



BrillOnline *Reference Works*

[Home](#) > [History](#) > [Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World](#) > Philology: Editions and Editorial Practices in the Early Modern Period

Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World

Philology: Editions and Editorial Practices in the Early Modern Period

(14,426 words)

¶ Viewed in hindsight, it is principally the overwhelming flood of editions that attests to the revivification of classical learning and literature propagated by Renaissance humanism. This flood did not cease in the years following the spread and popularisation of the printing press because humanist scholars did not limit themselves to editions of the original classical, biblical and patristic texts. They also translated Greek texts into Latin, and Greek and Latin texts into the vernacular. Moreover, in their endeavours to make the complete legacy of antiquity accessible to a large reading public, they composed commentaries on texts they had edited, as well as paraphrases, anthologies, summaries, encyclopaedias and lexicographical works that pervaded and interconnected the basic texts as a huge and finely meshed exegetical infrastructure. Thus, in a pan-European movement that before long thoroughly informed politics, religion and social life, the humanists opened up the classical world and its cultural heritage. In view of the fact that the lion's share of these editions and their concomitant forms of explanation have not been

[Article Table of Contents](#)

[Humanism](#)

[Publishing Centres, Printing Houses and Their Employees](#)

[Humanist Editors](#)

[Establishing the Authority of the Text](#)

[Favourite Authors, Canon, Education](#)

[The Position of Greek and Hebrew versus Latin](#)

[Editorial Methods: Constituting the Text *ope codicum* versus *ope ingenii*](#)

[Daily Practices](#)

[Literary Conservatism](#)

thoroughly studied or even completely charted, we can give hardly more than a rough and very provisional outline meant only to indicate perspectives for new research.¹ Furthermore, from the outset we wish to make clear that this chapter mainly regards editions of classical, biblical and patristic texts. Early modern humanists also spent much energy in editing mediaeval and contemporary texts, but this specific aspect of their activities falls outside the scope of our contribution and will be touched upon only in passing. For the same reason we will not go into the efforts of the humanists to publish their own correspondence or that of their colleagues, even though these editions, undertaken for honorary, apologetic or polemic reasons, shed much light on the eventful history of early modern scholarship.²

Humanism

As a multi-faceted intellectual movement, humanism incisively affected man's world view and its philosophical underpinning. Above all, however, it strived for an educational reform that focused on the word in the broadest sense, that is, language as it had been used in the era before the squalor, as the humanists considered it, of the *medium aevum* or *media aetas* set in.³ Of course, this idea of language included the word of God, the Bible, the more so because divine providence was believed to have preserved it in its pristine lustre. For humanists, antiquity denoted both ancient pagan culture and the sources of Christian faith. They tried to merge cultural artefacts like the texts of Homer, Cicero, Ovid, the Bible and the writings of the Fathers of the Church into one amalgam that would serve all students, scholars, government officials and ecclesiastical worthies. The importance of the well-chosen word, the correct use of language, and the command of a broad vocabulary required a thorough knowledge of ancient Latin, Greek and Hebrew, and this knowledge could only be obtained if carefully amended and edited texts were available, as well as grammars and reference books that the student needed for finding his way through the thicket of classical and post-classical sources.

Publishing Centres, Printing Houses and Their Employees

Humanist editing was closely related to the art of printing books with movable type. This art was first practised in Germany. Spreading quickly from Mainz where the famous Johannes Gutenberg (c. 1397–1468) was settled, it began to blossom in Italy from 1460 onwards, thanks to an unprecedented cooperation of scholars and learned publishers.⁴ The Venetian printer and publisher Aldus Manutius (1449–1515) is one of the best known examples, but he had to deploy

Ideological Motives

Arrangement and Layout

Towards Lachmann: The Dawn of a New Era

The Bible

Law

Auxiliary Sciences and Tools: Paleography, Codicology and Reference Works

Concluding Remarks

Further Reading

his activities in competition with a quickly growing number of fellow printers who made Rome, Florence and other Italian cities into important printing centres.⁵ It may be safely assumed that the low price of a book compared to the price of a manuscript greatly stimulated the spread of printing. Around 1500 the main European cities already hosted more than 240 printing shops.⁶ Later on, Paris confirmed its dominance, with the Estienne or Stephanus family deploying impressive activity. Lyon and Geneva soon followed, Geneva also with a branch of the Estiennes. Basel distinguished itself with the Froben and Amerbach printers. Cologne, Deventer, Madrid, London, Oxford, and Cambridge became other important centres. Louvain gained fame due to the influence of the 'Collegium trilingue', founded in 1517, but at the end of the sixteenth century the centre of gravity shifted to Antwerp. In the seventeenth century Leiden–Amsterdam came to the fore as centres of printers' activities in the Low Countries through the Elzeviers and the Blaeu printing houses respectively.⁷

Often such centres were located in places where scholars gathered around a rich private or public library, a renowned educational centre or a princely court. In general, however, printers were obviously driven by economics; for a smooth distribution of their stock, they preferred to settle in great centres of trade networks. Printing firms often employed scholars to assist them, and some of their typesetters and correctors were learned men also. In these ways humanism and printing with movable type became closely connected.

Humanist Editors

The interest in and dispersal of classical texts did not originate with the introduction of Renaissance ideals; already in the Middle Ages a rich manuscript culture was flourishing: many classical authors, such as Aristotle (in translation), Cicero and Ovid were copied and widely disseminated in (sometimes beautifully illuminated) manuscripts. But the humanists were much more productive, impelled as they were by the demands of the printing press. The Italian precursor of humanism, Andrea de' Bussi or Johannes Andreas de Buxis (1417–1475), 'hero of the *editiones principes*', produced an impressive number of editions for two printers hailing from Mainz, Conrad Sweynheym and Arnold Pannartz, who set up a famous firm, first in Subiaco, then in Rome in 1467. De' Bussi's productivity, however, surpassed his precision by far, as may be inferred from the story that he prepared the text of Silius Italicus (1471) in fifteen days.⁸ Among the most famous humanist editors, the Dutchmen Rodolphus Agricola (1443/4–1485), Christophorus Longolius (1488–1522) and Desiderius Erasmus (1466–1536) deserve mention, as well as the German scholars Simon Grynaeus (1493–1541), Beatus Rhenanus (1485–1547), Sigismund Gelenius (1497–1554) and Henricus Glareanus (1488–1563). Rhenanus, for example, published authoritative editions of Quintus Curtius (1518), Velleius Paterculus (1520) and the Church Fathers. The editorial practices of another 'giant' in this field, the French philologist Isaac Casaubon (1559–1614), have been researched with the help of his private annotations and the overwhelming amount of marginal notes that he wrote in his books.⁹

Justus Lipsius (1547–1611) earned fame for his editions of the works of Tacitus and Seneca, Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484–1558) for his reworking of Aristotle's poetics, and his son Josephus Justus Scaliger (1540–1609) for his edition of Manilius (1579, 3rd ed. 1600). By editing Manilius' abstruse and heavily corrupted *Astronomicon*, the younger Scaliger attested to exceptional learning and philological skills, which also showed up conspicuously in his chronological studies.¹⁰ Moreover, his stature inspired a circle of pupils, whose scholarly enterprises transformed seventeenth-century Leiden into a new centre of excellence: Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), Daniel Heinsius (1580–1655) and his son Nicolaas (1620–1681), Petrus Cunaeus (1586–1638), Gerardus Joannes Vossius (1577–1649), his son Isaac (1618–1689) and the Gronovius family are important in this respect. In the United Kingdom Richard Bentley (1662–1742) gained fame with groundbreaking editions of Horace (1711), Terence (1726) and Manilius (1739). Further examples are the *Lecteurs royaux* assembled in the 'Collège de France'. This college was founded in 1530 by King Francis I at the instigation of Guillaume Budé (1468–1540).¹¹ Exemplary editions saw the light, for instance that of Lucretius (1563) by Dionysius Lambinus (1520–1572), which remained the standard until the Lachmannian era.¹² In the beginning, enthusiastic 'amateurs' such as typesetters and proofreaders were entrusted with the editorial task, but after a set of canonised classical authors had been fully integrated in the curricula of schools and universities, most editions were prepared by professional philologists.

The history of editorial practices is an important field of research because it enables us to delve into the hidden recesses of early modern scholarship. When casting light on the often well-founded and ingenious, but also audacious and even reckless conjectures that lie hidden in many editions and commentaries, the unparalleled grade of expertise attained by these scholars should be taken into account. The importance of this field of research may be demonstrated by referring to manuscripts that disappeared after having been collated, transcribed or processed in printed editions.¹³ This, for instance, applies to a manuscript of letters of Cicero that was once owned by the Lyon printer Jean de Tournes. Only the variants that were recorded by Dionysius Lambinus, Adrianus Turnebus (1512–1565) and Simeon Bosius (1536–1581) have been preserved.¹⁴ Even now, many early modern editions are of interest for current research aimed at establishing a reliable text. Moreover, the history of editions is important when we study the reception and appreciation of an author or text.

