

REVIEW

LIVY: A BELGIAN BIMILLENARY

Pierre Assenmaker and Sandrine Paternotte, edd., *Tite-Live, une histoire des livres: 2000 ans après la mort du Prince des historiens latins*. Namur: Presses Universitaires de Namur, 2017. Pp. 217. Hardback, €29.00. ISBN: 978-2-87037-995-0.

According to Jerome, Livy was born in Padua in 59 BC and died there in AD 17. Syme argued that these dates are five years too low and that he was in fact born in 64 BC and died in AD 12; Ogilvie agreed (without reference to Syme, whose article was first published in 1959), but nobody now believes them.¹ Assenmaker discusses the matter on pp. 16 and 18 of this volume, but his claim that the discussion is far from closed is out of date.² I myself am still not sure: my apparent acceptance of the consensus³ was due, respectively, to Ernst Badian's altering what I had written⁴ and my reluctance to engage in a lengthy dispute with John Rich.

However that may be, 2017 was widely celebrated as the bimillennium of Livy's death, most of all in Padua, by both City and University. The celebrations culminated in a conference in November, at which I was honoured to be invited to speak. In Namur (Belgium) the Département de langues et littératures classiques of the Université de Namur mounted an exhibition at the Bibliothèque Universitaire Moretus Plantin, consisting of thirty-eight printed volumes from the Library's *Réserves précieuses*, both editions of Livy and works illustrating his reception. The title page of this elegantly produced (though the print is somewhat small and faint) and lavishly illustrated volume describes it as the exhibition catalogue, but while the forty-two brief chapters—eight (one jointly) by Assenmaker himself, who has an impressive knowledge of the history of scholarship and publishing—discuss all the items exhibited (pointing fingers provide cross-references to other chapters; there is, inevitably, a certain amount of repetition), there is no list of them as such. The longest chapter, by Michiel Verweij, concerns manuscripts and incunables in

¹ R. Syme, *Roman Papers*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1979) 414–15; R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5* (Oxford, 1965) 1.

² Cf. e.g. S. P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1997) 109, not even mentioning the contrary view.

³ At *OCD*³ 877 (= *OCD*⁴ 852) and *Fragments of the Roman Historians* (Oxford, 2013) I.82.

⁴ Badian had attacked Syme's view in W. Schuller, ed., *Livius: Aspekte seines Werkes* (Konstanz, 1993) 10–11.

the possession of the Bibliothèque royale de Belgique in Brussels, which did not, I presume, feature in the exhibition. The Namur Library, it emerges, while possessing many important works, is not particularly rich in editions of Livy (it does not compare with the John Rylands Library in Manchester, not to speak of the Bodleian and the British Library). Thus on p. 47 Assenmaker reveals that the 1543 Basle edition is the earliest held at Namur. That is to say that it has no incunables and lacks such important editions as the Ascensian of 1513 (though neither the Rylands nor the Bodleian has it), that published at Mainz in 1519 (which first printed, from a now lost Mainz manuscript, book 33.17.6–49.8 and 40.37.3–59.8), the Aldine of 1518–21, and the Basle editions of 1531 and 1535, which Assenmaker discusses in his chapter on the 1543 edition; the former was the *editio princeps* of Books 41–5, from a manuscript which Simon Grynaeus had discovered at Lorsch four years earlier,⁵ the latter used newly discovered manuscripts to improve the text of the first and third decades, while in the fourth it corrected misreadings of the Mainz manuscript. Similarly, none of the editions of Sigonius (Venice, 1555, 1566, 1572) seems to have been in the exhibition, though Assenmaker mentions them on p. 99 (he adds 1592, which was a posthumously revised reprint of the 1572 edition); and he does no more than refer to J. F. Gronovius' editions of 1644–5 and 1664–5 in chapter 33, devoted to the edition of 1678–9, a revised reprint accompanied by the notes of his son, J. Gronovius (J. F. died in 1671). Even more strikingly, Drakenborch's *variorum* edition (1738–46), of vast and long-lasting influence and still of great value to a modern editor, is mentioned only in the bibliographies on pp. 76 and 185 (citing the Stuttgart reprint of 1827).

