

## HOW DID GOMARUS ACQUIRE THE COPY OF FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS IN GREEK FROM SCALIGER'S LIBRARY?

H.J. DE JONGE

*Leiden*

Franciscus Gomarus, professor of theology at Leiden (1594-1611), Saumur (1615-1618), and Groningen (1618-1641), died in Groningen on 11 January 1641.<sup>1</sup> His large library was sold in an auction sale in Leiden. The auction began on 4 October of the same year. For the auction a catalogue of Gomarus' library was drawn up and printed. It was published by the printers and publishers Abraham and Bonaventura Elzevir,<sup>2</sup> in whose bookshop the auction was to take place. The catalogue, as are so many other catalogues of private libraries, is a gold mine of historical information. However, only four copies of it, scattered over Europe, are now known to exist. Thus, the recent publication of a photographic reprint, with an introduction and indexes, can only be welcomed with gratitude.<sup>3</sup>

The introduction to the reprint edition provides much valuable information and several useful analyses. But it also contains a passage which requires reconsideration and correction. The passage concerns Gomarus as a frequent visitor of book auctions, his presence at the auction of Joseph Scaliger's library in Leiden on 11 March 1609, and his acquisition of Scaliger's copy of the *Opera omnia* of Flavius Josephus in Greek. The volume was published by H. Froben and N. Episcopius, Basel 1544, and contained manuscript annotations written by Scaliger, the great Leiden expert in chronology and classical philology (1540-1609).<sup>4</sup> It is perhaps best to begin by quoting the passage at issue here in full.

We also know that he [Gomarus] had a Flavius Josephus with MS. corrections of J.J. Scaliger, a volume now at Weimar. Contrary to the opinion of H.J. de

---

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank Profesor Antony Grafton of Princeton University for his comments on an earlier version of this note.

<sup>2</sup> *Catalogus librorum reverendi atque eximii theologi D. Francisci Gomari*, Leiden 1641.

<sup>3</sup> E. Dekker, J. Knoop, and C.M.L. Verdegaal (eds.), *The Auction Catalogue of the Library of F. Gomarus. A facsimile edition with an introduction and indexes*, Houten 1996 (Catalogi redivivi 10).

<sup>4</sup> The volume does not appear in the auction sale catalogue of Gomarus' library.

Jonge, Gomarus did not buy this at the auction of Scaliger's library, 11 March 1609. Although he [*i.e.*, Gomarus] may have been present, we cannot infer his presence from the fact that he had the book. According to Van Itterzon, we read in Scaliger's testament that the book was to be given as a "payment" to Gomarus for his future efforts in the publication of a second edition of Scaliger's *Thesaurus*.<sup>5</sup>

This passage may give rise to misunderstanding.

Firstly, I have never asserted nor even entertained the thought that Gomarus bought his copy of the Basel 1544 Josephus containing Scaliger's marginal notes at the auction of Scaliger's library. What I did claim (and still claim) is (a) that Gomarus was present at the auction mentioned, and (b) that he was in possession of the Josephus with Scaliger's manuscript emendations which is now in Weimar.<sup>6</sup> However, I did not connect these two facts in a conclusion to the effect that Gomarus bought the Josephus at the auction of Scaliger's library. The opinion now ascribed to me cannot have been mine for at least two reasons. (a) The Josephus at issue does not appear in the auction catalogue of Scaliger's library which I myself edited. It was obviously removed from the library before it was auctioned and not offered for sale. (b) The volume in question contains Gomarus' *ex libris*, which informs us that he acquired the book *ex illustris P.M. Scaligeri Testamento*.<sup>7</sup> This *ex libris* was edited by D'Ansse de Villoison in a publication to which I made reference in a footnote within the very passage criticized by Dekker and his co-authors.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Dekker, Knoop, and Verdegaal, p. xii, n. 30. There follow references to G.P. van Itterzon, *Franciscus Gomarus*, The Hague 1929; repr. Groningen/Castricum 1979, pp. 270-271, and to H.J. de Jonge (ed.), *The Auction Catalogue of the Library of J.J. Scaliger*, Utrecht 1977 (Catalogi redivivi 1), p. 5 and p. 8, n. 23.

