



Johannes Piscator: One man or a Ramist dichotomy?

Citation

Ong, Walter J. S. J. 1954. Johannes Piscator: One man or a Ramist dichotomy? Harvard Library Bulletin VIII (2), Spring 1954: 151-162.

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:42669839>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

Johannes Piscator: One Man or a Ramist Dichotomy?

IT is a tribute to anyone's industry to have written so long and so hard and so much that the guardian spirits of some of the great libraries of the world are left with the impression that you are really not one man, but two. Yet this is the case with a man who, if his name is little known today, must still be reckoned with, and even read, by those claiming first-hand familiarity with the mind of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Puritan. This person is Johannes or Joannes Piscator (1546-1625), the German Protestant theologian whose books lie heavy in the principal libraries of England and Western Europe, as well as in the Harvard University Library, where the collection admirably illustrates the tendency of Piscator's writing to feature 'logical analyses' of the various books of the Scriptures.

Piscator's works were early transported to America and to Harvard as part of the great engine of theology operated by Puritan divines. They, with other works like them at Harvard, represent some of the Ramist furnishings of the Puritan mind, furnishings acquired, sometimes directly and sometimes at third or fourth hand, from the French regius professor Pierre de la Ramée, or, as he was better known in an anglicization of the Latin form of his name, Peter Ramus (1515-1572). His aim was to reconstitute every subject in the curriculum in the name of a reconditioned 'dialectic' or logic; and the assemblage of his own work floats through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries surrounded by a host of other books which Ramism called into being — pro-Ramist books, anti-Ramist books, or syncretizing efforts, overt or covert, which seek to reconcile Ramism with other less intransigent philosophies.

The Harvard Library is rich in all this Ramist literature, not only in Ramus' own works, but in works from the Ramist penumbra inhabited by Ramus' literary lieutenant Omer Talon and by Piscator and Alsted. Such works at Harvard include, for example, George Downham's *Commentarii in P. Rami Dialecticam* (Frankfurt, 1610), Friedrich Beurhaus' (Beurhusius') *De P. Rami Dialecticae praecipuis capitibus dis-*

putationes scholasticae (London, 1582), and William Ames's Ramist 'methodization' of the Scriptures which is entitled *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity, Drawne out of the Holy Scriptures and the Interpreters Thereof, and Brought into Method* (translated out of the Latin; London, 1643). The works in the Ramist tradition range in size all the way from the tiny redactions of the Ramist *Dialectica* and *Rhetorica* published at Hanau as unbelievably condensed schoolboy manuals, which are to be found at Harvard, up to the huge Ramist-colored *Encyclopaedia* (Herborn, 1626, and later editions), long a favorite work in New England. This *Encyclopaedia* was the product of the industry of Johann Heinrich Alsted, whose name in its common Latin form Alstedius was, as someone soon discovered, an anagram for *sedulitas*, 'hard work.' As his career shows, Alsted lived up to his anagram. One of the advantages of Ramism was that it enabled its practitioners to turn out material in quantity. Piscator's production record is notable, but not unique.

Cambridge University was the English center of Ramism, and the Gabriel Harvey marginalia at Harvard form an integral part of the Cambridge Ramist tradition, as does the Harvard copy of the tract defending Ramist mono-methodology, *Pro Mildapetti* [i.e., William Temple] *de unica methodo defensione contra Diplodophilum* [i.e., Everard Digby] *commentatio* (London, 1581), written by William Temple (later Sir William), the elder (1555-1627), who was to become fourth provost of Trinity College in Dublin and a proponent of Ramism there. Piscator is perhaps best known today in English-speaking circles for his activity along this Ramist front occupied by Temple and his Cambridge entourage. Entering the lists for Ramus, Temple had soon found himself engaged in a three-way dispute, in which Piscator was the third combatant. In this dispute, Piscator seems to have thought of himself and to have behaved as not only basically loyal, but also decently heterodox in his devotion to the French savant; he addresses Temple, rather slightly his junior, as 'distinguished young man.'¹

However they may have differed in their notions of what true loyalty to Ramus should consist in, both Piscator and Temple advertise unmistakably their adherence to the central Ramist tradition by the titles of their books. From Temple we have *Analysis logica triginta*

¹ *Gulielmi Tempelli philosophi Cantabrigensis Epistola de Dialectica P. Rami ad Joan. Piscatorem Argentinen., una cum Joan. Piscatoris ad illam epistolam responsione* (Frankfurt, 1590), p. 19.

