* might become a place to be seen rather than a point to surpass.

The *Theatrum* was a work of synthesis, merely providing a compilation of other people’s maps. Nonetheless, the editorial scholarship of Ortelius gained widespread acclaim, leaving the impression that the atlas was not just regarded as convenient (and therefore sellable) but as an original work of scholarship in its own right. As has been shown, it is difficult to assess to what extent readers appreciated the goals of the author in his publication. The laudatory poems written to celebrate Ortelius’ scholarly achievement in his book give no sense of it as a work-in-progress, instead commenting on the restitution of geography from ignorance or on the glorious and useful reduction of the entire world into one book. Many of these poems are eulogies that convey both Ortelius’ international standing as a scholar and what the nature of his achievement was meant to be. Four themes in particular stand out. First, Ortelius has created a self-contained world for the scholar’s imagination, overcoming the dangers of travel. Second, in doing so he is either a new Phoebus or Apollo, the sun bringing light to the world. Third, his scholarship exceeds that of Ptolemy and all other previous cartographers. And fourth, his atlas is described as having positive spiritual or religious effects. Such appraisals must be understood as laudatory and epideictic verse. The shared themes may well have occurred because one writer drew inspiration from another, rather than because they both independently viewed Ortelius in the same light. And indeed some of the images are variations on standard tropes. But the *Album Amicorum* nonetheless provides ample evidence both of the celebrity that Ortelius had attained and that there is considerable consistency in those things for which he is praised. It also demonstrates that Ortelius’ milieu was entirely humanist and that he had connections in various fields that can only be linked through a common concern for antiquity - geography, lexicography, numismatics, historical linguistics and history itself. Thus, rather than viewing the *Theatrum* as significant solely within the history of cartography, it is necessary to consider it within the context of learned humanist historical scholarship. Peter van der Krogt has stated the situation simply: “Ortelius was in the first place a historian ... This may be why Ortelius next to coins

---

and historical objects also collected maps." Ortelius’ historical scholarship and familiarity with his sources are impressive and have created an invaluable resource for historians. What unites the historical scholarship and the editorial synthesis of contemporary cartographic knowledge in the atlas is the philosophy of humanism. It is this which supplied the collaborative ethos both in the atlas and in the wider geographical community, and it is also this which lay behind the scrupulous historical and contemporary referencing in the atlas.

The manner in which Ortelius presented his humanist approach to geography on the 1587 world map was compact and to the point, drawing out what had been less explicit in the 1570 version. Yet the first edition of the atlas was no less a humanist work, and immediately prior to the world map’s symmetrical Ptolemaic projection and Ciceronian invocation of the smallness of mankind on the scale of the universe, the reader encountered a text introducing the map. This introduction provides first a list of the continents; second, a laudatory mention of Mercator’s world map of the previous year and its division of the world into the old world, the new world, and the as-yet undiscovered southern regions; third, a section from book two of Pliny’s *Naturalis Historia*; and fourth, a bibliography of authors, ancient and modern, who have made significant contributions to knowledge of parts of the globe. The text quoted from Pliny deals with the folly of man’s ambition to acquire possessions, territorial and otherwise, focusing on his selfishness and continual struggle to take for himself at the expense of his neighbours. The quotation ends with the question, “After he has greedily stuffed himself full, how will his dead body keep possession of it all?” Ortelius could not have been clearer in his message – contemplate the world piously, study Classical authors, and co-operate with others instead of fighting a losing battle in isolation. In the light of this chapter, it seems that Ortelius was proposing Pliny’s text as an expression of the ethos behind his construction of the atlas.

---

142 Van der Krogt in *AOFA*, 61. Nonetheless, the article is not concerned to explore in any depth the historical humanism of Ortelius’ work.

If this is the case, Jerry Brotton’s argument that Ortelius’ work represents a commercialisation of learned geography in response to the voyages of discovery rather misses the point. Basing his analysis on Ortelius’ letter to the reader, Brotton argues that the developments in Flemish cartography were “a further intensification of the professionalisation of the geographer and the commodification of his products,” citing Cornelius Koeman’s description of Ortelius as the “safe shop-keeper” of sixteenth century geography.\(^{144}\) Yet Ortelius did not publish a finished work, rather a work-in-progress; although this turned out to be a lucrative marketing decision, it seems to have stemmed from specific problems in the production of a reference work on cartography in an age of exploration. Whereas Brotton depicts a cartographic world riddled with intrigue, spying and national agendas, Ortelius relied on a cooperative network of contributing scholars to compile his work, and in the interests of maintaining its continued relevance he launched it on the web of international print-publishing networks to centralise information and create a site for collaboration. Such an approach may have been astute marketing, but only if fellow-scholars were willing to cooperate: thus the atlas could only provide a rather anodyne picture of commercial individualism.

Interpretations of the atlas as representing an altruistic spiritualist concern for the welfare of humanity also miss the mark. In 1976 the celebrated Leiden historian, Jan van Dorsten, claimed of Flemish cosmographers that,

Along with Mercator, who gave his famous *Atlas* the subtitle *Cosmographical Meditations on the Fabric of the Universe*, they described ‘their’ cosmography as ‘the first beginning of all natural philosophy’, the basis of all true knowledge of God’s intention for man and creation. When the (Familist) geographer Ortelius published his atlas in 1570 (under the significant title *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*), the French scholar Guillaume Postel called this Antwerpian book ‘truly after the holy scriptures the greatest work in the world’ – and he meant literally what he said.

\(^{144}\) Jerry Brotton, *Trading Territories: Mapping the Early Modern World*, 175; Cornelius Koeman,
Van Dorsten makes this claim in the context of his argument that Flemish cartographers pursued their studies “to find out unassailable truths about God’s work, so that mankind might finally might be made one again.”¹⁴⁵ These arguments have been extended recently by the Italian scholar, Giorgio Mangani, in his study of Ortelius.¹⁴⁶ That the rationale for Ortelius’ collaboration may be found in a combination of pragmatic scholarship and marketing strategies, while being imbued with a rich humanist tradition of co-operation in the interests of learned culture, renders the spiritualist account unnecessary as an explanatory device, but does not disprove it outright. Thus it is necessary to explore in the next chapter whether or not a religious framework underpinned the scholarly and professional collaboration of Ortelius and his colleagues.

Having established in the last chapter that collaboration was a prominent feature of Ortelius’ activity as a humanist, and having suggested that the major intellectual preoccupation of the atlas is with the production of a guide for the reading of histories, the following chapter explores the question of Ortelius’ religious beliefs to see whether they might provide an obvious context for his practice of collaborating on scholarly projects. The reason for this approach will appear from the historiographical background given in the course of the analysis. At the outset, it is worth noting that the major collaborative project of the period, the Polyglot Bible, published by Plantin and produced primarily by scholars in his and Ortelius’ immediate circle, has been explained through reference to spiritualist motives of both Plantin and those around him. Indeed, throughout the twentieth century an increasing trend in historiography has analysed or taken for granted the importance of mystical sects and spiritualism in the intellectual life of the Low Countries, particularly Antwerp, in the second half of the sixteenth century. While some recent scholarship has cast doubt on the findings of this research, the idea that Antwerp’s humanists were bound in secret heretical associations has proved tenacious, and, as such, it is necessary to explore the matter in some detail to establish whether such an account of intellectual culture may be relevant to Ortelius and his collaborative associations.

In 1588, three years after Farnese reconquered Antwerp for Spain, the town council investigated Abraham Ortelius’ religious affiliations as part of their post-conquest purge of the citizen guard. The Privy Council wrote to the town council asking whether, during the latest purge, Ortelius had been listed as a Lutheran, whether he had been disarmed, and whether he was still considered to be a heretic. The municipal authorities replied that Ortelius had never been recorded as a Lutheran and had always behaved in an orthodox Catholic manner. However, they admitted that in January 1586 Ortelius had indeed been asked to surrender his weapons as part of the purge, but that the error was quickly discovered and his equipment returned. The
initial error was accounted for by the fact that Ortelius’ close friendship with Peter Heyns, a Calvinist member of the revolutionary municipality, had cast suspicion upon him. Ultimately, no charge was brought. Ortelius’ gifts to influential members of the Privy Council perhaps helped to secure his position.1

Yet Ortelius’ religious beliefs have undergone more recent scrutiny. During the collation and editing of the documents of the Dutch exiles’ Church in London in the late nineteenth century, J.H. Hessels discovered a letter to Ortelius from the French Hebraist Guillaume Postel. In a postscript, the writer requests, “Greet our Plantin and tell him that the leaders of the School of Charity are not unknown to me.” The phrase “scholae charitatis” was taken to be a reference to the secretive mystical sect, The Family of Love, confirming the opinion of Max Rooses, then curator of the Museum Plantin-Morteus, that the famous printer and his friend Ortelius were both members of the group.2

In a brief but influential article in 1952, René Boumans brought these pieces of evidence together with the other known material relating to Ortelius’ religious beliefs. His analysis was terse but acute, attempting to bring clarity to the seventy years of debate since Hessels and Rooses stated their position.3 He argued that Ortelius was brought up with a leaning towards reform but never became a Protestant, and although initiated into the secrets of Hendrik Niclaes’ Family of Love (and sympathetic to the group), for reasons of safety he maintained all appearances of being Catholic. In summary, Ortelius’ personal beliefs inclined him towards a general Christianity, unaligned with any particular group. Boumans was a skilled religious historian familiar with the complexity of religious allegiance and affiliation in sixteenth century

Antwerp, but his study was seminal rather than definitive. Subsequent developments in the historiography of the Family of Love have complicated the picture. Studies by Herman de la Fontaine Verwey and Alastair Hamilton have detailed the development of splits within the group, its economic connections, and its appeal to learned humanists in the Low Countries. The number of identified members around Ortelius increased dramatically, particularly in the wake of Rekers’ controversial study of Benito Arias Montano, the renowned humanist who was for a time an influential advisor to Philip II. Claims for the influence of the Family of Love in England have also become more wide-ranging, as have analyses of the professional and cultural networks linking the Low Countries with England. In the early 1980s, three fine book-length studies appeared, synthesising, popularising and pushing forward these developments: Alastair Hamilton’s nuanced work, The Family of Love, Jean Dietz Moss’ ‘Godded with God’: Hendrik Niclaes and his Family of Love, and Christopher Marsh’s detailed monograph, The Family of Love in English Society 1550-1630. The Family of Love seemed familiar, and Ortelius’ membership of it was widely assumed and frequently cited, despite notes of caution from some leading scholars.4

Some of the dissatisfaction of historians with the widespread claims for the influence of the Family of Love was given concrete form in Paul Valkema Blouw’s sophisticated analysis of Christopher Plantin’s connection with the group. Blouw showed that much of Plantin’s connection with Hendrik Niclaes could be explained by commercial motives, and that his membership in, or adherence to the beliefs of, the group is not certain and is contradicted by some of the evidence.5 However, Blouw’s argument has not gained the support of the latest study of Ortelius’ religious beliefs.

---


Giorgio Mangani’s elaborate study of the geographer’s “world” portrays a Familist milieu, pace Rekers and Hamilton, littered with the esoteric symbolism of arcane studies and eirenicism. Nonetheless, the warnings of Blouw are not lightly set aside, particularly when evidence is thin on the ground, and Mangani’s learned, thorough collation of material often appears little more than circumstantial evidence, partial or tendentious reading of the sources, or insensitivity to the distinctions between different kinds of unorthodox belief. It is also somewhat bedevilled by the common tendency among detectives of arcana to assume that all communication on esoteric matters was mutual. Mangani concludes that Ortelius can best be understood through the late Familist teachings of Barrefelt, combined with something taken to be Christian Stoicism; however, his work has yet to receive due attention from Ortelius scholars. Most experts in the history of cartography still refer to Ortelius’ connection with the Family of Love as probable, though not fully understood. By contrast, wider historical literature continues to assume his full-blown membership of the group. This is taken to indicate that Ortelius’ religious beliefs were dominated by the heretical teachings of Niclaes and/or Barrefelt, and that his moral stance tended towards eirenic disregard for post-reformation politics.

In this article I discuss the evidence for Ortelius’ association with the Family of Love before proceeding to assess the remaining evidence for his religious position. I assume that religious belief, affiliation and practice can change over time and that these changes often reflect social and political, as well as religious, developments. I also assume that individuals, no matter how intelligent, can have inconsistencies in character and belief, and different modes of behaviour in different circumstances, whether consciously or not. Thus, I intend to depict the religious position in which Ortelius put or found himself, and from which he proceeded to act, at the various points for which there is evidence, without assuming from the outset that each

---

instance must be interpreted in terms of his life pattern. Only towards the end will I attempt to see whether a holistic interpretation of his religious character is possible.

The Family of Love, also variously referred to as the House of Love, the Service of Love, the Consort of Charity and the School of Charity, was a secret religious society founded by Hendrik Niclaes in the early 1540s. Despite the secrecy of its membership, the printed works of its leaders have survived, and there exists a chronicle of the group’s activities written by an elder within the society. It is important to be sensitive to changes over time in the ideas within the group. The core of Hendrik Niclaes’ beliefs was the actual presence of the spirit of Christ within the believer, who was thereafter described as “godded with God”. By leading a pious life focused on inward fusion with the unity of God, Familist adepts were to pave the way to a new era in which Church sacraments would be unnecessary and all would unite in the service of love. Niclaes swayed between tolerance of all creeds and expressions of damnation for those who refused to accept his ideas. Followers were encouraged to observe traditional ceremonies for the sake of peaceable existence until the inevitable removal of these rites in a society regulated by the single rule of love. Such a dismissal of the value of established churches evoked the loathing of both religious and political authorities, as did the apparent hypocrisy of the group’s policy of secrecy.

In the early 1570s a split occurred within the group with the secession of a number of the most senior elders who objected to the hierarchies Hendrik Niclaes had gradually imposed. In particular, Hendrik Jansen van Barrefelt, objected to Niclaes’ posturing as a prophet and his exhortations to members to follow his rule above and beyond that of Christ. In his teaching, Barrefelt emphasised self-knowledge, piety, and a pacific outlook, re-inforcing the willingness to dissimulate of Familism, encouraging tolerance, and displaying a more democratic understanding of the relationships between those “godded with God”. He styled himself as their guide rather than their leader. This approach seems to have appealed greatly to the learned humanists in the Low Countries who were disillusioned with the factionalism within organised

---

religions, and the endless disputes, persecutions and wars over inessential details of theology. 9

An added complication to the picture is that it is not clear to what extent the variant teachings of Barrefelt were part of the Family of Love prior to the split in 1573. The Chronicle of the Family of Love, written at a later date and heavily biased against those who broke from Niclaes in 1573, states that Barrefelt was sent to Antwerp on behalf of Niclaes in the 1550s, shortly before the printer Christopher Plantin became involved with the group. The Chronicle also claims that it was around this time that the group began to flourish in the city, and thus it is possible that Barrefelt helped to shape the distinct character of Antwerp Familism. 10 Alastair Hamilton has claimed that Plantin’s beliefs, expressed in 1567, pre-figure the ideas at the core of Barrefelt’s later split with Niclaes – that he does not recognise the absolute authority of Niclaes, and that this democratic ecclesiology made the Antwerp group of Familists distinct from elsewhere. 11 However, there is very little evidence to confirm this assertion, and it is not clear why Plantin may be taken as typical of a learned humanist response in Antwerp. In the 1555/6 he was newly arrived from France and had begun printing works for colleagues in Paris, when he received a lucrative commission from Hendrik Niclaes. The Familist Chronicle makes the exaggerated claim that Plantin owed the establishment of his business to this contract, and used the opportunity of his liaison with the Family of Love to learn Dutch. The Chronicle also suggests that he was valued by Niclaes for his contacts in Paris, not in Antwerp. 12 Thus, although Plantin belonged to a circle of learned humanists by the time he made the remarks that Hamilton analyses, any dealings he might have with the Family of Love would have been qualitatively different from those of his learned fellow citizens.

Many of Ortelius’ friends and correspondents have been associated with the Family of Love aside from Plantin. These include Benito Arias Montanus, Justus Lipsius, Luis Pérez, Arnold Mylius, Emanuel van Meteren, Jacob Colius (the last two were both

---

12 See Valkema Blouw, “Was Plantin a Member of the Family of Love?”, 12-17; Hamilton, ed., Cronica, 46.
relatives of Ortelius), and the Dutch writer Dirk Volckertszoon Coornhert. In some of these cases there is uncertainty; indeed, in the course of this article it will become evident that identifications may be simply erroneous. Nonetheless, within the wider, less intimate circle of acquaintances and correspondents who appear throughout Ortelius’ life the traces of the Family of Love seem to be clear and frequent. What then of Ortelius himself?

The main basis for the association of Ortelius with the Family of Love is the existence of some letters to him from the French scholar, Guillaume Postel, which appear to take for granted the fact that Ortelius is a member of the group. A scholar of biblical languages, Guillaume Postel’s expertise and perpetual travelling brought him into contact with many religious and linguistic scholars across Europe. For a while he enjoyed considerable favour at the French court, which brought him the opportunity to spend a year in the Ottoman Empire. He drew upon his experiences there to construct the first ever work of comparative linguistics. He also became increasingly interested in cabbala and Islam. In 1543 he published his book Of World Concord, which conveyed his newly found internationalism and eirenic hopes for the peace of the church. He joined the Jesuits briefly, but was expelled when he began to express his ideas. Then, in a life-changing experience, he met a woman in Venice who, he believed, was an incarnation of the Holy Spirit. Shortly after Christmas, 1551, he had a mystical experience during which he felt this woman’s spirit take possession of him. Thereafter, Postel devoted his life to an active ministry, believing in his own messianic calling to save the world. He travelled throughout Europe during this period, attracting universal admiration for his learning, associating with millenarian and mystical sects of various persuasions. Despite publishing a number of works, including a study of cosmography patronised by the Emperor Ferdinand, he remained for the most part pitifully poor. However, he attracted considerable attention and following in France in the early 1560s, resulting in his arrest in 1562, charged with political agitation. Postel had come to believe in the need for French world dominance to bring about the salvation of mankind, a doctrine that caused

13 The most expansive claims with regard to the influence of Familism and its membership can be found in Rekers, Benito Arias Montano. A more conservative assessment was given by Leon Voet, The Golden Compasses. A History and Evaluation of the Printing and Publishing Activities of the Officina Plantiniana at Antwerp, 2 vols., Amsterdam 1969-72, which study remains a standard work on Antwerp humanism. Familist theology is best analysed by Hamilton, who also discusses with acuity many of the questionable instances of membership; see Hamilton, The Family of Love.
considerable embarrassment for French international diplomacy. After a brief period of freedom, he was again confined, this time for life in the Priory of St Martin in Paris; a sympathetic court deemed him insane rather than allowing him to be executed for heresy. He lived in confinement for eighteen years, until his death in 1581. He never altered his beliefs, and, as we shall see, attempted to continue his ministry by means of correspondence with pious men of learning throughout Europe.  

The relationship between Ortelius and Postel can only be tentatively reconstructed on the basis of limited evidence. There are three known letters from Postel to Ortelius; no replies are extant.15 While a number of Ortelius’ maps draw upon the ideas of Postel, Ortelius seems to have viewed his atlas as a compendium of authoritative information and notable opinions, rather than as an expression of his own beliefs about individual cases or issues.16 Quoting Postel did not necessarily mean he agreed with him; rather, it is an indication that Postel’s reputation for learning had reached Antwerp along with his books, and that there were few others who provided information to question or replace many of his suggestions, particularly with regard to religious-historical geography. Thus, to gauge the relationship between the two men, scholars have relied upon what can be surmised from the nature of the matters discussed in Postel’s letters, supplemented occasionally by reference to the correspondence between Christopher Plantin and Postel.17

The first extant letter from Postel to Ortelius is dated 9 April, 1567. In it, Postel thanks Ortelius for sending a copy of his new wall map of Asia, and for referring to him on it. He claims that there is great similarity in their work, and proceeds to discuss topical issues in the production of maps and geographical accounts. This leads him to observe the greed with which exploration and publication is often carried out, particularly, so he claims, by Celtic peoples. He cites various authorities to

---

15 J.H Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, nos. 19, 20 and 81.  
16 See, for example, Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 196; and note the text of A. Ortelius, “Eryn. Hiberniae, Britanniae Insulae, Nova Descriptio”, Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1573.  
17 M. Spies, “Humanist conceptions of the far North in the works of Mercator and Ortelius”, in *AOFA*. The same author dramatises well the reception of Postel’s books in Antwerp; see, *Arctic Routes to Fabled Lands - Olivier Brunel and the Passage to China and Cathay in the Sixteenth Century*, Amsterdam, 1997, 76-82.
support this claim, and goes on to distinguish the importance of genuine cartography and cosmography from the practice of those who merely seek fame without understanding. This is a criticism of the mercantile and imperial goals of the Spanish and Portuguese, which is common among intellectual cartographers and cosmographers of the time. He praises the work of Ortelius and his predecessor, Gemma Frisius, in helping to determine accurately the longitude and latitude of the earth; this is deemed essential in order to establish that Jerusalem is the central point on both meridians and thus of the earth. Postel’s language is that of speculative mysticism, and his thread of argument (though obscure) seems to suggest that the geographical labours of Ortelius share a spiritual purpose and value with his own studies of geography and cosmic forces. He concludes, generously, by pointing out errors in Ortelius’ map of Asia.\(^{18}\)

It is difficult to know in what way, or to what extent, Ortelius would have understood this letter. It does not contain anything specifically heretical, but its language and logic are clearly eccentric. It is not clear whether the two men had previously met, though they seem to have known of each other’s works. That Ortelius had sent Postel a gift of his wall map does not necessarily indicate familiarity; he often used such gifts as a way to introduce himself to potential collaborators or patrons.\(^{19}\) Indeed, Postel may not have known Ortelius from anything other than this gift. His association of Ortelius with Gemma Frisius is both misinformed and inappropriate – Ortelius was not engaged in the kind of mathematical cosmology that could be useful to establish anything about longitude, though he did assiduously scrutinise the contradictory claims of different maps during the preparation of his atlas.\(^{20}\) Postel’s description of Ortelius’ cosmological interests seems far more applicable to his own interests in divine cosmology, synthesising arcane knowledge from Arabic, Jewish and Christian sources to establish the order of the universe. It may be that Ortelius did not reply to the letter, as, two weeks later, Postel wrote again seeking a response, or at least confirmation that the previous letter had been received. It is possible that Ortelius simply had not yet taken the time to reply, not perceiving Postel’s sense of urgency, or that his reply was lost or delayed.

\(^{18}\) J.H Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 19.

\(^{19}\) Ibid., nos. 30, 35, 40, 42, 44, 52, 75, 162, etc.

Postel’s subsequent letter, written on 24 April, 1567, apologises for interrupting Ortelius, who is said to be busy with his cosmographical labours; the interruption is justified “by the law of our friendship”, but this is standard humanist language and need not imply actual depth of familiarity, or indeed any at all. Postel’s purpose in writing is to request information about the progress of the wars in the Low Countries, especially in Antwerp and Valenciennes. He wants an account of events since 1 January, which he says is equivalent to 13 December in the Dutch calendar, leading him to comment on the true nature of the divine calendar. Consideration of the divine calendar is crucial, he says, in order for him to establish whether the Dutch wars may be an action of God or Nature, or rather of Satan. He comments on how these matters are to be assessed, drawing on platonic, alchemical and cabbalistic images. He then concludes, “these things will be enigmatic to you if you do not grasp them, clear if you do, revealing the origin of this new time that is beginning this year”. Postel has, indeed, expressed himself enigmatically; notably, this time he seems concerned as to whether Ortelius will understand him. In a postscript, he asks whether Ortelius received his previous letter. He says that this is a matter of some concern, “for with regard to it I have been elevated by Divine Providence ... so that although I may appear the most foolish of men, nonetheless it would not be useful to the republic of letters if the least fragment or letter of my writings were to be lost”. He explains himself by describing the succession of divine revelation down to himself. He concludes, “I wanted to add this to you Ortelius, most dear child and brother in Christ, so that you might not wonder if you do not understand at once everything that is written to you”. Again, Postel does not expect Ortelius to grasp his ideas fully. The ideas he expresses are typical of his own idiosyncratic belief system, which is not Familist, and of which Ortelius seems not to be an adept.

Thus, we have just seen that Postel is not expressing Familist ideas, rather ideas drawn from his own sense of messianic ministry, involving a highly sophisticated...

---

21 “Haec aenigmaticae, si non capis, clare si capis, tibi, temporis novi, hoc anno incipientis, originem patetfacient”: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 20.
22 “In eo enim gradu sum a Divina constitutus Providentia ... ut licet sum stultissimus virorum, tamen non expedit republicanum ullum meorum scriptorum fragmentum aut epistolium perire”: ibid., no. 20.
23 “Hoc volui tibi superaddere Ortelii fili et frater in Christo charissime, ut non mireris si statim non omnia capis quae ad te sunt scripta”: ibid., no. 20.
24 Ibid., no. 20. For Postel’s ideas, see Bouwsma, Concordia mundi.
theology that synthesises Jewish, Arabic and Christian religious traditions in an extremely personal manner. Postel proceeds in his postscript to Ortelius, “Greet our Plantin and say to him that the leaders of the school of charity are not unknown to me”.²⁵ This is the sentence upon which has rested much of the association of Ortelius with the Family of Love - surely Postel would not ask Ortelius to forward such a sensitive message to Plantin unless he knew both men to be members of the Family of Love?²⁶

Postel adds two clarifications. First, although he is not permitted any sacrament with any society of men, nonetheless, he says, he has explained in a former publication whom he esteems among the reformers. This is a reference to his book De Originibus (1553), in which, however, he is far from clear about this very matter. He says, rather generally, that he likes all those who consider all of humanity to be one body, the Church of Christ; he dislikes anyone who thinks that his sect alone contains the truth and Christ.²⁷ As a second clarification of his message to Plantin, Postel singles out David Joris for condemnation, but says that, “nonetheless I will recognise and follow the sacred practices of the consort of charity that they have so abused”.²⁸ David Joris was a leader of a mystical sect that acquired a considerable following in the 1540s.²⁹ Postel had encountered the group in Basel and, after showing some initial interest, decided, as we can see, strongly against the “pretensions” of the sect’s leader. Joris may have had some influence on the ideas of Hendrik Niclaes, their ideas having many similarities, and the two men were often mentioned together by contemporaries and later writers.³⁰ Thus, Postel seems to be offering cautious support for the Family of Love, with the caveat that he wants nothing to do with followers of Joris. He seems to be testing the water, trying to provoke a clear statement from the Family about its attitude to Joris. Postel’s message does not express allegiance. It attempts to open a dialogue, challenging Plantin to confirm his association with the Family of Love and to respond to Postel’s scruples.

²⁵ “Salua nostrum Plantinum, et dicas illi scholae charitatis summos alumnos mihi non esse ignotos”: ibid., no. 20.
²⁶ Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 20.
²⁷ G. Postel, De Originibus, Basel, 1553.
²⁸ “Tamen veritates omnes sacras quibus impie sunt abusi me in consortii charitatis usum, nosse et servare”: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 20.
We know that Ortelius forwarded the message to Plantin because the latter then wrote to Postel on 17 May, 1567.\(^{31}\) It is not pertinent here to enter the debate about the interpretation of Plantin’s reply and the correspondence that it engendered. Suffice it to say that it has long been taken for proof of Plantin’s membership of the Family of Love. On the other hand, Valkema Blouw has given a convincing alternative account of Plantin’s relationship with Hendrik Niclaes, and I think the evidence for membership contained in these letters is certainly not entirely clear.\(^{32}\) However, it is clear that Plantin finds it extremely difficult to understand Postel’s intentions, and eventually disclaims his own role as a mediator, suggesting that if Postel wants to debate with the Family of Love he should come to Antwerp to do so with Hendrik Niclaes in person. Plantin becomes extremely frustrated with the enigmatic and tendentious arguments of Postel, who exploits the ambiguity of the phrase “consort of charity”, and others like it, to evoke further curiosity and discussion from Plantin.\(^{33}\) The word “charity” has had a rich and complicated history in Christian tradition, acquiring a number of divergent significations, particularly in mystical theologies. Postel had been using the word with a highly personalised meaning for a number of years prior to his contacts with Familism, and thus his enigmatic comments about the “service of charity” were far from clear to Plantin. The ambiguity is, I think, deliberate – an attempt to engage interest and dialogue. Postel never joined the Family of Love and seems never to have had any intention of doing so. Rather, he tried to win the group over to his way of thinking so that they could further his cause while he was confined under house arrest in Paris.

Postel’s belief that he was an incarnation of the Holy Spirit with a messianic mission for the salvation of mankind and the restoration of peace and order in the world seems to have led him to take an interest in the Family of Love as a possible means that could be converted to his cause. Plantin was his approach to the Family, and Ortelius was his approach to Plantin; but what does this tell us about Postel’s view of Ortelius?

\(^{32}\) See Valkema Blouw, “Was Plantin a Member of the Family of Love?”
In a letter to Plantin written on 25 May, 1567, Postel adds a postscript to the following effect:

Having little leisure at present, I will write to our Ortelius, who I know does not understand French, another time. Greet him in the language that he understands and tell him that I would like to go to Antwerp to see you both. I will also write to our friend through him, Mylius, at the first opportunity, to see what he knows.\(^{34}\)

If this sounds like a Familist network, it is misleading. Postel has still had no response from Ortelius, is not sure whether he would understand French or, perhaps, more generally his language (proof that they had not met?), but has not lost confidence in his initial assessment of the man. The reference to Arnold Mylius, here, is further evidence that Postel is contacting people with whom he is only remotely acquainted: as there is no evidence of familiarity between Postel and Ortelius, still less can there be familiarity between Postel and Mylius if they are only friends through Ortelius. Postel’s confident, familiar tone is an attempt to induce friendship, not a reflection of one already in existence; he is grasping at straws and trying not to acknowledge his isolation, both physical and spiritual. Thus, on 31 July 1567, Plantin wrote to Postel, “Sir, I have received and read the latest letters you have sent to me; it seems to me that they are not at all responsive to mine and contain nothing which concerns me.”\(^{35}\)

There is a third extant letter from Postel to Ortelius – written twelve years later, in 1579. While his motivations and intentions are embedded in the obscurity of his thought, it seems that he wished for Ortelius to take up his mantle as the incarnate spirit of Christ. Postel claims in his letter that Ortelius’ atlas, the *Theatrum*, is the most important book since the Bible, believing that it was published for the good of the entire human race, published so that Ortelius might descend within himself and return to drive away evil – that this bears no relation to Ortelius’ own view of his atlas will appear later. Postel claims that his name, ‘Postel’, signifies ‘dew-spreader’ in

\(^{34}\) "Ayant peu de loysir à présent, une aultre foys j’escriré à notre amy Ortelius, lequel je ne sçay si il entend valon. Vous le salurés en la langue qu’il entend et luy dirés que je désire pour avec vous le veoir aller en vostre ville d’Antwerpen. J’escriray aussi à nostre par luy amy Mylius, à la première occasion, pour ce qu’il sçait": Ibid., 154-5.

\(^{35}\) Ibid.
Hebrew and that ‘Ortelius’ in Hebrew means ‘light of the dew’ – thus Ortelius is to illuminate the message that Postel has spread. As before, he asks Ortelius to ensure that his letter is not lost, this time he also requests that it be published for the good of humanity.\textsuperscript{36} Needless to say, Ortelius did not do so. Nor is there any evidence of a reply to this letter. Indeed, there is no way of knowing what Ortelius thought about it, though he certainly never accepted the messianic role in which Postel cast him. Although Ortelius kept these letters from Postel, this does not mean that he agreed with anything in them. Perhaps the risk involved in keeping such letters, which could be judged heretical material, suggests that Ortelius must have placed some value in them, but they cannot be used to assess Ortelius’ own beliefs about himself or about his atlas. Postel’s assumptions about both are enmeshed in his idiosyncratic view of the universe. What prompted him to approach Ortelius is open to speculation, but even if the answer were to be known it would almost certainly tell us more about Postel than about Ortelius.

It should be reiterated that Ortelius and Plantin both had good reason other than religious affiliation to cultivate the proffered friendship of Postel, who was, irrespective of his religious convictions, a highly respected scholar. He assisted Plantin with the preparation of an edition of the Bible in four languages – Hebrew, Chaldean and Greek, with a Latin translation. Plantin even publicised Postel’s contribution in order to promote the work, though this eventually came back to haunt him when the Bible gained an ill reception. Ortelius, too, had much to gain from a scholar who could advise him as to the geography of the Holy Lands, ancient and modern. Postel had had access to Ottoman geographical information and possessed the philological skills to answer some of the problems of etymology that beset Ortelius’ studies of toponymy. Further, he had written about cosmography, and his early more sober, if still abstruse, integration of this with eirenic religious concerns might well have received favourable attention in Antwerp’s religiously curious geographical circles. If one wanted to guess at the Ortelius’ attitude to Postel, it may have been similar to the opinion expressed by his friend Plantin in a postscript that he added when forwarding a letter from Postel to the influential Spaniard Gabriel Cayas.

\textsuperscript{36} Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 81.
Plantin, seeking patronage for his Bible project, describes Postel in the following manner:

Which man, even if he is considered a dreamer, seems to discuss many ingenious and not always vain matters in his works.37

So far it has only been possible to show that the letters from Postel to Ortelius, in the absence of any extant replies, do not provide strong evidence for Ortelius' being a member of the Family of Love. On the other hand, Ortelius did pass on the message about this group to his friend Plantin. Further, many of his closest friends and colleagues are among those who have been named as Familists by twentieth-century historians. It is well beyond the scope of this paper to deal with the entire friendship circle case by case. Though there may be room for doubt in several instances, I will assume that some of Ortelius' friends were closely associated with the Family of Love. For example, it is known that whether or not Plantin was a member of the sect, he had contact with the group throughout his professional career, printing many of their works anonymously despite the considerable risk this involved and irrespective of whether his motives were religious or economic. The question is in what way the presence of Familism within Ortelius' friendship circle can be used to implicate Ortelius himself. Therefore, before going on to introduce further evidence concerning Ortelius' possible relation with the Family of Love, it is appropriate to discuss briefly the category of evidence by association — that is, circumstantial evidence.

It is well urged that in the case of a secretive group such as the Family of Love circumstantial evidence must be taken very seriously as the closest one is likely to come to concrete proof of individual membership. However, direct evidence is not always as difficult to come by as is sometimes claimed. The case of Christopher Plantin has already been mentioned; it has been possible to reconstruct in detail his business relations with the Family of Love, and indeed one of his letters to Hendrik

37 "Qui vir, etiam si fantasticus habeatur, multa certe ingeniosa neque semper vana tractare videtur in suis operibus": Rooses & Denucé, Correspondance de Christophe Plantin, I: 192.
Niclaes has survived. In the case of the renowned humanist Justus Lipsius there exists a first-hand account of a colleague who regularly saw him in the company of Barrefelt showing considerable respect for the advice of the man who was then the leader of the Family. Even if the evidence in these cases were as compelling as is sometimes assumed, no similar evidence exists for Ortelius. The only mention of the Family of Love in relation to him in any of the extant sources is that discussed above in the letter by Postel. Further, even if such an association did exist, the historian would be left with the tricky task of establishing what type of association it was. It is extremely important to consider the social embeddedness of a society such as the Family of Love. How could it gain new members? How did it meet? How secretive were the members and did they have other friends? How did members understand their relationship to the group? And, how did non-members understand their relationship to the group?

The first thing to bear in mind in this regard is that the Family of Love, as a group, may not have regarded itself as a sect or as an exclusive community. It was secretive out of practical necessity, not because of an elitist or minoritist ideology. I have pointed out that a split occurred in the group during the time of Ortelius’ alleged membership of it. This split was caused in part by the imposition of discipline, by which members of the group were required to observe more rigorously the teachings of Niclaes. One might therefore assume that prior to the split, as well as afterwards, many members did not perceive their membership as entailing adherence to a specific body of beliefs or practices. Such members may have regarded Niclaes’ writings, to his chagrin, as inspiration rather than doctrine. Indeed, there is even evidence that some of those who stayed with Niclaes after the split in the Family were either ill-informed about, or chose to re-interpret, key elements of his teachings. Written in an elliptic style that makes Postel’s prose seem lucid, Hendrik Niclaes’ writings may

---

42 For example, see Hamilton, The Family of Love, 111. Note the discussion of doctrine and external relations in Marsh, The Family of Love in English Society, 21-7.
never have been clearly understood by many of his followers. Thus, a group such as this cannot be assumed to be comprehensible through the doctrines of its leader, or leaders, as represented in published texts. In fact, many of the published works of Hendrik Niclaes are focused upon admonishments to discipline, which, given their repeated appearance, and on the basis of other evidence, seem not to have gained the intended response. Thus, the fact of membership of such a group, contrary to the hopes of historians with a longing for neat classification, is not in itself sufficient to describe the beliefs of an individual. The use of the word ‘sect’ in this instance might even be regarded as misleading. Prior to the split within the group, and afterwards in terms of the followers of Barrefelt, the Family of Love seems to have been a nexus of common interests, some more common than others.

If it is precarious to assume anything in general about the members of the Family of Love, still more is it difficult to describe those who were familiar with the society and its members, but never joined it. A number of different kinds of interaction are possible; a broad typology might read as follows:

Those sympathetic to the society but never interested in joining.
Those who considered joining but decided not to do so.
Those who never decided one way or the other.
Those friendly with members but with no interest in the religious society.
Those hostile to the society who never chose to expose it.
Those hostile to the society who did choose to expose it.

It is important to note that the last two categories can overlap with the first two. People change their minds over time; thus, someone once sympathetic to the society can become hostile to it, whether or not they decide to voice their opinion. Further, within each category the question of influence is complicated by issues of interpretation, appropriation and opposition.43 Unfortunately, many historians in practice ignore the first five of these six categories. In fairness, this is often because of an awareness of the political sensitivity of any kind of connection to a heretical group. The government and Inquisition did not always choose to see the shades of

43 For an introduction to the use of some of these issues in religious history, see W. Frijhoff, "Toeëigening: van bezitsdrang naar betekenisgeving", Trajecta 6 (1997), afl 2, 99-118.
grey that I have outlined. Having said that, on many occasions they did choose to do so. For example, prompted by the political imperatives of Farnese, for his first few years as Bishop of Antwerp after that city’s return to Catholic control in 1585 Laevinius Torrentius pronounced a religious amnesty in which people were given the opportunity to consider their position and make up their mind to stay as Catholics or leave as Protestants. Aware that many were waiting to see how political events would turn out, he was prepared to extend that amnesty to 1589. If a counter-reformation bishop could be sensitive to the nuances and factors affecting religious affiliation, then it is important for historians to perceive similar degrees of gradation.44

What about Ortelius? It is clear that, like Plantin, he associated with members of the Family of Love, as he did with Calvinists, Catholics, and people with Anabaptist leanings. Given the mixed religious character of Antwerp, the increasing doctrinal and political divisions between confessions have to be set against the daily imperatives of trade, demography and social integration; it was not only Familists who transgressed boundaries when confessionalisation insisted on borders.45 In such a situation, prosopography is not so much a map of allegiance as a maze of patterns in which the historian may see what he likes without knowing what he sees. A fixed point is needed to interpret the patterns.

Having reconsidered the evidence connecting Ortelius to the Family of Love, it is possible to take a fresh look at his own statements about religion. Numerous letters from his own hand exist, providing ample evidence of his religious outlook, and many of the details of his life contribute to the picture. The earliest information relating to his religious background comes in the form of an anecdote about his father and his uncle, Leonard Ortels and Jacob Van Meteren. The latter is known to have been involved in the publication of the Coverdale Bible, perhaps with some assistance from

45 The religious situation in Antwerp has been studied extensively; for the most recent analyses, see the superb work by G. Mamef, Antwerp in the Age of Reformation: Underground Protestantism in a Commercial Metropolis, 1550-1577, Baltimore, 1996; and Thijs, Van Geuzenstad tot Katholiek Bolwerk. The counter-imperative of integration has been studied by A. Kint, The Community of Commerce: Social Relations in Sixteenth-Century Antwerp, Ph.D diss., Columbia University, 1996.
Ortels, who was his brother-in-law. In 1535, while Van Meteren was in London, Ortels’ house was searched for prohibited books by the Inquisition; the searchers narrowly missed discovering a chest full of such material. No arrests were made. On his return from London, Van Meteren named his new child “Emmanuel” (the Lord is with us) as thanks for the fortunate escape. The prohibited books were almost certainly early Lutheran writings, and perhaps material used for the Bible translation. The deliberate significance in the choice of the name “Emmanuel” raises the question as to whether the Old-Testament name “Abraham”, chosen eight years previously, also reflects the family’s interest in reforming ideas.

Prior to the death of his father in 1537, Ortelius received some education in Latin and Greek. Afterwards, he was brought up under the aegis of his uncle. What this might have entailed is difficult to ascertain. Van Meteren was often abroad for trade, and perhaps religious, reasons. He sent his own son north to study, but Emmanuel failed to develop a predilection for learning, instead taking up an apprenticeship with a cloth merchant, resulting in his eventual move to London. By contrast, little is known about Ortelius at this stage, or about the business that he inherited from his father. This seems to have been based upon trading in antiquities and curiosities, including the sale of maps. This last was a lucrative trade, as more and more information poured in from the voyages of discovery, and probably began to form the mainstay of Ortelius’ business. However, it was only in 1547 that he entered the guild of St Luke, as an “afsetter van carten”, perhaps indicating an expansion of his business enterprise, or the increasing control of the guild authorities. While religious persecution in the Low Countries intensified in the 1540s, the authorities’ attention had shifted to anabaptism. From what is known of the social composition of this group, it seems

47 Verduyn, Emanuel van Meteren, 43.
49 For the Guild of St Luke, see J. Van Der Stock, Printing Images in Antwerp, Rotterdam 1998.
unlikely that Ortelius would have belonged to its early members. A Lutheran community remained in Antwerp, following a policy of secrecy that earned harsh criticism from Luther but helped it to evade persecution, and subsequent historical analysis.\textsuperscript{50} It is impossible to say whether Ortelius had, or was likely to have, much contact with this group, about which so little is known. If it can be assumed that the town secretary, Cornelius Graphaeus, retained some interest in Lutheran reforms after his forced public recantation, then his familiarity with Ortelius might plausibly be counted significant.\textsuperscript{51} It is clear that the Van Meteren family remained closely involved in the reformed community during its “plastic phase”, when confessional boundaries remained undetermined. Jacob Van Meteren moved to London in 1550, but died shortly afterwards; his son, Emmanuel, worked as the London factor of the Antwerp merchant, Sebastian Danckaerts, and became a distinguished member of the reformed London exiles church.\textsuperscript{52} Ortelius travelled to England around 1551, perhaps on hearing of his uncle’s death, and seems to have spent some time at Oxford University.\textsuperscript{53} Whatever his own religious convictions at the time, his reliance upon family and the Dutch community in England would certainly have brought him into close contact with Protestantism, and the decision to visit a university there is striking, given that there is no evidence of similar involvement with local universities, despite the presence of a cartographic milieu around Frisius in Leuven.

Earlier in 1550, Ortelius had made his first known trip to the Frankfurt book fair, where he made the acquaintance of the bookseller Arnold Mylius. The purpose of this trip was presumably the purchase of foreign maps, which could then be coloured and re-sold in the Antwerp market. Ortelius’ registration in the guild of St Luke for this purpose three years earlier would suggest that this might not have been his first trip to Frankfurt. If this suggestion is correct, it may explain a visit paid to Ortelius by the English scholar John Dee, also in 1550.\textsuperscript{54} Dee may have heard of Ortelius through the network of cartographers and cosmologers around Frisius and Mercator, with whom Dee had been staying for some time; however, the earliest known meeting between

\textsuperscript{50} Marnef, \textit{Antwerp in the Age of Reformation}, 80-2 & 101-3. See also, W.J Pont, \textit{Geschiedenis van het Lutheranisme in de Nederlanden tot 1618}, Haarlem, 1911.
\textsuperscript{51} Puraye, \textit{Album Amicorum}, f.35; Hessels, \textit{Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae}, no. 69.
\textsuperscript{52} Verduyn, \textit{Emanuel van Meteren}, 20.
\textsuperscript{53} A. Wood, \textit{Fasti}, i.134.
Ortelius and Mercator is in 1554, again at the Frankfurt book fair. Alternatively, the connection might have come through the Antwerp Norbertine, Rhetius, who was a friend of Frisius. However that may be, it is clear that Ortelius’ business had already brought him into contact with scholars beyond the Antwerp metropolis, some of whom would remain friends throughout his life. As an educated dealer in the latest maps, with some knowledge of Greek, Ortelius was not just another merchant, but a person who might have held some interest to scholars in a range of disciplines.

While none of this suggests any particular religious orientation, it is an important background to the formation of a set of attitudes out of which Ortelius’ later religious and political attitudes could develop. As the trading capital of northern Europe, Antwerp served as an entrepôt for information and ideas as well as exotic goods. The society in which Ortelius reached adulthood was cosmopolitan in mercantile, religious and political outlook. This brought both fragmentation of social life, which allowed religious non-conformity to develop and to hide, and political power to protect the merchant population from the punitive scrutiny of the central government and Inquisition. It is in this context that Ortelius began to develop the international friendship network that made his later collaborative scholarly enterprises possible and that embodied, perhaps brought forth, his disregard for confessional boundaries.

The first four known letters from Ortelius demonstrate his international outlook in the 1550s, and the extent to which this was embroiled in religious matters. All of these letters are written to his cousin in England, Emmanel van Meteren, and they are clearly only a small part of a much more extensive correspondence that has not survived, thus it is important to gauge the ways in which Ortelius’ letters might have been shaped to the tastes of his reader. While the Van Meteren family was certainly marked by reforming tendencies - and Emmanuel was involved with the exiles church in London, eventually becoming an elder - his Protestantism must be placed under

---

55 I am indebted to Prof. Jan Roegiers for this suggestion. For the connection between Rhetius and Frisius see De Geleerde Wereld van Keizer Karel, 289-290.
57 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no.6, 7, 8 &9.
some scrutiny, not least because of his willingness and ability to remain in London during the reign of Mary. In 1561 he was excommunicated from the exiles church on account of his support for the minister Adriaan Van Haemstede, whose lenient approach to Anabaptist elements in the congregation was regarded as unacceptable. It is tempting to speculate on the reasons behind the depth of Van Meteren’s loyalty to Van Haemstede, who had previously become embroiled in conflict as minister to the reformed congregation at Antwerp. The issue had been his “salon” preaching to sympathisers who were unwilling, for social reasons, openly to leave the Catholic Church. In 1558, Van Haemstede insisted on preaching publicly, which action brought stricter persecution upon the reformed community, making it difficult for some time to maintain the continuity of the congregation. While Van Haemstede’s position as a Calvinist minister committed to proselytising and openly spreading the word makes it unlikely that he was among the earliest followers of the Family of Love, or a member of a similar group, his rejection of confessional exclusivity chimes well with the tolerant outlook later typical of Ortelius. That Van Meteren was one of the leading supporters of Van Haemstede in the early 1560s may suggest that his upbringing with Ortelius had granted them some similarity of outlook, albeit that Van Meteren’s religious development was shaped by the prevalence of Protestantism in the Dutch merchant community in London. A third character excommunicated during the London controversy, Jacobus Acontius, seems to have been connected to Ortelius, who introduced a friend to him five years later, in 1567. Acontius lived with Emmanuel Van Meteren for some time in London. His book, *Satanae Stratagemata* (1565), argued that confessionalisation was the devil’s means to obscure the truths of Christianity. He recommended freedom from political involvement in religion, urging the notion of unconstrained communal debate out of which the pure teachings of Christ would emerge. His association with Van Meteren and Ortelius may reveal something of their religious outlook at this point, but without further evidence it is impossible to draw firm conclusions.

---


The first letter from Ortelius to Van Meteren is written from the spring fair in Frankfurt in 1556. Ortelius, responding to Van Meteren’s eagerness for news, reports the compromises that were struck to ensure the smooth coronation of Ferdinand as Emperor by avoiding offending the religious sensibilities of three of the secular electors. Ortelius does not express any attitude towards the events he reports, except to suggest that Ferdinand wished to consent to the compromises, rather than having been forced. Likewise, it is difficult to gauge Ortelius’ attitude to the news he reports in his next extant letter to Van Meteren, written on 25 October 1557. Again he has acquired his information while in Frankfurt, this time regarding the Colloquy at Worms. He describes the dispute among the Lutherans as to whether the Calvinists and Zwinglians should be declared sacramentarians and thus damned as heretics, reporting that Melanchthon argued against, while those from the new university at Jena were in favour and left in a rage when the proposition faced opposition. While Ortelius makes no explicit comment in this, or the previous, letter to express his own convictions, a tolerant outlook is suggested by his even-handed treatment of the affairs. The motto he adopts at the opening of the second letter, “Virtuti fortuna comes”, emphasises the personal religious significance he takes from these affairs, perhaps even a contrast between virtuous piety and religious controversy.

The next two letters to Van Meteren were written in the second half of 1559. In the first, Ortelius reports on what he has seen during his recent trip to Paris. He provides his cousin with an account of the wedding of Phillip II with Princess Elisabeth of France (the Duke of Alva acting as Phillip’s proxy), and he describes a commemorative medal that he bought. He also relates news that has followed his return to Antwerp, that the King of France has been gravely injured during a tourney. However, much of the letter is taken up with reports of religious persecution. He says that amid the celebrations of the Prince of Piedmont’s wedding there was also sorrow for some because twelve councillors of the king were imprisoned on account of religion. Then, he gives a lengthy and detailed account of the threatened execution of about thirty nobles and learned men in Valladolid, also on account of religion. He describes the punishments of those who recanted, the constancy of others until they were about to ascend the scaffold, and the fate of one Dr Casallo, who refused to

---

60 Hessels, Abrahami Orteli... Epistolae, no. 6.
61 Ibid., no. 7.
recant and was thus burned alive, after having to stand with his tongue pierced by iron from 5am to 6pm. Although he adds no value judgments to his description of the event, the combination of dwelling upon the nature of the punishments and mentioning the respectable social background of the prisoners, without invoking any sense of the justness of the punishment or of the wisdom of God, conveys a sense of distaste for the events. This impression, though it is only an impression, is somewhat reinforced by the cautious reference to the sadness about the imprisonment of royal councillors for the same crime in France.

The next extant letter, written in September 1559, again opens with the motto, “virtutifortuna comes”. Ortelius mentions the news from Spain that the Bishop of Toledo has been imprisoned by the Inquisition “met groote macht”. Then, he describes in detail the events subsequent to the death of Pope Paul IV, when the Carafa family was expelled from Rome, the pope’s statue was pulled down, and religious prisoners from the recent repression were released. Once more, Ortelius makes no direct comment; however, his sense of the portentousness of the events is clear. He affirms the reliability of the reports he has heard, “I saw this edict, which was printed in Rome, and I would have sent it to you if it were not too big”, and concludes with what will become a standard phrase in his response to important news: “What will come of it, we shall see with time”.63

What is remarkable about this and the previous letter is not that so little has been said about them, rather that the writer says so little.64 Ortelius’ reports are characteristically devoid of value judgments, and given the fragmentary nature of the extant correspondence any attempt to find significance in his selection of material is a precarious enterprise. Nevertheless, a number of qualified observations can be made. First, within these letters Ortelius is committed to giving detailed and accurate reports, but he also shows particular interest in violent actions. This is also clear from the next extant letter, his well-known account of the iconoclasm at Antwerp in August 1566.65 However, this reflects the nature of reporting, as seen in printed material of the time,

62 Ibid., no. 8.
63 “Ick hebbe dit edict gesien, te Room gedruckt, hadde het niet te groot geweest ick soude het u oock gesonden hebben” and “Watter wt comen sal, dat sullen wij metter tijt hooren”: ibid., no. 9.
64 Some observations are made by M.P.R Van Den Broecke, “Introduction to the Life and Works of Abraham Ortelius (1527-1598), ATOFA, 40.
65 Hessels, Abraami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 17.
and presumably also reflects the sources from which Ortelius was drawing his information. Second, it is difficult to ascertain whether his lack of comment betrays fear of the letters being intercepted or confidence that his cousin would understand his attitude, rendering comment superfluous. Finally, if any factor unites Ortelius' interests in these disparate fragments of news-reportage, it is the political dimension of religion, be that in dispensing with tradition in the coronation of the new emperor, the in-fighting of Lutherans, the arrest and execution of supposed heretics, or the reaction of the Roman people to the death of a repressive pope and their attempts to influence the conclave thereafter. Whatever Ortelius' reasons for refraining from comment on these events, his reticence is striking and characteristic.

In his letter to Emmanuel Van Meteren describing the iconoclasm at Antwerp, Ortelius shows his feelings somewhat more clearly. Once more, his account is detailed and there is little by way of commentary or evaluation; however, value judgments creep into the fabric of the narrative. He describes how "several young lads ... began to mock the virgin", how "to these rogues now more and more people began to come". He says that it is remarkable that nobody intervened to prevent the iconoclasm, and that afterwards the churches looked as if "de duijvel sommyge hondert iaeren huijs gehouden hadde." Although he reports that Hermannus Modet denied the Calvinist consitories' role in the events, it is clear that Ortelius is not convinced, reporting that the iconoclasts chanted "vive les geux". He also notes that "There was a large amount stolen here, for while this was happening every whore and scoundrel took the chance to run through the church and carry away whatever they could find". That Ortelius did not approve of the iconoclasm, or the way in which it was done, is not surprising; even many previously sympathetic to the Calvinists turned against them in the wake of the destruction caused. Although it is impossible to know whether Ortelius had belonged to the large crowds that attended the hedge-sermons over the course of the wonder year, his language in describing Modet's defence of "synen oft hunder consistorien" would suggest that he was never close to the Calvinists.67

---

66 "Sommijge ionge lackerkens ... begonste mette lieve vrouw te gecken" and "tot dese gijten begonste noch meer toevlucht van volck te comen": ibid., no. 17.
67 "Hier is seer veele gestolen, die wyle dit gescheiden heeft elck hoere ende boeve oorsaecke genomen na de kercke te loopen ende mede te dragen wat hij gevonden heeft": ibid., no. 17.
By the mid-1560s Ortelius was a recognised humanist and tradesman with contacts extending from Italy to England, and from Portugal and Spain to Germany. He was familiar with the practicalities of obviating the restrictions placed by the Inquisition on international trade and scholarship. He had already published wall maps of his own design, and had begun his project to compile the latest maps in one volume as a map-book that would comprehensively treat the whole world in a format that would be convenient, portable, and appropriate to the study of history. His known acquaintances at this stage almost all come from the world of printing; although this inevitably reflects the nature of the extant evidence, the intimacy of Ortelius’ familiarity with the Birckmann factor, Arnold Mylius, and with printers and booksellers such as Sylvius, Libertus, De Jode and Plantin, is notable. The print houses of Antwerp were notorious centres for the dissemination of unorthodox and unfamiliar ideas. They were also places in which the humanist commitment to the international, non-confessional republic of letters was at its peak. Be it as businessmen or as scholars, these men had a vested interest in peace and freedom from faction. If the Family of Love commanded the interest in Antwerp that has been ascribed to it, it is very much within this context of synthetic intellectual and religious curiosity.

I have already discussed the letters from Postel to Ortelius, and how I think they may be interpreted. Though they cannot be taken as evidence that Ortelius was a member of the Family of Love, they certainly do reveal his exposure to the ideas of Postel, from which he carefully selected material useful for his maps. The letters also reveal Postel’s confidence in Ortelius as someone who could be approached about esoteric matters. It is difficult to know if this reveals anything reliable about his reputation within the republic of letters at the time.

Later in the same year, on 13 December 1567, Ortelius wrote again to his cousin in England. His reference to “der catholicken evel, guesen cortse, ende hugenoten melisoen” is well known. Less often quoted is the subsequent commentary:

68 See Mout, “The family of love (Huis der liefde) and the Dutch revolt”; Hamilton, “The Family of Love in Antwerp”. For early evidence of Ortelius evading the strictures of the Inquisition see Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 10.
All this we have deserved through our sins, for we are up to our heads in pride and ambition, and everyone is out to seem good, but not to be good, and everybody wants to lecture others but not be humble, to know much and do little, to rule have command over others and not to bow under God’s Hand with self-denial. May He be merciful to us and give us to see our sins.  

While this looks like a conventional expression of piety in a time of trouble, in fact its criticism of the vanity inherent in factionalism is quite specific. Ortelius’ concerns over claims to spiritual authority, and his concomitant concern over the lack of importance granted to good works, make him an unlikely follower of the self-styled prophet Hendrik Niclaes, irrespective of their shared dislike for confessional politics.