<sup>6</sup> In the Zentralbibliothek der Deutschen Klassik, the former Ducal Library at Weimar.

<sup>7</sup> 'P.M.' means *piae memoriae*, *i.e.*, 'the late ....' This means that Gomarus received the book after Scaliger's death. For this reason I wrote that the volume at issue 'was later owned by Gomarus.' See *The Auction Catalogue of the Library of J.J. Scaliger*, p. 8, n. 23.

<sup>8</sup> J.B.C. d'Ansse de Villoison, *Epistolae Vinarienses*, Turici 1783, p. 80, no. V,3: 'Josephus, Basileae 1544, fol. apud Hieronymum Frobenium et Nicolaum Episcopum, cujus primae paginae quae titulum praefert, inscriptum est: *F. Gomari, ex illustris P.M. Scaligeri Testamento*, et infra: *nunc autem sum Wilhelmi Goes 1657, et denique nunc ex auctione Goesiana pervenit ad Bibliothecam Schurzfleischianam*.' As early as 1714 Schurzfleisch himself, too, mentioned the fact that his copy of Josephus, which contained Scaliger's manuscript emendations, had been bequeathed to Gomarus by Scaliger by testament. A reference to Schurzfleisch' remark occurs in the footnote in which I also referred to D'Ansse de Villoison (p. 8, n. 23). H.L. Schurzfleisch, *Acta literaria*, Vitembergae 1714, p. 20: 'Quaedam [sc. opera a Scaligero manu emendata], e quibus Josephum possideo, ad Franciscum Gomarum

Secondly, my assertion that Gomarus attended the auction of Scaliger's library was by no means based on the fact that he owned Scaliger's copy of Josephus. It was based on the fact that Gomarus' name occurs several times as that of a buyer in the margins of the former Kiel copy of the auction catalogue of Scaliger's library. In fact, it was in the context of an examination of that copy, now lost, but fortunately still readable in a photocopy kept in Leiden University Library, that I was able to enumerate some of the purchasers present at the auction. Their names appear in the margins in manuscript notes, possibly in Scrivener's handwriting. In juxtaposition to a number of the titles, the same hand also noted down the prices for which the books were sold. Among the buyers we find Gomarus, as well as G.J. Vossius, D. Heinsius, C. Mylius, J. Rutgersius, D. Baudius, W. Snellius, and others.

Meanwhile, I have checked the Leiden photocopy of the former Kiel copy once again. Gomarus' name occurs seven times, scattered all through the catalogue. He bought: Themistii Opera graeca (p. 10), Nicandri Theriaca graecolatina (p. 11), Vineti Logistica (p. 16), Dionysius Halicarnasseus, graecolatina (p. 16), Iuvenalis cum Persio (p. 35), Costumi de' Turchi (p. 43), and Marciani Heracleotae Poëma de situ Orbis (p. 48). I interpret these seven references as being evidence that Gomarus was present—evidence to which Dekker and his co-authors hardly do justice when they write, clumsily, that 'he may have been present.'

Thirdly, contrary to what Dekker *c.s.* claim, Van Itterzon does *not* state that 'we read in Scaliger's testament' that the Josephus was given by Scaliger to Gomarus in compensation for the latter's efforts in the publication of a second edition of Scaliger's *Thesaurus temporum*. What Van Itterzon states is this: 'By testamentary disposition, he [Scaliger] committed this work [of overseeing the printing of a second, corrected edition of the *Thesaurus*] to Gomarus. As a token of gratitude, Gomarus received Scaliger's private copy of Josephus.'<sup>9</sup> Thus, Van Itterzon does not state (as the authors of the introduction to the reprint say he does) that the disposition by which Scaliger bequeathed the Josephus to Gomarus figures in Scaliger's last will. In fact, this disposition occurs in no version of Scaliger's last will known to date.

No utterance of Scaliger to the effect that he gave his Josephus to Gomarus in remuneration for any service is known to be preserved.

