

# THE RISE AND FALL OF SENECA *TRAGICUS*, c. 1365–1593\*

Jan Machielsen

A little attention has been paid to the reception of the entangled corpus produced by the rhetorician Lucius (or Marcus) Annaeus Seneca and his more famous son, the philosopher Lucius Annaeus Seneca the Younger.<sup>1</sup> This historiographical lacuna is especially curious given the drawn-out nature of the discussion, which began with Petrarch and Boccaccio and involved prominent *litterati* such as Justus Lipsius and Joseph Scaliger. The roughly analogous case of the two Plinys—the naturalist Pliny the Elder and his nephew Pliny the Younger—was successfully resolved in the early fourteenth century. In the Senecas debate, similarly, knowledge of the existence of a second author with the same name was lost during the Middle Ages but recovered during the early Renaissance. Unlike that case, however, no smoking gun (Pliny the Younger’s account of his uncle’s death during the eruption of Vesuvius) was available to clinch the argument.<sup>2</sup> Instead, the modern consensus emerged only in the late sixteenth century, after two centuries of scholarly discussion. That one Seneca was the philosopher forced to commit suicide under Nero was never in doubt, but the search for a second author did not settle on his father, instead producing a fictitious Seneca *tragicus*, whose identity and motives became the subject of fervent speculation. The recovery of contradictory and, for a time, incomplete testimony from antiquity first sparked off and then finally settled the confusion. In particular, two near-contemporaries of Seneca—Martial and Quintilian—played crucial parts in the story of the birth and demise of Seneca *tragicus*. Although Martial’s role in first prompting the debate has been widely recognised, the way his evidence structured later positions has not—nor the ways in which it was sometimes purposefully hidden. The role of Quintilian’s statements in deciding the question has thus far been largely ignored.

The present article will, necessarily, sift through the witness testimony available to the disputants but will also pay careful attention to their personal motivations and philosophical commitments. The high esteem in which Seneca’s philosophical

\* I would like to thank Anthony Grafton, Ian Maclean, Roland Mayer, and the reviewers and editors of this *Journal* for their comments on versions of this article.

Citations preceded by the abbreviation ILE (*Iusti Lipsi Epistolae*) use the numeration found in A. Gerlo and H. D. L. Vervliet, *Inventaire de la correspondance de Juste Lipse 1564–1606*, Antwerp 1968.

1. I know of only three studies exclusively devoted to the subject: P. Toynbee, ‘Dante and “Seneca Morale”’, in his *Dante Studies and Researches*, London 1902, pp. 150–56, who includes extensive quotations from the primary source material; G. Martellotti, ‘La

questione dei due Seneca da Petrarca a Benvenuto’, *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, xv, 1972, pp. 149–70; and M. van der Poel, ‘De Scheiding der twee Seneca’s: Een historische analyse’, *Lampas*, xvii, 1984, pp. 254–70, the only study to continue the story to its apparent conclusion.

2. On the essay by the Veronese clergyman Giovanni de Matociis (d. 1337) which resolved this issue see L. A. Ciapponi, ‘Plinius Caecilius Secundus, Gaius’ in *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, ix, ed. J. Hankins and R. A. Kaster, Washington DC 2011, pp. 73–152 (77–78).

works were held had a negative impact on the assessment of those parts of the corpus which were judged to belong to an obscure relative. The belief in a Christian Seneca, who allegedly corresponded with St Paul, also influenced questions of authorship, as did the revival of Stoic philosophy in the sixteenth century.<sup>3</sup> Both directly and indirectly, the authorship debate offers a window onto contemporary perceptions of the philosopher Seneca. Crucially, it also informs our understanding of the self-representation and perception of those drawn into the debate. From the outset the debate relied, at least in part, on stylistic judgements; and these, in turn, depended on but also influenced the reputations of the scholars involved.<sup>4</sup> As the argument over the two Senecas rumbled on, such assertions of critical acumen became an ever more important component. Detailed study of this debate, therefore, sheds light on the ways in which textual evidence, intellectual preconceptions and personal ambitions intersected to move humanist controversies forward.

It is now agreed that Seneca the philosopher composed, among other works, a number of tragedies (mostly under the emperor Claudius).<sup>5</sup> This essay will demonstrate that the present-day consensus on his *oeuvre* emerged out of an active dialogue between two old friends: the Flemish humanist Justus Lipsius (1547–1606) and the Flemish-Spanish Jesuit Martin Delrio (1551–1608). While their respective roles in solving parts of the puzzle of Senecan authorship have been noted, the issue has not received the systematic treatment it deserves.<sup>6</sup> The

3. L. A. Panizza, 'Biography in Italy from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance: Seneca, Pagan or Christian?', *Nouvelles de la république des lettres*, II, 1984, pp. 47–98; on Christian readings of Seneca's letters see also eadem, 'Textual Interpretation in Italy, 1350–1450: Seneca's Letter I to Lucilius', this *Journal*, XLVI, 1983, pp. 40–62.

4. The difficulties involved in settling questions of authorship helped to make, or tarnish, the reputations of several influential humanists, even when, as here, no religious commitments were at stake. The most famous case is the controversy surrounding Richard Bentley's *Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris*, studied by K. L. Haugen, *Richard Bentley: Poetry and Enlightenment*, Cambridge, MA 2011, pp. 100–24 (ch. 4). The young Dutch scholar Daniel Heinsius built his reputation in part by disproving the authorship of Aristotle's *De mundo*; see J. Krayer, 'Daniel Heinsius and the Author of *De mundo*', in *The Uses of Greek and Latin: Historical Essays*, ed. A. C. Dionisotti et al., London 1988, pp. 171–97. A modern forgery embarrassed Joseph Scaliger: Marc-Antoine Muret passed off his own poetical compositions as archaic Latin originals; see A. Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, I, Oxford 1983, pp. 161–62; J. Haig Gaisser, *Catullus and his Renaissance Readers*, Oxford 1993, pp. 178–83.

5. The modern consensus is that at least the majority of the plays antedate Nero's reign; see the introduction to Seneca, *Tragedies*, ed. and tr. J. G. Fitch, Cambridge, MA 2002 pp. 10–13. Seneca's

authorship is now rejected for two of the ten extant tragedies, the *Octavia* and the *Hercules on Oeta*; on the dating of the plays on internal grounds see J. Dingel, *Die relative Datierung der Tragödien Senecas*, Berlin 2009; and C. W. Marshall, 'The Works of Seneca the Younger and Their Dates', in *Brill's Companion to Seneca: Philosopher and Dramatist*, ed. G. Damschen and A. Heil, Leiden 2014, pp. 33–44 (37–41). Already Lipsius had argued on stylistic grounds that the composition of the *Medea* coincided with Claudius's conquest of Britain: see his edition of Seneca, *Opera, quae exstant omnia*, Antwerp 1605, p. xviii.

6. Lipsius's contribution to the debate has been noted by, among others, A. Grafton, 'Portrait of Justus Lipsius', in his *Bring Out Your Dead: The Past as Revelation*, Cambridge, MA 2001, pp. 227–43 (230–32); and J. Krayer, 'The Humanist as Moral Philosopher: Marc-Antoine Muret's 1585 Edition of Seneca', in *Moral Philosophy on the Threshold of Modernity*, ed. eadem and R. Saarinen, Dordrecht 2005, pp. 307–30 (314). For Delrio's role see R. Mayer, 'Personata Stoa: Neostoicism and Senecan Tragedy', this *Journal*, LVII, 1994, pp. 151–74 (153, 160); and before him G. D. Monsarrat, *Light from the Porch: Stoicism and English Renaissance Literature*, Paris 1984, p. 35. The two men knew each other from at least the early 1570s. Delrio's first publication, an edition of the Roman geographer Solinus, was based on a manuscript lent to him by Lipsius, 'hominis apprimè docti, mihique maxime amici'; see Martin Delrio, *In C. Iulii Solini Polyhistorum emendationes*, Antwerp 1572, p. 3.

importance of the disagreement between Lipsius and Delrio cannot be appreciated fully without paying attention to the two-hundred-year-old consensus they dislodged. Probably around 1365, Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–75), who had access to a manuscript of Martial's epigrams, found in them a reference to 'two Senecas and the one and only Lucan', from Cordoba.<sup>7</sup> Martial's near-contemporary testimony indicated that the second Seneca must have been a close relative of the philosopher. Boccaccio's solution was to divide the corpus of works between Lucius Annaeus Seneca, the famed philosopher, and a Seneca *tragicus*. In his commentary on the *Divine Comedy*, he insisted that Dante referred to Seneca as 'the moralist' in his masterwork 'in order to distinguish him from another of the same family who lived a short time later'.<sup>8</sup> What followed was a fruitless debate to ascertain the identity of the hypothesised tragedian as the brother, son or nephew of the philosopher—who continued to be regarded as the author of the rhetorical works.<sup>9</sup> Despite the lingering uncertainty over the exact relationship between the two Senecas, the thrust of Boccaccio's conclusion proved surprisingly long lasting: as late as 1576 Martin Delrio defended it in his first edition of the tragedies.<sup>10</sup> Thereafter, however, orthodoxy no longer held. In 1580, Lipsius in a famous essay introduced Seneca *rhetor* as the philosopher's father; then Delrio, in a second edition published in 1593–94, dispatched Seneca *tragicus* as a figment of the imagination.<sup>11</sup>

The birth and demise of Seneca *tragicus* offer a case study into the different, yet interrelated, factors which helped to propel humanist debates. To better understand these, we must seek to comprehend not only the durability of the original consensus but also the speed with which it finally crumbled. The solution was not prompted by a single discovery since, as we shall see, the arguments put forth by Lipsius and Delrio in the 1580s and 1590s had been anticipated by others, notably Paolo Pompilio in the 1490s and Andrea Alciati in the 1540s. Yet the edifice remained intact until Lipsius's forceful re-evaluation of a single part of the Senecan

7. Martial, *Epigrams*, 1.61: 'duosque Senecas unicumque Lucanum'. Martellotti (as in n. 1), p. 152, suggests, based on manuscript evidence, that Boccaccio passed on his discovery of this line of Martial to Petrarch in or shortly before 1365. A second, more obscure allusion to the 'docti Senecae ter numeranda domus' (iv.40), is either a reference to the philosopher and his two brothers, as suggested by Lipsius in his edition of Seneca (as in n. 5), p. xliii; or includes Lucan, their cousin, among the 'Senecas', as suggested by D. R. Shackleton Bailey in his edition and translation of Martial, *Epigrams*, I, Cambridge, MA 1993, p. 309 note c.

8. Giovanni Boccaccio, 'Esposizioni sopra la comedia di Dante', in *Tutte le opere*, ed. V. Branca, VI, Verona 1965, p. 252: 'È cognominato questo Seneca "morale", a differenza d'un altro Seneca, il quale, della sua famiglia medesima, fu poco tempo appresso di lui, il quale, essendo il nome di questo "morale" Lucio Anneo Seneca, fu chiamato Marco Anneo Seneca e fu poeta tragedo, per ciò che egli scrisse quelle tragedie le quali molti credono che Seneca morale scrivesse.'

English translation from *Boccaccio's Expositions on Dante's Comedy*, tr. M. Papiro, Toronto 2009, p. 231.

9. Among those who suggested a son were Rudolphus Agricola and Sicco Polenton; see Seneca [*rhetor*], *Declamationes aliquot*, ed. Rudolphus Agricola, Basel 1529, pp. 22–23; Sicco Polenton, *Scriptorum illustrium Latinae linguae libri XVIII*, ed. B. L. Ullman, Rome 1928, pp. 116, 119. Coluccio Salutati suggested the tragedies were composed by a brother; see Toynbee (as in n. 1), p. 152. A passing reference by Seneca to his nephew Marcus (the poet Lucan) led others, including Lipsius, to hypothesise a son; see Martellotti (as in n. 1), p. 159. According to Van der Poel (as in n. 1), p. 262, Raffaello Maffei Volterrano suggested a grandson of the philosopher, but *nepos* can mean either grandson or nephew.

10. Martin Delrio, *In L. Annaei Senecae Cordubensis poetae gravissimi tragoedias decem... amplissima adversaria*, Antwerp 1576, sig. \*\*\*1<sup>r-v</sup>.

11. Delrio had already completed a draft of his *Syntagma* by 1589; see below, n. 107.

corpus, which, for reasons which will become apparent, could not but upset the whole. It is only by reviewing, individually, the several interlocking building blocks of the consensus, that we can appreciate the strain under which, eventually, it fell apart. What impelled the debate forward was not only the evidence under consideration but also the relationship between the discussants. The two men were friends, but also rivals. Their arguments emerged in dialogue; Delrio built on parts of Lipsius's argument while undermining the remainder. Context also mattered. The backdrop to their disagreement, Lipsius's reconciliation with Catholicism in 1591, although not directly related to the philological debate, lent a confessional hue to its final stages.

