

Hebrew as “lingua simplicissima”: complexity in orations on the Hebrew language at the sixteenth- century Louvain Collegium Trilingue¹

Maxime Maleux

Research Foundation–Flanders (FWO) & KU Leuven


ABSTRACT

In the sixteenth century, Hebrew became part of the linguistic horizon of humanists, being taught in university curricula. Yet, professors of Hebrew felt the need to defend the study of the language from critics, using a varied array of arguments. One of these arguments was the language’s simplicity, contrary to its reputation as a difficult language. This article investigates how these orations dealt with the language’s simplicity. An interesting case is an anonymous speech delivered in the context of the Hebrew lessons of the Louvain Collegium Trilingue. Its author describes the character of Hebrew as “simple yet perfect”. Here, we see that the complexity of the language is strictly connected to the theological aspect.

KEYWORDS

Hebrew, humanism, orations, Trilingual College, Louvain

1. I would like to thank Raf Van Rooy and the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable criticisms and suggestions. The research for this paper was funded by the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO), grant number 1145321N.

Maleux, Maxime. 2023. Hebrew as “lingua simplicissima”: complexity in orations on the Hebrew language at the sixteenth-century Louvain Collegium Trilingue. *Simplicité et complexité des langues dans l’histoire des théories linguistiques*, dir. par Chloé Laplantine, John E. Joseph & Émilie Aussant. Paris: SHESL (HEL Livres, 3). 137-152. 

RÉSUMÉ

Au seizième siècle, l'hébreu entra dans l'horizon linguistique des humanistes et fut enseigné dans les universités. Cependant, les professeurs d'hébreu se sentirent obligés de défendre l'étude de cette langue contre les critiques, en utilisant toute une série d'arguments variés. Un de ces arguments était la simplicité de l'hébreu, ce qui ne cadre pas avec l'image que l'on avait généralement de cette langue. Cet article vise à explorer comment ces discours traitent la simplicité de la langue. Un cas intéressant à ce propos est un discours anonyme délivré à l'université de Louvain, au Collège des Trois Langues. L'auteur y présente l'hébreu comme langue « simple mais parfaite ». Dans ce cas précis, la complexité de la langue est étroitement liée à son aspect théologique.

MOTS-CLÉS

hébreu, humanisme, discours, Collège des Trois Langues, Louvain

1. Introduction: a new language on the linguistic horizon of the humanists

In his 125th letter, addressed to Rusticus, St. Jerome (c.345-420) confessed that learning Hebrew had been a particularly difficult task for him. In addition, he characterized the language's aesthetic qualities in utterly negative terms²:

12. Dum essem iuvenis et solitudinis me deserta vallarent, incentiva vitiorum ardoremque naturae ferre non poteram; quae cum crebris ieiuniis frangerem, mens tamen cogitationibus aestuabat. Ad quam edomandam cuidam fratri, qui ex Hebraeis crediderat, me in disciplinam dedi, ut post Quintiliani acumina Ciceronisque fluvios gravitatemque Frontonis et lenitatem Plinii alphabetum discerem, stridentia anhelantiaque verba meditarer. Quid ibi laboris insumpserim, quid sustinuerim difficultatis, quotiens desperaverim quotiensque cessaverim et contentione discendi rursus inceperim, testis est conscientia tam mea, qui passus sum, quam eorum, qui mecum duxere vitam. Et gratias ago domino, quod de amaro semine litterarum dulces fructus capio.

'12. When I was a young man, though I was protected by the rampart of the lonely desert, I could not endure against the promptings of sin

2. On Jerome's views on and appreciation of Hebrew, see Denecker (2015) and Barr (1967).

and the ardent heat of my nature. I tried to crush them by frequent fasting, but my mind was always in a turmoil of imagination. To subdue it I put myself in the hands of one of the brethren who had been a Hebrew before his conversion, and asked him to teach me his language. Thus, after having studied the pointed style of Quintilian, the fluency of Cicero, the weightiness of Fronto, and the gentleness of Pliny, I now began to learn the alphabet again and practice harsh and guttural words. What efforts I spent on that task, what difficulties I had to face, how often I despaired, how often I gave up and then in my eagerness to learn began again, my own knowledge can witness from personal experience and those can testify who were then living with me. I thank the Lord that from a bitter seed of learning I am now plucking sweet fruits³.