There is a gap of seven years, including the period of Alva’s rule in the Low Countries, before we come to Ortelius’ next statements with regard to religion. However, sources other than correspondence supply some information about Ortelius’ religious position at the time. Most striking is the evidence of his atlas, published in 1570. Dedicated to Philip II, the obvious sponsor of a work of such magnitude, it appears an entirely orthodox text that can have drawn little concern from the religious authorities. However, compiled during the turbulent beginnings of the revolt in the Netherlands, and against the backdrop of continuing civil and religious war in France, it could not help but reflect the pacific outlook of its maker. The title page depicts an imperial Europa commanding an ordered world in which Christianity rules supreme, while the first map, of the world, shows the harmonious creation as an integrated whole, strikingly symmetrical in structure. At the foot of this map is a quotation from Cicero: “What among human affairs can seem great to him who knows eternity and the whole of the universe?” The idea of the folly and pettiness of man contrasted

---

69 “Ende dit al om onser sonden wille daer wyt dit mede verdient hebben. Want ick sie dat wy in hooverdien ende eegiericheyt steeken totten hoofde toe, ende elck wt is om goet te heeten, ende niemant om goet te syne, ende alle eenen anderen willen leeren, ende niemant hem selven vernederen, veel weeten ende luttel doen, aller over de menschen heerscappie hebben, ende niemandt hem onder Godts (met stervinge syns selfs) lydsamijge Handt buijgen. Hij wille ons genadich syn ende onde gebreecken geven te siene”: ibid., no. 23.  

70 But see Mangani, Il “mondo” di Abramo Ortelio, 234-274; and ibid., “La signification providentielle du Theatrum orbis terrarum”, AOCII, 93-104.  

71 “Quid ei potest videri magnum in rebus humanis cui aeternitas omnis totiusque mundi nota sit magnitudo”: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum. On the title page see W. Waterschoot, “The title-page of Ortelius’ Theatrum Orbis Terrarum”, Quaerendo, 9 (1979), 43-68; R. Shirley, “The Title Pages to the
with the grandeur of the universe is developed in the text accompanying the map, which quotes from Pliny to criticise the small-minded avarice that drives human affairs into civil and religious strife through the inability to tolerate a neighbour.\textsuperscript{72} Pliny’s comments were sufficiently commonplace to evade censorship and in 1573 Ortelius was appointed geographer to the king, but the message was not lost on friends, who congratulated Ortelius on encompassing the world peacefully in his book before the Spanish could manage to do so by force of conquest.\textsuperscript{73}

Subsequent to publication of the atlas, Ortelius’ circle of friends included many individuals of doubtful orthodoxy, and still more of tolerant outlook, despite the recurrent legislation prohibiting all manifestations of heresy. The decision to enshrine these friendships in an album may well have stemmed from Ortelius’ contacts with university graduates, among whom the fashion was widespread, but the specific motivation was probably in response to receiving the honorary title of geographer to the king in November 1573.\textsuperscript{74} Although conferral of the award was one of the last acts of the Duke of Alva as governor of the Low Countries, it was almost certainly prompted by the advocacy of Ortelius’ friend, the Spanish humanist Benito Arias Montano. The contributors to the album come from a broad range of religious positions and it would be a mistake to attempt to draw a coherent religious message from their shared presence in the book over the course of the twenty-five years in which it was compiled. Nonetheless, the circle of friends around Ortelius and Plantin in Antwerp in 1573-4 was clearly inclined towards mystical, eirenic expressions of Christian belief. It is tempting to speculate that Ortelius’ decision to collect an album of inscriptions from friends, celebrating friendship itself, represents a moment of optimism within the circle in response to the departure of Alva and the increasing influence of Arias Montano. If so, the album quickly changed in character, becoming a monument to learned friendships maintained during war.


\textsuperscript{72} See text accompanying the world map in A. Ortelius, \textit{Theatrum Orbis Terrarum}, Antwerp, 1570.

\textsuperscript{73} See, for example, Ortelius, \textit{Album Amicorum}, ff.63, 83-4, 97-8.

Ortelius' next statements about religion come in the form of a letter of consolation that he wrote to his brother-in-law, Jacob Cool, on 31 May 1574. Commiserating with his relative about recent bankruptcy, Ortelius gives a standard Christian-stoical assessment of the indifference of external goods. The letter is a prime example of the influence of stoical thought during the civil strife in France and the Low Countries throughout the second half of the century, but what is particularly significant with regard to religion is Ortelius' comment, "What I call fortune or chance, you may call God or his sign. It is all the same to me". The relationship between fortune and providence is precisely the issue that later caused problems for Lipsius after publication of his De Constantia. It is unlikely that Ortelius here meant to express himself irreligiously, rather that he had little time for theological niceties that sought to quibble with the terms of a sound ethical point. His comments diverge further from the standard commonplaces of Christian asceticism by rejecting the value of all external goods, including friendship, not simply material acquisitions. This suggests a considered conviction rather than an inherited thought-pattern. It is possible that Ortelius' reference to God's "segen" could be taken as an allusion to the Hiëlist emphasis on forensic soteriology, in which case this passage would suggest that he uses stoical language but is indifferent about the transposition of terms into a Familist vocabulary. The implication would be that Ortelius was not a Familist, but was tolerant of the group. However, the word "segen" is not limited to Familist usage, and within such usage it is not clear that it could overlap with Ortelius' use of the word "fortuye". After adding that "I do not reject anyone's industry, only his self-assurance", he concludes, "Take this in good part, and I wish that others understood it as well as I think I do". Ortelius wrote these comments the day after Spanish mutineers had attained their goal of securing wage arrears of one million florins, having held Antwerp to ransom for over six weeks. His uncharacteristic tinge of

75 "V L mach het gene dat ick hier de fortuyne oft geluck heete, God oft syn segen noemen. Het is mij alleclens", Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 50.
76 For reference to the concept of the sign in Hiëlist doctrine see Hamilton, "Hiël and the Hiëlists", 256.
77 "Vervorre ick niemants neerstichyt, dan alleen syn betrouwen" and "V L nemet int goede, ende wide wel dat syt so wel begrijpen conde als mij dunckt dat ick doe": Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 50. For the response to Lipsius' De Constantia see R. Hoven, "De Constantia" in Dirk Imhof, et al., ed., Justus Lipsius (1547-1606) en het Plantijnse Huis, Antwerp, 1998, 75-81; G. Gülindner, Das Toleranz-Problem in den Niederlanden, 65-158.
78 Marnef, Antwerp in the Age of Reformation, 9-10.
self-righteousness may thus reflect a degree of distaste for the mutineers and his fellow citizens' response to them.

It is difficult to know how much Ortelius had suffered from the wars at this point, but in this letter he offers warm hospitality to his brother-in-law, and it seems he had profited well from the commercial success of his atlas. Certainly his prestige had increased greatly, which seems to have caused him some anxiety, as indicated by his note about caution in forming friendships, written on a letter of praise he received from Petrus Bizarus. Whatever the specific context animating Ortelius' thoughts at this time, towards the end of his life he expressed similar stoical disregard for external goods in the motto he adopted, "Contemno et orno, mente manu", thus it may be regarded as typical of his religious outlook throughout life.

A gap of a decade intervenes before the extant sources contain any further concrete expression of Ortelius' religious position, but this does not make it impossible to find any pertinent evidence. Contacts with the English and perhaps curiosity about their voyages of exploration enticed Ortelius into making a trip to England for a few months in 1577, where he again demonstrated his ability to contract friendships with Protestants of various hues. Shortly after returning, he travelled through Germany to Italy, where he journeyed through Venice to Rome. Meanwhile, his friendship album followed a different course, being passed from Cologne to England, Antwerp, and elsewhere. Not only did Ortelius show total disregard for confessional boundaries in terms of his destinations and the people with whom he chose to associate, but also he evoked openness about religious matters from many and seems to have been regarded by all sides as their own. It is worth emphasising that Ortelius' interests in these journeys were largely scholarly, indeed antiquarian, and that the preparation of his *Synonymia Geographica* must have been a prime concern. He travelled through the republic of letters as much as through the geo-religious politics of Europe, no doubt making his acceptance in each location considerably easier. News of events in the Low Countries followed him wherever he travelled, and correspondents seem to have assumed that he was a supporter of the revolt. That they were broadly right is confirmed by his letters to the Leiden Professor, Vulcanius, in which he often refers to

79 Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 33.
80 See Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 68, 69, 71.
the Spanish forces as the enemy. Thus, on 31 December 1584, he wrote in the wake of the death of William of Orange:

I received the mournful ceremonial in my thankful hand with grateful memory of a dear prince. Several times I have wondered that your university at Leiden has not yet given a public testimony of sadness for the sake of the death of its great parent, Orange! Not even one small tear! Surely it is not forgetful of so many kindnesses? It seems to me that Pliny could have said appropriately about this what he once said about Rufus to his Albinus: “There is only so much loyalty in friendships, as there is ready forgetfulness of deaths”, along with what else he adds. When he was vulnerable they produced the Discourse (as they call it), but not a thing since he has died. Everybody says nothing. Surely not because they received no reward from the dead man?81

Support for the revolt did not entail any particular religious position, and it is not clear at what stage it engaged Ortelius’ sympathies, or if he ever changed his mind. Interestingly, on 9 June 1593 he wrote to Vulcanius about the Dutch army, “Our (as you say) army is outside Gertruidenberg”. On the same day he reported to Lipsius that, “Ours are sticking to Gertruidenberg”, which suggests that the qualified expression he used for Vulcanius may have been wistful or ironic.82 What is clear is that Ortelius’ sympathy for the revolt allowed him to associate with people like the rebel leader Philip Marnix and to support Plantin’s decision to establish a press in Leiden.83 However, Ortelius can never have been close enough to the supporters of the revolt to incriminate himself later, given his decision that it was safe to remain in Antwerp in 1585, and considering the confidence of the civic authorities in his faithfulness to Catholicism, irrespective of the measures he then took to secure


82 “Exercitus noster (ut scribis) ante Gertrudebergam est” and “Nostri ante Gertrudebergam haerent”; Leiden, Cod Vule 105, III, letter dated 9.6.93; Gerlo & De Landtsheer, eds., Justi Lipsii Epistolae, 93.06.09.

83 Ortelius, Album Amicorum, 39; Leiden, Cod Vule 105, III, letter dated 18.9.82.
himself. Further, the Antwerp entries in his friendship album during the years of Calvinist rule exhibit Ortelius’ usual disregard for confessional boundaries. Nonetheless, as discussed earlier, Ortelius did face some scrutiny during the first years of the restored Catholic administration at Antwerp, and was concerned about the interruption of his correspondence.84

Ortelius escaped Antwerp before the fall of the city to Parma. He travelled first to the book fair at Frankfurt, where he met Plantin and journeyed on to Cologne. His return from Cologne into the arms of Torrentius in Liège, on hearing of the fall of Antwerp, might be taken as symbolic of his position thereafter.85 Whether through force of circumstance or design, thereafter Ortelius drew closer to the Catholic authorities in the Spanish Netherlands, reinforcing his public image as an orthodox Catholic. The Antwerp to which he returned halved in population as all those who would not convert to Catholicism departed. Nonetheless, although his friendship with Peter Heyns, as stated earlier, had placed his religious position in doubt after the fall of Antwerp, he continued to maintain contact with Protestants in Leiden, London, Breslau and elsewhere.86 Ortelius increasingly lived a double-life – outwardly a devout Catholic, inwardly cherishing learned contacts that crossed all religious boundaries, and despairing of the political-religious turmoil around him.

On 30 September 1588, in a letter to his brother-in-law in London, Ortelius wrote in sombre, repentant mood that the times were bad and that he did not expect them to improve, at least to human perception. He continued:

Things will improve when men improve, because it is true, as the man said, “to the good all things are good”, for thus all the storms of the devil or men are not harmful to the good. Although we are not yet good, we at least wish that

84 Ortelius, Album Amicorum, passim; Hessels, Abrahami Ortelli... Epistolae, no.144. The situation for Catholics under the Protestant administration is discussed by J. Andriessen, “De katholiken te Antwerpen (1577-1585)”, Bijdragen tot de Geschiedenis, 70 (1987), 61-77.
86 For the situation in Antwerp see Thijs, Van Geuzenstad tot Katholiek Bolwerk, 9-33. Note that Ortelius maintained his connection with Heyns and his family after the investigation; see A. Meskens, “Liaisons dangereuses”, 105-6.
The poignant hope that the good shall find peace struggles out from a train of thought woven with metaphor. The notion that “to the good all things are good” animates many perfectionist theories of regeneration, but Ortelius presents a picture of a society very gradually struggling with its sins, far from achieving regeneration.

The rebuilding of Antwerp and the renewal of Catholic worship in the Spanish Netherlands were related economic and cultural phenomena. For Ortelius, the process was lucrative and lonely. Many of his friends had left Antwerp, or died; Plantin had returned, but died in 1589. A new circle of old colleagues and new acquaintances ensured that he was not actually alone: Torrentius, Lipsius, Schottus, Bochius, and Sweerts all became increasingly close. However, Ortelius was an old man, frequently ill, albeit still active at work, and his letters to his nephew and heir, Ortelianus, repeatedly appeal for the latter to come to stay with him in Antwerp. Instead, Ortelianus behaved with increasing independence that frustrated Ortelius, who swung between pique, understanding, and even pathetic bribery. Thus, on 24 January 1598, again trying to convince his nephew to come to him, he wrote:

I will add no more. You would marvel at the very thing that I despise. With this, farewell. I do not write much, for I am dying day by day.

Nonetheless, Ortelius’ position as mentor to his nephew led him to discuss matters of religion with apparent candour in his letters. The first extant example occurs in a letter written on 8 April 1592, when Ortelianus was almost thirty. It is signed with Ortelius’ anagrammatic pseudonym “Bartholus Aramejus”, probably reflecting the

---

87 “Dan het sal beteren als haer de menschen beteren. Want ist waer, die daer seet Den goeden is alle dingen goet, so en connen allen de tempeesten der duyvelen oft menschen, den goeden geen quaet syn. Syn wy noch niet goedt, wy wilden ten minsten dat wyt waeren. So syn wy emmers onder het getal der slechter herderkens, die den vrede vercondicht werdt, om datse van goeden wille waeren”: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 161.
89 “Nihil addo verborum. Rem ipsam mirareris. Eam ipsam quam ego contemno. His vale. Prolixus non sum. Morior enim in dies”: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 314; note also numbers 228, 229 and 303.
sensitivity of the matters treated. After discussing books he has sent and received, Ortelius responds to his nephew’s criticisms of the works of the mystical writers, Tauler and Eschius:

I understand what you say about Tauler and Eschius. I do not deny that they are tainted with suspicion. To err is human. But next to those, who do not at all, as Horace says. I note from their writings that they are men of good intentions, and it was to such men that the angel first announced the Gospel. I also see that they write from the heart, not from books; the first is rare, the second most common, and not, I might add, inane, but rather most harmful, for from this so many troubles, past and present. So many crimes and barbarisms, and these all fortified with pretence of piety.

Ortelius’ defence of the mystics against more learned writers is not based on their authority from inspiration, rather on their good intentions. As before to Ortelianus’ father, Ortelius uses the example of the revelation of the gospel to the shepherds to portray fallible but good humanity. His attack on learned writers who substitute cavilling for piety is typical of humanist religiosity, but the crimes and barbarisms to which he claims their writings lead surely reflect his experience of religious fanaticism rather than an objection to literary style. Like many humanists earlier in the century, he seems to regard the inward piety of mysticism as the appropriate path to peace and doctrinal debate as the origin of social discord.

While Tauler and Eschius represent a mainstream of acceptable mysticism, Ortelius’ next recommendation was somewhat less orthodox: “If this sort of thing is to your taste, I recommend you read the Paradoxes of S.F.”. This refers to the work of Sebastian Franck, and not to that of St Francis (contra Hessels). Frank’s writings were regarded as heretical by all the major denominations and had been the focus of some controversy in the Netherlands during the 1560s as a result of the publication of numerous editions of his works and a defence by Coornhert. Ortelius’ only concern is about how difficult it might prove for his nephew to acquire a copy. A month later he restated his recommendation in response to comments from Ortelianus:

I understand what you say about the Paradoxes. They are available in our language, and if you listen to me you will read them. I believe there is more sap in them than in the writings of Tauler or Eschius.

It is important to be sensitive to the different strands of thought that Ortelius is drawing upon. Franck’s “paradoxes” encapsulate his objection to all forms of visible church, his conviction that persecuting others is a sign of heretical belief, his objection to the “new scholasticism” that he saw in reformed dogmatics, and his insistence on following conscience rather than the literal text of scripture. To recommend such a writer was to take a considerable risk indeed. Given Ortelius’ candour in these letters, it is notable that he did not recommend the writings of Barrefelt or Niclaes, though argument from absence cannot be taken as strong evidence. It is true that Franck’s writings may have influenced Familist ideas, but the points of divergence are significant and fundamental, relating to the issues of authority, affiliation and the certainty of spiritual knowledge, which also distinguish Ortelius’ thought from Familism. Although Barrefelt, contrary to Niclaes, was willing to cite authors who had influenced him (including Tauler), Sebastian Franck was not one of them. Thus, it is not apt to subsume Ortelius’ remarks into a general current of undifferentiated mysticism that can be assumed to have merged in Familism. The writings of Franck were widely printed and read in the Netherlands, at least from the 1560s onwards, and

---

91 “Si huiusmodi ad gustum tuum? Me auctore leges Paradoxa S.F.”: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 212.
92 On Franck see Williams, The Radical Reformation, 694-703.
93 “De Paradoxis quae ais, intelligo. Exstant nostrate lingua. Et si me audires, ea legeres. Plus succi veri in istis, quam in illis, Tauleri aut Eschij volo”: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 214.
provide a possible alternative source for anti-sectarian ideas to the writings or networks of Familists. Indeed, his rationalist, humanist approach to spiritualism would seem to fit much more closely with the sceptical outlook of Ortelius than the ideas of either Niclaes of Barrefelt.

Ortelius’ contemporaries, the writer whose ideas drew most upon Sebastian Franck was Coornhert. However, by 1592 Coornhert seems to have become an unpopular man within the Ortelius circle. As stated earlier, it was probably Coornhert’s criticisms of Lipsius that caused the rift with Ortelius. Ortelius did not favour public controversy, but he was drawn into the debates over Lipsius on numerous occasions in the early 1590s, mostly in private correspondence, but also in print.95 Thus, in his letter re-affirming to Ortelianus the value of Sebastian Franck’s writings, he continued:

I do not know what to say as to what is written to you from Leiden about that great man by that worthless man (thus I call him, even if he is learned in letters); whether he is of the Pope or of Calvin is not known to me, and if he has ears to hear he will be neither, for there are errors on both sides. I was never so familiar with him in person, so that I cannot judge him. God knows him, and made him, as he made himself.96

Ortelius’ repudiation of all concern about confessional allegiance has often been cited as evidence of his membership of the Family of Love. Thus, a few months later, responding to his nephew’s refusal to come to stay in Antwerp, he wrote:

I suppose what binds you is what binds all good men, namely religion. It binds me too, but not too place, time or men. To God only, having no part of these.97

95 Justi Lipsi ad Iac Monavium Epistola ... cum duabus Ad Abr Ortelium, Antwerp, 1592; for private correspondence see elsewhere in this article. 96 “Ad id quod scribis tibi futilem illum, (sic enim eum voco (quamvis insigniter litteratum) et nosco) Lugduno scribere, de magnō illo viro, non habeō quod dicam; nempe an Pontificis sit vel Calvinianus: mihi hoc enim non liquet. Et si aures ad audiendum habeat, neuter erit. Peccatur intus et extra. Ego illi coram numquam tam familiaris fui, ut de eo iudicem. Noscat eum Deus: et faxit idem, ut ille sese”: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 214. 97 “Ligat te, puto, quae ligat omnes bonos; religio nempe. Ligat et hæc me: at minime ad locum, tempus, aut homines. Ad Deum tantum, expertem horum”: ibid., no. 228.
Yet, given the lack of pertinent evidence, it is not clear why the Family of Love should be excluded from this disavowal of all attachment to temporal religious affiliations. To claim Familism as the inspiration for Ortelius’ statements is to ignore the more obvious source, Sebastian Franck, who was resistant to all claims to spiritual authority as the basis for gathering believers into a sect and argued that only God can identify heretical belief. Given that Ortelius never mentions the Family of Love in any extant sources but does praise Franck’s writings highly, to posit the former over the latter as the source of his spiritualism is to give preference to circumstantial evidence over primary sources, an approach to interpretation that appears tendentious.

It is also noteworthy that, in his defence of Lipsius, Ortelius openly states that he is neither a follower of the pope nor of Calvin, and not merely that both are fallible. This fits with his reference twenty-five years earlier to “der catholicken evel, guesen cortse, ende hugenoten melisoen”. Thus, in addition to emphasising the individuality of Ortelius’ religious beliefs, it is important to note that he had no lingering loyalty to Catholicism. This is particularly significant for Ortelius’ role as defender of Lipsius after the latter’s return to the Spanish Netherlands. He judges Lipsius’ return neither through a Catholic bias, nor through reverence of his learning. Thus he continues in his letter to Ortelianus:

I think he is a man most learned (as the style is), but it does not seem to me from his books that he is uncommonly or supernaturally wise, which would be an affront to God. I do fear greatly that he rather strives to write well than to be good. But as the old saying teaches us to recognise our friends faults but not to hate them, I will say no more about him. I know he is a man, and we are men. I consider the best and most learned to be those whose concern is virtue and the fear of God. Commonly they excel who are considered wise while killing knowledge and letters.
Ortelius’ refusal to judge Lipsius, other than as a fallible mortal like himself, marks his divergence from the approach and beliefs of Coornhert, whose perfectionism motivated a commitment to criticism, public and private, as an expression of charity. Indeed, to some extent Ortelius’ statements fit the picture that Coornhert painted of him. Thus, if the dialogue was not the cause of the split between the two men, it may nonetheless have identified the cause in focusing on their disagreement over the importance of moral/doctrinal critique.

In August 1592, Ortelius again defended Lipsius, this time from claims reported by his cousin, Emmanuel Van Meteren. Ortelius claims not to know whether Lipsius is attending mass daily as a Catholic in Liège, but insists “that he never professed the Dutch religion or took communion”. He also refutes the insinuation that Lipsius was quarrelling over money, citing examples of the offers that he has turned down and claiming that desire of money is as far as possible from Lipsius’ character.\(^{100}\) The support that Ortelius provided for his friend seems to have included acting as a bridge between Lipsius and his spurned colleagues in Leiden, providing information that the closely watched Lipsius could not safely communicate. Without further evidence, it is impossible to speculate on how widely Ortelius used his international network of contacts to create a favourable impression of Lipsius. Nevertheless, his intervention in the cause célèbre of his day suggests the response he might have given to Coornhert’s claim that his disengagement from critique was a breach of charity: for Ortelius charity entailed discretion and peaceable co-existence in recognition of mankind’s faults.

In order to characterise fully Ortelius’ religious position in the 1590s, some consideration must be given to the context in which he was writing the letters. Evidently, Ortelius was not simply free to believe what he wished; he was a non-Catholic who remained in Antwerp during the beginnings of the re-catholicisation of the Spanish Netherlands. That the restrictions placed upon religion related primarily to public expression of belief should not obscure the cultural pressure on citizens to

\(^{100}\) “Dat hy noyt vande Hollandsche religie professie gedaen en heeft, oft nachtmael genoten heeft”: ibid., no. 218.
embrace Catholic doctrine as well as practices. In March 1593, he acknowledged the situation in a letter to his nephew:

There is nowhere sufficient freedom, except for the free, no more among you than here. But security lies in silence and in becoming invisible (by means of Gyges’ ring). If I were with you without this ring, I would not escape the hand of Vulcan, I know that as sure as my own name. But the wise man is silent in such times, because the time is evil, as the prophet says, and being most Christian is not knowing, saying or doing this or that, but being. For the latter is of the few, the former of both good and bad. But about these things it is not possible to be open; in this way I think more freely than I speak.\(^{101}\)

Although Ortelius lamented his lack of freedom in Antwerp, his position was more secure than ever, both financially and socially. In letters to his nephew, he repeatedly alluded to his considerable prosperity. Although his will is not extant, that of his sister confirms the impression that they were wealthy, though not exorbitantly so.\(^{102}\) Ortelius invested considerable time and money in his collection of ancient coins and curiosities. In 1594, Archduke Ernst visited his museum of wonders, as did Archduke Albert the following year. Also in 1595, Ortelius presented an ornamental copy of the latest edition of his atlas to the town council; in return, the town treasurer Cornelius Pruynen made a presentation of a ruby cup and saucer, worth around 133 pounds.\(^{103}\) Indeed, he seems to have cultivated connections that guaranteed his safety and reputation as a loyal Catholic citizen. Most important in this regard is his friendship with Torrentius and Lampson. His friendship with the former extended back at least to 1575, when he visited Torrentius’ house in Liège while touring through southern

\(^{101}\) “Nullibi enim satis liberum, nisi libero. Non magis apud vos, quam apud nos. tacendo autem et inconspicuum (Gyges annuli medio) se prebere, una via est securitas. Apud vos si essem, sine annulo dicto, Vulcani manus mei non posse effugere, tam scio quam nomen meum. At in illo tempore sapiens tacebit, quia tempus malum est, ut inquit propheta. Et christianissimus est non hoc aut illud scire, dicere, vel agere, sed esse. Hoc enim paucorum est, illud malorum aequae ut bonorum. At de his non latius licet. Huiusmodi enim libentius cogito quam dico”: ibid., no. 229. The image of Gyges’ ring is used by Torrentius three years earlier, apparently with the same connotation: “Ille de quo ad Gandium scripsisti nunc Antverpiae est. En tibi versiculum: fida silentia sacris. Gygis ille annulus eum comitatur, sed aperta omnibus palà” - Delcourt & Hoyoux, Laevinus Torrentius Correspondance, vol. 2, letter 574.

\(^{102}\) Ibid., nos. 228 & 314. For Anne Ortels see Génard, “La généalogie du géographe Abraham Ortelius”.

\(^{103}\) Ibid.
Belgium and the northeast of France. In January 1587, through the intermediary of Cornelius Pruynen, Ortelius thanked Torrentius for some favour. It is not clear whether this alludes to a religious or scholarly matter. Torrentius' responded that he was glad to be of service to such a man and that Ortelius would enjoy good fortune and might philosophise mindful of him. This exchange took place while Torrentius was preoccupied with smoothing the way for his arrival to take up his episcopal role in Antwerp, seeking to gain the confidence of the population to ensure their return to observance of the Catholic faith. It is quite possible that the letter alludes to reaching an understanding with Ortelius about his religious position. Earlier in January 1587 Torrentius had written to Lampson that Ortelius might proceed with his small matter. Although this could refer to the *Thesaurus*, for which the last privilege was dated 29 April, neither the word “negotiolum” in this, nor “philosophetur” in the later, letter seem appropriate to the preparation of the book. Whether or not these references refer to Ortelius' religious standing in post-conquest Antwerp, by the end of the year (prior to his investigation by the town council) he enjoyed the full confidence of Torrentius, having been entrusted with his religious and political poems of the bishop that were apparently to be guarded with considerable secrecy.

Antwerp in the 1590s was not a place eager to persecute those who caused no public disturbance, and it seems that Ortelius was unmolested in his continuous dealings with Protestants both in the rebellious northern provinces and in hostile England. Yet his pose as a faithful Catholic, scion of his city, was in despite, or because, of the failure of the Catholic regeneration to appeal to him. On 18 October 1595, he wrote to Ortelianus:

> Everywhere there is fighting about religon, but no-one understands what it is; at least, no-one that I know. It is just as someone said in a German rhyme:

---

105 “Quod de Ortelio adjicis (magnas eum agere gratias mihi) gaudeo collatum tali viro a me beneficium non minus quam ipse acceptavi. Frutatur bonus avibus et philosophetur mei memori”: Delcourt & Hoyoux, *Laevinus Torrentius Correspondance*, vol. 1, letter 252.
107 On 2 November Lampson wrote to Ortelius, “Significes nondum ab ipso expletum desiderium meum Syntagmatis ab ipso [Torrentius] conscripti de Pace, quod si mittere dignaberis, ego cum nemine mortalium communicabo, atque optima fide statim remittam”: Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 154.
Christ is either this or that; whoever has him not is not wise. For blessedness is not knowing Christ, but possessing him. Among whom are those who think they have him but do not know his name.108

In this and the previously quoted letter, Ortelius’ insistence that Christianity is not about doing, saying or knowing, but about being, reflects his reading of mystical writings. More specifically, his argument that blessedness resides in possessing Christ and that there are some who can do so without even knowing his name, draws directly upon Sebastian Franck. That the Family of Love also drew upon this mystical tradition to emphasise the internal possession of Christ does not make Ortelius a Familist, any more than it makes Franck or Tauler a Familist.

Further evidence about Ortelius’ religious beliefs comes in the form of a dialogue written by the Dutch humanist Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert in which Ortelius is the author’s interlocutor. The author’s background is important for understanding the text. An artist and engraver, long based in Haarlem, Coornhert decided at the age of thirty-five to learn Latin and subsequently to set up a printing press for which he produced Dutch translations of Classical texts. All of his writings were initially composed and published in Dutch, even polemics against others writing in Latin. It is in this last capacity that Coornhert attained fame and notoriety in his own day, and he is still best known as the antagonist of Justus Lipsius in the debate over the latter’s argument in favour of national religious uniformity. Coornhert was one of the earliest proponents of genuine religious tolerance in modern Europe; thanks to the political and religious instability of the northern Netherlands during his life, he was not executed for his beliefs. Rather, he died in 1590 of what was described as “an apoplexy of the tongue.”109 The many who had been lashed by his tongue appear to have regarded this as a just fate, and it is only more recently that Coornhert’s reputation has seen something of a revival.110

108 “Utrinque de religione digladiatio: nullibi quid illa sit, intelligitur. Nusquam quod saltem ego sciam. Est ut quidam Germanico inquit ritmo: Christus ist wider dis oder das, Wer im niet hadt, der weyss nit was. Non scire enim Christum beatitas, at habere. Ex quo etiam habere eum sunt qui poterunt, neque nosse huius nomen”: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 278.
109 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 193.
110 For a historiographical survey see H. Bonger, Leven en werk van Dirk Volckertsz Coornhert, Amsterdam, 1978, 390-411. Aside from this work note also H. Bonger, et al., ed., Dirk Volckertszoon
Coornhert's connections with Hendrik Niclaes and the Family of Love extend as far back as 1546, when he had met Niclaes and provided illustrations for his publications. The details of the relationship between the two men are well known, so I shall only summarise them here. Niclaes sought to win Coornhert over to his growing group of followers, providing him with samples of his writings and seeking commentary on them. Coornhert was a critical reader from the beginning, but seems to have had some respect for Niclaes, who, it should be noted, was less emphatic about his own spiritual elevation at this stage of his career. Coornhert seems to have encountered Niclaes again during his travels in 1566, at which time the latter was beginning to reorient his movement towards eirenic pacifism that would appeal to the learned humanists in Antwerp and Cologne. Niclaes' attempts to emphasise his own prophetic and apostolic calling at this point may not have impressed the fiercely humble Coornhert. Then, in 1577, Coornhert encountered a member of the Family of Love who, due to misunderstanding the Familist doctrine of sanctification, believed himself to be God. Coornhert, always alive to the importance of charity, took the trouble to convince this poor man that he was neither immortal, nor blessed, nor particularly joyous. The incident seems to have convinced Coornhert to write against the growing influence of the increasingly presumptuous Hendrik Niclaes, and a series of publications followed.111

In his dialogue with Ortelius, Coornhert begins with an introduction in which he claims that Ortelius argues in favour of peaceful repose while he himself argues for well-meaning involvement in the affairs of others. Yet the dialogue focuses rather on the question of what sorts of things can be known with certainty. This is because Ortelius expresses concern about the right of one man to give advice to another. This argument for tolerance on the basis of scepticism was becoming increasingly common in this period. However, the dialogue ends before there is any progression from debate about knowledge in general to debate about moral knowledge. Thus, much of the text is taken up with Coornhert's attempts to show that all men know some things and that it is a breach of charity not to share what one knows with others. Ortelius is

---

willing to grant that some knowledge can be attained, although it is indicated at the end that he maintains some doubts about the motives for distributing that knowledge, particularly with respect to his own motives in producing his atlas. Coornhert ends the dialogue with the conclusion that, since knowledge in the form of literacy and numeracy can be attained, a person who keeps his own counsel about matters in this life is a “worthless wasp” who only takes from the world without giving anything in return. Coornhert’s logic is rather weak, but the dialogue is an effective rhetorical exposition of the importance of, indeed necessity for, moral critique.112

What does Coornhert’s literary dialogue reveal about Abraham Ortelius’ religious beliefs? The latter’s character is said to “praise” the position of secure repose, a literary term which may suggest a set-piece dialogue in which the characters defend positions other than their own. On the other hand, there are a number of indications that this dialogue was based on an actual discussion between the two men, albeit later grafted into a conventional literary form. This is particularly clear at the end when Coornhert, unusually, insists “and this is what I wanted to say”, as if he didn’t get his point across to Ortelius in the actual conversation and so is expressing himself in this literary dialogue. He adds that the conversation continued about Ortelius’ doubts whether, with regard to his atlas, he had his own or the readers’ interests in mind. The ‘reality effect’ is thus compelling. Nonetheless, whether or not the dialogue actually took place, it is clear from other texts that Coornhert’s interlocutors, when they are named after real people, do defend positions broadly attributable to their namesakes, albeit seen from Coornhert’s perspective.113

In this instance, Ortelius is presented as a humble sceptic, suspicious of the vanity of attempting to impose one’s opinion on others. The arguments that Coornhert attributed to Ortelius are identical to those about which he debated in correspondence with Plantin.114 Notably, these ideas are directly converse to those he associated with the Family of Love. Coornhert objected to the credulity of Familists, who were supposed to follow Hendrik Niclaes unquestioningly and to respect his writings more

112 The dialogue can be found in D. Coornhert, Wercken, Amsterdam, 1630, I: f.80r-v; also see the modern Dutch translation in Bonger & Gelderblom, eds., Weet of rust: Proza van Coornhert, Amsterdam, 1993.
113 Coornhert, Wercken, I: f.80r-v.
than the Bible. He found the arrogance of Niclaes particularly offensive, as he did the ignorance of the Familist who claimed to be god. Coornhert was aware that Barrefelt's brand of Familism was different from that of Niclaes. He had read Barrefelt's writings and knew that Plantin was connected to him. Alastair Hamilton concluded that, in his dialogue with Ortelius and his letter to Plantin, Coornhert astutely identified scepticism as a distinctive feature of Antwerp Familism. Yet, Coornhert does not suggest any link between Ortelius and Barrefelt and, indeed, his own argument fits better with Barrefelt's reliance on revealed truth. The humble (albeit pernicious) scepticism of Ortelius and Plantin troubled Coornhert as much as Barrefelt's claim to express inspired truth in obscure style. Coornhert may have seen that doubts as to the value of moral critique might create a receptive environment for Barrefelt's mysticism, but rather than presenting the idea as originating with the latter, he seems concerned with a broader milieu that included Ortelius.

Coornhert and Ortelius evidently had some regard for each other; however, at some stage the two men fell out and at the end of his life Coornhert was not popular among Ortelius' circle of friends. Indeed, his entry is later scored out of Ortelius' album of inscriptions from friends (though it is as significant that it was included in the first place). It is possible that Coornhert's critique of Ortelius' religious beliefs generated this disagreement; however, there is no evidence of an edition of the dialogue appearing in Ortelius' lifetime, and it is not certain that he ever saw it. Given that he was in correspondence with Coornhert it is probable that the latter would have sent it to him, but only because it was not satirical or polemical. It is much more likely that Ortelius and Coornhert fell out over the latter's public attack upon Justus Lipsius, a friend whom Ortelius defended throughout his network, and for whom he acted as a mediator with old colleagues after Lipsius' controversial return to the Spanish Netherlands. Nonetheless, the evident hostility towards Coornhert within Ortelius' circle by the 1590s, does not seriously impair his credibility as a witness to Ortelius' beliefs at an earlier point. As a contributor to the friendship album of his patron and correspondent, Coornhert's testimony, in what is the only

116 See Ortelius, Album Amicorum, 120. For the friendship between the two men see Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 79.  
extant extended description of Ortelius' religious beliefs written during the latter's lifetime, must stand unless contradicted by other sources. In this respect it is worthy of note that he attributes to Ortelius the opposite idea of his atlas to that put forward by Postel — Ortelius worries about his motives in publishing the book, rather than presenting it as a means to reunify the world through spiritual regeneration. Coornhert's dialogue describes Ortelius' religious beliefs in their own right as the attitudes of an individual; Postel's letters impose his own theories with little regard to the stated opinions of his subject. Neither writer claimed that Ortelius was a Familist.

From Ortelius' letters, it is clear that he cared a great deal about the factional religious politics of his day. He followed events avidly, reporting to his relatives in London and to trusted friends abroad, always questioning the reliability of information. His scepticism about the likelihood of the situation improving appears frequently in the letters he wrote in the last years of his life. This increased pessimism is reflected in the difference between the motto he used in the 1550s and that which he adopted in the 1590s — from "virtuti fortuna comes" to "Contemno et orno, mente, manu." Yet the religiosity that he cultivated in secrecy as he approached death does not seem significantly altered from that of earlier years. There is, of course, much that remains unknown about his religious position at various stages throughout his life. Thus, it is not clear why the Privy Council suspected him of Lutheranism when any suspicions that arose at a local level were apparently due to his relations with a Calvinist. Perhaps, since his Catholicism was in question, and since he had shown no open support for the Calvinist administration, Lutheranism was the most likely guess. Equally at ease with Protestant rebels and Catholic bishops, he maintained friendships with people from all Christian denominations. It is not surprising that his closest friendships seem to have been with others whose religious position was ambiguous — Plantin, Vulcianus, Lipsius, Mylius and Galle. Ultimately, it is impossible to trace all the influences on Ortelius' thought with only fragments of his correspondence remaining, and with little record of his library. We know that he read David Joris with distaste, and that he was proud to possess a rare book edited by Flaccius

---

118 For Ortelius' political outlook see the letters to Vulcianus: Leiden, Cod Vulc 105, III dated 28.3.93, 9.6.93 and 30.4.98.
Illyricus, but the reasons behind these feelings are obscure. Nonetheless, the major contours of his religious position can be traced. From his early encounter with reforming ideas to his later reading of the stoics, mystics, Acontius, and, perhaps above all, Sebastian Franck, he seems to have maintained an interest in reformation without ever embracing Protestantism.

The case of the Family of Love requires more caution, as contacts can easily be confused with membership, of which there is no evidence in this case. Ortelius’ stated aversion to any form of affiliation with religious groups must have distanced him from Niclaes. There is simply no evidence of a direct connection to Barrefelt, but less reason to suppose such a connection uncharacteristic. It is striking that none of the extant correspondence of Ortelius with other supposed members of the Family of Love contains any reference to the group or its activities. Only Postel mentions it, and it is clear that he knew neither Ortelius nor the Family of Love very well at the time. Why, then, have so many historians been convinced that Ortelius and those around him were Familists? This is due, in part, to taking Plantin’s connections with the Family of Love, however they may be interpreted, as representative of the ideas of Antwerp’s humanists. Yet already in the 1550s, prior to his first known contact with Plantin, Ortelius seems to have had had the same religious outlook as later, when supposedly under the influence of Familism. This is characterised by: disregard for confessional boundaries, insistence on internal rather than external devotion, willingness to dissimulate rather than face martyrdom, and a tempermental affinity with eirenicism. This is not Familism. For Ortelius, it seems to have been the result of reaching adult life under the influence of ideas of reform that were forcibly supressed by the local government. Unlike those of his family who left for England, Ortelius inherited a business from his father that was best maintained in Antwerp. He conformed to the religion decreed by the state, though he lost neither his sympathy for nor his contacts with Protestant reformers. It is not surprising that he turned to the writings of the Classical stoics and the Christian mystics, those who emphasised personal virtue over indifferent, external goods. Instead of becoming a Protestant, Ortelius rejected organised religion. It is, of course, possible that he was attracted to the eirenec message of the Family of Love amid the volatile religious polemic of the

1560s, but the weight of the evidence suggests that this is unlikely. Ortelius did not adopt the language of the Family of Love in any of his extant correspondence; instead, his language is dominated by stoicism. His discussion of inner spirituality is neither unusual nor specifically Familist; rather, his religious outlook reflects his upbringing with reforming ideas under a repressive government. Thus, I must disagree with Alastair Hamilton when he states that the desire for religious peace among Plantin’s circle “can hardly be attributed to the wars of religion in the sixteenth century.” For the majority, who did not turn to Calvinism or doctrinaire Catholicism, the desire for religious peace was paramount, whether for political, moral, or economic reasons. Familism is no more necessary to explain the beliefs of Ortelius than it is to explain those of William of Orange.

It is possible to argue that the Family of Love, particularly Barrefelt’s version, would flourish in such a situation. One Reformed minister, Adriaan Saravia, felt that those around Barrefelt “adapt everything in the Scriptures to a Stoic philosophy.” In a society where the visible church was a byword for formalism, the secular life of contemplatives may well have filled a gap left by the diminishing numbers of orthodox mystics and divines. What associating with such people might mean is hard to interpret, particularly when they disclaimed followers and the formation of any kind of sect. Rather than acclaiming the Antwerp humanists as Hiëlists, it seems more appropriate to question what kind of role Barrefelt might have had in their society and how he may have shaped his message to their beliefs. However that may be, indirect prosopographic evidence is not sufficient to prove membership of the Family of Love; rather, it tends to demonstrate the smallness of Antwerp’s intellectual community. Ortelius’ statements with regard to religion can sufficiently be understood through the writers he mentions to others: Tauler, Eschius, Plato, Seneca and Sebastian Franck. If his ideas led him to be critical of the religious alternatives presented to him, he suppressed the impulse to admonish. His letters from the 1590s testify to his enforced silence in a society flooded by new forms of lay piety, while he seems to have observed the hardening boundaries of confessionalisation with an eye


towards the folly of man. He openly expressed this vision of the world in the text of his atlas, and he surrounded his last world map with quotations that encapsulated it: the responsibility of man towards the world, his ambitions and wars, the need to contemplate the whole of creation, and the desire for understanding. The quotation from Cicero that also faced readers of his first edition in 1570 stood at the bottom of the page:

What of human affairs can seem great to someone who knows all eternity and the entire universe.\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{122} "Quid ei potest videri magnum in rebus humanis, cui aeternitas omnis, totiusque mundi nota sit magnitudo": Ortelius, "Typis Orbis Terrarum", \textit{Theatrum Orbis Terrarum}, Antwerp, 1592.
In late 1573 Ortelius began to collect signatures, inscriptions and pictures from his friends in Antwerp. They entered their contributions in an album, called an “album amicorum” (book of friends).\(^1\) Within a few months a number of prestigious figures had entered their names, adding to the attraction of being asked to contribute. Entering one’s name was a mark of friendship with Ortelius and, increasingly, a mark of one’s own worth as a humanist who ought to be counted among such learned company. Partly due to restrictions upon geographical mobility during the Dutch revolt, Ortelius could not always proffer the album to his friends in person, and so his friends occasionally circulated it among themselves. Others sent their contributions directly to him in Antwerp. As the album grew in scope and prestige over the following twenty-four years, inscriptions were included on behalf of deceased friends. Eventually an index was inserted by Ortelius’ nephew; however, even after the index was made, entries continued to be added. The contributors cross generational, geographical and religious boundaries. By the time Ortelius died the album contained entries on behalf of 142 people. With entries from such illustrious figures as Jean Bodin, Justus Lipsius, William Camden and Gerard Mercator, it was one of the most distinguished signature collections of its time. However, in its current state the album is missing several entries and has pages out of order. It is no longer possible to identify the precise sequence in which the entries were made and it is difficult to be sure about the means of compilation – problems that will be discussed in more depth later in this chapter. Establishing the details of collection is fundamental; only then is it possible to consider more abstract but equally important questions: What was the purpose of collecting such an album? What does it tell us about the humanist networks within which it was collected? And why did a diverse group of academics, artisans and merchant scholars decide to celebrate friendship?

---

1. A. Ortelius, *Album Amicorum*, trans. and ed. J. Puraye, Amsterdam, 1969. Although this edition is indispensable on account of its facsimile reproduction of the text, the translation and annotation are unreliable. The original manuscript can be consulted in Pembroke College, Cambridge. I have used my own translations unless otherwise noted. Some historians date the album from 1573. The earliest entry (f.7r) is dated “15 January 1573, in the style of Brabant,” i.e. in January 1574. The entry also refers to Ortelius’ appointment as royal geographer, which took place on 20 May 1573, confirmed by letters patent on 17 November 1573, and therefore the album dates from 1574.
The previous chapter asked whether the religious outlook of Ortelius formed the context for his scholarly collaboration. Having dismissed the Family of Love as an explanatory factor in his affairs, recognising instead the influence of a broader, less sectarian stream of humanist spiritualism, I have argued that it is possible to discern a form of sceptical individualism in Ortelius' position. The correlate of this in the social sphere is the isolation he appears to have felt in the last ten years of his life. The following chapter will take the *Album amicorum* as the point of departure to explore the secular values of Ortelius as a member of the humanist 'republic of letters'. I argue that the *Album* demonstrates a self-consciousness about social relations that makes up for the absence of explicit commentary on the matter by Ortelius. Indeed, because it is demonstrably subscribed to by a large proportion of the network, it is a more useful document of the (semi-)private attitudes to social interaction within the network than some of the more public statements of its members. However, two caveats to this statement should be made at the outset. First, it will become clear that contributors to the album had differing motives and expressed distinct messages. Second, it will be necessary to question the extent to which the album is representative of the differing networks of which Ortelius was a member. Whereas the last chapter focused on the content of Ortelius' beliefs in order to undermine an argument that had largely rested on circumstantial evidence drawn from formal similarities in behaviour patterns, this chapter will reverse that approach by looking afresh at the structure of Ortelius' social interaction. The question as to the appropriateness of analysing friendship through formal patterns (some self-conscious, others not) will recur at a number of points in the discussion. The goal of the chapter is to provide a context for Ortelius' scholarly collaboration in the social practices of his network; thus, it is intended to explore an 'intellectual culture' in a broader sense than is often denoted by the phrase.

The first friendship albums (alba amicorum) were kept during the mid-1540s by students at Wittenberg. These students used books (often the *Emblem Book* of Alciati, or a Bible, or a work by Melanchthon) as albums in which they collected

---

autographs and insignia from professors in Wittenberg and the neighbouring Protestant universities that they visited in the course of their studies. Entries were sometimes written in the margins of these books, sometimes on interleaved pages, and sometimes on liminary pages at the front or back. While poems, sometimes of considerable length, are quite common in albums, most entries are brief salutations with short epigrams or quotations. These have been analysed into various statistical forms by Wolfgang Klose which are worth considering in some detail in order to gain some sense of the nature of the popularity of friendship albums. Unsurprisingly, most of the quotations come from Classical sources. Ovid is the most frequently cited author, reflecting his widespread popularity in the sixteenth century. The majority of these citations refer to the Epistulae ex ponto, with the rest dispersed evenly among the Ars amandi, Metamorphoses, and Tristia. Philip Melanchthon is the second most quoted author, comfortably ahead of Cicero and not far behind Ovid, receiving more than twice as many citations as Luther. This can be explained in part by his prominence in the lives of Lutheran students, for whom he produced textbooks, but also by his enduring popularity within humanist circles. Despite attacks upon him from within the Lutheran Church, Melanchthon was widely admired by humanists (often irrespective of their confessional allegiance) as an accomplished Latinist and Hellenist who had demonstrated where secular learning fitted in with religious reform. Given the broadly academic setting of the early albums, his reputation as “praecceptor Germaniae”, and as the supposed friend to all, made him an obvious point of reference to young scholars seeking to enshrine prestigious connections. Correctly or incorrectly, for many humanists he represented a commitment to debate and a willingness to compromise that chimed well with a fashion devoted to celebrating friendship as the basis of civility and social concord. The title page of one album, belonging to an Antwerpian exile in Cologne, Eberhard Jahrbach, claims to present Melanchthon’s own opinion of friendship books: “Iudicium Philippi Melanchthonis de eiusmodi libris. Sunt normae vitae. Sunt ornamenta legentis.”Irrespective of its authenticity, the quotation demonstrates how Melanchthon’s insistence on the ethical value of learning could be viewed as consonant with the ethos of friendship albums.

3 A. Alciati, Emblemata, 1531. Various editions of this work were used; Klose notes an edition printed in 1567 with extra sheets specifically for use as an album, see W. Klose, “Stammbucheintragungen im 16. Jahrhundert im Spiegel kultureller Strömungen”, 16, n.7.  
4 W. Klose, Corpus Alborum Amicorum.  
The third, fourth and fifth most-quoted authors are less remarkable: Cicero, Augustine and Seneca. Citations of Cicero most often refer to the *Laelius* [*De amicitia*] and *De officiis*, which pertain directly to the theme of friendship. The prominence of Augustine and Seneca reflects the importance of both thinkers to sixteenth-century debates about the nature of human fortune, as well as their general popularity. For the rest, Plato, Isocrates, Horace, Euripides and Homer gain most references among the ancients; Gregory Nazianus among the Church fathers; while Luther and Johannes Stigelius dominate among the remaining contemporaries. Stigelius was a neo-Latin poet who taught Greek and Latin in Wittenberg before becoming the first Professor of Eloquence in the new university of Jena – clearly his poetry enjoyed considerable popularity in the mid-sixteenth century and his career coincides geographically and chronologically with the spread of friendship albums.6

As yet, no comprehensive interpretative study has been devoted to the significance of the fashion for collecting albums.7 Generally speaking, the early Lutheran influence is clear and not surprising for a fashion that began in Wittenberg. Notwithstanding the various interests that individuals may have had for participating in the compilation of albums, the growth and popularity of the fashion was shaped by the proliferation of universities in the Empire during the sixteenth century, and by confessional boundaries, which became more entrenched in the wake of the Smalkaldic war. Yet the phenomenon quickly spread beyond an exclusively Lutheran context and needs to be considered within the wider humanist culture of published correspondence and prosopographies. The increasing number of university-educated humanists in

---

6 Stigelius is discussed in A. Schroeter, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der neulateinischen Poesie Deutschlands und Hollands*, Berlin 1909.
northern Europe (in conjunction with the increasing number of universities), and the rising status of neoterici in the arts and professions, are revealed in these albums, which celebrate a culture of learning and civility in which the names of scholars mingle with self-educated artisans, patricians and nobility. Less public and less intrusive than published correspondence, albums brought distinction both to the peer group and to its individual members. They also provided a peculiarly visual expression of friendship that must be understood in the context of the spread of the humanist fashion for portraiture, emblems, personal mottos and insignia. Whereas published correspondence implicitly emphasised writing style, not friendship (many correspondents were barely acquainted), and gave an insight to the curious as to how to approach learned discussion, albums emphasised pithy expressions of genuine familiarity. Most importantly, the manuscript nature of albums limited their circulation, making them fundamentally private documents in an age of mass communication. Albums did not enshrine relationships for posterity through mass reproduction in print, rather through the care with which they were kept. They did not publicise friendships for the benefit of a wider audience; they monumentalised them for a select few. As religious divisions increasingly cut across the republic of letters, and as both religious and political authorities became increasingly concerned to scrutinise private friendships, friendship albums expressed commitment to networking, whether merely as a signature book for those seeking to enter a professional peer group, or as an embodiment of a beleaguered international community of intellectuals.

9 Letter-writing as a formal art in the sixteenth century is best encapsulated in Erasmus’ often reprinted De Conscribendis Epistolis (1522). Lipsius’ later guide, Epistolica Institution (1591), insisted on the primacy of familiar tone over formality, but the issue remained largely stylistic – his Epistolicae Quaestiones (1577) and many of the Epistulae Miscellaneae (1585) were largely rhetorical exercises, as well as showing off distinguished acquaintances. See the articles by Mark Morford, “Life and Letters in Lipsius’s Teaching” and Robert Young, “Lipsius and Imitation as Educational Technique”, both in Tournoy, De Landtsheer and Papy, eds., Justus Lipsius Europae Lumen et Columen; also, M. Fumaroli, “Génèse de l’épistolographie classique: rhétorique humaniste de la lettre, de Pétrarque à Juste Lipse”, Revue d’Histoire littéraire de la France, 78 (1978), 886-900.
10 The prevalence of Christian and stoical motifs about surviving cruel fortune convey the embattled spirit of many entries. See, for example, Ortelius, Album, ff. 1v-3r, and f.42. Nonetheless, the networks revealed by albums often mimic or reinforce religious or political factions; for example, early German student albums, or albums collected during the Synod of Dordrecht. On the latter see, K. Thomassen, “De alba amicorum , aangelegd tijdens de synode van Dordrecht”, in Boeken verzamelen, Leiden, 1983, 292-306.
Klose's figures are drawn from his analysis of albums up to 1573, by which time their geographical range had spread substantially, and as the fashion spread it became less uniform.\footnote{Klose, "Stammbucheintragungen im 16. Jahrhundert im Spiegel kultureller Strömungen," 14-24.} Albums were kept as travel diaries, or as sketch books, and many were still compiled as student autograph books. Some general observations can be made about the development of the fashion, based on the statistical evidence compiled by Klose. There are about 1500 extant sixteenth-century albums, 320 of which were begun by 1573. Although it is certain that some have not survived, whether deliberately destroyed or victims of the accidents of history, it is likely that the rate of preservation increases relative to the (contemporary or posthumous) prestige of the albums' contributors.\footnote{For example, Ortelius' cousin Emanuel van Meteren, in his extant album, refers to an earlier collection that was requisitioned by the Spanish authorities in the Low Countries. Many albums have lost leaves (e.g. Ortelius') and some have been almost entirely dispersed, such as those of Cornelius Buys and Albert van Loo. For further discussion see Thomassen, \textit{Alba Amicorum}, 31-33, 56-7, and 126.} Until 1570, approximately half of the albums were compiled in the margins or spare pages of printed books, of which about half were emblem books. The proliferation of emblem literature in the 1560s coincides closely with the spread of friendship albums, with just under forty percent of albums being compiled in emblem books in the second half of the decade. Alciati's \textit{Emblemata} was most commonly used for early albums, but publications by Junius and Sambucus in the mid-1560s were also widely used. In the Low Countries, Claude Paradin's \textit{Les devises héroïques} was particularly common as a basis for friendship albums, both in the original text and in Latin translation.\footnote{Klose, "Stammbucheintragungen im 16. Jahrhundert im Spiegel kultureller Strömungen," 15; Thomassen, \textit{Alba amicorum}, 16-17.} In albums kept in printed works the inscriptions seem unrelated to the printed content of the page; inscriptions in emblem books generally follow the same pattern, but exceptions do occur.\footnote{See, for example, the album of Cornelius van Blyenburch in the Hague, KB. 130 E 28, where the exception is the inscription of Caspar Schetz, as noted by Thomassen, \textit{Alba amicorum}, 46-7.} There are a significant number of emblematic inscriptions in manuscript albums, reinforcing the impression of congruence between emblem literature and the pithy form of album entries. It is unclear whether, or in what way, the coincidence of the popularity of emblems and friendship albums reflects a common cultural or intellectual core.\footnote{A. Alciati, \textit{Emblemata}, 1531; J. Sambucus, \textit{Emblemata}, 1564; H. Junius, \textit{Emblemata}, 1565; C. Paradin, \textit{Les devises héroïques}, 1562, and \textit{Symbola Heroica}, 1565. For a discussion of the connection between friendship albums and emblem books see Nickson, \textit{Early Autograph Albums in the British Museum}.}
Printed albums designed for signature collections appear in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, but do not become particularly common.\textsuperscript{16} Printed title pages for albums were sometimes inserted into emblem books and textbooks, extending the trend for binding extra pages at the beginning or end of books to make space for signature collections. The seriousness with which collecting was pursued is also revealed by the increasing quality of calligraphy, sketches and paintings in albums. Illustrations develop from the early prominence of heraldic insignia to include emblems, sketches, portraits and landscape paintings. It is clear that considerable time, effort, and even money for the hire of painters or calligraphers, could be put in to contributions; on the other hand, it is likely that influential patrons could often rely on clients, relatives or friends to craft their contributions for them, as seems to have happened in the case of Bishop Torrentius' contribution to Ortelius' album.\textsuperscript{17} Despite the value of many of these albums, the overwhelming majority were compiled in small volumes that were easy to transport, or to hide should the nature of the names included cause interest or concern to the authorities.