---

voluntate ejus delata sunt.'

<sup>9</sup> G.P. van Itterzon, *Franciscus Gomarus*, The Hague 1929; repr. Groningen/Castri-cum 1979, p. 270.

The question arises, therefore, how the idea that the Josephus had to serve as a token of gratitude occurred to Van Itterzon. Van Itterzon is silent about the source from which he obtained his information.<sup>10</sup> It is rather interesting, however, to compare what Van Itterzon says concerning the provenance of the Josephus copy with a passage in J. Bernays' biography of Scaliger,<sup>11</sup> a passage to which Van Itterzon does not refer, although he cites Bernays' work elsewhere.

G. P. van Itterzon, 1929 (p. 270)

'Na de eerste uitgave van zijn 'Thesaurus' namelijk had Scaliger de tweede editie aangekondigd (Aug. 1606). Zelf had hij deze echter niet meer persklaar kunnen maken, waarom hij bij testamentaire beschikking dit werk aan Gomarus had overgedragen, waarvoor deze uit dankbaarheid Scaligers eigen exemplaar van Josephus had ontvangen.' [After the appearance of the first edition of the *Thesaurus*, Scaliger announced a second edition (August 1606). He himself, however, was unable to prepare the copy of the second edition for the press. By testamentary disposition, therefore, he committed this work to Gomarus. As a token of gratitude, Gomarus received Scaliger's private copy of Josephus.]

J. Bernays, 1855 (pp. 226-227)

'Gleich bei Uebersendung der ersten Ausgabe an Casaubonus kündigt Scaliger die zweite an in einem Briefe vom August 1606 ( ). Das fertige Manuskript war in Scaligers Testament dem Franciscus Gomarus zur Herausgabe überwiesen, und als Erkenntlichkeit für seine Mühe war ihm Scaligers durchcorrigirtes Handexemplar des Josephus vermacht.'

<sup>10</sup> In his letter to Petrus Cunaeus, rector magnificus of Leiden University, dated 24 March 1632 (Leiden, Univ. Libr., MS. C. un. 2) Gomarus discusses his task, assigned to him by Scaliger, to take care of a corrected edition of the *Thesaurus*. But he does not mention here the copy of Josephus. Gomarus also mentions the task Scaliger bestowed upon him in an undated letter to Franciscus Raphelengius, executor of Scaliger's last will, edited by G. P. van Itterzon, 'Nog twintig brieven van Gomarus,' *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, NS 46 (1976), pp. 413-449, no. 20. In this letter Gomarus asks Raphelengius to send him a transcript of the instruction in Scaliger's last will by which Scaliger left him the task of taking care of a corrected edition of the *Thesaurus*. Gomarus writes 'cum mihi opus sit illa sententia, qua editionem Eusebii [this is the *Thesaurus temporum*] vir illustris D. Scaliger commisit, neque eius copia mihi, perturbatis meis schedis, compareat, si non molestum est, rogo ut reliquis beneficiis hoc addere velis, ut pauca illa verba, per nostrum Moullartium obsignata communices.' Van Itterzon misinterprets this request as if Gomarus was asking Raphelengius here to send him a transcript of the opening sentence of (p. 424), or some other phrase from (p. 448), the *Thesaurus temporum*. Obviously, Van Itterzon understood neither the word 'sententia', nor the word 'commisit'.

<sup>11</sup> Jacob Bernays, *Joseph Justus Scaliger*, Berlin 1855, pp. 226-227.

For his assertion that the Josephus was bequeathed to Gomarus 'als Erkenntlichkeit für seine Mühe', Bernays quotes no evidence. Van Itterzon repeats Bernays' opinion without giving him due credit. The authors of the introduction to the recent reprint of the auction catalogue of Gomarus' library try to repeat what Van Itterzon wrote, but fail to check the evidence on which it was based. Moreover, they seriously misrepresent Van Itterzon's view by making him say that the disposition by which Scaliger left his Josephus to Gomarus in compensation for his work on the second edition of the *Thesaurus*, is something 'we read in Scaliger's testament.'

