Martin Llewellyn's Atlas of the East: a mystery partly unravelled

In 1969, I visited Christ Church hoping that, given its size and prominence, the library might contain some unusual cartographic material. Intrigued by an item described in the hand-written catalogue as, ‘Maps - 18th century, English and Foreign’, I asked to see what proved to be Martin Llewellyn’s atlas of the East. It is my contention that this volume, unknown to map historians for over three and a half centuries, constitutes the earliest sea atlas by an Englishman, and that, dating from about 1598, it contains the earliest known English charts of the East.

Christ Church's Donors' Book (p.84) records the gift of the atlas (Map O.14, West Table A 3) by Llewellyn’s sons, William and Martin, apparently in 1634 [though definitely between 1632 and 1639]:

"Gulielmus lluellin & Martinus Filij Martini Civis londinensis D.D. Cartas Geographicas patris manu depictas & ab eodem observatas sinus Maritimi in Africa & Asia a Capite bonae Spei ad Regnum China & partem Americae peruanae"

continued on page 7

History Channel & the Experiments with Walter de Milemete’s Kite Bomb

Walter De Milemete’s De Nobilitatibus, Sapientiis, et Prudentiis Regum (Christ Church Library, MS 92) has always held a special fascination for me. Most famously it features the earliest known depiction of a gun – a vase shaped piece of field artillery. I have shot a replica of this and upon detonation, it flashed and thundered and jumped and reared up on its wooden stand in a most lively fashion. I report this because, to me, it is the challenge and excitement of translating the images from the page into workable machines that makes this treatise so enthralling.

Prepared as a gift to the 15 year-old Edward III on the eve of his coronation, De Nobilitatibus was intended to stimulate a boy’s imagination and it continues so to do. Wrapped in its buckskin-lined chemise, albeit the present one is most likely a later replacement, this is not a book to be chained in a library but one to be bundled up and stuffed in saddlebags, one to be read by lantern light in a field-tent whilst on campaign and one to prompt practical experimentation.

continued on page 2
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It tantalises with vigorous ideas and so when *Wild Dream Films* approached me in the summer of 2008 for a series about ancient technologies, I had no hesitation in suggesting that we conduct some experiments with De Milemete’s kite bomb.

Aerial bombardment as a concept is so ahead of its time in 1327 that it requires a leap of faith to believe that it may have been possible. All we have is this image in De Milemete’s treatise. There are no known records of such a thing happening, though I have no doubt that the young Edward III would have carried out trials. How could he not, once having seen this image?

In the drawing there are three soldiers leaning back and straining to hold the rope. I took this to be the starting point for determining size. “I want a kite that would need three men to hold it in a strong wind,” I told Martin Lester, a well-known kite expert, who was to build our kite. Originally the materials would most likely have been silk and a flexible wood such as willow. Urged partly by the constraints of a tight production budget and partly by Martin’s faith in the consistency of modern materials (we did not have the time for a learning curve) we were persuaded to have it built using a synthetic fabric and carbon fibre struts.

As far as shape was concerned, there was no need to interpret De Milemete’s drawing. Martin recognised it as a classic design used for certain types of kites in the Far East and built it exactly as it is depicted in the manuscript.

We needed a kite that would lift a payload and hold it steady over the target. This was the perfect design. The large surface area of the head (7 feet x 5 feet = 35 square feet) offered tremendous potential for lift and the long tail, a further 30 feet trailing back from the vestigial wings, gave it stability. It is the aerodynamic effect of the long tail, both its weight and its drag, that balances the forces of lift to keep the kite stable. Kites without long tails chase the wind, darting hither and thither in the sky like swallows on a summer’s eve - not a desirable attribute in a vehicle designed to carry a bomb. With this design the tail may thrash about in the sky like that of an angry dragon, but the head of the kite remains stable, as still as that of a hovering hawk.

We headed for Brean Sands in Somerset on a bleak and grey August day for testing. There was barely a wisp of wind and I had visions of impending red-faced exertion, running and puffing along the wet
sands to get the thing airborne. To my amazement it was simply a question of offering it to the air and feeding out the nylon cord by which it was tethered. It rose majestically, almost vertically, and effortlessly. Within seconds the great red war-kite loomed high above our heads. It was a great thrill. I held the cord for a moment and felt the tremendous forces at play. Rarely do we feel the forces of nature in everyday modern life. When on occasion we do, we have a humbling glimpse of a terrifying power. On a day when the wind was hardly perceptible, and with the kite at no more than 50 feet, I could barely hold it and I could certainly lean back and rest my weight against it. Martin told me that it would take very little extra wind for it to be necessary to have three burly men to hang on to a kite of this size. Kiting on this scale is not for wimps.

In addition to the soldiers there is in the Milemete drawing a windlass-type device that appears as an upright post, supported by struts at its base and with two circles at its top. Richard Windley, a model maker, was charged with interpreting and building this contraption.

He saw through its two-dimensional representation and incarnated it as something that looked like a large mangle, only with a single roller. By taking a turn of the cord around the roller, it became much easier and more secure to feed the line out, letting the kite fly both higher and further away.

In terms of tactical deployment it would be necessary to be at least out of bowshot from the base of the enemy’s walls – in other words about 300 yards away. So having launched one’s kite and armed it with its payload, the next task would be to fly it over the enemy. This would require a great deal of line and also a windlass-type machine both for holding the spool of line and for easing the strain in letting it out. It would seem that the Milemete drawing had every detail correct. My only concern is the gauge of the rope that he represents. I believe that a rope of this width and weight would be so heavy that it would prevent the kite from flying. Hemp and linen fibres, as used for bowstrings, offered a contemporary technology that would have been adequate to take the strain without necessitating a cable of such weight. It may have been the intention of the artist to indicate that great forces were at play and that the gauge of the line is not to be taken too literally, though I am wary of being selective arbitrarily when it comes to deciding which pieces of visual evidence to take literally and which to discard. It may be that we are still failing to interpret a vital clue correctly.

From its depiction in the manuscript as a flaming pot, I take the payload to be an incendiary rather than an explosive device. Greek Fire had been deployed in earthenware pots, either dropped by hand from castle ramparts or thrown in staff slings or trebuchets, since its invention by Kalinikos in the 7th century AD and it seems very likely that this is what we see here. There have been several attempts to recreate Greek Fire, with its renowned properties to burn on water, and it was probably some form of naptha, a petroleum product that can be found in surface pools in the middle east. Other recipe suggestions have included the constituents of gunpowder – carbon, sulphur and saltpetre – combined with tallow. Unless fired in a confined space, the gunpowder ingredients are merely flammable, not explosive, and tallow is a substance that both burns and floats. On this occasion it was decided to concentrate on the kite side of the experiment and to use a paraffin/oil mix to substitute for the Greek Fire. When filled to the brim with this fuel (c 4 pints), the earthenware pot weighed 5lbs.

I had thought it ambitious to lift this as deadweight from the ground and so we attached a ring a few feet beneath the head of the kite, through which passed a second line. In this way the kite could be flown until it achieved maximum lift and then the second line could pull up the bomb. The whole could then be flown out until it was over the target and the bomb cord cut. All that remained was to determine how to fuse the bomb. I was a little disappointed to discover that the pyrotechnic people had only brought modern fuses with them. My request for match-cord with varying amounts of saltpetre impregnation had got lost somewhere in the chaos of television production. I suspect that the bomb would need to be fused for
anything between 30 minutes and an hour, to give
time to fly the kite into position and for an ultimatum
of surrender to be served upon the town or castle
and time to reel it back in and defuse it, in the event
of capitulation. At altitude the wind could have a
dramatic effect on the match and so I also think that
it would have to be housed in a perforated brass
tube, like a gunner’s match, to stop it either blowing
out or burning too fast. We would need to do quite a
bit of trial and error experimentation to get this
aspect right but I have little doubt that it could be
done and so, for present purposes, the modern fuse
was fine. Having flown the kite successfully all
morning, the time came to haul up the payload. At
that moment the wind ceased altogether. Our kite
floated to the ground like an autumn leaf and sat sad
and bedraggled in the wet sand. You don’t need a lot
of wind but one thing is for sure – kite bombs are
useless without any wind at all. However given that
the most likely application is in a siege situation,
there is no problem in waiting for the wind. When
filming on a tight budget the waiting game is rather
more of a problem. Fortunately, just as the light was
beginning to fade, a faint wind began to pick up. We
launched the kite, lit the fuse, pulled up the bomb,
cut the cord and the earthenware pot came hurtling
down, smashing on the beach and setting a large
area of wet sand alight. Blazing flames crackled and
sizzled upon watery pools and the great kite hung
menacingly above us like an avenging monster.

There may be tweaks that we would try another time
but in essence the kite bomb design in Walter De
Milemete’s manuscript is a practical and workable
military machine. The bomb that we used was
sufficient to start a significant fire in a town,
consisting largely of wooden buildings with thatched
roofs. It would be a simple matter of budget to make
it on an even larger scale. Given that this knowledge
of it existed in 1327, it is hard to believe that it was
never used.

Mike Loades

Details of the tv programme
Series title: Ancient Discoveries
Episode title: Airborne Assault
Channel: The History Channel

Mike Loades is a military historian, well known for his many
appearances on television, who specialises in practical
experimentation with military technologies. He is currently writing
a book Swords and Swordsmen, to be published towards the
end of 2009.

A Cartographic Treasure House
The Bodleian Library

The Bodleian Library is the largest university library
in Britain, holding in excess of eight million books,
and housing one of the World’s principal cartographic
collections, amounting to around 1,250,000 maps
and 20,000 atlases, along with rapidly growing
numbers of CD-ROMs, digital datasets and
cartographic software. The Library, named after its
founder, Sir Thomas Bodley, opened in 1602, and
has been serving its readers from all over the World
ever since.

