The Danish Neo-Latin poems and prose compositions of the 16th century share the destiny of many literary works from the period. The extant printed copies are either unique or very few, and the surviving manuscript versions are extremely rare. Especially as regards the flourishing genre of occasional poetry and oratory, many works are known to us today only from references in contemporary bibliographical catalogues.

In this perspective the Danish author Jacobus Jacobaeus Volffius (Jakob Jakobsen Wolf, 1554-1635) is relatively well represented with four extant Latin titles and a total of eight printed copies of these to be found in Danish and Norwegian libraries. Volffius’ printed Latin works are all registered in the standard work on early printed books in Denmark, Lauritz Nielsen’s Dansk Bibliografi 1482-1800 (hereafter referred to as LN).^3

^1 The original Danish-Norwegian manuscripts and printed books studied in this article I examined at first hand, whereas I had access to an excellent microfilm copy of the Scottish material. I would like to thank the National Library of Scotland, the National Library in Oslo, and the Royal Library in Copenhagen for having made this material available to me. I am grateful to Edgar Ytterbom of the National Library in Oslo and to Monika Aase of the University Library of Trondheim for valuable information on the printed books by Volffius which are found in these libraries. Russell L. Friedman kindly offered comments on an earlier draft of this article and corrected my English. — This study forms part of a research project which is financially supported by the Danish Research Council for the Humanities.

^2 In addition to this, Volffius wrote a ‘Chronicle of the Jews’ in the vernacular: Judækronikke, utsamlet udført af den hellige Saffet (et Josephs strt Røm kartelteb bøgeret, which was printed in Copenhagen in 1603. On this work see H. Ehrencreut-Müller, Forfatterlisten omfattende Danmark, Norge og Island indtil 1814, 12 vols (Copenhagen, 1924-1935), IX, 167-168.

^3 Dansk Bibliografi 1482-1550 (Copenhagen, 1919); DB 1551-1600 (Copenhagen, 1931-33); Regesta in DB 1482-1550 & 1551-1600 (Copenhagen, 1935). The whole work was reprinted with a supplement by Erik Dul in 1996.
(1) *Carmen de animae humanae immortalitate* (Copenhagen: Andreas Gutterwitz, 1582); LN no. 1665. Two copies at the Royal Library in Copenhagen, Denmark (RL).

(2) *Cenotaphium Friderico II* (Rostock: Stephen Möllmann, 1588); LN no. 1667. One copy at RL.

(3) *Carmen in nuptias Jacobi VI Regis Scoiae et Annae Friderici II filiae* (Copenhagen: Lorentz Benedict, 1590); LN no. 1666. One copy at RL.

(4) *Tragoediae duae* (Copenhagen: Mads Vingaard, 1591); LN no. 1668. Two copies at RL; one copy at the National Library in Oslo, Norway; and one at the University Library in Trondheim, Norway.²

Two of the four titles, viz. nos. (2) and (3), are occasional pieces, known by Lauritz Nielsen in only one copy each. In 1942, however, the Danish bookseller and bibliophile Volmer Rosenkilde announced the discovery of a complete handwritten draft of title no. (3), Volfius’ wedding poem celebrating the marriage in 1589 of King James VI of Scotland (later James I of England) to Princess Anne of Denmark.³ The draft, along with another manuscript containing a fair copy of the wedding poem (in which the first 12 lines are missing) and four proof sheets of the printed text, was discovered in a book binding together with other manuscript sheets and printed pages, all from the 16th century, and all from the Copenhagen printing press of Lorentz Benedicti.

The documents found by Rosenkilde made it possible to follow Volfius’ wedding poem to the royal couple all the way from manuscript copy to printed version. Thus, the handwritten draft contains the corrections and the written approval of Johannes Sascerides (Jan Sagers), who was from 1557 professor in Hebrew at the University of Copenhagen and an expert writer of Latin poetry himself, as well as the *imprimatur* of the rector of the University, bishop Paulus Matthiae (Poul Madsen). Moreover, the fair copy of the poem displays the inserted markings of the length of the columns as they were later reproduced in the printed book, and in the printed proof sheets are indicated the misprints to be corrected before the final printed version.

² I am grateful to Sigbjørn Grindheim of the National Library in Oslo for this information, and to Erik Petersen of the Royal Library in Copenhagen for confirming that RL was never in possession of the documents, cf. n. 8 below.

