

Zeitschrift: SPELL : Swiss papers in English language and literature
Herausgeber: Swiss Association of University Teachers of English
Band: 9 (1996)

Artikel: Everybody's genealogy : pop history in the Renaissance
Autor: Waswo, Richard
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-99922>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

Download PDF: 02.02.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Everybody's Genealogy: Pop History in the Renaissance

Richard Waswo

The Middle Ages inherited from Roman antiquity, powerfully reinforced by Virgil, the legend of the founding of western civilization as the *translatio imperii et studii*. The legend and the plot of transmission – with its journeys, conquests, and successive refoundations – were popularly regarded as actual history, retold in chronicle after chronicle, and claimed by dynasty after dynasty, from Iceland to Bohemia, from Picardy to Sicily. Furnishing the literary “matters” of Britain, of Rome, and of Troy, this “history” constituted our culture’s way of regarding itself as the fraternal coeval – and not the diminished descendant – of ancient Greece and Rome. But in its historical, that is, chronological, form, it still took the shape of a patriarchal genealogy, a list of “begats” that grafted the lineage of ancient heroes (Aeneas to Brut, Hector to Francus) onto that of biblical ones (beginning with the teacher of agriculture, Noah) to produce the ancestors of peoples and rulers: Britons and Franks, Merovingians and Plantagenets.

During the Renaissance, this historical discourse of the descent of Europeans from Noah and the Trojans achieved its most remarkable exfoliation through the agency of a singular, because fraudulent, book. Called usually the *Antiquitates*, it was first published in Rome in 1498 and written by Anniius (Giovanni Nanni) of Viterbo, a Dominican who was the papal theologian to Alexander VI. It consists of seventeen fragmentary texts – interspersed with elaborate commentaries – supposedly by various ancient authors, like Fabius Pictor and Berosus the Chaldean. (An edition of the texts alone, without the commentaries, also appeared in Venice in 1498.) Anniius claimed to have received these fragments from two Armenian monks in Genoa in 1471. Just as was the case with Geoffrey of Monmouth, the scholarly debate over the authenticity of these texts was immediate, and lasted for about two centuries (Jung, Ch. 2). But unlike the case of Geoffrey, whose putative British “source” is still disputed, the very Latin used by

Annius's ostensibly ancient authors was enough to suggest to scholars both then and now that the texts are forgeries. This was apparent even to the Dominican last-ditch defenders of Annius in the eighteenth century, who were obliged to argue that he wasn't a knave, but just a fool to have been imposed upon by those Armenians. Later scholars, however, have convincingly shown that Annius was himself the forger and identified his motives for that labour (Joly 543-44; Danielsson; Tigerstedt).

The very fact of forgery, however, shows an interesting change in the material circumstances of the transmission of the legend about transmission. With the advent of printing, the traditional reliance on the authority of authors acquires a new form and gives a new scope to fraudulence. Geoffrey claimed to have seen a "book" in the indigenous language which he was merely rendering into Latin, the language of universal civilization as he knew it. Thus claiming to follow a source was a typical move in most medieval discourse, which placed supreme value on authority as opposed to originality. But in a manuscript culture, texts were laborious to reproduce; Geoffrey felt no need to provide even a sample of his claimed source, since he was (supposedly) making it available in Latin. But the humanism of the Renaissance had as a primary aim the recovery of complete and accurate classical texts, an aim that fetishized the written word in general, and Ciceronian style in particular, still in the age of script. Print, the revolution in the technology of communication in the late fifteenth century, made reproduction easy, and so imposed a further criterion of authorial authenticity: his very words; his text itself.

Forgeries, of course, were not unknown in script cultures – the most famous one in the west being that of the "Donation of Constantine," which was definitively unmasked by Lorenzo Valla about 1440 (Coleman). But the pressure to produce them increased in response to both the new philological insistence on textual purity and the new physical means of reproducing texts. The desire to have the authority's exact words, banal as it seems to us, is a Renaissance desire; the Middle Ages were largely content with his name and a paraphrase of his words. This is one reason why Virgil himself was for so long a name rather than a book, and why the Renaissance so copiously produced, and argued about, translations. The *Aeneid*, for example, was not actually *translated* into any European vernacular until the last quarter of the fifteenth century. Medieval French versions of the poem are merely summaries of its content, taken as history and enriched by interpolated accounts of the whole later legend from Friga (Aeneas's brother) through Francion to Pharamond (see Moufrin).

