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The translation presented here, first published in 1726, has been largely unknown to anglophone readers for almost 300 years. *Laus Ululae, The Praise of Owls* is a loose translation of a Latin work named *Laus Ululae*, which, according to the OCLC database, was first published in Amsterdam in 1640 and was later reprinted a few times in the seventeenth century. Because this translation was apparently withdrawn from the market by its publisher, only a few copies have survived. Recently the digitized text of one of those copies became available to all readers connected to the Internet and reprints have appeared in hardcopy.

Given this easier access to what was until recently a rare text, has anyone rushed to publish the first modern study of this work to appear in English? Apparently not. This neglect may result from a belief that this text is at best minor and inconsequential. On the other hand, how many scholars of eighteenth-century literature knew that this text existed for centuries and is now more easily available? Relatively few, I would guess—a conclusion based on the fact that, at least for readers of English literature, it is rarely mentioned and has never appeared as the subject of any critical essays or books. The same can be said for many other minor works, so a question can be raised regarding this particular choice: why this work?

What led me at first to pursue this old and neglected work was mere curiosity. A few years ago, when I decided to see a copy, I discovered that most of the libraries that claim to own this work really do not. I eventually realized that in order to see a rare 1727 exemplar of this translation, I would have to visit Yale’s Beinecke Library. I was unable read the entire book during that visit, but fortunately I was able to order a digital copy of it and that gradually led me to undertake this edition.

One reason for my interest in this work is that it seemed to have some relationship to Alexander Pope’s uses of owl imagery. A few scholars have examined Pope’s uses of the owl image and its symbolism in various editions of his *Dunciad*, but not one of them has dealt with the owls depicted in the English translation of *Laus Ululae*. Edmund Curll published this work two years before Pope’s famous satire...
appeared in 1728. In their book on Curll (2005), Paul Baines and Pat Rogers briefly mentioned
Conradus Goddaeus’s *Laus Ululae* and its translator Thomas Foxton, but to explore that translation in
any depth was simply not their aim. Nor have any other anglophone scholars dealt at length with this
Neo-Latin work or with its translation. As for the Latin source of this translation, one modern study
(1934) by F. Kossmann—published in Dutch, in a Dutch journal—provides bibliographical
information about it. Kossmann’s essay is apparently our only modern study of Goddaeus’s career and
works. In what follows I shall offer some details about his ironic encomium, but my main concern will
be to explore the English translation of Goddaeus’s work, which was not mentioned at all by Kossmann.

**GENRE: THE PARADOXICAL ENCOMIUM**

When I taught courses in Satire, I would usually assign an English translation of Erasmus’s
masterpiece, his *Laus Stultitiae* or *Moriae Encomium* (1511), commonly rendered as *The Praise of
Folly*. In that work Erasmus revived and re-invigorated the genre of the paradoxical encomium, which
is best known in writings by Lucian of Samosata. We identify the genre as the paradoxical encomium,
but the writings of this kind are also called the mock encomium, the burlesque encomium, the satirical
encomium, and the satirical eulogy. Following the success of Erasmus’s *Moriae Encomium*, the genre
of the ironic or paradoxical encomium flourished on the Continent and in Britain as never before.
Authors who wrote in this genre strove to find new things or creatures to praise ironically. Most often
they praised vices of all sorts, various diseases, and many animals ranging from insects to the
elephant. Eventually this genre came to include paradoxical encomia on gout, on baldness, on lice, on
bats, on fleas, on war, on avarice, on poverty, on mice, on lying, and even on nothing. The full list is
much longer. Knowing that this genre was especially popular in the seventeenth century, we will not
be surprised to find that a minor author, Conradus Goddaeus, offered his own contribution to it, *Laus
Ululae*, which means “the praise of owls.” This seventeenth-century work survives today in various
editions printed in Latin and in a seventeenth-century translation from the Latin into Dutch. No further
reprints of this work, either in Latin or in Dutch translation, appeared after 1700. But in 1726 this
English translation (or imitation) of it did appear for sale briefly and then became scarce.

We do not know precisely why Conradus Goddaeus (1612-1658), a preacher in the Dutch town of
Vaassen since 1636, decided to write his *Laus Ululae*, but he probably knew of the success of
Erasmus’s *Encomium Moriae* and may have been eager to make his own contribution to the growing
body of works in that genre. The idea of praising owls in particular may have appealed to him possibly
because no one else had previously attempted it. The most popular literary treatment of an owl that
preceded *Laus Ululae* was the collection of humorous tales featuring Till Eulenspiegel, or Till Owl-glass, though there were of course other literary treatments of the owl in Medieval and Renaissance writings.

After his work on owls Goddaeus also published a volume of poems (1656) and corresponded with P.C. Hooft, one of the better-known Dutch authors of that period, but he never became a major author. He might have remained almost completely unknown today—the fate of most minor Neo-Latin authors—were it not for the English translation that recently became widely available.

The fact that neither the translator nor his publisher ever mentioned the name Goddaeus raises the possibility that neither of them knew the author’s identity, but if they did know the author’s name, they were not concerned to mention it. Neither of them, however, can be faulted for this reticence or blatant omission because the name Goddaeus is entirely absent from all of the Latin printings of *Laus Ululae*. That seems to have been a choice made by Goddaeus: his identity is deliberately masked on each title page, even in editions published after 1658, the year of his death. When the English translation first appeared in mid-1726, its readers might well have been mystified by the pseudonym of the author printed on the title page: Curtius Jaele.

**SOME NOTES ON THE SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY EDITIONS IN LATIN:**

a) According to the OCLC, *Laus Ululae* was first published in Amsterdam in 1640. I have never seen a copy of that first edition, but I do have access to the revised and expanded edition that followed in 1642. The only bibliography I have ever seen of early editions of this Neo-Latin work appears in Kossman’s article. Kossmann thought that the first edition of *Laus Ululae* was published in 1642, but the OCLC now reports that it was first published in Amsterdam two years earlier. The OCLC lists printings of the *Laus Ululae* for 1640, 1642, 1643, 1644, 1655, 1658, and 1700. At a certain point this work was published and bound together with Jean Passerat’s *Laus Asini*—the praise of asses or donkeys—possibly in the 1640s, but also in 1650, 1665 and 1681. The Latin text of *Laus Ululae* was reprinted, without its footnotes, in a Dutch anthology of paradoxical or mock encomia named *Admiranda rerum admirabilium encomia: sive, Diserta & amoena Pallas differens seria sub ludicra specie, hoc est . . .* (Noviomagi Batavorum [i.e., Nimegen], 1666, reprinted 1676). It was not re-issued in Latin after 1700.
b) A posthumous Dutch translation of Goddaeus’s *Laus Ululae* appeared in 1664 with the title *Het Waare Lof des Uyls*. That volume also contains a Dutch translation of Jean Passerat’s *Laus Asini* (mentioned above). Both translations into Dutch were published in Amsterdam in 1664 by Samuel Imbrecht and Adam Sneewater.3

c) The 1727 translation into English.

The two volumes of Curll’s *Miscellanea*, with the year 1727 printed on their separate title pages, were published in London and sold there and perhaps elsewhere beginning in mid-1726. Volume I contains (1) “Familiar letters written to Henry Cromwell Esq; by Mr. Pope,” (2) “Occasional poems by Mr. Pope, Mr. Cromwell, Dean Swift, &c.,” and (3) “Letters from Mr. Dryden to a lady, in the year 1699.” Volume two always has five separate works listed on its title page as follows: (1) “An Essay on Gibing, with a project for its improvement,” (2) “The Praise of Women, Done out of French,” (3) “An Essay on the Mischief of Giving Fortunes with Women in Marriage,” (4) “Swifteana,” and (5) “Laus Ululae, The Praise of Owls.”

When Curll decided to withdraw the last of these five works, he replaced it with at least three other works, successively. No matter what substitutions might appear in later printings of volume II, the fifth item was always reported on this volume’s title page as “Laus Ululae.” Those other substituted works, as R.H. Griffith informs us in his bibliography of Pope (Austin, Texas: 1922), include “sheets from ‘Original poems and translations. By Mr. Hill’ 1714 (group v); sheets from Pope’s ‘Court Poems,’ 1726 (group t); and sheets from N. Rowe’s ‘Poems on several occasions’ (group u), with additional leaves (sig. C, pp. 33-42).” Thus it appears that the fifth work in volume II of the *Miscellanea* was initially the translation of *Laus Ululae*, which shows up in Griffith’s bibliography of Pope as item no. 178. All of the five works collected in that second volume make up what Griffith called “variant a.”4 The sheets on which the *Laus Ululae* translation is printed are called “group s,” and very few copies of that specific variant have survived. About six copies of that variant in the *Miscellanea*, volume II, are listed in the online OCLC. In addition to being published as the fifth work collected in *Miscellanea*, volume II, this translation apparently existed as a separate stand-alone publication, but I have never seen a copy of it in that form.

We are left with the question of why the translation of *Laus Ululae* was removed. Curll might have learned that it was unreliable, meaning unfaithful to its Latin source—which is true. Or perhaps that work was discovered to be unappealing? Another possibility is that Curll may simply have wanted to
reduce his inventory of unbound works. Whatever the cause or causes may have been, he did change his mind fairly soon and began replacing the translation of *Laus Ululae* with other works. Did he have any knowledge of or forewarning of the kind of owl that was to appear in 1728 in Pope’s *Dunciad*? Is that what influenced him to stop publishing “The Praise of Owls”? The answer is a tentative “no,” simply because there is no proof to support that hypothesis. For whatever reason, the *Laus Ululae* was removed and it apparently dropped out of sight a year or two before Pope’s *Dunciad* appeared in May 1728. We are still drawn to consider the sources of Pope’s owl and cannot dismiss the possibility that Pope was reacting to various images of owls and asses in earlier literature and in visual art. Was he aware that Curll had published Foxton’s translation, and was he at all reacting to it? Perhaps, but that would need to be verified.

THE TITLE PAGES

The title page of the second edition of *Laus Ululae* [1642] reads as follows:

LAUS | ULULAE | AD | Conscriptos Ululantium | Patres & Patronos. | Authore | CURTIO JAELE. | Editio secunda, priori multo auctior & emendatior. | [Woodcut of an owl viewing itself in a mirror] | Prostat | GLAUCOPOLI, | Apud Caesium Nyctimenium: | In platea Ulularia, sub signo | ULADISLAI Regis Poloniae. | [n.d., but the date is probably 1642].

The notes that follow are intended primarily for anglophone readers, but they may possibly be of interest to classicists also. Translated into English, with some explication, the title page can be read as follows:

THE PRAISE OF OWLS, to the Conscript Fathers [i.e., Roman senators] and Patrons of Owls.

The author’s name, Curtio Jaele, seems to be (according to Kossman, p. 240) a pseudonym for Conradus Goddaeus. Curtius = Koert or Conradus, and the surname Jaele consists of two Hebrew words signifying God, namely Jahweh and El. The name Jaele thus “translates” the name Goddaeus, which can be read as God + deus.

The next line informs us that this is the “second edition, much augmented and corrected.”
We see below this a woodcut of an owl viewing an image of its face in a mirror, which would remind readers of the popular tales of Till Eulenspiegel, whose very name includes the terms owl and mirror. The published editions of *Till Eulenspiegel* usually included such a print on their title pages.

Under this image we find the imprint information. “Prostat” can be rendered as “for sale at” or “sold at.” The city of publication, Glaucopoli is a fictional invention from Greek roots “glaux” (=owl) and “polis” (=city), which combined give us “Owl City.” “Apud” (=among) introduces the name of the publisher. “Caesius” renders in Latin the Greek word “glaukos” (meaning “blue-gray”), and the simplest explanation of “Nyctimenium” is that it combines two Greek terms, “nux” (=night) and “mayn” (=moon), possibly signifying “moonlit night.” Some readers may recall the character Nyctimene (in Book II of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*) who was transformed into an owl for having slept with her father. It is possible that Goddaeus wanted the reader to make that identification, so that every part of the imprint would be associated with owls.⁵ “In platea Ulularia” can be rendered as “owl street,” and “sub signo Uladislai Regis Poloniae” means “under the sign of Ladislas (or Ladislaus), King of Poland.” Many kings with this name appear in European history over the centuries, but this “Uladislai” is probably the Ladislas who lived from 1595 to 1648, becoming king of Poland in 1632, after the death of his father King Sigismund III. (The Wikipedia article on this king gives his name as Władysław IV Vasa.)

This king Ladislas (or Władysław) apparently did visit the Netherlands briefly and had his portrait painted by Rubens in Antwerp. Did Goddaeus ever see him or actually meet him? The imprint seems to imply that the image of this Polish King Ladislas appeared on a bookseller’s sign on Owl Street in the city of Glaucopoli. Why did Goddaeus associate the name of this king with the other images, including those of the owl and of Nyctimene, on this problematic title page? Was it a question of a Protestant preacher disliking a Catholic king? At this point we do not know why this Polish King ‘Uladislai’ is mentioned, but, as one scholar has suggested to me, Goddaeus may have used that king’s name, Uladislai, for no weightier reason than that it sounds like the Latin word for owls.⁶

Compared with the various mysteries hiding plain truths on the 1642 title page, the title page of its English translation is fairly straightforward, except for the names of the author, “Curtius Jaele,” and its translator, “a Canary Bird.” We have already remarked upon “Curtio Jaele.” As for the “Canary Bird,” I do not know any reason why the name Thomas Foxton needed to be disguised. It seems unlikely that the inventor of this title page wanted his reader to think of a light yellow canary who sang a bird’s song. Nor is there any reason to have associated this work with the Canary Islands. By a process of
elimination we arrive at the likeliest connotation: this “canary bird” may delight in imbibing sack (a wine) called “canary.” He may, in fact, be a tippler, and he may be remotely associated with a work previously published by Curll, the *Laus Ebrietatis* (the praise of drunkenness). Until a more convincing account is offered, such an explication will remain at best an educated guess.

After Foxton’s translation was no longer available as the fifth item in the second volume of *Miscellanea*, it survived in bibliographies and came to be regarded as a rare book. An occasional copy turns up now and then in the sale lists of rare-book dealers. Many libraries worldwide are reported by the OCLC database as possessing a copy of *Miscellanea*, volume II, but more often than not, as I have found, their copies of volume II lack this specific work. Among the few libraries that do own Foxton’s translation of the *Laus Ululae* we can name the Huntington, the Spencer Library at the University of Kansas, the Teerink Collection at the University of Pennsylvania, the Lilly Library at Indiana University, the Beinecke Library at Yale, and the libraries of Trinity College (Hartford), Princeton University, Harvard University, and U.C.L.A. Within the last few years, however, Google Books has added Curll’s *Miscellanea*, vol. II (1727) to their collection online and fortunately the copy they have included in their database does contain Foxton’s translation. Thus a book that was once available in only a few rare-book rooms and through a few rare-book dealers can now be easily accessed by any readers connected to the Internet.

**THE CONTENT: IN WHAT WAYS IS THE OWL PRAISED?**

*Laus Ululae, The Praise of Owls*, which continues for over one hundred pages in this first and only English translation, has a central message that serves as its superstructure. Basically that superstructure is Goddaeus’s list of the traits and qualities for which the owl is praised, and these are presented to us almost from the beginning. On page iii of his opening note to the “Jocund Reader,” the author remarks that the owl is “a Creature formed by Nature for Sport and Pastime.” (This might be said of other beings too, but the speaker is not concerned with them here.) Furthermore the owl is the “Favourite and sacred BIRD of Minerva”; it excels all other birds in “Shape and Beauty”; and its appearance brings not disaster—as was commonly thought—but prosperity. The owl’s former infamy will vanish as its virtues come to be known and admired (“Preface,” pp. i-ii). But readers already familiar with some paradoxical encomia will also suspect the presence of irony in almost every page of this work, and they are right to do so.
Early in the main body of this work the encomium focuses upon the owl’s name and the origins of *ulula*, a name bestowed upon the owl “with great care and judgment” (p. 6). In fact, the owl “makes considerable approaches to human nature” by imitating “the voice and lamentation” of men. In this section the author speculates upon how the owl obtained his name, and he then discusses the sound of the owl’s voice, the phenomenon of echoes, and various interpretations of the word or name *ulula*. All of this leads us to his anticlimactic conclusion that “the OWL is a very fine bird, and a great ornament to all his winged fraternity.” This is indeed speaking tongue-in-cheek, with a broad smile from the author telling us that though we may learn certain things about owls that we did not know previously, the main goal of such a work is to please and entertain us.

The author next conducts us to his particular owl, the noctua, which is Athena’s owl. It soon becomes evident that this essay was designed not only to praise owls, as announced in the work’s title, but also to praise a particular variety of these night flyers called noctua. We discover early in this work that, in addition to praising owls, the speaker is often busy with description, examining the owls’ physical features and their habits and their behavior, usually through passages found in classical authors such as Aristotle, Pliny the Elder, Aelian and others. The information culled from these authors had been circulating for centuries. What makes this essay different from other writings on the owl is the fact that the speaker’s stated purpose is to praise the owl, which, in the folkloric and public imagination, had generally been regarded as a bird of ill omen.

Early in this work, Goddaeus reminds us that Athena prized the owl above all of the other birds (p. 12). The owl is praised for having gray eyes (glauk-ops), like Athena and like Caesar. Having gray eyes, it cannot see well in daylight—a detail that our author uses to amplify the owl’s value or stature by associating him with famous persons like Tiberius Caesar and the two Scaligers, all of whom reportedly had superior night vision (pp. 15-16). From this point onward the author mentions many famous persons and authorities who, merely by being associated with the owl, confer honor and praise upon him.

The owl, we learn, not only can fly in the darkness of night, but can also sing in the dark, like Philomel the nightingale. (Later the speaker notes that a major virtue of the owl is its silence.) The translator Foxton probably had his English readers in mind when he took this occasion to alter Goddaeus’s text by quoting the famous passage on the nightingale from Milton’s “Il Penseroso.” This alteration is significant because here Goddaeus’s work is made to include a quotation written in English and by an English author. But the Neo-Latin editions of this work published in the seventeenth century contain
no references to English authors and no quotations from their works. Foxton’s loose translation, on the other hand, includes at least half a dozen quotations from English works. Introducing these lines penned by English writers was a major adaptation of the Latin text. Unfortunately we do not know whether any eighteenth-century English readers were pleased by these alterations.

The next topic in this translation is place. The “native Soil” of this bird may be Athens, but the speaker ignores that limitation when he claims that the owl appears worldwide. By various means Goddaeus manages to import passages from the works of Homer, Socrates, Diogenes the Cynic, Augustus Caesar and Pliny the Elder into his discussion of the owl’s homeland. Foxton took the liberty of adding to this group a passage about Hannibal crossing the Alps that occurs in Nat Lee’s play *Sophonisba: or Hannibal’s Overthrow* (1675). Some lines spoken by Hannibal in that play vividly describe what it felt like for him and his army to cross the Alps. The owl, on the other hand, sensibly avoids the snowy Alps in order to inhabit a warmer climate, “and in this he shows an exquisite Judgement” (p. 22). Even though we are told that the owl is not confined to a particular region but is really found worldwide, Goddaeus nevertheless focuses on the city of Athens and writes that “Here it was . . . that the OWLS fixed their certain and imperial Seats” (pp. 23-24). Then, after praising the owls for their connection with Athens, the author seizes that moment to praise not only the owl but Athens itself. That discussion leads to Athenian coinage, for the image of the owl is stamped on one side of a famous Athenian coin while an image of Minerva dignifies the reverse side.

From the owls’ Athenian connection the author somewhat abruptly sweeps us back to the biblical books of Isaiah and Jeremiah, which report that God “drove out the Babylonians from their seat and introduced troops of owls into their kingdom, to whom he gave the habitations of men: so great a monarchy was transferred from men to owls!” Goddaeus was apparently enjoying his exaggeration. From Babylonia the author speeds up his history by summarizing the *translatio imperii*, the familiar progression of empire from East to West: the Chaldeans, the Persians, the Greeks, the Romans and thereafter the entire world—so that the owls (once again) are now found everywhere.

From the “Country, Habitation, and peculiar City” of the owl (p. 26) the speaker moves on to the owl’s origin and generation. The Book of Genesis supports the view that the owls and other creatures emerged either from the water or from the earth (p. 28). Discourse on the origins of the owl will sooner or later lead to the owl’s egg. The owl, Goddaeus asserts, “was before the Egg,” but all owls that followed were born from their eggs. Unlike most other creatures hatched from eggs, the owl emerges from its egg tail first, thus pointing to its contrariness, which is an odd observation in a work designed
to praise the owl. The owl’s eggs, according to Philostratus, can be useful when, consumed by children, they prevent drunkenness; or when, given to adults, they deflect or remove the drunkard’s desire for inebriating spirits. The general drift here is that temperance and sobriety are praiseworthy while inebriation is not—which we would expect any clergyman to affirm.

The author at this point shifts to another subject by noting that even while all owls are born from eggs, there are nevertheless different kinds of owls, some of which are nobler than others (p. 31). The first owl listed here is the Otis, also called the Asio (p. 32). The series continues with the Aluco (p. 33) which is subdivided into the Aluco Major and the lesser Aluco (p. 35). In the third category, descending in nobility, we find the Nycticorax, which some call “the Night-Raven” though it is not a raven at all but in the owl family. Fourth in this descending list are all other owls, followed by a fifth category, would-be owls, that is, birds that do not really belong to this group (p. 37). Among those falsely regarded as being owls are (sixth in order) the Screech Owls, described as being “clamorous, bold, cruel . . . and dangerous to Women lately delivered . . .” (p. 38). The seventh in this list, also excluded from the ranks of true owls, is the Bubo, a nasty bird that also flies abroad at night (p. 41 ff.). This might have served in the seventeenth century but for us today this short list can hardly pretend to be a scientific survey of the world’s variety of owls. It is not even an accurate account of the owls that Goddaeus had already mentioned in his book, for the simple reason that his list does not include Athena’s owl, the Noctua, the bird that occupies the center of attention from the very beginning of this work.

After examining different types of owls, including some birds that are called owls but really are not, Goddaeus moves on to the owl’s physical constitution (p. 44). We may feel somewhat cheated in this section because the author does not really examine the wings, the claws, the beak etc. but praises the owl’s sharp mind and his sense of smell. Surely there is more to the owl’s body or constitution than that? No matter; Goddaeus then announces the beginning of another major section, his survey of the virtues of the owl (pp. 52 ff.).

The first “virtue” that he associates with the owl is its propensity to religion: the owl “has a considerable Notion of Religion in that he loves and frequents Temples and sacred Places.” And what does the owl do in those places? “He” devours the mice! In this work the reader does not expect to come upon a discussion of the sacrament of Holy Communion and considerations of the Host and the body of Christ, but that is what we find when Goddaeus holds forth upon the owl and religion. The next virtue, the second in this series, is Fortitude (pp. 55 ff.), which brings us to the subject of the
perpetual warfare between the owl and the raven and also to other enemies of the owl such as the horse-leech and lice. The third virtue ascribed to the owl is his patience (pp. 64 ff.), a virtue that rarely co-exists with fortitude in the same creature. Examples of the owl’s patience lead to other instances of owl-like behavior in human beings even of the highest rank, including the Emperor Claudius, and in doting husbands who approve of their wives’ open infidelity. In such passages the author deliberately forgets that he is praising the owl but instead uses the owl the way Erasmus used Folly, namely, to imply that we are all owlish when we behave ignominiously or in a cowardly manner. Erasmus, of course, implied that we are all fools.

The fourth of the owl’s virtues is constancy. While most birds seek a warmer clime in winter, the owl, according to Pliny the Elder, hibernates where he is. Again, it is not the announcement of the owl’s constancy that intrigues the reader, but the unexpected illustrations that are supplied, usually with some satiric or comedic intent. The various details of this work’s primary structure are hardly exciting, but what brings interest and surprise to this progression of virtues is the string of quotations, proverbs, allusions, syllogisms and fables that Goddaeus dredged up from classical and biblical writings and tacked onto the main structure in an order that is completely unpredictable. We might describe all of these external materials, often loosely connected to the essay’s framework, as forms of ornamentation and embellishment.

From constancy the author moves to the fifth virtue he finds in owls, namely, temperance (pp. 73 ff.). In this section the author sounds more like a philosopher or preacher inveighing against strong drink and drinking contests and drunkenness. The upshot of this survey of the owl’s virtues is that the owl meets the requirements that Aristotle thought necessary to produce a virtuous man (p. 78). Another of the owl’s virtues—the sixth—lies in his usefulness to human beings, particularly in his destruction of mice which, over the centuries, have been dangerous and deadly to mankind. The author had previously connected the owl’s destruction of mice with the owl’s religion, but now that destructive activity is also used to support the owl’s utility to mankind. The seventh of the owl’s virtues is friendship, an assertion based on the claim that we never hear of owls battling against owls although human beings and other creatures frequently display such reprehensible behavior within their own groups (pp. 83 ff.).

Toward the end of his survey of the owl’s virtues the author praises the owl for his silence. Many in the animal kingdom, especially the nightingale, are notable for the sounds that they emit, but that excludes the owl. The author therefore seizes upon the owl’s lack of a distinctive or identifying sound
and elevates that lack into a crowning virtue. The reader at this point probably wonders why the author ignores the hooting of the owl, but the owl’s hooting is simply overlooked. The owl, notes the speaker, “may well be deemed a great example of Taciturnity, and therefore I shall now cease” (p. 85). But does he cease speaking? No, the speaker holds forth for at least another fifteen pages. He now seems to lecture or preach to the reader once more on the temperance of the owl, and then introduces the virtue of chastity which he illustrates by denouncing its related vices, lust and incontinence, particularly among the Cynics and among sailors and soldiers.

Quite abruptly the speaker bids farewell to the evils of venery and returns to the subject of the owl’s utility, this time focusing on the owl not as a hunter of mice but as a hunter of bats. Here he tells us how harmful bats can be to human beings, even to the point of consuming human flesh. We next see the owl being employed by the fowler as a decoy, luring other birds to their deaths. Does that also illustrate the usefulness of the owl to human beings? Perhaps. But in that function the owl, by attracting other birds, serves as a lure and is rewarded by the fowler for helping to snare other birds. At this point, is the author really praising the owl? Does a traitorous owl that lures other birds into being ensnared by the fowler deserve any praise at all? The situation is ambiguous in that the owl employed as a decoy is indeed betraying other birds, but may be doing so unwillingly, as a captive. Thus it can hardly be claimed, as we find here, that the owl tries to be beneficial or useful to human beings.

The next example of the owls’ utility to human beings lies in the medicinal value of the owls’ tears which, when applied to a person’s eyes, enable that person to see in the dark (p. 90). The owls, furthermore, are useful to us not only when they are alive, but also in death. One might think that the author may be about to recommend the owl’s flesh, stewed or roasted, for human consumption, but we are not owl eaters. Instead, what is praised in the dead owl is the usefulness of its wing or foot, hung up and displayed in a granary, as a means for deterring pigeons from eating the grain! Thus the owl, dead or alive, is useful to humankind.

Now surely this list of the owl’s virtues, especially its utility, has come to an end? Not yet! For the speaker insists that even if men have noble blood, are very wise, and “of the most unblemished Probity,” yet the brightness of their characters will be sullied if they lack “Pleasantness of Conversation.” This enables the speaker to dwell upon the example of Cato the Censor, who was anything but pleasant. The speaker then reviews the features of the owl’s body, praising the owl’s beauty under the general heading of its pleasantness, and it is that quality which the speaker next finds in the many depictions of the owl in illustrations, in architectural ornaments, in sculptures, and in
embroidery. Nearing the conclusion we learn that the owl is “very full of Compliments, and much
given to dancing” (p. 97). Dancing, which is introduced with implied approval, becomes another peg
on which to drape classical allusions, this time from Hesiod, Anacreon and Homer. He includes Cicero
in this series, but a diligent or informed reader will know, or will soon learn, that Cicero apparently did
not approve of sober people dancing.