³ Cf. Egil Kraggerud (ed.), *Kongehøster*. Skrifter av J. J. Wolf og H. Gunnarsson (Oslo, 1991), pp. 43-55 (introduction), pp. 96-103 (edition with translation), and pp. 112-113 (notes). Unfortunately, both in the table of contents and on p. 43, the chapter concerning the wedding, which took place in 1589, is erroneously entitled ‘Fyrstebrylluppet i Oslo 1591’. [‘The Royal Wedding in Oslo, 1591’]. The book also contains a re-edition of Volfius’ *Cenotaphium Friderico II* (1588), cf. no. (3) in the list above of Volfius’ printed Latin works.

⁴ Cf. *Kongehøster*, pp. 52-55. Kraggerud apparently based his study on photocopies to be found at the Dept. of Classics at the University of Oslo, cf. *Kongehøster*, p. 52, n. 36, and p. 53, section (b), and did not consult the original material which was then to be found at the University Library in Oslo, and never (pace op. cit., p. 52, n. 35) at the Royal Library in Copenhagen.
Catherine R. Borland. A Catalogue of Mediaeval Manuscripts in the Library of the Faculty of Advocates at Edinburgh (III, 702-703).\textsuperscript{9}

However, a closer look at the description in Borland’s manuscript catalogue reveals that the printed copy of the \textit{Cenotaphium} is bound together with nothing less than a complete manuscript copy of Volius’ wedding poem to King James VI and Princess Anne! Despite the fact that it is registered in the Edinburgh catalogue as well as in Paul Oskar Kristeller’s \textit{Iter Italicum},\textsuperscript{10} this Scottish manuscript has until now remained an unexplored source to the \textit{fortuna} of Volius’ wedding poem.

In the following, after a brief introduction to the author and to the circumstances of the composition of the wedding poem, I discuss the identification of the hands in the rediscovered Scottish manuscript and in the manuscript presented by Volmer Rosenkilde. Then follows an examination of (a) the relationship between the two manuscripts, and (b) the relationship between the manuscript sources and the printed edition. Finally I have edited the wedding poem to King James VI and Princess Anne on the basis of the Scottish manuscript which I argue must be Volius’ original version of the Latin text.

1. The author

Jacobus Jacobaeus Volius was born in 1554 in Odense on the Danish island of Funen. Volius went to school in Odense and in Ribe, and from 1577 to 1581 he was a student at the University of Copenhagen, where, in 1581, he obtained the bachelor’s degree and, in 1594, the master’s degree. In 1621 Volius was appointed professor in theology and Hebrew at the new school in his home town Odense. He died in 1635.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{9} The four handwritten vols of Borland’s catalogue (which belongs to the National Library of Scotland) were compiled in 1808-1808.


In the period from 1584 through 1594 Volius was the headmaster of the school in Oslo. It was while occupying this position that he, in 1588, and apparently at the instigation of his father-in-law, the bishop of Oslo, Johannes Nicolai (Jens Nilsson), composed the oration \textit{Cenotaphium Friderico II}, on the occasion of the death of the Danish King Frederik II.\textsuperscript{12}

Although he had thus already proven his abilities as an encomiastic writer, Volius was not among the poets who celebrated the events of August 1589, when, in Copenhagen, the 14-year-old daughter of the late King Frederik, and sister of King Christian IV, Princess Anne, was married by proxy to King James VI of Scotland. In many Latin verses and various metres, Danish and Scottish poets foretold how the Princess would travel peacefully over the North Sea and be received with due pomp and circumstance by King James in Edinburgh.\textsuperscript{13} However, in reality the travel went quite differently. Thus, having left Copenhagen on September 1, 1589, the ships en route with Anne to Scotland were forced by the autumn gales, after a whole month’s voyage, to put in on the Norwegian coast. The bad weather kept the Princess from continuing her travel, but did not prevent King James from setting out to join her in Oslo as soon as he was informed about her delay. Here the royal couple was married on November 23, 1589.\textsuperscript{14}

Jacobus Jacobaeus Volius’ wedding poem was composed to celebrate the unforeseen event of the royal wedding in Oslo, and — contrary to

\textsuperscript{12} Cf. \textit{Cenotaphium}, introductory address to Nicolai, pp. A3v-A4 in the 1588 edition; p. 60 in the re-edition of 1991; in \textit{Kongehuset} (cf. n. 7 above), pp. 56-55: ‘Quod ubi sensi tuae praeuentiae, mihi autem in omni vero conserwam et in auditorio rectiorem’ (italics mine, cf. n. 15 below); ‘Tua reverentia mihi persuasit ut ob praenomina