Nevertheless, he expressed his pleasure at having persevered, because his knowledge of the holy language enabled him to accomplish one of the most important translations in history: the Latin *Vulgata*. Ironically, his translation caused most Western scholars to feel no need to learn Hebrew in order to read the original text of the Old Testament, and thus, for a long time, scholars maintained the same negative views of Hebrew as a language (in addition to its negative association with the despised Jews).

Before the advent of humanism in western Europe, linguistic horizons were rather limited; a medieval scholar needed to know only scholastic Latin to have access to scholarly literature. A few learned men, like William of Moerbeke (c.1215-1286), translated some Greek works, but they were the exception. The Holy Writ was only read in Jerome's Latin translation, which was unquestioned⁴. However, with the rise of the *studia humanitatis*, a desire to know the languages of the classical sources (encapsulated in the Latin saying *ad fontes*) led to the appearance of Greek (the language of the ancient pagan Greek literature and of the New Testament) and Hebrew (first and foremost the language of the Old Testament) in the universities' curricula. This expansion, however, was not easily achieved; when the first university-linked institution to learn Hebrew, the *Collegium Trilingue*

3. Translated by Frederic A. Wright (1933). All other translations in this article are my own.

4. For the interaction of medieval scholars with Jewish culture and scholarship, see Dahan (1990).

*Lovaniense*⁵, was established in 1517 with the help of Desiderius Erasmus (1466/67/69-1536), the study of Hebrew and Greek was immediately attacked by theologians who regarded the study of the biblical languages as a threat to their authority in Biblical exegesis. One of the most fervent opponents of the new institution was the theologian Jacobus Latomus (c.1475-1544), who wrote a pamphlet on the uselessness of learning languages other than Latin for serious theological study.

Since its beginnings, professors of the Collegium Trilingue (or college of the three languages) wrote Hebrew grammars for their students' use. Some of these became quite successful and popular, like Clenardus' *Tabulae in grammaticen Hebraeam* (Louvain, 1529)⁶. Since the Hebrew language is not related to Latin or Greek and has its own grammatical tradition (modeled on Arabic grammar), it was a major challenge for these grammarians to describe the language using a Latin(ate) terminology and grammatical framework.

The study of Hebrew also faced the anti-Judaism of most Western scholars. As the language of the Jews, it was often disparaged. Most apologists for Hebrew explicitly note that they praised Hebrew "without praising the Jews". For the teaching of Hebrew, recourse was usually made to Jews who had converted to Christianity, yet these new Christians were not free from criticism⁷. The strangeness

5. On the history of the Collegium Trilingue, see De Vocht (1951-55). Papy (2017) and Van Hecke (2018) constitute the first serious endeavors into the Hebrew teaching methods at the Trilingual College.

6. From the early days of the Collegium Trilingue, Hebrew books were printed in Louvain. The Hebrew script was fairly challenging for the recently developed technique of printing, but as the need for printed Hebrew grammars and editions rose, the local printing press of Thierry Martens (1446/7-1534) invested in Hebrew type. As such, he was able to print the necessary textbooks for the Trilingue's Hebrew classes, like, for instance, Clenardus' *Tabulae*. These *Tabulae* were reprinted thirteen times in France by Christian Wechel and annotated by illustrious Hebraists like Johannes Quinquarboreus (Jean Cinquarbres, c.1520-1565) and Johannes Isaac Levita (1515-1577).

7. One example from the Louvain Collegium Trilingue is Johannes Isaac Levita, who had been a rabbi before his conversion. He taught Hebrew together with Andreas Balenus and used Jewish commentaries in his exegetical treatises. This use of Jewish sources was criticized by his former student, the Bishop of Roermond, Wilhelmus Lindanus (1525-1588). Levita reacted by writing his

and difficulty of the language, with its guttural sounds, and its writing system (a consonantal alphabet written from right to left), make it relatively hard for beginners to learn; these features were frequently used as fodder for attacks on the language⁸. These are the points that apologists for the language refute in their orations.