“Thus have I given the Extraction, the Nobility, the Wit, the Vertue, the Usefulness, and Pleasantness
of the OWL . . . .” (p. 98), and the only matter remaining concerns the owl’s death and burial. Instead
of dignifying the owl’s departed soul with a Christian or a Platonic afterlife, our author supplies
Hadrian’s famous lament to his departing soul, “Animula, Vagula, Blandula [etc.]” (p. 99). Before
concluding with a request for applause from his implied audience, the “conscript Fathers” and the
patrons of owls, the speaker remarks that the owl is fortunate in having a shorter life-span than some
other birds, and that he therefore will be spared the miseries of surviving into years of pain and
debility. As the work draws to an end we are asked to remember the owl’s various virtues, and to
“rescue him from all Contempt.” (101).

CONTEXTS of TRANSLATION

Regarding Foxton’s translation, we have already indicated that it is not faithful to its Latin source, nor
does it pretend to be that. In many passages it is closer to being an imitation than it is to being a careful
transmission of all of the words and sentences of its source. Another indicator of the liberties that
Foxton took appears in his footnotes. A simple count reveals that while the translation contains 125
footnotes, the number of footnotes in a 1642 copy of Goddaeus’s Latin text is 218, considerably more
than appear in the translation. As with the footnotes, the translator also altered or eliminated much
other material that he found in the Latin original. Thus the translation, though sometimes close or
faithful to its source, also contains much material that Goddaeus had never seen and some that first
appeared even after he was no longer alive. To ask whether Foxton’s is a “good” translation is
therefore almost pointless, if by a good translation we mean one that reproduces the words and
meanings of the original text; which is not the case here. Instead, the modern reader comes to
understand that when the translator was faced with the task of translating the quotations, he chose to
deliver those quotations in their original languages, meaning mostly the original quotations from Latin
works with some passages in Greek and a few in Hebrew. In some instances, as when we are given the
full text of the Emperor Hadrian’s famous verses beginning with “Animula, vagula, blandula,” we find
that Foxton provided an English translation of more lines from that poem than appear in Goddaeus’s Latin text.

The translation turns out to be “unfaithful” in various ways: the number of footnotes has been slashed; the length of the entire work has been reduced to about half; and the translator has attempted to anglicize the original Neo-Latin text by naming and quoting from at least a half-dozen English authors, all of whom were probably unknown to Goddaeus. It is impossible to know whether Goddaeus would have objected strongly to such mistreatment of his original text, or whether he would have accepted such alterations as the price one had to pay for the survival and expansion of one’s literary reputation.

OTHERS’ OPINIONS ABOUT THIS TRANSLATION OF LAUS ULULAE.

After conducting an extensive search for appreciations, evaluations, analyses, or any treatments or critiques of Foxton’s translation, I have failed to find a single instance of such a published critical work in English. Is that a sign of the work’s insipidness or inferiority? Some may think so, but on the other hand this lack of any criticism in English may perhaps be a sign of its rarity. Some scholars know that this work exists, but how many have taken the trouble to read it? Very few, one imagines. I do not mean to suggest that we have no critical work at all on Goddaeus and his oration on owls. If one can read Dutch, then he or she can learn directly what F. Kossmann wrote about Goddaeus in his 1934 bibliographical essay, “Conradus Goddaeus en zijn Laus Ululae.” A search of Google’s Dutch website produces more than a dozen hits devoted to the life and works of Goddaeus, usually in Dutch and also quite repetitious. But about Foxton’s English translation these websites tell us nothing. Thus far Kossmann may have been the only writer to examine at some length the life and writings of Goddaeus. Curiously Kossmann seems not to have known of the 1640 imprint of Laus Ululae (as reported by the OCLC), for in his own bibliographical survey he lists 1642 as the earliest year in which that work was published.

Discussions of The Praise of Owls in English have always been brief. It was mentioned in some nineteenth-century works, notably C.H. Herford’s still useful book (1886). Henry Knight Miller named it briefly in his influential 1956 essay surveying the genre of the paradoxical encomium. Though Curll’s Miscellanea, vol. 2 (1727) is listed in volume 2 of the NCBEL (1971), that bibliography seems not to name Goddaeus or Foxton or Laus Ululae at all. In her excellent study The Smile of Truth: The French Satirical Eulogy and Its Antecedents (Princeton University Press, 1990), which deals at length with French paradoxical encomia, Annette Tomarken mentions a few titles that contain the Laus
Ululae but she does not dwell on that work; nor does she mention Foxton’s translation. However, given her announced subject, there was no compelling reason for her to mention him at all.

Now that this translation is widely available, it may well spark some discussion or commentary regarding a rediscovered work, but the key question is probably that concerning its aesthetic value: how good is it as a work of literature? Does it deserve to be dismissed as simply another piece of hack writing produced in Curll’s infamous “Literatory” (“a sweatshop,” as one reviewer notes, “for the production of worthless literary commodities”)? It is very easy to dismiss this work if one is so inclined, together with thousands of other mediocre pieces, many of which appeared in periodicals. Indeed, this translation does show some of the characteristics of hack writing. On the other hand, we are lucky to have it because of its many connections to literary history. Its main importance for literary history probably lies in the fact that it is clearly a paradoxical encomium. By the eighteenth century that genre had declined in popularity and was no longer favored by authors as a vehicle to convey their thoughts or ideas. The main exception, of course, was Erasmus’s Praise of Folly, which continued to be reprinted well after the popularity of that genre had diminished. Readers who knew Erasmus’s masterpiece were better prepared to understand Goddaeus’s encomium of owls.

Related to the issues of this work’s literary value and its connections in literary history is the question of whether it is worth “saving” at all. Our positive answer to that question is implied throughout this edition. If reviving this work depended solely upon its literary excellence, then it might well have been left undisturbed on the library shelves. Resuscitations such as this one rarely occur only because a dormant work has now been found to reveal signs of genius or literary excellence. In this case, the revival of a little-known work is at least partly an act of literary archaeology, in which the remains of the literary past are exhumed. That literary past, housed in libraries worldwide, will never be entirely revived, nor should it be. But in this instance we are considering a work that is both curious and interesting, and not literally new but new in the sense of having had only a marginal existence or presence in previous discussions of anglophone literary history.

Neither Goddaeus’s praise of owls nor its translation into English ever earned the fame that The Praise of Folly had garnered. If it had not been translated at all then it would have survived today only as another little-known Neo-Latin composition. Are we fortunate to have the published translation of this work? Yes. But should we also recommend that this work be more widely known and studied? Our response to that question leaves room for many differences of opinion. What can one make of a work that has been salvaged, so to speak, and that has never been the subject of any extended study in
English? If one is prejudiced in favor of Bacon, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Newton and/or the Scientific Revolution, then this paradoxical encomium of owls may seem to be no better than most ephemeral writings that have little or nothing to say about new trends in scientific investigation. But those who want to know as much as possible about the formerly popular paradoxical encomia will be glad to have anything new to consider relating to that genre.

We are dealing not with another *Tom Jones* or *Gulliver’s Travels* or *Robinson Crusoe* or *Clarissa*, but with an unexpected survival from the mid-seventeenth century that has simply refused to disappear. That it failed to elicit any critical responses in English was possibly owing to the fact that it did not circulate widely and disappeared from view fairly quickly. We may be pleased that it is here exhumed, but we do not expect to witness a major revival. This raises once more the question of which works deserve our attention. Some who still cherish the “Great Tradition” will politely set this work aside and perhaps will conclude that “this won’t do.” Does a Shakespearean scholar or a Miltonist have the time to meddle with it? Probably not. The Dutch, so far as one can tell, do not highly prize the writings of their countryman Goddaeus. But those concerned with the works of Desiderius Erasmus will be interested in preserving and expanding the range of his influence, which in this case also includes Goddaeus’s ironic praise of the owl. We can also predict that Foxton’s translation will have a certain appeal to those who study early modern satire and Renaissance paradoxy in general, and also to those who study the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century reception of Dutch writings among British writers and readers. We have at least two articles on Swift and the Dutch, but neither one mentions Goddaeus or the translation that is here edited.

Any text that is saved from oblivion and is made available to modern readers will probably generate some interest—but for how long and to what extent we do not know. And some who are convinced that this translation is worth saving may also wish to see its Latin source revived. That could happen, but if it does, that Latin work will likely appeal to fewer readers than would its translation into English. Readers who think this work merits more attention may wish to explore the implications of its Dutch origin on its survival beyond the seventeenth century. To explore this work in greater detail, more needs to be said in explaining Goddaeus’s views on owl lore in both the Old and the New Testament, in the Classical tradition and beyond. Some may want to understand this work better in the contexts of the paradoxical encomium, proverb lore, and the most common collections of fables. Will this work ever become the subject of a dissertation? That remains to be seen.
NOTES


3 The OCLC, which lists only one copy of this work held by the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, gives the following fuller title: Het waare lof des uyls, Aan alle haare ingeschreeve Uylagtige Heeren, en Liefhebbers : Door Koertje Juyle, Te Glaskou, by Graauaardt Nagtenrijk, in de Uyle-straat, in Uyladislay, Kooninck van Poolen : En Het waare Lof des Ezels. By Jan Passeraat. Amsterdam : Samuel Imbrecht and Adam Sneewater, Booksellers, 1664.


5 Goddaeus’s further reference to this tale in Ovid can by found on p. 14 of his text, transcribed below.

6 Thanks to Dana F. Sutton for this suggestion.

7 See Het Boek, 22 [1934]: 231-256.

IMAGE URLs for LU edn. by I. Primer

(pp. 42-43) For a famous image of the owl at a Catholic Council, see this website: http://www.johnfoxe.org/woodcuts/f0626w.gif. This image reflects the contents of pp. 42-3 of Foxton’s translation. The place of this incident is given as a council in Rome.

(p. 69) http://dx.doi.org/10.3931/e-rara-4950
At this URL the reader will find the title-page of Johannes Leo Placentius’s Pugna Porcorum (1547), a work that was first published in 1530. See p. 69 of this translation and also its endnote.

(pp. 94-95) http://marquesimprimeurslibraires.fr/accueil.php?page=5
This web address leads to the printer’s device of the Chouet family printing house, which flourished in the seventeenth century. It includes an illustration of an owl and also the proverb “In Nocte Consilium.”
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To contribute comments about I. Primer’s translation of Laus Ululae, The Praise of Owls, translated by “A Canary Bird” (i.e. Thomas Foxton), London, 1727, please write to I. Primer at:

blickman@gmail.com
TO THE
Jocund READER,

THE
AUTHOR

Wisheth all Health and Happiness.

Noctua blandan veni, dulcesque venite Patroni,
Magnus honor vobis contribuendus erit.

See the soft Owl in all his Charms appears
Kind Patrons all lend your attentive Ears.
So shall your Fame survive thro’ long revolving Years.

That the Ancients affected all Manner of pleasant Conceits is evident from the memorable Practice of the Athenians, who were the greatest [iii] Masters of polite Learning: For who has not heard of the Poignancy of Attick-Wit, and Athenian-Elegance? And no Wonder since the noble City of Athens, was adorned with the Graces of Venus and Minerva. The sacred BIRD (therefore) of Pallas, cannot handsomly be shown, without some smart Jests and Pleasantries. Behold him then making his Entrance, fluttering in his own beautiful and proper Plumes. He does not expect to meet with Approbation from those severe Criticks, who show the Roughness of their Temper in their very Aspect; but he offers himself to those, who being fatigued with graver Studies, are desirous of refreshing themselves with Mirth and entertain[iii]ing Fancies. And he being a Creature formed by Nature for Sport and Pastime, (without which human Life it self would be very burthensome) is by no means willing to appear at a Tribunal, as rigid as that of the Spanish INQUISITION; but exhibits himself to his Patrons only for their Diversion. If any Thing in the following Pages, should seem to give just Matter of Offence, the Author has the common Plea of Human-Frailty, and the Reader may pass it by as Retracted. We can easily foresee, that all those Lucubrations which pleased us in Writing, will not be equally entertaining to every one, who shall hear or peruse them.

[iv] Farewel courteous Reader, and since our Germany will not produce a PHOENIX, receive an OWL with Favour.
ΠΡΟΣΦΩΝΗΣΙΣ, ANGLICE.

P R E F A C E

T O T H E

OWL and his PATRONS.

THOU Favourite and sacred Bird of Minerva, while I am in a profound Contemplation of the many wonderful Vertues which Antiquity has ascribed to Thee! Why dost Thou call upon me in the silent Night, and hover round my Window? Is it not because that tho’ Thou excellest all other Birds in Shape and Beauty, yet hitherto Thou hast had the ill Fortune never to be duly commended; and tho’ the mistaken Populace may reckon thy Appearance disastrous, yet on the contrary I shall shew it betokens Prosperity; and every sinister Thought, which that mortal and unfeathered Clan has entertained concerning Thee, is entirely owing to their Ignorance of thy Vertues: And an unknown Good (we all know) can never attract Affection: I will therefore endeavour to do Thee Justice, and celebrate thy deserved Praises, which I freely offer to all thy Patrons.

Make Way therefore with Pleasure, ye grave Fathers, for your famous and delightful Bird, that the Infamy of your Owl may cease for ever, and that all of you may yield to the unanswerable Dictates of Truth, your Pupil seriously intreats that he may take his more eminent and proper Place, and defend his own Station in the Sky.
THE Praise of Owls

TO THE CONSCRIPT FATHERS AND PATRONS OF OWLS.

BEING about, O Conscript Fathers, to raise a due Encomium on the OWL, I shall enter upon this Performance under the auspicious Influence of its own happy Omen, which was always reckoned fortunate, not only at Athens, but also throughout all Greece; insomuch that it grew into a Proverb, to say, the Owl has flown over him, when any Person succeeded according to His Expectations. Plutarch in the Life of Pericles tells us, that while he was making an Harangue upon Deck, an Owl flew upon his right Hand, and after fixt on the Mast; which remarkable Token so moved his Auditors that they immediately assented to his Proposals. I cannot but promise my self the same good Luck, while I am attempting to set forth the Praises of this excellent Bird, and that without Flattery, by rescuing him from the Contempt which he has undeservedly met with. There is no doubt but the Praises of an Owl will be grateful to many, since in our Days there are such great Numbers who resemble him in their Dispositions. Now, according to the Opinion of Aristotle, the Prince of Philosophers, every one is apt to be pleased with another who is like him; for Birds of a Feather always will flock together. That we therefore may set the OWL in his full Light, it will be proper to begin with his Name; for as Clemens Alexandrinus rightly observes, there are two Idea’s of Truth, Names and Things: Therefore we shall begin with the Name and then proceed to the Fowl.

As to the first Article, we shall find a Variety of Opinions. Those who would derive the Word Ulula from the Hebrew word Alah, are in my Opinion mistaken; for what does the word Alah signify but to swear, to forswear, to curse? From whence they fancy the Owl took his Latin-Name Ulula, or Owlula, because he never swears; but he might as well take his Name
from a Word which signifies to laugh, because he is never subject to that pleasant Passion. For what they bring concerning the Signification of this Word in the Chaldee, is indeed apposite enough, but the Exposition is strained since it occurs but once in the Hebrew Text. I rather incline to their Opinion who derive it from the Word Jahal, from whence comes the word Haëlil to howl, to wail, which is a Sound proper to this Animal, tho’ he makes a Diversity of Noises, and seems to be well skilled in all Languages; for who, I beseech you, can refer the following Words, to one Language only, ULULU from whence comes Ululare, to howl; CUCUHU, from whence comes Cucubare, to make a dismal crying; and TUTUHU, from whence we meet in Plautus with the Word TUTU; and in Hesychius with ΤΤΩ. Moreover, Nigidius attributes to the OWL nine different Names, representing as many different Sounds, of which those we have mentioned are the Chief; and concerning which, the Reader may consult Pliny’s Natural History: Now all these Sounds resemble that Noise which Men make when they are stiff with Cold, or the loud Crying of the Votaries of Bacchus; and hence comes the German word Huylen, Howling. Now, it is certainly wonderful that the Sound of this Creature from whence its Name is derived, should remain invariably the same in all original Tongues, which distinguishing Accident was formerly thought peculiarly to belong to a Sack: from whence it evidently appears with how great Esteem our OWL has been treated by his most ancient Patrons, in every Country, and Nation; as also, that his Name was given him with great Care and Judgement, which Affection he hopes (O Fathers and Patrons of OWLS) will still be continued towards him. Do but observe how near this Animal comes to human Wit, which is able to express the Voice and Lamentation of Men; though Alcibiades out of a singular Conceit found fault with the Harp because it resembled a Man’s Voice; yet sure no Man will reject the OWL upon this Account: For the Orators and Poets frequently represent Men as Howling, so the great Father of Roman Eloquence, says of a certain Man, that he began to cry out with a howling Voice. Lucan speaking of the Soldiers says——Lætis ululare Triumphis: And Virgil thus describes the Bacchanals, Ast alie tremulis ululatibus æthera complent. And again——Fæmineis ululant Plangoribus ædes. Surely it is a wonderful Piece of Sagacity in this Bird to imitate the Voice and Lamentation of a Man, whence it is easy to observe that he makes considerable Approaches to human Nature.

Doctam imitatricem, et versa hinc ducere voces.

I know very well that Plato and Aristotle assert that the Hyena has as great a Claim to Humanity, because she is wont to imitate a human Voice; but in her ’tis not natural but acquired
and employed to the basest Ends of Perfidiousness and Cruelty; for the same Authors tell us that the Hyena would get among the Sheep-folds, and call out some Shepherd by his Name, that so he might devour him when alone; but the Sound of our Bird [8] is natural and always the same, and brings no Prejudice to Mankind; and although he is not a Man, yet he acts his Part with singular Humanity. In the mean Time I beseech ye, O Patrons, not to be so inhuman as to imagine that this Sound we are speaking of is like that of a Wolf, because a Wolf is said to howl; but believe it is attributed to Wolves in imitation of your Pupil. A small Skill in the History of the Creation will let you see that the OWL was created before the Wolf; and you cannot but think it reasonable to suppose that the Animals received their Names according to the Order in which they were created. Consider farther, that the most of the Birds which flew out of the Ark after the first sending out the Raven had their Names agreeable to the Noise and Sound which they made: Thus the Cuckoe was denominated from his Note; the Pye from its Chattering; and the Crane, and the Crow from their respective Sounds, &c. Thus the OWL obtained his Name from the peculiar Lamentableness of his Voice, which ought to be esteemed as honourable, as it was formerly thought by some to be denominated from Laughter. Buxtorff observes, that the OWL takes his Name from the Hebrew word Jaaneh; neither (conscript Fathers) is this his Observation despicable, [9] for the Creature we are speaking of sends forth such a Sound as is immediately doubled, and often repeated, and thrown back with a wonderful Accent.

Qualis Iō Arethusa Iō Arethusa vocanti.

Now what is sweeter than an Eccho? what can be more entertaining or delightful to the Ear? since it often makes the Unexperienced admire themselves, and hearken with surprising Attention as 8 Ovid has shewn us in the melancholy Story of Narcissus. Farther, we may observe for the Honour of this Word Ulula, that a noted City in Italy took its Name from it, by Reason that OWLS were there very common; which Place was famous for the Birth and Education of Augustus Caesar. Hence Horace says,

Est Ulubris animus sit e non deficit æquus. 9

Nor can I see why Petronius Arbiter should triumph more in the Sound of his Carpus, than we in that of our Bird 10. But if Anagrammatizing, or playing upon the [10] Sound of Words were to be allowed, we might draw a very jocose Punning Parallel between those of ULULA and ALLELU. Though with all due Deference be it spoken, how strangely has this last Hebrew Word
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been stretched even by the Fathers of the Church (the Title of Children in such Conceits much better befitting them) to create Confusion in weak Minds, and thereby support the Controversies of the Times, which (says a most judicious Writer) are like Spirits in the Mines, with all their Labour nothing is done\textsuperscript{11}.

This Word which signifies no more than Praise,\textsuperscript{12} Has tortur’d been by Priests a thousand Ways\textsuperscript{13}.

And when the Syllable jah was added thereeto (ALLELUJAH) what better Appellation than OWLS do those Men deserve who have given us the following ridiculous Interpretations thereof. Hear St. Jerom\textsuperscript{14}, ALLE, that is, Creatura, (Creature) LU, laudato, (Praise) JAH, Dominum, (Lord). Now, St. Ambrose, ALLE, that is, Lux, (Light) LU, Virtus, (Virtue) [11] JAH, Vita, (Life). Next, St. Austin, ALLE, Salva, (Save) LU, me. Lastly, St. Gregory; Now for the finishing Stroke; He, without any Bones, confidently affirms, that ALLE, signifies Pater, LU, Filius, JAH, Spiritus Sanctus, i. e. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Thus is the Mystery of the most adorable TRINITY defined; Monstrum Horrendum! Now were such distant Constructions to be drawn from the Latin name of our Bird (ULULA) what might not be made of it? In short, if after the Manner of the Grammarians, Rabbi’s, and venerable Fathers, we should discuss the deepest Mysteries which lie hid in the word Ulula there would be no End, however we shall just mention some few of them. The first Letter V denotes Volucris (a Bird), the second Letter L signifies Lepida (fine); the third Letter V denotes vera (true); the fourth Letter L signifies Laus (Praise); and the fifth and last Letter A, Avium (of Birds) from whence we may reasonable conclude that the OWL is a very fine Bird, and a great Ornament to all his winged Fraternity. But as Venus and Minerva too, have more than one Name, so also has our Fowl, having the Name of Noctua among the Latins as well as Ulula, because he appears and sings in the Night. Hence the Grecians call’d him Νυκτίκοραξ and in some Coun-[12]tries he is called Nacht uyl and Nacht-rave. Now the Learned give two Reasons why the Nature of the OWL prompts him to appear in the Night, one is the Greyness of his Eyes which will not permit him to see any Thing well in the Day-Time. Now that those who have grey Eyes can see but indifferently in the Day Time, but very clearly in the Night, is positively affirmed by Pliny that great Searcher into the Secrets of Nature\textsuperscript{15}; but we do not only attribute this Greyness of Eyes, in common with the OWL, to the Horse, and the Lyon, but also [to] his own Minerva, who is often stiled Grey-eyed by Homer, Hesiod, and other Poets, and this is the Goddess to whom our Bird is sacred, and by whom he is had in the greatest Admiration\textsuperscript{16}. Now this Goddess is wiser in the Opinion of Jupiter himself,
than all the other Gods and Goddesses. Formerly the Gods chose particular Trees to be under their special Patronage. Jupiter was pleased to choose the Oak, and Venus the Myrtle. Apollo chose the Laurel, Cybele the Pine-Tree, and Hercules admired the tall Poplar. Minerva in Admiration asked why they chose barren Trees; Jupiter told her it was, because they would not seem to sell Fruit for Honour. Pallas replied, let every one follow his own Judgement; for my Part, I must confess, I prefer the Olive because of its Fruit. Then the Father of Gods and Men answered, thou hast undeniably shown thy self the wisest, for unless what we do be profitable, Glory is but vain. Nor is it any wonder that Pallas should be wiser than her Father himself, for she sprang from the very Seat of Wisdom, and leaped out of the Brain of Jupiter, having the Way laid open by an Instrument of Vulcan's; for which Reason she was constituted the Goddess of Wisdom, and of all Arts and Philosophy. And although the Grammarians are not much out when they derive the Word Caesar from Caesiis oculis (grey Eyes), yet certainly our OWL must be owned to have a Resemblance to so great a Monarch as Caesar and Augustus his Successor, since they both had grey Eyes; so that as in crooked Noses you have hitherto acknowledged Caesar, so you will take Notice of the distinguishing Colour which adorns the Eyes of our Bird. Indeed, if the OWL had not grey Eyes, yet nevertheless he would not be able to see well in the Day-Time; for our Philosophers bring another Reason why the OWL cannot see in the Day-Time, viz. That there is a dry and thin Substance in the OWL's Eyes which is dissipated and extinguished by the Lustre of the Day, as the Stars are hidden in the Presence of the Sun. Farther, as there was often a great Affinity between Men and Birds; so frequently Mens Vices were unjustly ascribed to OWLS, as when Nyctemene offended, it was ascribed to the OWL: And therefore, says the Poet,

*Conspectum Lucemque fugit, Tenebrisque Pudorem*  
* Celat--------

You see then that the Bashfulness (or Modesty rather) of our Bird, is the Reason why he appears not in the Day-Time: You see (Fathers) the Piety of this Bird; how much does he excel those who never blush, or show in their Faces the least Token of Shame or Modesty! You see that your Bird is so ashamed even of another’s Crime, so deeply does he blush, that he cannot see even at Noon-Day. But, however that be, this is most certain, that he has but little Use of his Sight in the Day-Time. Since then his Eyes are dim, as Pliny testifies, yet from hence we must not conclude that our Bird is a dark Lantern, or like a dismal Cyclops with his Eyes struck out, to whom Demades compared Alexander's Army after his Death. Be of good Chear, Fathers and
Patrons, your Pupil is a brisk and sprightly Bird at Night, and by the Sharpness of his Eyes then, makes ample Amends for their Weakness in the Day-Time. He is then indued with an acuter Sight than the royal Eagle, or the Peloponnesian Serpent; insomuch that he is sharp-sighted, and can clearly discern Objects in the thickest Darkness. Then as Eustathius tells us, his Eyes glitter like a burning Lamp; whatever Crescentius may say to the contrary¹⁹, who argues, that by reason of the Want of a proper Medium, that is, the Illumination of the Air by the Sun or Moon, he can hardly see. Indeed, his Argument will hold good with Respect to Men and other Animals; but our Bird must be excepted by reason his Eyes are formed after a particular Manner. The OWL then has, in the Night, no need of Light; he wants neither a Lamp nor Candle, since he himself illuminates all around, following herein the first Origin of Nature, when Light shone out of Darkness; and in this Respect he is much happier than those Men whom Pliny speaks of²⁰, who could see well enough in the Day, but were quite blind at Night. Consider, O ye Fathers, whether in this Respect he is not more fortunate than all Men, who want some auxiliary Light in the Night-Time, when they are about to do any Work, or pursue their Studies? Unles we may except a few, from the Rule, as Tiberius Caesar, and the two Scaligers; it is reported of Tiberius that he had most excellent Eyes, and what is really wonderful, at Night he could see very well in the dark; but this held but for a short Time, when he first awoke out of his Sleep²¹; but our Bird maintains the Sharpness of his Sight all Night long: As for the two Scaligers, and their being able to see in the Dead of Night, as well as others at Twilight²², I think none will doubt the Truth of it, except some surly Criticks; yet these could not do it in every Hour; but the OWL can see clearly through the whole Night, as I just now observed, be it ever so long; nay, I believe, he felt no Decay in his Eye-sight all that long Night in which Hercules was begotten; and though he was no Jew yet could he see very well [17] in the Egyptian Darkness. Now those who do not have the Talent of seeing in the Dark, must take care to furnish themselves with a Lamp or somewhat of that Nature. Hence the Performances of the Learned were stiled Lucubrations, because they were generally wrote by the Light of a Lamp (or Candle,) in which more Oil than Wine is consumed: Agreeable to the Story that is told of Demosthenes. It was a noted Speech concerning him that his Orations smelt of the Lamp, because he composed and wrote them in the Night. Now how chargeable is this, and what a great Expence must it be to maintain such constant Lucubration, especially at this Time when Oil and Candles are so dear! I am sensible that in your great economical Wisdom, you must be very apprehensive of the Importance of this Article: How great then is the OWLS Prerogative who is at none of these nightly Expences? As every Letter of his Name does express (I confess not without some Mystery;²³) from hence (conscript Fathers) you may easily observe how beautiful the Order of Nature is in appointing Birds which should be
able to see [18] to fly, and sing as well in the Night as others do in the Day-Time. Neither are the Night-Birds inferior to those that appear by Day: For is there any Bird that exceeds the Nightingale? Which tho’ very small, yet is most charming and ravishingly musical, and sings with the greatest Variety of Notes, sometimes with a quick, and at other Times with a slower Air, sometimes with a shrill Accent, and at other Times with a softer Cadence; and in a Word, rivals the Harmony both of the Voice and softest Instruments. Now this melodious Philomel, was inimitably described by Milton24,

Sings in her sweetest, saddest Plight,
Smoothing the rugged Brow of Night;
While Cynthia checks her Dragon Yoke
Gently o’er th’ accustom’d Oak;
Sweet Bird that shunn’st the Noise of Folly,
Most musical, most melancholy!
Thee Chauntress oft, the Woods among,
I woo to hear thy Even-Song.

