



Malloch, Simon (2015) Acidalius on tacitus. In: Latin Literature and its Transmission. Cambridge Classical Studies . Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 225-244. ISBN 9781107116276

Access from the University of Nottingham repository:

<http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/43207/1/Malloch%20-%20Acidalius%20on%20Tacitus.pdf>

Copyright and reuse:

The Nottingham ePrints service makes this work by researchers of the University of Nottingham available open access under the following conditions.

This article is made available under the University of Nottingham End User licence and may be reused according to the conditions of the licence. For more details see:
http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/end_user_agreement.pdf

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the repository url above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact eprints@nottingham.ac.uk

Acidalius on Tacitus*

F. R. D. Goodyear described 1607 as an *annus mirabilis* for Tacitean studies. Two publications exerted lasting influence on textual scholarship and commentary on Tacitus, and another marked a methodological advance in the appreciation of the manuscript evidence.¹ In 1607 appeared at Antwerp the final revision of Justus Lipsius' edition of Tacitus. In the breadth and depth of its coverage of philological and historical problems Lipsius' edition would provide a vulgate text and commentary² until German scholars put both on a new footing in the nineteenth century. In Frankfurt Curtius Pichena published an edition of Tacitus' works. Pichena, whose services to Tacitus Goodyear ranked second only to Lipsius',³ has the distinction of being the first editor of Tacitus to recognise that the first and second Medicean manuscripts in the Biblioteca Laurenziana in Florence are important witnesses to the text of the *Annals*: he was the first editor to use the second Medicean in a printed edition, the first to make both Mediceans one basis of a printed edition.⁴ It would be more than two hundred years before editors would develop Pichena's insight and recognise that the Mediceans were not merely a crucial but *the unique* source of the text of Tacitus' *Annals* and *Histories* and of all the other extant manuscripts of these two works. And in 1607 at Hannover appeared the *Notae* on

* Without the instruction and inspiration that I have received from Michael I should never have developed a serious interest in philology and could never have written this essay on Acidalius for him. For comments on drafts I am grateful to him, Nigel Holmes, Stephen Oakley, and Franz Römer.

¹ Goodyear 1972: 10. He also notes the publication in the same year of Janus Gruterus' 'useful variorum edition', which however 'contributes little of independent value' (11).

² Cf. Walther 1831-33: xxx; Ruperti 1834: cxviii.

³ Goodyear 1972: 10. He claims (7) that Rhenanus might vie with Pichena and Nipperdey for second place.

⁴ Goodyear rightly points out (1972: 10 n. 3) that Pichena did not recognise the *unique* importance of the Mediceans, since he also drew on Puteolanus' edition of 1497. Puteolanus had used MSS from group ε: see Malloch 2013: 16.

Tacitus' works by Valens Acidalius.⁵ Goodyear's description of Acidalius' notes as 'acute and original'⁶ scarcely expresses the nature of his work and his place in the history of scholarship on Tacitus. In fact, between the age of Lipsius and the middle of the nineteenth century no scholar contributed more by emendation to the establishment of the text of Tacitus, his *Annals* in particular, than Acidalius. Acidalius' achievement is all the more extraordinary for his early death, in 1595, at the age of 28.

Valens Acidalius⁷ – Valtin Havekenthal in the vernacular – was born in Wittstock in the Mark Brandenburg in 1567.⁸ He studied at the universities of Rostock (where he first met Janus Gruterus⁹), Greifswald, and Helmstedt between 1585 and 1589. In 1590 he left for Italy in the company of his boon companion from Breslau, Daniel Bucretius (1562-1611) – 'Rindfleisch' in his native tongue.¹⁰ In a sojourn that also saw him visit Padua, Florence, Rome, Naples, Siena, and Venice, Acidalius lingered longest in Bologna. There he took his doctorate in philosophy and medicine and moved in the circles of his teacher, the medical doctor Hieronymus Mercurialis, the philologist Ascanius Persius, who lodged him and taught him Italian, and the younger Camillus Paleaotus.¹¹ This network of friends and connections – Acidalius met Fulvius Ursinus briefly in Rome¹² – and the offers of chairs at Bologna and Pisa that they elicited could not persuade Acidalius to remain in a land where the impoverished condition of classical scholarship reduced him to a despair aggravated

⁵ Acidalius 1607a.

⁶ Goodyear 1972: 10.

⁷ 'Acidalius' evokes the Acidalian spring in Boeotia, the swimming hole of Venus and the Graces. See Odebrecht 1861: 210; Adam 1872: 26. For a thorough treatment of Acidalius' biography see Ijsewijn 1983, 1985.

⁸ Dihle 1953 places Acidalius' birth on 25 May, but there does not appear to be any evidence for it, and he perhaps confused the date of his birth and death: so Ijsewijn 1985: 74.

⁹ Acidalius 1606: *Epist.* 82; Adam 1872: 27-8; Ijsewijn 1985: 75. See also below.

¹⁰ Bucretius seems also to have been his patron: Odebrecht 1861: 212.

¹¹ For these connections see Adam 1872: 32-4; Fleischer 1981: 111; Ijsewijn 1985: 76.

¹² Cf. Acidalius 1606: *Epist.* 34; 1607b: dedication to the *Curculio*.

by illness.¹³ But his disenchantment was temporary, and the idealised view of Italy that he shared with many northern humanists until they crossed the Alps was reborn in time as nostalgia for his *italienische Reise*.¹⁴ He returned to Germany in 1593 and settled in Breslau. There he died almost two years later, when he was staying with his friend and patron, Johann Matthäus Wacker von Wackenfels (1550-1619), the scholarly episcopal Chancellor at Neisse in Upper Silesia.¹⁵

The controversy stirred up by a mischievous satirical theological tract on the question whether or not women were human beings, which was published in 1595 and attributed to Acidalius, provides the background to an end that was described variously and viciously: one version had him descend into madness during a religious service and die shortly after being carried home; another had him go mad and commit suicide.¹⁶ But sensationalism has been forced to give way to the explanation that Christianus Acidalius (1576-1631) had already put forward in 1606 in the preface to his edition of his brother's correspondence: Acidalius died of a fever that was contracted in Italy and exacerbated by his scholarly labours.¹⁷

Medicine and philosophy might have been Acidalius' formal programme of study in Italy, but Latin philology was his passion. Soon after he crossed the Alps he published at Padua in 1590 a critical edition of Velleius Paterculus.¹⁸ After his return to Germany, he published in 1594 at Frankfurt his *Animaduersiones* on Curtius Rufus, the last work of classical philology to appear before his death.¹⁹ After a gap of some

¹³ Chairs: Acidalius 1607b: dedication to the *Persa* (Bologna); 1606: *Epist.* 41 (Pisa). Scholarship: Acidalius 1606: *Epist.* (e.g.) 6, 7. See Adam 1872: 30, 35; Fleischer 1981: 111; Ijsewijn 1983: 190-2, 1985: 75-6.