## I

Although Boccaccio was never able to convince his older friend Petrarch of the existence of Seneca *tragicus* (or, indeed, any second Seneca), his argument was *prima facie* a solid one. Ten tragedies had survived the Middle Ages under Seneca's name. Assuming their shared origin made the philosopher's authorship problematic, since one play, the *Octavia*, was set in imperial Rome and featured Seneca in his role as Nero's adviser. Benvenuto da Imola (d. 1387 or 1388), an admirer of Boccaccio, pointed out that in this play Seneca predicts Nero's death, which 'he could not have done unless he had been a prophet'.<sup>12</sup> Coluccio Salutati (1331–1406) put forward much the same argument but at greater length. In a letter to Tancredo Vergiolesi, of 1371, he further pointed out that 'if this *Octavia* had been found among his papers at the time when Nero had compelled Seneca to choose death, it would have been completely destroyed on account of Caesar's fear and at the Senate's command'.<sup>13</sup> The possibility that the *Octavia*, the one play set in Rome, was the cuckoo in the nest, had occurred to Salutati but was rejected on stylistic grounds.<sup>14</sup> Rather, he observed, rightly, that even if the philosopher did compose the plays, he never cited them.<sup>15</sup> Finally, Salutati provided evidence which appeared to prove conclusively the existence of Seneca *tragicus*. He cited the testimony of a

12. Cited by Toynbee (as in n. 1), p. 152: 'predicit mortem Neronis, quod facere non potuit, nisi fuisset propheta.'

13. For Salutati's letter, dated 15 Oct. 1571, see *ibid.*, pp. 152–54 (153): 'Nec praetereundum censeo quod, cum Senecam ad eligendam mortem Nero compulerit, si inter libellos eiusdem *Octavia* fuisset reperta, metu Caesaris atque iubente Senatu prorsus fuisset deleta.'

14. We may read their rejection of this possibility as evidence of the strength attributed to the manuscript tradition. Salutati aired pre-existing doubts about the philosopher's authorship of the tragedies (*ibid.*, p. 153): 'Ego vero, cum diu de caeteris [tragoediis] dubitarim eo quod longe a stilo Senecae viderentur extraneae, *Octaviam* post eius fata compositam certissime coniectabam . . . Quae cum ita conveniant et idem *Octaviae* et ceterarum auctor esse putetur, michi facile persuasi illum Senecam Tragoedias non scripsisse.' When, in 1640, J. F. Gronovius discovered a much less corrupted

manuscript of the tragedies in the Medici library in Florence, one of the arguments advanced in its favour was the absence of the *Octavia*. See Gronovius's preface as reprinted in the variorum edition of Seneca, *Tragoediae*, ed. Joannes Casparus Schröderus, Delft 1728, sig. a3<sup>v</sup>.

15. Toynbee (as in n. 1), p. 153: 'Denique mirum est, cum vero proprius sit Senecam adhuc iuvenem Tragoedias debuisse conscribere, in tot librorum suorum voluminibus, quos provectori aetate composuit, ex hoc divino opere nullum usquam versiculum recitasse.' This issue still complicates the modern interpretation of the plays and the difficulty in reconciling Seneca's philosophy and poetry remains. See J. Dingel, 'L. Annaeus S[eneca] Politician and Stoic Philosopher, 1st Cent.', in *Brill's New Pauly*, ed. H. Cancik and H. Schneider [online edition], sec. II.C, 'Tragedies', who observes that it 'has proved impossible as yet to give a philosophical interpretation of the tragedies'.

poet from late antiquity, Sidonius Apollinaris, who distinguished between two Senecas: ‘of which one worships shabby Plato ... the other shakes the dance floor of Euripides’.<sup>16</sup>

Importantly, the high standing of Seneca *moralis* had repercussions for the reception of the tragedies. Petrarch, who still took the *Octavia* to be the work of the philosopher, believed that its contents reflected badly on Seneca. Drawing attention to Seneca’s rôle in Nero’s savage government, he asked: ‘Should you not have borne with greater resignation the yoke that you had voluntarily assumed, and at least have refrained from branding your master’s name with everlasting infamy?’<sup>17</sup> With the removal of the tragedies from his *oeuvre*, Seneca’s reputation flourished. In contrast to their medieval forebears, humanists began to believe that he might have been a secret Christian.<sup>18</sup> The philosopher was variously depicted during the fourteenth century as a Nicodemite follower of Christ, a John the Baptist at Nero’s court or a deeply religious pagan.<sup>19</sup> When the Florentine humanist Pietro Crinito (1475–1507) discussed Seneca *tragicus* he pointedly placed his relative, the philosopher, among Christians on the basis of St Jerome’s supposed testimony.<sup>20</sup> Seneca’s forced suicide, in particular, made a deep impact on Renaissance thought.<sup>21</sup> If anything, this positive impression, even when shorn of most of its Christian connotations, grew over time. Erasmus’s view of Seneca, that ‘if you read him as a pagan, he wrote like a Christian; while if as Christian, he wrote like a pagan’,<sup>22</sup> was echoed by Lipsius and Delrio, both of whom cited Tertullian’s claim that Seneca was ‘often ours’.<sup>23</sup> The two friends agreed that surviving letters allegedly exchanged between

16. Toynbee (as in n. 1), p. 154. Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carmina* 9.230–38: ‘quorum unus colit hispidum Platonem ... orchestram quatit alter Euripidis’; cited in W. Trillitzsch, *Seneca in Literarischen Urteil der Antike*, 2 vols, Amsterdam 1971, II, pp. 384–85; tr. Mayer (as in n. 6), p. 152.

17. Petrarch, *Le familiari: edizione critica*, ed. V. Rossi, IV, Florence 1942, p. 234 (XXIV.5.15): ‘nunquid non equanimius pati poteras iugum quod sponte subieras, et hoc saltem prestare ne domini tui nomen immortalibus maculis insignires?’ English translation from *Rerum familiarium libri XVII–XXIV*, ed. and tr. A. S. Bernardo, Baltimore 1985, pp. 322–25 (324). Martellotti (as in n. 1), p. 152, notes that Petrarch inserted doubts about Seneca’s authorship of the *Octavia* in a later version of the manuscript.

18. As shown by A. Momigliano, ‘Note sulla leggenda del Cristianesimo di Seneca’, in his *Contributo alla storia degli studi classici*, I, Rome 1955, pp. 13–32 (23), this idea was a humanist, not a medieval, invention. Even such fervent admirers of Seneca as Abelard and Héloïse still deemed him a pagan; see *The Letters of Heloise and Abelard...*, tr. M. M. McLaughlin and B. Wheeler, New York 2009, pp. 27, 176.

19. See Panizza, ‘Biography in Italy’, and ‘Textual Interpretation in Italy’ (as in n. 3).

20. Pietro Crinito, *Libri de poetis latinis*, Florence 1505, sig. e2<sup>v</sup>. Crinito’s *Vita* of Seneca *tragicus* was included in the numerous editions of the tragedies

produced in Lyons between 1536 and 1587 by Sébastien Gryphe and his son and successor, Antoine Gryphe: see, e.g., Seneca, *Tragoediae*, Lyons 1536, 1554, 1584 and 1587, pp. 3–4. They were succeeded by the editions produced by the Plantin Press which are the principal focus of this essay.

21. This is demonstrated by J. Ker, *The Deaths of Seneca*, Oxford 2009.

22. Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, 12 vols, ed. P. S. Allen et al., Oxford 1906–58 [online edn 2012], VIII (1529–30), no. 2091: ‘Etenim si legas illum ut paganum, scripsit Christiane; si ut Christianum, scripsit paganice.’ English translation from Erasmus, *The Correspondence, Letters 2082 to 2203, 1529* (*Collected Works*, xv), tr. A. Dalzell, Toronto 2012, pp. 50–51. Also cited by Trillitzsch (as in n. 16), I, p. 238; and P. Walter, ‘“Nihil enim huius praeceptis sanctius”: Das Seneca-Bild des Erasmus von Rotterdam’, in *Stoizismus in der europäischen Philosophie, Literatur, Kunst und Politik*, ed. B. Neymeyr et al., 2 vols, Berlin 2008, I, pp. 501–24 (509).

23. Tertullian, *De anima*, 20: ‘Seneca saepe noster’. This comment is discussed by Delrio in his *Syntagma tragoediae latinae*, 3 vols, Antwerp 1593–94, I, p. 52; Lipsius cites it in his edition of Seneca (as in n. 5), p. xxix, and appears to allude to it in his dedication to Paul V when he describes the philosopher as ‘virtutis studio paene Christianum’ (sig. \*3<sup>v</sup>).

the philosopher and St Paul were forgeries; but they suggested, on the testimony of St Augustine and St Jerome, that the original letters must have been lost—a position which attracted the derision of Joseph Scaliger.<sup>24</sup>

By contrast, little was known about Seneca *tragicus*, who was considered mostly in relationship to his more famous relative. Sicco Polenton (1375–1447) depicted the *Octavia* as a literary revenge on Nero by Seneca *tragicus*, the philosopher's son.<sup>25</sup> Giglio Giralaldi (1479–1552) reported that little was certain about the death of Seneca *tragicus*, but on that of Seneca the philosopher 'there is the famous account in Cornelius Tacitus, which I do not remember ever reading without tears'.<sup>26</sup> The tragedies were popular. Despite the lack of information about him, Erasmus rated their author—'whoever he was'—as highly as Euripides.<sup>27</sup> Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484–1558) famously favoured the Senecan tragedies over their Greek counterparts.<sup>28</sup> This did not mean, however, that they could compare to the philosophical works. Erasmus also observed that the tragedies 'don't look the sort of thing Seneca could have written'.<sup>29</sup> Lipsius, the most influential populariser of Stoic philosophy, was their most severe critic: for him their *sententiae* or maxims offered were no match for the philosopher's pithy sayings. They were *sententiole*, 'that is, certain broken, short sayings, obscure or empty, which may flatter at first sight, [but when] examined, provoke laughter'.<sup>30</sup> The detachment of the tragedies from the Senecan corpus influenced their assessment; the inevitable comparison

24. Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), I, pp. 61–62; Lipsius, in his edition of Seneca (as in n. 5), p. xxv. For Scaliger's caustic comment see *Scaligerana, Thuana, Perroniana, Pithoeana, et Colomesiana*, 2 vols, Amsterdam 1740, II, p. 568.

25. Polenton (as in n. 9), pp. 116, 119.

26. Giglio Gregorio Giralaldi, *Operum quae extant omnia tomus secundus*, Basel 1580, p. 316: 'de seniore [i.e., the philosopher] notissima est historia apud Tacitum Cornelium, quam nunquam me sine lachrimis legisse memini'. Cf. Tacitus, *Annals*, xv.51–54.

27. In an epistle to 'philologis omnibus' prefacing the 1533 *Adagia*, declared that: 'nescio quo pacto Graecorum admiratio propensior effecit ut Latini sua videantur habuisse neglectui. Alioqui non video quamobrem Virgilius sit Homero et Hesiodo posthabendus; aut Seneca [i.e., *tragicus*], quisquis is fuit, Euripidi; aut Plautus et Horatius Aristophani—nam M. Tullius, quod ad hanc sane rem attinet, longe superat Demosthenem.' Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum* (as in n. 22), x (1532–34), no. 2773. W. Trillitzsch, 'Seneca tragicus: Nachleben und Beurteilung im lateinischen Mittelalter von der Spätantike bis zum Renaissancehumanismus', *Philologus*, cxxxii, 1978, pp. 120–36 (133), and in his 'Erasmus und Seneca', *ibid.*, cix, 1965, pp. 270–93 (272), notes that Erasmus took Seneca *tragicus* to be the brother or son of the philosopher. Walter (as in n. 22), p. 501 n. 2, suggests that the passage cited above reflected uncertainty about the identity of Seneca *tragicus* later in Erasmus's life.

28. Julius Caesar Scaliger, *Poetices libri septem*, 6 vols, Stuttgart and Bad Cannstatt 1994–2011, v, ed. and tr. L. Deitz and G. Vogt-Spira, pp. 274–75. Scaliger's view was cited among others by Delrio, *Adversaria* (as in n. 10), sig. \*\*\*3<sup>f</sup>. The literature on the Senecan influence on early modern, especially French, drama is vast; see the recent synthesis by F. de Caigny, *Sénèque le tragique en France (XVI–XVII<sup>e</sup> siècles): Imitation, traduction, adaptation*, Paris 2011; and J. Ambrose, 'The Reception of Seneca the Tragedian in Early Modern France: Editions, Translations, Commentaries', D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford 2008.

29. Erasmus, 'Dialogus Ciceronianus', in his *Opera omnia*, I.2, ed. P. Mesnard, Amsterdam 1971, pp. 581–710 (657): 'Nam tragoediae quae probantur a doctis, vix videntur a Seneca scribi potuisse.' English translation from *The Ciceronian: A Dialogue on the Ideal Latin Style (Collected Works, xxviii)*, tr. B. I. Knott, Toronto 1986, p. 409.