Establishing the Authority of the Text

While preparing his edition, the editor had to cope with the problem of the authenticity of the text. Was it actually written by the person whose name was to be featured on the title page? And if so, did the offered text represent the best version? These two questions lead us to two essential observations. First, during the period under investigation the authenticity of the text and the identity of the author were the main issues of research.¹⁵ Many editors tried to prove the author or date of origin to be erroneous on the basis of linguistic, chronological and

historical data. Philologists such as Lorenzo Valla (c. 1405/7–1457) and Casaubon liked to ‘debunk’ texts. Their philological and historical research showed how these texts had come into being as a result of deliberate attempts to rewrite history for specific ideological motives. Famous examples are the *Donatio Constantini*, which Valla proved to be false, and the *Letter of Aristeas*, identified as an apocryphal source by Juan Luis Vives (1492/3–1540) and Humphrey Hody (1659–1707).¹⁶ Casaubon was instrumental in unveiling the apocryphal status of the sources his adversary Caesar Baronius had used to justify the dogmas, rites and organisational structure of the early Roman Catholic Church. Later in the seventeenth century, during the famous controversy of the *Quérelle des Anciens et Modernes*, Richard Bentley convincingly proved the spuriousness of the Epistles of Phalaris, edited by Charles Boyle.¹⁷ Obviously it was not only the crumbling of classical culture’s authority that made itself felt in the scholarly debates. After the advent of the Reformation—this is the second important observation that can be made—religious controversy enhanced the wish to investigate the reliability of texts, for instance those accredited to eminent Fathers of the Church.¹⁸

As a rule, editorial paratexts such as dedications and letters to the reader highlighted the importance of the new edition against the faults and omissions of existing ones, if only for commercial reasons. The readers were given to understand that the text represented the highest level of accuracy attainable in comparison with previous editions, which were ‘as full of mistakes as a leopard is full of spots.’¹⁹ The reliability of the text was used as a selling point, as was the accessibility of the layout and the detailed explanations heaped up in the commentary. Another way to whet the appetite of potential buyers was to insert illustrations, either as an integral part of the contents, for instance in emblem books or scientific treatises, or as finely elaborated frontispiece illustrations, such as those by Peter Paul Rubens for editions by the Plantin-Moretus firm in Antwerp.²⁰ It was commonplace to say that meticulous editorship had restored the edited author to his former splendour. But the prefatory material in humanist editions never accounted in full detail for the procedures that had been adopted during the process of restoration. We also learn hardly anything about the selling price of books. For assessing the impact of any particular edition, research into the spread of the print run is called for in order to establish the reach of a publisher.²¹ Another obvious approach in the study of editions concerns the manuscript notes in individual copies. The latter domain has hardly been explored, since this kind of research requires patience and palaeographic skills.²²

Favourite Authors, Canon, Education

Over the ages many authoritative editions saw the light, for instance the works of Plato, enriched with a translation and extensive commentary by Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499).²³ Some editions became so influential that they are still cited today, for instance Henri Estienne’s edition of Plato (1578), Isaac Casaubon’s edition of Strabo (1587), and Daniel Wyttenbach’s

edition of Plutarch (1795–1810).²⁴ Of course, the shelves of the book trader carried the weight of other kinds of editions as well, for example, ‘pocket books’ in smaller formats and school editions of authors like Terence, Cicero and Virgil. The format that was chosen for a particular text depended on the target audience and the prospective use, but undoubtedly in offering these texts the intellectual movement of humanism demanded completeness in the first place. The editions had to contribute to a full knowledge of ancient culture. This implied that all works had to be published, including those treating more specialised or abstruse disciplines like zoology, botany, mineralogy, medicine, mathematics, astrology, shipping, clothing and household, warfare, numismatics, etc. In all these domains the legacy of antiquity pointed the way to valuable standards for relevant research. Obviously, the vast multitude of sources made the publication of anthologies and reference works attractive.

At the dawn of the Renaissance, the Latin schooling programme of the Middle Ages did not immediately undergo conspicuous changes. The traditional objectives were maintained and gradually intensified.²⁵ Nowadays, scholars rightly stress continuity in terms of the choice of authors such as Aristotle, Ovid and Virgil. The actual canon, viz., the manageable corpus of main authors, was in great part the result of choices made in teaching. Besides ancient works, many mediaeval texts were edited, not only Latin ones but also texts in vernacular languages. More often than not, editorial practice tried to conceal parochial and chauvinistic motives, fuelled by the wish to provide one’s own town, region, nation or state with an illustrious ancestry and thus with a higher status. The Leiden scholar Janus Dousa is well known for his edition of Melis Stoke’s *Rijmkroniek*.²⁶ His fellow citizen Petrus Scriverius (1576–1660) acquired great fame as an antiquarian who studied and published many sources on the history of the Netherlands.²⁷ In general, antiquarianism—collecting knowledge on the artefacts and practical aspects of daily life in antiquity—was an important stimulus to edit obscure authors. The knowledge harvested from such recondite sources was deemed indispensable for an adequate understanding of the texts.

Contemporary Neo-Latin authors were also important, as is proven by the efforts of Janus Dousa (1545–1604) to translate, in collaboration with Jan van Hout, the *Basia* (Kisses) of Janus Secundus (1511–1536).²⁸ Later in the seventeenth century, several authoritative editions of the original Latin version of Secundus’ poetic and prose works appeared under the auspices of Petrus Scriverius.²⁹ Under the anagram Ranutius Gherus, the Heidelberg professor and librarian Janus Gruterus (1560–1627) published a series of *Delitiae*, collections of Neo-Latin poetry by Italian, French, German and Dutch authors (Frankfurt, 1608–1614).

The way in which the canonical authors from antiquity were studied at schools, universities or in the professional scholar’s secluded study, is illustrative of how the classics were dealt with. As a rule, the classical text was valued for its practical information, moral instruction, relevance to the political situation, or just for its polished style and elegant wording. The

student sought to follow, imitate or even emulate the author of his choice by using him as a reliable guide, not in a slavish way, but inventively. The specific style, wording and contents of the selected example offered a model to be followed that could elevate one's own knowledge of facts, linguistic versatility, moral outlook and 'esprit'.³² Of all prose authors, Cicero was the most imitated as far as vocabulary, syntax and style are concerned. He was extolled to such a degree that his absolute monopoly became questioned: a linguistic battle arose in which Erasmus' *Ciceronianus* (1528), a convincing plea for an independent, personal style, soon proved to be the main reference point.³¹ Imitation, deliberate adaptation in prose or verse, and eventually inventive emulation thus contributed to the formation of the canon. The main example for conversational Latin was Terence, whose comedies were dispersed in countless scholarly and school editions. Of course, the history of the canon is also marked by momentary vogues, short-lived polemics and gradual rearrangements. Around 1600, the younger Seneca's style gained popularity under the growing influence of Neo-Stoicism, propagated by scholars like Justus Lipsius. Another example is the interest in Tacitus, whose works served scholarship as a gold mine from which all kinds of data could be extracted for bolstering the controversial state theories proclaimed by Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527).³²

The Fathers of the Church enjoyed a special status similar to the privileged position of the Bible. The Roman Catholic Church placed them on a pedestal as an essential element in the authoritative tradition. On the other hand, the leaders of the Reformation stressed the central position of the Bible, but refrained from discarding the patristic legacy, convinced as they were that it should serve as a means for corroborating their particular view of dogmas, rituals and ecclesiastical organisation.³³ A key figure in the history of the edition of the Church Fathers is Erasmus.³⁴ He also inspired Juan Luis Vives to edit and comment upon Augustine's *De civitate Dei* in an edition that would remain the standard throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.³⁵

The Position of Greek and Hebrew versus Latin

The knowledge of Greek, and *a fortiori* of Hebrew and other Near Eastern languages remained the domain of a small group of experts. For divulging the contents of texts in these languages, translations were important. As translators of Greek texts, Leonardo Bruni (1369–1444), Francesco Filelfo (1398–1481), Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499) and Angelo Poliziano (1454–1494) began to work in a tradition that started from Florence and quickly spread throughout Europe.³⁶ In Germany, for example, Willibald Pirckheimer (Nuremberg) was important in spreading the Greek legacy by translating many (post-)classical Greek authors.³⁷ In the wake of the great German scholar Johannes Reuchlin (1455–1522), who did pioneering work both for Greek and Hebrew, Hebraists such as Sebastian Münster (1488–1552), Paulus Fagius (1504–1549), François Vatable (c. 1495–1547), Immanuel Tremellius (c. 1510–1580), Franciscus Junius (1545–1602) and Johannes Buxtorf I (1564–1629) and II (1599–1664) deserve mention. Later in

the early modern period this development found a parallel for other exotic languages as well, for example Arabic, Aramaic and Syriac. In the seventeenth century the Hebraists Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669) and Constantijn L'Empereur (1591–1648) published important editions of rabbinical writings with Latin translations in order to make the Mishnah and the Talmud accessible to a wider range of Christian exegetes.³⁸

The study of Greek, greatly stimulated by the fall of Constantinople in 1453, grew even more speedily around 1520, when the number of Greek manuscripts that circulated among scholars increased rapidly.³⁹ The Venetian printer Aldus Manutius played an essential role in the edition and publication of Greek texts, if only because of his elegant Greek fonts. From 1494 onwards, he introduced many *editiones principes* to the market. Manutius also published the first Aristotle in Greek (1495–1498), but sales were rather scarce: fifty years later copies of the same edition were still offered for sale.⁴⁰ In France, the first book in Greek was printed in 1507.⁴¹ Before long, however, the interest in Greek texts grew considerably, mainly due to the ground-breaking editorial projects of Guillaume Budé who edited Basil the Great, Demosthenes, Plutarch and Xenophon,⁴² and the French printers' family Estienne, led by its 'founding father' Henri Estienne or Henricus Stephanus (1528/31–1598).⁴³

Whereas *circa* 1550 all Latin texts had been made accessible in printed editions,⁴⁴ many Greek works were still waiting to be published. This delay might be ascribed to the limited availability of Greek fonts, but the main reason must have been that the demand for Greek texts remained rather small, and the manuscripts fewer than those of Latin texts.⁴⁵ It was only in the nineteenth century that 'parity of esteem and time spent in study' was obtained.⁴⁶ This explains why the edition of Pindar's poems of 1515 by Zacharias Callierges (*c.* 1473–*c.* 1524) remained the standard text for three centuries.⁴⁷

Editorial Methods: Constituting the Text *ope codicum* versus *ope ingenii*

Until the end of the Middle Ages and even afterwards, time freely exerted its devastating influence on the artefacts of antique culture. The *codices vetustissimi*, hailing from or even before the Carolingian Revival (*c.* 800 CE), were only a small minority, and although later centuries produced an ever growing stream, most manuscripts that circulated were recent and corrupt.⁴⁸ During the long period of transmission of the classical texts, many textual changes and errors had crept in. It was mainly on late mediaeval manuscripts that humanists based the transcripts that served as printer's copy.

Printing with movable type changed editorial practice. Each manuscript is unique and before the advent of printing it was this singularity that precluded efficient collaboration among scholars who were geographically separated. To be sure, the end of the Middle Ages witnessed a more or less systematic production of manuscripts,⁴⁹ but the manufacturing process provided for uniformity to a limited extent only. In contrast, the printing press enabled

scholars to ground their research and ensuing debates on identical (or, because of corrections on the press, nearly identical) copies. Moreover, an ever more refined system of paratexts facilitated navigation through the text, as well as a purposeful exchange of learning regarding specific details of its contents. Uniformity worked synchronically, to wit, between scholars working on a text at the same time, and diachronically, because a widely dispersed readership was now able to investigate the improvements a new edition offered. Thus supported by his predecessor, the editor could pass his findings on to posterity in his own edition. The introduction of page numbers, chapter titles, and indexes in particular helped scholars to peruse the text without toilsome search and, even more important, to simplify and streamline the reciprocal exchange of thought.⁵⁰ Thus, the standardised production of textual material provided a 'boost' for establishing and emending texts. For the first time, a systematic accumulation of manuscript data in consecutive editions was made possible.