Psalmorum, dedicated to Robert Cecil (London, 1611), and, in English, *A Logical Analysis of Twentie Select Psalmes Performed by W. Temple* (London, 1605). From Piscator there is a formidable array of volumes: *Analysis logica Evangelii secundum Johannem* (London, 1595; second edition, Herborn, 1595), *Analysis logica Evangelii secundum Lucam* (London, 1596), *Analysis logica libri S. Lucae qui inscribitur Acta Apostolorum* (London, 1597), *Analysis logica omnium epistolarum Pauli* (third edition, London, 1608) — to cite only a few titles of this sort from such of his works as were published in London.

The term 'logical analysis' (*analysis logica*) or its equivalent 'dialectical analysis' (*analysis dialectica*), when these terms first became current in the sixteenth century, is, at the very least, an all but certain hallmark of a Ramist work. Examination of most of the accessible texts points to the conclusion that 'logical analysis' is in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries a term so unmistakably partisan that no one but a professing Ramist or one intellectually descended from a professing Ramist would use it.

The literary and philosophical significance of this apparently dull and uneventful fact is more evident when the perspective is seen. 'Logical analysis' was, roughly, what we should now call précis writing, but carried to a kind of logical extreme so as to result, ideally, in concatenations of pure syllogisms. As applied to literary, rather than merely to philosophical productions, such analysis is a distinctively sixteenth-century phenomenon. The Middle Ages made no particular issue of such a précis — indeed, seem to have been for the most part quite unaware of the précis as a technique for anything but philosophical, legal, and theological commentary, where it was preliminary and rather incidental. It is under Ramist auspices that logical analysis becomes an issue in the late Renaissance, and that it becomes more than that, a philosophy of literature which grows by implication into a metaphysics, a means of getting at reality. For a Ramist, what is said by a bit of Scripture or a geometrical treatise or a poem or any sort of discourse whatsoever (Ramus is explicit in his inclusiveness here) is not the text of the work itself as such but what you can put down in a précis or logical analysis — that, and nothing more.² To interpret any form of

² See Ramus, *Dialecticae institutiones* (Paris: Jacobus Bogardus, mense septembri 1543), fols. 48 ff., and *Dialectique* (Paris, 1555), pp. 114–119, 129–135, and elsewhere. These loci mark the beginnings of Ramus' principle, which henceforward carries

discourse whatsoever, one writes a *précis* of it. The way for the cult of 'reason' is of course being leveled here, ruthlessly and with dispatch.

Thus it is that, true to Ramist technique — or, to use the Ramist's own term, 'technology'³ — Piscator need not have confined, and as we shall see did not confine, his logical analyses to the Scriptures. He was, however, primarily a theologian (that is, he operated Ramistically primarily on theological subjects), and his output of logical analyses is concerned chiefly with the Scriptures, which, given time, he would probably have processed book by book, from beginning to end. These logical analyses of the Scriptures, together with Piscator's well-known Calvinist translation of the Bible, are listed in the *Catalogue of Printed Books in the Library of the British Museum* under 'Johann Piscator of Herborn,' while similar logical analyses performed on Cicero's *De officiis* are listed as by a quite different author, 'Johannes Piscator of Wittenberg.' In France, the *Catalogue général des livres imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale* and at Oxford the (unprinted) catalogue of the Bodleian Library present a Johannes Piscator under a third guise — the Strasburg Piscator (Argentinensis). But these catalogues use this Piscator to replace the Herborn Piscator, so that their division, too, results in only two Piscators after all. This is a point of some interest, because Ramists all maintained stoutly that a dichotomy, the keystone on which all Ramist teaching was poised, was the best form of division. 'Dichotomy is the best distribution,' proclaims a thesis defended in 1646 at Harvard by Jonathan Mitchel, and in 1678 another Harvard thesis still echoes, 'The most accurate distribution is dichotomy.'⁴ It restores one's confidence in the workings of the mills of the gods to find the posthumous dismemberment of Piscator going forward according to specifications which his party propounded.