The map collection consists of maps from all parts of
the globe, with topographic and thematic maps
dating from medieval times to the present day,
created on surfaces ranging from animal hides to
computer screens. In addition to maps and atlases,
the Map section holds a comprehensive collection of
gazetteers and guide books, which accompany
books and journals immediately accessible to
readers on the bookshelves, with subject matter
concentrating on cartography, geographical
information systems (GIS) and travel. Mapping
produced by overseas national surveys worldwide
can be consulted, including commonly available
Western European and North American output to
more recently accessible Eastern European material.
As a library of legal deposit, the Bodleian assumes
not only a University-wide rôle, but also a national
and international one as a result of the wealth of its
holdings. Deposit of Ordnance Survey (OS) material
has resulted in an almost complete collection of OS
mapping being held in the Library (OS itself was
bombed in the Second World War, so their own
collection is far from complete). Only the British
Library has a similar strength of collection. Since
1998, the Library has received annual snapshots for
the whole of Great Britain, delivered digitally at the
most detailed survey scale appropriate for each area.
Thus, it is possible to monitor landscape change both
thoroughly and accurately by consulting the Library’s
collections.
The illustrations above demonstrate how OS products have changed over time in terms of their delivery, yet how similar they remain as a means of examining what was present on the ground when the map was surveyed.

Current legislation requires a full environmental audit for any new building development being undertaken anywhere in the country, so the Library’s virtually complete geographical and historical record of British landscape change has enabled the Bodleian to provide a comprehensive service to commercial environmental consultants.

Sir Thomas Bodley founded the Library to serve “the republic of the learned”, and encouraged his contemporaries to enrich it with gifts of money and books. His agreement with the Stationers’ Company of London in 1610 was a fore-runner of legal deposit legislation, as a result of which the Bodleian came to acquire British publications in ever-increasing quantities. The result of four centuries of building the collections is a veritable treasure trove of library materials.

Further major cartographic acquisitions included the arrivals of Richard Gough’s collection of maps in 1809, and more recently the Todhunter Allen collection in 1987. During the late eighteenth century, most of the county maps then being published in Britain were claimed by the Library, while the nineteenth century saw the commencement of the unbroken deposit of OS mapping.

Purpose-built map consultation facilities were first provided in the New Bodleian Library in 1946, prior to which the Library had no special facilities for map users. There is spacious accommodation for fifteen readers, in addition to the card catalogue of maps, which currently contains around 250,000 entries, while map records are steadily being made available on-line in OLIS, the Oxford Libraries Information System.

The Map section has a current staff of seven, together responsible for its day-to-day running, including all aspects of reader service, acquisitions and cataloguing. Restorative work, a constant requirement, is undertaken by the Library’s Conservation and Collection Care team.

Reader constituencies differ considerably in scope. There are the academic users, based within the University using maps to further their research; there are the commercial users, wishing to identify land use change; there are those planning expeditions or holidays to distant locations; there are the genealogists; there are those researching boundary disputes – be they legal teams working on international boundaries, or private individuals examining footpath routes passing their houses; there are that particularly British phenomenon – the railway buff, studying the changing locations of stations and sidings; and there are the historians of cartography, keen to exploit the Library’s sizeable antiquarian holdings.

There is also an increasing demand from people using the Bodleian’s facilities to create their own maps, and a digital mapping service has now become part of the map section’s remit, guiding academic users through the benefits and pitfalls of creating a unique cartographic representation of their research requirements.

The antiquarian (pre-1850) collection is considerable, including the ca.1360 Gough Map – the oldest surviving route map of Great Britain. For this, see: www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/guides/maps/goughmap.htm

It is drawn in pen, ink and coloured washes on two skins of vellum, the map's dimensions measuring 553 x 1164 mm. It was donated to the Library by Richard Gough in 1809, yet little is known of its provenance other than the map was bought by Gough at a sale in 1774 for half a crown (12½ pence).

The identity of the mapmaker is unknown, but its status as the first modern map of Great Britain is unchallenged, and its impact on the cartography of the nation left its imprint for over two centuries.
to this map’s appearance. Some other notable holdings are the Todhunter Allen collection which consists of over seven hundred items of cartographic significance (ten thousand individual maps in total), illustrating the development of British cartography through almost three centuries.

Also in this collection are large numbers of county maps, mostly from the late eighteenth or early nineteenth centuries. About one third of these are large scale, giving more accurate description of life and landscape in the individual county than earlier small scale maps. Further parts of the collection include two sets of the first edition one-inch OS maps, and thematic material such as railway, canal, road and geological atlases.

There are also manuscript portolan charts, designed for safe passage at sea, and produced in Spain, Portugal, and the Netherlands, as well as Britain; numerous (primarily English) estate plans, for example the Laxton Map of 1635, which shows the open field system of this particular Nottinghamshire village, made all the more remarkable by the fact that the Bodleian holds the accompanying terrier describing each of the thousands of individual plots marked on the map, and that the Laxton landscape remains largely unchanged into the twenty-first century; the Agas map of Oxford (1578); and Hamond’s map of Cambridge (1592).

A recent acquisition has been a major segment of the Sheldon Tapestry Map of Gloucestershire, one of four such maps produced for Sir Ralph Sheldon of Weston (Warwickshire) in the 1590s. The tapestry, woven in wool and silk, is a fragment of a much larger work, the Library’s map’s dimensions measuring 1880 x 1225 mm – the complete tapestry measured around 13 feet by 20 feet (4.0 x 6.5 metres). It was bought at auction by the Bodleian in June 2007, and its provenance is extremely well documented – it has been in various private hands since the Sheldon family house sale in 1781. The identities of the individual tapestry makers are uncertain, although a gentleman by the name of Richard Hyckes is likely to have been heavily involved. The cartographic content is largely based on Saxton’s 1570s map of Gloucestershire, with settlements, parks, woodland and hills especially prominent.

The Map section offers its readers the chance to work with GIS. A site licence for MapInfo Professional enables educational users to create customised maps for academic purposes. Interest in GIS crosses disciplinary boundaries and more information is available on the Map section website at: www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/guides/maps/dmapht.htm.

A principal feature of this facility is Digimap, co-ordinated by EDINA at the University of Edinburgh, which began life in the mid-1990s at the Bodleian as a two-year trial bringing digital OS map data, via a web interface, direct to University members. Some of the projects undertaken using Digimap have included: air pollution monitoring; externality fields produced by Tottenham Hotspur Football Club; feeding Cromwell’s New Model Army; and habitat use by farmland bird species.

More information can be found at: http://edina.ac.uk/digimap/description/. Use of the Map Room is open to anyone holding a valid Bodleian Library Reader’s Card. Details of procedures and application forms can be found at: http://www.ouls.ox.ac.uk/bodley/services/admissions.

Nick Millea
Map Librarian, Bodleian Library

Further details
The Map Room is located within the New Bodleian Reading Room on the first floor of the New Bodleian Library on Parks Road. The ‘Getting Here’ section of the Map Room homepage has details:http://www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/guides/maps/infofrme.htm

The Map Room’s opening hours are:
Monday – Friday: 09.00-19.00; Saturday: 10.00-16.00
The Bodleian Library is closed on Sundays, Good Friday, Easter Eve and Easter Monday; the weekday next before Christmas Day, 25 December – 1 January inclusive.

Contact details
Map Section, New Bodleian Reading Room, Bodleian Library, Broad Street, Oxford, OX1 3BG; Tel: 01865 287300 / 01865 277013; Fax: 01865 277139; Email: maps@bodley.ox.ac.uk
Home page: http://www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/guides/maps
In translation, the text in the *Donors’ Book* reads: William and Martin Llewellyn, sons of Martin, Citizen of London, made the gift of the geographical charts, drawn in the father’s hand and according to his own observations, of maritime straits in Africa and Asia, from the Cape of Good Hope to the Kingdom of China and towards South America.

Martin Jr, who was later to become famous as a writer and court physician to Charles II, was an undergraduate at Christ Church, possibly in 1634, certainly two years later, and went on to get his BA in 1640. But when was the atlas compiled? Christ Church’s records cannot help there. To attempt an answer we must turn to the atlas itself and, first, what we know of its creator.

### Who was Martin Llewellyn?

Martin Llewellyn spent what must have been almost his entire working life in one place, St Bartholomew’s Hospital. In 1597 he was appointed as the Hospital’s Renter and two years later its Steward, a post he would hold until his death in 1634.

This is important in connection with the *Donors’ Book* statement that the atlas was ‘drawn in the father’s hand and according to his own observations’. To have travelled to the East would have required an absence from England of two or more years. Yet the day-to-day duties associated with collecting rents and, as Steward, the requirement to ‘supervise the victuals, and the admission and discharge of patients’, would have been incompatible with any voyage abroad after 1597. The almost annual succession of children born to him between 1606 and 1623 provides even more potent evidence.

Llewellyn’s growing family could well have been the cause of his perpetual state of debt, which involved him at one time in a dispute with William Harvey, the discoverer of the circulation of blood and the Hospital’s physician.

For a man on an annual salary of £10 to have incurred debts of many times that figure, and to have had the support of rich and influential figures, suggests there are important facets of his life of which we still know nothing. Despite the embarrassment he must have caused the Governors, his 35-year term as Steward was the longest in the Hospital’s history.

Llewellyn’s many associates presumably included Thomas Bodley, who lived next to the Hospital from the time of Llewellyn’s appointment. Those with whom he definitely had dealings included several influential figures: Sir Thomas Smythe (first Governor of the East India Company), James Ingram (Warden of the Fleet), Sir Paul Pindar (who lent £100,000 to Charles I) and Sir John Spence (Lord Mayor of London).

Few other biographical details are known. What linked the two spheres in which Martin Llewellyn operated, as chartmaker and Steward? Happily, there is a series of estate plans (a few of them dated 1617) in the Hospital *Repertory Book*.

