



The New
Synthese
Historical
Library
Volume 57



Moral Philosophy on the Threshold of Modernity

edited by
Jill Kraye
and Risto Saarinen



 Springer



although Vives considered himself to be the first to deal with the investigation of the emotions in an adequate manner, a closer inspection reveals that he pays considerable attention to earlier thinkers and that his account relies heavily on information from a variety of sources.

Although they are not introduced as opposing views, the positions of Aristotle and of the Stoics are mentioned as examples of the insufficient care with which the ancient studied the emotions. The Stoics are said to have corrupted the whole subject with their quibbling, and Aristotle is blamed for having dealt with the emotions in his *Rhetoric* only from an exclusively forensic point of view. Most of Vives's definitions of the single emotions, however, are drawn from Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and Cicero's *Tusculanae disputationes*. The fact that Cicero is associated with the Stoics also suggests that the latter work is one of Vives's principal sources for the Stoic theory of the passions. Moreover, his rejection of Aristotle's contribution to the subject of the emotions clearly indicates that he based his assessment principally on the *Rhetoric*.

The Peripatetic tradition nonetheless constitutes one of the most important sources of inspiration for Vives's conception of the emotions. Plutarch's *De virtute morali*, which is one of the best formulations of the Peripatetic ideal of a moderate degree of passion, together with his distinction between *êthos* and *pathos*, which Vives might also have encountered in Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, influenced him, not least in his crucial distinction between passions and emotions. Moreover, Vives's rejection of the Stoic theory of the passions is also indebted to the Peripatetic tradition. In the chapter devoted to anger and vexation, for example, he explicitly challenges the Stoic position, contrasting it unfavourably with the view expressed by Plutarch in *De cohibenda ira*.

What emerges from these considerations is a peculiar asymmetry. In Vives's moral philosophy one can discern unresolved attempts to harmonize Stoic conceptions with Christian views. Nor is there any doubt that he was deeply critical of Aristotle's ethics. He found Peripatetic, in contrast to Stoic ethics, completely incompatible with the Christian religion on account of Aristotle's worldly conception of happiness and virtue. With reference to the emotions, however, Vives's attitude is the opposite. He firmly rejected the Stoic view of the passions, maintaining that it amounted to no more than a deeply misleading juggling with words. Instead, inspired by sources belonging to the Peripatetic tradition, he came to conceive of the emotions not only as natural responses to the way things appear to us, but also as essential constituents of human life.⁹¹

⁹¹ This paper is closely connected to my account of Vives's conception of the emotions in Casini (2002). I have benefited from presenting earlier drafts to several audiences, and I

REFERENCES

- Annas, Julia (1993) *The Morality of Happiness*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aristotle (1984) *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, 2 vols., ed. Jonathan Barnes, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Augustine (1998) *The City of God against the Pagans*, transl. R. W. Dyson, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Becchi, Francesco (1975) 'Aristotelismo ed antistoicismo nel *De virtute morali* di Plutarco', *Prometheus* 1, pp. 160–80.
- Black, Deborah L. (1993) 'Estimation (*Wahm*) in Avicenna: The Logical and Psychological Dimensions', *Dialogue* 32, pp. 219–58.
- Bouwisma, William J. (1975) 'The Two Faces of Humanism: Stoicism and Augustinianism in Renaissance Thought', in *Itinerarium Italicum: The Profile of the Italian Renaissance in the Mirror of its European Transformations*, eds. Heiko A. Oberman and Thomas A. Brady Jr., Leiden: Brill, pp. 3–60.
- Casini, Lorenzo, 'Emotions in Renaissance Humanism: Juan Luis Vives' *De anima et vita*', in *Emotions and Choice from Boethius to Descartes*, eds. Henrik Lagerlund and Mikko Yrjönsuuri, Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 205–28.
- Cicero (1962) *Orator*, transl. H. M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library, London: Heinemann.
- (1966) *Tusculan Disputations*, transl. J. E. King, Loeb Classical Library, London: Heinemann.
- Clements, Raymond D. (1967) 'Physiological-Psychological Thought in Juan Luis Vives', *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 3, pp. 219–35.
- Conde Salazar, Matilde (1998) 'Presencia de Quintiliano en las "teorías psicológicas" de Juan Luis Vives', in *Quintiliano: Historia y actualidad de la retórica*, eds. Tomás Albaladejo et al., 3 vols., Logroño: Instituto de Estudios Riojanos, III, pp. 1209–18.
- Cooper, John M. (1998) 'Posidonius on Emotions', in *The Emotions in Hellenistic Philosophy*, eds. Juha Sihvola and Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 71–111.
- Del Nero, Valerio (1992) 'Pedagogia e psicologia nel pensiero di Vives', in Juan Luis Vives, *Opera Omnia I: Volumen Introductorio*, ed. Antonio Mestre, Valencia: Generalitat Valenciana, pp. 179–216.
- De Petris, Alfonso (1977) 'Il *Dialogus consolatorius* di G. Manetti e le sue fonti', *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 154, pp. 76–106.
- (1979) 'Giannozzo Manetti and his *Consolatoria*', *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance* 41, pp. 493–525.
- Dillon, John M. (1983) '*Metriopatheia* and *Apatheia*: Some Reflections on a Controversy in Late Greek Ethics', in *Essays in Ancient Greek Philosophy*, II, eds. John P. Anton and Anthony Preus, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, pp. 508–17.
- (1996) *The Middle Platonists: 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Dilthey, Wilhelm (1914) *Weltanschauung und Analyse des Menschen seit Renaissance und Reformation*, in his *Gesammelte Schriften II*, Leipzig: Teubner.
- Erasmus (1969–) *Opera omnia*, Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Fillion-Lahille, Janine (1984) *Le De ira de Sénèque et la philosophie stoïcienne des passions*, Paris: Klincksieck.

would like to thank all the participants for their helpful suggestions and criticism. I am particularly grateful to Lilli Alanen and Jill Krave for their valuable comments.

- Fortenbaugh, William W. (1994) 'Quintilian 6.2.8–9: *Ethos* and *Pathos* and the Ancient Tradition', in *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle*, eds. William W. Fortenbaugh and David C. Mirhady, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, pp. 183–91.
- Gill, Christopher (1984) 'The *Éthos/Pathos* Distinction in Rhetorical and Literary Criticism', *Classical Quarterly* 34, pp. 149–66.
- (1997) 'The Emotions in Greco-Roman Philosophy', in *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, eds. Susanna Morton Braund and Christopher Gill, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 5–15.
- (1998) 'Did Galen Understand Platonic and Stoic Thinking on Emotions?', in *The Emotions in Hellenistic Philosophy*, eds. Juha Sihvola and Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 113–48.
- González y González, Enrique (1987) *Juan Lluís Vives: De la escolastica al humanismo*, Valencia: Generalitat Valenciana.
- Green, Lawrence D. (1994a) 'The Reception of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in the Renaissance', in *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle*, eds. William W. Fortenbaugh and David C. Mirhady, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, pp. 320–48.
- (1994b) 'Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and Renaissance Views of the Emotions', in *Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. Peter Mack, New York: St. Martin's Press, pp. 1–26.
- Harvey, E. Ruth (1975) *The Inward Wits: Psychological Theory in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, London: The Warburg Institute.
- Hasse, Dag Nikolaus (2000) *Avicenna's De anima in the Latin West: The Formation of a Peripatetic Philosophy of the Soul 1160–1300*, London: The Warburg Institute.
- Ijsewijn, Jozef (1981) 'Zu einer kritischen Edition der Werke des J. L. Vives', in *Juan Luis Vives: Arbeitsgespräch in der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel vom 6. bis 8. November 1980*, ed. August Buck, Hamburg: Hauswedell, pp. 23–34.
- Inwood, Brad (1985) *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (1993) 'Seneca and Psychological Dualism', in *Passions and Perceptions*, eds. Jacques Brunschwig and Martha C. Nussbaum, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 150–83.
- Klubertanz, George P. (1952) *The Discursive Power: Sources and Doctrine of the Vis Cogitativa According to St. Thomas Aquinas*, Saint Louis: The Modern Schoolman.
- Kraye, Jill (1981) 'Francesco Filelfo on Emotions, Virtues and Vices: A Re-examination of his Sources', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 43, pp. 129–40.
- (1988) 'Moral philosophy' in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, eds. Charles B. Schmitt et al., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 303–86.
- (2001–2) 'Stoicism from Petrarch to Lipsius', *Grotiana* 22–3, pp. 3–27.
- (2002) 'Eclectic Aristotelianism in the Moral Philosophy of Francesco Piccolomini', in *La presenza dell'aristotelismo padovano nella filosofia della prima modernità*, ed. Gregorio Piaia, Roma: Antenore, pp. 57–82.
- Manetti, Giannozzo (1983) *Dialogus consolatorius*, ed. Alfonso De Petris, Rome: Storia e letteratura.
- Margolin, J.-C. (1976) 'Vivès, lecteur et critique de Platon et d'Aristote', in *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 1500–1700*, ed. R. R. Bolgar, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 245–58.
- McClure, George W. (1986) 'The Art of Mourning: Autobiographical Writings on the Loss of a Son in Italian Humanist Thought', *Renaissance Quarterly* 39, pp. 440–75.
- (1991) *Sorrow and Consolation in Italian Humanism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Noreña, Carlos G. (1970) *Juan Luis Vives*, The Hague: Nijhoff.
- (1989) *Juan Luis Vives and the Emotions*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

- Nussbaum, Martha C. (1978) *Aristotle's De Motu Animalium*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Plutarch (1939) *Moralia VI*, transl. W. C. Helmbold, Loeb Classical Library, London: Heinemann.
- Quintilian (1939) *Institutio oratoria*, transl. H. E. Butler, 4 vols., Loeb Classical Library, London: Heinemann.
- Rist, John M. (1989) 'Seneca and Stoic Orthodoxy', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang des Römischen Welt II* 36.3, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 1993–2012.
- Rivera de Ventosa, Enrique (1977) 'El joven J. L. Vives, comentador de "La Ciudad de Dios" de San Agustín', *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofía* 4, pp. 145–68.
- (1986) 'El Augustinismo de Juan Luis Vives', *Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofía* 13, pp. 99–111.
- Salutati, Coluccio (1891–1911) *Epistolario*, ed. Francesco Novati, 4 vols., Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano.
- Sancipriano, Mario (1981) 'G. L. Vives e la descrizione delle passioni', *Atti e memorie della Accademia Petrarca di lettere, arti e scienze* 44, pp. 131–7.
- Sihvola, Juha (1996) 'Emotional Animals: Do Aristotelian Emotions Require Beliefs?', *Apeiron* 29, pp. 105–144.
- Sorabji, Richard (1998) 'Chrysippus—Posidonius—Seneca: A High-Level Debate on Emotion', in *The Emotions in Hellenistic Philosophy*, eds. Juha Sihvola and Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 149–69.
- (2000) *Emotion and Peace of Mind: From Stoic Agitation to Christian Temptation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Striker, Gisela (1996) 'Emotions in Context: Aristotle's Treatment of the Passions in the *Rhetoric* and His Moral Psychology', in *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*, ed. Amélie Oksenberg Rorty, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 286–302.
- Swift, Louis J. and Block, Stanley L. (1974) 'Classical Rhetoric in Vives' Psychology', *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 10, pp. 74–83.
- Travill, A. A. (1987) 'Juan Luis Vives: A Humanistic Medical Educator', *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History* 4, pp. 53–76.
- Trujillo, Isabel (1993) 'Juan Luis Vives e la tradizione aristotelica nell'umanesimo', *Schede medievali* 24–5, pp. 267–78.
- Vives, Juan Luis (1782–90) *Opera omnia*, ed. Gregorio Mayans y Siscár, 8 vols., Valencia: Monfort; reprinted London: Gregg Press, 1964.
- (1974) *De anima et vita*, ed. Mario Sancipriano, Padua: Gregoriana.
- (1991) *Praelectio in quartum Rhetoricorum ad Herennium*, in his *Early Writings* 2, eds. Jozef Ijsewijn et al., Leiden: Brill, pp. 126–37.
- Watson, Foster (1913) 'J. L. Vives and St. Augustine's *Civitas Dei*', *Church Quarterly Review* 76, pp. 127–51.
- (1915) 'The Father of Modern Psychology', *Psychological Review* 22, pp. 333–53.
- Wisse, Jakob (1989) *Ethos and Pathos from Aristotle to Cicero*, Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Witt, Ronald G. (1983) *Hercules at the Crossroad: The Life, Works, and Thought of Coluccio Salutati*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Wolfson, Harry Austryn (1935) 'The Internal Senses in Latin, Arabic, and Hebrew Philosophic Texts', *Harvard Theological Review* 28, pp. 69–133.
- Zilboorg, Gregory (1941) *A History of Medical Psychology*, New York: Norton.

The Humanist as Moral Philosopher: Marc-Antoine Muret's 1585 Edition of Seneca

Jill Kraye
(The Warburg Institute, London, UK)

Paul Oskar Kristeller, the great historian of Renaissance humanism, never tired of reiterating his belief that the *studia humanitatis* stood for 'a clearly defined cycle of scholarly disciplines, namely grammar, rhetoric, history, poetry, and moral philosophy'. In his considered and highly influential view, the intellectual programme of humanism included only 'one philosophical discipline, that is, morals'.¹ This pronouncement needs a good deal of refinement in light of the interest displayed by humanists, from the middle of the fifteenth century onwards, in logic, physics, cosmology and all the other philosophical fields on which the ancient thinkers they revered had written. Nonetheless, it remains true that, within the broader range of philosophical texts they increasingly came to see as within their remit, humanists never lost their predilection for moral philosophy. In order to understand the role which they played in this discipline, it is necessary to make a detailed examination of how, in studying and interpreting ancient works of moral philosophy, their humanist skills and preoccupations meshed with more philosophical concerns.

To the extent that such investigations have been undertaken, they have focused, not unreasonably, on humanist editions, translations and commentaries of the two greatest moral thinkers of antiquity, Plato and Aristotle.² Seneca, the chief Roman representative of Stoic moral philosophy, has not so far received much attention in this context, even though three of the most important humanists of the early modern period produced editions of his philosophical works: Desiderius Erasmus (c. 1469–1536), Marc-Antoine Muret (1526–1585) and Justus Lipsius (1547–1606). I have chosen to concentrate here on the French humanist Muret.

¹ Kristeller (1961), p. 10.

² E.g., on Plato see Hankins (1990); on Aristotle see Kraye (1995).

This is partly because his edition of Seneca has been overshadowed in the recent scholarly literature by those of his Dutch predecessor Erasmus and his Flemish successor Lipsius.³ More importantly, however, I want to argue that Muret's 1585 edition marks an important moment of transition from the 1515 and 1529 editions of Erasmus to the 1605 edition of Lipsius. Muret's position between the two scholars from the Low Countries can be seen not only in relation to quintessentially humanist issues—attitudes towards Latin style and philological methods—but also with regard to assessments of Seneca's Stoic ethics. It therefore provides a useful case study of the humanist contribution to moral philosophy on the threshold of modernity.

The 1585 edition of Seneca was issued in Rome a few months after the death of its editor. The name Muret (Latinized as Muretus) comes from the village, near Limoges, where he was born in 1526. His academic career got off to a promising start in France. In 1547 he taught at Bordeaux, where the young Michel de Montaigne was one of his pupils.⁴ By 1551 he was lecturing on the *Nicomachean Ethics* at the Collège du Cardinal Lemoine in Paris,⁵ where he formed a friendship with Pierre de Ronsard, publishing a commentary in French on the poet's *Amours* in 1553.⁶ The next year, however, he was arrested in Toulouse and condemned to death as both a sodomite and a Huguenot.⁷ The combination of accusations was no accident. In the heated atmosphere of the Wars of Religion, French Catholics were inclined to assume that all Huguenots were sodomites and that all sodomites were Huguenots. If Muret was guilty of either charge, it was most likely sodomy. Many years later, when the unrivalled brilliance of his Latin style had earned him the position of official orator of the king of France before the Holy See, he gave a notorious speech in celebration of the St Bartholomew's Day massacre,⁸ which would seem to rule out Protestant sympathies. Three years later, moreover, he was ordained a priest of the Roman Catholic Church.