While it concurs with the British Museum in presenting a Piscator of Wittenberg, the Bibliothèque Nationale catalogue transfers the through the hundreds of editions of his works, reaching its peak of popularity in about the 1580's.

³ See, for example, Omer Talon, *Rhetorica*, edited by Claudius Minos or Claude Mignault (Paris, 1577), 'Prooemium in hanc technologiam rhetoricam,' and compare Adrien Turnèbe's remarks on 'cold technology' in his volume *Libelli de vino, calore, et methodo* (Paris, 1600), fols. 30-31. Technology among New England divines is discussed in Perry Miller, *The New England Mind* (New York, 1939), pp. 161-180, and elsewhere.

⁴ Miller, *The New England Mind*, pp. 127-128. Cf. Samuel Eliot Morison, *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), especially Chapter VIII.

Ramus editions from him to its Strasburg Piscator, who otherwise corresponds to the British Museum's Herborn theologian. Thus in the Bibliothèque Nationale catalogue, the Wittenberg Piscator is left with only logical analyses of classical authors credited to his name — the analyses of Cicero's *De officiis* assigned him by the British Museum, plus analyses of Horace's *Epistolae* and *De arte poetica* and of Cicero's *Paradoxa*.

There is evidently no little uncertainty here, and some reason for it is to be found in Piscator's career, which was geographically complex enough. Born at Strasburg, as the *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* notes,⁵ he also taught at Strasburg as well as at Heidelberg, Dillenberg, Neustadt, Mörs, Herborn, and Siegen, migrating to the latter place from Herborn on two separate occasions with his school because of the plague. But to make matters worse, the path of this 1546–1625 Johannes Piscator is crossed in some of the standard biographical reference works by another German Protestant Johannes Piscator who, according to Louis Moréri, *Grand dictionnaire historique* (Paris, 1759), died at Strasburg in 1546 — the exact place and year of our Piscator's birth! The reference in Moréri to Bossuet (M. de Meaux) leads nowhere, as far as the distinction of persons goes, for Bossuet speaks only of the 1546–1625 Piscator. By the mid-eighteenth century, there was already considerable confusion concerning this second Johannes Piscator, for in Christian Gottlieb Jöcher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1751), the notice for him had placed his death at Strasburg in 1646, a hundred years later, and had stated that he was professor of theology in the gymnasium at Siegen and wrote 'methodic commentaries' on the New Testament — specifications which are concurred in by Zedler's *Universal Lexicon* (Leipzig and Halle, 1741), but which fit the 1546–1625 Piscator too closely for comfort. For there is no doubt that the 1546–1625 Piscator was professor of theology at Siegen, besides being a writer of 'methodic commentaries' — methodic being a Ramist synonym for analytic. The title-page of a book in the Bibliothèque Nationale connects the professorship precisely with the date of his death: Georg Pasor, *Oratio funebris in obitum J. Piscatoris, scholae Sigenensis Nassoviorum professoris theologiae* (Herborn, 1625). Jöcher's possibly accidental differentiation of his two individuals as 'Joh. Piscator' (1546–1625) and 'Jo. Piscator,' a differentiation perhaps echoed in the present library catalogues, is

⁵ Without mention of a second Johannes Piscator.

worthless. One's hunch that so neat a spelling distinction could not survive the ebullient energies of Renaissance typesetters is substantiated by a glance at the titles in the library catalogues.