Some of these betray the characteristic style of the charts, and the handwriting is clearly the same. This establishes beyond doubt that the atlas was, as his sons stated, drawn by Llewellyn himself.

---

1 Most of the following section derives from discoveries made by Dr Nellie Kerling, the then Archivist of St Bartholomew’s Hospital, in 1975, in the Archives, including a systematic trawl through the Hospital’s accounts, 1594-1610, and also the Churchwardens’ Accounts of St Bartholomew’s the Less, 1597-1615.

2 One of the plans is evidently referred to in the payment to Llewellyn in 1613-14 of 3s 4d "for drawing a platt of the precinct of this parish" (Churchwardens Accounts).
The Atlas of the East

Llewellyn's atlas is large folio and consists of sixteen charts drawn on vellum in black ink and five colours. They are 'portolan charts', that is, they display a series of conventions established in the 13th century: place-names written inland at right-angles to the coast, a series of differentially coloured compass ('rhumb') lines emanating from intersection points (some elaborated into compass roses) placed on a large hidden circle, and so on.

Each chart measures approximately 65 x 92 cm (26 x 36 in). Preceding the charts is a sheet of paper, ruled into four compartments; the upper pair is blank [perhaps intended for a title and dedication] and the lower pair has been used for a descriptive title and a list of the charts. From this we can establish both that the atlas is complete and that the preliminary leaf and the charts are in the same hand. The work is preserved in a full calf binding, die-stamped on both covers. It is undoubtedly the original binding and is typical of English work of the early 17th century. The charts extend from the Cape of Good Hope to the Far East, including Japan, the Philippines, the Marianas and the north-western part of New Guinea.  

Since Llewellyn could not have voyaged after 1597, any charts drawn 'according to his own observations' must pre-date that.

Until the first Dutch and English fleets appeared in the Indian Ocean at the end of the 16th century, the Portuguese had a commercial monopoly in the East Indies. They strived to keep secret the navigational details beyond the Cape of Good Hope. Portuguese charts of the 16th century varied considerably but they were usually on a relatively small scale. Inevitably, Llewellyn's charts are based on Portuguese work. However, his scale is about four times those of earlier charts, and no model has been found for the outlines Llewellyn gives to the islands in the East Indies or to Japan.

Chartmaking in England was still in its infancy during Elizabeth I's reign. But there were a number of people working close to the Thames to serve the needs of English mariners. One of these, John Daniel, was later to found a school of chartmakers, all of whom were apprenticed in succession into the Drapers' Company of the City of London, thus perpetuating a certain distinctive 'house style'. Llewellyn's decoration is distinctive and no other pre-Daniel charts have been found that share its characteristics.

As a 'gentleman' rather than an artisan, it seems unlikely he was apprenticed to a chartmaker. Yet the method by which he constructed his charts and the way he conveys his hydrographical information show him to have been in the mainstream of the portolan chart tradition.

Place names and Java

When was the Llewellyn atlas drawn and what were its sources? An initial search for obviously datable features met with no success. The maps of later centuries might reflect discoveries, new surveys or theories, changes in political boundaries, the foundation of cities; but the East in the late 16th and early 17th centuries was not responsive to tests of these kinds. True, the turn of the century saw the dramatic replacement of the Portuguese by the Dutch and English, but the presence of a new colonial power would not necessarily stand out on a chart.

Toponymy is an obvious tool, but Llewellyn's atlas contains some 1,100 names. Therefore it was decided to concentrate on the north coast of Java, which revealed a development in its toponymy not paralleled elsewhere.

---

3 The concluding words of the hand-written title to the atlas, 'Towards Peru in America', means no more than 'to the east'.

The most striking finding was that an entirely new series of Java names began to appear about 1598 and are first seen on a detailed chart of Java, Sumatra and southern Borneo. Entitled 'Nieuwe caerte op Java geteeckent', it was compiled by G.M.A. [Willem] Lodewijcksz, engraved by Baptista à Doetecum, and published at Amsterdam by Cornelis Claesz.⁵

Examination of some twenty-five earlier maps compiled in the period up to and including 1598 revealed a consistent total of between fifteen and nineteen Java names. That the greatest number detected, twenty-three, had appeared on a map of c. 1540 illustrates the static nature of East Indies cartography in the 16th century.

The selection of names was fairly constant too. The forty-nine names that are found on Lodewijcksz's chart would therefore have provided a striking contrast to this traditional, unchanging picture had they merely combined different earlier selections. In fact, two-thirds of Lodewijcksz's total are innovations and his chart thus marks a transfer of initiative from the Portuguese to the Dutch which is, in a cartographic sense, as dramatic and sudden as the changes that were taking place in the geo-political sphere.

Lodewijcksz sailed with Cornelis de Houtman as supercargo on the first voyage made by Dutch ships to the East and published his own account. He explains there the source for the new names along Java's north coast. This was a Portuguese living in Java, Pedro de Tayda, whom the Dutch met in Bantam (and who is first mentioned on 25 July 1596). A later English translation of a different series of Java names began to appear about 1598, dating of charts supposed to have been produced at the end of the 16th century, the inclusion of Lodewijcksz's Java names, therefore, must point to 1597, or more realistically 1598, as their earliest possible date. Llewellyn's undated atlas includes 21 of the 32 new names (even if sometimes in variant spellings). The greater part of the impact of Houtman's voyage (or perhaps more properly of de Tayda's knowledge) was expended on Java but ripples reached Borneo and Sumatra at least, adding a further four new names for the former and a possible eleven for the latter. Llewellyn includes all but one of these.

The significance of the Llewellyn's atlas


Footnotes:
⁵ This can be consulted in high resolution via the James Ford Bell Library site: http://bell.lib.umn.edu/historical/Lode.html.
⁶ Isaak Commelin, A collection of voyages undertaken by the Dutch East-India Company (London, 1703), p.156 [translation of the 1646 Dutch text].

murdered three weeks later (16 August) apparently as a direct result of his discussions with the Dutch. [Is this the first example of a cartographic killing?] Presumably his maps and pilotage instructions, or copies of them, were taken back to Holland where they would have been gladly received by the publisher, Claesz., although the title of the Lodewijcksz map states that it 'was drawn on the island of Java, where the shoals and shallows and intervening cliffs are marked out from life'.

An independent Portuguese source helps to explain why the new names are not Dutch words but rather a selection of indigenous or Portuguese names new to cartography. The most obvious are 'lacatra' (formerly Sunda Calapa, after 1621 renamed Batavia and now, once again Jakarta, the Indonesian capital) and Surabaja, now the second-largest city. However, the inclusion on most maps of the early 17th century of some at least of Lodewijcksz's innovations justifies us in treating them as one of the most important, if not the most important, element in the cartographic context we are describing. When considering the dating of charts supposed to have been produced at the end of the 16th century, the inclusion of Lodewijcksz's Java names, therefore, must point to 1597, or more realistically 1598, as their earliest possible date. Llewellyn's undated atlas includes 21 of the 32 new names (even if sometimes in variant spellings). The greater part of the impact of Houtman's voyage (or perhaps more properly of de Tayda's knowledge) was expended on Java but ripples reached Borneo and Sumatra at least, adding a further four new names for the former and a possible eleven for the latter. Llewellyn includes all but one of these.

The earliest known English sea charts of the East

The earliest known English sea charts of the East belong to a series by Gabriel Tatton of 1620-21.⁷ Robert Dudley's Arcano del Mare of 1646 had previously been considered the earliest sea atlas by an Englishman.⁸ Although we do not know when Llewellyn made his fair drawings, they belong, as far as their contents are concerned, to the previous century and are thus by a clear margin the earliest English ones of their kind. It might be assumed that Llewellyn was a Welshman but there is no evidence linking him directly with Wales.⁹ He lived the greater

⁶ Coincidentally, Dudley had been at Christ Church, from 1588.
⁷ Indeed he seems to have come from Somerset, see Notes and Queries, series 3, volume 1 (Jan-June 1862) p.28.
part of his life in London, gave English names to his children and was buried in St Bartholomew's the Less, London. The compromise term, British, is both cumbersome and inaccurate. No evidence has emerged to confirm that Llewellyn was one of the eighty-nine (or 87) survivors of the de Houtman expedition (in which case, as a foreigner, he might well have disguised his name). But was it mere coincidence that he presented himself to the Hospital Governors on 27 August 1597, just two weeks after the return of de Houtman's fleet? 10 Llewellyn's atlas certainly derives from that voyage, the only one whose timing and itinerary could have fitted in with the known details of his documented career. No trace has yet been found in it of any information dating from later than 1597.

A number of tantalising research avenues beckon. Perhaps this Newsletter's readership may have suggestions.11 Who was it who financed Llewellyn? Who paid for his eighth son (only) to attend Westminster School and Christ Church? Sir Thomas Smythe, or Llewellyn's brother Maurice [Morris] (to whom he owed £852)? Perhaps. If he had sailed with de Houtman, why had the Dutch chosen him? Presumably for some specialist knowledge. Might he have been on the Raymond & Lancaster voyage of 1591-4, which reached Sumatra?

I wonder if Christ Church had any idea of the extraordinary coincidence involving two consecutive donations they acquired, apparently in 1634. Alongside the classics and theology that fill most of the pages of the Donors' Book, they received in that year the unconnected gifts of Llewellyn's atlas and Wagenars Mirror of Mariners, or, in other words, the English translation of Waghenaer's Spieghel der Zeevaerd, which appeared in 1588 as the first sea atlas to be produced in England. A bumper cartographic year indeed for Christ Church.