In the present climate, when the practical value of a classical education is constantly called into question, it is worth repeating two anecdotes found in the early biographical accounts of Muret. Though perhaps not strictly

³ On Erasmus as an editor of Seneca see Jardine (1993), chapter 5; on Lipsius see Morford (1991), chapter 5; and for a comparison of the Seneca editions of Erasmus and Lipsius see Papy (2002). Andersson (2002) deals with Muret's moral philosophy in relation to his commentary on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* rather than his Seneca edition.

⁴ Trinquet (1965).

⁵ Mouchel (1997), p. 575.

⁶ Ronsard and Muret (1999).

⁷ On his life see Dejob (1881); Mouchel (1997); and Lohr (1988), pp. 277–8.

⁸ 'Pro Carolo IX. Galliarum rege Christianissimo ad Gregorium XIII. Pont. Max.', in Muret (1789), I, pp. 173–9. On Muret as a Latin stylist see Mouchel (1997) and IJsewijn (1998).

speaking 'vero', they are unquestionably 'ben trovato', for they illustrate how his life was saved, not once, but twice by his knowledge of Latin. In the first place, he was able to escape certain death in Toulouse because, the night before his planned execution, a sympathetic guard handed him a slip of paper inscribed with the Vergilian line: 'Heu! fuge crudeles terras, fuge litus avarum'.⁹ Muret took the hint and immediately crossed the border into Italy on foot. He soon fell ill, however, and was forced to put himself in the hands of some local doctors, who mistook him for a tramp on account of his dishevelled clothing. One of the physicians, assuming he was speaking in a language unknown to his humble patient, said to the other: 'Faciamus experimentum in corpore vili', on hearing which, Muret, cured by fear, leapt out of bed and escaped once again.¹⁰

Despite having left France under a cloud, such was Muret's reputation, particularly as a Latin orator, that he was immediately offered a chair of rhetoric in Venice. In 1559 he joined the entourage of Cardinal Ippolito II d'Este, to whom he dedicated his first collection of *Variae lectiones*. He remained in the service of the Francophile cardinal until 1563, when Pope Pius IV appointed him to the chair of moral philosophy at the University of Rome, La Sapienza, where he lectured on a variety of Greek and Latin philosophical and literary texts until near the end of his life.¹¹

The considerable fame which he achieved in his own day was based less on his philological and philosophical activities, though much of his energy went in those directions, than on his much admired Latin style. Montaigne, who was proud to have been taught by him as a schoolboy in Bordeaux and to have played the lead role in a performance of Muret's

⁹ Vergil, *Aeneid* III.44. For this anecdote see Dejob (1881), p. 58.

¹⁰ Dejob (1881), pp. 59–60.

¹¹ For Muret's teaching career at the University of Rome see the 'ruoli della Sapienza' published in Conte (1991), I, pp. 41 ('Anno 1566 ... In Philosophia morali et candidioribus Litteris; scuta 100: D. Marcus Antonius Muretus. Hic benemeritus et necessarius'), 78 ('Anno 1570–71 ... Ad Pandectas enucleandas ... scuta 200: D. Marcus Antonius Muretus. Hic ob excellentiam sui valoris et aptitudinem facundissimam ad unamquamque lectionem legendam ut Arist[otelis] Politicam vel ex authoribus politioribus aliquem legat, summopere desideratur'), 92 ('Anno 1574–75 ... D. Marcus Antonius Muretus. Hic, qui vir gravis et excellens est, semper benemerendo suum munus studiose et sollicitate prosequendo egrefert, et maxime quando ab infestantibus eius lectio interturbatur. Hic etiam tempore vacantium maxima infirmitate vexatus est, verum auxilio Dei convaluit'), 104–5 ('Anno 1575–76 ... scuta 500: D. Marcus Antonius Muretus. Huius scientia facile sciri potest. Hic non aggressus est nisi post festivitatem sancti Martini, et hoc propter infirmitatem. Verum alias semper benemeritus; etiam domi suae privatas haben[do] lectiones...'), 118 ('Anno 1579–80 ... Rethoricus: lib. Aeneidos. D. Marcus Antonius Muretus. Hic qualis sit ab omnibus facile sciri potest ...'), 123 ('Anno 1582 ... In Rhetorica ... D. Marcus Antonius Muretus: scuta 700'). See also Grendler (2002), pp. 180–81, for the doctorate of law *in utroque jure* which Muret received from the University of Macerata during the Easter vacation of 1572, even though he had never studied or attended lectures there.

Latin drama *Julius Caesar*,¹² said that he was acknowledged in France and Italy as ‘the best orator of his day’.¹³ And no less a critic than Joseph Scaliger proclaimed: ‘After Cicero there was no one who could speak and write Latin with greater ease than Muret.’¹⁴

Muret’s reputation nowadays, at least among historians of humanism, is still linked to his Latin style. This is largely thanks to Morris Croll. In a series of articles beginning in the 1920s, Croll claimed that Muret, though starting out as a textbook Ciceronian, had changed his style in mid-career and was responsible for initiating the anti-Ciceronian movement which reached its full flowering under his disciple Lipsius.¹⁵ Recently, the Croll thesis, at least as it applies to Muret, has been challenged.¹⁶ It has been convincingly demonstrated that Muret remained faithful to the *stylus Tullianus* throughout his life, consistently adopting a balanced, moderate and mature form of Ciceronianism. Like Erasmus in his *Ciceronianus* of 1528,¹⁷ Muret objected not to Cicero but to his fanatical supporters and slavish imitators. A good example of this attitude can be found in Muret’s commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics*. He takes issue with his compatriots Denys Lambin and Joachim Périon for mindlessly following Cicero by translating the Greek term, τὰ πάθη, passions or emotions, as *morbi* or *animi perturbationes*, diseases or disturbances of the soul. These terms, Muret points out, reflect the Stoic view that emotions were harmful and should therefore be eradicated, instead of the Peripatetic belief that they were useful and need only be moderated. Consequently, while it was perfectly acceptable for Cicero to use these translations in the *Tusculan Disputations*, given that he wanted to defend the Stoic position, it was ill-considered of Lambin and Périon to employ Cicero’s words, which were foreign to Aristotle’s meaning, in their versions of the *Ethics*.¹⁸

¹² Montaigne (1962), p. 176 (*Essais* I.26): ‘j’ai sostenu les premiers personnages és tragedies latines de [George] Buc[h]anan ... et de Muret ...’; Muret (1995).

¹³ Montaigne (1962), p. 173 (*Essais* I.26): ‘Marc Antoine Muret que la France et l’Italie recognoist pour le meilleur orateur du temps’.

¹⁴ *Scaligeriana* (1666), p. 235: ‘Mureto nullus fuit post Ciceronem qui expeditius loqueretur et scriberet Romane’; translated by Morford (1991) p. 77.

¹⁵ Croll (1966), esp. pp. 103–62, a reprint, with a new foreword, of Croll (1924).

¹⁶ Mouchel (1997) and IJsewijn (1998).

¹⁷ Erasmus (1971).

¹⁸ *Commentarius in Aristotelis Ethica*, in Muret (1789), III, p. 262 (commenting on *Nicomachean Ethics* II.5, 1105^b21): ‘Primum quaeramus, quomodo τὰ πάθη Latine dicantur. Cicero videtur indicare, “morbos”, aut “animi perturbationes”, dici posse. Sed haec Stoica videntur. Peripatetici enim qui τὰ πάθη utilia esse dicunt, et non tollenda, sed ad mediocritatem perducenda, nunquam vocarent ea “morbos” aut “perturbationes”. ... Ut autem Cicero [*Tusculan disputations* III.iv.7] prudenter et artificiose fecit, qui, cum vellet τὰ πάθη impugnare et Stoicorum opinionem defendere, ita interpretatus est hanc vocem, ut ipso nomine significaretur vitiosum quiddam et tollendum potius quam moderandum; ita Perionius et Lambinus, ut homines de verbis solliciti, rerum ipsarum non admodum

But though Muret and Erasmus were broadly similar in their attitudes towards Ciceronianism, they were worlds apart when it came to Seneca's Latin. In the preface to his first edition of the philosopher's works, which came out in 1515, Erasmus claims to be unimpressed by the ancient critics of Seneca's style.¹⁹ There are, to be sure, certain aspects of his writing which Erasmus himself would like to alter: Seneca's lifeless rhetorical appeals, for instance, and the precipitate vehemence of his style; but then, as he sagely concludes, no one is perfect.²⁰ In his revised 1529 edition of Seneca, Erasmus is far more censorious, dwelling on the affectation of his words and rehearsing in detail Quintilian's complaints about his too concise and abrupt diction.²¹

Muret addressed such criticisms, and worse, in his inaugural lecture for the 1575 course at the University of Rome on Seneca's *De providentia*. This speech was printed in the 1585 edition of Seneca, where it served as an introduction to Muret's notes on this text. He begins by stating that if he wanted to refute Seneca's detractors, he would have to adduce notable arguments from his writings in order to show that he far surpassed all his malicious critics, both in the abundance of his learning and in the refinement of his writing. Seneca's works, however, were unknown to his audience: how few of you, he laments, before today, have even clapped eyes on his writings, let alone read or pored over them. He has therefore decided to give them a foretaste, so that they can judge Seneca's wisdom and eloquence for themselves, asking them only to leave aside any prejudices they may have and to disregard the foolish and thoughtless words of those who attack what they do not understand.²²

intelligentes, parum considerate, qui easdem voces hoc loco adhibuerint, quae ad Stoicorum quidem sententiam confirmandam essent aptissimae, a sententia autem Aristotelis alienae.' The translation of τὰ πάθη which Muret prefers, because it is endorsed by 'Seneca, Quintilianus et alii boni Latinitatis auctores', is 'affectus' (p. 263).

¹⁹ See his dedicatory preface to Thomas Ruthall, dated 7 March 1515, in Erasmus (1906–58), II, p. 53: 'Nec ... me magnopere commovent veteres quorundam calumniae ...'; see Suetonius, *De vita Caesarum*, 'Caligula' 53; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* X.i.125–31; and Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* XII.ii.

²⁰ Erasmus (1906–58), II, p. 54: 'Quanquam est quod ipse quoque mutari malim. Offendunt ... epiphonemata suffrigida, sermonis impetus abruptus ... Verum quis unquam extitit autor tam absolutus ut nihil in eo requireretur?'

²¹ See Erasmus's dedicatory preface to Peter Tomiczki, dated January 1529, *ibid.*, VIII, pp. 31–2: 'Primum, habet voces suas velut in hoc affectatas ... [Quintilianus], ni fallor, notat in eo concisum et abruptum dicendi genus.' See Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* X.i.130.

²² 'Disputatio habita cum subsequentem Senecae librum interpretatus esset Romae iii. Non. Iunii MDLXXV' (3 June 1575), in Seneca (1585), pp. 218–23, at 218: 'si vituperatores illius confutere vellem, necessario mihi ducenda essent praecipua argumenta e scriptis ipsius, ut ostenderem eum et doctrinae copia et scribendi elegantia longe multumque omnibus obtractatoribus suis praestitisse. Nunc cum apud eos disseeram, quibus Senecae scripta nota non sunt (quotus enim quisque vestrum ante hunc diem ea, non dicam evoluit aut legit, sed

In the preface to the 1575 edition of *De providentia* which he prepared for the use of his students, but which the printers (naturally) failed to get ready in time,²³ Muret writes in a similar vein, though here he makes it clear that it was really Seneca's style that was controversial. 'I have always valued Seneca very highly', he says, 'and have always judged him to be not only a very wise author, which everyone acknowledges, but also a very skilful writer, which foolish people deny.'²⁴ Muret takes the same line in Book IX of his *Variae lectiones*. Discussing a passage from one of the letters to Lucilius, he blames the dull palates of Seneca's critics for their inability to appreciate the delicacies of his style, which were readily apparent to men of more refined taste.²⁵

Five years later, lecturing on Tacitus, Muret once again confronted contemporary objections to Silver Age Latin and once again put the blame on the feeble minds of the faultfinders. This was a favourite tactic of his: in his 1553 commentary on Ronsard's *Amours*, he had argued that the obscurity which some claimed to find in these poems was really a confession of their own ignorance.²⁶ Muret told his students that when he heard complaints about the obscurity of Tacitus's Latin, he was reminded of an anecdote told by Seneca about an old man who, because his eyesight had grown dim with age, complained every time he entered a room that it was too dark and was in need of more windows.²⁷ It is not by chance that

inspexit aut attigit?), puto me commodius esse facturum, si prius hunc libellum, mole quidem, ut videtis, exiguum, sed et orationis et argumenti gravitate, ut sentietis, eximium, vobis proposuero, ac deinde permisero, ut ex eo Senecam, tanquam ex ungui, ut dicitur, leonem aestimantes, de ipsius sapientia et eloquentia arbitrato vestro iudicetis. ... Hoc tantum a vobis peto, ne quid huc praeiudicatae opinionis adferatis, neve permoveamini stultis ac temere iactis vocibus quorundam, qui quae non intelligunt, vituperant.'

²³ See the oration he gave in 1575 introducing a three-day course on Juvenal's *Satire XIII*, in which he explains that he is going to lecture on this poem while waiting for the printers to produce the text of *De providentia*, on which he had originally planned to lecture: 'Aggressurus Satyram tertiam decimam Juvenalis. Oratio ... habita Romae anno MDLXXV', in Muret (1789), I, pp. 291–4, at 291.

²⁴ See the dedicatory preface to Seneca (1575): 'Semper maximi feci Senecam, semperque de eo, ut de scriptore non tantum, quod omnes fatentur, sapientissimo, sed etiam, quod fatui negant, disertissimo, iudicavi', cited in Niutta and Santucci (1999), p. 82.

²⁵ *Variae lectiones IX.8*: 'Illustratus locus ex Senecae epistolis', commenting on *Epistolae LXVII.14*, in Muret (1789), II, p. 207: 'multa sunt non publici saporis, quae qui surdiore, ut ita dicam, palato sunt, ingustata praetereunt; cum elegantiores homines, et talium deliciarum intelligentes, mirificam quandam ex eis percipiunt suavitatem'.

²⁶ See Muret's 'Preface', in Ronsard and Muret (1999), p. 8: 'l'obscurité qu'ils pretendent n'est qu'un confession de leur ignorance'.

²⁷ See the inaugural lecture for his second course on Tacitus's *Annales*, 'habita Romae pridie Non. Novembris MDLXXX' (4 November 1580), in Muret (1789), I, p. 307: 'Equidem cum istos de obscuritate Taciti querentes audio, cogito, quam libenter homines culpam suam in alios conferant, quantoque facilius omnia alia accusent quam semetipsos. Simul mihi venit in mentem senis cuiusdam, de quo urbane Seneca narrat [*Epistolae L.2*], eum, cum aetatis

Muret, in his defence of Tacitus, called on Seneca. Nor is it coincidental that he chose to lecture on both writers. He was deliberately attempting to open up the university curriculum to Silver Age prose authors, so that they might stand alongside, rather than replace, Cicero.²⁸ Translated into today's vocabulary, one might say that he was not seeking to abolish the canon but to expand it.

This was an uphill battle in Counter-Reformation Rome, which was as conservative academically as it was in other spheres. But Muret did at least manage to convince one young scholar to turn his attention towards Tacitus and Seneca. When the twenty-one year old Lipsius arrived in Rome in August 1568, he carried with him a letter of recommendation from his Louvain teacher, Cornelius Valerius, to Muret, who duly took the promising youth under his wing. And on Lipsius's return to the Low Countries in April 1570, he carried with him a letter from Muret to Valerius, praising the 'extraordinary qualities' of his student: 'When he left', wrote Muret, 'I felt that part of myself was being torn from me.'²⁹ Little did he realize that these words would turn out to be literally true; for Lipsius, so Muret later implied, had walked off with some of his intellectual property, in the form of emendations to both Tacitus and Seneca, and had published them as his own.³⁰ Because of these accusations, we know that during Lipsius's stay in Rome he was studying both Tacitus and Seneca with Muret. The impetus to focus on these authors no doubt came from the older and more established Muret. Lipsius, in his dialogue on the correct pronunciation of Latin, which came out in 1586, a year after Muret's death, portrayed himself in Rome as an eager young tyro and the Frenchman as his wise master,³¹ just as in *De constantia*, published two years earlier, he had cast himself as the Stoic *proficiens*, while his older and now deceased friend Langius played the role of the *sapiens*.³² Like Muret,

vitio minus commode oculis uteretur, in quocumque cubiculum ingressus esset, dicere solitum, illud parum luminosum esse, maiores fenestras fieri oportuisse.'