Hence she is called Luscinia by the Latins, because she sings before ’tis Light. And who does not know how much the Glow-Worms are esteemed? Now these only appear [19] and shine by Night: And who can be so infatuated as to despise the Moon because she displays her lovely Silver only in the Night? There are Changes of Times and Variety of Things; and there is a proper Season assigned to every Creature, as well of acting as of living. Hence the Athenians in Honour of Pallas and her Bird performed their sacred Rites by Night, and in the open Air25.

We shall not waste altogether so much Time in enquiring after the native Soil of the OWL, as we have done in discoursing on his Name. We read that seven Cities contended for the Honour of Homer’s Birth, but all must confess that the whole World is our Bird’s Country, a very few Places excepted; and in this Respect he is not unlike Socrates the wisest Man of his Age, who being asked to what Place he belonged, replied, I am 26 a Citizen of the World. Also, he is like Diogenes, who being asked what Sort of a Person he was, replied, I am a Compound of every Sort. We need not then, after the Manner of Orators, go about to set forth the Praises of so spacious a Country, which would be with Augustus Caesar to describe the Universe. Yet tho’ our Bird ranges through [20] the World, he has some Places in which he particularly delights; and 27 Pliny tells us, that the Island of Crete produces no OWLS, and if one be brought into that Island it will immediately die. Consider, (conscript Fathers,) what Business our Bird can have in that
Country, whose Natives were notorious for Lying, Lust, Luxury, and all Manner of Vices, and whom St. Paul smartly reproves out of their own Poet Epimenides; the Cretans are always Liars, evil Beasts, slow Bellies; and farther adds, that this Testimony is true. They were indeed infamous throughout Greece, for lying and endeavouring to impose upon their Neighbours by false and ridiculous Stories; hence came the Word κρητιζεῖν to be used all over Greece, to signify the Heighth of Falsehood and Dissimulation, because they boasted that Jupiter’s Sepulcher was in their Island: But now our Bird is free from all these Vices, and therefore carefully avoids that Island, much wiser in this Respect than many Men, who shun not the Company of vicious Persons. The OWL chuses purer Regions, and thence reaps no small Advantage; since he who converses with evil Persons must necessarily be tainted, &c. [21] Bellonius indeed asserts, that a certain Bird which sucks the Milk from the Goats, (and which some will have to be a Sort of an OWL) because by the Testimony of Aristotle it is seldom seen in the Day-Time, made so great a Noise in Crete that all the Inhabitants were smitten with Amazement; whence some may perhaps be apt to imagine, that at least some Kind of OWLS have found their Way thither: But to speak the Truth this Creature has no Affinity with the OWL, but is vastly bigger, and milks the Goats in the Night-Time; from whence he is called Caprimulgus. Now, who ever heard of any such Action performed by our Bird, or even by he largest Troops of OWLS? but setting these Absurdities aside, we will consider what Pliny, who is most expert in the Secrets of Nature, farther tells us concerning the OWL’s Habitation, viz. That he is never to be seen on the Alpine-Hills; the Reason of which I suppose is, because Provision there is deficient, and Snow plentiful, and the Air most cold and piercing. Such formidable Places he may well avoid since it cost the great Hannibal so much Labour to pass through them, which is thus Ele-[22]gantly expressed by one of our most celebrated English Poets:

Like Gods we pass’d the rugged Alpine-Hills
Melted our Way and drove our hissing Wheels,
Thro’ cloudy Deluges, eternal Rills.
What after Ages shall with Pain believe,
Thro’ burning Quarries did our Passage cleave,
Hurl’d dreadful Fire and Vinegar infus’d,
Whose horrid Force the Nerves of Flints unloos’d,
Made Nature start to see us root up Rocks,
Shake off her massy Bars, o’er Mountains go
We are not therefore to wonder if the OWL seeks for a more convenient Seat, where he may lead a Life according to his own Desires in a warmer Climate; and in this he shows an exquisite Judgement. How often do we see Men changing their Habitation for Convenience-sake, transporting their little Houses like the Tortoise, or roving like the wandering Scythians, lest they perish for Want of Necessaries. And self Interest (as to this Matter) will prevail over the dullest or roughest Tempers. But here we must first of all wonder at [23] the great Judgement of the OWL, that among all other Kingdoms and Provinces he should make choice of Greece, the Mother of Arts and Sciences, where he was made a Denizen of Attica, which was remarkable for Plenty of OWLS; but our Bird chose the famous City of Athens as his royal Seat, and from thence he drew out his Colonies; whence NOCTUAS Athens became a Proverb. Let us now a little consider the Nature of this Region and City. Athens was always renowned for Strength and Beauty; insomuch that Tully calls it the Market of Letters; and St. Austin affirms it to be the Mother and Nurse of liberal Disciplines, and of many great Philosophers who were never exceeded by any educated through the whole Country of Greece. Athens was a City which was so famous for Eloquence, Knowledge, Wisdom, Sobriety, and Justice, that in his Time affirmed, it was like to the Serener Regions above, and was so illustrious as to transcend all Praises whatsoever: Here it was (I say) that the OWLS fixed their [24] certain and imperial Seats. Neither were they troublesome to the Inhabitants by reason of their Numbers, as Sparrows, Ravens, Swallows, and other noisy Birds were apt to be; on the contrary, the Citizens were inexpressibly delighted with the OWLS who pitched their Tents among them, and reckoned their Flying to be a Sign of Victory, because they were sacred to Minerva; for which Reason the Athenians had stamped both on their Gold and Silver Effigies of Pallas on one Side, and on the Reverse the Figure of our Bird; which a Servant pleasantly remembred when he was Enigmatically discovering his Theft to his Master; there are, says he, many OWLS that lodge under our Roof, meaning the Pieces of Money which were hidden, and had the Figure of the OWL upon them: To which Aristophanes alludes, when he thus spoke to the Inhabitants of Lauros, whose Country abounded with Veins of Gold; The OWLS will not forsake you, but are present in your very Houses, and build themselves Nests in your Purses. Moreover (to talk a little in our own Stile) the Piece of Money adorned with the Image of Jupiter would go but for Sixpence, whereas that which was stamped with the Effigies of Minerva and the OWL was worth four Shillings; of so much greater Account was the Money that had our Bird upon it, than that which was dignified with the Image of Jupiter himself; on the contrary, the very Heads of
Eagles are not preferred before the Heads of Owls on Coin, but this we must attribute to Want of Judgement; however, I cannot but wish that the OWL was as much esteemed by us as he was by the Athenians; and even that Part of them who were ready to drive their Neighbours, and Counymen from their proper Seats, yet willingly admitted the Owls into their Country, hospitably treated them and made them free of the City. Now what was formerly more glorious, while Greece was flourishing, than to be called a Grecian? Or a Citizen of Athens when that Place was in its Beauty? As there was nothing more honourable than to be stiled a Roman, while Rome was the triumphant Queen of the World. This Title, therefore, of an Athenian our Owl claims, which was even denied to the Women of Athens, as St. Austin tells us out of Varro. It is also very observable in the sacred Writings, that God drove out the Babylonians from their Seat, and introduced Troops of Owls into their Kingdom, to whom he gave the Habitations of Men: So great a Monarchy was transferred from Men to Owls! And though their Bounds were thus enlarged, they dwelt chiefly in the Woods, in Caves, and desolate Houses, in Vallies, stony Places, hollow Trees, and Willows just sinking with Age, there they live with Pleasure:

----------Licet sub paupere Tecto,
Reges et Regum vita præcurrere amicos.
Hor.

Now this is certainly better than the Habitation of Diogenes; the Cynick, who, as Laertius tells us, dwelt in a Tub. They passed indeed with the Change of Monarchies from the Chaldeans to the Persians, from the Persians, to the Grecians, and from the Grecians, to the Romans; and after the Roman Empire extended thro’ the World, Owls also were dispersed through every Region, and it would therefore now be inhuman to banish them, let them therefore live happily with you as long as they please.

Thus have I described his Country, Habitation, and peculiar City; I suppose, by this Time, you may be desirous to hear of the Origine and Generation of your Pupil. Now it is plain that the OWL was created before Adam, and assuredly before all that Croud of Heathen Gods and Goddesses which old Hesiod has made such a Pother about. There is a Dispute from whence he was produced in the first Creation; since some of the Learned affirm, that Birds were raised out of the Water, and Men out of the Earth: For who among you can believe that any living Creature was produced from the Air or the Fire? Since Aristotle, that Prince of Philosophers, affirms it to be impossible; though Pliny says, that in some Furnaces in Cyprus there is engendred a winged four-footed Animal; but however that be, it is beyond all Controversy certain, that our
Bird had not his Original from the Fire, nor can he live in it like the Salamander: Nor was it ever heard even among the wildest poetical Fictions that any living Creature was produced from the Air alone. Those who are of Opinion that the Birds were produced from the Waters, bring their Proof from the History of the Creation: 39 Let the Waters bring forth abundantly, living Creatures, and Fowls which may fly upon the Earth: But [28] those who are of Opinion they were produced from the Earth, have the following Words on their Side; 40 And the Lord God formed out of the Ground all the Beasts of the Field, and all the Fowls of the Air; which latter Opinion we embrace, because it is not said let the Waters bring forth Birds, as was said concerning the creeping Things, but only Fowls which may fly upon the Earth; this rather confirms our Opinion than destroys it. Now as to the Procreation of this Creature, that he may according to the old Saying begin, ab Ovo We must know that the ordinary Generation of an OWL is from an Egg, from which all, except the primigenial One, (as out of a Trojan Horse) have sprung

Et Nati Natorum et qui Nascentur ab illis.

Tho’ there are some so stupid as to assert that OWLS lay no Eggs, certainly they deserve to be pelted with rotten Ones, or to swallow the Young, together with the Egg for their Folly. That there are such Eggs, Experience the Mistress of Fools manifestly proves; and we have often seen them with our Eyes, which is undeniable Evidence, and we have also felt them with our Hands. But here arises that old Dispute among Philosophers, whether the Owl or the Egg first existed, for the Owl comes from an Egg, and the Egg from the OWL: A wonderful Thing! for if the Egg was before the Owl, whence came the Egg? If the Owl was before the Egg, whence came the OWL? 41 Plutarch and 42 Macrobius have largely treated of this Matter; but we may easily solve the Question from the History of the Creation which certifys us, that all Animals were first made perfect, (notwithstanding St. Austin seems to be of Opinion, that there were Eggs before the Existence of Birds.) The Owl therefore was before the Egg; and when it proceeds from an Egg, ’tis not from a disastrous one like that of a Cock, from whence is said to spring a fiery Serpent; but its own auspicious and profitable one, like to the Origine of Castor and Pollux, who sprung from an Egg, which had two Yolks in one Shell: Now, this Egg was very auspicious and profitable to Mortals; if it were not so, the Twin-Constellation in the Heavens would not be reckoned so favourable to [30] Mariners. We read that 43 St. Paul was in a Ship adorned with the Sign of Castor and Pollux; such great Companions has our OWL as these two Deities, who also had their Original from an Egg. Indeed, this our Bird is produced from an Egg in a different Way
from other Birds; since we read in *Pliny* that *it comes out of the Egg with its Tail foremost, because the Heaviness of its Head has caused it to be at a greater Distance from the cherishing Warmth of the Female*. Now this is wonderful; nor can even the *Crab-fish* who go backwards all their Lives pretend to come into the World by this Method. How many Companions has the OWL in this Respect, who manage every Affair in Life preposterously, and turn about with their Backsides before their Heads, and the End before the Means, which they could learn no where so readily as from our OWL. Noble *Pallas*, what an admirable Thing it is to have a tractable Scholar! Moreover, *Philostратsus* tells us a wonderful Thing concerning the *Egg* of an OWL; *Observe* (says he) *where the Owl builds her Nest, and then take the Eggs and roasting them moderately give them to a little Child: Because whoever eats of these Eggs before he has tasted Wine* [31] *will ever have an Antipathy to Wines, and consequently be sober all his Life-Time,* thus far *Philostратsus*. Nor does their Vertue extend only to Infants and Children, but likewise (as we are informed by several Physicians) to Drunkards who are of riper Years: *For if they take these Eggs three Days together in Wine, they will ever after abhor it.* How is it then that so many in our Days either know not these Things or contemn them? For who has a sufficient Esteem for this Bird? or rightly considers his Extraction, and how by his Means he may make himself temperate. We can attribute this Ignorance to nothing so well as to the Prejudices of Education; but lest you should imagine that all OWLS (as springing from an Egg) are of equal Dignity: It is to be observed that there are several Species of this Bird, of which one is commonly esteemed nobler than the other; as in human Kind one Family excels another in Honour. Now among the different Sorts of OWLS there is one called *Otis*, because it has *Wings about its Ears*, as *Aristotle* assures us. The Latins call him *Ulula Aurita*, which, as *Pliny* testifies, is larger than the common OWLS, and has *Wings about his Ears*, which are [32] bigger than ordinary: Hence also the Latins call him *Asio*, the Dutch *Oor-uyle*. Now he agrees in this Protuberance of Ears with MIDAS King of the *Phrygians*, and with you also (conscript Fathers;) for if we may believe *Persius,*

\[Auriculas Asini Quis non habet?\]

Now this Creature (*Asio.*) because he cannot *see* well in the Night, has it abundantly made up in the quickness of his *hearing*; for we are not to imagine that Nature has given him such *large Ears* in vain: Besides, the Night-Season is the properest Time for Quickness of hearing, as the *Stagyrite* tells us: And Nature generally orders it so, that when one of the natural Faculties is to be in Perfection the other is made remiss. Thus in a Man, if the intelligent Faculty be
predominant, then the refreshing Sensitive and digesting Powers is weakened: Hence, take a very studious Man out of your Society, and you will find his Stomach out of order, and he will view with Grief large Gammons of Bacon hanging in the Chimney: On the other Hand, you will find a Peasant, who does not trouble his Head with Controversies, to be a very good trencher Companion, let his Fare be what it will: Again, when the Passions are predominant, the intelligent Faculty is weakened; and when a Person is wholly taken up with the Care of polishing his Mind, (as I trust you all do) he regards but little the Advantages of Dress and Ornament, and often sits down to Dinner without his Neckcloth, or goes to Market with his Shoes unbuckled. So, as ofte as you are intent on viewing any Object, the Hearing is suspended; on the contrary, while you are attentively listening to any Sound, you scarce mind the Objects which are before you. Consider then (Fathers,) that though the Bird we are discoursing of has a weak Sight in the Day-Time, yet his hearing is stronger and more intense; which is also applicable to all OWLS in general, who, though they have not so large Ears as the Otis, yet excel all other Birds in hearing.

The next Degree of Dignity is claimed by the Aluco, of which there are two Branches, the greater and the less; the greater has this peculiar Property, that, when the Rest of the Birds move their lower Eye-lids, and by that only close their Eyes, this can move the upper Ones, and wink and manage his Eye-lids as he pleases; insomuch that some are of Opinion he can see even in his Sleep, since [34] then his Eyes are not quite shut. Consider now how wonderful this is reckoned in those Men whom the Grecians call κορυβαντεϊς and in Lions and Hares who sleep either with their Eyes open, or half shut, as the most curious Searchers into Nature informs [sic] us. What shall I say concerning the Noctambulos, or those Men who walk in their Sleep, whose Eyes are open, or however they wink but little, and go about their Business as they used to do in the Day-Time, and perform such Exploits which they neither can nor dare do when they are awake? Aristotles seems then to have given us an imperfect Definition of Sleep when he stiles it a natural Cessation of all outward Senses, appointed for the Rest and Welfare of Animals: For the Sight which is an external Sense does not cease in OWLS, and those who walk in their Sleep, neither has Rest always a Place in these latter; for they often rise from their Beds, put on their Cloaths, open the Doors, take their Weapons, and if they be on board a Ship run up the Mast, &c. But what is wonderful; if you call them by their Christian-Names they will immediately descend, let them have climbed never so high. Lemnius attributes this [35] to the Efficacy of their Baptism, but I rather think it proceeds from their being so continually used to hear it; but these Things by the Way. Farther, the Naturalists tell us concerning this Aluco Major, that, though he is by no Means remarkable for any eminent Ears, yet Nature has given him in their Place a Crown composed of Feathers, which yet does not surround the upper Part of
his Head: For that is too often imitated by the Vulgar at their Nuptial Feasts; but goes round all
his Face in that elegant Form and Position which I am going to describe. He has beautiful little
Plumes conspicuous above his Eyes, elevated after the Manner of noble Eye-brows, and they
spread themselves over his Temples, and descending under his Chin they twine into the Figure of
a Woman’s Hood. This Feather-Crown by a wonderful Contrivance of Nature so covers and
surrounds the Eyes and Bill, that no Wind, nor Rain, nor Snow can hurt them. Thus he receives
greater Benefit from this Crown of Feathers, than the most potent Monarch ever could from his
Diadem of State, adorn’d with the richest Jewels; and could our Bird gain such a one, it would be
of no more Service to him, than the Diamond was to Æsop’s Cock we read of in the Fable. As for
the lesser Aluco one Thing in him is very remarkable, and a Sign [36] of the Nobleness of his
Temper, that he is so great a Lover of Cleanliness that before he eats he first pulls off all the
Feathers from his Prey, and makes it very clean; which is still more wonderful when we consider
he has so large a Gullet, that he can very easily swallow Morsels bigger than an Egg. Certainly,
if those Gluttons and greedy Bellies of whom Ælian has given us a Catalogue had had so large
a Gullet, they would never have taken half the Pains to have made their Victuals ready as this
Bird does.

There remains now the Nycticorax, which some call the Night-Raven; but it does not
properly belong to that Clan, but to the Lineage of the OWLS, and differs from the common Sort
in that it is somewhat bigger, and has a small Resemblance of the Raven. Now, these we have
been mentioning are the principal Sort of OWLS: As for the Rest of the promiscuous Croud,
their [sic] is but very little Difference among them and the Constitution of their Bodies is much
the same. But then, as the Manner is when any one has risen to the highest Honour and Dignity,
or being nobly born excels others, it is usual for some [37] bold Person to break in upon that
Family, and ascribe to himself the Name and Honour belonging to it: So, many who by no means
do belong to the OWL usurp his Name and Family; and though we may permit some Men to
please themselves by taking the Name of the OWL, [51] because, perhaps, they may also deserve a
Share of the PRAISE which belongs to HIM: Yet surely none of the Birds or Insects may be
permitted to Share in this Honour: It is therefore your Part, O Patrons of OWLS, to defend the
NAME from being fraudently [sic] invaded, that so the Publick may not be damaged: For how
great is the Rout of Birds and Insects which aspire to this Excellence? To begin with the least
considerable; There are a Sort of little Animals, such as Palmer-Worms, Flies, &c. which
buzzing round a Candle in the Night-Time, burn their Wings and hasten their own Death: these
Insects, I say, pretend to some Affinity with our OWL: But unless your Eyes are very dim, you
may easily perceive the vast Difference that there is between them; and I can scarce forgive myself for mentioning these silly Pretensions.

Neither will you in your Wisdom admit those Night-Birds which are vulgarly called Screech-OWLS, for these are unluckily clamorous, bold, cruel, and what is still worse, very troublesome and dangerous to Women lately delivered: 52 Ovid has given us a just Description of them;

Sunt avide volucres, non quæ Phinaæa mensis
Guttura frandabant, sed genus inde trabunt.
Grande caput, stantes oculi, rostra apta rapinae,
Canities pennies, unguibus hamus inest.
Nocte Volant, puerosque petunt nutricis egentes,
Et vitiant cunis corpora capta suis.

These greedy Birds fly scrieking thro’ the Skies,
Large are their Heads, and fix’d their cruel Eyes;
Their sharpen’d Beaks for Slaughter are prepar’d
To rush on Infants found without a Guard:
Then unrelenting seize the tender Prey
O’er the sweet Babes their nauseous Wings display
And with their Blood they make the Cradle gay.

And 53 Pliny informs us, that Homer has named and described them. 54 Lucan also takes Notice of them;

Quid tremipidus Bubo, quid Strix Nocturna
Queruntur.

And 55 Horace tells us, that Canidia the Sorceress made Use of the Screech-OWL’s Features in her Enchantments. And in the prophetical Writings they are often described in all their natural Fierceness. To give one Instance out of the Prophet Isaiah may suffice: (Chap. xxxiv. v. 14.) The wild Beasts of the Desert shall also meet with the wild Beasts of the Island, and the Satyr shall cry to his Fellow, the Screech-Owl also shall rest there, and find for her self a Place of Rest.

Now these pernicious Birds are likened not only to Witches, but Dæmons, and they have the
same Name both among the Hebrews and the Latins\textsuperscript{56}: Hence the Ancients were always of Opinion, that their Presence was dismal and ominous, which is the Reason why the Jews write upon the four Walls of the Chamber where a Woman lies in Childbed, the four following Words in Hebrew Characters ADAM, EVA, FORAS, STRIX. The celebrated\textsuperscript{57} Buxtorff gives us the History of this Matter at large; \textit{When} (says he) \textit{a Jewish Woman is pregnant, and the Chamber is made ready for her decent Reception, and all Things necessary are provided: Then comes the Master of the Family, or some other Jew eminent for his Sanctity and unspotted Conversation, (if such a one can possibly be had under the Cope of Heaven,) and taking a Piece of Chalk he draws a Circle on all the Walls, and also upon the Door on both Sides, and near the Bed he writes these Words in Hebrew Characters ADAM, CHAWA, CHUTZ, LILIS, \textit{i.e.} Adam, eva apage te Lilis.}

Now, here I cannot but Wonder that the sagacious\textsuperscript{58} Pliny should be seized with so great a Fit of Infidelity, as to doubt whether these Birds we have been speaking of ever had any Existence; for in this he goes against the Testimony of all Writers both sacred and prophane; and indeed if there are no such Birds, Why do we now mispend [sic] our Time in rejecting them from the genuine Family of the OWLS? Perhaps Pliny might think on what\textsuperscript{59} Ramus wrote in his \textit{Logick} so many Ages after, (though I fancy he was too positive and rash in it:) \textit{Testimonies and Authorities are but small Proof when the Truth of any Nice, and curious Proposition is to be enquired into.} If this be true we can depend on no History: Tho’ I doubt\textsuperscript{41} not (Conscript Fathers,) but you will readily assent to so many and great Authors, unless after the Manner of the Scepticks you will be so very doubtful, as to call in Question not only the Existence of this particular \textit{Bird} we are discoursing of, but also of the whole Tribe of OWLS; which Pallas forbid!

Another \textit{Night Bird} whom we must exclude from our honourable Society, is called by the Latins \textit{Bubo}, and is, by some less discerning Persons, reckoned to belong to the Clan of OWLS, and so called accordingly: He seems to have derived his Name from the Syriac Word \textit{Bobo}, he being reckoned an Enemy to Mankind, though others will have him called so from his mimicking the Lowing and an Ox; but, however that be, the Poet\textsuperscript{60} tells us,

\textit{In festus Bubo est dirum Mortalibus omen.}

And another to the same Purpose,

\textit{Bubulat horrendum ferali carmine Bubo}

\textit{Humano Generi tristia Fata feren.}
Pliny gives us a dreadful Description of him. This Night-Bird, (Bubo) says he, is a very dismal Creature, and the Bane of all pleasant Fortune. This Monster of the Night has nothing of a vocal Note but only groans; and therefore when he appears in Cities, or indeed any where else in the Day-Time, he is a very strange and direful Spectacle. And a little after the same Author says, He entered into a small Apartment under the Capitol when Papellius Istrus and Lucius Pedanius were Consuls, for which Reason the City soon after received a Lustration: But why do I mention Heathen Rome? I shall entertain you with something of this Nature very remarkable, and which happened in Holy Rome; for there this direful Bird, we are speaking of, disturbed the Synod which was held there, under Pope John the Thirteenth, in the Year of our Lord 1411. Let us attend to an Historian who lived at that Time, giving us this terrible Account of it. The Pope for above four Years had been importuned to call a Council at Rome; and when all who were to be present thereat were convened, Mass was celebrated in the usual Manner, and the Holy Spirit invoked to be present with them and aid their Consulations, [sic] and Pope John sate on high in his Pontifical Chair, when lo! A very fierce and dreadful OWL, (for our Author is pleased to compliment that Bird with this Name) breaking forth from his lurking Corner flew about making a dreadful Noise; at length he fixed on a Beam in the Middle of the Church, and kept his Eyes stedfast on the Pope; all who were present began to wonder, that a Night Bird should presume to venture into so numerous an Assembly, and reckoned it very ominous, while some more subtle than the Rest whispered one to the other, See the Spirit appears in the Shape of a Bird! others could scarce refrain from laughing out. Pope John himself on whom the Owl had fixed his Eyes was very much surprized and mightily put to the Blush; and not knowing well what to do he rose up and put an End to the Council. There followed sometime after a second Session in which this unluckily [sic] Bird (who I suppose had no Invitation) came again, and after the same Manner fixed his Eyes on the Pope, who, seeing him return again was more confounded than at first, and being no longer able to endure him, commanded that they should drive him away with Shouting, and also by throwing Sticks at him: Yet neither would this rough Treatment drive him from the Place. I have told you (Fathers) this Story that you may perceive the Impudence of the Night-Bird (called Bubo,) who had no respect for so venerable and sacred a Synod: And besides, he used to drink up the Holy Oil which he found in the Temple Lamps, so that he is profane and sacrilegious as well as impudent. Let then these Furies (so we may rather call them than Birds) pack away to Libya, and the Indies, where the Natives worship the Devil they are fitter for that Place than to be admitted into our famous College of OWLS; with whom they have no Manner of Affinity, except that like them they usually fly abroad in the Night-Season; and if that
were a sufficient Title the Bat might also be numbered among the Lineage of OWLS: For he appears only in the Dusk of the Evening, tho’ he is so far from having any Title to this Honour, that it is disputed whether he be indeed a Bird or a Mouse.  