The geographical distribution of friendship albums within the sixteenth century is largely based upon student migration between universities, specifically following the pattern of locations of large 'German nations'. Up to 1573, Wittenberg, Tübingen and Strasburg figure most frequently, followed by Padua and Paris.\textsuperscript{18} It is difficult to track the religious affiliation both of albums and of contributors, given the fluidity of confessional allegiance and the limited extent to which student migrations were restricted by religious boundaries in the middle of the century. Common 'nation' did not necessarily mean common religion. The cross-confessional geographical spread of the fashion can be gauged by the prominence of Leipzig and Jena (Lutheran), Bourges and Vienna (Catholic), Heidelberg and Geneva (Calvinist), in addition to the

\textsuperscript{17} For Torrentius' contribution see Ortelius, \textit{Album}, f. 10v; however, in a letter to Dominic Lampson he says, "en tibi Ortelii nostri munusculum his adjunctum literis. Vides locum vacuum hunc: si epigrammata aliquo tuo impleveris, facies utrique nostrum rem longe gratissimam et materiam habes tuo et ingenio et arte dignam": Delcourt & Hoyoux, \textit{Laevinus Torrentius Correspondance}, vol. 2, letter 801. There is no separate entry by Lampson, thus it is likely that Torrentius, assuming that he was not refused, was requesting a contribution on behalf of himself. By contrast, Alexander Graphaeus' letter to Ortelius on 1 June 1577 reveals the difficulties that could beset a contributor: Hessels, \textit{Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae}, no. 69.
earlier-mentioned cities. The presence of large ‘German’ student bodies also explains the frequent occurrence of prestigious Italian locations, such as Venice, Bologna and Rome. Many of the leading locations were also leading centres of trade. Thus, inscriptions in Cologne often bear no connection to the university. The extent to which friendship albums spread beyond the academic world is apparent in the frequency of contributions made in Speyer, Nürnberg, Lyons, and Regensberg. What was initially a student fashion quickly became a humanist preoccupation in both courtly and mercantile settings.

Linguistic evidence also conveys something of the diffusion of the fashion. The overwhelming majority of entries in friendship albums up to 1573 were written in Latin, reflecting both the humanist character of contributors and the frequency of international collections. Greek and German are next most common, occurring much more frequently than French, which is the fourth most common. Thereafter come Hebrew and Italian, followed by Dutch, which is barely more common than the remaining miscellaneous selection of languages. Klose argues, probably correctly, that the linguistic breakdown of early album entries indicates the prevalence of Protestant contributors. It also confirms the geographical extent of the fashion, which was most prominent within Imperial lands and their immediate surroundings – eastern France, the Low Countries, Switzerland and northern Italy.

To some extent, early Dutch albums followed the original student model, the fashion having been passed on within the ‘German nations’ in universities; however, a number of factors shaped the development of the fashion within the area. Philip II’s attempt to restrict the travel of his Dutch subjects to universities in France led (if not to the success of his policy) to the importance of Douai in the early appearance of

19 While Klose emphasises the role of Protestantism in the spread of albums, he recognises J-U Fechner’s insistence on the broader humanist milieu, including Calvinists; neither places due emphasis on Catholic collectors or contributors. See Klose, “Stammbucheintragungen im 16. Jahrhundert im Spiegel kultureller Strömungen,” 19, n.9.
20 Thus, in Ortelius’ album the Cologne entries of Metellus, Ximenius, and the Isaacs (later joined by Mylius) represent a network that was not based on the university; see especially Ortelius, Album, ff. 68-71. The album of Aegidius Anselmus Antoniszoon (see bibliography) is a good example of a merchant collection.
22 Klose, “Stammbucheintragungen im 16. Jahrhundert im Spiegel kultureller Strömungen,” 22-3; particularly at issue is the high frequency of Hebrew and German inscriptions. These statistics pertain to pre-1573; thereafter the situation is more complicated.
Dutch friendship albums. The Dutch nobleman, Janus Dousa, there became the core of a group of students who kept albums and whose example quickly led to the spread of the fashion throughout the Low Countries. Dousa sought signatures from poets and men of learning in Paris as well as from students and professors. The compilation of albums outside the university context became particularly common in the Low Countries, perhaps fostered by the extent of the diffusion of humanist education into the merchant population. The broad basis of education in the region also, in part, explains the relatively high number of albums kept by women. Dutch albums were frequently marked by the effects of the civil and religious wars that ravaged the Low Countries during the second half of the sixteenth century. Laments for the despoiling of the land "in a time of great angst" are common, while some albums also contain celebrations of the raising of sieges, or anti-Spanish remarks. This made albums of interest to political authorities, though the experience of Ortelius' cousin, Emanuel van Meteren, whose album was confiscated by the Spanish administration, may not have been common.

It is not difficult to surmise how Ortelius came to the decision to keep a friendship album. Although not a student at any university, his contacts throughout the world of learning had already made him familiar with the artist Johannes Vivianus, who began collecting an album in 1570, to which Ortelius made a contribution in 1571, and the scholar Victor Giselinus, who had contributed to Dousa's album in 1568. It is not clear when Ortelius met Janus Dousa, though they were well acquainted with each other by the late 1570s. Lists of the contributors to Dousa's album, of early Dutch album owners, and of the first contributors to Ortelius' album, reveal a network of individuals who could have introduced Ortelius to the fashion for keeping albums:

25 Non-student albums in the Netherlands include those of Ortelius, Van Meteren and Vivianus (see bibliography), and those albums collected by women, for which see Thomassen, *Alba Amicorum*, 129-139.
26 "In een tijt van angste groot": Jan van Hout's entry in the album of Janus Dousa, f.102 (see bibliography); similar sentiments can be found in Ortelius, *Album*, ff.20v and 51.
28 Vivianus' and Dousa's albums are described in Thomassen, *Alba Amicorum*, 51-4 and 123; Ortelius' contribution to Vivianus' album was made on 1 June 1571 (see bibliography).
apart from Vivianus, Giselinus and Dousa, also the Spanish priest and scholar Benito Arias Montanus, the artist Peter Coeck van Aalst, the schoolmaster Peter Heyns, the scholar and printer Arnold Mylius, and the merchant Joannes Radermacher. Associated with these are groups of later contributors to albums such as the scholars and poets Vulcanius, Lernutius, Susius and Pulmannus, and the artists Lucas d’Heere and Maarten de Vos. Friends did not always contribute to each other’s albums at the first opportunity, often taking months or years to do so (for example, Radermacher contributed to Vivianus’ album in 1590, five years after joining him in Aachen where he became a close family friend), hence later entries do not indicate late familiarity with the fashion or the person. Dousa, who was instrumental in transmitting the fashion for albums from student networks to literary coteries, was familiar with some of Ortelius’ English colleagues, including the latter’s cousin, John Rogers. The neo-Latin poet Victor Giselinus, mentioned above, was known to all three in part through his employment at the printing-house of Plantin, which was where many of the early entries to Ortelius’ album were written. The network of scholars was bound together by enthusiasm for neo-Latin verse and the social setting of the Antwerp print-houses of Plantin and Silvius. The attraction of friendship albums to such individuals was obvious — a forum in which to compose and circulate poems in manuscript among talented contemporaries. The composition of verse letters and eulogies for albums was a small part of the genre’s dominance in the published poetic oeuvres of the same time. Anthologies of contemporaries’ writings were also common, enhancing the sense of a poetic community promoting and providing an audience for itself. Dedicatory verses in non-literary works were also important as a way of becoming known to a wider reading public. Of most importance was the use of epideictic verse to gain patronage, directly or indirectly financial; while this does not seem to have been a feature of the first entries in Ortelius’ album, it does appear later and is an

29 The albums of Ortelius, Radermacher, Vivianus, Van Meteren, Dousa and Tobias Lullius each contain inscriptions from several of these figures, often years apart despite the frequent proximity of the individuals concerned (see bibliography). Vivianus and his wife had been witnesses at the baptism of Radermacher’s children in 1586 and 1590.
important aspect of the literary coteries represented in albums. Although many of those who dedicated themselves to literary activities were, like Dousa, of noble background, others required patronage and the support of their peers to be able to pursue creative or scholarly activities in earnest — albums were an opportunity to combine creative output with networking.

Ortelius’ connection with literary circles reflects his humanist pedigree. Although there is only one extant poem from his hand, he was a member of a chamber of rhetoric called “Jesus of the Balsam Flower” in Ghent in the early 1560s, and in the late 1580s he was involved in editing a collection of the poems of Dominic Lampson, an artist and secretary to the prince-bishop of Liège. His research into Classical toponymy brought him close acquaintance with ancient inscriptions, mottos and epigrams, and he was a lively participant in the vogue for personal devices in the last decades of the century. Ortelius was not known for his literary activities, but throughout his life he maintained friendships with leading neo-Latin poets and essayists (notably Rogers, Dousa, Lipsius, Torrentius, Graphaeus, Lernutus, Giselinus), as well as pioneering writers in the vernacular (Coornhert, Gruterus, Van der Hagen). Closer than all of these was the school-master and vernacular poet, Peter Heyns, who seems to have been the first to contribute to Ortelius’ album. Ortelius

32 The extensive selections of dedicatory verses in Ortelius’ Theatrum and Goltzius’ Caesar and Thesaurus (see bibliography) are good examples of the reliance of authors and poets upon one another for mutual self-promotion. Sweertius’ contribution to Ortelius’ album in 1593 (f.73) admits to being uninvited; Andreas Dycchius in 1596 (f.43) admits “ambition” – both seem very aware of the prestige of inserting their names, though the benefits that might accrue to them could hardly be called financial. The album of Paulus Melissus served to celebrate and thus promote his nomination as Poet Laureate, receiving entries within Wittenberg University and from the nobility; by contrast, Conrad Müller, of mercantile background, appears to have collected inscriptions from the most prestigious nobles and professors he could find – descriptions in Hans Henning, “Zu Entstehung und Inhalt der Stammbücher des 16. Jahrhunderts”, 36-40.

34 Ortelius’ poem can be found in a letter to Lipsius: ILE 94 12 27; reference to his editing Lampson’s poems about the waters of Spa and Tongeren can be found in Delcourt & Hoyoux, Laevinus Torrentius Correspondance, vol. 2, letters 640 and 659, where Torrentius comments to Lampson about Ortelius’ progress in the matter. Other members of “Jesus with the Balsam Flower” included Goltzius, D’Heere, Petrus Dathenus, Carolus Utenhovius, and Dominic Lampsonius: see Cust’s article on D’Heere in Archaeologia, LIV, 66.

35 Ortelius used the motto “virtuti fortuna comes” in some of his early letters (Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii… Epistolae, no.7 & 9); he later adopted the motto “contemno et orno, mente, manu” (ibid., no.295); and “quiescere optimum” (ibid., no.375). He often used as an emblematic signature the monogram of Christ with an alpha and omega on either side (for example in the front page of his Album amicorum), and he designed a medal with his image, the reverse of which contained an emblem of a serpent tangled round books below a globe, around which was inscribed the motto “MOPIA ΠΑΡΑ ΤΟ ΔΕΩ” — foolishness in the eyes of God (for a photograph see AOFA, 48). He also encouraged the contribution of devices and emblems for the collection of Jacob Monau, Ipse Faciet, as discussed in the next chapter.
was close to the entire family, and maintained his familiarity with them after Peter Heyns' departure from Antwerp in the wake of Parma's re-conquest of the town in 1585.\(^{36}\) Apparently uninvited, Heyns transformed the text of the *Theatrum* into vernacular verses for a small-format version in 1577, which Ortelius subsequently authorised and expanded into his *Epitome*.\(^{37}\)

As we have seen in the last chapter, his close friendship with Heyns, who was a member of the Protestant municipality in Antwerp before the town's return to Spanish control, cast a shade of suspicion over Ortelius' religious beliefs in the late 1580s. Thus, as a close friend and collaborator of Ortelius, and apparently the first contributor to his album, it is likely that Heyns was among the group within which the idea to compile the album arose.

Poets were not the only group fostering the fashion for compiling albums; artists also made a strong contribution. As an illuminator of maps, Ortelius was a member of the Guild of St Luke in Antwerp, which brought him into close connection with the city's artists, and his opinion on art was respected by collectors such as Torrentius.\(^{38}\) His interest in and patronage of painting is well documented, particularly his predilection for the works of Dürer and his close friendship with Peter Breughel. His involvement with the Flemish movement headed by Lambert Lombard (the precursor of Van Mander as the Vasari of the north) has been studied, and his familiarity with Lucas d'Heere is well known.\(^{39}\)

As with poets, Ortelius' professional needs brought him into close collaboration with artists, both in his geographical and antiquarian studies. The commercial success of the *Theatrum* can in no small part be attributed to the high-quality engravings of Hogenberg, as well as Ortelius' own artistic judgment in the design and colouring of the maps. Likewise, Ortelius' analysis of ancient coins and monuments relied on art-historical techniques and the assistance of artists such as

---


38 In a letter to Lampson, Torrentius cites Ortelius as the source of his interest in the works of the painter Petrus Furnius: Delcourt & Hoyoux, *Laevinus Torrentius Correspondance*, vol. 2, letter 309.

Philip van Winghe. These various artistic influences are evident in the album, which contains entries by Winghe, d’Heere, Vivianus, Hoefnagel and Hogenberg, while Ortelius himself contributed entries for Lambert Lombard and Peter Breughel. The latter contains a famous assessment of the painter’s fidelity to nature: Ortelius cites Pliny’s praise of Apelles as one who painted the unpaintable, always signifying more than just the objects represented; but he adds that Breughel alone of modern painters is exempt from the fault of altering his material for aesthetic improvement. In a similar evocation of the value of faithful artistic representation, Galle contributed a picture of Christ’s head with the question, if Christ is the goal towards which all men strive, what could be better than to represent his likeness [“syns beelds beeld”] in Ortelius’ album? Some of the images in the album are standard devices that the contributor used elsewhere in friendship albums or publications, for example those of Montanus, Lucas d’Heere, Goltzius, Marnix and Gheeraerts. However, others seem to have been crafted to convey messages specifically intended for Ortelius’ album, such as the rebuses by Peter Heyns and his son Zacharias. The contributions of Marcus and Guido Laurinus, Aegidius Wijts, Nicolas Rockox, Gulielmus Pantinus, Adolph Meetkerke, Philippus van Winghe, and William Camden appear to be modelled on numismatic or monumental designs. Camden explained in a letter on 24 September 1577 that he had designed his device long previously, based on his nativity system. Similarly, Johannes Metellus wrote to explain at length the anagrammatic design for his own contribution and that of Petrus Ximenius, emphasising that in each the words are the soul, the picture the body, of the symbol, and that they cannot be understood independently of each other.
The emblematic style of many of the contributions, encapsulated in the explanation provided by Metellus, fits the character of albums more generally, as described earlier; this is not surprising considering the milieu in which the album was compiled. Ortelius was in contact with Johannes Sambucus in the mid-1560s, around the time of publication of the latter’s *Emblemata*; Plantin’s printing house was then a key centre for the promotion of the fashion for emblems. That this reflects more than simply astute business practice on the part of Plantin is revealed by the use to which emblems are put in Ortelius’ album and in the publications of his friend Philip Galle in the early 1570s. Galle and the influential Spaniard, Benito Arias Montanus, collaborated on spiritualist works that combined religious epigrams with emblems to depict a pacific journey towards spiritual elevation focused on Christ. The emblematic form was geared towards contemplative piety rather than doctrinal elaboration; it proceeded from the expression of simple truths to a complex reflection of those ideas in static pictorial form – the relation between words and image was the key to the emblem. This process of meditative abstraction was consciously promoted by writers such as Galle, Montanus, and later Lipsius, as the appropriate mental response to the social and political turmoil of war in the Low Countries. Later, I will assess the extent to which Ortelius’ album contributes to this literature or reflects this mentality. Nonetheless, Galle’s contribution to the album reflects the wider prominence of artists as contributors, which in turn reflects their integral role in the development of the trend for keeping albums in the Low Countries.

---

48 For Ortelius’ connections with Sambucus see the following chapter and Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no.13, 14 & 44. The emblem books of J. Sambucus, *Emblemata*, 1564; H. Junius, *Emblemata*, 1565; C. Paradin, *Les devises héroïques*, 1562, and *Symbola Heroica*, 1565, were all published by Plantin, who also issued editions of Alciati’s *Emblemata* in 1566, 1574, 1581 and 1583.


51 Lipsius’ seminal account of this process is in his *De Constantia*, I: chapters 1-15.
The occasion that prompted Ortelius to compile an album was probably the conferral upon him of the title “Geographer of the King” on 17 November, 1573, at a ceremony in Antwerp at which the Duke of Alva officiated - one of his last duties as Governor of the Low Countries. The award had been secured on 20 May, primarily through the agency of Arias Montanus, who exercised some influence on Philip II’s patronage in the Low Countries. Having attained official recognition of the prestige he had acquired through the publication of his atlas, Ortelius marked his new-found status among his peers by collecting dedications from them. The first inscriptions refer to his new distinction and celebrate his achievements, echoing the epedeic tone of correspondence to him at the time, yet they come from Heyns, Mylius, Pulmannus and Giselinus - his closest friends and colleagues. This formality among intimates in deciding to consecrate a space for literary celebration of a friend encapsulates the seriousness with which humanists took their friendships as an expression of cultivation and civility.

The Album Amicorum of Ortelius is a small booklet (16x11cm) originally containing 145 leaves; most albums were about this size, rendering them portable and easily concealed. The original structure of Ortelius’ album was built around the inclusion of sketches for his numismatic book, the Deorum Dearumque Capita, which was published in 1573, immediately prior to the beginning of the album. Forty-nine of the design sketches for this work were inserted in the album when it was first bound, along with four other cartouches. In the original publication a coin is depicted in the centre, with a cartouche above and below identifying the figure represented and the source of the coin. The use of these sketches as part of the basic structure of the album was a pragmatic recycling of material that was ready-to-hand, but it is also the only friendship album constructed in this way. It is clear that the ornamental borders were included in the album when it was first bound because the first dated entry to use one is that of Bonaventurus Vulcanius, written on 1 March 1574. When the album travelled to Bruges in June-August 1574, seven members of the antiquarian network around Marcus Laurin contributed entries (mostly close together), inserting in the

---

52 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii ... Epistolae, preface, xxvi.
53 Ortelius, Album, ff.4v & 7 (Heyns); f.61 (Mylius); f.120v (Pulmannus); ff.58v-59v (Giselinus).
54 Ortelius, Deorum Dearumque Capita, Antwerp, 1573.
cartouches designs that resemble sketches of ancient coins.\textsuperscript{55} These entries reinforce the sense of continuity of purpose with Ortelius' published numismatic work, which was produced in collaboration with Laurin's milieu.\textsuperscript{56} Just as the virtues are celebrated as a pantheon of Roman gods and goddesses in his numismatic publication, the ideas of virtue upheld by a network of friends are celebrated in identical format in the \textit{Album amicorum}. Both books reflect the humanist idea of creating a visual monument to a historical culture, and it is appropriate that the first title page of the album used a similar cartouche.

Despite this systematic arrangement of the album, many of the ornamental designs were not used by any contributor – for reasons of space, most poems, portraits or sketches were written on undecorated sheets. There are two examples of unrelated entries having been written on the same page, but there are also 150 blank pages in the album, which indicates that these doubled-up entries and the contributions on alien sheets were not due to shortage of space in the album itself.\textsuperscript{57} The insertion of these contributions was continuous during compilation of the album and reveals the circumstances of its collection.

Although the album has been rebound (during which it was clipped at the edges) and ten leaves are missing, it is possible to reconstruct the contents through analysis of the index attached by Ortelius' nephew, Jacob Colius.\textsuperscript{58} He compiled the index on 26 January 1596 during a visit to Antwerp to consult his uncle's books, ordering the contributions alphabetically by each author's first name. Although undated entries

\textsuperscript{55} Ortelius, \textit{Album}, ff.63v-64 (Vulcanius); f.23 (Marcus Laurin), ff.30v-31 (Adolph Meetkercke), ff.35v-36 (Goltzius), ff.81v-82 (Cornelius Brinctus), f.28 (Guillaume Pantin), ff.24v-25 (Guido Laurin), f.26 (Aegidius Wijts) – this last was by a Bruges humanist who was first to sign the album on its return to Antwerp in September 1574.

\textsuperscript{56} See the next chapter for discussion of Ortelius' involvement in numismatic circles around Laurin and Goltzius. See also C. Dekesel, "Abraham Ortelius: numismate" in \textit{AOCH}, 181-192; and H. De La Fontaine Verwey, "De eerste 'Private Press' in de Nederlanden: Marcus Laurinus en de 'Officina Goltziiana'" in the same author's \textit{Humanisten, Dwepers en Rebellen in de Zestiende Eeuw}, Amsterdam, 1975, p.69-83.

\textsuperscript{57} The doubled-up entries are: f.117 (Rudolph Snellius and Hieronymus Megiser) and f.120v (Pulmannus and Languet). The blank pages are ff.5v, 9, 13v, 14v, 17v, 18v-19, 22, 24, 25v, 27v, 28v, 29v-30, 31v, 32v-33, 34, 36v, 40v, 41v, 42v, 43v-44, 45v, 46v-47, 49-49v, 52v, 54, 58, 60, 62, 65v, 67-68, 69, 71, 73v, 76v, 78v, 80v, 85v-86, 87, 88v, 89v, 98v, 101v, 103, 104 and 112. Among the missing leaves there appear to have been six further blank pages: Colius nos. 41, 65, 72, 149, 223 and 252 – bringing the total number of blank pages to 150.

\textsuperscript{58} An analysis of the original pagination of the album has been given by J. Depuydt, "Le cercle d'amis et de correspondants autour d'Abraham Ortelius," in \textit{AOCH}, 119-120.
could have been made at any time prior to Ortelius' death, the last dated entry was made by Aloysius Dichiocus on 6 December 1596 (this entry was incorrectly read by Puraye, an error repeated by Depuydt – “An.m.d.iiiic” is 1596, not 1594). Eleven further contributions appear to have been made to the album subsequent to Colius' initial drawing up of the index. These additional entries were added to the index either between lines or at the end of the appropriate alphabetical division - for example, Hieronymus Scholierus was added at the end of the “H” entries. The index is an unusual feature of the album, demonstrating the seriousness with which the collected names were viewed, and a sense of closure that was felt appropriate at the time of Colius' trip to Antwerp. It also suggests that people were reading the album, looking for particular contributions, or at the very least that it was intended to be read in such a way. It is possible that the concern of his nephew for the album, and the attraction of having an index, revived Ortelius' interest in the collection, given the spate of new entries during 1596.

Joost Depuydt has analysed the original pagination of the album, revealing the contents of the ten leaves, thus twenty pages, that have become detached since the index was compiled. No longer extant are contributions from Jean Bodin, Joannes Woverius, Jan Moretus, Johann Georg von Werdenstein, Gerartus Hasselt, Joachim Margenrode, and Theodore and Cornelius Galle. Six contributions have lost one page each: those of Joris Hoefnagel, Lucas Cupus, Clemens Perret, Emmanuel van Meteren, Marcus Geeraerts, and Otto Venius. The other six missing pages appear to have been blank sides conjugate to the missing leaves. Although it is not clear when or why the album lost leaves, the prevalence of artists among those whose contributions have been partly lost suggests that paintings or sketches of some value may have been removed deliberately. Comparison of Colius' index with the description made by Hessels in 1887 reveals that one of the leaves, that containing the beginning of the contribution of Emanuel van Meteren, has been lost since then.

59 Ortelius, Album, f.26v. Ortelius refers to Colius' visit in a letter to him on 23 March 1596: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no.286.
60 The additional entries are: Aloysius Dichocus, Andreas Dycchius, Balthasar Moretus, Cornelius Galle, Cornelius Kilianus, Dirck Volkertszoone Coornhert, Hieronymus Scholierus, Johann Georg von Werdenstein, Joannes a Wouters (Woverius), Lazarus Henckelus and Theodorus Galle.
61 Depuydt, "Le cercle d'amis et de correspondants autour d'Abraham Ortelius," 119-120.
62 Ibid., 120; and Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, preface, liv-lv.
Colius' index is an important reminder that the album does not have an author in the modern sense, hence attempts to find coherence within it must have recourse to the 136/7 contributors.\textsuperscript{63} To some extent chance must have affected who could and who could not inscribe his name. Analysis of the paper on which contributions were written reveals that several were sent from abroad, occasionally on parchment.\textsuperscript{64} Because the album has been rebound on at least one occasion, it is difficult to know the original structure of the binding, and in what way the loose pages were attached. Portraits were either painted on a separate sheet and then pasted on to an album page, creating a single thick leaf, or cut from printed works and pasted on to pages. One contribution was bound at the head of the sheet and folded half-way down in order to fit into the dimensions of the album.\textsuperscript{65} The current structure of the book, aside from the lost folios, matches the index compiled by Colius, with only one exception.\textsuperscript{66} The question therefore arises, at what stage and in what way was the album originally bound?

It is possible that the album could initially have been collected as loose sheets, which were only later bound together in book form, indeed potentially as late as the compilation of the index by Colius in 1596. If this were to be the case, it would create numerous possibilities as to the collection of inscriptions from individuals of opposing religious or political positions – they might only be shown signatures of those from their own side. Such an arrangement certainly might have proved useful during religious persecution; however, a number of arguments must be set against this account. First, the difficulty of explaining contributions from people of opposing religious or political positions can be surmounted once the practices of humanist

\textsuperscript{63} Although there are 141 entries in Cools' index, six were written by Ortelius on behalf of his friends, five of whom were deceased; hence although Ortelius is not included in the index he must be counted as a contributor in his own right. Puraye and Depuydt consider the younger Dousa to be a separate contributor even though he is not listed in Colius' index.; in fact, it is likely that his portrait was contributed after his death by his father.\textsuperscript{64} The entries on parchment are: f.14 (Peter Heyns), f.17 (Benito Arias Montanus), f.20 (Michiel van der Hagen), f.33 (Clement Perret -written on verso), f.42 (Philip Marnix), f.47 (Joannes Mofflin), f.53 (Daniel Engelhard), and f.84 (Janus Dousa – only the last sheet of his contribution – Jacob Susius then wrote on the verso). The entries probably sent from abroad include that of Benito Arias Montanus (f.17), the first entry by Daniel Engelhard (f.7v) and the contribution of Georgius Calaminus (f.115).\textsuperscript{65} The first method was used for f.11v (Crato) and f.96v (Aquanuus); the second method was used for f.6 (Hoefnagel), f.8 (Crato), f.23v (Clusius), f.38v (Occo), f.47v (Mofflin), f.50 (Lombard), f.51v (Wingius), f.57v (Wolfius), f.66v (Furio y Ceriolanus), f.74v (Lipsius), f.82v (Dousa), and f.114v (Mercator). The letter pasted bound in at the head of the sheet is f.115 (Georgius Calaminus).\textsuperscript{66} The entry by Peter Heyns has been divided in two because Colius' pages 26-29 have been placed between his pages 2 and 3, presumably during the nineteenth-century rebinding.
interaction are understood to be more flexible in Antwerp than a simplistic depiction of confessional Europe allows. Second, there is no manuscript evidence to support the idea that fragments of the album were collected separately; on the contrary, the early entries seem to be deliberately spaced at even intervals from the front to the back of the album. This indicates that the structure of the album was maintained from the beginning (which implies that it was bound), but also that the first contributors deliberately eschewed hierarchical arrangement of the entries of the album. This is significant because the placement of contributions was a matter of considerable concern in many albums - for example, the front of the album being reserved for the nobility. In Ortelius' album, close friends are the first contributors, and their contributions physically frame the rest by being placed at the beginning, middle and end of the book.67

However, the front pages of the album underwent some transformation in the first few months. The earliest dated entry, by Peter Heyns, is described by Colius as pages two and three; Colius describes the contribution by Daniel Rogers as "ad libri front.", which indeed now stands at the front of the album, but was written in 1578.68 The subsequent three entries after that of Heyns, according to those that are dated, were contributed by Mylius, Pulmannus and Giselinus. However, six years later Giselinus added a comment, below his previous entry, stating that Mylius was the first to sign the album, followed by Pulmannus, then Giselinus himself. He refers to them as a "triad" upon which the album is based, around which the album forms a perfect circle.69 Does this mean that Giselinus was unaware of the entry by Heyns, or that he is merely indicating the order in which the three friends contributed to the album? The first is unlikely, since Heyns' entry was clearly written first and there is no

67 The first twenty folios in Ortelius' album remained relatively empty until the late 1570s, but contributions from Heyns (now ff.4 & 7, but originally the first three pages of the album) and Ortelius himself (ff.10, 12v & 13 – entries on behalf of deceased friends) confirm that these folios were not a later addition. The practice of reserving the front of albums for more prestigious contributors, especially nobility, is attested by Thomassen, *Alba amicorum*, p.18; he cites the case of the album of the Swedish student Johan Femaeus in which a failure to give pride of place to a superior led to arbitration in the university of Upsala.

68 Using Puraye’s pagination, the beginning of Heyns’ entry (dated 15 January 1574) is now f.4v; the recto contains the first title page. Rogers’ entry is on ff.1v-3; the second title page is on the recto of f.1. At the front of these is a leaf the recto of which was signed by Colius in 1598; the verso is blank.

indication that the album was initially divided in two – even if it had been, Giselinus would have been able to see the entry by Heyns when he made his second contribution in 1580. The second interpretation is plausible, but it is not clear why Giselinus would group himself with Pulmannus and Mylius in this way. Rather, the entry clarifies the comment in his earlier contribution to the effect that it was pleasant to enter the album surrounded by Mylius and Pulmannus – by 1580 their entries were separated by many other names, thus Giselinus in his later inscription explains that the entries of the three friends were the first contributions to the album and therefore form the basis of it.

Why, then, does Giselinus not mention the entry by Heyns? Heyns' contribution originally formed the front of the album (it begins on the verso of a title page that bears the inscription “Album amicorum Abrahami Ortelii”); it seems that Giselinus regarded it as being part of the structure of the book, perhaps as a kind of preface. Heyns' contribution was a picture of the nymph Daphne transformed into a laurel tree, under which he wrote that “true friendship, like the laurel, remains ever green” – a conceit that refers to Heyns' school, the Lauwerboom. Around the image was a rebus expressing Heyns' motto: “wel haar die God vertrouwen”. On the opposite page he drew a pyramid containing an inscription presenting to Ortelius his “stam” (both milieu and origins - a “stambuch” could be a record of lineage, like a family tree, but was also the earliest used name for a friendship album), announcing his elevation to the title of royal geographer and claiming that, although all praise him for his genius, Heyns knows that Ortelius’ only object in life is Christ, thus he has placed the symbol of Christ at the top of the pyramid. The text thus suits well the idea that Heyns wrote it to inaugurate the collection of the album and that Giselinus regarded the first contributions to have been made thereafter. Further, the image used by Giselinus six years later – an album built on the solid base of the number three – echoes the claim by Heyns that his pyramid was a “solid” base upon which he has placed the emblem of Christ. It is therefore unlikely that Giselinus was unaware that the inscription by Heyns came first, rather that he was placing his “triad” of inscriptions within the context of it. Aside from explaining the allusion to Mylius and Pulmannus in his

---

70 Ibid., ff.4v & 7 – now separate because of a late alteration to the structure of the album (see n.66). Heyns comments that “Uwen grondt is Christ [Christ’s monogram]” and “Heyns ton amy, en Pierre bien solide, a mis ton but sur ceste pyramide.”
earlier contribution, his comment also serves to establish who inaugurated the album as the first entrants, given that by 1580 this might be unclear due to the numerous undated entries.

The importance of establishing the sequence of the early entries is that it clarifies both the idea behind compiling the album and the structure of the book itself. Heyns’ entry clearly indicates that the context for collecting the album was the elevation of Ortelius to the position of Royal Geographer, while underlining the fact that piety is more important to Ortelius than fame. It may even have been Heyns who prompted the collection of the album, just as he later prompted the creation of a reduced-format edition of Ortelius’ atlas.71 Giselinus’ entry seems to corroborate this view by treating Heyns’ entry not as a contribution to the album but as part of the book itself. However, by 1596, when Colius compiled his index, Heyns’ entry no longer formed the front of the book. It is clear that the verses written by Rogers in 1578 had been placed at the front of the album by June 1594, when Ortelius drew the cross of Christ on the recto of the folio containing the beginning of the verses. The cross has the symbols of alpha and omega on either side (punning on Ortelius’ initials) and the inscription “vitae scopus” underneath it; below this, Ortelius wrote a dedication of the album to his nephew, Colius. However, this second title page was drawn on the second of four conjugate folios, which were thus all placed at the front of the album, leaving one entirely blank folio as the cover page.72 It therefore appears that Ortelius specifically requested the verses from Rogers to form a new beginning to the album; Rogers’ poem, appropriately, is an ode to the “school of friends” of Ortelius and begins by invoking whoever it was who first compiled a friendship album.73 In 1598, when Ortelius died, Colius wrote his own name on the recto of the blank cover page. It is probable that the four extra folios, containing the new title pages and dedicatory verses, were bound into the front of the book roughly at the time of writing the verses

71 Ibib., f.7: Heyns presents to Ortelius “Abraham, u stam die wordt nu eeuwich met u hooghe verheven” and refers to Philip II “die nu synen Ortelium in Consten ryck ghemaect heeft Geographum van synen hove.” For Heyns’ role in the production of a miniature version of the atlas, Spieghel der Werelt (1577), see Ortelius’ introduction to his Epitome (1588), an improved version of this work; also H. Meeus, “Abraham Ortelius et Peeter Heyns”, AOCH, 157-8; and P. Van der Krogt, “The Theatrum Orbis Terrarum: the first Atlas?”, AOF A, 76-7.

72 Ortelius, Album, f.1: title page; the blank folio “A” was then inscribed with Colius’ name and the date “1598”.

73 Ibid., flv: “Ode ad Philophylacium Abrahami Ortellii... Qui primus albo, nomina dulcium signanda duxit grata sodalium ...”
(1578), and that the dedication to Colius was a late addition in 1594. If this is the case, then Colius may have produced an index for an album that was only partially bound.

As stated above, Colius dated his index: “Finis. 26 Jan 1596”; but there are eleven entries in the index, written in a different ink, that either occur out of sequence or have been squashed in to the appropriate place after the original index was written: “Aloysius Dichiocus” has been inserted rather messily in the correct position; “Andreas Dycchius” has been inserted out of sequence at the end of the A’s, after “Augustinus Mustus”; “Balthasar Moretus” has been inserted in the correct alphabetical order above the previous first entry in the B’s; at the top of the second page, in the middle of the C’s, “Cornelius Galle” has been inserted out of alphabetical sequence; at the end of the C’s “Cornelius Kilianus Dufflaeus” has been inserted out of sequence; at the end of the D’s “Dierik Volkaert Cornhert” has been inserted in the appropriate place; at the end of the H’s “Hieronymus Scholierus” has been inserted out of sequence; above the L’s “Lazarus Henkelius” has been inserted out of sequence; and at the beginning of the T’s “Theodorus Galle” has been inserted in the correct position. The person who entered these names appears to have inserted names in the proper sequence where this could be done neatly, or where there was no neat alternative; if there was no space to do so, the alphabetic order was interrupted. While the hand in which these names is written is quite similar to that in which the original index was written, the body of each letter is consistently more upright, the formation slightly squarer, suggesting a different author – Ortelius. It would then also be Ortelius who corrected a mistake in Colius’ page numbers: Colius had mis-labelled page 181 as “180”, hence Ortelius labelled a later entry on the previous page (p.180) as “179b”. The hypothesis that Ortelius made these changes is supported by the

74 The dedication to Colius on f.1 is dated 1 June 1596. On 27 January 1593 Ortelius had warned Colius that “Omnia mea tibi lubens in manu tradidisset. Nunc alium cogitabo”: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no.228. It seems that the latter placated his uncle, whose main complaint was Colius’ failure to visit him in Antwerp; it may be that the change of heart was related to Colius’ marriage to Maria Theeus, which took place on 14 July 1594.

75 Ortelius, Album, ff.122-125.

76 Depuydt notices this change but ascribes it to Colius correcting his own error. Depuydt also notices that the recto of f.12 is not labelled, hence the verso is labelled page 14 instead of 15. He comments that the error is maintained until the end even though an opportunity to correct it occurred when Colius
spelling of the surname “Galle”, which is spelt “Gallaeus” in the original index – the Latinisation indicating less familiarity, as perhaps also in the case of referring to Woverius as “Joannes a Wouther”. Further, in the contribution of Nicolaus Clemens the author signs himself “N. Clemens.T.M” [Trello Mosellanus], which Colius transposed into his index as “Nic. Clemens T”, to which the letters “rello” have been added in the ink of the later index corrections – again implying that the later entries were made by someone who knew the contributors better than Colius.\(^\text{77}\)

To conclude, it seems that Ortelius added these names subsequent to the compilation of the index by Colius. The dates of the contributions of five of the entries confirm this: Cornelius Kilianus (1.2.1596), Andreas Dycchius (21.3.1596), Lazarus Henckel (16.6.1596), Balthasar Moretus (24.9.1596) and Aloysius Dichiocus (6.12.1596). The contribution by Hieronymus Scholierus is undated, but a letter from Ortelius to Colius on 18 October 1595 mentions that Scholierus has been absent and is expected to return soon, and a letter from Scholierus to Colius, dated 1597, celebrates a recently begun friendship, using the same motif that he inscribed in Ortelius’ album, hence it is quite possible that his contribution was made around this time, though it should be noted that his friendship with Ortelius was as old as the album.\(^\text{78}\) The contributions of the Galles, Werdenstein and Woverius are missing, but there is no reason to suppose that they break the pattern, and hence a composition date in 1596 or 1597 can be assumed. The exception is the contribution of Coornhert, which is dated 1579. It is possible that Colius decided not to refer to it in his index because the page containing the contribution had been crossed out, but that Ortelius then reversed this decision by inserting Coornhert’s name. This raises the question of who crossed out Coornhert’s contribution; unfortunately, the “Quia” written at the foot of the page is insufficient evidence to identify the handwriting, though the letter-formation matches that of both Ortelius and Colius.\(^\text{79}\)

From the evidence of the index it appears that Ortelius did not

labelled both f.51v and 52r “103” – but 52v is blank and 53r is numbered “104”, hence the fault remains uncorrected: Depuydt, “Le cercle d’amis et de correspondants autour d’Abraham Ortelius,” in AOCH, 119. Consultation of the manuscript reveals that Colius made no error in the second instance – f.52 is a thinner leaf that must have been inserted after Colius compiled his index. It contains a picture representing the friendship of Ortelius and Philips van Winghe, inserted beside the portrait of the latter, who died unexpectedly young in 1592. Colius only ascribes a single page to Winghe; Ortelius later altered the index entry to “103...”, flagging the interpolation after page 103 by adding the dots. Hence Colius’ numbering at this point was not in error; rather an extra leaf was added between his pages 103 and 104 by Ortelius after the index was completed.

\(^\text{77}\) Ortelius, Album, ff.122-125.

\(^\text{78}\) Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, nos.278 & 301.

\(^\text{79}\) Ortelius, Album, f.120.
wish for the entry to be erased from his album; whether this was a change of heart, or whether the crossing-out was done by someone else, is not clear from the evidence. A final change to the index can be identified in the closing signature. The words “Finis. 26 Jan 1596” are in a different ink from what follows: “Antverpia hunc ind. scripsi Jac Colius Ort.” This supports the argument that Colius compiled the index assuming the album to be finished.

There are two notable features of the entries that were recorded in the index but that have subsequently been lost. First, some of them appear to have been among those entries that were added to the index out of sequence, indicating that they were late contributions; second, some of the others seem to have been written in 1577 or 1578. The former category comprises the entries of Cornelius and Theodorus Galle, Ioannes Georgius a Werdenstein, and Ioannes Woverius. The page numbers given in the index reveal the original positions of the missing leaves, as noted by Depuydt. Assuming that the entries of the Galle brothers (p.251 & p.253) were made on conjugate leaves of a single folio, all of these contributions were connected to others that occur in the appropriate place in the index. Thus the contributions of the Galle brothers were conjugate to that of Joachim Margenrode (p.250), the contribution of Woverius (p.130) was conjugate to that of Marcus Geeraerts (p.131), and the contribution of Werdenstein (p.179b) was conjugate to that of Gerartus Heeselt (p.180). This means that the pages on which they made their contributions were part of the album itself prior to the compilation of Colius’ index – they were not loose sheets. The second group, those entries that seem likely to have been written in 1577 or 1578, were contributed by Emmanuel van Meteren, Clement Perret, and Marcus Geeraerts. The entries by Clement Perret and Marcus Geeraerts are only in part missing, and the extant halves are both dated “1577”. Van Meteren’s contribution is entirely lost, but there remains a response to it composed by Daniel Rogers that may have been copied in by Van Meteren himself; Rogers’ other contribution was made in 1578, as discussed above, and it is probable that his poem about Van Meteren’s

---

80 Ibid., f.125.  
82 Ortelius, Album, ff.122-125. For the odd numbering of Werdenstein’s contribution see above and n.76.
contribution links the three entries as a group. To these may be added the contribution of the Italian humanist Paolo Giustiniani, also dated 1578, which was not made during Ortelius’ trip to Italy that year but rather, as the entry itself states, at the behest of Emanuel van Meteren, who was then in London. Hence the contributions of Rogers, Perret, Van Meteren, Geeraerts and Giustiniani were all made in England in 1577 and 1578, along with those of Thomas Wilson, Richard Garth, John Dee, William Charke and William Camden, which all specify their location and date. Ortelius himself was only in England for several months in 1577, yet the album was evidently there after his departure. A letter to Ortelius from Alexander Grapheus, written in Cologne on 1 June 1577, reveals that the album was brought to the author in Aix-la-Chapelle; the album entry itself bears the same date. From there the album returned to England, where Camden signed it on 21 September, and where it stayed until the end of the following year. This last fact has been missed by historians, who have assumed that the album travelled with Ortelius during his journey through Germany to Italy in late 1577 and 1578. Aside from the contribution of Grapheus, there are eight entries that were made on the continent during Ortelius’ trip, but careful analysis of the manuscript reveals that each of these was made on a loose sheet of paper that was later pasted into the album; indeed, the entry by Daniel Engelhart was a letter which still contains a fragment of the original seal.

The large number of contributions to the album in these two years, many of them collected as loose sheets, may well have been the reason for the reorganisation of the album mentioned above, placing the verses by Rogers at the front with a new title page. Thus, the contributions of Hubert Languet, Pirro Ligorio and Augustino Musto were pasted in at the back of the volume, so that the last entry was no longer that of...

---

83 Ortelius, Album, f.37 is Rogers’ poem on Van Meteren’s contribution – Colius labelled it page “74” under both Rogers’ and Van Meteren’s names. His page “73” is now missing but contained the contribution from Van Meteren to which Rogers’ poem refers. Rogers’ other contribution is the poem that now opens the album on ff.1v-3.
84 Ibid., f.106v: “Per comandamento del virtuoso sig. Ortelio mihi imparto dal s. Emanuele.”
85 Ortelius, Album, ff. 1v-3, 33v, 37, 54 and 106v respectively; and ff.18, 24, 89, 100v-101 and 113v respectively.
86 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no.69.
87 Ibid., no.72 and Ortelius, Album, f.113v.
88 Ortelius, Album, f.7v (Daniel Engelhart), f.120v (Hubert Languet), ff.37v-38v (Adolph Occo), f.57v (Hieronymus Wolfius), f.121 (Augustino Musto), f.121v (Pirro Ligorio), f.15 (Paul Gerardius), and f.8v (Herman Hortenberg). Puraye dated the entry by Joannes Hermannus (f.9v) to 1578, apparently relying on the poor quality reproduction in his own facsimile edition; consultation of the manuscript reveals clearly that the text is dated “85” and was thus made in 1585 with the other contributions in Breslau.
Pulmannus. It was therefore probably after this date that Joachim Margenrode, about whom nothing is known, made his contribution. Margenrode’s entry is referred to as page “250” by Colius; pages “251” and “253” were signed later by the Galle brothers, after Colius had completed his index. Given that all these entries are lost, and that the back of the album was altered in 1578, it is likely that these entries were conjugate on a folio that was inserted during this rearrangement, and it is possible that they were poorly integrated with the rest of the collection, resulting in their eventual separation from it. Thus, too much blame may have been placed on the nineteenth-century re-binding of the album, and the loss of artistic works from the collection may have had as much to do with poor binding of loose sheets as with their supposed deliberate removal by subsequent collectors. However, the missing contributions of Joris Hoefnagel and Jean Bodin present a different problem. These entries were made on successive pages of the same leaf. The two extant entries by Joris Hoefnagel were contributed on widely separate dates: 1574 and 1592; Jean Bodin’s entry was probably made during his time in Antwerp in the entourage of the Duke of Alencon in 1582 – thus they do not fit the profile of the other missing entries. At some stage after Ortelius’ correction of Colius’ index and before the description of the album by Hessels in 1887 one folio (Colius’ pages 26-9) was moved to between Colius’ pages 2 and 3, dividing in two the contribution of Peter Heyns. It is the leaf following the original position of this folio (Colius’ pages 30 and 31) that is missing; again, therefore, it is possible that it became insecurely attached, whether its ultimate removal from the volume was deliberate or not.

Before analysing the relation of the album to the networks within which it was collected, it is necessary to consider the process by which it was compiled over time. As discussed above, Ortelius began to collect his album in the wake of new-found

89 Ibid., f.120v (Languet), f.121 (Musto), f.121v (Ligorio) – Pulmannus’ entry is above that of Languet on f.120v.
90 Ibid., ff.122v-124v.
91 Contra Depuydt, “Le cercle d’amis et de correspondants autour d’Abraham Ortelius,” in AOCCH, 120.
92 Ortelius, Album, ff.6-6v (Hoefnagel). Of course, there is no way to confirm the dating of Bodin’s contribution, since it is no longer extant; lacking other evidence, his stay in Antwerp is the most likely time.
93 On the moving of this folio see Depuydt, “Le cercle d’amis et de correspondants autour d’Abraham Ortelius,” in AOCCH, 119; however, he does not suspect a link with the loss of the two subsequent entries.
fame, having attained the title “Geographer of the King”, and following publication of his numismatic image gallery. In 1573 Ortelius also published the first expanded version of his atlas, capitalising on its intellectual as well as commercial success – the supplement was the fruit of reader-response to the atlas and fulfilled the promise of the first edition to inaugurate a collaborative work-in-progress. Inauguration of the friendship album was, by contrast, a notably local affair, beginning with the collection of signatures from close friends. The first few inscriptions were made in Antwerp, followed by a series of contributions made in Bruges during the summer of 1574, after which the album returned to Antwerp. Several entries were made in Louvain in the summer of 1575, from whence the album passed through Antwerp and then on to Frankfurt for the autumn book fair. It was then brought to Cologne, where Mercator contributed his portrait with a brief tribute to Ortelius. Only two entries are dated 1576, though that of Arnold Freitag may have been written on 13 January 1577 (taking into account variations in dating the new year). In 1577, Ortelius took the album with him to England and thence through Germany en route to Italy. Although Ortelius did not travel to England again the following year (1578), he sent the album to friends there, where it stayed at least from the beginning of May until the end of November. It was passed between Leiden and Antwerp during 1579 and 1580, then remained in Antwerp (acquiring only a few signatures) until mid-1583, when it appeared in Breslau, staying there at least until August 1585. At some stage during the next two years it returned to Antwerp, where it seems to have remained until Ortelius’ death, despite having been dedicated to Colius in 1596.

Whereas many friendship albums were kept as daybooks, sketchbooks, or signature albums during a peregrinatio academica, Ortelius’ album travelled without him. This is revealed by the fact that some of the inscriptions made outside Antwerp coincide with journeys he made, but some do not. The rhythm of contribution to the album
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94 Ortelius, Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1573, and Additamentum Theatri Orbis Terrarum, 1573 – both printed by Anthony Coppens van Diest.
95 Ortelius, Album, f.114v. For the development and movement of the atlas over time see the appendix of contributions arranged in chronological order.
96 Ibid., ff.79v-80 (Freitag) and 87v-88 (Alvarus Nunez).
97 The trip to England has been discussed; the album also spent two years in Breslau, 1583-85, though Ortelius never travelled there, as is revealed by a letter and the contribution from his close friend Jacob Monau, whom he never met and who lived in Breslau all his life. See Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no.89: “saepe miror animum erga me tuum quo amicum ignotum et nunquam de te bene
thus varies as much due to its geographical displacement through various urban humanist centres as to the fluctuating interest of its owner and his friends. Often the journeys of the album and its owner reflect the political vicissitudes of the Low Countries during the period of the album’s compilation, whether directly (through the themes inscribed in it) or indirectly (through the personal histories of the people encountered). Thus, the sparse number of contributions dated 1576 may be due to the turmoil in Antwerp at the time, while the journeys to England, Germany and Italy in 1577 and 1578 reflect both increasing freedom of movement in the wake of the Pacification of Ghent and Ortelius’ desire to escape the troubled regions of the Low Countries. The spate of inscriptions made in Antwerp and Leiden in 1579 and 1580 reveals the influx to Antwerp of scholars following William of Orange who were involved in the early years of Leiden University. The difficult and polemical situation in Antwerp in the early 1580s perhaps in part explains the small number of contributions. While the sending of the album to England in 1578 and Breslau in 1583 probably reflects the movements of individual people who could be used to bring it to the hub of relevant circles, it may also reflect a prudent desire to remove the album from Antwerp during times when political repression appeared to be looming.

Given this manner of collecting the album, it is not clear to what use it was put. Although the total number of entries is quite large, the rate of collection varies greatly over time. In the first two years contributions were made just less than once a fortnight, with two exceptions (1584/5 and 1596), from 1580 onwards the rate was about once or twice a year. While in the early years the album seems to have moved quickly to and from centres such as Bruges and Cologne, later it stayed longer in London (six months) and Breslau (roughly two years). By whom was the album kept meritum tanta tamen et fide et humanitate complecteris”; and Ortelius, Album, ff.93v-94: “Quod nec visum unquam, et tantum de nomine notum Monavium, plus quam credere possit, amas.”

98 The entries of Adolphus Occo (ff.37v-38) and Hieronymus Wolfius (f.57v) in 1577 convey the sense of friendship formed amid danger and exile. Herman Hortenberg (f.8v) expresses it explicitly: “Te, Musas, Charites, nunc simul hospites duris eripiunt Numina, Casibus: ut rebus placidis, vos vehant.”

99 This milieu is detailed extensively by Jan Van Dorsten, Poets, Patrons and Professors, though he omits from his analysis the Antwerp years in the early 1580s, perhaps because he follows the fortunes of Daniel Rogers, who was at that time imprisoned. The milieu and its ideas are also effectively discussed, though with an overstated emphasis on the Family of Love, by Nicolette Mout: “Het intellectuele milieu van Willem van Oranje”, BMGN, 99 (1984), 596-625; and “Abschied von Erasmiianismus. Humanisten und der niederländische Aufstand”, in Duck & Klaniczay, eds., Das Ende der Renaissance: Europäische Kultur um 1600, Wiesbaden, 1987, 63-80.
and circulated? Was it kept secretly? Who determined whether someone should be invited to contribute? The problem arises again for entries made in Antwerp in the 1590s: while Ortelius himself invited some to contribute, others appear to have done so either uninvited or at the behest of a third party.100 There are a number of examples of someone writing that a friend requested his contribution, though it is not always clear whether this was an indirect request from Ortelius himself.101 These considerations are central to understanding the purpose of collecting the album in the first place. If it was intended for the glory of Ortelius, and perhaps also of the contributors, was it viewed by anyone other than those who contributed? Did those who circulated the album feel the need to hide it from unfriendly eyes and the investigations of the Inquisition? Could Ortelius display the album openly in his private museum in Antwerp? Given that the album of his cousin, Emanuel van Meteren, was confiscated by the authorities and examined for the connections it revealed, it is unlikely that Ortelius' album was openly displayed anywhere.102 His sense of the need for concealment and dissimulation in religious matters in the 1590s in Antwerp (discussed in the previous chapter) must have affected his album as well, particularly since it was his friendships with Protestants that brought Ortelius trouble in the late 1580s. The contributions of eminent Catholics such as the Bishop of Antwerp, Torrentius, and the Jesuit, Schottus, reveal that Ortelius had trusted friends of both influence and moderate outlook, but not that the religious climate of Antwerp was lenient or non-intrusive.103 Yet the contribution of entries from people of opposing religious or political positions is extremely significant in that it underlines the extent to which circulation of the manuscript must have been preceded by knowledge of the recipient's trustworthiness. The album thus may have circulated relatively freely within a coterie, not of like-minded individuals, but of individuals who were prepared to sublimate their differences over religion or politics into a higher

100 Ortelius, *Album*, f.43r (Andreus Dycchius), and f.72r (Franciscus Sweerts).
101 In a letter to Ortelius on 1 June 1577, Alexander Graphaeus writes that the album was brought to him "a nescio quo" but that when he opened it "quid velles facile conijciebam": Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no.69. A year later, Rogers reported that he had signed it himself and then left it with Thomas Wilson: Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no.76. As mentioned before, the contribution by Paulo Giustiniani in 1578 was made in response to a request from Ortelius communicated by Van Meteren (see n. 84).
102 As mentioned earlier, see n.27.
103 Ortelius, *Album*, f.10v (Torrentius) and ff.108v-109 (Schottus). Notably Torrentius refused to contribute to Jacob Monavius' *Ipse Faciet*, a volume of verses on the theme of Monavius' motto, on the grounds that the author and various contributors were heretics: Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no.242.
goal of celebrating learning and the learned, emphasising their shared cultivation of virtue rather than focusing upon their different opinions as to what that meant in practice.\textsuperscript{104}

The apparently unsystematic manner in which Ortelius' album was collected has the consequence that the contributors to it might not form a particularly coherent group, but this does not mean that absolutely anyone could enter his or her name. Although not all the contributors knew Ortelius personally, they all had the trust of someone who did, and they all knew of him. Thus personal acquaintance was less important than esteem – both the contributor's esteem for Ortelius and the intermediary's esteem for the contributor. However, this was only the most remote kind of connection to Ortelius; most of the contributors were personally connected to him, though to differing degrees. While it is significant that these different kinds of relationship were celebrated in the same album, it is important to explore the varied contexts of contribution before drawing conclusions about the extent of underlying unity in the entries.

What, then, were the characteristic features of the intellectual culture in which the album was collected? Indeed, was there one culture or several? In this section I will discuss the social structures through which Ortelius' friendships were formed and maintained, and then I will analyse the extent to which this picture alters as the network extends internationally into different geo-political contexts, particularly in London, Leiden and Cologne. Throughout the analysis, I will be concerned with the extent to which the album reflects what is known of the social context in which it was collected.

The immediate circle around Ortelius throughout his life was his family; notably, it is only partially represented in his album. Although he was not married, the omission of his sister Anne, his life-long house-mate and business partner, suggests that a wife would not have been included either. Only two of his immediate family are included:

\textsuperscript{104} "Virtue" and "virtues" are mentioned in many entries, but a particular focus on the former as a counter to the vicissitudes of fortune can be found in Ortelius, \textit{Album}, f.23 (Marcus Laurin), f.23v (Carolus Clustus), ff.24v-25 (Guido Laurin), f.77v (Rambert Dodonaeus), ff.79v-80 (Arnold Freitag) and f.95v Joannes Barvicius).
his cousin, Jacob van Meteren, and his nephew, Jacob Colius. The former, as discussed above, inserted an emblem which is now lost; however, the response by another relative, Daniel Rogers, suggests that the missing contribution focused on the theme of trust. Colius’ entry is a small picture of a tower on which the ‘name of the lord’ is written in Hebrew, and around the tower is inscribed “Refugium Justorum” [refuge of the just], referring to Proverbs 18:10. This image is inserted in a sketch of an ornament designed for Ortelius’ numismatic collection, Deorum Dearumque Capita, representing the theme of honour. Colius signed his contribution using, perhaps for the first time, the appellation ‘Ortelianus’ that he continued to use for the remainder of his life, indicating his status as Ortelius’ adoptive son or spiritual heir. As we have seen, he also wrote the index to the album while in Antwerp examining his uncle’s coin collection in January 1596. Both Colius and Van Meteren maintained intimacy and shared intellectual pursuits with Ortelius despite geographical separation. It is presumably for these reasons, rather than on account of blood relationship, that they were numbered among Ortelius’ ‘friends’. Humanism was their qualification, not consanguinity.