Unlike Waghenaer, Llewellyn seems to have had no influence on the development of marine cartography, since his atlas clearly remained in his possession, and no other version is known. History is inflexible: publish, or be damned to obscurity. The possibility remains, though, that Llewellyn was involved in some way in the early days of the East India Company (founded in 1600). His atlas demonstrates that he had information of value to those in the new company who were planning English voyages to the East (the first of which left in 1601), and there are suggestive connections. Llewellyn's brother, a founding member of the new company, and its first Governor, Sir Thomas Smythe, were among those to whom Llewellyn owed money. John Woodall, Surgeon of St Bartholomew's (from 1616) was appointed in 1613 as the first Surgeon General of the East India Company, having probably obtained that post through his patron, the same Sir Thomas Smythe. Richard Hakluyt, the assiduous collector of English travel narratives, advised the nascent Company about the cartography of the East.12 Unfortunately, although his cited sources include the testimony of unnamed crew members on earlier expeditions, there is no reference that seems to point to Llewellyn.13

Possibly the closest we have come to a 'smoking gun' is the recent discovery that Thomas Smythe was on the committee of governors which awarded Llewellyn his Hospital post in 1597. Not only was Smythe the first named, perhaps implying he was in the chair, but another authority lists him as being the Hospital's Treasurer from that same year. If this makes it even more likely that Smythe was indeed Llewellyn's patron, that in turn could provide oblique corroboration of the value of Llewellyn's first-hand knowledge to those planning the first English voyage to the East.

In the absence of any surviving charts directly associated with the early years of the East India Company, Llewellyn's atlas has significance as the earliest known sea atlas expressly designed for navigation in the East, by a chartmaker of any nationality. In a wider sense, it must rank as the closest surviving manuscript atlas to the all-important first voyage of the Dutch, an event that signalled the twilight of the Portuguese empire and the simultaneous births of the Dutch and English successors to it. The detail contained in his charts, and the fact that Llewellyn evidently voyaged to Indonesia himself, combine to ensure his atlas a prominent and authoritative place in any future cartographic studies of the East.

Note
This study is based on an unpublished paper distributed at the Sixth International Conference on the History of Cartography, Greenwich, London, 9 September 1975 [featured that same day in a piece by Philip Howard on the front page of The Times], and 'Atlas Pioneers', Geographical Magazine 48:3 (December 1975) pp.162-7. For a more detailed, updated account, with further references, see 'Martin Llewellyn's Atlas of the East (c. 1598)' http://www.maphistory.info/llewellyn.html. I am not aware of any other studies or reproductions of the atlas. The 1975 text acknowledged the assistance of the librarian of Christ Church, Dr J.F.A. Mason. To that should be added thanks for recent help supplied by Sarah Tyacke.

Tony Campbell,
Former Map Librarian, British Library

10 The two vessels reached Amsterdam on 11 and 14 August respectively. The idea of an Englishman sailing with the Dutch need not stretch the imagination. Two of the four Dutch fleets that set sail to the East in 1598 had English pilots aboard.

11 See particularly the sections 'Possibilities for future research' and 'His associates', on the Llewellyn webpage: http://www.maphistory.info/llewellyn.html

12 Richard Hakluyt was an undergraduate at Christ Church, where he took his B.A. in 1574 and was later a Fellow until 1586. 13 For the text of one of the surviving MS versions see John Bruce, Annals of the Honorable East-India Company, 3 vols (London, 1810), 1: 115-21. The text is also available online: http://www.archive.org/details/annalsofhonorable00brugoog.
Where are Wake’s books?

The consistency of provenance in the Wake Collection in the Upper Library varies. For most of the stretch of the wall against which it is housed, an Archbishop Wake’s provenance is rather certain, with around one or two books per bay being a later addition to the original Bequest. However, towards the west side of the Library (shelf-marks corresponding to the lower case letters of the alphabet in the classification system), the ratio is almost reversed with, in some cases, only as few as one or two books per shelf having actually belonged to the Archbishop. Some books in these areas have been published after Wake’s death, others are long runs of periodicals stretching for several shelves, others have been moved from other parts of the library, as attested by previous shelf-marks.

A very striking example of the later reshuffling of the collections in the Library is given by shelf Wr.6. It contains several of Johannes van Meurs’ works (1579-1639). A Dutch scholar and antiquarian, professor of Greek and History at Leiden University, and later of History at Soro, in Denmark, he was a very prolific and eclectic writer. The books on Wr.6 include antiquarian descriptions of classical areas (Rome, Athens, the Greek islands), history texts and editions of classics. The items on this shelf were all published on the continent, and circulated widely in Great Britain, as attested by the abundance of copies held in Oxford colleges.

Several of the works on shelf Wr.6 display a similar but somewhat different binding from those common to the Wake collection, to which I have become accustomed during my two years of cataloguing his books for the Early Printed Books project.

The binding might be a first hint to a different provenance, but several of these texts also bear inscriptions and annotations in two different hands.

The inscriptions in the smaller hand are scholarly in content, in Greek or Latin, and throughout the text; the inscriptions in the other hand are generally limited to the first free upper end-paper, and are exclusively provenance inscriptions:

“Ph. Fowke. MD.”; “Ph. Fowke. MD. Ex Bibliotheca … Jo: Pearsonij …”;
“Ex Bibliothecâ Jo: Pearsonij Cestriensis Episc. …”; or “Ex Bibliothecâ Eruditiss. Patrij Joan. Pearsonij Cestriensis Episc. …”.

A little research leads to the identification of “Ph. Fowke” as Phineas Fowke, M.D. He was born in 1638 in Bishop Burton, Yorkshire, studied medicine at Cambridge, and practiced in London. In 1689 he was admitted to Christ Church, as a nobleman, and in 1704 he gave Christ Church Library 49 volumes of Meursius (Benefactors' Book, p. 228). According to Fowke’s inscriptions, some of these volumes had previously been owned by John Pearson, Bishop of Chester (1613-1686), who annotated them “propria manu”.

What is interesting to note for the history of the Wake Collection is that there are entries for these titles in all of the three Wake catalogues in the Library, but with a specificity which highlights the fact that books were reshuffled throughout the Library, including books belonging to the named collections.

The three Wake’s Library catalogues can be found in Library Records. They have most likely been compiled at Christ Church, and show evidence of subsequent re-shelving and re-locating of almost all the books. As part of my cataloguing routine, I check all three to ascertain whether each book belonged to Wake or not, and I have come to identify a pattern of previous shelving.

Library Record 20, the oldest, is a 1674 Bodleian printed catalogue, interleaved and annotated in ms. ink to reflect the Wake Collection holdings, either by underlining the Bodleian entry or by an added ms. entry on the page facing the correct listing point (work carried out ca. 1730-1740). For some of the entries, but not for all, it records shelf-marks, which are consistently not current, and have no relation to the present-day shelving scheme. In certain instances these shelf-marks are repeated in the books, sometimes followed by the words “ArB’ry” (Archbishopric), crossed out in ms. pencil and replaced by the current shelf-mark. Library Record 21, an undated manuscript, is titled “Catalogus Bibliothecæ Reverendissimi in Chr[ist]o Patris ac Domini Domini Guilielmi Wake Divina Providentia Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis &c. &c.”. It is arranged alphabetically, and systematically reports the older shelf-mark, as recorded in Library Record 20, erased and replaced by a new shelf-mark, usually but not always the current one. Some additions to the collections might be detected at this time: a different
hand has inserted titles not found in the previous catalogue. Several of these were published after Wake’s death. It was probably used as a tool for reorganising the Collection. Library Record 27 is a manuscript catalogue with a sumptuous, illuminated title page on parchment, dated 1788, and was likely intended as the definitive copy. It has been compiled taking into account all the changes registered in Library Record 21, and lists the items at their current location. It was subsequently annotated, in a more modern hand, to reflect the addition of more recent books on the shelves. Apart from the case in which Library Record 20 shelf-marks are found in the book, the only inscriptions on the end-papers report the shelf-marks listed in Library Record 27.

Some of the Meurs books on shelf Wr.6 comply with this pattern. However, there is a very important difference. The shelf-mark, hand-written in the book, which coincides with the shelf-mark listed in Library Record 27, is not the shelf-mark where the book can actually be found nowadays, and conversely, this current shelf-mark is not recorded in any of the Wake Catalogues. This is for instance the case of the book currently held at Wr.6.21: “Theophylacti, Archiepiscopi Bulgariae, Epistolae. Ioannes Meursius nunc primùm è tenebris erutas edidit.”, published in Leiden in 1617. The book is listed in Library Record 20, without a shelf-mark; in Library Record 21 it appears as located at A.7.2. A.7.2 is also the shelf-mark listed in Library Record 27, and transcribed in the book. However, the volume is not shelved at WA.7.2, as one would expect, but at Wr.6.21.

Several other books on this shelf, and namely the ones with the Pearson-Fowke provenance, do not comply with the pattern described above. Or, to be more precise, there is something one might call a ‘virtual book’ which would indeed comply with the scheme just mentioned. The physical copy on the shelf however is not the copy recorded in the catalogues.

Let us consider, for example, the copy of “Ioannis Meursiæ Denarius Pythagoricus. Sive, De numerorum, usque ad denarium, qualitate, ac nominibus, secundùm Pythagoricos.”.

The title is listed as usual in all three catalogues: the Bodleian entry is underlined in Library Record 20 (no shelf-mark recorded); the title is listed in Library Record 21 with the shelf-mark given as r.6.14 (over previous, unread shelf-mark); the same title is neatly transcribed in Library Record 27 as shelved at r.6.14. However, the actual book is not shelved at Wr.6.14, but at Wr.6.24. The latter is also the shelf-mark inscribed on the first free end-paper of the book, and the previous shelf-mark recorded next to it and cancelled does not read r.6.14, but AF.7.23. This previous shelf-mark links this specific copy to the shelves in the Upper Library named after Dean Aldrich, which face the Wake Collection.