64 Aristotle the Prince of Philosophers numbers him among the Birds, when he says, *There are some Birds that fly with Wings as the Eagle and Hawk, some with a dry Membrane as Bees and Hornets, and others with a Skin as the Bat.* However, we shall leave these trifling Speculations, and proceed to more important Enquiries: As for the bodily Constitution of the OWL, (or if you had rather his Disposition) his Temperature is so aptly disposed and composed of radical [45] Heat and Moisture, and even all the four Humours so harmoniously fixed, and so full of vital Spirits that he may live a great many Years unless some sudden Accident or Distemper carries him off; tho’ indeed it matters not how long a Person lives, but how well: And a calamitous old Age is to be dreaded: Agreeable to the Expression of Cato Major65 *We all desire to arrive at old Age, but complain of it when it comes.* Farther, our OWL has no Occasion with the Bird in Æsop to deck himself out with borrowed Plumes, his own are sufficient and ornamental enough; and though his Body is but small, yet he excels in the Largeness of his Wings, which are not only the Instruments with which he Flies, but they also serve to keep off the Cold in Winter, while he contracts himself like the Hedgehog, or like the Tortoise hides himself in his Feathery Shell. The Plumes of our Bird are not only of Use, but exceedingly beautiful, and stained with a Variety of Colours; so that (Conscript Fathers) we may sing of this Bird as Catullus does of his Lesbia,

[46] Noctua *formosa est, que cum pulcerrima tota est,*

*Tum omnibus una omnes surripuit veneres.*

But this I must ingenuously confess would be but a small Commendation, unless he was also endowed with excellent Qualities of Mind; that is, with Wit and Vertue, in which as Cicero observes, *true Beauty does consist*; and in these Respects the OWL excels all other Birds.

As for *Wit* and *Sagacity* (even to the utmost that can be expected in a Bird) he sufficiently shows them in his Actions; and we read in an ancient Fable, that the OWL gave the Birds wholesome Counsel to *pull up the Flax while it was yet sprouting and tender, lest afterwards it should come to Maturity, and furnish Men with Materials for Snares:* But they despising his Counsel, he forsook their Company, and chose to come abroad in the silent Night. The Rest of the Birds being wise to [sic] late, as often as they saw the OWL would fly round him in great Numbers, expecting to receive from him more wise Directions how to avoid the crafty Snares of Men. Moreover, 66 Pliny tells us, that *this Bird is a very great Mimick, and will imitate whatso-
ever he sees Men do, which certainly is a Sign of great Wit; so that as the Ape among four-footed Beasts is the greatest Imitator of Man; so among Birds the Owl approaches nearest to human Nature. But, as Boetius very well observes, The greatest Understandings are not always joined with the best Fortune; so it happens, that this our most ingenious Bird does not always meet with Prosperity and Success; for this very Subtilty of his, which we have now been discoursing of, is often the Cause of his Ruin: For the Naturalists observe, that the Fowlers take occasion from this their tractable Disposition to circumvent and ensnare them.

Now, the Fowler’s Method of taking the OWL is this, He goes towards him with a slow Pace, and standing over against him he rubs his Eyes with a glutinous Ointment, which afterwards he leaves on the Ground, and goes away for a Time: I the mean While our Bird thinking no Harm, comes and acts as the Fowler did before him; but by anointing his Eyes they are so glewed together that he cannot see, and then the Fowler runs and takes him. This I must confess is an Indiscretion, though nothing but what is even incident to human Nature, for

Ingenio perit Naso Poeta suo.

Ovid, if he had had less Wit in his own Country, had never been so miserable in Pontus; and how many are there who in Imitation of others suffer their Eyes to be closed up, and destroy themselves with the Poison of mortal Vices: For Men think they may act safely when they have Examples before them. But our Bird gives yet greater and more happy Specimens of his Wit, while (as it is reported) he conducts the Quails and other Birds cross the Sea. Consider now, of what a vast Advantage it is then to him that he can see in the Night, and how great is the Profit which accrues from hence to the other Birds; for it is very dangerous to be guided by one whose Sight is imperfect in the Night-Time: Now he gains a double Reputation by this Means. And first, hereby he shows a great Dexterity of Mind, and an admirable Penetration, in that he is not only a Companion to these Birds, but is also their Leader, flying before and conducting them over the Ocean; from whence the Name Avis peculiarly belongs to our Bird; the Rest are called Aves because they deviate (à via) and rove with uncertain Excursions through the Air: Now, according to the Opinion of a very wise Man, the Way of a Bird, the Way of a Ship, the Way of a Serpent, and the Way of a young Man cannot be traced. Now our Bird not only takes this long Journey we have been speaking of, but also quickly returns back again and takes up his Habitation among us, and may frequently be seen in Winter. Moreover, how great is this Bird’s Humanity (I hope the Reader will pardon the Impropriety of the Expression) in undergoing so much Labour and Trouble for the Sake of others, as to fly so many thousand Miles, Day and
Night, and hazard his Life and Fortune for the Interest of other Birds, whilst he readily points out to them the Way without Weariness. Behold (Fathers) how a great Genius may sometimes lie obscure! Who among you could have imagined that an OWL had so much Wit? For as every Man is not born with a silver Spoon in his Mouth, so it is not for every Bird to fly over the Ocean, so large and tempestuous. Now how beneficent a Thing it is to lead Strangers in the right Way, may be made evident by a thousand Considerations. \textit{Tobias [50]} we find was ready very liberally to reward the Angel who had conducted him; and \textit{Ennius} says,

\begin{quote}
\textit{Homo qui erranti Comiter monstrat viam, quasi Lumen de suo Lumine accendat, facit.}
\end{quote}

It is farther a great Argument of a careful Mind, that when the Wind begins to blow pretty strong against him, he takes up some little Stones that thereby he may fly more steady, and the Wind may not have so great an Influence over him\textsuperscript{69}. Some Authors attribute this same Contrivance to the \textit{Cranes}, lest they should be incommoded when they are asleep. This Instance shows that our Bird is not only wise for others, but also for himself.

Another wonderful Instance of our Bird’s \textit{Sagacity} appears in his being able to presage a future Tempest\textsuperscript{70}: And it is a common Observation, that if he leaves the Woods it betokens an unfruitful Year; if he leaves the Caverns, and betakes himself to other unusual Mansions, it betokens Death to the Inhabitants of that Country; and he frequently flies by the Windows of those Chambers where the sick Man lies a dying. Now, surely it is a great Proof \textsuperscript{51} of Wisdom, not only to see what is present, but also to foresee future Things: And you would wonder if I should inform you, that the OWL is a Sort of a Prophet. Now, from whence can we suppose this Presage to arise? It is most absurd to imagine that it arises from any extraordinary Revelation which some Enthusiasts pretend to; but in my Opinion rather proceeds from a natural Instinct with which he is endowed, and by which he is able to smell out dead Carcasses that are at a vast Distance: But perhaps you will say, sick Persons are surely not dead Corps, how is it then that he attends their Chambers? It is true they are not actually such; but yet we must observe, that the nearer Approaches any Body makes to Death, the nearer at the same Time it is to Corruption; and so Persons just about to die infect the Air with a cadaverous Smell, which the OWL (without a Nose) can distinguish at a vast Distance from a sound Evaporation. And cannot you your selves (conscript Fathers) smell the Rain which is extracted from sulphureous Places, and condensed into a Cloud many Miles off, unless you have a great Cold upon you. And if (as we every Day see) \textit{Hounds} have so exquisite a Nose, and therefore are much esteemed: Our Bird may claim a
greater Share of Praise for his nice [52] Smelling: Nor will it, I hope, be any Reflection upon the Nobleness of his Nature, that he is so much delighted with dead Carcasses, for this is a Fault in common both with him and you: For are not all of you exceedingly pleased with diverse Kinds of dead Bodies? For what else (a few Herbs and Fruits excepted) do all Mankind feed upon? Do they not feast upon almost all Sorts of Beasts, Birds, and Fishes after they are dead, for few will eat them alive? Thus the Flesh of dead Creatures is rent by the Teeth of Men, and their Entrails buried in human Bowels, contrary to the Custom of the golden Age, and the Institution of the celebrated 71Pythagoras. In this Practice, therefore, we all agree with the OWLS, only they eat them raw, and we boiled and roasted; for it would be too chargeable and troublesome for them to keep a Cook; but according to their Sagacity they find out dead Bodies and eat them, which we see is also practiced by Mankind. But Wit without Vertue signifies little; for as Cicero observes, True Glory arises from Vertue only: We therefore proceed to display the Vertues of our Bird, which indeed are so many that I scarce know where [53] to begin, or where to end. I hope the Divines will pardon me if I begin with that which is most excellent. I mean Religion, which regards sacred Things, and is opposed to Superstition. This indeed our Bird is far from; yet surely he has a considerable Notion of Religion in that he loves and frequents Temples and sacred Places, and often dwells in them, and there destroys the Mice, which might otherwise enter the Holy Repository and devour the consecrated Host; by which Action he does more Service to the Church than all the whole Herd of Fryers and Monasticks with their subtle Disputations: And thus composes Strife to the Satisfaction of all Parties. Now, lest any should think this strange, I desire he would seriously consider these following weighty and great Discussions.72

(1) How, and in what Place the consecrated Host may safely be laid that it may not be devoured by the Mice?

(2) Whether the Mouse which has eaten the Host may truly be said to have eaten the Body of Christ.

[54] (3.) What is to be done with such a Mouse? Whether he ought to have his Bowels rent out for this Sacrilege, or be burnt with the Hereticks?

(4.) Whether that Host or Particle of the Host which is in the Mouse be a proper Object of Adoration?

(5.) Whether such a Mouse be indeed holier or more profane than other Mice?
Now so long as our religious Bird thus fiercely persecutes the Mice, there is no Occasion for such Canons as these: 73 Whosoever shall not look after the Sacrament, and the Mouse by his Negligence shall eat it, that Person shall do Penance forty Days, &c. And again, in the penitential Canons we find an Order to the same Effect; and elsewhere, but it would be tedious to transcribe them all: And besides, the Claws of the OWL are much sharper, and tend more to the Extermination of the Mice than all these Canons. Go on, therefore, thou virtuous Bird, to wage a lasting War with those pernicious Creatures the Mice, and thereby make Peace among the Priests who celebrate Mass, and clear the Temples from sacrilegious Invasion. Thus proceed by a Kind of Holy War to root out [55] the Generation of Mice. Certainly thou hast more Religion than those who never enter into a Church all their Life-Time to perform any Acts of Worship, or receive an Instruction, but after Death are conveyed thither with great Pomp and Solemnity. You cannot (worthy Fathers) be much surprised to hear the OWL has some Religion; since 74 Pliny attributes it even to the Hens, who, (says he) tremble after they have laid an Egg and shake themselves. Now if a Fear and Horror may be reckoned religious, how much more may the Frequenting of sacred Temples where Religion is taught? And as all Virtues have a certain common Bond, and have a mutual Relation one to the other; so allowing our Bird to have Religion, other Vertues will naturally follow. And first, as to Fortitude, which is reckoned by the Ancients to belong to the moral Vertues, our Bird possesses it in such an eminent Degree, that he always forth intrepid to meet his Enemies; for he has an Enemy with whom he engages with a very strong and heroick Assault, for his Courage does not exert itself in a foolish and furious Manner; he is not like the Andabatians who encountered with [56] the South-Wind; nor with Xerxes does he pretend to restrain the boisterous Waves of the Sea; but the Raven is his mortal Enemy with whom he wages perpetual War. And this Enmity is hereditary, so that there is no Room to doubt of the OWL’s Fortitude. Methinks, I see, (O ye noble Patrons of this Bird) how strenuously he exerts himself in his Conflict with the Raven; and tho’ he has no Trumpet to rouze his Spirits, he courageously attacks his Adversary with his Beak and Claws. Indeed these Enemies are unequally matched, which you will soon perceive, if you consider the respective Strength of each Bird; for the Ravens are an evil, unjust and noisy Clan, who live by Rapine, and are continually bent on Spoil and Cruelty, and so are daily accustomed to rending and tearing; and this Quality they brought with them out of the Egg, and therefore we are not to wonder that it is so predominant; for Mali Corvi Malum Ovum, was a true Proverb. Again, their very Colour demonstrates their Nature.

[57]------Hic Niger est hunc Tu Romane Caveto.
For which Reason Pliny ranks them among the Birds of ill Omen. And tho’ it be an old Saying, *That it is better to fall among Ravens than Flatterers*, yet this tends more to the Dishonour of *Flatterers* than the Praise of *Ravens*: But all the Lineage of OWLS are quiet, harmless, and modest, and therefore our *Bird* comes with a vast Disadvantage to encounter so formidable and evil an Adversary, whom he knows how to subdue rather by Magnanimity and a peculiar Stratagem, than any Strength of Body.

*Dolus an virtus quis in Hoste Requirat?*

Now, here I know it would be taken very ill if I should say, That the *Owl* is more valiant than many Men, who often suffer themselves to be overcome by their Inferiors: But were not the *Pygmies* who (degenerating from human Gravity, and forgetting their own Dignity) waged War with the *Cranes*, overthrown and put to the Rout? I must confess the *Cranes* had not to deal with tall and veteran Troops; neither have the OWLS ever engaged with the *Pygmies*; if they had, they must have overcome them, unless you will sup-[58]pose their Strength inferior to that of the *Cranes*. However, this every one must confess, that our *Bird* with a magnanimous and constant Mind is not afraid to engage with a fiercer Adversary.

*Fortiaque adversis opposit Pectora rebus.*

For he is very sensible that many Persons have been rendered illustrious by contending with more potent Adversaries, who would otherwise have remained in Obscurity: Agreeable to which, Seneca, the Prince of the *Stoick*-Philosophers, has this remarkable Passage [77]: *The Gladiator reckons it a Disgrace to be joined to an inferior Swordsman; for the Glory of the Conquest is then taken away, when the Victory is obtained without Danger.* Tho’ a little after our Author forgets himself, and does not speak like a *Stoick*: *To contend* (says he) *with an Equal is doubtful, with an Inferior is sordid, and with a Superior is desperate*; but with the good Leave of you, and the Philosophers, I say, ’tis glorious. Never did the Valour of the *Romans* shine brighter, than when they were engaged in many fierce Wars with the most formidable Nations. And the *Belgians* gained [59] an immortal Honour in contending with the *Spaniards* [78], one of the most potent Monarchies of the Universe. Had the Strength of *Spain* been less, *Holland* had lost much of its Renown. So, as much as you detract from the Raven’s Strength, so much you take away of the OWL’s Commendation. For true is that Saying of Terence, That *no Action can be great and
memorable which is not accompanied with Danger. Neither does his Renown stand only upon
this single Basis, nor is his Fortitude tried by one Adversary only; for \textsuperscript{79}Pliny tells us, that the
OWL is assaulted by the Bees, Wasps, and Hornets; nor is this indeed to be wondered at, since
these Insects with their pointed Stings are often very troublesome to Mankind: Hence arose the
old Proverb, \textit{Thrust not your Hand into a Hornet’s Nest}, by which Means they will be provoked
to do great Mischief; for their Sting is very sharp and pestilent, and frequently causes a Fever;
and the aforementioned Author speaks of a Man’s being killed with the Stings of twenty seven
Hornets. The Poet who wrote \textsuperscript{80}Archilochus’s Epitaph alludes to \textsuperscript{60}this, (it seems the
Deceased had been a very contentious Person,)

\textit{Ne fors crabrones, qui huic insedere sepulchro
Irrites, tacitum carpe viator Iter.}

In encountering with these troublesome Creatures, the OWL shows a Fortitude more than human:
For who of Mankind can spurn with Disdain at the Stings of these Furies? Who dare with an
undaunted Mind to hold up his Head against them, and courageously stand the Battle? On the
contrary, every Body is apt to run from them,

\textit{Nam illos}
\textit{Defendit numerus junctæque umbone Phalanges.}

Nay, I have known some so delicate (even in your Society, Fathers) as call upon Heaven for Aid
when disturbed but with the Biting of a Flea;

\textit{Scilicet is superis Labor est, &c.}

But your Bird is not afraid courageously to attack and destroy these pernicious Animals. If,
therefore, Nature had not before given him a beautiful Crown of Feathers, he ought to have the
victorious Laurel bestowed upon him for his Mag-
\textsuperscript{61}animity. I have read of a Peasant, who
threw a Hive full of Bees into the River, because they had stung him; and bursting into a Passion
said, \textit{Lie there thou mischievous Swarm, shall any Thing which I possess have Dominion over
me? Hitherto I have been Lord over my own Goods, and acted as Superior, and I am resolved to
act up to the Height of that Character as long as I live. A great Reputation indeed, joined with
much Damage! For the same Reason he might also have drowned his Cows, because they made
Use of their *Horns*. Perhaps the *Rustick* had heard of that absolute Dominion, which the *first Man* once had over the *Beasts*, and so was willing to attribute such an Authority to himself. There is, indeed, nothing sweeter than the Words *Lordship* and *Dominion*; though *Augustus*, who was so great a Ruler, would not permit his Children or Kinsmen to call him Lord, either seriously or in Jest\(^{81}\). But now the Humours of Mankind are different, when *Politicians* (as well Ecclesiastical as Civil) greedily catch at swelling Titles of Dominion: Hence the Emperor *Maximilian*, used pleasantly and truly to say, *There are three remarkable Kings at this Time*; One *is a King of Men*, the [62] Other of *Asses*, and the *Third is a King of Kings*: The *King of Men* is the *King of Spain*, who hitherto has ruled with great Moderation, considering that he is a Governour of Men; the *King of Asses* is the *King of Arabia*, whose *Subjects* like *Asses*, patiently submit to all the unreasonable *Burdens* he imposes on them: And I am my self a *King of Kings*, for every one of my *Subjects* will be *Lord* and *King*. But I digress too far.

Our *Bird* is also a great Enemy to *Horse-Leeches*: For *Pliny* truly asserts, that he is a great Foe to Blood-suckers; not that hereby I would insinuate he has any Quarrel with the Physicians, who in divers Distempers prescribe the Opening of a Vein. This is certain, the cruel *Horse-Leech* is an Enemy to our *OWL*, and is perpetually crying *Give*, *Give*, and from his forked Tongue the Blood flows as from a Spout, as *Pliny* observes\(^{82}\). Since, therefore, this *Creature* thus unsatiably thirsts after Blood, and the Blood is the Life of every Animal, it is but just it should Experience the *Fortitude* of our *OWL*, and not only be deservedly slain by him, but also thrown into a Bason full of Blood with an Insult of this Nature, *Satiate thy [63] Self with Blood*, which thou hast so much desired. Having thus surveyed the various Battles wherein our *OWL* is engaged abroad, which are all but so many Trophies of his *Courage*; we shall now touch upon a civil and domestick One, which is commonly reckoned most dangerous. Now, this *Bird* is daily obliged to combate with those *Lice*, which he feeds and nourishes (as the *Pelican* does her young) with his own Blood: But neither can these conquer him, for he always comes off victorious, and gives them proper Punishment with his *Beak*. Who ever heard of an *OWL’s* being eaten up by *Lice*; and yet several Men have undergone that ignominious Death\(^{83}\). These Vermin then can never insult over him. Now, tho’ it be a Disgrace to be devoured by *Lice*, yet it is none to be troubled with them, for this is common as well to *Men* as OWLS; and it was a Saying of *one of the Kings of France*, that *a Louse was a Man’s Companion, but a Flea was more proper to be a Dog’s Associate*. Therefore, as you are Men, you ought not to think your selves above any Accident belonging to Humanity: But should you be beset with any of these *Vermin*, after the Example of the [64] *OWL*, arm your selves for the Combate, and move your Fingers and Nails about with Nimbleosity; and imitate not the Superstition of the *Jews*, who reckoned it unlucky to
kill a Louse on the Sabbath-Day; but briskly defend your selves at all Times, for this is truly OWL-like and noble. Consider, therefore, with how many and great Enemies our Bird is every Way surrounded, and yet he obtains the Victory. It is an old and true Proverb, Ne Hercules Quidem contra duos; tho’ his twelve Labours are famous through the World. And yet our Bird is forced to contend with the Raven, with the Bees, with the Wasps, and Hornets, with the Blood sucking Horse-Leeches, and with his own Lice, and appears stronger than them all. And what should hinder also, but that he is stronger than Herod King of the Jews, and Philip King of Spain, who were vanquished by Lice; whereas our Bird triumphs over them.[111] But what is still more surprising, the OWL has as much Patience, as he has Fortitude; which two Virtues are seldom joined together; very rarely do they meet even in Mankind: For a valiant Man is more properly stiled daring, than Patient, and intrepidly rushes upon Danger, but bears Calamities (when they arrive) with De-[65]cency, as Seneca observes. Now, our Bird gives undeniable Tokens of his Patience while he is exposed to the Hatred of all other Birds, and made their laughing Stock: They fly round him in Troops when he appears in the Day Time, and beat him with their Beaks and Wings; they hiss at him and deride him all Manner of Ways: Yet all these Insults (provoking as they are) he patiently bears with an unshaken Constancy, and a Mind undisturbed. Seneca tells us, It is the Mark of a great Soul to despise Injuries. Our OWL therefore is to be admired, because he overcomes this intolerable Petulance of the Birds with peculiar Patience. So remarkable is this, that the afflicted Church (as we read in the 102 Psalm,) draws a Simile from our Bird, with reference to Affliction and Meekness: I am, says David, like a Pelican in the Wilderness, and like an OWL in the Desart: Though I must confess Interpreters and Expositors very much vary concerning the proper Translation of these Words. Rabbi Solomon will have it to be the Hawk, and others the Night-Raven: But the usual Reading has the greatest Authorities, as well as Reason on its Side. In a Word, I am very desirous of setting our Bird’s Excel-[66]lencies in a due Light, yet I am almost tired with recounting his Grief and Vexations: But I consider, my Friends, that there have been even among your selves, Examples of this Kind in every Age; for who does not know how patient an OWL Claudius the Emperor was, who, although, (as Augustus observes) he showed to others a Nobleness of Mind, was himself so obnoxious to Contempt, that if he went a little after the appointed Hour to any Supper or Entertainment, he was not received into the Parlour without great Reluctance and Delay. Now, I believe the OWL never yet met with such a Reception at a Banquet made among the Birds: Again, when he slept after Meals, he composed himself to Rest on the Stones and Husks of Olives, Dates, and other Fruits, and sometimes was roused with Stripes by way of Sport and Diversion; which I cannot remember ever happened to our Bird when he was sleeping; and yet
this great Prince of the Universe patiently endured it: But why do I here mention Cæsar? as tho’
there were not under him another OWL, viz. Bibulus the Consul, who took every Thing in good
Part from his Colleague, and at last retiring to his own House, was no otherwise known than by
setting his Hand [67] now and then to an Edict; whence his Patience was magnificently
celebrated;

Non Bibulo quicquam nuper, sed Cæsare gestum est;
Nam Bibulo fieri Consule nil memini. 87

In short, there was an OWL to be met with, formerly in all Assemblies, whether Festival,
or Political: And I may, I hope, without Offence, make the same Observation concerning our
Times. Is it not customary in the Universities, and other Schools of Learning in Europe; at
certain Times, for the Students to divert themselves with some ludicrous Persons of their own
Society; who then supply the Place of OWLS? And as for the Court, whoever frequents that
Place, with a Design of being preferred, must laugh at the same Time that he is beaten, and
patiently bear a thousand Indignities. There are OWLS also among Mechanicks, who when they
are not able to prove their Performances to be good, dare not defend them: In a Word, (conscript
Fathers) are not there OWLS to be met with at Court, in the Market, in the Schools, and
especially, at Festival-Entertainments, who are endowed with so much Patience, that one [68]
would wonder that this single Vertue, should have so many Followers, insomuch that four
Persons can scarcely meet, but there will appear a fifth to act the Part of an OWL, who, the more
he resists and strives to defend himself, becomes the greater Laughing stock, and so renders
himself unworthy of the OWL’s Affinity, in not being able to take a Jest: Nay, even in the
smallest Society that can possibly be, that is Wedlock, there is sometimes an OWL to be met
with: For when Xantippe threw the Chamber Pot upon her Husband, what was Socrates but a
great OWL, tamely to bear such an Indignity, and put it up with a jest? What shall I say
concerning those Cuckolds, who, according to the Platonical System, are very communicative of
their Wives: Surely these are the greatest OWLS under the Sun, while they grossly delude
themselves, and readily believe all the Stories they hear from there [sic] Help-mates, and look
upon all their Tales as Oracles, fearing a female Frown, more than the sharpest Reproaches of
Mankind: Nay, if they surprise their Wives in the very Act, will easily pardon them if the
Adulterer be but rich or noble, and so sufficiently imitate the Patience of the OWL; what shall
we now say?
But to proceed, our *Bird* is not only famous for his *Patience*, but also for his *Constancy*; with reference to which, we may observe, that he does not like the *Swallow*, and some *other Birds*, leave us at certain Seasons of the Year, but he stays continually with us, as well in the Winter as Summer: Now *Pliny* tells us, that the *OWL* lies close for sixty Days in the Winter, and consequently he does not leave us, but takes a Rest, tho’ if he should tarry all Winter with those Birds, whom he is said to conduct beyond Sea, he must then wholly forsake you for that Season, and you could neither see nor hear him: But, since Experience makes the contrary evident, you have thereby a singular Proof of his *Constancy*: The Sum of the Matter is this, the OWL continues with us, and therefore he is *constant*, he lies close for sixty Days, therefore he is Quiet and Calm: Yet we do not pretend to praise him upon account of his Indolence or Sleeping, or raise a *Panegyrick* to *Endymion*, instead of *Praising* our *Bird*; but only mention it as an Argument of Security and Happiness; for if this his *Constancy* be joined with Pleasure, I beseech you envy him not upon that Account.

Were he always to be intent upon his Prey, he would be a very wandering and restless Creature; but now, by taking so long and undisturbed a *Sleep* his Days are Halcyon; and he avoids the busy Concourse of the Market, the Noise of Cities, and the tedious Formality of Palaces: Besides, How great is the Pleasure of *Sleep*?

*Somne quies rerum, placidissime Somne Deorum,*

*Pax animi, quemu cra fugit, qui corpora duris*

*Festa ministeria mulces, reparasque labori.*

Now, if there was not greater Pleasure in *Rest* than in *Motion*, (according to the Observation of the *Prince* of *Philosophers*) certainly our *Bird* would not be so much addicted to *Sleep*, neither would he be so happy; for while the Mind and Body are thus composed, the Animal must needs grow plump and fat; since *Aristotle* observes, that *Animals thrive more in their Sleep than when they are awake*: So that our OWL *is truly happy*, which we will prove by a logical Argument.

I. He, that *lies down well*, *sleeps* well.

II. He, that *sleeps well*, commits *no Fault*.

III. He, that commits *no Fault*, is *happy*.
IV. Therefore, he that \textit{lies down} well, is \textit{happy}.

Since we are now discoursing of \textit{Constancy}, particularly with reference to \textit{Sleep}; permit me (Fathers) to give you an Instance of such \textit{Constancy} in a \textit{certain} Student, who desired \textit{all the Family} to call him up so precisely before seven a \textit{Clock}, that he might go out exactly as the \textit{Clock} struck that \textit{Hour}, neither a \textit{Moment} before, nor after; for if he was called before, he must lose some of his \textit{Sleep}, and if after, he was in danger of being disappointed in his \textit{Journey}: The \textit{Maid} came in the \textit{Morning} about half an \textit{hour} after Six, and called him; he supposing it was just upon the Point of Seven, in all \textit{Haste} put on his \textit{Cloaths} and set forward: Just as he came upon the \textit{Threshold} the little \textit{Bell} gave warning that it wanted a \textit{Quarter} of Seven, he immediately was very angry and chid the \textit{Servant} because she had deprived him of a \textit{Quarter} of an \textit{Hour’s Rest}; and so, without any more \textit{ado} he very methodically \textit{undresses} himself and goes to \textit{Bed} again, crying out, that it was unreason-able to lose so considerable a [72] \textit{Portion of Time} in \textit{Watching}, \textit{which might be spent} in \textit{Sleep} in a much more agreeable \textit{Manner}: \textit{In the mean Time}, he was so overcome with \textit{Sleep}, that he did not \textit{wake} till long after \textit{Seven}, which you know must have been very prejudicial to his \textit{Affairs}. But,

\textit{Justum et tenacem propositi virum, &c.}^{92}

You guess the rest.