In this article, I will concentrate on one such oration written in the context of the Louvain Collegium Trilingue. Among many other arguments, the oration explicitly mentions the language’s simplicity as an important feature. Was this argument made simply to attract new students? Or does this quality fit the humanists’ understanding of Hebrew grammar? Or is it perhaps a mere theological argument? In this case study, I will look at how these texts written by professors of the Louvain Collegium Trilingue relate to other documents within the same genre as regards the argument of simplicity.

2. Linguistic description of Hebrew in orations: the genre and practices in Louvain

Numerous orations promoting the study of languages like Greek and Hebrew appear in the sixteenth century and beyond. Especially at the dawn of this period, Hebraists felt the need to defend their object of study. A first notable example is the oration by Petrus Mosellanus (1493-1524), *De variarum linguarum cognitione paranda oratio* (Leipzig, 1518), in which he praised Erasmus for having established the Collegium Trilingue and advocated the study of languages as an indispensable skill for theologians⁹. In the seventeenth century, such texts continued to appear, but these later orations tended to focus more on academic questions regarding the provenance of Hebrew and

Defensio veritatis Hebraicae sacrarum literarum (1559), in which he defended the traditional Biblical scholarship by the Jews. See Dunkelgrün (2017: 418).

8. Vitus Winshemius in 1549 (fol. Bv^r) quoted such an argument of his adversaries: “*Aiunt linguam horridam esse [...] nec multo certius eam percipi posse, quam si nunc velimus Aegyptiorum Hieroglyphicas literas interpretari.*” (Translation: They say that the language is rough [...] and that it cannot be understood much better than if we now would want to interpret the hieroglyphic letters of the Egyptians).

9. Cf. François (2003 & 2005).

its relation to other Semitic languages (especially Arabic, Aramaic, and Syriac) that were then more intensively studied. The character of these orations was less apologetic and more ceremonial. One of these later orations is the *Linguae Hebraicae encomium* (Louvain, 1614) by Andreas Valerius (1588-1655), professor of Hebrew at the Louvain Collegium Trilingue¹⁰.

The ideological program for the Collegium Trilingue was set by the famous humanist Desiderius Erasmus in his *Ratio seu compendium verae theologiae* (Basel, 1519). In this programmatic booklet, Erasmus defended the emphasis on language education as a gateway to a more philologically sound theology. The first professor of Hebrew, the Spanish converted Jew Matthaeus Adrianus (c.1475-after 1521), delivered an oration at Louvain in 1519 that was later published in Wittenberg, in which he defended the utility of the study of Hebrew against his opponents, who were clearly the Louvain theologians. Jacobus Latomus wrote his *De trium linguarum et studii theologi ratione dialogus* (Antwerp, 1519) in reaction to Adrianus' oration, but he also aimed his attack at the more influential *Ratio* of Erasmus. The Englishman Robert Wakefield (d.1537), the second professor of Hebrew at the Collegium Trilingue, taught only a few months at Louvain, but in 1524, he too delivered an oration on Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldaic.

It is in this context that the anonymous oration in praise of the Hebrew language (*Oratio in laudem linguae Hebraicae*) that interests us was written. The autograph of the text, which does not mention its author's name, is preserved in a sammelband that was compiled by the sixteenth-century Hellenist Theodoricus Langius (d.1578). A later annotator added a title and listed some possible authors, but none of these names can be definitively tied to the oration. The author writes Hebrew with an elegant Sephardic cursive hand, which means he was relatively well-versed in the language¹¹. He also directs his speech to an audience of students, as he refers to a class on the Book of Psalms, which suggests that he taught Hebrew at the Collegium Trilingue. Most remarkably, the author showed a profound interest in Christian

10. Studied in detail by Denecker & Van Hecke (2019). See also Zwiep (1993).

11. See Van Hecke & Feys (2017).

Cabbala¹². In the sixteenth century, Christian Hebraists developed their own version of this reading strategy and used it to prove the prefiguration of Christ in the Old Testament. An extensive part of his brief appraisal of Hebrew is taken up by cabbalistic arguments aimed at proving that much of the original meaning is lost in translation. This interest in Christian Cabbala was particularly in vogue at the beginning of the sixteenth century and was famously exercised by Pico della Mirandola (1463-1494) in Italy, Johannes Reuchlin (1455-1522) in Germany, and Guillaume Postel (1510-1581) in France¹³. As for Louvain, there are few Hebraists who had an outspoken interest in Cabbala; one interesting example is Andreas Masius (1514-1573), who had studied at the Collegium Trilingue. In his notebook, which contained mainly self-written Hebrew poems, appears a list of cabbalistic works in Hebrew in which he was interested¹⁴, though Masius never involved these in his exegetic works.