²⁸ See 'Ingressus explanare M. T. Ciceronis libros De officiis oratio ... habita Romae III. Non. Novembris MDLXXIV' (3 November 1574), in Muret (1789), I, pp. 249–55.

²⁹ Muret's letter to Valerius, 3 April 1570, is published in Ruysschaert (1947–8), p. 167: 'Redit ad te Lipsius, et redit magno dolore. Ita enim me devinxit sibi, praestantia ingenii et doctrinae, integritate morum, suavitate sermonis et consuetudinis suae, ut, eo discedente, a memetipso mihi avelli viderer'; translated by Morford (1991), p. 57.

³⁰ For Muret's accusations with regard to his Seneca emendations see his letter to Jean Chifflet, 7 July 1582, published in Ruysschaert, (1947–8), pp. 190–1; the charges relate to Lipsius's *Antiquae lectiones* IV.7 and V.6, in Lipsius (1675), I, pp. 403 and 424. For Muret's accusations regarding the Tacitus emendations see *Variae lectiones* XI.1, in his *Opera*, I, pp. 249–50; see also Ruysschaert (1947–8), pp. 155–62; and Morford (1991), pp. 57–60.

³¹ Lipsius (1586). See also Sacré (1996) and Ford (1998).

³² Lipsius (1584).

Lipsius also lectured on Seneca, giving courses at the University of Louvain from 1593 to 1602 on a variety of treatises, including one on *De providentia* in 1599.³³ But although Lipsius took his cue from Muret, he went much further than his mentor, not only producing editions of both Tacitus and Seneca,³⁴ but also remodelling his own style on their terse, pointed and epigrammatic Latin.³⁵ Muret, even though he had a more positive view of Seneca's style than Erasmus and promoted the teaching and study of it, nevertheless continued to write in an essentially Ciceronian manner, as we have seen. It was only with Lipsius that Muret's appreciation of Silver Age Latin was transformed from theory into practice.

In Muret's notes to the 1585 edition of Seneca, which are incomplete, since he died in the course of writing them, matters of style do not play an especially prominent part.³⁶ The vast majority of his comments concern philological or philosophical issues. One of the philological achievements for which Muret has received credit, most recently in the catalogue of an exhibition on Seneca held in Rome in 1999, is that his edition was the first to restore the *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* to the philosopher's father, Seneca the Elder.³⁷ It is true that in earlier editions of Seneca, including both those of Erasmus, these rhetorical works were bundled together unquestioningly with the philosophical ones. The 1585 edition also contains these works; but the Jesuit Francesco Benci, a former student of Muret,³⁸ stated in the preface that his dead master had considered them to be written by 'Seneca the rhetorician, who is known to have been the philosopher's father'.³⁹ This fact was known, however, because five years earlier, Lipsius, in the first chapter of his *Liber electorum*, had set out a comprehensive case for it, arguing that on chronological, biographical and stylistic grounds these works should be attributed to Seneca's father and

³³ Papy (2002), p. 22, esp. n. 43.

³⁴ His first edition of Tacitus came out in 1574; see Ruyschaert (1949).

³⁵ See, e.g., Croll (1966), pp. 7–44.

³⁶ See, however, his note on 'Reddere enim est rem pro re dare', *De beneficiis* VI.5.2: 'Subfrigida vocabuli notatio, quales frequentissimae sunt apud Stoicos, et Stoicorum hac in re imitatores veteres Romanos iureconsultos', in Seneca (1585), p. 56. Erasmus also uses the adjective 'suffrigidus' in relation to Seneca's style: see n. 20 above. See also Muret's note on 'Qui saluatorium publicum exercent', *De constantia* II.iv.2, *ibid.*, p. 313, where he suggests the alternate reading 'Qui hoc salutationum publicum exercet' which he found in a manuscript: 'neque quidquam magis ex consuetudine Senecae, id est, urbanus et elegantius dici potest.'

³⁷ Niutta and Santucci (1999), pp. 71–3 and 83.

³⁸ Negri (1966) and Peeters (1998).

³⁹ Seneca (1585), sig. † 2^v: 'de Seneca rhetore, quem philosophi patrem constat fuisse'.

namesake.⁴⁰ Accordingly, Lipsius left them out of his own 1605 edition of the philosopher Seneca's *Opera*.⁴¹

Lipsius's critical instincts let him down, however, when it came to Seneca's plays; for he claimed in his *Animadversiones* of 1588 that only *Medea* was written by the philosopher, while the others were written by at least three different authors. As Roland Mayer has shown, it was Lipsius's friend, the Spanish Jesuit Martin Del Rio, who, in his *Syntagma tragoediae Latinae* published from 1593 to 1594, decisively attributed all the plays, with the exception of *Octavia*, to the philosopher, maintaining furthermore that they embodied the same Stoic doctrines which were expounded in the treatises and letters.⁴²

In relation to the forged correspondence between Seneca and St Paul, which had enjoyed a vast diffusion in the Middle Ages,⁴³ it was not Lipsius's critical instincts which let him down but rather his obsessive desire to stay in the good graces of the Mother Church, following his reconversion to Catholicism after many years teaching in the staunchly Protestant University of Leiden. Erasmus had printed these letters in his first edition of 1515 but had secluded them in a section of works which, 'though learned, were completely at variance with Seneca's style'.⁴⁴ In his second edition of 1529, Erasmus added a preface to the Seneca–St Paul letters, in which he spelled out his reasons for rejecting their authenticity.⁴⁵ This spurious correspondence is not even mentioned, let alone included, in the 1585 edition of Muret. In most respects, as I have been trying to show, Muret stands midway between Erasmus and Lipsius. On this issue, however, it is difficult to see Lipsius's position as an advance on that of Muret. Lipsius's philological acumen led him to dismiss the letters as the product of a half-educated forger who wanted to make laughing stocks of us. His piety, however, prevented him from imputing an erroneous judgement to Pope Linus, Church Fathers such as Jerome and Augustine, and even the twelfth-century bishop John of Salisbury, all of whom had mentioned the correspondence. He claims, therefore, that although the

⁴⁰ *Electorum liber I*, in Lipsius (1675), I, pp. 631–4. This work was first published in Antwerp by Christophe Plantin: see *Bibliographie lipsienne: Oeuvres de Juste Lipse* (1886), I, pp. 235–7.

⁴¹ See 'De vita et scriptis L. Annaei Senecae', in Seneca (1605), p. xiii: 'Pater ... a se scriptisque suis etiam notus, L. Annaeus Seneca, quem *Declamatoris* agnomine (in hoc genere excelluit) a filio fere distinguunt.'

⁴² Mayer (1994), pp. 151–74.

⁴³ For the apocryphal letters see Bocciolini Palagi (1978); for its influence in the Renaissance see Panizza (1976).

⁴⁴ Seneca (1515), sig. a1^v: 'Haec licet erudita, tamen, ut a Senecae stilo abhorrentia, semovimus.'

⁴⁵ Erasmus (1906–58), VIII, pp. 40–1.

extant letters were forgeries, Seneca and St Paul had exchanged others, which were now lost.⁴⁶

We have seen that Muret was not the first to attribute the *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* to Seneca the Elder. Nevertheless, he did make an important philological contribution to establishing the text of these works by supplying the missing Greek words. He was able to fill in these lacunae, as his student Francesco Benci tells us in the preface to the 1585 edition, with the aid of a Vatican manuscript which Pope Gregory XIII had allowed him to borrow and consult in his own home, since his health was poor and he was worn out from over twenty years of university teaching.⁴⁷ This information is corroborated by the register of loans from the Vatican Library, which records that on 12 July 1581, Muret was given permission to borrow a manuscript of Seneca's *Declamationes*.⁴⁸ Moreover, the actual manuscript has now been identified as Vat. lat. 3872, a ninth-century codex produced in Corbie from which all later witnesses derive.⁴⁹

In the notes to his edition, Muret frequently cites readings which he found in manuscripts. He describes a highly prized manuscript as the 'Liber Siculus' or sometimes 'Siciliensis', but gives no further clues to its identity.⁵⁰ Apart from this 'Sicilian book', Muret refers to his manuscript sources simply as 'libri veteres'.⁵¹ This was, of course, standard procedure for Renaissance humanist editors, with the notable exception of Angelo

⁴⁶ Seneca (1605), p. xxv: 'Sed heus, Epistolas ad Divum Paulum non memoramus? Quae nunc sunt, non sunt tanti; imo certum est eiusdem auctoris, et Pauli et Senecae, illas esse, et compositas a semidocto in ludibrium nostrum. ... Ergo inter se non scripserunt? Hieronymus, Augustinus atque etiam antiquior utroque Linus Pontifex, asserunt et passiva opinio olim fuit. Atque Io[hannes] Sarisberiensis fortiter: "Desipere videntur, qui non venerantur eum, quem Apostolicam familiaritatem meruisse constat." Itaque reicere hoc totum et calcare non ausim. Fuerint aliquae, sed aliae.' See John of Salisbury (1909), II, pp. 318–19.

⁴⁷ See the dedicatory preface by Francesco Benci, in Seneca (1585), sigs † 2^v–3^r, at 3^r: 'complures lacunas, quae erant in Controversiis, etsi non omnes (quis enim hoc mortalium praestet?) explevit ex codice multae aetatis et fidei, de bibliotheca Vaticana, quem ut deferret domum, eoque commode uteretur, interprete Sirleto Cardinali optimo, sanctissimus permisit Pontifex GREGORIUS, qui etiam cum ab eo, anno superiore, multis precibus Muretus iam affecta valetudine, et publice docendo fessus (annos enim unum et viginti Romae docuit) missionem impetrasset, quod iam sibi vivere diceret velle, et perpolire quae habebat informata, ut Senecam et gestu et voce ostendit, Senecae sibi edendi consilium mirifice probari.' For Muret's ill-health in the 1570s see n. 11 above.

⁴⁸ Grafinger (1993), p. 7. See also Boutcher (1995); but at p. 199, he wrongly assumes that Benci's phrase 'interprete Sirleto Cardinali optimo' indicates that the manuscript had 'comments by Cardinal Sirleto' rather than that the loan had been arranged 'through the good offices of Sirleto'.

⁴⁹ Winterbottom (1986).

⁵⁰ E.g., Seneca (1585), pp. 206–8, 212, 310.

⁵¹ E.g., *ibid.*, p. 209: 'liber vetus meus ... veteres libri ... in vetere libro'.

Poliziano and a few of his disciples.⁵² For example, Erasmus supplied annotations, containing some philological information, to his second and much improved Seneca edition of 1529. When, in these notes, he cites a reading from a manuscript, he refers to it, unhelpfully, as 'codex manuscriptus' or 'liber manu descriptus' or just 'quidam codex'. On the basis of the readings themselves, however, it has been determined that Erasmus must have had access to Vatican Pal. lat. 1547, a northern Italian manuscript which from the ninth to the late fifteenth century was housed in the monastery of Lorsch.⁵³ By comparison with his uninformative manuscript citations, Erasmus was very forthcoming about a copy of the 1478 Treviso edition of Seneca's *Opera philosophica* with annotations by the Frisian humanist Rudolph Agricola, whose emendations he clearly valued and cited with pride. So delighted was he to have access to the book that he gave Haio Hermann, who had loaned it to him, two of the three free copies of his own 1529 edition which he had received from his publisher⁵⁴—it seems that publishers in the sixteenth century were just as tight-fisted as they are today. When it came to citing manuscript sources, Lipsius was no better than Erasmus or Muret: he did not identify a single one in the annotations to his 1605 edition. Admitting, in the preface, that he had not done so, he asked: 'What's the point?'⁵⁵

Muret, in addition to reporting manuscript readings, sometimes offers palaeographical explanations for scribal errors. For instance, he made the ingenious suggestion that the phrase 'In superioribus libris', at the beginning of Book V of *De beneficiis*, originally read 'quattuor superioribus libris', but that the 'quattuor' was written in Roman numerals, 'IV', which gave rise to the erroneous 'In'. Modern editors, with better manuscript resources at their disposal, have not accepted the emendation, preferring instead: 'In prioribus libris'.⁵⁶

In the fashion of Renaissance commentators, Muret entertains and educates his readers by providing learned digressions: on the custom of vomiting in antiquity,⁵⁷ for instance, or on the correct technique of crucifixion, where he argues that painters and sculptors depict this form of capital punishment wrongly because they fail to realize that it was necessary to use nails, as well as ropes, when binding the victims: 'If they

⁵² Grafton (1977).

⁵³ Reynolds (1986), p. 363.

⁵⁴ Erasmus (1906–58), VIII, p. 66: 'Remitto codicem tuum—quo nihil, ut scribis, pulchrius—una cum duobus excusis. Ex pacto mihi debebantur tres; maiorem portionem tibi cedo.' See Jardine (1993), pp. 137–8.

⁵⁵ Lipsius, 'Introductio lectoris', in Seneca (1605), sig. A1^v: 'Non cito passim libros, fateor; quid opus est?' See also Morford (1991), p. 172.

⁵⁶ See, e.g., Seneca (1914), p. 116 and (1975), p. 290.

⁵⁷ See his note on 'vomitu remetientur', *De providentia* III.13, in Seneca (1585), p. 231.

had hung tied only by ropes', he asks, 'how would they die, except by hunger?'⁵⁸

Renaissance humanists also, of course, used such notes for exegetical purposes. In an annotation to Letter XCIII, Erasmus suggested that Seneca's dismissive comment about the longwinded '*Annals* of Tanusius': 'you know how heavygoing the book is and what they say about it', was an allusion to Catullus's description of the similar sounding *Annals* of Volusius as 'cacata charta'.⁵⁹ Muret, in his commentary on Catullus, repeated the suggestion, but without mentioning that it was first made by Erasmus.⁶⁰ Consequently, in modern editions of Catullus, it is Muret, not Erasmus, who gets credit for making the connection.⁶¹ Lipsius, on the other hand, was not interested in such matters and passed over the passage from Seneca in silence. He was pursuing a very different agenda from that of Erasmus or Muret. And this is reflected in his very brief 'notae perpetuae', which were not addressed to a scholarly audience, but rather were intended to make Seneca accessible to everyone—everyone, that is, who could read Latin and afford a folio edition of some 800 pages.⁶²

By contrast, Muret, who had no desire to bring Seneca to a wider public, sprinkled his annotations with donnish wit. Like many of his learned readers, Muret was exercised by the problem of plagiarism, in which he was both sinned against and sinning. This concern is clearly expressed in his note on a passage from Book III of *De beneficiis* which, he says, had been taken over wholesale by Macrobius, who had also shamelessly lifted material from Aulus Gellius and Plutarch. 'He appears to have habitually practised the same art', writes Muret, 'which many in our day habitually practise; regarding nothing human as foreign to them

⁵⁸ See his note on 'crucibus', *De beata vita* xix.3, *ibid.*, p. 309: 'Quomodo ... mortui essent, nisi forte longa fame, si funibus tantum revincti pependissent?' For Lipsius's views on the use of ropes and nails in crucifixion see Lipsius (1595), pp. 60–2: 'iam ad *Adstrictionem* transeo, quae facta clavis aut funibus, sed plurimum illis'; he then quotes the same passage from Seneca's *De beata vita*.

⁵⁹ Seneca (1529), ad *Ep.* XCIII.11: 'Catullus iocatur in quendam Volusium: "Annales Volusi cacata charta" [36.1]. Hinc illud, "et qui vocentur".'

⁶⁰ In *Catullum commentarius*, in Muret (1789), II, p. 770: '*Annales Volusii*] Suspiciatus sum aliquando, horum annalium mentionem fieri a Seneca, lib. XIV epistolarum, his verbis: ... *annales Volusii; scis, quam non decori sint et qui vocentur*. Haec autem postrema verba huc referebam, ubi eos Catullus *chartam cacatam* vocat. Sed tamen hoc non valde asseveranter affirmaverim. Etenim apud Senecam, *Tamusii*, non *Volusii*, legitur.'

⁶¹ See, e.g., C. J. Fordyce's note to XXXVI.1, in Catullus (1961), p. 179: 'Following a suggestion of Muretus, Haupt and others identified Volusius with the Tanusius ... who appears in Sen. *Ep.* 93.11, as a type of long-winded writing.'