¹⁴ Ijsewijn 1983: 191-2.

¹⁵ For Wackenfels see Adam 1872: 38-40; Ijsewijn 1985: 77.

¹⁶ The version involving madness can be traced as far back as a note made by Caspar von Barth (1587-1658) in his copy of Acidalius' poems, and he also mentions the claim by some that Acidalius died by his own hand. See Adam 1872: 51-2; also Schmidt 1819: 117-18; Fleischer 1981: 113.

¹⁷ See the address to the reader in Acidalius 1606.

¹⁸ Ijsewijn 1985: 75, 79-80.

¹⁹ Ijsewijn 1985: 77, 80.

years Christianus oversaw the publication of Acidalius' critical notes on a variety of classical authors: in the same year as his *Notae* on Tacitus appeared, his notes on Plautus were published at Frankfurt by Christianus and his notes on the Panegyrics were incorporated into an edition of those speeches prepared by Gruterus. Some of Acidalius' notes on Apuleius' *Apologia* were printed in an appendix to Scipio Gentilis' edition of 1607, and, apparently in full, in Oudendorp's posthumous edition of 1776-1823;²⁰ some of his notes on Ausonius were incorporated into J. Tollius' edition of 1671. Much, however, remained (and remains) unpublished or apparently lost: notes on Terence, Manilius, Seneca's tragedies, Aulus Gellius, and Symmachus.²¹

Acidalius' work on Velleius had already advertised his critical acumen,²² and by the time of his death his talent and potential was drawing comment from Justus Lipsius. Lipsius was the greatest scholar to have worked on Tacitus, if not otherwise a rival to Scaliger and Casaubon, and a central figure of late humanism, a network linked by scholarly pilgrimages, printing and patronage, and wide circles of correspondence.²³ Acidalius knew of Lipsius as a student and later ventured to join his circle of correspondents with his first letter to him from Bologna in May 1592. He offered Lipsius a copy of his Velleius, in which he had praised Lipsius' *Epistolicae Quaestiones* and sought his judgement on his emendations to Seneca's *De beneficiis*.²⁴ Acidalius kept up the correspondence until his death: Lipsius is

²⁰ See Reeve 1991: 226.

²¹ See Bursian 1883: 243-44. Halm remarked in 1875 that Acidalius' notes on Gellius, Symmachus, and Apuleius 'unbekannt geblieben oder ganz verloren gegangen sind'. Some of Acidalius' notes on Apuleius' *Apologia* are preserved at Leiden: see Kristeller 1989: 4.377 and Reeve 1991: 226 n. 2. Twenty years ago Reeve (1991: 239) hoped for a 'full and annotated publication' of Acidalius' *Animadversiones* on Manilius.

²² Bursian 1883: 242. Acidalius' textual notes were contained in the *Velleianarum lectionum liber* that accompanied the edition.

²³ See Kenney 1974: 54; Fleischer 1981: 111-12; Ijsewijn 1983. For a sketch of this world see Grafton 2009: ch. 1.

²⁴ Acidalius 1606: *Epist.* 19. See Ijsewijn 1983: 198.

mentioned in twenty-two of the one hundred letters of Acidalius published by Christianus, and seven of these twenty-two are addressed to him.²⁵ Acidalius idolised Lipsius, and sought approval and support from him.²⁶ Lipsius' opinion of Acidalius is conveyed in a letter written in early 1594 to the learned German lawyer and man of letters Jacobus Monavius, a patron of Acidalius in Breslau.²⁷ Lipsius predicted of Acidalius: 'Valens himself (my divination will not deceive you) will be the jewel of your country, let him only live...'.²⁸

Posthumous publication of some of Acidalius' surviving classical scholarship vindicated Lipsius' estimation and intuition. In his survey of editions of Plautus, Friedrich Ritschl described Acidalius as 'ein so ausgezeichnetes kritisches Talent'.²⁹ Although Acidalius' use of the Aldine edition of 1522 rendered his services to Plautus relatively modest 'im Verhältniss zu seiner divinatorischen Kraft',³⁰ his critical achievement, in Ritschl's view, stood above that of his contemporaries, including Lipsius'.³¹ Later in the nineteenth century, Karl Halm, himself an important editor of Tacitus, claimed that Lipsius' prediction had come to pass despite Acidalius' early death.³² At the same time, Halm's younger contemporary, Georg Andresen, also an important student of Tacitus, placed Acidalius on a par with Lipsius for his textual

²⁵ Acidalius 1606: *Epist.* 19, 22, 46, 54, 56, 73, 78. See Ijsewijn 1983: 195-6.

²⁶ Ijsewijn 1983: 199.

²⁷ Ijsewijn 1983: 199, 1985: 76-7.

²⁸ 'ipse Valens (non te fallam augur) gemmula erit Germaniae uestrae, uiuat modo'. Christianus Acidalius printed an extract from this letter on the page following the title page of his edition of his brother's correspondence; the letter appears in full as Burman 1727: no. 402.

²⁹ Ritschl 1836: 505 = 1868: 93.

³⁰ In 1836 Ritschl 1836: 505 wrote that Acidalius '...im ganzen die Plautinische Kritik nur wenig gefördert hat', but he later 1868: 93 adjusted that judgement in a footnote: 'Richtiger: "doch nur mäsizig gefördert hat", im Verhältniss zu seiner divinatorischen Kraft und zu der Zahl der von ihm behandelten Stellen'.