Outside the various biographical notices, there is evidence that, in close proximity to the first Johannes Piscator, 1546-1625, a second person of the same name existed, one who antedates rather than post-dates the first for the simple reason that he is his father. The evidence can be found in Alsted's *Encyclopaedia septem tomis distincta* (Herborn, 1630), where, among the dedicatory verses, are some signed 'Johannes Piscator f. anno 1622 aetatis 77.' The 'f.' would certainly mean 'the son' (*filius*), and the age given identifies this Piscator unmistakably as the 1546-1625 individual, allowance of a year being made for the dating practices of the time, so that we can assume a Johannes Piscator 'the father' as the progenitor of our 1546-1625 man. These verses would be at hand for any compiler and may have helped create confusion, although I find no indication that this was the case.

The sorting out of individuals named Piscator, or even Johannes Piscator, is a major project for any compiler of biographical notices or catalogues concerned with the Renaissance.⁶ As the Latinization of such names as Fischer or Engler or Engeler,⁷ or of other names which, like these, mean or seem to mean fisherman (*piscator*), although etymologically perhaps they sometimes do not, the name Piscator is exceedingly common. Johann Moller, who in 1697 published a 'four-part homonymoscope,' to serve in identifying authors commonly confused with one another, does not treat any Johannes Piscator individually, but includes the Piscatores generically with the Agricolae, Albini, Molitores, Pontani, Sartorii, Silvii, Venatores, and scores of others of like stamp who are 'to be found in any quantity you want anywhere,'⁸ and whom he despairs of straightening out completely.

In the international Latin community formed by the intellectuals of the time, these Latin names served for their equivalents not only in German but in all the Western European languages. These were the Farmers, Bauers, and Fermiers, the Whites, Weisses, Wittes, Blancs, and

⁶ In the catalogues of the Harvard Library, the dichotomized Piscator here discussed is correctly listed as one undivided individual.

⁷ Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexicon*, III, col. 1592, lists a German Piscator or Engeler.

⁸ 'Quamplurimi ubivis obvii'—Johann Moller, *Homonymoscopia historico-philologico-critica, sive Schediasma περιερυικον de scriptoribus homonymis quadripartitum* (Hamburg, 1697), p. 844. A copy of this work may be consulted in the Harvard Library.

Leblancs, the Millers, Müllers, Möllers, Mollers, and Meuniers, the Bridges, Brückers, and Duponts, the Taylors, Schneiders, the Couturiers, the Woods, Walds, and Dubois, the Hunters, Jägers, and Chasseurs or Chasserats — to cite equivalents in only three of the Western European tongues. Such names, with which fall Fisher or Fischer and its equivalents in other vernaculars, can be had for the asking in any and all languages. When they were uniformly reduced to Latin, not only did the Müllers become in effect identical with the Mollers, but the Taylors, Schneiders, and Couturiers became quite indistinguishable from one another. The most obscure and isolated family thus acquired all sorts of international pseudo-relatives. Little wonder that Moller throws up his hands in despair at this crawling mass of homonyms. He treats some of them in passing and, out of deference to his own name, he does try to do something definitive with the Millers, Müllers, Möllers, Mollers, Meuniers, and their clan, with the result that he has to devote to them at the end of his work a special appendix of thirty-three pages entitled (I translate) 'A Half-Hundred Writers of the Same Name as the Author of This Check-List.' The Piscator clan would have yielded a list perhaps as full, and so with most of the others whom Moller refuses to treat.

In the late eighteenth century and the early nineteenth, a supplement and continuation of Jöcher's *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon* was undertaken by Johann Christoph Adelung and his successor Heinrich Wilhelm Rotermund,⁹ in which an attempt was made to correct Jöcher's double entry for a Johannes Piscator. Rotermund, who did the volume in the supplement where the Piscator entries appear, lists four men by the name of Johannes Piscator and one Johannes Jacob Piscator, including among the four Jöcher's first Johannes Piscator (the 1546-1626 individual) but not his second, whom Jöcher had listed as dying at Strasburg in 1646. Rotermund notes that this second was really identical with the first.