In his study on the transmission of the classical text, Kenney draws attention to the vicious circle that the humanists of the pre-critical period were unable to break. The humanists never succeeded in developing a fixed protocol or standard procedure for the edition of texts. The simple reason was that they could only reach a very limited overview of the manuscript material. They did not develop—and felt no need to develop—an adequate technique of establishing an 'ideal' text. In other words, due to the humanists' limited radius, the goal to reach a *constitutio* of the text was unfeasible for them and for that reason they were not enticed to strive after it. Kenney dubs this vicious circle 'the false problem', an expression that also serves as the title of the first chapter in his wonderful study. In our opinion, the problem might be broached and explained from another angle as well by highlighting textual conservatism: the mere existence of an *editio princeps*, albeit sloppy, hampered the constitution of a new, more reliable text. While in the early days of the Renaissance editors were keen on producing editions just for the sake of making texts available in order to meet the public demand, later on the need for more reliable editions made itself felt. However, more often than not, the readings of the *editio princeps* had gained authority, even when they turned out to be spurious. In this way intellectual inertia thwarted any fundamental textual revision of a revered author.⁵¹ Nonetheless, the early modern period witnessed a gradual awareness of the need for editorial methods that made verification by the reading public possible. A token of this 'scientification' of editorial practice was the increasing insight into the substantial difference between variant readings that had been transmitted in the sources and those that came into being on the basis of the scholar's own divinations. A straightforward accountability of textual adaptation, however, became the norm only very hesitatingly and gradually.

Editors had two ways of establishing a more reliable text. The first one was the *emendatio ope ingenii*. Humanists cherished the idea that by studying an author and his texts intensively, a scholar could acquire insight into his style, wording and ideas to the extent that it became

possible to perfectly fill in lacunas and solve cruces in the transmitted manuscripts by way of conjectures. In general, this philological optimism opened the door to an unbridled licence in adapting the text. Another striking effect of the editorial practice of *ope ingenii* was a carelessness that is stunning in modern eyes: emendations on the basis of conjectures were not always duly accounted for. Yet, emendations *ope ingenii* were deemed highly valuable and even necessary because they eliminated irritating 'knobs' in the text. Beyond doubt, it was the editor's greatest pleasure to see the fruit of his creative skills attested by a reading found in a newly studied codex. A notable example is Joseph Scaliger's emendation *parabouleusamenos* in Paul's letter to the Philippians 2, 30.⁵²

The second approach was the *emendatio ope codicum*. Editorial activity on the basis of manuscripts was also primitive according to modern standards. In this respect, too, a systematic account in preliminary matter and marginal notes was rather the exception. Often only one manuscript was used for emending a previous edition. Because this edition served as the basis during the collation of the manuscript, many errors were thus reiterated. Systematic collation of manuscripts was unusual; collating and emending were often combined.⁵³ This editorial way of working can be described as 'eclectic'. Nevertheless, rudimentary beginnings of a systematic *recensio* and *collatio* appeared. In this respect the scholars that deserve mention are Lorenzo Valla and Angelo Poliziano (1454–1494).⁵⁴ Another, much later example is Nicolaas Heinsius. As a diplomat and part-time philologist, he travelled through Europe and became acquainted with widely dispersed manuscripts of beloved authors such as Ovid. For a long period his editions were authoritative because he exploited his vast material, acquired through systematic collation, with an extraordinary 'divinatory skill'. Heinsius concentrated on one segment of classical literature, viz. Latin poetic texts, and thus succeeded in becoming a true specialist. Based as it was on common sense, his method lacked any deep theoretical justification. Still, the *codicum auctoritas* and his *ingenium* were perfectly and fruitfully balanced. When the manuscripts were unanimous on a certain passage, any intervention was forbidden: in such cases, conjectures were merely *ingeniosae nugae*.⁵⁵ Before Heinsius' time, selective collation had been the common procedure; the famous rule 'that the appeal to the manuscripts must be continuous' was neglected.⁵⁶

Daily Practices

In order to weigh the changes that took place, several aspects of scholarly life in the early modern period must be noted. In the first place, the *peregrinatio academica*, or 'grand tour', enabled scholars to communicate with their peers abroad and to gather manuscripts and transcripts by visiting bookshops, monasteries and libraries. Italy was the country that northern European bibliophiles chose to visit the most, in the early modern period as well, even though Spain also became an important hunting ground for manuscripts.⁵⁷ Manuscripts were also bought on other occasions when scholars from different countries met, such as

during the Council of Constance (1414–1418). The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw the further spread of a scholarly habit emanating from Italy: association within learned societies that streamlined scholarly exchange. Of tremendous importance were the vast, finely meshed networks of correspondence that scholars organised all over Europe and even other continents.

In the early modern period manuscripts were hard to locate and, if located, hard to exploit. More often than not, these treasures were in private hands. A case in point is the famous *Aratea*. This richly illuminated ninth-century codex resides now in the Leiden University Library, but in the seventeenth century it was constantly roaming through the Republic of Letters, with Hugo Grotius and Isaac Vossius as proud owners.⁵⁸ Around 1600, consultation of relevant material in private, semi-public and even public libraries was problem-ridden and troublesome. Gradually, Europe saw the growth of institutions that were publicly accessible. In France, Cardinal Jules Mazarin proclaimed free access to his library, while for other collections, such as the Royal Library and the *Bibliotheca Thuana*, special permission was needed.⁵⁹ In England, the university libraries of Oxford and Cambridge attracted many researchers. The famous Laurentiana Library in Florence with its enormous collection was accessible, though only on special recommendation. Many philologists complained about closed libraries, unobtainable manuscripts, uncooperative staff, and severely reduced opening hours. Manuscripts repeatedly changed owners: every self-respecting philologist gathered pieces for his own collection, which was doomed to be dispersed again after his death. The story of the manuscript collection of Isaac Vossius is an illustrative exception. This collection was purchased in its entirety by Leiden University before English collectors could lay hands on it. The collection greatly contributed to the fame of Leiden as a centre of philological expertise. Vossius' biography also leads us to conclude that the incorporation of a manuscript into a famous library such as that of his patroness Queen Christina of Sweden did not guarantee accessibility and preservation.⁶⁰ Even incorporation in an institutional library did not ensure 'permanent security', the more so because the special status of rare, costly produced books and manuscripts aroused the scholar's greed and appealed to a loose sense of propriety. Scholars like Pierre Pithou (1539–1596) used to 'borrow' manuscripts from monastery libraries.⁶¹

After 1650, when western libraries attached to royal courts, universities, chapter churches, monasteries and rich patrons had been explored extensively, the Levant remained as a treasure trove of ancient and, in particular, orientalist culture. Orientalist studies were seen as an important key to solving the problems posed by the history of the early Christian church. Growing acquaintance with the Mediterranean as the cradle of the monotheistic religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, greatly intensified the interest in manuscripts in oriental languages. Meanwhile, hopes remained high that in the Near East Ottoman rule had left many relics of the Graeco-Roman culture unimpaired. Johannes Hartung's *Bibliotheca sive*

antiquitates urbis Constantinopolitanae (Strasburg, 1578) is remarkable. This translation of a Greek manuscript, preserved in Vienna, contains a catalogue of nine libraries in the Turkish capital. It was a deceitful inventory that nonetheless may have contributed to the myth of the oriental depository.⁶² Often supported by mighty patrons, scholars travelled in the Levant, gathering rich collections of Greek and oriental manuscripts.⁶³ Many of the codices in Turkish, Persian and Arabic purchased by Jacobus Golius (1596–1667) and his pupil Levinus Warner (1619–1665) are now in the University Library of Leiden. And if the quest for important works, for instance the complete plays by Menander or the full Greek text of the *Conica* by Apollonius of Perga, was without any result, the traveller could overcome his disappointment by gathering inscriptions, coins and other artefacts, which were easy to discover. Wherever you dug into the ground, as one traveller observed, you hit upon remnants of classical culture.⁶⁴

Philologists collected manuscripts but, as noted before, gave scarcely any account of their use of these sources in their letters of dedication, in the prefaces' *ad lectorem* or in other preliminary texts. On the other hand, they did account for the results of philological research in specific forms such as *Praelectiones*, *Variae lectiones*, *Adversaria* and *Castigationes*.⁶⁵ As a rule, editors were working under high pressure, often pursued by printing house directors who wished to keep their presses going.⁶⁶ Even when relevant manuscripts were at hand, the editors refrained from consulting them. A notorious example (among many others) is Justus Lipsius. For his edition of Tacitus he did not take the trouble to collate the Ms. Mediceus 68.1 all over again, but decided to rely on the results of Philippus Beroaldus and Aemylius Ferretus, explaining his nonchalance in a laconic way in his letter to the reader: '... I did not have the opportunity to examine the manuscript nor, to be honest, the desire to do so after others had inspected it'. This haphazard approach resulted in an editorial imbalance that would be deemed unacceptable if current standards were to be applied.⁶⁷ Through painstaking research it has become clear that Lipsius availed himself of two basic sources for his texts and annotations. As a consequence, the transmitted text, as well as the variants and conjectures, became all one great confusion.⁶⁸ As remarked previously, such selective collation was the rule. If any systematic collation was deemed urgent enough, the task was often assigned to others. In those cases, the editor processed the results of collations that had been given to him by cooperative colleagues. It was also common practice that supervision of the transition from the editor's copy to the printed version was entrusted to a colleague or a typesetter on the assumption that this task was too dull, time-consuming or burdensome to be fulfilled by the scholar himself. The same applied to the making of indexes. In this respect, Josephus Justus Scaliger distinguished himself from his fellow humanists by stressing the importance of a reliable index as an easy access to a complicated source text. He did not consider himself above the laborious task of adding about 200 folio pages with 24 indexes to Janus Gruterus' *Inscriptiones antiquae totius orbis Romani* (1602–1603).⁶⁹ Once a manuscript had been printed,

it decreased in value on the grounds that it had become superfluous because all information was now universally available. Manuscripts disappeared repeatedly because they were not returned to the legal owner.