³¹ Ritschl 1880: LIII: 'Praeter editores autem qui illa aetate magno grege critici ad perpoliendum Plautum undique convolarunt, eorum nullam laudem Ioannes MEVSIVS meruit: vel exiguum vel mediocre Adrianus TVRNEBUS, Iani DOVSAE pater et filius, Caspar SCIOPIVS, Iustus LIPSIVS, Mellerus PALMERIVS: maiorem IANVS GVLIELMIVS: maximam atque adeo eximiam VALENS ACIDALIUS, quamquam nec metrorum scientia valens, qua tum nemo satis instructus erat, nec Camerariae editionis auctoritatem perspectam habens, magno id detrimento suo'.

³² Halm wrote the entry on Acidalius for the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*: see 1875.

work on Tacitus' *Dialogus*.³³ But, Andresen argued, Acidalius' work on the *Dialogus* was not fully appreciated: 'everyone agrees that Lipsius alone has best served all the works of Tacitus; but in my opinion the effort that Acidalius exerted in emending the *Dialogus* has not been estimated at its true value even today'.³⁴ Andresen is questioning the judgement of his editorial and critical predecessors in evaluating Acidalius' textual criticism. But part of the problem was that Acidalius' classical scholarship was not receiving the close and sustained attention that Andresen judged it deserved when he wrote those words. Gone were the days when Valentin Heinrich Schmidt could enthusiastically exclaim in 1819, 'who is not familiar with [Acidalius'] effort in explaining Velleius, Tacitus and Curtius!'.³⁵ The situation has not improved. In an article published in the early 1990s on Acidalius' *Animaduersiones* on Manilius, M. D. Reeve aptly remarked that 'anyone these days who recognizes [Acidalius'] name will have met it in an apparatus'.³⁶ That must have been largely true since editors of classical texts in the nineteenth century abandoned the tradition of producing variorum commentary that reprinted the critical notes of earlier scholars – particularly so in the case of editors of Tacitus, when the establishment of the manuscript basis of the *Annals* and *Histories* rendered much earlier commentary redundant. Acidalius was not the only early-modern scholar of Tacitus to suffer neglect from this wiping clean of the slate. In an article published in 1951 C. O. Brink observed that what he described as the *Corpus Lipsianum* (comments by Lipsius and comments on Lipsius' notes) became less well known when variorum-style commentary was abandoned: 'to many readers of Tacitus the work of Lipsius is

³³ Andresen 1871: 107.

³⁴ Andresen 1871: 107: 'Lipsium enim de omnibus Taciti libris unum optime meritum esse inter omnes constat; Acidalii autem in emendando Dialogo operam collocatam ne hodie quidem ex merito aestimari puto'.

³⁵ Schmidt 1819: 115: 'wer kennt nicht seine Bemühungen um die Erklärung des Velleius, Tacitus und Curtius!'.

³⁶ Reeve 1991: 226.

probably known only from those emendations of his that survive in our texts and critical notes'.³⁷ Acidalius' neglect, then, was neither isolated nor a measure of his importance. If Lipsius' scholarship, which influenced Tacitean studies for so long, fell into neglect, Acidalius' hardly stood a chance.

This essay will attempt to illustrate Acidalius' importance as a critic of Tacitus, with specific reference to the *Annals*. First, a methodological point. Acidalius' importance will not be appreciated by counting the number of appearances that he makes in the apparatus criticus of the Oxford Classical Text or of a selection of Teubner editions.³⁸ Such a procedure, which Denys Page described as arising from 'an excess of curiosity or even abuse of leisure',³⁹ says less about the quality of a critic's scholarship than about a range of historical and methodological issues: the state of the text when it was rediscovered or at its first printing;⁴⁰ how much information editors believe should be put in an apparatus (for Tacitus' *Annals* one might compare the detail of Wellesley with the sparseness of Heubner);⁴¹ the criteria on which editions are selected for the exercise; and the calculation employed to harmonise the different figures produced by apparatuses of varying detail.

Acidalius' interests and methods are more effectively illuminated by examining his textual criticism. Acidalius' *Notae* are concerned with the elucidation of the sense of Tacitus' Latin and in particular with the emendation of Tacitus' text.

³⁷ Brink 1951: 32.

³⁸ For an example of such an approach see Dawe 1990: 377-80. Dawe, perhaps feeling justified by Page's endeavours (below), presents a mass of information almost entirely irrelevant to an otherwise informative and entertaining discussion of the life and work of Richard Porson. Brink (1951: 49-50) also played this game (and had to admit along the way that Lenchantin 'does not profess to give a full apparatus' [n.110]) but decried it when played in preference to analysing the critic's work in context: it was 'only through a study of the text which the critic had sought to emend that an impression of success and failure can be gained' (37; cf. 32-3).

³⁹ Page 1960: 231 (= p. 11 of the separately-printed lecture). Page presents approximate figures for conjectures of Hermann, Elmsley, and Porson that were accepted in the best editions of his day.

⁴⁰ For example, if one adopts the calculation of Brink (1951: 49), the younger Beroaldus, the first editor of Tacitus, is responsible for eighty emendations in *Annals* 1 alone, an average of one every chapter; Lipsius is second, with twenty.

⁴¹ Wellesley 1986 is to be preferred for its bibliography, Heubner 1994 for its text.

Historical problems do not concern him, nor does the interpretation of Tacitus' narrative for contemporary political purposes, in the tradition of commentaries published in the 1580s by Paschalius (1581) and Scotus (1589), and of works by Lipsius himself.

Two manuscripts provide the unique source of the text of Tacitus' *Annals*: the first Medicean, written in the middle of the ninth century probably at Fulda,⁴² preserves *Annals* 1-6; the second Medicean, written in the middle of the eleventh century at Monte Cassino, preserves *Annals* 11-16 (and *Histories* 1-5). The first Medicean was used by Beroaldus for his edition of 1515, which formed the basis of subsequent editions;⁴³ although *Annals* 11-16 was first published in 1472/73 it was not printed from the second Medicean, and the second Medicean was not used for an edition of Tacitus before Pichena's of 1607.⁴⁴ Acidalius was aware of the importance of manuscripts and mentions their readings,⁴⁵ but partly through lack of opportunity and partly through ignorance of their existence and location he did not use them: 'Leider beeinträchtigt der Mangel an handschriftlichem Apparat alle kritischen Arbeiten des Acidalius'.⁴⁶ For his *Notae* on Tacitus he worked from a printed edition. Such an approach was not out of keeping with his own practice, nor with the standards of his day: new editions were not expected to be based on manuscript sources but reprinted an earlier text, sometimes with variant readings from a selection of manuscripts and emendations from different sources quoted in the margins or notes.⁴⁷ The spirit of the age is illustrated neatly by the method of Lipsius himself.