30. Justus Lipsius, *Animadversiones in tragoedias quae L. Annaeo Senecae tribuuntur*, Leiden 1587, p. 8: 'Iam sententiae probae, acutae, interdum ad miraculum. Sed nonne saepe et sententiole? Id est, fracta, minuta quaedam dicta, obscura aut vana: quae ad spectu blandiantur, excussa moveant risum.' Although the date 1588 appears on the title-page, the work was published on or just before 16 Oct. 1587, when Lipsius sent a copy to Theodoros Canterus; see ILE II 87 10 16. On Lipsius's Neo-Stoic project see esp. J. Lagrée, *Juste Lipse et la restauration du stoïcisme*, Paris 1994.

with the remainder of that corpus, still assigned to the famous philosopher, seemed to confirm the rightness of the division.

## II

Boccaccio's solution ran into one major difficulty early on. The early humanists had ascribed the works of rhetoric to Seneca the philosopher. Merging the writings of a father and son into the literary output of a single author inevitably gave him an unusually long life span. The Seneca who composed the rhetorical *Controversiae* comments that, had he been in Rome as a youth, he could have heard Cicero speak.<sup>31</sup> According to Polenton's (conservative) judgement, at the time of his death in 65 AD, Seneca must have been 118 years old. Polenton defended his calculation bullishly: those who failed to accept it 'would rather quarrel than admit the obvious truth'.<sup>32</sup> An anonymous life of Seneca, included by Erasmus in his second edition of the philosopher's *Opera* (Basel 1529), reported that he had lived to the ripe old age of 124. The same life, now wrongly ascribed to Polenton, was reprinted in the editions of Vincenz Pralle (Basel 1573, Paris 1581).<sup>33</sup> As James Ker has observed, this 'super Seneca' may well have appealed to humanists, since his great age made the philosopher, quite literally, a relic of traditional republican virtue at the time of his death.<sup>34</sup>

A second locus of debate opened with the unearthing of more testimony from antiquity. Although Martial had reported the existence of two Senecas and a range of later authors had also cited Senecan verse,<sup>35</sup> it was Quintilian's testimony which established that at least one of the tragedies, the *Medea*, had circulated under Seneca's name in the first century AD. The early Renaissance had possessed only the middle part of Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, 'mangled and in pieces', in the words of Leonardo Bruni, until Poggio Bracciolini found a complete text in a German monastic library in 1416.<sup>36</sup> This voluminous work contains a short quotation from the play, together with a reference to a debate between Seneca (or *a* Seneca) and the tragedian Pomponius Secundus, and a brief comment on the range of Seneca's

31. Seneca the Elder, *Controversiae*, I, preface, 11.

32. Polenton (as in n. 9), p. 494: 'certare potius quam fateri quae sint vera et manifesta'. This is discussed by Grafton, 'Portrait of Justus Lipsius' (as in n. 6), p. 230, who notes that Polenton sought to bury the difficulty with rhetoric.

33. Seneca, *Opera*, ed. Erasmus, Basel 1529, sigs a7<sup>r</sup>-a8<sup>v</sup>. Erasmus describes the *vita* as 'incerto autore, nisi quod constat illum fuisse recentiorem, ut qui subinde citat Petrarcham, Boccacium, et alios huiusmodi' (sig. a7<sup>r</sup>). It is identical to the 'Vita Lucii Annaei Senecae ex Tacito et Suetonio decerpta', in Seneca, *Opera, quae extant, omnia*, ed. Vincenz Pralle, Basel 1573, sigs a9<sup>r</sup>-a10<sup>r</sup>, and Paris 1581, sigs ē4<sup>v</sup>-ē6<sup>f</sup>. Panizza, 'Biography in Italy' (as in n. 3), p. 75, identifies its author as Gasparino Barzizza (1360-1431). The *vita* remains ambivalent about the existence of a separate Seneca *tragicus*, describing the matter as 'adhuc sub iudice lis'; see the 1573 version, sig. a10<sup>r</sup>.

34. Ker (as in n. 19), p. 198.

35. See the very useful list of 'Testimonia veterum et recentiorum quorundam de L. Annaeo Seneca' in Schröderus's edition of the tragedies (as in n. 14), sigs i1<sup>r</sup>-i2<sup>v</sup>; and the modern list provided by Van der Poel (as in n. 1), pp. 255-56, in which the testimony of Quintilian is, however, incomplete.

36. Leonardo Bruni to Poggio Bracciolini, 13 Sep. 1416; see Bruni's *Epistolarum libri VIII*, ed. Laurentius Mehus, 2 vols, Florence 1741, I, p. 112 (IV.V): 'Quintilianus enim prius lacer atque discerptus cuncta membra sua per te recuperabit. Vidi enim capita librorum, totus est, cum vix nobis media pars, et ea ipsa lacera superesset.' I am grateful to Hester Schadee for the reference. On the transmission of Quintilian see M. Winterbottom, 'Quintilian: *Institutio oratoria*', in *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, ed. L. D. Reynolds, Oxford 1983, pp. 332-34 (333).

writings.<sup>37</sup> Salutati had, in fact, already noticed this last reference to Seneca, although it is clear from his allusion to it that he did not have the text to hand.<sup>38</sup> Polenton also knew Quintilian's testimony, at least in part, but cited him only on the point that Seneca 'dealt with almost every department of knowledge; for speeches, poems, letters and dialogues circulate under his name'.<sup>39</sup> Even the mention of poems did nothing to sway his mind. Polenton volunteered, by way of explanation, that Seneca 'is, however, usually remembered as having composed one book in verse, the burlesque [on the death of] Claudius'—an allusion to the satirical *Apocolocyntosis*.<sup>40</sup>

Humanists, for the most part, simply did not know what to make of Quintilian's references to Seneca. It was only the Roman humanist Paolo Pompilio (1453/54–1490/91) who opposed Sidonius with Quintilian, rather than the other way around. In his *Vita Senecae* of 1490, he noted the orator's recollection that 'in my youth there was a dispute between Pomponius and Seneca which even found its way into their prefaces, as to whether *gradus eliminat* was a phrase which ought to have been allowed in tragedy.'<sup>41</sup> Attempting to explain the comment, Pompilio merged the poet and philosopher into a single figure: '... by which I understand that Pomponius Secundus, the prince of Latin tragedians, vied with Seneca, who was also, as it is reasonable to believe, the poet and the same philosopher'.<sup>42</sup> Pompilio's conclusions on the division of the corpus are not entirely clearcut. Anticipating a later turn of the debate, he questioned the philosopher's authorship of the rhetorical writings: 'some contend that his [Seneca the Elder's] *declamationes* do not survive, others that they are the ones which have falsely circulated under the name of his son Lucius Seneca'.<sup>43</sup> Yet he still agreed with his predecessors 'that no one in his right mind who reads it a little more carefully will believe that the *Octavia* is truly by Seneca the philosopher, but by another, later person of the same family'.<sup>44</sup> Most likely, then, he attributed only the *Octavia* to the tragedian; if so, he approximated the modern consensus.

Unfortunately, Pompilio died shortly after the publication of his little work, few copies of which survive today. Whatever influence it exerted was probably indirect and therefore hard to measure. Pompilio was a member of the so-called

37. Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, VIII.3.31 (the debate with Pomponius Secundus; see also below, n. 41), IX.2.9 (citing half a verse from Seneca, *Medea*, 453), and X.I.129 (writings; see further below, n. 39).

38. See Toynbee (as in n. 1), p. 153. It is apparent that Salutati is paraphrasing from memory: 'cum meminerim apud Quintilianum, ubi in libro *De Institutione Oratoria* facit Senecae mentionem'. The allusion which follows is to X.I.129 (cited next note).

39. Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, X.I.129: 'Tractavit etiam omnem studiorum materiam. Nam et orationes eius et poemata et epistolae et dialogi feruntur.' Cf. Polenton (as in n. 9), pp. 494–95: 'Quintiliani quoque testimonium extat ab eo studiorum omnem fere materiam pertractatam et orationes, poemata, epistolae, dialogos relictos esse.'

40. Polenton (as in n. 9), p. 495: 'Metro autem fecisse de Ludis Claudii librum unum memorari solet.'

41. Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, VIII.3.31: 'Nam memini iuvenis admodum inter Pomponium ac Senecam etiam praefationibus esse tractatum, an *gradus eliminat* in tragoedia dici oportuisset.'

42. Paolo Pompilio, 'Vita Senecae', in *Études sur Sénèque*, ed. P. Faider, Ghent 1921, pp. 271–323 (314–15): 'Ubi Pomponium Secundum intelligo, latinorum tragicorum principem, cum Seneca etiam, ut credi par est, poeta et eodem philosopho contendisse.'

43. *Ibid.*, p. 284: 'Huius declamationes alii non extare contendunt, alii perperam eas esse quae L. Senecae filii titulo circumferuntur.'

44. *Ibid.*, p. 313: 'Octaviam vero Senecae philosophi fuisse nemo sanae mentis existimabit qui attentius eam legerit, sed ex eadem familia alius posterioris.'

Roman Academy and in his preface he reported having ‘from time to time spoken about the life of Seneca the philosopher with Pomponio Leto’, its founder.<sup>45</sup> Another Rome-based scholar, Raffaello Maffei Volterrano (1451–1522), may have been alluding to these discussions when he reported that Marcus Annaeus Seneca, ‘the father of the philosopher Seneca, ... was very erudite, since some attribute to him the *declamationes* which are said to be by the son’.<sup>46</sup> Moreover, the *Vita Senecae* may have influenced the Paduan humanist Gellio Bernardino Marmita (c. 1440–c. 1497) who, in his 1492 edition of the tragedies, timidly advanced (as the suggestion of others) a similar opinion to Pompilio’s regarding the plays. Noting that the *Octavia* could not possibly be by the philosopher, he reported that:

There are those who make excuses; they say that not all the tragedies were by the same author, that a certain variety in style indicates this to those who pay careful attention and that therefore the ninth tragedy [the *Octavia*] was by another, while the others [belong] to the Seneca whom we usually call *moralis*.<sup>47</sup>

The extent to which Marmita was committed to this theory is unclear, but his comment was later noticed by Martin Delrio, who believed that it represented his own view.<sup>48</sup>

With the exception of Pompilio, then, the strength of the prevailing paradigm was such that Quintilian made little impact; but his words did not go unnoticed. Crinito, writing in the early sixteenth century, observed that Pomponius Secundus ‘flourished in the same age and was occupied with the composing of tragedies, a match for Seneca himself in [these] pursuits, as Fabius Quintilian testifies’.<sup>49</sup> Crinito was more sceptical than most other commentators, noting the purely conjectural status of claims that Seneca *tragicus* was the philosopher’s son. Nonetheless, he assured his readers that ‘There is not the least doubt that there were two Senecas, the second of whom is regarded as distinguished in the pursuit of philosophy’.<sup>50</sup>

45. *Ibid.*, p. 282: ‘aliquando de Senecae philosophi vita cum Pomponio Laeto sermo fuisse’. Concerning Pompilio’s apparent membership of the Roman Academy see Faider’s introduction, *ibid.*, p. 272; and J. F. d’Amico, *Renaissance Humanism in Papal Rome: Humanists and Churchmen on the Eve of the Reformation*, Baltimore 1983, p. 158. L. Gualdo Rosa, ‘Le strane vicende di Seneca nelle biografie umanistiche da Gasparino Barzizza a Erasmo, con qualche eccezione alla scuola di Pomponio Leto’, in *Syntagmata: Essays on Neo-Latin Literature in Honour of Monique Mund-Dopchie and Gilbert Tournoy*, ed. D. Sacré and J. Papy, Leuven 2009, pp. 19–32 (27–28), has pointed out that Pompilio’s discussion recalls a similar one in a manuscript life of Lucan by Leto, which suggested that Seneca the Elder had composed other rhetorical writings, since lost.

46. Raffaello Maffei Volterrano, *Commentariorum urbanorum liber primus* [–XXXVIII], Rome 1506, sig. N6<sup>v</sup>: ‘Senecae philosophi pater, ... eruditissimus fuit ut Cui declamationes quae filii dicuntur esse nonnulli referant.’

47. Seneca, *Tragedie ... cum commento*, ed. Gellius Bernardinus Marmita, Venice 1492, sig. a2<sup>r</sup>: ‘At hi qui excusant: non omnes tragoedias eiusdem auctoris fuisse dicunt: quaedam varietas stili diligenter intuentibus indicat: et sic nonam alterius fuisse: alias vero Senecae quem moralem appellamus.’

48. See Delrio, *Adversaria* (as in n. 10), sig. \*\*\*1<sup>v</sup>, and *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), I, p. 66. Mayer (as in n. 6), pp. 156–57, suggests that Marmita still saw a clear difference between the poet and the philosopher; Van der Poel (as in n. 1), pp. 260–61, represents this passage as unambiguously representing Marmita’s opinion.

49. Crinito (as in n. 20), sig. e2<sup>v</sup>: ‘Pomponius Secundus, qui eadem aetate claruit, et cum ipso Seneca paribus studiis versatus est in faciendis Tragoediis: ut Fabius Quintilianus testatur.’

50. *Ibid.*, sig. e2<sup>v</sup>: ‘Minime autem dubium est duos fuisse Senecas: quorum alter in philosophiae studiis praeclarus atque excellens habitus est.’

