Transformations of the Classics via Early Modern Commentaries

Edited by

Karl A.E. Enenkel

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2014

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vii
Notes on the Editor	ix
Notes on the Contributors	xi
List of Illustrations	xv

Introduction – The Transformation of the Classics. Practices, Forms, and Functions of Early Modern Commenting	1
KARL A.E. ENENKEL	

POETRY

Horace and Ramist Dialectics: Pierre Gaultier Chabot's (1516–1598?) Commentaries	15
FLORIS B. VERHAART	

Changing Metatexts and Changing Poetic Ideals	47
TRINE ARLUND HASS	

Horaz als Schulfibel und als elitärer Gründungstext des deutschen Humanismus. Die illustrierte Horazausgabe des Jakob Locher (1498)	61
CHRISTOPH PIEPER	

Petrus Nannius als Philologe und Literaturkritiker im Lichte seines Kommentars zur <i>Ars Poetica</i> des Horaz	91
MARC LAUREYS	

Scholarly Polemic: Bartolomeo Fonizio's Forgotten Commentary on Juvenal	111
GERGÓ GELLÉRFI	

Commenting on Claudian's 'Political Poems', 1612/1650	125
VALÉRY BERLINCOURT	

HISTORY AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY

Josse Bade's <i>Familiaris Commentarius</i> on Valerius Maximus (1510): A School Commentary?	153
MARIJKE CRAB	
Illustrations as Commentary and Readers' Guidance. The Transformation of Cicero's <i>De Officiis</i> into a German Emblem Book by Johann von Schwarzenberg, Heinrich Steiner, and Christian Egenolff (1517–1520; 1530/1531; 1550)	167
KARL A.E. ENENKEL	
Understanding National Antiquity. Transformations of Tacitus's <i>Germania</i> in Beatus Rhenanus's <i>Commentariolus</i>	261
RONNY KAISER	
Annotating Tacitus: The Case of Justus Lipsius	279
JEANINE DE LANDTSHEER	

NATURAL HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY

The Survival of Pliny in Padua. Transforming Classical Scholarship during the Botanical Renaissance	329
SUSANNA DE BEER	
Elephants and Bears through the Eyes of Scholars: A Case Study of Pliny's Zoology in the 15th–16th Centuries	363
EKATERINA ILYUSHECHKINA	
Frühneuzeitliche Landesbeschreibung in einer antiken Geographie – Der Rhein aus persönlicher Perspektive in Vadians Kommentar zu Pomponius Mela (1522)	389
KATHARINA SUTER-MEYER	
Index Nominum	411

ANNOTATING TACITUS: THE CASE OF JUSTUS LIPSIUS*

Jeanine De Landtsheer

SUMMARY

During a sojourn in Rome (1568–1570) Justus Lipsius's patrons, Granvelle and Muretus, introduced him to prominent humanists in the city who gave him access to their manuscripts and early printed books, and often also to collections of inscriptions and coins. A few years after his return to the Low Countries, his first edition of Tacitus's *Opera omnia* was published by Christopher Plantin (Antwerp, 1574), a publication which earned him fame in humanist circles. Lack of time had forced Lipsius to limit his *notae* almost exclusively to philological remarks: variant readings, attempted emendations, and remarks on issues of textual corruption not yet resolved, without giving much attention to the historical context, biographical details of persons mentioned, or adding information about practical issues. Nevertheless, in his still limited collection of *Notae* Lipsius is already proving his familiarity with an impressive number of Latin and Greek authors and also with Tacitus's idiosyncratic language. Moreover, he is making good use of the epigraphic material he had copied during his stay in Rome or acquired from early printed collections of inscriptions. Soon after the *editio princeps* appeared, Lipsius resumed his work on the Roman historian by thoroughly revising his text and establishing the promised commentary. It became probably an extended version of what he had in mind before, for his lectures had made him aware that a correct and 'clean' text, however important, was not the only requisite to truly understand an author. The 1581 edition was accompanied by a commentary to the *Annales* only; in 1585 Lipsius had also finished the *Notae* to the *Historiae* and the *Opera minora*.

In the fall of 1568 Justus Lipsius interrupted his studies at Leuven university for a *peregrinatio academica* to Rome where he stayed until the spring of 1570.¹ Armed with a letter of recommendation from Valerius Cornelius ab Auwater, his Latin teacher at the *Collegium Trilingue*, the young philologist introduced himself to the French humanist Marcus Antonius Muretus, then professor at the Sapienza. Initially, Lipsius lived at his own expense,

* I am indebted to Prof. Charles Fantazzi for correcting my English. Leiden University Library and Museum Plantin-Moretus in Antwerp kindly granted permission for the publication of the illustrations.

¹ See on this stay Ruysschaert J., "Le séjour de Juste Lipse à Rome (1568–1570) d'après ses *Antiquae lectiones* et sa correspondance", *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 24 (1947–1948) 139–192.

but in May 1569 he entered the service of Cardinal Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle as his secretary of Latin correspondence. In his leisure time he roamed through the city admiring the physical remains from the Roman Empire and copying with painstaking care the inscriptions from antiquity he came across. But he was even more pleased that these two influential patrons, Granvelle and Muretus, introduced him to prominent humanists in Rome, who opened the doors of their magnificent libraries, treasure troves of manuscripts and early printed books, and often also of collections of inscriptions and coins.² Lipsius was particularly interested in browsing through their manuscript and book collections: countless days of patiently studying and collating allowed him to gather a cornucopia of annotations to be incorporated in the strictly philological publications he sent to press after his return from Rome during the seventies. Above all, his research was a great help for his first annotated edition of the *Opera omnia* of Publius (or Caius as he preferred)³ Cornelius Tacitus, published with the Antwerp printer Christopher Plantin in 1574 [Fig. 1]. Although this publication earned him fame in humanist circles, Lipsius was not satisfied, in particular with the commentary he had promised his readership. For, as we will see, it consisted almost exclusively of philological remarks: variant readings sometimes with a few words of comment on them, suggested emendations, and remarks on issues of textual corruption not yet resolved, without giving much attention to the historical context, biographical details of persons mentioned, text interpretation, or adding information about practical matters, e.g. law texts, religious habits, or military practice. Hence Lipsius would keep working on the Roman historian throughout his scholarly career: revising the text, discussing it in his lectures, taking into account remarks and information several colleagues sent him, and, in particular, devoting himself to elucidate the text by adding an ever increasing historical commentary from the second, 1581 edition onwards until the seventh, posthumously published edition of 1607.

² A small part of the epigraphic and numismatic material that Lipsius copied is still preserved at Leiden University Library as ms. Lips. 22. The provenances added in the manuscript mention visits to the collections of the Farnese and the Cesi families, and of Fulvio Orsini among many others.

³ In his first footnote added to the title of the work (1574 edition, 647), he explains that he preferred the praenomen *Caius* rather than the more commonly used *Publius*, following the example of Sidonius Apollinaris in his letters (*Epistulae* IV, 14, 1, to Polemius, and IV, 22, 2, to Leo), and also the heading of one of the main manuscripts he consulted in Rome, then in the library of Cardinals Ranuccio and Alessandro Farnese.

Fig. 1. Title page of the *editio princeps* of Lipsius's edition of Tacitus's *Opera omnia* (Antwerp, Christopher Plantin: 1574; private collection).

I have already discussed the successive editions of Lipsius's Tacitus at length on a previous occasion.⁴ The context of the present collection of essays, however, offers the opportunity to have a closer look into the commentary itself: how Lipsius conceived it and the sources he used. In doing so, I will distinguish between, on the one hand, the *editio princeps*, which has only the one modest section of *Notae*, and, on the other hand, the subsequent edition from 1581 onwards up to the 1607 reissue.

1. *The Notae of the editio princeps*

The 1574 edition is a sturdy in-octavo book of 762 pages including about one hundred pages of *Notae*, matching the order of the works from p. 643 on.⁵ This section is preceded by an "Ad lectorem monitio" ("Warning to the reader", 643–646) which opens with an apology for the delay in publishing the intended commentary, while at the same time defining the distinction between *commentarius* and *notae*:

In Cornelium Tacitum scriptorem [...] paucos habebam et Commentarios et breves Notas, illos qui obscura vel ambigua explicarent; istas quibus lectionum modo varietatem et, cum incidisset, castigationis meae rationes proferrem. Utrumque scriptum cum hoc tempore pararem emittere, decreto meo violenti Tribuni intercesserunt Festinatio et Angustum tempus, a quibus ad populum provocatio non esset.⁶

I was preparing a limited number of commentary and annotations to the author, Cornelius Tacitus [...], the former to explain what remained unclear or ambiguous, the latter to merely give variant readings and arguments for any emendations which may have occurred to me. Although it was my intention to publish both at once, my decision was thwarted by two vehement commanders, Urgency and Lack of time, to which no appeal was possible.

⁴ De Landtsheer J., "Commentaries on Tacitus by Justus Lipsius. Their Editing and Printing History", in Rice Henderson, J. with the assistance of Swan, P.M. (eds.), *The Unfolding of Words: Commentary in the Age of Erasmus* (Toronto 2012) 188–242.

⁵ Lipsius's copy of the *editio princeps* with additional autograph annotations on almost every page in view of a second edition, is preserved in Leiden, University Library, shelf number 760 F 11, missing the major part of the first quire with the title page, the dedicatory letter to Emperor Maximilian II, and the "Admonitio ad lectorem" (1–12). It should be noted that in the *editio princeps* Lipsius preferred to have the *Historiae* precede the *Annales*, because that was the order in which Tacitus composed his major works, as he explains. Yet from the 1581 edition onwards, he conformed to the commonly used chronological order.

⁶ Cf. the 1574 edition, 643.

This decision was taken because Plantin⁷ was eagerly waiting to send his edition to press, and Lipsius used the opportunity to add a few words of praise addressed to the printer: 'Plantini nostri, unius omnium quot sunt, quot erunt accuratissimi typographi' ('of our dear Plantin, by far the most accurate of all printers now living or who will ever be living'). It was definitely not an idle compliment, for the Antwerp printer took great care to deliver an almost flawless text. Moreover, the layout of the work is mainly for the user's convenience: line numbers were added (by five) in the inner margins of the text and the *notae* are systematically preceded by the page and the line number. The lemma is always given in italics and the annotation in roman, with possible quotations in italics again.⁸ Inscriptions and occasionally also coins are quoted in small capitals with respect to the formal aspect. Whenever a phrase is considered hopelessly corrupt, the reader is warned by an asterisk in both the text part and the *nota*.

In the second part of his "Ad lectorem monitio", Lipsius informs his reader about the versions he had collated in Rome to establish his text and the *Notae*:

Usus sum Romae tribus codicibus manuscriptis; Bibliothecae Farnesianae primus fuit, quem beneficio Clarissimi Viri et humanissimi Fulvii Ursini sum aptus; duo alii prompti ex illo thesauro Musarum, Vaticano. Sed alteri ex his duobus neque aetas neque bonitas eadem fuit; alter ex interiore et arcana bibliotheca, admirabile dictu est, quas notas boni et sinceri codicis saepe praetulerit. [...] His tribus accessit editio Veneta vetus, anni M.CCCC.XCIII. Quam adhibere vice libri scripti ideo non piguit, quod inter studiosos harum rerum constet, Taciti manuscripta exemplaria spisso et vix in Europa inveniri.⁹

⁷ Cf. *ibidem*. It was Plantin who had approached Lipsius (apparently as many as three times) to entrust his manuscript to him, promising to begin with the printing immediately, using a new set of letters, and to respect the author's wishes about the format and the letter type of the publication. Cf. ILE I, 73 12 [15]. Perhaps Plantin was afraid that any delay might cause Lipsius to have second thoughts and accept a previous invitation by Henricus Stephanus, cf. ILE I, 73 03 23. (ILE I = *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae, pars I: 1563–1583*, ed. A. Gerlo – M.A. Nauwelaerts – H.D.L. Vervliet [Brussels: 1978]).

⁸ In the successive editions a similar procedure was followed, always making a clear distinction by giving lemma, text, and quotation its own letter character. Moreover, some letters between Lipsius and Balthasar Moretus preserved in the Museum Plantin-Moretus in Antwerp prove that collaborators of the *Officina* ensured that the page numbers in both the annotations and the index were adjusted to the corresponding newly set text.

⁹ Cf. the 1574 edition, 643–644.

