The ever-growing tendency — as much in Neo-Latin studies as in the humanities in general — towards the publication of scholarly findings in collections of articles instead of journals and monographs is one to be watched with caution. This is regrettable, for multi-authored books do not necessarily display the dreaded superficiality and incoherence. When various experts cooperate to shed light on an underexposed and well defined subject, this form of publication certainly offers scholarly opportunities. The key to the success of such projects is hidden precisely in the words „well defined.“ It is indispensable that the object of research should be clearly demarcated and that the problem to be taken on should be stated explicitly and distinctly.

The rather scant preface to the latest collection of articles about Justus Lipsius, entitled *Jam illustravit omnia* and edited by Jeanine de Landtsheer and Pierre Delsaerdt, does not quite fulfil this requirement. The preface (p. vii–viii) does set out to demarcate the subject of the collection. The main objective of the book is to commemorate („gedenken“) Lipsius on the occasion of the fourth centennial of his death — which according to the computation of the editors is supposed to have occurred in the year 1206.1 The topics to be treated are highlighted by means of an explanation of the tangled web of allusions in the book title: Lipsius’s many-sidedness, his participance in a European network of scholars, his qualities as a Latin author, and his success as a writer for the Plantin press. Subsequently, the preface complicates matters by proceeding to map the themes of the collection anew, in different terms, under an ominous reference to the collection’s „rijke verscheidenheid aan thema’s“ („rich variety of themes“). At this point, the book is divided into six sections devoid of any clear cohesion and without apparent connections to the earlier arrangement of topics: (a) Lipsius’s stay in Leiden, (b) vernacular translations of his philosophical works, (c) his antiquarian works, (d) his philosophical writings, (e) publications on the occasion of his death, (f) a residual category, in which „twee praktische aspecten“ („two practical aspects“) are discussed. On the whole, it is hard to avoid the impression that one is dealing with a ragbag of articles.

1 P. vii: „... op 23 maart 1606 was het vierhonderd jaar geleden dat hij, 58 jaar oud, in Leuven overleed“ („... on 23 March 1606, four hundred years had passed since he died in Louvain at the age of 58“).
This impression conveyed by the preface is to the disservice of the book, which certainly has its scholarly merits. Most importantly, the articles — different though they might seem to be — do feature some broad and related thematic lines. I propose to signal a few of these recurring general issues which lend the book a certain attractiveness for a larger audience of scholars in early modern studies.

Virtually every article contains observations on Lipsius’s network. This attention extends to both personal (p. 1–25, 171–5) and professional aspects of social relationships — the latter involving proofreading (p. 5, 165), exchange of antiquarian material (p. 14, 27–43, 47–58, 137–44), and printing (p. 69, 87–9, 105–6, 171–5). The contributions by Dirk Sacré even bring up the subject of the reaction of Lipsius’s network to his death (p. 257–68, 271–9). This attention to the social conditions that allowed for Lipsius’s success as a scholar is illuminating, particularly when we get a glimpse of the practical details: the dispatch and receipt of presentation copies (p. 141–2, 167, 168, 173, 208), the operation of a literary sodality (p. 8–9), negotiations with printers (p. 69, 87–9, 105–6, 171–5) and translators (p. 80–9, 104–7), book dedications (p. 134–7, 165–6, 241–2), congratulation letters for new publications (p. 79–80, 87, 141, 168), etc. It is however important to beware of anachronism in the study of early modern social practices: for instance, usually private and professional spheres can hardly be separated and amicitia more often signifies ties of dependence than bonds of affection. Some contributors are keenly aware of this problem (p. 30 n. 10, 171–5), but others are not; none of them actually uses a sociological model to describe these unfamiliar relationships in an adequate manner.

The interesting thing about network analysis is that it provides insight into the mechanisms governing the spread of information and ideas. The same applies to the data on book trade and the policies of censure and privilege. The mercantile basis of the distribution of Lipsius’s scholarship throughout learned Europe is amply documented by Erik Breuls on the basis of the dispatch lists for the Frankfurt book fairs in Plantin’s account books (p. 281–93). His article shows the pivotal function of Frankfurt in the transmission of state-of-the-art knowledge around 1600. Breuls’s article also highlights the importance of imperial privileges for the distribution of books (p. 290–1), a routine procedure of publishing also reflected in the request and minute of a royal privilege dug up from the archives by Touroy & Deceulaer (p. 193–9). The delicate balance demanded by the exercise of censure is well illustrated by Dávila Pérez’s analysis of the censor’s expurgation of the Spanish translation of the Política (p. 117–23) and the handwritten approbations of Stanihurst’s De rebus in Hibernia gestis (p. 69–70, 77) and of Lipsius’s Manuactio ad Stoicam philos-
This instructiveness about the distribution of books is of course nothing short of appropriate in a special edition of the „De Gulden Passer“, a journal on the history of the book.