\textsuperscript{13} On the poems by Andreas Robertsonus and Hercules Rollock, and on the \textit{Harmonia gratiosioria} composed by Abrahams Pueritosius, see Pernille Harsting, ‘Epitalamus latini della riforma in Danmarka (1536-1990): imitazione classica e rappresentazione literaria,’ \textit{Revista Publico Literarum}, 15 (992), 97-106 (pp. 103-104). See also the Flemish poet Hadiunianus Damman’s \textit{Schedesia de nuptis Jacobi VI et Anna} (Frankfurt, 1590), reprinted in \textit{Delitiae C. Poetarum Belgiorum} (Frankfurt, 1614), I, 43.

\textsuperscript{14} The royal wedding is described in an anonymous contemporary Danish and Latin report, two copies of which are preserved in the mss. Add. 332 4° and Add. 51 4° at the Royal Library of Copenhagen. A version of this material was edited by P. A. Munch in \textit{Norske Samlinger}, 1 (Christiania, 1852), 450-512. On the Princess’ interrupted voyage, and on the trials of the ‘witches’ who were accused of having caused it, see Thomas Riis, \textit{Should Auld Acquaintance Be Forgott...Scottish-Danish Relations c. 1450-1707}, 2 vols, Odense University Studies in History and Social Sciences, 114 (Odense: Odense University Press, 1988), I, 263-269.
the poems presented in Copenhagen in August — therefore turned out to be the proper word at the proper time and place. It is possible that the poem was read aloud as part of the actual wedding celebrations.\textsuperscript{15} However, due to the extraordinary circumstances of the wedding, it was not finished in time to be presented in a printed version to King James and Princess Anne. As Rosenkilde suggests, Volfius probably offered a manuscript copy of the poem to the royal couple while they were still in Norway.\textsuperscript{10} This would have been before Christmas 1589 when King James and Princess Anne left Oslo in order to spend the rest of the winter and the beginning of the spring of 1590 in Elsinore and in Copenhagen.

2. The copyists

A manuscript copy of the wedding poem was subsequently sent to the printer in Copenhagen. This manuscript — the one found by Volmer Rosenkilde — was written in two different hands: p. 2 through p. 5, line 10 were written in a ‘first hand’, whereas the frontispiece (p. 1) as well as p. 5, line 11 through p. 7 were written in a ‘second hand’. In his introduction to the 1991 re-edition of Volfius’ poem, Egil Kragerud explains the occurrence of the two hands by the possibility that Volfius was interrupted before he had finished copying the text himself. The first of the hands Kragerud accordingly attributes to Volfius himself, whereas he characterises the second hand as that of a poorer writer and claims that it should possibly be attributed to the messenger who transported the poem from Oslo to Lorenz Benedict’s press in Copenhagen.\textsuperscript{17}

However, this hypothesis about the two hands seems to be based exclusively on a value-laden argument: it is thus Kragerud’s personal evaluation of the quality of the second hand, along with his unwillingness to associate the author of the poem with poor handwriting, that leads him to suggest that the copying was begun by Volfius himself and later taken over by someone else.

In fact, both hands are typical 16th century Northern European hands, and I would describe the second hand as a regularly flowing humanist cursive, and definitely not as poor handwriting. Contrary to the hypothesis presented by Kragerud, I would suggest that the first hand belongs to the scribe whom Volfius initially commissioned to make a copy of the poem to be sent to the printer, whereas the second hand is that of Volfius himself. The change of hands in the manuscript, from that of the scribe to Volfius’ own hand, could be explained by the author himself having taken over the task — maybe in order to finish the copying of the poem in time for the departure of the royal retinue for Denmark before Christmas of 1589 — but of this we know nothing.

This hypothesis is strengthened by a comparison with the copy of Volfius’ *Cenotaphium Friderico II* which belongs to the Royal Library in Copenhagen (no. (2) in the list above). On the frontispiece of the Copenhagen copy of the *Cenotaphium* is found a manuscript dedication (reproduced in table 1) to Georgius Simonis (Jørgen Simonsen,\textsuperscript{18} 1602) of Odense: ‘Venerando viro, doctrina et virtute...> praestanti M<agistro> Georgio Simonio Otho<niensis>...> D<ominum> Francisci pastori fidelissimo D<...> (“To the honourable man of great learning and virtue, Master Georgius Simonis of Odense, the faithful pastor of [...].”)’ The dedication was not considered in Kragerud’s analysis of the two hands in the Rosenkilde manuscript, even though in his 1991 re-edition of Volfius’ wedding poem and *Cenotaphium* Kragerud based his edition of the latter work on the Copenhagen copy, which was at that point the only known copy of the book.\textsuperscript{19}