⁶² Lipsius, 'Introductio lectoris', in Seneca (1605), sig. A1^v: 'ut etiam minora quaedam et semidoctis obvia non neglexerim. Quid ita? Quia Senecam producere et vulgi manibus inserere votum mihi fuit, ideoque consilium vulgo etiam haec adaptare'.

(‘humani a se nihil alienum putant’), they use what belongs to others as if it were their own.⁶³

Another contemporary evil afflicting the scholarly world, according to Muret, was the custom of disparaging the achievements of one's predecessors. A future editor of Seneca will come along, he predicted, and say that everyone who had worked on the text before him was moronic and boneheaded.⁶⁴ In fact, it was Muret himself who was guilty of the vice of ingratitude, with the brunt of his insults falling on Erasmus, a copy of whose 1529 Seneca edition we know he owned.⁶⁵ In one note he claimed that Erasmus's emendation of a text was so inept that you would have to make a special effort to come up with anything clumsier.⁶⁶ In another annotation, he vented his exasperation at the Dutch scholar for further corrupting an already corrupt passage: ‘If only Erasmus had kept his hands off Seneca. More readings could be restored with less effort.’⁶⁷

Contrary to Muret's predictions, the future editor of Seneca turned out to be far more generous towards his predecessors than he himself had been. Indeed, Lipsius, in the preface to his 1605 edition, defended Erasmus, his Low Countries compatriot, against the Frenchman's scornful comments. ‘I pay no heed to that famous man who wishes Erasmus had never laid a hand on Seneca. This is a spiteful desire and one that derives from passion rather than judgement. Speaking with greater justice, I should say, on the contrary, that unless he had gone before and provided explanations, there would be rough and jarring patches in the text, to which we would perhaps even now still be clinging.’⁶⁸ Although Lipsius disapproved of Muret's

⁶³ See his note on ‘Quanquam quaeritur’, *De beneficiis* III.18.1, in Seneca (1585), p. 26: ‘Totam hanc disputationem, de servis, num dominis beneficia tribuere possint, partim ex hoc Senecae loco, partim ex Epist. 47 ... confarcatam Macrobius libro primo [cap. 11] Saturnaliorum pro sua venditavit. Sed et ex Agellio et e Plutarchi Sumposiacis tam multa, nullo pudore, in septimum librum Saturnaliorum suorum transtulit, ut appareat, eum factitasse eandem artem, quam plerique hoc saeculo factitant, qui ita humani a se nihil alienum putant, ut alienis aequae utantur ac suis.’ For the tag see Terence, *Heauton timorumenos* 77. See also Muret's note on *Epistola* XLVII, in Seneca (1585), p. 203: ‘Multa ex hac epistola impudenter compilavit Macrobius libro primo Saturnaliorum.’

⁶⁴ See his introductory note to the *Epistolae*, in Seneca (1585), p. 194: ‘Blenos, fatuos, fungos dicet fuisse prae se alios omnes ...’

⁶⁵ Nolhac (1883), p. 28.

⁶⁶ Commenting on the phrase ‘Inaspro et probo’ in *Epistola* XIX.10.3, in Seneca (1585), p. 199: ‘Quod hic somniavit Erasmus de Aspero et Probo grammaticis, ita ineptum est, ut laboraturus sit, si quis velit quidquam ineptius excogitare.’ See also his note on ‘Immo reddo illi’, *De beneficiis* VII.xix.4, *ibid.*, p. 65: ‘Locum hunc, ut alios sanequam multos, depravaverat Erasmus.’

⁶⁷ See his note on ‘Et tutior est vita’, *De beneficiis* IV.xxii.3, *ibid.*, p. 37: ‘Comprehensionem hanc iam ante depravatam ab aliis magis etiam depravavit Erasmus qui utinam a Seneca abstinisset manus. Minore negotio pleraeque restituerentur.’

⁶⁸ Lipsius, ‘Introductio lectoris’, in Seneca (1605), sig. A1^r: ‘Neque enim virum celebrem audio optantem: Ne ille umquam eum attigisset! Malignum votum est et ab affectu, non a

shabby treatment of Erasmus, he nevertheless described him as a man of discriminating intellect and judgement.⁶⁹ Death had prevented him from completing his work on Seneca, but there was much that was good and laudable in his edition. Muret's only fault, in Lipsius's opinion, was that he overconfidently substituted his own readings for those found in the manuscripts, making Seneca speak, not according to their authority, but to his sense.⁷⁰

Most sixteenth-century editors were guilty of this vice, including Erasmus: when his knowledge of Latin usage contradicted the manuscript evidence, he did not hesitate to impose his own reading on the text.⁷¹ Lipsius, who himself made few conjectures,⁷² was nevertheless correct to point out that Muret freely indulged in *emendatio ope ingenii*.⁷³ Muret seems to have considered it as valid a way to improve a text as consulting manuscripts, though he was not necessarily prepared to allow other scholars the same liberty. Commenting on the phrase 'nihil sine aere frigidum', 'nothing is cold without air', from Seneca's Letter XXXI, Muret cites a parallel passage from Cicero's *De natura deorum* in order to explain the Stoic belief that air is the coldest of all bodies. This conveniently allows him to lash out at one of his bugbears, Denys Lambin, who, in ignorance of the Stoic doctrine, had recklessly changed 'frigidus' to 'humidus' in his edition of Cicero, even though 'frigidus' was found in all the manuscripts.⁷⁴

iudicio emissum. Ego aliter et verius enuncio: nisi ille praevenisset et explanasset, salebras et aspera fuisse, ad quae etiam nunc fortassis adhaereamus.'

⁶⁹ Ibid.: 'M. Antonius Muretus, elegantis ingenii et iudicii vir'.

⁷⁰ Ibid.: 'Bona tamen et laudabilia multa sunt. Unum non attolas, imo non tolere, quod fidenter nimis saepe contra libros rescribit, et Senecam non eorum fide, sed suo sensu, facit loquentem.'

⁷¹ Seneca (1529), p. 7, commenting on *De beneficiis* I.ii.3: 'Nec dubitem affirmare, quamlibet reclamantibus exemplaribus, "redit" a Seneca fuisse scriptum, non "reddet": "Tantum erogatur, si redit aliquid, lucrum est; si non redit, damnum non est." Nam fructus proprie "redire" dicitur ...'

⁷² Seneca (1605), sig. A1^v: 'Pauca sane a coniectura nostra, nisi sicubi ea ita clara est, ut pervicacia sit dubitare.'

⁷³ See, e.g., his note on 'Tantusque morsus', *De tranquillitate animi* i.9, in Seneca (1585), p. 311: 'Coniectura ductus, legendum putavi "tacitusque morsus"'; his note on 'Amamur', *De beneficiis* IV.v.2, *ibid.*, p. 36: 'Nemo non videt, quanto hoc melius sit, quam quod ante legebatur. "armamur"; on 'Iuvenum otiosorum aures', *Epistola* XX.2, *ibid.*, p. 199: 'Quis putasset quemquam usque eo stultum fore, ut hoc loco, pro "Otiosorum", legeret "Occisorum"? Et tamen ea scriptura omnes libros occuparat.'

⁷⁴ See his note on *Epistola* XXXI.5, *ibid.*, p. 221 [*recte* 201]: 'Haec sententia Stoicorum erat, omnium corporum aera frigidissimum esse. ... Balbus apud Ciceronem secundo *De natura deorum* [II.ix.26]: "Ipse vero aer, qui natura est maxime frigidus, minime est expers caloris." Quo in loco operae pretium est cognoscere Lambini temeritatem, vel exempli causa, ut intelligatur, quantum ei fidei haberi debeat. Qui cum in omnibus libris constantissime ita scriptum videret, ignoraretque illam quam dico Stoicorum sententiam, deleta voce "Frigidus", substituit "Humidus" et in notis suis ita scripsit: "Sic legendum est,

In the following note, however, Muret himself proposes an emendation to the same letter which also has no manuscript authority whatever. To his credit, Muret saw the funny side of this. 'We are amazing people', he muses, 'those of us who spend our time emending ancient books. What we condemn in others, we often permit in ourselves. Having just reprehended the emender of Cicero, I am apprehended committing a similar fault. Let us both therefore be thrashed, if we both have erred.'⁷⁵ It must be said, however, that many of Muret's emendations were spot on and that his name appears more frequently in the critical apparatus of modern editions of Seneca than that of Erasmus or Lipsius.

It emerges clearly from Muret's edition of Seneca that for a philologist, he was a pretty good philosopher. He knew more about Stoic doctrines not only than Lambin but also than Erasmus. In his notes he provides an ample supply of philosophical information on Stoicism, culled from both Greek and Latin sources.⁷⁶ Throughout his career, in fact, Muret displayed a keen interest in philosophy. Even in his early vernacular commentary on Ronsard, he inserted a few philosophical notes: one, for example, on Plato's two horses from the *Phaedrus* and another concerning Aristotle's concept of ἐντελέχεια—the former borrowed, without acknowledgement, from Marsilio Ficino,⁷⁷ the latter from Guillaume Budé via Angelo Poliziano.⁷⁸ In both Paris and Rome Muret lectured on Aristotle's

vel libris omnibus invitis." Mirum quin dixerit, "Ipsa Cicerone invito" aut "ipsa veritate reclamante"... Eant nunc qui negant, multum huic homini debere Ciceronem. Non enim hoc tantum loco, sed innumerabilibus aliis eandem illi operam invitis omnibus libris praestitit.'

⁷⁵ See his note on 'Laborem si non recuses, parum est; posce', *Epistola XXXI.6*, *ibid.*: 'Mirifici homines sumus, quicumque corrigendis veterum libris operam damus. Quod damnamus in aliis, ipsi saepe numero admittimus. Ne longius abeamus, ego qui modo correctorem Ciceronis reprehendebam, eidem culpa affinis deprehendor. Certe enim in omnibus, quos vidi, libris scriptum erat, "Laborem si non recuses, parum est posse." Vapulemus igitur ambo, si ambo deliquimus.'

⁷⁶ See, e.g., his discussions of Stoic ἀπάθεια and the difference between δεῖσθαι and ἐνδεῖσθαι in his note on *Epistola IX.2* and 14, *ibid.*, p. 197.

⁷⁷ See his commentary on poem 21, in Ronsard and Muret (1999), p. 41: 'Le cheval noir.) Par sa Roine il entend sa raison. Par le cheval noir, un appetit sensuel et desordonné, guidant l'ame aus voluptés charneles. Par le cheval blanc, un appetit honeste et moderé, tendant toujours au souverain bien. Cette allegorie est extraite du Dialogue de Platon, nommé Phaedre, ou, de la beauté.' Cf. Ficino's commentary on *Phaedrus* 246A–B, in Allen (1981), pp. 96–100.

⁷⁸ See his commentary on poem 69, in Ronsard and Muret (1999), p. 102: 'Ma seule Entelechie) Ma seule perfection, ma seule ame, qui causés en moi tout mouvement tant naturel que volontaire. Entelechie en Grec signifie perfection. Aristote dit, et enseigne, que chacune chose naturelle a deus parties essentielles, c'est à savoir, la matiere, qu'il nomme ὕλη ou τὸ ὑποκείμενον, et la forme, qu'il nomme εἶδος, μορφή, ou ἐντελέχεια. Dit en oûtre, que cette forme, ou Entelechie, donne essence et mouvement à toutes choses. Tellement que ce qui fait les choses pesantes tendre en bas, et les legeres en haut n'est autre chose que leur entelechie. Ce qui fait que les herbes, arbres, plantes prennent nourriture

Nicomachean Ethics. In Rome he also gave courses on Aristotle's *Rhetoric*⁷⁹ and on the *Politics*.⁸⁰ In another effort to open up the curriculum, Muret lectured in 1574 on Book II of Plato's *Republic*, although the university authorities prevented him from continuing with this text the following year.⁸¹

Like most Renaissance thinkers, and most people nowadays, Muret regarded Aristotle and Plato as the two greatest philosophers of classical antiquity.⁸² In his commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics*, based on his lecture courses, he enjoined students to accept the splendid and immortal doctrine of Aristotle, the supreme philosopher, upholding it in all disputations on ethical matters and continually directing all their thoughts to it.⁸³ He himself certainly followed this advice, invariably supporting the

et accroissement est aussi cette forme essentielle qui est en eus. Ce qui fait que les bestes sentent, qu'elles engendrent, qu'elles se mouvent de lieu en autre, n'est aussi que leur entelechie, c'est à dire leur ame. Parainsi ce divin Filosofo (car ainsi me contraint sa grandeur de l'apeler) ce grand Aristote (duquel l'erudition a toujours esté celebrée par les doctes et de nôtre tans, en l'université de Paris, comme a l'envi, clabaudée par les ignorans) voulant definir l'ame, l'a dit estre ἐντελέχειαν σώματος φυσικοῦ ὀργανικοῦ [*De anima* II.1, 412^b5], en laquelle definition le mot, Entelechie, signifie une forme essentielle, non pas un perpetuel mouvement, comme l'a exposé Ciceron [*Tusculan Disputations* I.x.22], qui et en cet endroit, et en beaucoup d'autres, s'est monstré asses mal versé en la Philosophie d'Aristote.' Cf. Budé (1557), II, p. 12 (*De asse et partibus eius*), whose source was, no doubt, Poliziano (1553), pp. 224–8 (*Miscellanea centuria prima*, cap. 1), on which see Kraye (1983), pp. 83–4.

⁷⁹ See his inaugural lecture, 'Cum Aristotelis libros De arte rhetorica interpretari inciperet. Oratio ... habita Romae postridie Non. Martii MDLXXVI' (8 March 1576), and 'Cum pergeret in eorundem Aristotelis libros De arte rhetorica interpretatione. Oratio ... habita Romae postridie Non. Novembris MDLXXVI' (6 November 1576), in Muret (1789), I, pp. 255–68. His Latin translation of Book II was published in 1585.

⁸⁰ See his inaugural lecture, 'Explicaturus libros Aristotelis De republica. Oratio ... habita Romae pridie Non. Novembris MDLXXVII' (4 November 1577), in Muret (1789), I, pp. 269–74. Muret owned a copy of the Latin version of Juan Gines de Sepúlveda, which he annotated, crossing out many of the Spaniard's translations and replacing them either with his own or with the Greek text; see Nollhac (1883), p. 11.

⁸¹ See the inaugural lecture for his course on Cicero's *De officiis* (cited n. 28 above), pp. 249–50: 'Denuo hoc anno ... denuo Platonem cum Cicerone conjungere ... ut nobilissimus Philosophus, cuius ante me in his scholis nunquam, ut opinor, audita vox erat, paullatim familiarior factus, uberrimis illis sapientiae et eloquentiae suae fontibus ingenia nostra copiosius et abundantius irrigaret. Aliter visum est iis, quorum nutu atque auctoritate nostra omnium studia diriguntur, qui ... omnem a me huius anni operam in uno Cicerone consumi maluerunt.'

⁸² See, e.g., his inaugural lecture on Aristotle's *Politics* (cited in n. 80 above), p. 272: 'principes philosophorum, Plato et Aristoteles'.

⁸³ See his comments on *Nicomachean Ethics* I.9, in Muret (1789), III, p. 231: 'Accipite praeclaram et immortalis memoria dignam summi philosophi Aristotelis sententiam, quam in omnibus huius generis disputationibus teneatis, quam sequamini, ad quam sensus cogitationesque vestras perpetuo dirigatis.' On this commentary see Kraye (1995), esp. pp. 116–117.

Peripatetic side against the Stoics. So, he held, along with Aristotle, that it was only necessary to control the passions;⁸⁴ and he described the Stoic belief that they could and should be eliminated as, like so many other doctrines of theirs, totally absurd and in conflict with nature itself.⁸⁵ He rejected another key Stoic pronouncement, that virtue was the only good and on its own was enough to enable one to live happily and well, citing the critique of the doctrine presented by the Greek Aristotelian commentator, Alexander of Aphrodisias.⁸⁶ As for Platonism, Muret was inclined to give it credit for those Stoic doctrines which he regarded as admirable: the belief that the wise man receives no injuries, for example, derived from Socrates, who had expressed almost the same view in the *Apology* and in Book I of the *Republic*.⁸⁷

Far from being a whole-hearted supporter of Stoicism, Muret was not even a half-hearted one. Although much better informed about Stoic philosophy than Erasmus, he was no more sympathetic towards it—if anything, less so. Erasmus, warning readers of his 1529 Seneca edition about doctrines that they, as Christians, should be wary of, noted that the Stoics regarded their wise man as the equal, if not superior, of the gods, and made him entirely responsible for his own happiness.⁸⁸ Muret, in attacking

⁸⁴ See his note on *Nicomachean Ethics* II.3, in Muret (1789), III, p. 255: ‘moderandas esse affectiones, non ex homine tollendas’; see also his commentary on Book II of Plato’s *Republic*, *ibid.*, p. 572: ‘Fortes autem qui sunt, iidem plerumque et iracundi esse consueverunt; recteque dictum est a Peripateticis, iram esse fortitudinis cotem.’