Literary Conservatism

The humanist editors cherished their own methods, which enabled them to provide for many editions, especially *editiones principes*. These were based on copies that had been transcribed from old manuscripts. The editors were, however, only slightly aware of the intricacies resulting from the long-lasting transmission process to which texts had been subjected. Whether a manuscript served as a layer for an edition depended on contingency, because the editors contented themselves with the manuscript or manuscripts at hand. During the process of transcribing the printers' copy, emendations were made without explicitly accounting for these interventions. No distinction was made between actual variants found in the manuscript(s) and conjectures.⁷⁰ When the editor encountered a crux, he consulted a second manuscript (if extant), but only for this incomprehensible place (selective collation). The version offered to the public in the *editio princeps* therefore depended on sheer coincidence. More often than not, however, this defective status did not prevent the text from determining tradition, sometimes even for centuries. Respect for the *lectio recepta* or *vulgata* was tenacious, as can be exemplified by the history of the edition of Ovid. For ages, Puteolanus' faulty edition (Bologna, 1471) remained the standard text, and in later ages great efforts were required to establish and disperse a 'clean', more reliable text.⁷¹ Although printing enabled emending texts through interactive cooperation, paradoxically not many classical authors profited from this opportunity: for them, one edition followed upon another, duplicating the standard text in a straight line.⁷²

With the fixation of the text into a stable printed format, a most important condition for a reliable synchronic and diachronic exchange of learning was met. However, laziness, commercial gain and traditionalism were persistent barriers preventing the editor from revising the standard version of the text. Readers studied the text for its contents, often in an educational setting such as school and university. They familiarised themselves with the text in good faith, and showed no interest in its eventful history of creation and transmission, while printers aimed at efficiency and teachers stuck to the version of the text they knew, often for didactic reasons. Thus, the printing press brought great progress in terms of scholarly communication and accumulation of textual improvements. On the other hand, human inertia proved to be a significant barrier for radically abandoning a version once it had become the standard and redoing the work 'from scratch'. Even when the material that called for such a radical approach was available, this task was not carried out due to the lack of support from 'public, printers and patrons'.⁷³ For many texts, emendations were attested only in the margins or in footnotes.⁷⁴ In preserving the *textus receptus*, both theologians and jurists

offer the most striking example of theologically and legally inspired conservatism. Here we see that the standard version of the Elzevier edition of the New Testament (1624) and of the *Corpus iuris civilis* remained the basis, not so much because of laziness or methodological convention, but because that particular version was understood to represent divine truth or to buttress the existing legal system. In both disciplines the commentary developed into a platform whose secondary, ancillary function made it apt for resolving textual anomalies.⁷⁵

In spite of the intellectual escape route offered by the commentary, textual traditionalism is harder to understand when it comes to the transmission of purely literary works. Editors avoided making a new start when they discovered an old and important manuscript and preserved the *lectio recepta*, even when they ranked textual evidence in manuscripts above conjectures. For instance, for his edition of Horace, Dionysius Lambinus used the exceptionally large number of five manuscripts. Nonetheless, he was loath to abandon the standard text.⁷⁶ In all probability heuristic impediments prevailed, in addition to the deeply rooted practices already mentioned. Until far into the early modern period, the number of manuscripts that offered themselves for perusal remained limited. Library catalogues were rarely printed. Bibliographic resources began to be available on a still modest scale only in the seventeenth century. The disadvantage of poor research instruments was increased by the often irretrievable circulation of manuscripts, continuous mutations in ownership and sudden disappearances from libraries. Thus, scholars had to cope with constantly changing research conditions, in particular during the period from 1500 to 1800. Prior to that period, manuscripts were simply ignored, stored away as they were in monastic and private libraries. After the turmoil caused by the French Revolution, growing numbers of manuscripts found a definite resting place in public collections. But during the intermediate period, many irreplaceable treasures disappeared without a trace once they had served as the basis for an edition.⁷⁷

An important reason for the privileged, inviolable status of the standard version lies in the high esteem that the printed text was automatically accorded, on the grounds that it was always supposed to be based on a reliable manuscript. Moreover, the artistic value of the *bonae litterae* added to their prestige. In this respect it is important to note that the *apparatus criticus* was still unknown in early modern times.⁷⁸

Ideological Motives

Texts were studied—and edited—for their applicability to contemporary situations. Cicero was a dominant beacon for his prose style, Tacitus was read for his aphoristic and cynical answers to all kinds of governmental problems, and Ovid never turned a deaf ear to readers who sought solutions to their moral dilemmas. Seen in this light, it is small wonder that, in embarking on their editorial enterprises, early modern editors were often led by strong ideological motives. The pagan philosopher Plato, for instance, was cherished as a proto-

Christian who had implicitly expressed Christian beliefs and ethics. To be sure, this mechanism of ideological appropriation could also work the other way around: research into the original text of Aristotle's works was impeded by the upsetting insight that they contained tenets that were diametrically opposed to Christianity, viz. the assertion of concepts such as an eternal world and a mortal soul. Generally, the processing of pagan ideas was a problem that many editors struggled with. Viable solutions included an adequate and selective choice of texts, an even more austere selection for school editions, precautionary remarks in the paratexts, encapsulation of subversive ideas through (in)sincere rebuttal in the commentary, or silent adaptation of the text. These cunning devices all belonged to the standard procedures of the versatile humanist editor. Understandably enough, the early modern philologist who ventured to apply the rules of textual criticism to the Bible was faced with even less room for manoeuvring.⁷⁹

There are also many examples of editions that were made with specific political motives. We already referred to Machiavelli's interest in Tacitus' historical works, which were supportive of his own ideas on reason of state, and to Justus Lipsius' focus on Seneca for expounding his Neo-Stoic ideas. In this context Pierre Gassendi's work on Epicurus is interesting too: although he went to great lengths to establish the most reliable text of Book X of Diogenes Laertius' *Life and opinions of eminent philosophers*, he was first and foremost driven by the desire to propagate Epicurean atomism as a metaphysical system without doing harm to Christian faith.⁸⁰

Arrangement and Layout

Gradually, a refinement of the typographical arrangement and layout of the editions came about. It goes without saying that editors and publishers strived for an accessible, even sophisticated presentation of the textual material. For the readers' convenience, advanced and laborious printing techniques were applied in order to procure a clear separation between text and commentary. Initially, the commentary encircled the text (as the marginalia in a mediaeval manuscript had done), but because of its special status it became more and more clearly marked during the period under consideration: set in another font, it found a place at the bottom of the page; sometimes it was relegated to a section at the end of the book or even presented as an independent bibliographic unity with a new title page and second pagination. For this reason editors were also keen on establishing a clear relationship between text and commentary. Therefore, texts were divided into chapters, sections and paragraphs, pages were subdivided into columns (a and b) and sections or paragraphs (A-F), lines were numbered, and roman and cursive fonts were ingenuously employed. Already during the sixteenth century the application of italics in order to indicate a literal quotation turned into common practice. In the thirteenth century, the books of the Bible had been divided into chapters, but the current division into verses was introduced as late as 1555. These standardising procedures

greatly facilitated the discussion among scholars who were spatially separated. The growing interest in oriental languages, discussed before, required new, exotic fonts. In the seventeenth century Leiden–Oxford became important centres in this respect.⁸¹

As said before, the critical apparatus was an innovation that began to be used on a wide scale only after the early modern period. Before the introduction of printing, variants or emendations were noted down in the manuscript. But a systematic collation of more than two manuscripts demanded registration in an accessible format. The development into the *apparatus criticus* started with scattered remarks in the margin, later including *sigla* to indicate the manuscripts that had been used. Theodorus Pulmannus (1511–1581) was one of the first scholars who used capitals to indicate his textual sources, in order to decongest his notes.⁸²

The phenomenon of the index deserves special attention. More often than not these indexes were made by a printer's collaborator who simply gathered the marginal entries, arranged these alphabetically and added page numbers. Later, the marginal notes were often ignored. The editor (or his amanuensis) carefully drew up a list of names and/or subjects. Sometimes he added not only the page numbers, but also the column (I or II, or a or b), and the paragraph (A-F). Characteristically, many editions of Niccolò Perotti's *Cornucopia*, in the first instance a commentary on a small part of Martial's epigrams but in fact a bulky instruction book for the correct use of Latin, have the sophisticated index at the beginning. A reliable index enhanced the accessibility and usefulness of the edition. Understandably enough, title pages often mention the sophisticated index as an argument for purchasing the book.⁸³

Towards Lachmann: The Dawn of a New Era

For the centuries to come Karl Lachmann's name will be attached to a revolutionary change in the scientific method of editing classical texts. While we are living in the age 'after Lachmann', we are inclined to neglect the achievements of the scholars before him or even to discard them as irrelevant. In order to assess the progress the humanists made, we might start from three general axioms as listed by Kenney.⁸⁴ The first axiom restates 'the false problem' mentioned before by postulating that an editor's work is destined to remain inside the boundaries created by the material at his disposal. Contrary to Von Münchhausen, he will never be able to pull himself out of the swamp of textual corruption to reach beyond the possibilities inherent to his material. In the early modern period, editors were hampered by limited room for manoeuvre, a limited overview of preserved manuscripts, and limited means of communication.⁸⁵ A second axiom is that one can distinguish between those philologists who attach great weight to method and those who prefer a practical approach, deciding each individual case according to its peculiar features. Bentley is the prototype of an editor who treated each case differently and intuitively on the grounds that it differed from all others. A

third axiom is that '[t]here is no manuscript so old as common sense', which means that in the end it should always be sound judgement that has to sift and scrutinise the transmitted material.⁸⁶

Even since the earliest period of the Renaissance, however, protests against dealing with texts too freely and carelessly were heard. If a preface boasted that the text was heavily revised to such an extent that a completely new author made his appearance, this statement was meant as a recommendation. Nonetheless, an unbridled passion for conjectures was rejected as overbold frivolousness. 'Our conjectures mislead us', Joseph Scaliger remarked, 'and we are ashamed of them when we come across better manuscripts'.⁸⁷ Normally, outspoken reservations were voiced against the *emendatio ope ingenii* as a method that ranked below the *emendatio ope codicum*.⁸⁸ The main editorial objective should be directed at the restoration of what the author had written on the basis of diligent research of the extant manuscripts. That is why every now and then editors had recourse to the deceitful strategy of exalting their conjectures by referring to imaginary manuscripts.⁸⁹ However, the lust for emendation proved to be unquenchable, even though it was severely criticised, for instance by the renowned philologist Justus Lipsius in his *Satyra Menippea* (1581). The liberty that editors permitted themselves received an extra stimulus from 1650 onwards, when manuscripts containing hitherto unknown works failed to emerge after the discovery of Theophrastus' *Characteres* 29 and 30 in MS Vat. Gr. 110 had evoked considerable enthusiasm.⁹⁰ Scholars acknowledged the problem that, due to the insufficient evidence provided by the manuscripts, complete restoration of the text to its original lustre was a far-off ideal. For that reason, a revival of conjectural practice came about, enhanced as it was by the optimism of the Enlightenment. It was Richard Bentley who provocatively stated: 'nobis et ratio et res ipsa centum codicibus potiores sunt' ('to us, reason and common sense are better than a hundred codices'). This much-quoted phrase in a note on Horace, *Odes* III, 27, 15⁹¹ loses some of its pithiness, however, if the subsequent qualification is taken into consideration: 'praesertim accedente Vaticani veteris suffragio' ('especially with the added testimony of the old Vatican codex').⁹²