For Crinito, the testimony of Martial and Sidonius—the latter of whom he cited at some length—trumped Quintilian. He seems therefore to have read the orator as discussing the two Senecae interchangeably. In the case of Giraldi, in 1545, Quintilian's scathing criticisms of Seneca compounded the problem of interpretation.<sup>51</sup> Giraldi noted Quintilian's citation of half a verse from the *Medea* but speculated about why the tragedian had, seemingly, not otherwise merited the orator's attention. He concluded that:

Fabius indeed seems not to have considered [the tragedies] worthy of his judgement, even if elsewhere he mentions the *Medea* on its own. Some reckon that it was done because this Seneca was still alive; others, because he had not yet settled into his hatred for the Senecae.<sup>52</sup>

Quintilian, therefore, was certainly read; but the significance of his testimony was not yet appreciated.

### III

The late fifteenth-century discussions had no visible effect on Erasmus and his friends and collaborators, Juan Luis Vives and Beatus Rhenanus.<sup>53</sup> In 1532, a young humanist inspired by Erasmus's 1529 edition of Seneca, John Calvin, did not question the traditional division of the corpus.<sup>54</sup> When Delrio first came to the authorship of the tragedies in the 1570s, it was as if the debate had not moved on one inch in two centuries. He framed his contribution as a discussion between Boccaccio and Petrarch and rejected the fifteenth-century speculations, personified by Marmita. He based his argument, as many had done before him, on the quality of the *Octavia*. In his preface Delrio ended a list of ancient tragedians with

this our Seneca, whoever he was: whether, as Petrarch thought, the philosopher and teacher of Nero or, as appeared more likely to Giovanni Boccaccio, not him, but either, according to some, his brother or, according to others, a son or a descendent through a brother, which most have thought and which also appears more probable to me. I am, to be sure, prevented from agreeing with Petrarch by the penultimate tragedy, which is called *Octavia*. The philosopher Seneca would not have introduced himself speaking in that tragedy, nor would he have denounced the vices of Nero so freely. Added to these points is the authority of Martial, who acknowledges two Senecae. Sidonius also sang in this manner, delivering on both

51. On Quintilian's grudge against the 'Senecae' see L. A. Sussman, *The Elder Seneca*, Leiden 1978, pp. 163–65. Lipsius, in his edition of Seneca (as in n. 5), pp. vi–x, came to Seneca's defence.

52. Giraldi (as in n. 26), p. 317: 'Fabius quidem nec illas sua censura dignas putasse visus est, tametsi alicubi tantum Medeam nominat. Quidam ea causa id factum rentur, quod hic Seneca viveret adhuc; alii, quod necdum eius in Senecae odium resederat.' Giraldi, who introduced the *tragicus* as either the son or the brother of 'prioris Senecae, qui vulgo cognominatus est Moralis' (p. 316), believed that Quintilian and the older Seneca had been engaged in a personal vendetta (ibid.): 'Taxatus quidem prior Seneca a Fabio Quintiliano, modesta quadam Hispani hominis censura, ne scilicet id fortasse odio potius, quam

veritatis candore fecisse videretur: quam rem mecum saepe reputans, ea ratione fecisse crediderim, ut Senecae parem gratiam referret, qui Quintilianum declamatorem, cuius adhuc nonnullae extant declamationes, acrius antea fuerat insectatus.'

53. For Erasmus see above, nn. 27–29. For Vives see K. A. Blüher, *Séneca en España: Investigaciones sobre la recepción de Séneca e España desde el siglo XIII hasta el siglo XVII*, Madrid 1983, p. 253; for Rhenanus see Johannes Isaac Pontanus, 'De auctoribus tragoediarum ad V. Cl. Petrum Scriverium, prolegomenon', in Schröderus's edition of the tragedies (as in n. 14), sig. c2<sup>r</sup>.

54. John Calvin, *Commentary on Seneca's De Clementia*, ed. and tr. F. L. Battles, Leiden 1969, pp. 6–8; see also Battles's note on p. 14.

Senecas ... [Delrio excerpts from Sidonius]. This passage in Sidonius is so clear that it cannot be twisted into another meaning. Nor would I think what Marmita has put forward is to be admitted: that these ten tragedies are by different authors and that, the *Octavia* excepted, the other nine should be attributed to Seneca *philosophus*. He says that a certain variety in style indicates this to those who pay careful attention. I gladly acknowledge that I truly do not understand this variety in style, which a critic of little value devised. Indeed, [either] I see nothing or this tragedy [the *Octavia*] is so similar to the other nine that an egg is not able to be more similar to an egg or a fig to a fig.<sup>55</sup>

What is remarkable here is not the argument itself, but the fervour with which Delrio defended a commonly accepted view against a long-deceased and, as we have seen, rather hesitant challenger. This was a combative opinion put forward by a young humanist in search of recognition. The closing literary flourish alludes to a famous discussion of the problem of discerning authorship: Erasmus had maintained that ‘those who are extraordinarily attentive or who oppose proverbs are allowed to discern an egg from an egg or a fig from a fig’.<sup>56</sup> Delrio’s discussion of the authorship of the tragedies was, therefore, based not only on tradition but also on his own assessment of their quality. Indeed, as Lipsius would also do, he wagered his reputation on it: ‘I am content for you to think badly of me if you do not immediately discern what I have affirmed to be true’.<sup>57</sup> For all the bluster, this argument possessed a logic which was lacking in Marmita (who, after all, did not explain the identity of the second Seneca). Having accepted (a) that the *Octavia* could not have been written by the philosopher, (b) that ancient sources suggested there were two literary Senecas and (c) that all ten plays were by the same author, the inevitable conclusion was that the tragedies were all written by a single Seneca, who was not the *philosophus*. As we shall see, twenty years later, Delrio built on Lipsius’s scholarship and revised the last assumption on which his argument had rested.

## IV

While Quintilian’s testimony had as yet made little or no impact on the debate, Seneca’s supposed longevity was seized on by Lipsius, who made it the centrepiece

55. Delrio, *Adversaria* (as in n. 10), sig. \*\*\*1<sup>r-v</sup>: ‘hic noster Seneca; quisquis ille fuit: sive, ut Petrarcha putabat, philosophus Neronis praeceptor; sive, quod Ioanni Boccatio verisimilius videbatur, non ille, sed vel illius frater, secundum quosdam, vel iuxta alios, filius; vel ex fratre nepos, quod plerique existimarunt, et mihi quoque magis probatur. Sane ne Petrarchae assentiar, tragoedia penultima, cui nomen Octavia, facit. Neque enim philosophus Seneca seipsum in ea tragoedia loquentem introduxisset, neque tam libere Neronis vitia perstrinxisset. His accedit Martialis auctoritas, qui duos Senecas agnoscit. Sidonius quoque cecinit in hunc modum, de utroque Seneca agens ...: qui Sidonii locus tam apertus est, ut in alium sensum detorqueri nequeat. Nec vero illud admittendum putem, quod Marmita prodidit, has decem tragoedias diversorum auctorum esse. Et quidem,

*Octavia* excepta, ceteras novem tribui Senecae philosopho debere. Idque ait styli varietatem diligenter intuentibus indicare. Ego sane me non assequi illam styli varietatem, quam non magni precii criticus comminiscitur, lubens agnosco. Imo, aut nihil video, tragoedia illa nona ceteris tam similis est, ut ovum ovo, aut ficus ficui similior esse non possit.’

56. St Jerome, *Lucubrationes*, ed. Erasmus, IV, Basel 1525, sig. a5<sup>r</sup>: ‘vehementer attentis, ovum ab ovo, ficum a ficu licet discernere, vel refragantibus proverbiiis.’ On the proverb ‘non tam ovum ovo simile’ see Erasmus’s *Adagia* Iv10, in his *Adages Iiv to Iv100* (*Collected Works*, xxxi), tr. M. Mann Phillips, Toronto 1982, p. 393.

57. Delrio, *Adversaria* (as in n. 10), sig. \*\*\*1<sup>v</sup>: ‘causam non dico, quin male de me sentiat, nisi confestim, quae affirmavi, vera esse comperietis’.

of the opening chapter of his 1580 *Electa*, the first major work which he published after his arrival and appointment as professor in history and law in Leiden.<sup>58</sup> Much like Delrio's assessment, Lipsius's was an attempt to forge his reputation: 'I shall begin this book, as the censors of old [began] their propitiatory offerings, with an auspicious name. I shall speak about Annaeus Seneca, with the good hope that my writing will withstand the years and grow old.'<sup>59</sup> Whereas Delrio had defended the age-old consensus, Lipsius was suitably iconoclastic: 'The *vulgus* holds that books entitled *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* were written by the Seneca known as the philosopher, who was Nero's tutor. The *vulgus* holds this, and therefore it errs.'<sup>60</sup>

In systematic fashion, Lipsius lined up contemporary references culled from the rhetorical and philosophical writings attributed to Seneca. The author of the rhetorical works had lived under the emperors Augustus and Tiberius. He had heard Ovid declaim his poetry;<sup>61</sup> and, had he been in Rome as a young man, he could even have heard Cicero speak. Lipsius mocked the lives by Polenton and others for their implausible conclusions: 'Tricksters! Medea is nothing compared to their art of rejuvenating the old by boiling!'<sup>62</sup> Tacitus, who was well disposed towards Seneca, had described the philosopher as old, but 'he had not reached this great, little short of miraculous, age'.<sup>63</sup> Indeed, when Seneca had sought retirement from public life, Nero described him as 'in vigorous manhood'.<sup>64</sup> Seneca had described himself in a letter to Lucilius as being young under Tiberius. Who would believe that this person could be born in the time of Cicero, asked Lipsius rhetorically, 'unless someone is so absurdly witless that he believes a sixty-year-old man should be called a youth.'<sup>65</sup>

The inevitable conclusion, then, was that there were two Senecas: one a rhetorician, who was a provincial knight born under the Republic and who lived until the age of Claudius; the other, his son. What is more, the elder Seneca had dedicated his writings to his three sons Seneca, Novatus and Mela: 'Among the

58. His first publication, an edition of Livy's book 1, was sparsely annotated, for which he apologised in a brief preface to his printer Christophe Plantin: Livy, *Ab urbe condita liber primus*, ed. Justus Lipsius, Antwerp 1579, sig. A1<sup>v</sup>. On Lipsius's appointment and time in Leiden see esp. J. de Landtsheer, *Lieveling van de Latijnse taal: Justus Lipsius te Leiden herdacht bij zijn vierhonderdste sterfdag*, Leiden 2006, pp. 31–72 (ch. 3).

59. Justus Lipsius, *Electorum liber I, in quo, praeter censuras, varii prisca ritus*, Antwerp 1580, p. 17: 'Ut Censores olim lustrum a bono nomine: sic ego ordiar hunc librum. Dicam de Annaeo Seneca; cum bona spe fore, ut hoc scriptum meum annos ferat et senescat.' Lipsius's reference is to the lustration or purification ceremony which concluded the Roman census and 'bono' here signifies auspicious. Cicero, *De divinatione*, 1.102, had recommended that in such ceremonies only those 'bonis nominibus' should be tasked with leading the offerings. For a description of the rituals involved see D. J. Gargola, *Lands, Laws, and Gods: Magistrates and Ceremony in the Regulation of Public Lands in Republican Rome*, Chapel Hill 1995, p. 77.

60. Lipsius, *Electa* (as in n. 59), p. 17: 'Libros eos qui Controversiarum et Suasoriarum inscribuntur, Annaei Senecae esse; illius, qui Philosophus dicitur, et qui Neroni praeceptor. Censet vulgus, et ideo errat.' Translation from Grafton, 'Portrait of Justus Lipsius' (as in n. 6), p. 231.

61. Seneca the Elder, *Controversiae*, II.2.9.

62. Lipsius, *Electa* (as in n. 59), p. 18: 'Homines praestigiatos! et prae quorum arte in recoquendis senibus nihil sit Medea.' The reference here is to the murder of Pelias, King of Iolcus, by Medea, who had persuaded the king's daughters to cut him up, with the false promise that she would rejuvenate him by boiling.

63. *Ibid.*, p. 19: 'grandem hanc, et non longe a miraculo aetatem, non attingit'.