After 1679 the only editions to be mentioned (and, therefore, to have appeared in the exhibition), a school edition of Book 21 apart (see on ch. 41 below), are those of the Budé series. The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the great age of German editing, are thus entirely absent. This, no doubt, is because the editions of Weissenborn, Hertz, Madvig (a Dane), M. and H. J. Müller, who revised, respectively, Weissenborn's Teubner edition and edition with commentary, Zingerle (an Austrian), and W. Heraeus (who revised Weissenborn's Teubner of Books 39–45) are in the ordinary collections at Namur, not in the *Réserves précieuses*. So too with the modern Teubner editions (Books 21–5 Dorey, 26–30 Walsh, 31–45 myself) and the Oxford Classical Texts (Books 1–25 Conway and Walters, 26–30 Conway and Johnson, 31–5 McDonald, 36–40 Walsh; new editions of Books 1–5 Ogilvie and 21–5 myself).

Surely, though, the Budés are not in the *Réserves précieuses*: yet they are discussed in the final chapter, with photographs of p. 49 of Book 26 (Jal) and the cover of Book 29 (François). In this case, I imagine, we have an exception,

⁵ On pp. 20 and 47 Assenmaker wrongly says 1526; cf. M. Gitlbauer, *de codice Liviano vetustissimo Vindobonensi* (Vienna, 1876) 1 n. 2.

the result of the understandable pride, felt in Belgium as much as in France, in the Budé series as the great glory of modern Francophone scholarship (see the remark of Jean-Louis Ferrary, joint head of the Latin side of the series, cited on p. 213; I had the pleasure of meeting him at the conference in Padua). Anglophone scholars have frequently been critical of Budé editions in reviews (Harry Jocelyn, in conversation, once talked of ‘Budé bashing’) and neither Stephen Oakley nor I are exceptions.⁶

I now give an indication of the content of the individual chapters, with the names of the respective authors and page numbers, adding comments as appropriate.

P. 9. Preface. D. Vrydaghs (Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters, Université de Namur). He remarks that Livy is perhaps less well known to the public than Sallust or Tacitus, hardly the case in Anglophone countries, and says that Livy was rediscovered in the humanist period, particularly by Petrarch: that is not the case with the first and third decades, for which we have manuscripts, as well as those from late antiquity, dating from the whole of the Carolingian period (see further below, on ch. 24); in addition, the fourth decade was known to the proto-humanists Lovato Lovati in Padua in the second half of the thirteenth century.

Pp. 10–13. Introduction. P. Assenmaker and S. Paternotte.

Ch. 1. pp. 16–20. ‘Tite-Live, une Histoire romaine de 2000 ans’. P. Assenmaker. He says (18) that Livy began his work between 27 and 25 BC: those are the *termini post* and *ante quem* for the completion of the text of Books 1–5 as we have it, but he may have begun earlier, perhaps before the battle of Actium (cf., e.g., Oakley (1997) 109–10). On pp. 18–19 he appears to think that Livy himself was responsible for talking of decades and says that the division by decades established itself in medieval manuscripts and determined the transmission of the work. In fact the word is first used by Pope Gelasius (fifth century AD); it was determined by the fact that before the advent of Gothic script ten books was the most that could be fitted into a parchment codex. The fragment of Book 11 was indeed discovered in the sands of Egypt (20), but it is parchment, not papyrus.

Ch. 2. pp. 21–6. Quintilian and Livy’s *lactea ubertas*. P. Marchetti (best known for his *Histoire économique et monétaire de la deuxième guerre punique* and articles on the Roman calendar between 203 and 167 BC). Discussing *Pataunitas*, he does

⁶ For the faults of the editions of Livy and my bad relations, repaired towards the end of his life, with Paul Jal, the late head of the Latin side, see my remarks in *Liviana* (Oxford, forthcoming 2018) 20.

not mention Syme's, clearly mistaken, view that Pollio was talking about Livy's moral attitude. On p. 22 he says there are more than 250 manuscripts of Livy, a considerable underestimate, on p. 24 that all our editions derive from a recension made in the fourth century AD: he is thinking of the Nicomachean recension, which was only of the first decade.

Ch. 3. pp. 30–9. Manuscripts and incunables of Livy in the Bibliothèque royale de Belgique. M. Verweij. See above.