3. “Lingua simplicissima”: simplicity as argument for learning Hebrew

The author begins his oration with a witty anecdote from the *Lingua* (Antwerp, 1525), a work by Erasmus, which itself is taken from Plutarch’s *Apophthegmata*. The anecdote relates that an orator was about to begin an oration on Hercules, when the Spartan king Antalcidas interrupted him by asking if there was anyone who could criticize Hercules. The message evoked here is that it would be absurd to praise someone or something which is already unanimously praised. He then proceeds with his main argument: describing the qualities of Hebrew. The first thing to remark about Hebrew is its divine nature: God created the language and taught it to Adam. This remark stems from a long debate begun in antiquity: is Hebrew the first language, invented by God, or one of the many languages that

12. Cabbala was a Jewish esoteric philosophy focused on looking for hidden meanings in Hebrew words and letters, which then would reveal a hidden reality. For a general introduction to Cabbala, see for instance Dan (2007) and Busi (1998).

13. For Postel’s interest in Christian Cabbala, see Secret (1964).

14. See Maleux (2020: 69).

appeared after the building of the tower of Babel? The church fathers, Augustine most notably, had no doubt that it was in fact the first language. Our author (like most humanists) holds the same opinion and declares that God created the language and taught it to Adam:

*Imo si penitius rem intueri placet, deprehendētis facile huius idiomatis ipsum Deum sanctum et benedictum autorem extitisse, quem legimus primum parentem nostrum Adam non alium quam hebraicum sermonem docuisse, qui eum simplicitatis ac castitatis admoneret: est enim haec lingua omnium linguarum simplicissima purissimaque, et ob hoc ipsum Deo quam gratissima, ac in explicandis divinae naturae mysteriis quam maxime conveniens atque idonea.*¹⁵

‘For if you would like to look at the matter more precisely, you will understand with ease that God Himself is the holy and blessed creator of this idiom; for we read that He taught none other language to our first ancestor Adam than Hebrew, and He made him aware of its simplicity and purity. For it is the most simple and pure of all languages, and therefore pleases most to God, and it is the most convenient and apt to explain the mysteries of the divine nature.’

God deemed this language suitable to teach mankind because of its *castitas* (purity) and *simplicitas* (simplicity). The qualifier *purissima* refers to the belief that Hebrew is a pure and true language without any defects (an idea known as the *hebraica veritas*, or Hebrew truth). Here, simplicity of language is used as illustration and proof of its divine nature and purity. The author nowhere provides grammatical examples of the simplicity of the Hebrew language, but takes it as a fact, as a consequence of its creation. There are, however, other cases in which grammatical examples have been used in defense of the language. In his oration on Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldaic, Robert Wakefield (d.1537) claims that Hebrew is an easy language to learn, especially for Englishmen. He argues that the pronunciation of the language is very close to that of the English language:

[A]d eius vocabula efferenda Gallis [...] Italis & Germanis multo nostrates sint aptiores. Quandoquidem ea aptitudine & facilitate modo operam dent,

15. Ms. 744-55 p. 1.

*hebraica ad purum verba inspirant Angli ac de illorum ore resonat, qua media nati educatique Hierosolyma Iudei.*¹⁶

‘[I]n pronouncing these words, [...] our fellow countrymen are much better versed than the French, the Italians, and the Germans. Whenever they just pay attention to this aptitude and simplicity, the English breathe the Hebrew verbs purely, and it resonates from their mouth as if they were Jews born and brought up in the middle of Jerusalem.’