⁸⁵ See his note on *Nicomachean Ethics* II.3, in Muret (1789), III, p. 254: ‘Ut autem alia pleraque, ita hoc quoque Stoicorum placitum absurdissimum est, et pugnat cum ipsa natura, quae numquam illos animorum motus hominum generi insevisset, si illi eradicandi et evellendi, tanquam prorsus inutiles, essent.’

⁸⁶ See his note on ‘Peperceram’, *Epistola* LXXXV, in Seneca (1585), p. 209: ‘Multa colligit, quibus Stoici probabant, virtutem solam satis esse ad bene beateque vivendum; et aliter sententiarum opiniones breviter refutat. Multa de hac Stoicorum sententia apud Ciceronem in libris De finibus et quinto Tusculanae leguntur. Sed extat et summi Peripatetici Alexandri Aphrodisiensis eruditissimus commentariolus, in quo accurate adversus hanc gloriosam et magnificam Stoicorum sententiam disputatur’; see Alexander of Aphrodisias (1887), pp. 159–68.

⁸⁷ See his introductory note to ‘In librum quod in sapientem, neque iniuria cadat, neque contumelia’, i.e., *De constantia*, *ibid.*, p. 312: ‘Hoc quod inter admirabilia Stoicorum numerarit aliquis, sapientem nulli iniuriae patere, plane Socraticum est. Nam cum iniuriam accipere non dicatur, nisi qui ab alio laeditur; sapiens autem laedi non queat; consequens est, eum extra iniuriam esse. ... Haec a Socrate et in Apologia, et libro primo de Rep[ublica] in hanc fere sententiam disputantur.’ See also his note on ‘Nemo prudens’, *De ira* I.xix.7, *ibid.*, p. 278: ‘Platonicum.’ Muret thought that Seneca’s *Naturales quaestiones* were largely taken over from Aristotle’s *Meteorology*: see ‘Ad libros Senecae Naturalium quaestionum’, *ibid.*, p. 410: ‘Hi libri, maximam partem, sumpti sunt ex Aristotelis Meteorologicis ...’

⁸⁸ Erasmus (1906–58), VIII, p. 31: ‘nusquam magis discrepat [Seneca] a Christiana philosophia quam quum ea tractat quae nobis sunt praecipua. ... [Q]uoties incidit in sapientem illum Stoicum, sic eum attollit ut frequenter diis aequet, nonnunquam et anteponat. Ait sapientem universam felicitatem suam sibi uni debere, diis nihil opus esse,

this same doctrine, is openly abusive, decrying ‘the impious and intolerable arrogance of the Stoics’.⁸⁹ In addition to insulting the Stoics, he also enjoyed poking fun at them. Drawing, as he frequently does, on Plutarch, who was no friend of the Stoics, he notes that the doctrine that all virtues and all vices are equal means that it is no more courageous to receive a wound fighting for one’s country than to endure a flea bite, and that it is no more temperate to abstain from a beautiful virgin in the full flower of youth than from an ugly old woman with one foot in the grave.⁹⁰

The problem with the Stoics, as Muret saw it, was that while many of their *sententiae* were worthy of respect, many others were manifestly idiotic. An example of the latter category was the belief held by the early Greek Stoics that everything, including virtues and the good, was not only composed of matter but was actually a living creature. This notion was so ridiculous that you would scarcely believe that a demented old woman dreamed it up. Yet those severe founding fathers of the Stoic sect, those bearded masters, those pillars of wisdom had in all seriousness handed it down as true doctrine. Muret praises Seneca for attempting to refute this Stoic nonsense.⁹¹ He also approves of Seneca’s opposition to the view of

immo deos aliquid debere sapienti. At pietas nobis persuasit etiam passerculos et lilia Deo curae esse, tum hominem nihil habere ex sese boni, sed summam suae felicitatis debere munificentiae Numinis.’ See also Panizza (1987).

⁸⁹ See his note on ‘Ferte fortiter, hoc est, quo deum anteceditis’, *De providentia* vi.6, in Seneca (1585), p. 232: ‘Haec vero intoleranda Stoicorum arrogantia est. Parum putarunt, sapientem suum cum deo conferre, etiam anteposuerunt. Haec monstra opinionum perterrefacere nos debent, ne unquam ingenio nostro confisi, quidquam de rebus divinis temere aut statuere aut pronuntiare audeamus’; see also his note on ‘Bonus ipse tempore tantum a deo differt’, *De providentia* I.5, *ibid.*, p. 230: ‘Itaque dicebant, hominem esse mortalem deum; deum vero hominem immortalem. Sed hoc multo quam par est audacius ac superbius dictum est’; and his note on ‘Est aliquid quo sapiens antecedit Deum’, *Epistola* LIII.11, *ibid.*, p. 204: ‘Impia et intolerabilis arrogantia Stoicorum, qui non satis esse ducebant sapientem suum cum Deo ex aequo componere nisi etiam anteponerent.’

⁹⁰ See his note on ‘Quoniam utrumque ubi ex virtute fit, par est’, *De beneficiis* VI.xliii.1, *ibid.*, p. 57: ‘Stoici, ut omnia peccata, sic omnia recte facta paria esse dicebant, neque maiorem esse fortitudinem in vulneribus pro patria excipiendis, quam in morsu pulicis fortiter ferendo, neque maiorem temperantiam, si quis a virgine formosa, et ipso aetatis flore constituta, quam si ab informi et capulari vetula abstineret, dum utrumque ex virtute fieret. Auctor Plutarchus [*De Stoicorum repugnantiis* 1039A].’

⁹¹ See his note on ‘Tardius rescribo’, *Epistola* CVI.1, in Seneca (1585), p. 214: ‘Stoicorum multae graves sententiae erant, multae etiam insigniter fatuae. Huius secundi generis est ea, quae hic a Seneca molli, ut aiunt, brachio tractatur: Bonum omne esse corpus. ... Ab hoc principio profecti, ut, ubi falsa aliquid pro vero positum est, necessario multa consimilia consequuntur, eo progrediebantur, ut, et virtutes et vitia, et omnes animi motus non corpora modo sed et animalia esse dicerent’; and on ‘Desideras’, *Epistola* CXIII.1, *ibid.*, p. 215: ‘Nisi certa et manifesta veterum testimonia extarent, vix crederemus sententiam, quae hic a Seneca confutatur et irridetur, cuiquam excordi ac delirae ancilulae in mentem venire potuisse. Quid enim absurdius aut magis ridiculum cogitari potest quam, non modo animum ipsum animal est ... sed et omnes virtutes, omnia vitia, omnes motus animorum, ipsas

Zeno and Chrysippus that the wise man should engage in politics;⁹² and he applauds Seneca for regarding the life of scholarship as more beneficial to mankind.⁹³ Muret, in fact, gives the general impression of rather regretting that such a sensible man as Seneca had ever got caught up in the 'foolish wisdom of the Stoics'. After condemning the Stoic belief that it was legitimate for the wise man to commit suicide, Muret writes: 'I wish that Seneca had kept his distance from this madness or at least had been more moderate and sparing in commending it.'⁹⁴

The Senecan *sententiae* which Muret recommended to his readers were not hard-line Stoic pronouncements, but somewhat hackneyed moral precepts, such as the need for a serious philosopher to regard poverty as of no account.⁹⁵ It is revealing that the only time Muret consciously adopts a Stoic attitude, his tone is distinctly humorous. Lamenting the deplorable state of the text of *De ira*, he says that we would be justified in getting very

denique cogitationes nostras esse animalia? Et hoc tamen severi illi Stoicae disciplinae principes, illi barbati magistri, illa sapientiae columina pro vero ac serio tradiderunt.'

⁹² See his note on 'Etiam si non praecepto, at exemplo', *Epistola* LXVIII, *ibid.*, p. 207: 'Stoicorum enim principes, etsi remp[ublicam] sapienti capessendam esse dicebant, ipsi tamen ad eam nunquam accesserunt. Atque hoc nomine in primis eos reprehendit Plutarchus, quod eorum cum vita pugnat oratio.' Elsewhere, however, Muret's noted that Seneca too had been accused of not practising what he preached: see his note on *Nicomachean Ethics* I.8, in Muret (1789), III, p. 215: 'Stoici verbo negligebant opes, sed non constabant sibi; ... et quidam eorum nimium magnum studium posuerunt in congerendis opibus. Quo nomine a quibusdam notatus est etiam Seneca.'

⁹³ See his note on 'Tu me, inquis', *Epistola* VIII.1, in Seneca (1585), pp. 196–7: 'Videri poterat Seneca disciplinae suae conditoribus contraria docere, cum Lucilio auctor esset, ut se a rebus agendis abduceret, vitaretque omnium prope consuetudinem otiumque, ac solitudinem amaret. Zeno enim et Chrysippus et ceteri Stoicorum duces suadebant, capessendam esse remp[ublicam], neque sapienti esse in otio consensendum. At Seneca neque se id sibi consilii capere ait, neque cuiquam dare, ut se desidiae atque ignaviae tradat; tantum, ne nos improborum, quae maxima multitudo est, exempla transversos agant, secedendum esse, et excolendum in otio animum, ommissa aliarum rerum omnium cura, intereaque commendanda ac consignanda litteris sapientiae praecepta; quod qui faciunt, multo eorum vita humano generi fructuosior est, quam si forensibus negotiis intenti, levium et nihil ad beatam vitam pertinentium rerum tractatione tempus omne consumerant.'

⁹⁴ See his note on 'Post longum intervallum', *Epistola* LXX.1, *ibid.*, p. 207: 'Hoc ... ex illa stulta Stoicorum sapientia est, qua putabant multa evenire posse, propter quae sapiens mortem sibi consciscere deberet. Vellem, Seneca aut ab illa insania abfuisset, aut saltem in ea commendanda parcior ac moderatior fuisset.'

⁹⁵ See his note on 'Si vales', *Epistola* XX.1, *ibid.*, p. 199: 'Re et vita, non verbis, philosophandum; et contemnendam paupertatem ei qui serio philosophari velit.' See also his note on the word 'Librorum', in *Epistola* XLV.1, *ibid.*, p. 222 [*recte* 202]: 'Libris non multis opus esse, sed bonis; et in studiis non subtilia quaerenda esse, sed utilia.'

angry indeed at those responsible for its poor condition, if the work itself did not prohibit anger. Let us bear this loss, he says, with equanimity.⁹⁶

Muret, who became a Catholic priest in 1576, was deeply concerned about the relationship of Stoicism to Christianity. On one occasion, commenting on the statement in *De providentia* that a good man is ‘the true offspring’ of God, he writes, echoing various passages from the Bible: ‘They will be sons of God’,⁹⁷ and continues: ‘At times you would say that this man had laid his hands on the Holy Scriptures and dipped into them.’⁹⁸ Far more commonly, however, he draws attention to the incompatibility of Stoic doctrines with Christian theology. Erasmus, as we have seen, had done the same in his 1529 edition;⁹⁹ but Muret was much more forthright in denouncing the views of the Stoics on fate, the origin of evil and the nature of the divinity as dangerously impious, as well as utterly foolish.¹⁰⁰

This issue was also confronted by Giulio Roscio, another of Muret’s former students, who prepared the index for the 1585 edition. In the preface to this index, Roscio explains that Cardinal Savelli, representing the Holy Office of the Inquisition, had advised him to issue a spiritual health warning, alerting readers to the heretical doctrines they would encounter in Seneca. Roscio therefore provides a list of those topics which Christian readers should approach with caution, including Seneca’s polytheism and

⁹⁶ See his note on *De ira*, *ibid.*, p. 276: ‘Hi libri, ut pleraque huius scriptoris, ita mutili decurtatique sunt, ut iusta prope causa fuerit graviter iis irascendi, quorum id negligentia contigit, nisi ipsimet irasci nos vetarent. Feramus hanc quoque iacturam aequo animo ...’

⁹⁷ See his note on ‘Et vera progenies’, *De providentia* i.5, *ibid.*, p. 230: ‘Erunt filii Dei’; cf. Matthew 5:9, Romans 8:16 and 9:26, Galatians 3:26.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*: ‘Dicis interdum hunc hominem litteras sacras attigisse ac degustasse.’ His note on ‘Infrunita et antiqua est’, *De beneficiis* III.xvi.3, *ibid.*, p. 26, is merely lexical: ‘Infrunita est insulsa. Sic in libro De vita beata [xxiii.3]: “Alterum infruniti animi est, alterum timidi et pusilli.” Sic in sacris litteris [Ecclesiasticus 23:6]: “Animo irreverenti et infrunito ne tradas me Domine.”’

⁹⁹ See the passage cited in n. 88 above.

¹⁰⁰ See his note on ‘Fata nos ducunt’, *De providentia* V.7, in Seneca (1585), p. 232: ‘In quo insaniebant. In deo enim libera et absoluta rerum omnium potestas est, necessitas nulla ... Ut a tam impiarum opinionum faeditate longissime abesse, ita omnes voces quae illarum suspicionem movere aliquam possint, studiosissime vitare debemus. Si Christiani sumus, utamur et moribus et vocibus Christianis’; his note on ‘Non potest artifex mutare materiam’, *De providentia* v.9, *ibid.*: ‘Stulta haec opinio de origine malorum. Materiam continuisse in se malorum omnium semina; eam autem a Deo non potuisse mutari. ... Non cogitant videlicet, ut cetera omnia, sic materiam ipsam a Deo conditam esse. ... Itaque malorum origo aliunde repetenda et aliter explicanda est’; and his note on ‘Quam stultum est optare’, *Epistola* XLI.1, *ibid.*, p. 222 [*recte* 202]: ‘Impietatis et stultitiae plena haec sententia Stoicorum fuit. Audiebant summo omnium gentium consensu deos bonorum datores vocari. Ipsi autem praeter virtutem, bonam mentem, rationem perfectam, et talia nihil in bonis habendam esse dicebant, et ea divinitus dari negabant; sibi ea quemque suis viribus parere dicebant. Itaque si sibi constare vellent, deos nullius boni datores esse dicerent, necesse erat.’

determinism, his approval of suicide and his dubious position on the immortality of the soul.¹⁰¹ He goes on to say, however, that this should not lead readers to disdain or skip over other, far wiser, precepts of Seneca, which deserved careful consideration; for Seneca's errors often occurred in close proximity to views that were close to Christian truth. After citing a few parallels between Seneca and the Bible, Roscio writes: 'Those things which we often read in Christian authors constantly crop up in Seneca: the greatest and most powerful God directs everything; the world was created on account of his Goodness' and so on.¹⁰² It is a great pity, he concludes, that this man who lived at the dawn of the Christian era and could have heard Peter and Paul preaching the truth failed to see the light. For had he received baptism, we would have, with only a few changes, a Christian philosopher.¹⁰³

These words seem close in spirit to Lipsius, who in dedicating his 1605 edition to Pope Paul V, stated that Seneca was 'virtually a Christian'.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰¹ See 'Iulius Roscius Hortinus Lectori', in Seneca (1585), sigs Zz1^v-2^r: 'Ego vero IACOBI SABELLI Cardinalis amplissimi in primis consilium secutus, qui in iis, quae ad pravitatem haereticorum coercendam ac conservandam religionis dignitatem pertinent, vigilantissimus est; operae pretium duxi et de hoc primum admonere lectorem, et eorum errorum, qui apud Senecam reperiuntur exempla quaedam, e quibus alii intelligi possint, indicare. Nam et de divina natura usitato Ethnicorum more loquitur, quasi plures Dii sint, et factorum necessitati nimium saepe tribuit. Tum de mundo an ex tempore vel ex aeternitate sit conditus, non definit; de eodemque utrum corpus an anima sit ambigit. Quam deinde inconstanter de animo humano disputat, quem modo igne tenuiorem, corporeum tam videtur dicere modo Deum ipsum in humano corpore hospitantem appellat, modo animal asseverare non dubitat, eiusque immortalitatem ab omnibus sapientibus receptam in certamen vocat.' See also Niutta and Santucci (1999), pp. 80, 82.