⁴² The first Medicean was discovered at Corvey and reached Rome c. 1508. See Goodyear 1972: 3-4.

⁴³ Beroaldus took the rest from Puteolanus (n. 4).

⁴⁴ Malloch 2013: 16.

⁴⁵ Value: cf. e.g. his note on the notorious crux at 11.23.4, 'hic quoque locus fractus & corruptus: nec quem persanare hominis est, sine libris'. Manuscripts: e.g. 11.25.2 (mentioned in n. on 12.5.3: Farnesianus = Naples, Bibl. Nazionale IV. C. 21); 12.13.3 (Vaticanus = Vatican, Vat. Lat. 1863).

⁴⁶ Adam 1872: 31-2 (quote on 32), 43 (on Plautus); Ritschl 1836: 505 n.50 (on Plautus).

⁴⁷ Brink 1951: 34.

Lipsius constructed the text of his first edition of 1574 from the second edition of Rhenanus, published in 1544, and from some manuscripts descended from the second Medicean; the text that he used for his brief *Notae* on Tacitus, which formed an appendix to his edition of 1574 and was a forerunner of his commentary, had a different basis altogether, Ferretus' edition of 1542.⁴⁸ At the end of his life Lipsius revised his text and commentary in the light of Pichena's report of readings from the Mediceans in his *Notae* of 1600 and 1604. But Lipsius looked mainly for confirmation of his own text and did not recognise, or would not act on the recognition, that Pichena's true estimation of the importance of the Mediceans required him to revise thoroughly the manuscript basis of his edition.⁴⁹

Lipsius' text provides the lemmata for Acidalius' *Notae*.⁵⁰ At the commencement of Acidalius' notes on *Annals* 1, Christianus Acidalius remarked that the arabic page numbers that precede some lemmata refer to Lipsius' fifth edition of 1589, published in Antwerp; the Roman numeral chapter numbers that are used to divide the Latin text are drawn from the edition of Gruterus and the most recent one by Pichena.⁵¹ Acidalius, it seems, worked directly from Lipsius' edition of 1589 and made notes according to the page numbers of that edition, or more probably wrote his notes directly into his copy of that edition.⁵² During the editorial process Christianus must have added the chapter numbers from the latest editions of Gruterus and Pichena as the new convenient method of referring to the text of Tacitus. If Christianus rightly gives chronological priority to Gruterus' edition, his statement incidentally lends support to those scholars who urge against Pichena the claim of Gruterus to

⁴⁸ See Brink 1951: 34. For Lipsius' *Notae* and *Liber Commentarius* see Ulery 1986: 112-13.

⁴⁹ See Malloch 2013: 16.

⁵⁰ In what follows quotations from Tacitus are taken from Acidalius' *Notae*.

⁵¹ Acidalius 1607a: 'Numerus Paginarum refertur ad editionem Lipsii quintam, ex officina Plantiniana Anno MDLXXXIX in fol. Capitum vero ad I. Gruteri editionem, et novissimam Curtii Pichenae'.

⁵² Acidalius also refers to Lipsius' earlier editions: e.g., the first, on 14.29.3.

have been the first editor to divide the text of Tacitus into chapters.⁵³ In any case Christianus' statement provides a more accurate context for Acidalius' work on Tacitus than the publication date of 1607: from 1589 at the earliest, at the same time as or shortly after his labours on Velleius.

Awareness of a more exact context for the production of the *Notae* requires some emendations to be reattributed to Acidalius, or at least attributed to him as well as to the contemporaries normally cited in the scholarship.⁵⁴ He mentions some contemporaries in his notes, and his clear identification of them indicates that he did not adopt Lipsius' inconsistent, obscure, and sometimes dishonest handling of the scholarship of others.⁵⁵ In addition to Lipsius, he engaged extensively with M. A. Muretus (1526-1585).⁵⁶ When Acidalius rejects Muretus' emendations, he often endorses a vulgate text that in fact transmits the readings of the Medicean manuscripts, an indication of his grasp of sense and Tacitean style.⁵⁷ On a number of occasions he argues for emendations that Muretus had also made in his *Variae Lectiones* of 1580. He never gives the impression that he is arguing for Muretus' emendations, or drawing on Muretus' arguments. His language repeatedly suggests

⁵³ See Goodyear 1972: 11 for Gruterus; Mendell 1957: 367 for Pichena. Christianus' statement also dates the publication of Acidalius' *Notae* in relation to the editions of Gruterus and Pichena.

⁵⁴ E.g. at *Ann.* 3.62.1 Acidalius proposed *proximi Magnetes* for the *proximo Magnetes* of the vulgate, but editors routinely attribute the emendation to J. Freinshemius, who was born the year after Acidalius' *Notae* were printed. At 11.15 Acidalius corrected *accitis* to *accitos*; the emendation is normally attributed to F. Ursinus, whose *Notae* on Tacitus were published at Antwerp in 1595. At 12.11.2 Acidalius, as well as Ursinus, proposed *laetiora* for *toleratoria* (also in the second Medicean). At 12.65.2 *metum* (for *meritum*, also in the second Medicean) is normally attributed to O. Ferrarius but Acidalius had proposed it too. At 13.5.1 Acidalius and Ursinus proposed deleting the *quidem* in *ne designatis quidem quaestoribus*. At 14.30.1 *diseiectis* (for *deiectis*, also in the second Medicean) is attributed to I. Prammer, but Acidalius proposed it almost three hundred years earlier (as Wellesley 1986 rightly noted). At 14.33.2 Acidalius proposed *segnes* (for *insignes*, also in the second Medicean), as did I. Mercerus, whose notes on Tacitus were published in 1599.

⁵⁵ Acidalius seems to have been aware of Lipsius' habit of omitting names: cf. his note on *Ann.* 2.40.1 'Muretus suum deleri voluit, quod refutat Lipsius, suppresso nomine, et ipsa coniectura, tantum rectum esse vulgatum aiens'. For Lipsius and Muretus see Brink 1951: 36, 51. For Muretus see Sandys 1908-21: 2.148-52; Wolkenhauer 2012: 862.