What is the evidence for Bernays' statement that Scaliger bequeathed his Josephus to Gomarus out of gratitude for the latter's efforts in re-editing the *Thesaurus temporum*? Bernays himself refers to no source whatsoever. There is no other option for us than to look at what Scaliger's last will itself says about the matter.<sup>12</sup>

It may be helpful to recall here the fact that Scaliger made his last will at least three times.<sup>13</sup> His earliest testament was the one he made in January 1601.<sup>14</sup> We shall leave this testament out of consideration here since Scaliger revoked it in October 1607. Moreover, it preceded the publication of the first edition of the *Thesaurus temporum* by five years. Consequently, it cannot throw any light on the possible relationship between Gomarus' obtaining the 1544 copy of Josephus and his responsibility for a new edition of the *Thesaurus temporum*.

Scaliger's second testament is that of 25 July 1607. It is written in Latin, except for an addition or codicil dated 18 November 1608 which is in French. We shall refer to this testament as Scaliger's Latin testament of 1607.<sup>15</sup>

The third and definitive last will of Scaliger, however, was drawn up in French and dated 18 November 1608. It is a revision of the Latin

<sup>12</sup> Scaliger felt deeply miserable about the countless typographical errors in the first edition of the *Thesaurus temporum*. On this as well as his instruction that the printing of a corrected edition should be overseen by Gomarus, see now A. Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship II Historical Chronology*, Oxford 1993, pp. 513-514, 750.

<sup>13</sup> H.J. de Jonge 'The Latin Testament of Joseph Scaliger, 1607', *Lias* 2 (1975), pp. 249-263. To the four copies of Scaliger's Latin testament mentioned on p. 250, a fifth one, preserved in the Bibliothèque Municipale de Bordeaux, can be added. See *Revue de l'Agenais* 77 (1951), p. 163: no. 95 'Testament de Joseph-Juste Scaliger. Texte latin. Copie du XVIIIe siècle, dans un recueil de testaments d'hommes célèbres.'

<sup>14</sup> J.J. Scaliger, *Epistolae*, Leiden 1627, Frankfurt 1628, nr. 56.

<sup>15</sup> It was edited by H.J. de Jonge, 'The Latin Testament.'

will of 1607, with many changes, on major as well as minor points. We shall refer to this definitive last will as the French testament of 1608.<sup>16</sup>

In Scaliger's Latin testament of 1607, Gomarus does not yet play a role. His name appears only in the French testament of 1608. In the latter document Scaliger gave directions to the effect that his *Thesaurus temporum* should be reprinted through the care of Gomarus—a task which the Latin testament of 1607 had assigned to Daniel Heinsius.<sup>17</sup> According to the French will of 1608, Gomarus received a large volume of Chinese paper, possibly as a sign of Scaliger's gratitude for Gomarus' involvement in the revised edition of the *Thesaurus temporum*, although Scaliger does not say so explicitly: 'La grande main de papier de la Chine ie la donne a Monsieur Gomarus, docteur et professeur en théologie de cette académie.' According to the Latin testament of 1607, this Chinese paper was to be divided equally between Heinsius and Baudius. What Gomarus did receive, with a view to his labours on the new edition of the *Thesaurus temporum*, was a set of two printed copies of that work. The one was Scaliger's desk copy containing his manuscript corrections of typographical errors; the other was a clean copy, unbound, in which Gomarus was expected to take over Scaliger's corrections in neat handwriting. The latter copy was to be presented to the printer as printer's copy.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>16</sup> The most recent edition is by P.C. Molhuysen, *Bibliotheca Universitatis Leidensis. Codices Scaligerani (praeter Orientales)*, Leiden 1910, pp. v-viii.