Yet family links were extremely important within the network, as is revealed by the manner in which Ortelius ‘fostered’ his nephew Colius, seeking to promote his interests in intellectual networks across Europe. Likewise, Ortelius seems to have been proud of his connection through marriage to Daniel Rogers. The families of friends are also evident both in the album and in Ortelius’ wider network, which was an intricate web of family connections. The most obvious examples are the Heyns
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106 Ibid., Album, f.78r: Jacob Colius. Proverbs 18:10, “The name of the Lord is a strong tower; the righteous run to it and are safe,” (N.I.V.).
107 Ortelius, Deorum Dearumque Capita (Antwerp: Galle, 1573).
108 Ortelius, Album, 112r-125r. See also, Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 286.
109 Colius dedicated his Syntagma Herbarum Encomiasticum (1614) to Ortelius and was his primary heir. Van Meteren likewise dedicated his Historia Belgica (1599) to Ortelius.
110 Colius spent the first eight years of his life in Antwerp with Ortelius, 1563-1571. By 1589 he had adopted the name “Ortelianus”: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, nos.164 and 165; Ortelius introduced him to leading scholars throughout his network: ibid., nos.192, 196, 197, 199 and 303. In the case of Rogers, Ortelius announced in advance in his Theatrum (1570) the study of Ireland upon which his cousin was engaged: “De veterum Britannorum moribus et legibus scriptis Commentarium Daniel Rogerii cognatus noster, sed nondum edit” and seems always to have referred to him as “cognatus noster”, e.g. Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no.144. On account of their family connection, Ortelius had been entrusted with the sale of the books of Daniel’s father, the English Protestant martyr John Rogers: ibid., no.330.
family, the Galle family, and Plantin's relatives. In the former case three contributions are made, including the only entry by a woman, Catherine Heyns, who writes that:

Si ce livre s'appelle  
Reserve des amys,  
Une simple pucelle  
N'y devroit estre admis.  
Mais puis que vous Ortel  
Voulez mon ecriture,  
C'est honneur immortel.  
Excuse ma facture.\textsuperscript{111}

[If this book is designated the reserve of friends, a simple girl should not be admitted. But seeing that you, Ortelius, desire my contribution, it is an immortal honour. Excuse my craftsmanship.]

The Heyns family ran a prestigious school for girls in Antwerp, which is the necessary context to understand this contribution: she was a humanist and poet, who may have had some duties teaching in the school, and as such she was deemed worthy to enter her name, even though she suggests that in general women ought not to be included. Ortelius became a godparent for children in each of the aforementioned families.\textsuperscript{112} Many in the friendship network were connected to one another in similar ways, including marriages into friends' families and transfer of houses from one to another, so that even less intimate members of the circle could be related.\textsuperscript{113} Such an overlap between friendship and kinship relations provided financial and social security, intimacy and trust. It was a means of securing or demonstrating friendship, without in itself being friendship. Integration of this kind would normally suggest that a network

\textsuperscript{111} Ortelius, \textit{Album}, f.117v.
\textsuperscript{112} H. Genard, "La genealogie du geographe Abraham Ortelius" in \textit{Plantiniana IV}, Antwerp, 1881.
\textsuperscript{113} Hessels, \textit{Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae}, preface, lxiii, provides a basic family tree for Ortelius; J.L. Nevinson, "Emanuel van Meteren, 1535-1612", \textit{Proceedings of the Huguenot Society}, XIX (1959), p.128-145, provides similar information with regard to Van Meteren. J. Van Dorsten, \textit{Poets, Patrons and Professors}, 21, documents the broader links of the network, focusing on the exiles in England. Thus, Ortelius was related through marriage to the families of Daniel Rogers, Marcus Geeraerts, Matthias Lobelius, Janus Gruterus and Franciscus Junius, though, with the exception of Rogers, only distantly. Considering that Ortelius never married, these links are quite broad.
was relatively closed to outsiders; however, Ortelius' network was not. The international character of the network, combined with the politically requisite mobility of many of its members, ensured that new people, and their networks, appeared continuously. Nonetheless, family connections remain an appropriate measure of the degree of intimacy of friendship, and the overlapping patterns of kinship suggest small circles of friends in close proximity with one another which formed nodes of the larger networks.

Salutations at the beginning and ends of letters are particularly useful as evidence of these circles, though they must be used carefully since correspondants often send greetings reflecting their own connections, not necessarily those of their recipient. They may also greet those whom they know the recipient will write to rather than see in person (for example, Ortelius is often asked to forward greetings to Monavius, whom he never met), and they may omit references to those with whom they correspond directly. Nonetheless, a sense of the immediate circle around Ortelius can be gleaned from names that recur in letters in which the correspondant sends greetings to his mother or sister (thus revealing intimate knowledge of his situation in Antwerp), and by eliminating from consideration those known to live elsewhere but for whom Ortelius acted as an epistolary intermediary with others in the network (Lipsius, Monavius, Montanus, etc). This list can then be checked against greetings sent in other letters by those whose names appear within this circle, assuming also that correspondants who greet Ortelius' mother and sister have belonged to this intimate group at some stage. The resulting list of friends living in Antwerp consists of Galle, Plantin and Heyns; the correspondants outside Antwerp who forward messages to them are Van Meteren, Colius, Rogers, Thorius, Goltzius, Mylius, Freitag and Arias Montanus. The first three are relatives of Ortelius; the rest lived in Antwerp for a more or less extended period of time and clearly retained intimacy with Ortelius thereafter. A comparison of this list with one compiled from the correspondence of

115 Thus, in this case, geographical centres such as Antwerp, London, Cologne and Leiden; but also circles of intimacy or family such as Ortelius, Vulcanius and Mylius; Dousa, Rogers and Melissus; or Plantin, Moretus and Raphelengius.
116 Ortelius forwards messages from Monavius particularly often in his extensive correspondence with Vulcanius, for which see the next chapter; but also in his correspondence with Lipsius: Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, nos.189, 191, 201 and 208.
Plantin reveals that he was similarly intimate with Galle and Heyns, although Plantin's own close circle is slightly different and the image is complicated by a greater range of professional sub-groups depending on the correspondent. It is not surprising that the list of Orteliuss' intimate friends as gauged by this method coincides closely with the list of families in which he acted as a godfather. This confirms the impression that kinship links were an important consolidation of close friendships; from the opposite perspective, given that families needed godparents, it is not surprising that close friends were asked. It is also important to point out that professional connections between Ortelius, his close friends, and his correspondents, render overlapping references among them likely, but that hardly undermines the depiction of them as a close circle of friends. In each instance these friends also appear to have retained friendship with Ortelius over the course of his life, not merely for a limited period.

Kinship may have been a measure of intimacy, but not necessarily of the importance of the friendship either to the individuals concerned or to their wider network. It is always difficult to gauge the personal dimension of a friendship, and particularly so given the formal rhetoric of friendship that characterises humanist correspondence of this period – effusions of affection and esteem did not necessarily reflect a real relationship. Yet style can be revealing when read in context: Goltzius' consistent use of Dutch to Ortelius was clearly a preference reflecting intimacy, given that he discussed Latin inscriptions, whereas Emmanuel van Meteren's use of Dutch may simply have been a reflection of his lack of facility in Latin. Prestige and usefulness were also key factors in the value placed on a friendship; for example, Ortelius' cultivation of the friendship of Benito Arias Montanus or Torrentius was extremely useful as a means of protecting himself from religious scrutiny, likewise his friendships with Lipsius and Vulcanius were useful for his scholarly endeavours, and each of these individuals represented a prestigious association to have, yet with each of these friends Ortelius shared affection and common interests. The mutual

---

117 Both Goltzius and Van Meteren consistently used Dutch in correspondence with Ortelius but not necessarily with others. In an early letter, Ortelius joked about not writing in Latin to Van Meteren; later, in 1592, he advised his cousin to employ a translator to produce a Latin text of his history, since to produce it himself would take too long: Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, nos. 7 and 218.

118 Ortelius' friendships with Montanus and Lipsius have been the subject of some scrutiny: J. De Landsheer, "Benito Arias Montano and the Friends from his Antwerp Sojourn", *De Gulden Passer*, 80 (2002), 43–6; J. Depuydt, "'Vale verum antiquae historiae lumen'; Antiquarianism in the
esteem with which these individuals regarded one another and the benefits they
accrued by association together were constituent parts of the genuine affection with
which they befriended Ortelius. Thus no easy distinction can be made between
genuine friendships and relationships of mutual professional or social advantage.

On the basis of the limited evidence available, it is difficult to gauge to what extent
Ortelius’ language of friendship was shaped for the recipient, thus whether it reflected
actual relationships. His overall style alters little in his extant Latin correspondence,
but the tone of his personal remarks to Vulcanius is more affectionate than his tone to
Lipsius. It could be argued that effusive protestations of affection are merely
rhetorical, and that well-established friendship is expressed in more subdued or direct
tones (Lipsius himself argues this in his handbook of letter-writing style); however,
other evidence suggests that Ortelius’ feelings for Lipsius were indeed more equivocal
than his feelings for Vulcanius, implying that the language of his letters was
sincere. In this context the letters from Monavius to Ortelius are significant, though
the replies are not extant; Monavius writes extremely affectionately, despite never
having met Ortelius in person. Monavius himself commented with surprise on the
strength of Ortelius’ feelings for him as gauged not merely by his letters but also by
the gifts that accompany them. The friendship is an example of affection conceived
through correspondence, a phenomenon recorded (and imitated) at least from the time
of St Jerome. While it is tempting to find utilitarian motives in such relationships
(such as the value of networking for attaining prestige, influence or practical goals),

Correspondence between Justus Lipsius and Abraham Ortelius”, in Justus Lipsius Europae Lumen et
Columnen, eds., Tournoy, De Landtsheer & Papy, Leuven, 1999, 34-46. A good portrait of the
friendship of Ortelius, Torrentius and Lipsius is provided by Lipsius’ letter to Ortelius ‘de gestatione’: ILE, 94.06.30. For Ortelius’ friendship with Vulcanius see the next chapter.

Ortelius often addressed Vulcanius as “amicissime”, “anatissime” or “optime amicorum”, even
stating; “me inter tui studiosos si numeraveris, non erraveris”; he addresses Lipsius rather as “mi
Lipsi”, or with tokens of friendly respect such as “clarissime” and “verum antiquae historiae lumen”: see Vulcanius Correspondence 81 11 26, 82 03 12, 82 06 05 and, most notably, 96 05 20; for Lipsius
see ILE, 92 08 20 O, 93 06 09 and 95 09 29.

Lipsius, Epistolica Institutio, 1591 – of course, Lipsius’ letters merely use a different kind of
rhetoric, preferring drama to prolixity. Although Ortelius consistently maintained support for Lipsius
during and after the latter’s controversial departure from Leiden, in private correspondence his
assessment was quite reserved: “Vereor autem valde ne potius dicere bene, quam esse, summio studio
contendat”; Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 214.

Monavius refers to Ortelius as “optime et amicissime”, “carissime” and uses phrases such as “saepce
miror animum arga me; tuum” and “meque quod facis amae; tui perpetuo amantisissimum et
studioissimum dum vita Deosque sinet futurum”: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, nos. 89, 106
and 242; and letters dated 22 July 1597 and September 1597 in Leiden MSS Vulc 105 III. On the
Christian tradition of epistolary friendship in late antiquity see C. White, Christian Friendship in the
the small amount of polite flattery required to oil the workings of patronage is recognisably different from the effusive rhetoric of epistolary intimacy. Such friendships were often extremely useful, but the expressions of affection went beyond the merely useful. That correspondants often express affection through the language of esteem suggests that at least part of the key to their fervour is the feeling of having established a mutual understanding with a prestigious figure, and what that might reflect about themselves.

Although the sphere of Ortelius’ intimate friends extended beyond the limits of Antwerp, particularly as more and more people left the city for political or religious reasons, the majority of his correspondants and acquaintances were primarily professional connections, some formed within Antwerp, others during research trips abroad. Early modern towns were cramped and over-crowded; this was particularly the case in Antwerp where the population grew dramatically up to the beginning of the revolt, requiring considerable planning and alterations to the medieval town.122

Under such circumstances people connected through trade tended to conglomerate in one area. Most of Ortelius’ time in the city would have been spent within an area of about one square mile (around Lombardenvest) where the artists, and printer-publishers, tended to live and work. He would also have frequented the area around the Nieuwe Beurs, the stock exchange where artists kept stalls, which became a second focal point for artists and printer-publishers. This spatial proximity was enhanced by guild networks.123 Ortelius’ professional milieu was his neighbourhood and many of his closest friendships were formed and maintained in this setting: Galle and Plantin are only the most obvious. A still narrower focus can be drawn around Ortelius’ house and the print shop of Plantin. The latter in particular was a centre around which humanists visiting Antwerp tended to flock.124 Print houses across Europe tended to play this role because they constantly had a number of humanists working as proof-readers, artists or translators, or personally supervising publication

of their work, or simply aiming to meet learned humanists in the town – such gatherings were self-perpetuating. It is possible that Ortelius’ house, which he turned into a museum of curiosities that became a site of some celebrity in Antwerp, formed a similar focus in later years.  

Many humanist works reproduced lists of scholars resident in major towns, not merely as a tribute to the prestige of the location but also as a guide for travelling scholars that revealed whom to visit in each place. The mention of Ortelius in some of these (Goltzius' Caesar or Guicciardini’s Descrittione are good early examples) makes it likely that he received visits from such itinerant scholars. This is an important aspect of the intellectual culture of the period because it ensured that the scholarly world was smaller and more intimate than it might otherwise have been.

This professional milieu reveals itself throughout the pages of Ortelius’ album. As an illustrator of maps, he was a member of the artists’ guild of St Luke, which in Antwerp also included printers. Not only are a significant number of the signatories of his album connected to this guild, but he also seems to have used his contacts within it to forge professional links with artists elsewhere, providing a convenient network through which to pursue his trade in maps and works of art. Thus, for example, through Galle Ortelius was brought into contact with the engraver, poet and philosopher, Dirk Coornhert, and with the humanist artist, Hendrik Goltzius. These professional links were particularly significant in the Low Countries where the rich traditions of learning and humanism penetrated deeply into the artisan culture. Ortelius drew upon these connections in his work, not merely to get his atlas engraved and lavishly adorned, but also to have sketches made of coins, inscriptions and images that were pertinent to his antiquarian studies. Although a competent illustrator in his own right, he seems to have brought expert artists with him on important journeys – to Italy with Breughel in 1552 and Hoefnagel in 1578, to Poitiers in 1560 with Galle and Hogenberg, and on his tour through Luxemburg and Lorraine in 1575 with Vivianus. His own contributions to antiquarian scholarship, as will appear in the next chapter, were heavily indebted to his background in the artists’ guild of St Luke.

---

126 Thieme-Becker, Allgemeines Lexicon der Bildenden Kuenstler, s.v. “Goltzius, Hendrick.”
127 The best study of this subject is now indisputably T. Meganck, Erudite Eyes: Artists and Antiquarians in the Circle of Abraham Ortelius (1527-1598), Ph.D diss., Princeton, 2003; see also E.M. Kavaler, Peter Bruegel: Parables of Order and Enterprise.
(which had a high reputation in Antwerp for its involvement in the arts generally, particularly through the associated chamber of rhetoric, the "Violieren"). He also patronised the arts in Antwerp, gaining commissions for Martin de Vos, making known the ideas of Lambert Lombard, and collecting the paintings of Dürer and Breughel. Finally, his connection with printers was also extremely strong, doubtless stemming from their professional affinity with the members of the guild of St Luke, which was a pragmatic necessity that over-rode the historically troubled relationship between printers and the guild leaders, which was somewhat resolved by the installation of Plantin as the government's licensor of printers. As mentioned earlier, a significant proportion of the contributors to album were artists; indeed, they represent his working milieu much better than professional cartographers, of whom there was only Mercator (though many of the contributors were amateur cartographers or supplied Ortelius with maps). Half of the six deceased friends for whom Ortelius inserted entries were artists. This provides a valuable insight into his working world and the background in which he developed his career. Yet it should be stressed that his engagement with artists was not restricted to Antwerp; the Laurinus brothers in Bruges, with whom he was closely associated in the 1550s and 1560s, were leading patrons of the arts in the Low Countries. Ortelius provided them with connections to artists, but through them he too came into contact with a wider network. Perhaps the most significant aspect of these connections for the present study is that the activities of artists in the publishing industry and in scholarship in general was almost inevitably collaborative, whether as illustrators, or as sketchers of coins or monuments, or as investigators of nature or antiquity in their own right. The extent to

129 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, nos. 330 and 331; also N. Büttner, "Abraham Ortelius comme collectionneur", AOCH, 169-180, and T. Meganck, Erudite Eyes, chapter four. 130 The best study of the interaction between printers and the guild is Jan van der Stock, Printing Images in Antwerp. Ortelius' own statement of his relationship to the industry comes in the form of a letter of advice to Van Meteren, 14 January 1590, in which he explains his personal involvement with the atlas, noting that it is unusual for an author to be so directly engaged in publishing and therefore in the acquisition of profit: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 174.
131 Leon Voet, "Abraham Ortelius and his World", AOF, 25, expresses surprise at the high proportion of artists and printers among Ortelius' most intimate friends; his surprise is surprising – both by background and career trajectory Ortelius was embedded in the artisan networks of the southern Netherlands. The five entries inserted by Ortelius himself are f.10 (Goropius Becanus), f.12v (Breughel), f.13 (Thorius), f.35 (Graphaeus), f.50 (Lambert Lombard), and f.111 (Cornelius Curtius) – Breughel, Lombard and Curtius are artists.
132 He introduced them to Goltzius, as mentioned above, and perhaps Lombard (see Wauwermans, "Ortelius", 296); through them he encountered the entire network of Bruges literati and artists.
which this context contributed to Ortelius’ earliest years as an antiquarian will appear in the next chapter.

The artwork within the *Album Amicorum* is not of the highest order, though it is nevertheless poorly represented by the widely-consulted black-and-white facsimile (and the attractive rubrication of letters is almost entirely lost). The loss (or deliberate removal) of sheets containing contributions from major artists may of course have diminished the quality of the manuscript. Nonetheless, there are several images of some interest, not least the rebuses constructed by Heyns and his son, and the depiction of an altar to friendship by Philip van Winghe. Some of the images have been copied from elsewhere or cut out of books, and some are found in almost identical form in other albums and contain emblematic messages that are not difficult to decipher. Their repeated use elsewhere does not indicate a lack of personalisation, rather the contrary – they are the personal icons of the contributor. Much of the artistic character of the album comes from the decorative ornaments taken from the *Deorum Dearumque Capita*, and from the portraits of friends that have been pasted in – some printed, some hand-painted. Most of the contributions are written in a relatively clear hand; some of those that appear obscure in the facsimile edition are so because of the use of coloured ink, or because they were written on parchment. There are a number of skilfully crafted calligraphic hands: notably the contributions of Clemens Perret, Catherine Heyns, and two innovative emblems by Joannes Metellus (one for himself, one for Petrus Ximenes) consisting of anagrams with numbered letters and an accompanying symbol: in a letter to Ortelius he explained that “Verba, symboli sunt anima; pictura vero, corpus” [The words are the soul of the symbol and the picture its body]. While most of the images have self-evident meanings, some, like those of Metellus, could scarcely be understood by an

---

134 Ortelius, *Album*, f.4v (Peter Heyns), f.52 (Winghe), f.104v (Zacharie Heyns).
135 The reticulated image contributed by Torrentius was clearly copied from elsewhere; the contributions of Rogers, d’Heere, Gheeraerts, Marnix and Radermacher were all inserted in other albums: Ortelius, *Album*, f.10v (Torrentius), f.3v (Rogers – Van Meteren’s album), f.29 (d’Heere – Vivianus’ album), f.42 (Marnix – Narsius’ album), f.66 (Gheeraerts – Vivianus’ album) and f.93 (Radermacher – Van Meteren’s album).
136 For the portraits, see n.65.
137 For entries on parchment see n.64. Coloured ink is frequently used in the album to illuminate the texts; poor reproduction of it has affected the legibility of ff.15, 20, 81 and 86v.
138 Ortelius, *Album*, f.33v (Perret), f.68v (Metellus), f.71v (Ximenes & Metellus), f.117v (Catherine Heyns); for Metellus’ explanation of his contributions see Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no.60.
outsider. Indeed, at first glance the album seems to be full of codes; that some of these turn out to be commonplaces is important but should not obscure the oblique aesthetic of the entries. It is difficult to assess to what extent, and for whom, the contributions in different languages contribute to this effect. On the one hand, entries are generally written in the language most often used by the author in a humanist context: Dutch vernacular poets used Dutch, and likewise Neo-Latin and Neo-Greek poets contributed verses in their favoured languages. The use of different languages may have been intended as a tribute to the linguistic facility of Ortelius, but most humanists were similarly competent in several languages, and many were more accomplished in more. On the other hand, the contributions in Hebrew by Joannes Isaac, Christian Isaac and Rudolph Snellius were beyond most people’s, and Ortelius’, comprehension - hence Joannes Isaac provided a translation for Ortelius, which he sent in a letter. When this is taken alongside several of the more obscure emblems, it is perhaps not inappropriate to surmise that the album was intended to be accessible only to initiates, and indeed that may have excluded even some of the contributors. For example, it is doubtful whether a word-of-mouth translation of Galle’s fairly straightforward Dutch rebuses would have been passed round England with the album in Ortelius’ absence. Yet the obscurity of many of the entries to a general audience does not appear to carry a particular purpose, such as hiding political messages. The entries that do contain political comments are not coded, indeed they are quite unambiguous. The editors of the facsimile edition wondered whether the album might conceal in its symbols a deeper religious purpose; yet the religious positions of the contributors span a broad range and it is not clear to me that anything other than the binding brings them together. That they are bound together is significant, revealing the cross-confessional character of Ortelius’ friendship network, though his ecumenical approach was not shared, nor sympathised with, by all the contributors. The esoteric symbols themselves reveal a medley of different connotations that have no underlying connection; most of them are merely ‘witty’, in the sense of skillful

139 For Dutch entries see ff.4v &7 (Heyns), f.14 (Galle), f.20v (Van der Hagen), f.21 (Lorichs), f.29 (d'Heere), f.53v (Gruterus), f.98 (Aquanus), f.112v (Van Hout), f.120 (Coornhert); for Greek entries see ff.30v (Meetkercke), f.34v (Nansius), f.41 (Plancius), 57v (Wolfius), 61v (Falkenbergius), 64v (Damman), 81v (Brinctus), f.100v (Charcus).
140 Ibid., ff.102v, 103v and 117; Isaac’s letter is Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no.59.
141 Ibid., ff.20-20v (Van der Hagen), ff.82v-84 (Douia), ff.96v-98 (Aquanus) – these all contain clear messages either against the Spanish or for the revolt.
puns or twists of concepts, and those that do address religious themes do not demonstrably do so with a particular set of teachings in mind. The messages of Galle and Heyns, which state unambiguously that Christ himself is the only important goal of life, are perhaps the most broadly typical. In his introduction to the facsimile of the album, Jean Puraye hinted that such comments might reveal an underlying sympathy for reforming ideas in the album; later writers have seen it as evidence for familism. Far from indicating the influence of either, the emphasis on Christ follows a pattern that can be traced back much earlier in the sixteenth century (most famously to Cassander and Erasmus, but also to Eschius) to a devotional effort to avoid dogmatic elaboration, particularly in an age of schism. While there is no consistent religious message in the images of the album, its very compilation without regard to religious boundaries lends credence to the image of Ortelius drawn in the previous chapter.

The political context within which these social networks could transgress confessional boundaries has been explored to a limited extent in the previous chapter, particularly with regard to Antwerp. The legal situation with regard to religion (though in little else) in the Low Countries was relatively straightforward; no deviation from orthodoxy, as defined by the church in Rome, was permitted in belief or practice. This position was clearly stated in canon law, and forcefully repeated in the placards issued on behalf of the Habsburg princes of the Low Countries. Scope for disagreement could be found by denying either the legitimacy of the legislation (appealing to natural or divine law) or the necessity of obedience (appealing to personal or constitutional law), but the majority were well aware that jurisprudential quibbling was ineffective in an increasingly centralised legal administration. It was under these circumstances that the lesser nobility sought to force the issue of toleration through recourse to the old methods of magnate recalcitrance and political insurrection, attempting to force the hand of the Governor. The extreme character

143 Ibid., f.7 (Heyns) and f.14 (Galle).
144 Puraye, Abraham Ortelius Album Amicorum, introduction. For less well-known Flemish mystics such as Eschius, and for their connection to elements of late-medieval mysticism, see L. Cognet, Introduction aux Mystiques Rhéo-Flamandes, 282-345.
145 The legal situation in the Netherlands is best analysed by Cauchies & De Schepper, Justice, grâce et législation. Genèse de l'état et moyens juridiques dans les Pays-Bas 1200-1600, Brussels, 1994; and
of this solution reflects anxiety about the undermining of a more pervasive, quietist mode of resistance: ineffective enforcement of the law at a local level. This is a key characteristic of urban religious politics in the Low Countries. The enforcement of royal placards against heresy varied over time, yet even during the most repressive periods local politics determined to some degree the targets of persecution. As is well known, the anabaptists were an easy target on account of their low social position and tended to take the brunt of each new impetus towards the extermination of heresy. By contrast, the Lutheran community in Antwerp evolved in a precarious but tenable situation, evading persecution by social and political conformity and secrecy.

While this religious climate was far from tolerant, it allowed religious pluriformity within certain limited conditions. Within a trading metropolis, such as Antwerp, the foreign merchant community contributed significantly to the presence of heterodox belief, and the town council was extremely anxious to preserve their independence to ensure that this situation could continue in the interests of economic prosperity. Nonetheless, the spread of anabaptism through the conduit of mercantile networks caused considerable pressure to be placed on these privileges – and contributed to the revulsion that other reform-minded individuals often felt for them. The sudden growth of Calvinism in the 1560s put increasing pressure on the authorities to ensure the enforcement of the placards, causing further polarisation of opinion at a local level. The resulting swings between repression and open disobedience that marked the beginnings of widespread revolt in the Low Countries transformed the social climate as well as the religious situation. Not only were there sudden and large movements of peoples, but also commensurate changes in opinion. By the time of the inauguration of Ortelius’ *Album Amicorum* in Antwerp in 1574, the worst period of religious persecution had passed in that city, though the greatest emigration *en masse* came eleven years later, in 1585 and 1586. In between these times, the city became

the focal point of the conflict as a stream of Governors and princes passed through, seeking the support of the populace there, and the city came under the control of a militant Calvinist faction in the early 1580s.148

While Antwerp was unique in terms of both the size of its non-Catholic communities and the extent of political independence it enjoyed as a consequence of its hugely important international trade, the magistracy in many other towns across the Low Countries faced similar, if lesser, problems: religious persecution threatened trade and created factions that might undermine the stability of urban elites. As the studies of the Dutch historian J.J Woltjer have repeatedly shown, a significant proportion of the urban population seems to have had little concern for the religion of neighbours if the only way to alter it was to sacrifice peace and social order. However, the proportion favouring forbearance diminished commensurate to the increasing influence of Calvinists in the political management of the revolt – in other words, as the options for maintaining social order changed. The religious beliefs of the populace changed at a much slower rate than the institutions of daily life, varying according to location and social position.149

The vicissitudes of religious politics from town to town had an enormous impact upon the contours of social life, and the intellectual network of Ortelius is no exception. Ortelius himself remained based in Antwerp throughout his life, and the previous chapter has shown how this affected his religious position.150 Many friends left, whether by choice or compulsion, alternately returning and fleeing in waves as the political situation changed; a list would include most of those in Ortelius’ acquaintance, depending on the definition of exile according to length of time spent abroad. Most constrained were those, like Plantin, whose career relied upon the stability of their urban life; Arnold Mylius’ lucrative opportunity to resettle in Cologne, taking over the Birkmann publishing firm, is a good instance of the

150 Though Herman Hortenberg referred to Ortelius’ trip to Germany and Italy in 1577-8 as “exilium”: Ortelius, Album, f.8v.
exception that proves the rule.  

A notable example is the schoolmaster Peter Heyns, whose forced departure after the Spanish reconquest of Antwerp overturned his life and career. Ortelius looked after Heyns’ affairs after his departure, despite enduring religious investigation on account of the friendship, and ultimately purchased his properties – an instructive example of the interwoven economic and social consequences of remaining in the city. Likewise, the circle of patronage in Bruges round the Laurinus brothers was destroyed by the forced departure of Marcus Laurinus, brought about by a Calvinist coup in the city, and the theft of his collection of antiquities by a band of Scottish mercenaries as he fled to Ostend.

While many academic scholars were less reliant on geographical stability than their merchant or noble humanist friends, the interruption to their careers could be severe, as in the well-known case of Lipsius. On a number of occasions Ortelius was involved in procuring jobs, or information about them, for friends through his influential connections, most notably with regard to a lectureship in medicine at Louvain University which had become vacant due to the temporary (though frequent) absence of Petrus Breughel. Ortelius was well-placed to act as an intermediary in this instance as doctors formed a considerable proportion of Ortelius’ network, perhaps partly because their training in mathematics and natural philosophy made them apt companions for a geographer (though it is clear from Ortelius’ account at Plantin’s print shop that he had an early interest in medical handbooks for self-diagnosis). In 1582 he was asked to find a qualified person to fill a position as

---

151 For Plantin’s fortunes, the standard account of Voet, *The Golden Compa nees*, is still most useful; Mylius has not been thoroughly studied, though his affairs are treated in some detail in J. Denucé, *Oud-nederlandsche kaartmakers in betrekking met Plantijn*, Amsterdam, 1964, 253-264.
154 Ortelius discussed the position with Giselinus, supposing that the position would be filled by Cornelius Gemma; Giselinus then wrote to Ortelius to correct him on this, and to request further information. Ortelius subsequently put Giselinus in direct contact with Breughel: Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, nos., 47 and 48. The medical faculty of Leuven in the sixteenth century has never been adequately studied, though much information is available in the simple archives of the university kept in the Tabularium.
mathematical tutor to the Hungarian humanist Andreas Dudith, then living in Breslau, who had recently retired from the imperial court to pursue intellectual pastimes, and who announced that it should not be difficult for Ortelius to find an appropriate person in the Low Countries due to the uprooting of so many scholars by the wars.156 These scraps of extant evidence in Ortelius’ correspondence invite speculation as to the extent of the role of non-academic networks in the history of early modern universities, both in prosopographical and intellectual terms.

While the destructive impact of war on social networks was significant (resulting in the death of many and inhibiting the free flow of correspondence that was the life-blood of the republic of letters), it could also be creative. The shifting political centres of the revolt brought scholars together as well as driving them apart. Thus, the influx of Protestant intellectuals into Antwerp in the late 1570s in the entourage of William of Orange hugely reinvigorated the intellectual climate of the city after its decimation at the hands of mutineers in 1574 and 1576.157 Ortelius was able to reacquaint himself with Vulcanius, Dousa, Clusius, Languet and Marnix, and to make the acquaintance of Jan van Hout and Rudolph Snellius.158 The prime consequence of this ferment of intellectual encounter was Ortelius’ awakened interest in the fortunes of the recently-founded university of Leiden, on behalf of which Dousa was seeking professors and students throughout the late 1570s and early 1580s. Two of Dousa’s greatest coups in this period, Lipsius and Vulcanius, brought Ortelius into close personal connection with the professorial body, and the connection was further consolidated by the decision of Plantin to buy out the heirs of Willem Sylvius, in order to fill the role of university printer two years after the latter’s death in 1580.159 Whereas the standard historical account depicts Plantin’s departure for Leiden as a tragedy for the Catholic world that reflected the dismal predicament of Antwerp,

156 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no., 114.  
158 Ortelius, Album, ff.23v (Clusius), 42 (Marnix), 112v (Van Hout), 117 (Snellius) and 120v (Languet); Vulcanius Correspondence 81 08 00 and 81 10 28.  
Ortelius eagerly anticipated the contribution Plantin would make to the new seat of learning. The *Album Amicorum* reflects how caught up he was in the growth of the university, as it shuttled back and forth between Antwerp and Leiden in the early 1580s. As an Orangist experiment in the cultivation of a non-aligned intellectual culture, Leiden became one of the main centres for refugees from the wars (a fact which was to have a decisive impact on the political atmosphere of the town), and thus a plethora of possibilities developed with the fledgling university. When Vulcanius took up the position of Professor of Greek in 1581, Ortelius was able to follow affairs particularly closely, acting as intermediary for correspondence from humanists in Cologne, Breslau and Spain who sent messages to the university’s new professors through him in Antwerp: Mylius, Monavius, Montanus.

The role of intermediary in correspondence networks was an integral part of the dynamics of the humanist republic of letters. Scholars often used each other as the means of introduction to a third party, but they also occasionally continued to correspond via this intermediary route, even after having become intimate with the third party. While this was sometimes the reflection of a professional rather than personal connection, in other instances it seems to have been a way of enhancing the sense of communal friendship. Ortelius acted in the capacity of an intermediary for a number of friends, most notably the renowned Breslau humanist Monavius, whom he connected to Lipsius, Plantin, Goltzius, Gruterus, and to his friends and family in England through Colius. The triad of Ortelius, Monavius and Vulcanius is particularly revealing due to the amount of extant material. While Monavius did on occasion write to Vulcanius directly, more often he sent his letters via Ortelius, and often merely included messages for Vulcanius in his letters to Ortelius, which the latter then either transcribed for his friend or simply forwarded to him. Part of the

---

160 Vulcanius Correspondence 82 09 18: "Gaudeo Plantinum academium vestrum suis typis ornamentum."

161 See n.158.


163 See Vulcanius Correspondence, passim.

164 Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolaes*, nos., 89, 105, 106, 131, 144, 156, 184, 189, 191, 195, 199, 201, 205, 208, 212, 214, 242, 265, 266, 277, 278, 288 and 300.

165 The material is conserved mainly in the archives of Leiden University, for which see bibliography; of particular interest is the Ortelius-Vulcanius correspondence (see appendix) as well as the letters from Mylius to Ortelius in Cod. Vulc. 105 III. The following comment of Ortelius conveys briefly the character of the interaction among the three men: “Monavius tibi quaedam communicarem e suis litteris, sed en ipsas, quas lege, neque eas remittere opus” – Vulcanius Correspondence 97 08 22.
logic behind this manner of corresponding was the ease of writing one letter instead of two, or the greater efficiency of sending several letters at once to a central distribution point local to the recipients, allowing a trusted friend to ensure delivery on the basis of the latest news of the intended recipient's whereabouts. Often such postal centres were print houses, or the workshops of leading merchants – places that already dealt with a large amount of correspondence each day and thus had secure means of doing so. Yet postal efficiency and security do not fully account for the phenomenon: occasionally Ortelius mentioned to Vulcanius that it was possible for Monavius to write to him directly, but in fact he remained the intermediary. The effect was to enhance the sense of shared friendship, and perhaps of belonging to a community of friends rather than merely a bilateral relationship. This feature of intellectual interaction is worth noting because it chimes with the allusion to the number three as the basis of the friendships celebrated in the *Album Amicorum*. No explicit connection is likely, but both the album and the epistolary practice of using unnecessary intermediaries contrast sharply with the emphasis on exclusive bilateral friendship found in some of the literature of the period that is clearly influenced by a Platonic (more correctly, Aristophanic) model.

Nonetheless, the imperatives of war lay close beneath the surface of most of the topology of Ortelius' network. Leiden represented for much of the 1580s and 1590s the possibility of scholarly freedom from religious and political restraint, though by the end of the century such an image was scarcely tenable. The conflicting political and religious pressures on the professorial body in the first decades of the university have justly been the subject of much historical scrutiny, as has the episode surrounding the departure of Lipsius. Less well known, and more difficult to analyse, is the impact of this development on non-academic networks. In the case of

---

166 “Hoc itaque repetendum erit a Monavio; aut per me, aut, si mavis, per te” – Vulcanius Correspondence 93 01 01.
167 See above, n.69.
Ortelius it seems that the increasing degree of religious scrutiny in Leiden caused little concern, but not because the university was none of his concern, rather because it continued to flourish. Although quite a close friend of Lipsius, Ortelius viewed his departure from Leiden as a threat to the prosperity of the university, and cast a critical eye on his friend’s behaviour, although he was prepared to defend him in the face of opprobrium and was delighted to support and collaborate with him once he had settled in Louvain. That Ortelius was well aware of the lack of religious freedom in Leiden in the 1590s is revealed indirectly by his comment to his nephew that there was nowhere free from constraint in religious matters.\textsuperscript{170}

After his return from Leiden in 1585, Plantin too found existence in Antwerp difficult, partly due to the need to smooth over the political problems caused by his sojourn in the Protestant north, still more due to the economic crisis caused by the mass emigration of fifty percent of the population after Spanish reconquest. His discontent was widely suspected so that he was variously entreated to relocate his valuable printing business to Paris, Rome and Madrid; instead, he dreamed of moving with Lipsius to Cologne.\textsuperscript{171} Although the plan never came to fruition (Lipsius lingered in Leiden until several years after Plantin’s death in 1589), it conveys much of the attitude to Cologne among Flemish humanists during the worst periods of the revolt against Spanish authority. As an imperial free city and electoral seat, it was one of the prime targets of Protestant ambitions within the Empire, despite the legal protection of the city’s Catholicism provided by the “ecclesiastical reservation” of the Peace of Augsburg, which declared archbishops who converted to Protestantism to have forfeited their ecclesiastical and electoral status – this addendum was added to the Peace of Augsburg in the absence of Protestant delegates, who therefore denied its legitimacy.\textsuperscript{172} Despite the reputation for orthodoxy earned for the city by its university, Cologne was very much in the mind of the delegates who drafted the

\textsuperscript{171} Vulcanius Correspondence 92 08 25; Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no.229.
\textsuperscript{172} Correspondance de Christophe Plantin, nos. 1119 and 1167.
\textsuperscript{173} The most detailed information regarding Cologne in the later sixteenth century can be found in L. Ennen, Geschichte der Stadt Köln, Cologne, 1875. See also C. Neuhausen, Das Ablasswesen in der Stadt Köln von 13. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert, Cologne, 1994; and Mölich & Schwerhoff, eds., Köln als Kommunikationszentrum: Studien zur frühneuzeitlichen Stadtsgeschichte, Cologne, 1999.
reservation. During the 1540s, the Archbishop-Elector of Cologne, Herman von Wied, had attempted to reform his see in a manner that stretched the limits of orthodoxy, even inviting Melanchthon and Bucer to assist him. As a consequence, Von Wied was deposed as a Lutheran by Paul III in 1546. Yet neither this nor the ecclesiastical reservation promulgated at Augsburg prevented further problems arising in Cologne. In 1577 Archbishop Salentin von Isenburg resigned his position in order to marry, thus recognising the authority of the ecclesiastical reservation. However, his successor, Gebhard von Truchsess, was not so compliant. Prompted by Protestant advisors, he chose to marry into the Calvinist Mansfeld family and refused to forfeit his see and electoral position. In the confusion that followed, Ernest von Bayern, a member of the ultra-Catholic Wittelsbach family from Bavaria, was installed as archbishop and secured control of his see in the subsequent war of Cologne (1583-88). Truchsess fled to join William of Orange in Delft in 1583, having lost the military support of Johann Casimir, whose interests were diverted towards succession within the Palatinate. The outcome of the Cologne war turned the tide of Catholic fortunes in the Empire and under Ernest of Bavaria the city became a bulwark of the Counter Reformation.

The failure of the Protestant party in Cologne has resulted in its gradual eclipse in subsequent historiography, to the extent that the proposals of Ghent’s Calvinist leadership in 1583 that the Low Countries should form a union with the city now seem inexplicable. Yet Cologne’s political position with regard to the revolt had been a matter of constant concern to the Duke of Alva since 1568 when William of Orange had used the city as a political and financial centre for the preparation of his invasion of the Low Countries. He placed considerable pressure on the town administration to suppress the influx of Flemish Protestant refugees, while Orange and Louis of Nassau applied contrary pressure, attempting to secure the continued

174 The Archives de la Maison Orange-Nassau, vols. III & IV, document the efforts of Louis of Nassau and William of Orange to gain the conversion and/or support of Archbishop Salentin d’Isemberg: see vol. III.441-4, IV.133, 195, 224, 284 and 335-6.
175 L. Ennen, Geschichte der Stadt Köln, vol. 4; 572-779; Möhlich & Schwerhoff, eds., Köln als Kommunikationszentrum: Studien zur frühneuzeitlichen Stadtgeschichte, Cologne, 1999, 116-140; G. Parker, The Dutch Revolt; and ibid., The Thirty Years War, 18.
176 See C.V. Wedgwood, William the Silent, London, 1948, 244-5.
quiescence of the town, or active support for the revolt.\textsuperscript{177} Although the (at that time Catholic) lawyer from Utrecht, Arnold Buchelius, exaggerated in 1587 when he claimed that in Cologne "The majority have embraced Calvinism and some also Lutheranism, but they obey the magistrate as they should", the religious composition of the town was inevitably strongly influenced by the struggle over its political fate.\textsuperscript{178}

Although anabaptists (typically of a low social background) were persecuted consistently throughout the century, other forms of dissenting opinion were able to establish themselves in the merchant community. In 1565 the burgermaster, Arnold von Siegen, wrote to the emperor that he could no longer maintain his position because the council was straying from the old religion. However, two years later the council held fast when Theodor Fabritius, superintendent in Anhalt, pushed it to reject Catholicism.\textsuperscript{179} The interests of the council were not in reform but in the maintenance of order and prosperity. This position became increasingly problematic due to the rapid spread of Calvinism through the Low Countries in the mid-1560s, leading to hedge-preaching within the Cologne area, and the threat of iconoclasm, which exercised the minds of the council throughout 1566 and 1567.\textsuperscript{180} Already in 1560, Commendone, nuncio to the archbishop, had warned of the threat to religion caused by immigrants, and throughout the decade foreign merchants were required to carry documents asserting their orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{181} Yet the town’s interests were greatly served by the influx of Flemish refugees, reviving the silk industry and bringing new commercial methods that resulted in the establishment of a Flemish-style Bourse [market/exchange] in 1566. By 1568 there were approximately 150 Flemish families there, contributing some 60 businesses. Nonetheless, the council felt compelled to implement measures to safeguard Catholicism in 1570, resulting in the departure of up to 2000 immigrants.\textsuperscript{182} Thereafter, the city was supposedly less hospitable to non-Catholics, yet it housed the Schwenckfeldian Aggaeus van Albada and the familial heresiarch Hendrik Niclaes in the 1570s, and the latter’s successor, Hendrik Jansen van Barrefelt, settled there in the 1580s. The city remained one of the first ports of

\textsuperscript{177} Archives de la Maison Orange-Nassau, vol. III.441-4 & IV.224.
\textsuperscript{179} L. Ennen, Geschichte der Stadt Köln, vol. 4, 800.
\textsuperscript{180} L. Ennen, Geschichte der Stadt Köln, vol. 4, 834-5.
\textsuperscript{181} L. Ennen, Geschichte der Stadt Köln, vol. 4, 835-7.
call for exiles from the Low Countries; thus, most of the Portuguese “new Christian” merchants who left Antwerp between 1583 and 1585 went there, while during the subsequent five years there were about forty Flemish expatriates trading overland with Italy from Cologne.183

The reputation of the city’s university as a conservative bastion of old-fashioned Catholicism against both heresy and humanism was earned with gusto in the early decades of the sixteenth century, evoking the comment from Agrippa of Nettesheim that “When anyone wants to designate a plan as exceptionally ill conceived, he calls it a ‘Cologne decision.’”184 Nonetheless, a younger generation of scholars showed greater readiness to adopt new approaches and engage in dialogue, the most familiar of whom is the influential advocate of tolerant Catholicism, Joris Cassander, but there were also lesser figures, such as Ortvinus Gratius, who advocated a moderate humanist approach to resolving religious controversy.185 Although these figures never gained the ascendancy in the university, they had a direct influence on the humanist community in the city, and indeed on Ortelius’ friends, some of whom were taught by Cassander and explicitly sought to preserve his legacy.186 Nonetheless, the predominant influence in religious life in Cologne was the Chancellor, Johannes Gropper, who drove the early reforming initiatives of Herman von Wied, attempting to established a territorial reformed Catholic Church in the years 1526-1536, culminating in the Council of Cologne, which was an important precursor to the doctrines later promulgated at Trent. Gropper attained international celebrity through

183 L. Ennen, Geschichte der Stadt Köln, vol. 4, 727-42; A. Hamilton, The Family of Love, 61-4; and J. Israel, Dutch Primacy in World Trade 1585-1740, 28-37. The town remained in a great degree of turmoil because of the Dutch immigrants, as is evidenced in the following letter to Jean de Nassau: “Wir Catholische besorgen uns nit wenig das die Lutherische und Calvinische ketzereien mit diesen itzigen Niederlendischen krieg und trubelen die lenge so weidt zu reisen möchte, das man nit allein im Niederlandt, sonder auch etwan alhier in dieser stadt und weiters nit woel verhuetten noch voerkommen möchte, das sie nit auch irer religion publica exercitia haben wolten, das uns geistliche waerlich in’s gemein zu geringen vortheil gereichen würde und ungern sehen; jedoch versehe ich mich die Hern Jesuiten werden’s an sich, mit zuthuen anderer, ungern darzu kommen laszen und soviel möglich verhinderen, daran ich keinen zweiffel hab; seindt vii der meinung, haben ire hoeffnung seher dauff gesteldet, vermeinen auch nit geringen beystandt zu haben” – Archives de la Maison Orange-Nassau, vol. VI.489-90: 28 November 1578 (George of Wittgenstein to Comte Jean de Nassau).
185 Ibid., 131-6 and 144-9; L. Ennen, Geschichte der Stadt Köln, vol. 4, 726-745.
his personal triumph at the Regensburg Colloquy in 1541, where he negotiated agreement (later undermined) with the Protestant representatives over the divisive doctrine of justification. His influence within Cologne lessened during the 1540s due to his staunch opposition to Archbishop Von Wied’s request for assistance from Bucer and Melanchthon; however, his position was somewhat re-established after the dismissal of Von Wied in 1546, and was confirmed by his appointment as a cardinal in 1556 by the ultra-orthodox Paul IV, who thereby indicated his support for the reforms Gropper had introduced after 1536. Nonetheless, it was the Jesuits, under the guidance of Canisius, who proved the most dynamic and influential force at the university, having established a college there in 1555. While the town council struggled to balance the competing demands of religious duty and mercantile logic, the church rapidly developed into one of the key centres of Catholic reform in Northern Europe – both intellectually and politically. Thus, the image of Cologne as dominated by a sterile orthodoxy alien to humanism was, by the mid-1550s, at best an anachronism.

In 1579, in his *Synonymia Geographica*, Ortelius described the Cologne as “a celebrated city, possessing not only a strict university but also illustrious trade”, encapsulating the dual character of the city. He spent more time in the city than anywhere else outside the southern Netherlands, using it as the basis of his frequent trips to the Frankfurt book fair. Three of his closest intellectual colleagues and friends lived there for much of their lives – Mylius, Hogenberg and Braun – while Coornhert, Graphaeus, Lipsius, Vulcanius and others spent extended periods there. Both Ortelius and Plantin relied heavily on the intellectual networks in the city, and it was one of the main centres within which the *Album Amicorum* was collected. The importance of the city to the network lay in its primacy within the book trade, its position as a centre for Flemish refugees, and the relative freedom from religious scrutiny enjoyed by its residents (and defended by the town council in response to
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188 Mölich & Schwerhoff, eds., *Köln als Kommunikationszentrum*.
189 “Celebris urbs, non modo Academia haud poenitenda, sed mercatura etiam clara”: Ortelius, *Synonymia Geographica*, “Colonia Agrippina”.
190 At the height of the restrictions on movement during the early stages of the revolt, Ortelius attained a passport from the Duke of Alva to travel to Cologne and Frankfurt, swearing that it was essential to his business: “juravit qu’il est indispensable de se rendre à Cologne et à Francfort”: see Wauwermans, “Ortelius”, *Biographie Nationale*, 16 (1901), 300.
papal scrutiny). Yet, as mentioned above, it also made a decisive contribution to the intellectual character of Ortelius’ friends. Lipsius was educated there by the Jesuits, Vulcarius and Ximenius by Cassander. Further, the Family of Love became based in the city after 1570, though the tolerant scepticism about confessionalisation that is evident in the Cologne humanists clearly has older roots, as well as a concrete context in the mercantile atmosphere of the city. Thus, in the mid-1580s, sandwiched between Cologne and Antwerp in his diocese of Liége, Torrentius scrutinised the pragmatic equivocations of his humanist friends as they exploited the religious pluralism in the two metropolises. His forbearance and willingness to plead their cases did not reflect a tolerant attitude, rather a recognition that the network was built around these nodes because they provided space to negotiate the confessionalising pressures that split other circles apart, and because he was aware that each would eventually be forced to choose – his main concern seems to have been that they avoid compromising themselves irreversibly in the interim as they travelled through the humanist centres of Europe. Appropriately, it was from Cologne that Plantin, Ortelius, and Louis Perez returned into the arms of the future bishop awaiting them in Liége after the fall of Antwerp to Parma.

The consequence of urbanisation for humanist friendships is that networks developed around nodes in major towns, affecting the circulation of information and the distribution of influence. In this sense cities behaved identically to courts, a number of which were the focus for groups of Ortelius’ friends. Through the pattern of

---

191 The album received nine inscriptions in Cologne in 1575: f.68v (Metellus), ff.69v-70 (Pighius), f.70v (Bizarus), f.71v (Ximenius), f.72v (Bodeghem), f.77 (Schenk), ff.95v-96 (Bartvicius), f.102v (Christian Isaac), f.103v (Johannes Issac) – also, George Braun, normally resident in Cologne, made his inscription nearby (f.99), and it is almost certain that Stenzel of Namsl made his contribution in Cologne (f.99v). Plantin’s attitude to the city is mentioned above; his relationship with the city was based on interaction with the Birckmann firm, for the later years of which see J. Denucé, Oudnederlandsche kaartmakers in betrekking met Plantijn, Amsterdam, 1964, 253-264. He was also closely involved with Barrefelt, Ximenius and Metellus there. Ortelius collaborated extensively with Georgius Braun and Frans Hogenberg, both based in the city, as well as with Mylius.


194 M. Delcourt & J. Hoyoux, ed., Correspondance de Torrentius, nos.159 and 161.

195 Notably the imperial courts of Maximilian II and Rudolph II, at which were based Hoefnagel, Crato, Dudith and Sambucus, for which see R.J.W. Evans, Rudolf II and his World; Mout, Bohemen en de Nederlanden in de Zestiende Eeuw; and H. Louthan, The Quest for Compromise: Peacemakers in
entries, Ortelius' album reveals how useful these civic and court circles could be for the creation and maintenance of friendships. Likewise, exchange of letters was facilitated by concentration of friends in one place. Thus it is important to remember that while to some extent humanist friendship networks represented a meeting of like minds, the composition of each network was inevitably in part fortuitous, based upon the shifting rhythms of attendance at courts and in urban centres. Travel between towns was dangerous, particularly during times of hardship or social unrest; the learned circles at the end of each journey were the humanists' elixir (hence the humanist guide books, such as that by Guicciardini, which are largely devoted to descriptions of towns and courts, explaining whom to visit there).

Inevitably within such confined circles there must have been numerous contacts that can only be speculated about by historians. Nonetheless caution must be used in assessing the impact of locality on friendship networks, particularly where evidence is scarce (proximity could remove the need for written communication) or links are indirect. For example, the Irish humanist Richard Stanihurst lived in the Spanish Netherlands from 1584 to 1591, during which time Ortelius was actively promoting historical studies of the British Isles, yet there is no evidence of contact between the two men, even though Plantin published some of Stanihurst's works on Ireland. Thus although urban networks were often instrumental in the development and maintenance of friendships, they are necessarily tantalizingly nebulous and difficult to interpret.

Ortelius remained in Antwerp for his entire life, despite obvious reasons for joining the diaspora or the mass emigration of his fellow citizens to the north. Only after the sack of Antwerp in 1576 did he flee for refuge for a year. Herman Hortenberg's entry in Ortelius' album two years later laments this enforced hardship looking back to the time "When the great Peace honoured fortunate Belgium it pleased the Muses

Counter-Reformation Vienna, Cambridge, 1997. Also the court in Spain, where Montanus and Mollin were based, for which see the discussion of the publication of the Thesaurus and Spanish Theatrum in chapter one.

196 Lodovico Guicciardini, Descrittione di tutti i Paesi Bassi (Antwerp, 1567).
and Charities to leave their settled lodgings and reside with you, as if in your breast.  

The muses and charities refer both to Ortelius’ own attributes and to the presence of other illustrious contemporaries in Antwerp. In 1582, during the Calvinist rule in Antwerp, Ortelius remained a highly respected figure as reflected by Nicholas Clemens’ entry in the album, containing an anagram of ‘Abraham Ortelius’: “Urbis laetus amor” [Happy love of the town]. Clemens went on to describe Ortelius as he “Who with his pen has confined the immeasurable universe in a city. / (Only your city, which is its equal, can contain it.)” While this is certainly flattery, no doubt prompted in part by the possibilities of the anagram, Clemens’ entry indicates the currency of expansive notions of civic loyalty, honour and pride. That the pride of a town in its prestigious citizens was not necessarily reciprocated is evident from Plantin’s plans to leave Antwerp in the late 1580s. It is possible that Ortelius considered relocating to London to join his family and old friends (Radermacher, Hoefnagel, etc); certainly, he later dismissed the idea in a letter to his nephew, explaining that he would not have freedom of religious expression there any more than in post-conquest Antwerp. Whereas Leiden and Cologne provided a place of refuge from religious scrutiny, London was a haven for Protestant refugees only. The presence of a well-organised and increasingly Calvinist Dutch exiles’ church made it difficult to slip into the crowd of refugees unnoticed. Nonetheless, the influence of the London-Dutch community on life in the Low Countries has been amply documented, and its contribution to Ortelius’ social, intellectual and family networks was equally large. As the next chapter will make clear, he exploited his relatives’ resources in England through trade links and academic interest, using them as contacts for key information and for the inauguration of scholarly projects, an important consequence of which was the impact Ortelius and his family had on the intellectual life of England, helping to integrate it fully with international humanist culture.

199 “Dum laetum coleret Pax bona Belgium, Musas et Charites, sedibus hospitis, Consedisse tuis, iuvit, ut in sinu”: Ortelius, Album, f.8v: Herman Hortenberg.

200 “Immensura calamis orbem qui condis in urbe. (Est orbis, sibi par, urbs tua sola capax.)”: Ortelius, Album, f.51r: Nicholas Clemens. This is a reference to the Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, Antwerp, 1570 - the universe drawn by Ortelius’ pen.


Movement and communication across Europe was, of course, as much the domain of diplomats and spies as it was of merchants and scholars. The political divisions of Europe during the sixteenth century placed limitations on both international trade and the humanist 'republic of letters'. This was particularly the case during times of war, hence the Dutch revolt resulted in the economic and intellectual debilitation of Antwerp in the 1570s and 1580s as thousands departed for Germany, England, and the northern Netherlands. Ortelius' correspondence is permeated with the fear that letters could be analysed by the inquisition or that gifts would be lost en route through mischance or theft. Finding trustworthy people to carry goods or letters was a constant preoccupation. While identification of such couriers and their methods is often all but impossible, it is clear that Ortelius frequently relied on the agency of his cousin, Daniel Rogers, who was engaged in diplomatic embassies and espionage on behalf of the English and Dutch from 1575 to 1580, when he was captured and imprisoned for four years by Germans hoping to extract a ransom. Rogers, with the co-operation of Ortelius' other trusted friends, could ensure the safe circulation of his cousin's album even when its owner was unable to travel on account of border restrictions and the danger of crossing volatile regions. Thus the album and the bonds of friendship it embodies were materially shaped by the political context in which the entries were collected.

Ortelius' album itself was politically sensitive. A document containing proof of personal contacts could be of great value to inquisitors trying to establish the loyalty and orthodoxy of citizens. Thus an album collected by Ortelius' cousin, Emanuel van Meteren, was confiscated and not returned when the latter was arrested by the Spanish authorities in 1575 while visiting Ortelius in Antwerp. As discussed earlier, Ortelius' own album contained contributions from a dangerous mixture of

203 Van Dorsten, Poets, Patrons and Professors, emphasises the productive ways in which these networks could mingle. 204 H. Van der Wee, The Growth of the Antwerp Market and the European Economy, vol. II, 245-269; and L. Voet, Antwerp: The Golden Age, Antwerp, 1973. See also, R. van Roosbroeck, Emigranten, Nederlandse vluchtelingen in Duitsland; and J. Israel, Dutch Primacy in World Trade 1580-1740 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), 28-37. 205 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, nos. 174, 212, 229 and 278 were written using the pseudonym "Bartolus Arameius", reflecting insecurity about identification as their author; in no.144 Ortelius comments that some of his letters had been opened during transit, and nos.10 and 314 specifically address the concerns of reliable delivery. 206 F.J. Levy, "Daniel Rogers as Antiquary" in BRH, 27 (1965), 444-462. 207 W.B. Verduyn, "Het Leven van Emanuel van Meteren" (Den Haag, 1926).
personalities, crossing religious boundaries and political loyalties. While the album does not have a consistent political or religious slant, individual contributions are mildly critical of the Spanish regime. Many of the entries are themselves innocuous except in so far as they reveal Ortelius’ connections with leaders of the revolt such as Philip Marnix van St Aldegonde and Janus Dousa. Nonetheless, there is no evidence that Ortelius kept the album hidden from the authorities. When, partly with regard to his friendship with Peter Heyns, Ortelius was investigated by the Spanish authorities after their reconquest of Antwerp in 1585, there seems to have been little difficulty establishing his orthodoxy. If the album embodies a political message, it is a plea for freedom from constraint for the transnational republic of letters, rather than a committed, partisan ideology that might have been regarded as particularly dangerous by the authorities. On the other hand, it is clear that in many cases politics was the basis for the growth of friendship, providing the obvious context for the beginnings of Ortelius’ friendships with Languet and Marnix in Antwerp in the early 1580s. Thus the bonds of friendship celebrated in the album operate through politics in two senses - both originating in political affiliations and transgressing them.