64. Tacitus, *Annales*, XIV.56; Lipsius, *Electa* (as in n. 59), p. 19: 'valida aetas'.

65. Seneca, *Moral Letters*, 108; Lipsius, *Electa* (as in n. 59), p. 20: 'Nisi quis tam inepte desipiens, qui sexagenarium senem iuvenem censet appellandum.'

three sons whom he names is Seneca *philosophus*, the others are his brothers.<sup>66</sup> This reading, Lipsius went on to demonstrate, was corroborated by both external and internal evidence. Tacitus had referred in passing to Mela as Seneca's brother, and Seneca had alluded to his brothers in his *Consolatio ad Helviam*.<sup>67</sup> The entire, dazzling exposition concluded with a promise: 'I shall add more clarification about his age and family tree in a separate book which I have diligently composed on the life and writings of Annaeus Seneca'.<sup>68</sup>

Lipsius's impressive achievement had, in fact, been anticipated in the early 1540s by the famous Italian jurist and emblemist Andrea Alciati (1492–1550), who had also used Seneca's age to argue that the rhetorician was the father of the philosopher. Alciati spent less than a paragraph arguing that it was the father

to whom the *Declamationes* belong, [and] who attested that he could have heard Cicero. Therefore the opinion of those who, when they add together the age of both men, allege that he lived for more than 120 years is ridiculous.<sup>69</sup>

Whether Lipsius was aware of Alciati's view is unclear. Like Pompilio's exposition, Alciati's comment seems to have made little immediate impact.<sup>70</sup> By contrast, Lipsius's essay was difficult to miss or dismiss. Cogently argued and much longer, its professionalism dazzled contemporaries and impressed historians. The life of Seneca which had prefaced the editions of Erasmus and Pralle was reprinted once more by the latter in 1581, but then disappeared from view.<sup>71</sup> When in 1585 Francesco Benci published Marc-Antoine Muret's posthumous edition of Seneca, he apologised for the inclusion of the rhetorical works.<sup>72</sup> In 1587 Nicolas Lefèvre (Nicholas Faber) declared in his edition of both Senecas that it was now commonly accepted that the rhetorical works were by Seneca the Elder: 'Justus Lipsius, a man of great judgement and of the most rare erudition and learning, published the arguments which support this opinion at the beginning of the *Electa*'.<sup>73</sup> Lefèvre also reported, however, somewhat snidely, that this view had first been put forward by Raffaello Maffei—granting the Italian more than was properly his due.<sup>74</sup>

66. Lipsius, *Electa* (as in n. 59), p. 21: 'Inter tres filios quos nominat, Seneca philosophus est: reliqui eius fratres.' Cf. Seneca the Elder, *Controversiae*, I, preface.

67. Tacitus, *Annales*, XVI.17; Seneca, *Consolatio ad Helviam matrem*, 18.1; Lipsius, *Electa* (as in n. 59), pp. 21–22.

68. Lipsius, *Electa* (as in n. 59), p. 23: 'plura illustrandae aetatis, et stemmatis, addam in libro singulari, quem, de vita Annaei Senecae et scriptis, studiose composui'.

69. Andrea Alciati, *Parerga iuris libri VII. posteriores*, Lyons 1544, p. 16: 'cuius sunt Declamationes, qui se potuisse Ciceronem audire attestatur: ut ridicula sit eorum sententia, qui utriusque aetatem coniungentes, vixisse posteriorem annos supra CXX. comminiscuntur.'

70. The first reference to it which I have found is Seneca the Elder, *Controversiar. lib. X, suasoriarum liber I*, ed. Nicolas Lefèvre, Paris 1587, pp. 207–08: Lefèvre

introduces Alciati after excerpting at some length from Lipsius's *Electa*: 'sed et ante eum Andreas Alciatus Parergon lib. IV. cap. XIV.' The next reference I have found to Alciati is by Pontanus, 'De auctoribus tragoe-diarum' (as in n. 53), sig. c3<sup>v</sup>, dated 18 Dec. 1618.

71. See above, n. 33.

72. *L. Annaeus Seneca a M. Antonio Mureto correctus et notis illustratus*, Rome 1585, sig. +2<sup>v</sup>. See Krayer, 'Muret's 1585 Edition of Seneca' (as in n. 6), p. 314.

73. Lefèvre (as in n. 70), sig. Aa2<sup>r</sup>: 'Argumenta quibus suam sententiam fulciunt, vir magni iudicii, rarissimaeque eruditionis et doctrinae, Iustus Lipsius Electorum primo vulgavit.'

74. *Ibid.*; and for Maffei see above, n. 46. The view that Maffei was the first to make the distinction between the two Senecas has been challenged by Blüher (as in n. 53), p. 252, Van der Poel (as in n. 1), pp. 261–62, and Walter (as in n. 22), p. 502. In my view Lefèvre is the likely source of this long-standing error.

Lipsius's forceful position is also noteworthy for its silences. His argument was deliberately partial in its scope, covering only two-thirds of the Senecan corpus. If he did find his inspiration in Alciati, then he followed the jurist only so far. Alciati, without stopping to mention the authority of Martial, Sidonius and Quintilian, or to exempt the *Octavia*, had also declared the philosopher to be the author of the tragedies.<sup>75</sup> Tellingly, Lipsius did not cite Martial's testimony concerning the two Senecas as support for his judgement. Given his early work on the poet, he should have known the reference.<sup>76</sup> He avoided Martial for the same reason he avoided mentioning the tragedies: he did not believe Seneca *philosophus* was their author. Lipsius's view on the authorship of the *Octavia*, the most doubtful of the plays, evolved in the late 1570s, at the same time as he was writing the *Electa*.<sup>77</sup> In 1575, he still considered the *Octavia* to be the work of Seneca *tragicus*, 'certainly a worthy author, although far from the highest quality'.<sup>78</sup> By 1581, when he revised his notes on Tacitus, he had changed his mind, stating that the play was not by any Seneca but an 'undistinguished poet'.<sup>79</sup> There is no denying, then, that he considered the authorship of at least one of the Senecan tragedies at the same time as he was setting out his view on the philosophical and rhetorical works.

Martial's testimony, which had originally led Boccaccio to deduce the existence of a second Seneca,<sup>80</sup> meant that Lipsius's partial revision of the authorship of the Senecan corpus could not hold, as a roughly contemporary discussion of the problem illustrates very well. The Spanish historian Ambrosio de Morales (1513–91), who was born in Cordoba in a house popularly known as the 'casa de Seneca', discussed the entire family at some length.<sup>81</sup> He touched briefly on the life of Seneca *tragicus* in his vast *Coronica general de España* of 1574. He existed—'there can be no doubt about it'—because of the *Octavia*, as well as the authority of Martial and Sidonius. 'And there is no other Seneca who could count as the second person along with the philosopher (for nobody takes much account of his father), except for this other one, who wrote the tragedies.'<sup>82</sup> As Morales made clear, Seneca *tragicus* existed because a second Seneca was needed.

75. Alciati (as in n. 69), p. 16.

76. See the emendations to Martial in Justus Lipsius, *Epistolicarum quaestionum libri V*, Antwerp 1577, pp. 7–13.

77. The *Electa* were mostly written immediately after Lipsius's arrival in Leiden in the years 1578–79. His correspondence suggests that part of the work may have dated from his earlier period in Leuven: see ILE I 78 01 18.

78. Justus Lipsius, *Antiquarum lectionum commentarius*, Antwerp 1575, p. 29: 'scriptori quidem probo, longe tamen ab optima illa nota'. While he refers to the author of the *Octavia* as Seneca, he does not explicitly identify him as the tragedian. Lipsius does note, however, that he is not among those who 'inferiorum temporum ingenia prorsus despicio'.

79. Justus Lipsius, *Ad Annales Cornelii Taciti liber Commentarius sive notae*, 2nd edn, Antwerp 1581, p. 435: 'illi poetae ignobili ... (non enim Senecae: cum

certis argumentis post mortem eius scripta ea Tragoedia sit)'. This comment is absent in the first edition of 1574.

80. See above, n. 8.

81. Ambrosio de Morales discusses the story at some length in his *La coronica general de España*, Alcalá 1574, fol. 245<sup>v</sup>. The house had been given to Morales's father by Don Pedro Fernández de Córdoba, Marqués de Priego, because 'la casa de un Cordobes sapientissimo, no avia de estar sino en poder de otro Cordobes tan sabio'. Morales did not believe the legend surrounding the house, because he took the nearby ruins of Madinat al-Zahra, the caliphal palace, to be those of Roman Cordoba. I am grateful to Katherine Elliott Van Liere for the reference.

82. Ambrosio de Morales, *La coronica general de España*, Alcalá 1574, fol. 257<sup>v</sup>: 'sin que pueda aver duda en ello ... Y no ay ningun Seneca, que pueda contar por segundo con el philosopho (porque de su

With Morales another part of the puzzle also fell into place. The Spaniard seems to have been the first to take Quintilian's passing reference to Seneca's *Medea* as straightforwardly about the philosopher:

Quintilian never mentioned more than one of these tragedies, and this he attributes to Seneca the philosopher. And this is one of the strongest reasons there can be for believing that [the tragedies] are by different authors.<sup>83</sup>

It remains unclear whether Morales assigned solely the *Medea* or all the plays except the *Octavia* to Seneca the Younger. Delrio, who was in Spain when Morales's work appeared, later assumed the latter.<sup>84</sup> When in early 1587 Lefèvre published his edition of Seneca, he also attributed the *Medea* to the philosopher on Quintilian's testimony. The other tragedies, along with the *Octavia*, he assigned to Seneca *tragicus*.<sup>85</sup> Interestingly, Lefèvre relegated Martial's reference to the two Senecas to a list of testimonies appended to the preface.<sup>86</sup> As we saw, the Frenchman had accepted the validity of Lipsius's argument on Seneca *rhetor*. Like Lipsius, he was avoiding a surplus.

When in the late summer and early autumn of 1587 Lipsius sat down to compose his *Animadversiones* on Senecan tragedy, his thinking was further shaped by Lefèvre's edition, which he had partially read as early as March.<sup>87</sup> He implicitly rejected the view of a single author for the plays as set out by 'our friend forever', Delrio: 'I do not assign one author to them, nor do I listen to our critics, who persist in a different view.'<sup>88</sup> In contrast to the argument he set out in the *Electa*, in the *Animadversiones* Lipsius based his determination of their authorship on his stylistic judgement: 'Does anyone, who examines the style and diction a little more seriously disagree with me? They either discern it or they discern nothing at all.'<sup>89</sup> Ostensibly, Lipsius advanced a personal opinion based on his superior critical acumen. As Delrio had done before him, he invoked a great deal of rhetoric to build his case:

Would anyone say that the *Octavia* and the *Medea* are by one mind and hand? Or the *Phoenician Women* and the *Trojan Women*? No skilled judge whose ears are a little cleaner.

padre nadie haze tanta cuenta) sino es a estotro, que escrivio las tragedias.'

83. Ibid., fol. 258<sup>r</sup>: 'Quintiliano nunca haze mencion de mas de una destas tragedias, y aquella a Seneca el philosopho la atribuye. Y esto es una de las mayores causas que puede aver, para creer, que son de diversos autores.' Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, IX.2.9.

84. Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), I, p. 66.

85. Seneca, *Scripta quae extant*, ed. Nicolas Lefèvre, Paris 1587, p. vi.

86. Ibid., p. xxiii.

87. On 15 Mar. 1587 Lipsius wrote to Josias Mercier that 'in parte vidi et quae vidi, valde probavi' (ILE II 870315). Lefèvre is not mentioned in the *Animadversiones*, but the similarity in their treatment of the *Medea* is apparent, as we shall see. The *Animadversiones* were composed as a letter (ILE II 871008) to Lipsius's student Franciscus Raphelengius Jr, who was also editing the tragedies. Lipsius had already formed his

view on the authorship of the tragedies when he wrote to Janus Lernutius on 30 Aug. 1587 (ILE II 870830). Cf. S. Zaninotto, 'La "divinatio Lipsiana" nelle notae alle tragedie di Seneca', in *Juste Lipse (1547-1606) en son temps*, ed. C. Mouchel, Paris 1996, pp. 137-62; but Zaninotto's claim that the emendations offered in the *Animadversiones* were praised by Delrio and J. J. Scaliger (p. 143) is not correct.

88. Lipsius, *Animadversiones* (as in n. 30), p. 4: 'Scriptorem iis dari a me non unum: nec criticos nostros audio, qui aliter pendunt.' Lipsius refers to his friendship with Delrio, whose edition he used as his base text, a few pages later: 'Antonius Del-rio, aeternum nobis amicus' (p. 9). A partial copy of Delrio's *Adversaria* containing annotations by Lipsius is in Leiden, University Library, shelf-mark 759.C.12.

89. Ibid. p. 4: 'Stilum et elocutionem quisquis seriose paullo magis examinat, non a me sentit? sentit, aut profecto nihil sentit.'