¹⁰² Seneca (1585), sig. ZZ2^r: 'Nec interim contemnat alia longe plura sapientissime dicta, eaque non praepropera lectione excurrat; sed diligenter considerata, animoque infixata, exequi re ipsa ac perficere studeat. Nam ut iis quorum exempla protulimus, erroribus in simili argumento cum veritate Christiana coniunctissimas sententias apud Senecam haberi ostendamus, nonne cum dicit, Deum etiam ingratum multa tribuere, alludere ad illud videtur, quod est in Evangelio [Matthew 5:45]: Pluit super iustos et iniustos? Nonne quod Regius propheta dicit [Ecclesiasticus 39:24]: Omnia aperta sunt oculis eius, simillimum est illi, quod Seneca aliis verbis exponit, Deum omnia nosse etiam futura? ... Et illa quae apud nostros saepe legimus, crebra sunt apud Senecam: Deum maximum et potentissimum omnia vehere; fabricandi mundum bonitatem ipsius causam fuisse; eundem providentia, quam Pronean vocant Stoici, opus suum disponere, ac sedentem spectare; fato nec preces, nec vota, nec expiationes, nec libertatem arbitrii ullo modo repugnare; Deum probare homines, et quos amat recognoscere atque exercere; nullam sine eo mentem sanam esse; mortem denique expectandam sine taedio vitae.'

¹⁰³ Ibid.: 'Miserandum sane, Virum, qui nascentis religionis nostrae initia spectare, Petrumque et Paulum veritatis praecones audire potuit, fidei fulgorem divinitus tunc mundo illucescentem non respexisse. Nam si sacro ei lavacro ablui datum esset, paucis mutatis, Christianum philosophum haberemus.'

¹⁰⁴ See Lipsius's dedicatory letter to Pope Paul V, in Seneca (1605), sig. *3^v: 'En, Annaeum Senecam laudatissimum inter omnes veteres scriptorem, et virtutis studio paene Christianum (ita nostri censuerunt) ...'

The Christian Neostoicism of Lipsius is unlikely, however, to have won approval from Muret. We know that he owned a copy of Lipsius's *De constantia* published in 1584;¹⁰⁵ but if he managed to read the treatise before he died the following year, it left no discernible trace on his edition of Seneca. Nor would Muret, whose philosophical inclinations were towards Aristotle and Plato, have agreed with Lipsius's view that Seneca, in philosophy, especially moral philosophy, had surpassed 'all who have been and will be'.¹⁰⁶ Muret's knowledge of Stoic philosophy, though deeper than Erasmus's, was less thorough than that of Lipsius, who made it his business to collect every scrap of information on the sect surviving from antiquity. Unlike Muret, who believed that Seneca deserved to be read despite his Stoicism, Lipsius valued Seneca in large measure because he offered the most attractive and comprehensive version of Stoic moral philosophy, which he believed was the necessary remedy for the turbulent passions of the civil and religious wars which threatened the peace of mind of his contemporaries. Just as the historical works of Tacitus, in Lipsius's view, could serve as a political textbook for late sixteenth-century Europe, so Seneca's philosophical works, he firmly believed, were an invaluable moral tract for his own times. As with attitudes towards Seneca's Latin style and approaches to the philological problems presented by his writings, so too with the assessment of his moral philosophy, the 1605 edition of Lipsius was the end result of a humanist re-evaluation of Seneca, beginning with Erasmus and carried forward by Muret.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander of Aphrodisias (1887) *De anima libri mantissa*, ed. I. Bruns, Supplementum Aristotelicum II.1, Berlin: G. Reimer.
- Allen, M. J. B. (1981) *Marsilio Ficino and the Phaedran Charioteer*, Berkeley etc.: University of California Press.
- Andersson, D. C. (2002) 'Marc-Antoine Muret's Moral Philosophy: The Renaissance Contest of Disciplines', *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance* 64, pp. 669–78.
- Bibliographie lipsienne: Oeuvres de Juste Lipse* (1886), 2 vols, Ghent: C. Vyt.
- Boccolini Palagi, L. (1978) *Il carteggio apocrifo di Seneca e San Paolo*, Florence: Olschki.
- Boucher, W. (1995) "'Le moyen de voir ce Seneque escrit à la main": Montaigne's *Journal de voyage* and the Politics of *Science* and *Faveur* in the Vatican Library', *Michigan Romance Studies* 15 [= *(Ré)interprétations: études sur le seizième siècle*, ed. J. O'Brien], pp. 177–214.

¹⁰⁵ See Niuitta and Santucci (1999), p. 113 (scheda 50).

¹⁰⁶ 'Iudicium super Seneca eiusque scriptis', in Seneca (1605), p. xi: 'Itaque sententiam pro te, Seneca, audacter ferimus: in Philosophia, ac praesertim Morali eius parte, vicisti qui fuerunt, qui erunt; accipe palmam, non magis quam Herculi clavam (omnes omnia faciant) extorquendam'.

- Budé, Guillaume (1557) *Omnia opera*, 4 vols, Basel: Nicolaus Episcopus; repr. Farnborough: Gregg, 1969.
- Catullus (1961), *Carmina*, ed. C. J. Fordyce, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Conte, E. (1991) *I maestri della Sapienza di Roma dal 1514 al 1787: i rotuli e altre fonti*, 2 vols, Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo.
- Croll, Morris W (1924) 'Muret and the History of "Attic Prose"', *PMLA* 39, pp. 254–309.
- (1966) *Style, Rhetoric, and Rhythm: Essays*, ed. J. M. Patrick et al., Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Dejob, C. (1881) *Marc-Antoine Muret: un professeur français en Italie dans la seconde moitié du XVI^e siècle*, Paris, E. Thorin; repr. Geneva: Slatkine, 1970.
- Erasmus, Desiderius (1906–58) *Opus epistolarum*, ed. P. S. Allen et al., 12 vols, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (1971) *Ciceronianus*, ed. P. Mesnard, in his *Opera*, Amsterdam, North-Holland, I.2, pp. 599–710.
- Ford, P. J. (1998) 'Justus Lipsius and Sir Philip Sidney', *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome* 68 [=The World of Justus Lipsius: A Contribution towards His Intellectual Biography, Proceedings of a Colloquium (Rome, 1997), ed. M. Laureys et al.], pp. 121–36.
- Grafinger, C. M. (1993) *Die Ausleihe Vatikanischer Handschriften und Druckwerke (1563–1700)*, Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.
- Grafton, A. T. (1977) 'On the Scholarship of Politian and Its Context', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 40, pp. 150–88.
- Grendler, P. F. (2002) *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance*, Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hankins, J. (1990) *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*, 2 vols, Leiden etc.: E. J. Brill.
- IJsewijn, J. (1998) 'Marcantonio Mureto', *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome* 68 [=The World of Justus Lipsius: A Contribution towards His Intellectual Biography, Proceedings of a Colloquium (Rome, 1997), ed. M. Laureys et al.], pp. 71–80.
- Jardine, L. (1993) *Erasmus, Man of Letters: The Construction of Charisma in Print*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- John of Salisbury (1909) *Policraticus*, ed. C. C. I. Webb, 2 vols, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kraye, J. (1983) 'Cicero, Stoicism and Textual Criticism: Poliziano on κατόρθωμα', *Rinascimento* 23, pp. 79–110.
- 'Renaissance Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics', in *The Vocabulary of Teaching and Research between Middle Ages and Renaissance*, Proceedings of the Colloquium: London, Warburg Institute, 11–12 March 1994, ed. O. Weijers, Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 96–117.
- Kristeller, P. O. (1961) *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanist Strains*, New York etc.: Harper Torchbooks.
- Lipsius, Justus (1584) *De constantia libri duo, qui alloquium praecipue continent in publicis malis*, Antwerp: Plantin.
- (1586) *De recta pronuntiatione linguae Latinae dialogus*, Antwerp: Plantin.
- (1595) *De cruce libri tres ...*, Antwerp: Plantin.
- (1675) *Opera omnia*, 4 vols, Wesel: Hoogenhuysen.
- Lohr, C. H. (1988) *Latin Aristotle Commentaries*, Florence: Olschki, II: *Renaissance Authors*.
- Mayer, R. (1994) 'Personata Stoa: Neostoicism and Senecan Tragedy', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 57, pp. 151–74.
- Morford, M. (1991) *Stoics and Neostoics: Rubens and the Circle of Lipsius*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Montaigne, Michel de (1962) *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. A. Thibaudet and M. Rat, Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Mouchel, C. (1997) 'Muret (Marc-Antoine)', in *Centuriae Latinae: Cent une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières offertes à Jacques Chomarat*, ed. C. Nativel, Geneva: Droz, pp. 575–9.
- Muret, Marc-Antoine (1789) *Opera omnia*, ed. D. Ruhnken, 4 vols, Leiden: Luchtmans.
- (1995) *Caesar. Juvenilia*, ed. and transl. D. Schmitz, Frankfurt a. M.: Lang.
- Negri, F. (1966), 'Benci, Francesco', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, VIII, p. 192–3.
- Niutta F. and Santucci, C. (eds.) (1999) *Seneca: mostra bibliografica e iconografica* (Teatro dei Dioscuri, Roma ... 1999), Rome: Fratelli Palombi.
- Nolhac, P. de (1883) *La bibliothèque d'un humaniste au XVI^e siècle: catalogue des livres annotés par Muret*, Rome: Imprimerie de la Paix.
- Panizza, L. A. (1976) 'The St Paul-Seneca Correspondence: Its Significance for Stoic Thought from Petrarch to Erasmus', PhD dissertation, Warburg Institute, University of London.
- (1987) 'Erasmus' 1515 and 1529 Editions of Seneca, and Gasparino Barzizza', *Classical and Modern Literature* 7, pp. 319–32.
- Papy, J. (2002) 'Erasmus's and Lipsius's Editions of Seneca: A "Complementary Project"?', *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 22, pp. 10–36.
- Peeters, H. (1998) 'La correspondance de Juste Lipse avec Plauto/Francesco Benci: la récit d'une amitié', in *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome* 68 [=The World of Justus Lipsius: A Contribution towards His Intellectual Biography, Proceedings of a Colloquium (Rome, 1997), ed. M. Laureys et al.], pp. 97–119.
- Poliziano, Angelo (1553) *Opera quae quidem extant omnia*, Basel: N. Episcopius.
- Reynolds, L. D. (1986) 'Seneca the Younger: *De beneficiis* and *De clementia*', in *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, ed. L. D. Reynolds, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 363–5.
- Ronsard, Pierre and Muret, Marc-Antoine (1999) *Les Amours, leurs Commentaires. Texte de 1553*, ed. C. de Buzon and P. Martin, Paris: Didier.
- Ruysschaert, J. (1947–8) 'Le séjour de Juste Lipse à Rome (1568–1570)', *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome* 24, pp. 139–92.
- (1949) *Juste Lipse et les Annales de Tacite*, Turnhout: Brepols.
- Sacré, D. (1996) 'Juste Lipse et la prononciation du latin', in *Juste Lipse (1547–1606) en son temps*, Actes du colloque de Strasbourg, 1994, ed. C. Mouchel, Paris: Honoré Champion, pp. 117–31.
- Scaligeriana* (1666) Geneva: P. Columesius.
- Seneca (1515) *Lucubrationes omnes...*, ed. D. Erasmus, Basel: Froben.
- (1529) *Opera*, ed. D. Erasmus, Basel: Hervagius.
- (1575) *De providentia liber singularis. Emendatus a M. Antonio Mureto ...*, Rome: J. De Angelis.
- (1585) *L. Annaeus Seneca a M. Antonio Mureto correctus et notis illustratus*, Rome: B. Grassi.
- (1605) *Opera*, ed. J. Lipsius, Antwerp: Plantin.
- (1914) *De beneficiis libri VII, De clementia libri II*, ed. C. Hosius, Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- (1975) *Moral Essays*, transl. J. W. Basore, Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, III.
- Trinquet, R. (1965) 'Recherches chronologiques sur la jeunesse de Marc-Antoine Muret', *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance* 27, pp. 272–85.
- Winterbottom, M. (1986) 'The Elder Seneca', in *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, ed. L. D. Reynolds, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 356–7.

INDEX OF NAMES

- Abel, G. 274
 Abercrombie, N. 54, 60
 Acciaiuoli, A. 286
 Acciaiuoli, D. 3, 8, 15, 19, 21
 Adrian VI 55
 Aegidius Romanus 8, 14, 18, 24,
 70, 149
 Agricola, R. 317
 Ailly, P. 159, 199
 Al-Farabi 226
 Alanen, L. 303
 Albert of Saxony 8, 16
 Albert the Great 8, 12, 16, 19-20,
 23, 25-26, 70, 219, 225-29
 Aldama, J.M. 54
 Alexander of Aphrodisias 323
 Alexander VII 109
 Alfaro, J. 68, 75
 Alfrado, J. 60
 Allen, M.J.B. 321
 Almain, J. 165-67, 178
 Alsted, J. 258, 262
 Althaus, P. 195
 Amico, F. 127, 132-33
 Amort. E. 108-09
 Andersson, D.C. 308
 Annas, J. 285
 Anscombe, E. 104-05
 Anselm of Canterbury 38
 Antoninus Florentinus 184
 Aquinas, see Thomas
 Aragón, P. 117, 123, 125, 127,
 131
 Argyropoulos, J. 21, 212
 Aristotle 4-5, 7-29, 34, 80, 93,
 104, 115, 144, 150, 175,
 195, 197-98, 212, 217-18,
 223-24, 226-28, 230, 235,
 240, 247, 249 50, 258, 272-
 74, 284-86, 289, 295-96,
 298, 300, 302, 307-10, 321-
 23, 328
 Armellada, B. 83
 Arnauld, A. 51, 108
 Arriaga, R. 73, 125, 131
 Ascoli, C. 18
 Auer, J. 52
 Augustine 23, 38, 52-53, 59, 67-
 68, 76, 79-80, 126, 128,
 152, 207, 270, 284, 287-88,
 296, 315-16
 Aulus Gellius 287, 296, 311, 318
 Austin, J. 48-49
 Averroes 8, 12, 14, 16, 19, 23-24,
 26, 70
 Avicenna 294
 Azo, P. 182, 186
 Azor, J. 108
 Azpilcueta, M. 125
 Baciero, C. 99
 Baethgen, F. 142, 152
 Baius, M. 3, 51-90
 Baius, J. 67
 Baldelli, N. 128-29, 136
 Báñez, D. 72-73, 131
 Barad, J. 10
 Bardi, F. 107
 Baron, H. 175
 Baron, V. 101
 Barrientos Garcia, J. 117
 Baudry, L. 56

- Baur, J. 267
 Bayer, O. 196-97, 201
 Becchi, F. 285
 Becker, H.-J. 155
 Behrisch, L. 260
 Belda Plans, J. 74, 81
 Bellarmine, R. 54, 64, 67, 125
 Bellucci, D. 4, 5, 235-54
 Beltrán de Heredia, V. 72, 74
 Benci, F. 314, 316
 Bentham, J. 105, 110
 Bentley, J.H. 56
 Benzo Mestre, M. 72
 Bermejo, I.J. 72
 Betts, R.R. 185
 Beyerhaus, G. 267-68
 Bèze, T. 261
 Bianchi, L. 8, 19
 Biel, G. 199, 202, 237
 Biersack, M. 54, 67
 Black, D.L. 294
 Blic, J. 94-95
 Block, S.J. 293
 Blythe, J.M. 158
 Bociolini Palagi, L. 315
 Bockmühl, K. 255
 Bohatec, J. 267
 Boissard, E. 64
 Bonagratia of Bergamo 151-54
 Bonaventure 79, 121-22, 142-43,
 168, 170-72, 175-76, 183,
 221
 Bonet-Maury, G. 268
 Boniface VIII 149
 Bonino, S.-T. 51, 77
 Borde, B.-M. 73
 Bornier, P. 115
 Borromeo, C. 66
 Bossuet, W. 124, 126
 Bottin, F. 147
 Bourdaloue, L. 123-24
 Butcher, W. 316
 Bouwsma, W.J. 284
 Bradley, D.J.M. 70, 76
 Bramhall, J. 39
 Bresser, M. 95
 Brett, A. 57, 80-81, 141-42, 156,
 159, 166, 168-69, 181, 184-
 85, 189
 Brodrick, J. 64, 67
 Bruni, L. 21
 Brunn, E. 225
 Buckland, J.A. 170
 Budé, G. 321-22
 Burger, C.P. 53
 Buridan, J. 3, 7-29, 107
 Burley, W., see Walter
 Burmeister, K.-H. 272
 Burr, D. 143, 168
 Busenbaum, H. 95
 Cajetan 3, 70-73, 75, 78-81, 94-
 95, 102, 116-19, 121, 123,
 126
 Calvin, J. 58, 255, 262-65, 267-69
 Campo, H. 56
 Canning, J. 142
 Cano, M. 131
 Capitani, O. 150
 Capreolus, J. 73, 77, 116, 125-26
 Caramuel Lobkowitz, J. 107, 109
 Cardenas, J. 107
 Carro, V. 53, 72
 Casini, L. 5, 283-305
 Cassirer, E. 275
 Castro-Palao, F. 131, 136
 Catullus 7, 318
 Celenza, C.S. 7
 Ceyssens, L. 57, 67
 Charles V 99
 Charron, P. 101, 115
 Chifflet, J. 313
 Chrysippus 325
 Church, W. 101
 Cicero 7, 26, 82, 236, 238, 245,
 247-48, 272-73, 284-87,