Drawing on this evidence we can assume that, at a certain point, all Meurs books in the Wake collection were first grouped on shelf Wr.6, then some of them were replaced by the same titles from the Fawke donation, taken from the shelves on the opposite wall.

A word of warning: these two processes have been described as separate for reasons of clarity. They might however have happened at the same time, as part of the same decision.

When did this happen? And why? Who did it? There are no answers to these questions, as the documentation about the history of the books in the Library is not detailed enough to shed light on these sort of instances.

Similarly, we do not know for sure what happened to Wake’s books. There have been several duplicate sales along the years, but no lists of the duplicate items have been retained.

Therefore, unfortunately, the current whereabouts of the books by Meurs which once belonged to Wake is, at present, unknown.

Maria Franchini
Early Printed Books Project, Christ Church
Maps of the Mind
Giordano Bruno’s approach to illustration

Earthbound humans can only embrace tiny fractions of the planetary surface at any one time. In their imagination, however, they have always grasped a whole lot more than what was within their reach. Maps, charts and diagrams are perhaps the best expression of man’s propensity for graphic, often emblematic, representation of both concrete and abstract reality at work.

Tellingly, it is a great cartographer, Gerard Mercator (1512-1594), who notes that, like emblems, maps “presenteth to our sight the Globe [...] as it were a Mirrour [...], and doth show the beauty [...] of the Whole Fabricke of the Worlde”.

The text alludes to the idea that mapping space and mapping abstract concepts could be regarded as the two faces of the same coin and suggests a link, much pondered upon in the painting of the period (Dutch masters excel in this respect) between visual imagery and an unquenched inclination for conjecture.

The idea is particularly evident in the artwork of Gerrit Dou (1613-1675). Paintings like Astronomer by candlelight or Interior with a young violinist connect mapping and emblems directly.

Gerrit Dou, Interior with a Young Violinist
Oil on panel (31.10 x 23.70 cm)
National Gallery of Scotland

In the image above for instance, a young man is seated next to a table on which a globe supports an open book of emblems. Emblem books are a particular style of illustrated volumes first developed during the 16th century, normally containing combinations of symbolic pictures and text. They enjoyed an enormous vogue for about 200 years or more and exercised a huge influence on literature and the visual arts.

It is this particular influence and the importance of emblematic imagery in relation to discursive speech that this article has in view.

"Images of things here below are subject to the celestial images", Marsilio Ficino (1433-1499) says in book three of De Vita Coelitus Comparanda. What this suggests is an uncanny harmony between the world above and human expression. The key to this harmony is the principle of imitation.

Giordano Bruno (1548-1600) is a powerful example of a author who pondered a great deal on the concept. The way he handled in his writings is both highly original and illustrative of the mood of the age.

Bruno (like many other authors of the Renaissance) was profoundly influenced by the concept of creative imitatio for which Ficino pleaded so passionately. This is a very special type of imitatio, pointing to an unstoppable (indeed, God-given) need to ‘appropriate an alien discourse’.

The case of Bruno the writer stands out as perhaps more intriguing than that of many of his fellow contemporaries. His uncompromising and enigmatic ‘appropriations’ have created a lot of confusion from the moment of their publication until now.

The name who casts most light on Bruno’s involvement in the publication of his own works is Johannes Wechel, a distinguished Frankfurt-based printer. It was the press of Wechel and Fischer who in 1590 published his Latin poems. These works offer telling clues as to Bruno’s interest in the printing process, an aspect with direct implications in the design of his books and his treatment of images.

In the dedication to De triplici minimo, the Wechel says: “He did not only carve the diagrams with his own hands, but also provided [proof] corrections to his works”.

Bruno’s attention to detail in so far as the illustrations of his works are concerned becomes evident if one compares the original print-run of the poems published by Wechel to subsequent editions.

1 Quotation in Denis E. Cosgrove, Apollo’s Eye: A Cartographic Genealogy of the Earth in the Western Imagination (Baltimore: JHU Press, 2003), 154.


4 Apart from De triplici minimo, Wechel also published De monade, numero et figura and De innumerabilibus, immenso & infigurabili, seu De universo & mundislibri octo.
Whereas in the Wechel editions the woodcuts are abundantly decorated with stars, flowers and leaves, following editors stripped the images to their basic geometrical forms omitting the decorative effects altogether. Figures and diagrams are simplified, sometimes even condescendingly amended.

In spite of their being one of the trademarks of Bruno's published work, its often bewildering visual dimension is, on the whole, little discussed. True, more than often, images fail to represent the text accurately. This may be due to the habit of sixteenth-century printers of using the same woodblocks in different publications. It is certainly a possible explanation and may account for at least some of the inconsistencies.

Having said this, one is compelled to add that, given the author's direct involvement in the printing of his books and his appetite for experiment, it is also likely that the link between written word and the image chosen to accompany it is stronger and more complex than is usually assumed to be. As a consequence, what sometimes passes as a mistake in the woodcut might in fact not be accidental at all.

Bruno’s extensive use of emblems, diagrams and mandala-like figures is meant to challenge the reader. Most visual references are not conventional representations. They postulate magical effects by virtue of being harmonically linked with the celestial essences they embody. The connection with Ficino’s theory of symbolic iconography is staring us in the face, yet it seems there is little we can do beyond recognizing it. Bruno’s literary experiments are not straightforward. His way of translating the ‘alien’ discourse of the heavens is not really a translation into a language we fully understand for it is only part of what he says that is comprehensible or does not raise more questions than the answers it offers. Despite this, annoying and frustrating as they may be, these questions may well provide a key to unlocking some of the secrets to Bruno’s writing.

His intriguing experiments with text and image are very obvious in the works published in Germany, and his poetics perhaps nowhere as obvious as in De imaginum. As the title suggests, the book openly engages with the topic of images, signs and ideas. What particularly interests the author is the process by means of which images are perceived, ‘translated’ into one’s own vision of the universe. Whether intended or not, this volume can be seen as a kind of a ‘primer’ allowing a better understanding of his work as a whole.

It is composition, therefore the act of interpretation which interests Bruno. More precisely, the interpretation of a celestial discourse. This places the author admittedly under Ficino’s direct influence.

There was a lot of speculation about how deeply immersed in the latter’s work Bruno was. According to contemporary accounts for instance, during a series of lectures at Oxford, Bruno got in trouble because he was accused of plagiarising De vita coelitius comparanda. Unflattering and improbable as this may be, the accusation points to the fact that Bruno’s audience recognized the impact of Ficino. Nowhere is this more clearly visible than in De imaginum.

The book has three parts. The first is an art of memory. In connection to this the reader is confronted with a very complex architectural memory system, suggesting sequences of ‘memory’ rooms in each of which ‘memory’ images are placed. Everything in the physical world is one way or another encapsulated into these images: all plants, stones, metals, all arts and sciences, all human activities. While the first part of De imaginum dwells on the concept of the ‘lower world’, the second offers a glimpse into the celestial ‘figures’ or ‘statues’ of the cosmic gods that are said to be the causes of all things. Thus symbolic image is invested with real power. Like mathematics, it is a kind of universal language granting access levels beyond reality and projecting meaningful glimpses of the macrocosm directly onto one’s mind. The idea is further developed in the third part of the book which consists of ‘thirty seals’, listing various types of memory systems, keys to unlocking the heavens, means of making ‘darkness visible’. Like the ‘memory’ rooms ‘appropriating’ parts of the celestial discourse, each one of Bruno’s writings can be seen as individual ‘hieroglyphs’, the very building blocks of an intricate, but essentially coherent script, encyclopedic in nature and designed to be enigmatic. Their intricacy is striking and over-contrived, following a series of rules.

This suggests the presence of a strong ludic element in Bruno’s approach to writing, which should not surprise us too much, as, during the Renaissance, play was often used as a sign that one had a superior grasp on a difficult discipline. Play was regarded as a marker of both being in control of...

---

8 *De imaginum signorum et idearum compositione. Ad omnia inventionum dispositionum et memoriae genera libri tres* (Frankfurt: Wechel & Fischer, 1591).
one’s work and being willing to open one’s work to the public.11 

For exemplification, let us take the case of La cena de le ceneri (one of the less intricate works in terms of juxtaposition of text and illustration) and see Bruno at play. This is a work published in England in 1584. It accounts Bruno’s visit to Oxford and the controversial clash with a number of professors over his alleged Ficinian interpretation of Copernicus’ heliocentricity. La cena is not an easy work to approach. Its structure is not linear but recursive. The arguments Bruno makes in one place are often related in convoluted ways to arguments and comments made elsewhere. The work has a topographical setting which takes the form of a journey through the streets of London and a dinner party at the house of Fulke Greville. Rhetorically the book flows in what may be perceived as a highly demonstrative fashion, most of the time at odds with the reader’s expectations, but entirely in harmony with Bruno’s universe. This is a universe in which everything interacts with everything else and there is an emblematic message grafted underneath the surface of the discourse. Because of this particular quality of Bruno’s style, his works are always surprisingly versatile despite what may seem very rigid constraints of composition. His text is thus intentionally open to a variety of possible interpretations. In addition, the text is not alone in doing this. Like the majority of Bruno’s publications, La cena is noticeably illustrated with woodcut diagrams and tables. As usual, Bruno brings in images to make his point clearer. There are nine figures in all. None of these is particularly exciting. All but one (representing a ship) are geometric diagrams.

What makes them special is not their quality, but something quite unexpected. Apart from one singular case, they display blatant errors and annoying discrepancies. In other words, there is little harmony between image and the text referring to it. Unsurprisingly, Bruno is criticised for these rather discrediting lapses. On the surface, it looks like he was either careless or rather confused as to what he wanted to say. But given his predisposition for play and love of experiment, there is also a chance that these curious discrepancies and errors are not accidental. This line of interpretation may of course be wishful thinking. It has however the advantage of bringing forward an interesting parallel discourse in the dialogue that the book opens for consideration.