Ch. 4. pp. 40–3. Petrarch and Livy. P. Assenmaker. He accepts, as everyone did until 1986, Billanovich's account of the *uetus Carnotensis* (Eduard Fraenkel's name for a manuscript in the Cathedral Library at Chartres), apparently unaware of Reeve's article in *RFIC* 114 (1986) 129–72 and the preface to my edition of the fourth decade. The manuscript of Livy used by Boccaccio was not, as Assenmaker implies, London, BL Harley 2493 (A), but one derived from β , also the work of Petrarch (the earliest witness is London, BL Burney 198).

Ch. 5. pp. 44–6. The *editio princeps* of all Petrarch's Latin works, published at Basle in 1496. R. Adam.

Ch. 6. pp. 47–53. The Basle edition of 1543. P. Assenmaker.

Ch. 7. pp. 54–6. The dedicatory letter of Erasmus in the 1531 Basle edition, reprinted in the 1543 Basle and 1553 Lyon editions. M. Minet. Much of the material in ch. 6 is repeated here.

Ch. 8. pp. 57–62. The 1553 Lyon edition. P. Assenmaker, who evidently does not know Regoliosi's edition of Valla's *Antidotum in Facium* (Padua, 1981) and is therefore unaware that there is no manuscript authority for the title *Emendationes ex librorum T. Livii de secundo bello Punico*, which first appears in the *editio princeps* of Valla's works, published at Lyon in 1532.

Ch. 9. pp. 63–7. The Paris edition of 1573. M. Verweij. The chapter begins with an unfortunate error, talking of the forty-five surviving books. It contains (63) the volume's first mention of Sigonius.

Ch. 10. pp. 68–71. Justus Lipsius. L. Isebaert. He does not mention that Lipsius' notes were cited verbatim by Drakenborch. I presume that Lipsius wrote *tribunitias*, not *tribunitiae* (68).

Ch. 11. pp. 72–7. The Frankfurt edition of 1588. P. Assenmaker.

The following five chapters concern translations and images of Livy: I lack the competence to comment on them.

Ch. 12. pp. 80–3. Italian translation (Venice, 1540). A. Constantinidis.

Ch. 13. pp. 84–8. Dutch translation (Antwerp, 1541). M. Lefft.

Ch. 14. pp. 89–90. French translation (Geneva, 1582). O. Latteur. The Namur library possesses only two of the three volumes.

Ch. 15. pp. 91–2. French translation (Paris, 1617). O. Latteur.

Ch. 16. pp. 93–5. Busts of Livy portrayed in the editions discussed in chs. 14 and 15, modelled on the one on the wall of the Palazzo della Ragione at Padua. M. Cavalieri.

Ch. 17. pp. 98–103. The *fasti Capitolini* and the inscriptions published by Panvinus in 1557. P. Assenmaker. On pp. 100–1 there is a reproduction of the beginning of the *lex agraria* (*Roman Statutes*, no. 2), but there is no specific mention of it in the text.

Ch. 18. pp. 104–6. Ursinus and Roman coins. C. Arnould. On p. 104 there is the curious statement that Ursinus edited ‘plusieurs textes de Festus et de Cicéron’, as if Festus wrote a number of different works. On p. 105 Arnould says that Ursinus possessed a splendid manuscript of the third and fourth decades, written by Poggio, but in the next sentence that these ‘volumes’ were written in 1453 and 1455. I am aware of only one manuscript containing just the third and fourth decades, Florence, Med. Laur. 63.33; Arnould cannot mean Vat. Lat. 1849 and 1852, which were written in the 1420s, with 1843 (first decade); cf. McDonald’s OCT of Books 31–5, p. xxxiii.

Ch. 19. pp. 107–9. An illustrated album of engravings of the ruins of ancient Rome, first published at Rome in 1606. M. Cavalieri.

Ch. 20. pp. 110–13. A Dutch translation, published at Amsterdam in 1704, of a work by F.-J. Des(s)eine, in French, on Roman topography. J. Richard.

The following nine chapters concern the influence, or lack of it, of Livy on the literature, philosophy, and politics of the early modern period (chs. 21–5), and Livy in the *grand siècle* (chs. 26–9). With one exception I again refrain from comment.

Ch. 21. pp. 116–18. Erasmus’ *Praise of Folly*, first published in 1511. M. Minet.

Ch. 22. pp. 119–21. Citations of Livy in Montaigne. M. Brix.