In Rome, I used three manuscripts. The first belonged to the Farnese Library, which I had at my disposal thanks to the benevolence of Fulvio Orsini, a most illustrious and courteous man. The other two I could use from the Vatican, that treasure trove of the Muses. But one of these two was not up to the same level because of its age and its quality; the second, however, from the inner and private library has often offered annotations of an astonishingly good and honest quality. To these three manuscripts was added an early edition from Venice, from the year 1494. I did not regret using it as if it were a manuscript, for scholars of this subject agree that the manuscript versions of Tacitus are of later times and hard to find in Europe.

The early printed copy, indicated as 'Veneta 1494', probably was an earlier variant of Francesco Puzeolano's second folio edition, published by Filippo Pinzi for Benedetto Fontana in Venice 1497. The three Roman manuscripts have been identified by José Ruyschaert: the Farnese manuscript is now in the Royal Library in Naples (*Neapolitanus* IV C 21), whereas the manuscripts from the Vatican collection correspond to what is now ms. lat. 1864 from the *Bibliotheca publica* and ms. lat. 1863 from the *Bibliotheca secreta* (or 'ex interiore et arcana bibliotheca,' as Lipsius calls it).¹⁰

But the copies available in Rome disappointed him when he arrived at the *Annales*: in a short paragraph at the beginning of the *Notae ad Annales* Lipsius warns his reader about the problem with the text tradition of the first part of this work, which is only preserved in one manuscript in Florence at the *Laurentiana*¹¹ and missing in all the Roman versions. Since, however, an early 16th-century edition corrected by the Italian humanist Aemilius Ferretus was available, he had made use of that, without deeming it necessary to go to Florence himself:

¹⁰ Cf. Ruyschaert J., *Juste Lipse et les Annales de Tacite. Une méthode de critique textuelle au XVI^e siècle*, Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie, 3e série, fascicule 34 (Leuven: 1949), 26–30. See also a review article of this publication: Brink C.O., "Justus Lipsius and the Text of Tacitus" *Journal of Roman Studies* 41 (1951) 32–51.

In the remaining part of his introduction Lipsius first dwells upon the order he chose, with the *Historiae* before the *Annales*, since both passages in the text and stylistic arguments prove that this corresponds to the order in which the works were written. Finally he discusses the titles he gave to the works, *Historiae* and *Annales*.

¹¹ The *Mediceus* 68.1 (9th century) is indeed the only manuscript to have preserved the (mutilated) text of what is in modern editions *Annales* I–VI (Lipsius was the first to distinguish between books V and VI, cf. his explication of the lemma 'Cn. Domitius et Camillus', 1574 edition, 707). The *Mediceus* 68.2 (11th century), which was never used as the main foundation of an early printed text, contains the remaining part of the *Annales*, books XI–XVI, and the *Historiae*. The 15th-century manuscripts depend either directly or indirectly on *Mediceus* 68.2.

Monendus mihi initio, Lector, es in hos quinque priores libros observationes meas paucas futuras et eas ipsas ab ingenio omnes, non a libris. Nam quibus usus sum in Italia exemplaribus, ea communi calamitate premebantur et avulsum a reliquo corpore hoc quinque librorum quasi caput amiserant. Unicum exemplar manuscriptum Europa habet, reconditum Bibliotheca Medicaea, quod accurate et cum fide, ut opinio mea fert, Philippus Beroaldus exprimi curavit. Ait et Ferretus vidisse. Quorum fide nitar. Nam mihi inspiciundi occasio non fuit, et, ut vere dicam, post alios ne cupiditas quidem.¹²

At first I have to inform you, reader, that I will make only a small number of observations with regard to books I to V, all of them the result of my own ingenuity, not from my reading. For the copies I used in Italy had all of them suffered a common disaster by having lost these five books like a head torn away from the rest of the body. Europe has only one manuscript copy, held by the *Bibliotheca Medicea*, of which, in my opinion, Philippus Beroaldus has provided an accurate and reliable edition. Ferretus also says that he has seen it. I will rely upon their trustworthiness. For I did not have the opportunity to examine the manuscript nor, to be honest, the desire to do so after others had inspected it.

The edition mentioned was an octavo published by Sebastianus Gryphius in Lyons 1542; it was the continuation of an earlier edition by Beatus Rhenanus (Basle, Hieronymus Froben: 1533), based on an edition by Philippus Beroaldus (Rome: 1515) and reissued by Aemylius Ferretus after he collated it with the important Tacitus manuscripts in Florence.¹³ The major part of Lipsius's copy still survives in Leiden University Library (shelf number 760 F 10) and is interspersed with his barely legible annotations in the margins.¹⁴ [Fig. 2]

1.1. *The Notae as a Predecessor of the Critical Apparatus in Modern Editions*

Before focusing on the information offered in the *Notae*, it is worth having a look at the formal aspect, namely, in what way Lipsius dealt with his source material. Browsing through the *Notae* makes it clear that his practice corresponds fairly well to the critical apparatus in the modern

¹² Cf. the introduction to the *Notae ad Annales* of the 1574 edition, 692.

¹³ Viz. Tacitus, *Ab Excessu Augusti Annalium libri sedecim. Ex castigatione Aemylii Ferreti, Beati Rhenani, Alciati ac Beroaldi* (Lyons, Sebastianus Gryphius: 1542), an octavo. See its description in Baudrier H.L., *Bibliographie lyonnaise*, t. 8 (Lyons: 1910), 168. Nonetheless, as Brink, "Iustus Lipsius and the Text of Tacitus", 33, n. 5 points out, 'Ferretus may have turned the pages of the *Mediceus* [68.1] but the two readings which he reports in his *Annotatiunculae* [...] are both incorrect'.

¹⁴ Lipsius's copy is incomplete: part of the introduction, the transition between the *Dialogus de oratoribus* and the *Vita Agricolae*, and the final pages of the index are lacking.

editions, albeit that Lipsius adds some small remarks. Hence one encounters references such as *vulgati* or *vulg<ata> lectio* ('the common version' or 'the common reading'), *Vat<icani> cod<ices>* or *opt<imus> ille Va<icanus>* ('the manuscripts in the Vatican library' or 'the best Vatican codex'), the latter a reference to the manuscript in the Private Vatican Library, *in Farn<esino> cod<ice>* ('in the Farnese manuscript'), and *ab edit[ione] Veneta* (a reference to the aforementioned 1494 edition. When referring to the 1542 edition Lipsius usually adds the names of the editors: Beatus (with or without Rhenanus; sometimes also *ms. Budensis* or *ms. regius*, after the manuscript he had used for his edition),¹⁵ or Ferretus (occasionally also *in Medicaeo*, the codices Medicaei 68.1 and 2 the latter had consulted). A few examples:

38, l. 31. *Velut ad perdendum imperium. Ita libri omnes scripti et impressi. Rhenanus acumine lectionis novae demereri, ut opinor, Tacitum voluit, et partiendum reposuit.*¹⁶

38, l. 31. *As if to destroy the empire.* Thus all the written and printed sources. Rhenanus, who, I think, wanted to oblige Tacitus through the shrewdness of a new reading, altered *perdendum* ('destroy') in *partiendum* ('divide').

486, l. 2. *Ipse scaenam incendit. Restitui ex libris. Nam Farn<esinus> 'Scaenam incendit' addito superius S et Vat<icanus> 'Scaenam incendit'. Vulgati 'Scaenas incedit'.*¹⁷

486, lin 2. *He himself mounted on the scene.* I have restored this from the books. For the Farnesinus reads 'He set fire to the scene' but with a letter S written above it, and the Vaticanus has also 'He set fire to the scene'. The printed versions have 'He went on the scene'.

It should also be noted that in general, emendations, even the ones he approves of, were seldom introduced into the text, but only mentioned in the annotations. Whenever the text has been corrected, it is always indicated in the *Notae*:

106, l. 8. *Aut suomet astu. Ferreti coniecturam ut liquido veram in contextum admisi. Vulg<ati> 'statu'.*¹⁸

¹⁵ Sc. a manuscript in Budapest, belonging to the collection of Matthias Corvinus (1443–1490), king of Hungary, Croatia and Bohemia (= ms. Bud. 9).

¹⁶ 1574 version, 654. I have added the page number between brackets, when the *nota* I quote is not the first lemma of that page to be discussed by Lipsius.

¹⁷ Ibidem 737.

¹⁸ Ibidem 668.

106, l. 8. *Or through his own adroitness.* I have inserted Ferretus's emendation in the text, as it is clearly right. Usually 'through his own position'.

Although Beatus Rhenanus is not mentioned in the "Ad lectorem monitio" reference to the 1542 edition, his name occurs frequently in the *Notae*. Quite strikingly, Lipsius mostly disagrees with his predecessor's readings or emendations, often even in a rather condescending way, e.g., by the end of an annotation to *Consul cum Titiano fratre (Historiae I, 77)*,¹⁹ where he adds 'Rhenanus, cum mutilum hac in parte exemplar Budense esset, Musae vestram fidem, quantum turbat! Et quas nugas παρὰ τὴν ἰστορίαν adfert!' ('Since the copy in Budapest was mutilated in this place, by your leave, Muse, what confusion did Rhenanus bring, and what nonsense he added, having nothing to do with the issue!'). And elsewhere:

56, l. 26. *Non tamen quies urbi red<ierat>.* Locum foede interpolatum partim restitui, partim explevi, auctoribus Vat<icano> et Farn<esino>. Rhenani lectionem, quam gloriatur post diuturnum laborem a se erutam, verisimilem esse ne Cethegus quidem ille Ennii cum Suada sua mihi persuaserit.²⁰

56, l. 26. *Yet peace had not returned in the city.* I have partly restored, partly completed an ugly interpolation, following the authority of the Vatican and the Farnesian manuscripts. But even Ennius's well-known Cethegus together with his Persuasion would not be able to convince me of the likeliness of Rhenanus's reading, which he proudly claims to have discovered after a hard day's work.

84, l. 11. *Aut circumvolitantium alitum.* Ita libri consensu habent et hac lectione nihil melius, nihil clarius. Rhenanus sui similis est, et pro Taciti verbis mera monstra nobis obstruit: 'Coetu hominum circumvolitantem alitem.' Praeclare! Tacitus ait uno loco constanter desedissee; ille volentem eam facit, misertus (credo) tam longae sessionis.

84, l. 11. *Or winged creatures flying around it.* That is what all codices agree upon, and there is no better, no clearer way of reading it. Rhenanus is true to himself and thrusts some real monsters against us, instead of Tacitus's words: 'A winged creature, flying around a group of people'. Marvellous! Whereas Tacitus says that [the bird] remained motionless the whole time, he has it flying around, taking pity (I suppose) on such a long period of rest.

Time and again Lipsius also refers to Marcus Vertranius Maurus, a humanist from Lyons, although his name is not explicitly mentioned in the introduction. He had edited the *Annales* and published *Notae* to both the *Annales*

¹⁹ Ibidem 657, explaining the text [p. 51] l. 32.

²⁰ Ibidem 658. The Cethegus mentioned here was a distinguished orator who is also praised by Cicero and Horace.

and the *Historiae*,²¹ and although he is often characterized as a learned man (*vir eruditus*), he often gets a taunt as well, if only for being too dependent on his predecessor since he had based his edition on Rhenanus:

543, l. 32. *Quod ad omina olim*. Sincera haec lectio. Omen futuri exitus Neroni ex eo, quod Divum appellarat. Ridicule Rhenanus et eius quasi subscriptor Vertranius, 'Quod clam ad omen ac dolum'. Nam 'olim', ut grammatici loquuntur, futuri hic temporis nota est.²²

543, l. 32. *Which is interpreted as an omen of his future [death]*. This is a correct reading. The omen of Nero's impending death comes from the fact that he was called 'the Divine'. Rhenanus's suggestion, adopted by Vertranius, his copyist, so to speak, 'Which is secretly as an omen and a trick' is ridiculous. For 'olim', as mentioned by the grammarians, here indicates the future.

Furthermore, Lipsius occasionally refers to manuscripts or early editions he had casually consulted throughout his travels. For instance when annotating *Bedriaci sistit*²³ he comments in the following way:

70, l. 33. *Bedriaci sistit*. Vicus parvus, sed duabus Romanis cladibus insignis, nec minus dignus cuius verum nomen noscatur quam Pharsalia aut Philippi. Vulgo Bebriacum appellant atque ita Iuvenalis libri praeferunt illo versu:

Bebriaci in campo spoliū adfectare Palati

Sincerus ille Vat[icanus] semper Bedriacum. Quomodo et in manuscripto libro Clarissimi Viri Iohannis Sambuci exstare cognovimus, cum strictim eum Viennae et quasi per transennam inspexissemus. In Suetonii duobus antiquis Betriacum legi vir industrius Theodorus Pulmannus me monuit. Sane et in Plutarcho scribitur *Βητριάκον πολίχνην πλησίον Κρεμύωνες*. Nos tamen Vaticanum secuti sumus.

