

Raffaele Maffei's *Anthropologia* (1506): the birth and diffusion of a (quasi)-neologism

Leonardo Piasere

Abstract

After the appearance in 1501 of the term *ant(h)ropologium* coined by Magnus Hundt, in 1506 Raffaele Maffei (or Raphael Volaterranus) used (perhaps) the Latin term *anthropologia*, from which the corresponding forms in today's national languages derive, for the very first time. This scarcely-known fact has remained as such to scholars who in recent decades have dealt with the semantic history of the word "anthropology". This article shows the emergence of the (quasi)-neologism, the ways in which it spread in Europe during the sixteenth century and how the meaning that Maffei gave the term, close to today's prosopography, remained practically the same throughout that century. The article shows that authors, whose position has been little understood and sparsely studied to date, fit perfectly into the intellectual genealogy started by Maffei.

Keywords: Semantic history of "anthropology"; Aristotle's *anthrōpologos*; Early modern Anthropologies; Renaissance

Introduction

This article aims to contribute to the semantic history of the term "anthropology". Although this topic is certainly not new, it still needs to be constantly updated, as Santing's (2018) recent study demonstrates. Philosophy and science historians realized years ago how fascinating the history of the word "anthropology" is, and have not neglected to investigate into the evolution of the term's usage (see, for example, Marquard 1965; Moravia [1970] 1978: 66-67; Schipperges 1972; Gusdorf 1974: 227-268; Bauer 1984; Blanckaert 1989; Vermeulen 2015: 359-366). In the field of professional anthropology, it has long been known (see Hunt 1863: 1) that the term *anthrōpologos* (ἀνθρωπολόγος) was used by Aristotle in *Nicomachean Ethics* (1125a, 5) and also that the first modern work in which the word "anthropology" appears (or seems to appear) was Magnus Hundt's *Antropologium de hominis dignitate* in 1501 (see Bendysche 1865: 352; Topinard 1876: 200). Since the modern term was to become established as of the 1600s, especially in the German scientific realms, several German-speaking ethnologists, such as Adolf Bastian (1881: 7-10) and Wilhelm Schmidt (Schmidt & Schmidt, 1906) were already attracted to the history of the word. They were also well-aware of the existence of *Anthropologia* (1533) by

Galeazzo Capra (or Capella): this work, written in Italian, had been analysed earlier than Santing's afore-mentioned study particularly by female Italian literature scholars, attracted by his book entitled *Della eccellenza et dignità delle donne* (1525) which later merged into *Anthropologia* itself (Doglio 1988 and 1993:71-100; Rotzoll&Benzenhöfer, 1991; Bolzoni 2007; Ferro 2013). But several authors have asked themselves whether there really was a link between Aristotle's term and those that first appeared in the sixteenth century. As we will see, many misunderstandings have arisen due to the way in which the term *anthrōpológos* is translated today.

However, before Galeazzo Capra, the word *anthropologia* appeared in a work by Raffaele Maffei and, as far as I know, this was its first historical occurrence. Up until now, Raffaele Maffei's use of the term has not attracted the attention it deserves, perhaps because it is not included in the title of the work in which it constantly appears. The book is entitled *R. Volaterrani Commentariorum Urbanorum Octo et Triginta Libri*; the first *in folio* edition was issued in Rome in 1506 by the editor Besicken and the title is usually quoted as *Commentarii Urbani* or *Commentaria Urbana*. Many Renaissance historians were aware of Maffei's usage of the word without, however, realising the importance in the term's semantic history (except maybe for Cherchi 1998: 37). To my knowledge, only John Howland Rowe acknowledged that:

«It is a fact of some interest that the word 'anthropology' is of sixteenth century origin. It is foreshadowed in the title of a Latin book on human anatomy published at Leipzig in 1501, the *Antropologium*, or "discourse on man" of Magnus Hundt the Elder. The word "anthropology", as the general name of a subject, comes however from another Renaissance Latin form, *anthropologia*, 'study of man', which is first attested in 1506, appearing as the title of one section of a popular Latin encyclopaedia by the Italian writer Raffaele Maffei of Volterra. The section entitled "*Anthropologia*" was a dictionary catalogue of famous men» (1964: 1).

Rowe's discovery stayed buried in the journal in which it appeared and was never investigated further. Before addressing the topic, providing a description of Maffei's work and proposal would seem appropriate.

Raffaele Maffei, aka Volaterranus, and his *Anthropologia*

Raffaele Maffei (Rome 1451 - Volterra 1522) often signed his name in Latin as Raphael Volaterranus, which is how he is usually cited (or Volterranus, Volaterrano, Volterrano, Volaterra, Volterra), since he belonged to a Volterra family, a Tuscan city under the Republic of Florence at the time. His father worked in the Papal chancellor's offices in Rome and, at only 17 years of age, Raffaele himself, born in

Rome, was employed by Pope Paul II as a *scriptor apostolicus*, a scribe employed to write apostolic letters¹. Apart from a short trip in 1479-80 in Hungary to the court of Matthias Corvinus as an apostolic nuncio escort, he spent most of his life in Rome. He represented humanism under the Roman Curia: he cultivated classic studies, especially Greek, and maintained contacts with leading humanists of the time, both in Rome and Florence. In the 1470s, he financed one of the first printing businesses which was located in his building. He wrote several works in Latin (not all published) and translated or summarized classic Greek texts (Homer, Aristotle, Xenophon, Procopius, etc.) into Latin. In 1507 he retired to his home in Volterra, and his last fifteen years were spent virtuously and chastely pursuing sanctity. He continued to cultivate his great passion for studying Greek, translating patristic theology texts (Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, John of Damascus, etc.). He wrote books on Christian worship, making his contribution to developing that Christian humanism that was trying to apply Socratic “know thyself” to an austere lifestyle. He developed a “moderate classicism”, in line with those Fathers of the Church who encouraged, among the teachings of classic authors, selecting those suitable for a good Christian (D’Amico 1983: 189-211). He wrote one of the first treatises confuting Luther’s theological essays even before the latter was officially condemned by the Pope in 1520 (D’Amico 1975; D’Ascia 1993). When he died, “contemporaries recognized his *fama sanctitatis*, his reputation for sanctity” (Frazier 2005: 272)².

Italian Renaissance scholars considered the *Commentarii urbani* as an “authentic monument of humanistic encyclopaedism” (Benedetti 2006: 4), in line with what might be expected “of a humanist from the Roman school” (Dionisotti 1968: 47), but also of a “strong innovator of encyclopaedic works” (Cherchi 1998: 37). Published in Rome in 1506, as previously mentioned, and dedicated to Pope Julius II, the work was extremely successful on a European scale with the Paris editions in 1511 (re-printed in 1515 and 1526), Basel in 1530 (reprinted in 1531, 1540, 1544 and 1559), Lyon in 1552 and 1599, and Frankfurt in 1603. Often quoted, it acted as a reference point for at least two centuries.³

The work stood out from previous and later encyclopaedias due to its unusual three-part layout. It was, in fact, divided into three *tomi* (three sections in one single volume), respectively entitled: *Geographia*, *Anthropologia* and *Philologia*. Each tome was then also divided into “books”. The term *Anthropologia* therefore appears

¹ On Raffaele Maffei’s biography see Falconcini (1722), Paschini (1953), D’Amico (1983), Frazier (2005: 269-281), Benedetti (2006), Budetta (2008). His elder brother, Antonio Maffei, famous for attempting to assassinate Lorenzo de’ Medici in 1478 during the “Pazzi Conspiracy”, was also an apostolic writer.

² Raffaele Maffei’s austere period and his studies on Christian authors are well analyzed by Frazier (2005: 268-314).

³ To be precise, the editors were: Petit & Bade in Paris, Froben in Basel, Gryphe and Veyrat in Lyon, De Marne in Frankfurt. The citations herein were always taken from the Roman edition of 1506.

as the name of the second section, that is, as the name of a *taxon* in a classification of encyclopaedic knowledge.

Let's start from the third *tomus* (books XXIV-XXXVIII), which is the closest to today's idea of an encyclopaedia. *Philologia* is defined as the "rudiments of various arts" (*variarum artium rudimenta*). It contains mere hints of the information that we would call philological today: it starts with a description of the human body, illnesses and medicines and ends with the "liberal arts" after dealing with animals, plants, metals, architecture and town planning. Before dealing with the usual topics linked to grammar, poetry, rhetoric, mathematics, optics and astronomy, a significant part is devoted to customs (*mores*) in which he tackles various themes of a moral, political and judicial nature as well as warfare and human emotions, etc. Philosophy is ordained to summarize Aristotle's texts, his philosopher-guide, although the other philosophers from ancient times are duly cited. Some topics are dealt with by summing up entire Greek works, for example, the chapter on poetry (book XXXIII), includes a lengthy summary of Hesiod's *Theogony*; to speak about tyranny, he summarized a work by Xenophon (book XXX), to speak about legislators, he summarized Plato's *Laws* (book XXIX), even if in other works he declined anti-neo-Platonic positions; etc. As Dionisotti pointed out (1968: 49-51), the linguistic experiment in book XXX (*De Nominibus*) in which the author proposes the etymology of Tuscan words directly from Greek, bypassing Latin, is interesting⁴. The description of the human body (book XXIV), which is so important in Hundt's *Antropologium*, is confined to 13 of the almost 600 *folia* that make up the 1506 edition of *Commentarii Urbani* from 342r to 355v. The only highlight could be that the body is the first subject dealt with in *Philologia*. But Maffei's intention was clearly to consider the body outside of anthropology: not only is it dealt with after a large "End of Anthropology" (*Finis Anthropologiae*) written in capital letters on the previous page, it is also part of a book which is entitled "On animals and firstly on their parts" (*De animalibus ac primum de partibus eorum*). The chapter that follows the description of the human body is entitled "On other animals in general" (*De reliquis animalibus in universum*). The body is part of animality, and animality is not part of *Anthropologia*. Maffei obviously acknowledged that man is made of body and soul ("*Homo igitur cum ex utroque constet*", f. 342r), but he only speaks of the soul in book XXXVIII (f. 528v-532r) and through the works of Greek philosophers, Aristotle in particular.

⁴ This was also done in other parts of the work: scholars of Romani studies have long found Maffei's proposal strange (book XII "Persia") according to which Gypsies derive from the Uxii, a population living in Persia in the region called Uxia, mentioned by Strabo. Maffei did not go into detail but the proposal can be explained knowing that, in his day, Gypsies were called Ussi in Tuscan (a term used up until the 17th century). The name actually derived from that used by the Bohemian theologian, Jan Hus and the Hussite sect he originated, many of whose members fled from Bohemia into western Europe at the same time as the first Roma migrations (Piasere 2006: 11).

The first two *tomi* are a totally different matter. In *Geographia* (books II-XII), the description of places is accompanied by further studies of each individual regional and local history, in line with what was then called “chorography”, a discipline that had been established for some time following the influence of works by Flavio Biondo (who had also worked at the Papal courts in the previous decades). Maffei’s geography is a geography of “places and peoples” (*loca ac populi*), that is, regions and cities occupied by men with their historical profundity. It starts by speaking about the great geographers of ancient times and goes on to describe Europe (starting from Spain), Asia (as far as China) and northern Africa (as far as Ethiopia). Being a summary taken mainly from Greek and Latin sources, populations such as the Nasamones, Garamantes, Troglodytes, etc., who populated the texts of ancient authors, also appear. There is also information at the end of book XII on “recently discovered places”. The author goes into more detail about Portuguese travels along the coasts of Africa and in the Indian Ocean than the Spanish transatlantic voyages. These include Christopher Columbus’ second journey (1493-1496) to the islands “beyond the Canaries”: the inhabitants are white, feed on grass, are lawless and godless and, on some islands, are cannibals. On the island of *Cannibula*, women of the “Amazonite genus” (*Amazonidum genus*) were found living without men. It is in *Geographia* then, that Maffei deals with topics that we would now call ethnographic, referring to different peoples and customs, near or far in time or space. It should be noted that the author, speaking of Greece, draws a lot of information from Stephanus (Stéphanos) of Byzantium, who Maffei referred to as *ethnographus* (1506: 124v), a sixth-century Byzantine geographer, author of *Ethnica*. As Vermeulen (2015: 275-283) teaches us, this term was to re-appear in Germany in 1767 as *Ethnographia* with its contemporary meaning, but several authors after Maffei referred to Stephanus as *Ethnographus*.