⁵⁶ Acidalius also mentions N. Faber, H. Groslotius (3.66.3), Mercerus (e.g. 3.24.1, 11.18.1), M. Vertranius (14.54.3), F. Modius (14.58.3). It seems that Acidalius read of critics in Lipsius' editions.

⁵⁷ See e.g. his notes on 2.9.2, 6.7.3, 11.4.2, 12.3.2, 13.50.3, 14.51.1, 14.64.1. Acidalius' own emendations sometimes propose what is transmitted by the Medicean: see below.

that he arrived at the same solution independently: e.g. 1.16.3 *dilapsis* (for *de-*) ‘habet et Muretus’; 1.72.1 *dict<it>ans* ‘ut et Muret.’; 2.15.1 *terga* (for *-um*) ‘visum sic et Mureto’; 2.26.3 *consultum es<se>t* ‘et Muret. mecum’; 3.34.2 *veterum <in> melius* ‘sic etiam Muret.’; 3.58.3 *aemulationi* (for *-e*) ‘et ita quoque Muretus’; 6.34.1 *saepe <in> modum* ‘voluit ita quoque Muretus’; 13.57.1 *concretum* (for *-a*) ‘quod et Mur. notavit’. Many of these emendations are rightly printed by editors and rightly attributed to Muretus; Acidalius’ independent proposal of them is one indication of his critical acumen.

The best illustration of this critical acumen is his frequent correction of the vulgate to a reading that is transmitted by the first or second Medicean. Acidalius’ emendations are small, neat changes of one or two letters and deletions, but he was not merely correcting the vulgate text: he was correcting a text that Lipsius had edited several times and divining passages, missed by Lipsius, in which the text seemed unsatisfactory. He demonstrates a sure grasp of sense and a sound judgement on style that is informed by the usage of Tacitus and authors such as Plautus and Livy. He is also sensitive to errors that could have crept in during transmission.⁵⁸ I quote the vulgate text of Tacitus from Acidalius’ *Notae* and place his corrections in brackets:

1.36.2 *periculosa seueritas, flagitiosa largitio. seu nihil militi, seu omnia concederentur, in ancipiti rep. (‘respubl.’);*

2.23.3 *disiecitque naues in aperta Oceani, aut insulas saxis abruptas (-is), uel per occulta uada infestas;*

2.45.3 *spolia adhuc et tela Romanis direpta (de-) in manibus multorum* (comparing Plaut. *Aulul.* 705);

⁵⁸ At 4.27.2 Acidalius prints *cum maxime* for *tum maxime* and remarks ‘Illud, *cum maxime*, saepe turbauit’; at 12.27.2 he (and Muretus) print *dilapsis* for *delapsis*: ‘Hic quoque scribe *dilapsis*, in qua voce saepe erratum’.

- 2.64.2 *igitur Rhescuporim quoquo (-que) Thraciae regem astu adgreditur;*
- 2.65.3 (noted on 1.72.1) *Rhescuporis sanciendo, ut dictabat, foederi (dictitabat);*
- 2.79.1 *ille eludens respondit, adfuturum ubi praetor, qui de ueneficiis quaereret, reo atque accusatoribus diem praedixisset* ('An potius prodixisset? Id enim verbi potius in hac re usurpatum. Liuius lib. III[.57] *in carcerem est coniectus, eique Tribunus diem prodixit.* Et ex eodem et item aliis plura exempla dat Scaliger in Festum. Sane et Muret. ita legit');
- 4.70.1 *uertit in Sabinum, corruptos quosdam libertorum et peritum (petitum) se arguens, ultionemque haud obscure poscebat;*
- 5.4.1 *inserere se dubitantibus, ac mouere (mon-) consules, ne relationem inciperent;*
- 6.23.2 *tradidere quidam descriptum Macroni (praescriptum; 'et sic Muretus');*
- 12.1.1 *orto apud libertos certamine, quis diligeret uxorem Claudio, caelibis (-is) uitae intonanti* ('Muretus intoleranti. Consideretur') *et coniugum imperiis obnoxio;*
- 12.24.2 *et quos tum Claudius terminos posuerit, facile cognitu, et publicis actis praescriptum (per-; 'etiam Muretus notavit');*
- 12.39.2 *per saltus, per paludes, ut cuique fors, aut uirtus: temere prouisa, ob iram, ob praedam* ('Malo, prouiso. aduerbali forma, qua item improuiso, inopinato, inexpectato, et talia');
- 13.21.2 *nouissimam suscipiendae accusationis operam anni (anui) rependunt;*
- 13.49.3 *quae si summa dissimulatione transmitterentur, quanto magis inanibus abstinendum (quod si; 'ut et Muretus');*
- 14.4.1 *quo rumore reconciliationis efficeret, acciperetque Agrippinam (-a[m]), facili feminarum credulitate ad gaudia uenientem;*
- 14.29.3 *nauesque fabricatur plano alueo aduersus breue litus et incertum* ('delenda plane vox *litus*, Mureti etiam iudicio.');

14.36.2 *gloriaeque eorum accessurum, quod modica manu (-s), uniuersi exercitus famam adipiscerentur;*

14.53.4 *ego quid aliud munificentia adhibere potui, quam studia, ut sic dixerim, in umbra educata? e quibus claritudo uenit (et quibus);*

14.55.2 *attamen neutrum datis a se praemiis exiit* ('malim ac tamen. quod et Muretus');

14.60.4 *mouetur tamen primo dissidii ciuilis specie (ciuilis dissidii specie);*

15.59.3 *dum auxilia libertati inuocat, dum miles potius deesset, et plebes desereret (...inuocat? miles potius deesset...);*

15.62.1 *quod unum iam tamen et pulcherrimum habebat (habeat);*

15.67.1 *neque se armatum cum inermibus effeminatis tantum facinus consociaturum (inermibus et effeminatis);*

16.2.1 *nec missis uisoribus, per quos nosceret, an uera assererentur, auget ultro rumorem* ('legendum omnino afferrentur. vt et Muret.');

16.28.1 *maiore ui Marcellus, summam Reip. agi clamitabat* ('melius: summam Remp. quod et Muretus censuit')

Acidalius displayed his eye for sense and usage in many places where he judged editors' handling of the text or the text itself unsatisfactory. At *Annals* 1.4.2, Tacitus' examination of the Augustan revolution in political *mores*, Lipsius printed: *nulla in praesens formidine, dum Augustus aetate ualidus seque et domum et pacem sustentauit. postquam prouecta iam senectus, aegro et corpore fatigabatur,...* In his *Liber Commentarius* of 1581 Lipsius proposed relocating *et* before *aegro*. Acidalius rightly understood *et* to mean *etiam*⁵⁹ and by deleting the comma before *aegro* took

⁵⁹ See Goodyear 1972.

senectus as the subject of *fatigabatur* ('after his old age, already advanced, was being taxed also by bodily illness').⁶⁰ Acidalius sought to emphasise the statement's connection with the preceding sentence by replacing the full stop before *postquam* with a colon, although the connection is still clear with a full stop: Augustus' adult health is balanced by his illness in old age.