We also find an argument about the grammatical basis for Hebrew’s simplicity in college notes taken in the classes of Andreas Balenus (c.1484-1568), professor of Hebrew at the Trilingue from 1532 until 1568. As a rule, Hebrew words are formed by three consonants that carry the word’s basic meaning (the so-called *root*), while the vowels provide only additional information. Balenus put it this way:

*Quamquam in addiscendis cunctis fere linguis nihil sit aut difficilius aut utilius vocabulorum primitivorum exacta cognitione. In hæbreorum tamen lingua huius rei noticia nihil potest esse facilius, cum huius lingue primitiva vocabula sunt admodum pauca, atque adeo trium literarum dumtaxat omnia, quod sine grandi mysterio factum esse non putes.*¹⁷

‘Although in the learning of almost all languages nothing is more difficult or more useful than the exact knowledge of roots, in the Hebrew language nothing is easier than knowing this matter, since the roots of this language are very few and all consist of only three consonants, which you cannot imagine being made without great mystery. For as the Lord himself, the creator of this language, much rejoices in the threefold number of the persons, so too are all the roots of this language completed by the threefold number of the consonants.’

Here, too, we can see that the simplicity of Hebrew is related to its divine creator, suggesting Hebrew was some sort of divinely constructed language, designed to be easy and efficient. Balenus is far from the only Hebraist to make this observation. The Italian grammarian Santes Pagninus (1470-1541) ascribed the same Trinitarian perfection to the Hebrew root in his monumental grammar *Institutiones*

16. Wakefield (1524: 38). He furthermore notes in (transcribed) Hebrew that the French are not able to correctly pronounce the letter ψ (š).

17. Ms. 8471-75 fol. 25’.

Hebraicae (Lyon, 1526)¹⁸. Balenus explicitly relates this divine feature to the concept of simplicity, which Pagninus, however, does not seem to suggest.

One of the clearest examples of basing Hebrew's simplicity on its grammar appears in the orations of the German Hebraist Hermannus Rennecherus (1550-after 1605), who taught Hebrew at Leiden University at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century. In 1603, he wrote an oration on the excellence of the Hebrew language (*oratio brevis in laudem hebraeae linguae*). In this oration, Rennecherus develops his argument in a well-structured manner, highlighting every aspect he considers characteristic of Hebrew, of which simplicity is an important one (*antiquitas, dignitas, sanctitas, castitas, utilitas, necessitas, brevitatis, facilitas, jucunditas*). He explains that its simplicity relates to its brevity¹⁹ and enumerates many grammatical (morphological) features (like gender and number in nouns and the verb tenses, but also Hebrew accents) which are simpler in Hebrew than Latin and Greek, languages Rennecherus characterizes as being very difficult. If there are exceptions in Hebrew, he remarks that they are so few that they pose no difficulty to the learner. Moreover, he not only relates simplicity of language to brevity and conciseness, but also to aesthetic qualities.

4. “Lingua purissima”: simplicity in conjunction with the perfect divine nature of Hebrew

When the Latin church fathers described Hebrew, they generally acknowledged it as a holy tongue and the oldest language, but that did not prevent them from calling it ugly and difficult, as we already

18. See Kessler-Mesguich (2013: 22-23 & 129-130).

19. Rennecherus 1603: 22: “*Facilitas huius linguae aliqua ex parte cum eius brevitate est coniuncta. Primo igitur in eo haec lingua est facilis, quod tam multa vocabula & voces non habeat quam graeca & Latina lingua, ut ante in eius brevitate dictum est.*” (Translation: This language's simplicity is partly related to its brevity. First of all this language is easy, because it does not contain so many words and expressions as Greek and Latin, like I remarked before on account of its brevity).

saw in the case of St. Jerome. Humanists were remarkably more positive, because for them the qualities of Hebrew were all related to each other. They theorized that it was the holiest of languages, since its creator was God, who taught it to Adam. Therefore, it was also by far the oldest language to have existed, as well as the most perfect language, since it was designed to be as such.

A perfect language for humanists was a language which was highly logical and consisted of short words reflecting reality²⁰. This approach, known as iconicity, is articulated in Plato's *Cratylus*, where the eponymous character asserts the intrinsic link between the referred object and the word. Plato, however, did not seem to share this view and propagated through Socrates a more moderate view that most words do not share this link with reality, though there are unmistakably words that do²¹. In the Renaissance, humanists chose to follow Cratylus' approach to forming etymologies, combined with Varro's etymological procedures of shifting letters. This led certain humanists to develop etymologies based on Hebrew roots, which to our ears sound quite outlandish²². The quality of simplicity is therefore a consequence of the aforementioned qualities.