Yet, there is no doubt that the ‘dedicator hand’ of the Copenhagen copy of the *Cenotaphium* is identical with the second hand found in the Rosenkilde manuscript copy of the wedding poem. Compare, e.g., the characteristic letter ‘t’ (e.g., ‘ct’), as well as the capital letters ‘M’, ‘D’, and ‘F’ in the dedication to the printed work (table 1), with the same letters in, e.g., p. 6, lines 1–4 of the Rosenkilde manuscript (table 2). In other words, there is reason to believe that the ‘second hand’ of the Rosenkilde manuscript, and the dedicator of the Copenhagen copy of the

\textsuperscript{15} As was the case with Volfius’ *Cenotaphium Friderico II* which he himself read aloud at the school in Oslo on the same day as the funeral took place in Roskilde in Denmark, cf. the quotation in italics in n. 12 above, and the frontispiece of the printed oration: ‘Cenotaphium illustrissimo Principi ac Domino, Domino Friderico II Danorum et Norvegianorum Regi etc. scriptum et die 5 Junii Anno 85 quo tempore eius funeris Roschildeis justa reliquit, in Gymnasio Aslenmi recitatum a Jacobo Jacoboo Volfio’.

\textsuperscript{16} See Rosenkilde, ‘Nogle hidtil ukendte Lorenz Benedict-Tryk’ (cf. n. 4 above), p. 84.

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. Kragerud, *Kongehyllest*, p. 53.

\textsuperscript{18} See Bjørn Kromerup’s article on ‘Jørgen Simonsen’ in *Dansk Biografisk Lexikon*, XXII (Copenhagen, 1942), p. 34.

\textsuperscript{19} On the re-edition and use of this source, see Kragerud, *Kongehyllest*, p. 40.
CENOTAPHIUM
Illustrissimo Principi ac
Domino, Domino
FRIDERICIO II.
Danorum & Norvegianorum Regi & c. Utrum Regi & c. scripsit & die .
Junij, Anno 88, quo tempore eis funeris Roschiltiae uitus
stitabant, in Gymnasio Aslœnifi
recitatum
à
IACOBO IACOBAEO VOLFI.
THOMAS MORUS.
Principe plus quam carissimi
Tutissi est regni pater.
Principe amant ergo felissimis
Ter liberos, quos suscipit.

ROSTOCKII
Stephanus Mylonar excedebat
anno
1312

Venerando vivi, deo dicit urbi
præsatis, quibus damus Othoriam ad
Te verissimi, omnem,« quæs tusus, quæ qubis»

Table 1
Vulpius' dedication on the frontispiece of the Copenhagen copy of the
Cenotaphium Friderico II (1588) (Royal Library, Copenhagen)

Table 2
Vulpius' hand in the Rosenkilde manuscript, p. 6, lines 1-8
(National Library, Oslo)

Cenotaphium Friderici II, is none other than the author of the two
works, Jacobus Jacobaeus Vulpius.

The Scottish material carries still more evidence for this identification
of the 'second hand' of the Rosenkilde manuscript. The hitherto
virtually forgotten Scottish manuscript copy of the wedding poem consists
of eleven pages, the first of which contains a dedication from Vulpius
(reproduced in table 4) to a distinguished fellow poet, namely James
VI's royal chancellor, Johannes Metlandi (John Maitland, c. 1545-
1595):22 'Magnifico et amplissimo / Domino, D<omin> Johanni Me= /
<de>landi serenissimae Sco<to> / num regiae Maestatis / Cancellario,
domino suo / et mecaenati benignissimo / clientulus / Jacobus Jake= /
baeus.' ('To the magnificent and great Lord, Lord John Maitland, Chan-
celloi of His serene Royal Majesty of Scotland, his Master and most
kind patron, from his humble servant Jacobus Jacobaeus.')
Table 3
Volffius' hand on the title page of the Rosenkilde manuscript
(National Library, Oslo)

Table 4
Volffius' dedication on p. 1 of the Scottish Manuscript
(National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh)
It is well known that John Maitland while escorting King James and Princess Anne on their travel to Denmark in 1590 made the acquaintance of several Danish noblemen, scholars, and fellow poets. One of these was the Danish astronomer Tycho Brahe, whom Maitland presented with poems of his own as well as with his Latin translation of an English poem by King James. The discovery of Volﬁus’ dedication copy to Maitland of his wedding poem to King James and Princess Anne along with a printed copy of Volﬁus’ Cenotaphium is new evidence of the poetic exchange between the Scottish chancellor and his Danish acquaintances.