The eleven books of *Anthropologia* (books XIII-XXIII) are positioned between *Geographia* and *Philologia*, and deal, as the index in book I states, with “illustrious men of all times, all languages and all peoples” (*hominum clarorum omnium temporum, linguarum, gentium*)⁵. This is the only definition that Maffei gives of *anthropologia*, a term that is, however, much used within the text. Dionisotti (1964: 47) defined this part as “initially a historical onomastic dictionary in alphabetical order from ancient times, then a review of illustrious men of the modern age by category and profession”.

Maffei starts his exposition in the initial pages of book XIII by summarising the history of the world up to Augustus and the birth of Christ, subdividing it into six ages and calculating the years from the beginning of man’s creation. He traces the biblical genealogy, name by name, starting from the sons of Adam, outlines the history of the Jewish people, without neglecting what happened at the same time to

⁵ The *folia* in the 1506 edition of book I are not numbered.

other peoples in the Middle East and Mediterranean, such as the Assyrians, Babylonians, Egyptians, Carthaginians, Etruscans, Romans. Although only a few pages long, this partial “parallel genealogy” reconstruction defined the way Maffei proceeded and, when he had the relevant information, he always inserted a person into his/her genealogy or family network. After this initial introduction, Maffei begins an extremely long list, in alphabetical order, of famous people from ancient times that continue until book XX, starting from Ablabius (a Praetorian prefect at the time of Emperor Constantine) to Zerubbabel (a biblical figure). Each entry gives the characteristics that made the person worthy of mention and the source of the information. For example (from book XX: 286v):

«Xanthus: ancient writer on events in Lydia. Strabo was uncertain whether he was Lydian or from the city of Sardis. The *Suidas* says he was a Lydian from Sardis and that he wrote four books on the history of the Lydians»⁶.

These entries, which can be of extremely varied length, together contribute to giving a history of the world starting from the people “who have left writers something to say about them” (*qui materiam qualemcumque scriptoribus de se loquendi tradiderunt*, 1506: 170r). In other words, people who, due to the things they did in life, were able to attract the attention of others and who continued to be talked of through writing. The resulting multi-centred history is like a cosmos full of stars of varying brightness (based on the length of the entry) that is not held together by any chronology or by explanations of historical causality, but is instead connected either by explicit references or by implicit similarities that cross generations, languages and peoples.

For the devoutly Christian Maffei, the Advent of Christ divided world history into two rather different eras which were structured in different ways. In fact, from book XXI, the alphabetical order used for the ancient figures (including, however, non-Christian characters from the early centuries AD) is relinquished, and great men who had left their mark on a totally Christian humanity, are taken into consideration. These figures are classified into categories and each category followed a chronological order. It starts with the history of Christianity: Maffei mentions the great Christian authors of the very first centuries and goes on to describe the birth and history of religious orders: from the Basilians to the Augustinians, from the Benedictines to the Dominicans, to the Franciscans, to numerous religious-military orders that arose at the time of the Crusades.

⁶ “XANTHUS antiquus rerum Lydorum scriptor. Lydus ne an Sardinus fuerit, Strabo se dicit incertum habere. Suidas Lydum eum dicit e Sardibus civitate fuisse, scripsisseque historiam Lydorum Libris IIII”.

There then follows a description of authors from recent centuries who wrote on what he called the “circular arts” (grammar, poetry, rhetoric, mathematics and philosophy), although he also includes artists, jurists and scientists. He starts from Dante Alighieri and lists scholars of varying degrees of fame today, up to Maffei’s time, including all the most famous Italian humanists. He showed a particular interest for Greek teachers operating in Italy in the 1400s “who made our century more illustrious” (*qui seculum nostrum clarius reddidere*, f. 298v).

Book XXII is entirely dedicated to the chronological history of the Church of Rome and its popes, from Saint Peter to Alexander VI. The last book of *Anthropologia* deals with the Roman Empire’s emperors in a broad sense: from the Empire started by Augustus, to the Roman Empire of the West and that of the East, up to the fall of Constantinople, and lastly, the Holy Roman Empire founded by Charlemagne up to Maximilian I of Hapsburg, the Emperor in power in 1506. Despite several studies being published on “illustrious women” in the previous decades, and unlike Galeazzo Capella’s subsequent *Anthropologia*, Maffei’s books leave little room for women: several women are mentioned when he speaks of “illustrious men” but there is no specific space on women, except for a short mention in *Philologia* on “women’s customs” (*de moribus mulierum*) in the part dedicated to marriage in book XXX.

Maffei’s *Anthropologia* did not purely aim at commending the people it listed: the fact that they were “illustrious” (*clari*) because a source of some kind reported their name did not mean that their defects were not to be mentioned. Quite the opposite. He compiled an “encyclopaedic theology” in which short biographies interpreted a moral purpose (D’Amico 1983: 190). Catullus, for example, the famous Latin poet, is defined as “as lecherous as he is biting” (*cum lascivus tum mordax*; f. 198r). When writing about his contemporaries, Maffei did not refrain from giving his own impression, especially if he had met them personally. For example, he met Pico della Mirandola twice in his lifetime and, while the eulogy speaks of his fame for “intelligence and doctrine” (*ingenii doctrineque*, f. 299v) in his younger days, Maffei was hostile when, as an adult, Pico della Mirandola went to Rome “with ostentatious doctrine” (*ostentata doctrina*) to illustrate “certain proposals undoubtedly not appreciated by the Parisian School” (*quibusdam propositis haud sane Scholae Parisiensi probatis*). In 1486, Pico did in fact go to Rome to present his *Nine Hundred Theses* (*Conclusiones nongentae*), but he was accused of heresy and Maffei took the side of the Pope⁷. Unlike Hundt and Capella then, Maffei’s *Anthropologia* did not follow the thread of the “dignity of man” which places Man at the centre of the universe. His *anthropologia* outlines a rather ambiguous ideal Christian and

⁷ The reference to the “Parisian School” regards the attack launched at Pico by the Spaniard Pedro Garzia, a doctor at the Sorbonne and spokesman for more conservatory scholastic theologians, who was protected by cardinal Rodrigo Borgia, the future Pope Alexander VI (see D’Amico 1983: 165).

Roman society, one that is less optimistic about *Man's* place in the world and more attentive to individual *men* with their glories and faults, without fearing confrontation with the men of classic antiquity: the Others by definition in that period. Unlike other Renaissance courts, in the second half of the 1400s in Rome there was a bitter debate on the relationship between Christianity and paganism. Some members of the Curia had created the Roman Academy and were even trying to re-establish the Ancient Roman religion in a kind of "humanistic conspiracy" (Dionisotti 1968: 48). The fact brought to light the problem of relations between intellectuals and Papal power. Pope Paul II dissolved the Academy in 1468 and its members were imprisoned. The Academy re-opened under Pope Sixtus IV and it appears that Maffei sometimes attended; as previously mentioned, in his *Commentarii* he donates ample space to the religion of the ancients through a summary of Hesiod's work, speaking with evident pleasure of each god and their genealogies. Catholic authors have always had a problematic relationship with ancient religion, so much so that even Erasmus of Rotterdam criticized the Italian humanists in his *Ciceronianus* in 1528 since, in his opinion, they were re-installing Paganism⁸.

As Dionisotti underlines (1968: 47), geography and history are the bases behind the whole of this encyclopaedic work, which deviates from the encyclopaedic *summae* that were previously compiled in university settings and which presented an order of topics that was more in tune with the scholastic classification of the typical "liberal arts" of the trivium (grammar, i.e. Latin; rhetoric; dialectics, i.e. philosophy) and of the quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, music). As is known, medicine (and architecture) has always held an ambiguous place between trivium and quadrivium, as well as between liberal and mechanical arts, and it is no coincidence that it developed within natural philosophy. For example, *De expetendis et fugiendis rebus opus* (1501) by Giorgio Valla, an encyclopaedic work published immediately prior to *Commentarii*, had an order in which the "dissolution of compartmentalization" (Panowsky 1962) process of medieval disciplines was already highlighted, even though the order of liberal arts still prevailed: 1. Arithmetic, Music, Geometry, Astrology (i.e. Astronomy), Physiology, Medicine; 2. Grammar, Dialectics, Rhetoric, Moral Philosophy, Economics, Politics, Human Body, (souls, body, urine), Miscellaneous.

As can be seen, "Physiology, Medicine and Human Body" were divided among the quadrivium and trivium teachings. Moreover, moral philosophy, economics and politics were added to the trivium due to the enormous influence that studying Aristotle was having in Italian universities at that time (Lines 2002). "Beyond any academic complicity" (Dionisotti 1968: 47), Maffei offered a totally innovative taxonomy of knowledge in his encyclopaedia in which history, through the

⁸ On the famous dispute between Erasmus and the Roman "Cicerorians", see D'Amico (1983: 138-143).

aid of Greek antiquity, permeates the entire work. He was clearly influenced on the one hand by the archaeological and Roman topography studies that he had begun to develop in the 1400s, when his intellectuals realized they were living in a “city of ruins”, as Burckhardt said (1860). On the other hand, he was influenced by that way of dealing with history that was based on the construction of galleries of illustrious men who had important precedents in ancient times (Cornelius Nepos, Valerius Maximus, Plutarch), in earlier centuries (Petrarch, Boccaccio) and in his own day (Giovio, Fazio). This manner of reporting history was, in turn, highly influenced by the idea of individual glory that was being created, expressed brilliantly by Francesco Petrarch in *Triumphs*, especially in “Triumph of Fame” (Burckhardt 1860; Piasere 2000). And, seeing that the humanists were of the opinion that educated people were more human than those who had had no education (Burke 1998: 29), Maffei’s innovation consisted in calling *anthropologia* that part of *studia humanitatis* that distinguished exemplary men (for better or for worse).

Returning to Aristotle’s *anthrōpológos*

My proposal is that we cannot understand why Maffei gave that meaning to the word *anthropologia* and why the term was being used in his day unless we go back to the famous Aristotle’s *anthrōpológos*⁹.

According to Bonitz’s *Index aristotelicus* (1870: 58), the only place in which the word “*anthrōpológos*” (ἀνθρωπολόγος) is found, the passage in *Nicomachean Ethics* (1125a, 5), is the only part in which it appears in Aristotle’s writings. And, as far as is known, it is also the word’s only appearance in classic Greek. The philosopher was referring to *megalopsychía* (μεγαλοψυχία) and described the characteristics of *megalópsychos* (μεγαλόψυχος). Literally “man of great soul”, “magnanimous”, a *megalópsychos* is a man who is fully aware of his own value. One who neither overdoes it (otherwise he would become a braggart) nor downplays it (otherwise he would become a wimp). The several pages dedicated to the magnanimous man are “a collection of *endoxa* on magnanimity; many critics maintain that it is just a list of popular opinions that Aristotle did not share; others, however, state that he agreed with these positions, at least to a certain degree” (Natali, in Aristotle 1999: 482). In this list that outlines the characteristics of the “superior man” (*áristos*), one of “perfect virtue” (*axía timé*), one “who believed to be worthy of great things”, we learn that this man despised the common people, he helped other people but did not want benefits in return because that would have put him in a

⁹ This article does not deal with Aristotle’s anthropology in general; it only intends to analyse the historical connection between the term “*anthrōpológos*” and the modern term “anthropology”. In regard to Aristotle’s philosophical anthropology, I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer who drew my attention to the work of Stephen Clark (1975), to which I refer.

position of inferiority. He ignored the opinions of others, was not surprised at anything, walked slowly, spoke in a deep and mellow voice, etc. And this self-sufficient individual (*autárcous*) never bore a grudge, never reaped others' malice and "is not *anthrōpológos*". What the text literally says is:

«οὐδ' ἀνθρωπολόγος· οὔτε γὰρ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐρεῖ οὔτε περὶ ἑτέρου»,
«neither (is he) *anthrōpológos*: in fact, he neither speaks of himself nor of another».