The idea that perfection can be combined with simplicity is clearly formulated in the following passage from the anonymous Louvain oration:

*Quod si non nobilitate originis commendari videbitur, certe hoc inficiari non possunt, quin propter sacram scripturam, quam hebraice scriptam esse, apud omnes in confesso est, permultum laudis commendationisque accipiat. Si enim propter rerum cognitionem ut bonarum disciplinarum, artiumque scientiam, putamus grecam linguam aut latinam esse utilem, idem de lingua sancta cur non audebimus dicere, quae perfecta est et absoluta neque ullo modo potest fallere, sed omnia simpliciter ac plane ob oculos ponit, quae ad intelligentiam scripturarum sunt necessaria.*²³

20. A prominent defender of this theory was the Dutch humanist Johannes Goropius Becanus, though he considered the Antwerpian dialect instead of Hebrew to be the oldest language on these same grounds. See Deneire & Van Hal (2006: 24).

21. See e.g., Law (2003: 20-23).

22. For a seventeenth-century example of this practice, see Eco (1993: 92).

23. Ms. 744-55 p. 3.

‘If it does not seem to be praiseworthy because of its noble origin, then certainly they cannot deny that it receives all praise and honor because of the Holy Scripture, which as everyone knows is written in Hebrew. For if we think that Greek and Latin are useful for both practical knowledge and intelligence in the good disciplines and arts, why do we not dare to say the same about the holy language, which is perfect and absolute and cannot be wrong whatsoever, but poses simply and clearly before one’s eyes everything that is necessary to understand scripture.’

Because Hebrew is a perfect language without flaws, it is not ambiguous and therefore clear and simple in its idiom. The author proceeds to give examples of ambiguities in the Greek translation of the Biblical Hebrew text that had caused multiple errors in the Latin translation.

Yet, the author primarily emphasizes cabbalistic arguments. In his view, the most important reason to learn Hebrew is to be able to read the Old Testament without reliance on translations, since a translation cannot possibly transfer every nuance as precisely as the original text. In addition, the Hebrew text possesses not only meaning on the superficial level, but also hidden meanings behind the Hebrew letters, a theory known as Cabbala. Our author offers a couple of examples to prove his point: the first word of the Hebrew bible, בראשית (*bərē’sīt*, “in the beginning”) also contains the words בר אשית (*bar ’āšīt*), which means “I will bring forth a son”²⁴. This hidden meaning is obviously impossible to perceive via a translation; therefore, one should learn Hebrew to become aware of the cabbalistic interpretations. The use of Cabbala to recommend the usefulness of the study of Hebrew is reminiscent of the words of the famous Christian Hebraist Johannes Reuchlin, author of the *De arte cabalis-*

24. Ms. 744-55 p. 8: “*In prima si quidem dictione, Deus pater statim certoque tempore, se daturum nobis filium promittit. Nam vocabulum בְּרֵאשִׁית quod proprie, in principio significat, sic prolatum בְּרֵאשִׁית significat filium dabo: בר bar enim filius est, unde et Petrus Simon bariona, hoc est, filius columbae, a Christo appellatus est אשית autem dabo significat.*” (Translation: Indeed, in the first word, God the Father promises to give us a son on a fixed and certain moment. For the word *bərē’sīt* – which in itself means “in the beginning” – means “I will give a son” when pronounced as *bar ’āšīt*; for *bar* means “son,” whence Peter Simon is also called *Bariona*, which means “son of the dove;” *’āšīt* on the other hand means “I will give”).

tica (Hagenau, 1517): “[the cabbalistic hidden meanings] cannot be successfully discerned if not by a scholar of Hebrew”²⁵. The author’s focus on Cabbala should be understood in the light of Reuchlin’s book, which was probably read in Louvain²⁶. These untranslatable hidden meanings would most probably have stirred the students’ imagination, and it moreover strengthens the idea of the divine nature of the language: God himself laid these hidden meanings in the Hebrew letters, and therefore no other language more purely expresses the divine message.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, Hebrew’s apologists do not describe the language as “simple” to lure students. The concept of simplicity is closely related to the concept of the perfect language, which Hebrew was thought to be during the early age of humanism. The holy and pure nature of Hebrew implied that its structure was highly logical, and thus it should be easy to understand. At the same time, behind every Hebrew letter there lurked other meanings that could be interpreted only with a sound knowledge of Christian Cabbala. Only later, towards the beginning of the seventeenth century, did scholars begin to doubt the traditional primeval position of Hebrew²⁷. The idea of Hebrew as a simple and universal language, however, continued to exercise influence until the nineteenth century, when the quest for the perfect language was peaking (resulting in the creation of artificial languages like Volapük and Esperanto) and when Modern Hebrew was re-invented as a national language for the Jewish people²⁸.