Esteem such then, according to their \textit{Worth}, and particularly honour our \textit{Bird}, who continually remains with us, both in \textit{Storms} and \textit{Sunshine}, when Fortune smiles and when she frowns; herein excelling those of whom the Poet writes;

\begin{quote}
\textit{----------diffugiunt Cadis}\\
\textit{Cum Fæce siccatis amici}\\
\textit{Ferre Jugum pariter dolosi.}
\end{quote}

Moreover, as the wise \textit{Epictetus} reduced all his \textit{Precepts of Philosophy} and \textit{Vertue}, to these two, \textit{Sustain} and \textit{Abstain}; so our \textit{Bird}, conforms his \textit{Life} agreeably thereunto: As for the \textit{first} Branch of these, which consists in \textit{Fortitude}, we have already demonstrated that the \textit{OWL} [73] is possessed of it in a very great Degree: And as for the latter \textit{Precept} \textit{Abstain}, we shall presently shew how well our \textit{Bird} observes it. And here it ought not to seem wonderful to any, that we ascribe \textit{Temperance} to the \textit{OWL}, which seems a \textit{Virtue} confined to Men only: For, if \textit{Ælian}
praises the voracious *Eagle*, because he endures *Thirst*, and will not roll in the *Dirt* like other Birds\(^93\); why should we not remark the like Virtues in the OWL? The same Author also, praises the *Bees* for their *Temperance*, because they hate those who are just come from Scenes of Luxury and Debauchery\(^94\); why then should we not be at Liberty to produce greater Specimens of *Temperance* in the OWL? For our *Bird* derived this Vertue from the very *Egg*; and though \(^95\) *Aristotle* very gravely asserts, that there is no such Things as natural and innate Vertue, yet this *Egg* demonstrates the Contrary, which as we have before shewn (out of *Philostratus* and other good Authors) is a present Remedy against *Intemperance*: Now, if this *Egg* has such a great Influence on Men, whose Nature is different, \([74]\) much more will it conduce to the OWL’s *Temperance*, of whom it is the Author and Parent: For according to the old philosophical Maxim, *Such as the Cause is, such will the Effects prove*. *Pliny* tells us\(^96\), that our *Bird* will fall nine Days together, which certainly is no vulgar Token of *Abstinence*. *Aristotle* indeed affirms, that *all Sorts of Birds drink but very few sparingly, and if at any Time they exceed, it is to their great Detriment*\(^97\); which indeed, I judge probable enough, since they never make Water, having neither *Reins* nor *Bladders*, and therefore want no *Water-Casters* when they are out of order.

And *Vespasian* could have had no Tribute from them. For Heat being predominant in them, all superfluous Moisture is easily sucked up; indeed it must be owned, that few among the Four-footed Beasts, will eat or drink more than Nature requires: Yet this Moderation of theirs, does not come up to that of the OWL; for his *Temperance* is so exquisite, that it was born in him and with him. For which Reason, our *Bird* was so dear to *Minerva*, that *Eubulus* the comick Poet, styles him the *Chicken of Pallas*; as tho’ that unmarried Goddess, had \([75]\) produced him from an *Egg*. And so much did the *Athenians* esteem our *Bird*, as to make him their Example of *Continence* and *Temperance*: And *Eubulus* has left us this Testimony of them, that the *Athenians* were very eloquent and abstemious, but the *Thebans* were Lovers of their Bellies: And farther he tells us, that their very Wives and Children, were inured to suffer Hunger and feed upon Hopes. On the contrary, too many bring the Vices of Gluttony and of Drunkenness from their very Cradles; who do not eat and drink for the Preservation of their Lives, but live only that they may eat and drink, according to the Opinion of the Poet\(^98\), *What is it to live? Why I say to Drink*; which Definition, the Fishes in the Sea (could they speak) would mightily applaud. This is living like *Bonesus*, of whom *Aurelian* used to say, *that he was not born to live, but to drink*. And yet he was in great Esteem for a long Time, upon a political Account; for when Embassadors were sent from all Parts, *Bonesus* used to entertain them with Drinking, and when he had sufficiently warmed their Heads, easily made himself Master of their secret Designs; whilst he himself could \([76]\) drink as long as he pleased without being disguised; so far from it, that every Glass made
him more subtle; besides, he had this Advantage, that his Drink ran thro’ him without any Diminution. Claudius Tiberius Nero had arrived to such a Pitch of drinking, that they altered his Name thus, Caldius Eiberius Mero: And even in our Times (O conscript Fathers,) there is a wretched Degeneracy from the OWL’s Temperance; and it is become a common Thing to contend for Victory in drinking.

Pocula pota placent, deciesque epota placebunt.

Are not these the Times which the wise Roman foretold long ago. Drunkenness (says he) will come to be a great Honour, and it will be reckoned a Vertue to swallow large Draughts: You see here the Prophecy, and the Accomplishment is visible enough; for who at present are more honoured than those?

Et potare pares et respondere Parati.

Which Quality is deemed vastly to transcend unfashionable Temperance; without which, religious Persons are reckoned superstitious, the Valiant austere, and the Patient called stupid; so that no outward Sweat can any longer pretend to strive [77] with this inward Liquor. O rare Times! and admirable Manners! We seem as if our Thirst had been inflamed in our Infancy, and from sucking then we had contracted a perpetual Habit of drinking; and every Draught leaves some Relicks behind, which must be washed off with a new One: Hence comes such a Pleasure, that Men spend whole Nights in this Employment, and view the Morning’s Approach without any Drowsiness. But is our Bird thus educated? Or how is it, that since you are resolved to drink, any of you should presume to drink out of those Cups which have the Figure of our Bird impressed on them, thus making the Master of Sobriety an Instrument of Drunkenness? I was lately at a very jovial Banquet, where a very beautiful and shining silver Cup was brought out, which had been wrought by the curious Artist into the exact Shape of an OWL; yet could not divert us with his pleasant Note, because his Belly and Mouth was full of Wine, which we were forced to suck out through his Beak. I turned then to the Master of the Feast, asking him why he put the Wine about so briskly, as tho’ it had been OWL’s Milk. Sir (says he) upon my Word there is nothing wholesomer than Wine; yet I must confess, it ought to be used with Temperance; and knowing no Animal so proper [78] to give Men an Example of this Virtue as the OWL, therefore I have produced this Cup. Very good (says I) but how comes he to fly around us so
often? don’t you think he must by this Time be tired, being so thoroughly wet both within and without?

Generosum et lene requirat-------------
Quod curas abigat, quod cum Spe divite manet
In venas animumque suum, quod verba ministret,
Quod se Lucanae Juvenem commendet Amicæ.

Certainly, if the Story be true of Archytas of Tarentum, that he made a wooden Pidgeon which could fly, it were much to be wished that our silver Bird had the same Ability, and would fly out of the Parlour with all the Wine. But I think we have sufficiently bewailed the Prevalency of this Vice: And yet I am afraid most of you are more taken up in debating whether you shall drink Wine or fat Ale, than in searching to display his particular and uncommon Virtues, not that I want Matter. Can the Ignorant now rashly affirm, that our Bird is not good, since he has all the Qualifications which the celebrated 99 Philosopher thought necessary in the Character of a virtuous Man. But farther, [79] to make his Commendation perfect, we shall observe, that he is not only good to himself, but also beneficial to others: For you know very well, that the ancient Philosophers reckoned those Virtues most excellent which were most profitable. The OWL is undoubtedly very serviceable to Mankind in this Respect, in that he helps them to distinguish Times and Seasons. We know very well, what an incomparable Favour was granted to Mankind when the Sun, Moon, and Stars were appointed for the Observation and Distinction of Times. Hence that beautiful Apostrophe of the Prince of Poets,

--------Vos, O clarissima Mundi
Lumina labentem caelo quæ ducitis Annum.

Now, our Bird in the Absence of these Luminaries supplies their Places; so that Point of Time which immediately follows Twilight, is distinguished by his flying abroad, and called OWL-light 100. And unless he afforded us this Benefit, that Period of Time would want a Name; for the Poet’s Description of it is too loose and uncertain.

[80] Qualia sublucent Fugiente crepuscula Phæbo,
   Aut ubi nox abiit, nec tamen orta Dies.
The OWL determines it more exactly, who, as soon as Day light is departed, flies abroad; which I suppose to be the true Reason, why the Athenians (as Pliny informs us,) numbered their Days, from the setting Sun, beginning the Day from the Time, in which the OWL begins to fly abroad: Now, have we not many among us, who imitate the OWL in this Respect, and at this Time begin their Scene of Pleasures, and unlawful Enjoyments, performing nothing good or laudable, but turn the Day into Night, and the Night into Day; putting Darkness for Light, and Light for Darkness, which in them is against Nature, but our Bird acts with greater Regularity. Another considerable Benefit which accrues to Mankind from the OWL is, that he destroys Mice, and such like Vermin; for which Reason, several Gentlemen, as well as Farmers, prefer an OWL to a CAT for this Purpose. Every Body knows what troublesome Animals Mice are to the Countryman, spoiling and eating up his Corn, and that so suddenly and unexpectedly, that in a short Time, they will leave but little in a Granary: They are likewise, very inconvenient to the House, the Barn, and the Cellars. I may add also, sometimes in the Bed Chambers, while they demolish the gilded Roofs of princely Apartments, tear Books in Libraries, and gnaw fine Linnen: Nay, in the Island of Cyprus, they have gnawed Iron, and in other Places Gold, and in Italy, they left the Marks of their Teeth, in Silver Buckles. Farther, this Animal is very restless and unquiet, and oftentimes disturbs the Repose of Men in Bed; and not only so, but Pliny tells us, that once they came in such Multitudes to Troy, that the Inhabitants were forced to fly from the City. And to compleat their Tyranny, they have sometimes devoured even Men themselves; thus they served a Polish Duke, and an Italian Bishop. When I consider these Things, I cannot help crying out

Damnosi quid Non imminuunt Mures?

However by this, you may the more readily perceive, the great Service which the OWL does, in freeing Mankind from such pestilent Creatures: He pursues them, overtakes them, kills them, and rends them in Pieces; like as Hounds pursue a wild Beast, and for that Reason are stiled generous, though the Generosity of these Dogs generally exceeds the Profit they bring to Mankind, whilst they leave Rabbets, Hares, and Boars, whose flesh is good Food, and run after Bears and Panthers, Lions and Elephants, which are more for Ostentation on the Theatre, than for Benefit in the Kitchen. But our Bird is both generous and profitable, in destroying Mice who are Enemies to the Elephant, and dare even attack so formidable a Creature, so very bold are these little Animals: And what is still more wonderful, a Mouse sometimes overcomes an Elephant who dreads his Approach, and trembling, refuses to touch any Provender, which the
Mouse has touched; if therefore the Elephant be a generous Creature, he that subdues him must be more generous, and our Bird, who is the victor’s Conqueror, must be [83] Generous in the superlative Degree. Besides the OWL, is not prevented, even by old Age, from pursuing Mice, and need not, like the Weasel, hide himself in the meal Tub.¹⁰⁷

Neither, would I have any reflect upon our Bird, because in this Matter, he does not exactly keep within the Bounds of Decency, in reference to Consanguinity: But for this he has Precedents enough, among the heathen Deities: Saturn and Jupiter &c. all married their own Sisters. But who, I beseech you, is able to enumerate the Virtues of the OWL? He is eminent also for Friendship, concerning which the Philosophers have made such a mighty Stir; and the Lineage of OWLS, have always maintained an inviolable Concord among themselves, for who ever heard of a Battle, among the OWLS? But Men are often engaged in most furious Quarrels: Hence Lucan sings¹⁰⁸

Emathian Plains, with Slaughter cover’d o’er,
And Rage unknown to Civil Wars before;
Establish’d violence, and lawless Might,
Avow’d and hallow’d by the Name of Right;
A Race renown’d, the World’s victorious Lords,
Turn’s on themselves, with their own hostile Swords;
[84] Piles against Piles, oppos’d in Impious Fight,
And Eagles against Eagles bending Flight.

ROWE.

How much more friendly, then, are the OWLS one to another, than the Romans were. As for Justice, which contains in it all Virtues, the OWL has a very good Claim to it, for he hurts no Body, but gives every one their Due. And for his Truth and Sincerity, we need not doubt of them, since he is a very harmless and well meaning Bird, and I am sure no one could ever yet prove him guilty of a Lie. We may also, by the way, observe his Modesty, in that he esteems other Birds to be more excellent than himself; and having but a mean Opinion of his own Worth, hangs down his Head and Eye-brows: Now, Aristotle observes, that to gaze with open Eyes, is a Sign of Confidence¹⁰⁹. Lastly, I must take notice of his Silence; for tho’ a Parrot pleases us by his Loquacity, yet the OWL is the more acceptable for holding his Peace: Nay, so great is the OWL’s Taciturnity, that he maintains it at the Point of Death. How different was the Behaviour of Priamus King of Troy¹¹⁰?
Now, if a Fool is counted wise when he holds his Peace, how much ought our sagacious Bird to be esteemed, who crowns all his Virtues, with a philosophical Silence. I remember to have seen an Ancient Picture, in which were drawn Alexander, Hæphestion, and an Owl; on one Side stood Alexander, on the other Hæphestion, upon whose Lips, the King clapt a Seal in token of Silence; and in the Midst there was an Owl, with this inscription, SILENTIA i.e. Silence. Now, some may perhaps think it strange, that the Painter should thus compliment the Owl, with the Character of being Silent above all other Birds; the Reason whereof, I suppose, may be this, we read in ancient Histories, that diverse Birds and Beasts, have pronounced several Words clear and distinct: But concerning the OWL, we find no such Matter recorded, not so much as the least Tittle; whence he may well be deemed a great example of Taciturnity, and therefore I shall now cease. After proper Remedies for Intemperance, certainly if I may freely speak my Mind, I believe you had rather be sprinkled with the palatable Liquors of Bacchus, than with Holy Water. However, if you would not forfeit all Right and Title to the excellent Lineage of the OWLS, I desire you would vigorously endeavour to obtain some Measure of their Temperance; and since all sudden Alternations are dangerous, it will be proper for you to break your selves of this Habit of Drunkenness by degrees, and for the future, drink Wine out of OWLS Eggs, and Ale out of their Sculls; by this means, as the Soldier once pulled off his Horses Tail by little and little, so may you in Time forget you ever were Sots. But to proceed, our Bird is famous as well for Chastity as Temperance, in that he uses the Act of Coition with his Mate only in the Night, and in this he agrees with Mankind; for those Cynick Philosophers are not properly stiled Men but Dogs, who, as St. Austin tells us, were the Broachers of this brutal Maxim, That because a Man’s Copulation with his Wife was lawful, therefore it might as well be Done in the Street as in the Bed Chamber. But surely nothing can be more opposite to Chastity, than to perform such obscene Actions in Publick, and like Absalom, to commit Lasciviousness in the Sight of the Sun, who went in to his Father’s Concubines before all Israel. What shall I say concerning Mariners, who have a Mistress at every Port? The like may be said of Soldiers, tho’ Uriah left them a Singular Example of Continence, who now a days at their return from distant Countries, rush impatiently to Venery, with their Boots and Spurs on.

Let us hear the Fable, A certain Weasel being weak with old Age, could not pursue the Mice as usual, and so hid him self in the Meal-Tub; and when the Mice came for a Bait he snappt them
up: At last, one Wiser than the Rest, came and stood at a Distance, and said, I perceive your Subtilty well enough, but you may e’en take your course, for neither you, nor the Meal, are worth my looking after.

You see then (conscript Fathers) how much more profitable the OWL is to Mankind than the Weasel, which when Old, spoils our Meal, and yet catcheth no Mice. I must also observe, (though I am in some Haste) that our Bird likewise destroys the Batts: Now, that these Animals are very mischievous and cruel, appears in their stealing away the Food, which Men prepare for their own eating; and if it were not for the OWL, Batts would be as plentiful about Twilight, as Atoms are in the Sun Beams, which perhaps you may think incredible, and much more that which is reported of them, viz. That in some remote Places, the Batts are not content to rob Men of their Victuals, but also are so impudent, as to attack the Men themselves while they are asleep, and wound those Parts which are uncovered with their Bills, that they may have the Pleasure of sucking human Blood: Nay, sometimes they fly away with pieces of Men’s Flesh, which is a Sign they have not so many OWLS in that Country as we have. Rejoice then, that we are not infected by such ravenous Birds; and consider the Service our OWL does in protecting you from such dismal Insults. But to proceed from Hunting to Fowling; who knows not that the OWL is very serviceable to Mankind, in this Exercise? While the Fowler by his Aid, allures all Sorts of Birds into his Nets; and his Method is this: He takes the OWL and puts him upon some fine Stock of a Tree, where he is no sooner placed, but a vast Company of Birds fly round him, wondering at such an unusual Sight, and while their Eyes are fixed upon our OWL,

*Illa solo Fixos oculos aversa retorquet*

Their Feet stick fast in the Birdlime, or the Net is thrown over them; then the Fowler runs, and condemning the rest, lets the OWL free, and according to the Laws of Justice, cherishes and rewards him for his Service. Indeed I must confess, our Bird is not so useful to the Angler, as some Water Fowls are, because he loves his own proper Element: and Quintilian rightly asserts, that it is easier to live according to Nature than against it; and the OWL having been used to the Air, and the pure Region of Attica, cannot well bear so barbarous an Element; which (according to the Opinion of some Grecian Smatterers in Philosophy) extinguisheth the Soul, together with the Body.

Altho’ our Bird be so happy, as scarce ever to have any Occasion of shedding Tears, for what should make so excellent a Creature weep?
Yet if the OWL should chance to weep, in compassion to the Misfortunes of others, they report that his Tears are very Medicinal; and some farther assert, that whoever anoints himself with them, will be able to see, as well in the Night, as in the Day. Besides, the OWL is not only useful when Living, but also after he is Dead: (I am sorry that in this respect he resembles Swine, but then I am glad to consider, that they are never useful before.) Pliny writes, that his Gall is good for all manner of Distempers in the Eyes, and that the Fat of him, is a great Clearer of the Sight: A Remedy, sure beyond all the quackish Medicines of strolling Mountebanks. If his Wing or Foot be cut off after he is Dead, and hung in a Granary window, it will drive away the Pidgeons, from eating the Corn: I know the same Thing is said of a Cat’s Foot, but the Owl’s foot is more efficacious. Let now the Despisers of OWLS, go on if they please, to contemn our Bird; we have, I think, sufficiently demonstrated his Usefulness both Living and Dead: One Thing yet remains, (worthy Fathers) which must give a Relish and Smartness to all the Rest, and that is the Pleasantness of the OWL; and this (like a Pyramid of Sweetmeats) we have to crown the Feast.

Omne ferat punctum, qui miscuit utile dulci.

Now Pleasantness, is the Life and Soul of all his Actions, which deserve true Praise. A sweet Affection of the Mind, as Cicero testifies, bringing an honest Delight, without which a Person can hardly be said to live. Antalcidas the Lacedemonian was sensible of this, who being ask’d by what Method a Man might gain the most Favour? He answered, by performing profitable Actions, and speaking pleasant Things. For, supposing a Man to be of the noblest Extraction, of the most consummate Wisdom, of the most unblemished Probity; yet if he wants a Pleasantness of Conversation, the Brightness of his Character is entirely sullied.

Cato was Noble, Wise and Sedate, and a great Friend to Rome; but wanting this Facetiousness, and not being able to lay aside the Gravity of a Censor, went out of the Theatre, when some unlucky Part [92] was to be represented; according to the Poet.¹¹⁹

Nosses jucunda dulce cum Sacrum Floræ
Festoque Lusus, et Licentiam vulgi,
Cur in Theatrum Cato severe venisti?
An ideo tantum veneras, ut exires? 120

Now, such Persons cannot be pleasant if they would, without putting a great Force upon Nature: For we find it reported, that Cato never laughed but once, and once he played at Tennis, at a very improper Time; namely, when he was repulsed by the Roman Citizens. But our OWL is not only pleasant, but pleasantness it self; for which Reason, he is very much esteemed in great Men’s Houses. I will not discuss this Point gravely, but manage it agreeable to its Nature in a sportive Manner: Do but view well the amiable Countenance of our Bird, it is round like that of a Cat: [93] Do but observe how he reclines his Head, sometimes to the Right, and sometimes to the Left: Take notice of the pretty Motion of his grey Eyes, and how dexterously he rolls them about, and winks after a very particular Manner; now raising his Eye-brows, and then presently letting them fall again, and like the wise Ulysses

----------Oculos pulum tellure moratos
Ad Proceres tollit----------

As tho’ he were in some profound Contemplation. Consider his Bill, how nicely and regularly it is shaped? observe his downy Belly, distended as it were with a Grove of Feathers: In a Worfd, the Structure of his whole Body is completely elegant, which renders his Presence delightful. Certainly, you will never then (according to the Opinion of some injudicious people) reckon him among the Monsters and Bugbears, with which Children are frightened to Bed; ---------the Laughing-stock of Nature.

Quæ genuit, quoties voluit Natura jocari:

But in him, you have a finished Model of Beauty, in which is supplied, whatever is wanting in gaudy Peacocks, gilded Parrots, spotless Doves, or generous Elae-[94]gles: Than which, what can be more delightful! 121 Tully says, that the Beauty of the Body, moves and delights, when all the Parts are harmoniously joined together. Now Men would not care one Figg for the Virtue of our Bird, (so depraved is common Judgement) unless he was also extremely handsome; but now

Gratior est Pulchro veniens è Corpore virtus.
So that the OWL seems formed by Nature, for Mirth and Festivity. Let me then keep my Eyes fixed upon so delicious an Object: But why do I speak of my Self? None of his Patrons ever yet saw him, but desired still to gaze more at him, till they had formed his lively Image in their Minds. Farther we may observe that in Books, when the Printers want a Picture to adorn a Title-page, you shall meet with none more frequent than the Effigies of Madge-Howlet; and consequently, he makes no small Figure in the learned World: Nay, oftentimes you shall see his Head, engraven in several initial Letters; and there were Printers at Geneva, of the Family of the Chouets, who always adorned the Title-pages of their [95] Books with the Effigies of our Bird, accompanied with this Motto, In Nocte Consilium. -----If now we inspect Men’s Houses, we shall find the Picture of OWLS glittering in the Windows: And moreover, we may see our Bird’s Head upon stately Columns, and noble Statues, which can be placed there with no other View, than that of giving Delight. Unless haply, the Birds may be drawn thither by it, and the Batts effectually kept off.

In a Word, all fine Pieces of Painting, or Sculpture, or Embroidery are of little Esteem, unless embellished with the Figure of OWLS. But here arises a difficult Question, whether the Pictures of OWLS were to be met with among any of the Ornaments of the Jews, and if not whence it proceeded? I must confess, I never yet could find any Reason for this in the Misnaioth, nor Gemara, or old Glosses of the ancient Rabbies; yet methinks, it may easily be found out; for since the Jewish Religion was very awful, such a sweet and pleasant Bird would have been a very improper Symbol, to have been made use of by the Israelites. He is reckoned among the unclean Birds in the old Testament; but in our Days, such ceremonial distinctions are vanished, and our Bird is now made the clean and pleasant Emblem of Purity, and may be seen painted in [96] Church windows. I must confess, we may often find him drawn in ludicrous Pieces, and I remember to have seen a very ancient and curious Picture, wherein the OWL was drawn working at a Spinning Wheel, after the Manner of Women, and pulling out his Thread very dexterously; there stood by him a Man holding a Candle in one hand, and pointing to a Mouse with the other, and reclining his Head, saluted the OWL with a Verse: I stood for a considerable Time, and viewed this Piece with Pleasure, and could scarce forbear wishing for a Shirt of his Spinning, which would have been dearer to me, than that which Sardanapalus Spun among his Company of Misses; or Hercules to please Omphale. Neither would I have you think it strange, that an OWL should spin, for he is Minerva’s Bird; whoever therefore, shall in Time to come behold him spinning, either in reality, or in representation,

_Sive levi terentem versantis Pollice fusum,_
Which our Bird (like Arachne) will never deny. Had he not been a wonderful facetious and pretty Creature, the Athenians would never have depicted him upon all their Money-Bags: The same Reason, has induced me to have this ENCOMIUM [97] ULULÆ, printed in a Pocket Volume, that all of you (as many as are Patrons of OWLS) may carry it continually about with you, as a useful Vade Mecum, and have it always ready in your Houses by way of necessary Defence. Nor must I omit what Pliny takes notice of, that he is a Bird very full of Compliments, and much given to dancing: Now Dancing as Cicero observes, is the highest Act of Mirth, and usually crowns the Delights of a Festival. Now our Bird dances according to Nature, and not by the Rules of Art; for as the above mentioned 122 Author observes, he walks with Difficulty, by Reason of the Crookedness of his Claws; and therefore is sometimes forced to dance like the Magpye. And herein he sets a good Example, for I know not what new Superstition has seized Mankind. And made them almost out of love with Dancing; since we find in Hesiod, and Anacreon, that the Muses themselves dance for Recreation; and Homer reports the same of Jupiter himself. And in that Author we find, that Musick and Dancing were generally annexed to Festivals: Nay, the grave Ulysses himself, when he was returned to Ithaca, appointed Dancing in his Palace, that [98] Persons might imagine there was a Marriage in Penelope’s Court. And to bring one Example more, which is beyond all Exception, Socrates himself, used sometimes to Dance for his Health’s sake. To conclude, our Bird is not only cheerful in himself, but diffuses Mirth wheresoever he comes, and makes all his Spectators joyful; which reminds me of the Poet’s Character of Pamphilus,

Sic vita erat facile omnes perferre ac pati
Cum quibus erat cumque una iis sese dedere,
Forum obsequy Studiis, adversus Nemini. 123

Thus have I given the Extraction, the Nobility, the Wit, the Vertue, the Usefulness, and Pleasantness of the OWL: Thus much may suffice with reference to his Life; we should now say something concerning his Death and Burial. And here

Ventum ad Supremum est
Vos, o vos, o mihi, Manes
Este Boni -------

61
Sancta ad vos anima, & nullius conscia Culpæ

Descendat ---------

For Ovid has not more bewailed the Death of his Parrot, or Catullus his Sparrow, nor did ever any Lady more lament the Death of her favourite Lap Dog, than I do Thine, thou most excellent of Birds; wert thou so ambitious as to admit of a solemn Mourner, or so unhappy as to fear Death, I would weep for thee: But as thou wert ever easy in all respects in thy Life Time, I am sensible, thou takest but little care about thy Sepulcher.

———Capit omnia Tellus

Quæ genuit Cælo tegitur qui non habet Urnam.

Whether our Bird after his Decease, goes to the gentle Troops of his winged Fraternity in the Elysian Fields, or to some other destined Region, I cannot determine: But I am sure he may now say with the Emperor

\[124\]

\[\text{Animula, Vagula, Blandula} \]
\[\text{Hospes, Comesque Corporis,} \]
\[\text{Que nunc abibis in loca,} \]
\[\text{Pallidula, Rigidæ, Nudula,} \]
\[\text{Nec, ut soles, dabis jocos.} \]

[100] Could he now hear me, I would advise him to make the best of his Way to the shining STARS; where he shall find his Station; for if Plato’s Opinion holds true, concerning the Immortality of the Souls of Birds, certainly the peaceable OWL must have a Place there, as well as the barking Dog, the heavy Crab Fish, or the poisonous Scorpion. Astronomers also tell us that Above, rest Lions, Bears, and Serpents. And shall the Bull and Ram reside there, and our Bird be excluded?

\[\text{Quicquid eris, nec te Reginam Tartara sperent,} \]
\[\text{Nec tibi regnandi veniat tam dira Cupido.} \]

But perhaps some may ask why our Bird is no longer lived [sic] since Pallas is his Friend?