The whole of the Scottish manuscript, i.e., the dedication copy to John Maitland, is written in the very same handwriting as both the so-called ‘second hand’ of the Rosenkilde manuscript copy of the wedding poem, and the ‘dedicator hand’ of the Copenhagen copy of the Cenotaphium. Compare, e.g., the capital letters ‘D’ and ‘M’, as well as the words ‘Jacobus’ and ‘Jacobus’ in the title page of the Rosenkilde manuscript (table 3), with the same letters and words in Volﬁus’ dedication in p. 1 of the Scottish manuscript (table 4). We can now with certainty identify this hand as that of the author and poet, Jacobus Jacobaeus Volﬁus himself.

3. The two manuscript sources

Both the rediscovered Scottish manuscript and the second part of the Rosenkilde manuscript are thus Volﬁus’ autographs, and both manuscript copies of the wedding poem probably date from late November to mid-December 1589, i.e. from the time before the royal couple, accompanied by, among others, Chancellor Maitland, left Oslo on their way to Elsinore in Denmark.

As regards the Latin text, the two manuscripts evince only few internal variants, the most important of which are the following (line and verse references are to my edition below): (a) inversion of the word order: ‘Regis Scotiae’ (Scottish ms.) vs. ‘Scotiae Regis’ (Rosenkilde ms.), line 5 in the title of the work; (b) omission of a word: ‘regis filiae’ (Scottish ms.) vs. ‘ﬁliae’ (Rosenkilde ms.), line 10 in the title; (c) replacements of a word: ‘dedit’ (Scottish ms.) vs. ‘dabit’ (Rosenkilde ms.), v. 50; and ‘Musae’ (Scottish ms.) vs. ‘linguae’ (Rosenkilde ms.), v. 71.

There are many corrections in the Rosenkilde manuscript, especially in the first part, where the text copied by the unidentified ‘ﬁrst hand’ was revised both by Volﬁus himself and by the official corrector at the University of Copenhagen, Johannes Sasserides. One of the corrections clearly indicates that the Rosenkilde manuscript is the earlier version of the poem. This correction was made by the ‘ﬁrst hand’ himself who copied and immediately thereafter deleted a whole pentameter: ‘Arctius, et valida quemque tuerunt, amant.’ Subsequently he replaced the verse by another: ‘Et proceres ipsos indigenasque fovent?’ (v. 12 in the edition below).

In his introduction to the 1991 re-edition of the printed version of Volﬁus’ wedding poem, Egil Kragerud correctly observed that both the ﬁrst and the second version of the pentameter were written by the same hand, i.e. the ‘ﬁrst hand’. From this Kragerud attributed the copying, deletion, and replacing of the line to Volﬁus himself. I have already shown that this attribution is incorrect. What we may conclude from the replacement of the pentameter is either (a) that the scribe, while copying Volﬁus’ exemplar, caught himself including a verse that had already been expunged, or (b) that Volﬁus himself, while dictating the poem to the scribe, changed his mind about the verse in time for the scribe to enter the correction into the text itself.

22 See Kragerud, Kongehyllen, p. 53. Kragerud was unable to read the ﬁrst version of the line, because he used only a microﬁlm copy. The original manuscript offers a quite clear reading.

23 The copyst deleted the ﬁrst version of the pentameter in question, but forgot to indent the substituting verse when he copied it into the next line. In the manuscript it therefore follows the left margin and visually misleads the reader to expect an hexameter.
There is no trace of corrections in the Scottish manuscript, and here the line which was replaced in the Rosenkilde manuscript appears in its second and better version. The Scottish manuscript thus seems to have been copied by Volfsius after he had put a final touch to the Rosenkilde manuscript, i.e. the copy of the wedding poem which was to be sent to the printer in Copenhagen. The Scottish manuscript, i.e. the presentation copy to John Maitland, apparently represents Volfsius’ finished and polished original version of the wedding poem.