70, l. 33. *He stopped at Bedriacum*. A small village, but notorious because of two Roman defeats and its true name merits to be known no less than Pharsalia or Philippi. It is usually called Bebriacum and that is how it is preferred in a verse in Juvenal:

'In the plain of Bebriacum to aspire to the spoils of the Palatine'

²¹ Both works were seen through the press in Lyons by the heirs of Sebastianus Gryphius in 1569. Lipsius owned a copy, at least of Vertranius's commentary, cf. his library catalogue (Leiden, University Library, ms. Lips. 59), fol. 14r, book 6: 'Vertrani Mauri Notationes in Tacitum, 16, Lyon, 69'.

²² Ibidem, 748.

²³ *Historiae* II, 23, cf. the 1574 edition, 661. *Vicus [...] insignis* is a paraphrase of how Tacitus defines the village; the quotation from Juvenal is *Satirae* 2, 106 (but now read as *Bebriaci campis solium [...]*); *strictim [...] per transennam* is borrowed from Cicero, *De Oratore* I, 35 (cf. also Erasmus, *Adages*, III, 1,49); Suetonius mentions Betriacum in *Otho* 9, and the Plutarch quotation is *Otho* 8, 1.

The reliable Vatican manuscript always has *Bedriacum* and I have seen that that is also how it occurs in a manuscript of the illustrious Johannes Sambucus, which I have examined cursorily and, so to speak, while staying in Vienna. Theodorus Pulmannus, an industrious scholar, informed me that two old manuscripts of Suetonius read *Betriacum*. And in Plutarch also is written *Betriacum*, a small town near Cremona. I, however, have followed the Vatican version.

Lipsius is recalling here his sojourn in Vienna in the summer of 1572, where, with the help of a letter of recommendation by Christopher Plantin, he became acquainted with Sambucus (1531–1584).²⁴ Elsewhere, he remembers discussing some passages in his favourite author with Claudius Chiffletius (1541–1580) during a brief sojourn in Dole.²⁵

417, l. 10. *Quidquid habitum Neronibus*. Monuit me cum nuper in Sequanis essem Claudius Chiffletius, Iuris Consultus, leg<endum> 'Quidquid avitum', cui planissime assentior.²⁶

417, l. 10. *Whatever Nero's family owned*. When I was in Burgundy lately, the learned Claudius Chiffletius, a lawyer, pointed out to me that one should read 'Whatever they had from their ancestors', and I completely agree with him.

²⁴ Lipsius dedicated Tacitus's *Opera minora* to him (the *Annales* and *Historiae* were dedicated to Emperor Maximilian II). Sambucus in his turn ensured that Lipsius was granted 30 gold ducats by the emperor and sent him additional variant readings after the *editio princeps* was published. Cf. on this additional material an overlooked letter from Sambucus to Lipsius, cf. Deneire T. and De Landtsheer J., "Lipsiana in the Waller Manuscript Collection, in particular an Unknown Letter from Johannes Sambucus (1582) and a Letter to Janus Dousa (1583) reconsidered", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 57 (2008) 209–226. The contacts with Pulmannus were easier: they probably met occasionally in Antwerp, since Plantin had published several of Pulmannus's editions of classical authors.

²⁵ Lipsius spent a few weeks in Dole, on his way to Vienna, around New Year 1572. He was present when his friend, Victor Giselinus, obtained the degree of doctor in medicine, on which occasion he delivered an oration, *Utrum iurisprudentia an medicina plus boni hominibus attulerit*. Cf. ILE I, 72 06 00, introd.

²⁶ Cf. 1574 edition, 717. Two years after the demise of his brother, Johannes Chiffletius (1550–1602) received a letter from Muretus (dat. 7 July 1582), insisting that he should publish Claudius's manuscript of Tacitus, to vindicate part of the merits of Lipsius's 1574 edition. Cf. Ruysschaert, *Le séjour* 160–161 and Muretus's letter on pp. 190–191. Claudius Chiffletius's (still unedited) manuscript is preserved in Besançon, *Collection Chifflet*, vol. 144 and has been discussed by Ruysschaert, *Juste Lipse et les Annales de Tacite* 144–154. In a letter (dat. 17 January 1595) Johannes Chiffletius assures Lipsius that he will certainly not revive the squabbles over his edition of Tacitus. He longed to publish some 500 of his brother's conjectures on Tacitus, but the greater part can be found in Lipsius's subsequent editions, an evidence of the sound judgement and unflagging zeal of both humanists. Quarreling about who was the first to come upon them would be sheer narrow-mindedness. Cf. ILE VIII, 95 01 17 C (ILE VIII = *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae, pars VIII: 1595*, ed. J. De Landtsheer [Brussels: 2004]).

Quite often Lipsius offers an emendation based not on a variant reading but rather on his own sense of the language. In such cases he usually states 'lego / scribo' ('I read / write'), 'lego igitur' ('hence I read'), 'sic emendavi' ('I made the following emendation'), or somewhat less sure 'legendum / scribendum arbitror' ('I believe one should read / write'), 'verius puto' ('I think it is better'), 'malim' ('I rather prefer'), 'legerim' ('I would rather read'), 'forte' ('perhaps'):

[39] l. 17. *Expeditionem et aciem*. Nisi cui videatur audacius, perquam libens legerim 'expeditionem quam otium, praemia quam stipendia malebat', ut clarior sit ἀντιθέσις.

[39] l. 17. *Campaign and battle-array*. Unless this seems rather preposterous to someone, I am very much inclined to read 'campaign rather than inactivity', rewards rather than mere payment, to make the antithese more pronounced.²⁷

Often he also adds a formula to indicate that the final decision is left to the reader:

108, l. 9. *Petovionem*. Vat<icanus> Petoevionem; Farn<esinus> Petrovionem. Ammianus nominat 'Petobionem'. Eligat lector.²⁸

108, l. 9. *Petovionem*. The Vatican manuscript has Petoevionem; the codex Farnesinus Petrovionem. Ammianus mentions 'Petobionem'. Let the reader make his choice.

128, l. 20. **Simul ceterorum fides*. Non ignoro quam sententiam ex his verbis Ferretus et alii expresserint; mihi tamen non persuadent locum aut integrum esse aut certe sincerum. Iudicent docti.

128, l. 20. **At the same time the loyalty of the others*. I am well aware of the interpretation Ferretus and others have given to these words, yet they do not persuade me that this passage is complete, or at least that it is not corrupt. Let learned readers be the judges.²⁹

In some occurrences a formula such as 'Videtur mutanda distinctio' (Apparently, the punctuation needs to be altered), or something similar asserts that a mere change in the punctuation may clarify a seemingly obscure text:

²⁷ Cf. 1574 edition, 654.

²⁸ Ibidem 669.

²⁹ Ibidem 676.

16, l. 14. *Agerent ferrent cuncta*. Sic Graeci ἄγειν καὶ φέρειν usurpant. Veteres tamen mei 'Agerent verterent' referebant. Videtur mutanda distinctio, 'Agerent verterent cuncta odio et terrore. Corrupti in dominos <servi>'.³⁰

16, l. 14. *They robbed and everything*. The Greeks use ἄγειν καὶ φέρειν in this way. Yet my early versions have here 'Agerent verterent'. Apparently the separation mark should be altered: 'They robbed and ruined everything amid hatred and terror. Slaves were bribed against their masters'.

Lipsius also warns his readers about the orthography of certain words, confirming his point of view by quoting inscriptions:

27, l. 7. *Proculo speculatori*. Sic ubique scribendum et spiculatores illos qui vulgatos libros insederant e finibus Romanae historiae eiiciendos puto. Auctores habeo libros in quibus omnibus paullum modo antiquioribus semper *speculator* ἀντὶ τοῦ *spiculator* scribitur. A quibus dicunt lapides, Romae ad Divi Sebastiani

P[UBLIO] AEL[IO] MUCIANO.
SPEC[ULATORI] LEG[IONIS] II.
ADIUT[RICIS]

et ad primum lapidem ab Aemilia

L[UCIO] CASURIO. L[UCII] F[ILIO]
CL[ARO] V[IRO] SPECULATORI.

Item alibi

SCHOLA. SPECULATORUM. LEGIONUM.
I. ET. II. ADIUTRICUM. PIARUM. FIDELIUM [...]³¹

27, l. 7. *To Proculus, a body-guard*.³² That is how it should be written everywhere and I believe that those 'spiculatores' who are occupying the published books needs to be banned from the borders of Roman history. My opinion is vouched for by all the somewhat older publications, in which is always written *speculator* instead of *spiculator*. See on this matter inscriptions in Rome, near St Sebastian's

TO PUBLIUS AELIUS MUCIANUS
SPECULATOR (BODY-GUARD) OF THE II
AUXILIARY LEGION

and on the first stone from the Aemilia

TO LUCIUS CASURIUS. SON OF LUCIUS
A NOBLE MAN, A SPECULATOR (BODY-GUARD)

And elsewhere

SCHOLA. SPECULATORUM. LEGIONUM
I. ET. II. ADIUTRICUM. PIARUM. FIDELIUM [...]
THE SCHOOL OF THE SPECULATORES (BODY-GUARD) OF THE
AUXILIARY LEGIONS I AND II DEVOUT AND LOYAL.

³⁰ Ibidem 648.

³¹ Ibidem 651. A *legio adiutrix* (auxiliary legion) was raised in the provinces by a proconsul to reinforce the veteran army. The complete inscription dedicated to Lucius Casurius can be found in Leiden, University Library, ms. Lips. 22, fol. 20r.

³² About the translation by 'body-guard' instead of 'scout', cf. infra, n. 50.

On several occasions, however, he has to admit that it is impossible to restore an entirely correct text; in these cases he informs his reader either laconically or in rather ornate language that something is wrong with the phrasing, without offering a solution. A few examples:

25, l. 12. *Exactioni XXX equites*. In Suetonio legitur 'quingaginta'. Uter horum emendandum mihi non liquet.³³

25, l. 12. *Thirty Roman Knights [were appointed for] the process of recovery*. In Suetonius one reads 'fifty'. Which of these has to be corrected is not clear to me.

110, l. 6. *Ceterum ut transmitteret in Italiam* *. Locus foede corruptus et quem vix Aesculapius cum parente suo sanaverint. [...].³⁴

110, l. 6. *But to send him back to Italy* *. An awfully corrupted passage, which even Aesculapius and his father will hardly be able to restore. [...].

111, l. 22. *Fidei commissae* *patientior. Apollo, tuam fidem, nam Lipsius divinandi artem non habet. In Vat<icano> et Farn<esino> erat 'Gens fidei commissior patientior', de qua scriptura mihi hiscendi est nulla potestas, ut Lucretius loquitur.³⁵

111, l. 22. *More inclined to committed faith*. By your leave, Apollo, for Lipsius has no experience at all with the art of divination. The Vatican and the Farnesian codices read 'A tribe, more committed and more patient', a phrasing 'on which I can by no means open my mouth and tell', to quote Lucretius.

486, l. 12: *Necdum insignis* *aetatis. De hoc loco non aliud pronunciem quam Delphos ad Apollinem ablegandum videri, si forte illic medicinam possit accipere. Nam ego sane divinitus nescio et destituunt nos libri.³⁶

486, l. 12: *Not yet of a prominent age*. The only thing I would say about this passage is that one should send someone to Apollo in Delphi, if perchance one could find some remedy there. For I am definitely out of inspiration and our books fail us.

1.2. *About the Contents of the Notae*

Unlike the modern critical apparatus, which is limited to variant readings or possible emendations with their source reference, the major part of Lipsius's *Notae* include some arguments to justify the reading or the emendation of his choice, mostly by quoting other occurrences. A quick glance

³³ Ibidem 651.

³⁴ Ibidem 669.

³⁵ Ibidem 673, with a quotation of Lucretius, *De rerum natura* IV, 66.

³⁶ Ibidem 737.

makes it clear that he used an impressive amount of sources: a wide range of Greek and Latin authors, covering more than a thousand years, from Homer to the early Fathers, historians, but also poets, playwrights, philosophers, grammarians, sometimes even other occurrences in Tacitus himself or the occasional law text, depending on the issue. His sojourn in Rome had also made him aware of the importance of epigraphic and, in some rare cases, numismatic information. But as mentioned previously, these sources are mostly used to confirm a reading or to prove an emendation, not to give the reader a better understanding of what Tacitus is narrating.