Of the new listings in this supplement, two are clearly different from our 1546-1625 Piscator, but the third creates new difficulties. This is a Johannes Piscator who made his name chiefly as a Latin occa-

⁹ *Fortsetzung und Ergänzungen zu Christian Gottlieb Jöchers allgemeinem Gelehrten-Lexico*, 6 vols. (Leipzig and Bremen, 1784-1819). Vol. VI (Bremen, 1819) is the one with the Piscator entries. In 1897 Otto Günther published a Vol. VII at Leipzig which picks up at the letter 'R' where Vol. VI had left off, but which does not finish even this letter.

sional poet and professor of poetry. He studied at Wittenberg, we are informed, where he probably began his studies about 1553 and later taught, becoming subsequently rector of the Gymnasium at Altenburg and in 1574 professor of poetry (Latin, of course) and later professor of Greek at the University of Jena, and living at least till sometime in the 1590's. He styled himself, says Rotermund, sometimes as 'of Nuremberg' and sometimes as 'of Neustadt.' Rotermund lists fourteen works as his, all of them being occasional verse or orations except the following four:

Animadversiones in dialecticam Petri Rami, epist. II. Francof. 1582. 8.

Petri Rami scholarum physicarum libri VIII. emendati [i.e., per Ioannem Piscatorem]. Francof. 1583. 8.

Petri Rami scholarum metaphysicarum libri XIV. emendati, i.e., per Ioannem Piscatorem]. Francof. 1583. 8.

Analysis logica epistolarum Horatii et artis poëticae, nec non selectarum aliquot Odarum, una cum Scholiis. Spirae 1595. 8.

Here, although Rotermund had earlier eliminated Jöcher's original error, he has perpetrated a grosser one of his own, for these four works¹⁰ — anomalous on the face of it among the occasional poetry and orations of this Nuremberg-Neustadt Piscator — are clearly, as will be seen, not by him but by our 1546-1625 man.

Rotermund's error is doubtless the immediate occasion of the difficulty which still persists when the Bibliothèque Nationale assigns the last of these four works, and the British Museum the last three of the four, together with editions of others of Ramus' *Scholae*, to a Piscator of Wittenberg, for Rotermund's Johannes Piscator of Nuremberg and of Neustadt had studied and taught at Wittenberg and published most of his works there — that is to say, his genuine ones. It is easy to show that the editions of Ramus' *Scholae physicae* and *Scholae metaphysicae* are by the Strasburg Piscator, for of the editions cited by Rotermund (Frankfurt, 1583) and the editions in the British Museum (Frankfurt, 1606 and 1610 respectively), all four in their full titles

¹⁰ Copies of the second and third works in the editions here in question are to be found in the Harvard Library, copies of the first and fourth in the Cambridge University Library. Fuller locations of copies of such works will be given in the complete inventory of the published works of Peter Ramus and of Omer Talon and in check-lists of related works which I hope soon to publish in connection with a comprehensive work on Ramus and Ramist method in its intellectual milieu.

identify the editor, on their title-pages themselves, as Johannes Piscator of Strasburg ('Argentinensis').¹¹ The other editions of Ramus' *Scholae* attributed by the British Museum catalogue to the Wittenberg Piscator are similarly by the same Strasburg Piscator, as is evident both from title-pages and from prefatory material. The Bibliothèque Nationale lists its copies of all these works quite justifiably under its Strasburg Piscator.

The *Animadversiones* on Ramus' *Dialectica* which Rotermund attributes to his Nuremberg-Neustadt Piscator is likewise clearly shown to be by the Strasburg Piscator, for its full title, too, identifies its author as 'Joan[nes] Piscator Argentinensis.' The 'epist. II' of Rotermund's entry confirms this identification, as it obviously refers to an item or items in the exchange of letters between Piscator of Strasburg and William Temple referred to above.¹² The several letters were frequently included in the same volume with others of Piscator's or Temple's writings on dialectic.