The argumentative figure of Dirk Volkertszoon Coornhert provides an excellent example of the boundaries within Ortelius’ network. In the same year (1579) that he wrote a virulent attack on Hendrik Niclaes’ teachings (subsequently published), Coornhert made a contribution to Ortelius’ album which is quite specific about his religious sympathies with Ortelius:

Doort verkyesen vant beste eynde oprecht
Doort gaen op eenen wech effen en slecht
en doort opmerken in Godes claerheydt
werden vereent van geest hert en zinne
met d’onbrekelyht bandt van minne
in vrundtscap getron gegrondt op waerheit
Abraham Ortelius met zyn vrundt

208 See n.142.
209 R. Boumans, “Was Abraham Ortelius katholiek of protestant?".
Coornhert, die hem tbest als hemzelven gundt.210

[Through choosing the best and honest end, through travelling on a smooth and even path, and through observing God’s light, Abraham Ortelius and his friend Coornhert, who wishes the best for him as for himself, have been united in spirit, heart and mind by an unbreakable bond of love, in a faithful friendship based on truth.]

The friendship was, however, breakable, as discussed in the previous chapter. The above entry was crossed out, though it is not entirely clear by whom. Coornhert’s contribution to Ortelius’ album reveals his ideal of “waerheit” [truth] in friendship, and it is this that prompted him to criticise Lipsius and Ortelius himself as part of a combative attempt to reform the society around him.211 The same value is upheld throughout the album and, indeed, was a Classical topos common in sixteenth century friendship literature. Coornhert’s toleration was different from that of Ortelius - where the latter sought quietly to allow for co-existence of different opinions (acknowledging the imperfection of man) the former sought a continuous, corrective debate.212

‘Friendship’, as a sub-section of ethics, was inevitably imbued with the language and concepts of Christian morality in the sixteenth century.213 The concept of ‘virtue’ that recurs as an essential feature of friendship throughout the contributions to Ortelius’ album is the hybrid notion of virtue formed at the intersection between christianity and Classical philosophy. It is thus entirely typical of the humanist tradition.214 Thus Peter Heyns, in what appears to be the first contribution to the album, wrote “U stam die wordt nu eeuwich met u hooghe verheuven. Door u ghelihickt leuen prust u eeck int ghemeene” [Your family is now elevated for eternity with you. Because of your holy life you are praised by all]. Virtue is a path to glory, though Heyns adds the
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210 Ortelius, Album, f.120r. Dirk Coornhert, Spieghelen vande ongerechticheydt ofte menschelicheyt des vergodeyen H.N. (1581).
211 Dirk Coornhert, Werken (Amsterdam, 1630), volume 1, f.80r-v, contains a fictional dialogue with Ortelius in which these criticisms are made. Coornhert and Lipsius had a public feud in the 1590s.
212 James D. Tracy, “Erasmus, Coornhert and the Acceptance of Religious Disunity in the Body Politic: A Low Countries Tradition?” in Berkvens-Stevelinck, et al., The Emergence of Tolerance in the Dutch Revolt, 49-62; also relevant is Nicolette Mout’s contribution to this collection: 37-48.
213 See P. Burke, “Humanism and Friendship in Sixteenth Century Europe.”
caveat that that is not the aim of Ortelius, whose goal is Christ.\textsuperscript{215} The second dated entry in the album, by Arnold Mylius, focuses on another topos of sixteenth century friendship: “Ut est sola bonorum vera amicitia, ita est inter homines valde rara” [Since only the friendship of good men is true friendship, so it is very rare among men].\textsuperscript{216} While such expressions have their origin in Classical philosophy and literature, they are so widespread as to transcend any particular school. No doubt to some extent the promulgation of these ideas by early humanist writers was an attempt to popularise an alternative code of virtue to that of the \textit{vita activa}, nonetheless medieval tradition already emphasised many similar concerns with regard to friendship.\textsuperscript{217}

However, distinctively humanist ideas of friendship do appear in Ortelius’ album, focusing on the connection between virtue, learning and friendship. Ludovicus Carrio pithily states the relationship in his entry on 30 May 1575: “Eruditio laboris filia. Eruditionis humanitas. Humanitatis amicitia” [Learning is the child of work, humanity is the child of learning, friendship is the child of humanity].\textsuperscript{218} This contribution is unusually explicit in detailing the humanist spirit of the friendship album; nonetheless, the epigrammatic form is a useful reminder that the album should not be analysed as a moral discourse on the nature and qualities of friendship; rather, it is a series of acts of friendship. While the contributions do draw upon, or crystallize, the available philosophical and religious discourses of the late sixteenth century, their significance more directly relates to the context of Ortelius’ life. It is through this context that the relationship between friendship and learning becomes most widely apparent. Almost all of the contributors to the album were connected in some way to the compilation or revision of Ortelius’ magnum opus, the \textit{Theatrum Orbis Terrarum}, whether through geographical, numismatic or philological studies, through map engraving or through other artistic works. This does not mean that his friendships were primarily utilitarian; rather that humanism was fundamentally collaborative. It is this that underlies Carrio’s statement that humanity is the child of

\textsuperscript{215} Ortelius, \textit{Album}, f.7r: Heyns.
\textsuperscript{216} Ibid., f.61r: Mylius.
\textsuperscript{218} Ortelius, \textit{Album}, f.45r: Ludovic Carrio.
learning: the true lover of wisdom wishes to share it and to further the pursuit of knowledge through others as much as through himself.\textsuperscript{219}

As shown in the first chapter, Ortelius was in many ways simply an editor and compiler of other people’s work. Compiled by the geographer who constructed the first ever unified representation of the entire known world contained in one volume as an atlas, his album sits strangely in relation to the geo-political fragmentation in Europe. He is repeatedly praised for allowing the imagination freedom to roam around the obscurest regions of the world from the comfort, or constraint, of home. One contributor writes that Ortelius has created a means by which a man “sitting safely at home, free from all danger and trouble, can roam anywhere in the entire terrestrial world contained between the two poles”.\textsuperscript{220} There are also occasional hints that Ortelius has done what the Spanish could not - he has unified the known world with one laudable enterprise for the benefit of mankind. Thus Nicholas Rhedinger, in Silesia, writes: “Lately Spain claims to have discovered a world. That is nothing, Ortelius, compared to your light, because you unite the old and the new in one map”.\textsuperscript{221} Ortelius’ act of ‘socians’ [uniting] thus encourages scholarly endeavour and imaginative freedom.

The friendship book itself contains many of the same features as the atlas - uniting across distances, surpassing religious and national borders. The imaginative liberation of the atlas is paralleled by the actual physical distances covered by the album as it is passed from friend to friend. It is almost a ‘friendship map’ of Europe. Likewise, it is constructed out of the contributions of others. It is a collaborative, rather than author-centered, work, which nonetheless goes under the name of Ortelius. One contributor, Gerard van Corck, condenses the various parallels into the theme of virtuous humanist scholarship: “You who could bring the world into a Theatre are

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{219} Ortelius, \textit{Theatrum Orbis Terrarum}, Antwerp, 1570. See the ‘Preface to the Reader’ with regard to collaboration.
\item \textsuperscript{220} “Domi tutus sedens, periculo, et molestia omni vacuus, omnem pererret quilibet orbis globum, sub axe utroque consitum”: Ortelius, \textit{Album}, f.90v: Alexander Grapheus. See also, f.97r-98r: Cornelius Aquanus; and, f.83r-84r: Janus Dousa.
\item \textsuperscript{221} “Inventum nuper se iactat Iberus ob orbem. Ad radium, Ortelii, sed nihil ista tuum. Namque una socias veteremque novumque tabella”: Ortelius, \textit{Album}, f. 63: Nicholas Rhedinger.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
yourself a theatre of virtues, Ortelius. I have written this as a supporter of your virtue and learning”.

As discussed earlier, Ortelius’ other humanist work published prior to compilation of the album, the Deorum Dearumque Capita, also bears a close relationship to the manuscript collection. The shared tradition of iconography, with its emphasis on the enduring reputation of noble figures, is emphasised by Petrus Bizarus, who wrote:

> Given that the life of man is extremely short, they act wisely who try to prolong it, whether through military affairs or through outstanding monuments of genius. You are therefore to be exalted with the greatest of praises, learned Ortelius, you who, adorned with the greatest gifts of the mind, have worked hard both to secure the immortality of your name and also to do a service for humanity.

This combination of a sense of life’s brevity with the desire to produce an enduring monument is typical of the album. While some contributors focus on humility as the appropriate response to the fragility and vicissitudes of life, others focus on praising virtue and its eternal rewards. The balance is perfectly conveyed by Ortelius’ motto: “Contemno et orno, mente, manu” [I scorn and adorn with mind and hand], which interweaves the Christian or stoic spirit of contemptus mundi with the artist-humanist’s commitment to endowing the world with works of genius. A number of contributions on behalf of deceased friends underline the commemorative value of the album, as does the expressed anxiety (or sometimes joy) among a number of the younger contributors regarding their merit for inclusion in a volume that will be viewed by posterity. Whether seeking immortality or exhorting humility, all the

---

222 "Theatro Orbem qui inferre potes, Virtutis Theatrum et ipse es, Orteli. Virtutis doctrinaeque tuae cultor scipsi": ibid., f. 102r: Gerard van Corck.
223 Ortelius, Deorum Dearumque Capita, 1573.
224 "Cum hominis vitae longe breviss’ a sit, prudentiss’e agunt, qui ea, aut re bellica, vel praeclariss’is ingenij monumentis propagare student. Maximis ergo laudibus ev hendus es, doctiss’e Ortelii, qui eximius animi dotibus undiquaque omatus, et nominis aeternitati consulere, et de humano genere quoque opt’e mereri allaboraveris": Ortelius, Album, f.70v: Petrus Bizarus.
contributions betray a concern with time that stems from the biblical notion of 'no enduring city,' quoted directly by Philip Marnix.226

The concern with time and earthly vicissitude shown throughout the album is not, however, merely philosophical or religious reflection. If the album was begun in a moment of optimism during the Dutch revolt, it was nonetheless collected against an continuous background of war, religious persecution, civil disorder, and the random destruction caused by mutineers. Thus Michael van der Hagen's contribution laments the widespread devastation in the Netherlands and France: "How many towns have been turned into piles of rubble by divisions and contention?" He focuses on the need to hold together and retain unity: "Union brings strength or power. Thus remain united as one, clinging to one another, and drive away partisanship, the origin of all evil, of destruction and plagues." Punning on his surname (Hagen = hedge), he writes that, "Ghelyck de haghe groen wol doorflochten ... soo blyft lanckdurig oock, dat tsame is geknoopt" [Like a green hedge totally interwoven ... that which is knotted together is long-lasting].227 Thus the celebration of friendship, recorded in the leaves of the album, was intended as a bastion against time and trouble, an attempt to salvage a sense of stability and civility in a period of social and cultural disintegration.

It would be wrong to try to find too much coherence in the intellectual positions adopted by the various contributors to Ortelius' Album Amicorum. It was not produced by one mind and there was no attempt to systematize the album in the way that, for example, emblem collections or commonplace books could be ordered. No doubt contributors differed in their motives for contributing. The result is a mixed sample of the various humanist friendship-relations that occur during the sixteenth century. Renowned men of learning, such as the scholar Jean Bodin or the diplomat Hubert Languet, can hardly be attributed the same motives as younger, less established scholars such as Franciscus Sweerts or Janus Gruterus. Jacob Cools' relationship with his uncle follows the familiar pattern of a humanist mentor relationship. Still further varieties of 'friendship' appear when the numerous artists

227 "Hoe mennich stad verkert in stenen opgelegd door scheurings ende twist?", "Eendracht gheft cracht ob macht. Dus in bouw by een blyfen, nog malcaarde gheclift, en sij eenzingheid verdrijfen, oorspronck van alle quaat, van verderf ende plaghen.": ibid., f.20v: Michael van der Hagen.
are considered, linked by trade or patronage to Ortelius, when overlapping family links are added, and when the possibility is left open that many of the contributors could have been prompted to inscribe their names on account of membership of the Family of Love. Thus 'friendship' appears as a value or characterisation placed on a multiple set of possible relations, whether mundane or more prestigious.

Ortelius’ album provides none of the erotic playfulness or gender politics found in more imaginative literary depictions of friendship in Tudor England. More pertinent is the recent re-evaluation of the impact of neo-stoicism on late sixteenth and early seventeenth century learned culture, which appears to have huge significance for the study of friendship networks within the republic of letters; yet the inspiration for each contributor appears sufficiently varied in source, reference and intellectual pedigree that to interpret the contributions through a single philosophical discourse would be of limited value. Perhaps what the album best reveals about ideas of friendship during the turbulent final quarter of the sixteenth century is that individuals sought stability in interpersonal fidelities and were willing to draw upon almost all and any sources to provide a language in which to express their sense of togetherness. Aristotelian sentiments mingle with their Neoplatonic and Neostoic counterparts throughout the pages of the sixteenth century’s alba amicorum, but it is the immediate circumstances of the contributors’ lives that provide the key context for interpretation. In the case of Ortelius’ album that context is found in the Dutch revolt; whether they lived in the Netherlands or not, all the contributors were aware of the devastation surrounding Ortelius and could relate it to the fragility of their own existence. In the wake of the reformation and counter reformation no scholar of international standing could be unaware of the debilitating effects political and religious wars were having on the pan-national culture of letters and learning. After long service as a doctor at

229 T. Meganck, Erudite Eyes: Artists and Antiquarians in the Circle of Abraham Ortelius, agrees that Ortelius was heavily influenced by stoicism. For the broader movement of neostoicism in the period see G. Oestreich, Neostoicism and the Early Modern State, Cambridge, 1982, especially part one; Mark Morford, Stoics and Neostoics: Rubens and the Circle of Lipsius, Princeton, 1991; Peter N. Miller, Peiresc’s Europe: Learning and Virtue in the Seventeenth Century, Yale, 2000; and Geoff Baldwin, “Individual and Self in the Late Renaissance,” in The Historical Journal, 44, 2, Cambridge, 2001, 341-364.
the courts of three emperors, the distinguished scholar Johannes Crato of Craftheim wrote to Ortelius from his sick bed asking how posterity could possibly repay:

You who have adorned by your study and by your genius this theatre of earthly vicissitude, and have brought back to light that which has been forgotten, re-establishing that which has been demolished, recovering in this way by indefatigable labour so much that time has ravaged.\footnote{Qui studio hoc ornas et tota mente Theatrum/ Vicissitudinum, tua/ Diruta restituens, indefessoque labore,/ Vastata tot modis, colens/ Tempore et extincta in clara nunc luce reponis"; Ortelius, \textit{Album}, f.12r: Johannes Crato von Craftheim.}

He concluded that there was nothing which could fully repay Ortelius, unless he were to accept the writer’s gratitude and his humble contribution to the album, which he describes as “ductum carmen ab aegre ... mente” [a song drawn from a suffering mind].\footnote{Ibid.: f.12r: Johannes Crato von Craftheim.} With his atlas Ortelius had pictorially united and illuminated the world; in his album of friends he attempted to embody an international humanist network in a lasting monument for posterity. As with his atlas, Ortelius himself attracted most of the praise and renown for this compilation of others’ works; such renown was for appearing to embody through the language of friendship and scholarly collaboration the virtues of the republic of letters that seemed unattainable when surrounded by social disintegration during the revolt of the Netherlands and the French wars of religion. The language of friendship was thus a code of survival and mutual support, and at the same time an imaginative liberation from the constraints of the present, an attempt to partake in an eternal culture across geographical and temporal boundaries. Hence Daniel Rogers, in a poem designed to open the album, wrote that whoever first collected such an album,

When he saw that the name of friendship dies because pious agreements are exposed to the forgetfulness of time or broken by the distance of places, he, inspired by god’s will, found a means through which love of divine origin could last forever and years to come might not be forgetful of pacts made in the past ... thus in this way it will be known that friends who someone has
loved once remain friends after death, bound together by intimate connections, and in mutual love.\textsuperscript{232}

He goes on to comment that, "Indeed, Abraham, the ties of nature, love and Pallas link us both three times, joined by the bonds of family, personality and intellect."\textsuperscript{233} Thus friendship, as understood by almost all the contributors to the album, is a rational love of ethical individuals who seek to share their lives, knowledge and reputations, rejecting dissension within the republic of learning; but whereas this idea of friendship remained only an ideal, the practice of collecting an album of friends was an enactment of the humanist collaborative ethos that tried to evade the vicissitudes of fortune and time. The modest sentiments expressed in the album do not conceal the fact that it represents a circle of friends celebrating itself, of individuals glorying in the prestigious company they keep; but its value lies in just this balance between the individual scholar and his intellectual community. Six languages and numerous dialects are inscribed in the album; no doubt this was partly practicality and partly deliberate flattery of Ortelius, but it serves as a reminder of the humanist preoccupation with language and communication that coincided with the recovery and promulgation of Greek and Roman texts on friendship. Ortelius’ album is the result of the intersection of these texts with ideas of Christian love and charity at a time of social disintegration during civil and religious war.

At times, the content of entries reflects or comments upon recent political events, though normally in a rather general way. Thus, in reaction to the relaxation of penal laws in the wake of Alva’s departure, the contribution of Aegidius Wijts, dated 1 September 1574 (inserted into the border design from the \textit{Deorum Dearumque Capita} for the god Libertas) depicts a dove carrying an olive branch, encircled by the words, "Intact, it flies across numerous towns."\textsuperscript{234}

\textsuperscript{232} "Quare videret foedera cum pia oblivioso obnoxia tempori, tractique, divisae locorum nomen amicitiae interire, artes inivit numine concitas amor perennaret quibus eriliens nec foederum ictorum futuros immemores paterentur annos... sic ei scietur quos quis amiculos amavit olim, sic quoque mortui iungentur arctis copulati nexibus inq. vicem se amabunt": ibid., f. Iv: Daniel Rogers.

\textsuperscript{233} "Nam nos, Abrame triplice foedere natura, amor, Pallasq, ligant duos, vincloq. stamine copulati et generis, genii, ingenijq.": ibid., f.3r: Daniel Rogers.

\textsuperscript{234} "Volitet crebras intacta per urbes": Ortelius, \textit{Album Amicorum}, f.26r: Aegidius Wijts.
The dominant context for the collection of the album is the turmoil of the Dutch revolt - uprooting and overturning the fortunes of families and friends, breaking loyalties and forming faiths. One contributor proffers his verses "of cold sap and spirit ... because coarse Holland has been their nurse ... Now lacking the mass, the fruit of the spirit is also disappeared."\(^\text{235}\)

The exile mentality of many contributors is encapsulated in the entry by Marnix van St Aldegonde, who contributed a picture of a ship near rocks on a stormy sea with the words "repos ailleurs" [rest elsewhere] written in the sky.\(^\text{236}\) The idea of escape to a utopia free from conflict resonates elsewhere in Ortelius' work. Tine Meganck's sophisticated analysis of the Tempe and Daphne maps in the Parergon demonstrates how Ortelius adopted the contemporary iconography of himself as Apollo, representing the culmination of the myth of the god's frustrated love for the nymph Daphne. The map of Tempe depicts the location of Apollo's first encounter with Daphne, and the subsequent Daphne map shows the site of her enduring existence transformed into a laurel tree; yet, as Meganck argues, the protagonists of the myth are curiously absent from the maps, prompting the symbolic association of Daphne with art and Apollo with Ortelius, the scientist returned to mount Helicon to cultivate the Muses and console himself with artful harmonies.\(^\text{237}\) Aside from accounting for two otherwise incongruous landscapes in Ortelius' collection of historical maps, Meganck's interpretation allows a further connection to be made. The representation of Daphne in the opening contribution to Ortelius' Album amicorum is not simply a punning reference to the contributor's school, Heyns' Lauwerboom, or Laurel Tree; rather, it is an evocation of the myth of Apollo and Daphne, alluding to Ortelius' illumination of the world as Phoebus Apollo. The message is the same as that of the Tempe and Daphne maps: the album is a place of repose in which to cultivate harmony with the peaceful muses. Thus Heyn's epigram, "virtuous friendship, like the laurel, remains forever green", ties together many of the themes of this chapter: friendship is celebrated by these professional humanists as a constituent part of the preservation of culture at one remove from the turmoil of the world.\(^\text{238}\)

\(^{235}\) "Van geest en sap vercout ... want tbuette Holland zijn zooochamme es geweest ... De mis nu missende, mist ooc der geesten vrucht": ibid., f.112v: Jan van Hout.

\(^{236}\) Ibid., Album, f.42r: Philip Mamix van St Aldegonde.

\(^{237}\) Tine Meganck, Erudite Eyes, 218-221.

\(^{238}\) Ortelius, Album, 4v.
Ortelius’ album is a testament to his friendships’ endurance, despite the increasing divisions in society. The album appears to unite in one binding diverse groups and rival factions, but in fact it presents a sub-section of a larger coterie of intellectuals engaged in a humanist lifestyle, pursuing learning through creative emulation of the ancients in an attempt to recover culture from barbarism. The commitment to purifying the culture of learning through the study of antiquity brought together individuals from previously diverse spheres, such as the market and the university, both domestically and across Europe; thus, as many of the contributors to Ortelius’ album were lawyers as artists, a still larger number were university-educated doctors or philologists, and they met in print shops, courts and universities across Europe. The international distribution of the contributors to Ortelius’ album is not unusual; while it is true that the lines of contact between scholars increasingly were circumscribed by religious boundaries, the manifesto of a “return to the sources” made transgression of such boundaries a necessity for the practice of antiquarian research.
Ortelius' decision to enshrine his friendships in an album devoted to the ideal of unity through friendship represented a more elaborate vision of the republic of letters than the student networking at the core of most albums. He and his friends created a physical manifestation of their cultified milieu, an artefact, in order to preserve for posterity what it represented. The friendship album was a kind of group portrait, and as such represents the cross between corporate and individualist mentality evident in so much of both the urban politics and the artistic production of the Netherlands in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. However, although the last chapter demonstrated the concern of Ortelius and his friends with representing the abstract ideals of virtue and friendship, which they saw as the basis of civility in the republic of letters, in fact the collaboration of these antiquarians and philologists was indispensable to them for practical reasons. In order to pursue the return to the sources that humanists so venerated, scholars had to locate, access, interpret and publish those sources. The period of the great editions of humanist scholarship was not past, rather it was in a transitional stage. The triumph of the first Aristotelian, Galenic and Platonic editions in Greek led to heightened technical debate about interpretation, rather than merely establishing a set of canonical texts. Building on these developments, the erudite critical practice of Lipsius, Scaliger and Casaubon raised the standard of philological scholarship beyond the range of the competent amateur enthusiast. While it is true that the spread of printing made access to editions and commentaries much simpler than before, the number of publications far outstripped

---


the ability of scholars to keep track of them. The growing size of the Frankfurt book fair, and the practice after 1564 of publishing its catalogues, went some way towards centralising both advertising and the distribution of new works, as did the appearance of published bibliographies such as Gesner’s Biblotheca Universalis. Nonetheless, the correspondence of scholars in the second half of the century is preoccupied with finding books as well as manuscripts, lending copies to one another, and clarifying opinions, rumours and readings. The centre of antiquarian scholarship was no longer at the sources in Rome or Italy, but in the correspondence of scholars across Europe. As religious divisions and pressures denied them an obvious forum in which to collaborate, they found new spaces in which to enshrine their commitment to cooperation. Ortelius’ album was one such space; the world of the printed book, and the correspondence within which it was embedded, was another.

The effect of the Dutch revolt on antiquarian scholarship, and learned culture in general, was perceived to be disastrous at the time; nevertheless, as discussed in the previous chapter, the ensuing diaspora laid the foundations of scholarly encounter within the contours of long-established trade routes and centres. Thus, Leiden, London, Cologne and Prague became the new nodes of Dutch international scholarly networks, soon to be joined by Amsterdam. Ortelius already had family connections in London, where the first wave of religious émigrés from the persecutions of Charles V had found a climate made receptive by centuries of competition with skilled overseas merchants. As the learned Dutch community in London developed, Ortelius drew heavily upon his contacts there to extract information, make new connections,

---


4 Peter Miller’s study of the network of Peiresc in seventeenth century France demonstrates the vitality and importance of the manuscript circulation in scholarly circles, explaining the celebrity of Peiresc despite his lack of publications: P. Miller, Peiresc’s Europe: Learning and Virtue in the Seventeenth Century, Yale, 2000. On the geographical shift in the centres of antiquarianism see W. Stenhouse, Epigraphical Research and Historical Scholarship, 1530-1603, Ph.D diss., University of London, 2002.

5 H. Clotz, Hochschule für Holland: die Universität Leiden im Spannungsfeld zwischen Provinz, Stadt und Kirche 1575-1619; Van Dorsten, Poets, Patrons and Professors; Gramulla, Handelsbeziehungen Kölner Kaufleute zwischen 1500 und 1650, Cologne, 1972; N. Mout, Bohemen en de Nederlanden in de Zestiende Eeuw; R.J.W. Evans, Rudolf II and his World; R. van Roosbroeck, Emigranten, Nederlandse vluchtelingen in Duitsland (1550-1600); and Oscar Gelderblom, “Antwerp Merchants in Amsterdam after the Revolt (1578-1630),” in Peter Stabel, Bruno Blonde, and Anke Greve, eds., International Trade in the Low Countries, Leuven-Apeldoorn, 2000, 223-241.

and sponsor new works of learning in a land of poor scholarly reputation. Ortelius would have been familiar with Cologne for almost as long, due to his forays into Germany to attend the biannual book fair in Frankfurt, and perhaps also en route to Italy. As discussed in the last chapter, the Dutch community in the city was transformed by the outbreak of war in the Low Countries, and many of Ortelius’ closest friends moved there to gain the protection of the imperial city. In Leiden, the foundation of the university, and its success in attracting some of the leading scholars in Europe to teach there, is the most obvious example of the creative dimension of the Dutch wars. The importance of Ortelius’ connection to the scholars there has never been duly stressed, nor has the effect of the foundation of the university upon his own intellectual pursuits.

In this chapter I will follow the development of particular relationships as a first step towards understanding the scope and significance of the intellectual collaboration between scholars in the four cities of Antwerp, London, Cologne and Leiden. This study will not be in any way comprehensive, but is preferable to focusing on one city because the intersection of concerns is striking and the strength of these networks was that they overlapped. Humanists could not rely on two-dimensional networks to produce the information they needed; instead, they had to follow the fortunes of a rhizome of communication lines that made scholarship affordable and feasible in the security of one’s home or library.

Ortelius’ personal and professional involvement with some of the leading humanists of his day has often been taken as a sign of his importance as a man of learning and culture; yet he was neither university-educated nor one of the most learned men of his day. He is, however, treated as a prominent and respected humanist within circles of learned university-men. What was the nature of the relationship between him and them? What differences did his lack of university background make? Humanism is an umbrella term that covers scholarship and artistic practices across a range of disciplines and social milieus; a figure such as Ortelius, who appears to have crossed these boundaries, might plausibly be seen as an embodiment of the transdisciplinary nature of humanism. Rather than regard him as representative in this way, I wish to explore the nature and extent of his interaction with scholars in a number of different areas. First, I will outline the trajectory of his scholarly career as an antiquarian; then
I will look in turn at a series of scholarly collaborations that demonstrate some of the roles Ortelius played within the republic of letters; finally, I will attempt to draw together my analyses within the context of geographical patterns and intellectual trends of the time.

Although Sweertius states in his biography that Ortelius was taught Latin and Greek by his father, before the latter’s early death, it is not clear how and when he continued his study of either language. His registration in the Guild of St Luke as an “afsetter van caerten” in 1547, at the age of twenty, might be taken as an indication that he was at that stage not notably learned. Yet, as mentioned in previous chapters, the learned magus John Dee later recorded that in 1550 he travelled from Louvain to Antwerp to meet Ortelius, and a year later, Ortelius is recorded as having been a “sojourner” at Oxford University. Further evidence of Ortelius’ broad humanist pedigree comes in his association with a Chamber of Rhetoric, Jesus of the Balsam Flower, in Ghent in the 1560s, indicating an interest in vernacular composition. Later in life he participated in the patronage and personal contact networks of poets, and demonstrated a humanist passion for literary works as much as for artists’ compositions and collector’s curiosities.

While it is not clear how to interpret these fragments of information, they suggest that Ortelius was more broadly learned than his professional description as a painter of maps reveals. Although his earliest extant letters are in Dutch, they are written to his cousin Emmanuel van Meteren, to whom he never wrote Latin, although he did so, without exception, to all his later correspondants. As mentioned briefly in the last chapter, in a letter to Van Meteren, dated 25 October 1557, Ortelius wrote one sentence in Latin and then joked, “Ghy soudt ander mejnen dat ick geen latijn en conste” [Otherwise you might think that I don’t know Latin]. While he could mean to reveal that he was learning Latin, it is more probably an ironic comment about the fact that their correspondence is in Dutch: Van Meteren never mastered Latin style and
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Ortelius later advised him to write his history of the Netherlands in Dutch and seek a Latin translator.\(^\text{10}\)

The letter of 1557 also provides the earliest record of Ortelius’ interest, expertise and trade in ancient medals, which he discusses at length, indicating a humanist orientation. His entrance into the guild of St Luke as a lowly “illustrator of maps” need not, then, indicate a lack of learning at that stage; Ortelius never showed ambition for position within the guild and never seems to have served an apprenticeship. It is not unreasonable to conjecture that his entry into it was a legal requirement on the basis of the part of his business that entailed colouring the maps in which he traded – the use of artist’s materials on printed works had been established, through legal battles with printer-publishers, as the means of identifying those who were required to join the guild.\(^\text{11}\) Yet a career as an artist, and still more as a trader in maps or old coins, increasingly required engagement with the culture of Latinity. Latin learning was common among the merchants and artisans of Antwerp; it is merely the extent of their learning that can be questioned in individual cases.\(^\text{12}\)

Ortelius’ writings reveal that he was a competent Latinist who was capable of raising his style to a high standard for publication. His letters are written in a peculiarly crisp, almost simplistic, style, with little ornamentation or artistic craft; but it is an authentic Latin idiom of comfortable and eloquent expression. It is difficult to determine to what extent he altered his style to suit different correspondents because there are only four instances of extended correspondence to individual addressees: Colius, Lipsius, Clusius and Vulcanius. His letters to Colius, although intimate in content, are mostly written in his usual style: short businesslike sentences, balanced both in structure and argument, with little circumlocution. In these letters his eloquence is conveyed by precision and nicety of expression rather than by flourishes,

\(^{10}\) Hessels, *Abraham Ortelii... Epistolae*, nos. 7 and 218.

\(^{11}\) For discussion of guild regulations about the use of materials and the reproduction of images in Antwerp see Jan van der Stock, *Printing Images in Antwerp*, Rotteram, 1998.

dramatic phrasing or word-play. In his letters to Vulcanius and Clusius, Ortelius writes in a brisk, efficient manner, typical of frequent professional correspondence. He ends most letters with news of political affairs, characteristically undercut by expressions of reserve about the veracity of reports and the outcome of events – the phrase “dies docebit” recurs frequently. However, his letter about the failure of Leiden University to produce public laments for the death of William of Orange provides a rare example of more vivid prose:


The rhetorical play Ortelius allowed himself with “gratiae-grati-gratum” occurs slightly more frequently in his correspondence with Lipsius. This is perhaps the one sign of Ortelius altering his style to suit the tastes of his correspondent, rather than to fit the subject at hand. His artistry is evident in phrases such as “machinas te machinari iam diu intellexi” and “idque te credere credo”. He also addressed a poem to Lipsius, praising his textual scholarship, written in a lyrical form of alternating Glyconic and Asclepiadie lines, in the manner of Horace, with some variation for poetic effect, particularly in the last line, which contains two extra syllables in the middle. The confidence he shows in addressing himself thus to Lipsius, one of the great prose writers of his era, is impressive and the poem is a

13 Some of Ortelius' most eloquent passages written to Colius are quoted in chapter two; he discusses religious issues with precision, clarity and forthright expression, often evoking truisms and maxims: see especially Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, nos. 212 and 214. His balanced mode of ratiocination is particularly evident when discussing explanations of fossils in Hessels no. 164.
14 For example, see Vulcanius Correspondence 7.5.1584; 14.5.1593; and 2.12.1597.
15 Vulcanius Correspondence 31.12.1584.
16 ILE, 95 09 29.
17 ILE, 94 12 27.
competent example of neo-Latin versification. Therefore, although apparently a self-educated artisan, Ortelius' ability as a neo-Latin author should no more be questioned now than it was by his contemporaries, who esteemed him greatly, not as a stylist but nevertheless as a learned Latin author. In this regard he is somewhat different from Plantin, who was a competent but not confident Latinist whose prose style occasionally sought clarity through diffuse circumlocution.¹⁸

As regards Ortelius' published works, the *Theatrum* is attractively written, particularly in the opening letter to the reader, which, as discussed in chapter one, draws upon familiar motifs such as the "oculus historiae", building upon them with original metaphors such as his comparison of the atlas to a kind of shop furnished with the tools necessary for the study of history.¹⁹ Whereas some of the map texts naturally tend, as in the later *Synonymia* and *Thesaurus*, towards the brevity suited to a reference work, Ortelius did manage to ensure lively reading through the familiar technique of integrating geographical description with anecdotes from ancient texts, even when he doubted their accuracy.²⁰ The re-telling of such stories within the framework of dismissing their veracity heightened the rhetorical colour of the text while paradoxically enhancing the impression of the author's probity and cautious judgement – qualities that are stylistically foregrounded in all of Ortelius' writings. His comment of Lipsius, that "potius dicere bene, quam esse, summo studio contendat" [he rather makes the effort to speak, than to be, well], might aptly be turned on its head to describe Ortelius' style: that he tries to write in a manner suggestive of a good person [tam dicere quam bene videri summo studio contendat].²¹

Nonetheless, Ortelius' travel narrative, the *Itinerarium*, was a carefully constructed literary text. Because it was written in collaboration with Joannes Vivianus it is impossible to know for certain who was responsible for the Latin style, but,  

¹⁸ Rooses & Denucéré, *Correspondance de Christophe Plantin*, vol. IV, no.567, n.3.
²⁰ For example, the description of the British Isles, in which Ortelius quotes the fifteenth-century account of Laonicus Chalcondylas; Ortelius admits that the account contains absurdities, but quotes them anyway, such as the claim that wife-swapping was common practice in Britain. Likewise Ortelius pandered to popular stories of wonders of nature, even when he knew them to be false, such as his account [*Regni Hispaniae ... Descriptio*] of a bridge in Spain on which ten thousand cattle feed daily, referring to the river Guadiana which was purported to flow underground for seven miles before resurfacing; again, Ortelius retained the story while admitting that it was false.
²¹ Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 214.
irrespective of who composed the text, both authors can be held accountable for the final product. Although the antiquarian features of the text have previously received scholarly attention, and will be discussed further below, the literary style has attracted little attention.22 The prose in the opening sections appears to be arranged in a loose periodic structure that shows no great mastery of the form, but that is elegantly ordered. Thus the first sentence ends with a verb from a sub-clause, but one which is conceptually fitting – the idea that the authors might have noted anything worthy of comment on their trip.23 This pattern is followed throughout the first few pages, until the beginning of the travel narrative itself with an account of the departure from Antwerp to Mechelen, after which the sentences vary between short and long, arranged at times more as notes than as fluid prose.24 Although strict periodic form is not observed throughout, the early passages reveal competence in the balancing of the sentence through concinnitas, and in variation of syntax to create interest and lead the reader on through the text. The main body of the text, in which the narrative is structured around the town-by-town archaeological investigations, is more lively than a straightforward objective account. Local colour is provided throughout by the descriptions of the natural environs of towns and by incorporating details that convey the human dimension of the trip – that the footing was difficult on the steep climb up to the origins of the waters of Spa, or that the presence of the plague caused the travellers to change their plans after Luxembourg.25 Although the text is quite short and remains focused throughout on its purpose as an antiquarian guide, the descriptions of scenery and landscape elevate the account to literary eloquence, conveying the facility of the authors in humanist Latin prose.26

22 Tine Meganck refers to the “bland, dry text, and technical illustration”, contrasting the objective, scientific approach with the more evocative style of Ligorio’s Libro delle atichitì di Roma (Venice, 1553): T. Meganck, Erudite Eyes: Artists and Antiquarians in the Circle of Abraham Ortelius (1527-1598), 50; Klaus Schmitt-Ott merely sets the Itinerarium in the publishing context of other travel descriptions of the period: see his Itinerarium per nonnullas Galliae Belgicae partes [with German translation and commentary], Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2000, 1-24. I have used page numbers from this edition for ease of reference throughout, unless otherwise stated.
23 “Si quid in ea observatione dignum occurisset”: Ortelius, Itinerarium, 28.
24 Ortelius, Itinerarium, 36.
25 Ortelius, Itinerarium, 68 (Spa) and 88 (plague). Ortelius is particularly taken by the setting of Hoy, which he describes as “amoenissimus”: Ortelius, Itinerarium, 46-8.
26 See, in particular, the description of the Mosel valley between Riol and Neumagen: “Hinc Mossella per magno sinu assumitur, ut ad eundem locum inquietus revertatur, unus inter omnes montes, abiungit omnino agmine montis, sunt enim non ita praerupti, quin facilis sit colonis ascensus ad supportanda quae ad vineta requiruntur, nec ita alti, ut alter alteri solem praeripiat, adiuvantibus ad hanc rem ipsis anfractibus, per quos Solis radii viam repetuntur, grata vicissitudine montes ad utramque repam statis temporis illustrant. Sunt vero in altioribus montium lugis, et pineta, et aptus sementi locus. Ad
Ortelius’ production of a diverting and well-written piece of travel literature is consonant with his other humanist interests, such as the collection of coins and artistic works. Constructing a profile of his early involvement in learned culture provides a useful context for understanding his later works, underlines and characterises the humanist orientation of his studies, and charts a trajectory that clarifies the goals behind each project. The record of Ortelius’ participation within the republic of letters begins with his correspondence in the early 1560s, written to him by the humanist doctors Scipio Fabius and Johannes Sambucus, the former a friend he made on his travels to Italy, the latter an acquaintance with a common interest in coins and epigraphics.27 By 1563 he was involved in the publication of Hubert Goltzius’ *C. Julius Caesar* about which he corresponded with Sambucus, who two years gave evidence of the friendship between them by sending him Latin and Greek epigrams about Albrecht Dürer – indicating both that he knew of Ortelius’ special interest in Dürer and that he knew him to be proficient in Greek.28 In 1564 Ortelius produced his first known published work, a wall map of the world printed by Gerard de Jode and dedicated to the Maecenas of Bruges, Marcus Laurinus, Lord of Watervliet, who was also Goltzius’ patron.29 Thus, by the mid-1560s Ortelius was producing innovative and ambitious work, as well as corresponding on a friendly level with leading humanists of his day about literary and antiquarian matters. He was engaged in collecting and editing the maps for his projected map-book, though whether it was already designed to be useful for historical studies is not known, and he had also begun to explore antiquarian problems relating to the ‘Arx Britannica’, an ancient Roman building immersed off the coast of North Holland, of which he published a map and about which he corresponded until late in his life.30 The Arx Britannica seems to have been the prompt for his studies of Roman Britain, and the background

ipsam etiam ripam, (ne quid hac in parte desideretur) inter fluminis alveum, et vineta, sicubi colles longius recedunt, prata sunt spectatissime virentia, ubi videre est armenta pascentia, quibus et adveniente aestu facilis est ad aquam descendere, iuvatque tota prospectare armenta in ipso flumine ad pectus usque frigus captantia. Quin et usque eo humanis natura rebus circa hoc flumen consiluit, ut multis in locis, ubi altera ripa montem habet aut collem paullo arduum, altera omnino sit acclivis, qua demum ratione vinetis integer est suas sol, et ad postumem locus reliquit commodissimus” – Ortelius, *Itinerarium*, 138-140.

27 H. Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, nos., 11 and 13-16.
to his friendship with the Welsh scholar Humphrey Lhuyd, whose writings he subsequently edited and had published in Cologne in 1572 as the *Commentarioli Britannicae descriptio fragmentum*. At the same time, Ortelius was in contact with his English relative, Daniel Rogers, about writing the history of Roman Britain. An important diplomat and spy for the English crown, Rogers was unable to complete this task, and five years later Ortelius was to prompt the young William Camden to tackle it with the aid of Ortelius’ resources, sponsorship which was eventually to lead to the publication of Camden’s *Britannia*, as indicated in the preface to the work.

Thus, with his connections in the republic of letters already so well developed, when Ortelius published his *Theatrum* in 1570 his reputation was enhanced and secured; as was demonstrated in chapter one, this was the product, not the beginning, of his scholarly collaboration and interaction with other humanists.

Although his antiquarian interests often overlapped with or fed into his cartographic work, this was not always evident from his resulting publications; for example, his 1573 publication of a selection of ancient coins and medals depicting the heads of gods and goddesses. His later publications in the field of historical toponymy have more easily been assimilated into the scholarship that treats Ortelius primarily from the perspective of cartographic history: the *Synonymia Geographica* (1578), which was an expanded version of the comparative list previously included in the *Theatrum*, the *Parergon* of historical maps (first in print in 1579), the extensive Ptolemaic lexicon which first appeared in the atlas in 1584, and the *Thesaurus Geographicus* (1587), which synthesised his earlier toponymic studies into a monumental geographical dictionary in which was mingled historical, cartographic and natural historical material. While this research had initially stemmed from cartographic pursuits, and continued to be of relevance and to find expression in that area, Ortelius had become competent, indeed expert, in this particular branch of philological study. On the basis of this research, combined with his expertise in ancient coins and

---

34 See particularly the superb studies by P. Meurer: “Ortelius as the Father of Historical Cartography”, *AOFA*, 133-160; and ibid., *Fontes cartographici Ortelianii*, Weinheim, 1991.
inscriptions, he began to collaborate with leading humanist philologists such as Lipsius and Vulcanius; for example, as will be discussed below, in the 1580s and 1590s, he helped Lipsius with his works on ancient amphitheatres and on Roman crosses.35 Thus, by the end of his life Ortelius had ascended the humanist ladder from self-educated amateur enthusiast to antiquarian and philological projects of considerable intellectual and scholarly import. It is the goal of this chapter to chart that development, to explain the means by which it was achieved, and to consider the significance of it for understanding Ortelius' own intellectual trajectory and the history of Classical scholarship in the later sixteenth century.

From the earliest stages of his career, Ortelius seems to have been closely engaged with the printing industry both in the Low Countries and in Northern Germany. Thus his first extant letter was written while attending the Frankfurt book fair, and letters sent to him from Portugal and Italy reveal that he was exporting maps and books there in the early 1560s.36 The context for his involvement with the book trade is made clear by Joannes Radermacher in a letter to Colius written shortly after Ortelius' death. He explains that Ortelius' business was based upon the acquisition of the most recent printed maps, which he then edited aesthetically and scientifically for re-sale as large-scale wall maps. His involvement with the book trade and his continued residence in Antwerp made him the best person to arrange for the sale of the books of John Rogers, the English Protestant martyr, in 1555.37 Rogers was married to Ortelius' cousin, Adrienne van der Weede, and his death rendered Ortelius the oldest male in the family. Because the library contained many works of Protestant theology, it could not be sold in England. It is probable that Ortelius arranged for its sale through his contacts in Frankfurt, since Flemish booksellers when then under considerable government pressure to suppress heretical works, yet much of the work must have been conducted in Antwerp, since Radermacher records that it was in this context that he visited Ortelius and made his acquaintance.38 If Ortelius did not already have considerable inside knowledge of the northern-European print networks,

35 J. Lipsius, De Amphitheatris quae extra Romam Libellus, 1584; ibid., De Amphitheatro Liber, 1585; and ibid., De Cruce, 1593.
36 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, nos. 6, 10 and 11.
37 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 330.
38 Ibid., no. 330.
the sale of a large and much sought-after collection of heretical books would have brought him it.

It is rarely apparent what was the nature of his input into specific publications, but his connections with printers in Antwerp and Cologne recur as significant contributions to the scholarly endeavours of others, sometimes, as will be seen, as an integral part of the creation of the work, at others merely as a circumstantial contributor of advice or information. 39 By the 1570s he had clearly compiled a significant personal collection of books and manuscripts, which he then placed at the disposal of other scholars. 40 By the mid-1580s he was confidently acting as a supplier of books for scholars in international academic centres, both from his own collection, and lent or sold from other sources. 41 The importance of his contribution in this area is difficult to assess given the fragmentary nature of the correspondence and the routine manner in which Ortelius circulated books and references. In a period in which war destroyed many manuscripts and limited scholars’ travels to rescue others, the bibliographic patronage of book collectors and trade-insiders, such as Ortelius, functioned as a key pre-critical scholarly activity that partly made up for the lack of comprehensive reference tools. In this respect, it is not surprising to find some of the most distinguished scholars of the day consulting Ortelius about publications and manuscript sources relating to their areas of specialty. 42

Towards the end of his life, Ortelius produced several works of little intellectual stature but which betray a playful and continuing engagement with literary themes. Such were his map of Utopia and his poetic guide to the culture of the ancient Germans (largely as described by Tacitus) the Aurei Saeculi Imago. 43 Ortelius apparently produced both works at the behest of others, respectively Johannes Wacker

39 A good example of the latter is his involvement in the negotiations between Plantin and Baronius about the printing of the latter’s Annals: see Torrentius’ letter to Schottus, Delcourt & Hoyoux, Laevinus Torrentius Correspondance, vol. 2, letter 564.
40 In a letter to Ortelius written on 16 January 1577, John Dee refers to a previous trip he made to visit “Bibliothecam tuam” – this refers to a journey made in 1571, when Dee was travelling to the Duchy of Lorraine, from which we can deduce that Ortelius’ library was already worth stopping for.
41 See the discussion later in this chapter of his collaboration with Vulcanius, and particularly his offer of the use of his library to Vulcanius in letter 81 08 10, and his claim in 1584 that “nihil meo operi ex veteri historia, neque poesi latina deest”: 84 02 18.
42 The cases of Vulcanius, Camden and Lipsius will be considered in detail; others include Mercator, Joachim Camerarius and Andreas Schottus: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, nos. 32, 38, 70, 99, 113, 146, 160, 169, 254, 304.
43 A. Ortelius, Utopiae Typus, 1596; ibid., Aurei Saeculi Imago, 1596.
and Jacob Monau. Producing these texts reflects the literary interests and leisure pursuits of an established figure who has neither reputation nor money to make. The publication of *Lachrymae* lamenting his death, including contributions from Scaliger, Lipsius and leading Neo-Latin poets, reveals the extent to which Ortelius had succeeded in becoming a prominent figure in literary circles, while the content of the poems confirms that he was remembered primarily for his life’s work-in-progress, the *Theatrum*. Yet although the atlas was Ortelius’ magnum opus, brought him celebrity and remained a major focus of his energies throughout his life, as was demonstrated in chapter one, it was neither the beginning nor the end of Ortelius’ scholarly activities.

Ortelius’ earliest known antiquarian interest was in ancient coins and medals. As mentioned above, in 1557, in a letter to Van Meteren, he showed a collector’s appreciation of the value and rarity of different pieces. Requesting that his cousin act as an intermediary between him and an English artist, from whom Van Meteren has himself bought medals, Ortelius describes what type of medals he is looking for and how to identify them. It is not clear from the letter whether he is collecting for himself, or for re-sale; although he expresses particular interest in medals with pictures of women’s faces, this is only because of their rarity. He is unsure of the nature of the collections owned by the artist, but keen to know more. Although no more is known about this enquiry and possible transaction, two years later Ortelius acknowledged the receipt of medals from his cousin, perhaps indicating that this had become something of a regular supply.

Amateur enthusiasm for the collection of old coins and medals was widespread during the sixteenth century, appealing to artists, scholars, and those curious for the rare or

---

44 For the origins of the Utopia map see Hessels, *Abrahami Orteli... Epistolae*, nos. 274 and 286; the dedication of the *Aurei Saeculi Imago* makes it clear that its origin was as a gift for Monavius’ children.
46 Hessels, *Abrahami Orteli... Epistolae*, no. 7.
47 “Vrouwen aensichten syn rare, wtgenomen dese Faustina, Lucilla, Crispina, ende somijge meer” and “hij de syne soude oversenden ende de selve estimeren om hier to betalen”: Hessels, *Abrahami Orteli... Epistolae*, no. 7.
48 Hessels, *Abrahami Orteli... Epistolae*, no. 9.
antique, as well as to wealthy nobles and burghers seeking adornments that brought kudos. On account of cost, the great collectors were nobles, such as Pope Paul II, the Medici, Gonzaga and Este, and later the Habsburg emperors, Maximilian II and Rudolph II, as well as lesser nobles and the very wealthy, such as the Laurini in Bruges or the Fuggers in Augsburg. Old coins could be found with little difficulty at historic sites, and much of the collecting of the period drew, directly or indirectly, on chance finds from such locations. The designs and inscriptions on these coins was of interest to artists, who sought to explore the celebrated but largely lost art of antiquity, and to scholars looking for details about the history and culture of the Roman Empire. At a secondary level, they were also of interest to traders in rarities and curiosities, who could market coins for their age and their association with the tales of Classical histories and poems, or simply as something uncommon and unusual.

That Ortelius could distinguish the relative value of each type may indicate nothing more than a salesman’s market awareness; indeed, his early interest in coins is one of the few pieces of evidence corroborating Sweertius’ claim that Ortelius inherited his father’s trade in obscure miscellanea. However, it is quite possible that Ortelius was already collecting out of personal interest in, more or less serious, study of antiquity. By 1563 he was contributing to the scholarly study of coins through participation in the publication of Hubert Goltzius’ C. Julius Caesar (see below), and

---

49 Note that Ortelius claims that in terms of size and quality his own collection might vie with any other in the Low Countries: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 149. On the history of renaissance numismatics see R. Weiss, The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity, 1973, 167-179.


the collection and interpretation of epigrams and images from old coins and medals remained a recurring theme in his correspondence throughout his life.\footnote{Hessels, \textit{Abrahami Ortellii... Epistolae}, nos., 13, 14 (both on Goltzius collaboration) and 144 (on coin-collecting and Ortelius’ lifetime investment in it).}

Ortelius’ study of coins has received only little, and recent, attention from historians.\footnote{L. Lentz, “Abraham Ortelius and the Medallic Art”, \textit{The Medal}, 25 (1994), 6-14; and C.E. Dekesel, “Abraham Ortelius: numismate”, \textit{AOCH}, 181-192.} His one numismatic publication, the \textit{Deorum Dearumque Capita}, was not a work on the scale of the \textit{Theatrum} or \textit{Thesaurus} and received little comment from contemporaries, though it seems to have sold quite well.\footnote{Passing mention of it can be found in Hessels, \textit{Abrahami Ortellii... Epistolae}, nos., 44, 55, 71, 85, 194, and 313. The book’s popularity is indicated by its being reprinted several times (in 1582, 1602, 1612, 1683 and 1699), though this may have been largely due to Ortelius’ own celebrity rather than in the inherent attraction of the work.} Early modern numismatics in general has been little studied by historians or numismatists until recently; figures celebrated in their own day, for example Hubert Goltzius, were reviled by later collectors and scholars who had to sift through the forgeries, false attributions and misreadings of earlier enthusiasts – a “Goltzism” later became a by-word for the product of poor numismatic practice.\footnote{See Berghaus, \textit{Numismatische Literatur 1500-1864: die Entwicklung der Methoden einer Wissenschaft}; and Dekesel, \textit{Hubert Goltzius, the Father of Ancient Numismatics}.} In this sense, early modern numismatists show poorly in the light of the great achievements of their contemporary philologists. The widespread popularity and imitation of their studies is as much the problem as it is the reason that further study is required. For many, collecting coins was merely an expression of enthusiasm for antiquity. That some experts pursued the subject with the highest scholarly standards brought vicarious esteem to amateur enthusiasts, but it also allowed these collectors to contribute to serious scholarship by salvaging the remnants of the past and then by granting access to their collections.\footnote{Hence the interest of non-classicists such as Emanuel van Meteren in coin-collecting. Many of Ortelius’ friend were amateur enthusiasts and his correspondence contains many examples of people sending or describing coins for his use, as discussed by Dekesel, “Abraham Ortelius: numismate”, 183-191.} A clear distinction was nonetheless understood between amateur collectors and numismatic scholars, the latter gaining an enduring reputation for abstruse and dry enthusiasms. By collecting coins for study or for re-sale Ortelius was, deliberately or not, collecting cultural or intellectual capital, increasing his status in the world of humanism, but he
was also identifying himself with an approach to antiquity that had a reputation for being scholarly but dry, even sterile.\textsuperscript{58}

The \textit{Deorum Dearumque Capita}, published three years after the appearance of the \textit{Theatrum}, does not, at first glance, fit this picture. Ortelius had already attained celebrity as a learned cosmographer and had nothing to gain in stature by publication of a fragment of his coin collection. The title page states that the coins come “Ex museo Abrahami Ortelii”, suggesting the existence of a substantial source collection, yet the book was not a comprehensive treatment of its subject and lacked any commentary; on receiving his copy from Ortelius, Sambucus instantly suggested a second edition augmented with coins from his own collection, as well as others.\textsuperscript{59}

The few other comments about the book in Ortelius’ extant correspondence indicate that he sent copies of it as a gift, and that it was received as a charming, pleasurable publication.\textsuperscript{60} However, the simplicity and unambitious character of the book are themselves revealing: the dedication to Sambucus, who had achieved international fame through publication of his influential \textit{Emblemata} in 1564, reflected literary-intellectual comradeship rather than aiming for financial patronage. The book was dedicated to him in recompense for the encouragement that he gave Ortelius to collect coins. The letter recounts Ortelius’ early enthusiasm for collecting “from adolescence, indeed first maturity, drawn by I don’t know what spirit”, even though “I was of precarious fortune”. He explicitly states that he was then unknown, when Sambucus showed interest in him; hence, having now acquired celebrity and the means to publish this work, he could not neglect to dedicate it to the man who first encouraged him, even though he knew the work to be of little practical use to his dedicatee.\textsuperscript{61} It suited the current vogue for books of images, a particular speciality of the printer, Philips Galle, a close friend of Ortelius, and the design of the cartouches and the skilful execution of the engravings made it an attractive and successful printing – its success doubtless enhanced by Ortelius’ recently-acquired fame. The

\textsuperscript{58} Ortelius himself felt the need to defend numismatic study from its negative image: “Studium enim non est adeo sterile, ut quibusdam horum imperitis forte videtur” - Hessels, \textit{Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae}, no. 144. Early-modern attitudes to collecting are surveyed in B. Benedict, \textit{Curiosity: A Cultural History of Early Modern Enquiry}, Chicago, 2001.

\textsuperscript{59} A. Ortelius, \textit{Deorum Dearumque Capita}, title page; Hessels, \textit{Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae}, no. 44.

\textsuperscript{60} Hessels, \textit{Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae}, nos., 55, 71, 85, 194 and 313.

\textsuperscript{61} “Ab ineunte aetate, naturae quodam, an cuius Genij nescio ductu” and “mihi fortuna satis tenuis”, A. Ortelius, \textit{Deorum Dearumque Capita}, dedicatory epistle.
title-page of the book proclaims that it was produced “in gratitude to those studious of antiquity”. While this is rhetoric, it points back to Ortelius’ membership of a coterie of numismatists and antiquarians with whom he collaborated and by whom he was urged to publish this book.