It is obvious that already in this early period of his scholarly career Lipsius had become quite familiar with Tacitus's idiosyncratic language. In consequence, he often rejects unnecessary corrections by predecessors or acknowledges suggestions made because the text becomes more Tacitean.

218, l. 26. *Questus, adulationes*. Assentior Petro Divaeo, erudito viro, 'adulationes' legenti. Singula enim verba opposita a Tacito videntur singulis. Vulg<ati> adulatione.³⁷

218, l. 26. *Complaints, flattering words*. I agree with Petrus Divaeus, a learned man, who reads 'flattering words'. For Tacitus seems to have opposed words in singular with each other. The commonly known reading is 'flattery'.

528, l. 21. *Et quaesitissimis poenis*. Ita Vat<icanus> recte et ex consuetudine Taciti. Vulgo exquisitissimis.³⁸

528, l. 21. *With the most sophisticated punishments*. The Vatican codex is right here and corresponds to Tacitus's idiom. Usually 'exquisitissimis'.

Unusual idioms are sometimes confirmed by a similar phrasing elsewhere in Tacitus:

[21] l. 16. *Octaviam uxorem amoliretur*. Hac dictione in eandem rem usus est Tacitus, libro XIV et sic libri manuscripti referebant. Rhenano aliter visum est.³⁹

[21] l. 16. *Until he could rid himself of his wife Octavia*. Tacitus used this idiom about the same issue in book XIV [of the *Annales*] and that is what you find in the manuscript codices. Rhenanus has a different opinion.

[61] l. 8. *Regem Aëriam*. Mire variant libri. Vat<icanus> Verianum, quomodo et Budensis; Farn<esinus> Venerianum. Alciato Iurisconsulto placuit Vra-

³⁷ Ibidem 693.

³⁸ Ibidem 746.

³⁹ Ibidem 650 with a reference to *Annales* XIV, 59: 'maturare parat Octaviamque coniugem amoliri'.

nium. Ego ut veterem lectionem in possessione retineam, moveor altero Tacito loco, Annalibus III, 'Exin Cyprii tribus delubris, quorum vetustissimum Paphiae Veneri, Aërias auctor, post filius eius, Amathus' etc.⁴⁰

[61] l. 8. *King Aërias*. It is quite amazing how the codices differ. The Vatican codex reads Verianus, as does the one in Budapest. The Farnesinus has Venerianus. Alciati, a lawyer, prefers Vranus. I am encouraged to keep the reading in the early printed version from another occurrence in Tacitus, in *Annals* 3: 'Next the Cypriots referred to three temples. The oldest, built by Aërias is devoted to Venus of Paphus, the next one, built by his son, Amathus' etc.

230, l. 15. *Ex duce metus*. Nihil mutandum. Loquitur sic in Agricola: 'Quos conscientia defectionis et proprius ex legato timor agitabat'.⁴¹

230, l. 15. *Dread of the general*. Nothing must be changed. He speaks in a similar way in the *Agricola*. 'They were troubled by the conscious guilt of defection and a particular dread of the legate'.

But other authors are also frequently used to confirm an emendation:

87, l. 14. [*Nihi...*] *Vitellio anquirente*. Non dubitavi antiquum hoc verbum reponere, cum in Vatic[ano] et Farn[esino] reperissem 'acquirente'. 'Anquiro' pro 'inquirō' sive 'valde quaero' probum et meliori nota signatum verbum est, Ciceroni, Varroni, et primariis scriptoribus sexcenties usurpatum, sed fere ab imperitis depravatum in 'acquirō' aut 'inquiro'.⁴²

87, l. 14. *Vitellius making no inquiries*. I had no doubts at all to replace this archaic word, although I had found in the Vaticanus and the Farnesinus 'to acquire'. 'Anquiro' as a synonym for 'inquirō' or 'to institute a careful examination' is correct and well-approved, and used hundreds of times by Cicero, Varro, and authors of the first rank, but men without experience have it corrupted into 'acquirō' or 'inquiro'.

92, l. 4. *Inter inania belli*. Lego 'immania'. In eodem verbo error inveteravit in Ciceronis II de legibus: 'Tum ebur ex inani corpore extractum.' Nam et illic leg[endum] 'immani'.⁴³

92, l. 4. *Amidst idle wars*. I read 'enormous'. There is an error of long standing concerning this same word in the second book of Cicero's *Laws*: 'Then the ivory was extracted from the empty body'. For here too, one should read 'enormous'.

⁴⁰ Ibidem 660. *Annales* III, 62, 4 is quoted.

⁴¹ Ibidem 695. *Agricola* 16 is quoted.

⁴² Ibidem 665.

⁴³ Ibidem 665 with a reference to Cicero, *De Legibus* II, 18, 45, where 'inani' is corrected into 'inanimi'.

Besides innumerable linguistic issues Lipsius frequently suggests corrections in proper names, be it of persons or geographical specifications, proving his point by referring to other historians of the same period – Suetonius, Cassius Dio, and Plutarch in his *Parallel Lives* – to Strabo's geography, and quite often to epigraphic material. At the same time, the philologist cannot resist pointing out errors in the sources cited and suggesting emendations.

15, l. 7. *Servius Galba iterum*. Sulpiciae gentis, ex qua Galba ortus, peculiare praenomen Servii fuit. Emendandus aliquammultis locis Suetonius, apud quem Sergius perperam scribitur, gentile nomen Catilinarum. In Dione et Plutarcho est Σερούιος Γάλβας.

l. 8. *T[itus] Vinus Co[n]sul*. Vulgati T[itus] Iunius. Mihi religio non fuit sequi scripturam antiqui marmoris eruti ad radices montis Caelii :

SER[VIO] GALBA II T[ITO] VINIO CO[N]S[ULIBUS].

A quo praesertim staret Plutarchus, qui fere hunc hominem *Τίτον Ὀβίνιον* aut *Ουίνιον* nominat. Interpretes eius qui id immutarunt ubique in Iunium, ut libere loquar, duri oris videntur.⁴⁴

15, l. 7. *Servius Galba for the second time*. The *gens Sulpicia*, of which Galba was a descendant, had the rather peculiar first name of Servius. Suetonius needs to be corrected in several places: in his work it is often erroneously written Sergius, the family name of the Catilinas. In Dio and Plutarch one finds Servius Galba.

l. 8. *Consul Titus Vinus*. The common reading is Titus Iunius. I had no objection in following the inscription on an old marble stone, excavated at the foot of the Caelian hill:

WHEN SER[VIVS] GALBA FOR THE SECOND TIME AND TITUS VINIUS WERE CONSULS.

Plutarch in particular does not agree with this: he most often calls this man Titus Ovinus or Vinus. The commentators who have changed this everywhere to Iunius seem to have had an insensitive ear [literally: mouth], if I may speak bluntly.

402, l. 19: *Domum suam Mnester*. In Vat<icano> est 'Nesteris', in Farn<esino> Nestoris. Mnester germanum huic histrioni nomen fuit, idque praeter Senecam, Suetonium, Dionem duo lapides vetusti docent Romae in aedibus Crepanicii,

TI[TO] IULIO
AUG[USTI] L[IBERTO]
Mnesteri

Rhenanus 'M<arcus> Nestor' Homerum somnians reposuerat.⁴⁵ [Fig. 3]

⁴⁴ Cf. 1574 edition, 647.

⁴⁵ Ibidem 711.

Fig. 3. Two pages of the *Notae ad Annales* (Antwerp, Christopher Plantin: 1574) 710–711 (Leiden, University Library, 760 F 11).

402, l. 19: *His house to Mnester*. The Vaticanus has 'Nester', the Farnesinus Nestor. Mnester is the real name of this stage-player, and besides in Seneca, Suetonius, and Cassius Dio, it is also attested by two ancient stones in Rome, in the house of Crepanicius,

To Titus Iulius

Mnester,

Freedmen of Emperor Claudius,

Rhenanus was dreaming of Homer when he corrected Marcus Nestor.

Lipsius, unlike many of his friends and colleagues, never showed much interest in coins, but nevertheless he occasionally adds a reference to a coin. Presumably he copied a number of their inscriptions during his sojourn in Rome, when Fulvio Orsini showed him his impressive collection:

[486] l. 21. *Livineius Regulus*. Sic restitui, cum in libris esset Lividineius. Livineiae gentis Reguli fuerunt. Nummus Gaii Caesaris, L[ucius] LIVINEIUS REGULUS III.VIR. A[ERE] A[RGENTO] A[URO] F[LANDO] F[ERIUNDO] AB ADVERSA PARTE, CAESAR IMP[ERATOR].⁴⁶

[486] l. 21. *Livineius Regulus*. That is what I restored, for in the codices I found Lividineius. The Reguli belonged to the *gens Livineia*. This is attested on a coin from Caius Caesar: LUCIUS LIVINEIUS REGULUS, DIRECTOR OF THE MINT.⁴⁷ And on the obverse CAESAR IMPERATOR.

Inscriptions, on the other hand, are often used to elucidate a passage:

[80] l. 8. *Cui cognomen rapaci*. Non ab re arbitror, quoniam cognomina legionum saepe Tacitus

commemorat, veterem a me lapidem proponi, quod sciam in vulgus nondum editum, qui singulas Populi Romani legiones cognominibus suis recenset. Conspicitur Romae in Capitolii area columella marmorea, [Figs. 4–5]

NOMINA LEGIONUM

II. AUGUSTA	II. ADIUTRIX	IIII. SCYTHICA
VI. VICTRIX	IIII. FLAVIA	XVI. FLAVIA
XX. VICTRIX	VII. CLAUDIA	VI. FERRATENSIS
VIII. AUGUSTA	I. ITALICA	X. FRETENSIS
XXII. PRIMIGENIA	V. MACEDONICA	III. CYRENENSIS
I. MINERVIA	XI. CLAUDIA	II. TRAIANA
XXX. ULPIA	XIII. GEMINA	III. AUGUSTA
I. ADIUTRIX	XII. FULMINATRIX	VII. GEMINA
X. GEMINA	XV. APOLLINEA	II. ITALICA
XIII. GEMINA	III. GALLICANA	III. PARTHICA
I. PARTHICA	II. PARTHICA	

⁴⁶ Ibidem 737. The coin, an *argenteus*, is listed in Leiden, University Library, ms. Lips. 22, fol. IIIv. Next to it Lipsius noted details about the representations: 'lituus et infundibulum' (a crooked staff and a funnel).

⁴⁷ Literally 'Tresvir of casting and coining bronze, silver and gold'.

Fig. 4. Lipsius's copy of an inscription with the surnames of the Roman legions (Leiden, University Library, ms. 22) fol. 18v.

Fig. 5. The same list in the *editio princeps* (Antwerp, Christopher Plantin: 1574) 663 (Leiden, University Library, 760 F 11).

Videatur et enumeratio legionum apud Dionem, libro LV, quem paullo felicius interpretes vertissent ab hoc lapide adiuti.⁴⁸

Whose surname was the rapacious. It is not beside the point, I believe (for Tacitus often mentions the surnames of the legions), to propose an old stone giving a survey of each of the legions of the Roman people with its surname, because that stone has never been published before, as I know. It can be seen in Rome, in the court of the Capitol, on a marble column.

[*Here follow the names*]

The list of the legions can also be seen in Dio Cassius, book 55, which the translators could have translated somewhat more successfully with the help of this stone.

Lipsius had copied the names from a 'round marble column on the Capitol' during his stay in Rome, but overlooked a mistake in the printed version here, where III. ITALICA is omitted in the third column, between II. ITALICA and III. PARTHICA.

Occasionally he will also elucidate the meaning of a word or elaborate on a personal or geographical name to help his reader to better understand the text. In the aforementioned case where he insists on writing *speculatores* instead of *spiculatores*,⁴⁹ he prefaces his annotation with a few words on its meaning:

Quibus locis omnibus speculator appellatur non is qui vulgo κατάσκοπος, sed militum certum genus qui praeter gladium lanceas gestasse videntur. Suetonius in Claudio: 'Neque convivia inire ausus est, nisi ut speculatores cum lanceis circumstarent.' Et in Galba: 'Descendentem Galbam speculator impulsu turbae lancea prope vulneravit.' Hanc scribendi rationem etiam in Budensi codice perpetuam fuisse testatur.⁵⁰

In all these aforementioned occurrences 'speculator' does not refer to someone who is usually called 'κατάσκοπος' [scout], but to a particular type of soldier wearing a lance besides his sword. Suetonius in his *Claudius*: 'He did not even dare to enter a banquet unless bodyguards with lances surrounded him' and in the *Galba*: 'And as Galba dismounted, a body-guard, pushed forward by the crowd, almost wounded him with his spear'.