4. The manuscript sources and the editio princeps

Lorentz Benedicht’s editio princeps of 1590 — and Egil Krægurud’s 1991 re-edition of this — differ in various places from Volfsius’ original poem in the two manuscript versions. In order to compare the handwritten and the printed material we have to take into account the many levels of correctors involved. Thus, the Rosenkilde manuscript was emended by three different hands: (1) the unidentified ‘first hand’, (2) Volfsius himself, and (3) the official corrector, Johannes Sascerides. As regards the printer’s material, both the proofs and the final printed version of the poem reveal the work of an editor at the printing press. The following examples of the differences between the two manuscript sources and the editio princeps clearly show how the official corrector and the editor, while preparing the text for the printing press, both made several minor adjustments and some major changes to Volfsius’ Latin text (NB: the verse references are all to my edition below).

To the category of minor corrigenda belong the changes of capitalized and emphasized words in the text. An example are the words ‘Jacobe’, v. 26, and ‘Anna’, v. 28, in the two manuscripts. These words were corrected to ‘IACOBE’ and ‘ANNA’, respectively, in the printer’s fair copy and appear like this in the final printed version. Apparently these corrections were the responsibility of the press and were made according to the editor’s taste and understanding of the decorum of the genre as well as of the specific occasion.

Of greater importance, and probably also the editor’s full responsibility, is the inclusion in the beginning of the printed text (p. A2v) of the quotation from Psalm 128:24 ‘Uxor tua sicut vitis fructifera’, which was a general topos in the context of the genre, but cannot be found in Volfsius’ original manuscript. On pp. A1v-A2 in the editio princeps are depicted the Scottish and the Danish royal coats of arms. This appears, in fact, to have been an obligation feature of the wedding poems presented to the royal couple.25

One of several major changes to Volfsius’ Latin text is the official corrector’s reworking of vv. 53-54 in the Rosenkilde manuscript from: ‘Mascula nulla fuit regali sanguine proles / Iam duxit Danis illa sed interiti’, into: ‘Mascula non fuerat regali sanguine proles / Iam duxit Danis ast ea corruerat’. The latter reading is found ante correctionem in the printer’s fair copy of the poem. However, the verses apparently did not satisfy the editor, since they were subsequently corrected and remodelled into the form in which they appear in the editio princeps (cf. the apparatus criticus in my edition below).

Presumably with an eye to variatio, the whole of v. 56: ‘Nescio quo fato prorsus et interiti’ in the Rosenkilde manuscript appears to have been changed by the official corrector to: ‘Concederat, finem mox habitura suum’, which is found in the printed edition as well. Moreover, in v. 82, the manuscripts have ‘Junerato herosas’, which the corrector changed to ‘Heroas juxit’, preferring praeteritum simplex to Volfsius’ praeteritum perfectum. The corrector’s version is the one found in the editio princeps.

Volfsius concludes his poem with an eustichon, a type of distich in which the capital letters were to be read as Roman numbers that added up to the date of the wedding in question. Eustichon was in fashion and could be found in many Danish wedding poems by the end of the 16th century. After the Greek genre titulus, ἐσχοτισιον, Volfsius adds in the manuscript versions: ‘etiam diem initi matrimonii complectens’ (‘An eustichon which also gives the day of the wedding’). Yet, Volfsius’ distich only gives the year of the wedding. This unfulfilled promise seems to have bothered the editor at the printing press, who in the final printed version added in a parenthesis after the word ‘matrimonii’:

24 Cf. Psalm 127 of the modern version of the Vulgata, ‘Uxor tua sicut vitis abundantia’.

25 See, e.g., the six printed parts of Abrahamus Praestorius’ Harmonia gravulatoria (cf. n. 13 above), copies of which are to be found in the Royal Library in Copenhagen, in the British Library, and in the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel.

*Is erat xxiiii. Novembris, anni a apprehension salutis humanae 1589* (‘i.e. November 23, in the year of our Saviour 1589’).27

* * *

Usually we are unable to examine the development of a 16th-century poem from manuscript draft to printed edition. The chance finding of the printer’s material reused in a contemporary book binding, combined with the lucky survival of two complete manuscript copies (one and a half of which are autograph), makes this a rare opportunity to study the author’s working process and to evaluate the influence of the corrector and the editor on the final printed version.

The extant source material demonstrates the meticulous work of the University’s corrector and the editor at Lauritz Benedict’s printing press. It also suggests that their influence on the final printed product was only just second to that of the official *imprimatur*. Although the corrections made to Jacobus Jacobaeus’ Volfius’ wedding poem certainly did not change the poem altogether, nevertheless they clearly left behind the traces of the various levels of censorship involved.