As is known, in translations from the twentieth century onwards the term was given a negative connotation. In a French version the sentence is translated as "*Il n'aime pas non plus les commérages: il ne parlera ni de lui-même ni d'un autre*" (Aristotle 1997); in an English version: "*Nor is he a gossip; for he will speak neither about himself nor about another*" (Aristotle 2009); a German version says that the term means: "*über andere Menschen reden (im Sinne von 'Klatsch')*" (Riedel 2007: 433); in a perhaps vaguer Spanish version: "*Tampoco habla sobre la gente: no hablará ni sobre sí mismo ni sobre otro*" (Aristotle 2001); in a Italian version: "*Egli non è un pettegolo, non parla né di sé, né degli altri*" (Aristotle 1999).

This way of translating *anthrōpológos* is normally blindly accepted by today's anthropologists. The Italian case is interesting. Starting from the version by Armando Plebe, who translated it with *pettegolo* ("gossip") in the 1950s (see Aristotle 1957), this word has become invasive.¹⁰ Only Moravia (1978: 66), while recognizing the negative undertone of the term, considered this translation as "too liberal and misleading". But Remotti (2000: 16) included it in an introductory text to anthropology, claiming that Aristotle used *anthrōpológos* "in a detrimental and rather dismissive sense" implying that "a 'gossip' is someone who is inclined to 'talk about people'". And nowadays, in a waterfall effect, many Italian authors are repeating the same thing. It should be pointed out that *pettegolo* in Italian has a strong meaning: etymologically it derives from the Venetian word *petegola* (initially only feminine), built on the word *peto* (flatulence), and refers to "someone who passes gas through their mouth", with allusions "to the verbal incontinence [...] of a person who has the habit of talking and swapping other peoples' business, indiscreetly and malevolently divulging the private facts of others and happily giving in to allusions and malicious comments" – as the Treccani dictionary states.¹¹

In this respect, one of the most famous passages in international anthropology comes from Max Gluckman, who, in "Gossip and Scandal", a paper written in honour of Melville J. Herskovits and focussed exactly on the anthropological study of gossip, does not miss the opportunity to emphasize:

¹⁰ Every Italian version but one published in the 1900s that I consulted, bore this translation, including Claudio Mazzarelli's which appears in Aristotle's collection of works edited by Giovanni Reale (see Aristotle 1993).

¹¹ <http://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/pettegolo/>

«It is worth noting here that the Greek Lexicon defines “an anthropologist” not as “anthropos plus logos,” a “student of man,” but only as “a scandalmonger;” and in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle—who anticipated us all—says of the great-souled man: “He is no scandalmonger (anthropologos): he will not talk either about himself or another person”» (1963: 314).

One might ask if Aristotle really thought that someone could be a gossip or a scandalmonger about himself (!). Since he only used the term *anthrōpológos* once and in such a cryptic manner, we will never know this, but what we are interested in is seeing how Aristotle’s readers interpreted the word. Over the centuries, in fact, the term was not always seen in today’s negative sense, which would seem to have been fixed definitively during the 1900s. In the seventeenth century, for example, Casaubon, a French commentator who wrote in Latin, translated *anthrōpológos* as “he who spends much in men’s praises” (*Qui multus est in hominum laudibus*; Casaubonus 1605: 151). In the 1800s, this line was still being followed by Topinard who even wrote that Aristotle “called those who remarked on man as anthropologists [*anthropologues*]” and in particular on “moral man” (1876: 200). And the last one to believe him seems to be Gusdorf, a science historian, according to whom “the term already appeared in Aristotle who gave thinkers who reflected on the moral nature of man the name of anthropologists. But the word was lost with the Greek philosopher’s work” (1974: 258). Topinard was to repeat it in several works and Blanckaert (1989: 14) reprimanded him for it a century later: assuming that the term “does, in truth, have a negative connotation”, he underlined that the Greek “-lógos” could also have had an ambiguous meaning that was not always positive.¹²

What is therefore important to see is the way in which, in Maffei’s time and in the centuries prior to it, the meaning of *anthrōpológos* was actually intended. My proposal is that the three different currents that were to shape the idea of “anthropology” up until the end of the 16th century, derived from the various meanings that the word took on. Now, in the passage in *Nicomachean Ethics*, the term *anthrōpológos* is a *nomen agentis* (Vox 2014: 283), ambiguous in itself. Let’s compare it with the term *theológos* which we find immediately below: I can translate

¹² Perhaps the contradictory ways in which Aristotelian *anthrōpológos* has been translated in recent centuries already went back to the 1500s when Regazzola (alias Felicianus) gave the following definition (1543: 87): “he who speaks *libenter* of men” (*qui de hominibus libenter loquatur*). The sense of *libenter* (willingly, with pleasure) could be interpreted negatively (the gossip) or positively (one who praises). But for quite a long time, the passage was translated with neither positive nor negative connotations: see, for example, the translations by Matthias Berg (Bergius) (Aristotle 1591: 167), where the phrase is simply translated as “neither does he speak of men” (*neque de hominibus loquitur*); a famous 18th century Greek-Latin dictionary, reprinted again in the 19th, translated the Aristotelian term as “speaking of men” (*de hominibus loquens*) (Hederich 1825: col. 546), etc. A systematic study on how it has been translated over the centuries into various languages, would be most welcome.

it quite well with “he who speaks of god”, if the person is living in a monotheistic context, or with “he who speaks of gods”, if he lives in a polytheist context. But we cannot do this with *anthrōpolōgos* as it appears in the meagre Aristotelian definition: is it “he who speaks of man” or “he who speaks of men”? Different answers result in the two “anthropologies” that were to arise in the sixteenth century.

The *anthrōpologēō* of Christian theologians

However, much earlier than the 1500s, yet another anthropology originated that answered a different type of question: if a *megalōpsychos* did not speak about man/men, what did he speak about? Aspasius (1889: 114), a Peripatetic philosopher in the second century AD, had no qualms about the meaning of *anthrōpolōgos*, which, for a Greek speaker in those days, was evidently clear. He was more interested in explaining that a *megalōpsychos* did not speak of man/men because he preferred to speak of the nature of the world and the nature of the gods: he is not an *anthrōpolōgos*, he said, but rather a *theolōgos* (θεολόγος). And he mentions the very philosopher of whom Plato speaks in *Theaetetus* (173E-174A) who took no notice of the things around him, not even realizing they were there, but wandered with his head in every place, in the depths of the earth and the realms of the sky, to discover the laws of nature¹³. It is interesting to note that the sentence “because [the *megalōpsychos*] is totally *theolōgos*” (*hoti mēn tò hólōn theolōgos estī - ὅτι μὲν τὸ ὅλον θεολόγος ἐστī*), would become particularly famous although it was to be interpreted differently by Byzantine theologians and the fathers of the Church. In Philo of Alexandria (or Philo Judaeus, 20 BC - 45 AD) we already begin to see the appearance of some new voices of a new verb, *anthrōpologēō*, which seem to be formed by a kind of inverse symmetry compared to Aspasius’ interpretation: if it is taken for granted that man can speak about God, the problem for a Christian is that there is a God that speaks like a man. Trying to understand the humanization process of God, as God could act like a man, became a fundamental theological topic, and the verb used to denote the human actions of God was, precisely, *anthrōpologēō* (“anthropologize”, one might literally translate), a verb that was non-existent in classic Greek.

God “speaking like a man” and “doing things like a human”: we are a very long way from the idea of gossip! Odo Marquard (1965: 224-225) was perhaps the author who most deeply analysed this line of thought. He identified the basis for Christian theological anthropology in the process of Christ’s humanization. Based on

¹³ In line with twentieth-century doxa, Carlo Natali emphatically liquidates (“it is not credible”) Aspasius’ reasoning and that of rare interpreters who now agree with it, such as René-Antoine Gauthier (in Aristotle 1999: 482).

Marquard's indications and with the addition of some other authors, I can summarize the information in my possession here: it is, then, as of Philo of Alexandria that we begin to find the verb used to speak of human attributes referable to God. Why does Moses, the philosopher asked himself at one point, "speak again of His [the Uncreated] jealousy, His ire, His angry moods and other similar emotions, 'anthropologizing' (*anthrōpologōn*, ἀνθρωπολογῶν)?" - in other words: "describing him in human nature terms with human traits?" (Philo of Alexandria 1897a: 60). In another text he writes that God is given human attributes (*anthrōpologētai*, ἀνθρωπολογεῖται) because he teaches us, his pupils (1897b: 254). As of these initial appearances, later authors conjugated the verb with different forms: *anthrōpologoumena* (ἀνθρωπολογούμενα), again in Philo of Alexandria (1896: 241) and in [pseudo-]Basil the Great in the 4th century (1857, vol. XXIX: 752)¹⁴; *anthrōpologēthēnta* (ἀνθρωπολογηθέντα) in Didymus the Blind of Alexandria (1863: col. 816c), one of the lesser Fathers of the Church, who lived in the 4th century; *anthrōpologēi* (ἀνθρωπολογεῖ) in [Pseudo-]Dionysius the Areopagite (1755: 306) in a late 5th or early 6th century text¹⁵; and *anthrōpologētai* (ἀνθρωπολογεῖται) in Anastasius Sinaita (1865: col. 200d), a 7th-century ecclesiastical writer. The expression "to *hólon theologéin* kái to *hólon anthrōpologéin* (τὸ ὅλον θεολογεῖν καὶ τὸ ὅλον ἀνθρωπολογεῖν)" used by Apollinaris of Laodicea (1904: 260), a 4th-century Greek bishop, is to be highlighted. It was later retrieved in the 6th century by Leontius of Byzantium (1860: col. 1949) in his confutation of Apollinaris' very ideas. The sentence partly resumes Aspasius' previously cited expression, the difference being that it refers to the fact that the Scripture recognizes the nature of Christ both as completely divine and completely human, inseparably, and the two verbs (*theologéin* and *anthrōpologéin*) are used with the aim of metaphysically explaining the divine part and the human part in a much-debated theological controversy that left its mark on Christianity's initial centuries (see Gleede 2015).

Odo Marquard (1965: 224) points out how this line continued in French theological language until the mid-1800s. However, *anthrōpologéō*, such a difficult verb to translate, disappeared and was replaced by the noun: it no longer appears in Malebranche (1680:78), who uses the abstract noun *Anthropologie(s)* (which had, in the meantime, been amply imposed), to refer to attributing human characteristics and actions to God. While the continuity with patristics is evident, it must be highlighted that in Malebranche's text the term appears in italics, a sign, perhaps, that he intended it to be a neologism¹⁶. Blanckaert (1989: 14-15) and Van Delft (2000: 116) also cite

¹⁴ Several authors attribute the text to Didymus of Alexandria, but this attribution has recently been rejected (Venter 2016).

¹⁵ As is known, Dionysius the Areopagite lived in the first century AD while the writings attributed to pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, date back to the fourth century AD.