So Annius, to lay any claim to scholarly credit in the high Renaissance, evidently felt obliged to provide the texts, to follow the typical humanist model of the edition and commentary. But what went into this new bottle was very old wine indeed. For the words that Annius puts in the mouths of his miscellaneous authorities are simply designed to produce a genealogy and chronology to end all genealogies and chronologies: to show, as his own commentaries explicitly insist, that the peoples and rulers of western Europe all descend directly from Noah, that their civilization is not just coeval but prior to that of Greece and Troy and Rome. Both the impulse and the materials to demonstrate the sibblinghood of present Europe to past antiquity had existed for centuries, in the medieval chronicles we have examined. Annius pushes both to their farthest extension, exaggerating the impulse by replacing parallel with prior development, and inventing new materials. The demonstration proceeds by unmasking virtually the whole body of Mediterranean myth to reveal that the stories about the pagan gods, especially those who were *civilisateurs*, like Saturn and Hercules, are but garbled and mendacious versions of the actual deeds, the true history, of Noah and his progeny. True history is biblical – necessarily, because of the Flood, more ancient than the coopted, occluded versions of it reflected in heathen mythology.

The key text, and by far the longest, in the demonstration is attributed to (the real historian of Babylon) Berosus (under whose name many subsequent versions of Annius's text are known), who lived in the third century B.C. But Annius predates his existence by a century or two, and makes him the reporter of an immeasurably antique tradition concerning the doings of Noah and his incredibly various progeny (1512: fol. 104). Berosus was a not unskillful choice, since he was known to the learned world by fragments quoted in Eusebius, was thought to have instructed the Greeks in astronomy, and was located in Babylon – the site of the presumably first civilization to have descended from Mount Ararat (not far to the north), where the Ark landed (*Gen.* 8.4). This geography was also cannily considered by Annius in the tale he told of the provenance of his sources: Ararat is in what used to be Armenia, and where more logically should such texts have been preserved than in the oldest Christian country in the world? Annius is doing his best to be convincing in the disciplinary manner of humanist philology; but he apes its new techniques in order to fake a text that basically opposes its aims and tastes.

The story that Berosus is made to tell is well described by the title of its English paraphrase, which radically reduces all the cumbersome scholarly

apparatus of Annius to brisk narrative: *An Historical Treatise of the Travels of Noah into Europe* (Lynche 1601). Even in this streamlined form, the narrative is too confused and contradictory to summarize; but its main thrust can be sampled easily enough. Noah, quite simply, is the ur-civilizer, the single source from which our entire culture is diffused by his "travels." He and his whole biblical family are simply identified with all the known, plus a few unknown, gods and demi-gods in all previous mythology. He is literally the "key to all mythologies" that Mr. Casaubon (in George Eliot's *Middlemarch*) was labouring to discover. Annius beat him to it.

After the Flood, Noah taught plowing, viticulture, mathematics, astronomy (and all else) to the Scythians (the ancient inhabitants of the lower Caucasus). He is literally the beginning of everything; hence what the Romans feigned of their god Janus is true of him. The marriage of Janus and Vesta (heaven and earth) is a figure for that of Noah and Tytea; their first offspring were forty-five giants called, after their mother, Titans (1512: fol. 110^V). Noah then begat the three sons – Shem, Ham, and Japheth – whom he installed as rulers of their respective continents – Asia, Africa, and Europe. Japheth begat a line of nine kings of Gaul, beginning with Sabatius (in some recensions called a "nephew" of Noah, which is hardly possible), whose just rule was transmuted into the pagan Greek stories of Saturn. The fictions of Saturn were also told about Noah himself and Ham, who is similarly the real original of Zoroaster, Pan, and Sylvanus. Ham married Rhea and begat Osiris, the original of Jupiter in all his avatars, and Isis, the similar equivalent of Juno and Ceres. They brought tillage to Egypt and in turn produced (incestuously, but this is overlooked) Hercules of Libya. And it is, of course, this character's wanderings and adventures that the ancient Greeks erroneously attributed to their own Hercules, who was nothing more than a pirate. The Libyan (later known as the Gallic) Hercules was the king of Gaul, Italy, and Spain. At some earlier point, however, Noah himself, along with his grandson (or nephew) Saturn, had to take over Italy personally when Ham, not content with Africa, invaded it; Noah founded Rome, and his rule there is what Virgil mentions as the golden age in *Aeneid* VIII. This testimony is corroborated (Annius's usual method) by the text attributed to Cato, where the same Virgilian passage is also cited (1512: fol. 66). The Libyan Hercules had three wives, from whom descend long lines of kings of Franks, Etruscans, and Gauls. The second of these lines produces Dardanus, called the founder of Troy, and so on down to Priam's cousin,