Of these illustrations, only one, Figure 8, reflects the text correctly. Significantly, alongside the diagram, this woodcut contains a few lines of text as well: “O, la uista, l’occhio. OAB, OC, OD, lunghezze, longitudini et linee usuali. AC, AD, CD, larghezze, latitudini.” These words simply (and accurately) explain the geometry of the illustration. Nothing out of the ordinary here. Still, by virtue of their uncommon presence in the diagram, words as such put themselves under the limelight. It looks as if the text in the woodcut has the role of catching the reader’s attention, re-directing him to the paragraph which refers to the diagrams. This may unveil more than the literal line of interpretation. By bringing into discussion how the eye perceives distances to stars, depending on the angle of vision, the words outside the framework suggest that appearances can be deceiving and we should perhaps be less certain that what we see is the truth. It is enough to change the viewpoint and things previously hidden from vision by realities too close to ignore become obvious. This could translate as an invitation for the reader to examine the work with an open mind and from a different perspective.

Indeed, if we follow this route, it becomes evident that movement is further developed in the next diagram, Figure 9. The image illustrates the concept of the four motions. Textually this is a difficult passage to translate and interpret. But if we focus on the discrepancies, we notice that attention is drawn to the line marked AE on the diagram, AB in the text. A minor dissimilarity in itself, but looking at the larger context this points to movement, therefore to a change of perspective, on a vertical line. This, as I said, is the last of the diagrams in La cena. The text ends rather abruptly after a couple of pages.

Compared to the elaborate set-up of the beginning, the final paragraphs are disconcerting. There is no conclusion. Even rhetorically the style is different. No sense of real closure. If however, we follow the parallel discourse built into Bruno’s series of diagrams we see that the first diagram, Figure 1, is in natural continuity with the last. The focus is still on movement and the direction vertical, point of view shifting further and further away from the earth. The discrepancy in this case is the missing line (D-D) and its corresponding projection (4-4) in the image. Hence the focus on the horizontal on this occasion,

---

11 In Nicolaus Cusanus’ words, “This game has to be played; however not in a puerile way, but like God’s sacred wisdom has played it with the new sphere”. See De ludo globi (1463). Also in Opera I (1514), 159v.
the idea with which the text plays around being an increase in the confusion of the view with the distance.

Bruno’s optical arguments are very interestingly developed in the second diagram, Figure 2. Here the author discusses the case of two luminous bodies, one much larger than the other, in relation to a third opaque body. The text stipulates that when the two luminous bodies experience a total reciprocal illumination, the opaque body ceases to be an obstacle to the exchange of light. In this context, it is perhaps no surprise that in the diagram the discrepancy between text and illustration appears in the letters marking the two luminous spheres.

The concept highlighted at this point is recognizably Ficinian: the two luminous bodies are seen exchanging light in much the same way as Ficino’s view of Platonic love holds that the lovers exchange their souls through rays emitted from and projected into the pupils of their eyes. In both Ficino’s physiological theory and Bruno’s optical argument, two become one.

The next three diagrams, Figures 3, 4 and 5, dwell on the metaphysical power of light to illuminate beyond the physics of the possible. Again, it comes as no surprise that in all of these figures geometry is increasingly distorted by means of errors in the diagram and a great deal of confusion in the text. Invariably though, the conclusion is always correct. Putting all this together, we are made more and more aware of the metaphorical value of the discourse thus initiated. In the end everything converges in a diagram very different from the rest, Figure 6, the one illustrating the ‘ship experiment’.

This had a long and rather famous history before Bruno. Copernicus mentions it. Galileo does it too. For once geometrical design is abandoned in favour of an illustrative woodcut. The text discusses the case of a ship in motion. An object dropped from the masthead will fall straight down on the foot of the mast. From another viewpoint (and an entirely different context) a man on the shore throws an object at the ship. He will miss it (the text says) “by as much as the space determined by the speed of the current”. The number of discrepancies here is tellingly high. The text mentions a river. On the woodcut the image is more likely suggesting the sea. The two men mentioned are not represented and neither are the letters marking the different positions of the stone. The text is very detailed. And so is the image. Only in different ways. Overall the idea that comes through is of two distinct systems: one dynamic, well integrated, following the natural flow of things in motion. The other, that of the man on the shore, is static. In the latter the man significantly does not strike the target at which he aims.
The names of Ptolemy and Copernicus appear, the latter above, the former below the horizontal line, at the bottom of the woodcut. It feels as if a brackets is being closed. Casting an attentive eye on how Bruno juxtaposes text and images may, in contexts such these, be both useful and revealing. A work like La cena could well have been provided with an alternative ending. Bruno’s versatility as a writer is endless. Impatient and forever playful, he engages his readers in a challenging adventure, giving them clues and occasional hints, taking them on a journey and mapping the road. It is up to us whether to follow one path or another… The beauty with authors such as Bruno is that even if we reject the more outlandish interpretations, such as this, there is always plenty more (less risky!) for us to embrace.

Cristina Neagu
Christ Church

Scrubal Conversation in MS 152 (1)

When John Verney donated to the Christ Church Library, in 1769, the manuscript copy of The Canterbury Tales that has come to be known as MS 152, the gift was recorded as “Librum MS Chauceri opera, Lidgate et aliorum complectentem.”¹ This description of Verney’s gift, apt for the practices of the scribes responsible for its compilation, seems also to have conceived of this book in much the same terms as a compilation of works of multiple authors. It includes Chaucer, Lydgate, and others (e.g. Hoccleve).²

Because Chaucerians do not accept Gamelyn as the work of Chaucer, its inclusion in these early manuscripts functions as an indictment of their authority as witnesses of The Canterbury Tales, the prevailing scholarly and editorial objective being the identification of those manuscripts closest to the archetype for the purposes of publication.³ Gamelyn and other such apocryphal tales are regarded as curious but erroneous scribal addenda to Chaucer’s text and the manuscripts including them, even some very early, are typically viewed with similar suspicion.⁴

Yet, MS 152 - which contains Gamelyn as well as a Ploughman’s Tale (i.e. Thomas Hoccleve’s Item de Beata Virgine, with a two-stanza scribal prologue; not to be confused with the ecclesiastical satire of the same name included in William Thynne’s editions), Lydgate’s Churl and Bird and the Siege of Thebes among Chaucer’s tales - complicates matters. This is due to MS 152’s combination of thorough scribal integration of apocryphal tales, resulting in an unusual round-trip rendition of the pilgrimage-frame (all this while being highly regarded by Chaucerians because of its affinities with the Hengwrt and Ellesmere manuscripts).⁵

An examination of the connections between the successive contributions to this book of multiple scribes reveals the stylistic debts of each of the latter scribes to their predecessor(s) and the paradigmatic and instructive commitment of the inaugural scribe to a conception of The Canterbury Tales as an essentially collaborative text or collection of texts.

It is the efforts of MS 152’s scribes, who present themselves as very close readers of those texts, Chaucerian and otherwise, which enable us to consider these apocryphal tales in the appropriate context.

Scholars generally agree that MS 152 was copied (at the beginning in the third quarter of the fifteenth century) primarily from a single exemplar closely related to Hengwrt and Ellesmere. It displays multiple Anglicana hands on 342 almost exclusively paper folios gathered in quires of twenty folios each (folio 1 is vellum and the third quire consists of ten folios).⁶

¹ Gamelyn, a popular metrical romance featuring a disenfranchised younger son of a knight turned Robin Hood-style greenwood outlaw, is the most popular scribal additions to manuscripts of The Canterbury Tales. I include here the London, British Library .Harley MS 7334 and Oxford, Corpus Christi College MS 198, both dated early in the fifteenth century. Gamelyn has long been regarded as apocryphal because it does not fit Chaucer’s style of versification and because its placement in most manuscripts makes little sense as a tale for the Cook of London.

² Peter Robinson, in his digital edition of The Miller’s Tale on CD-ROM. Leicester: Scholarly Digital Editions, 2004, connects MS 152 with the Ellesmere and Hengwrt manuscripts, listing all of these manuscripts as “o variants” of the archetypal manuscript of The Canterbury Tales.

³ Oxford, Christ Church MS 152, Folios 58v-71v, 228v-231r, 227r-342r; The Ploughman’s Tale included here (fols. 228v-231r), a Marian miracle tale, should not be confused with the tale of the same name attributed to the Plowman in William Thynne’s editions of Chaucer’s Works, London, 1542 and 1550. In Oxford, Christ Church MS 152, the Canterbury Tales are ordered, rather unusually, as follows (hyphens connecting tale titles indicate prologues and other links): General Prologue (GP)-Knight’s Tale (KnT)-Miller’s Tale (MiT)-Reeve’s Tale (ReT)-Cook’s Tale (CkT) Cokys Tale of Gamelyn (Gamelyn) Wife of Bath’s Tale (WBT)-Friar’s Tale (FrT)-Summoner’s Tale (SuT) Clerk’s...
Until very recently, the Christ Church MS has been consistently described as the work of two or three scribes, the first of whom copied Chaucer’s tales and Lydgate’s *Siege of Thebes* from one exemplar and, later, *Gamelyn* as “the Cokys tale etc” onto folios 58v-71v at the end of Quire 3 20 and the entirety of the irregular fourth quire of ten folios (excepting the final third of fol. 71v), which was inserted after the preceding and following quires were copied.7 Many of the descriptions of this manuscript assign to a single second scribe the copying of the following: a Table of Contents (fol. 1v) and the *Ploughman’s Tale* (hereafter *PloughT*), where the *Squire’s Tale* breaks off a few lines into fol. 228v (through fol. 231r), also Lydgate’s *Churl & Bird* in the gap between the premature end of the *Parson’s Tale* (hereafter *PsT*) and Lydgate’s *Siege of Thebes* (fol. 277-81).