The process of editing found a culmination in the method named after Karl Lachmann (1793–1851).⁹³ Lachmann stressed the importance of following a method, a set of fixed rules that would lead to the reconstruction of the archetype, the text as envisaged by the author. This method is often labelled *via ac ratio* (the way and the reason). Before long, Lachmann became an icon of modern textual criticism, but in fact he was so much indebted to his direct predecessors that it is questionable whether the method named after him deserves to be called 'Lachmannian'. His main achievement was probably the systematisation of the practice of his predecessors, thus bolstering it with a sound theoretical basis. Be that as it may, with Lachmann the so-called 'pre-critical period' was considered to have come to an end. Kenney mentions three causes why this breakthrough, which might be denoted as a 'scientification' of editorial practice, took place so late, despite the fact that long before its principles had been

articulated rudimentarily.⁹⁴ First and most important, the source material was now sufficiently explored, charted and laid open to research on a full-scale basis. Secondly, historical palaeography had developed to the extent that manuscripts could be dated and interpreted. In the third place, insights acquired in the study of the New Testament spilled over to research on classical texts. More than other disciplines, New Testament philology had to master such a great variety of manuscripts that an approach à la Lachmann was called for.

The optimistic assumption that a text could be restored to its original splendour to such an extent that it could exactly reveal 'the author's intention' was the dominant motive for the humanists of the early modern period to flood the world with their editions. This zealous interest in antiquity reached its zenith in nineteenth-century scientific positivism. Only in the twentieth century was this ideal reluctantly abandoned due to a growing awareness that the *lacunae* in the transmitted material do not allow for such unbridled optimism. Now the dictum is that research can only explore the way in which the context was instrumental in determining the content of a specific version of the text. This 'New' or 'Material Philology' was coined by Bernard Cerquiglini, who challenged Lachmann's method and assigned a new significance to variant readings by stressing the unique value of variants as the outcome of a specific historical context.⁹⁵ In the same vein, genetic editing is aimed at the reconstruction and analysis of the different phases that a text has gone through.⁹⁶

The Bible

In textual scholarship, the Bible had a special position. From the times of the early Christian Church the books that constituted the canon of the Bible were accorded a supernatural, sacrosanct status. The transmission of the biblical text was both extremely complicated and flawed, due to the preservation of a myriad of (mostly fragmentary) manuscripts. The continuous exploration of libraries yielded many ancient translations, whose importance derived from the fact that more often than not they were grounded on old Greek or Hebrew manuscripts that proved to be irretrievably lost later on. A gradually more and more careful collation of extant sources resulted in numerous variant readings, which were set off against early Christian explanations and quotations in the works of the Church Fathers. In this ocean of often contradictory and in any case confusing materials, believers who were bent on salvation preferred to stick to a standard version of the text as a rock-solid basis for their creed. Only gradually, readers of the Bible dared to distinguish between the divine truth that, according to the Christian believer, was conveyed by the text, and the extra-biblical, objective truth of the authorial intention behind the different Bible books brought to light by painstaking philological and historical research.

From Jerome onwards, scholars and ecclesiastical authorities were acquainted with the overwhelming variety of biblical sources. In the high Middle Ages, exegetes undertook systematic research into the versions in which the text of the Old and New Testaments had been handed down.⁹⁷ However, it was not until Lorenzo Valla (1405/7–1457) and Desiderius Erasmus (1466?–1536) that modern biblical criticism came into being. The Reformation and its cogent plea for independent, autonomous research on the basis of the original text (*ad fontes*) firmly stimulated (cautious) textual innovation, exegesis and hermeneutics. The first editions of the Old Testament in Hebrew were published in Venice at the print shop of Daniel Bomberg in 1517 and 1524–1525. In 1618–1619, Johann Buxtorf the Elder published a ‘new and improved’ Hebrew Bible, the text of which remained the standard for all Christians until 1937.⁹⁸ The *textus receptus* of the New Testament goes back to Erasmus. In 1516 he published a thoroughly revised Greek version as a means for the learned world to check his new Latin translation.⁹⁹ Polyglot editions were fundamental for a more critical approach to the text. The most famous polyglot was the *Complutense* published by the University of Alcalá in 1520. Sophisticated printing techniques, vast financial investments, distribution channels that covered a wide European market, as well as substantial government grants helped to realise such huge editorial enterprises. For a long time, the Greek *textus receptus*, whose status was enhanced by the famous Elzevier editions of 1624 and 1633, remained intact as a sacred, God-given text.¹⁰⁰

The editor who ventured to propose textual emendations of the Bible met strong opposition. One may think of the notorious ‘comma Johanneum’ in 1 John 5:7, a textual knot in which Erasmus got entangled when he published the first edition of the Greek text of the New Testament. In this edition a passage that traditional exegesis used to claim as an irrefutable and most evident proof of the Trinity had been left out on the ground that the passage lacked any manuscript evidence: ‘For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one’. The deletion of these words as apocryphal, even though they existed in full glory in the Vulgate, aroused great uproar, as if the editor were bent on undermining the doctrine of the triune Godhead.¹⁰¹ The example shows how dangerous it was to tinker with the biblical text. Understandably enough, it was only in the specific domain of the biblical commentary that denominational interpretations of the mutually competing confessions materialised and exegetes ventured to discuss textual variants.

Eventually, a combination of factors caused Christian believers to abandon the traditional vulgate of the Old and New Testament. Driven by apologetic tendencies, Catholic theologians drew attention to the rather unstable, unclear status of the scriptural text that is open to several interpretations. In this way they tried to highlight the value of tradition. In their turn, Protestant exegetes questioned this line of reasoning by demonstrating that, instead of a key to a correct interpretation of the Bible, tradition provided an unreliable standard. In the seventeenth century, for example, it was good Protestant custom to shed light on the heterogeneous and thoroughly corrupted exegetical works transmitted in the Greek and Latin

patristic corpus. The result of this reciprocal refutation soon became clear. Although divine providence was supposed to guarantee biblical truth and perspicuity, the status of the pristine text as well as the feasibility of a commonly satisfying interpretation were challenged from both sides. Meanwhile, exegetes became more and more inspired by the tremendous progress in the fields of history, orientalism, comparative studies of religion and linguistics. In this way they obtained an ever increasing insight into the transmission of the text and in the contemporary situation that had caused variant versions to emerge. At the beginning of the seventeenth century a critical and more objective approach to the Bible and the Church Fathers began to find favour in spite of the still dominant exigencies of systematic theology adopted by the Christian confessions.¹⁰²

The chronological studies by Joseph Scaliger greatly helped philologists and historians who attempted to gain a firmer grip on biblical, patristic and pagan sources.¹⁰³ During the entire early modern period and thereafter, biblical philology was a field in which decisive changes and renewals took place, fuelled by material that was extracted from newly found manuscripts and ancient translations and paraphrases that went back to unique versions of the text. The Codex Alexandrinus is a case in point. Patriarch Cyril Lucaris donated the Codex to King James I of England in 1624. The manuscript arrived in England in 1627. Its exceptional importance was immediately recognised by scholars such as Patrick Young, Hugo Grotius, Claudius Salmasius, and Daniel Heinsius.

Precisely because of the complicated transmission history (with countless manuscripts, translations based on now untraceable manuscripts, and commentaries with excerpts taken from other manuscripts that had disappeared long before), New Testament research became an area that was rich in reflection on the methods being used. The very abundance of variants forced editors to consider the best way to handle this material 'scientifically'. Despite, or should we say because of, the pressure exerted by the adherents of systematic theology as the 'science' that informed the various confessions, experts in the discipline of biblical philology developed methods that soon held sway outside this area, in the editorial techniques applied to classical and vernacular texts. It is not for nothing that Lachmann was a New Testament scholar.¹⁰⁴

Law

Legal texts, primarily the *Corpus iuris civilis*, deserve mention when editorial practices in the early modern era are to be discussed.¹⁰⁵ The edition of the *Digesta*, part of the *Corpus*, has a complicated history in which we see the same mechanism at work as in the history of the interpretation of the Bible. In mediaeval times, the text of the *Corpus* was heavily commented upon by glossators and post-glossators (or commentators), because it played a primary role in the European legal system. Remarkably enough, however, an unmistakable ambiguity marked

the text tradition: the exceptional importance of the Florentine manuscript called the *Pisanus*, according to a former location, was recognised as a source that stood near the autograph, but in spite of this the *littera vulgata* remained in vogue among jurists. This paradox is easy to understand if one takes into account that until then all juridical causes and settlements had been based on the *vulgata*. Professional lawyers were loath to incorporate variants taken from the Florentine manuscript for the simple reason that such a procedure threatened to discredit the multilayered accretions that had been added to the *vulgata* in the form of more or less autonomous comments. Jurisprudence had developed independently of, and sometimes even contrary to, the most authoritative version of the text. Illustrative are the places where it was uncertain whether a denial like 'non' had to be included in the text or not. During the sixteenth century, philologists from the school of the so-called *Mos Gallicus* tried to restore the *vulgata* on the basis of assiduous textual research. An important milestone in this development is the edition of the *Pisanus* by Laelius Taurellus (Torelli) printed in 1553 after Antonio Augustín had already published an incomplete list of readings in 1543. Furthermore, the growing usage of Byzantine sources such as the *Basilica*, a later collection of laws issued to modernise the Justinian legal system, enhanced the philologico-historical assessment of the transmission and contents of the text.