¹⁶ "Or comme l'Écriture est faite pour tout le monde, pour les simples aussi-bien que pour les sçavans, elle est pleine d'*Anthropologies*. Non seulement elle donne à Dieu un Corps, un Thrône, un Chariot, un

various French sources from the 1700s, authors and dictionaries, that give this meaning. Marquard (1965: 224) points out that even some German philosophers, such as Leibniz¹⁷ and Feuerbach, use the term in this sense, but he highlights the rootedness of French thinkers, so much so that he asks himself, whether “the value of the theological meaning of anthropology in French delayed the appearance of the philosophical meaning of the word” (*ibidem*: 225) until the end of the 1700s, a philosophical meaning that was, instead, imposed in Germany, so that *Anthropologie* in the early 1800s was considered in France as the German equivalent of the local emerging *science de l'homme* (Blankaert 1989: 23). If the leap of about one thousand years in our reconstruction, from Anastasius Sinaïta to Malebranche, may arouse suspicions, one should remember that late Middle-Age scholars and modern theologians made constant use of patristic sources. For example, Mingarelli (1863: col. 1014), an Italian theologian, in 1763 on commenting on Didymus the Blind’s text, included *anthrōpologēthénta* (“things said in a human way”) in a list of “Noteworthy terms” (*Voces notabiles seu peculiare*s).

He who speaks of Man

While the “French” theological route to *anthropologie* only reconnects indirectly to Aristotelian *anthrōpolōgos* through the mediation of patristic *anthrōpologēō*, the question of what we could call the “German” medical-philosophical route to *Anthropologie* and the “Roman” humanistic route to *Anthropologia*, which both originated in the 1500s, is different. The first was started by Hundt and the second by Maffei, but to understand them we must go back to the translation problem.

The first Latin translations of *Nicomachean Ethics* date back to the 13th century and the first publications appeared in the 15th (Marchesi 1904; Lines 2002). Up until the mid-1500s, the most commonly found and famous translations were: a) *Liber Ethicorum* by the English bishop, Robert Grosseteste, in its anonymous revised form, perhaps done by the Fleming William of Moerbeke, in the 13th century¹⁸; b) a 1416-17 version by Tuscan Leonardo Bruni (or Leonardo Aretino); c) the one by Greek expatriate John (Johannes) Argyropoulos in 1478. These three translations

Equipage, les passions de joye, de tristesse, de colere, de repentir, & les autres mouvemens de l’ame. Elle luy attribuë encore les manières d’agir ordinaires aux hommes, afin de parler aux simples d’une manière plus sensible. Si Jesus ChrIst s’est fait homme c’est en partie pour satisfaire à l’inclination des hommes qui aiment ce qui leur ressemble, & s’appliquent à ce qui les touche. C’est pour leur persuader par cette espèce d’*Anthropologie* véritable & réelle, des vérités qu’ils n’auroient pu comprendre d’une autre manière” (Malebranche 1680: 77-78; italics in the text).

¹⁷In *Discours de Métaphysique* (1686), a text actually written in French.

¹⁸ See *textus purus* (Aristotle 1972: 215) and *textus recognitus* (Aristotle 1973: 442), published by Gauthier.

were also published together in *Decem Librorum Moraliū Aristotelis, tres conversiones* as of 1497 and were very widely distributed throughout Europe (Lines 2002: 49-54; 460-461; 487-489). Aristotle's phrase (1497: IIII, 65) is translated in the following way in the three versions (followed by the literal translation in English):

a) *Neque humaniloquus, neque enim de se ipso loquit, neque de alio* (And it is not *humaniloquus*, in fact, he neither talks of himself, nor of others)¹⁹

b) *Neque de ho[mi]nibus multum loquet, nam nec hic de se dicet neque de aliis* (And he will not speak much of men, in fact, he will not speak of himself nor of others)

c) *Magnanimus de ho[mi]nibus / hominumque factis non loquit. Nam neque de seipso neque de aliis dicit* (The magnanimous does not speak of men / of the facts of men. In fact, he speaks neither of himself nor of others).

As can be seen, in (b) and (c) the term *anthrōpolōgos* has been translated literally in propositional form: "he speaks/will speak of men". Bruni adds *multum* which, in principle, goes beyond the purely literal translation, while it is interesting that Argyropoulos, who was Greek mother tongue, translates it into two options "of men/of the facts of men". *Liber Ethicorum*, on the other hand, offers a literal translation by constructing the Latin neologism *humaniloquus*. This neologism can also be found in Albert the Great's comment, written around 1250-1252²⁰, which specifies that the magnanimous is not *humaniloquus*, "retaining all human things small" (*humana omnia p[ar]va reputans*, 1520: 53v). The term also became widespread due to the interpretation that Thomas Aquinas gave to Aristotle's text. In drafting his famous *Sententia*, written around 1270-1272, Thomas used the translation of *Liber Ethicorum* and reported the same term in his comment ("*Deinde cum dicit: Neque humaniloquus* etc."), which was then to be found in all the manuscripts and all the printed editions of *Sententia* as of 1478. The fame of this work led the term to be used by many other commentators and translators. Thomas proposed a similar interpretation to that of Aspasius, for whom the *magnanimus* "does not speak much of people because he attributes little importance to the particular facts of men, but places all his interests into common and divine good; consequently, he even speaks little of himself and of others" (1969: 235)²¹. One could think that both Bruni's *multum* and Argyropoulos' *hominumque factis* derive from the influence of Thomas' comment.

¹⁹ In the edition of *Aristoteles Latinus* edited by Gauthier, the passage is translated as follows: in the original version by Grosseteste (*textus purus*): "*Neque humaniloquus. Neque enim de se ipso loquitur, neque de alio*" (Aristotle 1972: 215); in the revised version (*textus recognitus*): "*Neque humaniloquus; neque enim de se ipso loquitur, neque de alio*" (Aristotle 1973: 442).

²⁰ See Lines in regard to these dates (2002).

²¹ "Non multum loquitur de hominibus, quia particulares res hominum non multum appetiatur. Sed tota eius intentio est circa bona communia et divina. Unde nec de seipso multum loquitur, neque de aliis" (Thomas Aquinas 1969: 235).

We can see that the neologism derived from the adjective *humanus+loquus* (< *loqui*, “speak”), not from the noun as in Greek, therefore the literal translation was more like “he who speaks of human things”, as Albert the Great pointed out, and is closer to “he who speaks humanly” in *anthrōpologéō*, by which it may have been influenced.

One translation in the 16th century, which partly supplanted those by Bruni and Argyropoulos in Italy, is the one by Giovanni Bernardo Regazzola (aka Felicianus), which circulated as of 1541. Translating a comment on *Nicomachean Ethics* by Eustratius of Nicaea (XI-XII sec.) into Latin, which clearly referred to Aspasius, this time Felicianus translated *anthrōpologos* with *hominiloquus*, from *homin-+loquus*, defining it as “he who speaks willingly of men” (“*qui de hominibus libenter loquatur*”, 1543: 87), adding that ambiguous *libenter*, as mentioned in note 8, which was to cause the Aristotelian term to be interpreted in several ways in later centuries. In Regazzola’s translation, in the wake of Aspasius and Thomas Aquinas, *Hominiloquus* is in contrast with *Deiloquus* or *Theologus*, “he who makes all his speeches on God and the nature of things” (*qui de Deo, scilicet naturaque rerum dissertationes omnes suas faciat*)²².

Humaniloquus and *hominiloquus* were certainly two possible ways of translating the Greek term: the former refers more to “human”, that is to “Man” in general, while the latter refers more to particular “men.” On this track, we can say that Hundt’s *Antropologium* aims at “Man” while Maffei’s aims at “men.” While still Aristotelian in many ways, Hundt and Maffei refuted Aristotelian *megalopsychos*: perfectly in line with the humanistic idea for which *studia humanitatis* did not oppose *studia divinitatis* (see Trinkaus 1970, vol. 2: 555-682; Frazier 2005). They identified two forms of study on man which respectively focused on the unity of man and the singularities of man. And they called both “anthropology”. From this point of view, it may be said that an articulate knowledge under this word originated at the beginning of the 1500s.

Hundt wrote *Antropologium* in 1501, including his description in the framework of the medieval/Renaissance discussion on the dignity of man, as shown by many authors²³. Maffei took another path. At the moment there is no clue as to whether Maffei knew of Magnus Hundt’s work, an author who did not appear among the thousands of people he cited, neither under that name nor in its Latinized form of Magnus Canis, nor under Parthenopolitanus, his antonomastic title. The *Commentarii* were published in 1506 and they were called *Urbani* because derived from the work

²² Again in the 1800s, a German philosopher, Karl Ludwig Michelet, was in total agreement (I translate from the Latin): “The magnanimous does not speak of men, but of nature and God; for this reason Feliciano elegantly says that he is more of a *theologos* than an *anthrōpologos*. That is, he deals with truth, not with what concerns individuals” (in Aristotle 1848: 146).

²³ Starting from Eugenio Garin’s seminal study (1938), the debate in literature on *dignitas hominis*, developed in the Middle Ages and resumed during the Renaissance period, became impressive.

he did in Rome, *Urbe* (Dionisotti 1968: 40), a city that the author left in 1507. This means that Hundt's term *antropologium* and Maffei's *anthropologia* originated practically during the same years²⁴. These years were marked by an authentic Hellenomania, at least among the intellectuals in the Italian courts. The humanists were certainly an intellectual elite, but not all humanists knew Greek, and those who did, were considered as the elite of the elite. Maffei himself sometimes scorned those who knew no Greek²⁵; in fact, he was known to exchange letters in Greek with Poliziano, the famous poet at the court of Lorenzo de' Medici, even though both were Tuscan and both spoke Tuscan (see Pagliaroli 2016). On the other hand, those were the years in which it began to be fashionable to create "Hellenized neologisms [...] as book titles, followed by a more intelligible Latin sub-title" (Janni 1986: 15).

We do not know anything about Hundt's command of Greek, and while all Maffei's work is "dotted" with Greek words and phrases, Hundt's is dominated by Latin monolingualism. But we do know that he was well aware of Aristotle's work and that he had written summaries on logic and natural philosophy that he must have known either in its Latin form, *humani loquus*²⁶, or in Greek form, *anthrōpolōgos*. Unlike *anthropologia*, the form *ant(h)ropologium* was not so fortunate. The construction of this neologism with its second Latin-based component (*-logium*) was particular but not unusual, even if much less common (see *hagiologium*, *horologium*, *martyrologium*, *necrologium*, etc.). It is likely, as Bendyshe cryptically suggested when he cited it as *Anthropologeion* (1865: 362), that it can be re-linked to the Greek *logéion* (λογεῖον; hence the Latin form *-logium*), rather than an eccentric form of the more common *-logia*. If this is the case, the meaning of "collection, exposition", as well as "platform, pulpit, podium" would be intended, in line with an "anatomic model" which was becoming popular and which foresaw "the transposition into human sciences of the dissection practice, actually called medical" (Van Delft 2008: 264). This model did not exclude making a spectacle out of an autopsy, which was performed in open amphitheatres with external observers (Van Delft 2000). Therefore, Hundt's *Ant(h)ropo-logium* was like an "exposition" in which human body

²⁴ Bodin (1566: 461) indicates 1500 as the year for *Commentarii urbani*. We do not know whether the work or parts of it were distributed in manuscript prior to its publication, but it should be pointed out that Maffei also reports the facts of 1506, for example, the finding of the famous Laocoon sculpture in Rome in the January of that year, just two months prior to publishing *Commentarii*.

²⁵ See the invectives in book XXI against Pomponius Laetus, a top exponent of the Roman Academy, defined as "ignorant about Greek things" (*Graecarum ignarus*).

²⁶ Santing writes that Hundt made great use of the works of Albertus Magnus (written in Latin) without consulting direct sources (2018:12). She also notes that in "*Antropologium*" the etymological theta has not been transformed into *th* of *ánthropos* (*ibidem*: 2), and this could testify his incompetence. But I would point out that the term sometimes appears written with "t" and sometimes with "th": to be precise, the forms *Antropologium* (both nominative and accusative), *Anthropologio* (in the ablative) and *Anthropologii* (in the genitive) all appear. Hereinafter, therefore, I will write the term as *Ant(h)ropologium*.

parts were put on show: it is no coincidence that it was one of the first works in which anatomic tables appeared. But, unlike the past, as Van Delft (2000) and Santing (2018) rightly underlined, the body was needed to demonstrate the *dignitas* of man, instead of his *miseria*; together, of course, with his soul, except that in this new visualism, a minimal part was devoted to the invisible soul - just three almost invisible pages in the final section of the work.