At 11.34.2 Claudius is returning to Rome to punish Messalina for her treasonable affair with Silius. Messalina makes an appeal to Claudius and is countered by Narcissus, her chief enemy among the freedmen of the emperor: *et iam erat in adspectu Messalina, clamitabatque audiret Octaviae et Britannici matrem: cum*⁶¹ *obstreperet accusator, Silium et nuptias referens* (so Lipsius, and the second Medicean). Acidalius' proposal of *obstrepere* for *obstreperet* produces an historical infinitive in an inverted *cum*-clause, which is excellent Tacitean Latin, and reads more smoothly than the awkward detachment of the *cum*-clause: 'And now Messalina was in view, and started to shout that [Claudius] should listen to the mother of Octavia and Britannicus, when her accuser shouted her down, mentioning Silius and the wedding'. Acidalius' emendation also renders clearer the temporal and causal relationship between the two actions.

Acidalius had a passion for deletion, here the final *t* of *obstreperet*. At 11.8.1, Tacitus describes the savagery of the Parthian king Gotarzes, *qui necem fratri Artabano, coniugique ac filio eius praeparauerat, unde metus eius in ceteros* (Lipsius, and the second Medicean). Acidalius noted merely that he should prefer to delete the second *eius* of the vulgate, which is also transmitted in the second Medicean. In his variorum edition of 1721 J. G. Gronovius defended *eius* by comparison with 13.16.2

⁶⁰ M is now thus punctuated.

⁶¹ In Lipsius' version of the text *cum* = 'since'. It cannot there mean 'when' (otherwise Tacitus would not need to use the subjunctive), and 'although' does not give the right sense. Narcissus is reacting against Messalina.

uenenum...ita cunctos eius artus peruasit, ut uox pariter et spiritus eius raperentur.

The parallel offered by Gronovius is not exact since in our passage each *eius* refers to a different person, the first to Artabanus, the second to Gotarzes. Since Tacitus would hardly repeat *eius* in this way, the second one should be deleted following Acidalius.

In his second edition of Tacitus' works, published in 1772, J. A. Ernesti deleted the second *eius* in the passage compared by Gronovius; some would therefore dispute the text there too. Acidalius' urge to emend away subjunctives was not always successful.

At 11.23.3, Tacitus has the opponents of the admission of *primores Galliae* to the Roman senate invoke fear of Gallic occupation and Gallic wealth. If the Gauls are allowed to hold office at Rome, *quem ultra honorem residuis nobilium, aut si quis pauper e Latio senator foret*. Acidalius proposed inserting commas after *nobilium* and *senator* and printing *fore* for *foret*. This is unnecessary. The main clause already assumes *fore*, and there is no reason to make it explicit in an awkward place at the end of the sentence.

Acidalius defended the vulgate text (and in this case also the first Medicean) against emendation by invoking Tacitean usage. At 1.7 Tacitus describes Tiberius' circumspect behaviour on the death of Augustus. At 1.7.3 Tacitus states that *ne edictum quidem, quo Patres in curiam uocabat, nisi tribuniciae potestatis praescriptione posuit sub Augusto acceptae*. Acidalius defended the simple *posuit* against the more normal use of *proposuit*, suggested by Muretus, by comparing the same use of *ponere* at *Annals* 4.27.1. He was certainly right to defend the text at *Annals* 1 by invoking Tacitean usage: Tacitus generally favours simple over compound verbs, and there are parallels in other writers for this use of *ponere*.⁶²

⁶² Tacitus: see Malloch 2013 on 11.4.2, and to the bibliography there add Kuntz 1962: 117-19. Other writers: see *TLL* X.1 2646.13-35, cf. 2658.39-2663.13; *OLD* 17.

Acidalius elsewhere defended text and sense with parallels from writers as distant from Tacitus as the Panegyrics and Symmachus (e.g. on 11.25). Sometimes other authors were emended along the way, Suetonius in particular, and in at least one case Acidalius deserves to be mentioned in the apparatus criticus.⁶³

Acidalius' convincing emendations are so numerous that only a small selection can be used to illustrate his technique.

When at *Annals* 11.26.1 Messalina starts to drift towards libidinal excess out of boredom with her adultery, Silius urges an end to their *dissimulatio, siue fatali uecordia, an imminentium periculorum remedium ipsa pericula ratus* (Lipsius, and the second Medicean). Acidalius remarks: 'did Tacitus write *siue* here? He does not usually follow it with *an*. Nor for that matter does any good writer. It should be deleted or changed...'.⁶⁴ Since Acidalius *siue* has had its defenders: it is printed by Fisher (1906) and recently by Wellesley (1986). But Acidalius was right to delete it. Tacitus prefers to express alternatives with *siue* followed by *seu*, and very often with *an* alone. Analogies at 14.59.1, where Tacitus expresses three alternatives with *siue...seu...an*, and at Ovid *Fasti* 3.771, where Ovid expresses four with *siue...seu...siue...an*, are not exact since longer chains of alternatives are involved. The suppression of initial *siue* is very Tacitean: the particle *an* throws the emphasis, as so often in Tacitus, onto the second, more elaborate explanation.