Time and again, he already anticipates his next publication, the *A 345 antiquae lectiones*,⁵¹ in which he gathers once more corrections or explana-

⁴⁸ Cf. 1574 edition, 663. The inscription is preserved in Leiden, University Library, ms. Lips. 22, fol. 18v. In the later editions the omission has not been corrected.

⁴⁹ Cf. the corresponding text to n. 31.

⁵⁰ Cf. Suetonius, *Claudius* 35 and *Galba* 18. Lipsius is right with his remark: these scouts formed a special unit in each legion; under the emperors they were employed as special adjutants and body-guards of a general or of the emperor.

⁵¹ Its full title is *Antiquarum lectionum commentarius tributus in partes quinque, in quibus varia scriptorum loca, Plauti praecipue, illustrantur aut emendantur* (Antwerp, Christopher Plantin: 1575).

tions to dubious passages in a number of classical authors, Tacitus among them.

59, l. 12. *Nondum conditorum ancilium*. Rationem huius consuetudinis a paucis perspectam in Commentariis meis Antiquarum lectionum, libro V explicavi.⁵²

59, l. 12. [...] *That the sacred shields had not yet been restored to their place*. The practical information of this practice, which is known to only few, is given in my *Comments on ancient readings*, book V.

In rare occasions Lipsius justifies his reading or emendation by pondering upon the sense of a phrase:

223, l. 9. *[Non] adesse caput reipublicae*. Ferretus ait ita legi in Medicaeo. Quae si recta lectio est, nihil sane video cur his verbis offendi tantopere Tiberius debuerit. Ego putem legendum 'Capita reipublicae' atque id verbum Tiberii animum altius penetrasse, tamquam Haterius reipublicae regimen ad plures revocaret.⁵³

223, l. 9. *That the state has no leader*. Ferretus says that this is the reading of the Medicaeus. If this is indeed right, I really do not see why Tiberius should have been so deeply offended by these words. I would rather consider reading 'that the state has no leaders' and that word must have penetrated more deeply into Tiberius's consciousness, as if Haterius claimed that the government of the state would be a concern for several people.

487, l. 24. *Necessitate certandi*. Ita libri, rectissime. Constat enim a Nerone aliisque principibus cum ipsi cura ludorum fungerentur, nobiles cives subactos ad necessitatem certaminum gymnicorum. Vulgati spectandi.⁵⁴

487, l. 24. *The obligation of fighting*. That is what you find in the books. Quite rightly, for it is beyond doubt that Nero and other emperors who occupied themselves with organizing games submitted noble citizens to the unavoidable obligation of taking part in gymnastic games. The common version is 'of watching'.

In a few cases an annotation is added without the need to discuss a variant reading or an obscure meaning, solely because Tacitus's uncorrupted text offers the opportunity of emendating another author. This happens in the following examples:

⁵² Cf. 1574 edition, 659.

⁵³ Ibidem 694.

⁵⁴ Ibidem 740.

18, l. 27. *Cluvius Rufus*. Is est qui sui temporis historiam scripsit, alibi a Tacito nominatus. Emendandum eius nomen in Plutarchi Othone, sub initium, ubi male legitur 'Κλαύδιος δὲ Ροῦφος pro Κλούβιος'.⁵⁵

18, l. 27. *Cluvius Rufus*. He is the one who wrote the history of his own age, named elsewhere by Tacitus. His name should be corrected in Plutarch's *Life of Otho*, near the beginning, which has the erroneous reading 'Clausius Rufus' instead of 'Clubius'.

37, l. 17: *Pisonem Verania uxor [ac frate. . . composuere]*. Ex hoc loco emendandus Plutarchus: τὴν δὲ Πείσωνος [κεφαλὴν] ἢ γυνὴ ἔλαβεν οὐ κρανίου δεηθεῖσα. Legendum q<uasi> ἔλαβεν Οὐεράνια δεηθεῖσα. Verania enim uxor precibus caput mariti extorsit. Non attigit germanam emendationem vir eruditus interpres Plutarchi, qui vertit 'Pisonis accepit uxor precibus a Veranio'.⁵⁶

37, l. 17: *Piso was [laid to rest] by his wife Verania [and his brother. . .]*. On the basis of this passage Plutarchus must be corrected: 'His wife received the head of Piso, without asking for the skull'. It should be read as if it were 'For his wife Verania, by pleading, succeeded in obtaining her husband's head'. The learned translator of Plutarch, who wrote 'Piso's wife received by pleading from Veranium', did not arrive at a true emendation.

To sum up this first part, it can be stated that the annotations were still rather limited in number and mostly focused on establishing as pure a text as possible, presenting the reader with variant readings found in previous sources and possible emendations, sometimes merely keeping to the facts, sometimes adding explanations of justifications. Moreover, in his *Notae* Lipsius is already proving his utter familiarity with an impressive number of Latin and Greek authors, and making good use of the epigraphic material he had copied during his stay in Rome or acquired from early printed collections of inscriptions.

2. *The Commentaries of the Later Editions*

2.1. *The Commentarius ad Annales* (1581)

Soon after the publication of the *editio princeps*, Lipsius resumed his work on Tacitus by thoroughly revising his text and establishing the promised

⁵⁵ Ibidem 649. Lipsius refers to Plutarch, *Otho* 3, 2. His emendation is adopted in (and explicitly mentioned in the critical apparatus to) the edition by R. Flacelière and E. Chambry, *Plutarque. Vies*, t. 15 (Paris: 1979) 186.

⁵⁶ Ibidem 654. Lipsius refers to Plutarch *Galba* 28, 2. The modern editions all have the correct text.

commentary. According to Plantin's correspondence the second edition of Tacitus, an in-octavo of over 600 pages, was sent to the press already before New Year 1580. Marginal notes, signified by an asterisk in the text, were added to alert the reader of corrupt or suspect passages, which were discussed in the commentary. Notwithstanding his friend's promises, Plantin had to be patient again, for writing the commentary took more time than Lipsius had expected. It became probably an extended version of what he had in mind before, for his lectures had made him aware that a correct and 'clean' text, however important, was not the only requisite to truly understand an author. His audience and his readership also needed a more practical commentary combining biographical details with more elaborate information about historical events, occasional remarks about the accounts of the same events in other historians, and information about innumerable aspects of life in antiquity. Finally, and perhaps also to push his friend somewhat, the printer decided to go ahead with the text edition in order to have it available at the Spring book fair of Frankfurt (it was ready near the end of January 1581).⁵⁷ By that time 'the commentary was sweating on the press', as he informed one of his correspondents without, however, mentioning that it was limited to the *Annales* only. The *Notae* to the *Historiae* and the *Opera minora* have disappeared.⁵⁸ In an address to the reader Lipsius apologized for its delay, stressing the fact that it was far more extensive than anything Tacitus scholars before him had ever published:

Habes Commentarium meum, Lector, opinione tua, et promisso meo fortasse tardius. Nec mirum: quia serio opus adgressus eiusmodi, comperi ut properandum in eo mihi fuerit, non festinandum. Multa in Annalium libris rara, recondita, et paucitate scriptorum eius aevi obscura: multa etiam ex non vulgatis ritibus et vetustissimo iure haurienda. Nec dux mihi alius ad hoc iter. Primi, inquam, hanc viam ingredimur, Ferreto, Alciato, Vertranio visam potius quam tritam. Denique scripsi hos Commentarios, non exscripsi: et meo remigio, ut ille ait, rem gessi. Correctiones aliquot veteres firmavi, novas addidi, neutrum ambitiose [...].⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Unlike the *Notae* of the first part, the lay-out is less easy for the reader: only page numbers are given, with only an indent when the next lemma on the same page is discussed. Moreover, the letter size of the lemma and the explication is the same. Whereas the lemma in the 1574 edition was mostly limited to only a few words, it is much longer now.

⁵⁸ *Iusti Lipsi ad Annales Cornelii Taciti liber commentarius, sive notae* (Antwerp, Christopher Plantin: 1581). Lipsius's copy with occasional annotations scribbled in the margins is preserved in Leiden, University Library, shelf number 76o G 9.

⁵⁹ Cf. "Ad lectorem" of the 1581 commentary, fol. *5r–*6r. The opposition of *properare* – *festinare* is borrowed from Cato the Elder *apud Gellium* XVI, 14, 2. Once again, the name of Beatus Rhenanus is lacking in the enumeration!

Behold, here is my *Commentary*, Reader, albeit probably later than you expected and later than I promised. No wonder: by applying myself to that kind of task in earnest I learned that I had to hasten, but not to hurry. In many points the *Annales* are unusual, abstruse, and, because of the paucity of authors of that time, also obscure. Many other facts must be drawn from secret rites or very ancient laws. I had no one to guide me on this journey; I mean, I was the first to follow this path, which was only glanced at by Ferretus, Alciatus and Vertranus Maurus, rather than trodden. In a word, I have written these commentaries myself, not copied them and I had to make do with what I had, as the saying goes. Besides agreeing with earlier corrections, I also added my own, though without being overambitious in either case [...].

With two well-chosen metaphors he also warned his readers that he had not deemed it necessary to expound on events or details which had already been elucidated at length by other authors, such as Cassius Dio and Suetonius. He had only wanted to hold a torch for others (*praetuli facem*), not to light a lamp in the middle of the day (*mero meridie accendere lucernam*).⁶⁰ Moreover, he had consciously opted for briefness. *Argumenta* were added in the margin of the *commentarius* summing up a somewhat longer note, referring the reader to ancient sources and remarks made by previous Tacitus scholars, or pointing out possible emendations in either Tacitus's *Annales* or in one of the sources quoted.⁶¹ Book II of the *Annales*, for instance, opens with a reference to p. 41 of the text and an annotation dealing with the hostages sent by the Parthian king Phraates to affirm

⁶⁰ In the 1590s he even considered publishing a *Fax historica*, as he usually called it. The initial ambitious project consisted of an exhaustive general commentary to all historical works from antiquity, but was gradually expanding to also editing these authors. Cf., e.g., ILE IV, 91 01 13 M and O, where Lipsius announces his plans to his Antwerp friends Johannes Moretus and Abraham Ortelius. (ILE IV = *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae, pars IV: 1591*, ed. S. Sué and J. De Landtsheer [Brussels: 2012]) In the end, he only realized the sections on warfare, which is, of course, an ever recurring subject in (ancient) historiography: *De militia Romana libri quinque, commentarius ad Polybium. E parte prima Historicae facis* (Antwerp, Joannes Moretus: 1595–1596) on the organization of the Roman army and *Poliorecticōn sive de machinis, tormentis, telis libri quinque. Ad historiarum lucem* (Ibidem, 1596) on the methods, engines, and weapons used when attacking or defending a city or a fortress. A third part, *De triumphis*, on the triumphal processions granted in certain cases to the victorious commanders in chief and their armies, was announced but never finished. Cf. De Landtsheer J., “Justus Lipsius’ *De militia Romana*: Polybius Revived, or How an Ancient Historian was turned into a Manual of Early Modern Warfare”, in K. Enenkel K.A.E. – Jong J.L. de – De Landtsheer J. with collaboration of Montoya A. (eds.), *Recreating Ancient History. Episodes from the Greek and Roman Past in the Arts and Literature of the Early Modern Period. Intersections*, 1 (Leiden-Boston: 2001) 101–122.

⁶¹ These marginal *argumenta* were used up to the (penultimate) 1600 edition.