As we have seen, Rowe (1964: 1) translated *ant(h)ropologium* as “discourse on man” and *anthropologia* as “study of man”; however, wanting to give a precise meaning to terms that were undergoing semantic construction, is excessive. Maffei’s text also appears as a large “exposition”²⁷, but one of (illustrious) men. It is certainly not designed as an “exhibition”: apart from a few colourless drawings, it has very few small diagrams in the chapters in *Philologia* and it is far from pursuing any form of visualism. His *anthropologia* is not to be looked at, it is to be read or listened to. Hundt’s book is to be read and looked at. The practice of dissecting a human body for medical purposes only began in the early 1300s. Therefore, the body (including its internal parts) had highhandedly entered into the discussion on the “dignity” of man.

If, as I believe, Hundt’s *Ant(h)ropologium* and Maffei’s *Anthropologia* originated in the same years as neologisms due to a kind of “parallel invention”, we should highlight that they also originated as different semantic proposals. I have always been struck by the fact that German philosophy and medicine historians, who study the history of anthropology, go nonchalantly from Hundt in 1501 to Casmann in 1594²⁸. Seeing the fortune that the term has had in the history of German science, this is understandable, considering that it had appeared in the title of about thirty books (Vermeulen 2015: 361) back in the 1600s and that over one hundred were counted between 1790 and 1840 alone (Schipperges, 1972: 197). This “German line” has been studied for some time and I believe that Dilthey’s famous interpretation (1904) still holds true: in an attempt to metaphysically explain the unity of man in his soul and body composition, those scholars simultaneously constructed a medical-philosophical study, sometimes in a joint manner and sometimes separately, in which the boundaries between metaphysics and physics are never very clear. The name *Anthropologia/Anthropologie*, which is the object of this cluster of studies, certainly began with Hundt but it developed enormously after Casmann, exploiting the neologism of *Psychologia* that had been coined by Marcus Marulus (Marko Marulić) in the meantime and resumed by philosophers who followed the Ramism trend, such as Freigius (Johann Thomas Frey) and Goclenius (Rudolf Göckel)²⁹, defined

²⁷ One could say that, with today’s criteria, Hundt’s text appears more *anthropo-logia* while Maffei’s is more *anthropo-logium*, because here the “review-type” listing is more evident. But while the former was successful, the latter was not.

²⁸ See, for example, Marquard (1965: 211), Schipperger (1972: 194), Bauer (1984: 36), etc.

²⁹ Goclenius actually wrote the introductory Presentation to Casmann’s book. For the origin of psychology at the end of the 1500s as a new study context, see Luccio (2013).

Anthropologia as the “doctrine of human nature” and, in turn, human nature was defined as “a participating essence of a double, spiritual and bodily nature, united in one single foundation” (1594: 1)³⁰. It is at this point that anthropology was divided into *psychologia* and *somatotomia* (anatomy), which was to be enormously successful. In some ways we can see the content of this anthropology as a sideslip of Christological anthropology: just as theologians had a problem to metaphysically explain the unity of Christ’s divine dimension and human dimension, now there was the problem of metaphysically explaining the unity of man’s soul and body. If Hundt wrote *Ant(h)ropologium* before the coming of Luther, it is undeniable that *De anima* by Melanchthon (1540) gave an essential boost to this line of study. The debate was to be deep in other places (see Cartesius, for example), but especially in Germany where it was to be called “anthropology” in the long term. This line, which was to appear for the first time in what we now call philosophical anthropology on the one hand, and physical anthropology on the other, would continue to study Man, not men. In order to have a conscious physical anthropology that studied men in their diversities and similarities, we had to wait for Kant and, above all, Blumenbach at the end of the 1700s.

He who speaks of men

To bridge the gap between 1501 and 1594, some scholars quickly added names of other authors who used the word *anthropologia* in that time period, but these often appear as eccentric extras in an otherwise uniform story that starts with Hundt and ends with Kant. These authors, however, should be positioned in an intellectual tradition coherent with the line proposed by Maffei. In the 1500s this line seemed like a wedge between Hundt and Casmann. In fact, Maffei was that *anthrōpológos* that Aristotle so hurriedly liquidated: his *anthropologia* is nothing more than an enormous, endless, staunch and conscious “speaking of men”. It does not speak of peoples, nor does it speak of human nature. It speaks of human singularities. “Gossip”, if we prefer... He was not the first to speak of “excellent men”, on the contrary, but he was the first to do it by proposing them as the subject of a disciplined discourse. The scholastic tradition with which he was imbibed, had taught him to love Aristotle, but his humanistic culture, that he contributed to building, taught him that true men were the “excellent” ones, those who left a mark, those that Fame “draws from the tomb and keeps alive”, as Petrarch said in his *Triumphs*, which were the philosophical source of Maffei’s humanism. The humanistic *megalópsychos* underwent a transformation and became *anthrōpológos*.

³⁰ “Anthropologia est doctrina humanae naturae. Humana natura est geminae naturae mundanae, spiritualis et corporeae, in unum hyphistamenon unitae particeps essentia”.

Maffei knew Aristotle's text well: book XXXVI of *Commentarii Urbani* is dedicated to philosophy and is, in fact, a great translation of Aristotle's works (*Aristotelica*). It starts exactly with the translation of *Nicomachean Ethics*, considered as one of the first attempts at humanistic literature that tries to break away from scholastic readings (Lines 2002:17). But the passage at 1125a, 5 is only summarized and there is no expression that could refer to the "oud'anthrōpologos" (οὐδ'ἀνθρωπολόγος) in the Greek text. The description of the characteristics of the *magnanimus* is summarized with a list of adjectives and nouns that remark on his autarky: "he openly loves and hates, he asks the least possible, if anything he scorns, he is audacious, he is sincere, he hardly contradicts [the others], he hardly admires [them], he does not persist in hatred, he does not complain, he does not fawn"³¹ (Maffei 1506: 498r). It almost seems as if Maffei did not want to mention a word that he himself partly re-semanticized in the same work. Moreover, Maffei was a great connoisseur of patristic literature in Greek and almost all the names of the theologians that I have cited above, appear in his *Anthropologia* among the *homines clari*, of whom he proved to know the works. As previously mentioned, he was particularly interested in the writings of Basil the Great, of which he published a Latin translation of prayers, sermons on psalms and speeches in 1515. We know that one of [pseudo-] Basil's texts (1857: 752) includes the participle *anthrōpologóúmena* (ἀνθρωπολογούμενα), the "things said according to human usage."

Now, Maffei's *Anthropologia* was so full of names and intellectual information that later authors, who used it for reference, often referred to it as if it were a book in itself rather than a section of an entire work.³² I have counted about twenty works published in various European countries between 1519 and 1590 that contain one (or more than one) citation like "as Volaterranus says in his *Anthropologia*", or something similar. It is important to note that, in some cases, the neologism is introduced into national languages exactly by translating Maffei's term *anthropologia*: for example, in Pedro Mejía (old Spanish spelling: Pero Mexía) *Anthropologia* becomes the Spanish *Antropología* (1547: 561). In the same way, it is curious to see that perhaps the merit for the first occurrence of the German word *Anthropologie* goes to the translator of the *centuriae Magdeburgenses* in the fourth volume of *Ecclesiastica Historia* in the parts where Volaterranus is mentioned (see Flaccius *et alii* 1565: 856, 864). Future studies will be able to find further examples, perhaps even earlier ones.

While scholars soon acknowledged and translated the term, more than often it was still only a bibliographic reference. Its destiny was ambiguous because, while it

³¹ "Magnanimus palam amat atque odit, minime rogator, contemptor potius, audax, verax, minime oblocutor, minime admirator, nec odii tenax, nec querulus, nec adulator".

³² On the other hand, several parts of *Commentarii urbani* were even removed and published separately over the next centuries.

was enormously successful as a word, the meaning that Maffei gave it was not so fortunate. But there was no lack of followers.

Giuliana Bellati (1992) helps us to re-consider the poetical work of Jean Bouchet (1476-1557/1559), normally more appreciated as a historian than a poet (see Britnell 1986). He was a part of the *grands rhétoriciens* category, those poets that were accused of seeing poetry “only from a formal point of view, like science and art, which is essentially concerned with rhyme, rhythm, the distinction between poetical genres, in other words, purely formal and abstract questions” (Bellati 1992: 29). In 1517³³ (when three editions of *Commentarii Urbani* had already been issued, of which two in Paris), he published the poem, in French, entitled *Le Temple de Bonne Renomee* (The Temple of Good Fame). With the excuse of going in search of the body of his protector, Charles de la Trémoille, killed in the battle of Marignano in 1515 (fought by Francis I to conquer the Duchy of Milan), the poem’s leading character embarks on a long journey along the *Sentier de Merite* (path of merit) during which “the noble actions of some figures from the past who deserved eternal fame” are recalled (*ibidem*: 43). He visits the tombs grouped together in “tabernacles” consecrated by various Virtues, with the idea that virtuous men enjoy a particular existence after death, since, thanks to *Renomee*, they continue to live on (*ibidem*: 57). The poem is yet another hall of fame and glory, just as Maffei’s *Anthropologia* is. Here too we can see the influence that Petrarch’s *Triumphs* had throughout the Renaissance period: man, due to the great actions performed in his life, conquers death and leaves an eternal memory for posterity.³⁴ The eleventh tabernacle, reserved for “inventors and authors of arts and sciences”, is the important part of the poem. Defending the Poem (*Rethorique*) from his critics, Bouchet used arguments already listed by Boccaccio in the 14th century (*ibidem*: 69), but he also re-touched upon the problem of classifying humanistic knowledge: poetically intended, Rhetoric is no longer a knowledge in itself, as in the old trivium, but is extended³⁵:

«Plusieurs savoirs y sont souvent compriz,
C’est à savoir science historiale,
La naturelle et aussi la morale,
Philosophie et l’entropologie
Geographie et la philologie».
(Bouchet 1517: 64r; 1992: 326)

³³ The book was published on 2nd January 1516, as shown in *f.* 90v, but, as Bellati (1992: 205) explained, the date is shown here in the “French style”, according to which the year began at Easter, not on 1st January (“new style”). Therefore, 2nd January 1516 was 2nd January 1517 in the “new style”. This is why the date sometimes appears differently in the authors who cite Bouchet’s work.

³⁴ For this theme, see the famous book by Burckhardt (1860).

³⁵ I quote from the original 1517 version, bearing in mind Bellati’s transcription (see Bouchet 1992).

It is presented as the set made up of historical, natural and moral Science, Philosophy, Anthropology, Geography and Philology. As can be clearly seen, the last three correspond perfectly with the three sections of Maffei's book (the order was modified for the sake of rhyme), which therefore come, with equal dignity, among the components of the poetry that he so fervently advocates. The chronological structure of the poem is similar to that of Maffei's *Anthropologia* and of other previous and coeval works "with hundreds of names of which at least three quarters belong to antiquity" (Burckhardt 1860: 150)³⁶, the difference being that, among the illustrious historians, Bouchet actually includes Maffei: *Volaterre!*

«*Sigibertus, Platina, Volaterre*
Et aultres maints tous gisans soubz la terre».
(Bouchet 1517: LXX; 1992: 328)³⁷.