<sup>17</sup> 'Aussi ie prie Monsieur Gomarus, de donner ordre, que mon Eusebe [*i.e.*, the *Thesaurus temporum*, which has as its core an edition of Eusebius' Chronicle] soit reimprimé, suivant l'exemplaire par moy corrigé, car i'ay vergogne des horribles fautes que les imprimeurs y ont laissé. Mais avant que se resoudre de l'edition, il en parlera premierement a Jehan Commelin et Jude Bonnenuit son neveu, lesquels s'ils entreprennent la besogne, le dict Sieur Gomarus les obligera de la despescher le plustot que faire se pourra, si non, alors il luy sera libre de faire imprimer le livre par qui bon luy semblera. Au dict Sieur Gomarus sera delivré un exemplaire de mon Eusebius non relie, que Ionas [Scaliger's servant] luy baillera, affin qu'il puisse mettre au net les corrections que i'ay marquées en mon livre.' Molhuysen, p. vii.

<sup>18</sup> It cannot be ascertained whether these two copies really passed into the hands of Gomarus. True, nr. 51 in the auction catalogue of his library is a copy of Scaliger's 1606 *Thesaurus* 'cum notis Scaligeri'. But the last three words refer to Scaliger's commentary on Eusebius and Jerome printed in the *Thesaurus*, not to manuscript annotations. This appears from entry nr. 24: 'Testamentum Novum cum notis Bezae, 1588.' For several reasons it is difficult to identify nr. 51 with either of the two copies meant in Scaliger's last will. Firstly, the auction catalogue of Gomarus' library itself does not identify nr. 51 as the author's desk copy. Secondly, nr. 51 was bound, whereas the clean copy of the *Thesaurus* which Scaliger assigned to Gomarus was unbound. Thirdly, it is most likely that Gomarus

Scaliger's last will of November 1608 in French contains no further disposition by which any book from Scaliger's library is assigned specifically to Gomarus. But it does contain a passage in which Scaliger refers to a 'codicille' consisting of a list of volumes from his library, identified by their titles, which he wished to distribute to certain friends. This is what the text of the testament says:

Le catalogue de tous les livres de ma bibliothèque dont i'en distribue ceux qu'il m'a semblé bon a mes amis, en une roolle que i'ay faict signer au notaire devant tesmoins, lequel roolle ie veux qu'il ayt vigueur de codicille, est dans mon poulpitre verd, sur lequel i'ay accoustumé d'escrire.<sup>19</sup>

None of the beneficiaries is identified here by name. Nor does Gomarus' name appear in this context. No copy of the 'codicille' seems to exist any more. But from another passage in the French testament of 1608, several lines further down, it appears that the friends who were entitled to choose a number of volumes from Scaliger's library before it was auctioned, included Cornelius Mylius, Daniel Heinsius, Dominicus Baudius, as well as some other persons.

Quant aux livres qui resteront apres que les Sieurs Mylius, Heynsius, Baudius et autres miens amis en auront retiré ceux qu'il auront trié pour eux, ie veux que Jonas Rousse [Scaliger's servant] les vende a l'encan, et que l'argent qui en proviendra de la vente soit totalement a luy.<sup>20</sup>

Regrettably, it cannot be ascertained whether the 'autres miens amis' mentioned here included Gomarus. But there is indeed some probability that this was the case, since Gomarus' ex libris in Scaliger's copy

---

already owned a copy of the *Thesaurus* (1606) before Scaliger died (1609), probably nr. 51 of the catalogue.—I do not know whether Scaliger's desk copy of the *Thesaurus* still exists. It does not appear among the 369 *libri annotati* of Scaliger listed by R. Smitskamp, *The Scaliger Collection*, Leiden 1993, pp. 103-110. W.E. van Wijk, *Het eerste leerboek der technische hydrekunde*, Leiden 1954, p. 19, speculates that it was lost in the fire of 1672 that ruined the premises of Johannes Janssonius, the publisher of the second edition of the *Thesaurus*, Amsterdam 1658. However, although this second edition was published by Janssonius in Amsterdam, according to the colophons on p. 435 and at the end of the index to the 'Animadversiones in Chronologica Eusebii', it was printed by Nicolaus Hercules in Leiden.

<sup>19</sup> Molhuysen, p. vi.