In the following edition of Volfius’ wedding poem I have included the two extant manuscript sources as well as all of the printer’s material. Whereas the printed proof sheets and the final edition are represented along with the Rosenkilde manuscript and the printer’s fair copy in the *apparatus criticus*, the main text is based on my transcription of Volfius’ hitherto neglected dedication copy to John Maitland which, as I have argued above, may be regarded as Volfius’ original — uncensored and autograph — version of the poem.

---

27 Knaggerud in *Kongkyndhet*, p. 55, claims that there is a printer’s error in the distich (a supposedly missing ‘i’ in the word ‘SeXIVs’). This is not correct: the letter is certainly there, both in the printed proofs, and in the final printed version.
CARMEN
in nuptias illustrissimi et potenissimi Principis et Domini IACOBI VI
Regis Scotiae etc.
et serenissimae herionae ANAE NAE laudatissimae memoriae
Friderici II Daniae et
Norwegiae <etc.> Regis filiae, scriptum
a
Jacobo Jacobaeo
ludimodarote Asloenst. 28

Inclyte Rex, ampli Scotorum gloria regni
Et decus Arctoi spes salutis fulsit.
Multis saepe agitat variam sententiam mentem,
Hosque velut pinum verbere ventus agit:

Maxima regnorum quae gloria, maxima plebis
Ornamenta, decus, vita, corona, salus.
Num sacra levi constorta e marmore templo,
Aetheraque tangunt turribus alta suis?
vel nimirum fossae munitae et montibus arces,
Quales magnanimitatis regibus esse solent?
Num sanctae leges sanctissima quae viscern regni,
Et proceres ipsos indigennasque fovent?

Sic animos torquent, sed eos, Rex optime, solus
Illas doces, huius dulcis imago rei.

15 Quid refero solus? Nonne id tua regia conjux
Obinet, aut pariter vendicat ANNA sibi? 30
Hanc certe laudem merita est cum rege marito,
Qua nec privata nostra Thalia sinet.
Verum quid cunctor? Quid sic ambagibis utor?

Quin potius retro Musa reflectat iter?
Exprimat et paucis, quod pro ducte ante, politis:
Maxima quae regnis gloria, quaeque salus?

Si libet annales Danorum inquirere regum,
Et conferre simul secla vetusta novis,
Si libet illustrem scrutari ab origine stirpem
Ex proavis Danis, Rex Jacobo, tuam,
Si libet et notitis virtutibus, HEROINA
Anna, tuam penitus cerne progeneri,
Quae sit vera salus lucens quae gloria regnis

Hic labor et multis unicus expedit.
Regna licet decorant permuta, tamen decus unum
Est regnis, Regem regibus esse satum.
Non tamen hoc satis est, sed prolem regna virilem
Continue ex ducibus posse tenere suis.

O regio felix igitur, rex culius honestum
Connubii, prosperans ardet inire thorum.
Quoque thoros fuerit fecundior ipse jugalis,
Major eo regnis venerit inde salus.
Hinc reges uno coalescunt corpore multi.

Latius hinc fines tendit amicitia, 30
Hinc manet inviolata suis pac publica regnis
Et placida colitur religione DEUS.
Quid multis? Quicquid felicis est nomine regnis,
Felix hoc uno nomine semper erit.

Quocirca Domino dicendae pectore grates,
Qui Danos tanta prosperitate beat,
Vidit enim multos gemmantia sceptrum per annos
Continue reges obtinuisse suos.

15 Contra facius F 2 16 aut a c. O 2 et add. et del. O 2 aut p c. O 2 sic... F 17 mariste
mc... F 2 F 2 F 2 F 17 Quae sit... regnis difficilior legitur F 2 31 unico... O 2 33 vic... O 2 37 thorus... O 2 F 2 ante torus del. th F 2 40 Post hanc lineam expl. P 45 post dicendas add. ex. O 2 s.l., F, B 2

Felix illa dies. CHRISTI DE NOMINE PRIMO
Dania ubi primum regna regenda dedit.
Felix illa dies niveis signanda lapillis
Ille subit thalamos qua. DOROTHEA, tuos.
Mascula nulla fuit regali sanguine proles
Iam dudum Danis, illa sed interit.
Quocirca antiquum serios et linea regum
Nescio quo fato prorsus et interiti.
Sic DEUS omnipotens cum fert sua sancta voluntas
Transfert regna, alios constituitque duces.
Quid poterit, quaeso, nunc esse beatus illo
Cum vides tantam surgere progeniem?
Ut patulos uno diffundit stipite ramos
Arbor dans foetus fertilitate suos,
Uique aliis illa decernitos arbore ramos
Inserimus. fructus uberiusque ferunt.\(^1\)