The term appears as "[']*entropologie*", and is considered as the first occurrence of the word in the French language.³⁸ It is certain that Bouchet knew of Maffei's work since, in the *Annales d'Aquitaine* of 1524, he explicitly mentions book XXI of "*Anthropologie*" by "Volateranus" in order to refer to the legend linked to a festival³⁹. And this was perhaps the first occurrence corresponding to the current French spelling.⁴⁰

Maffei's proposed alliance between geography and anthropology attracted attention and posed the problem of their position in relation to history. In his book *De disciplinis*, the famous Spanish humanist, Juan Luis Vives, proposed new lines in pedagogy shaped towards the new humanistic culture and included words of praise for Maffei: he cites him as an example of an educationalist due to the translation from

³⁶ Speaking of the construction of glory during the Renaissance, Burckhardt also mentioned the way in which Maffei's *Anthropologia* was organized.

³⁷ Also due to what was said earlier, I believe I am right in recognizing Raffaele Maffei in this *Volaterre*. Bellati (in Bouchet 1992: 379), however, recognizes a "Giacomo Maffei, so called because he was born in Volterra, a 15th-century historian." In fact, another historian also called Volaterranus (Jacobus Volaterranus) did exist, but this was Giacomo Passarelli, the author of *Diarii romani*; I am not aware of a Giacomo Maffei. The only problem is the date of death, seeing that Bouchet speaks of dead men (*gisans soubz la terre*): in fact, Giacomo died in 1496 and Raffaele died in 1522. But there is no guarantee that, in 1517, Bouchet knew that the author of *Anthropologia* was still alive or even that he knew there were two Volaterranus.

³⁸ See also Blanckaert (1989: 15) and Van Delft (2000: 115). If Bouchet's *entropologie* marks in some way the beginning of anthropology in French, it is pleasing to remember that, in a famous passage in *Tristes Tropiques*, Lévi-Strauss (2008:444) predicts that, in the end, anthropology would be elected to become an *entropologie*, but then it was intended as the study of entropy!

³⁹ "Volateranus on vingtniesme livre de son *Anthropologie*..." (quoted from the 1557 edition: 76r).

⁴⁰ Britnell (1986: 127) mentions the passage of another work in which Bouchet refers to Volaterranus.

Greek (1531: 101v)⁴¹; as a “man of varied and wide erudition”, he cites him among important authors of what, in turn, he called *philologia* and which, compared to Maffei’s, underwent a drastic decline: *philologists* are authors who draw on “stories, legends, semantics, oratory and topics of philosophy” (*ibidem*: 108v)⁴². When he underlines that Volaterranus “in *Anthropologia* and in *Geographia* gathered a lot of information and his works will be of great utility for history” (*ibidem*: 129r)⁴³, he places Maffei’s geo-anthropology among the ancillary knowledges of history, more or less as, centuries later, the French historians belonging to the *Annales* group were to do. The positioning of anthropology and geography in regard to history became a question of debate. Jean Bodin inserted Maffei among the most important *Geographistorici universales*, authors of universal geo-history, together with Strabo, Pomponius Mela and Pausanias (1566: 447), and among the leading authors of biographic collections (*ibidem*: 461), but he also clearly stated that he had no intention of following him because he was one of those historians who “wrote very little on various laws, religions, sacrifices, festivals and peoples’ institutions” (*ibidem*: 91). While Vives appreciated Maffei’s universalism, Bodin underlined his little benefit in the study of individual populations and single states.

That the meaning of anthropology linked to a list of illustrious men was starting to become a little restricted was, in fact, evident as of mid-century when humanistic universalism began to replace nationalistic upheavals in Europe,

When, in Burke’s words (1998: 124), humanism began its “fragmentation” process. In 1550, Leandro Alberti, a Dominican monk and geographer from Bologna, published a *Descrittione di tutta l’Italia* (Description of all Italy) with a style that “endeavours to understand to what measure man is implicated” in geophysical phenomena (Gambi 1977: 269). In 1561, an extra hand-written part entitled “*Isole appartenenti alla Italia*” (Islands belonging to Italy) was added to the work, which often cited Volaterranus. Here the author wrote that he wanted to continue his work (which actually remained unfinished due to his death in 1552), explaining: “and I will add the illustrious men of those islands to the geography and to topography, history and anthropology” (1561: 5 of the additional part).⁴⁴ Besides the fact of having the first proof of the Italian term without the etymological th (unlike in Capella 1533),

⁴¹This was not the opinion of Erasmus of Rotterdam who severely criticized Maffei’s translation of St. Basil’s work (see Van Gulk 2018: 382). It is obvious that Erasmus involved Maffei in his debate against Roman humanists, who, in turn, had previously doubted his knowledge of Greek; the fact remains that Maffei’s theological positions are now considered close to those of Erasmus, as D’Amico well explains (1983: 139; 202). In general, on the ambivalence of Erasmus towards Italian humanists, see Burke (1998: 97-100).

⁴² “historias et fabulas, et vocum significatus, et oratoria, et philosophica”.

⁴³ “In anthropologia, et in geographia multa de rebus gestis congerit, quae illius operae vehementer historiae proderunt”.

⁴⁴ “E gli uomini illustri di quelle usciti, congiungerò colla Geografia, et Topografia la Historia et Antropologia”.

here it would seem that anthropology should not refer to the description of illustrious men (which were “added”), but rather to something different; and it is not clear whether it might refer to “customs of the people” which he had spoken of a few lines earlier. What is important is seeing the indication of an anthropology used for local purposes, an anthropology that loses its universalistic character.

This operation is evident in Robert Céneau, a French bishop. He often mentions the work of Volaterranus although only *Geographia*, never *Anthropologia*. He divides his *Gallica Historia*, published in Latin in 1557, into two volumes: the first entitled *Anthropologia* and the second *Chorographia*. It is essentially a political work in which the union between geography and history tries to demonstrate the territorial expanse that France should have on the basis of the dissemination of ancient Gauls and Celts. The nationalistic intent led to a further re-classification of the disciplines. According to Céneau, history could be studied in four ways: “topographically” (*topographice*), considering the diversity of places; “anthropologically” (*anthropologice*), considering the names of men (*nomenclatura hominum*); “chronographically” (*chronographice*), considering the series of eras, and “tropologically” (*tropologice*), considering the exemplary customs of men and all the feats that could be of example for posterity. With Céneau, anthropology became a kind of study of ethnonyms and, for the first time, its object was not Man in general, in Hundt style, nor the lives of illustrious men (here the task of “tropology”), in Maffei style, but rather of the intermediary entities: the peoples, and in particular, the *gens gallica*. He intended to do a study that united topography, chronology and anthropology (1557: *Praefatum*), leaving “tropology” completely aside. In fact, Céneau’s *Anthropologia* is a long treatise in which he tries to explain the origin of the French directly from Noah, arming himself with biblical pseudo-genealogies that were fashionable at the time, and making the words derive in a way not unlike that of other linguistic treatises in Renaissance times, in which there were no phonetic transformation rules and where assonance, imagination and political aims were rife. And so, if it is true that “we are all Barbarians one for the other” (1557: 11), at the end it turns out that, since the *Gallica nomenclatura* disseminated and distributed in the global universe, the French are not Barbarians for anyone because they are well known everywhere. The nationalistic anthropology that Céneau constructed was accompanied by a just as nationalistic chorography that cunningly positioned France surrounded by Hapsburg domains in Germany and Spain and which saw an increasingly more “Gallic” land in northern Italy. Céneau belonged to that rank of intellectuals who had started to use the Gauls and Gaul legend for nationalistic purposes, trying to construct a glorious past which, going from the Celts, would avoid genealogical connections with Ancient Rome and Greece. He was part of that “reaction against classic humanism and its universalist trends” (Dubois 1972: 41) which developed vigorously in France in the second half of the 16th century.

Anthropology with nationalistic intentions also crossed the Channel and appeared in a work by Richard Harvey at the end of the century. He too grappled with re-configuring humanistic knowledge in an anti-Aristotelian tone. In his *Philadelfus* (1593) he foresaw that “History of Brute and Brutans” should adhere to the following schema: *Anthropology*, *Chronology* and *Topography*. Aware of Maffei’s classification and remembering the importance that Maffei gave to biography and genealogical reconstructions, we now understand why *Anthropology* should, in turn, focus on the description of *persons* and their

«genealogy or issue which they had
artes which they studied
actes which they did» (1593: 15).

He also referred to the work of Arthur Kelton (1547), *A Chronicle with a Genealogie declaring that the Brittons and Welshmen are linealiye dyscended from Brute*. Now considered as one of the proto-nationalistic authors of the time (Escopedo 2004: 18-19), Harvey was convinced of the “Britishness” of Wales and England, even justifying the incorporation of the Duchy of Wales into the Kingdom of England in 1535-1542. He therefore recommended going in search of the true genealogy of Britons, which he called Brutans, and of their progenitor Brut(us). In this reconstruction, the history of the Saxons disappeared, a barbarian people, whose exclusion in the Tudor period had an anti-Roman function, since “the Saxons, unlike the Britons, were converted directly from Rome” (Schweizer 2004: 40).⁴⁵

There is no information on any later authors who may have followed this line, therefore we can say that the proposal of an “anthropology of men”, generated in 1506 with Maffei, seemed to die out with Céneau and Harvey’s “Celtic anthropologies”. It lasted a lifetime, just like the lives that Maffei described. Compared to Christological anthropology and the anthropology of Man, it was characterized by the fact that it had no metaphysical intent. Besides this characteristic which classifies it as totally humanistic, its semantic field remains fuzzy, denoting, depending on the authors, the description of illustrious men, the description of the names of peoples or the description of individuals in their genealogy. In any case, it is an anthropology that is extremely connected to history and geography, with which it has an ambiguous relationship of inclusion/autonomy: sometimes it is considered as part of history, other times it is a knowledge in itself. It is an anthropology that leans towards an “aristology”, a study of individual differences/excellences, not from a psychological or political point of view, but from a person’s capacity to leave a mark,

⁴⁵ As is known, some medieval authors told the story in which a certain Brutus of Troy, the first King of the Britons, was said to be a descendant of Aeneas or, according to other versions, of one of the seven kings of Rome, or even of Japheth, one of Noah’s sons.

which, while it certainly took into consideration the genealogical group, above all it considered the contribution made to arts and to human actions and the celebrity earned through personal merit. If, at the beginning of the 1500s, Maffei gave the name of anthropology to that universal pantheon of illustrious men which, since ancient times, Cornelius Nepos, Plutarch and others had tried to construct, now, to celebrate the typical “Renaissance man” in Burckhardt (1860) style, in the second half of the century, anthropology shifted to denote either indigenous glories with Alberti (at least in intentions) or the openly nationalistic patriotism of Céneau and Harvey. Works celebrating local glories already had their history, but it is undeniable that there were, since they are mentioned in written texts, many more names to celebrate in Ancient Greek and Roman times than in those of Gaul or Britannia. That past-centric configuration that Maffei’s *Anthropologia* shared with other expositions of illustrious men and/or women written either earlier or at the same time as his, derives from here.

In all this discussion, the position of the *Anthropologia* by Galeazzo Capra in 1533, is still eccentric. Santing (2018) recently compared Hundt’s work with that of Capra. Although they have a very different style, both works have “anthropology” in the title and both works want to be included in the area of the age-long discourse of “the dignity of man.” Essentially, Capra was the first to give Italian the term *anthropologia*, which he defines as the “reasoning of human Nature” (*ragionamento della Natura umana*, 1533:1). It is quite debatable whether he re-adapted it from Hundt but it is, however, highly probable that he took it from Maffei, seeing that he also wrote it with th. In his days, Capra was more famous as a historian and diplomat for the Duke of Milan than as a writer. The author of several history books relating to his time, he must have known the then extremely famous *Commentarii* by Volaterranus⁴⁶. I would refer the reader to Santing’s text and to studies on Capra previously mentioned in order to have an idea of the content and the literary genre in which his book can be included. I will only say that Capra’s “light” anthropology, exploiting the already well-worn schema of the question of human dignity and misery, can certainly be inserted, partly ironically, into the current on human nature, but should be independent from Hundt-Casmann’s “German” anthropology and later works: it is an anthropology on Man, on human behaviour, with the variation that Man is now organized into men and women. Historical personalities are also cited but are mentioned as exemplary prototypes of the gender to which they belong rather than humanistically heroic individuals. In general, the imprint is decidedly Erasmian⁴⁷ and

⁴⁶ As is known, Capra signed as Capella (i.e. “little goat” in Latin), and the name Capella appears in the list of Roman Academy members in 1524 (see D’Amico 1983: 290), which would seem to prove that he attended those humanistic environments; furthermore, the first edition of his *Delle eccellenze e dignità delle donne* came out in 1525 in Rome.