While some contend that a third scribe is responsible for *Churl & Bird*, it has been uniformly agreed that the Primary-scribe is responsible for the canonical *Canterbury Tales*, *Gamelyn*, and Lydgate’s *Siege of Thebes*.8 Yet, Ralph Hanna, in the online version of the soon to be published description of the Western MSS of Christ Church, identifies four distinct hands in *MS 152* .9

That of the Primary-scribe responsible for Chaucer’s *Tales* and Lydgate’s *Siege of Thebes* (fols. 282-342v), with another scribe being responsible solely for *Gamelyn* (hereafter *Gamelyn-scribe*), dating his hand as “a slightly later Anglicana,” another scribe being responsible for the *PloughT* and the *Table of Contents* (hereafter *PloughT-scribe*), and yet another scribe being responsible for Lydgate’s *Churl & Bird* (fols. 277-81v) and the entry for that work in the Table of Contents (hereafter *Churl-scribe*).

The implications of Hanna’s findings may be profound for the study of this manuscript as an articulation of *The Canterbury Tales* that offers us an array of more authentically medieval readings of the pilgrimage-frame than do modern editions.

To what extent do the scribes following the Primary-scribe—i.e. *Gamelyn-scribe*, *PloughT-scribe*, & *Churl-scribe*—each learn from his predecessor(s)? To what extent are one scribe’s contributions, canonical or apocryphal, authorized by his predecessor(s)?

The evidence of *MS 152* suggests that each scribe (whether one identifies two, three, or four at work here) takes his license to include and his methodology for integrating (an) apocryphal tale(s) from the scribe(s) responsible for the text as he received it.

**The primary-scribe and the idea of a multi-author**

The Primary-scribe clearly conceives of this manuscript both as a work of Chaucer’s authorship, but also, and ultimately more importantly, as a collection of tales told by pilgrims en route to Canterbury to which multiple authors (i.e. Chaucer and Lydgate) may contribute.

This multi-authorial conception of the text is evidenced by the incipit with which he begins the *General Prologue*: “Incipit tractatus Galfredi CHaucer de Gestis Peregrinorum versus Cantuariam.”10

This is more fully realized in the copying of the prologue to Lydgate’s *Siege of Thebes*, in which the Primary-scribe’s rubrication incorporates marginal glosses recalling aspects of Chaucer’s tales (e.g. that the Pardoner is beardless) but also the following annotation of Lydgate’s praise encomium to Chaucer:

> Words for worde w’ ev’y circummstaunce Echan y writte & put in remembranca By hym that was if I shall not fayne ffloure of poetes though all Bryteyne

It is noteworthy that it is the scribe and not Lydgate who mentions Chaucer by name, evincing an association of Chaucer with the *Canterbury Tales* that Lydgate recalls in his prologue to the

---

7 See Ralph Hanna, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts at Christ Church, Oxford* (http://www.chch.ox.ac.uk/msscatalogue).


9 See Ralph Hanna, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts*.

10 “Here begins Geoffrey Chaucer concerning the deeds of pilgrims going to Canterbury.” Oxford, Christ Church MS 152, 2r.

11 Ibid, 282v.
Siege of Thebes. It certainly is no surprise that this scribe, who has already copied Chaucer's tales, should make plain the identity of he whom Lydgate identifies as the "filoure of poetes though all Bryteyne." 12 This is an important note, when one considers this scribe's subsequent gloss of Lydgate's own self-identification as pilgrim-narrator of the prequel to Chaucer's Knight's Tale. He inserts a rubricated marginal gloss reading "Lydgate monke of Burye", a notation underlined by, it would appear, the PloughT-scribe responsible for so many corrections throughout the manuscript. 13

The combination of these marginal glosses identifies the text of The Canterbury Tales as the corporate production of both Chaucer and Lydgate, which sets a precedent of inclusiveness embraced variously by all three of the scribes who succeed the Primary-scribe. The succession of scribes emulating this model echoes and distinguishes MS 152 from the practices of those scribes responsible for the other Canterbury Tales manuscripts including Lydgate's Siege of Thebes.

It is the consistent practice of the Primary-scribe to begin the first lines of prologues and tales with ornate red capitals in a variety of sizes (i.e. typically three or four lines in height for prologues and other links between tales, and typically two lines in height for the tales themselves) and occasionally to mark important points within prologues and tales.

The first such and most significant example is this scribe's treatment of the General Prologue on foilo 2r, where the aforementioned incipit is followed by a red capital, four lines in height, beginning The Canterbury Tales in a thoroughly conventional manner 14:

This manner of inaugurating the text of the General Prologue with an ornate capital W is, of course, typical. Equally commonplace is the way in which the Primary-scribe draws attention to the beginnings of the pilgrims' portraits:

12 Ibid.
13 Ibid, f. 283r.
14 Oxford, Chirst Church, MS 152, f. 2r.
15 Ibid, f. 2v.
descenders, hanging below the line in which the capital appears, which are not connected to the feet of the right descenders. Similarly, the capital ‘W’, one line in height (drawing attention to the beginning of the Squire’s portrait, echoes the cursive style of the capital ‘W’, five lines in height (at the beginning of the General Prologue. There is, however, one anomaly (or more, depending upon whether or not one agrees with Hanna’s identification of the Primary-scribe as being responsible for Gamelyn) in this scribe’s practice. The six-line blue capital he used to start his copying of Lydgate’s *Siege of Thebes*. This simultaneously distinguishes and connects, consciously or otherwise, the sequel to Chaucer’s frame-narrative visually:

The beginning of the *Siege of Thebes* (MS 152, f.282r)

The rounded orthography of this capital echoes that of the five-line red capital W (f. 2r) and the one-line red capital W (f. 3r) with which the Primary-scribe decorates the opening lines of the General Prologue and the beginning of the Squire’s portrait respectively.

Each of these three capitals, regardless of colouring, is comprised of two, overlapping, rounded ‘U’s, each bordered on the right by a straight descender curving outward, to the right, at its foot. Additionally, both ‘U’s are joined at the height of their ascents by a straight, horizontal, crossbar curving up slightly at its right end. It is not clear why the Primary-scribe chose to colour the capital at the beginning of the Siege of Thebes blue, while the capitals appearing earlier in the manuscript are red. Incidentally, red was chosen for the rubrication and glosses of the remainder of the *Siege of Thebes*.

Whatever this scribe’s motivation, his use of blue in this instance marks this section in the text as somehow different from the frame-narrative that precedes it. However, the strong graphic similarity of this capital to the capital with which the same scribe has marked the starting point of the same frame-narrative (f.2r) forges a significant connection between these two points in the text.

The capital ‘W’ at the outset of the *Siege of Thebes* (f.282r) is - through the combination of its graphic similarity to, coupled with its chromatic disparity from the capital ‘W’ beginning the General Prologue (f.2r) - a variation on a theme. In establishing this visual relationship between the two sections of his text, the Primary-scribe has illustrated (literally) the narrative and stylistic relationship between Lydgate’s sequel and Chaucer’s pilgrimage-frame (though the *Siege of Thebes* is actually a prequel to the *Knight’s Tale*). With this choice, the Primary-scribe set an important precedent of qualified integration of apocryphal tales for those scribes who inherited this text from him.

[To be continued]*

Alexander Vaughan Ames
Georgia Institute of Technology, USA

* Part two of this article will be published in volume 5, number 3 of Christ Church Library Newsletter.

**Medieval Mapping of Transylvania**

**Cartography at the time of Sigismund of Luxemburg (1368-1437)**

Early medieval cartography had been as much concerned with the profession of faith, as with geographical accuracy. The celebrated *Hereford Mappa Mundi* (c.1300) has Jerusalem, with a depiction of the crucifixion, at the centre of the universe.

*Hereford Mappa Mundi*

At the apex of the map the Last Judgement is shown, with those saved being led to Heaven for eternal glory while the damned are dragged down by demons to Hell.

The four letters on the straps holding the Earth spell out ‘MORS’ (death), emphasizing the contrast between divine timelessness and the limitations of human chronology and endeavour.
In common with all other T-O maps, east is at the top, and Europe is drawn in the lower left quadrant. In the centre of the continent the Danube is shown, with its source (Hic surgi[m] fons danubius) near Augsburg in Recia minor, a province annexed in 15 B.C. by the Romans. Savaria, the birth-place of St. Martin (Sabaria sanc[ti marti[n]) appears in Lower Pannonia (pannonia minor), and Dacia near the Olt river is marked as Dacia hec et russia written in red ink.

In 1375 Abraham Cresques (†1387) produced an ornate world map for King John I of Aragon, known as the ‘Catalan World Map’. One of the eight sheets of this magnificent portolan map shows the Danube and its environs.

Within the Carpathian basin place-names include the fortifications at ‘arusuar’ (Oroszvár), ‘cais’ (Kőszeg), ‘castro pere’ (Vasvár), ‘moseno’ (Moson), ‘jaun’ (Győr) ‘amarum’ (Komárom), ‘poissonium’ (Pozsony), ‘bach’ (Vác), ‘buda’ (Buda), ‘temisuar’ (Temesvár), valamint ‘dir’ (Nándorfehérvár). Of special interest is the area of Transylvania.