- 292, 297, 302, 310, 313,
 320-23
 Claeys-Bouuaert, F. 55, 65, 67
 Clainer, G. 136
 Clements, R.D. 290, 299
 Coleman, J. 171
 Colombo, G. 60
 Concina, D. 97
 Conde Salazar, M. 293
 Coninck, G. 131
 Conte, E. 309
 Contenson, V. 101-02
 Cooper, J.M. 291
 Copenhaver, B. 1, 101
 Cordoba, A. 128
 Courtenay, W. 68, 149, 199-203,
 213
 Couttenier, J. 55
 Couvreur, G. 156
 Covarruvias, D. 117, 120-21, 134
 Craemer-Ruegenberg, I. 225
 Croll, M.W. 310, 314
 Cyprian 260, 267

 Dahan, G. 56
 Daiber, H. 226
 Dal Ponte, R. 150
 Daneau, L. 5, 257-74
 Davies, J. 23
 Dawson, J.D. 159
 De France, J. 62
 De Jongh, H. 55-56
 De Petris, A. 286
 De Ram, P.F.X. 58
 De Vocht, H. 55
 De Vries de Heekelingen, H. 261
 Decker, R. 120
 Dejob, C. 308-09
 Del Nero, V. 288
 Del Rio, M. 136, 315
 Deman, T. 92, 102
 Denzinger, H. 62-64, 68
 Descartes, R. 101

 Deuringer, K. 123, 131
 Di Napoli, G. 71, 78
 Diemer, A. 262
 Dierse, U. 262
 Dieter, T. 210
 Dillon, J.M. 286, 297
 Dilthey, W. 219, 275, 301
 Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite 152
 Dolcini, C. 153, 158
 Dostoyevsky, F. 132
 Doyle, J.P. 116, 120-21, 128-30
 Driedo, J. 56
 Du Chesne, J.-B. 54
 Dufour, A. 261
 Duns Scotus, J. 33-35, 38, 76-79,
 141, 147-52, 157, 192, 200
 Durandus of Saint-Pourçain 77,
 124, 126-27, 138
 Döllinger, I. 108

 Ebbesen, S. 2, 141
 Ebeling, G. 201
 Eberle, A. 109
 Elert, W. 255
 Elizondo, F. 143
 Elorduy, E. 72
 Epictetus 7
 Erasmus 289, 307-08, 310-11,
 314-15, 317-21, 323, 326,
 328
 Eusebius 270
 Eustratius 8, 11-12, 16, 19, 26

 Fabisch, P. 55-56
 Fabri, H. 118
 Farnese, A. 66
 Fatjo, O. 261, 271
 Federico Vescovini, G. 16, 19
 Feenstra, R. 167
 Feld, H. 181
 Félice, P. 261, 269
 Fenelon, L. 124, 126
 Ferrari, F. 73

- Ficino, M. 7, 231, 321
 Field, A. 23
 Filelfo, F. 286
 Fillion-Lahille, J. 291, 296
 FitzRalph, R. 159, 184-85, 188
 Flood, D. 154-55
 Florentinus 189-91
 Flüeler, C. 18, 141, 146, 150-51
 Ford, P.J. 313
 Fordyce, C.J. 318
 Forsberg, J. 201
 Fortenbaugh, W.W. 293
 Francis of Ascoli 154-56
 Francis of Assisi 169
 Francis of Meyronnes 152
 Frank, G. 4-5, 217-33, 252
 Franklin, J. 92
 Frati, L. 16
 Frederick V 261
 Friedberg, E. 98
 Friedman, R.L. 2
 Fumagalli, M. 68

 Gál, G. 154-55
 Galen 290-91
 Galeota, G. 54, 67
 Galston, M. 226
 Garin, E. 16
 Garzoni, G. 16
 Gass, W. 261
 Gauthier, R.-A. 9, 15, 17, 19
 Gerard of Abbeville 167-68, 170-71, 173, 175
 Gerard of Odo 8, 16, 20-21, 25
 Gerberon, G. 54
 Geremia da Montagnone 7
 Gerson, J. 4, 107, 159, 184-89
 Gielis, M. 56
 Giles, see Aegidius
 Gill, C. 285, 291-92
 Gillner, M. 99
 Gilson, É. 70, 78

 Godfrey of Fontaines 4, 119-32, 146, 168, 176-78
 Gonet, J.B. 120
 González, E. 290
 Goris, H. 71
 Gozeus, T. 57
 Grabmann, M. 70
 Grafinger, C.M. 316
 Grafton, A.T. 317
 Granado, D. 125, 131-33
 Granvelle, Cardinal 57-58, 65-66
 Gratian 167
 Green, L.D. 284
 Gregory of Rimini 76
 Gregory IX 169-70
 Gregory XIII 66, 316
 Grendler, P.F. 309
 Greschat, M. 199
 Grimani, D. 15
 Grisar, J. 66
 Grosse, S. 107
 Grossi, P. 141
 Grotius, H. 128
 Guelluy, R. 55
 Guevara, J. 99
 Guillot, A. 261
 Guldentops, G. 82

 Hall, B. 268
 Hallensleben, B. 72
 Hamelius, J. 67
 Hamm, B. 199, 202
 Hankins, J. 7, 307
 Harvey, E.R. 294
 Hasse, D.N. 294
 Hauchlin, J. 66
 Hegel, G.W.F. 260
 Hell, C. 136
 Henniges, H. 130
 Henri IV 257
 Henricus de Hassia 190
 Henricus Totting de Oyta 190

- Henry of Friemar 8, 16
Henry of Gent 168, 176
Herder, J. 260
Hermann, H. 317
Hervaeus Natalis 183-84
Hesiod 236
Hessels van Est, W. 73
Hessels, J. 55-58, 62, 73
Hieronymus of Rhodes 298
Hillenaar, H. 126
Hobbes, T. 39-40, 47, 165
Hoenen, M. 56, 71
Holl, K. 126, 255
Holm, B. 213
Horace 7
Hosius, S. 66
Hotman, F. 270-71
Hotson, H. 262
Houdt, T. 133, 136
Hugh of Digne 171
Hughes, L.M. 61
Hundeshagen, K.B. 255
Härter, K. 260
Höffner, J. 99
- Ijsewijn, J. 283, 308, 310
Innocent IV 169-70
Inwood, B. 286, 297
Ippolito d'Este 309
Irenaeus of Lyon 221
- Jansen, C. 68
Jansen, F.X. 54, 59, 61-62
Jardine, L. 308, 317
Javelli, C. 78-79
Jerome 270, 315-16
Johannes Quidort 73
John Buridan, *see* Buridan
John Duns Scotus, *see* Duns
John of Paris 157-58
John of Salisbury 315-16
John of St. Thomas 77
- John XXII 151, 153-56, 168, 173,
178
Jouanna, A. 257
Justenhoven, H.-G. 99
Juvenal 312
- Kaeppli, T. 20
Kaiser, A. 54, 60
Kant, I. 105, 110, 118-19
Kantola, I. 92, 94
Kaser, M. 170
Kessler, E. 1
Kibre, P. 21
Kilcullen, J. 141
Kisch, G. 272
Kittsteiner, H.-D. 119
Klein, J. 262
Klubertanz, G.P. 294
Knebel, S.K. 3,4,107, 115-39
Koellin, K. 78-79, 94
Korolec, J.B. 56
Koslowski, P. 136
Kramer, J. 262
Kraye, J. 5, 7, 23, 51, 82, 198,
286-87, 303, 307-30
Kremer, E.J. 51
Kreppel, F. 260
Kristeller, P.O. 1, 27, 71, 307
Kusukawa, S. 252
- Lagarde, G. 141, 150, 158
Lamberigts, M. 55
Lambert, M.D. 168
Lambertini, R. 4, 141-63, 167-68,
171, 199-200
Lambin, D. 310, 320-21
Landau, P. 117
Langholm, O. 146, 148, 152
Lapparent, P. 142, 152
Las Casas, B. 99
Latomus, J. 56
Laursen, J. 101
Lavard-Keller, J.M. 61

- Laymann, P. 135
 Le Bachelet, X.M. 64
 Le Gal, P. 267-68
 Leahy, L. 62
 Lecerf, A. 267
 Leclercq, J. 153
 Lefèvre d'Étaples, J. 7-8
 Leff, G. 167-68
 Lehmann, H. 266
 Leibniz, G.W. 51
 Leijenhorst, C. 2
 Leith, J.H. 267
 Lemaitre, N. 63
 Lenain, P. 54
 Lensaeus, J. 66
 Léonard, E.G. 261
 Leonicensis, N. 21
 Lessius, L. 4, 67, 117-20, 128-29,
 131, 133-37
 Lettieri, G.L. 51
 Libera, A. 225
 Liguori, A. 109
 Lines, D. 3, 7-29
 Linsenmann, F.X. 54
 Linus 315-16
 Lipsius, J. 274, 307-08, 310, 313-
 15, 317-21, 327-28
 Lissin Ramos, D. 81
 Litt, F. 54
 Litt, T. 260
 Livy 7
 Lobkowitz, J.C. 101
 Locke, J. 165, 167, 178, 232
 Lohr, C.H. 8, 308
 Lohse, B. 195-96, 199
 Lombrana, J. 109
 Longpré, E. 149
 Lorca, P. 128, 131
 Lössl, J. 52
 Lottin, O. 92
 Louis the Bavarian 153
 Löwith, K. 260
 Lubac, H. 51, 54, 60, 66, 68
 Lucretius 7
 Lugo, J. 107, 117, 119, 134, 136
 Luscombe, D. 152
 Luthardt, C.E. 261
 Luther, M. 4-5, 195-215, 220-21,
 241, 255, 263, 265
 Lüthy, C. 2

 Machiavelli, N. 7
 MacIntyre, A. 1, 165
 Macpherson, C. 105
 Macrobius 318-19
 Madruzzi, C. 66
 Maeschalk, E. 55
 Maier, H. 219
 Mair, J. 116, 127
 Mäkinen, V. 4, 122, 141, 146,
 165-80, 181, 183
 Malebranche, N. 51
 Manetti, G. 286
 Mann, J.D. 159
 Mannermaa, T. 211
 Mannhart, F.X. 120
 Margolin, J.-C. 284
 Marsilius of Padua 157-58
 Martinez de Ripalda, J. 132
 Matoré, G. 257
 Maurer, W. 196, 199
 Mayans y Siscar, G. 283
 Mayer, R. 315
 Mazzatinti, G. 21
 McClure, G. 286-87
 McGovern, J.F. 175
 McGrade, A.S. 157, 178
 Medici, P. 19, 23
 Medina, B. 4, 92-96, 100, 131
 Meisner, B. 134
 Melanchthon, P. 4-5, 217-55, 262-
 63, 287
 Methuen, C. 255
 Meylan, H. 261
 Meyronnes, F. 142

- Michael of Cesena 141, 152-55
 Michael of Ephesus 8, 26
 Michael, B. 9, 15-16, 18-21
 Michel, W. 262
 Miethke, J. 141-42, 149-50, 156-58, 168
 Milbank, J. 1
 Millet, O. 268
 Molanus, J. 57
 Molina, L. 53, 116-21, 128, 131, 133-34
 Monheit, M.L. 268
 Montaigne, M. 101, 308-10
 Moonan, L. 68
 Moreau, D. 51
 Morford, M. 308, 310, 313, 317
 Mortari, V.P. 272
 Mouchel, C. 308, 310
 Mousnier, R. 257
 Mugnai Carrara, D. 21
 Muller, J.-P. 73
 Munro, J. 190
 Muret, M.-A. 5, 307-30
 Murray, J.L. 56
 Musonius 273
 Münch, P. 256

 Nardi, B. 71
 Ndiaye, A.R. 51
 Negri, F. 314
 Nicholas III 142-43, 156, 169, 172, 175-76
 Nielsen, L.O. 2, 141
 Niutta, F. 312, 314, 327-28
 Nolhac, P. 319, 322
 Noonan, J.T. 181, 190
 Norena, C.G. 283-84, 290, 294
 Noris, E. 128
 Nussbaum, M.C. 296

 Oakley, F. 159
 Oberman, H. 199

 Ockham, W. 4, 141, 151, 155-59, 173-74, 178, 183-84, 202, 237 38
 Oexle, O.G. 142
 Olarazàn, J. 74
 Oliger, L. 152
 Olivares, E. 131
 Olivi, P.J. 76, 143-45, 151
 Orcibal, J. 54, 64
 Orlandi, S. 20
 Ortiz-Monasterio, X. 73
 Ott, H. 181
 Oviedo, F. 123, 125, 128-29, 131

 Pade, M. 7
 Panizza, L.A. 315, 324
 Papy, J. 308, 314
 Parisoli, L. 148-49
 Park, K. 23
 Pascal, B. 107, 117-18, 133
 Pascoe, L.B. 188
 Paul 52, 75, 200, 206, 221, 224, 241, 243-44, 266, 271, 315-16, 327
 Paul V 327
 Peeters, H. 314
 Pelagius, A. 142
 Pelland, G. 52
 Pellegrin, E. 20
 Pellegrini, L. 22
 Perion, J. 310
 Peter Auriol 147, 150
 Petersen, P. 219
 Petitmengin, P. 57
 Petrarch 22
 Petrus Joh. Olivi, see Olivi
 Petrus Paludus 70, 116, 124-25
 Petrus Tartaretus 125-26
 Philip the Fair 149
 Philip II 58, 62-63
 Piaia, G. 71
 Piccolomini, F. 287

- Pico della Mirandola, G. 15, 21, 242
 Pinchard, B. 70
 Pinckaers, S. 73
 Pink, T. 3, 31-50, 82
 Piron, S. 153
 Pistoia, G. 18
 Pius IV 309
 Pius V 63-66
 Plantin, C. 315
 Plathow, M. 196
 Plato 7, 26, 144, 217, 219, 222-23, 239, 273, 307, 321-23, 328
 Plutarch 7, 285, 290-91, 293, 297-98, 300, 302, 318-19, 324
 Pole, R. 66
 Poliziano, A. 317, 321-22
 Pomponazzi, P. 78
 Popkin, R. 101-02
 Poppi, A. 71, 78
 Posidonius 290-91
 Possevino, A.M. 8
 Posthumus Meyjes, G.H.M. 159
 Potestà, G.L. 155
 Prierias, S. 78, 94
 Prodi, P. 141

 Quaghebeur, T. 64
 Queralt, A. 53
 Quintilian 292-93, 302, 311

 Rachel, S. 101-02, 108
 Rada, J. 77-78
 Ramos, D. 99
 Rashdall, H. 167
 Ressler, C. 108-09
 Raunio, A. 207, 209
 Ravestyn, J. 55, 57, 62-63, 65
 Reibstein, E. 262
 Reid, W.S. 268
 Reilly, J.P. 70
 Reinhard, W. 256
 Reusch, F. 108