⁴⁷ D’Ascia (1990) has shown that Capra’s text contains whole passages translated from Erasmus of Rotterdam’s works.

we could argue that, from the viewpoint of the term's semantic history, Capra was perhaps the first to "steal" it from Maffei and use it with a "German-style" meaning, but his experiment seems to be one-of-a-kind and, in any case, it needs much further analysis.

Is it possible to speculate why it suddenly disappeared at the end of the sixteenth century? Except for the case of Harvey, an astrologist as well as Anglican priest with Ramist ideas (Swain 2012), the anthropology "of men" spread among Catholic authors. Maffei had been a functionary of the Curia during one of the papacy's darkest periods in history, but he remained a staunch papist and was one of the first to criticize Luther. As a curial, he had to ask the Pope's permission to marry and become a *clericus coniugatus*, and he then spent his old age in abstinence and chastity. Céneau was a Catholic bishop who took part in that Council of Trento that approved the Counter-Reformation. He wrote "books to defend the Catholic doctrines and to respond to reformers of his time" (Doublet 1906: 143). Alberti was a Dominican monk who was even became an inquisitor (Redigonda 1960) and he dedicated his book to the "very Christian" king Henry II and to Catherine de' Medici, the queen of the protestant massacre on the night of St. Bartholomew. Bouchet, besides being an intellectual and historian, was also the author of religious works: he was a moderate Catholic but "a determinedly Christian writer [...] and one of the very earliest writers in French attempting to combat Lutheranism by providing alternative instruction in French" (Britnell 1986: IX). As well as being predominantly Catholic, the authors cited also share the characteristic of not being academics but rather functionaries connected in various ways to the courts of their respective countries. Harvey was the exception from this viewpoint too. We can state that it was the "German" anthropology generated in the university with Hundt and developed in the university after the arrival of Protestantism that forced its way into the detriment of an anthropology born outside the university and which buried itself during the Counter-Reformation period. In the Catholic world, it was the anthropology of Christ that was to be preserved in the theology schools. Harvey's trans-religious attempt, more in line with the transnational tradition of the Renaissance, was perhaps the only last-ditch effort.

Conclusion

With this article, I have tried to show that Aristotle's *anthrōpologos* has clearly had an influence on the history of the term "anthropology", which was interpreted as a study of the Human in God (*anthrōpologēō*) and then, also through the medieval translations of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, as a study of the human in Man (*Ant(h)ropologium*) and as a study of men worthy of being remembered (*Anthropologia*). This latter approach obviously had moral intentions but was

completely free of any metaphysical interest, despite its users being extremely one-sided from a religious point of view. It seemed to prevail during the 1500s, but, while in the first part of the century it referred to a worldwide pantheon of illustrious men in line with the universalism of Humanism, in the second part it was increasingly more tied to the particularistic studies of local glories due to proto-nationalistic interests and to “fragmentation” in the late Renaissance period. As of the seventeenth century, the other two meanings were to prevail, especially the “German” one, and, in a more modest way, the “French” one, but by then with the more widespread term of *Anthropologia*. There is no need to exaggerate in the use of an anachronistic methodological nationalism, seeing that the transnational flows of ideas are also evident in this case. It will, however, be interesting in future studies to see how much the emergence of the Reform influenced the dissemination of the “German” idea of anthropology and how much the emergence of the Counter-reform affected blocking the “Roman” idea of anthropology in favour of the “French” one. The fact remains that anthropology had to wait another few centuries before it could speak of men without metaphysical intentions, but then it would do it in a different way to that proposed by Raffaele Maffei, the hyper-Catholic humanist from Volterra. Lévi-Strauss said that anthropology is the more general form of what we call humanism (1973: 319-322). If this is the case, Maffei was the first conscious anthropologist-humanist to focus on “men”. *Pace Aristotle*.

References

- Albert the Great. 1520. *Moralissima in Ethicen Commentaria*. Venice: Heredum [...] Octaviani Scoti.
- Anastasius Sinaïta. 1865, *Viae dux adversos acephalos*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, edited by J.-P. Migne, tomus LXXXIX, coll. 35-310. Paris: Migne.
- Apollinaris of Laodicea. 1904, “Epistola ad Dionysium” in *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule. Texte und Untersuchungen*, edited by H. Lietzmann, vol. I, 256-262, Tübingen: Mohr.
- Aristotle. 1497. *Decem librorum Moralium Aristotelis tres conversiones. Prima Argiropili Byzantij, secunda Leonardi Aretini, tertia vero Antiqua per capita et numeros conciliate. Communi familiarique commentario ad Argyropilum adiecto*. Paris: s. e.
- Aristotle. 1591. *Aristotelis Ethicorum, sive de Moribus, ad Nicomacum libri decem [...] Studio & opera Matthiae Bergii*. Frankfurt: apud A. Wecheli, C. Marn. & J. Aubr.
- Aristotle. 1848. *Aristotelis Ethicorum Nicomacheorum Libri Decem*. Edited by Karl Ludwig Michelet. Berlin: Schlesinger.

- Aristotle. 1957. *Etica Nicomachea*. Traduzione di Armando Plebe. Bari: Laterza.
- Aristotle. 1972. *Ethica Nicomachea. Translatio Roberti Grosseteste Lincolnensis sive 'Liber Ethicorum'. A. Recensio Pura*, edited by Renatus Antonius Gauthier. Leiden and Brussels: Brill and Desclée de Brouwer.
- Aristotle. 1973. *Ethica Nicomachea. Translatio Roberti Grosseteste Lincolnensis sive 'Liber Ethicorum'. B. Recensio Recognita*, edited by Renatus Antonius Gauthier. Leiden and Brussels: Brill and Desclée de Brouwer.
- Aristotle. 1993. *Etica Nicomachea*, Introduzione, Traduzione, Note e Apparat di Claudio Mazzarelli. Milan: Rusconi.
- Aristotle. 1997. *Ethique à Nicomaque*. Nouvelle traduction, avec Introduction, Notes et Index par Jules Tricot. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin.
- Aristotle. 1999. *Etica Nicomachea*, Traduzione, Introduzione e Note di Carlo Natali, Rome and Bari: Laterza.
- Aristotle. 2001. *Ética a Nicómaco*. Introducción. Traducción y Notas de José Luis Calvo Martínez. Madrid: Alianza.
- Aristotle. 2009. *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by David Ross, revised with an Introduction and Notes by Lesley Brown. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aspasius. 1889. *Aspasia in Ethica Nicomachea quae supersunt commentaria*, edited by Gustavus Heylbut. Berlin: Reimeri.
- [Pseudo-]Basil the Great, 1857, "Adversus Eunomium" in *Patrologia Graeca*, Tomus XXIX, edited by J.-P. Migne, 498-774. Paris: apud Migne.
- Bastian, Adolf. 1881. *Die Vorgeschichte der Ethnologie*. Berlin: Dümmlers Verlagsbuchhandlung Harrwitz und Gossmann.
- Bauer, Axel. 1984. "Bemerkungen zur Verwendung des Terminus 'Anthropologie' in der Medizin der Neuzeit (16.-19. Jahrhundert)", in *Medizinische Anthropologie*, edited by Eduard Seidler, 32-56. Berlin: Springer.
- Bellati, Giovanna. 1992. "Introduzione" in Jean Bouchet, *Le temple de bonne renommée*, edited by Giovanna Bellati, 3-219. Milan: Vita e Pensiero.
- Bendyshe, Thomas. 1865. "The History of Anthropology", in *Memoirs Read before the Anthropological Society of London. 1863-4*, I: 335-457.
- Benedetti, Stefano. 2006. "Maffei, Raffaele" in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 67, Rome: Istituto Treccani. http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/raffaele-maffei_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/
- Blanckaert, Claude. 1989. "L'Anthropologie en France. Le mot et l'histoire (XVIe-XIXe siècle)" *Bulletins et Mémoires de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris* n. s. 1 (3-4):13-43.
- Bodin, Jean. 1566. *I. Bodini Advocatus Methodus, ad Facilem Historiarum Cognitionem*. Paris: apud Martinum Iuvenem.
- Bolzoni, Lina. 2007. "L'amore e le donne nella trattatistica degli anni Trenta", in *Les années Trente du XVIe siècle*, edited by Danielle Boillet and Michel Plaisance. Paris: Centre Interuniversitaire de Recherche sur la Renaissance Italienne.