Here, under the blue and red ‘BURGARIA’ (Bulgaria), seven castles are illustrated with the inscription “Here is Transylvania, which is called Siebenburgen by the Saxons, and Erdély (‘ergiul’) by the Hungarians”. This is the first cartographic mention of Transylvania. At the other end of the cartographic scale only local plans, showing boundaries between neighbouring properties, were produced. Of these very few survive - most of them in later transcribed copies. The foundation document of the Abbey at Tihany from 1055, written in Latin, describes the eighteen royal demesnes which King András I gave to the Benedictine Order to support his new foundation. Although the document has no plan attached, it contains the earliest written record extant of the Hungarian language in “a … feheruuaru rea…” that is: a Fehérvárra menő hadi útra [the military road leading to Fehérvár], which is also the earliest Hungarian reference relating to topography. There are also some useful contemporary descriptions of fortifications situated within the Kingdom of Hungary. One is from a French traveller, who in the autumn of 1432 described Nandoralba (Belgrade) in great detail: “... a fort capable of accommodating five or six thousand horses with their mounts. Beside its walls on the one side is the Sava river arriving from Bosnia, and the other side the castle and the Danube into which the Sava flows. Within the vertex, or angle formed by the two rivers, is the town itself. Around its walls the ground is somewhat higher, except the one from dry land, where it is quite flat and can be reached without any difficulty right up to the first ditch. On this side a village, as wide as the flight of an arrow, encircle the town from the Sava to the Danube rivers. Due to its location, this exceptionally strong fort is encircled by a ditch and a double wall, which follow the contours of the land. It has five bulwarks, three of them dominate the high ground and two beside the river, which also are well fortified. The small harbour, capable of sheltering about 15-20 galleons, is defended by two towers between which a strong chain easily block access to it.”

So, in general, either large scale world-maps, or local plans and descriptions concerned with local interests, were produced at the time of Sigismund, with some travellers’ descriptions completing the picture of our medieval world. We are therefore extremely fortunate that a manuscript map of the Balkans has survived. It is this little known document that I shall now turn to.

The map in question can be found at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris bound into the Santini copy of Mariano di Jacopo Taccola’s De rebus militaribus / De machinis. The document is known as Codex Latin 7239. Taccola’s work, dating from 1440, had been copied in Northern Italy around 1470 by Paolo Santini da Duccio in all probability for King

1 Árpád Papp-Váry, Magyarország Története Térképeken, [The history of Hungary on maps] (Kossuth Kiadó, Budapest: 2002), 74-75.

2 Ibid., 78.

3 See http://crowland.uw.hu/images/csata/nandorfehervar.html
Matthias Corvinus’ library and was taken to Constantinople together with the other treasures of the library after the fall of Buda to the Ottomans in 1541, as explained by Pierre de Girardin, French ambassador to the Porte, in a letter written in 1687 to Louvois, a French minister:

“...I was able to obtain through a renegade intermediary officer, who had been the Sultan’s favorite in the service of Selicbar, a number of Greek authors, but not exceeding two volumes. Bernier, the Jesuit father and Marcel, my learned subordinate have examined [some other books] and chose about fifteen (of which I enclose a list) – mainly due to their appearance and not their content. Some are on vellum, the rest on paper and each has the sultan’s seal. I have included a book in Latin, which shows a great number of military equipment, and in all probability were taken by the Turks when they begun the conquest of Hungary…”

The map itself was not originally part of the Santini codex. It existed before it had been bound into it, to become pages 113-114 of the manuscript. During the binding process the map had been trimmed to the size of the volume, cutting both text and several illustrations of forts and fortresses. The map is extremely detailed, showing mountains and mountain passes, rivers, also some bridges: one over the Zsil and one over the Maritza rivers, and another much smaller over a brook between Tekirdag/ Rodosto [tedesto] and Silivri/Selybria [salonbica].

Fortifications along the Danube by the Iron Gate (Codex Latin 7239)

The main feature of the map, however, is the number of forts, fortresses in a line of fortifications between Belgrade/Nándorfehérvár [bel grado] on the west and past Constantinople [chostantinopoli] on the east; some 55 named and 13 un-named, the flags flying over them denoting in whose possession they were at the time the map was made. The legends on the map give local information:

“...a place, where carts will be able pass” and on the Danube it warns that at the gorge called ‘le porte de Fero’ [Iron Gate] there are rocks in the river and can only be navigated with the aid of an expert. Details about fortifications include the “high and very strong” at Nis, while the un-named Ris is marked as a “deserted fort”. Under Plovdiv (Filipopuli), in the bend of the Marica river, the text goes “… from Edirne (Adrinopoly) to Constantinople (Chostantinopoli) the way is through flat ground”.

When was the map made?

The Santini codex, into which the map is bound, is dated to around 1470 – but as I have mentioned earlier it was not part of Santini’s work, but was included in it at the time of its binding. The clearest indications as to the date of the map are the flags over each fort, denoting either Christian or Muslim, in this case Turkish, possession. Constantinople, which fell in 1453 is still shown with a flag bearing the cross, so it was still in Christian hands; so is Nissa. Szörényvár [now Turnu Severin, Romania], rebuilt by Filippo Scolari in 1424, still flies the Christian flag and Szentlászlóvár, on the left bank of the Danube opposite Galambóc [now Golubac, Serbia], built

---

during the winter of 1427/28 is not yet named, only planned.\(^5\)


Constantinople with a flag bearing a cross  
(Codex Latin 7239)

Galambóc, although not marked with either side’s symbol, did not fall until 1428, therefore the map must have been made before that date. Hadrianapolis, flying the crescent, on the other hand had been taken by the Turks in 1361, making it their new capital, so the map dates from sometime between 1361 and 1428. Factors, such as the line of fortresses along the Danube built or strengthened following the disastrous campaign of 1396, when most of Sigismund’s army was annihilated at Nicopolis, can further narrow the date-gap to the early part of the fifteenth century.

### The provenance

The text on the map is written in medieval Italian, by someone making use of the Venetian dialect. Therefore the maker of the map was most likely to be from Venice. There were already quite a number of merchants from Italy trading in Buda at that time, one such being Luca Pecchia, a wealthy Florentine, to whom a young man called Philippo Scolari had been apprenticed some years before. This young man, through his own talent and good fortune entered into the service of Miklós Kanizsai, treasurer to the Royal Court of Sigismund, and later with the help of Cardinal János Kanizsai, brother of Miklós, in 1399 met Sigismund at Esztergom, who on hearing his extraordinary talents in mathematics, entrusted him with the administration of all the gold-mines in his kingdom and appointing him ‘ispán’ of Kőrmőcbánya [Kremnitz], therefore entering into royal service. The same year he also received the command and revenue of Simontornyá and its surrounding villages in Tolna county, southern Hungary.

Two years later Philippo Scolari – known to Hungarians as Ozorai Pipo or Pipo of Ozora after marrying Borbála, daughter of Andráss of Ozora whom Sigismund himself invested with the rights of a son – was made ‘ispán’ of all salt-mines, the main source of royal revenue. At the end of April in 1401, he together with Sigismund were taken prisoners by Cardinal Kanizsai and Palatine Bebek and were not released until that autumn, and only after Sigismund promised to consult with the barons. In 1403, another armed rebellion by the barons at Várad declared the dethronement of Sigismund and invited the pretender Ladislas of Naples to the Hungarian throne.

This time the rebellion found Filippo Scolari free. As such, he managed to organise an army which defeated the barons and forced the pretender to flee the country. Sigismund rewarded Scolari with one of the most prestigious appointments of his kingdom, that of ‘temesi ispán’, which he received together with the royal demesnes in the Counties of Temes, Krassó, Keve and Csanád. At Temesvár (now Timişoara, Romania) the young János Hunyadí (the later hero of Nandoralba) started his military career and became Scolari’s aide, accompanying him on a number of his military campaigns and expeditions.\(^6\) Filippo Scolari by now became one of the most trusted advisors to the king, and spent a lot of his time at the royal court at Buda, and in 1407 became chief to the royal treasury.

In 1408 Sigismund established the Order of the Dragon and Filippo Scolari was given the title of ‘Bán of Szörény’, enabling him to be included in this chivalrous order. The following year Sigismund bestowed on him the last remaining royal castle at Sárvár together with the town and further nine villages, making Filippo Scolari one of the biggest landowners in the counties of Vas and Sopron in western Hungary.\(^8\)

By 1410 Sigismund’s chances of attaining the title of ‘Holy Roman Emperor’ became very real. In order to achieve this he had to have the support of the Holy See. The problem arose from the fact, that at the time, there were no less than three popes who considered themselves Saint Peter’s sole successor. So, in the summer of 1410, Sigismund decided to send a delegation to Bologna in order to obtain the support of Pope John XXIII with whom he had a somewhat strained relation. His choice for a suitable envoy for this hugely important and extremely difficult mission fell onto Filippo Scolari, his trusted advisor and councilor. In order to make a suitable impression the king gave him an escort of several hundred mounted knights. Scolari did not disappoint his sovereign and returned laden with papal bulls granting all of Sigismund’s requests; amongst them the crown’s sole right to appoint bishops and other members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, as well as

\(^6\) Erik Fügedi, Uram királyom… [My lord, My king] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1974), 181.

\(^8\) Ibid., 75.
making all Papal Bulls and Encyclicals in Hungary dependent on royal assent.\(^9\)

At this point the question must be asked: just why Filippo Scolari? Contemporary sources give ample examples of the Hungarian nobility’s indifference or even outright contempt towards mathematics, while money-matters were regarded in no higher esteem, befitting merchants and money-lenders only. In contrast, it was the financial brilliance of the young Scolari which attracted the attention of Sigismund who entrusted him with overseeing the royal revenues flowing from the gold- and salt-mines of his realm. Furthermore, if the nobles and the king’s men had little or no aptitude for mathematics, national or military budgeting, then it is most unlikely that they would have or could have had an understanding of the concept of cartography.

Therefore, I contend, that it was Filippo Scolari, who through his mathematical talents, with the experiences of a successful military career and not least with his connections in Italy and Venice, who alone would have been able to conceive, commission and create such a map at the beginning of the 15th century in Hungary.

\textit{László Gróf, F.R.G.S,}
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