Ortelius’ familiarity with the network of artists and scholars centred around Bruges and associated with the wealthy local lords, the Laurin family, is well known. Marcus Laurin was an influential patron of the arts who possessed a substantial collection of ancient coins and medals on the basis of which he hoped to produce a historical study, to which end he commissioned Hubert Goltzius to study coins and Martin de Smet to analyse ancient epigraphs. The work never achieved fruition in the planned form, and in 1580, when forced by the new Calvinist council to leave Bruges, Laurin was attacked en route to Ostend by Scottish mercenaries, who stole his collections and the manuscript for Smetius’ work (later acquired in London by the curators of Leiden University and published in 1588, edited by Lipsius, as the *Inscriptionum Antiquarum liber*). The Bruges collaboration had already been beset by difficulties due to the unstable political situation, and Laurin had a large outstanding debt to Goltzius. In 1579, the latter had published his *Thesaurus Rei Antiquariae Huberrimus*, with a preface to Ortelius, dedicated to the Fugger’s rather than to Laurin, indicating that he had sought patronage elsewhere. While his patronage relationship with Laurin was re-established shortly thereafter, Goltzius had to battle for his money with his patron’s brother and heir after Laurin died in 1581, apparently in despair having lost his collections. Thereafter, Ortelius became involved in arbitrating between competing parties to the will, about which he

---

62 “In gratiam Antiquitatis studiosorum”, ibid., title page.
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corresponded with Goltzius, and which matter was complicated by further debts owed to the widow of their common friend Lieven Steppe.66

Despite the evident intimacy between Ortelius and the Laurin circle, the nature of their friendship and collaboration can only be established to a limited degree on the basis of the surviving materials. In the wake of Goltzius' first numismatic publication, Ortelius introduced him to Laurin and seems thereafter to have been closely involved in the publication of C. Julius Caesar (1563), the first fruit of Goltzius' work with Laurin (in fact, largely written by the latter).67 This was an innovative work, sumptuously produced as the first output of a private press established by Goltzius at the behest and sponsorship of Laurin. On receiving a personal copy, Joannes Sambucus wrote to Ortelius enquiring about the logic behind including two of his letters in the text, at front and back, and asking that this be altered along with a number of other errors, all at Sambucus' own expense. He also discussed arrangements for delivering a large package, containing copies of the book, to Vienna to secure imperial patronage for the work.68 The letter thus reveals not only Ortelius' intimacy with Goltzius, whom he is asked to make amenable to Sambucus' request, but also that Ortelius was himself involved in arranging the text, hence the phrase "vos epistolam meam in fine etiam reliquisse". It was common for scholars to work as compositors and editors for Latin publications and Ortelius' contribution may have been of this nature, though extant records of Goltzius' printing work for Laurin only contain evidence of other assistants.69 The print itself provides no evidence of Ortelius' involvement with it; the only mention of him is under the entry for Antwerp in the list of European coin collectors included towards the end of the publication. In the copies of the book that I have examined none of the changes requested by Sambucus have been made, leaving the extent of Ortelius' role in the publication unclear. It is likely that his input was as an advisor to both the numismatic and typographic component of the publication, as an esteemed expert and friend close at hand with strong links in the printing industry at Antwerp.

66 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 105.
67 H. Goltzius, Vivae Omnium Fere Imperatorum Imagines, Antwerp, 1556; ibid., C. Julius Caesar, sive Historiae Imperatorum Caesarumque Romanorum ex Antiquis Numismatibus Restitutae, Bruges, 1563.
68 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 13.
Sambucus' letter was sent from Ghent to Antwerp "inde vette Hinne, in die cammerstratt", the house of the Birckman's factor, Arnold Mylius, where Ortelius was resident for several years during the mid-1560s. Discussing the difficulty of sending complimentary copies of Goltzius' work to the Emperor, Sambucus suggests that Birckman might send an advance copy with the promise of more to come, while alternative arrangements may be made with the agents of the Fuggers for delivery of the main package of books. A further message is to be passed to the bookseller Libertus, with whom Ortelius seems to have been in frequent contact, to add an index and errata to the printed copies and to send four leather-bound copies "ad Hospitium Rosae Gandauum", once more at Sambucus' expense. Thus, irrespective of the success of Sambucus' intervention in the publication-distribution process, Ortelius seems to have been closely involved in it, indicating a much closer connection with the book trade than has previously been recognised.

Sambucus addressed his letter to "Cosmographo Antuerpiensi amico suo"; this was a year prior to the earliest known cartographic publication of Ortelius. The following year he sent him Latin and Greek epigrams about the German artist Albrecht Dürer, with the brief note that "I wrote to Laurinus about the coins you wanted". This provides evidence that Ortelius was esteemed as learned long before publication of the Theatrum, that a close colleague regarded him as a cosmographer, not merely a cartographer or geographer, and that he could already read Greek: his later interest in coins and art (specifically that of Dürer), his reputation for Classical learning, and his study of maps within a universal order, are all indicated. Confirmation of this comes in the form of Ortelius' 1564 wall map of the world, his first publication as author. Dedicated to Marcus Laurinus, the map was a large and ambitious undertaking executed with a high degree of skill and success: this was not the work of an amateur or beginner. It has become commonplace to suggest that 1564 or 1565 is about the time at which Ortelius must have begun to compile his atlas, judging by an estimation

---

70 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 13. See M.P.R. van den Broecke, "Introduction to the Life and Works of Abraham Ortelius", A OFA, 41.
71 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 13.
72 "D. Laurino rescripsi de numis quid velim": ibid., no. 14.
73 A. Ortelius, Nova Totius Terrarum Orbis Iuxta Neotericorum Traditiones Descriptio, Antwerp, 1564. Laurinus' letter of acknowledgment was mis-dated by Hessels; it is properly to be assigned to 1565, not 1583, by which time Laurinus was dead. Conclusive evidence is provided by the allusion to a forthcoming map of Egypt, produced in 1565. Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 122.
of how long it would have taken to compile the work; yet he clearly already had materials at hand and the expertise to use them astutely and creatively.\textsuperscript{74} It is also evident that his first geographical publication was published in the context of his numismatic coterie, begging the question of the relationship between Ortelius' geographical and historical interests.

The study of coins could contribute to a number of areas of antiquarian research. The coins themselves were generally of two types: currency struck during the period of the Roman Republic and Empire, which could contain information about dates and place names, and medals struck to commemorate festivals, battles, coronations and so forth. The second type was particularly of interest to numismatists, partly on account of their greater rarity, and partly because of the store of information contained within them. Thus one of the primary uses of numismatic finds was to establish the correct chronology of the Emperors, tribunes, consuls, praetors, and so forth, and to correlate these with the accounts of Classical and more recent historians. As examples of the value of numismology, Adolph Occo, in his \textit{Imperio Romanorum Numismata} (1579), noted contributions to orthography, citing among other examples the restitution from old coins of the name of Lucus Cornelius Sulla, misread by historians as Sylla; likewise Macrinus Imp. Opelius, misnamed Opilius.\textsuperscript{75} While some of these corrections drew upon little expert knowledge, others required interpretation of highly-abbreviated Latin or Greek epigraphs, which were often scarcely legible in poor exemplars. To translate or expand these epigraphs required familiarity with the standard usages of each period, hence necessitating a comparative approach drawing on as many contemporary coins as possible, as well as on inscriptions on architectural monuments and ruins.\textsuperscript{76} Information could also be gleaned from Classical texts, of the poets as well as historians, and thus the expert numismatist had to be well-versed in the broad culture of antiquity. This was particularly the case when cognomens were used to describe gods or historical characters, but was also required to distinguish individuals with the same name, requiring familiarity with the styles of each period,

\textsuperscript{74} See, for example, P. van der Krogt, "The \textit{Theatrum Orbis Terrarum}: the First Atlas?", \textit{AOFA}, 61.


\textsuperscript{76} Thus, the point of Goltzius' \textit{Thesaurus Rei Antiquariae Huberrimus} was to draw all these disparate sources together to illuminate particular themes.
so that the coin could be dated accurately. Knowledge of style also entailed the ability to interpret the symbolism of images on the coins, including distinguishing the physiognomy and accoutrements of Emperors and gods. Yet the images often also included other elements, never miscellaneous but often of obscure signification, the interpretation of which required extensive knowledge of Classical literature and iconography, as well as critical judgment. Each coin was not merely to be interpreted through a broad scheme of such images, but to contribute to knowledge of the scheme. 

In his own numismatic work, although it was modest in scale, Ortelius placed concerns about methodology in the foreground. In his letter “Ad lectorem” he stressed that the visual aspect of his publication was particularly crucial. He alludes to criticism of the value of reproducing images of coins as incidental to numismatic study, arguing, by way of rebuttal, that images are as important and instructive in numismatic publications as they are in books of geography, medicine, natural philosophy and cosmology. This is significant because it indicates the intellectual and commercial context for the publishing repertoire of printers such as Philips Galle and Aegidius Coppens van Diest (who published Ortelius’ early works), and possibly also Gerard de Jode. Typographic developments in natural philosophical and medical works, as well as in cartography, provide a more immediate context for the proliferation of image-based publications of moral philosophy and spiritualist writings – broadly continuous with emblem literature – than has been suggested by studies that have speculated about the input of familism as interpreted by Barrefelt. The value
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77 The achievement of Budé in his De asse et partibus eius was to use his extensive knowledge of Classical texts to draw upon all areas of life for information pertinent to his topic, leading Roberto Weiss to describe it as “the philological masterpiece of the early Cinquecento”: R. Weiss, The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity, 177.

78 The method was commonplace in numismatics as well as in textual scholarship of the later sixteenth century; a good example of Ortelius’ use of numismatics and epigraphy in this way can be found in his letters to Lipsius: see ILE 92 08 200 and 95 09 29. The first of these was a contribution to Lipsius’ De Cruce, one of the great examples of synchronic analysis of antiquity. An example of Ortelius discussing the difficulties in interpreting coins is provided by Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 149.

79 A. Ortelius, Deorum Dearumque Capita, prefatory epistle “Ad lectorem”.

80 Discussion of the developments in the printing of images can be found in Jan van der Stock, Printing Images in Antwerp; Landau & Parsall, The Renaissance Print 1470-1550; and Riggs & Silver, eds., Graven Images: The Rise of Professional Printmakers in Antwerp and Haarlem 1540-1640. In his Il “mondo” di Abramo Ortelio, G. Mangani has brought together the claims that Barrefelt promoted an emblematic vision of ethics and morality that was profoundly influential on Antwerp society and publishing.
of Ortelius’ emphasis on the importance of the printed image to numismatics was in his care to ensure accurate and detailed reproduction of the coins, which is indeed done to a very high level, improving considerably on the quality of many contemporary works. Nevertheless, emphasising the use-value of Ortelius’ numismatic publication would be to deny the rhetoric of the preface as well as the evidence of the publication itself. It was a light contribution to the market for numismatic enthusiasts, not a scholarly study or practical guide. Even when Ortelius’ devotee, Fransiscus Sweertius, published an annotated edition of the _Deorum Dearumque Capita_ in 1603, it was little more than a posthumous tribute to an admired predecessor, not a learned work – the commentaries provided sparse information about the depicted gods with brief references to relevant Classical topoi.81 Characteristically, Ortelius had himself included a list of references to ancient and modern discussions of the gods in his original publication; he made no claims to originality.82

The coins that Ortelius used for his publication included some extremely rare items, lending credence to the claim, made in a letter to his nephew in 1587, that he had spent more than two thousand crowns on books and coins in his life-time; further, his description, interpretation, and assignation of provenance for each coin is extremely accurate.83 Why, then, did he not produce a more scholarly study on numismatics? Two possible reasons might not stretch the boundaries of speculation. In the first instance, Ortelius did help to produce numismatic works through the authorship of Goltzius and with the patronage of Laurinus. Thus, a letter from Goltzius, written on 21 February 1574, requests advice on the interpretation of inscriptions that the author intends to include in his planned _Thesaurus Rei Antiquariae Huberrimus_.84 This work was to be published in Bruges later in the year, but political troubles intervened and the publication was continually postponed until, in 1579, it appeared in Antwerp, printed by Plantin and dedicated to the Fuggers, as mentioned earlier.85 While it has

81 A. Ortelius, _Deorum Dearumque Capita ... et Historica narratione illustrata a Francisco Sweertio_, Antwerp, 1602.
83 C.E. Dekesel, “Abraham Ortelius: numismate”, 192; Hessels, _Abrahami Orteli... Epistolae_, no. 149.
84 Hessels, _Abrahami Orteli... Epistolae_, no. 45.
recently been claimed that Goltzius “peut être incontestablement considéré comme le fondateur de la numismatique ancienne”, it might more aptly be surmised that the publication of his works was the product of a continuing collaboration between a network of humanist numismatists connected by the geographical locations of Bruges and Antwerp, and by the financial and intellectual paronage of Laurinus and Ortelius. Indeed, it seems that when the financial support of Laurinus failed to materialise in time, Ortelius provided the necessary means to continue the project. That Ortelius supported the numismatic and epigraphic researches of others has been demonstrated by Tine Meganck in the case of Jean-Jacques Boissard. He also provided indirectly-financial support by distributing copies of his Deorum Dearumque Capita for free, not, as claimed by Dekesel, to publicise his own numismatic activity to a broad audience of scholars, but to maintain links with those with whom he had already had dealings, and also to make accessible to them, in exquisitely copied engravings, an important part of his collection. He further assisted research that used numismatic material by supplying scholars with copies of important numismatic texts, such as those by Goltzius. Hence, his role in the production of numismatic texts seems to have been that of an advisor and patron, a facilitator rather than an author. While he was himself a key figure in the gathering, analysis and collation of coins and inscriptions, he put most of his efforts at the disposal of others, providing advice and support while focusing his attention on other matters.

Nonetheless, these other matters were a crucial part of Ortelius’ engagement with numismatic scholarship. As will be seen, his earliest cartographic publications drew upon studies of coins and epigraphs to clarify the toponymy of the ancient world so that geographical information from Classical sources could be collated with modern descriptions and naming practices. This was a matter of utmost importance, not

86 C.E. Dekesel, “Abraham Ortelius: numismate”, 187; see also the same author’s Hubert Goltzius, the Father of Ancient Numismatics.
87 See Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 105, from which it appears that Ortelius had leant Goltzius money, which complicated the matter of resolving the debts owed to the widow of Steppe.
88 T. Meganck, Erudite Eyes, 228-244.
89 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, nos. 55, 71, 85, 194 and 313. Contra Dekesel, “Abraham Ortelius: numismate”, 183, the people to whom Ortelius distributed his work (Piso, Camden, Boissard, Soranzo and Freherus) were already well-acquainted with his numismatic scholarship.
90 Ortelius provided copies of works by Goltzius to Rogers, Camden, Barbosa and Boissard: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, nos. 42, 72, 258 and 313.
simply as a reflection of respect for the authority of ancient authors, but because almost no modern topographical accounts were mathematically precise, and, even where the mathematical exactitude of ancient authors could be shown to be loose, two faulty sources could correct each other to provide greater accuracy. Accurate historical maps, drawing on coins as ancient sources, could then be used in turn by the numismatist as a guide to interpreting other coins through correct identification of place names.91

The extent of the difficulty of establishing the precise geographical referent of locations mentioned in ancient texts can be gauged by Ortelius' life-long interest in the site of the *Arx Britannica*, a Roman ruin situated off the north coast of Holland, near Katwijck that had been submerged in the North Sea during the course of the late-medieval rise in sea-levels, and thus was only on exceptional occasions visible to scholars. In 1568, Ortelius published a map of the *Arx Britannica* based upon original surveying at the site, presumably in 1562, the last time it was accessible to view prior to publication of the map.92 With the help of Goltzius and Guido Laurinus, Ortelius interpreted and illustrated the ruins, arguing that it was an arsenal used by Claudius Caesar en route to Britain, and that it may have been the site at which he erected a monument, later restored and dedicated to Marcus Antonius Aurelius by Septimus Severus. As with the early writings of Goltzius, it appears that the text incorporated at the bottom of the text, signed by Ortelius, was largely composed by one of the Laurinus brothers, in this case Guido: the information contained in it is mentioned in a letter by Guido Laurinus in which he says that he has attached an “epistolium ad lectorem” to Ortelius’ depiction of the ruins.93 The latter was clearly concerned as to how to represent the relic faithfully. If he depicted the inscription as it might originally have looked, he would take the risk of erring and thus obscuring the genuine source; if he depicted the inscription in its extant form it could not easily be deciphered. This was a matter of some debate among antiquarians of the time, and

91 In a letter to Andreas Schottus on 30 August 1588, Torrentius comments on his coin collecting that, “Ut ergo Ortelii nostri ut suades opera”, referring most probably to the *Thesaurus*, though possibly also the *Theatrum*: Delcourt & Hoyoux, *Laevinus Torrentius Correspondance*, vol. 2, letter 480.
93 Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 16.
Ortelius outlines his solution in his address to the reader.94 For the upper part of the main stone relic, Ortelius opted to follow the practice of Laurin’s protegé, Smetius, by using diacritical marks to indicate where he had provided missing words or letters, or supplying the missing letters outside the margins of the cartouche in which he represented the inscription.95 For the lower part, he appears to have attempted to indicate the current shape of the stone ruin and to superimpose the inscription in the appropriate place so that it could be seen which words are on the remaining stone, all else having been reconstructed. This visual approach was less successful because the arrangement of lettering was poorly executed so that only the first two lines are correctly positioned; thereafter the image gives a false impression of what remains on the stone. Further, an error by the engraver mistook “SEVERO” for “SENERO”, which is quite surprising in a print of otherwise very high quality.96 Ortelius further illustrated his map with coins and inscriptions found at the site, acquired for him by Goltzius, that seemed to confirm his interpretation of the ruins. The importance he grants to remains found at the location reveals his sensitivity to the problems of provenance and to archaeological techniques in the study of antiquity. The Arx Britannica was a ground-breaking publication on a matter of considerable topical interest in the Low Countries as scholars sought to further regional studies in Classical antiquity, often with a political agenda, and Ortelius spurred much further investigation by authors such as Lhuyd, Camden, Dousa, Vulcanius and Scrverius.97 His map is an important example of the analysis of archaeological remains and coins to clarify toponymic references in ancient texts. Its provenance is clearly the collaboration of Ortelius, Goltzius and the Laurini, demonstrating the use to which they put the collection and study of inscriptions.

94 “Quae cum manca sit, his marginalibus additamentis suae integritati restituta videtur”: A. Ortelius, Ruinarum Arcis Britannicae apud Batavos Typus.
95 Ortelius’ adoption of Smetius’ approach is discussed by T. Meganck, Erudite Eyes, 29-30. See also H. de Vocht, “Maarten de Smet van Oostwinkel, Grondlegger der Latijnsche Epigraphie”, Miscellanea Historica in Honorem Alberti de Meyer, Louvain, 1986, 825-35.
96 A high-quality reproduction of the map can be found in AOF4, 351.
97 The site was already discussed by Cornelius Aurelius in Die Chronijcke van Holland ende Vrieslandt, Leiden, 1517, who used it as a basis for his political promotion of the identification of the ancient Batavians with the modern Hollanders. Vulcanius set out Aurelius’ arguments in his Batavia, sive de Antiquo veroque eius Insulae quam rhenus in Hollandia facit Situ, Antwerp, 1586. The debate around his ideas, including selections from Camden’s writings on the topic, is presented in Petrus Scrverius’ Batavia Illustrata, Leiden, 1609. British interest in the site was already evident in Humphrey Lhuyd’s “De Mona Druidum Insula”, which was included in Latin editions of the Theatrum. Janus Dousa, jnr., planned to write on the topic, interrupted by his premature death, then published posthumously in expanded form by his father: see Vulcanius Correspondence, 83 01 07; and J. Dousa, Bataviae Hollandiaeque Annales, 1601.
While research of the *Arx Britannica* seems to have been carried out largely by others, many other maps by Ortelius indicate use of his own analysis of coins to illuminate toponymic difficulties, or to ornament the geographical representation with ethnographic detail. For example, his map of Egypt (1568), although toponymically constructed within the tradition of textual scholarship, contained a depiction of Canope that was later to appear in the *Deorum Dearumque Capita*, and representations of Egypt and of the Nile that were taken from depictions on coins or medals. Further, the use of coins for historical analysis is frequently discussed in Ortelius' correspondence; his advice is often sought by leading scholars, or they ask him to acquire information from others. A good early example is a letter from his cousin Daniel Rogers, written on 20 October 1572, in which Rogers requests Ortelius to get Goltzius to send him all information from old coins and inscriptions that is pertinent to the ancient history of Britain. His request might seem a tall order, but as mentioned previously Ortelius had suggested to him the production of an historical-topographical account of Britain, a subject that had held special interest for Ortelius since the time of his study of the *Arx Britannica* and his encounter with the Welsh scholar, Humphrey Lhuyd, who contributed a philological essay on toponymy to the first edition of the *Theatrum*, and whose posthumous writings were edited and published by Ortelius. Lhuyd's philological arguments about the ancient British language (based on study of Welsh) were beyond the expertise of Ortelius, who was uncertain about passages of the text. A letter of John Dee, written on 16 January 1577, revealed that Ortelius had showed him Lhuyd's manuscripts prior to publication: he thanks Ortelius for hospitality shown a few years previously when Dee had visited his library specifically to consult them. This could only have occurred in 1571, when Dee received a licence to travel to Lorraine (presumably passing through Antwerp) to purchase laboratory equipment—his only trip abroad since Ortelius had received the manuscripts. This may have been an opportunity to gain the advice of

98 A. Ortelius, [untitled — map of ancient Egypt], 1567; see the discussion by Peter Meurer, “Ortelius as the Father of Historical Geography”, *AOFIA*, 137-140.
99 Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 42.
102 Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 67.
the distinguished Welsh scholar before proceeding to publish Lhuyd's incomplete work later in the year. The publisher that Ortelius chose was the Birckman firm in Cologne, with whom he had strong links through Arnold Mylius. As mentioned above, Ortelius lived with Mylius in the Birckman's Antwerp base during the 1560s; Lhuyd's text suited the capabilities and interests of the firm, which often published philological studies and was thus perhaps a more promising option than the publishers of graphic art and science books previously used by Ortelius in Antwerp.\textsuperscript{103} It is not possible to determine whether he funded the publication himself; certainly there is little evidence of his distributing copies of it, except for the specific use of his relative, Daniel Rogers. Nonetheless, it was relatively successful and was quickly translated into English, perhaps justifying Ortelius' efforts and confirming his assessment of the need and the market for a more thorough study of British antiquity.\textsuperscript{104}

The project that Ortelius wished to promote was a topographical account of Roman Britain, using local archives alongside archaeological and philological evidence, collated with the accounts of ancient historians. By the time of the publication of Lhuyd's text, Rogers was already compiling his work on the ancient Britons, as indicated by Ortelius in the first edition of his atlas: "Our relative, Daniel Rogers, has written a Commentary on the customs and laws of the ancient Britons, but it is not yet published".\textsuperscript{105} In his letter written on 20 October 1572, Rogers reveals the reasons for the delay in publication: he was busy with other affairs (diplomacy and espionage) and he was studying a field either neglected or corrupted by previous historians so that he had to find and interpret only the oldest manuscripts, coins and inscriptions. He thanks Ortelius for the help that he has already provided and asks him to request the above-mentioned assistance from Goltzius.\textsuperscript{106} However, Rogers never completed his study due to the ever-increasing load of diplomatic responsibilities assigned to him as England became more and more embroiled in the political wranglings resulting

\textsuperscript{103} The Birckmann firm's relations with Plantin through Mylius are discussed in J. Denucé, \textit{Oud-nederlandsche kaartmakers in betrekking met Plantijn}, Amsterdam, 1964, 253-264; see also J. Cools, "Arnold Birckman, 1529-1542", \textit{De Gulden Passer}, 2 (1924), 71-87.

\textsuperscript{104} The publication history of the book is discussed by Chotzen, "Some Sidelights on Cambro-Dutch Relations". Although Lhuyd's work was ridiculed by Philip Sidney and Hubert Languet, in its form as \textit{The Breviary of Britain} (trans. Thomas Twyne, 1573) it seems to have enjoyed some success and was reprinted several times.

\textsuperscript{105} "De veterum Britannorum moribus et legibus scripsit Commentarium Daniel Rogerius cognatus noster, sed nondum edidit": A. Ortelius, \textit{Theatrum Orbis Terrarum}, 1570.

\textsuperscript{106} Hessels, \textit{Abraami Orteli... Epistolae}, no. 42.
from the Dutch wars and the shifting allegiances of imperial dukes and counts in the increasingly polarised and international power struggles engulfing the Germanic lands throughout the 1570s and 1580s.\textsuperscript{107} After a trip to England in 1577, Ortelius shifted the focus of his patronage to William Camden, who subsequently produced his monumental study, \textit{Britannia}, as the first fruit of inheriting the Ortelian project to provide a topographical account of Roman Britain.\textsuperscript{108}

For Ortelius, the study of coins was thus not ancillary but integral to the study of antiquity. It embraced his interest in both geographical studies and the particular historical projects that they spawned. More than that, it was the route through which Ortelius came to enjoy the intellectual company of the Laurini, Goltzius, Sambucus and Lhuyd. They provided the means and the forum to collaborate towards projects that launched his career as a humanist pursuing historical scholarship, rather than following merely artistic or cartographic concerns. Yet Ortelius brought to the study of coins his expertise in geography and art, and it was the way in which he channelled these strengths through numismatic material to a broader contribution to epigraphy and philology that then enabled him to collaborate with the leading antiquarian scholars of his day.

The lexicon of ancient place names included in the \textit{Theatrum} was Ortelius' first publication in the field of toponymy. Although it was not a properly philological study, having been compiled on the basis of wide-ranging but unsystematic reading, it represented the beginning of thorough onomastic research that eventually led to publication of the comprehensive and rigorous \textit{Thesaurus Geographicus}. In the preface to a later publication, his \textit{Synonymia}, Ortelius explains that he had compiled a card catalogue of ancient place names, which he came across during preparation of the \textit{Theatrum}, with the intention as using it as the scientific basis for historical maps that he wished to publish. As the \textit{Theatrum} neared completion, he decided to append a list of these names at the end of the publication to assist the student of history to use the atlas as a guide. Lacking time to collate and edit the material himself, he asked his friend and colleague Arnold Mylius to do so, resulting in the list entitled "Antiqua

\textsuperscript{107} F.J. Levy, "Daniel Rogers as Antiquary", 444-462.
regionum ... nomina” included at the back of the early editions of the atlas. This account of the origins of the project was designed to explain the development of the work up to publication of the Synonymia in 1579, a few months after Ortelius produced his second Additamentum to the atlas, containing some of the long-planned historical maps. It thus serves as a sales-pitch for three works rather than just one: the Synonymia, the new edition of the Theatrum and the Additamentum. Nonetheless, it underlines the connection between Ortelius’ early interest in historical geography and his awareness of onomastics as a productive field of study. His hurried decision to publish a premature version of the list as an accompaniment to his modern maps should not be taken as a lack of seriousness of purpose, rather an awareness of the continuity or complementarity of his historical and cartographical projects.

As an editor and synthesizer of the maps of others, Ortelius was particularly well placed to analyse historical place names; even more so as an antiquarian and numismatist. Most recent critical studies of early modern geography have focused on the difficulties of mapping new territories and integrating new accounts into an established understanding and representation of the world. In fact, much of Ortelius’ energies were devoted to studying the geography of Europe. As established in chapter one, to do so was partly a historical exercise in correctly identifying a place in relation to what earlier authors had written in order to comprehend how the current status of the place had come about. Hence the distinction, rather broadly delineated by modern scholars, between historical geography and contemporary geography needs to be drawn carefully. Whereas the modern discipline of geography distinguishes between cartography (the drawing of maps), historical geography (representing an area as it was in the past) and political geography (depicting political boundaries), for Ortelius they were fully integrated studies. Thus, whereas much recent scholarship has focused on ethnographic elements in early modern geography, or on political influences on cartography, Ortelius’ geographical understanding may best be
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109 “Antiqua Regionum ... Nomina” in A. Ortelius, Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1570; ibid., Synonymia Geographicca, 1579, 3-4.
110 A. Ortelius, Additamentum Theatri Orbis Terrarum, 1579.
111 Only 31 (17.5%) of the 177 contemporary maps produced by Ortelius for the Theatrum, and 13 (18.6%) of the original 70, depicted areas beyond Europe (including the world maps, the map of the North Pole, and maps of Russia, Turkey and the Middle East).
112 A good treatment of the gradual separation and compartmentalisation of the different fields of geography is provided by Aril Holdt-Jensen, Geography, its History and its Concepts, 1999.
described as a kind of civil ecology, that is, the study of how civilisations have developed and responded to environmental and political pressures and changes. That this description might also be applied to many of the histories written by early modern scholars is no coincidence. For Ortelius geography was a humane study of the world and in order to understand the world it was necessary to know the past.

In the first edition of the Theatrum, the list of ancient place names and their modern equivalents was rudimentary, though it usefully cross-referenced names in two indices, one with ancient key-words, one with modern, so that the reader might seek to proceed from both ancient to modern and vice versa. While the extent of the sources used for the lexicon was limited, and the orthography restricted to modern usage (hence seriously restricting the usefulness of the work), nonetheless the seriousness of purpose can be gauged by the dedication of nearly fifty pages to the lists. For the second edition, published later in the year, Ortelius had already added several pages of new material, and within three years the size of the lexicon had almost doubled. During the following six years it remained unchanged, indicating that he had already envisaged replacing the work with an independent publication, the name of which had been prefigured by an alteration of the title of the lexicon in the 1571 edition of the Theatrum to “Synonymia Locorum Geographicum”.

The idea to publish a lexicon of ancient names was not new (in his own publication, Ortelius characteristically provided a bibliography of earlier examples); it was the need for scientific rigour that prompted Ortelius’ effort. While this was his stated aim for the very first version in the Theatrum, the work that he produced during the following nine years was a more convincing engagement with the task of scholarly analysis and collation. In his preface he presented the work merely as a larger version

113 The current term was “chorography”, designating a description of the character of a place rather than its geographical location, as defined at the beginning of Ptolemy’s Geographia; see G. Strauss, “Topographical-Historical Method in Sixteenth-Century German Scholarship”, Studies in the Renaissance, 5 (1958), 87-101.
115 Ortelius, Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1571.
116 “Autores in hac Synonymia citati” in A. Ortelius, Synonymia Geographica, 5-7; although this list was eliminated from the Thesaurus, the latter work states frankly in the preface that the geographical lexicon was not an original idea. Earlier lexica include Stephanus Byzantinus, Eδωρια (tenth century, first published Venice, 1502); and Η Ζωνάδας (tenth century, first printed Milan, 1499). Earlier humanist lexica are listed by Meurer, “Synonymia – Thesaurus – Nomenclator”, 331-2, including works by Boccaccio, Lilio, Nebrija and Robert Estienne.
of what had gone before, earning a separate volume through size not nature; but this
was rhetoric, the work was qualitatively different. In fact, the dictionary had now
been divided in three. The volume opened with a list of the authors consulted in the
compilation of the dictionary; the main eighty-five percent of the text was devoted to
a lexicon of place names drawn this time exclusively from Classical authors, not their
humanist derivatives; and finally a much smaller "Elenchus" of modern and non-Latin
names. Although Ortelius described it as "a work useful and necessary not only to
Geographical studies, but also to those of poetry and history", by geographical studies
he means primarily those that are devoted to the analysis of Classical geographical
texts.117 What had initially seemed merely an adjunct to a collection of maps was
now a properly historical, indeed philological, study. In his letter of dedication to
Plantin and Mylius, Ortelius stressed the concern to purify onomastics of neologisms
and errors of orthography, noting that his own previous work had shamefully fallen
foul of these traps.118 Thus, over the course of the 1570s, Ortelius had become
involved in philological scholarship, even while expanding and re-editing his atlas.

The extent of this shift in focus can be gauged by consideration of the sources used by
Ortelius for the compilation of the lexicon. There are approximately ten thousand
entries drawing on over four hundred Classical authors and a large number of
medieval and humanist writings, as well as maps, coins, inscriptions, and the Bible.
While the Classicism of the Theatrum is striking, it does not reveal the depth of
Classical scholarship evinced in the Synonymia. Discussing textual variants and
quoting Greek as well as Latin sources, Ortelius exhibited a high level of critical
scholarship, taking up the humanist clarion call of a return to the sources, and raising
the question of the nature and context of the sources – for example, poetry is often
misleading because of innovative, metaphorical or circumlocutory appellations. He
even discusses onomastic history, such as the supposed increased meaningfulness of
modern names.119 Diligence, rigour and the pursuit of reliable sources are claimed as
the standards expected by the author; while the philological expertise necessitated by
such a study was not as large as the requisite effort, care and breadth of reading, the

117 "Opus non tantum Geographis, sed etiam Historiae et poesos studiosis utile ac necessarium": A.
Ortelius, Synonymia Geographica, title page.
118 "Ad DD. Christophorum Plantinum et Arnoldum Mylium", Ortelius, Synonymia Geographica, 3-4.
119 Ortelius states this explicitly in his preface: "Ad DD. Christophorum Plantinum et Arnoldum
Mylium", Ortelius, Synonymia Geographica, 3-4.
book itself was a notable work of scholarship in the linguistic and not merely antiquarian vein.

As with work on his map collection, Ortelius' study of onomastics, once begun, remained a preoccupation for the rest of his life; but whereas the *Theatrum* was constantly re-issued in newly revised forms to meet market demand, gradually enhancing the scope and quality of the work each year, the *Synonymia* advanced in larger, slower strides. It was eight years before a new version appeared, transformed into a publication of greater sophistication and thoroughness with a new title, the *Thesaurus Geographicus*. Yet the philological study in which he was engaged was continuous, merging with and emerging from collaborative antiquarian projects and cartographic pursuits.¹²⁰

As discussed earlier, in 1575 Ortelius undertook a journey through parts of what he called Belgian Gaul in the company of Joannes Vivianus, Hieronymus Scholierius and Jan van Schille. The stated reason for the trip was to see those neighbouring territories so celebrated by historians but not previously visited by Ortelius and his friends.¹²¹ The actual reason for the journey is unlikely to have been quite so disinterested; Ortelius was acutely aware of the difficulties of identifying ancient place names with modern towns or sites - difficult in principle, and further complicated by the competing claims of local traditions, which could fabricate or obscure historical record through pride or confusion. In fact, the ultimate goal of the journey was to get to the autumn Frankfurt book fair, at which point the narrative ends; the decision to take a detour south through Luxemburg and Lorraine must have been prompted by circumstance and opportunity as much as anything else.¹²² The Spanish reconquest of territory lost in the first years of the Dutch revolt was at a temporary standstill while peace talks took place in Breda (3 March - 3 July 1575).

¹²⁰ A. Ortelius, *Thesaurus Geographicus*, Antwerp, 1587. A transitional manuscript, dating from the early 1580s, and thus indicating the continuous process of revision on which Ortelius was engaged, can be found in the Museum Plantin-Moretus: M 285.


¹²² For rhetorical effect Ortelius makes the trip to the book fair seem incidental; in fact he travelled there most years for business reasons: "Instabat iam nundinarum tempus, quae Francordiae, quae ad Moenium fluvium est, magnó totius Germaniae conventu frequentantur, quo etiam properandum videbatur, adverso Rheno flumine", Ortelius, *Itinerarium Per Nonnullas Galliae Belgicae Partes*, 142.
Although the theatre of war immediately prior to the negotiations was further north than the direct route to Frankfurt via Cologne, the area around Maastricht had recently been affected by mutinies (7 November 1574 – 5 March 1575). Nonetheless, Ortelius did not depart at least until after 25 May 1575, when he wrote a letter from Antwerp to his nephew, and it is more probable his route was determined by the opportunities created by the truce rather than by the limitations of recent or potential war.\textsuperscript{123} Indeed, the first part of his route follows the ‘Spanish road’ used to transport southern-European armies to and from the Netherlands; no troops were transported via this route from 1574 to 1576 inclusive, though those travelling south could only be confident of this during peace negotiations.\textsuperscript{124} However, the legacy of military transportation did affect the journey directly; plague was endemic in this highly populous corridor and an outbreak in 1575 closed the doors of all towns between Luxemburg and Nancy, forcing Ortelius and his companions to travel directly between the two, a distance of over sixty miles through hilly terrain.\textsuperscript{125} Thus, although the relative calm in the wars presented the opportunity for such a journey, the determination of the travellers to visit particular locations of historical significance is clear.

Transport via arterial rivers structured some of the route, but the company made detours to most of the key historical sites. Thus, they proceeded south from Antwerp to Namur, then east via the Maas river to Liège, whence they made a detour north to Tongeren; then south through Liège to Spa and Stavelot; southwest from there to Bastogne and Arlon, then through the woods to Luxemburg. It is not clear whether they were able to travel via the Moselle river in between the towns while avoiding the plague on their way to Nancy. From there they made a return trip south to St Nicolas-de-Port, then travelled north for the rest of the trip along the Moselle up to Koblenz, at which point the narrative ends, mentioning that the company continued on to the fair at Frankfurt. The text continues, however, with an appended transcription by Joannes

\textsuperscript{123} Hesses, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 57.
\textsuperscript{124} For discussion of the “Spanish road” and the condition of the surrounding areas see G. Parker, The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road, 1567-1659, Cambridge, 1972.
\textsuperscript{125} “Luxemburgo Nanceium per Mediomaticorum fines cogitabamus: sed cum morbus contagiosus dicetur totu eo tractu et in ipsa adeo Mediomaticorum urbe grassari, atque ea de caussa in Lotharingicas urbes non admitti qui illac transissent, necessum fuit vitatis urbibus Nanceium recta petere”: Ortelius, Itinerarium Per Nonnullas Galliae Belgicae Partes, 88.
Scholierius of a manuscript that he consulted during the trip, a life of Notger, the Bishop of Liège.\textsuperscript{126}

It is not known why Ortelius did not publish the account of his journey until 1584. As mentioned before, it purports to be a letter, in response to one from Mercator written on 26 March 1575; the authors claim that they decided not to reply immediately as they were in the process of departing on their journey. Given that they did not set out for at least two months, and probably more, after Mercator’s letter was written, this claim is probably mere rhetoric, though lengthy delays in the delivery of correspondence were not uncommon. The detailed and lively descriptions of the journey itself make it likely that the narrative was written shortly afterwards, though the date of 1 October 1575 given in the text seems very early considering the business trip to Frankfurt made after the trip described. Evidence of early composition comes from Ludovico Guicciardini, who seems to have used a manuscript version of the \textit{Itinerarium} as the basis for the second edition of his \textit{Descrittione di tutti i Paesi Bassi}, published in 1581.\textsuperscript{127} It is likely that a version of the \textit{Itinerarium} was written as a letter to Mercator in 1575, and that the authors later edited it for publication; hence the narrative may be assumed to be a largely faithful account of Ortelius’ activities in 1575.\textsuperscript{128}

The activities of the company during the trip are described in varying degrees of detail; the focus of the text at each point reveals the relative importance attributed to the activity by the authors. The most striking feature of the account is its preoccupation with recording inscriptions; this is done in both textual and pictorial form. While there are frequent discussions of inscriptions throughout the book, particular attention is given to the tomb of Jean de Mandeville, in a Williamite monastery near Liège; to the inscriptions on monuments and gravestones belonging to the Count of Mansfeld; to the funeral monument of the Secundinus family in Igel.

\textsuperscript{126}\textit{Ibid.}, 144-160.


\textsuperscript{128} A letter from Arnold Wachtendonck in November 1575 reveals that Ortelius had sent to Liège a brief account of the trip in which he focused primarily on the ancient coins discovered en route. Wachtendonck says that a more elaborate account was expected: Hessels, \textit{Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae}, no. 61.
Ortelius demonstrates in his transcriptions and interpretations of these fragments is sophisticated and skillful. He transcribes and interprets abbreviations accurately and relates them to the claims of previous scholars; for example, he faithfully transcribes an inscription in the Benedictine monastery of St Hubert in Gembloux, which confirms the claim by the Italian scholar Bartholomeus Platina that it was founded Guibert of Lotharingia in 922. Ortelius also shows particular ability to read images and to take them seriously as evidence for the interpretation of the past, carefully reproducing them for the benefit of future scholars, particularly when he was himself unable to decide how to interpret an artefact or site, as in the case of the baths at Trier which Ortelius wrongfully associated with a poem by Ausonius about a triumphal arch. Indeed, the text of the Itinerarium provides ample evidence that Ortelius' scholarship was grounded in the analytic techniques of an artist/art collector and numismatist. There are five high-quality engravings accompanying the text, underlining Ortelius' argument, stated explicitly in the Deorum Dearumque Capita, about the value of pictorial representation of antiquities. In printing Scholierius' transcription of the life of Notger of Liége, the Itinerarium gives prominence to the consultations of manuscripts mentioned in passing during the main narrative. Indeed, despite the claim at the beginning of the text that the travellers did not undertake the journey, or a description of it, with the goal of providing new information about the area, they clearly do set out to find and analyse artefacts and documents of historical import, and to report on their findings.

Throughout the Itinerarium, the preoccupation of the authors with locale takes a specific form. Each place is discussed with regard to its antiquity, the origin of its name (where known), interesting historical artefacts that remain there, and


130 Ibid., 44; B. Platina, De Vita Christi ac de vitis summorum pontificum omnium, Venice, 1479.

131 Ortelius, Itinerarium Per Nonnullas Galliae Belgiae Partes, 120-22, and 294; see also the discussion by Schmitt-Ott in his notes, 242-3.

132 Ortelius, Deorum Dearumque Capita, prefatory letter. T. Meganck places great emphasis throughout her dissertation on Ortelius' use of artefacts and images to interpret the past, rather than engaging in textual scholarship, an approach that, she claims (following Momigliano), characterises the activities of an antiquarian not a historian.
The text is systematic and concise. It is not a travel narrative aimed at recording the experience of travelling, rather it is an attempt to place a framework of historical interpretation over the map of “French Belgium”. To this end, the text begins with a brief discussion of the history of the region, and thereafter each town is identified as a historical site, rather than merely as a contemporary town. Given Ortelius’ own stated caution about identifications of modern towns with ancient place names, and the reserve he expresses in several instances, the nature of the evidence he uses for identification and the method of his analyses are significant.

To some extent, Ortelius follows the trend among contemporary philologists of attempting to interpret the origins of a town through analysis of its name. Frequently there are several current interpretations; Ortelius sets down the basic principle that etymology must at least rely on the local vernacular, rather than Latin. For the towns where this was deemed possible, he had to draw upon his knowledge of the history of the French and Germanic languages of the region, though he also consults local opinion on the matter, and occasionally expresses doubts about its validity. As in his account of the Arx Britannica, he assesses artefacts found in the region as evidence of the settlements that have occurred there, that is, an archaeological approach. As a dimension of his onomastic research, this is particularly interesting because the role of fieldwork in such studies is not well-documented for the early modern period, and it represents a considerable improvement on studies that relied solely upon local tradition and etymology. Yet a further element in this respect is Ortelius’ description of the local environment, while these were probably included in part to provide colour to the narrative, they are also a

---

133 Those mentioned en route are Petrus Divaeus, Dominic Lampson, Jacob Susius, Laevinus Torrentius, and the Count of Mansfeld; Johannes Moffin is encountered passing through, and Carolus Langius is mentioned as having recently died.

134 For example, he expresses extreme reserve with regard to Louvain: “De eius initii aut nominis origine nobis nihil constat. Nam quod Luposinam ante C. Iulii Caesaris tempora appellatam fuisse nonnulli tradant, fabulae quam historiae similium ducimus”, Itinerarium Per Nonnullas Galliae Belgicae Partes, 38. Of Liège he merely states, “Unde sit Leodium nomen, nobis non constat, ac ut de eo multae circumferuntur opiniones, ita nihil quod cuiusquam videatur momenti”: ibid., 56.

135 The most celebrated example of this approach is Goropius Becanus’ Origines Antverpianae, Antwerp, 1569.

136 “Ubi tamen poetica potius allusione, quam fidem historicam agnoscas, cum nomencl etymologiae ex quisque gentis vernaculo melius, quam ex peregrino sermone petantur”, Itinerarium Per Nonnullas Galliae Belgicae Partes, 36.

137 Ortelius uses etymology to ascertain the original names of Mechelen, Zeedijk, Stavelot, Arlon, Luxembourg, Pont-à-Mousson, Thionville, Trier and Koblenz.
crucial part of the mapping process. There is no evidence that Ortelius took the opportunity to map the area mathematically using triangulation (though this was probably because the area had been mapped using such techniques by Van Deventer and Mercator), but the vivid descriptions provide additional evidence of the character of each town and the nature of the region as a historical site. They confirm that the location is apt for the identification of a town described by ancient writers; the assumption is that names and peoples may change, but topology does not. The most striking example of this is his identification of Tongeren with the town of Advacam Tungrorum inhabited by the Eburones, described in Tacitus and Caesar. While the number of artefacts at the site confirms local traditions and the similarity of the names, in fact it is the landscape to which Ortelius turns to confirm the association. Notably Ortelius used inscriptions found on coins and monuments as evidence relating specifically to the location in which they were discovered. While coins of indefinite provenance could also be useful evidence, those found, as it were, on site were deemed of particular value in determining the nature of the site. It is in this respect that Ortelius combined his expertise in numismatics with a geographer’s sense of locale and a fledgling archaeological science.

However, merely to emphasise the antiquarian study of artefacts in which Ortelius engaged on this trip would be to underplay his repeated reliance on the textual tradition of the ancients. This issue is perhaps best approached through the discussion of Tongeren, mentioned above. For Ortelius the problem is twofold: both to understand the history of the geographical location, and to identify the referents of place names mentioned in Classical texts. The question therefore arises: “What is there to stop us from identifying this place with the Αξοξοκοβ of Ptolemy, whatever way it may be read, and with the Atuatucam of Caesar?” The problem is

---

138 “Si quis vero curiosius singula Caesaris verba expendat, quibus de Atuatica facit mentionem, reperiet cum nullo melius, quam huius ipius oppidi, tum loci natura convenire ... Valles praeterea magnas, et colles in his locis non desideraveris, ut omnia quadrant Caesaris descriptioni, quae facilius agnoscat quisquis tam elegentam et munitum orbis situm diligenter expenderit”, Itinerarium Per Nonnullas Galliae Belgicae Partes, 66-8.

139 This is notable in the case of Arlon, which had recently been damaged by fire, so that Ortelius had to rely on monuments in the surrounding area and those that he knew to have been taken from the site for the Count of Mansfeld’s collection: Itinerarium Per Nonnullas Galliae Belgicae Partes, 78-80. It is possible that an early version of the Itinerarium focused much more predominantly on coins; see above, n.127.

140 “Quid vero prohibet quin hic Ptolemaei Αξοξοκοβ, vel quomodocumque legatur, et Caesaris item Atuatucam referamus”: Itinerarium Per Nonnullas Galliae Belgicae Partes, 66.
to correlate different manuscript references with each other and with the geography of the location. Thus Ortelius worries that his identification of the site is inconsistent with the evidence of the Antonine Itinerary, one of the major sources for identifying Roman toponymy of the region; his solution is to claim that, given the celebrity of the town under consideration, scribal error is more likely than a mistake on the part of the compiler of the itinerary, and indeed he notes that scribal variations do occur in this case. Likewise he uses philological techniques to deduce that the correct rendering of the place name in Caesar’s account is “Atuatucam”, not “ad Vatucam” as some manuscripts read. In order to clarify this, he has consulted the oldest manuscripts (“vetustiora exemplaria”), and he has also established that the reading “ad Vatucam” is contrary to Latin grammar and is not used elsewhere by Caesar. He justifies this conjectural emendation in terms of onomastic principles, explaining that names often alter over the course of time, as can be seen in contemporary usage, and that it would therefore not be surprising if a spelling varied among Greeks and Romans from different periods. Ortelius then proceeds to discuss the historical development of the town from the initial settlement or castle, adding the caveat that his explanation is conjectural, and then uses his account to clarify details in Caesar’s text. This is textual exegesis, drawing on Ortelius’ combined strengths in geography and, increasingly, philology.

The *Itinerarium* is thus not a geographical study read through a historical framework, but an antiquarian study organised and interpreted according to geographical principles. However, it is also a humanist text promoting the study of humane letters. Through the genre of the personal letter, merged with the genre of travel literature, Ortelius finds a forum to discuss his observations on Classical texts. Claiming not

141 “Facilius fuit scribam in numeris errare, quam ut tantae urbis nomen omissis credamus, ut in hoc codem libello, eorumdem prorsus locorum distantiam, aliter atque aliter notatam, videas”: *Itinerarium Per Nonnullas Galliae Belgicae Partes*, 64.
143 “Videntur enim illa in idem recidere, nisi quantum vulgi imperitia temporis successu tandem, in propriorum nominum prolacione, quod ipsum et hac memoria usu venire videmus, immutat; ut non mirum sit Romanos, aut Graecos homines diversis temporibus in eorum scriptura variasse”: *Itinerarium Per Nonnullas Galliae Belgicae Partes*, 66.
144 “Sed haec ex coniectura”, *Itinerarium Per Nonnullas Galliae Belgicae Partes*, 66-68.
145 The generic development of humanist exegesis and methodological writing, struggling with the contraints of rhetorical eloquence, is discussed with regard to an earlier period by A. Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, Oxford, 1983, 6-44.
to contribute to scientific knowledge of the region, it presents itself as a kind of guide book for humanists. Structurally, the accounts of each town are reminiscent of the descriptions in books such as the Guicciardini's *Descrittione di tutti i Paesi Bassi*. The mention of eminent local figures, or friends encountered en route, is a key part of the genre, indicating who is worth meeting in the area, who might act as a guide, and promoting the prestige of friends by alluding to them as learned humanists. Attention to contemporary architecture is particularly striking in this regard: the houses of Laevinus Torrentius and the Count of Mansfeld are described in detail, partly for the grandeur of design, but also perhaps as evidence of their contribution to the arts.

The structured, almost formulaic, style of the book offers it as a model for humanist/antiquarian travel accounts, but also for the appropriate manner of travelling: in this regard, it has been seen as instrumental in reviving the "antiquarian tour", which became so fashionable in the following century.

The journey in 1575, which formed the basis of the *Itinerarium*, was followed by a trip to France in the first months of 1577; from there to England in the summer; and, in winter, a journey south through the Rhine valley to Italy, whence he returned in early 1578. The context for these trips was the increased freedom to travel in the Low Countries in the wake of Alva's departure, as well as the need to avoid the waves of war and mutiny that tore apart towns and regions in this period. Although Ortelius was then engaged in extensive research into geographical names, the publication of his *Synonymia* in 1578 could not have benefitted from these journeys, in terms of the increased access to sources which Ortelius enjoyed, because his return was too late to have permitted him to incorporate extensive amounts of new material.

---

148 The English and German trips were discussed in chapter three in relation to the *Album amicorum*; the trip to France is revealed by a letter from Joannes Moretus to Plantin written on 13 February 1577: Rooses & Denucé, *Correspondance de Christophe Plantin*, vol. V, no. 754.
149 Ortelius returned to Antwerp in early 1578, but the financial preparations for printing the work were already agreed by Ortelius, Plantin and Mylius on 10 August 1577: Denucé, *Oud-nederlandsche kaartmakers in betrekking met Plantijn*, 260. On 4 August Camden, who had recently been in Ortelius' company, wrote that he eagerly expected the *Synonymia* at the next Frankfurt fair, i.e. October 1577, hence Ortelius seems not to have intended to delay publication by the introduction of major changes: Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 71. The work was already printed and for sale by
manuscript sent to Mercator in 1575 has plausibly been identified as an early form of the *Synonymia*; whether or not this identification is accurate, Ortelius was certainly working in earnest on the study in this period.\(^{150}\)

Ortelius' efforts paralleled the continuing work of Goltzius on inscriptions taken from ancient coins and monuments. While there is little remaining material by which to gauge the level of cooperation between the two men at this stage, the coincidence of their studies is striking. Goltzius was preparing his *Thesaurus Rei Antiquariae Huberrimus*, which is a catalogue of inscriptions and their sources, arranged by topics so that the reader can, for example, check the different social and political titles used in the Roman Republic and Empire.\(^{151}\) The prefatory letter is addressed to Ortelius and assigns to him much of the responsibility for promoting the work — too busy to become directly involved, he urged Goltzius to compile a scholarly compendium using the resources that had been placed at his disposal by so many patron.\(^{152}\) Goltzius' *Thesaurus* was published in 1579, after several years of delay caused in part by the negative effects of war upon the supply of paper and funds to print large scholarly tomes. As mentioned earlier, Goltzius' patron, Marcus Laurin, was in a particularly difficult political and financial situation in the late 1570s and hence had not paid Goltzius the money promised to produce the work; Ortelius seems to have advanced the necessary funds to Goltzius, ensuring publication in 1579. For his own work, however, the costs were divided equally between the publishers Plantin and Mylius.\(^{153}\) This is of particular interest because of the financial predicament of Plantin at the time. Although he had been turning away scholars' submissions for several years unless they could supply some of the costs themselves, had been forced to sell his Paris business at half the estimated price, and complained frequently about his finances in letters to potential sponsors in Spain, even mooting the possibility of selling everything, in fact his financial situation permitted him to expand his

---


\(^{152}\) "Ut nihil tibi, Clarissime Orteli, otii aut occasionis remittis, quo aliquid in communere consulas; ita ante aliquot annos litteris me urgere soles, ut tandem adpareret, et quid ex tot antiquitatibus apud me et huilus studii Maecenates depositis, in republicae et humanitatis usum proferre possem": Goltzius, "Ad ornatis. Ab. Ortelioum ... Praefatio", *Thesaurus Rei Antiquariae Huberrimus*.

properties in Antwerp and to favour projects in which he had a particular interest. The financial state of scholarship in general at this point is extremely important for understanding the contours of intellectual life. Thus, the role of Mylius in the publication of the *Synonymia* is indicative of a much deeper and broader collaboration both between him and Plantin, and between scholars in Antwerp and Cologne, where (as discussed in the last chapter) so many refugees and exiles stayed or visited. To place the antiquarian projects of Goltzius and Ortelius in this context is not to overstate their exemplarity, rather it is to note that they contributed to and reflected the patterns of intellectual circumstance during the civil and religious wars in northern Europe. The impact of these wars upon both studies was particularly acute because they were career-long compilations designed as comprehensive reference books embodying continuing collaboration; yet the disruptions in intellectual life simultaneously increased the need for standard reference works, a situation which favoured collaboration as much as it made it problematic, and which greatly increased the cultural position of the authors.

A further consequence of the wars was that they coincided with, and were partly responsible for, the flourishing of humanist scholarship in England; what the English contributed in terms of financial support for the Dutch forces, the Low Countries returned as cultural benefaction. The Flemish diaspora flowed through centuries-old trade routes, leading to the replenishing of strangers' communities in London and East Anglia as well as the strengthening of bilateral diplomatic contacts between the two countries. Yet such geo-political transformations did not necessarily have a positive effect on the intellectual interaction across the region. Increasing English antagonisation of Spain (exploiting the stretched resources of Philip II by fostering atlantic piracy to the considerable economic benefit of English citizens and the

---

154 For examples of Plantin’s complaints of penury, often geared towards extracting patronage, see Rooses & Denucé, *Correspondance de Christophe Plantin*, vols. IV and V, passim, especially the letters to Cayas and to Philip II.

155 Denucé, *Oud-nederlandsche kaartmakers in betrekking met Plantijn*, 253-64, and especially the comment on page 257 that, “Keulen was voor vele vervolgde ingezetenen van de Nederlandsche gewesten een tweede vaderland geworden”.

crown), as well as its political reversion to Protestantism at the accession of Elisabeth, made travel between Spanish dominions and England a matter of administrative interest; the operation of Dutch pirates in the North Sea made it dangerous. Yet, for Ortelius, it added an extra layer to his interest in British scholarship – English ships were now exploring the north-eastern coast line of America. Thus, when the Pacification of Ghent opened up the possibility to leave an Antwerp recently mutilated by the Spanish mutineers, Ortelius travelled to Paris and then north to cross the Channel to England.

Immediately prior to Ortelius’ trip, on 6 October 1576, Martin Frobisher had returned from the new world with a strange black ore believed to contain gold. The English court came alive with rumour. The queen herself was eager to find out what had transpired on the trip to America. What strange peoples had been encountered? What curious discoveries could be claimed? Was there any evidence of the invaluable Northwest Passage to the Indies? And - the question that over the following few months began to dominate all others - was there gold? Information of this kind was highly sensitive. Voyages of exploration were commercial enterprises requiring considerable financial investment before a ship could leave port. This was particularly the case in England where support from the Queen was opportunistic and inconsistent. While learned sponsors, such as John Dee, were keen to promote the scientific value of each voyage, money was the lure that motivated sailors and made their journey viable. It also attracted gossip networks, which were built on the diplomatic retinues of European states and on the extensive links of international trade concerns. That governments were aware of the political and economic significance of geographical information is made clear by the controversy between Spain and Portugal over mapping the Moluccas Islands. Prior to that, Portugal’s secretive attitude to their exploration of the African coastline suggests an awareness of the

---


merchant principle that knowledge is money.\textsuperscript{159} Perhaps partly for this reason, Ortelius found a ready market for his atlas, giving concrete expression to information about the remote lands that affected everyday commercial operations. Nonetheless, the financial significance of geographical knowledge created obstacles as well as opportunities for those who pursued learning primarily for its own sake. Knowledge could be difficult to come by and, perhaps inevitably, experts became chary as access to information became more exclusive.