I detect three writers, maybe also a fourth. Listen. I admit that many [of the tragedies] are by Annaeus Seneca (whether his first name is Lucius or Marcus; for my book [*i.e.*, Lipsius's manuscript copy of Seneca] brings both ambiguously together in one passage) but a later [*novioris*] Seneca. By a son of the one who is a philosopher? I hardly think so, nor would the writings persuade me of such a good age. I shall not stray far from the truth if I say that he lived under the emperor Trajan or indeed afterwards.<sup>90</sup>

Three plays—the *Octavia*, the *Trojan Women* and the *Medea*—Lipsius exempted from the corpus of Seneca *tragicus*. Although, like Lefèvre, he acknowledged that Quintilian's testimony indicated the philosopher as the author of the *Medea*, he also invoked his own stylistic judgement to ascribe it to Seneca, but 'the good [Seneca], mine'.<sup>91</sup> He regarded the unfinished *Phoenician Women* as of such outstanding quality that it might have been the product of a writer from the Augustan age: 'This is a small gem of a work and I would gladly even restore it to the Augustan period.'<sup>92</sup> A fourth author was responsible for the *Octavia*, a work Lipsius detested and considered puerile: 'I myself am a boy if [the *Octavia*] was not written by a boy; certainly it is in the manner of a boy.'<sup>93</sup>

Lipsius adduced two pieces of external evidence to substantiate his conclusions regarding the post-Trajan Seneca *tragicus*, neither of them very credible. His first witness was, surprisingly enough, Sidonius.<sup>94</sup> The poet had not only been ignorant of the existence of Seneca *rhethor* but had also believed, as Delrio later pointed out, that the philosopher was a follower of Plato.<sup>95</sup> His second source was the obscure mid-third-century grammarian Terentianus Maurus, who had referred to 'wise Annaeus Seneca and Pomponius Secundus before him'.<sup>96</sup> Lipsius, who in all likelihood took this passage from Lefèvre,<sup>97</sup> spelled out its significance: 'See: [Terentianus] makes this tragedian later than Pomponius, who clearly lived in the same period as the greater Seneca, that is, the Claudian age.'<sup>98</sup> His argument was specious. Even if Terentianus intended to imply a substantial temporal distance, which need not be the case, there was also the testimony of Quintilian, who, as we have seen, had alluded to a public debate between Seneca and Pomponius on the subject of tragedy.<sup>99</sup> 'What other Seneca was ever named by [Quintilian] except

90. Ibid.: 'Octaviam et Medaeam unius mentis et manus esse quis dixerit? Quis Thebaïda et Troada? peritus nemo iudex, et cui purgator paullo auris. Ego tres scriptores odoror, fortasse et quartum. Audi. Plerasque ex istis Anneaei Senecae esse fateor (sive Lucium ei praenomen sive Marcum. Nam liber sane meus uno loco utrumque ambigue congerit) sed Senecae novioris. Filiine illius, qui Philosophus? Vix arbitror: nec scripta mihi suadeant tam bonum aevum. Traiani imperio, imo infra, si vixisse quemcumque hunc Senecam dicam, a vero non abibo.'

91. Ibid., p. 5: 'Etiam Seneca: sed ille bonus, ille meus.'

92. Ibid., p. 6: 'Scripti gemmula haec est, et quam lubens retulerim vel ad Augusti aevum.'

93. Ibid., p. 7: 'Puer ego sum, nisi a puero ea scripta; certe pueri modo.'

94. Ibid., p. 4: 'Certe [Seneca *tragicus*] a veteri illo alius est, vel Sidonio teste, cuius versus innotuere'.

95. Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), I, p. 67.

96. Lipsius, *Animadversiones* (as in n. 30), p. 4. Terentianus Maurus, *De litteris, syllabis et metris*, 2135–36: 'diserti / Annaeus Seneca et Pomponius ante Secundus'; cited in Trillitzsch, *Seneca im Literarischen Urteil der Antike* (as in n. 16), II, p. 387.

97. Cf. Lefèvre, in his edition of Seneca, *Scripta* (as in n. 85), p. vi. Pontanus later understood 'ante' to refer to both men, concluding that they were the first to adopt the stylistic device under discussion. See Van der Poel (as in n. 1), p. 270 n. 54.

98. Lipsius, *Animadversiones* (as in n. 30), p. 5: 'Nam Tragicum hunc, ecce, posteriorem facit Pomponio: quem clarum est vixisse eodem cum grandiori Seneca, id est, Claudiano aevo.'

99. See above, n. 41.

for ours?’ Lipsius asked rhetorically, when acknowledging his authorship of the *Medea*.<sup>100</sup> He ignored the orator’s testimony on this second point.

There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of Lipsius’s assessment, given that it led to his main innovation: the division of the tragedies between more than two authors. Yet this should not blind us to his rhetorical strategy. Noticeable once more by his absence is Martial. The poet had flourished under Domitian and, as Lipsius would have known from the letters of Pliny the Younger, died at the beginning of Trajan’s reign.<sup>101</sup> For Boccaccio, Martial’s near-contemporary testimony had meant the tragedies must have been written by a close relative of Seneca. For Lipsius they could not have been, as a second Seneca was already accounted for. Quintilian’s testimony only demanded the attribution of the *Medea* to the philosopher. Lipsius knew that Terentianus, who lived well after Martial, had elsewhere cited the *Hercules* as a Senecan work.<sup>102</sup> If, as he sincerely believed, the philosopher had not composed the other tragedies, then a third Seneca had to exist. The sole option still open was for a Seneca *tragicus* to have lived *after* Martial, but before Sidonius and Terentianus.<sup>103</sup> By recovering the authorship of Seneca the Elder, Lipsius had removed the bathplug; now he was trying to stop the water draining away.

## v

Graffiti has subsequently confounded Lipsius’s thesis. A line from the *Agamemnon*, adorning one of the walls of Pompeii, has established beyond doubt that one additional play ascribed to Seneca *tragicus* was a first-century creation.<sup>104</sup> Lipsius had, however, provided Delrio with the building blocks for his own theory, even if he would resist his friend’s conclusions. When Delrio published his second edition of the Senecan tragedies, he relied on Lipsius’s help and expertise, turning the work into an ‘everlasting testimony of my friendship and piety towards you’.<sup>105</sup> Lipsius had left Leiden in the spring of 1591, never to return. Delrio, who was at that time residing in Liège, played a part in effecting his reconciliation with Catholicism, although his precise role and its importance remain a matter of debate.<sup>106</sup> While a draft of Delrio’s new *Syntagma tragoediae latinae* had already been completed by 1589, a variety of factors, including the death of its printer Christophe Plantin,

100. Lipsius, *Animadversiones* (as in n. 30), p. 5: ‘Quis ergo alius Seneca uspiam ei nominatus, praeter nostrum? Et certe si non hunc voluit, nota aliqua aut verbulo (quae eius accuratio est) indicasset.’

101. Pliny the Younger, *Letters*, 3.21. Lipsius certainly knew that Martial’s last book of epigrams was written during his retirement in Spain, after Domitian’s death: see his *Epistolicae quaestiones* (as in n. 76), p. 170.

102. Lipsius, *Animadversiones* (as in n. 30), p. 5, citing Terentianus, *De litteris, syllabis et metris*, 2672–75, who in turn cites Seneca, *Hercules*, 875–77.

103. Van der Poel (as in n. 1), p. 269 n. 50, claims that the existence of a third Seneca posed a problem for Lipsius and finds it odd (‘vreemd’) that he seems not to have considered this fact. The evidence, however, leads to the opposite conclusion: Lipsius was

acutely aware of Martial’s testimony regarding the two Senecas. To avoid it, he used stylistic grounds to place his third Seneca (*tragicus*) as living *after* Martial.

104. A. J. Boyle, *Tragic Seneca: An Essay in the Theatrical Tradition*, London 1997, p. 15.

105. Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), III, p. 4: ‘hoc amicitiae et pietatis in te meae testimonium sit sempiternum.’

106. W. Thomas, ‘Martin Antonio Delrio and Justus Lipsius’, in *The World of Justus Lipsius: A Contribution towards his Intellectual Biography*, ed. M. Laureys, Brussels 1998, pp. 345–66; J. Machielsen, ‘Friendship and Religion in the Republic of Letters: The Return of Justus Lipsius to Catholicism (1591)’, *Renaissance Studies*, xxvii, 2013, pp. 161–82.

prevented the work's publication.<sup>107</sup> When it appeared, Delrio publicly thanked Lipsius for his help, claimed his approval—'you have read, examined and approved'—and with his letter dedicated to him three of the tragedies: *Oedipus*, the *Phoenician Women* and his favourite *Medea*.<sup>108</sup>

Delrio's debt to Lipsius was, in fact, much greater than he cared to admit. On the question of authorship, two intellectual debts went unacknowledged. Delrio adopted his friend's judgement of the *Octavia* as an inferior work—a play he had once called as similar to the others as 'an egg to an egg or a fig to a fig'.<sup>109</sup> The *Octavia* had been the stumbling block which prevented Delrio, and many others before him, from ascribing any of the tragedies to the philosopher. He now used the foundations provided by Lipsius to build a case which was the exact opposite of Boccaccio's: if no additional Seneca was required, and if only one play, the *Octavia*, could not have been Seneca's, then there was no cause to question the authorship of the remainder. Delrio's opinion, which he described as 'certainly less doubtful and more probable' than the alternatives, is essentially the modern position on the plays: there is no reason to believe that the majority were not written by Seneca.<sup>110</sup> Delrio also expressed some doubt about the *Hercules on Oeta*, as much longer and different in tone than the others.<sup>111</sup> This is the only other tragedy which is not generally attributed to the philosopher at present.

Delrio constructed his argument for the authorship of the tragedies in a short treatise entitled 'De L. Annaei Senecae Vita et Scriptis' ('On the life and works of Seneca').<sup>112</sup> The allusion is hard to miss: in the *Electa* Lipsius had promised his own work 'de vita Annaei Senecae et scriptis' (which he later delivered in his 1605 edition of Seneca).<sup>113</sup> In his *Vita* Delrio excerpted at length, not only from Seneca but also from Tacitus, the author with whom Lipsius had established his reputation. In the margins he suggested emendations, including: 'I agree with my friend [i.e., Lipsius] that something is lacking here'.<sup>114</sup> Not only did Delrio accomplish what his friend had once promised to furnish himself; the biographical format was also the ideal vehicle for the argument he sought to develop. In his opening chapters, he outlined the lives of Seneca's brothers, (assumed) children and nephews, so as to dismiss more easily their claims to authorship later on. His main intellectual

107. On the work's troubled publication history see J. Machielsen, 'How (not) to Get Published: The Plantin Press in the Early 1590s', *Dutch Crossing*, xxxiv, 2010, pp. 99–114.

108. Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), III, p. 4: 'quia patrem infaustum non vult Antigone deserere' (cf. Seneca, *Phoenician Women*, 3, where Oedipus asks his daughter to 'deserere infaustum patrem'); 'Tuum mihi iudicium multorum instar millium. legisti, recensuisti, probasti'. The first volume of the *Syntagma* was dedicated separately to Laevinus Torrentius, bishop of Antwerp.

109. See above, n. 55.

110. Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), I, p. 67: 'Praedicta satis evincunt, hanc nostram sententiam, minus quidem dubiam, et verisimiliorem esse, quam ceterae.'

111. For Delrio's views about the *Hercules on Oeta*

see the text cited below, n. 133. His doubts regarding this play are also apparent in some of his notes; see, e.g., *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), III, p. 334 (on *Hercules on Oeta*, 899).

112. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 30–72.

113. For Lipsius's promise see above, n. 68; for its fulfilment see his edition of the *Opera* (as in n. 5), pp. xii–xxv. In 1593 Lipsius told one enquiring correspondent that he was not going to write a life of Seneca because Delrio had just produced one: ILEVI93 10 22.

114. Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), I, p. 46: 'Assentior amico et hoc loco quaedam deesse'. Cf. Tacitus, *Annales*, xiv.55. Lipsius in the margin of his edition of Tacitus, *Opera omnia quae exstant*, Antwerp 1581, p. 278, had noted that 'haec et sequentia videtur mutila'.

debt to Lipsius was buried in a marginal note, located several pages away from the authorship debate with which the *Vita* culminated. In the chapter on the philosopher's ancestors, Delrio observed that 'there is no reason why anyone should follow the common error and attribute the *Declamationes* and *Controversiae* to the philosopher...; that this is not possible has been accurately demonstrated by others'. A note credits both Lipsius's *Electa* and Raffaello Maffei Volterrano.<sup>115</sup> Maffei had not changed Delrio's mind in the 1580s when he was drafting the *Syntagma*. In all probability he found the reference in Lefèvre's 1587 edition.<sup>116</sup>

Having carefully laid the groundwork, Delrio turned to the question of who wrote the Senecan tragedies in the concluding chapter:

The difficult question about the ten extant tragedies remains; all the more difficult because what I formerly stated some fourteen years ago, in the preface of the *Adversaria*, must now be retracted. What was said by friends must be refuted, and I must dispute against the views held by most. But so great is the truth.<sup>117</sup>

Delrio conceded that he 'had not spoken rightly' in his 1576 edition.<sup>118</sup> His starting point was again the *Octavia*, but the argument was the inverse of the one he had put forward previously: 'Finally, [the *Octavia*] can scarcely—indeed, not even scarcely—be attributed to Seneca *philosophus*; if the others are by the *philosophus*, it is necessary that they are not by a single author.'<sup>119</sup> His admission of error, like the trick of a skilled magician, blinds us to the fact that originally he had believed that *none* of the tragedies had been composed by the philosopher.