Bavo, king of the Belgic Gauls, and Hector's son Francus, king of the Celtic ones.¹

Needless to say, the names of these dozens of western European kings between the Flood and the fall of Troy are carefully chosen for the most part to be patronymic of peoples and places (a few have the names of Greek deities, just to show where the Greeks stole them). So, in the line of Gauls descending from Japheth, there is, for example, a Paris, a Lugdus (the Roman name of Lyon was Lugdunum), and a Lemannus (probably intended for the Germanic people the Romans called Alemanni), to whom later embroiderers upon Annius would credit (via Lake Léman) the foundation of both Lausanne and Geneva (see Deonna). For such enthusiastic readers of Annius – and they were many – literally any European location or person could (with some imagination) be fitted into or derived from his riot of toponymous patronyms.

Annius performs on a grand scale, with the alleged support of the latest “discovery” made by scholarly research, the chronological linking between the genealogies of Noah, the Trojans, and the Europeans that had been attempted only in outline by the medieval chronicles. He filled the gaps, all right, and what he filled them with was designed almost to reverse one of the main meanings of our founding legend. For Annius wants to show that our civilization did not originate in antiquity, that it first happened here, where we now are, that it was exported from here to the near east and then reimported later. Noah created it himself here in the west, and his descendant the Libyan Hercules was the pivotal common ancestor of Spaniards, Italians, Gauls, and Trojans alike – with the Greeks and the Romans as but Johnnies-come-lately. The kind of anxiety and tension inherent in the legend's obsession with cultural paternity finds in Annius its clearest and most extreme expression. The Trojan connection by itself had always served as a way to recast cultural paternity as fraternity. It allowed the Romans to see themselves as the coevals, not the heirs and imitators, of the Greeks; it allowed the Franks and Britons to see themselves as the siblings, not the diminished offspring, of the Romans. The Noah connection as fabricated by Annius allows all Europeans, at the moment when modern nation-states are beginning to form, to see themselves no longer even as the siblings of either dominant ancient culture, but as ancestral to both. The patrilineal obsession is thus revealed as supremely paradoxical: it is desperate to invent a line of fathers that will supersede or come before or

¹ Annius's incoherent genealogical table of all this (fols. 110^v-112^v) is abridged to a handy chart by Jung, 51.

cancel out another line. Our myths invent fathers in order to assure us that we have none, that we are selfcreated. We want to be our own origin.

But in the terms of our own culture, of course – with cities, dependent on surplus-producing agriculture, and writing as the criteria – we cannot be. And nobody thought, then or now, of changing the terms, of altering the criteria of civilization that came to western Europe from the ancient Mediterranean world. No one suggested that the forest-dwelling hunters and gatherers or the pastoral nomads of Europe's real past and part of its present were anything but savages and barbarians. Our landscape was tilled; our market-towns and noble courts had become the sites of universities, printing-houses, and academies both formal and informal for the instruction, dissemination, and discussion of Greek and Roman texts whose "rebirth" was what the Renaissance meant. And it is precisely against this whole accelerated privileging and prestige of classical antiquity that Annius is reacting, "against the exaggerated worship of the Graeco-Latin tradition" (Joly 543). Annius fakes the new learning in order to oppose its reverence for just those forms of classical writing – mythography, history, philosophy, and epic – that transmit and define our civilization. So, having displaced the real text-producers as cultural fathers in favour of the Scythians and Babylonians, he was yet obliged to come up with some texts by them: mainly Berosus, whom he elaborates on, in order to validate the origin of civilization as sketchily described in the west's supreme text, the Bible.