The working results, unearthed by Andreas Alciatus, Jacobus Cuiacius and other less known representatives of the *Mos Gallicus*, had only limited influence on the daily legal practice upheld by the *Mos Italicus*.¹⁰⁶ A typical example is the French jurist Charles Dumoulin (1500–1566), who took issue with the *recens mutilatio* of the *littera vulgata*, endorsed by the *Mos Gallicus*: 'standum ergo communi et antiquae literae, in scholis et iudiciis adusque receptae, quae verissima est et aptius congruit' (we should stick to the common and ancient text, which being handed down in the schools and the courts until now is most trustworthy and suits better).¹⁰⁷ It would be wrong, however, to overstress the dichotomy between the two schools. As Hans Erich Troje has explained in great detail, the editions of the *Corpus iuris civilis* gradually encompassed the fruits of philological and historical research in spite of the fact that the conservatism in the circles of the jurists maintained itself throughout the centuries. The most convincing evidence is contained in the seminal edition of the *Corpus iuris civilis* by Dionysius Gothofredus (1583 and later editions). The text was established in a way that was capable of satisfying practising jurists without excessively unnerving the scholars who had worked on a revision of the text according to contemporary demands of philological research. Perhaps a clash between the two factions did not take place because the philologists of the *Mos Gallicus*, in particular the famous Cuiacius, preferred to store away their often disquieting findings in *Praelectiones* and other 'innocent' forms of commentary.¹⁰⁸

Auxiliary Sciences and Tools: Paleography, Codicology and Reference Works

The names of Jean Mabillon and Bernard de Montfaucon are frequently mentioned when it comes to describing the developments in the fields of palaeography, the study of ancient writing, and diplomatics, the study of mediaeval documents as physical objects. But how did they contribute to these disciplines? Departing from dated copies of mediaeval manuscripts, Mabillon tried to construe a chronology of other undated ones. In this kind of research it was of great importance to gather knowledge on the developments in handwriting. Whereas Mabillon became known as the father of the science of diplomatics and palaeography, Montfaucon greatly furthered the discipline of Greek palaeography with his editions of the Fathers of the Church. Gradually, and at first very hesitatingly, reflection on the art of editing texts found its expression in manuals discussing the practice of the editor's craft. This started rather late and in the beginning results were quite rudimentary, so much so that one rightly speaks of the pre-critical period. Not only a painstakingly precise description of general developments in handwriting and the production of manuscripts was deemed unnecessary, but also a thorough analysis of the psychological inclinations, idiosyncratic working habits and other peculiarities of individual copyists. Initially, the insight that textual corruptions are directly related to their context and may thus provide vital information needed for solving hard cruces, did not exist. Important are Francesco Robortello, *De arte sive ratione corrigendi antiquorum libros disputatio* (1557), and other works mentioned by Kenney, for example Casparus Scioppius, *De arte critica* (1597) and Jean Leclerc, *Ars critica* (1697), with the first express articulation of the concept *difficilior lectio potior*. In the pre-critical period, the guidelines in these works remained quite basic even though *Elémens de critique, ou recherches des différentes causes de l'altération des textes latins* (1766) by Jean-Baptiste Morel marked essential progress.¹⁰⁹

The large number of editions gave rise to a stream of commentaries, reference books, catalogues and anthologies. Moreover, it was possible to produce dictionaries on the basis of reliable editions, but they also 'managed' the 'overload of information.'¹¹⁰ The most famous reference book is Robert Estienne's *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* that was printed in 1531, and reprinted in 1536 and 1543. His son Henri published a *Thesaurus linguae Graecae* in 1572, reprinted about 1580.¹¹¹ The prefaces added to the subsequent editions of these dictionaries give insight into the research that had to be conducted to realise such vast enterprises, the preparations for printing (which in the case of the four bulky volumes of the Greek thesaurus bankrupted the poor editor), and the wide reception of these monumental works.

The history of editorial practices is a very rich one. In the course of time, many other vast editorial projects were carried out in substantial series which became widely consulted reference works because of their broad range and voluminous contents. Famous examples are the *Sacra bibliotheca sanctorum patrum* (1575–1579) of Margarin de la Bigne, the *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae* (Byzantine du Louvre, 1648–1711), the collection *Ad usum*

Delphini (1670–1698), the patristic editions by members of the Congregation of St Maur (1660–1750), and Migne's editions of the Church Fathers in the *Patrologia Latina* (1844–1855) and the *Patrologia Graeca* (1862–1865).¹¹²

Concluding Remarks

From the above it becomes clear that we have only offered some tentative answers to a series of central questions and problems all circling around one theme: which texts were edited where, when, by whom and for what particular reason? But many interesting developments have been left aside. Can we trace a general historical development or expansion in the preferment of certain texts, stretching from sacred texts via literary works to philosophical ones, and how is this preferment related to the traditional educational curriculum (trivium, quadrivium)? In what way did antiquarianism affect the choice of authors and texts? Is it possible to determine how antiquarianism enhanced interest in less well-known authors who had written on more abstruse aspects of daily life, such as military strategy and agricultural practices? And, even more important, is it justified to envisage a replacement of the gravitational centre of editorial activity from southern Europe up to the north (England, the Low Countries)? This last question in particular calls for further research. In all probability, the gradual shift to the north is easily overstated and might be explained by referring to the indubitable fact that the northern countries gradually succeeded in catching up with the southern ones. In the period of early modern humanism, Roman Catholic censorship could not prevent scholars and printers, based in the cradle of the Renaissance, from publishing works of the classical canon in important editions. A case in point is the already mentioned Complutensian Polyglot.

The 'Lachmannian' method that developed from humanist editorial practice is now challenged by the 'New' or 'Material Philology', and by genetic philology, perhaps another reason for ignoring the achievements of humanist scholarship. Hopefully the description above makes clear that editorial practices in the period 1450–1750 deserve further study as a valuable and neglected field of research that will disclose a mass of hidden information on intellectual life in previous ages. Without these editions, classical philology and the reception of the classics would have been unthinkable. On the other hand, humanists often produced sloppy editions: once ingrained, these editions hampered textual progress for many centuries.

Further Reading

Kenney, E. J., *The Classical Text. Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book* (Berkeley–Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974).

Landfester, Manfred, 'Philology (C.T.)' in *Brill's New Pauly* (= Landfester, 'Philologie' (RWG) in *Der Neue Pauly* 15, 2 (Stuttgart–Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2002), cols. 237–298).

Pöhlmann, Egert (ed.), *Einführung in die Überlieferungsgeschichte und in die Textkritik der antiken Literatur. Vol. 2: Mittelalter und Neuzeit* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003).

Reynolds, Leighton Durham (ed.), *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983).

Reynolds, Leighton Durham, and Nigel G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars. A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991, 3rd ed.).

Jan Bloemendal
Henk J. M. Nellen

Notes

1. For this chapter we used E. J. Kenney, *The Classical Text. Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book* (Berkeley etc.: University of California Press, 1974) Sather Classical Lectures, 44; Leighton D. Reynolds and Nigel G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars. A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991 (3rd ed.)); and Manfred Landfester's excellent overview in *Der Neue Pauly* 15, 2 (Stuttgart–Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2002), 'Philologie (RWG)' 'A: Byzantinische Philologie' and 'B: Frühneuzeitliche Philologie (c. 1450–c. 1800)', cols. 237–298 (also in English in *Brill's New Pauly Online*, s.v. 'Philology (CT)'). We would like to thank Dirk Sacré for his valuable commentary on an earlier draft of this chapter.

2. A famous example is the publication of a collection of fictitious letters in the *Epistulae obscurorum virorum*, Hagenau 1515–1519; see Reinhard Paul Becker, *A War of Fools. "The Letters of Obscure Men". A Study of the Satire and the Satirized* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1981) New York University Ottendorfer Series N.F., 12.

3. Harro Höpfl, 'History and Exemplarity in the Work of Justus Lipsius', in *(Un)masking the Realities of Power. Justus Lipsius and the Dynamics of Political Writing in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Erik de Bom a.o. (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2010), pp. 47–49. For the continuities and discontinuities between mediaeval Latin and Neo-Latin, see, for instance, Albert Rabil, Jr. (ed.), *Renaissance Humanism*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988); Paul Oskar Kristeller, 'Humanism', in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. by Charles B. Schmitt, Quentin Skinner and Eckhard Kessler (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 113–137.

4. See, for instance, Elisabeth L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

5. See Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, *The Coming of the Book. The Impact of Printing 1450–1800* (London: NLB, 1976). See also Martin Davies, 'Book, Printed', in *The Classical Tradition*, ed. by Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most and Salvatore Settis (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), pp. 142–146, esp. p. 144.
6. See <http://www.hrc.utexas.edu/educator/modules/gutenberg/books/legacy/>. See also 'The spread of printing', in S. H. Steinberg, *Five Hundred Years of Printing*, new ed., rev. by John Trevitt ([London]: The British Library & Oak Knoll Press, 1996), pp. 17–54.
7. On Leuven University and printers, see Hilde de Ridder-Symoens (ed.), *A History of the University in Europe*, vol. 2: *The Universities in Early Modern Europe (1500–1800)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 202–203; on the situation in Leiden, see *ibid.*, pp. 203–204.
8. '... absolvit diebus xv', quoted after Kenney, *The Classical Text*, p. 13. A list of first editions: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Editio_princeps. See also Egert Pöhlmann (ed.), *Einführung in die Überlieferungsgeschichte und in die Textkritik der antiken Literatur*. Vol. 2: *Mittelalter und Neuzeit* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003), pp. 108–112.
9. See Anthony Grafton and Joanna Weinberg, *'I have always loved the Holy Tongue': Isaac Casaubon, the Jews and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011).
10. On Scaliger, see Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger. A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship. I: Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983); *II: Historical Chronology* (Oxford–New York: Clarendon Press, 1993). For the edition of Manilius which was, according to A. E. Housman, 'the only avenue to a study of the poem', see vol. I, pp. 180–226.
11. On the Collège de France see Pierre Toubert, Michel Zink and Odile Bombarde (eds.), *Moyen Âge et Renaissance au Collège de France. Leçons inaugurales* (Paris: Fayard, 2009).
12. Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, pp. 174–175. On Lachmann, see below.
13. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, pp. 82–83, gives some examples.
14. Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, p. 175.
15. Anthony Grafton, *Defenders of the Text. The Traditions of Scholarship in an age of Science, 1450–1800* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), especially the chapters on J. J. Scaliger and Casaubon.