25. “*a nemine prorsus intellecta nisi hebraice praedocto.*” Reuchlin (1506: 4).

26. In the 1543 inventory of a bookshop located near the Trilingue, the *De arte cabbalistica* is included. See Delsaerd (2001).

27. See Van Hal (2010).

28. On this particular history, see Halperin (2012).

References

Manuscript sources

- Anonymous. *Oratio in laudem linguae Hebraicae*. Royal Library of Belgium: mss. 744-55.
- Anonymous. *Annotationes quaedam ad hebraeae linguae noticiam*. Royal Library of Belgium: mss. 8471-75.

Primary sources

- Adrianus, Matthaeus. 1520. *Oratio quam Louanii habuit de linguarum laude*. Wittenberg: per Ioh. Grunenberg.
- Andreas, Valerius. 1614. *Collegii Trilinguis Buslidiani, in Academia Lovaniensi, exordia ac progressus. Et linguae Hebraicae encomium*. Lovanii: Typis Philippi Dormalii.
- Clenardus, Nicolaus. 1529. *ליה הדיקדיק* Tabula in grammaticen Hebraeam. [Louvain]: Theodo[ricus] Martin[us].
- Erasmus, Desiderius. 1519. *Ratio seu compendium verae theologiae*. Apud inclytam Basileam.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. 1525. *Lingua per Des[iderium] Erasmum Roterodamum, opus nouum, et hisce temporibus aptissimum*. Antuerpiae: apud Michaellem Hillenium.
- Latomus, Jacobus. 1519. *De trium linguarum et studii theologici ratione dialogus*. Antuerpiae: per Michaellem Hilleniu[m].
- Levita, Johannes Isaac. 1559. *Defensio veritatis Hebraicae sacrarum scripturarum, aduersus Libros tres Reueren[di] D. Vvilhelmi Lindani S.T. Doctoris, quos de optimo Scripturas interpretandi genere inscripsit*. Coloniae: apud Iacobum Soterem.
- Mosellanus, Petrus. 1518. *De variarum linguarum cognitione paranda oratio*. Lipsiae: in officina valentini Schvmann.
- Pagninus, Sanctes. 1526. *Hebraicae Institutiones [...]*. Lyon: Antoine du Ry.
- Rennecherus, Hermannus. 1603. *Oratio breuis et succincta in laudem sanctae et reuerendae Hebraeae linguae*. Lugduni Batavorum: apud Thomam Basson.
- Reuchlin, Johannes. 1506. *De rudimentis hebraicis libri tres*. [Pforzheim]: [Thomas Anshelm].
- Reuchlin, Johannes. 1517. *Ioannis Reuchlin Phorcensis LL. Doc. De arte cabalistica libri tres Leoni X. dicati*. Hagenau: apud Thomam Anshelmum.
- Wakefield, Robert. 1524. *Oratio de laudibus & utilitate triu[m] linguar[um] Arabice Chaldaicae & Hebraice atq[ue] idiomatibus hebraicis quae in utroq[ue] testame[n]to i[n]ueniuntur*. London: apud VVinandum de Vorde.

- Winshemius, Vitus. 1549. *Orationes duae de stvdiis linguae Ebraicae*. Vitebergae.
- Wright, Frederic A. 1933. *Jerome, Select letters*. Cambridge: Harvard university Press.