The attempt at displacement failed, of course, as it had to. What worked was pretty much the opposite: far from displacing the ever-ambivalent cultural paternity of classical antiquity, the popularity of Annius more thoroughly reconciled it with the authority of the Bible. The priority on which he insisted was happily taken over for the purpose of flattering the nascent nationalisms of the continent, but wholly without effacing or displacing the Trojans and their legend from the great chain of transmission. Annius made it possible for Europeans to have it both ways: the Trojans are our ancestors, but their ancestors were ours, too; we're just one big family. We Europeans, that is: Annius is consciously seeking to form the conception of Europe as western Christendom by excluding Byzantium, now in the hands of the infidel Turks (Tigerstedt 302-5), who are necessarily excluded from the Trojan descent (since that came from Europe) that they had shared in the earliest chronicles. But the identity of Europe thus formed remained, like its landscape and its new architectural style, despite Annius, quite as classical as Christian. The Renaissance response to Annius was not, as he might have hoped, to produce epic poems about Noah's civilizing mission

throughout Europe or histories showing how we are related to the Babylonians, but rather to go right on with new vigour, perhaps even with a better Christian conscience, to repeat as epic and as history the founding legend as the descent from Troy. As Virgil had long been Christianized, so Noah was now classicized: he did not replace the culture-bringing heroes and deities of ancient myth; he just became another of them, the happily syncretic functional equivalent of Saturn, Hercules, and all the emigrants from Troy.

The vogue for Annius lasted throughout the sixteenth century, and was concentrated in the transalpine region – that former “frontier” – where the founding legend had already received its fullest medieval development. Although two translations into Italian of his text were published during the century in Venice, no reprintings of it seem to have been made in Italy after its first appearances in Rome and Venice. But his text, sometimes abridged of its lengthy commentary, went through six editions in Paris, three in Lyon, two in Antwerp, and one each in Basel, Heidelberg, and possibly Strasbourg, before its final reprinting in Wittenberg in 1612. Paraphrases into other vernaculars than English also appeared. In addition to arousing the indignation of many serious scholars, Annius was accepted by some, and his work stimulated a great deal of philological debate as well as historical imagination (see Grafton).

The most potent agent of his popularity, especially in France, was Jean Lemaire de Belges, who reproduced, embellished and extended Annius's enterprise in a way that perfectly illustrates the impulse to syncretic reconciliation that utterly defeated Annius's wish to bypass the Greeks and Romans altogether. Lemaire's large tomes, published between 1509 and 1512, refocus on the Trojans with a vengeance, as his title indicates: *Les Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troie*. What the book does is to recount virtually all the extant lore about the Trojans, uniting the romances about the fall of Troy with the legends of the descent from Troy as amplified by Annius and with particular emphasis, of course, on the Gauls as the glorious progenitors of the French. But Lemaire, whose father was German and whose mother was a daughter of the last Duke of Burgundy, is not narrowly nationalistic; he is equally interested in providing entitlements to civilization for Germans, Austrians, and Habsburgs (July 559). He dedicated his first volume to Margaret of Austria, Regent in the Netherlands for the nephew she was raising there, the future Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, who was the last to have truly imperial pretensions. Lemaire shares Annius's aim to create an ideal conception (at a time when Europe is riven by rival

monarchical ambitions) of a Christian Europe unified and united against the Turk by means of a noble ancestry that owes nothing to ancient Greece and Rome.

One scholar describes this effort as one of “cultural decolonization” (Dubois 38). So it certainly was for Annius, and Lemaire dutifully repeats the chronology that makes Noah’s wanderings and the list of Gallic kings ancestral to Troy. But Lemaire never stresses the falsehood of the Greeks as Annius constantly does, and goes on blithely to recapitulate all the stories of Trojan foundation that he knew. That of Brutus and Albion is summarized, with no credit to Geoffrey (II.1296). Lemaire delights in furnishing, by repetition or invention, Trojan ancestors for a long list of locations from southern France to Holland and upper Franconia, not forgetting the “Sicambrians” (the Roman name for the Hungarians). And this activity constituted his enormous influence on subsequent regional historians (Joly 582-89).