Namque Coturnices inter sua Prælia vivunt,
Forsitan et fiunt inde frequenter Anus
Vivit & armiferæ Cornix invisa Minervæ,
Illa quidem Sæclis vix moritura Novem.

You are to esteem it as a peculiar Privilege granted to our Bird, that he is permitted to finish his Life in such a short Time, and not to lengthen it out with the Phœnix, or the Crow: It is certain, that Men cannot arrive at this Happiness, but are forced to endure many tedious Years of Misery. Well is it therefore for the OWL, that when he can live no longer, he calmly breathes out his departing Spirit thro’ his crooked Bill, without any Complaint against Fortune; much better than for those

Queis ante ora Patrum Troja sub minibus altis
Contigit oppetere——

Henceforth, (O conscript Fathers) retain a particular Regard for this inestimable BIRD, and rescue him from all Contempt. Justly admire both his Wit and his Wisdom. Strictly imitate his Virtues. Delight your selves with his Pleasantry. And join with me, in spreading his deserved Fame:

P L A U D I T E.
In the 1727 translation the footnotes appeared at the bottom of most pages. They were not numbered consecutively but instead were connected to their places in the main body of the text by means of these typographical symbols: (*), (i), (ii), and (‡). In the translation these symbols are repeated in that order on each page where they are used, but most pages have from one footnote to three footnotes, and the double-dagger (for the fourth footnote) appears on only one page in this book. Twenty-four pages of the main text of the 1727 translation have no footnotes; the remaining 77 pages have from one to four footnotes each, each introduced by a typographical character. In this edition these typographical symbols or characters have been eliminated, and each footnote from the first to the last is now identified by an arabic number, beginning with footnote 1 on page 4 and ending with footnote 125 on p. 99. The last numbered page of this translation is p. 101.

Some of the footnotes in the 1727 translation contain quotations from a few English authors such as Samuel Butler, John Milton and Nat Lee, who were unknown to Goddaeus. But most of the footnotes in the 1727 translation are simply renderings into English of notes that had previously appeared in early seventeenth-century editions of the Latin original, which was first published in Amsterdam in 1640. In the copy of this work owned by the New York Public Library, an 18mo edition published in Amsterdam in 1642, there are 218 separate footnotes, far more than the 125 that appear in the 1727 translation. One would conclude from this information that the 1727 translation corresponds only loosely to Goddaeus’s original Latin text. The translation was probably not based on the Latin text reprinted in the anthology of paradoxical encomia, Pallas (Nijmegen, 1666), because that edition eliminated Goddaeus’s footnotes entirely.

Apparently the 1727 translation of Laus Ululae was not reprinted, in whole or in part, until it became available online recently in Google Books and in some print-on-demand formats. In this first new edition of the 1727 translation, the numbers in boldface that are placed within boldfaced square brackets [ ] refer to the page numbers of the 1727 translation. All of the 125 footnotes that appear in the 1727 translation are faithfully transcribed here and are re-numbered (from 1 to 125) in this edition. Any comments or remarks that are not numbered (from footnote 1 to footnote 125) are additions by the current editor and therefore appear, as is customary, within brackets [ ].
[3] [Here begins the main body of the text. This is also the first of the twenty-four pages that have no footnotes whatever.]

[4] 1. (ομοιον όμόιω ἰλον.) [The three Greek words that make up this work’s first footnote were presumably quoted from a work by Aristotle. They state that we tend to love those who are like us. The Latin text of Laus Ululae (ed. 1666) translates the Greek as “similis gaudeat simili.”]

[At the top of this page the author’s reference to an owl flying onto Pericles’s right hand does not appear where he claims to have found this image, i.e., in Plutarch’s “Life of Pericles.” However, in Plutarch’s “Life of Themistocles” we find what may be the source of Goddaeus’s words about Pericles and the owl: “Some say that while Themistocles was thus speaking on the deck, an owl was seen flying to the right hand of the fleet, which came and sate upon the top of the mast; and this happy omen so far disposed the Greeks to follow his advice, that they presently prepared to fight.” See Plutarch, The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans, tr. John Dryden, revised by A.H. Clough (NY: Modern Library, n.d.), p. 141.]

2. Δύο είσίν ίδεαι τῆς ἀληθείας τά τόνομα και τά πράγματα
Strom. Lib. 6. [In his Stromata, Book 6, Clement of Alexandria writes that “there are two kinds of truth, names and things.” The last word of text on this page—“Fowl”—is obviously not the literal translation of the Greek word “pragmata.” The translator seems to have enjoyed the game of doctoring or altering some of the texts that he cited from Goddaeus’s Latin or from his Greek sources. Goddaeus himself apparently admired good-natured joking, as we see in some of the anecdotes and fables that he employs. But his propensity for joking extended also to some of the sources he quotes or cites in his footnotes. The translator here follows that liberty taken by Goddaeus.]

[5] [This page of the 1727 translation has no footnotes, but I shall supply a few. Here Goddaeus considers whether the Hebrew word “alah” (to swear or curse) is the source of the Latin word “ulula” or “owlula.” We are informed that it occurs “but once in the Hebrew text.” In the Latin reprint of 1666 the phrase used to convey this textual condition (transliterating the original Greek letters) is hapax]
legomenon, a rhetorical phrase signifying a single appearance of a word in any body of writing. Foxton did not reproduce that Greek phrase or any transliteration in his 1727 translation.]


[[6] 3. Lib. 10. c. 17. [Pliny the Elder, Natural History, Bk. 10, ch. 17, but it appears that in the Loeb Library edition of this work (Bk. X, ch. 17) the text deals not with the names or sounds of the owl, but specifically with the mysterious “fire-bird” and “spinturnix” not mentioned by Goddaeus. Pliny cites Nigidius’s information about the owl’s nine different sounds in Bk. X, ch. 19 of his Natural History.]

4. Wilh; Schickardi Horol. Hebr. De Harmonia originum. [Wilhelm Schickard (1592-1635), a German professor of Hebrew and Astronomy, was “revived” by 20\textsuperscript{th}-century historians of computing technology owing to his having invented a calculating machine. The book mentioned here is his Horologium Hebraeum, sive Consilium quomodo Sancta Lingua Spatio xxiv Horarum, ab aliquot Collegiis sufficienter apprehendi queat. (1623 and later editions). This title can be translated as "The Hebrew Clock, or Advice on How the Holy Language can be Understood within the Space of Twenty-Four Hours"—which reminds us of similar claims made today by some companies that sell language-learning programs!]


[Foxton, the translator of Laus Ululae, attributes “laetus ululare triumphis” to Lucan but does not identify its precise source, which is Lucan’s Pharsalia, VI, 261. The Latin passage means “to sound out in joyful triumph.” The infinitive “ululare” is clearly related to “ululation,” which is still practiced in some countries today.]

[Foxton also did not properly identify the Latin that followed: “Ast aliae tremulis ululatibus aethera complent”; in English, “But other tremulous shouts fill the skies.” This line in the text is attributed to Virgil; however it is not by the author of the Aeneid, but by Polydore Vergil, and it appears in his Adagiorum Liber, VII, 395. This Latin is followed by another unidentified Latin tag, “Fœmineis ululant
Plangoribus ædes,” a passage from Virgil’s Aeneid, II, 487-488 (Loeb edition): “. . . penitusque cavæ plangoribus aedes / femineis ululant . . . .” In English, “deep within, the palace halls resound with women’s wailing.” Here we see that “ulula,” the Latin word for “owl,” is related to the downfall of the Trojan people and the destruction of their city, Troy.

[The next quoted line of Latin—“Doctam imitatricem, et veras hinc ducere voces”—is an altered version of line 318 of Horace’s Ars Poetica. While the narrator of L.U. has been discussing the owl’s ability to imitate the human voice, he thinks it would be useful to remind the reader that Horace had stated in a very famous work that he who wants to imitate well should closely study human life and manners in order to be able to describe them with truth.]

6. Lib. 8. Hist: Nat. cap. 30. [I am unaware that any of the information about the hyena noted here can be found in Plato. Is the author—or the translator—playing a bit with the reader’s credulity? But we do indeed find that Pliny the Elder discusses the hyena in his Natural History, Bk. VIII, ch. 30. On the hyena see also the following website: http://bestiary.ca/beasts/beast153.htm .]

7. H. A. Lib. 6. cap. 32. [For the hyaena, see Aristotle’s History of Animals, not Bk. VI, 32 but Bk. VIII, Part 5, translated by D’Arcy Wentworth Thompson. There Aristotle describes the wily and murderous nature of the hyaena (or hyena).]

[8] [This page has no footnotes. Goddaeus claims that the owl was created before the wolf, and that animals’ names reflect the sounds that they make. In the case of the owl, we are told, its name derives from “the peculiar Lamentableness of his Voice,” though Christian Hebraist Johann Buxtorf (1564-1629), widely known for his massive Synagoga Judaica, believed that the name of the owl derived from the Hebrew word Jaaneb. Exact source not yet located. For a later citation of Buxtorf in this work, see note 57, below. For an annotated English translation of Buxtorf’s Synagoga by Alan D. Corré, see online: https://pantherfile.uwm.edu/corre/www/buxdorf/index.html .]

[9] 8. 3. Metam. Fab. 8. [The word “echo” allows Goddaeus to dredge up the story of Echo and Narcissus, from Ovid’s Metamorphoses, Book III. As for the line quoted earlier on this page (“Qualis Io Arethusa . . .”), that refers to Ovid’s tale of the river god Alphæus chasing the naked Arethusa who is now hidden with a mist or fog. He calls to her with “Ho Arethusa, ho Arethusa,” in order to find her. See Metamorphoses, V, 625.]
9. Vide Porphyr. Ad H. l. Epist. 2. Lib. [The quoted line “Est Ulubris . . .” is by Horace, I Epistles, xi, lines 29-30. This passage became the motto for The Tatler, no. 202 and was later carved into the pediment of the home built by James Boswell’s father, Auchinleck House: “Quod petis, hic est, Est Ulubris, animus si te non deficit aequus (‘Whatever you seek is here, in this remote place, if only you have a good firm mind’).” This can be found in


The reference to Porphyry is probably to Pomponius Porphyrio’s commentary on Horace, which I have not seen.]


[ (Text available at: www.thelatinlibrary.com). In English, beginning some lines earlier: “Trimalchio . . . now called out, ‘Cut!’ Instantly the Carver advanced, and posturing in time to the music, sliced up the joint with such antics you might have thought him a jockey struggling to pull off a chariot-race to the thunder of the organ. Yet all the while Trimalchio kept repeating in a wheedling voice, ‘Cut! Cut!’ For my part, suspecting there was some pretty jest connected with this everlasting reiteration of the word, I made no bones about asking the question of the guest who sat immediately above me. He had often witnessed similar scenes and told me at once, ‘You see the man who is carving; well, his name is Cut. The master is calling and commanding him at one and the same time.’” See the English text at:

http://www.sacred-texts.com/cla/petro/satyr/sat07.htm#XXXVI.]

[10] 11. Mr. Hales of Eton. [The phrase “controversies of the times” and the person associated with it, John Hales of Eton, would have been well known to readers of religious literature in the 1720s. It appeared as a motto on the title page of the Golden Remains of the ever Memorable M. John Hales of Eaton College &c., third impression. (London: Pawlet, 1688). It was also used as a motto in the pamphlet A Key [to the] Travels of Lemuel Gulliver. By Signor Corolini . . . .

London, 1726. The full motto reads, “Controversies of the times, like spirits in the mines, with all their labour nothing is done.” This thought appears in Hales’s sermon on Romans XIV, i., “Of Dealing with Erring Christians,” a piece included in the collection of his writings, The Golden Remains . . . . This note was obviously supplied not by Goddaeus but by the translator.]

12. Allelu id est Laudate. [I.e., “allelu” means “praise.”]
13. **Dryden’s *Mac Flecknoe***. [See line 208 in that poem: “And torture one poor word ten thousand ways.”]

14. **Inveni in M. SS. abavi mei, qui huius vocis interpretationes è patribus collegit.** [“I found (these) in manuscripts by the Church Fathers assembled by my forefathers . . . .”]

[11] [The author, while continuing to discuss the philological origins of the word “ulula,” treats various Church Fathers—especially St. Augustine and St. Gregory—disrespectfully. He also satirizes those who pretend to find hidden mysteries in the letters of certain words, including “ulula.”]

[12] 15. **Hist. Nat. Lib. 11. cap. 32.** [A passage by Pliny the Elder reports that those with gray eyes see better in the dark, but this is not the specific place in his *Natural History* where he makes this remark. See instead Bk. XI, ch. 54. Foxton, or whoever wrote the footnotes for the 1727 translation, included more than one footnote on this subject; see note 19, below.]

16. **Vid Suid.** [Suidas was formerly regarded as the author of a popular 10th-century *Lexicon*, a dictionary and encyclopedia that exists in many manuscripts and was first printed (in Greek) in 1499. Unfortunately Foxton or an unknown editor of the 1727 translation doesn’t tell us where in “Suidas” one can find this information about gray-eyed Athene. He may have had access to the relatively recent edition of Suidas published by the Cambridge University Press in three folio volumes in 1705.]

17. **In Fabel. Phæd.** [The translator does not reveal to us in which of Phaedrus’s Fables Jupiter says that Athene is wiser even than he is. But a search reveals that Goddaeus here recounts virtually all of Phaedrus’s Fable LXX (“The Trees and their Tutelary Gods”).]

[13] 18. Lucian *in Dialogo Vulcani & Jovis*. [In Lucian’s third dialogue of the gods, we find the god Vulcan aiding Jove or Jupiter to release from his temple (that is, a side of his head) the full-grown goddess Athene (or Minerva).]

[14] [The quoted verses are from Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, Bk. 2, ll. 494–495. Nyctimene, having turned into a bird (an owl) as punishment for having slept with her father, flees the sight of men and the light, and conceals her shame in the darkness of night—which translates the Latin]
passage by Ovid, quoted here. One should recall that the word “Nyctimenium” appears on the title page of Latin editions of *Laus Ululae*.


19. *Lib. 10. cap. 15.* [Pliny the Elder reports that those with gray eyes see better in the dark. This passage, however, appears not in Pliny’s Bk. X, ch. 15 but in Bk. XI, ch. 54. See Pliny the Elder’s *Natural History*, Loeb Classical Library, vol. III, pp. 520-521.]

[The Eustathius mentioned here was probably the twelfth-century Archbishop of Thessalonica who stated that “the owl’s clear vision at night was due to its powerful eyes, which could dissolve the shadows.” See Alva William Steffler, *Symbols of the Christian Faith* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), p. 117.]

[16] 20. *Nyctipolas appelat. Lib. 6. 20. cap.* [Nothing about “nyctipolas” appears in Bk. VI, ch. 20 of Pliny’s *Natural History*. On p. 493 of the 1666 reprint of *Laus Ululae* we find not “Nyctipolus” but “Nyctilopas.” In the Liddell & Scott Greek dictionary “nyctipolos” is defined as “roaming by night,” which would apply aptly to the owl, but the word “nyctilopas” does not appear at all. If the author intended “nyktipolos,” then the fault may be assigned to a copyist or to a compositor who worked on the 1666 edition. Interestingly, the term “nyctalopia” turns up in John Gideon Millingen’s book *Curiosities of Medical Experience* (1839).]


22. *Vid Epist. de gente Scaligera.* [Did the two Scaligers have excellent night vision? The exact passage is unknown to me, but Goddaeus may have found that information in one of the following works: Josephi Scaligeri... epistola de vetustate et splendore gentis Scaligerae et J. C. Scaligeri vita. J. C. Scaligeri oratio in luctu fiuoli Audecti. Item testimonia de gente Scaligera & J. C. Scaligero. 4to., Lugduni Batavorum, 1594.]
23. *Noctua* enim est *Noctu omnia* cernens Tenebrosa visu acuto; ita.

Conveniunt Rebus Nomina sæpe suis.

[“An owl (noctua) is indeed a night flyer able to see everything clearly through the darkness.”

No exact source found. The “ita” (“thus”) is a bridge to the proverb that follows, which asserts that “Names and natures do often agree,” or “Names often fit their objects.” See M.P. Tilley, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (1950).]

24. *Il Penseroso.* [Lines 57-64. In these lines by Milton the translator again introduces an English passage, probably to make Goddaeus’s work more appealing to English readers. In this passage the musicality of the nightingale is emphasized. If we ask why Foxton thought that a quotation from *Il Penseroso* belongs here, we can probably conclude that he justified importing this selection by Milton from the text’s assertion that night birds are not inferior to those that appear by day! The *Luscinia* is a genus of birds that includes the nightingale, but (it seems) not the owl.]

25. *Cicero de Leg. Lib.* 2. [The second book of Cicero’s *De Legibus* (Of the Laws) includes a wide-ranging review of religious matters in Greece and Rome, with some references to Pallas Athena. But Foxton chose not to translate the passage on Venus which follows that on Athena in the Latin text. A passage in Book 2 of Cicero’s *De Legibus* mentions the Roman antipathy to the nocturnal Bacchanalia, but Minerva in this work is a subject of praise. Another passage emphasizes that the gods should not be confined within buildings but should be celebrated out of doors.]

26. *Κοσμοπολίτιω.* *Laert.* *in Ejus vita.* [In a famous passage in “The Life of Socrates” in Diogenes Laertius’s *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, Socrates, in reply to a question, states that he is “a citizen of the world.” That Greek term survives in modern English in the words “cosmopolite” and “cosmopolitan.” See Eric Brown, “Socrates the Cosmopolitan,” available on the Internet at:

http://www.newschool.edu/tcds/wr09reader_cosmo/2_Brown_Socrates%20the%20Cosmopolitan.pdf  Brown’s essay is a thorough study of that subject.]

proceeds to rehearse the old canard popularized by St. Paul in the N.T. book of Titus (I. 12) that the Cretans are always liars, and consequently the owl does well to avoid the taint of their vices.]


[Bellonius refers to Pierre Belon’s *Histoire de la Nature des Oyseaux* (Paris, 1555), in which a description of the “caprimulgus” or goat-sucker appears.]

29. *Pliny, Lib. 10. cap. 40.* [See Bostock’s translation of Pliny: “CHAP. 56. (40.)—RESPECTING THE FOOD OF BIRDS–THE CAPRIMULGUS, THE PLATEA.” According to Pliny, "Caprimulgus is the name of a bird, which is to all appearance a large blackbird; it thieves by night, as it cannot see during the day. It enters the folds of the shepherds, and makes straight for the udder of the she-goat, to suck the milk. Through the injury thus inflicted the udder shrivels away, and the goat that has been thus deprived of its milk, is afflicted with incipient blindness.”]

[22] 30. Lee’s Sophonisba. [Nathaniel Lee, *Sophonisba: or, Hannibal's overthrow: A tragedy. Acted at the Theatre Royal by their Majesties Servants*. Fifth edition. (London, 1704), I, i, 3-13. This passage, of course, was unknown to Goddaeus. It was inserted by the translator, probably to make the entire text more appealing to his British audience.]


[Translated, “The Achaian region extends from the fields of Megara all the way to Cape Sunium.” Source unknown.]

33. *Lib. 4. cap. 7.* [Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, Bk. IV, ch. 7 is not the place where Pliny praised ancient Athens. That praise, though, was common among many authors of the Classical Age.]

34. *In avibus.* [See Aristophanes’ comedy, *The Birds*, in *Five Comedies of Aristophanes*, translated by B.B. Rogers, ed. A. Chiappe (NY: Doubleday Anchor, 1955), pp. 49 & 75. In this section Goddaeus praises the city of Athens and notes that the image of Minerva’s sacred bird also appears on a coin that is more valuable than another which carries the images of Jupiter and the eagle. The owl here becomes a proud Athenian in that city’s days of glory in Classical Greece.]

35. *De Civitat Dei Lib. 18. cap. 9.* [St. Augustine’s *De Civitate Dei* (i.e., *The City of God*), XVIII, 9. The author Goddaeus, with tongue in cheek, confers Athenian citizenship on the owl while noting that even the women of Athens were denied this honor.]

36. *Isaiah c. xiii. 21. Jerem. xxxix.* [The praiser of owls cannot resist introducing biblical owls into his text, so he points to Isaiah’s prophecy that wild beasts and owls and satyrs will possess Babylon after it is overthrown by the Lord. The reference to the Book of Jeremiah is reported incorrectly. The owls dwelling where human beings once lived is mentioned in chapter 50, verse 39—not in chapter 39. Goddaeus here associates the owl with the fall of Babylon and the Jewish captivity.]

and water are the material elements of all bodies that animals live in them alone and not in air or fire.” This work is available online at the following electronic address:


38. Lib. II. cap. 36. [Though our text sends us to Pliny’s Natural History, Bk. II, ch. 36, when we consult Bostock’s translation of this passage, we find that it does not explain his remark about the engendering of a fabulous creature, the furnace-produced winged four-footed animal. But the Griffin, a winged four-footed animal, is indeed mentioned in Bk. X, ch. 70.]

39. Gen. i. 20. [This line from the Book of Genesis asserts that living forms arose from water. For Goddaeus the material world consisted of combinations of the four elements—earth, air, fire, and water—and there is no hint in Laus Ululae of the Scientific Revolution that would emerge later in the seventeenth century.]

[28] 40. Gen. ii. l. 9. [Genesis II. 9 alone does not account for all of the images or beings named by Goddaeus on this page. The phrases “every beast of the earth” and “every foul of the air” appear in Genesis I. 30. That the translator Foxton was not at all intent upon footnoting all of his sources or rendering them accurately can also be seen in the next Latin quotation, which he completely ignores: “Et Nati Natorum...“ (Virgil, Aeneid, III, 98.). This line, which means “And the children of our children, and those who shall be born to them” is wrenched out of context and applied instead to generations of owls. The high subject matter of the epic genre, including the Trojan horse, is here brought low and burlesqued.]

[29] 41. In Symposiacis. [See Plutarch’s “Symposiacs” in Plutarch’s Morals. Translated from the Greek by Several Hands. Corrected and Revised by William W. Goodwin, with an Introdution by Ralph Waldo Emerson. 5 Volumes. Vol. 3., “Symposiacs,” Book II, Question 3. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1878). In this Question (placed within a dialogue) Plutarch raises the issue of “Which came first, the bird or the egg?” Goddaeus here states that at the Creation each animal was a perfect example of its kind, but he adds that St. Augustine believed that the egg came first. Accessed from: http://oll.libertyfund.org/title/1213/92086 and 8327.]

[The discussion of owls and eggs leads our author to contrast the births of Castor and Pollux, both born from one egg, with the birth of a fiery serpent from a cock’s egg, the serpent being a (mythical) cockatrice. The owl’s birth from an egg is called “auspicious and profitable,” like that of the two gods Castor and Pollux, born from a single egg.]

43. Acts xxviii. [The mention of Castor and Pollux as the sign of a ship occurs in the book of Acts, xxviii.11. The author, finding this pair in the New Testament, is very willing to call these deities born from one egg the companions of the owl, who is also born from an egg. Though the reference is to the Book of Acts in the New Testament, this pair of deities is plainly pagan. Furthermore, all who are born like the owl ("with its Tail foremost") share with the owl the propensity to “manage every Affair in Life preposterously . . . .”). Thus, though the owl has many virtues, it also behaves in many situations “preposterously.”]

44. Lib. cap. 6. [No book number is given—which suggests that the translator or whoever was responsible for overseeing the production of this publication was careless. Pliny discusses birds in Book X of his Natural History. In the Loeb translation of Book X, ch. 74, we find that “All birds are born feet first.” Another passage by Pliny the Elder (Bk. 10, ch. 16, on nocturnal birds) states that the owl and other birds emerge from the egg tail-first (Philemon Holland translation, published by the Wernerian Club, 1849 and later editions. In the Loeb edition of this work, see Bk. X, ch. xviii.). As we have already noted, Goddaeus used the owl’s emergence from its egg tail-first as a model for those “who manage every Affair in Life preposterously”—backside first! Though the author ostensibly is concerned to praise the owl throughout his book, this aspect of the owl’s birth may detract from, rather than to enhance, the owl’s reputation.]

[The reference to Philostratus (c.170-245 C.E.)—which is not footnoted—is to his Life of Apollonius, III., sec. 640, which is here translated by Conybeare: “And again a certain man who was a father said that he had had several sons, but that they had died the moment they began to drink wine. Iarchas took him up and said: ‘Yes, and it is just as well they did die; for they would inevitably have gone mad, having inherited, as it appears, from their parents too warm a temperament. Your children,’ he added, ‘must therefore abstain from wine, but in order that they may be never led even to desire wine, supposing you should have another boy, and I perceive you had one only six days ago, you must carefully watch the hen owl and find where it builds its nest; then you must snatch its eggs and give them to the child to chew after boiling them]
properly; for if it is fed upon these, before it tastes wine, a distaste for wine will be bred in it, and it will keep sober by your excluding from its temperament any but natural warmth."

For the source text, see: http://www.livius.org/ap-ark/apollonius/life/va_3_36.html .]

[31] 45. *H. A. Lib.* 8. cap. 12. [Aristotle, *History of Animals*, Bk. VIII, ch. 12 has this passage: “The eared owl is like an ordinary owl, only that it has feathers about its ears; by some it is called the night-raven. It is a great rogue of a bird, and is a capital mimic; a bird-catcher will dance before it and, while the bird is mimicking his gestures, the accomplice comes behind and catches it. The common owl is caught by a similar trick.” Translated by D’Arcy Wentworth Thompson and available at this University of Adelaide website: 
http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/a/aristotle/history/index.html]

[32] [Re: “*Auriculas Asini . . .*”: see Aulus Persius Flaccus, *Satyræ*, I, 121. Literally, “who does not have asses’ ears?” This implies that everyone is an ass or a fool. The translator may have thought that this line—at least in his time—was so well known that it did not need to be glossed. The author reminds the reader that King Midas in particular had ass’s ears and implies to the “conscript Fathers” that they too have such ears. If Erasmus’s *Praise of Folly* suggests to the reader that we are all fools, Goddaeus’s *Praise of Owls* similarly suggests here that we are all asses.]


[33] [This page contains no footnotes.]

[34] [Re: Κορυβάντεις; transliterated into English as “Corybantes.” In classical mythography they are usually identified as sons of Apollo and of the muse Thalia, and they are said to have followed and worshipped the goddess Cybele, called Great Mother of the Gods.]
47. *Vid. Plin. Lib* 11. *cap.* 32. [In the Loeb Library edition of the *Natural History*, nothing in Book 11, ch. 32, corresponds to matter included on p. 34 of *L.U.* (1727), which is not surprising when we learn that Pliny’s encyclopedic work survives with three different numbering systems.]

48. *Lib. de Somn.* *cap.* 33. [Aristotle’s definition of sleep appears at the end of his essay “On Sleep and Sleeplessness,” but this short work can also be regarded as an essay in definition. Readers can view online a number of different translations into English. One example is the translation by J.I. Beare, available online at: [http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/sleep.html](http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/sleep.html).]