Silius, urging action, then asserts that *insontibus innoxia consilia; flagitiis manifestis, subsidium ab audacia petendum*. For *flagitiis manifestis* Acidalius proposed *flagitii manifestis*, 'for those obvious in their outrages', an expression he described as most elegant and common in Tacitus. Acidalius' emendation makes the

⁶³ At Seneca *Controu.* 9.2.23 Håkanson 1989 attributes the deletion *nec...[nec] alii* to the *editio Romana* of '1585 (1594)'. Acidalius proposed the deletion in his note on *Dial.* 16 (p. 292). He ranged wider than the main author under examination in his other commentaries too (cf. Adam 1872: 31).

⁶⁴ 'Hicne vt Tacitus *siue* illud scripserit? Non solet ita, vt *an* subsequatur. nec id adeo quisquam probatorum. Delendum aut mutandum, *etiam Silius ipse, fatali uecordia, an* etc'.

phrase more intelligible. *subsidium ab audacia petendum* makes better sense if *manifestis* rather than *flagitiis* is taken as a substantive: the two parts of the sentence can share syntax.⁶⁵ And the resulting antithesis of *insontibus* and *flagitii manifestis* shows Tacitus deploying a favourite figure of style. Acidalius was in good company when he proposed emending the text here. In his copy of Lipsius' 1581 edition of Tacitus' works, later owned by Richard Bentley and now in the university library at Cambridge (Adv.d.3.14), Isaac Casaubon, I discovered, underlined the ending of *flagitiis* and in the margin wrote *flagitii* with another word or mark before it which was lost when the fore-edge of the book was recut. *flagitii* is a note or, most likely, a correction of the text. Either Casaubon, on reading Acidalius, inserted this correction into his Tacitus towards the end of his life (he died in 1614), or he made the emendation himself. Casaubon finally makes his debut in the apparatus criticus of an edition of Tacitus.

In a miscellaneous end-of-year report at 13.32.2, Tacitus states that *Pomponia Graecina insignis femina Plautio, qui ouans se de Britanniis retulit, nupta ac superstitionis externae rea, mariti iudicio permissa* (Lipsius). Acidalius reasonably described *qui ouans se de Britanniis retulit* as an indefinite, chronologically inexact expression.⁶⁶ He may be betraying the limits of his knowledge of history, but the expression is indeed vague and otiose here as a statement of fact. In 1672 J. F. Gronovius defended it by reference to occurrences of reflexive *referre* ('to go back, to return') at Vergil *Georg.* 4.180, *Aen.* 7.286, and Horace *Sat.* 1.6.114, among only a

⁶⁵ E.g. sc. *agenda* (uel sim.) with *insontibus innoxia consilia*.

⁶⁶ 'Indefinitus sermo, *qui de Britanniis ouans se retulit*. quando enim? Sed idem nec Cornelianus. Omnino credo scriptum fuisse, et legendum, *quem ouasse de Britannis retuli*. Id tamen quo libro, non memini, nec sat scio, an in his qui exstant. In vita Agricolae meminit quidem Plautii, sed non ouationis: *consularium*...'

handful of such uses before Tacitus.⁶⁷ Tacitus nowhere else uses *referre* reflexively; and any sense of autonomy on the part of the subject of the verb that this use may imply⁶⁸ is inappropriate in this context: Plautius was recalled from Britain and granted an ovation by Claudius – who even accompanied him during the parade. Acidalius proposed *quem ouasse de Britanniis retuli* (‘who I have recorded celebrated an ovation over the Britons’).⁶⁹ The emendation is paleographically economical, and produces superior sense: Tacitus identifies Graecina by identifying in turn a Plautius who has appeared earlier in the narrative; *there* one will find his ovation described. Cross-references litter the *Annals*, and Tacitus often employs *referre* of his writing.⁷⁰

When in 62 the notorious informer Cossutianus Capito accused the praetor Antistius of *maiestas* for scribbling and publicising poetry that slandered the emperor, Tacitus observed, *tum primum reuocata ea lex credebatur, quae haud perinde exitium Antistio, quam Imperatori gloriam quaesivit, ut condemnatus a Senatu, intercessione tribunicia morti eximeretur* (14.48.2; Lipsius). Acidalius begins his note by considering earlier attempts to make sense of *quae*.⁷¹ As the text stands its antecedent is *lex*. Mercerus rightly saw the problem in taking *lex* as the antecedent of *quae*: the law itself did not seek glory for the emperor but had a function and history above and beyond Capito’s revival of it. Mercerus thus changed *quae* into ablative *qua* so that

⁶⁷ The *OLD* (3) quotes the passage from the *Aeneid*, and *Acc. Trag.* 283, *Cic. Att.* 3.2.1 (SB 48), 6.1.10 (SB 115), *Caes. Ciu.* 1.72.5.

⁶⁸ Cf. Gowers 2012 on *me...refero*: ‘as opposed to being escorted or escorting someone’.

⁶⁹ The first hand of the second Medicean changed *qui* into *quem* and then restored it.

⁷⁰ Gerber-Greef 1903: 1367A-B.

⁷¹ ‘Aestuat hic Lipsius: nec cuneum reperit huic nodo, quem sola particula *quae* nectit. Expedit tamen Iosias Mercerus, *qua haut perinde*. vt ad accusatorem referatur, non ad legem. Bene profecto. Sed eandem in sententiam vt de lege quoque ipsa acciperetur, voluerat Muretus, notaueratque legendum, *quaereret*. Mihi alterum horum satisfaceret, nisi locutio ista dissuaderet: *Tum primum reuocata ea lex credebatur*. Quid, credebatur? inepte. quasi id non certum. Reuocata tum primum Lex Maiestatis fuit, quae tam diu sub Nerone acquieuerat. Remouendum igitur hinc illud *credebatur*, et cum sequentibus iungendum: quomodo eorum expeditissima sententia, et verissima Taciti scriptura confiet: *Tum primum reuocata ea lex: credebaturque haud perinde exitium Antistio, quam imperatori gloriam quaesisse*. quamquam hoc postremum variam admittit mutationem: necdum satis constitui, quid potissimum recipiendum. Possit, *gloriam quaesitam; gloria quaesita; gloriam quaeri; gloria quaeri*: denique et *gloriam quaerere*.’