Lemaire made specifically Trojan origins more popular than ever. He thus reinforced what Annius had laboured to make superfluous. He was able to do so simply because the myth had already been enacted as history. The Trojan ancestors may have been fictions; but the colonizing, planting, city-building, and law-giving had in fact occurred, and the attachment of this form of civilization by Virgil to Rome and to Troy was too old and too strong to be resisted. It was not, finally, by its picture of civilization that Renaissance Europe would begin to decolonize itself from the Greco-Roman antiquity it so ambivalently admired. It was rather by the use of vernacular languages, the conscious cultivation of spoken mother-tongues and their legitimation as objects of serious study. And even this was secured only at the price of assimilating vernaculars to the canons of grammatical and rhetorical description devised for and taken over from Latin and Greek (Waswo, Ch. 4). Even here remains some form of colonization – as how could it not, since, as every version of the legend (including that of Annius) and every episode of its enactment demonstrates, we get civilized only by being colonized. Someone must transmit “culture” to us in all its forms – who does so and when is irrelevant to this unchanging dynamic. Our civilization is not a spontaneous production; it always comes from elsewhere, and it does so repeatedly. No matter if Noah brought it here first; others must bring it later. One foundation follows another.

Thus at the height of the Renaissance, in the decade between 1498 and 1509, appeared two texts that were seminal for the continuation of the legend as historical discourse. Annius gave the luster (however much

tarnished by dissenters) of the new scholarship to the oldest form of that discourse, the patrilineal chronology. And Lemaire extended it with gay abandon, fusing the romance of Troy with its legend, enrolling Noah in the ranks of classical culture-bringers, popularizing just that (later) foundation that Annius had attempted to elide and subsume, and inspiring a host of writers to do likewise (for examples, see Jung 52-68).

The Trojan foundation was also reinforced by one other writer who emulated both his predecessors, using the techniques of Annius to counter the Gallic patriotism of Lemaire with his own exclusively German variety. This was Joannes Trithemius (Johann Trithem), Abbot of Sponheim, who invented two ancient Frankish sources, Hunibald and Wasthald. These he alternately quotes and summarizes (just as Annius had done with his), in order to produce an unbroken patrilineal chronology from Marcomirus (here, a son of Antenor; in medieval French romance, a brother of Aeneas) down through Charlemagne to the early German (Holy Roman) Emperors. His text, first published in 1515, was popular for a century. Though much less ambitious in its fraudulence than Annius's, and even less convincing, since he offered no story at all about the provenance of the manuscripts he claimed were now lost (see Joly 551-52), it had much the same purpose: to justify by faked scholarship the inherited medieval legend of Trojan lineage with all its etymological fantasizing of patronyms and toponyms. And just as in the Middle Ages, the legend could be pressed into service for different political occasions or groups. What Annius used to dignify present Europe as opposed to ancient Greece and Rome, Lemaire focused on France and the Rhineland; Trithemius simply appropriates the entire (legendary) history of the Franks for the Germans. They are the real heirs of Troy, subject to no one, and hence the true inheritors of the present Empire.

The freedom and dominion of the Franks is asserted from the beginning of Trithemius's text (a prefatory letter to his Bishop) to the end of it. Noah is wholly ignored; Trithemius is concerned more with legitimizing power than with making a cultural claim, and for this the Trojans serve exactly as they served in the eighth-century *liber historiae francorum*, which is the basis for Trithemius's embellishments. Marcomirus leads his people from the Danube to the Rhine, in the course of which their name alters from Trojans to Scythians to Sicambrians to Franks. Doing so, he but follows a prophecy of Jove, which informs him that his brothers are Brutus, the ancestor of the Angles, and Romphaea, that of the Saxons. So he makes a treaty with the Britons and must subdue the Gauls (Trithemius 2-4). The Franks take their name from their seventeenth king, Francus (13); the old story of their

refusing tribute to Valentinian is repeated, along with the Roman praise of their toughness and ferocity in the cause of liberty (31-32). Thus does Trithemius, like Lemaire, only more narrowly partisan, return to the Trojans what Annius had tried to displace onto their mythical forbears: their status as imperial founders. Together with Geoffrey of Monmouth, these three texts and their imitators, diffused by the new technology of print, indeed made it “possible to elaborate the Trojan origin of every European people, to account for the dispersion of the arts and sciences, and to provide an etymology of illustrious antiquity for every place name” (Hay 108).