16. Lorenzo or Laurentius Valla, *De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione declamatio* (1440), ed. and transl. by Christopher B. Coleman (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922), with a reference to Rudolf Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from 1300 to 1850* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), pp. 38–40; Juan Luis Vives, *In XXII libros de civitate Dei commentaria* (1522) and Humphrey Hody, *Contra historiam Aristee de LXX*, dissertation Oxford, 1685, resp. 1705.
17. See Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, pp. 150–152. Hugh de Quehen, ‘Bentley, Richard (1662–1742)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online ed., Jan. 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/view/article/2169>, accessed 26 July 2013].
18. See also *infra*, sections Favourite Authors (*in fine*) and Bible.
19. Henk Nellen and Steven Surdèl, ‘Short But Not Sweet: The Career of Gisbertus Longolius (1507–1543), Headmaster of the Latin School in Deventer and Professor at the University of Cologne’, in *Lias*, 32 (2005), 1–22, esp. p. 14: ‘... tot enim mendis scatet quot pardus maculis’.
20. On the role of illustrations in printed books, see the contributions by Ursula Kocher, Wolfgang Neuber, Manuel Braun, Thomas Rahn and Maximilian Bergengruen in Karl A. E. Enenkel and Wolfgang Neuber (eds), *Cognition and the Book. Typologies of Formal Organisation of Knowledge in the Printed Book of the Early Modern Period* (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2004) Intersections, 4.
21. Most of the archives of famous early modern printing houses have disappeared. A notable exception, however, is the manuscript legacy of the printers’ dynasty Plantin-Moretus, which yields detailed information on the culture of entrepreneurship in this Antwerp firm: <http://www.museumplantinmoretus.be/>.
22. Research in this field is being carried out by Arnoud S.Q. Visser: ‘Annotated Books Online. A Collaboratory for the Study of Reading and the Circulation of Ideas in Early Modern Europe’.
23. This translation (1484) appeared earlier than the complete Greek text, which was printed by Aldus Manutius in 1513.
24. Cf. Landfester, ‘Philologie (RWG)’, col. 249. Aristotle is now cited according to the page number, column and line number in the edition established by Immanuel Bekker (1831–1836). See Ernst Vogt, ‘Griechische Philologie in der Neuzeit’, in *Einleitung in die griechische Philologie*, ed. by Heinz-Günther Nesselrath (Stuttgart–Leipzig: Teubner, 1997), p. 122 and 126.
25. Paul F. Grendler, *Schooling in Renaissance Italy. Literacy and Learning, 1300–1600* (Baltimore–London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), pp. 3 sqq.

26. See Coen Maas, *The Lure of the Dark Ages. Writing the Middle Ages and Political Rhetoric in Humanist Historiography from the Low Countries* (dissertation Leiden, 2012); Eckart Schäfer and Eckard Lefèvre (eds.), *Ianus Dousa. Neulateinischer Dichter und klassischer Philologe* (Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 2009) NeoLatina, 17, and the chapter by Guillaume van Gemert, “Rudes tamen plae-rique ipsorum in narrationibus atque incompositi . . .”. Dousa und die Geschichtsschreibung Hollands’, *ibid.*, pp. 173–188.

27. See Chris L. Heesakkers, *Praecidanea Dousana* (Amsterdam: Holland University Press, 1976), dissertation Leiden, for instance pp. 129–130; Sandra Langereis, *Geschiedenis als ambacht. Oudheidkunde in de Gouden Eeuw. Arnoldus Buchelius en Petrus Scriverius* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2001), dissertation, Amsterdam.

28. See Johannes Secundus, *Het boeck der kuskens*, transl. by Jan van Hout and Jan van der Does (Maastricht: A.A.M. Stols, 1930).

29. Johannes Secundus, *Opera*, ed. by Petrus Scriverius (Leiden: J. Marcus, 1619; Leiden: Fr. Hegerus 1631, and Leiden: Fr. Moyaerd, 1651).

30. Jeroen Jansen, *Imitatio. Literaire navolging (imitatio auctorum) in de Europese letterkunde van de Renaissance, 1500–1700* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2008).

31. On Ciceronianism, Charles G. Nauert, *Historical Dictionary of the Renaissance* (Lanham, Maryland–Oxford: The Scarecrow Press, 2004), s.v., and Manfred Landfester, ‘Ciceronianism (CT)’, *Brill’s New Pauly Online*, <<http://0-referenceworks.brillonline.com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/entries/brill-s-new-pauly/ciceronianism-ct-e1307020>> (accessed 15 July 2013) may be consulted.

32. See Erik De Bom, *Geleerden en politiek. De politieke ideeën van Justus Lipsius in de vroegmoderne Nederlanden* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2011). Ulrich Muhlack. ‘Tacitism (CT)’, *Brill’s New Pauly Online*, as well as Anthony Grafton, ‘Tacitus and Tacitism’, in Grafton, Most and Settis (eds.), *The Classical Tradition*, pp. 920–924.

33. Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity. The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century* (Oxford: University Press, 2009). See also Martin Davies, ‘Book, Printed’, in Grafton, Most and Settis (eds.), *The Classical Tradition*, pp. 142–146.

34. See Jan den Boeft, ‘Erasmus and the Church Fathers’, in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West. From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. by Irena Backus, vol. II (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2001), pp. 537–572.

35. Enrique González González, 'Fame and Oblivion', in *A Companion to Juan Luis Vives*, ed. by Charles Fantazzi (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2008) Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, 12, pp. 362–365.
36. Christopher S. Celenza, 'Hellenism in the Renaissance', in *The Oxford Handbook of Hellenic Studies*, ed. by George Boys-Stones a.o. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 150–165.
37. Niklas Holzberg, *Willibald Pirckheimer: Griechischer Humanismus in Deutschland* (Munich: W. Fink Verlag, 1981) Humanistische Bibliothek, I (Abhandlungen), 41, with an extensive analysis of his activities as translator.
38. See Peter van Rooden, *Theology, Biblical Scholarship and Rabbinical Studies in the Seventeenth Century: Constantin L'Empereur (1591–1648), Professor of Hebrew and Theology at Leiden* (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 1989), esp. pp. 119–132 and 231–232.
39. Landfester, 'Philologie (RWG)', col. 246. See also Han Lamers, *Reinventing the Ancient Greeks. The self-representation of Byzantine scholars in Renaissance Italy*, dissertation Leiden, 2013, pp. 9–15.
40. Celenza, 'Hellenism in the Renaissance', p. 160.
41. Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, p. 171; Davies, 'Books, Printed', p. 143.
42. Jean-François Maillard a.o., *Europa Humanistica. La France des Humanistes, Hellénistes I* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), pp. 41–97: 'Guillaume Budé, Paris 1468–Paris 1540'.
43. On the Estienne/Stephanus printers, see Fred Schreiber, *The Estiennes: An Annotated Catalogue of 300 Highlights of their Various Presses* (New York: E. K. Schreiber, 1982); Elizabeth Armstrong, *Robert Estienne, Royal Printer. An historical study of the elder Stephanus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954); Bénédicte Boudou, Judit Kecskeméti, Jean Céard and Hélène Cazes, *La France des humanistes. Henri II Estienne, éditeur et écrivain* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003); Bénédicte Boudou, Judit Kecskeméti and Martine Furno, *La France des humanistes. Robert et Charles Estienne. Des imprimeurs pédagogues* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009).
44. Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, p. 165.
45. Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, pp. 154–155.
46. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, p. 35.
47. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, pp. 35–36.

48. See for an overview the introduction to Leighton D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), pp. xiii-xliii, especially xxvii and xxxvii-xliii, as well as Christine Walde (ed.), *The Reception of Classical Literature*, transl. by Duncan Smart and Matthijs H. Wibier. Brill's New Pauly Supplements (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2012).

49. Landfester, 'Philologie (RWG)', col. 285.

50. Karl A. E. Enenkel and Henk J. M. Nellen, 'Introduction', in *Neo-Latin Commentaries and the Management of Knowledge in the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period (1400–1700)*, ed. by Karl Enenkel and Henk Nellen (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2013) *Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 33, pp. 39–54.

51. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, pp. 19–20. See section Literary Conservatism for a more detailed treatment of this subject.

52. See Henk Jan de Jonge, *De bestudering van het Nieuwe Testament aan de Noordnederlandse universiteiten en het Remonstrants Seminarie van 1575 tot 1700* (Amsterdam–Oxford–New York: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1980) *Verhandelingen Kon. Ned. Academie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, N.R.*, 106, p. 22.

53. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, pp. 8–9.

54. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, p. 18. Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, p. 180, give the example of Franz Modius.

55. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, pp. 61–62; see also Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, p. 183.

56. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, p. 57.

57. See, for instance, Alejandra Guzmán Almagro, 'Lucas van der Torre, Van Torre, Torrius. La identidad de un erudito flamenco a la luz de algunos documentos', *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 59 (2010), 165–189; Dirk Sacré, 'Torrius. Appendix: Some Unpublished or Little-known Documents', *ibid.*, 191–211; Gilbert Tournoy, 'A Correspondent of Lorenzo Ramírez de Prado and of Justus Lipsius. Robert de Scheilder', in *Humanismo y pervivencia del mundo clásico. Homenaje al profesor Antonio Fontán III.3*, ed. by José María Maestre Maestre, Joaquín Pascual Barea and Luis Charlo Brea (Alcañiz-Madrid: CSIC Press, 2002), pp. 1249–1261.

58. Leiden, UL, Vossianus lat. q 79. A description in: K. A. de Meyier, *Codices Vossiani Latini, pars II: Codices in quarto* (Leiden: Universitaire Pers, 1975), pp. 186–189.

59. Pierre Gasnault, 'De la bibliothèque de Mazarin à la bibliothèque Mazarine', in *Histoire des bibliothèques françaises. Les bibliothèques sous l'Ancien Régime, 1530–1789*, ed. by Claude Jolly (Paris: Promodis, 1988), pp. 134–145, esp. p. 138: Mazarin's decision to allow free access to his book collection caused quite a stir in the scholarly world because at that time only three public libraries existed, the Ambrosiana in Milan, the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome and the Bodleian in Oxford.

60. Frans F. Blok, *Isaac Vossius and his Circle. His Life until his Farewell to Queen Christina of Sweden, 1618–1655*, transl. by Cis van Heertum (Groningen: Forsten, 2000), pp. 199–213.

61. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, p. 84.

62. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, p. 88. In the first half of the seventeenth century the famous scholar Nicolas-Claude Fabry de Peiresc played a mediatory role in the exploration of the Mediterranean: Peter N. Miller, *Peiresc's Europe. Learning and Virtue in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven etc.: Yale University Press, 2000).

63. See Alistair Hamilton a.o. (eds.), *The Republic of Letters and the Levant* (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2005) Intersections, 5, pp. 4–10, and passim.