Moreover, this Strasburg Piscator is the same as the British Museum's Herborn Piscator, for, taking the *Analysis logica Evangelii secundum Johannem* (Herborn, 1595), listed in the British Museum catalogue as by 'Johann Piscator of Herborn,' we find the author in the preface writing 'Argentorati [i.e., Strasburg] in patria mea.' Further, there never has been any doubt that the Johannes Piscator who wrote one of the 'logical analyses' in this series on the Scriptures wrote them all.

But what of the logical or dialectical analyses of Cicero and Horace assigned variously by the Bibliothèque Nationale and the British Museum to Johannes Piscator of Wittenberg, and by Rotermund to the Piscator of Nuremberg and Neustadt? The title-pages of the two analyses of Cicero show that the author again is the Piscator of Strasburg. *M. T. Ciceronis De officiis librorum III analysis dialectica, ad praeceptiones P. Rami potissimum accommodata per Joann. Piscatorem Argentinensem* (Speyer, Bernhardus Albinus, 1582 — the same title, with the 'Argentinensem,' in the second edition, Speyer, Bernhardus Albinus, 1585), and *M. T. Ciceronis Paradoxorum ad M. Brutum analysis dialectica per Joann. Piscatorem Argentinensem* (Speyer, Bernhardus Albinus, 1597). The work devoted to Horace, the *Analy-*

¹¹ It need hardly be mentioned that Renaissance place-names such as 'Argentinensis' used as surnames after the family name refer ordinarily to the place of a man's origin, not of his residence.

¹² P. 152.

sis logica Epistolarum Horatii omnium, connumerato etiam libello qui inscribitur De arte poetica, necnon selectarum aliquot Odarum una cum Scholiis, auctore Johanne Piscatore (Speyer, Bernhardus Albinus, 1595), does not specify the 'Argentinensis,' and was assigned by Rotermond to his Nuremberg-Neustadt Piscator, as we have already seen. However, not only is this volume by the same printer as the analyses of Cicero, but its author's preface is dated from Siegen ('ex illustri schola Nassovica Sigenensi, mense junio 1595'), just as is the preface ('Sigenae, 21 apr. 1597') of the 1597 volume of Cicero's *Paradoxa* already mentioned, which identified its author explicitly as Piscator Argentinensis. Moreover, the same preface of the 1595 volume which omits the 'Argentinensis' discusses, with dates putting the identification beyond controversy, Piscator's career at Herborn and Mörs, mentioning also such famous Ramists as Claude Mignault (Minos) and Andreas Cragius (Krag). Thus there can be no doubt that the author of this work, too, is our Piscator Argentinensis, the 1546-1625 Piscator.

Since it is certain that the Strasburg and the Herborn Piscators are one man, the Ramist Piscator, what is left of the Piscator of Wittenberg after all the works by this Ramist Piscator have been taken away from him? Nothing in the Bibliothèque Nationale catalogue, and in the British Museum catalogue only three works, attributed, correctly, by Rotermond to his Nuremberg-Neustadt Piscator, who thus seems to be the sole reality behind the Wittenberg name.

Our 1546-1625 Piscator had a fling at tutoring, as well as at Scriptural exegesis, and his 'logical analyses' of classical texts were an almost automatic by-product of a course in an author, as Piscator himself explains in the prefaces, where he owns that some of the analyses were dictated to his pupils. These analyses represented the commentary which accumulated apace as the teacher worked his way through the text and which he naturally hated to see lost to future generations, as it was sure to be if it remained in unprinted form. Indeed, Ramist commentary and Ramist philosophy had a way of generating themselves spontaneously out of the preparation of classes for young boys — a fact perhaps throwing considerable light on John Milton's *Artis logicae plenior institutio, ad Petri Rami methodum concinnata* (London, 1672), which thus, more probably than ever, represents what Milton

had grubbed up for himself much earlier in life when he came to teach logic to Edward Phillips. At a mature age (fifty-one in 1597), as Milton was when he published his Ramist logic, Piscator did not hesitate to see into print a product begotten at an earlier date not out of curiosity by insight, but out of the exigencies of teaching by an all-purpose, never-faltering Ramist 'method.'