It does not seem accidental that these texts should have been produced just when Europe is first becoming aware that the planet contains another hemisphere. At the moment when this unimaginably wider frontier is beckoning the commercial energies and imperial ambitions of the maritime nations, their inhabitants are being made more intensely aware of the numerous, smaller frontiers in their own past: all of those borders between cultivation and the *inculte* where civilization, carried by Noah, Saturn, Hercules, and the sons of Troy, first encountered us. The repeated settling of frontiers by colonists constitutes the foundations in the legend; the defining character of our civilization is precisely the “transmission” that equates it with colonization. And Europe is just on the verge of repeating its own experience of foundation, just as it is now repeating the legend of that experience, around the globe.

Annus, in fact, dedicated the *Antiquitates* to Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, probably intending no more by it than flattery of the Aragonese origins of his Pope. But it is more than a pleasant coincidence that his fake “discovery” of ancient sources should be presented to the very patrons of Columbus’s real discovery of a future part of the world (a future part, that is, of the European world: another frontier that would get civilized as the site of commodity production). For the two dimensions of these two different discoveries – temporal and spatial – will themselves coincide in the European perception of the indigenes in the new world. What explorers and colonizers will see in those distant places is their own past, as pictured in the founding legend; and what they will do is what the culture-bringers in the legend did to them. And as they do it, they will modify the legend accordingly; and when the legend ceases, at length, to be credited as history, it will diffuse itself through poetry into the discourses of philosophy, law, and science.

Works Cited

- Annius of Viterbo. *Antiquitatum variarum volumina XVII*. Paris: Jean Petit and Josse Bade, 1512.
- Coleman, Christopher B., trans. *The Treatise of Lorenzo Valla on the Donation of Constantine*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922.
- Danielsson, O.A. "Annius von Viterbo über die Gründungsgeschichte Roms." *Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom* 2 (1932): 1-16.
- Deonna, Waldemar. "La fiction dans l'histoire ancienne de Genève et du pays de Vaud." *Mémoires et documents publiés par la société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève* 35 (1929): 1-177.
- Dubois, Claude-Gilbert. *Celtes et Gaulois au XVIe siècle: le développement littéraire d'un mythe nationaliste*. Paris: Vrin, 1972.
- Geoffrey of Monmouth. *The History of the Kings of Britain*, trans. Lewis Thorpe. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966.
- Grafton, Anthony. *Forgers and Critics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Hay, Denys. *Europe: The Emergence of an Idea*. Rev. ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1967.
- Joly, A. *Benoît de Sainte-More et le roman de Troie*. Paris: A. Franck, 1870.
- Jung, Marc-René. *Hercule dans la littérature française du XVIe siècle*. Geneva: Droz, 1966.
- Lemaire de Belges, Jean. *Les Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troie*. Ed. J. Stecher. Vols. 1 and 2. Louvain: Lefever, 1882.
- Lynche, Richard. *An Historical Treatise of the Travels of Noah into Europe*. London: Adam Islip, 1601.
- Moufrin, Jacques. "Les Traductions vernaculaires de Virgile au Moyen Age." *Lectures médiévales de Virgile*. Rome: École française, 1985. 189-249.
- Tigerstedt, E. N. "Ioannes Annius and *Graecia Mendax*." *Classical, Medieval and Renaissance Studies in Honor of B.L. Ullman*. Ed. Charles Henderson, Jr. Vol. 2. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1964. 293-310.
- Trithemius, Joannes. *Compendium sive breviarium . . . chronicorum . . . de origine gentis et Regum Francorum*. In *Opera Historica*. Frankfurt: Wechel, 1601.
- Waswo, Richard. *Language and Meaning in the Renaissance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.