Delrio listed those who stripped Seneca of the authorship of the nine remaining tragedies—a list mainly composed of early humanists, starting with Boccaccio and Salutati and ending with Lipsius.<sup>120</sup> He noted that these scholars disagreed among themselves, and commended Lipsius for at least not trying to assign the plays to a member of Seneca's immediate family. He also identified an opposing camp, in which 'some attribute all ten [plays] to Seneca, others [all] except the *Octavia*, with whom I side, because, although they rely on conjectures, they are nevertheless more certain than the rest'.<sup>121</sup> This second list was a curious motley in which medieval authorities such as Vincent of Beauvais (c. 1190–1264) joined, among others, Petrarch, Erasmus, Morales and Marmita.<sup>122</sup> As we have seen, as a young man,

115. Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), I, p. 31: 'Nec est, quod quis vulgatum errorem sequi pergat, et Declamationes Controversiasque Philosopho tribuat ... id enim fieri non posse, fuit ab aliis accurate demonstratum.' His marginal note reads: 'Lips in Elect. et meminit Volaterran. l. 19.'

116. See above, n. 74.

117. Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), I, p. 64: 'Restat difficilis quaestio, de Tragoediis decem quae exstant; hoc difficilior, quod et ea quae quondam ante XIV. annos, in Adversariorum praeludiis, tradidi, nunc retractanda; et quae ab amicis dicta sunt, refellenda; et contra quam plerique iudicant disserendum sit. sed tanti veritas est.' This passage, as well as those cited below, refutes Van der Poel's suggestion that Delrio,

unlike Pontanus later, 'offered no ... polemic'. Van der Poel (as in n. 1), p. 265.

118. Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), I, p. 64: 'non recte dixi.'

119. Ibid.: 'Denique cum vix, ac ne vix quidem, Philosopho Senecae tribui queat; si ceterae Philosophi sunt; non unius auctoris esse, necesse est.'

120. Ibid.

121. Ibid., I, p. 65–66: 'quorum aliqui omnes decem Senecae tribuunt, alii Octaviam excipiunt, quibus, etsi coniecturis nitantur, quia tamen minus incerte quam ceteri, subscribo.'

122. Ibid., I, pp. 65–66. For Vincent of Beauvais see below, n. 124; for Petrarch see above, n. 17. The presence of Erasmus in this list is puzzling on many

Delrio had openly mocked Marmita in the *Adversaria*.<sup>123</sup> By including the Venetian humanists alongside medieval commentators and the doubting Petrarch in the list of authorities on whom he now professed to lean, he reduced the extent of his *volte face*.

That practical end alone, however, does not explain his lists. By placing Lipsius with his opponents, Delrio further downplayed his debt to him. At the same time, some of those he cited in support of his position cannot reasonably be seen in that light. Of those on Delrio's side only Morales approximated his argument. Vincent of Beauvais (misidentified by Delrio as Vincent of Lerins) had been ignorant of the existence of a second Seneca. Unaware of Martial's testimony, he ascribed the whole Senecan corpus to a single author.<sup>124</sup> Delrio's insistence that 'many nevertheless consider that the philosopher was the author of these tragedies' was therefore plainly disingenuous.<sup>125</sup> In seeking to understand Delrio's invocation of these reluctant authorities, it is important to recognise that, unlike Lipsius's argument in the *Electa*, Delrio's resolution of the issue was emphatically not a claim to novelty. Rather, his lists may be interpreted as serving a metaphorical and implicitly confessional purpose. The *Syntagma* has long been recognised as a confessional project, which sought to present the Senecan tragedies as safe for young Christians to read.<sup>126</sup> In the preface Delrio dwelt at some length on the Christian ethos which underpinned his edition.<sup>127</sup> His philological approach appears to have been imbued

levels. Delrio included him explicitly based on the short discussion in the *Ciceronianus* (cited above, n. 29), which he also excerpts at I, pp. 69–70. Perhaps he believed the claim that the tragedies 'vix videntur a Seneca scribi potuisse' (emphasis added) still left open the slight possibility that they were the philosopher's. Also listed was Daniel Caietanus, whose edition of Seneca, *Tragoediae*, Venice 1493, excerpted Marmita's comments on their authorship (sig. A4<sup>r</sup>). Its dedicatory epistle asserted that the Seneca who died under Nero 'in philosophiae penetralibus ac secretissimis locis plane eruditus ad scribendam tragoediam demum se contulit' (sig. A2<sup>v</sup>). The list contains two 15th-century religious figures. The Augustinian friar Jacques Legrand (Jacobus Magnus), in his *Sophologium*, Paris 1516 (but composed c. 1400), appears unaware of the existence of a second Seneca, attributing to one person the rhetorical works (fol. xxxv<sup>r</sup>), the tragedies (fols lxviii<sup>r</sup>, xciv<sup>r</sup>) and medieval spuria such as the *De quatuor virtutibus* (fol. xlvi<sup>v</sup>) and the letters to St Paul (fol. li<sup>r</sup>). Much the same argument can be made for the early German humanist Albrecht von Eyb, who had been, as Delrio notes (p. 66), chamberlain to Pope Pius II. Von Eyb's *Margarita poetica*, Basel 1503, which Delrio consulted (as he notes *ibid.*, II, p. 4), includes a short life of Seneca at sig. q5<sup>v</sup>; it contains references to both the rhetorical works and the tragedies, showing no awareness of the existence of a second figure.

123. This passage is cited above, n. 55.

124. Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), I, p. 65. Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum maius*, IV, *Speculum historiale*

(Douai 1624; facs. repr. Graz 1965), pp. 309, 312–13 (VIII.102, 112–14), lists ten tragedies and five 'libros quoque declamationum' among Seneca's writings, also providing excerpts. Vincent was also ignorant of the existence of the two Plinys, identifying Pliny the Younger as the author of his uncle's *Natural History*, *ibid.*, p. 391 (x.67).

125. Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), I, p. 65: 'Multi nihilominus putant Philosophum harum tragoediarum fuisse auctorem'.

126. M. Dréano, *Humanisme chrétien: La tragédie latine commentée pour les chrétiens du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle par Martin Antoine del Rio*, Paris 1936. On the importance of the *Syntagma* for Jesuit education see W. J. Ong, 'Latin Language Study as a Renaissance Puberty Rite', *Studies in Philology*, LVI, 1959, pp. 103–24 (115); and for a close reading of Delrio's preface see Mayer (as in n. 66), pp. 159–60. The confessional impulse behind all of Delrio's writings will be a major part of my forthcoming study: *Martin Delrio: Demonology and Scholarship in the Counter-Reformation*, Oxford 2015.

127. Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), I, sigs \*2<sup>r</sup>–\*4<sup>r</sup> (\*\*2<sup>v</sup>), presented himself as a Christian editor correcting both a text and the vices it contained: 'Non audio Criticos; qui a solis litteratoribus, aut antiquariis ista petenda, qui solis eorum testimoniis utendum iudicant. Audio potius, quem utinum et ipsi, divum Bernardum, qui clamat tali ordine discendum, ut hoc prius quod maturius ad salutem. Tali studio, ut hoc ardentius, quod vehementius ad Dei amorem.' Accordingly, with his exhaustive notes Delrio preferred (sig.

with the same spirit. With his list of (mostly spurious) predecessors, he cast his novel argument as if it was a restatement of tradition against the internal quarrels and disagreements of the opposing side. He defended an established orthodoxy against the innovations of others, his friend Lipsius included.

In the discussion which followed, Delrio implicitly constructed his case on the two arguments first advanced by Lipsius: ‘First, because the *Octavia* (as I have said) cannot be by Seneca *philosophus*. Then, because I have found that there are so far only two Lucii Annaei Senecae, the father the *declamator* and the son the *philosophus*.’<sup>128</sup> His preceding discussion of Seneca’s extended family, to which he provided repeated cross-references, served his purpose here:

If not a brother, nor a son, nor a grandson or nephew, I wait for them to instruct me: who is this Seneca *tragicus*, if not the same *philosophus*? For I am about to show that he was known to Quintilian; therefore, it is not credible that he lived under the emperor Hadrian. Those who say this [i.e., Lipsius], are soothsaying.<sup>129</sup>

Delrio systematically worked his way through the available evidence. Martial’s two Senecas had been accounted for already. According to Tacitus, Seneca composed poetry (*carmina*).<sup>130</sup> Quintilian cited a verse from the *Medea*. Many other famous men had composed tragedies, so the genre was worthy of Seneca.<sup>131</sup> In the same order as Lipsius had discussed Sidonius and Terentianus, Delrio dismissed them. ‘Weigh those little verses of Sidonius and you will note that he is pretty often deceived.’<sup>132</sup> Terentianus may also have been mistaken and was, at least, proven wrong by Quintilian.

None of this was directly relevant to Lipsius’s stylistic judgement, which, however, was no longer supported by the evidence he had adduced. Delrio’s next move needs to be quoted at length for his engagement with Lipsius’s method to become apparent:

The accepted reading refutes those [i.e., Lipsius] who pushed Seneca *tragicus* back into the reign of Hadrian because of the difference in style. Had they referred only to the *Octavia*, I would have assented. Because they go further, I resist; I do not follow. It is known to befall writers frequently that they change their style with age, so that it even imitates the affections of their mind in a certain way. Are you dejected? Your style lies down and crawls. Are you excited? It surges and rises up. Are you happy? Blossoming forth, it grows luxuriantly. Are you grieving? It is compressed and as good as dries up. How, I ask, do you distinguish

\*\*3<sup>D</sup>) ‘multum in tradendis morum praeceptis, in gentiliis deliriis refellendis, in Catholica veritate confirmanda’, over ‘nit-picking’ (λεπτολογεῖν).

128. Ibid.: ‘Primo, quia Octavia (ut dixi) Senecae Philosophi nequit esse. Deinde quia duos adhuc tantum Lucios Annaeos Senecas repperi, patrem Declamatorem, et Philosophum filium.’

129. Ibid.: ‘Si ergo nec frater, nec filius, nec ex filio vel fratre nepos; exspecto me doceant, quis iste Tragicus Seneca, si non idem Philosophus? Nam cognitum illum Quintiliano mox docebo; quare non est credibile Hadriano imperante vixisse, vaticinantur, qui hoc tradunt.’ He provides cross-references in

marginal notes: ‘Vide supra cap. 3’; ‘Vide supra cap. 4’; ‘Vide d.c. 4.’

130. Ibid.; Tacitus, *Annals*, xiv.52.

131. See also Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), I, pp. 20–29: this chapter ‘a quo inventa et exculta sit tragedia’ immediately precedes Delrio’s life of Seneca. His list includes Julius Caesar, the emperor Augustus and the poets Ovid, Virgil and Catullus. The concluding paragraph on p. 29 suggests that this section, too, may have been composed with the authorship question in mind.

132. Ibid., I, p. 67: ‘Perpende hos ipsos Sidonii versiculos, saepicule illum falli animadvertes.’

between Ovid's *Letters [of Heroines]* and his *Tristia*? Between Lucan's *Pharsalia* and the poem to Piso? How dissimilar to himself is our [Seneca] in the *Consolatio ad Marciam* and the other [consolation] to his mother [*ad Helviam*]? Your [works], critics, if anyone were to discuss what you have written previously and are writing now, they would scarcely believe that it is by one author. What? You do not feel the same about yourselves? [One] contends that the *Phoenician Women* is purer than the others, [another] the *Medea*. Some believe it is the *Hercules on Oeta* which smacks of the schoolroom, others another play. Whom shall I follow? The *Phoenician Women* was written in a continuous series, but imperfectly because the choruses are lacking. Would you consider any tragedy written without a chorus [to belong] to this age? Its Latinity is better than the others, I admit. But why would our [Seneca] not be able to compose in such a pure fashion? Pardon me then, for thinking that, out of these nine, none are to be removed from our [Seneca] (unless perhaps *On Oeta*): and that *On Oeta* and *Agamemnon*, which are of modest quality, were written by Seneca in his adolescence; afterwards, *Oedipus*, *Phaedra*, *Hercules* and *Trojan Women*, which are a little better but still smack of the schoolroom. The others, *Thyestes*, *Medea* and *Phoenician Women*, are more mature and worthy of an old man. These three are so pleasing to my mind that I could not easily say which I prefer.<sup>133</sup>

Delrio was taking issue here with well-established humanist practice, to which Lipsius was heir, at least in the *Animadversiones*: the ability to identify the author of a text. Erasmus, in the letter on discerning authorship to which Delrio had alluded as a young man in his *Adversaria*, described an author's 'characteristic and habitual manner of writing [as] the most certain indication, truly, as they say, a Lydian stone'—that is, a touchstone by which gold and silver could be tested.<sup>134</sup> Erasmus conceded that an author's style varied according to age and genre: 'For Cicero's speech is not the same in the *Philippicae*, which he wrote as an old man, and the *In Verrem*, which he wrote as a youth. ... Cicero discusses his *Orator* more eloquently than he had taught in his rhetorical *De inventione*.'<sup>135</sup> And yet, as we have seen, Erasmus argued that the textual critic could even distinguish one egg from another. A craftsman, he insisted, was able to judge his craft, and textual critics

133. Ibid., I, p. 68: 'Vulgata lectio illos refellit, qui Tragicum Senecam in Hadriani Imperio reiciunt, ob styli diversitatem. Quam si ad solam Octaviam referrent, assentirent: quia ulterius tendunt, subsisto; non sequor. Gnarus frequenter scriptoribus contingere, ut cum aetate stylum mutant, ut etiam ille animi affectiones quodammodo imitetur. Deiecto es animo? Iacet et repit. Erigeris? Assurgit ille et attolitur. Laetaris? Luxuriat efflorescens. Moeres? Contrahitur, et quasi exarescit. Quantum, quaeso, discrimen inter Ovidii Epistolas, et libros Tristium? Lucani Pharsaliam, et carmen ad Pisonem? Quam sibi dissimilis noster in Consolatione ad Marciam, et altera ad matrem? Vestra (Critici) si quis conferat, quae quondam, et quae nunc conscribitis, unius esse scriptoris vix credat. Quid, quod nec ipsi idem sentitis? Est qui Thebaidem, est qui Medeam ceteris puriorem contendat. Uni Oetaeus, alteri aliae magis scholam sapiunt. Quem sequar? Continua serie scripta Thebais, sed imperfecta, cui desunt chori. An tu tragoediam ullam sine choris scriptam illa putes

aetate? Latinior et melior, quam ceterae. Fateor. Sed cur non potuerit tam pure noster? Ignoscite ergo, ex his novem, nullam nostro adimendam (nisi forte Oethaeum) censeo: et a Seneca in adolescentia scriptas Oethaeum et Agamemnonem, quae modicae bonitatis: postea Oedipum, Hippolytum, Herculem Furentem et Troadem quae paulo meliores, sed adhuc scholam sapiunt. Maturiores et sene dignae reliquae, Thyestes, Medea, et Thebais. Quae tres ita meo animo arrident, ut quam malim, non facile dixerim.'