It is perhaps natural to suppose that a person so committed to Bible translation and theological commentary as Piscator would not be the man to produce logical analyses of classical authors. But this is to miss the whole rationale of Ramist method and 'logical analysis,' and, indeed, of a whole undergrowth of deep-set modern attitudes which reach early maturity in the Ramist intellectual climate. Once he was trained in 'logical analysis' — and Ramus himself boasts that he had his students trained in it when they were thirteen or so¹³ — the Ramist was by that very fact constituted a general practitioner. There was no text, no form of discourse, which he could not force to yield up to him its 'secrets of method' without delay. Oratory, history, poetry, biography, ethics, theology, geometry — all alike succumbed as they were tumbled into the hopper of the Ramist machine, which produced at the other end whole strings of syllogisms.¹⁴ Descartes' quest for a universal method and his postulate that even theology be merely a branch of philosophy was being anticipated here, philosophy being, for the Ramist, his all-consuming dialectic. The diversified canon of Piscator's works thus appears in function of the universal applicability of Ramist dialectic, as his characteristic titles help fix the dates of the fad for 'logical analysis' — a strictly dated term and concept if there ever was one.

There are other problems concerning other Piscators, which I, like, Moller, do not undertake to solve, even though one or another of

¹³ Ramus, *Pro philosophica Parisiensis Academiae disciplina oratio* [1551], in his *Scholae in liberales artes* (Basel, 1569), cols. 1020, 1044-1047.

¹⁴ See the syllogisms which burst into flower throughout Piscator's various 'logical analyses' already cited, or in any of Ramus' or Omer Talon's commentaries, and compare Ramus, *Professio regia*, edited by Joannes Thomas Freigius (Basel, 1576). Voltaire once remarked that books coming from Freigius' hands made interesting reading for stupid people. The attempt of Ramism to resolve once and for all the persistent theological dispute among Protestants concerning the meaning of the words used at the Last Supper is discussed in Frans Lukas Bos, *Johann Piscator: Seine Stellung in den Erörterungen über das heilige Abendmahl* (Kampen, 1932), pp. 30 ff.

them may be tangential to the problem here treated. It is enough for the present to have pointed out the one thing which seems clear: whichever way you undertake to dichotomize the Johannes Piscator who was a follower of Peter Ramus, he remains, reluctantly but always, the same man.

WALTER J. ONG, S. J.

List of Contributors

- RICHARD C. HARRIER, Instructor in English, Colby College
- HENRY W. HOLMES, Professor of Education and Dean of the Graduate School of Education, Emeritus, Harvard University
- WALTER J. ONG, S. J., Instructor in English, Saint Louis University
- ELEANOR N. LITTLE, in charge of the Treasure Room, Harvard Law School Library
- KEYES D. METCALF, Professor of Bibliography, Director of the Harvard University Library, and Librarian of Harvard College
- GEORGE PEIRCE CLARK, Associate Professor of English, Northern Illinois State Teachers College
- WILLIAM KELLAWAY, Library Assistant, Guildhall Library, London
- PHILIP J. MCNIFF, Assistant Librarian of the Harvard College Library in charge of the Lamont Library
- WILLIAM H. BOND, Curator of Manuscripts in the Houghton Library
- WILLIAM VAN LENNEP, Curator of the Theatre Collection in the Harvard College Library
- HYDER E. ROLLINS, Gurney Professor of English Literature, Harvard University
- LOUIS L. NEWBY, Assistant Director of the Office of Student Placement, Harvard University

CORRIGENDUM

Vol. VIII, No. 1 (Winter 1954)

In the article entitled "The Harvard Collection of Hugo von Hofmannsthal," p. 61, the year of accession of the collection of printed works of Hofmannsthal presented by Mr Gilbert H. Montague, '01, should read '1949,' and not '1947' as printed.