Secondary sources

- Barr, James. 1967. St. Jerome's appreciation of Hebrew. *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 49. 281-302.
- Busi, Giulio. 1998. *La Qabbalah*. Roma-Bari: Editori Laterza.
- Dahan, Gilbert. 1990. *Les intellectuels chrétiens et les juifs au Moyen Âge*. Paris: Editions du Cerf.
- Dan, Joseph. 2007. *Kabbalah: a very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Delsaerd, Pierre, 2001. *Suam quisque bibliothecam. Boekhandel en particulier boekenbezit aan de oude Leuvense universiteit 16de tot 18de eeuw*. Leuven: Universitaire Pers Leuven.
- Denecker, Tim. 2015. Language attitudes and social connotations in Jerome and Sidonius Apollinaris. *Vigiliae Christianae* 69. 393-421.
- Denecker, Tim & Pierre Van Hecke. 2019. Why learn Hebrew? Text and translation, with an introduction and commentary, of Valerius Andreas' *Linguae Hebraicae Encomium* (1614). *Lias* 45. 45-111.
- Deneire, Tom & Toon Van Hal. 2006. *Lipsius tegen Becanus*. Amersfoort: Florivallis.
- De Vocht, Henry. 1951-55. *History of the Foundation and the Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense 1517-1550* (4 vols.). Louvain: Publications Universitaires.
- Dunkelgrün, Theodor. 2017. De bekeerling als onmisbare schakel tussen joodse en humanistische geleerdheid. *Erasmus' droom: Het Leuvense Collegium Trilingue 1517-2017. Catalogus bij de tentoonstelling in de Leuvense Universiteitsbibliotheek, 18 oktober 2017 – 18 januari 2018*, ed. by Jan Papy. Leuven: Peeters. 416-419.
- Eco, Umberto. 1993. *La ricerca della lingua perfetta nella cultura europea*. Roma – Bari: Laterza.
- François, Wim. 2003. The plea by the humanist Petrus Mosellanus for a knowledge of the three biblical languages. A Louvain perspective. *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 98. 438-481.
- François, Wim. 2005. 'Ad divinarum rerum cognitionem'. Petrus Mosellanus and Jacobus Latomus on biblical or scholastic theology. *Renaissance and Reformation* 29. 13-47.

- Halperin, Liora R. 2012. Modern Hebrew, Esperanto, and the quest for a universal language. *Jewish Social Studies* 19. 1-33.
- Kessler-Mesguich, Sophie. 2013. *Les études hébraïques en France de François Tissard à Richard Simon (1508-1680)*. Geneva: Droz.
- Law, Vivien. 2003. *The History of Linguistics in Europe: From Plato to 1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maleux, Maxime. 2020. On Hebrew nymphs and aqueducts. Two Hebrew poems by Andreas Masius. *Lias: Journal of Early Modern Intellectual Culture and Its Sources* 47. 67-87.
- Papy, Jan, ed. 2017. *Erasmus' droom: Het Leuvense Collegium Trilingue 1517–2017. Catalogus bij de tentoonstelling in de Leuvense Universiteitsbibliotheek, 18 oktober 2017 – 18 januari 2018*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Secret, François. 1964. *Les kabbalistes chrétiens de la Renaissance*. Paris: Dunod.
- Van Hal, Toon. 2010. "Moedertalen en taalmoeders". *Het vroegmoderne taalvergelijkende onderzoek in de Lage Landen*. Brussel: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten.
- Van Hecke, Pierre. 2018. Omnium linguarum purissima: The study of Hebrew at the Collegium Trilingue. *The Leuven Collegium Trilingue 1517-1797. Erasmus, Humanist Educational Practice and the New Language Institute Latin-Greek-Hebrew*, ed. by Jan Papy. Louvain: Peeters. 155-182.
- Van Hecke, Pierre & Xander Feys. 2017. Anonieme lofzang op de Hebreeuwse taal. *Erasmus' droom: Het Leuvense Collegium Trilingue 1517–2017. Catalogus bij de tentoonstelling in de Leuvense Universiteitsbibliotheek, 18 oktober 2017 – 18 januari 2018*, ed. by Jan Papy. Leuven: Peeters. 419-427.
- Zwiep, Irene E. 1993. The unbearable lightness of Hebrew. Didactic trends in seventeenth-century Dutch grammars of Biblical Hebrew. *Five hundred years of foreign language teaching in the Netherlands 1450-1950*, ed. by Noordegraaf, Jan & Frans Vonk. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU. 27-55.