Ch. 23. pp. 122–6. Livy's influence on Shakespeare. N. Borrelli and D. Belabastita.

Ch. 24. pp. 127–33. Livy's influence on Machiavelli. D. Engels. I do not understand what Engels means when he says (127) that Livy was little read in the middle ages and is almost absent from the great manuscript traditions: Munk Olsen (*L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux xi^e et xii^e siècles*, 2.4–13) lists twenty-one first decade and eight (add Chicago, Newberry 164) third decade manuscripts written between the ninth and twelfth centuries.

Ch. 25. pp. 134–41. The almost complete absence of Livy in Montesquieu. D. Engels.

Ch. 26. pp. 142–5. Livy and Corneille. M. Brix.

Ch. 27. pp. 146–8. French translation, published in Amsterdam in 1722. M. Brix.

Ch. 28. pp. 149–51. La Fontaine's use of Menenius Agrippa's image of the stomach and the limbs (Livy 2.32). M. Brix.

Ch. 29. pp. 152–7. The Delphin edition (Paris, 1679). P. Assenmaker.

Ch. 30. pp. 160–2. The Geneva edition of 1609. M. Verweij. The first paragraph, concerning the *Fasti Capitolini*, largely repeats what was said in ch. 17.

Ch. 31. pp. 163–7. Gruter's 1628 Frankfurt edition. L. Isebaert. As Isebaert says, Gruter introduced the divisions of each book of Livy into chapters, the basis of the modern reference system (Drakenborch was responsible for the sub-division into sections). It is unclear whether Isebaert realises that they appeared in Gruter's first edition, in 1608, not in 1628, as Drakenborch claimed, misleading many (myself, for a long time, included). Isebaert mentions the editions of 1608 and 1619, but is evidently unaware of those of 1609 and 1612. See my *Liviana*, 5 n. 17.

Ch. 32. pp. 168–70. The Amsterdam edition of 1635. C. Arnould.

Ch. 33. pp. 171–5. The 1678–9 reprint of Gronovius' edition (see above). P. Assenmaker. He does not mention that an earlier reprint appeared in 1678.

Ch. 34. pp. 178–81. Editions of the speeches in Livy, published at Geneva in 1570, by H. Stephanus, and in Amsterdam in 1652 or 1653. Y. Berthelet. He does not mention J. Perionius (not to be confused with Perizonius), *T. Liiiii Patauini conciones* (Paris, 1532).

Ch. 35. pp. 182–5. G. J. Voss, *de historicis Latinis* (Leiden, 1627). L. Isebaert.

Ch. 36. pp. 186–9. Rollin's *Histoire romaine* (from the foundation to the battle of Actium; Paris, 1738–48). On p. 188 Crévier's initials are wrongly given as M., instead of J. B. L.

Ch. 37. pp. 192–8. B. G. Niebuhr. N. Meunier. On p. 197 Meunier talks about *Quellenforschung* applied to Livy, describing it as 'le triomphe de la rigueur méthodologique', without making it clear that it is now universally discredited. On p. 198 Mineo's *Tite-Live et l'histoire de Rome* is cited as the prime example of a multi-disciplinary approach to Livy. (I had the pleasure of meeting Bernard Mineo at Padua.)

Ch. 38. pp. 199–101. Taine's *Essai sur Tite-Live* (Paris, 1856). N. Richard.

Ch. 39. pp. 204–5. C. F. Lhomond, *de uiris illustribus urbis Romae a Romulo ad Augustum* (Paris, 1775). P. Pietquin. This school book is a translation, with phrase by phrase translation into French, of the *de uiris illustribus* attributed to Aurelius Victor, often cited by modern scholars (as *uir. ill.*). Unfortunately, Pietquin appears to be under the misapprehension that it is a composition by Lhomond himself.

Ch. 40. pp. 206–7. J. Grafé. *Cours de thèmes latines* (3rd edn., Namur, 1882; I have not been able to ascertain the date of the first edition). P. Pietquin. A school book, designed for the purposes of prose composition.

Ch. 41. pp. 208–9. J. van Ooteghem, School edition of book 21 (Liège, 1923). P. Pietquin. Van Ooteghem was an ancient historian of merit, but also devoted to secondary education in Belgium.

Ch. 42. pp. 210–13. The Budé series. H. Malisse.