134. Erasmus, in his edition of St Jerome, *Lucubrationes* (as in n. 56), IV, sig. a4<sup>v</sup>: 'Certissimus index, et vere Lydius, ut aiunt, lapis est, character orationis et habitus.' I am grateful to Anthony Grafton for the reference. Delrio's previous allusion to this letter is discussed above at nn. 55–56.

135. Ibid., sig. a5<sup>r</sup>: 'nec enim eadem est oratio Ciceronis in Philippicis, quas senex scripsit, et in Verrinis actionibus, quas iuvenis. ... Et Tullius eloquentius tractat oratorem suum, quam praeceperat de inventione rhetorica.'

could be as discriminating as painters. ‘Protogenes recognised without hesitation Apelles, whom he had not seen before, from a line he had drawn; but while one artist will recognise another, a ploughman would not discern the hand of Fulvius or Rutuba from the hand of Apelles or Zeuxis.’<sup>136</sup> Erasmus claimed he needed no more than five words to recognise the writing of St Jerome (whose *spuria* prompted the discussion), Cicero, Quintilian or, indeed, Seneca. Delrio’s response, after the dust of the Reformations had settled, was to argue that to privilege private reason over tradition would lead only to a cacophony of voices, each dissenting from the other.

Delrio’s position was not entirely consistent, of course. It depended on the stylistic judgement of a single play, the *Octavia* (an inconvenient fact he sought to downplay); yet Lipsius, who was his immediate target, had claimed much greater licence. Delrio set out to refute ‘what was said by friends’, and Lipsius concluded a list of those on the opposing side. Delrio adopted the same rhetorical questions which Lipsius had used and singled out the same plays, the *Medea* and *Phoenician Women*. He adapted his friend’s thesis, arguing that the author of the tragedies may have written them at a different time in his life, rather than that they belonged to altogether different ages. Indeed, he turned the argument against his critics: ‘if anyone were to discuss what you have written previously and are writing now, they would scarcely believe that it is by one author’. This comment might well be applied to Lipsius’s *Electa* and *Animadversiones*.<sup>137</sup>

## VI

The recovery of Seneca *rethor* thus led to two entirely opposing solutions: the fragmentation of the authorship of the tragedies; and their reattribution (except the *Octavia*) to Seneca the Younger. In the short term Lipsius’s judgement gave licence to younger scholars to carve up the tragedies in whichever way they liked.<sup>138</sup> Perhaps in part because of this, Delrio’s position won out in the longer term. The Protestant scholars Johannes Isaac Pontanus (1571–1639) and Joannes Fredericus Gronovius (1611–1671) accepted the philosopher’s authorship of the tragedies; Pontanus’s lengthy discussion echoes that of Delrio, with the Jesuit’s name unsurprisingly absent.<sup>139</sup> Joseph Scaliger wrote, derisively, to Lipsius’s former student

136. Ibid. ‘Protogenes Apellem non ante visum e linea ducta inconstanter deprehendit, sed artifex artificem, cum bubulcus interim aliquis nec Fulvi, aut Rutubae manum ab Apellis, aut Xeusidis manu sit discreturus.’ The source of this anecdote is Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, xxxv.81–82.

137. Delrio’s text is cited above, n. 133.

138. This is evident from their title-pages: *L. et M. Annaei Senecae atque aliorum tragoediae*, ed. Thomas Farnaby, London 1613, sig. ¶4<sup>r</sup>, who curiously enough invoked the authority of both Lipsius and Delrio to question the authorship of the tragedies; *L. Annaei Senecae et aliorum tragoediae*, ed. Daniel Heinsius, Leiden 1611, pp. 483–99. See also Mayer (as in n. 6), pp. 167–70.

139. See Pontanus (as in n. 53), sigs c1<sup>v</sup>–c3<sup>v</sup>; and Gronovius’s letter to the reader, repr. in Schröderus’s edition (as in n. 14), sig. a3<sup>v</sup>. I am sceptical of Van der Poel’s suggestion that Pontanus (and others) had not read Delrio’s edition. Protestant scholars such as Farnaby (as in n. 138), Joseph Scaliger (see next note), Janus Gruter and J. F. Gronovius all used it and the latter two made extensive references to Delrio in their notes: see, e.g., Seneca, *Tragoediae*, ed. Janus Gruterus, [Heidelberg] 1604, pp. 386, 391, 396; and Schröderus’s edition (with notes by Gronovius), pp. 289, 520–21. Van der Poel (as in n. 1), p. 265, seems to have been unaware of Delrio’s dedication of volume III of the *Syntagma* to Lipsius or the role he played in his friend’s reconciliation with Catholicism.

Janus Gruter: ‘Immortal God! What does he [Lipsius] think of *Trojan Women*, the best tragedy of them all? And who will he persuade that there are different authors? I hope it is not in vain that I recognise a single genius and hence a single parent in those nine [tragedies].’<sup>140</sup>

With the reputations of two humanists at stake, this was more than a disinterested philological debate. Yet Delrio’s rebuttal was also more than a refutation. In his dedicatory epistle to Lipsius of book III of the *Syntagma*, he offered an extensive reflection on false and true friendship. He declared that his friendship with Lipsius was true, despite the differences which had once existed.<sup>141</sup> If, as Delrio claimed, their work on Seneca was a mark of their true friendship, then that same friendship marked Lipsius’s Catholicism. For other Jesuit editors, Delrio’s judgement on Senecan authorship was emblematic of the shared purpose and agreement of the two men. The German Jesuit Jacobus Pontanus insisted in his edition of Ovid’s *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto* that

... this Seneca *rhetor* or *declamator*, to whom the *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* belong, is the father of that great Stoic *philosophus* Seneca, which is proven with arguments by Lipsius in his *Electa* and by our Delrio in his life of Seneca *tragicus*, whom both assert to be the same as the *philosophus*.<sup>142</sup>

Pontanus’s friend and student Matthäus Rader briefly touched on the authorship debate when confronting Martial’s reference to two Senecas:

If you do not agree [that Seneca *rhetor* was the father of Seneca *philosophus*], I place before you two Achilles with immortal weapons, the champions Lipsius and Delrio. If you escape from their arguments and strength, I will give up.<sup>143</sup>

There is one curious rider. This remained a dialogue and Lipsius did not, in fact, accept Delrio’s arguments. Intriguingly, a poem by Lipsius, which Delrio included in the *Syntagma*, already made that clear. It began:

If there is any person from the old and new class of authors  
I honour and love with all my heart and soul,

140. Joseph Scaliger, *The Correspondence*, ed. P. Botley and D. van Miert, 8 vols, Geneva 2012, IV, pp. 300–03 (302). Letter 1602 06 09: ‘Deum immortalem, quid sentit de omnium principe tragoedia *Troade*? Et cui persuadebit diversos esse auctores? Ego illarum novem unum genium, atque ideo unum parentem agnosco, ne frustra sit.’ Joseph Scaliger owned a copy of Delrio’s *Syntagma*; see *The Auction Catalogue of the Library of J. J. Scaliger: A Facsimile Edition*, ed. H. J. de Jonge, Utrecht 1977, p. 5.

141. Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), III, p. 3: ‘Audeo dicere talem nostram [amicitiam], iuste Lipsi; quam, nec tot annorum, tot locorum intervalla, nec partium adversarium (quae te vel invitum, vel, inopinantem, et improvidum abstraxerant) factiones, nec aliae quae aliis graves caussae viderentur; rescindere potuerunt.’ Rivalry dissolves only false friendship: ‘verae [amicitiae] non erant, quas vel ambitio, vel cupiditas, vel

simulatio coniunxerat’. By contrast, ‘veras [amicitias] non nisi probitas et virtus et fides conciliant, connectunt, et conservant’.

142. Ovid, *Poetarum ingeniosissimi, Tristium, et De Ponto*, ed. Jacobus Pontanus, Ingolstadt 1610, p. 10: ‘illum dico Senecam Rhetorem, seu declamatorem, cuius sunt *Controversiae*, et *Suasoriae*, Senecae magni illius et Philosophi Stoici parentem, quod argumentis probant Lipsius Elect. ... et Delrius noster in vita Senecae Tragicis, quem uterque eundem cum Philosopho contendit esse.’

143. Matthaeus Rader, *Ad M. Valerii Martialis, epigrammaton libros omnes, plenis commentariis*, 3rd edn, Cologne 1627, p. 138: ‘si contra venias, duos Achilles cum immortalibus armis obiicio propugnatores Lipsium et Delrium, quorum si vim et argumenta eluseris, ego manus dabo.’

It is each of the two authors  
To whom old age (*Senium*) has given ageless renown.<sup>144</sup>

Lipsius did not mention Sidonius by name, but preserved the division set out by the ancient poet, stating that he loved equally the *philosophus* ‘who exceeds even Thales [of Miletus] himself’ and the other Seneca who ‘proves himself with eloquent poetry’.<sup>145</sup> His poem, which lavished praise on the Jesuit Delrio as ‘the darling of Minerva’,<sup>146</sup> not only restated Lipsius’s own position but also asserted his independence. Nor did he change his mind in his 1605 edition of Seneca *philosophus*, although he chose not to re-argue his case.<sup>147</sup> Some of the accumulated evidence, however, Lipsius was able to accommodate. The *carmina* reported by Tacitus he listed among ‘books which are not extant’.<sup>148</sup> Quintilian’s reminiscence of Seneca’s dispute with Pomponius Secundus was placed among the ‘fragments from books of Seneca which have perished’.<sup>149</sup> Tellingly, Martial’s admiration of the ‘two Senecas and the one and only Lucan’ remained absent, not only from the citations Lipsius assembled in praise of the philosopher, but from the entire preface.<sup>150</sup> The reasons, both intellectual and personal, for Lipsius’s rejection of Delrio’s argument were multiple and complex. Yet his position, based as it was on the quicksand of stylistic judgement and on *ad hoc* explanations, in the long run simply could not stand.

---

*New College, Oxford*

144. Delrio, *Syntagma* (as in n. 23), I, sig. \*\*4<sup>v</sup>: ‘Si quemquam e veteri novaque classe / Scriptorum colo diligoque, tota / mente et pectore; is est uterque scriptor, cui nomen Senium dedit seni experts.’ Lipsius sent this poem to Delrio by letter: ILE VI 93 03 24. Unfortunately, Delrio’s reply has not been preserved.

145. *Ibid.*: ‘Namque alter superat Thalem vel ipsum, /// Alter, carmine se probat disertio.’ Cf. Sidonius, cited above, n. 16. Lipsius’s use of ‘alter ... alter’ recalls Sidonius’s ‘unus ... alter’, while his references to the philosopher Thales and to poetry recall Sidonius’s mention of Plato and Euripides.

146. *Ibid.*: ‘corculum Minervae’.

147. Seneca, *Opera*, ed. Lipsius (as in n. 5), p. xviii.

148. *Ibid.*, p. xxv: ‘Libri, qui non exstant.’ This reference had been noted by Delrio: see above, n. 130.

149. *Ibid.*, p. xxx: ‘Fragmenta ex libris Senecae qui interciderunt.’ Presumably on account of the phrase ‘gradus eliminat’ (see above, n. 41).

150. As noted above in n. 7, Lipsius did cite Martial’s reference to ‘docti Senecae ter numeranda domus’ (IV.40), which he interpreted as a reference to the philosopher and his two brothers. He also, on p. xxix, included two other references from Martial under his ‘elogia auctorum de Lucio Annaeo Seneca’.