Sic quoque CHRISTIERNI foecundo e corpore REGIS.
Reges innumeris secula nostra vident
Magnarimosque duces, reginas atque ducissas
Quis refleus famam terminat Oceanus.
Ut modo praeter eam multos. Rex, omnis unus
Sufficit, et conjux regia, SEXTAE, tua.
Nec, fatero, nostrae tanta est facundia Musae
Carmine quae cunctos concelubreque queat.
Quot memorat Fabios una de stipe celebres
Roma, quot augustos Marte togaque duces,
Tot reor excelso Christierni sanguine reges
Atque duces fortes dumerare licet.
Ille etiam radix vestrum Christierni utrique
Stemmatis et clari portio parce fuit.

---

49 Felix... PRIMO] difficile legitur F II 50 dabit O\(a\). a.c.: dedit E, O\(2\) [seu O\(3\)] F, B II 52 ille F a.c.: in F p.c. B II subit O\(a\), F B II 53 nulla fuit] non fuerat O\(3\), F a.c.: iam dudum F p.c. B II 54 lam dudum F a.c.: Nulla fuit F p.c. B B alla sed] sed p.c.> O\(a\). a.c.: ait ea O\(a\). p.c.> illi interit: O\(a\). a.c.: convenit F a.c.: ille> F p.c.> 56 Conceli> nem< et< nuna> turia> 1 add. in me. O\(2\) il Nescio> interiit> Conciderat, finem max habitura suum F, B II 57 volumine> O\(a\). illa sancta< et< F II 58 die> F II 64 post ferunt expl. O\(a\). et ince O\(b\). II 65 Reg< ever> F II 68 Ocean<...> F II 69 Ut... unus] difficile legitur F II 70 SEXTAE; un Sexto? II 71 Nec> Non F II fatero> non legitur O\(2\). II Musae] linguae O\(b\). B, F II

\(^1\) In O, a catchphrase 'S' is added in the right margin, maybe by Volpini himself. — In F, the page division is marked at the beginning of the next line.

---

VOLFIUS' CARMEN IN NUPTIAS JACOBI VI ET ANNA (1589)
Sed genus amborum vestrum ceu scinditur uno
Sanguine, sic uno corpore junxit amor.
Vos pater omni potens, uno qui corpore binos
Junxit et eroas, servat et unamini.
Nestoreos vivant REX et REGINA per annos
Fertilis et vident magnara comnubii
Et natos natorum et qui nascendar aut illis
Ut proeras prisci vido uterque suos.
Vivite felices igitur, REX inclyte et ANNA.
ANNA, decus patrii et magna corona soli.
Vivite felices, soli sed vivite Christo.
Qui dabit aeternae gaudiae sortis. Amen.

\(\text{etiam diem initii ma}\)\(^{32}\) comple\(\text{t}^e\text{ns}\)

CLEMENS LAETVS erat, IAOCBVBS SEXTVS et Anna

Dept. of Greek and Latin
University of Copenhagen

Nassjalg 92
DK-2300 Copenhagen S, Denmark

E-mail: harsting@hum.ku.dk


\(^{32}\) After the word 'matrimonii' is added a caret in P. This corresponds to the inserted parenthesis after the same word in B: "(is crat xxii. Novembris anna a relatione salutis humanae / 1589)"

\(^{33}\) The sum of the capital letters, C = L = M + L + V + I + C + V + X + V + C + S + V + L + V = 1589, indicates the year of the royal wedding. In O follows, at the bottom of p. 7, the corrector's note: 'Carmen hoc vid. correctorumique sibi satis existimavi, quantum ad grammaticam et prosodiam. Johan·nes· Sacerdotes', along with the approval of the rector of the University of Copenhagen: 'Imprimatur. P. Matzenes'. On p. 8 is found an anonymous note from the printing press: 'Den 25. Dag februari beygte jeg at sette dette Carmen / anno 1590, som er underskuefven af D. Poul / Matzen och M. Hans Sacerdotes [sic!] ('On the 25th of February, 1590 I began to set this Carmen which is signed by Doctor Poul Matzen and Master Hans Sacerdotes'.
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