- Bonitz, Hermannus. 1870. "Index aristotelicus", in *Aristotelis Opera*, vol. V, edited by Academia Regia Borussica. Berlin: Reimeri.
- Bouchet, Jean. 1517. *Le temple de bonne renommée et repos des hommes et femmes illustres trouvé par le Traverseur de voies périlleuses en plorant le très regretté décès du feu prince de Thalemont unique filz du chevalier et prince sans reproche*. Paris: Galliot du Pré.
- Bouchet, Jean. 1557. *Les Annales d'Aquitaine*. Poitiers: par Enguilbert de Marnes.
- Bouchet, Jean. 1992. *Le temple de bonne renommée*, edited by Giovanna Bellati, Milan: Vita e Pensiero.
- Britnell, Jennifer. 1986. *Jean Bouchet*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Budetta, Enrica. 2008. "'Excitata est ea natio ante paucos annos singulari et eleganti ingenio Matthiae Regis': il viaggio del Volterrano in Ungheria" *Verbum Analecta Neolatina* X, 1: 51-66.
- Burckhardt, Jacob. 1860. *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien*. Basel: Schweighauser.
- Burke, Peter, 1998. *The European Renaissance. Centres and Peripheries*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Capella, Galeazzo. 1525. *Della Eccellenza et Dignità delle Donne*. Rome: Francesco Minizio Calvo.
- Capella, Galeazzo. 1533. *L'Anthropologia*. Venice: heredi d'Aldo Romano, e d'Andrea d'Asola.
- Casaubonus, Isaacus. 1605. *C. Svetoni Tranquilli De XII Caesaribus Libri VIII*. [Geneva]: Stephanus Gamonetus.
- Casmann, Otto. 1594. *Psychologia Anthropologica, sive doctrina animae Humanae*. Hanover: apud Guilielmum Antonium, impensis Petri Fischeri Fr.
- Casmann, Otto. 1596. *Secunda pars anthropologiae; hoc est Fabrica humani corporis methodice descripta [...]* Hannover: Guilielmum Antonium, impensis Petri Fischeri.
- Céneau, Robert. 1557. *Roberti Coenalis [...] Gallica Historia in duos dissecta tomos: quorum Prior ad anthropologiam Gallici principatus, Posterior ad soli Chorographiam pertinet*. Paris: Apud Galeotum à Prato ad primam columnam Regij Palatij.
- Cherchi, Paolo. 1998. *Polimatia di riuso. Mezzo secolo di plagio (1539-1589)*. Rome: Bulzoni.
- Clark, Stephen R. L. 1975. *Aristotle's Man. Speculations upon Aristotelian Anthropology*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- D'Amico, John F. 1975. "A Humanist Response to Martin Luther: Raffaele Maffei's Apologeticus" *Sixteenth-Century Journal* 6, 2: 37-56.
- D'Amico, John F. 1983. *Renaissance Humanism in Papal Rome. Humanists and Churchmen on the Eve of the Reformation*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- D'Ascia, Luca. 1990. "Galeazzo Flavio Capella traduttore di Erasmo" *Lettere italiane* XLII: 66-88.
- D'Ascia, Luca. 1993, "Martin Lutero e il *Genio romano*. L'*Apologeticus* di Raffaele Maffei. Studio ed edizione" *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 29: 107-152.
- Didymus the Blind. 1863. *De Trinitate libri tres*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, edited by J.-P. Migne, tomus XXXIX, coll. 269-992. Paris: Migne.
- Dilthey, 1904. "Die Funktion der Anthropologie in der Kultur des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts" *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* I-II: 2-32; IX: 316-347.
- Dionisotti, Carlo. 1968. *Gli umanisti e il volgare fra Quattro e Cinquecento*. Florence: Le Monnier.
- [Pseudo-]Dionysius the Areopagite. 1755. "De Divinis Nominibus" in *Sancti Dionysii Aeropagitae Opera Omnia*, edited by Balthasar Corderius, Tomus I, 283-542. Venice: Zatta.
- Doglio, Maria Luisa. 1988. "Introduzione", in Galeazzo Flavio Capra, *Della eccellenza e dignità delle donne*, edited by Maria Luisa Doglio, 13-66. Rome: Bulzoni.
- Doglio, Maria Luisa. 1993. *Il segretario e il principe. Studi sulla letteratura italiana e il Rinascimento*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Doublet, Georges. 1906. "Robert Céneau, évêque de Vence (1523-1530) et de Riez (1530-1532)" *Annales de la Société d'Études Provençales* 3: 139-148.
- Dubois, Claude-Gilbert. 1972. *Celtes et Gaulois au XVIe siècle. Le développement littéraire d'un mythe nationaliste*. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin.
- Falconcini, Benedetto. 1722. *Vita di Raffaello Maffei detto il Volterrano*, Rome: Komarek.
- Ferro, Roberta. 2013. "Osservazioni sull' 'Anthropologia' di Galeazzo Capella (1533)", in *Prima di Carlo Borromeo. Lettere e arti a Milano nel primo Cinquecento*, edited by E. Bellini and A. Rovetta, 91-120. Milan and Rome: Bulzoni.
- Flacius, Matthias, et alii 1565. *Kirchen Historia, die Vierde Centuria, Oder das Vierde Hundert Jhar...* Jena: Thomas Rebart.
- Frazier, Alison Knowles. 2005. *Possible Lives: Authors and Saints in Renaissance Italy*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gleede, Benjamin. 2015. "Τὸ ὅλον θεολογεῖν καὶ τὸ ὅλον ἀνθρωπολογεῖν. Der Sprachgebrauch der Schrift als Wurzel apollinarischer Christologie", in *Apollinarius und seine Folgen*, edited by Silke-Petra Bergjan, Benjamin Gleede and Martin Heimgartner, 115-128. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Gluckman, Max. 1963. "Gossip and Scandal" *Current Anthropology* 4, (3): 307-316.
- Gusdorf, Georges. 1974. *Introduction aux sciences humaines. Essai critique sur leurs origines et leur développement*. Nouvelle édition. Paris: Les Éditions Ophrys (1st. ed. 1960).

- Harvey, Richard. 1593. *Philadelphus, or a defence of Brutes, and the Brutans history Written by R. H.* London: John Wolfe.
(<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A72252.0001.001/1:1?rgn=div1;view=fulltext>)
- Hederich, Benjamin. 1825. *Novum Lexicon Manuale Graeco-Latinum et Latino-Graecu primum a Benjamine Hederico institutum.* Leipzig: Gleditsch.
- Hundt, Magnus. 1501. *Antropologium de hominis dignitate, natura, et proprietatibus, de elementis, partibus et membris humani corporis. De iuvamentis nocumentis, accidentibus, vitiis, remediis, et physionomia ipsorum. De escrementis et exeuntibus. De Spiritu humano eiusque natura, partibus, et opibus. De anima humana et ipsius appendicijs.* Leipzig: per Baccalarium Wolfgangum Monacensem.
- Hunt, James. 1863. “Introductory Address on the Study of Anthropology” *The Anthropological Review* 1, (1): 1-20.
- Janni, Pietro. 1986. *Il nostro greco quotidiano*, Rome and Bari: Laterza.
- Leontius of Byzantium. 1860. *Adversus eos qui nobis proferunt quaedam Apollinarii, falso inscripta nomine sanctorum patrum*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, edited by J.-P. Migne, tomus LXXXVI, coll.1947-1976. Paris: Migne.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1973. *Anthropologie structurale deux.* Paris. Plon.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 2008. *Tristes Tropiques*, in *Œuvres*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Lines, David A. 2002. *Aristotle’s Ethics in the Italian Renaissance (ca. 1300-1650)*. Leiden: Brill.
- Luccio, Riccardo. 2013. “Psychologia – the birth of a new scientific context” *Review of Psychology* 20 (1-2): 5-14.
- Maffei, Raffaele. 1506. *R. Volaterrani Commentariorum urbanorum octo et triginta libri.* Rome: per Ioannem Besicken Alemannum.
- Malebranche, Nicolas. 1680. *Traité de la nature et de la grâce.* Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Marchesi, Concetto. 1904. *L’Etica Nicomachea nella tradizione latina Medievale.* Messina. Trimarchi.
- Marquard, Odo. 1965. “Zur Geschichte des philosophischen Begriffs “Anthropologie” seit dem Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts”, in *Collegium Philosophicum. Studien Joachim Ritter zum sechzigsten Geburtstag*, edited by Ernst Wolfgang Böckenförde, 209-239. Basel: Schwabe.
- Mexía, Pero [Mejía, Pedro]. 1547. *Historia Imperial y Cesarea.* Basel: Ioan Oporino.
- Melanchthon, Philip. 1540. *De Anima Commentarius Philippi Mel[anchthonis]*. Paris: apud Christianum Wechelium.
- Mingarelli, Joannes Ludovicus. 1863. “Epistola [...] ad Rev. D. Joannem Archintum [1763]”, in *Patrologia Graeca*, edited by J.-P. Migne, tomus XXXIX, coll. 993-1030. Paris: Migne.
- Moravia, Sergio. 1978. *La scienza dell’uomo nel Settecento.* Rome and Bari: Laterza (1st ed. 1970).
- Pagliaroli, Stefano. 2016. “La lettera greca di Angelo Poliziano a Raffaele Maffei e la traduzione latina di Jacques Toussain”, in *“Paignion”.* *Piccola Festschrift per*

- Francesco Donadi, edited by Attilio Mastrocinque and Andrea Tessier, 43-74. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste.
- Panofsky, Erwin. 1962. "Artist, Scientist, Genius: Notes on the Renaissance-Dämmerung", in *The Renaissance: Six Essays*, edited by Wallace K. Ferguson 123-182, New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Paschini, Pio. 1953. "Una famiglia di curiali: i Maffei di Volterra" *Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia* VII: 344-369.
- Petrarca, Francesco. 1975, *Trionfi*, in *Opere* 191-238, Florence: Sansoni.
- Philo of Alexandria. 1896. "De sacrificiis Abeli et Caini", in *Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt*, vol. I, 202-257, edited by Leopoldus Cohn, Berlin: Reimeri.
- Philo of Alexandria. 1897a. "Quod Deus sit immutabilis", in *Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt*, vol. II, 56-94, edited by Paulus Wendland, Berlin: Reimeri.
- Philo of Alexandria. 1897b. "De confusione linguarum", in *Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt*, vol. II, 229-267, edited by Paulus Wendland, Berlin: Reimeri.
- Piasere, Leonardo. 2000. "Pratica della storia e storicismi", in *Antropologia delle tradizioni intellettuali: Francia e Italia*, 31-54, edited by Michel Izard and Fabio Viti. Rome: CISU.
- Piasere, Leonardo. 2006. *Buoni da ridere, gli zingari. Saggi di antropologia storico-letteraria*. Rome: CISU.
- Plato, 2002. *Θεαίητος / Teeteto*, edited by Manara Valgimigli and Anna Maria Iappolo. Rome and Bari: Laterza
- Redigonda, Abele L. 1960. "Alberti, Leandro", in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 1, Rome: Istituto Treccani. [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/leandro-alberti_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/leandro-alberti_(Dizionario-Biografico)/)
- Regazzola, Giovanni Bernardo (alias Felicianus). 1543. *Aristotelis Stagiritae Moralia Nichomachia cum Eustracii, Aspasii, Michaelis Ephesii, nonnullorumque aliorum graecorum explanationibus, nuper a Ioanne Bernardo Feliciano latinitate donata, et cum antiquo codice collatione, suae integritati restituta*. Paris: apud Ioannem Roigny.
- Remotti, Francesco. 2000. *Prima lezione di Antropologia*. Rome and Bari: Laterza.
- Riedel, Wolfgang. 2007. "Literarische Anthropologie", in *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft*, edited by Georg Braungart *et al.*, vol. II, 432-434. Berlin: De Gruyter
- Rotzoll, Maike & Benzenhöfer, Udo, 1991, "Zur 'Anthropologia' (1533) von Galeazzo Capella. Die früheste bislang bekannte Verwendung des Begriffs Anthropologie", *Medizinhistorisches Journal*, n. 26, pp. 315-320.
- Rowe, John Howland. 1964. "Ethnography and Ethnology in the Sixteenth Century" *Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers* 30:1-19.
- Santing, Catrien. 2018. "Early anthropological interest: Magnus Hundt's and Galeazzo Capra's quest for humanity" *History and Anthropology* online. DOI: 10.1080/02757206.2018.1474353.

- Schipperges, Heinrich. 1972. "Anthropologien in der Geschichte der Medizin", in *Neue Anthropologie*, edited by Hans-Georg Gadamer and Paul Vogler, vol. 2, 179-214. Stuttgart: Thieme.
- Schmidt W. and G. Schmidt. 1906. "Die moderne Ethnologie. (Fortsetzung) / L'Ethnologie moderne. (Suite)" *Anthropos*, 1 (2): 318-387.
- Schwytzer, Philip. 2004. *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swain, David. 2012. "Harvey, Richard", in *The Encyclopedia of English Renaissance Literature*, edited by Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr and Alan Stewart, vol. II, 455-457. Oxford: Blackwell
- Thomas Aquinas. 1969. *Sententia Libri Ethicorum*, in *Sancti Thomae de Aquino Opera Omnia*, cura et studio Fratrum Praedicatorum, tomus XLVII, vol. II. Rome: ad Sactae Sabinae.
- Topinard, Paul. 1876. "Anthropologie, ethnologie et ethnographie" *Bulletins de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris*, 2nd s., XI: 199-215.
- Trinkaus, Charles. 1970. *In Our Image and Likeness. Humanity and Divinity in Italian Humanist Thought*. London: Constable.
- Valla, Giorgio. 1501. *De expetendis, et fugiendis rebus opus, in quo haec continentur*. [Venice: In aedibus Aldi].
- Van Gulik, Egbertus. 2018. *Erasmus and His Books*, edited by James K. McConica and Johannes Trapman. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Vermeulen, Han F. 2015. *Before Boas. The Genesis of Ethnography and Ethnology in the German Enlightenment*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Vives, Juan Luis. 1531. *De Disciplinis Libri XX*. Antwerp: Michael Hillenius.
- Vox, Onofrio. 2014. "Forging Ancient Greek Words in Modern Times", in *Fakes and Forgers of Classical Literature*, edited by Javier Martínez, 283-289. Leiden: Brill online.



Portrait of Raffaele Maffei, by Theodor de Bry (in Jean-Jacques Boissard, *Bibliotheca chalcographica, hoc est Virtute et eruditione clarorum Virorum Imagines*, Heidelberg, Clemens Ammon, 1597)