49. *De Occult. Nat. Mir.* [Levinus Lemnius (1505-1568), *Occulta Naturae Miracula* (Leipzig, 1579) or *De Miraculis Occultis Naturae*, Libri III (Ienae, 1588). For an English translation see *The Secret Miracles of Nature: In Four Books* (London, 1658). Chapter or section 5 of this work (pp. 99ff.) has this heading: “Of those that come forth of their Beds, and walk in their sleep, and go over tops of Towrs, and roofs of houses, and do many things in their sleep, which men that are awake can hardly do by the greatest care and industry.” This translation is available at Google Books.]

[35] [The translator, Thomas Foxton, may have thought, perhaps correctly, that Aesop’s fable of the cock and the diamond did not need to be glossed. It is the first fable in John Ogilby’s *The Fables of Æsop Paraphras’d in Verse* (London, 1668) and has been in print for almost as long as the history of the printing press. The cock in this fable knows that he has found a diamond that human beings would consider valuable, but he would rather have found some food.]

[36] 50. *Lib. I. Var. Hist.* *cap.* 27. [Following his short description in I. 26 of Aglaias, a woman who was not only a trumpeter but a great eater, Ælian (ca 175-ca 235) in his *Various History*, I.27 (tr. Thomas Stanley, 1665), lists over a dozen other great eaters—apparently to emphasize that the owl, who might gorge as they do, is much more careful in preparing his food. See [http://penelope.uchicago.edu/aelian/varhist1.xhtml](http://penelope.uchicago.edu/aelian/varhist1.xhtml).]

[37] 51. *Viz. Uylij, Ulencampij, Ulenburgij, et Ulenbrookij, &c.* [How these surnames came to exist and be used for persons and families may best be elucidated by the genealogists. In some cases, the spelling appears as “Uhl” as in Uhlenbrook. Goddaeus asserts that all such surnames containing an image of or reference to an owl were deliberately intended to be]
associated with the honors of the owl. One sees these names today in biographical dictionaries, telephone directories and other such lists.]

[38] 52. *Lib.* 6. Fast. [In this passage of Ovid’s *Fasti*, VI, 131-136, the poet describes the deadly dangers of the screech-owl, especially in mauling unattended infants.]

53. *Lib.* 10. *cap.* 40. [No reference to Homer appears in the Loeb Library edition of this chapter of Pliny the Elder’s *Natural History*, but some owl references from Homer do appear in Pliny, for example, in the *Natural History* 7. 73 (trans. Rackham, Loeb Library): "When a mountain in Crete was cleft by an earthquake a body 69 feet in height was found, which some people thought must be that of Orion and others of Otus, one of the Aloadai." See Homer’s *Odyssey*, Bk. XI, line 305.]


[Continuing to discuss the screech-owl in pagan and biblical sources, the author cites *Isaiah* 34.14, but Foxton or whoever wrote the notes did not footnote that reference.]

56. *Vide* Schindler *Lex. Pent. Gl.* [This apparently refers to Valentin or Valentino Schindler (d. 1604), *Lexicon pentaglotton, Hebraicum, Chaldaicum, Syriacum, Talmudico-Rabbinicum, & Arabicum* (Hanau: typis J.J. Henei, 1612). Early seventeenth-century copies of this work can be seen in the Google Books website. Presumably it contains a passage in which the Latin and the Hebrew terms for screech-owl are said to be the same or similar. The King James Bible (1611) originally gave “screech owl” at *Isaiah* 34.14 but today one finds “lamia” in that passage.]

57. *Cap.* 2. *Synag. Jud.* pag. 74. [As found in Johannes Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica* (1661), ch. IV, p. 80. The italicized English on pp. 39-40 of *Laus Ululae* is a translation of this passage from Buxtorf, but we do not know which edition of Buxtorf Goddaeus used. See p. 8 of the translation of *Laus Ululae*, above, for an earlier reference to Buxtorf.]
58. *Lib. 10. cap. 50.* [Nothing in Pliny’s *Natural History*, Bk. X, ch. 50 corresponds to the content of the passage to which this footnote is attached. The issue is whether Pliny was correct in questioning the existence of some types of owl that he had already mentioned. Interestingly such a passage shows up in Book 10, ch. 70, where Pliny says he has doubts about the existence of the scops, a kind of owl mentioned by Homer. See the Loeb Library edition of Pliny’s work, vol. 3, p. 381.]


[41]  60. *Ovid Metam. Lib. 8.* [The line “In festas Bubo est dirum Mortalibus omen” does not appear in *Metamorphoses* Bk. VIII, but here is line 550 of Book V of this work: “ignavus bubo, dirum mortalibus omen.” Translated: “the cowardly screech-owl, a dreadful omen to all men.” Ovid tells us that Ascalaphus was turned into a screech-owl for having prevented Proserpina from returning to earth. A number of illustrators of this famous work have produced renditions of this scene.]

[The lines beginning “Bubulat horrendum . . .” are traced not to Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* but to Albi Ovidii Juventini. See his “Elegia de Philomela,” lines 37-38, in *Poetae Latini Minores* (Paris: N.E. Lemaire, 1826). Here we have another quotation that should have been identified but was not.]

61. *Lib. 10. cap. 12.* [In his *Natural History*, Bk. X, ch. 12, Pliny the Elder describes the Bubo in very unappealing terms. In Bostock’s translation (London, 1855) this description of the Bubo, here called a horned owl or a screech-owl, occurs in Bk. X, ch. 16.]

[42]  62. *Nicolaum de Clamangis.* [The sensational story of how an owl upset the Council of Rome held by Pope John XXIII in 1411 appears in a work by de Clamangis, or de Clémanges. The 1727 text at this page of *LU* gives “Pope John the Thirteenth,” but in the 1666 Latin reprint of *Laus Ululae* that Pope is John XXIII. If the relevant passage is found, this note can then be
made more precise. The Google Books site lists the following work: Nicolai de Clemangiis, 
*Opera omnia* ... edidit Iohannes Martini Lydius... (Lugduni Batavorum: Apud Iohannem 
Balduinum, 1613). For a clear English account of this episode, see Herbert B. Workman, *The 
Dawn of the Reformation*, vol. II, The Age of Hus, sec.iii, p. 82. This text is available online at: 

---

Navigationis in Brasiliam, Quae et America Dicitur* (1578 and later editions and translations); in 
English, *History of a Voyage to the land of Brazil, otherwise called America*. Goddaeus refers to 
De Léry’s book again in *L.U.*; see page 88, below.]

64. *H. A. cap. 5*. [Aristotle, *History of Animals*, ch. 5—but the compiler or author of the 
footnotes to *L.U.* (1727) carelessly (or deliberately?) chose not to indicate in which book of 
Aristotle’s long work this chapter 5 appears. The passage can be seen, however, in Book I, ch. 5, 
par. 8 of the English translation of Aristotle’s *Historia Animalium* by D’Arcy Wentworth 
Thompson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), and it can now be accessed at: 

65. Cicero *de Senect.* [In the first chapter of Cicero’s *De Senectute* (“On Old Age”), the 
speaker Scipio remarks that “Everyone hopes to attain an advanced old age; yet when it comes 
they all complain. So foolishly inconsistent and perverse can people be.” See Cicero, *Selected 

[The fable of the bird in borrowed plumes has been attributed to Aesop and to other fabulists in 
ancient times. A version of it appears in La Fontaine’s *Fables*. Perry Index, no. 101.]

66. [Catullus, *Carmina*, Carmen 86, lines 5-6: “Lesbia formosa est, quae cum pulcherrima tota 
est, / Tum omnibus una omnis subripuit Veneres.” Loosely translated: “Lesbia, that most 
beautiful woman, has stolen her beauties from innumerable other women who are votaries of 
Venus.” Goddaeus has playfully altered one of the most famous passages in Catullus to serve the 
aims of his mock encomium.]
[The specific source in Cicero may be this passage in the *Tusculan Disputations*, IV, xiii, as translated by C.D. Yonge (NY, 1877): “And as what is called beauty arises from an exact proportion of the limbs, together with a certain sweetness of complexion, so the beauty of the mind consists in an equality and constancy of opinions and judgments, joined to a certain firmness and stability, pursuing virtue, or containing within itself the very essence of virtue.” One can read the *Tusculan Disputations* online at: http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/14988/pg14988.txt.]

[Goddaeus’s source here is probably a sixteenth- or a seventeenth-century printing of Aesop’s fable of “The Owl and the Birds,” which depicts the owl as being wiser than all of the other birds. Their refusal to heed his advice produces disastrous results for them. This fable is no. 437 in Perry’s list. See Aesop's Fables. A new translation by Laura Gibbs. (Oxford University Press, 2002), no. 488. To view Perry’s Index to the Aesopica and Laura Gibbs’s translation of Aesop, see http://mythfolklore.net/aesopica/perry/index.html. Ben Edwin Perry’s Index first appeared in his Loeb Classical Library edition of Babrius and Phaedrus (Harvard University Press, 1965).]

66. *Lib.* 10. *cap.* 23. [The Philemon Holland translation of Pliny’s *Natural History*, Bk. 10, ch. 23, informs us that one kind of owl in particular, the otis (in Greek) or the asio (in Latin), does imitative dancing and, like human beings, is also subject to falling sickness.]

[47] [“The greatest Understandings . . .” is one of the general ideas in Boethius’s medieval classic, *The Consolation of Philosophy*. In the 1666 reprint of his *Laus Ululae* (p. 536), Goddaeus cites this passage from Boethius: “Ubi maximus intellectus, ibi minima quoque fortuna.” The author uses this thought from Boethius as a way of complimenting the owl, to whom he ascribes “greatest understanding.”]

[48] [“Ingenio perit . . .” is from Ovid’s *Tristia*, 3. 3. 74. Translated: “The poet Naso, i.e. Ovid, perished by his own wit”—apparently a reference to the events leading to Ovid’s exile in Pontus.]

[49] To be “born with a silver spoon in his mouth” is part of a proverb that comes down to us from Antiquity. Foxton used this proverb to translate the following Latin from Goddaeus’s *Laus Ululae* (quoted from the 1666 edition, but that is probably not the edition Foxton used to make his translation): “Non cuivis homini contigit adire Corinthum” (Horace, *Epistles*, Bk. I, xvii, line 36). In English, “It is not every man’s lot to go to Corinth,” a Greek city of great luxury and consequently a place that only the wealthy could afford.

68. Tob. xii. 1, 2, 3. [The length to which Goddaeus goes to cite a classical or biblical parallel to his main thread is sometimes ludicrous. Here the rewarding of the angel who accompanied Tobit (in the Book of Tobit) is cited as a parallel to the owl’s leading other birds in their flights overseas.]

[50] In his *De Officiis*, Bk.I, sec. 51 Cicero quotes the first two lines (beginning “Homo qui erranti . . .”) from Ennius and also adds another line by him. In the Loeb Classical Library edition (1938), Walter Miller translates these three lines as follows:

“Who kindly sets a wand’rer on his way
Does e’en as if he lit another’s lamp by his:
No less shines his, when he his friend’s hath lit.”

69. *Plin. Lib.* 10. cap. 23. [In Philemon Holland’s translation of Pliny the Elder’s *Natural History*, X, ch. 23, it is the cranes that fly with added stones, for balance, in strong winds. In the Loeb edition of this work, v. 3, p. 337, it appears that at certain times various birds including the owl carry such ballast.]

70. *Plin. Lib.* 18. cap. 35. [In Bostock’s translation (1855) we find that Bk. 18 is about the “natural history of grain” and that ch. 35 in that book is about turnips—none of which relates to the owl’s ability to “presage a future tempest.”]

[51] [No footnotes on this page. The owl is “a Sort of a Prophet” not through any supernatural or divine power, but simply from his extraordinary sense of smell which enables him to smell sick and dying persons who are a great distance away from him.]

[52] 71. Ovid. *Metam. Lib.* 15. [In Book 15 of his *Metamorphoses* Ovid devotes much space to Pythagoras, the famous mathematician and vegetarian, and also describes the Golden Age when
animals were not carnivorous. In developing the parallel between human beings and owls, Goddaeus concludes that both are meat eaters but the owls eat their meat raw because they cannot afford “to keep a Cook”! Following this discussion, as the reader will shortly see, the author then focuses specifically on the owl’s killing and consuming of church mice.

[The remark that Goddaeus attributes to Cicero (“true glory arises from virtue only”) is essentially present in his Pro Archia, where he states that “We are all motivated by a keen desire for praise, and the better a man is, the more he is inspired by glory.” But a better known source is probably Cicero’s De Officiis, Bk. II, ch. 13.]

[Theolog.?] Parisiis cap. 7. Thomam de Eucharist. Quest. 79. Art. 3. Johan. De Burg de Custodia Euchar. cap. 10. Alexand. Halens. Part 4. Quest. 4. [These learned references are only a few of the many titles in which the problem of the eucharist consumed by a mouse is discussed. That the problem is still very much alive for Catholic theologians can be seen by consulting (a) Enrico Mazza’s The Celebration of the Eucharist: the Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1999), p. 121, and (b) Ian Christopher Levy, “The Eucharist and Common Law in the High Middle Ages” (pp. 399-446) in A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages, ed. by I.C. Levy, G. Macy, and C. Van Audall (Brill’s Companions to the Christian Tradition, v. 26. Leiden: Brill, 2011), p. 436. For Johannes de Lapide, see the Wikipedia article for Johann Heynlin (c. 1425-1496), who is famous for having established the first printing press in France, publishing from 1470 onwards.]

[54]  73. De Consecrat. Dist. 3. cap. 94. item in Missal. Eccles. Rom. [We do not know precisely which Missal Goddaeus quoted from, but he does tell us that the forty-day penance can be found in many other texts. He also suggests, probably playfully, that the owls’ “persecution” of the mice was eliminating the problem of assigning penance to those who neglected to guard the Sacrament properly.]

[55]  74. Lib. 10. cap. 41. Gallinis & Religio inest. Inhorrescunt enim, &c. [Pliny the Elder, in his Natural History Bk. 10, ch. 41, describes the quaking of the hen after she lays an egg as a religious ceremony, and that is one of the pieces of “evidence” Goddaeus supplies in claiming that the owl has religion!]
75. Herodotus. Lib. 4. [Herodotus reports that the Psylli, as a result of a drought, fought with the South Wind and lost their lives when they were buried by sand. See Herodotus, The Histories, Bk. IV; Penguin edition, translated by A. De Sélicingourt (1955, 1964), p. 301.]

76. Plutarch de Ira cohib. [One of Plutarch’s essays in his Moralia is De Cohibenda Ira (On the Control of Anger); see his Moralia in the Loeb Classical Library edition, vol. VI, p. 109 (1939). Plutarch repeats the story of the Persian King Xerxes who ordered the disobedient waves to be lashed and branded. A footnote in the Loeb edition directs us to the source of this passage, Herodotus’s Histories, VII, 35. For Aubrey de Sélicingourt’s English translation of that passage, see the Penguin edition (1964), p. 429.]

[The English translation of the proverb “Mali corvi malum ovum” is “From a bad crow a bad egg,” but it has also been rendered as “Bad Crow from a Bad Egg.” It may have been circulating in ancient Greece; in early modern times it appeared in Erasmus’s collection of Adagia (1558).]

[“Hic Niger est . . .” appears in Horace, Sermones (i.e., Satires), I, iv. 85. In his Penguin translation Niall Rudd renders this line as “He’s the blackguard; beware of him, O sons of Rome!” It can also be translated as “This man is black—beware of him, O Roman.”]

[The “old Saying”—better to fall among ravens than flatterers--is often attributed to Antisthenes, one of the earliest Cynics and a member of Socrates’ circle. It became a classic adage: “It were better for a man to fall among ravens than among flatterers: for ravens will eat none but the dead; but these will devour a man while he is alive.” The Youth’s Instructer . . . for 1838, p. 306. This saying was included in the Puritan Peter Wentworth’s “Speech in behalf of the Liberties of Parliament. House of Commons, February 8, 1576.” See Political Orations from Wentworth to Macaulay, ed. William Clarke (London & NY, 1889), p. 5. Hume discusses Wentworth’s famous speech in his History of England.]

[“Dolus an virtus . . .” Virgil, Aeneid, II, 390. Translated: “Who asks whether the enemy was defeated by deceit or by valor?”]

[The battle of the pygmies and the cranes is mentioned in Homer’s Iliad, III, 3ff. Part of the humor intended by Goddæus is probably apparent when he quotes or alludes to Virgil, Horace,
Homer and many other famous classical authors and passages, all serving to advance the fame and reputation of the owl.]

[58] [Horace, *Satires*, II, ii, 135-136. Niall Rudd’s translation: “. . . So be brave / and bravely throw out your chest to meet the force of fate.”]


[The passage, “. . . *no Action can be great and memorable* . . . ” by the Roman dramatist Terence is translated from his *Heauton Timoroumenos (The Self-Tortmentor)* II, ii, lines 314-315. The servant Syrus speaks: “SY. heus / non fit sine periclo facinu' magnum nec memorabile.” The text of Terence’s *Heauton Timoroumenos* is available online at http://thelatinlibrary.com.]

79. *Lib.* 29. *cap.* 4. [This information by Pliny the Elder appears not in Bk. 29, ch. 4, but in Bk. 29, ch. 29 of his *Natural History*. See: http://www.masseiana.org/pliny.htm . Goddaeus calls “*Thrust not your Hand into a Hornet’s Nest*” an old proverb, but he was deliberately misinforming at least some readers, because he has altered the conclusion of that proverb. Ordinarily one would see “Thrust not your hand into the fire.”]

80. *Lib.* 11. *cap.* 22. [The “poet who wrote Archilochus’s Epitaph” was Gaetulicus—not the father (Cossus Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus), most likely, but his son Gnaeus Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus (d. 39 A.D.). The name “Gaetulicus” comes from the name of an African nation, the Gaetuli.]

[60] [Re: “Ne fors crabrones . . . ”:}
“Stranger, on tiptoe pass, and do not wake
The wasps for ever perched upon his tomb.”

This passage from Gaetulicus appears on p. 522 of the Collected Works of Erasmus, vol. 86, translated by Clarence H. Miller and edited and annotated by Harry Vredeveld. (Toronto: U. of Toronto Press, 1993). The editors speculate that these lines in Latin, which appear in the Adagia (I, i, 60) derive from a mock epitaph written by Gaetulicus on the death of the early Greek satirist Archilochus. For that text, see the Anthologia Palatina, 7.71.]

[“Nam illos . . .” See Juvenal’s Satire 2:
faciunt nam plura, sed illos
defendit numerus iunctaeque umbone phalanges,
magna inter molles concordia, non erit ullum
exemplum in nostro tam detestabile sexu.

Juvenal in this passage satirizes homosexual behavior, both male and female. They behave atrociously, we are told, but their numbers protect them, “and their phalanxes close serried with their shields.” Translated by Lewis Evans (The Satires of Juvenal, Persius, Sulpicia [etc.] (London, 1882), p. 10. For the Latin text, see Juvenal and Perseus, Satires, ed. G.G. Ramsay, (London, 1918), Juvenal’s Satire ii. 45ff.]

[“Scilicet is superis . . .” See Virgil, Aeneid, IV, 379. “Surely this is the work of the Gods.”]


[One of the versions of this anecdote of the three kings is the following, found in The Familiar Discourses of Dr. Martin Luther (translated by Captain Henry Bell; London, 1818), p. 392: “Of Emperor Maximilian. WHEN Emperor Maximilian made a league with the Venetians, he said, Three Kings are in the Christian world; himself, the French King, and the King of England. Himself (he said) was a King of Kings; for what he imposed upon his Princes, if they were pleased therewith, then they accomplished his will; otherwise they let it alone; thereby shewing, that the Princes never were in immediate subjection under the Emperors, but did what they pleased. The French King was a King of asses, for they did every thing that he commanded them.
But the King of England was a King of people; for what he laid upon them, the same they did willingly, and loved their King like obedient subjects.”]

[62] 82. Lib. 34. cap. 10 [This remark on the antagonism of the horse leech (Latin, hirudo) and the owl, though attributed to Pliny, does not appear in the chapter indicated. The horse leech appears in the Book of Proverbs, 30.15 and also in the last line (line 476) of Horace’s Art of Poetry—indeed, the last word in Horace’s famous Ars Poetica is “hirudo,” a leech. In Goddaeus’s account the owl triumphs over the leech, but that may not be an accurate description of the conflict of the owl and the leech in real life.]

[63] 83. Lenthall, Speaker of the Rump-Parliament, &c. [I have not found any statement that supports the claim that William Lenthall (1591-1662) died from lice. Since Lenthall’s name would not appear in the Latin editions of Goddaeus’s work in the earlier seventeenth century, it must have been added here by the translator Thomas Foxton, or by whoever wrote the footnotes for his translation. He may have meant by “lice” the accusers who wished to persecute Lenthall for having cooperated with Cromwell’s government by resisting the attempt of King Charles I to arrest five members of the House.]

[The reference to “one of the kings of France” is almost certainly to King Louis XI who, in the anecdote, rewarded a courtier for finding a louse on his person but ordered another who found a flea on him to undergo forty lashes. See the account in French Wit and Humour: A Collection from Various Sources (Philadelphia: G.W. Jacobs & Co., 1902), p. 17.]

[64] [The reference to Jewish belief about killing any living thing on the Sabbath is elaborated, for example, in The Concise Code of Jewish Law: Compiled from Kitzur Shulhan Aruch, second edition, by Rabbi Gershon Appel (Jersey City, NJ: KTAV Publishing House, 1978), II, 262. Joseph Karo’s Shulchan Aruch was first published in Venice in 1565.]

[The Latin proverb can be translated as, “Not even Hercules contends against two,” or “not even Hercules can overcome two.” Some sources on the Internet attribute this proverb to Aulus Gellius, but others assign it to Ennius, as quoted by St. Augustine.]
[65] Did lice literally kill both King Herod and King Philip II of Spain? Modern researchers do not support this claim, but to judge from the posthumous reputations of these two kings they did not lack detractors (“lice”?) who continued to oppose them.

84. *Epist.* 99. [While this Stoic sentiment might well be expected in Seneca, it is not evident in the content of Seneca’s 99th letter. That letter is available online at a Wikipedia site on Seneca.]


[See Psalm 102, verse 6. Goddaeus, himself an ordained preacher, would have known well the places where the word “owl” shows up in the Jewish Scriptures. The “Rabbi Solomon” mentioned in this passage might have been Rabbi Solomon Luria, who wrote extensively on the Kabbalah. But there were other rabbis named Solomon.]

86. Sueton. *In ejus vita.* [This specific account of an insult to Claudius appears to be absent from Suetonius’s “Life of Claudius,” but Suetonius conveys the impression that Claudius was at times an embarrassment in the Roman social scene. In Goddaeus’s comparison of the Emperor Claudius to an owl, the owl emerges with superior traits and behavior. To compare this emperor to an owl is demeaning to the emperor, and it hardly conduces to the praise of the owl.]


“The event occurred, as I recall, when Caesar governed Rome –

Caesar, not Marcus Bibulus, who kept his seat at home.”

Graves’s translation is a bit free, for the second line in this couplet states that the speaker does not recall that Bibulus was ever made a Consul. Did the author of this note to *Laus Ululae* write “Suidas” while meaning to write Suetonius”?

88. [Most references to Socrates’ wife Xantippe tell us that she emptied a chamber pot on his head. Goddaeus satirized human cowardliness and pusillanimity in various persons and groups
by comparing their poor behavior to the patience of the owl. Thus Socrates too is identified as an owl. Although that suggestion dishonors Socrates, it may possibly be a means of adding luster to the owl. The Xantippe legend has a parallel in all the images of Phyllis riding on the back of Aristotle. Here Goddaeus seems to be imitating Erasmus, who implies in his Praise of Folly that all people are fools.]

[69] [Re: “Pergite porro pati, patiendo Palma paratur.” (In English, “Keep on suffering, for by suffering the reward of victory is obtained.”)] By quoting this example of extreme alliteration—in this case, a line in which all words begin with the letter “P”—a smiling Goddaeus was probably pointing to the practice of the Dominican monk Johannes Leo Placentius, also known as Léon Plaisant, who published under the name of P. Porcius. In his most famous work, Pugna Porcorum (1530 and later editions), all of the words begin with the letter “p.” A late appearance of the “Pergite porro” line can be seen in Josephus E. Barisien’s Fragmenta poëtarum veterum recentiorum, ponderosioribus metris: cum laudi ... [v. 1], (Prague, 1747), p. 196, where it is grouped with other quotations under the heading “Infirmitates.” For the text of the Pugna Porcorum, see Mori’s Humor Page at: www.mori.bz.it/humorpage/pugna.htm.]

88. Lib. 10. 29. [Pliny the Elder, Natural History. In the Loeb Classical Library edition (vol. III, p. 317) we read that “Nigidius relates that night-owls [noctuas] hibernate for 60 days every winter, and that they have nine cries.” This statement occurs not in X, 29 but in X, 19.]

[Two other subjects are discussed on p. 69 of Laus Ululae: the possibility of the owl’s accompanying other migrating birds (which Pliny examines in Bk. X, ch. 33), and the owl’s constancy. The idea of constancy in the earlier seventeenth century was especially important in philosophical and theological discourse, and its most famous commentator was Justus Lipsius, whose popular work Two Books of Constancy first appeared in 1605.]

[In Greek myth Endymion, who sleeps perpetually on Mount Latmos, is kissed by Selene, the moon. The most famous literary treatment of this legend in English is probably Keats’s poem Endymion. Though Endymion is not included in Ovid’s Metamorphoses, Goddaeus would have known that myth from many different sources among the Greco-Roman and the Renaissance authors.]
89. Ovid. Metam. Lib. 11. [These lines from Ovid’s Metamorphoses, Bk. XI, lines 623-625, are spoken by Iris to the god of sleep, Morpheus:

'Somne, quies rerum, placidissime, Somne, deorum,
pax animi, quem cura fugit, qui corpora duris
fessa ministeriis mulces reparasque labori,

(See these verses online at: http://ovid.lib.virginia.edu.)

In English, translated by A.S. Kline:

“Sleep, all things’ rest: Sleep, gentlest of the gods, the spirit’s peace, care flies from: who soothes the body wearied with toil, and readies it for fresh labours”. In the Perseus database online, Iris’s famous speech to Somnus the god of sleep is translated by Brookes More as follows: “O, Sleep, divine repose of all things! Gentlest of the deities! Peace to the troubled mind, from which you drive the cares of life, restorer of men's strength when wearied with the toils of day, command a vision that shall seem the actual form of royal Ceyx to visit Trachin famed for Hercules and tell Halcyone his death by shipwreck. It is Juno's wish.”]


[Examples of faulty syllogisms, like the one at the top of this page, had been circulating for centuries. Sometimes they seem to form an identifiable genre or sub-genre of satire or humor.]

92. Horat Lib. 3. Ode 3. [Horace, Odes, Bk. III, ode 3. Translated: “He who is just and strong-willed . . . .” The quotation in its broader context can be translated as: “The just man, firm of purpose, cannot be shaken in his rocklike soul, by the heat of fellow citizens clamouring for what is wrong, nor by the presence of a threatening tyrant . . . .”]

[The Latin lines that follow (“-----diffugiunt Cadis . . . .”), not footnoted by Thomas Foxton, are also from Horace’s Odes; see Bk. I, ode 35, lines 26-28; Loeb Library, p. 94. Translation by C.E. Bennett: “. . . friends scatter as soon as they have drained our wine-jars to the dregs, too treacherous to help us bear the yoke of trouble.”]
[For Epictetus’s “sustain and abstain,” the most often-quoted sentence is, “All philosophy lies in two words, sustain and abstain.” I have not yet found its precise location in his writings.]