Fig. 6. Genealogical tree of the Parthian kings in *Ad Annales commentarius* (Antwerp, Christopher Plantin: 1581) 76–77 (Leiden, University Library, 76o G 9).

his ties with Rome. This is illustrated by a quotation from Strabo (with the source reference in the margin: 'Liberi & nepotes Phraatis. Libro. XVI' and, as Lipsius uses the occasion to correct the Greek geographer, also the warning 'Correctus Strabo'). Next follows an enumeration of eleven Parthian kings, from Orodes up to Vologeses or Vologaesius (summed up in the margin as 'Reges Parthorum, quatenus ad Rom. pertinent'). [Fig. 6] After affirming 'Raro venatu, segni equorum cura' (in the margin summed up as 'Venationi addicti Parthi') by quoting Xenophon, *Cyropaedeia* 8 in Greek, a long note is added explaining the lemma 'Utilissima utensilium anulo clausa' (in the margin summed up as 'Anulus signatorius') with quotations from Plautus, Pliny the Elder, Martial, Cicero, and Clement of Alexandria (the latter quoted in Greek followed by a Latin translation), and completed by a short excursion about the combination of signet rings and keys, examples of which Lipsius had seen unearthed in Holland. This is also the only occasion where a drawing was added to the text.⁶² [Fig. 7] Another, extremely long and almost essay-like note can be found at the end of *Annales* III (p. 90 of the text), expounding on the lemma 'De moderanda [lege] Papia Poppaea',⁶³ where each new step is given in the margin, together with the references to a whole list of ancient authors and lawyers quoted, and numerous emendations to these sources. At the end of the *Commentarius* an exhaustive genealogical tree of the Julian-Claudian house was added on a separate sheet and dedicated to a friend, the Bruges poet Janus Lernutius (1545–1619).⁶⁴ [Fig. 8] By providing his readers with neatly arranged genealogical material (there are other examples as well, but this is the most extensive) Lipsius endorsed a tradition which had become increasingly popular with the historiographers of the sixteenth century. Possible examples were trees in the works of David Chytraeus or Reinerius Reineckius.⁶⁵

Despite Lipsius's promise of briefness, the *Ad Annales liber commentarius*, also in-octavo to match the text edition, counted nearly 500 pages. From the 1581 edition on, the *Annales* will be published first, hence the first

⁶² In later editions I also found the representation of both sides of a coin.

⁶³ Cf. *Annales* III, 28, 4. The *lex Papia Poppaea* was introduced in 9 AD to encourage and strengthen marriage. It included provisions against adultery and celibacy and complemented and supplemented previous laws of Augustus to reestablish Roman marriage.

⁶⁴ The letter is published as ILE VIII, [80 end / early 81]. In the reissues this genealogical tree was reprinted with the page numbers carefully adapted to the new edition.

⁶⁵ See Grafton A., "Method and Madness in the *Ars Historica*", in idem, *What was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: 2007) 123–188 (esp. 147–163).

Fig. 7. Woodcut of signet keys, in *Ad Annales commentarius* (Antwerp, Christopher Plantin: 1581) 78–79 (Leiden, University Library, 760 G 9).

notes concern the title: the first name of Tacitus, almost literally repeating the first annotation to the first book of the *Historiae* in the 1574 edition, and a remark about the title of the work:

1. *Annalium libri*: Bene Rhenanus qui hanc inscriptionem adserit etiam contra libros. In quibus est Actorum diurnalium vel, ut in Veneto, Actionum diurnalium.

1. *The books of the Annales*: A compliment to Beatus Rhenanus: he added this title, even contrary to the printed books which all have Daily events or Daily activities as in the edition from Venice.

Lipsius further argues that his choice has been determined by Tacitus himself, who time and again refers to his work as the *Annales*, a title also used by Jornandes:

Lucio Pisone consule pauca memoria digna evenere, nisi cui libeat laudandis fundamentis et trabibus volumina implere, cum ex dignitate populi Romani repertum sat res illustres Annalibus, talia diurnis Urbis actis mandare. *Alibi*

Nemo Annales nostros cum scriptura, *itemque* Ni destinatum mihi foret suum quaeque in annum referre. *Jornandes in rebus Gothicis* Cornelium hunc citat Annalium scriptorem.⁶⁶

When Lucius Piso was consul, little occurred deserving mention, unless one would like to fill books by praising the foundations and the beams [...]; whereas it has been sufficiently proved that it suits the dignity of the people of Rome to entrust great achievements to yearbooks and to leave such details to the daily chronicle of the City. *And elsewhere* Nobody must [compare] my *Annales* with the writings, *and also* Unless I had decided to report everything according to its own year. *Jornandes, in his History of the Goths*, refers to our Cornelius, the author of the *Annales*.

A few annotations further he finds a further argument confirming his decision to abandon the until then commonly adopted division of Tacitus's oeuvre in 21 books in favour of a distinction between what in modern editions is always published as the *Annales* and the *Historiae*, an issue he had elaborated on in the "Ad lectorem monitio" of the 1574 edition:

Tiberii Caiique [...] Neronis res. Fines designat intra quos hi libri: quattuor dumtaxat principes. Ut vel hinc liqueat *Historias* seorsum scriptas finemque Annalium fuisse in fine Neronis.⁶⁷

He is indicating the limits within which these books are situated: exactly four emperors. This may also make it clear that the *Historiae* were written separately and that the end of the *Annales* coincided with the end of Nero.

Most of the annotations of the 1574 edition are incorporated in the 1581 commentary; if they merely consisted of a variant reading, they may have been moved to the margins of the text part. As to their formal aspect, often the phrasing is somewhat altered, making the explanation more concise and strictly to the point. Lipsius still disagrees with Rhenanus (and Vertranius Maurus in his wake), but no longer in a condescending way. The aforementioned annotation about Mnester,⁶⁸ for instance, becomes in the 1581 edition:

[p. 284] *domum suam Mnestrus et Poppaeae congressibus.* Veterum editionum lectio Valerii et Poppaeae. Apte sane ad historiam, quia Valerio Asiatico obiectum adulterium Poppaeae, et forte equitibus istis quod interpretes et administri. Libri tamen scripti Nesteris, aut Nestioris. Ex quo Rhenanus

⁶⁶ Cf. *Liber commentarius* (1581) 1–2. Lipsius is quoting *Annales* XIII, 30; IV, 32 and 71 and Jornandes, *De origine actibusque Getarum* II, 13, with the typo *Goticis*, which he corrected in his copy but without taking this correction into account in the later editions.

⁶⁷ It is summed up in the margin as 'Annales Taciti quatenus progressi' ('The extent of Tacitus's *Annales*').

⁶⁸ Cf. *supra*, 296. The 1581 version remains unchanged in 1585, 110 and 1607, 166, n. 17.

M. Nestoris, nec recte. Germanum illi pantomimo nomen Mnester, qui in aedibus Crepanicorum Romae

TI[TO] IULIO

AUG[USTI] L[IBERTO]

MNESTERI

Nescio ergo an Poppaeae etiam adulterium obiectum delecti huius mimi in quo et Messalina deperiit. Ceterum haec Poppaea illa est quae cunctas aetatis suae feminas pulchritudine supergressa, gloriam reliquit filiae quae scortum sive uxor Neroni. Quam genuit ex priore marito, T[ito] Ollio.

[p. 284] *his house for the meetings of Mnester and Poppaea*. The reading of the early editions was 'of Valerius and Poppaea'. Surely this agrees very well with the facts, since Valerius Asiaticus was accused of committing adultery with Poppaea, as perhaps also the knights because they acted as his interpreters and servants. Yet the manuscript codices have Nesteris or Nestoris. Hence Rhenanus corrected M. Nestoris, albeit erroneously. The real name of this stage-player is Mnester, who is mentioned in the house of the Crepanicii.

To Titus Iulius

Mnester,

Freedmen of Emperor Claudius,

I do not know whether Poppaea was also accused of having an amorous relation with this favourite pantomime player, who also became the ruin of Messalina. Besides, this Poppaea was that famous woman who surpassed all women of her age in beauty and passed on that reputation to her daughter, who became the whore or wife of Nero. This was the daughter she had with her first husband, Titus Ollius.

On the other hand, he adds further sources to prove his point: the number of references to parallel passages in Tacitus's oeuvre have considerably increased.

Most of the new annotations, indeed, provide further information about numerous aspects of the text: biographical details about descent, marriage, or function may explain personal names, or there may be references to earlier or further occurrences; geographical names are situated; cursory remarks to historical or military events are elaborated on; comparisons with the accounts of other writers are made and discussed . . . In most cases this information is illustrated by often lengthy quotations from a whole plethora of authors: historians (Suetonius, Cassius Dio, Plutarch, Livy and Tacitus himself), geographers (Strabo), encyclopedists (Pliny the Elder, Varro), or epigraphical material, depending on the issue, with occasional translations of Greek quotations. Nevertheless, Lipsius also added the occasional philological remark – either a new emendation or a remark concerning Tacitus's style – and continued to elucidate ambiguous or (seemingly) contradictory passages, as he had done in the 1574 edition.

Fig. 9. Opening part of the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, in Lipsius's *Auricularium* to Martinus Smetius, *Inscriptionum Antiquarum quae passim per Europam liber* [...] (Leiden, Franciscus Raphelengius: 1588) fol. 19 (Leiden, University Library, 341 A 6).

And of course, the innumerable quotations from other writers incited him also to emendate these texts.

An interesting example can be found at the beginning of *Annales* I, where Tacitus is discussing the first steps in the political career of Augustus' grandsons Gaius and Lucius. A marginal note informs the reader about 'Dionis error sive a lapide dissensio' (an error of Dio or a discrepancy with the epigraphic source'. Lipsius questions the information in Tacitus that the boys had already been granted the title of 'principes iuventutis' ('leaders of the youth') despite their age (even the older boy, Gaius, had not yet reached adulthood). After cursorily mentioning the Greek translation of the title in Zonaras, the humanist adds the inscription of a coin, representing both youngsters and explains its context. This is confirmed by a quotation from Dio, in Greek. Lipsius then points out the discrepancy between Dio, who is speaking of golden spears, whereas 'a stone' mentions silver spears; a lacuna in the inscription is easily solved by combining it with Tacitus and Dio. Lipsius has every confidence in the 'stone' in question, since its text was composed by Augustus himself and can still be seen in Ankara. It is, indeed, a quotation from the famous *Monumentum Ancyranum*, discovered by Augerius Busbequius (1522–1591), who copied it during his sojourn at the sultan's court as ambassador of Emperor Maximilian II. After meeting Lipsius in Vienna in the summer of 1572, Busbequius had kindly provided Lipsius with a copy.⁶⁹ [Fig. 9]

Necdum posita puerili praetexta, principes iuventutis appellari. Ridiculum ut principes iuventutis sint qui etiam in pueris. Natus autem Caius anno urbis DCCXXXIV Sexto Appuleio Publio Silio consulibus. At Lucius biennio toto minor ex Dione LV in actis eius anni. Princeps iuventutis (προκρίτους τῆς νεότητος Zonaras hic reddidit) ab Augusto invaluit ad futurum imperium titulus et omen. Sunt nummi cum inscriptione C[AIUS] L[UCIUS] CAESARES AUGUSTI F[ILII] CO[N]S[ULES] DES[IGNATI] PRINC[IPES] IUVENT[UTIS], adpositae effigies Caii Lucique cum clypeis et hastis.⁷⁰ Quae tirocinii die equites dederant honoris Augusti caussa. Dio: καὶ αἱ πέλος τότε δόρατα, ἃ

⁶⁹ Later, Lipsius received a second copy, from another correspondent from Vienna, the botanist Carolus Clusius, who had been given a copy by two other diplomats. Lipsius published the text in his *Auctarium*, 19–22, under the heading 'Notabile marmor quod indicem continet rerum ab Augusto gestarum' ('A remarkable marble stone containing a survey of Augustus' feats'). In the margin he specified: 'Accepi ab illustri D[omino] Augerio Busbequio et postea a Carolo Clusio' ('I received it from the illustrious Lord Augerius Busbequius and afterwards from Carolus Clusius'). There are only slight differences between both versions. The *Auctarium* was published as part of *M[artini] Smetii Inscriptionum Antiquarum quae passim per Europam liber*. [...] *Accessit Auctarium a Iusto Lipsio* (Leiden, Franciscus Raphelengius: 1588).

⁷⁰ They are called 'filii' because they had been adopted by Augustus, who had no son and heir of his own.