<sup>20</sup> Molhuysen, p. vi. On the disposition *ante et post mortem* of Scaliger's books, there is also the moving testimony of D. Heinsius in his letter to Casaubon, *Epistolar Scaligeri*, Frankfurt 1628, no. 453, pp. 775-776. This account, however, is not entirely in agreement with Scaliger's last will. In particular, Heinsius fails to say that Scaliger had commended the re-edition of the *Thesaurus* to the care of Gomarus. Instead, Heinsius says that Scaliger 'quae edi iterum voluit, aut emendata reliquit, fidei meae credidit,' which is only part of the truth.

of the Basel 1544 Josephus states explicitly that it passed into Gomarus' hands *ex illustris P.M. Scaligeri Testamento*.

However, the codicil appended to the French testament of November 1608 is not likely to have specified which beneficiary precisely was to receive which volume. From the Latin will of 1607 we can infer what the codicil looked like.<sup>21</sup> It consisted, firstly, of a list of titles of books Scaliger had selected from his library from which some friends were entitled to make a choice before the library was sold. Secondly, it included a short list of the names of the friends to whom Scaliger wished to accord this favour and an indication of the order in which they had to make their choice. In 1607, the number of friends was still limited to three: Mylius, Heinsius, and Baudius, and this was also the order in which they had to make their choice.

Probably, then, Gomarus' name was added to those of Mylius, Heinsius, and Baudius in the codicil added to the last will of November 1608. But even in that case Gomarus was not endowed specifically with Scaliger's Basel 1544 copy of Josephus. He was only allowed to take his turn when his name came round on the list, and to select the volumes he wanted from the ones which remained. When he took the Josephus with Scaliger's annotations, the choice of the volume was his own, not Scaliger's.

It is plain that Scaliger did not accord this favour to Gomarus until the revision of his last will in 1608. This is also the last will in which Scaliger introduced Gomarus as the intended editor of the corrected edition of the *Thesaurus temporum*. It is not entirely impossible, therefore, that Scaliger's disposition, by virtue of which Gomarus was entitled to make a selection from his library, had something to do with Scaliger's wish that Gomarus would assume the responsibility for the new edition of the *Thesaurus temporum*. But this remains a speculation, though not an improbable one.

### *Conclusion*

It is quite plausible that Scaliger added Gomarus' name in 1608 to the list of persons whom he authorized to take for themselves one or more volumes from a selection of volumes out of his library which were

<sup>21</sup> De Jonge, 'The Latin Testament,' p. 258: 'Nobilissimo viro Cornelio Mylio, huius Academiae curatori, item Heinsio, atque Baudio potestatem facio, quos velint libros de meis Graecis et Latinis eligere, ita ut post Mylium Heinsius, post Heinsium Baudius sequatur. Horum librorum catalogus repositus est in viridi pulpito, cui inniti soleo scribens.'



especially set apart for this purpose. The beneficiaries had to make their choice after Scaliger's death and before the library was auctioned. However, the authorization given to Gomarus was not recorded in Scaliger's last will proper, but, at most, in the codicil of November 1608 which is now lost. Consequently, Scaliger's disposition is no longer something we can read, let alone something we can read in his testament.

The reason why Scaliger authorized Gomarus to take for himself one or more volumes from his library may certainly have been that Scaliger wished to express his feelings of obligation towards Gomarus for the part the latter was to take in overseeing the printing of the revised edition of the *Thesaurus temporum*.

If Scaliger included Gomarus among the persons who were entitled to take one or more volumes from his library, he refrained from specifying which volume or volumes he wanted to give to Gomarus or to any other person. When Gomarus made use of Scaliger's offer, he had to make his own choice. Thus, regardless of whether or not the Josephus passed into Gomarus' hands because Scaliger wished to repay Gomarus' work on the second edition of the *Thesaurus temporum*, the volume was certainly not Scaliger's choice for Gomarus.<sup>22</sup> It was the choice of Gomarus himself.

---

<sup>22</sup> Contra Dekker, Knoop, and Verdegaal, p. xii, n. 30.