95. *H. A. Lib 8. cap. 18.* [Aristotle, *History of Animals*, Bk. VIII, ch. 18. Aristotle may indeed have stated that there is no such thing as natural or innate virtue (probably in his *Nicomachean Ethics*), but that thought does not at all appear in the book and chapter supplied in Foxton’s footnote. See D’Arcy Wentworth Thompson’s translation of Aristotle’s *History of Animals*, VIII.18, available online at this site: http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/a/aristotle/history/book8.html]

[74] [“Such as the cause is, such will the effects prove.” This simple proverb on cause and effect was discussed for centuries before it came under David Hume’s close critical analysis in his *Treatise of Human Nature* (1739). In the centuries that followed it continued to be one of the standard topics of philosophical inquiry, giving rise to numerous articles and books.]


[According to the OED, a “water-caster” is “One who practises inspection of patients' urine as a means of diagnosis: in early use sometimes depreciatively applied to the medical profession generally; latterly, used as equivalent to ‘quack.’” Birds have no need of “water-casters” because they have “neither Reins nor Bladders.”]
Thus far I have not located a passage in which the comic poet Eubulus calls the owl “the chicken of Pallas.” No complete work by Eubulus survives, only fragments. Those have been published, and somewhere in those fragments one might find Eubulus’s passage on the owl. There is also another Eubulus recorded, “Eubulus Oxoniensis,” who was the putative author of an Oxford poem in Latin (“Qui Mihi”) which J. Roberts published in 1720 together with an English translation. This satirical poem in praise of drunkenness anticipates images of that vice which appear elsewhere in Laus Ululae. The text of this 1720 publication can be seen in Google Books.

98. Vivere quæso quid est, bibere inquam Ego. [This Latin is the source of Foxton’s translation, visible in italics on this page. The first half of this sentence seems to be a variation of line 971 in Terence’s Heauton Timoroumenos: “Prius quaeso dicere, quid sit vivere”—what does it mean to live? On this page of Laus Ululae the immediate answer is, “to live, I say, is to drink.” But the author Goddaeus seems to caution us to drink moderately, not to excess.]

[“Bonesus,” as rendered in this translation, is a misspelling of “Bonosus,” who appears in various accounts of the Emperor Valerian. The tale of Bonosus’s ability to drink large quantities without becoming drunk, while actually growing more subtle, can be found in the Historia Augusta: The Lives of Firmus, Saturninus, Proculus and Bonosus (Loeb Classical Library, 1932), p. 412.]

[Though the 1727 text shows no footnotes on this page, many passages deserve further explication. The heavy drinking of the Emperor Tiberius (Claudius Tiberius Nero) is usually mentioned in the published biographies. “Caldius Biberius Mero” is a famous pun on Tiberius’s name connected with his drinking. Wayne A. Rebhorn recently explicated it very well in a footnote to his edition of George Puttenham’s Art of English Poesy (Ithaca, NY: Cornell U. Press, 2007), p. 286 n. 35: “Calderius Biberius Mero punning on calidus (hot), bibere (to drink), and merum (undiluted wine): i.e., Hot-Drinker-StraightWine.”]

[The observation that “it is become a common Thing to contend for Victory in drinking” is well known to modern readers because Hamlet expressed that opinion. See Shakespeare’s Hamlet, I, iv, 19-22.]
[For “Pocula pota . . .” see Friedrich Taubman, *Melodiaesia sive Epulum Musaeum . . . Ludi Iuveniles & Bacchanalia* (Leipzig: Schurerius, 1597), p. 562. The full text of this work is available online at: www.uni-mannheim.de/mateo/camena/AUTBIO/taub.html. It may have appeared somewhat earlier in his *Lusus duo juveniles* (Witebergae, 1593). The line suggests that one drink (of wine or liquor) is fine but ten drinks are better.]

[The words here italicized (“Drunkenness (says he) . . .”) translate into English the Latin words of Seneca in his *Epistulae*, lxxxiii, sec. 9: “. . . habebitur aliquando ebrietati honor et plurimum mera cepisse virtus erit.”]

[“Et potare pares et respondere Parati”: This is the fourth line in a Latin poem, “Porcus et Achates,” contained in an anthology or miscellany privately printed for the author James Grahame, titled *Poems in English, Scotch and Latin* (Paisley, Scotland: 1794). But either that particular line pre-dates the poem, or else the entire poem was known to Goddaeus in the earlier seventeenth century. The quoted line (“Et potare pares . . .”) was altered (either by Goddaeus or by another Renaissance author) from its famous original, lines 4-5 of Virgil’s *Eclogues*, where the “Arcades ambo” refers to the shepherds Corydon and Thyrsis:

Ambo florentes aetatibus, Arcades ambo
Et cantare pares et respondere parati.
Both shepherds will have a singing contest, and both say that they are ready. In the alteration, the singing contest becomes a drinking contest, and both are ready to drink.]

[77] [“O rare Times . . .” These words translate Cicero’s famous exclamation in his “First Oration against Catiline,” lines 16-17: “O tempora! O mores!”]

[78] [Horace, *Epistles*, I, 18-21. In Christopher Smart’s eighteenth-century translation: “when I have arrived at a sea-port, I insist upon that [wine] which is generous and mellow, such as may drive away my cares, such as may flow into my veins and animal spirits with a rich supply of hope, such as may supply me with words, such as may make me appear young to my Lucanian mistress.”]

[Archytas was a Greek mathematician and geometrician of the school of Pythagoras; he was also a statesman and general, an inventor, and a friend of Plato. Goddaeus reminds his readers that Archytas was said to have invented a wooden mechanical pigeon that was able to fly a short]
distance—which our author connects with the wish that the owl-shaped cup, filled with wine, would fly away from the assembled drinkers.]


[79] [For “Vos, O Clarissima . . . ,” see Virgil, Georgics, I, lines 5-6. In the English translation by H. Rushton Fairclough, “O ye most radiant lights of the firmament, that guide through heaven the gliding year” (Loeb Classical Library, vol. I, 1950).]

100. From hence, no doubt, it is, that our Sea-Coast Robbers, who commit their Depredations by this Light are called OWLERS. [The OED defines “owler” as “A person engaged in the illegal exportation of wool or sheep from England. Also: a sailing vessel used for such an activity.” Here again the translator introduces English terms and contexts to create a note that simply would not have appeared in Goddaeus’s Neo-Latin work.]

[80] [“Qualia sublucent . . .” occurs in Ovid, Amores Book I, v, lines 5-6. The speaker says that the light of his room was like that of the woods, “or like the glow which follows after sunset; or rather like the twilight that comes between departing night and dawning day.”]

101. Lib. 2. cap. 77. [Pliny the Elder, Natural History, Bk. II, ch. 77. This information appears in the opening sentences of Pliny’s chapter.]

102. Isaiah 20. [This famous passage appears in Isaiah, ch. 5, verse 20. Goddaeus, with the help of this biblical passage, continues to satirize the revellers and heavy drinkers as a means of emphasizing the temperance of the owl.]

[81] 103. Plin. Lib. 8. cap. 57. [Pliny the Elder. Natural History, Bk. VIII, ch. 57. Neither Mayhoff’s Latin text nor Bostock’s English translation mentions mice in a granary; they are absent from this book and chapter. But Bostock’s text does deal with mice in a granary in Bk. XVIII, ch. 73.]

104. Ibid. [See Pliny the Elder, Natural History, Bk. VIII, ch. 82, for mice eating iron and gold.]
105. *Ibid. Lib. 10. c. 65.* [See Bk. X, ch. 65, where Pliny mentions the invasion of mice that drove the inhabitants out of Troas (Troy). In Bk. VIII, ch. 29, tr. by Philemon Holland, various cities are mentioned that “have been utterly destroyed by little beasts.”

   See online: //penelope.uchicago.edu/holland/pliny10.html]


   *Thus Sung by Mr. Butler.*

   A Saxon Duke did grow so fat,
   That Mice, as Histories relate,
   Eat Grots and Labyrinths to dwell in
   His postique Parts, without his feeling.

   Hud. Pt. 11. Can. 1. Rowe

   [The first line of this note sends us to a work by the Alsatian or Swiss Conrad Lycosthenes (Konrad Wolffhardt, 1518-1561); see his *Prodigiorum ac Ostentorum Chronicon . . . ab Exordio Mundi usque ad haec nostra Tempora,* That is, *A Chronicle of Omens and Portents . . . from the Beginnings of the World up to these Present Times* (Basle: H. Petri, 1557). This year-by-year chronicle of violations of the order of Nature, based on an earlier collection by Obsequens and on many other works, was the best-known Renaissance history of monsters and portents or omens. An expanded translation by Stephen Batman (or Bateman), *The Doom,* appeared in 1581. For the lines from Samuel Butler’s *Hudibras,* see Nicholas Rowe’s edition of that poem, Part II, Canto 1, lines 205-208. Butler’s eighteenth-century editor, Zachary Grey, informs us that the lines quoted above refer not to a Saxon Duke but to Hatto, Bishop of Mentz (or Otho I, tenth Archbishop of Mentz) who was devoured by mice. See vol. I, pp. 303-304, in the London 1799 edition of this poem edited by Zachary Grey and available in the ECCO database.]

[82] [“Damnosi quid . . . ?” The original line appeared in Horace’s *Odes* (III, vi, 45): “Damnosa quid non imminuit dies?” In the Loeb Library translation by C.E. Bennett: “What do the ravages of time not injure?” Goddaeus played with that quotation a bit and came up with: “Damnosi quid Non imminuit Mures?”—i.e., “what do the ravages of mice not injure?”]

[83] 107. Phaedri *Fab.* [See Phaedrus’s *Fables,* Bk. IV, fable 2. Perry’s “Index,” no. 511. This fable of the weasel and the mice is no. 298 in the translation of Aesop published by Laura Gibbs]
108. See Mr. How’s Translation. [“How” seems to be an error. Following these translated lines, which continue on the next page, the translator is clearly identified as “Rowe.” See Lucan, *Pharsalia*, Bk. I, lines 1-8, translated by Nicholas Rowe (London, 1718).]

[84] 109. Physiol. cap. 33. [We have no record of a book by Aristotle named Physiology. The note may refer to one of the many editions of Physiologus in which a citation from Aristotle appears. In this translation of *Laus Ululæ* the author (and possibly the translator too) sometimes intentionally play with the reader by providing wrong or inadequate or misleading information.]

110. Virg. *Æn*. 2. [Priam’s words spoken before he is slain by Pyrrhus appear in Book II of Virgil’s *Aeneid*, lines 535-543.]


[Though we have thus far failed to find the print containing Alexander, Hephaistion, an owl, and an inscription within this print that reads “Silentia,” we shall try to include that image, or its URL, and other relevant information when it is found.]

[86] 112. See more upon this Subject, in a very Polite Treatise intituled, Ebrietatis Encomium: Or, the Praise of Drunkenness. Printed for E. Curll. [Thomas Foxton here indicates to the reader that he’s aware of earlier works in the genre of the paradoxical encomium, of which Erasmus’s *Praise of Folly* is the most famous modern example. According to Dr. Tomarken (p. 53), the earliest published praise of drunkenness, by Christoph Hegendorff (1500-1540), appeared in 1519. Foxton informs us that it was Curll who published the translation of *Ebrietatis Encomium*. The occasion for taking note of this work is Goddaeus’s praise of the temperance of the owl—which of course is very different from any praise of drunkenness. The pages on the owl’s temperance are virtually a sermon on the dangers of strong or excessive alcoholic drink.]
[For the anecdote about the slow removal of a horse’s tail, see Plutarch’s “Life of Sertorius” in his *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans*, translated by John Dryden and revised by Arthur Hugh Clough (Random House, Modern Library, n.d.), p. 688.]

113. *De Civitate Dei Lib. 14. cap 20.* [In the online translation of *The City of God*, Bk. 14, ch. 20, “It is this which those canine or cynic philosophers have overlooked, when they have, in violation of the modest instincts of men, boastfully proclaimed their unclean and shameless opinion, worthy indeed of dogs, viz., that as the matrimonial act is legitimate, no one should be ashamed to perform it openly, in the street or in any public place.” Translation from St. Augustine’s *The City of God*, online at: http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/120114.html.]

[87] 114. 2 Sam. 16. 22. [This verse in the biblical book 2 *Samuel* explicitly states that Absalom went into his father David’s concubines, who are said by some commentators to be state property. But the story still suggests some kind of incest. For Uriah in the biblical story of David, see 2 *Samuel 11:5-27*]

[Aesop’s fable of the old weasel and the mice (Perry no. 511; Phaedrus, 4.2), tells us how a wise mouse avoided the trap set by an old weasel hiding in a meal tub. To praise the owl on this page and the next, the author Goddaeus tells the reader that some mice were able to elude the deceitful weasel, but the owl more successfully eats mice and also bats, which can be very harmful to human beings. The author’s point here is that the owl is superior to the weasel in this fable. See *Aesop's Fables. A new translation by Laura Gibbs* (Oxford University Press, 2002.; reprinted 2008), fable no. 298.]

[88] 115. Lerii. *Hist. Navig. in Brasil cap.* [Text is unclear here; perhaps a chapter number? For this account of bats wounding human beings and sucking their blood, our author footnotes a Latin text of Jean De Léry’s *History of a Voyage to the land of Brazil, otherwise called America*. The OCLC mentions a French edition of this work published in 1557. An English translation by Janet Whatley (Berkeley: U. of California Press) was published in 1990; the blood-sucking bats are mentioned on pp. 91-92 of that translation. Goddaeus refers to De Léry’s account of his voyage to Brazil earlier in this book: see the note to p. 44, above.]
116. Stadius part 3. Hist. Brasil. [J. Stadius is described as a German officer employed by the Portuguese; he describes his nine-year captivity in Brazil in his history of that country, published in 1656. Thus he was a contemporary of de Léry and both wrote accounts of Brazil.]

[89] 117. See the Frontispiece.

The Latin line from Virgil ("Illa solo Fixos oculos . . .") is not identified in the 1727 text. It would normally be cited as Aeneid, VI, 469, but instead of “tenebat” as its last word, Goddaeus substituted “retorquet”, i.e., twist back. We do not know whether Goddaeus was quoting from a different source, and why this substitution was made at all. Dryden translated this line as “But fix’d her eyes unmov’d upon the ground.” See Bk. VI, line 634, in F. Keener’s Penguin edition of Dryden’s translation of The Aeneid. For the Latin line, see F.A. Hirtzel’s edition of P. Vergili Maronis Opera (Oxford U. Press, 1955), Aeneidos, VI, 469; the pages are unnumbered. In the frontispiece to Laus Ululae birds are depicted flying around a fixed owl. Would that normally remind anyone of Dido staring at the ground and saying nothing to Aeneas when he visits the Underworld? The comparison is absurd, as are some other passages in this paradoxical encomium.

The English translation of Quintilian’s statement in Book XII of his Institutio Oratoria is, “For as water is the natural element of fish, dry land for creatures of the earth and the circumambient atmosphere for winged things, even so it should be easier to live according to nature than counter to her will.” For this source see the following website: http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Quintilian/Institutio_Oratoria/12E*.html. In neglecting to identify these passages from Virgil and Quintilian, the translator of the LU, Foxton (or whoever wrote the notes to this translation of LU), again reveals the unpredictable and erratic nature of the treatment of sources in this work.

[90] 118. Ovid Metam. Lib. 2. [See Metamorphoses, Bk. II, lines 621-622. Translated: “Nor is it seemly that celestial faces be wet with tears.” Mary M. Innes’s prose translation is briefer: “Tears are forbidden to the gods.” Penguin edition 1955; p. 72.]

The next reference, ignored in the 1727 footnotes, is to Pliny the Elder’s Natural History, Bk. XXIX, ch. 38, where we find this sentence: “The eyes of a horned owl, it is strongly asserted, reduced to ashes and mixed in an eye-salve, will improve the sight.” See:
[91] Horace, *Ars Poetica*, line 343. “All applaud the man who mixes the useful with the delightful.” One commonly sees Horace’s line rendered as “Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci”—which leads us to ask why Goddaeus used “ferat” instead of “tulit.”

[I have not succeeded in finding the exact source in Cicero for his remark on “A sweet Affection of the Mind . . . .” Goddaeus’s Latin (in the edition of 1666, p. 586) reads as follows: “Dulcis animi affectio, quæ Cicerone teste voluptatem honestam assert: sine qua qui vivit, non in vita, sed præter propter illam vivit.”]

[The passage on Antalcidas appears in Plutarch, *Apophthegmata Laconica* ed. by William W. Goodwin (1870 and 1883). See Apophthegm no. 14, which includes: “To another demanding how one might please most men, he replied, By speaking what delights, and doing what profits them.” This can be found at the following URL: http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0198%3Achapter%3D14 .]


120. Thus rendered by Mr. Addison,

*Why dost Thou come, great Censor of this Age,*
*To see the loose Diversions of the Stage?*
*With awful Countenance and Brow severe,*
*What in the Name of Goodness dost thou here?*
*See the mixt Croud! How Giddy, Lewd, and Vain!*
*Did’st thou come in, but to go out again?*

[For this epigram by Martial see *The Spectator*, no. 446 (Friday, August 1, 1712). Addison supplied the same Latin passage from Martial’s *Epigrams* (the first epigram, “To Cato,” in Martial’s Book I), but in the first line Addison gave “jocosae” where Goddaeus had transcribed “jucunda.”]
[The Latin passage (Oculos pulum tellure . . .) is from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, XIII, lines 125-126. Here is the entire verse paragraph:

Finierat Telamone satus, vulgique secutum
ultima murmur erat, donec Laertius heros
adsttit atque oculos paulum tellure moratos
sustulit ad proceres exspectatoque resolvit
ora sono, neque abest facundis gratia dictis.

In these lines Ulysses, the son of Laertius, looks upon the ground before looking up and then speaking directly to his audience.]

[The Latin line “Quæ genuit, quoties voluit Natura jocari” is perhaps a deliberate variant of Juvenal’s statement in his *Satires*, III, 39: “Whenever fortune wishes to joke, she raises people from their low state to the highest affairs of society,” which translates Juvenal’s line, “Ex humili magna ad fastigia rerum Extollit, quoties voluit fortuna jocari.” Goddaeus, or someone else in the seventeenth century or earlier, had inserted “natura” in place of Juvenal’s “fortuna.” Goddaeus’s line would then become “Whenever Nature wishes to joke . . .”]

[121. *Offic Lib*. 1 [See Cicero, *De Officiis*, Bk. I, ch. xxviii, section 98. In the Loeb Classical Library text (pp. 100-101): “Ut enim pulchritudo corporis apta compositione membrorum movet oculos et delectat hoc ipso, quod inter se omnes partes cum quodam lepore consentiunt, sic hoc decorum, quod elucet in vita, movet approbationem eorum, quibuscum vivitur, ordine et constantia et moderatione dictorum omnium atque factorum.” As translated by Walter Miller (1938): “For, as physical beauty with harmonious symmetry of the limbs engages the attention and delights the eye, for the very reason that all the parts combine in harmony and grace, so the propriety, which shines out in our conduct, engages the approbation of our fellow-men by the order, consistency, and self control it imposes upon every word and deed.”]

[Re: “Gratior est pulchro . . .”: see Virgil, *Aeneid*, V, 344. “More pleasing is virtue when associated with beauty.” If we turn to Dryden’s translation, we find a different reading: “But Favour for *Euryalus* appears; / His blooming Beauty with his tender Tears, / Had brib’d the Judges for the promis’d Prize . . .”; see V, lines 448-450 on p. 128 of Frederick M. Keener’s Penguin edition, 1997. In F.A. Hirtzel’s edition of the *Opera* of P. Vergili Maronis (Oxford, 1900, 1955), the Latin line at V, 344 is given as “gratior et pulchro veniens in corpore virtus.”]
[Since the fifteenth century, if not earlier, “Madge Howlet” was a common British name for the barn owl (aluco). Madge is a familiar form of the name Margaret.]

[Did the publisher Edmund Curll know that one of the most important instances of an owl image in print would soon appear in the frontispiece of Alexander Pope’s verse satire, The Dunciad? Swift and Pope must have been aware of Curll’s publication of Foxton’s translation. Did that publication at all affect Pope’s decision to include the image of an owl in the frontispiece to his Dunciad? It is tempting to think that there is a cause-and-effect relationship between Curll’s withdrawal of the translation of Laus Ululae from volume 2 of his Miscellanea and Pope’s decision to include the owl and the ass in the frontispiece to The Dunciad, but we lack the documentation that might enable us to treat this guess as a fact. Apart from the intentions of Curll or Pope or Swift, the temporal progression of these images is itself quite interesting.]

[The Chouët family, including Pierre (1580?-1648) and Jacques (1583?-1661), were important printers in seventeenth-century Geneva. The motto “In Nocte Consilium,” which appears on their printer’s mark, is translated in various ways: “Advice comes over night, i.e., Tomorrow is a new day,” or, “night is the season for counsel.” Erasmus included it in his Adagia, where it may mean “night is the mother of counsel.” “Chouette,” for those who did not know it, is the French word for owl.]

[Regarding owl images in windows of houses and on columns and other architectural features, one finds many specific instances in the online image databases—as, for instance, in the huge collection assembled by the Metropolitan Museum of Art.]

[There are many published discussions of Jewish attitudes toward the owl, and those usually concern owls in the Jewish Scriptures, or the Old Testament. For the relevant essay in Wood’s Bible Animals by John George Wood et al. (Philadelphia, 1875), see the following website: http://www.zoocreation.com/biblespecies/owls.html. Later publications on this subject are also listed on the Internet. The general impression conveyed by these accounts is that in the Old Testament the owl is depicted as a bird of ill omen; it is unclean and unfit for human consumption.]

[It is most likely that what Goddaeus described in his Latin text—an engraving or etching of an owl working at a spinning wheel—does exist, but after consulting many experts and]
viewing hundreds of images of owls, I have still not found either an original or a copy of that print.]

[Re: Sardanapalus spinning in “his Company of Misses”: Sardanapalus, the last of the Assyrian kings, is remembered mainly for his luxury and effeminacy, for his resumption of manliness in a time of war, and for his self-immolation (with all his wives and possessions) when Nineveh could no longer be defended. Details of his story survive in the historical writing of Diodorus Siculus. See *The Historical Library of Diodorus the Sicilian*, tr. G. Booth (London, 1814), vol. I, ch. ii, p. 119. Hawthorne mentions Sardanapalus’s spinning wheel in his sketch “A Virtuoso’s Collection,” and Sardanapalus’s spinning is cited in Lempière’s dictionary and other reference works.]

[For Hercules spinning to please Omphale, see Ovid’s *Ars Amatoria (The Art of Love)*, II, 219. Google Images contains various illustrations of Hercules and Omphale, and of Hercules spinning. See also, 

[Re: “Sive . . . doctam.” This couplet, with some differences in orthography, is found in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, Bk. VI, lines 22-23: “sive levi teretem versabat pollice fusum, / seu pingebat acu; scires a Pallade doctam,”—as found at this web address: 
In Mary M. Innes’s translation (Penguin edn., p. 146): “or whether she [Arachne] was twirling the slender spindle with her deft thumb, or embroidering the finished material. / It was easy to see that she had been taught by Pallas . . .”]

[97] 122. *Pliny Lib.* 10. *cap.* 19. [Dancing owls are named at least twice in Pliny’s *Natural History*, Bk. X, in ch. 33 and in ch. 70. It is interesting to find Goddaeus defending the art of dancing by finding it in Hesiod, Anacreon, and the dancing of the Muses. For Cicero, a special case, see the next note. These references lead to the difficult walking of the owl, which is here described as a dance.]

[Cicero’s words as reported by Goddaeus (found in Cicero’s oration *Pro Murena*, Section 13 or 14) have to be taken in their larger context, in which the man he is defending is described as
sober and not given to dancing: “For no man, one may almost say, ever dances when sober, unless perhaps he be a madman, nor in solitude, nor in a moderate and sober party; dancing is the last companion of prolonged feasting, of luxurious situation, and of many refinements.” From *The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero*, literally translated by C.D. Yonge (London: Bohn, 1856). Part of Goddaeus’s tactic in this mock encomium is to praise many things in the owl, including the owl’s dancing. To insert a passage in which Cicero seems to be praising dancing when he actually does not, reflects Goddaeus’s attraction to irony, part of a game he plays with his readers.]

[Readers will recall that toward the end of the *Odyssey* Odysseus (or Ulysses) orders dancing to proceed, as a means of deceiving any outsiders while the slaughter of the Suitors is ongoing.]

123. Terence in Adria. [From Terence’s play *Andria*, I, i. 35-37. As translated by J.H. Fowler: “His manner of life was this: to bear with everybody's humours; to comply with the inclinations and pursuits of those he conversed with; to contradict nobody . . . .”]

[“Ventum ad Supremum est” is found in Virgil’s *Aeneid* Bk. XII, line 803. The lines “Vos . . . Descendat” appear somewhat earlier, in XII, 646-649. Goddaeus’s text differs a bit from that of J.B. Greenough, available on the Perseus website:

\[\ldots\text{Vos O mihi Manes}\]
este boni, quoniam superis aversa voluntas!
Sancta ad vos anima atque istius nescia culpae
descendam . . . .


124. Adriani *morientis ad Animam Suam*. [Lines to his soul composed by the Emperor Hadrian, as he was dying.]

125. *Thus imitated by Mr. Prior.*

*Poor little pretty flattering Thing,*
Must we no longer live together?
And dost thou prune thy trembling Wing,
To take thy Flight thou know’st not wither?
Thy humorous Vein, thy pleasing Folly,
Lyes all neglected, all forgot;
And pensive wav’ring, Melancholy,
Thou dread’st, and hop’st thou know’st not what.


[100] [Without naming the zodiac, the author nevertheless implies that many animals inhabit the heavens, as readers will recall from their knowledge of the names of the constellations. The author laments the absence of the owl, for it is not among the birds commonly associated with the heavenly bodies.]

[Virgil, *Georgics* I, 36-37. Goddaeus’s text differs from that in the Loeb Classical Library edition, which reads: “quidquid eris (nam te nec sperant Tartara regem, / nec tibi regnandi veniat tam dira cupido . . .)” In the Loeb translation by H. Rushton Fairclough: “—whate’er thou art to be (for Tartarus hopes not for thee as king, and may such monstrous lust of empire ne’er seize thee . . .).”]

[The next sentence appears to suffer from poor typesetting, and its main puzzle lies in the phrase “is no longer lived,” which is awkward and ungrammatical. If we change the faulty “lived” to “alive” in the same place, the entire thought makes better sense because at the end of this mock encomium the author terminates the owl’s life.]

[The next four lines in Latin, beginning “Namque Coturnices . . .,” are quoted from Ovid’s *Amores*, Bk. II, Elegy vi, lines 27-28 and 35-36. In the English translation in the Loeb Library edition by Grant Showerman: “Look! quails are ever battling with their kind; and perhaps that’s the cause of their living to old-wives’ ages” and “the raven, too, hated by armour-bearing Minerva, lives on—it, at least, will hardly die after nine generations.” Thus it appears that part of Goddaeus’s paradoxical praise of the owl includes an early death for this bird, in comparison
with the longer lives of quails and ravens. Goddaeus might have included the concomitant issue of suicide, but did not—probably because it is not an idea or practice associated with the owl.]


[The reader of this work will already know, or else can guess, that “Plaudite” means “applaud.” This instruction or request has an interesting history. Before he died the Emperor Augustus recited a commonplace theatrical tag, in Greek, which Robert Graves translated as “Since well I’ve played my part, all clap your hands / And from the stage dismiss me with applause.” See Graves’s translation of Suetonius’s *The Twelve Caesars* (Penguin Classics, 1958), p. 106.]
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