παρὰ τῶν ἱππέων εἰς τοὺς ἐφήβους ἐσιόντες χρυσᾶ εἰλήφεσαν, εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον ἀνετέθη. *Observe Dionem aureas hastas dicere, quas lapis (magnae apud me fidei, ut quem vivus conceperit Augustus ipse) qui Ancyrae, argenteas. Verba sunt, uti ad me missa beneficio viri illustris Augerii Busbequii: EQUITES AUTEM ROMANI UNIVERSI PRINCIPEM [...] HASTIS ARGENTEIS DONATUM APPELLAVERUNT, quam lacunam rite expleveris Principem iuvent<utis> Caium.*⁷¹

To illustrate the evolution in the commentary I have compared various versions of the notorious episode of the burning of Rome during Nero's reign in *Annales* XV, 38–44. The 1574 edition, 745–746 has eight annotations and except for the seventh, they all give variant readings or caution that the text is either obscure or corrupt. The 1581 edition, 451–456, on the other hand, has 22 annotations for this episode, excluding two of the 1574 annotations, which have been incorporated in the margin of the text. The third annotation of 1574, about other fires of long duration, has been reduced to what was the conclusion of 1574. The seventh annotation in 1574, 'In usum nocturnae luminis' is extended with the remark that it was the first violent repression of the Christians, confirmed by quoting Tertullian; the last annotation in 1574, 'Permixtus plebe vel circulo insistsens', merely stressing the need to emendate 'circulo' in 'curriculo', is augmented by references to Pliny the Elder and his nephew. Most of the additional annotations are much longer, except for the one about the buildings on the *campus Martius*, where Lipsius contents himself with a mere reference to Cassius Dio and the book number. There are several references to ancient writers on topography, Publius Victor among them, but also encyclopaedic information based on Pliny the Elder and Isidore of Seville, the latter about the imperviousness of 'Sabinian' stone, which is corrected into 'Gabinian'. Lipsius further points out the discrepancy about the length of the fire in Tacitus, Suetonius, and an ancient inscription near St Peter's, which he then solves; he discusses the variant 'Chrestianus' for 'Christianus' with quotations from the Suda, Arrian, and Suetonius, and marginal references to Tertullian and Lactantius. Perhaps the most interesting, and also the longest annotation is the one about the temple of Luna: Livy and Rufus are called upon to prove the existence of such a temple on the Aventine, but Lipsius immediately adds that Sol and Luna were surely not venerated during the first centuries of Rome, as is suggested by 'vetustissima'. Hence his suggestion to emend 'Lunae' into 'Luae', a goddess whose cult already existed in those early times, which he proves with two

⁷¹ *Liber Commentarius* 6–7, with a reference to p. 6 of the text part.

quotations from Livy. After attributing the merits of this emendation to the French humanist Adrianus Turnebus (1512–1565), he explains that Lua was the goddess of fortunate sacrifice and atonement, with a reference to an etymological remark by Varro.

Vetustissima [...] Lunae. Templum Lunae in Aventino reperto apud Liv. XL [quotation of Livy, *Ab urbe condita* XL, 2] et Rufus in regione XII ‘Templum Lunae in Aventino magnum’. Sed ausim ego in Livio Tacitoque et Rufo rescribere Luae non Lunae. Luna et Sol inter priscos non sunt Romanorum deos, nec culti temporibus regum. At est Lua mater et eius religio antiqua. Livius lib[ro] VIII [quotation of Livy, *Ab urbe condita* VIII, 1]. Lib. XLV [quotation of XLV, 33]. Ita enim eum locum emendatum magno Turnebo debemus. Lua autem dea litationum, opinor, expiationumque, a luendo. Varro: ‘Habes qui et cuius rei caussa fecerim Hecatomben, in quo ego, ut puto, quoniam est luere, solvere lutavi’.⁷² Ubi acute et ambigue ludit in verbo solvendi.

2.3. *Towards a definitive Commentarius and Notae in the Editions between 1585–1607*

After the publication of the 1581 edition and commentary Lipsius kept working steadily on the still expected annotations to the *Historiae* and the *Opera minora*. Plantin succeeded in having the reissue of the text and the completed annotations available at the September book fair of Frankfurt 1584, although the title page bears the year 1585 for commercial reasons.⁷³ [Fig. 10] This time an in-folio format was chosen; the text part was followed by the *Liber commentarius* and the part with the revised annotations to the other works, entitled *Ad libros Historiarum notae* (also including the *opera minora*), each with its own title page.⁷⁴ As mentioned before, Lipsius would always maintain this distinction between *Liber commentarius* for the *Annales* and *Notae* for the other works, because the latter part still consisted mainly of text-critical remarks and it was considerably shorter

⁷² Cf. Varro apud Nonium Marcellum, 131, 19–21.

⁷³ Tacitus, *Opera quae exstant ex Iusti Lipsi editione ultima et cum eiusdem ad ea omnia Commentariis aut Notis* (Leiden, Christopher Plantin: 1585). Plantin, who dreaded the impending siege of Antwerp by Alexander Farnese, and wanted to ensure the continuation of at least part of the *Officina Plantiniana*, had accepted Lipsius’s invitation to establish a printing press in Leiden. He left the city a few weeks before Farnese took action and entrusted the Antwerp branch to his sons-in-law, the Protestant Franciscus Raphelengius and the Catholic Joannes Moretus.

⁷⁴ From this 1585 edition on, the layout of the annotations was again improved: the lemma was set in a slightly larger letter size and closed by a bracket; each lemma was preceded by an indent. In the 1607 edition, consulting the annotations became even more convenient, as we will see.

too. A comparison between the number of annotations of some books, selected at random in the various editions makes this clear:⁷⁵

	1574	1581	1585	1589	1607
<i>Ann. I</i>	40	187	192	203	273
<i>Ann. III</i>	29	138	140	146	179
<i>Ann. XV</i>	57	123	127	139	179
<i>Hist. II</i>	78	/	82	106	122

The “Ad lectorem” of the text part of 1585 opens with the statement that it will be the final revision: ‘En tibi, Lector, tertiam editionem Taciti nostri, et ni fallor, postremam’ (‘Here, dear reader, you have the third edition of our Tacitus and, if I am not mistaken, it will be the last one’). After enumerating the sources that he had consulted in Rome for the first edition, Lipsius explains that in the course of the years friends and colleagues kept sending variant readings and remarks to him. First, there was a manuscript owned by the Spanish lawyer Antonio de Covarruvias (1554–1602) in Toledo, read and collated by Andreas Schott (1562–1629), a friend from Lipsius’s student days in Leuven, who had also added some extra information for his commentary. This material would be referred to as *Hispanus* or *Covarruviae*, although it was seldom used because it arrived rather late, when the new edition was already on its way, and also because it was less interesting than expected.

Accessere nunc alia ab amicis. Manuscriptum exemplar, meo nomine et gratia in Hispaniis Toleti legit et cum vulgatis composuit Andreas Schottus, optimus doctissimusque vir: qui excerpta ad me misit et notas. Id exemplar est in bibliotheca viri illustris Antonii Covarruviae Leiva, cuius insigni doctrinae et disertae in scribendo elegantiae verum et sine fraude testimonium reddo. Id exemplar in citando alias Hispanum, alias Covarruviae nomino: minus tamen saepe auxilio eius usus, quia et tarde ad me venit plerisque istis iam perfectis, et ut rem dicam, non optimae nota.⁷⁶

⁷⁵ I have already included the later editions of some importance, omitting the smaller and cheaper fifth edition (Leiden, Franciscus Raphelengius: 1588) intended for students and focusing entirely on the text, with an abundance of marginal remarks, but without a separate part of annotations. Nor have I taken into account the sixth edition (Antwerp, Joannes Moretus: 1600), published without too many changes.

⁷⁶ Cf. 1585 edition, “Ad lectorem”, fol. 2r.

More useful were the notes received from Franciscus Modius, who during a stay with Erasmus Neustetter (Sturmer), had discovered a copy of the Venice edition of 1470, profusely annotated by a humanist of an earlier period, Rudolphus Agricola (1444–1485). Time and again Lipsius referred to these notes, mostly with the indication *Rudolphus noster*, although he usually contented himself with pointing out Agricola's emendations without following them too closely, 'for', as he explained, 'many of them seem to me too daring and too free, and they often stray too far from the manuscripts.' In his eyes, they were the product of a subtle and ingenious mind, rather than corrections leading to the original text. Moreover, Modius had also collated a manuscript from Bamberg belonging to his patron, but this only contained the *Germania*.⁷⁷

In the meantime fellow humanists kept collating Lipsius's edition with manuscripts or early editions in their libraries and sent variant readings or supplementary information to be added to the commentary. Hieronymus van Berchem, a friend of Lipsius's student days in Leuven, had conveyed a series of philological remarks he had received from Janus Mellerus Palmerius, a humanist who had his roots in Bruges.⁷⁸ Palmerius's annotations can still be found in Leiden, University Library, ms. Lips. 5. [Fig. 11] The French humanist Josias Mercier (ca. 1560–1626), for instance, sent a first list, based on the 1574 edition, together with ILE I, 81 o3 19.⁷⁹ A second list, not preserved but presumably based on the second edition, is referred to in the commentary of the 1585 edition. This latter edition would become the basis for a third list, also preserved in Leiden, University Library,

⁷⁷ Cf. *ibidem*, fol. 2r–v: 'Aliud item mihi auxilium a politissimo et doctissimo Francisco Modio. Qui dum in Germania agit apud insignem litteratorum patronum Erasmum Neustatterum, cognomento Sturmerum (virum genere et dignitate inter primos) nactus exemplar quoddam est manu Rodolphi Agricolae adnotatum: quod usui nobis fuit, ut videbis. Multa enim eruditus ille vir observarat, et ad margines libri sui rettulerat, sed ita ut iure ambigas prompta ea e vetustioribus libris sint, an ab ipso. Multa enim agnosco audacius et licentius inventa, et longius a verbis aberrantia: quae videantur mihi a subtilis ingenii fonte. Quaedam etiam eiusmodi, quae etsi non a libris, commendent se tamen lectori audacia quadam verecunda. Sed idem ille noster Modius etiam Romanam editionem veterem comparavit cum vulgata: eaque multis locis vera, aut dux nobis ad veritatem. Denique idem etiam codicem manuscriptum Bambergae allatum, quem Amplissimus Neustetterus emit. Sed qui nihil praeter Germaniam Taciti haberet, e quo ipso non optimo tamen locos aliquot correxisse videmur non laeve'.

⁷⁸ Cf. an overlooked letter to Janus Dousa Sr, dated 11 May [1583], edited in Deneire and De Landtsheer, '*Lipsiana* in the Waller Manuscript Collection', 221–224.

⁷⁹ The list is still preserved in Leiden University Library, in ms. BPL 1886.

ms. BPL 1886, and was sent together with ILE II, 87 11 20.⁸⁰ It was used in the *Ad Caium Cornelium Tacitum Curae Secundae* (Leiden, Franciscus Raphelengius: 1588), a sequel to the commentary part. In its dedicatory letter he informed his readers that he had extended or corrected a number of the annotations in the previous editions and supplemented new ones as well. Moreover, he had also explained, confirmed or revoked some of his own annotations.⁸¹ A considerable part of the new material in the *Curae secundae* was gathered from a copy of the 1585 edition still preserved at Leiden, University Library, shelf number 762 B 4. The innumerable annotations Lipsius scribbled in the margins of this fascinating document – full quotations or mere references to possible extra sources for his commentary – show how the humanist never tired of his quest for extra information.

It can be readily accepted that the main reason for the 1589 edition was the incorporation of the additional commentary from the *Curae secundae* in the already existing *Liber commentarius* or *Notae*. Nevertheless, Lipsius preferred to alert the reader by using an asterisk whenever the information provided by the *Curae secundae* did not easily fit in with the already existing commentary, because he wanted to point out his doubts, to change, to affirm or to refute what he had previously said.⁸² Two examples will make this clear. In the first one, discussing ‘Remisit Caesar, adroganti moderatione’ (*Annales* I, 8,7) Lipsius had been inclined to read *permittere* instead of *remittere*, according to the 1585 edition. Afterwards, however, his friend and correspondent, the French lawyer Jacobus Cuiacius (1522–1590) had convinced him that *remittere* was used in the sense of *permittere* as well. In the second example, explaining the lemma ‘Nuptiis sororis illectum’ (‘lured by marriage with

⁸⁰ Cf. Devillers O., “Josias Mercier, commentateur des *Annales* de Tacite”, in F. Rodaut, *Jean* (c. 1525–1570) et *Josias* (c. 1560–1626) *Mercier. L’amour de la philologie à la Renaissance et au début de l’âge classique* (Paris: 2006) 235–249 (ILE II refers to *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae, pars II: 1594–1587*, ed. M.A. Nauwelaerts and S. Sué [Brussels: 1983]).

⁸¹ See the dedicatory letter, fol. *2: ‘Notae aliquot meliores, quas olim cum plenum illum meum Commentarium dedi, aut non vidi, aut paullo sequius vidi. Multa enim interea propria lectio et dies me docuit, nonnihil aliorum suggestio; quibus gratiam retuli, cuique in suo loco. Sed et quaedam priora mea aut explicavi, aut firmavi, aut etiam (nec pudet) recantavi’.