Fortunately for scholars, exploration often proceeded under their supervision. While navigators were resistant to the advice of inexperienced scholars, a learned promoter could often be the key to patronage.\textsuperscript{160} In England John Dee had been liaising with mariners for over twenty years. In 1553, not long back from continental travels, during which he consulted with the young Mercator about cosmology and visited Antwerp specifically to meet Ortelius, Dee became involved in schemes for overseas exploration, and he continued to be involved with the Muscovy Company for the next two decades.\textsuperscript{161} Hence, when Michael Lok was planning a voyage to the Americas in 1576, Dee was considered a convenient interested party who might be able to procure financial investment from the court, while perhaps also being worth consulting about what was known of the northern regions to be explored. In May and June of that year Dee provided instruction for Martin Frobisher and Christopher Hall, the captain and first mate of Lok’s fleet – though the practical value of his input was almost certainly nothing, his contribution brought useful reassurance to potential investors.\textsuperscript{162} After nearly four months at sea, Frobisher returned on 6 October. Initially, excitement focused on a captured Inuit who, however, died shortly after arrival in England; attention shifted quickly to rumours of gold. Three ‘assayers’ were employed to test the ore brought back from the Labrador coast. Dee was not one of them and no evidence suggests that he had inside knowledge at this stage, though he was later

\textsuperscript{159} A particular emphasis on the political and financial aspects of mapping the new world is provided by Jerry Brotton, \textit{Trading Territories: Mapping the Early Modern World}, London, 1997 (with particular treatment of the Moluccas debate); and David Buisseret, ed., \textit{Monarchs, Ministers and Maps}, Chicago, 1993.

\textsuperscript{160} See Smith & Findlen, eds., \textit{Merchants and Marvels: Commerce, Science and Art in Early Modern Europe}, London, 2002, especially the article by Alison Sandman, whose work has extensively documented the resistance and rivalry between navigators and cosmographers.

\textsuperscript{161} Dee’s involvement with the Muscovy Company is discussed in W. Sherman, \textit{John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance}, Amherst, 1995; McDermott, \textit{Martin Frobisher}, and Loades, \textit{England’s Maritime Empire}.

\textsuperscript{162} See the opening chapters of McDermott’s, \textit{Martin Frobisher}.
asked by the crown to give a conclusive assessment of the substance. Having been closely involved from the outset of the trip, it is unlikely that his only source of information was the gossip that circulated London and the court, finding its way to Europe through such media as the correspondence of Philip Sidney and others. Nonetheless, when Dee wrote to Ortelius on 16 January 1577 it was as an insider collaborating with another expert, not merely a gossip or a detached observer.¹⁶³

As mentioned earlier, Dee had met Ortelius for the first time in Antwerp in 1550 and had also visited him there in 1571; however, his letter of 16 January is the earliest extant correspondence with between the two scholars. It begins by praising the Theatrum and Ortelius, but queries a number of geographical details with reference to Dee’s own studies. He sympathises with the plight of the Low Countries and advises scholars and artists to seek a place of temporary refuge. The letter suddenly changes tack as Dee suggests that Ortelius’ letters may be sent through Daniel Rogers or the servants of the Birckman’s. He goes on to comment that haste is necessary because time is short – preparations for Frobisher’s second voyage are already underway.¹⁶⁴ This letter is presumably in response to a previous one from Ortelius; nothing more is known of the correspondence. However, the letter reveals not only how information travelled between experts in a field, but also that Ortelius’ plans to travel to England in early 1577 were related to Frobisher’s journey.

Dee’s invitation to Ortelius did not stem from courtesy. He was not involved in the Frobisher voyage because of concern for gold; he believed that the uncharted area of North America might contain a sea passage to Asia. He also believed that England might be able to justify colonial claims to North American territory on the basis of the legends of St Brendan and Madoc, and the voyages of John Cabot in the 1490s.¹⁶⁵ Dee contacted Ortelius because the latter had access to the latest knowledge about the northern regions; indeed, Ortelius had published a wall map of Asia in which he

---

¹⁶³ Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 67; McDermott, Martin Frobisher.
¹⁶⁴ “Festinacione profecto aliqua opus est. Nostri enim homines ad Boreales Atlantidis partes maritimas, iterum iter maturant”: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 67.
¹⁶⁵ Dee set out his ideas in a text written for Queen Elisabeth, his Brytannici Imperii Limites, in which he called for a “reformation” of geography. After paying homage to Mercator and Ortelius, he concluded “Nihilominus in quibusdam tamen Geographicis rebus suis, ab utrisque istis tantis viris, ut expresse (hic et alibi) dissentiam, ipse ardentissimus Augustae veritatis (quo luculentissime flagro) impellit amor”: British Library, Add. 59681.
exhorted the British in particular to explore the area. The possibility of discovering a Northwest Passage to Asia excited the commercial minds of many in Europe. Control of trade routes to Asia had guaranteed the Portuguese a lucrative monopoly on eastern spices and merchandise. Spain was building a South American empire, which supplied precious metals and sugar, enabling the Spanish to fund their wars in Europe. The French were beginning to challenge Spanish supremacy in America and had explored further north than their rivals. Nonetheless, the English had shown only sporadic concern with overseas exploits; privateering had been tacitly permitted, but no consistent government backing had come for colonial projects. John Dee was trying to change this. In fact, a number of attempts to gain Elizabeth’s support for an expedition to seek the Northwest Passage were made in the mid-1570s. Ortelius’ world map of 1564 seems to have popularized the notion that the Northwest Passage existed and should be navigable. In 1576 Humphrey Gilbert used Ortelius’ map as the basis for an argument in favour of exploration, basing a map of his own on Ortelius’ original. Hence it is not surprising that Dee sought the advice of Ortelius. As a personal friend, or perhaps disregarding national interest, he does not seem to have been concerned about leaking confidential information to the Spanish or Dutch. Perhaps it was clear to him that the Dutch were not yet able to foster foreign exploration and unlikely to offer information to the Spanish; Ortelius’ status as ‘royal geographer’ to Philip II apparently made no difference in this respect. A number of years later Hakluyt claimed that Ortelius, during his English trip in 1577, commented that the Dutch would have established territories overseas long before then if they had not been delayed by civil wars. Hakluyt’s claim must be judged in relation to his efforts to convince Elizabeth of the value of expeditions to America; nonetheless, it is not necessarily unreliable. Although Ortelius probably became involved in Dee’s inquiries for his own professional purposes, he may, lacking an obvious alternative, have been willing to collaborate with the English for the sake of scholarly goals.

It is not known how much Ortelius learnt from or contributed to the English explorations, though it was probably next to nothing; however, it is possible to

reconstruct some of his activities in England. One of his first engagements was to visit John Dee at his home in Mortlake, where he could inspect the English scholar’s cabinet of curiosities and extensive book and manuscript collection. As mentioned already, he met Richard Hakluyt, with whom he discussed geographical matters, and who regarded him as something of a spy upon the English expeditions, and his Album amicorum reveals him also to have encountered scholars such as William Charke, Richard Garth, Thomas Wyelson and, most importantly, Camden. The latter seems to have introduced him to the Dean of Westminster, Gabriel Goodman, and had intended to arrange a meeting with William Cecil, Lord Burghley, who had extensive map and coin collections. Ortelius probably stayed with his cousin, Emanuel van Meteren, and began his intimate acquaintance with his nephew Jacob Colius, later styled “Ortelianus”. He could not, however, have spent much time with Daniel Rogers, his relative through marriage, as the latter was sent on a diplomatic mission to the Netherlands in March 1577, shortly after Ortelius arrived. Emanuel van Meteren claims to have accompanied Ortelius on a trip to Ireland in 1577, perhaps on the recommendation of Rogers, who had sent his poem about the island to Ortelius five years previously. I have been unable to find any contemporary evidence of the trip, or indications of its influence on Ortelius’ mapping of the island. Although the Tudor government was at this time particularly concerned about mapping Ireland (fearing the possibility of Spanish invasion), there is no official record of Ortelius being granted a licence to go there or a passport to travel throughout the island. If the trip was made at an unofficial level, the facilitator would presumably have been Rogers, but it would be extraordinary if it escaped the notice of the governor Henry Sidney, whose son Philip was both a friend of Rogers and

170 Dee made reference to Ortelius’ visit in his diary, though this is curiously omitted from the published edition; see W. Sherman, John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance, Amherst 1995, 5. 171 According to Hakluyt, Ortelius’ purpose in visiting “was to no other ende but to prye and looke into the secrets of Frobisher’s voyage”, The Original Writings ... of Hakluyt, ed. E.G.R. Taylor, London, 1935, 279. For reference to his meetings with the other scholars, and how the Album must be interpreted as a source, see chapter three. 172 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 71. 173 See F.J. Levy, “Daniel Rogers as Antiquary”, Bibliothèque de Renaissance et Humanisme 27 (1963), 444-462; and Van Dorsten, Poets, Patrons and Professors, 46-61. 174 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 42; Sweertius’ biography is the earliest source referring to the trip: “Vita Abrahami Ortelii”, in Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1603. Rogers’ poem is now in the possession of the Marquess of Hertford: Hertford MS., ff. 6a-17b.
Camden, and familiar with Ortelius’ work. Nor is it clear what the purpose of the trip might have been; tourism in politically unstable regions (the Pale was then in turmoil over the “cessing” of soldiers upon the land) was not characteristic of Ortelius, and travel in the North Sea was widely regarded as hazardous by continental travellers. Ireland would also have been a distraction from Ortelius’ interest in investigating Roman antiquity, unless he wished to consult learned figures or possible patrons, but some of those he might have wanted to visit there – Henry Sidney, Humphrey Gilbert – were in England at the time. If Ortelius did travel to Dublin it is remarkable that he did not make the acquaintance of Richard Stanihurst, who had just written a historical account of Ireland that was appended to Holinshield’s Chronicles in 1577, but who spent several years in Brussels in the 1590s apparently without contacting Ortelius. Nonetheless, it is difficult to see how Van Meteren could have been mistaken about having made such a trip; even if some confusion could be assumed in his case, the claim is repeated by Sweertius without receiving censure from the critical eye of Ortelius’ childhood friend Radermacher, who was in England throughout 1577. Thus, exactly when Ortelius made the trip, and for what purpose, must remain uncertain unless further evidence comes to light.

Perhaps the most unusual feature of Ortelius’ supposed trip to Ireland is that it would have distracted from his goals in visiting England – to enquire into the Frobisher expeditions and to pursue the project to produce a topographical account of Roman Britain. It is probable that Ortelius and Rogers met to discuss the latter in late February or early March 1577; Ortelius was in Paris on 13 February, presumably en route to England, and he visited Dee in Mortlake on 12 March, thus he almost certainly had time to meet his relative, who spent most of March in England. Unless he had done so at an unknown previous date, Rogers must have informed Ortelius that he was unable to pursue the project in earnest due to the extent of his diplomatic commitments, which required frequent travel through political circuits on the continent. The extant manuscript of his study reveals that he had not consulted

175 By contrast, when Rogers (a trusted English agent) travelled to Ireland in 1572 he had to request permission, and a government order was issued to limit his freedom of movement there: Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1509-73, 479.
177 Radermacher raises various objections to Sweertius’ text, but does not mention the reference to Ireland, though this could perhaps be because he was writing to Colius and Van Meteren, who hardly needed to be informed on the subject: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, nos., 330 and 331.
manuscript material, monuments or coins to any considerable degree, though in a letter to Ortelius, written on 20 October 1572, he claimed that the necessity of doing so had greatly delayed his work. It also reveals that Rogers had not focused on toponymic studies, though he did open the work with a discussion of the origin of the name “Britain”, and he did incorporate other more directly linguistic analyses. He worked primarily from earlier printed sources, in addition to the materials of Humphrey Lhuyd, procured for him by Ortelius. The manuscript also reveals considerable interest in Ireland and in the history of druidism; where it discusses Roman antiquity, it fails to integrate analyses of Imperial chronology with studies of British political history. However, the extant manuscript is only part of the material prepared by Rogers, and it reflects an incomplete study. In 1577, Ortelius must have acquired the text of Rogers’ work and given it to William Camden, who had already been studying the topic, and who thereafter became the focus of Ortelius’ efforts to procure a topographical study of Roman Britain.

A letter written by Camden on 4 August 1577 reveals that Ortelius had already returned to the continent, apparently suddenly and without warning. He refers to their conversation in London and to a planned project, about which he says he has not yet anything to report. This alludes to the study of Roman Britain proposed to Camden by Ortelius. He comments that he is eagerly awaiting Ortelius’ Synonymia from the Frankfurt fair, and he wants to know whether Goltzius’ Thesaurus will be available there. In fact, as already discussed, the Synonymia did not appear until the following year, and it was a further year before the Goltzius’ work was published, hence Camden’s expectation of them, which almost certainly came from his conversation with Ortelius, reflects the unanticipated delay in the appearance of both works. His interest in them suggests that he was beginning to gather materials and reference works to begin the study of ancient Britain; to this end he asked Ortelius
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178 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, 42; British Library, Cot.Titus F.X.
181 Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, 71.
182 Ortelius, Synonymia Geographica, Antwerp, 1578; Goltzius, Thesaurus Rei Antiquae Huberimmus, Antwerp, 1579.
whether he had access to a manuscript of the Antonine Itinerary, and if so, whether he
could send a transcription of the routes of Britain to him.\textsuperscript{183}

Camden wrote again on 24 September 1577, by which time he had received a letter
from Ortelius, which, however, was not a response to Camden’s of 4 August. Ortelius
had sent portraits (of whom is not known), a copy of Goltzius’ \textit{Sexti Ruffi Breviarium
rerum gestarum} (Bruges, 1565), which was the second part of Johannes Otho’s
introduction to Roman history, published in the same year – further evidence that
Ortelius was orienting Camden towards the study of ancient Britain by providing him
with important reference works. Ortelius also sent his \textit{Album amicorum}, requesting
an inscription from Camden, and a copy of Laurentius Gambara’s \textit{Rerum Sacrarum
Liber} to be presented to Goodman.\textsuperscript{184} Camden replied that he was delighted with
Goltzius’ work and that he intended to follow its example in restituting Flavia to the
number of Roman provinces in Britain, a detail omitted by previous authors, even
when they have enumerated the correct number of provinces, only naming the
others. He preferred the opinion of Goltzius over previous authors, assuming that he
has searched deeply into the oldest manuscripts.\textsuperscript{185} Thus, the antiquarian approach to
source-criticism promoted by Goltzius and Ortelius was shared by Camden; indeed,
he spent the following summer travelling round England on the kind of scholarly tour
modelled in the \textit{Itinerarium}, analysing coins and inscriptions found on field-trips to
identify the Classical heritage of each location – a proto-archaeological
methodology.\textsuperscript{186}

The early manuscripts of Camden’s \textit{Britannia} indicate that it was initially oriented
primarily towards Roman Britain, and that he gradually grafted in more material
relating to the post-Imperial and Anglo-Saxon period. This process continued through
the series of print editions, to the extent that one historian has referred to the later
versions of the study as a “Corpus Inscriptionum”, claiming that this was a deviation
from the initial Ortelian chorographic model.\textsuperscript{187} Yet in extending the range of the

\textsuperscript{183} Hessels, \textit{Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae}, 71.
\textsuperscript{184} Hessels, \textit{Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae}, no. 72.
\textsuperscript{185} “Existimo enim illum tuum Goltzium excellentissimum Antiquitatis restauratorem antiquorum
exemplarium fidem sequutum, et secus sentire mihi sit religio”: ibid., no. 72.
\textsuperscript{187} F.J. Levy, “The Making of Camden’s \textit{Britannia}”, 89.
work and incorporating a greater number of transcriptions, Camden was merely
enhancing a work of the form of the *Itinerarium* to become a more monumental study
of the scope of Goltzius' *Thesaurus*. Indeed, by addressing the specific problems
presented by the middle ages, he produced a study more conducive to his friend's
interest in etymology and onomastics. Ortelius' patronage continued as Camden
shaped his manuscript; he sent a copy of his *Synonymia* as requested, and attempted to
procure a manuscript copy of the Antonine Itinerary and the Peutinger Table. The
Antonine Itinerary was particularly important because it contained a wealth of
information about the geography of Roman Britain, but the published editions of it
were full of corruptions. Ortelius had consulted a manuscript version during
preparation of his atlas and lexica; however, he was unable to help Camden on this
occasion because he did not currently have access to a copy. As he later explained,

For many months you have been seeking a copy from me of the Antonine
Journey and also of Theodosianus: but I am very sorry, not so much for you
but also on my own account, that I have not yet been able to attain them for
you. I remember having seen part of a manuscript of the Antonine Journey at
Bruges, but when I asked for it from them they wrote back that it could be
found nowhere. They complain that many books of that type have fled from
them secretly to the French 'Studium'.

Other copies disappeared in like manner; Georgius Braun explained to Ortelius that he
had leant his copy, along with some other books, to one Cusantus, who, when asked
to return them, replied that he had lost them. Ortelius seems to have suggested that
Camden acquire an alternative copy through Mercator, who made arrangements to
send it. Ultimately, the philologist and friend of Ortelius, Andreas Schottus,
dedicated an edition of the Itinerary to him, reflecting the centrality of the document
to Ortelius' own onomastic studies, and fittingly rewarding him for his concern about
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188 "Ante multos menses petieras per me copiam Itinerarii Antonini, item Theodosiani: sed valde doleo
non tuo tantum sed et meo quoque nomine me tibi ea hactenus non potuisse praestare. 'Antonini'
itinerarii me aliquid manuscripti apud Brugenses vidisse memineram, sed dum istud ipsum ab iisdem
postulo, nusquam posse reperiri rescribant. Conqueruntur cum multis ejus generis libris ab iis clam
189 Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 96.
190 Van Durme, ed., *Correspondence Mercatorienne*, 154-5.
the manuscript's survival. As regards the Peutinger Table, Ortelius asked several friends, including Jan Bartwijk, Adolph Occo, Joannes Herman, Johan Roma and Daniel Rogers, to gain access to it for him. This manuscript was a medieval copy of a fourth century itinerary that was extremely valuable in itself and also necessary to interpret the Antonine Itinerary. It was discovered in a monastery by the German humanist Conrad Celtis, who bequeathed it to Peutinger, but the early attempts to edit it for publication came to nothing, and its whereabouts are unknown for the subsequent fifty years. It reappeared in the possession of the Augsburg patrician and humanist Marcus Welser, but not before he had published an edition in 1591, based on the copies made by Peutinger. When Welser then acquired the original he sent it to Ortelius to attempt to restitute it faithfully. The work was incomplete when Ortelius died, and the study was brought to a conclusion by Welser himself in an edition that respectfully alluded to Ortelius' role in bringing the manuscript to light.

Although he struggled to provide Camden with the Peutinger Table, Ortelius was able to contribute much else, including his *Theatrum* and his delineation of the *Arx Britannica*, and a brick rescued from the structure, which contained inscriptions identifying the legions that used the site. Ortelius points out that although in the local vernacular the structure is referred to as “Thuys te Britten”, inscriptions on the ruins reveal it to have been an arsenal. Camden responded to Ortelius' benefactions with gifts of his own, including John Stow's *Annals* (though he was apologetic about the inconsistent quality of the study), and he acted as an intermediary between Ortelius and Dee, as well as supplying information about the continuous English ocean voyages. He also sent Ortelius a finished draft of his *Britannia* early in 1584, two years prior to publication. Ortelius joked about the allusion to him as a “midwife” and offered any further assistance that might prove necessary. He was unsure whether Camden wanted him to get the work published in Antwerp, and, if so, under what conditions. He mentions the possibility of publishing with Plantin, but requests
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191 See Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 146.
192 Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, nos., 126, 204, 217 and 306.
196 Ibid., 9.
instructions from Camden; however, the work was eventually published in London two years later.197 Once Camden had begun to survey England himself, the prime role of Ortelius was to provide him with, or check references in, continental publications. Thus, the prime contribution of Ortelius to the project was not to inspire Camden with an idea (he was already engaged in similar studies) but to place at his disposal the resources of the Laurinus-Goltzius project and the manuscripts of the abortive British studies that Ortelius had sponsored, and, thereafter, to supply him with continental publications. Such contributions were secondary to the primary historical research undertaken by Camden, who, though sharing Ortelius’ vision, followed his own trajectory with the work. Nevertheless, they were important precisely because access to books in order to check the opinions of others, to keep up with the latest scholarship, and to gain access to ancient source material, remained one of the main tasks of the early modern antiquarian.

Yet Ortelius’ position among the antiquarians and philologists of the later sixteenth century was more than merely that of “midwife” to the works of others. In a letter written on 22 October 1580, Camden enquired “about what you are stretching the sinews of your mind”.198 The source of Ortelius’ strain was his *Thesaurus Geographicus*, upon which he had been working since shortly after the publication of his *Synonymia*, in which he had announced the plan to purify geographical nomenclature.199 After his return from Italy in early 1578, there is a marked increase in his purchases of historical studies, judging by Plantin’s accounts. Although he had been purchasing narrative histories for many years, the number now increased, and during the 1570s he had begun to buy philological studies of history, and it was the latter that increased greatly in number in his account after 1578.200 By 1580, news that he was hard at work compiling his new expanded lexicon had spread to Leiden, 
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197 Ibid., 21.
199 Ortelius, *Synonymia Geographicca*, “Ad DD. Christophorum Plantinum et Arnoldum Mylium”.
200 For example, in 1578 he purchased Torrentius’ *C. Suetonii Tranquilli XII Caesares Commentario*, 1578; Goltzius’ *Thesaurus*; as well as works by Homer, Lucretius, and Columella; in 1579 he bought works by Isidore of Seville, a collection of historical works newly arrived from France, and Modius’ edition of Quintus Curtius; in 1580 he bought works by Tacitus, Nicephorus, Juvenal, Thucidides, Diodorus Siculus, Justin Martyr, Severus Alexandrinus Carrio’s edition of Sallust, Becanus’ *Opera*, a German dictionary, and Janus Doussa’s *Ad C. Sallustii Crispi historiarum libros Notae* – among other books: J. Denucé, *Oud-nederlandsche kaartmakers in betrekking met Plantijn*, 178-186.
London and Breslau. A manuscript in the Museum-Plantin-Moretus, dating from 1581, reveals precisely what this work entailed. Ortelius was reading widely through ancient histories and literature in order to add to the material already gleaned from geographical literature. His research was complicated by the lack of reliability of printed editions, and by variations or lacunae in manuscripts. His principle was thus to consult the oldest extant manuscripts, assuming these to be the most reliable, and, where possible, to identify the source of later variations in order to determine whether they were legitimate variants or errors. The attempt to distinguish corruption in manuscripts and printed sources often required much more than attention to scribal errors and faulty transcriptions, which could be readily identified if older sources were available; if these were not to hand, it was clearly much more difficult to identify errors. While his journey south in 1577-8 was useful in this regard, correspondence with friends was still more crucial. Colleagues in Italy, Spain, the Netherlands and Germany consulted their libraries to find relevant manuscripts and either sent them to Ortelius or reported back on specific readings and problems. This required detailed familiarity with the project and so Ortelius tended to rely on a small number of individuals to whom he made repeated requests.

Onomastic study required a basic grasp of Greek, or access to a Greek scholar. While Ortelius was able to read Greek, and, as has been shown already, often received poems in Greek from friends, various scholars have expressed some doubt about his ability in the language. The confusion arises because of Ortelius’ response to a question from his nephew about a Greek inscription on some coins; he says that he cannot provide an answer, as much because of inexperience in the language as because of the rareness of the coins. Yet he adds that if there were more examples of

201 Camdeni et illustrum virorum epistolae, 9; Hessels, Abrahami Orteli Epistolae, no. 93; Vulcanius had arrived in Leiden, bringing the news with him.

202 In a letter to Vulcanius, Ortelius comments about Cassiodorus, “Utinam ab aliquo viro docto cum vetustis codicibus collatum haberemus. Farellus apud me est, et usus sum. Codex valde impurus in veteribus propriis nominibus. Omnia ex fontibus mihi petenda fuere”: Vulcanius Correspondence, 81 09 03.

203 For examples, see Hessels, Abrahami Orteli Epistolae, nos., 146, 147, 170, 183, 185, 186, 203, 204, and many others throughout the correspondence, aside from those discussed here. For reasons of space it is not possible to discuss all the collaborations or help that Ortelius received; suffice it to say that the extant records reveal a tendency to fall back on the help of people such as Monavius, Vulcanius, Lipsius, Schottus, Mercator, Van Winghe, and later Welser – of course, this varied according to the type of problem under consideration.

204 See M.P.R. van den Broecke, “Introduction to the Life and Works of Abraham Ortelius”, AOFA, 36; and T. Meganck, Erudite Eyes, 5 – both scholars seem to doubt Ortelius’ proficiency in Greek.
the coins he could perhaps collate the inscriptions to provide an answer. Without knowing what the question related to, it is impossible to assess the quality of Ortelius’ Greek from these statements. His lack of willingness to trust his linguistic facility in the language as the basis of a conjecture is typical of his predilection for collation over conjecture in general. In the remainder of the letter he proceeds to discuss features of Greek epigraphy that draw upon this approach, suggesting no lack of facility or experience in the language.

In fact there can be no doubt that Ortelius read Greek widely, as is evident both from his book purchases in Plantin’s records and from his practice of listing the sources of his scholarly works. Thus in a letter to Vulcainius on 28 October, 1581, he commented about a Latin text of Constantine that “I wanted to see the Greek, so that I might add it to this, as has been my way till now; but not to worry. Indeed, I often find myself deceived by Latin alone, thus nothing satisfies me unless I can consult the Greek as well”. Moreover, his comments on the specific problems of collating Greek and Latin sources for his lexicon provide confirmation that he was using the language extensively in his research. Of particular concern to him was that scribes and translators might have been inconsistent or incorrect in transliterating Greek to Latin so that, for example, “a certain word beginning AE but that a scribe has copied as E, I might incorrectly, on account of his error not having been corrected, place under E although it should be placed under A.” Ortelius was also plagued by the historical transmission of names from Greek to Latin, both in written and oral traditions. A good example is afforded by his discussion of “Abellinum” in the Synonymia Geographica. Pliny referred to the location as “Abella”, Ptolemy as “άβέλλα”. So far so good; however, Flavio Blondo associates this incorrectly with
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205 “Quae de Graecorum nummis ex me scire cupis, ignoro. Tum ob eius linguae imperitiam, tum ex talium nummorum raritatem [sic]. Si maior eorun copia nobis esset, forte collatio eorum in lucidum lucis adferret”: Hessels, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 149.

206 “Est Phillipi nummus apud me valde integer, in quo haec ΔΗΜΑΡΧΕΩΥΣΙΑΚΟΤΑΣ sine ullis punctis, uti hic vides. Tu cogita de caracteret, in ordine octavo, hac ut vides forma Θ numeri notam ne significet. Non enim est sygma, etsi inversa videatur. Nam haec hoc modo C. in omnibus quos hactenus viderim nummis exprimitur”: ibid., no. 149.

207 Dimuc, Oud-nederlandsche kaartmakers in betrekking met Plantijn, 149-235; Ortelius, Synonymia Geographica, “Autores in hac Synonymia citati”; ibid., Thesaurus Geographicus, passim.


209 “Vox quaedam inchoatur ab AE et librarius per E simulam[sic], ego eius vitio sub E libera, quae sub A, locanda erat, male constituteram”: Vulcanius Correspondence 81 10 08.
Avellino in Hirpinis. The error comes indirectly from Ambrosius Leo, who transliterated correctly from the old Greek “άέλλα” to “Aella” (drawing the name from the high winds in the region), but thereafter later Latinists inserted the extra “B”, leading to the erroneous identification with a location in Campania. Although identifying and fixing such errors did not require sophisticated philological training, it could not be done without considerable time and care. In the absence of relevant reference works, it also required considerable access to, and ability to deal with, manuscripts. Ortelius discusses this briefly in the preface to the *Thesaurus*, suggesting that one of the principle contributions of his work is towards the rectification of early-modern Greek orthography. Notably he adds a disclaimer about his ability to read some Greek manuscripts; though it is not clear if he means that he has limited to them, or limited abilities - even the latter translation cannot however be taken to mean that he had poor Greek, since the context is his widespread consultation of other Greek manuscripts that he could read. Thus, although Ortelius was not a leading Graecist, he was well placed to pursue the task, having the kind of international scholarly network that brought him access to manuscripts and advice, and owning an extensive library that facilitated consultation of printed sources. As an editor of maps he was already familiar with many of the problematic attributions and was often able to provide geographical solutions to problems that could not be solved merely through textual criticism. However, although this was, in conjunction with knowledge of old coins, the key to his expertise in onomastics, the increased scientific rigour of the *Thesaurus* stems from his realisation that he needed to carry out more extensive philological research. The *Theatrum* contains much evidence of his awareness of particular onomastic problems, but not of the need for a systematic project to purge geographical nomenclature, an oversight that he later referred to as a punishing and shameful mistake.

---


211 A sense of the problems with early modem Greek knowledge more generally can be acquired from R. Weiss, *Medieval and Humanist Greek*, Padua, 1977.

212 Ortelius, *Synonymia Geographicca*, “Ad DD. Christophorum Plantinum et Arnoldum Mylium”.
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A good example of the greater sophistication of the *Thesaurus* compared to the *Synonymia* can be gauged by comparison of the entries for “Belgium”. In the *Synonymia* Ortelius merely notes that Caesar placed three legions there, and that Marlianus and Glareanus interpret it as a town not a region, in which opinion they were followed by Blasius Vigenererus in his commentary on Caesar, who also interpreted Bavay as a town in Hainault. This last comment was clearly unsatisfactory to Ortelius. In the *Thesaurus* he added that some identify it with Beauvais, a region in Picardy. Further, he returned to the claim that “Belgium” was merely a town, arguing that, although one authority states that the capacity of a single town might extend to holding four legions, Caesar explicitly mentions many towns whose inhabitants were designated Belgians. He adds that Belgium must be distinguished from Belgica, of which it was only one part identified along with several others. He concludes by stating that Belgium was the northern part of Belgica, comprising Flanders, Brabant, Holland, Zeeland, Gelderland and Cleves. Ortelius also therefore expanded his entry for Belgica. Previously he had merely stated that it was a “place on the Antonine Itinerary between Aggripina and Treves, which was taken by Simlerus to be “Bullingen”. In the *Thesaurus* Ortelius retained these remarks, but prefaced them with more information allowing a more precise identification, and explaining differences in usage through political change over time. First he states that Belgica is referred to as “Gallia” by Caesar, Pliny and Strabo; then he explains that the reference to it as Celtica in Ptolemy is the result of a typographical error; finally he cites Ammianus and Athanasius to the effect that Gallia was later divided into two parts, one of which contained Aggripina. He concludes with the remarks from the *Synonymia* that Belgica occurs between Aggripina and
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213 “BELGIUM, in quo scribit Caesar se tres legiones collocasse, Marlianus et Glareanus pro urbe, non pro regione accipiant: in quorum sententiam succedit Blasius Vigenererus in suis Annotationibus Gallica lingua scriptis in Caesaris Commentaria; eamque Bavay Hannoniae urbem interpretatur”: Ortelius, *Synonymia Geographica*.  
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Treves in the Antonine Itinerary.\textsuperscript{216} The improvements did not end there. Ortelius added an entirely new entry for “Belgae”, which he says was a tribe in Britain that Camden has located in contemporary Somerset, Wiltshire and Hampshire, but which was also the name of the people of Gallia-Belgica.\textsuperscript{217} He also expanded his treatment of “Bavay” into a new entry: “Belgis”. He rejects the association with Beauvais, arguing on etymological and archaeological grounds that it is to be identified with the town of “Veltsick” – the morphological change from ‘V’ to ‘B’ and ‘G’ to ‘S’ is common, according to Ortelius, after which there is little audible difference in the two words; the many relics, ruins and coins easily found at Veltsick confirm the conjecture.\textsuperscript{218} Ortelius’ reliance on archaeological finds to confirm his conjectural etymology is characteristic, but it is clear that the core scholarship and analysis upon which the argument is based is philological – the retrieval and collation of manuscripts, textual variants, and competing lexical traditions, in order to restitute onomastics from the inaccuracies of received opinion and previous scholarship.

The publication of Ortelius’ \textit{Thesaurus} was repeatedly delayed, sometimes for scholarly, sometimes for technical, reasons. Already in January 1583 he claimed in a letter to Vulcanius that “my Thesaurus Geographicus is completed”.\textsuperscript{219} Just over a year later he rejected a work proferred by Vulcanius with the confident claim that “there is nothing lacking in my work from ancient history or Latin poetry. There are not any orators, doctors or philosophers that I have not studied”.\textsuperscript{220} In fact, it was not until summer 1586 that the work went to press. Ortelius himself paid the cost of printing in advance by discounting it against the debt of over one thousand owed to


\textsuperscript{219} “Thesaurus meus Geographicus absolutus est”: Vulcanius Correspondence, 83 01 07.

\textsuperscript{220} “Nihil meo operi ex veteri historia, neque poesi Latina deest. oratores, medicos, philosophos nullos non evolvi”: “Nihil meo operi ex veteri historia, neque poesi Latina deest. oratores, medicos, philosophos nullos non evolvi”: Vulcanius Correspondence, 84 02 18.
him on his account with Plantin; he received the money back in four installments within one year of publication. The finished product finally left the press in June 1587. Ortelius' letter to the reader described in detail the work of his predecessors and the painstaking methodology he had employed to improve on their works. Despite, or perhaps because of, his claims for thoroughness, he published an expanded second edition nine years later, in 1596.

The extent of Ortelius' success in his endeavour may be gauged rather by contemporary respect for his undertaking than by retrospective assessment of his accuracy. Ortelius' influence on leading historical scholars of his time, such as Vulcanius, Schottus and Lipsius, has never been duly appreciated, though his activities as an antiquarian have recently gained more attention than ever before. Yet, in the first decades of the seventeenth century, there is compelling evidence of that influence. From 1603 to 1608, Schottus published the four volumes of his Hispaniae Illustratae, the first systematic anthology of Spanish geographical and historical texts, among which are sections from the Theatrum. In 1609, Petrus Scriverius produced his anthology of antiquarian studies of the northern Netherlands, Batavia Illustrata, containing a large section of material drawn from Ortelius' work on the Arx Britannica, as well as the writings by Lhuyd and Camden that he sponsored and inspired. The Thesaurus Geographicus was widely distributed, becoming a standard reference work, and being reissued in 1611. Universities often acquired multiple copies in conjunction with the Theatrum, further evidence that the atlas was used as a guide for the study of history. Ortelius' influence on historical onomastics was enormous, his work being the point of departure for later writers, most notably Scaliger, whose Opera I.C. Caesaris qua Extant, ex Nova et Editio Ornata ... Nomenclator Geographicus ... Excerptus Potentissum e Thesauro Geographicco A. Ortelii was published in Leiden in 1605, and Lucas Holstenius,
whose *Annotationes in Geographiam Sacram C. a S. Paulo, Italiam antiquam Cluverii et Thesaurum Geographicum Ortelii* appeared posthumously in 1666.\(^{226}\)

The extant correspondence between Ortelius and Vulcanius reveals a great deal about how far Ortelius had come as a humanist and philologist. Vulcanius was an old friend from Bruges whom Ortelius knew in the company of Lernutius, Giselinus, Cruquius, and so forth. As such, he was one of the first contributors to the *Album amicorum*, on 1 March 1574.\(^{227}\) Shortly thereafter he took up a position as Professor of Greek in Cologne; however, in 1577 he became personal secretary to Marnix van St Aldegonde. His appointment as Professor of Greek in Leiden University was arranged during this period, but he did not take up the position until 1581.\(^{228}\) It was during his period as secretary to Marnix – a period that coincided with the Orangist period in Antwerp when the town briefly became the strategic centre of the revolt – that he renewed his friendship with Ortelius, just as the latter was becoming seriously involved with philological studies. The project seems quickly to have gained Vulcanius' respect and he assisted Ortelius with it by providing him with information and advice about Greek manuscripts. Vulcanius' esteem can be gauged by the fact that he sought Ortelius' advice on occasions, though more often merely relying on him to procure manuscripts relevant to his own studies, and the fact that he listened to Ortelius' advice about what texts needed to be edited.\(^{229}\) While Ortelius was certainly not a textual critic of Vulcanius' stature, the two men collaborated extensively and became indispensible to each other's studies. However, most of the services that Ortelius rendered to his friend were in his capacity as *maggiordomo* of the northern-European manuscript and book trade, finding and delivering obscure items for the service of his distinguished and productive colleague. If this was a collaboration of equals, their strengths were very different. To emphasise the developing philological trend in Ortelius' work is not therefore to put him on the same footing as the leading


\(^{227}\) Ortelius, *Album amicorum*, ff. 63v-64.

\(^{228}\) Biographical information about Vulcanius can be found in De Vries de Heekelingen, ed., *Correspondance de B. Vulcanius, 1573-1577*, The Hague, 1923.

\(^{229}\) See, for example, Vulcanius' request for information about the Council of Nicea, Vulcanius Correspondence, 93 03 28. Ortelius suggested the need for a Latin translation of Nonnus Panopolitanus, which Vulcanius agreed to produce: Vulcanius Correspondence, 82 09 18 and 84 02 18.
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scholars of Leiden. Nonetheless, it is clear that he had advanced far beyond the description of him as a "painter of maps" in the early years of his accounts with Plantin.  

As mentioned in the last chapter, his friendship with Vulcanius brought him much closer contact with other leading figures in Leiden University, among whom were Dousa and Lipsius. As he corresponded with Vulcanius about books and manuscripts, he passed frequent greetings to both men. He was particularly interested in the fortunes of the university on account of the opportunity it presented for scholarship. The departure of Lipsius from Leiden in 1591 caused him some concern for the future of the university, fearing that it might wither in the absence of its famous scholar. He was anxious for Scaliger to accept the invitation to replace Lipsius and delighted when the appointment was confirmed. In this case, he also became important in relaying information to Leiden about Lipsius, after the latter's arrival in Leuven and subsequent reluctance to maintain relations with his former friends that might attract suspicion in the south. Ortelius also seems to have had a strong sense of the public duties of the university and lambasted it for failing to produce laments on the death of William the Silent. His involvement with Vulcanius brought him access to the developing resources of the university library, as well as to the books and manuscripts of other scholars there. As a correspondent of Dousa, Clusius and Scaliger, Ortelius had a significant connection with the young university, providing books for its scholars and information about and access to those scholars who remained in or came to the Spanish Netherlands.

---

230 Denucé, Oud-nederlandsche kaartmakers in betrekking met Plantijn, 149-151; see also Dirk Imhof, "The Production of Ortelius Atlases by Christopher Plantin", AOF A, 79-80.  
231 Vulcanius Correspondence, 93 01 01 and 93 03 28.  
232 See Vulcanius' request for information about Lipsius' departure from Louvain, Hessel's, Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae, no. 220; and Vulcanius Correspondence (about Lipsius' arrival and salary in Louvain) 92 08 25, (about Lipsius' work on Florus) 93 01 01, (about De Cruce) 93 05 14, and (about De Militia Romana) 96 05 20.  
233 Vulcanius Correspondence, 84 12 31.  
234 Ortelius enquires about the university library in Vulcanius Correspondence, 97 01 08. Vulcanius supplied many books to the library on his death, many of which he may have acquired through Ortelius. Leiden MS Vulc I is a copy of the Etymologiarum of Isidore of Seville that came into the university's hands through Vulcanius, who was given it by Ortelius, who in turn had acquired it from the heirs of Theodore Pulsmannus, as is revealed by the inscription: "Nunc Abrahami Ortelii qui eum pretio redemit ab heredibus Theodori Pulmanni". For a discussion of Vulcanius' benefactions to the library, and its early history, see E.H. Pol, "The Library" in Scheurleer & Posthumus Meyes, eds., Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century: An Exchange of Learning, Leiden, 1975, 395-459.
Ortelius also acted as an intermediary between scholars in Leiden and Breslau, particularly between Jacobus Monavius and Vulcanius, and between the former and Lipsius, as discussed in the previous chapter. Ortelius and Monavius never met, yet although little remains of their correspondence, it is clear that it was extensive, frequent and full of material that was to be passed on to other figures connected to both men. Monavius was one of the most prominent humanists in Silesia, with a genuinely international reputation that is demonstrated by the contributions from renowned figures all over Europe to a collection of poems on his motto “Ipse Faciet”: Lipsius, Scaliger, Dudith, Sambucus, Arias Montanus, among others. Yet the Ortelius-Vulcanius correspondence reveals that Ortelius, himself a contributor, was instrumental in petitioning some of these figures for contributions, cajoling Vulcanius, Dousa and Lipsius on Monavius’ behalf until they sent their compositions, and even risking the censure of Torrentius, from whom he requested a poem but who refused to associate himself with heretics in a book by a heretic.

While Monavius’ *Ipse Faciet* was a light-hearted publication, a more serious enterprise that was discussed among Ortelius, Vulcanius and Monavius was in relation to the heirs of Thomas Rhediger, the renowned and wealthy humanist who had died in 1576. Rhediger had left a substantial collection of books to the town of Breslau for public use, but, although the library was established without apparent difficulty, it proved difficult thereafter for foreign scholars to get access to his books, which remained in a specially-dedicated chapel of a local church. Nonetheless, Ortelius did try to get books from the collection for Vulcanius. More serious still was a row that had earlier occurred between the two brothers of Thomas Rhediger who had inherited his goods. The source of the row was the library of Joannes Thorius, which arrived (presumably on the death of Thorius) in the form of over thirty cases of books. To the horror of Monavius and Ortelius the library “is still sealed up at this point, nor may it be opened because they consider many good books to be a great inconvenience”. Ortelius reported the situation to Vulcanius and added the comment

---

236 Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 131 and 242; Vulcanius Correspondence, 81 08 10, 81 10 28, 81 11 26, 82 02 29, 82 03 12, and 82 06 05.
237 Vulcanius Correspondence, 93 01 01.
that they might see what can be done about the situation. The outcome of the trouble is not known, but it is clear why Ortelius became involved. He saw himself as responsible to the republic of letters – both as any person of virtue should be and as someone who had received much from it – and duty-bound to use what influence he had to ensure that books and manuscripts were accessible to scholars. He expressed these values clearly in a letter to Vulcanius in which he said he was delighted to hear that Dousa was working on a project related to Britannia, but noted that “He has not asked me for any books. Some other time he might find me helpful to him, and rightly so, because I owe this to the republic of letters”. Although this refers specifically to Ortelius' lengthy engagement with the history of ancient Britain, the concept of a debt to the republic of letters paid through the provision of materials to other scholars seems in practice to underlie much of Ortelius' interaction with his friends. This was not necessarily a disinterested altruistic activity, indeed it was a very practical response to the circumstances in which scholars lived, but it is typical of an ethos of cooperation in the interests of the common good that is expressed in a collaborative approach to scholarship within Ortelius' network.

If the image of friendly interaction was expressed in self-congratulatory literary terms in volumes such as Ortelius' *Album amicorum* and Monavius' *Ipse Faciet*, it was given concrete form in the circulation of books and manuscripts that has been referred to throughout this chapter and in the assistance given to one another in the preparation of books. However, there are numerous instances of failure to cooperate that provide a useful perspective on more successful interaction. The case of the Rhedinger brothers mentioned above seems to have prompted active intervention from Ortelius and his friends, but many problems were more intractable. Ortelius tried for twenty years without success to get a copy of the Peutinger Table before it was eventually delivered to him through a circuitous and partly fortuitous route. He gained much more prompt access to a manuscript of St Cyril belonging to the Lord of Goychre, but it still took months due to the elusive epistolary practice of Goychre, and he had to provide a written testimony that he had borrowed the manuscript and would return it...
instantly at the desire of the owner, and he had to request the same from Vulcanius. Ortelius ruefully commented that Goychre was extremely greedy for books, and that it would be easier to prise a key from the hand of Hercules than to get a book from him. He makes a similar comment about Joannes Metellus, a friend who contributed to his *Album amicorum*, but who was so possessive of a copy of Ptolemy that Ortelius had to seek another copy elsewhere. While the acrimony between the Rhedinger brothers over Thorius’ books was the inverse of the normal reasons, inheritance often caused feuds, as in the case of the posthumous debts of Marcus Laurin, or the disputes between Plantin’s heirs. Indeed, in advance of his own death, Ortelius was not above implying that he would disinherit his nephew if the latter would not come to stay with him in Antwerp.

Scholarly networks could also quickly divide into opposing camps when ambition, rivalry or injured pride led to rows or public controversies. Within Ortelius’ networks the case of Coornhert has already been discussed. The latter’s commitment to continuous mutual critique, on a Socratic model, led to bitter remarks and rejection by Lipsius’ friends, including Ortelius, who consistently endeavoured to distance themselves from public debate about precisely the topic that Coornhert considered most essential for discussion: religion. Lipsius was a problematic figure in this regard as his preeminence as a scholar combined rather awkwardly with his satiric wit and his apparently fickle disregard for religious allegiances to engender widespread criticism throughout his career. Ortelius was forced to defend him in private correspondence on several occasions, and Monavius actively supported his friend in Germany, even publishing a small selection of the correspondence between Lipsius, himself and Ortelius as a way of affirming his good character. Less well-known disagreements were no less insidious. The correspondence of Lipsius throughout 1582 was filled with complaints about Ludovicus Carrion with regard to a

---

240 “Clavam facilius ex manu Herculis, ut dicitur, quam aliquid eorum pretio extorqueris. Prece fortasse facilem. Virum enim humanum, et erga litteras bonas benevolum scio, sed librorum valde avarum”: Vulcanius Correspondence, 81 11 26; see also 82 02 29, 82 08 28, 82 09 18, and 82 10 03.

241 Ortelius, *Album*, f. 68v; Vulcanius Correspondence, 92 08 25.

242 Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 228.

243 See, for example, the rather gleeful reference by the younger Raphelengius to Coornhert’s death: Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 193.

244 J. Lipsius, *Ad Iac. Monavium epistola, ipsius permisso correctior nunc edita, cum duabus ad Abr Ortelium*, Antwerp, 1592. See the discussion of this text by Jeanine de Landtsheer in Dusoir, de Landtsheer & Imhof, eds., *Justus Lipsius en het Plantijnse Huis*, 199-200.
disagreement over printing, and in the same year Andreas Schottus wrote cutting remarks about him to Ortelius from Madrid, claiming that he had suppressed one of Schottus' works so that he might gain more glory himself.\(^{245}\)

While in some cases the feuds between scholars were caused by personal issues, many were, of course, the reflection of religious differences. The above-mentioned refusal of Torrentius to contribute to Monavius' *Ipse Faciet* is a good example of the often silent but pervasive presence of religious boundaries within the republic of letters. Too often historians have paid attention either to public debates and disputes along religious lines or to a simplistically conceived eirenicism. Much of what has been described as eirenic disregard for confessional allegiance resulted rather from the practical circumstances of scholarly research. While it was not difficult to avoid Protestants while living in Madrid, it would have been extremely limiting to do so in Antwerp. Further, given that manuscripts were distributed across Europe without regard for confessional boundaries, scholars who wished to consult them had also to cross those boundaries in some manner. Few scholars in Ortelius' network saw this as a religious problem, when the texts themselves were not religious, rather as a practical problem that could have serious consequences for gaining access to necessary material. Nonetheless, the geographical shift in the centre of European antiquarianism that occurred in the second half of the sixteenth century was partly the consequence of Papal pressure on scholars in Rome to address religious concerns. That the initiative in antiquarianism moved north of the Alps into epistolary networks such as that of Ortelius, rather than to a specific geographical location (an alternative Rome) was also partly due to religious pressures, this time in terms of the fragmentation of northern European society.\(^{246}\)

The limitations that feuds and politico-religious boundaries placed on scholarship were perhaps less pressing than the effects of continual wars on the financial resources available to scholars, printers and publishers. Patrons were crucial; that Ortelius rarely sought them through dedications in his later years is a measure of his

\(^{245}\) *ILE* 82 04 11, 82 05 00, 82 05 14E, 82 08 05, 82 11 11G, 82 11 11LE; Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii... Epistolae*, no. 113. See also Rooses & Denucé, *Correspondance de Christophe Plantin*, vol.VII, no. 988. Schottus later in life expounded at length the disadvantages of scholarly dispute in an "Epistola Nuncupatoria" in his *Observationes humanarum*, 1610.

relative economic security. Little is known about the details of his finances, but he
seems to have distributed books widely, often for free, throughout much of his later
career. It is precisely because of the limitations placed on scholarship, through
restrictions on travel and through economic depression, that the activity of Ortelius in
compiling reference books, scrutinising publisher’s lists, and circulating copies of
new or rare works, was such a major contribution to scholarship and one that he could
see as repaying his debt to the republic of letters. Though almost all scholars
circulated books to some extent, he was particularly engaged in doing so, providing
information about and copies of books for his friends in Leiden and Breslau, while
drawing upon those very contacts and connections in Cologne, London and Rome to
ensure that scholars knew what works existed and that they had access to them.
Plantin, Mylius and Monavius were particularly important for Ortelius in this respect,
while Vulcanius was frequently the recipient, as a result building up collections that
formed a significant contribution to the early collections of the library of Leiden
University. Ortelius’ activities as a kind of clearing-house and entrepot for the book
trade should be distinguished to some extent from his widespread benefactions both to
close friends and to potential collaborators or patrons. In the first instance he was
merely one conduit for the phenomenon of private book-circulation in northern-
European scholarly circles; in the second instance he was self-consciously acting as a
patron of the arts and learning, whether for altruistic or self-interested motives.

Ortelius’ research, and the expertise he gained, for his onomastic study brought him
fully into the sphere of textual criticism and historical scholarship. He had come there
via the route of antiquarian interest in coins, combined with the presiding
preoccupation of his life and career, maps. In his *Thesaurus* he announced the value
of his work for textual emendations of Classical authors, elaborating on the caution
with which he had proceeded, avoiding the insertion of his own conjectures unless
there was manuscript evidence to support them. This extreme hesitancy about
conjectural emendation may stem from Ortelius’ lack of formal qualifications in the
field of textual criticism, but it is strikingly in tune with the major trend of Italian
textual scholarship in the later sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{247} Notably, Ortelius’ approach to
reconstruction and representation of inscriptions, discussed earlier in relation to the

\textsuperscript{247} For an account of the debate on conjecture see A. Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History
Arx Britannica, displayed the same concerns. Thus, although his philological expertise was not as great as the leading exponents of textual criticism in his day, his methodology was, by modern standards, more advanced than most. The emphasis that he placed on the role of images in the comprehension of histories, both in his Theatrum and his Deorum Deorumque Capita, was more clearly represented in the Itinerarium than the Synonymia or Thesaurus, due in large part to the nature of the material and the problems. However, although the latter works employed a purely textual means of expression, a lexicon, his method of research still involved analyses of maps, coins and ruins. His correspondence and collaboration with Philips van Winghe, who copied maps and engravings for him in Rome, is a good example of the coinciding of his interests in particular sources.248 Further, the combination of visual and textual forms in his light-hearted work for the son of Jacob Monavius, the Aurei Saeculi Imago, exemplifies the sort of tradition out of which he had come.249 Yet the Imago was an occasional piece produced for the diversion of a child, and the scholarship contained in it – about the customs of the ancient Germans – was derivative, drawing upon a previous publication by Lipsius, doubtless partly by way of tribute to Monavius’ frequent defense of Lipsius’ remarks about Germany.250

In an apt embodiment of the collaboration between Lipsius and Ortelius, Raphelengius published his 1593 edition of Caesar’s works using the text established by Lipsius’ philologically informed criticism illustrated by Ortelius’ historical maps drawn in accordance with his onomastic studies.251 Yet it was not the first time that Ortelius had made an appearance in a critical edition of an ancient author. He produced a historical map of the world, delineated according to the geography of Pomponius Mela, for the 1581 critical edition of Mela’s De situ orbis, published by Plantin with textual notes by, among others, the distinguished philologist Andreas Schottus. As part of the critical apparatus, Schottus included a separate lexical commentary entitled Annotationum in Pomp Melam Spicilegium, which he dedicated to Ortelius. In his dedicatory epistle he comments that he is fulfilling a promise made

248 Hessels, Abrahami Ortefii... Epistolae, nos. 170, 185, and 217.
249 Ortelius, Aurei Saeculi Imago, Antwerp, 1596.
250 This is the subject of a conference presentation by Jeanine de Landtsheer which is in preparation for the RSA Annual Meeting in New York, 2004 – I am grateful to her for discussing the matter with me.
251 Justus Lipsius, C. Iulii Caesaris omnia quae exstant, Leiden, 1593.
to Ortelius long ago to produce his observations on Mela’s text, and he praises him as one of the most learned of his country and of his time.\textsuperscript{252}

Far more significant as a representation of Ortelius’ fusion of text and image in his antiquarian scholarship, is his influence on Lipsius’ \textit{De Amphitheatris quae extra Romam libellus} and \textit{De Cruce}.\textsuperscript{253} The friendship between Ortelius and Lipsius deepened as the former’s research and library became more pertinent to the latter’s interests, but also after the consistent support Ortelius gave to Lipsius after his departure from Leiden.\textsuperscript{254} One of the most prestigious compliments that Ortelius received in his career was the dedication of Lipsius’ \textit{De Amphitheatro} to him. In the work, Lipsius discussed the different uses of amphitheatres and their archaeological features. Ortelius had provided him with information about the whereabouts of French amphitheatres and with books by Serlio and Ligorio.\textsuperscript{255} The significance of Ortelius’ contribution to the \textit{De Amphitheatro} was that his friendship and advice seems to have helped to reorient Lipsius towards consideration of material evidence for historical analysis. It is this contribution towards the appreciation of the value of iconography as more than merely a repository of inscriptions, but as itself a language of expression that could be analysed historically, that marked Ortelius’ influence on his friend’s methodology.

For the \textit{De Cruce} Lipsius exploited further visual evidence from Ortelius, who provided him with images of crosses from coins, which the latter used (with engravings included) in the last chapters of his work. Lipsius also consulted him over the interpretation of references to crosses in the letters of Seneca, of which Lipsius

\textsuperscript{252} “Tu enim mihi inter doctūsimos, quia ciuis meus; & inter ciues, quia doctūsimus, uunuv (ut Plato Antimacho) instares omnium: ‘Descripfti radio totum qui gentibus orbem’. Et Vniversum hoc in Theatro, tanquam in illustri loco & ore omnium, fpectandum propofuisti; in ea Vrbe, quae (ut olim a Polemone Roma) ξ ουκυμενης διπτομη iure optimo & censeatur, & appellatur”: Andreus Schottus, \textit{Pomponii Melae de situ orbis libri tres}. \textit{Andreas Schottus recensuit et spicilegio illustravit}, Antwerp, 1581.

\textsuperscript{253} J. Lipsius, \textit{De Amphitheatris quae extra Romam libellus}, Antwerp, 1584; ibid., \textit{De Cruce}, 1593.

\textsuperscript{254} The friendship has been the subject of two articles: Jeanine de Landtsheer, “Abraham Ortelius et Juste Lipse”, \textit{AOCH}, 141-151; and Joost Depuydt, “‘Vale verum antiquae historiae lumen’; Antiquarianism in the Correspondence between Justus Lipsius and Abraham Ortelius”, in \textit{Iustus Lipsius Europae Lumen et Columna}, eds., Tournoy, De Landtsheer & Papy, Leuven, 1999, 34-46.

\textsuperscript{255} \textit{ILE} 83 12 28, see also 84 04 050 and 84 01 100.
would later produce a critical edition and commentary.256 Yet Ortelius’ proudest moment came five years after the publication of this work, when he boasted to Vulcanius that he had dumbfounded Lipsius on a matter of historical interpretation. He had found the image of a particular type of cross on a coin, “beyond all doubt antique”, with an inscription on it dating from the reign of the Ptolemies in Egypt. He discusses the standard interpretations of the symbol, all of which claim it to be specifically Christian, and then draws attention to the anachronism. Thus, either the symbol has been incorrectly interpreted as Christian, or the coin is a fake. He concludes, “I have shared the same with Lipsius, but he is struck dumb and does not know what to reply”.257 The triumph was not in the specific problem presented, but in the fact that Ortelius had dumbfounded one of the leading scholars of his day in an area about which he had published, by drawing upon his expertise in numismatics, the approach that had launched his career as an antiquarian forty years previously – a long and painstaking development for a self-educated scholar who first signed his name into historical record as an “afsetter van caerten”, a job normally performed by children.