64. Henk Nellen, *Ismael Boulliau (1605–1694). Astro-nome, épistolier, nouvelliste et intermédiaire scientifique. Ses rapports avec les milieux du 'libertinage érudit'* (Amsterdam–Maarsse: APA, 1994), p. 62.

65. These commentary formats gained great popularity because they enabled the scholar to reveal his full mastery of the author's text and style through inventive, audacious editorial adaptation. See also Harm-Jan van Dam's micropaedia article on 'Adversationes, Annotations and Miscellanea'.

66. See, for instance, Ueli Dill, 'Die Arbeitsweise des Erasmus, beleuchtet anhand von fünf Basler Fragmenten', in *Dutch Review of Church History*, 79 (1999), pp. 1–38.

67. Jeanine De Landtsheer, 'Commentaries on Tacitus by Justus Lipsius. Their Editing and Printing History', in *The Unfolding of Words. Commentary in the Age of Erasmus*, ed. by Judith Rice Henderson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), pp. 188–242, esp. pp. 210–214: '... mihi inspiciundi occasio non fuit, et, ut vere dicam, post alios ne cupiditas quidem'. See also Kenney, *The Classical Text*, pp. 53–54.

68. José Ruysschaert, *Juste Lipse et les Annales de Tacite. Une méthode de critique textuelle au xvi^e siècle* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1949) *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 8, esp. pp. 124–126, and C. O. Brink, 'Justus Lipsius and the Text of Tacitus', in *Journal of Roman Studies*, 41 (1951), pp. 32–51.

69. Hugo Grotius, *Briefwisseling*, ed. P. C. Molhuysen a.o., 17 vols., vol. 17 (The Hague: Instituut voor Nederlandse Geschiedenis, 2001; <http://grotius.huygens.knaw.nl/years>), pp. 23–24: Gruterus to Grotius, 1 April 1602.
70. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, p. 8; see also Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, pp. 208–211.
71. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, p. 13; Pöhlmann (ed.), *Einführung in die Überlieferungsgeschichte und die Textkritik der antiken Literatur. Vol 2: Mittelalter und Neuzeit*, p. 111.
72. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, p. 18.
73. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, p. 10.
74. Landfester, 'Philologie (RWG)', col. 286.
75. See *infra*, sections 'The Bible' and 'Law'.
76. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, p. 65.
77. For instance the Mainz Codex of Livy; see Kenney, *The Classical Text*, p. 82.
78. See also Kenney, *The Classical Text*, pp. 66–71.
79. See section 'The Bible'.
80. Emmanuel Bury, 'La preuve philologique comme argument. Gassendi et Épicure face à la révolution scientifique (1624–1658)', in *Philologie als Wissensmodell / La philologie comme modèle de savoir*, ed. by Denis Thouard a.o. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010) Pluralisierung und Autorität, 20, pp. 207–227.
81. See, for instance, Eva Hanebutt-Benz a.o. (eds.), *Middle Eastern Languages and the Print Revolution. A Cross-Cultural Encounter* (Westhofen: WVA-Verlag Skulima, 2002).
82. Dirk Imhof, 'A Chest Full of Manuscripts between Anwerpen and Nijmegen. The Library of the Sixteenth-Century Textile Merchant and Philologist Theodorus Pulmannus', in *Syntagmatia. Essays on Neo-Latin Literature in honour of Monique Mund-Dopchie and Gilbert Tournoy*, ed. by Dirk Sacré and Jan Papy (Louvain: Leuven Universitaire Pers, 2009) *Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 26, pp. 401–414.
83. Ann M. Blair, *Too Much to Know. Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven–London: Yale University Press, 2010), esp. pp. 53–54.

84. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, pp. 96, 98 and 122.

85. In this respect it suffices to refer to the wide application of photography, which meant a tremendous stimulus in later times.

86. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, p. 99.

87. Dirk van Miert, 'Joseph Scaliger, Claude Saumaise, Isaac Casaubon and the Discovery of the *Palatine Anthology* (1606)', in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 74 (2011), pp. 241–261, esp. p. 256: 'Illudunt nobis coniecturae nostrae, quarum nos pudet, posteaquam in meliores codices incidimus'

88. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, p. 26.

89. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, pp. 32–33.

90. Another striking example is the discovery of important parts of Cicero's *De republica* in a palimpsest, Vatican. Lat 5757. See Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission*, pp. 131–132.

91. Vol. 1 (Berlin: Weidmann, 3rd ed. 1869), p. 218.

92. Landfester, 'Philologie (RWG)', col. 252. See also De Quehen, 'Bentley, Richard (1662–1742)', and Kristine Louise Haugen, *Richard Bentley. Poetry and Enlightenment* (Cambridge, MA–London: Harvard University Press, 2011).

93. See, for instance, Richard Tarrant, 'Lachmann, Karl', in Grafton, Most and Settis (eds.), *The Classical Tradition*, pp. 506–507.

94. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, p. 102.

95. Bernard Cerquiglini, *In Praise of the Variant. A Critical History of Philology* (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).

96. See, for this approach of the 'critique génétique', that has been developed at the CNRS in Paris, for instance, Dirk van Hulle, 'The *Wake's* Progress: Toward a Genetic Edition', *Text 13* (2000), pp. 221–232.

97. See Gilbert Dahan, 'La méthode critique dans l'étude de la Bible (XII^e–XIII^e siècles)', in *La méthode critique au Moyen Âge*, ed. by Mireille Chazan and Gilbert Dahan (Turnhout: Brepols 2006), pp. 103–128, esp. p. 128: '[...] l'exégèse médiévale [...] conserve une liberté de jugement qui fait que jamais l'interprétation ne peut cesser'.

98. Stephen G. Burnett, 'The Strange Career of the *Biblia Rabbinica* among Christian Hebraists, 1517–1620', in *Shaping the Bible in the Reformation. Books, Scholars and their Readers in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. by Bruce Gordon and Matthew McLean (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2012), pp. 64–72.

99. See Henk Jan de Jonge, 'Novum Testamentum a nobis versum. The Essence of Erasmus' Edition of the New Testament', in *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., 35 (1984), pp. 394–413.

100. Henk Jan de Jonge, *Daniel Heinsius and the Textus Receptus of the New Testament. A Study of his Contributions to the Editions of the Greek New Testament Printed by the Elzeviers at Leiden in 1624 and 1633* (Leiden: Brill, 1971) and, of the same author, 'Jeremias Hoelzlin. Editor of the "Textus Receptus" Printed by the Elzeviers Leiden 1633', in *Miscellanea Neotestamentica*, I, ed. by T. Baarda, A. F. J. Klijn, W. C. van Unnik (Leiden: Brill, 1978) Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 47, pp. 105–128, and his *De bestudering van het Nieuwe Testament aan de Noordnederlandse universiteiten*.

101. See Grantley McDonald, *Raising the Ghost of Arius: Erasmus, the Johannine Comma and Religious Difference in Early Modern Europe*, dissertation Leiden, 2011.

102. Irena Backus, 'The Fathers and Calvinist Orthodoxy: Patristic Scholarship. The Bible and the Fathers according to Abraham Scultetus (1566–1624) and André Rivet (1571/73–1651). The Case of Basil of Caesarea', in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West. From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. by Irena Backus, vol. II (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2001), pp. 839–865. See also, in the same volume, Eginhard P. Meijering, 'The Fathers and Calvinist Orthodoxy. Systematic Theology. A. Polanus, J. Wolleb and F. Turretini', esp. pp. 867–873.

103. See Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*.

104. See also Kenney, *The Classical Text*, pp. 98–101.

105. See for the following, in addition to the groundbreaking studies of Hans Erich Troje, Bernard H. Stolte, 'Text and Commentary. Legal Humanism', in *Neo-Latin Commentaries and the Management of Knowledge in the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period (1400–1700)*, ed. by Karl Enekel and Henk Nellen (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2013), pp. 387–406.

106. See Hans Erich Troje, *Graeca leguntur. Die Aneignung des byzantinischen Rechts und die Entstehung eines humanistischen Corpus* (Cologne–Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1971). *Forschungen zur neueren Privatrechtsgeschichte*, 18. See also, by the same author, *Humanistische Jurisprudenz. Studien zur europäischen Rechtswissenschaft unter dem Einfluss des Humanismus* (Goldbach: Keip Verlag, 1993) *Bibliotheca eruditorum*, 6, esp. pp. 77–123 and 143–158.

107. Troje, *Graeca leguntur*, p. 39.

108. Troje, *Graeca leguntur*, pp. 99–103.

109. Kenney, *The Classical Text*, pp. 29–36 (Robortello), 37–40 (Scioppius), 40–44 (Leclerc) and 44–46 (Morel).

110. Ann Blair, 'Reading Strategies for Coping with Information overload c. 1550–1700', in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 64 (2003), pp. 11–28.

111. Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, p. 155; for more detailed information, see the paratexts gathered in the volumes of *Europa Humanistica. La France des humanistes. Robert et Charles Estienne. Des imprimeurs pédagogues*, ed. by Bénédicte Boudou a.o. (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), and *La France des humanistes. Henri II Estienne. Editeur et écrivain*, ed. by Judit Kecskeméti a.o. (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003).

112. For Migne see *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, vol. X-2 (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1929), cols. 1722–1739 (L. Marchal), and R. Howard Bloch, *God's Plagiarist. Being an Account of the Fabulous Industry and Irregular Commerce of the Abbé Migne* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); on Bigne, see Pierre Petitmengin, 'Deux Bibliothèques de la Contre-Réforme. La Panoplie du Père Torres et la Bibliotheca sanctorum Patrum', in *The Uses of Greek and Latin. Historical Essays*, ed. by A. Carlo Dionisotti, Anthony Grafton and Jill Kraye (London: Warburg Institute, 1988), pp. 127–153.

Cite this page

Bloemendal, Jan; Nellen, Henk J. M.. "Philology: Editions and Editorial Practices in the Early Modern Period." *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World*. General Editor Craig Kallendorf. Brill Online, 2016. [Reference](http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/entries/encyclopaedia-of-the-neo-latin-world/philology-editions-and-editorial-practices-in-the-early-modern-period-B9789004271012_0016). University of Warwick. 01 May 2016 <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/entries/encyclopaedia-of-the-neo-latin-world/philology-editions-and-editorial-practices-in-the-early-modern-period-B9789004271012_0016>

First appeared online: 2014

First Print Edition: isbn:9789004265721