 Reventlow, H. 56
 Reynolds, L.D. 317
 Richard of Mediavilla 146
 Rieske-Braun, U. 210
 Riley, P. 51
 Ripalda, J.M. 54
 Rist, J.M. 52, 296
 Ritschl, O. 262
 Rivera de Ventosa, E. 288
 Roca, M. 54, 63
 Roegiers, J. 65, 82
 Ronsard, P. 308, 312, 321
 Roscio, G. 326-27
 Rossini, M. 146
 Rossmann, H. 142
 Roudet, H. 68
 Royeyer, B. 53
 Rublack, H.-C. 256
 Ruthall, T. 311
 Ruyschaert, J. 313-14
 Rythoven, M. 58

 Saak, E.L. 53
 Saarinen, R. 4, 195-212
 Sablonius, F. 57
 Sacré, D. 313
 Sales, F. 123
 Salmon, J.H. 257
 Salutati, C. 8, 17, 127, 286-87
 San Concordio, B. 18
 Sanchez, T. 95-98, 100
 Sancipriano, M. 283, 301
 Santucci, C. 312, 314, 327-28
 Savelli 326-27
 Sbogar, J.M. 123
 Scaliger, J. 310
 Schellong, D. 266
 Schilling, H. 256, 260
 Schindling, A. 256
 Schlageter, J. 144
 Schmidt-Biggemann, W. 258, 262
 Schmitt, A. 96, 100

- Schmitt, C.B. 1, 8, 101-02, 218
 Schmutz, J. 53, 60, 68, 71, 79, 107
 Schneckenburger, M. 255
 Schneewind, J.B. 51
 Schrama, M. 55
 Schulze, M. 52
 Schwarz, R. 197-98, 206, 208
 Schweizer, A. 261
 Schüssler, R. 3, 4, 91-113
 Seelmann, K. 115
 Segni, B. 8
 Segovia, J. 159
 Seneca the Elder 314-16
 Seneca the Younger 7, 11, 115,
 286-98, 301, 307-30
 Sepúlveda, J.G. 322
 Sextus Empiricus 101
 Sforza Pallavicino, P. 130
 Sierra del Santísimo
 Sacramento, T. 73
 Sihvola, J. 295
 Simler, J. 261
 Simonet, L. 55
 Simplicius 26
 Sinnema, D. 261
 Sirloto 316
 Skinner, Q. 1
 Sleigh, R.C. 51
 Sorabji, R. 286-87, 291, 296
 Soto, D. 3, 54, 73, 74-82, 94-95,
 99-100, 116-23, 125, 128-
 31, 134
 Spee, F. 115, 118, 120, 134, 137
 Stadelmann, R. 102
 Stadter, P.A. 7, 28
 Statius 7
 Stegmüller, F. 74, 79
 Stévaux, A. 61
 Stolleis, M. 260
 Stone, M.W.F. 3, 51-90, 92, 133,
 136
 Streiff, S. 210
 Striker, G. 286, 295
 Strohm, C. 5, 195, 255-81
 Suarez, F. 3, 31-50, 95, 100, 107-08,
 117, 122, 128-31, 133
 Suetonius 311
 Summenhart, C. 4, 94, 181-93
 Swanson, S.G. 165, 177
 Swift, L.J. 293
 Tabarroni, A. 141-42, 150-53,
 156, 158, 168
 Tacitus 243, 312-14, 328
 Tamburini, T. 107, 120
 Tanner, N. 62
 Tanner, A. 120, 135
 Tapper, R. 55-57
 Tarello, G. 143
 Tavuzzi, M. 78
 Taylor, C. 1, 195
 Terentius 319
 Terillus, A. 97, 102
 Tertullian 267, 269-70
 Themistius 26
 Thijssen, J.M.M.H. 2
 Thomas Aquinas 1, 3, 7-29, 33,
 35, 38, 40-41, 44, 61, 68,
 70-73, 76-79, 94, 104, 116-
 17, 119, 121-22, 128, 141,
 144, 146, 166 67, 176-77,
 187, 203, 219, 221, 225,
 229-30, 237-39, 247
 Thomas of Strasbourg 70
 Thomas, J.A.C. 170
 Tierney, B. 159, 167, 177, 181,
 183, 185
 Tignosi, N. 3, 8-9, 19, 23-26
 Toletus, F. 66
 Tomiczki, P. 311
 Töpfer, B. 144-45, 153, 156
 Torrell, J.P. 76-77
 Tostato, A. 128
 Traver, A.G. 167-68
 Travill, A.A. 299
 Trinquet, R. 308

- Triumphus de Ancona, A. 128
 Troeltsch, E. 255, 261, 267
 Troje, H.E. 271-72
 Trombetta, A. 78
 Trujillo, I. 284
 Tuck, R. 166, 189
 Tully, J. 165
 Työrinoja, R. 206-07, 210-11

 Uffelmann, H. 134
 Ullman, B.L. 7, 28
 Ulpianus 182, 186, 271
 Usingen, B.A. 197

 Valencia, G. 118, 120, 122, 124-
 25, 130, 134
 Valerius Maximus 7
 Valerius, C. 313
 Van Dooren, J.P. 54
 Van Eijl, E.J.M. 53, 55-57, 63-64,
 67
 Vanneste, A. 51-52, 59-60
 Varkemaa, J. 2, 4, 181-93
 Vasquez, G. 3, 31-50, 97
 Veneto, P.N. 18
 Vercruysee, J.E. 56
 Vereecke, L. 55
 Vergil 7, 243, 309
 Vernani, G. 18
 Vernias, N. 127
 Versor, J. 73
 Vettori, P. 287
 Viel, A. 74
 Villey, M. 141
 Vincent of Beauvais 145
 Vio, see Cajetan
 Vitoria, F. 79, 98, 116, 128
 Vives, J.L. 5, 82, 283-305
 Vulcanius, B. 261

 Waldburg, O. 66
 Walsh, J.J. 11
 Walsh, K. 183
 Walter Burley 8, 16, 18-22, 26
 Watson, A. 191
 Watson, F. 283, 288
 Weber, M. 255, 265-66
 Weerda, J.R. 256
 Weigand, R. 144, 190
 Weijers, O. 168
 Wieland, G. 225, 228
 William Ockham, see Ockham
 William of Alnwick 147
 William of Auvergne 93
 William of Auxerre 93
 William of Moerbeke 9
 William of Orange 258
 William of Saint-Amour 167-68,
 170, 174-75
 William of Sarzano 150
 Wilms, H. 78
 Winterbottom, M. 316
 Wisse, J. 292
 Witt, R.G. 287
 Witte, J. 195-97
 Wittneben, E.L. 153, 155
 Wolfson, H.A. 294
 Wolter, A. 33, 76
 Wuttke, A. 261

 Xenophon 235

 Ysambert, N. 73

 Zabarella, F. 286
 Zanchius, H. 261
 Zeno 273, 325
 Zepper, W. 256
 Zilboorg, G. 283
 Zweig, S. 255

Synthese Historical Library
Texts and Studies in the History of Logic and Philosophy

Series Editor: Simo Knuuttila (University of Helsinki)

1. M.T. Beonio-Brocchieri Fumagalli: *The Logic of Abelard*. Translated from Italian by S. Pleasance. 1969 ISBN 90-277-0068-0
2. G.W. Leibniz: *Philosophical Papers and Letters*. A Selection, translated and edited, with an Introduction, by L.E. Loemker. 2nd ed., 2nd printing. 1976 ISBN 90-277-0008-8
3. E. Mally: *Logische Schriften*. Grosses Logikfragment – Grundgesetze des Sollens. Herausgegeben von K. Wolf und P. Weingartner. 1971 ISBN 90-277-0174-1
4. L.W. Beck (ed.): *Proceedings of the Third International Kant Congress*. 1972 ISBN 90-277-0188-1
5. B. Bolzano: *Theory of Science*. A Selection with an Introduction by J. Berg. Translated from German by B. Terrell. 1973 ISBN 90-277-0248-9
6. J.M.E. Moravcsik (ed.): *Patterns in Plato's Thought*. 1973 ISBN 90-277-0286-1
7. Avicenna: *The Propositional Logic*. A Translation from *Al-Shifā': al-Qiyās*, with Introduction, Commentary and Glossary by N. Shehaby. 1973 ISBN 90-277-0360-4
8. D.P. Henry: *Commentary on De Grammatico. The Historical-Logical Dimensions of a Dialogue of St. Anselm's*. 1974 ISBN 90-277-0382-5
9. J. Corcoran (ed.): *Ancient Logic and its Modern Interpretations*. 1974 ISBN 90-277-0395-7
10. E.M. Barth: *The Logic of the Articles in Traditional Philosophy*. A Contribution to the Study of Conceptual Structures. 1974 ISBN 90-277-0350-7
11. J. Hintikka: *Knowledge and the Known*. Historical Perspectives in Epistemology. 1974 ISBN 90-277-0455-4
12. E.J. Ashworth: *Language and Logic in the Post-Medieval Period*. 1974 ISBN 90-277-0464-3
13. Aristotle: *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Translation with Commentaries and Glossary by H. G. Apostle. 1974 ISBN 90-277-0569-0
14. R.M. Dancy: *Sense and Contradiction*. A Study in Aristotle. 1975 ISBN 90-277-0565-8
15. W.R. Knorr: *The Evolution of the Euclidean Elements*. A Study of the Theory of Incommensurable Magnitudes and its Significance for Early Greek Geometry. 1975 ISBN 90-277-0509-7
16. Augustine: *De Dialectica*. Translated with Introduction and Notes by B. D. Jackson from the Text newly edited by J. Pinborg. 1975 ISBN 90-277-0538-9
17. Á. Szabó: *The Beginnings of Greek Mathematics*. Translated from German. 1978 ISBN 90-277-0819-3
18. Juan Luis Vives: *Against the Pseudodialecticians*. A Humanist Attack on Medieval Logic. Texts (in Latin), with Translation, Introduction and Notes by R. Guerlac. 1979 ISBN 90-277-0900-9
19. Peter of Ailly: *Concepts and Insolubles*. An Annotated Translation (from Latin) by P.V. Spade. 1980 ISBN 90-277-1079-1
20. S. Knuuttila (ed.): *Reforging the Great Chain of Being*. Studies of the History of Modal Theories. 1981 ISBN 90-277-1125-9

Synthese Historical Library

21. J.V. Buroker: *Space and Incongruence*. The Origin of Kant's Idealism. 1981
ISBN 90-277-1203-4
22. Marsilius of Inghen: *Treatises on the Properties of Terms*. A First Critical Edition of the *Suppositiones, Ampliationes, Appellationes, Restrictiones* and *Alienationes* with Introduction, Translation, Notes and Appendices by E.P. Bos. 1983
ISBN 90-277-1343-X
23. W.R. de Jong: *The Semantics of John Stuart Mill*. 1982
ISBN 90-277-1408-8
24. René Descartes: *Principles of Philosophy*. Translation with Explanatory Notes by V.R. Miller and R.P. Miller. 1983
ISBN 90-277-1451-7
25. T. Rudavsky (ed.): *Divine Omniscience and Omnipotence in Medieval Philosophy*. Islamic, Jewish and Christian Perspectives. 1985
ISBN 90-277-1750-8
26. William Heytesbury: *On Maxima and Minima*. Chapter V of *Rules for Solving Sophismata*, with an Anonymous 14th-century Discussion. Translation from Latin with an Introduction and Study by J. Longeway. 1984
ISBN 90-277-1868-7
27. Jean Buridan's *Logic*. *The Treatise on Supposition*. The Treatise on Consequences. Translation from Latin with a Philosophical Introduction by P. King. 1985
ISBN 90-277-1918-7
28. S. Knuuttila and J. Hintikka (eds.): *The Logic of Being*. Historical Studies. 1986
ISBN 90-277-2019-3
29. E. Sosa (ed.): *Essays on the Philosophy of George Berkeley*. 1987
ISBN 90-277-2405-9
30. B. Brundell: *Pierre Gassendi: From Aristotelianism to a New Natural Philosophy*. 1987
ISBN 90-277-2428-8
31. Adam de Wodeham: *Tractatus de indivisibilibus*. A Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation, and Textual Notes by R. Wood. 1988
ISBN 90-277-2424-5
32. N. Kretzmann (ed.): *Meaning and Inference in Medieval Philosophy*. Studies in Memory of J. Pinborg (1937–1982). 1988
ISBN 90-277-2577-2
33. S. Knuuttila (ed.): *Modern Modalities*. Studies of the History of Modal Theories from Medieval Nominalism to Logical Positivism. 1988
ISBN 90-277-2678-7
34. G.F. Scarre: *Logic and Reality in the Philosophy of John Stuart Mill*. 1988
ISBN 90-277-2739-2
35. J. van Rijen: *Aspects of Aristotle's Logic of Modalities*. 1989
ISBN 0-7923-0048-3
36. L. Baudry: *The Quarrel over Future Contingents (Louvain 1465–1475)*. Unpublished Latin Texts collected and translated in French by L. Baudry. Translated from French by R. Guerlac. 1989
ISBN 0-7923-0454-3
37. S. Payne: *John of the Cross and the Cognitive Value of Mysticism*. An Analysis of Sanjuanist Teaching and its Philosophical Implications for Contemporary Discussions of Mystical Experience. 1990
ISBN 0-7923-0707-0
38. D.D. Merrill: *Augustus De Morgan and the Logic of Relations*. 1990
ISBN 0-7923-0758-5
39. H.T. Goldstein (ed.): *Averroes' Questions in Physics*. 1991
ISBN 0-7923-0997-9
40. C.H. Manekin: *The Logic of Gersonides*. A Translation of *Sefer ha-Heqqesh ha-Yashar* (The Book of the Correct Syllogism) of Rabbi Levi ben Gershom with Introduction, Commentary, and Analytical Glossary. 1992
ISBN 0-7923-1513-8

THE NEW SYNTHESIS HISTORICAL LIBRARY
Texts and Studies in the History of Philosophy

41. George Berkeley: *De Motu* and *The Analyst*. A Modern Edition with Introductions and Commentary, edited and translated by Douglas M. Jesseph. 1992 ISBN 0-7923-1520-0
42. John Duns Scotus: *Contingency and Freedom*. Lectura I 39. Introduction, Translation and Commentary by A. Vos Jaczn., H. Veldhuis, A.H. Looman-Graaskamp, E. Dekker and N.W. den Bok. 1994 ISBN 0-7923-2707-1
43. Paul Thom: *The Logic of Essentialism*. An Interpretation of Aristotle's Modal Syllogistic. 1996 ISBN 0-7923-3987-8
44. P.M. Matthews: *The Significance of Beauty*. Kant on Feeling and the System of the Mind. 1997 ISBN 0-7923-4764-1
45. N. Strobach: *The Moment of Change*. A Systematic History in the Philosophy of Space and Time. 1998 ISBN 0-7923-5120-7
46. J. Sihvola and T. Engberg-Pedersen (eds.): *The Emotions in Hellenistic Philosophy*. 1998 ISBN 0-7923-5318-8
47. P.J. Bagley: *Piety, Peace, and the Freedom to Philosophize*. 1999 ISBN 0-7923-5984-4
48. M. Kusch (ed.): *The Sociology of Philosophical Knowledge*. 2000 ISBN 0-7923-6150-4
49. M. Yrjönsuuri (ed.): *Medieval Formal Logic*. Obligations, Insolubles and Consequences. 2001 ISBN 0-7923-6674-3
50. J.C. Doig: *Aquinas's Philosophical Commentary on the Ethics*. A Historical Perspective. 2001 ISBN 0-7923-6954-8
51. R. Pinzani: *The Logical Grammar of Abelard*. 2003 ISBN 1-4020-1246-2
52. J. Yu: *The Structure of Being in Aristotle's Metaphysics*. 2003 ISBN 1-4020-1537-2
53. R.L. Friedman and L.O. Nielsen (eds.): *The Medieval Heritage in Early Modern Metaphysics and Modal Theory, 1400-1700*. 2003 ISBN 1-4020-1631-X
54. J. Maat: *Philosophical Languages in the Seventeenth Century: Dalgarno, Wilkins, Leibniz*. 2004 ISBN 1-4020-1758-8
55. L. Alanen and C. Witt (eds.): *Feminist Reflections on the History of Philosophy*. 2004 ISBN 1-4020-2488-6
56. O. Harari: *Knowledge and Demonstration*. Aristotle's Posterior Analytics. 2004 ISBN 1-4020-2787-7
57. J. Kraye and R. Saarinen (eds.): *Moral Philosophy on the Threshold of Modernity*. 2005 ISBN 1-4020-3000-2