257 “Communicavi eadem cum Lipsio, at obmatacit, nec habet quod respondeat”: Vulcanius Correspondence, 97 10 26.
Conclusion

Much remains to be discovered and written about Ortelius; this thesis represents only the beginning of a necessary change in direction in Ortelius studies towards the creation of an integrated perspective on his cartographic and historical works. As I indicated in my introduction, several other scholars have begun to produce research in this line. What I hope to have achieved here is to have established for the first time the character and quality of Ortelius' onomastic studies, and the full extent of his scholarly collaborations with both antiquarians and philologists. Yet I have also done much more than this. I have placed such scholarly practices within the context of Ortelius' religious and social milieu, demonstrating that he and his friends were acutely conscious of trying to create a cultified milieu that was separated and secured from the barbaric events of a society disintegrating amid civil wars. In the process of reconstructing this context it has been possible to correct the common assumption that Ortelius was a member of the Family of Love. Although there is not sufficient evidence to prove definitively that Ortelius was not a member, there are compelling reasons to look elsewhere for explanations of his statements about religion. Above all, it has been possible to show that much of what Ortelius is known for – his atlas, his religious beliefs, his friendship album – can best be understood as pragmatic solutions to practical problems. This is not to say that Ortelius lacked ideals or imaginative insights, but they were carefully shaped in response to the options he faced and the limited means at his disposal. Where Ortelius impresses is in the consistently rigorous standards that he applied in the realm of critical judgment – be it in editing maps, judging morals, interpreting coins, or collating texts and manuscripts to establish the correct referent of a geographical name. The constant refrain of his letters might almost serve as his motto: "dies docebit".

While Ortelius’ reputation and talents as a scholar and antiquarian are worth uncovering in order to fill a gap in the intellectual history of the period, still more important is the argument that he and his friends deliberately sought forms of social interaction that would both express their beliefs about the value of preserving Classical culture and enshrine the culture itself through the compilation of a
manuscript that would out-last those who contributed to it. The humanist idea of escaping the transience of time through the immortality of writing is widespread and familiar, but the overlapping that exists in this case of theory, writing and the actual practices of friendship, is not. "Friendship" was not, for Ortelius, simply another humanist value; rather, it was a convenient label to express the common need of scholars to work together to preserve both the culture of the past and the present. As a concept it had good Classical pedigree, without restriction to any particular school of thought, and it was the obverse of the politicised or factionalised language of community that was becoming increasingly prevalent in early-modern Europe. In other words, "friendship" was the value at the interpersonal level whose correlate at a personal level was "virtue" and at a societal level was "the common good". Like these other terms in their own spheres, it served as an aspiration and as a practical guide to behaviour that helped to circumvent the traps of more politicised language. In this respect, it is remarkable that Ortelius implemented this ideal of friendship in the sphere of learning by promoting and practicing collaborative approaches to scholarship. In doing so, he often appears to slip between the interpretative categories commonly associated with his society, particularly when immersing himself in the practicalities of scholarship and negotiating difficulties with pragmatic adaptability. The result was a career that moved from the innovative and celebrated publication of the *Theatrum* to the less well known but much more impressive scholarly achievement, the *Thesaurus Geographicus*. Yet this apparent trajectory from popular to scholarly humanism obscures the continuity of his antiquarian interests throughout his life, and the end result was as much a success of the cumulative as of the collaborative approach.
Bibliography

I have chosen only to list manuscripts and early printed books that have contributed directly to the argument of my thesis; thus I have omitted references to many friendship albums, cartographic works, and writings emanating from Ortelius' network but with which he was not identifiably involved. I have been more free with the list of secondary literature, including references to several studies that I found useful in constructing a picture of the societies in which Ortelius and his friends lived. With regard to the multiple editions of the *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*, I have chosen only to list the first Latin edition, though references in the thesis often specify others. The reasons for this are threefold: first, considerations of space; second, a list of all the editions consulted would merely provide a partial rendering of the indices of Van der Krogt and Van den Broecke; third, the relation of copy to edition is often complex, reflecting the made-to-order character of many volumes.
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Appendix I: Preface to Theatrum Orbis Terrarum

ABRAHAMVS ORTELIUS ANTVERPIANVS, REGIAE MAESTATIS GEOGRAPHVS BENEVOLIS LECTORIBVS S.D.

Cvm omnibus perspectum satis esse credam, quanta sit cognitionis historiarum vtilitas, benigne Lector; equidem nehe persuadeo, neminem paene esse, modo historias primis (quod aiunt) labris gustarit, qui nesciat, quam necessaria sit ad eas recte intelligendas, Geographiae (quae merito a quibusdam Historiae oculus appellata est) cognition. Multa enim in historiis occurrunt, ne dicam paene omnia, quae, nisi aliqua locorum cognitione polleas, non solum intelligi bene non possunt, verum etiam contra quam debeant nonnunquam intelliguntur; vt sit, cum in aliis, tum potissimum in Regum, Imperatorumque expeditionibus, in diuersis gentium migrationibus, et in clarissimorum virorum diuersarum Regionum perlustrationibus, peregrinationibusque. Quod cum experientia ipsa doceat, non est quod ego heic latius declarem. Haec vero tam necessaria Geographiae cognition, vt multi egregij et docti viri testati sunt, ex Tabulis Geographicis longe facillime peti addiscique potest. Atque vbi aliquantulum harum Tabularum vsui adsueuerimus, vel mediocrem etiam Geographiae inde cognitionem adepti fuerimus, quaeunque leguntur, Tabulis his quasi rerum quibusdam speculis nobis ante oculos collocatis, memoriae multo diutius inhaerent. quo sit, vt tum demum cum fructu aliquo, quae legimus, percipere videamur. Omitto iam, multo iucundiorem videri, et esse, historiarum lectionem, si Tabulis ob oculos propositis liceat quasi praesentem, res gestas, aut loca in quibus gestae sunt intueri. Nam quantopere iuuemur, cum in sacris literis Israelitarum iter ex AEgypto per mare rubrum et immensam propesolitudinem in terram promissam factum legimus, si Palestinae Tabula inspecta, id quasi praesentes videamus; quemuis existimo saepius experiri. Quae cum ita sint, quantopere impediantur, retineanturque, imo retrahuntur etiam saepe in ipso cursu, historiarum studiosi, facile est videre, cum vel omnes Regionum descriptiones non possint haber; vel si haber quidem possint, cariores sint, quam vt quiius possit, praesertim cum plurimi sint tenuioris fortunae, coemere. Multi
enim sunt, qui delectantur quidem Geographia vel Corographia, in primis vero Tabulis, quae de Regionum descriptionibus, delineationibusque variae exstant: sed, quoniam aut non habent quod iis comparandis impendant; aut, si quidem habeant tantum, quanti illae valere solent, impendere nolunt, ab iis abstinent; nec sibi ipsis satisfaciunt. Sunt etiam qui cum habeant quo emant, emere quam lubentissime vellent, nisi locorum angustia obstaret, quo minus latae Chartae explicari et inspici commode possint. Nam, vt verum fatear, magnae illae et amplae Geographicae Chartae conuolutae, non ita commodae sunt; nec, cum aliquid forte legitur, inspectu faciles. Omnes vero ordine parieti expansas adfigere volenti, opus esset, non modo amplissima, latissimaque domo, verum etiam Regio quodam Theatro. Haec ego saepenumbero expertus, cogitare coepi, quae ratio inueniri posset, hisce, quae iam dixi, incommodis, medendi, vel vt diminuerentur aliquo modo, vel, si fieri posset, vt omnino e medio tollerentur. acceptum visum est, hac ratione, quam in hoc libro nostro (cui (vti speramus, singulisque optamus) quiuis facile locum inter suos libros dare poterit) obseruauimus; fieri posse.

Quo vero intelligas, quid a nobis in hoc Theatro nostro praestitum sit, quidve de eo tibi sit expectandum; id tibi heic paucis explicandum esse duxi. Primo, nobis animus fuit repraesentare tibi, quicquid in vllis Geographicis aut Chorographicis Chartis hinc inde tamrecenter, quam nuperrime multis abhinc annis (quo factum est, vt earum etiam multae nunc inueniri nequeant) in lucern editis, vnquam habueris, vel etiam num habeas. quod vt praestaremus, hac ratione sumus opus aggressi. Omnium Regionum, quarum Geographicae Tabulae exstant, vnam nobis (quarundam enim sunt plures) nostro iudicio omnium optimam proposuimus: quae tametsi esset aliquando magna et lata, in eam tamen formam contraximus, vt nostro operi conueniret, ac vno, tota absoluereetur folio: vel, quemadmodum aliquoties factum est, vti videri licet, vno, continerentur plures: nulla tamen, ne vel minima re omissa, quae erat in maiore obuia, nullave mutata: nisi quod saepius, quae in primis vix legi poterant, et ita in nostris expresserimus, vt legi facile a quolibet possent. Interdum vero, vbi res ipsa admonuit, et locus tulit, quorundam locorum vulgaribus nominibus adscripsimus antiqua. quod, vti putamus nobis bona ipsorum Auctorum venia licuisse, sic speramus, priscarum historiarum lectoribus, obseruatoribusque, fore non ingratum. In Tabulis, quae Auctorum nomina habent, hihil (vt diximus) est a nobis immutatum, exceptis duabus aut tribus Belgicarum Regionum maritimis oris, quas mare, post, quam ab Auctoribus descriptiones earum editae sunt, multum mutuit, quemadmodum (exempli gratia) in
Flandria, e regione Zelandiae, non longe ab oppido Watervliet, vbi maris beneficio post eius loci descriptione editam, Continenti multum accreuit: nos, pro vt hoc tempore is locus est, (accepta eis Topographia a clarissimo nobilissimoque et stemmate et literis viro, D. MARCO LAVRINO, istius loci Domino) formam, Regionis ipsius hodierni situs declarandi studio, mutauimus. In aliis vero, quae nullum habebant Auctoris nomen, fuimus paulo audacios: in quibus et mutauimus aliquoties pro nostro iudicio quaedam, et quaedam detraximus, et quaedam etiam nonnunquam, pro vt res videbatur postulare, adiecimus. Quarundam etiam Regionum, ad feriem nostram aliquo modo complendam, nouas primi pro nostro modulo Tabulas confeceimus, vt quam paucissime, quoaud hoc tempore fieri posset, deessent. In istis, quas diximus Auctorum nominibus additis, contrahendis, ea fide usi sumus, vt non modo a Lectore nos gratiam speremus inituros: verum ab ipsis etiam auctoribus aut ita saltem egisse, vt neminem merito pudere huius nostrae, quaeque etiam est, possit, imo hanc parum nostram non minus, quam illem magnum pro sua et agnoscre possit et non dislocere. Nec aliorum hoc tempore mores sumus imitati, qui vt noui aliquid in lucem videantur edere, nil faciunt alius, quam huiusmodi Auctorum opera et labores mutare, atque ex bonis saepe aliquid quod bonum non est, vulgo pro bono venditare, quibusdam nunc adiectis, nunc detractis, et ipsius Auctoris nomine dissimulato, vel apposito suo, vel ficto quopiam, quo nouitatis gratia placeat vulgo, vendique possit, vt pecuniam quouis modo corradant. Nos enim insana illa auri fame non sumus ad hunc laborem impulsi: sed nostra ad studiosos harum rerum adiuuandos propensa voluntate, posthabita omni ex alieno labore vanae gloriolae aucupandae occasione. Quid enim erat opus, cum aliorum, quae extent Tabulae, nostro satisfacerent operi, nouas facere?

Erunt fortassis, qui plures in hoc nostro Theatro particulares Regionum descriptiones desiderabunt, (quemadmodum quois naturae ductu optabit procul dubio patriae suae descriptionem heic extare) verum ij sciant, eas, quae hic non habentur, non esse aut nostra negligentia omissas, aut quod iis sumptus impendere veriti fuerimus: sed quia aut nullas vnum quam viderimus, aut ad nostras manus nunquam vllae venerint. Quod si est quispiam, qui huiusmodi vel habeat, vel sciat haberi posse, eum oratum etiam atque etiam velimus, vt nobis earum copiam faciat, certo promittentes, eas nostro sumptu non sine gratiarum actione, et honorifica nominis sui mentione, separatim exsculpendas curaturas, vt huic deininde libro, suo loco, aut vbi quisque volet, adiungi possint.
De ordine quoque in Tabulis his collocandis a nobis obseruato, ratio quoque tibi, candide Lector, reddenda videtur; vt, si sint forte, quibus aliter collocari debuisse videantur, iis hac nostra exponenda vel satisfaciamus, vel nos, quod officium postulare videbatur, daltem excusemus. Primo omnium, Tabulam vniuersum terrarum orbem complexam exhibemus; deinde eius praecipuas partes, veluti sunt, Europa, Asia, Africa et America: naturam secuti, qua semper ante, quam partes sint, totum aliquod, cuius illae sint, necesse est esse. His subiecimus harum partium singulas Regiones ab Occidentaliore Orbis parte exorsi, Ptolemaeum Geographorum Principem, et ceteros pene omnes imitati. Sicque Americae provinciae primo prodeunt: exin Britannicæ insulae, post Hispaniae, deinde Galliae: Hinc Germaniam petimus, cuius Regionibus perulgtratis, ex Heluetia transimus in Italianum huic contiguum, singulas eius quoque visuri prounicias. Inde in Graeciam nauigauimus, vnde in Sclauoniam profecti, singulas Provincias, quibus vsus est linguæ Sclauonicae, vti sunt Hungaria, Transyluania, Polonia, Scandia, et Russia, perspeximus. Hoc modo Europa absoluta, ad Isthmum, qui est inter fontes Tanaïs, et Oceanum Septentrionalem, Europæ ac Asiae terminum venimus; eoque in Asiam; quam contemplati, in Africam per angustias, quae sunt inter intimum sinus Arabici recessum, et Mediterranei maris Sirbonim lacum, descendimus. Vnde per AEgyptum, Barbariamque ad fretum Gaditanum peruenimus. quo traiecto, domum, vnde eramus egressi, tandem reuertimur, viatori similes, vel peregrinanti cuipiam, qui Nationibus singulis, et Regionibus, longo ordine, quo sibi inter se conjunctae sunt, nulla praeterita, perulgtratis, tandem, vnde exierat, laetus atque incolulis redit.

Hactenus de ipsis Tabulis; nunc de Tabularum auersa parte dicemus. Quoniam visum nobis est, ingratus Lectori aut Spectatori fore, foliorum terga ita vacua videre et omnino inania; statuimus ibi singulam Tabularum breuem quandam declaratiunculam adscribere, eodem modo quo in ipsis Tabulis diximus a nobis esse factum; nullius, qui nobis vsui fuerit, nomine omissu aut dissimulato. In fine, hisce adiecimus omnium, quotquot vel nouimus, vel habuimus, Auctorum nomina; e quibus singularum Regionum plenior cognitio (si quispiam requirat) peti possit. Quapropter Geographiae candidati habebunt hic, his Auctoribus ordine adscriptis, et Auctorum Tabularum Geographicarum Catalogo, quem libro praefiximus, ac his ipsis demum Tabulis, quandam quasi officinam omni instrumentorum apparatu instructam; e qua, forsauel ad librum aliquem, vel ad Regionum descriptions sibi deesse quippiam sentiant, leui, imo nullo negotio videre possint, vnde id peti queat.
Haec sunt quae putauimus Lectori esse indicanda. Superest, vt singulos oremus, ne alio animo hunc laborem nostrum excipiant, quam quo a nobis et inchoatus est et absolutus, ac tandem in lucem editus. Vale, et fruere; atque FRANCISCI HOGENBERGI artificiosae manui, cuius vnius indefatigabili diligentia fere omnes hae Tabulae caelatae sunt, bene faueto. Antverpiae M.D.LXX
ILLVSTRISSIMO D. PHILIPPO, COMITI DE LALAIN, GVBERNATORI
HANNONIAE, ET EXERCITUS
Belgici Ducis supremo, etc.
Daniel Cellarius Ferimontanus
S.P.D.

Ad cognoscendum Deum Opt. Max. (cui rei praecipue ac soli homo vacare, omnibusque neruis incumbere, ac pro viribus desudare debet) post librorum Sacrorum lectionem, et Theologiae sacrosanctum studium, momenti plurimum habet vniuersi huius, ac ingentis orbis machinae consideratio, ob Elementorum concinnam compagmen, sphaerarum orbiumque perpetuum, ac varium et analogum ordinatumque motum: syderum ortus et occasus, quibus assidue mutatis vicibus anni tempora in horas mutantur, diei ac noctis, aestus et algoris vicissitudines, senescentis reiuuenescentisque anni forma, generationis et corruptionis causae, alterationumumque omnium modi percipiuntur, naturae innata vis ac potestas intelligitur, ac quocunque tandem oculi conijciantur, dignitate maiestateque plena omnia conspiciuntur: ita vt vel stipitibus ipsis stupidiores censendi veniant, qui earum rerum, quarum indies intuitu fruuntur, quibus aluntur regunturque, ac vitam ducent, maiestate, varietate, ordine, facieue quacunque non rapiantur in admirationem, quosque eaedem ipsae res summi et aeterni sui opificis non commone faciant. Est enim vniuersi huius ac naturae ipsius cognitio ea, quae nos a rebus sensibus subiectis, ad cognitionem mentis nostrae, et ab ea ad species a materia separatas, ad primam vsque et simplissimam causam, et Deum Opt. Max. veluti manu perducit. Neque enim secus Plato ad diuinae essentiae cognitionem peruenit: et Aristoteles quoque a motu ad motorem vsque primum, primamque rerum omnium causam ascendit: siquidem recte a creaturarum consideratione ad Creatoris cognitionem, amorem, admirationem et cultum transcendentur, sic postulante id ordine serieque naturae, cuius immutabiles certissimaeque motuum leges euincunt, esse aliquam simplicissimam mentem, aeternam, infinitae potentiae, sapientiae et bonitatis, cuius haec nutu non solum
regantur, sustententurque, verum etiam cuius immensa potentia et virtute haec aliqunndo creata extiterint. Neque enim Diuus Lucas in Actis cap.14. aliter conuincit gentibus non potuisse penitus latere Deum, quam ex creaturarum ordinatis actionibus. Inquit enim: Et quidem non sine testimonio semet ipsum reliquit, benefaciens de coelo Dominus, pluuias et tempora fructifera dams, implens gaudio et laetitia corda eorum. Eiusdem lib.cap.17. Apostolus asseverat Deum ita. Prope nobis esse, vt pene manibus attractari queat, cum in ipso viuamus, moueatmur et simus, ipsius et genus existentes. Idemque Apostolus ad Romanos cap.1. ait: Inuisibilia Dei, (videlicet aeternam eius potentiam et diuinitatem, bonitatem insuper et sapientiam) a mundi creatura, per ea quae facta sunt, conspici sempiternam quoque eius virtutem et diuinitatem animaduerti ex illis: ita ut sint inexcusabiles impij. Quare nullam ado spectaculum, tum iucundius, tum homine dignius, meo quidem iudicio, esse potest, quam totius pene rerum vniuersitatis, naturaeque consideratio, quam coelum , terras, maria, rerumque fere omnium situm, formam, naturamque perspicere: generationis corruptionisque et modum, et causam, diuturnitatem, ac interitum ererum, vnde generatae, quo recurrist, quid stabile, quid caducum, quid diuinitum aeternumque sit videre, ipsumque moderantem et regement pene Deum deprehendere. Quarum equidem rerum et essentiam et voluntaten eius, cultumque quo prosequendus is sit, nobis patefaciens. At ne illud quoque, nisi beluinus quis totus fuerit, quenquam negaturum opinor, post adeptam ex verbo Dei ipsius notitiam, colendique et invocandi modum, piae menti iucundius nihil esse posse, quam haec diuinitatis indicia, vestigiaque, et hanc de Deo Opt. Max. famam sparsam in creaturis omnibus persequi, easque diligenter et attente quasi concionantes nobis de Deo audire. In quo contemplationis genere, cum Cosmographiae studium facile palmam obtineat, quod rerum multitudine, grauitate, maiestate, magnitudine et varietateque nulli cedat, quod ad omnia caeterarum disciplinarum genera percipienda, ad historias (quibus post Theologiae et iam dictum studium fortasse tertius honor debetur) rite intelligendas, ad itinera terra marisque quaquaversum libuerit, artificiose compendioseque dirigenda, vtilitatem ac commoditatem habeat non aspernandam, quod in viuili vita mercimoniorum omnis generis comparandorum viam quasi ostendat: dum, quid natura eiusque author ciuius plagae tam in vastissimo Oceano, quam in ipsis campis, abditissimisque etiam montium cairnem singulare contulerit, disquirit, dum portuum maritimorum ac emporiorum, vnde ad reliqua loca merces diffunduntur, situs commoditatesque explicat. Quin et ipsius quoque qui publica tum ciuillium, tum
bellicarum rerum gubernacula, habenasque moderantur, vel vitilissimum, adeoque
necessarium: vt ex eo diuersarum gentium moribus, ritibus, legibus, viuendique
institutis perceptis, optima quaeque eorum imitantes rebus publicis suis rite
administrandis, rerum plurimarum peritia muniti, tanquam in omnes casus instructi
milites exemplorum copia ad quauesis prompti industrij habilesque reddantur.
Vicissim quae foeda turpiaue, et a sanae mentis hominibus aliena, tum in politicis,
tum sacris ritibus conspexerint, summa cura et vigilantia dextere tanquam pestes
honestatem diuinumque cultum corruptura caueant, ac a suae tutelae
fideiquecommissis arceant. Straboni quidem non inciuiles modo videntur, verum et
ad publica munia obeunda parum vtiles, qui nullam Geographiae partem gustarunt.
Solent enimuo caeteri homines (vt reliqua taceam) ora et vultus eorum, qui ex illa
per naturam, et noua rerum miracula peregrinatione reuerterentur, veluti numina
quaedam obseruare, suspicere et colere: vtpote nouum coelum, noua maria, nouas
hominum et animantium figuras, nouos humanorum coetuum ritus, ampliora naturae
spacia comministrandum. Quid referam quod recenti auorum patrumque nostrorum
memoria, hoc tam celebri liberalique studio nobilissimae quaedam mentes, inuictisque
animi, ac quasi diuini excitati, Orientis pene ac Occidentes terminos lustrantes, ac
terrarum Nouum Orbem inuigantantes detexerint. Neque enimuo citra Columbi
et eius similium in ea re exploranda ardens desiderium Hispaniarum Reges vnquam
hoc tam amplo vastoque imperio potituri fuissent, quod in Occidente nunc occupant,
nec Lusitani Indorum non solum commercijs, sed et agris et urbibus, regrinisque
possessis diteserent: nec Angli extremi Orientis haurirent auri minaeras. In bellicis
autem rebus quantum Ducibus conueniit Geographiae (quae Cosmographiae pars est)
esse peritos doctosque, tum vt locorum gnari castra, iniquo loco haud locentur, tum vt
commeatuum, necessariumque rerum facilitatem et copiam, et itinerum insuper
expeditam rationem, ac ab insidijs securitatem sortiantur, et id genus multa, nemo est
qui id non penitus intelligat, quam a me explicari queat. Quantum autem lucis in
Poetarum scriptis, et ut ne id quoque omittam, ipsarum sacrarum etiam literarum
lectioni id studium afferat, ne epistolae modum exceedam, prudens praetereo: sperans
tam hebetis animi, pertusaeque, ac obstinatae mentis fore neminem, quin vltro fateatur
quae dicta sunt. In hoc itaque tam celebri, iucundo, vitilique studij genere, cum
praesens liber versetur totus (vtpote qui tum typice, tum graphice, ne dicam omnes, at
certe plerasque habitati orbis partes lustrandas ita proponit, vt terram ipsam oculis
circuire, ac mundum perambulare, et quia via per inuiia maria haud patet, circumuehi
videri quis possit, dum facies, situs, qualitates, quantitates terrarum, Imperiorum, Regorumque limites ac terminos, montes, fluuios caeteraque ad Cosmographum pertinentia explicat, quae quod in epistola ad lectorem, quo a nobis ordine serieque tractata sint, tanquami libri argumentum paucis praefata sunt (hic non ruminanda reiterandaque puto) ac iam qualis et quantulacunque studiorum meorum foetura, primitiaeque in publicum prodire properet: vt vel hoc exiguo labore tanti summique opificis structuram illustrare iuuet, nec videar minam vnam acceptam, vel doni mei exiguitate deterritus deiectusque, vel inertiae pigritiaeue morbo defodere, ac citra vsuram et lucrum perdere: Neu etiam temere in hoc publicae censurae discrimen, absque patrono aliquo, qui a seuerioribus Mimis sua authoritate patrocinari, tuerique possit id quicquid est operis emittere: necesse fore existimaui tutelarem aliquem mihi Theseum Herculemque eligere, ne authoris humilitate, exiguitateque rei huius ac mareriae dignitas spreta, emendicata prorsus venia a rigidioribus eululgandi facultatem et copiam fecisse videatur. Siquidem ea est vir magnifice temporum nostrorum inuria et condito, vt nil a liuidorum reprehensionibus tutum sit, nil non serpentinus arrodat dens, mihi Mimorum saeuerissimam effugit censuram. Id quod partim mortalium vitij, corruptisque moribus dandum puto: quibus egregium aestimant in perspectissimis etiam operibus alicju notare, vel nimium, vel iusto minus, vel non satis perspicue ornateue quid dictum, vel quoquo tandem modo peccatum sit, seu alicju mendo, defectu, labee infectum. Qui eo etiam magis odiosi sunt, quod eorum plerique, si extremis etiam viribus neruisque omnibus intensis conentur, vel simile quid praestare non valeant, aut certe nil eo absolutius. Id enim vitij peculiare adeo est, magisque proprium nasutulis et sciolis illis (qui cum alicuius artis vix dum gustum alicuem habeant, extremisue labris libauerint, audent tamen quiduis carpere, et non secus ac anser inter olores obstrepere) quam doctis et prudentibus, qui si velint melius perfectiusque quiddam tradere possint: ij enim si quid animaduertant vel monent amice, vel interpretantur candide, vt nullo vel leui admodum negotio saepenumero errores emendentur: cum contra illi affectibus indulgentes, tantum abest, vt quae excusari possint, defendant, vt nullum non lapidem moueant, quoad scrupulum excitent: atque adeo nodum (vt dici solet) in scirpo quaeunt: loquacula siquidem ingenia et peruersa confirmat audacia, vt nullius non rei scientiam sibi arrogare haud vereantur, vti verissime Thucydides ait:
amathia μεν θρασος, λογισμὸς δὲ οξυν φερει. Cunctantius enim me hercle docti cordatique, temerius imperiti reprehendere solent. Partim quique hanc sortem tribuendam existimo lapsibus et imbecillitati ingenij, viriumque humanarum, quibus nil vnum omnibus numeris absolutum in lucem prodijt. Ea siquidem res non modo cauillandi occasionem sycophantis, verum et excandescendi stomachandique nonnullis capitosis, ac reprehendendi multis doctis praebere solet. Qui, si sese sub eandem alea positos esse recordarentur, aqueor procul dubio animo aliorum ferrent hallucinationes: vel enim ipse aliquando ediderunt suas lucubrationes, et aut errore aliquo aut Zoilo non caruerunt, quibus semper quod mordeant suppetit, vel edant quiddam etiam emunctae naris, et experientur olim quempiam forsan in ipsorum foeturis oculatiorem ipsis, caecutientem autem in proprijs. Quae res citra controversiam mori illi occasionem dedit, quo omnes sua in publicum emissuri, vel scripta, vel rapsodias, ex potentioribus ac magnatibus vnum aliquem eligere sonibus obseruatem magni etiam nominis authoribus, non duxi mihi negligendum esse: praesertim cum non ignorarem fore plurimos, qui limatiorem forsan stylum expetent, quorum hoc vti praezens negotium non fert, ita alterum immensi et infiniti foret operis. Obijcionalij quod dici solet, Actum agis, et, Nihil dices, quod non dictum dit prius, et, Illiada post Homerum conscribis: quibus forssasse cum Echone recinam easdem voces, vel bonos imitari licere obijciam. In quibus est aliqua prodire tenus, si non datur vltra, praeter id quod et in magnis voluisse sat videri queat. Circumspicienti autem mihi quem ego potissimum huic libro patronum deligerem, ac cogitanti non cuius cuiusuis argumenti libros aeque esse gratos, sed alios alijs duci studijs: Eiusmodi mihi praesidem aliquem quarendum existimaui, qui praeterquam quod apud vulgum autitatate polleat summa hoc etiam studij genere delectetur, eisique non inuitus patrocinium suskeiturus sit: quorum illud ex publico quo nunc summo cum honore, animique inuicti magnitudine fungeris munere, me latere non potuit: vtpote cuius virtuti optimatum pene omnium consensu vnanimi, huius tam grauis intricati, intestinique belli cura fere omnis, totusque exercitus commissus sit, cuius prudentia, dextertate, fortitudine, vigilantiaque secundum Deum Opt.Max. communis patriae hostis propulsetur, ipsaque patria suo vetusto nitori, foelicitati, ingenuaeque libertati restituat. Quarum rerum gubernacula nemo sanae mentis indicauerit, alteri quam summis, tum ingenij, tum etiam animi, corporis fortunaesque dotibus, fortitudine, virtutumque adeo cumulo caeteris omnibus superiores, a tam ampio
septendecim Prouinciarum nobilissimarum senatu commissam fuisse. Quo quod maius virtutis licuit, quod tam maiorum tuorum, quam propria virtute adeptorum insignium, nobilitatisque notis ipsum huius libri limen foresque ornari volueris, veluti non violando saluo conductu et dyplomatet, quo more magnatum fidei tutelaevque commissorum praedia, ac fortunae a palantium praedonum incursionibus tutae redduntur. Hoc itaque tam insigni beneuolentiae, amorisque tui erga omnes humaniores artes adeoque totam artium argumento confirmatus, hanc qualem qualem foeturam, fructuum studiorumque meorum primitias tibi Vir magnifice dedicoque consecroque: etiam atque etiam petens hanc hilari fronte suscipere digneris, eique patrocinari. Quod eo libentius T. Magnific. facturam confido, quo plus recreationis praesens liber serijs negotijs fatigato, harumque rerum studioso, ac sciendi auido affere potest. Mihi quidem a medicis negotijs vacanti, nonnunquam haec recreationis haud inuicendae vices suppleuere. Hic enim non solum tanquam per florida tempus, amoens lucos, irriguo prata, sonorae valles, virentes campos, verticosos montes expacando, molestiae, melancholicique affectus pelluntur, sed et gentium aborigenes, quiue noui habitatores cultorum veterum sedes occupent, priscorum vocabulorum vestigia etiamnum remanentia, regionum situs, limites, fertilitas, populi, urbes, vici, nemora, fluuiij, montes, naturaeque nonnulla miracula docentur: in quibus nonnunquam iucundum erit versari et animum oblectare.

Verum ne encomium meorum-met, quos ex varijs congessi authoribus laborum canere videar, non dicam quidquam utra, nisi vt denuo T. Magn. eorum patrocinium commendem, vt a vitiligatorum stridulorum serpentinis linguis te protegente securi esse queant. Vale itaque vir Magnificentiss. cuius consilia actusque Deus Opt.Max. ita regat oro, vt tota Belgica haec, pro qua, vti pro dulci patria, nullis non laboribus periculisque te expondat, ex calamitosorum temporum iniurij, saeuissimorumque hostium populationibus semiruta, viriliter fortiterque te rem gerente, propediem foelicitate affluens, reuirescere renascique cernatur: ac me meaque studia pro tua mansuetudine, et in literarum amantes candore, nec non Gerardum de Iode, de ijsdem studijs optime meritum, huicque operi sumptus suos imponentem, commendatos habe. Datum ex Vlissingensi oppido 7. Calend.Febr.1578.
vrbes. Vtillissimum vero hoc studium cum privatis tum publicis: inter hos enim qui rebus praesunt publicis, qui regnorum, castrorum, ciuitatumue gubernaculis praefecti sunt. Huius non exiguam experiuntur vtilitatem, si eius vel mediocriter periti sint: idque imprmis, si populorum et gentium mores, ritus et consuetudines (quarum demum rerum observatio sapientiae, prudentiaeue suspicionem gignit haud vulgarem) locorum adijciantur descriptionibus. Neque poenitendam etiam hinc capiunt vtilitatem, qui negotiati, merciumque, commutationi incumbentes, et ijs in exteras longinquas regions transportandis operam fant, dum terrarum, itinerum, viarumque situs, impedimenta, commoditates, pericula, distantiasque, nec non et marium flexus, sinus, Charybdes, Syrtesque inuias, portuum insuper, emporiorumque loca commoda in promptu et cognita habent. Praeter has, mea quidem opinione, ingentes Geographiae vtilitates sunt, in politica ciuillique administratione, multae inquam his nequaquam inferiores sunt, vel ipsis Imperatoribus maxime, vt sciant quo loco in hostium regions exercitus commodo ducatur. Vbi transmittendus rapidus vspiam flu. vbi accluies colles, montes praecipites, inuias paludes, densissima nemora, aperti campi, clandestini vallium accessus: quae singula rei gerendae pro arbitrio, non raro maximum momentum habere solent: intelligere loca castris idonea, cum commeatus facilitate coniuncta, ex vicinae terrae qualitate aeris salubritatem cognoscere, quo minus orta lues militem absumat: ac huius generis plurima: quae, quam sint pulchra, nemo non videt. At vero apud literatos, quid fidelis Geographiae cognitio emolumenti habeat, omnibus palam est, nullam aut historiam aut fabulum recte sine Geographiae cognitione accipi posse. Quin et philosophiam magna ex parte mutilam et mancam esse, si Geographiae ignarus sit, quod Strabo ab initio statim sui operis testatur his verbis. Si qua ad Philosophum alia pertineat tractatio, et hanc quam hoc tempore de situ orbis delegimus, considerandum illi esse putamus, quod autem nostra haec minime asperranda sit opinio, permultis declaratur: nam qui eam primi attingere ausi fuerant tales quidam extitere, Homerus, Anaximander, Milesius, Hecathaeus, conciuis eius (vt inquit Erathostenes) Democritus, Eudoxus, Dicaearchus, Ephorus, alijque complures. Post hos etiam Erathostenes, Polybius, Posidonius, viri philosophici. Et ex philosophiae definitione idipsum quoque probat, subnectens. Multa vero disciplina, per quam solam ad hoc opus peruenire conceditur, nullius alterius est, nisi eius qui diuina simul et humana intueatur, quorum videlicet scientiam philosophiam esse dicant. Haec Strabo. In historia autem, quis est qui non intelligat, quantum lucis, ex loci quo quaeuis res gesta sit, circumstantia, accedat legenti: cuius notitia nullis

Pingit et exiguo pergama tota mero.

adferri. Verum quod is Eridani nomen Graecum asseueret, contra ostendet Cimbricum esse Ioannes Goropius Becanus, ex quo haec sumpta sunt. Talia quoque sunt, vt sciamus ab littore Indico Margaritas afferri, Citrum ex Athlante Mauritaniae, Purpuram ex Tyro, Loton a Syrti maiore, e Paro Marmor asportari, Crocodilos Nilum AEgyptium gignere, ac huiusmodi innumeram. Cui sententiae Maro quoque subscribit, naturae noscendae insignis ac percallens serurator, Georgicorum primo, His versibus:

At prius, ignotum ferro quam scindimus aequor,
Ventos, et varium coeli praediscere morem
Cura sit: ac patrios cultusque, habitusque locorum:
Et quid quaeque ferat regio, et quid quaeque recuset.
Hic segetes, illic veniunt foelicius vuae:
Arborei foetus alibi, atque iniussa virescunt
Gramina. Nonne vides vt croceos Tmolus odores,
India mittit ebur, molles sua thura Sabaei?
At Chalibes nudi ferrum: viroaque pontus
Castorea: Eliadum palmas Epeiros quarum?
Pulchre significans Geographiae cognitionem vtramque historiam, tam ciuilem ac politicam, quam naturalem non ornare solum, sed vtrisque plurimum quoque conferre. Neque etiam Theologiae studio nonnihil adfert lucis Geographiae. Israelis migrationes quis Theologus praeter tabularum usum recte intelliget? Iam de Poetis non est quod pluribus disseram: Eos enim vel sibi lecturus, vel alijs explicaturus, quo quaeso pacto in his feoliciter versabitur, ni Geographiae praeceptis imbutus sit? Id quod vel paulo ante scripti Virgiliani versis ostendere possunt. Quid enim Tmolus tibi in illis paulo ante scriptis versibus erit? an pro vrbe, fluuius, aut Monte accipies? Seruium, inquis consulam, dicet montem esse Ciliciae: sed fallet te, vir alioquin diligens ac doctissimus. Vere enim cum Beroaldus hoc loco reprehendit ostendens, non Ciliciae, sed Lydie montem esse: at tu iam vbi Cilicia sit, vbi Lydia requires, quod si Geographiam degustasses, haud equidem opinor tibi accideret, cognosceres enim ex Ptolemaei tabulis Lydiam Asiae prouinciam, AEgaio mari ad Ortum vicinam, Ionaie proximam: Tmolum autem in ea montem ad Occidentalem Caisti fluiij ripam conspiceres. Ita iam conspicuum arbitror, nulli pene non hominum generi, non modo vtilem esse Geographiae cognitionem, verum alijs omnibus per eam artibus, ingens ornamentum accedere, per picturam praesertim, quae tanquam speculum obiectarum formarum imagines: ita haec scite elaborata, vel totius mundi, vel amplissimorum
imperiorum, regnorum, regionum, atque prouinciarum situs, commoditates et contenta, ita ob oculos ponit et repraesentat, vt desuper circumujectus oculis te tuis lustrasse singula, et contuitum esse existimes.¹

¹ Thereafter is an explanation of the structure of the book.
The current collection of correspondence presents only the bare text of Ortelius' letters to Vulcanius. I have not yet been able to piece together all the extant fragments of Vulcanius' responses, of which those listed by Dewitte represent only a small part. Four letters from Vulcanius to Ortelius can be found in Hessels' edition of the latter's correspondence; there are also two messy drafts in Leiden (Vulc 36), which appear to have been Vulcanius' own record of letters sent. These combined with the extant correspondence between both men and Monavius, would form a useful basis for further research towards a scholarly edition. For the present I have included only the coherent set of Ortelius' unpublished letters to Vulcanius in order to make available the sources which I have quoted during the course of my thesis.

For the sake of clarity, I have silently expanded common contractions and I have translated dates directly without adjusting for calendar changes.

10.8.1581

loquor) perlustrabo. Officiosum multa vocabula, in libro Notitiarum extare, te minime latere, mihi persuadeo. Si nunc non habereris, tibi, eo carere vel tempus potero. Et ceteris, quae apud me sunt. Saluta ex me, obsecro, ornamentum Belgicum nostrum, Dominum Dousam. Et quando IPSE FACIET? Vel an fecerit fortasse, ex eo quoque Monavius enim me suis litteris interdum monere de eo non desinit. Vale Ornatissime. Antwerp, 10 August, 1581.

3.9.1581


28.10.1581

Salutem Plurimam clarissime Vulcani. Nunc tandem ad binas tuas litteras, postquam ex huius grassantis epidemice febris carcere effingerim. Gratias maximas habeo pro tuo Constantino, quam semel legi, atque instituto meo utilem fore observari. Sed cupio eundem denuo legere, postea eum tibi fidelissime remittam. Sunt non pauca in

Quod Constantium Graecum una cum Latino cuperem, est, quod vereor an forte libraria incauta, vox interdum non suo proprio elemento incipiat. Ut exempli gratia vox quaedam inchoatur ab AE et librarius per E semblem, ego eius vitio sub E libere, quae sub A locanda erat, male constitueram, et verum ordinem perlubat, etc.

26.11.1581


29.2.1582


12.3.1582

Salutem Plurimam. Clarissime atque idem amicissime Vulcani. Redditum est mihi carmen tuum, on Monavi symbolum, cuius nomine maximas tibi ago gratias. Non dubito quin D. Dousa, ubi litteras Monavi viderit, idem communi nostro amico, si non pluribus saltem paucis versibus gratificabitur. En obsecro amici hoc negocium promovire. Praeterea, sine queso me a te adamavi. Est apud Athenaeum lib. 1 capite (ut latinus interpres hunc distinxu) 28, locus, ubi multa virorum genera enumerat, inter alia latinus interpres quoddam habet Passaprum, a loco sic dutum. In Graeco

5.6.1582


28.8.1582

Salutem Plurimam. Salve clarissime Vulcani. Tui, neque tuorum erga me meritorum oblivisci non possum. Sed me videar quosque hanc paginam Livane urbis proditque historiolam continentem, tibi communicare volui. Adieci (ut vides) hanc schedulam a Monavio scriptam, ut videas quomodo is te faciat. Et cognoscas, tuum apud eundem negocium bona fide exequilum. Dux Brabantiae haeret hactenus Gandavi. Unde eum

Nihil respondit mihi, ad tua, Dominus a Goychre. Miror, sed minus: enim ex eius amicis, eum egire scribere, cognoscam.

18.9.1582


7.1.1583


D. Lipsium, obsecro, ex me salutem.

3.10.1583


12.3.1582 [sic, lege autem 1583]

Salutem Plurimam. Remitto tibi per hanc meum amicum Semiamiranum tuum, clarissime Vulcani; sartum tectum. Perlustravi eum diligenter, sed nihil in eo quod ad meum faciebat institutum, reperi, quod non antea ex ipsis unde hic sua hauserat

28.2.1584


16.3.1584


metum incutiunt intro miserum enim ducem Arschotanum; quem valde veremur filium ad defectionem pertracturum. His vale. Antwerp, 7 May 1584.

18.8.1584


Novorum hic nihil. Liram urbem cogitabamus ante triduum, sed frustra.

31.12.1584


25.8.1592


Salutem Plurimam doctissime Vulcami. Desiderare te Additamentum III nostri Theatri lubens intellexi, illudque ita tradidi. Spiringo ut ad te prima oblata

9.6.1593

Salutem plurimam clarissimo Vulcani. En particular litterarum Monavii ad me, ut videas quod tibi in Agathia tua ab illo expectandum. Omne nempe officium, idque lubens merito ut mihi promissit ante has. Litteras Kittelbachii a te missas, ad Hopperum sedulo curari, sique eius responsam ad me pervenerit, id ad te quoque a me. De auctore Hispano qui scripserit de Civitatis Hispaniae nihil vidi. Esse autem quidam Gorchumensis nomine Henricus Coquus apud Regem nostrum e numero satellitum (artzier vulgo) qui tale opus iam diu prae manibus habuit lingua Latina, cuius specimen ante paucos annos miserat ad Plantinum. F.M. qui illud excudere cogitatbat; una cum earumdem ad virum delineationibus cuius tunc unam aut alterum paratam apud eundem me vidisse memini. Laminis ereis nempe. Petrus de Medina Hispanus Hispanicae, si nescias, edidit volumen anno 1548 cuis titulus “De grandezas y cosas memorables de España” in quo multarum huius urbiur descriptiones, at sine imaginibus. Secundi Additamenti Theatri nostri Latini memor ero, et si ulla via fieri poterit ut habeas, non neglegetior a me. Tibi hoc persuadeas rogo. Exercitus noster (ut scribis) ante Gertrudebergam est, cogitatq de novo, per agros ab hoste inundatis, exstruendo aggere; perq eundem et annonam et alia
necessaria in urbem invehundo. Magnus rumor hic de pace inter Ligarios et Navarreos, at frustra, ut ego augor. Vale. Antwerp, 9 June 1593

24.8.1594


10.10.1594


20.5.1596

Salutem Plurimam vir clarissime a me, item a Jacobo Monavio, qui iamdiu responsum expectat ad suas postremas. Tu frustra expectas plura per me ad Adagia Hispanica. Nihil enim eorum spei: postquam diem suum obiit apud nos Ioannes Bellerus, qui iamdiu, ut promittitbat eiusmodi ex Hispania expectabat. Filii, qui rem librariam post patrem faciunt, huius prorsus fatentur se ignaros. Haec te scire velim, ut forte, si ita usum alia via, hoc tentare lubeat; atque per alios. Lipsium totum esse in Machinis bellicis, factumque historicum regis non inscium te esse, scio. Scias autem et hoc, se etiam cogitare huius historiam, quam videtur velle aggredi. Primum edere bellum Lusitanicum cum Afris, in quo Sebastianus rex occubuit. Novi hic haud habeo quod scribam. His vale, et me inter tui studiosos si numeraveris, non erraveris, hoc tibi persuadero, amicorum veteri optime. Antwerp, 20 May 1596.
23.9.1596

Salutem Plurimam vir clarissime. De libellulo a te misso, ne suis sollicitus, nam ni fallor, nam in manibus Monavii est, nisi illi via Hamburgica hinc. Inde ipse accepturus est, ut eadem via, multa alia per me. Quod diutius detinueram, fecit quod exterius nullius nomen in inscriptum erat. Ob id ignarus ego ad quem pertinebat, aut mittendum erat. De Utopiae tabula tu recte iudicas, imposita illa nomina diversa diversarum gentium, at item significantia. Eorum auctor est huius maecenas; in cuius gratiam haec tabula (invita Minerva vere addo) a me delineata. De Utopia tu agis, docte. At putas me auctorem ad etymon Graecam respexisse? Forte fictitium voluit, nihilque significans. At Davus sum, non Oedypus. Pro missa Freti Nassovici delineatione sane immensas gratias ago. Utinam gradus latitudino longitudinisque adfuissent. Habeo litteras a Monavio, exaratas XXVIII Aug. 1596 in quibus haec verba “A filio D. Douza non accepi alias ad patrem litteras, nisi eas quid ad te missi. Ad me tamen scrispis e Cracovia, et salvum et incolumen per aliquot menses in Polonia fuisse significavit. Inde in Pannoniam sese contulit, et quotidiem aliud ab eo illinc etiam adfuturum spero.” Haec si visum, Dno Duza si significaveris, adde etiam salutem a me Ortelio, obsecro; et vale. Antwerp, 23 September 1596.

8.10.1596

Salutem Plurimam. Dum priores meas iam diu obsignassem, en prodit hic libellulus e Bruxella, ubi ventum ne quid typis prodeat, quin sit censura approbatum, privilegio munitum, loci nomen additum, item typographi. Vides quam stricte hoc ab illis ipsis observatum. Quoque accepio litteras a communi nostro amico Monavio in quibus haec, quam vides schedula. Leges eam, intelliges quid velit. Quaeso communis amici nomine si potes responde, schedulamque remitte. Et vale. Antwerp, 8 October 1596.

8.1.1597

Salve a me, et item a nostro communi amico Monavio. Per me namque te salutem adscribit, et item sibi valde gratum esse, quod illustrium illorum vivorum natales
communicaveris. Et videbimus eas, si Deus volet (inquit) in opere publico. Idem
Monavius eriperet valde, si opportunitas adfulserit, illi mitti Petronium Ioannis a
Wouweren. Sin minus, saltem mittetur ad nundinos proxime futuras Francfordiam.
Adde iisque Oppianus Ritterstirisii. Componentur in fasciente inscriptio suo nomine.
Petersi hoc per amicum a Raphelengiis pretium solvique curabit. Cuperet quoque
nosse illum a Wouwerem, cuius sit, etc. Poteris tu hoc ad me; ego ad illum. An in tua
(quam te scio habere instructissimam) bibliotheca Methodii chronicon? Saepius
citatum legi, nemoque vidi. Cuperem tamen. En molestias, ignosse. Praeterea (nisi
grave sit) sciamus quid iam prae manibus habeas, occisum te enim esse, nemo
persuadebit, etsi persuaserit. Novi publici apud nos nihil. His vale. Raphelengius,
Clusius, quid agunt? Huius ne labores sub prelo? Salveant a me si obviam.
Antverpiae viii Ian 1597, quem annum tibi amicisque felicem faustumque voveo.

12.8.1597

Salutem Plurimam Dicit optime doctissimeque Vulcani. En litteras a communi nostro
amico Iac Monavio, in quibus etiam, ni fallor, ad Ios Scaligerem, quem voti
compotem, ut spero, faciet. At quid audio? F. Raphelengium ad plures abiisse?
Abeandam ubi nobis omnibus. Quando? Cum illi visum cui nos omnes curae. In
postremis meis ad te Methodio historico verbum feceram; item de Anna Comnenaom
extarent, de quibus responsum hactenus expecto. Sed en hanc schedulam iniectm;
aliud a me tibi negocium. Vides quam audeo uti (abusi tu fortasse respondes) tua
humanitaque et erga studia mea iam toties experta benevolentia? Ignosce, et vale.
Antwerp, 12 August, 1597.

Ioannem Metellem diem suum obiisse. Venit ad nos pater Andreus Schottus, si
nescias, diu a fratribus suis desideratus.

26.10.1597

Salutem Plurimam Dicit. En Lexicon a vobis desideratum iam diu. Remitti cupit Monavius cum usi fueritis. Ad eundem adieci tua numismata, ex quibus unum mihi retinui, pro quo gratias habeo. At quam de nummis antiquis, ex iis quid quod tibi communicare ibet. Habeo unum grandioris forme eream, integrum, et extra omnem controversiam antiquam, caesium in Aegypto sub Ptolemeis regibus. Ab altera parte habet Iovis Ammonis caput cornutum. Ab altera aquilam fulmini insistentem, atque
inter expansas pedes hunc characterem, P

ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ. X

Quare hoc tibi, quaeres forsan, de hoc nummo? Dicam, quia in eo quod admiror valde, nempe hanc quam vides formam, quem nostri aliqui pro Χριστον nomine, aliqui pro crucis signo habent. Si ita, non locum in illo saecula, in hoc nummo habet. Quid tu quaeso mi Vulcani aut vestri tripodes? Communicavi eadem cum Lipsio, at obmatescit, nec habet quid respondeat. Vale. Antwerp, 26 October 1597.

2.12.1597


26.4.1598

Salutem Plurimam Dicit amicorum optime. Fasciculum mihi a Schotto traditum ad te curandum haesit hactenus apud Moretum, a quo iam abit ad Christianam, a quo tuas spero manus perveniet. Miseram quoque per tabullariam fasciculum teretem oblongum, nempe Tabulum novam Argonautarum tibi, et ceterus quorum nomina

342

30.4.1598

AD LECTOREM


Vocibus antiquis Graecis toties, quoties per libros licuit, (nonnumquam enim Graecorum codicum nobis defuit facultas) subiunximus: vt eo melius ortographia constaret, atque conseruaretur. Singulis quoque sua, si quae erant, synonyma
addidimus. quod viderem his attente consideratis, lucem non contemnendam, historiae geographiaeque candidatis adferri. Ab epithetis et periphrasibus, poetis, oratoribusque valde frequentibus atque familiaribus, etsi speciem quandam nomenclaturae prae se ferant, quia tamen ad grammaticos potius, quam ad geographos; et ad gentis atque loci potius historias fabulasque, quam ad eius cognitionem aut situm conducunt, consulto abstinuimus. Et habent quorum haec scire interest, auctorem satis in eo huberem I. Rausium Textorem. In locorum descriptionibus si quis forte me prolxiorem optasset, is sciat me nomenclaturam, non historiam instituisse. Et tamen, cui ea tanti sint, habet hac nostra opera, quo sibi satisfieri poterit: cum singulis vocibus continuo suos auctores, qui earundem meminere, subnectimus. Ab ipsis certe fontibus, quam ex riuulis lacunisque a nobis aliisque inde deducendis, huiusmodi multo securius petenda, omnes mediocriter saltem eruditos, mecum recte sentire existimo. etsi longior tamen sim interdum: sed tantum vbi loci difficultas hoc desiderare videtur: aut in iis quae ex libris vel litteris, hactenus non editis, aut ore amicorum nostro instituto fauentium, habuimus. haec quia ex libris excusis haberi minime poterant, et studiosis tamen scire non inutile iudicabamus, paulo hic fuimus, quam in ceteris, liberaliores. Atque haec sunt ea talia, quae tibi candide Lector, hoc nostro labore candide impartimur. Vale, et bone consule.
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<td>197-200</td>
<td>5.1.1588</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.111v</td>
<td>Tiara, Petrus</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1.3.1580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.110v</td>
<td>Lernuttus, Janus</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>18.3.1580</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.74v</td>
<td>Horaeus, Rambert</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>16.6.1580</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.29v</td>
<td>d'Heere, Lucas</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6.7.1580</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.59v</td>
<td>Giselinus, Victor</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.51v</td>
<td>Clement, Nicolas</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.7.1582</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.38v</td>
<td>Verrutius, Hieronymus</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>13.7.1582</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.53v</td>
<td>Gruterus, Janus</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.8.1582</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff.107v-10</td>
<td>Gevaerts, Joannes</td>
<td>219-220</td>
<td>30.11.1582</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Bodin, Jean</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.118v</td>
<td>Rindfleisch, Daniel</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>26.7.1583</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.5</td>
<td>Bongars, Jacob</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.5.1584</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.50v</td>
<td>Dudith, Andreas</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>29.10.1584</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.53v</td>
<td>Engelhard, Daniel</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>10.12.1584</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.8</td>
<td>Crato, Joannes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.11v-12</td>
<td>Crato, Johannes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.56v-57</td>
<td>Wacker, Johannes Matthaeus</td>
<td>111-112</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff.93v-94</td>
<td>Monavius, Jacob</td>
<td>191-192</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.63</td>
<td>Rhedinger, Nicholas</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>11.1584</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.9v</td>
<td>Herman, Janos</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.7.1585</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.92v</td>
<td>Monavius, Petrus</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>7.1585</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.27</td>
<td>Rockox, Nicholas</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.1587</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.119</td>
<td>Raphelengius, Franciscus Jnr.</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>27.3.1587</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.109v</td>
<td>Venius, Otto</td>
<td>223-224</td>
<td>13.10.1588</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.78</td>
<td>Colius, Jacob</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>10.11.1588</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Index No</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.10v</td>
<td>Torrentius, Laevinus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>Antwerp/Liege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.102</td>
<td>Corck, Gerard van [Suberinus]</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>25.6.1589</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.104v-10</td>
<td>Heyns, Zacharias</td>
<td>213-214</td>
<td>28.3.1590</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.117</td>
<td>Megiser, Hieronymus</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>7.6.1590</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.110v</td>
<td>Plancius, Adam</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>4.11.1590</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.115-115</td>
<td>Calaminus, Georgius</td>
<td>235-236</td>
<td>.8.1591</td>
<td>Linz [Letter]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.72</td>
<td>Sweertius, Franciscus</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.11</td>
<td>Liber der Kraigg, Julius</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4.1594</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.119v</td>
<td>Fleming, Arnold</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>30.4.1595</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.113</td>
<td>Meyerus, Leo</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>15.1.1596</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.122-125</td>
<td>Colius, Jacob</td>
<td>Index</td>
<td>26.1.1596</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.81</td>
<td>Kilianus, Cornelius</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1.2.1596</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.114</td>
<td>Moretus, Balthasar</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>24.9.1596</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.43</td>
<td>Dicchius, Andreas</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21.3.1596</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.116</td>
<td>Henckel, Lazarus</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>16.6.1596</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.26v</td>
<td>Dichiocus, Aloysius</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Galle, Cornelius</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Werdenstein, Johan Georg</td>
<td>179.b</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Galle, Theodorus</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.100</td>
<td>Scholiers, Hieronymus</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Woverius, Joannes</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.A</td>
<td>Colius, Jacob</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.12v</td>
<td>Bruegel, Peter</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.13</td>
<td>Thorius, Joannes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.14</td>
<td>Galle, Philip</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.50</td>
<td>Lombard, Lambert</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Hesselt, Gerartus</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.16v-17</td>
<td>Arias Montano, Benito</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.108v-10</td>
<td>Schottus, Andreus</td>
<td>221-222</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.41</td>
<td>Plancius, Jacob</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.40</td>
<td>Crucquius, Jacob</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.39-39v</td>
<td>Vriendt, Maximillian de</td>
<td>78-79</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.111</td>
<td>Cort, Cornelius</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.35</td>
<td>Graphaeus, Cornelius</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Moretus, Joannes</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.82v-84</td>
<td>Dousa, Janus</td>
<td>169-170</td>
<td>5.12.--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.64v-65</td>
<td>Damman, Adrianus</td>
<td>127-128</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.84v-85</td>
<td>Susius, Jacob</td>
<td>171-172</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.117</td>
<td>Snellius, Rudolphus</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.51v-52</td>
<td>Winghe, Philip van</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Margenrode, Joachim</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.46</td>
<td>Valerius, Cornelius</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.22v</td>
<td>Cope, Lucas</td>
<td>39-40</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.20-20v</td>
<td>Hagen, Michael van der</td>
<td>34-35</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.19v</td>
<td>Haller ab Hallerstein, Ludovicus</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.32</td>
<td>Hogenberg, Frans</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>