Capito becomes the subject of *quaesiuit*. Muretus, on the other hand, preferred to read the *sententia* in relation to Capito *and* the law, and to this end he read *quae* and proposed *quaereret* for *quaesiuit*; the clause now expresses the point of reviving the law (*reuocata*). Acidalius considered the solutions of Mercerus and Muretus sound in themselves but rejected both because he saw the *locus* of the problem in the function of *credebatur* in the first part of the sentence. He was the first to realise the absurdity of stating ‘it was believed’ that the law was revived – as though the matter were uncertain. His solution was to place a colon after *lex*, take *credebatur* with the second part of the sentence, emend *quae* to *–que*, and change *quaesiuit* (preferably to *quaesisse*⁷²), ‘The law was then first revived: and it was believed that he sought not so much the destruction of Antistius as glory for the emperor’. Acidalius’ emendation effected superior sense and appropriate style: *credebaturque* evokes contemporary rumour in introducing a very Tacitean antithetical *sententia*.

I conclude by considering one of Acidalius’ emendations that deserves more notice than it currently receives. At *Annals* 1.59 Arminius is ranting to the Cherusci about Segestes’ recent surrender to and kindly reception by the Romans: *coleret Segestes uictam ripam; redderet filio sacerdotium: hominem Germanos nunquam satis excusatuos, quod inter Albim et Rhenum uirgas, et secures, et togam uiderint* (Lipsius : *s. hominem* M² : *s. hominum* M). Acidalius perceived two problems in this passage.⁷³ In addition to making the unnecessary emendation *filium sacerdotio*, he

⁷² Acidalius could not choose between *gloriam quaesisse*, *gloriam quaesitam*, *gloria quaesita*, *gloriam quaeri*, *gloria quaeri*, and *gloriam quaerere*. Tacitus uses the accusative and infinitive after passive *creditur* but prefers the nominative and infinitive. See Draeger 1882: §152; Furneaux 1896 I.v\$45, and his n. on 2.69.3.

⁷³ ‘Hic primum malim, *Redderet filium sacerdotio*. Rectius enim ita, quoniam ille sacerdotio aufugerat. Paulo superius [1.57]: *Quippe anno quo Germaniae descuere, sacerdos apud Aram Vbiorum creatus ruperat uittas, profugus ad rebelles*. Deinde *quae* sequuntur languent, nec Lips. erigit sua lectione, *Accusatuos*. Ego videor erigere, simul et asperare probrum in Segestem: *Coleret Segestes uictam ripam; redderet filium sacerdotio: enimuero Germanis nunquam satis excusaturum, quod inter* etc. Ex *Hominem* non nimis violenter *Enimuero*: ex *Germanos*, facillime *Germanis* fit. *Excusaturum* autem

altered *hominem* to *enimvero* and *Germanos* to *Germanis*, and retained the *excusaturum* that Lipsius, among others, had once proposed:⁷⁴ ‘what’s more he would never sufficiently justify to the Germans the fact that they had seen rods and axes and togas between the Elbe and the Rhine’.⁷⁵ Acidalius’ *Germanis...excusaturum* has been interpreted to mean that Arminius blamed Segestes for Rome’s presence in Germany. Furneaux (1896), following Nipperdey–Andresen (1915), printed the text of M, *Germanos numquam satis excusatuos, quod inter Albim et Rhenum uirgas et secures et togam uiderint*, which he translated, ‘True Germans [“in indignant contrast to Segestes”] could never make sufficient apology to themselves for that they have seen the fasces and the toga between the Rhine and the Elbe’. He took *quod...uiderint* to refer to Roman dominion (rather than invasion) in the period before the disaster of Varus, and stated that Segestes could hardly be seen as the cause of that dominion. Goodyear (1981) remarked that Acidalius’ *Germanis...excusaturum* ‘makes Segestes (in Arminius’ view) responsible for the Roman invasion of Germany, a wild exaggeration indeed, but not incredible in the context’. Nevertheless he printed the text of M.

Acidalius rightly perceived that the paradosis was unsatisfactory. Arminius’ transition from Segestes’ actions on the Roman side to a claim about the Germans is abrupt, and *satis excusatuos* is a weak concession in view of Arminius’ otherwise uncompromising stance. Arminius’ switch from his own brilliant successes to Segestes’ actions in fact creates the expectation of another statement in that direction. Acidalius’ emendation neatly satisfies that expectation and maintains Arminius’

etiam alias legitur. Lipsius olim voluit *Excusaturum* hoc sensu: Hominem natum neminem Germanos excusare posse, quod passi sint Romanos ad Albim pertingere’.

⁷⁴ Lipsius made the proposal in his *Notae* of 1574.

⁷⁵ For *satis excusare* cf. Ps. Quint. *Decl.* 5.4 *tenuit inter illos inexplicabiles doloris aestus, quam longum tenuit pietas misera consilium, et, quod numquam satis manibus filii, numquam satis excusabo conscientiae meae, non statim mihi ille deficiens unicus fuit.*

hostile tone by having him claim, not that Segestes is responsible for Roman invasion or rule in Germany, but that he would never be an effective apologist for Rome.⁷⁶ *‘Let him live with the Romans but he’s never going to persuade us...’* is the force of Arminius’ argument at this point. I should print Acidalius’ text, but in place of his *enimvero* and the *hominum* of M I prefer for sense and style the *omissum* of Seyffert (1843: 5-9): *coleret Segestes uictam ripam, redderet filio sacerdotium omissum: Germanis numquam satis excusaturum, quod inter Albim et Rhenum uirgas, et secures, et togam uiderint.*⁷⁷

⁷⁶ For *excusare quod* used of justifying or excusing someone else’s action cf. Liv. 42.6.6.

⁷⁷ The *hominum* of M is unsatisfactory in style and sense and (*pace* Goodyear 1981) could easily have been corrupted from *omissum*, Seyffert’s attractive proposal (cf. also Heubner 1964: 138-40), which picks up 1.57.2 *addiderat Segestes legatis filium, nomine Segimundum: sed iuuenis conscientia cunctabatur. quippe anno quo Germaniae descivere sacerdos apud aram Vbiorum creatus ruperat uittas, profugus ad rebelles*. For *omittere* cf. 3.60.2 *quod falso usurpauerant sponte omisere*, 6.32.2 *omisso cultu Romano, cui per tot annos insueuerat, instituta Parthorum sumit*, Hist. 4.86.2 *usurpata antea munia imperii omittebat*; TLL IX.2 583.84-584.4. For discussion of the text here see Goodyear 1981; add Watt 1988: 351-2.