⁸² Cf. “Monitio ad Lectorem”, fol. [**4]r: ‘Ceterum, universe Commentarium istum pleniorum melioremque aliis scito: cui inseruimus e CURIS SECUNDIS, suis quaeque locis. Quod si quid in iis tale, quod cohaerere cum priori Nota parum apte posset (puta, siquid ambigerem, mutarem, firmarem, refellerem) haec sub ipsam Notam disiunctim paullum subtexti iussimus cum signo isto * quod moneat te illud adtextum esse e posterioribus CURIS’.

his sister'), Lipsius suggests two emendations to a quotation of Seneca the Elder and also draws his readers' attention that Seneca and Cassius Dio are contradicting each other on this occasion. Moreover, a lacuna in his text of Seneca the Elder, which in his edition was indicated by a series of dots, is complemented in the margin by a quotation in Greek, which was sent to him by Andreas Schott. Finally, in the *Curae secundae* he returns to one of his emendations to Seneca the Elder, about the combination *Minerva Musa*, acknowledging that Janus Grotius, the father of the famous Hugo, had solved the problem for him and that one should, indeed, keep the text as it was.

Only in the final, seventh edition, also an in-folio, published posthumously by Plantin's successor in Antwerp, Joannes Moretus, in 1607, text and matching annotations were brought together on the same page, much to the reader's convenience.⁸³ In this 1607 edition, Lipsius had taken into account an extensive collection of annotations published by the Italian humanist Curtius Pichena (1553–1626), secretary to the Grand Duke of Florence. The Italian had examined the manuscripts in the Laurentiana, which Lipsius had never directly consulted, with painstaking care and discovered a number of errors, which had escaped his predecessor's attention. As pointed out by Ruyschaert, Lipsius incorporated almost half of the variant readings Pichena offered for books I–VI of the *Annales*, and one fifth only for the remaining part, but this explains the sudden increase of annotations in the survey above (p. 315). [Fig. 12] The text was set in one block, with small numerals in superscript before a word referring the reader to the annotations divided into two columns on the second half of the page. Because of the new layout, the somewhat longer, essay-like historical annotations were withdrawn and gathered in a separate section at the end of the edition, entitled *Excursus*, divided into the corresponding books and indicated by letters. In the commentary at the bottom of the page the reader was referred to the appropriate letter in these excursions. Almost all of them are situated in the *Annales*; there is only one to *Histories* III and another one to the *Germania*. Excursions F and G to *Annales* I (text p. 16), for instance, discuss the origins and the development of the

⁸³ *Ad Cornelii Taciti Opera Notae, iuxta veterrimorum exemplarium collationem* ([Frankfurt], Heirs of A. Wechel, C. de Marne and J. Aubry: 1600). The catalogue of Lipsius's library only mentions a copy of the second edition: 'Curtius Pichena, in *Tacitum*, 8, Hanoviae, 1604', cf. Leiden, University Library, ms. Lips. 59, fol. 11v, book 28. *Juste Lipse et les Annales de Tacite* 138–143. For books I–VI of the *Annales* 25 out of 57 variants were used, whereas for books XI–XVI Lipsius only kept 43 variants out of 221. Nevertheless, many of the ones he rejected made good sense.

Fig. 12. Beginning of Tacitus, *Annales* VI in the 1607 edition (Antwerp, Joannes Moretus) 142 (Leiden, University Library, 762 B 5).

soldiers' pay; K (text p. 20) expounds on the census. Excursions A and B of *Annales* II (text p. 42) give the genealogical tree of the Parthian kings in as far as they are connected with the Romans and dwell on the use of signet rings and keys. The essay on the *lex Papia Poppaea* in *Annales* III has become excursion C and excursion A of *Annales* XI (text p. 176) reproduces the inscription containing a fragment of the oration held by Emperor Claudius on his visit to Lyons, where he was born.⁸⁴ [Fig. 13] But all these longer annotations in the *Annales* can already be found in the *Commentarius* from 1581.

Usually the text of the already extant annotations remains the same as in the previous editions or only slight changes were made. The already mentioned annotation about Nero's plans to do away with his wife Octavia from the 1574 edition

21, l. 16. *Octaviam uxorem amoliretur*. Hac dictione in eandem rem usus est Tacit[us], lib[ro] XIV et sic libri m[anu]s[cripti] referebant. Rhenano aliter visum est.⁸⁵

21, l. 16. *Until he could rid himself of his wife Octavia*. Tacitus used this expression about the same issue in book XIV [of the *Annales*] and that is what you find in the manuscript codices. Rhenanus has a different opinion.

is somewhat adapted by inserting a reference to Covarruvias's manuscript, but is the same in the 1585 and the 1607 edition:

Octaviam uxorem amoliretur. Iisdem in hanc rem verbis usus est libro XIV Annalium et sic mei libri. Covarruviae tamen codex et Budensis 'Octavia uxor amoveretur'. Quod rectum aequē.⁸⁶

In another example the phrasing is somewhat altered, without changing the content:

20, l. 31. *Eodem actu invisior erat*. Ne Di sirint ut vera sit haec lectio, nisi placet Tacitum manifesto βαρβαρίζειν. Actu enim invisum esse nemo proletarius scriptor dixerit, nedum iste noster Assiduus. Ego illud 'actu' delendum iudico ut imperiti nebulonis glossema et Taciti scripsisse 'quanto potentior,

⁸⁴ On this occasion the inhabitants were granted the citizenship of Rome. The inscription, in bronze, is preserved in the archeological museum of Lyons.

⁸⁵ Cf. the 1574 edition, 650 with a reference to *Annales* XIV, 59: 'maturare parat Octaviamque coniugem amoliri'.

⁸⁶ Cf. 1585 *Notae ad Historias*, 2 (with a reference to the text on p. 143) and 1607, 311, n. 47.

eodem inuisor erat'. Vel potius 'eadem', quomodo Plautus sexcenties locutus reprehenditur.⁸⁷

20, l. 31. May the gods not allow that this is the true reading, unless they want Tacitus to be manifestly using barbaric language. For no second-rate author would speak like this, and by no means the first class writer that is our Tacitus. I believe this 'actu' should be deleted as the explanation of an ignorant fool and that Tacitus wrote: 'the mightier he became, the more he was hated', or rather 'in a similar way', as Plautus can be caught saying hundreds of times.

In the 1585 version this becomes:

Eodem actu inuisor. Quid est illud 'actu inuisum esse'? Ineptiae, sermo parum non dicam lautus, sed Latinus. Scribebam sublata ea voce 'eadem inuisor erat'. Genus sermonis notum vel ex uno Plauto. Non male etiam 'fastu inuisor', qui sane fastus comitari potentiam fere solet et hunc odium.

In the course of the years, Lipsius must have come upon a suggestion made by one of his correspondents, Jacobus Lectius, for in the 1607 edition the last sentence is changed as follows:

Eodem actu inuisor. Quid est illud 'actu inuisum esse'? Ineptiae, sermo parum non dicam lautus, sed Latinus. Scribebam sublata ea voce 'eadem inuisor erat'. Genus sermonis notum vel ex uno Plauto. Placuit Iac[obi] Lectii, eruditi viri, coniectura 'eodem auctu', nunc mea ista, 'eo dein fastu inuisor'.⁸⁸

Apart from the numerous additional annotations referring to Pichena's edition, Lipsius will sometimes insert an extra annotation. The following example probably occurred to him while he was working on his *Politica*,⁸⁹ which was published a few months after the 1589 edition appeared. A quotation from Aristoteles, both in Greek and in translation, leads Lipsius to a rare, personal intervention: a complaint about the corruption among the leading politicians of his time:

Othonem exstimulabant luxuria. Verae hae mutationum caussae et prudenter Aristoteles eas ingerit *Polit.* V [quotation of the Greek text] 'Fiunt mutationes cum per luxum sua prodigunt. Tales enim innovare omnia stu-

⁸⁷ Cf. the 1574 edition, 1574, 650.

⁸⁸ Cf. the 1585 edition, *Notae ad Historias* 2 (corresponding to the text on p. 143) and the 1607 edition, 311, n. 44 respectively.

⁸⁹ Or with its full title *Politiconum sive civilis doctrinae libri sex. Qui ad principatum maxime spectant* (Leiden, Franciscus Raphelengius: 1589).

dent et aut sibi tyrannidem aut alteri parare.' O veriloquium, quod utinam principes imbibant et corruptissimis hodie moribus advertant!⁹⁰

Otho was incited by luxury. These were the true reasons for the changes and Aristotle wisely lashes out against them: 'Changes happen when they are squandering their possessions through luxury. Such men intend to change everything and acquire absolute power for themselves or for another.' Word of thruth, which I hope the sovereigns will imbibe and apply against the corrupted behaviour of today.

Conclusion

The successive editions of Tacitus's collected works and their commentary certainly earned Lipsius his star on the humanists' Walk of Fame. When preparing the *editio princeps* he obviously concentrated his research on establishing as clear a text as possible, while the annotations primarily focused on the philological aspects of the text, along the lines of the first works he published. Yet from the second edition on, Lipsius devoted himself to offering his readership all possible help to fully understand the text and its veiled meaning. In doing so, he could count on the help of a number of colleagues abroad who collated interesting manuscripts of annotated editions with his own text and also made useful suggestions for the commentary. But the most important asset was, of course, Lipsius's own knack with the classical languages in general and of Tacitus's idiom and style in particular, his familiarity with the whole range of ancient and later authors, and his encyclopaedic knowledge of the world of antiquity. Hence the commentary kept increasing, both as to the number and the length of the annotations, and already extant annotations were often rephrased in view of the next edition. It is also striking that Lipsius often used information gathered from epigraphic sources and occasionally also mentioned inscriptions on coins, but that he did not consider illustrating some of his annotations by representing them. Yet this would not have been very hard to do, since apart from the already existing well-illustrated treatises on coins, some of his Antwerp friends were eager collectors of coins and would willingly have helped him find whatever illustration he wanted. I rather see this contribution as some kind of prospectus and I am convinced that a thorough, comparative study of the annotations to

⁹⁰ Cf. the 1607 edition, 314, n. 62. In the text, more subjects (all vices) are following, hence the plural of the verb in the lemma and the plural of the explanation.

whichever book of Tacitus's major works and of the sources Lipsius used to it will be most relevant to better understand his fascination for Tacitus on the one hand and, more generally, the way humanists proceeded to compose their erudite works in a world in which books were still not always easy to acquire and with hardly any auxiliary tools.

Selective Bibliography

- BRINK C.O., "Justus Lipsius and the Text of Tacitus", *Journal of Roman Studies* 41 (1951) 32–51.
- ILE: *Iusti Lipsi Epsitolae*, ed. A. Gerlo, M.A. Nauwelaerts, H.D.L. Vervliet et al. (Brussels: 1978–).
- LANDTSHEER J. DE, "Commentaries on Tacitus by Justus Lipsius. Their Editing and Printing History", in J. Rice Henderson with the assistance of P.M. Swan (eds.), *The Unfolding of Words: Commentary in the Age of Erasmus* (Toronto: 2012) 188–242.
- LIPSIUS JUSTUS, *Caii Cornelii Taciti Historiarum et Annalium libri qui exstant Iusti Lipsii studio emendati et illustrati. Ad Imperatorem Maximilianum II [...]; eiusdem Taciti liber de moribus Germanorum, Iulii Agricolae vita, incerti scriptoris Dialogus de oratoribus sui temporis Ad Clarissimum Virum Ioannem Sambucum* (Antwerp, Christopher Plantin: 1574).
- , *Ad Annales Corn[eli] Taciti liber commentarius, sive notae* (Antwerp, Christopher Plantin: 1581).
- , *Caii Cornelii Taciti Opera quae exstant ex Iusti Lipsi editione ultima: et cum eiusdem ad ea omnia Commentariis aut Notis* (Leiden, Christopher Plantin: 1585).
- , *Ad Caium Cornelium Tacitum Curae Secundae* (Leiden, Franciscus Raphelengius: 1588).
- , *Caii Cornelii Taciti Opera quae exstant. Iustus Lipsius quintum recensuit. Additi commentarii meliores plenioresque cum Curis secundis* (Leiden, Franciscus Raphelengius: 1589).
- , *Caii Cornelii Taciti Opera quae exstant. Iustus Lipsius postremum recensuit. Additi Commentarii aucti emendatique ab ultima manu. Accessit Caius Velleius Paterculus cum eiusdem Lipsi auctioribus Notis* (Antwerp, Joannes Moretus: 1607).
- RUYSCHAERT J., *Juste Lipse et les Annales de Tacite. Une méthode de critique textuelle au XVI^e siècle*, Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie, 3e série, fascicule 34 (Leuven: 1949).
- , "Le séjour de Juste Lipse à Rome (1568–1570) d'après ses *Antiquae lectiones* et sa correspondance", *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 24 (1947–1948) 139–192.