The contributors’ observations on the process of publication reflect New Philology’s concern with textual genesis. The same holds true for the mysteries of textual transmission which are solved in this book. Van Hal provides further clarification about the vicissitudes of the manuscript of the Wachtendonck Psalms, the disappearance of which has sometimes been chalked up to Lipsius’s treatment of it (p. 27). In addition, there are Vagenheim’s article about Smetius’s collection of inscriptions and the publication of this manuscript by Lipsius (p. 45–66), another by Meeus on the curious coming about of a Dutch translation of De constantia (p. 79–101), and a third by Janssens touching upon the journey of the Monita et exempla politica from manuscript to printed edition (p. 210–2).

The article by Marijke Janssens features another focal point of iam illustravit omnia: Lipsius’s humanist programme of scholarship. The main purpose of this project was the organization of classical knowledge in order to enhance its serviceability. Janssens demonstrates Lipsius’s efforts to arrange systematically political sententiae and exempla from classical authors (p. 208–16). She stresses how this accumulation of exemplary material is embedded in Lipsius’s ideas about education. The same striving for systematization of data is visible in Lipsius’s approach to antiquities in the Admiranda and the Fax historica project as described by Ballesteros (p. 178–84), in his method used in dealing with Stoic philosophy as analysed by Papy (p. 223–9), and in his way of making Seneca relevant to contemporary life by means of the introduction to his edition (this is shown by Morford, p. 242–5, 248–54).

All in all, it becomes clear that in many fields of scholarship, Lipsius’s activity as an editor and as a collector of data formed a vital link in the distribution chain of knowledge — a chain which by means of translations even extended to the vernacular domain. For Lipsius himself, the latter effect constituted only a by-product of his scholarly output. It seems that the national languages and their literature could hardly win any admiration from our scholar (p. 39, 82). Nevertheless, several articles in this collection raise the question of the precise relationship between Latin and vernacular discourse. The answers to this question are, however, tentative and many problems remain. For instance, how the literary agendas of Lipsius and Jan van Hout are related (p. 7, 8, 36)? Why was Lipsius at all interested in the Old Dutch Wachtendonck Psalms (p. 37–9)? What accounts for his ambiguous attitude towards vernacular translations of his works (p. 82–3, 86, 104)? What precisely was the intended audience of these translations (p. 90–2, 106–7)?
One might wonder whether a somewhat loose collection of articles like *iam illustravit omnia* can actually add something to the lively scholarly debates on early modern networks, cultural transfer, textual genesis, structuring of knowledge, and the relationship between Latin and the vernaculars. In at least one respect, the book does succeed in this challenge. Many contributors are closely associated or even involved in the *Justi Lipsi Epistolae* edition project. They know the Lipsius files like the back of their hand. Their superior command of the archival sources — not only the correspondence, but also autograph manuscripts, *alba amicorum*, privileges, and censors' notes — allows them to draw on this often unpublished material in order to illuminate the operation of the 'high' discourses in Latin scholarship. Often, the utilization of these documents involves painstaking and advanced philological analysis (palaeography, codicology, collation of editions, etc.), which is another major strength of this book.

Of course, there are weaknesses too. In some cases, the methodology of literary analysis is not entirely convincing. More specifically, some contributors fail to recognize rhetorical and manipulative strategies, particularly in letters and dialogues. The article by Chris Heesakkers, for instance, uses published material (letters, poems, dedications) and unpublished documents (letters, *alba amicorum*) indiscriminately for a biographical sketch of the friendship of Lipsius, Dousa, and Van Hout (p. 1–25), while it is to be expected that the structures of historical representation (and distortion!) in both kinds of writing differ significantly. Similarly, Deneire seems to underestimate the rhetoric of flattery in Lipsius's letter to Monelia (p. 164, cf. Meeus p. 79–80). As to the use of the dialogue form, Peeters's suggestion that it serves to render the presentation of scholarship more lively and playful (p. 128, 133–4) seems to overlook the strategic possibilities offered by this presentation mode. Ballesteros's interpretation of the form is certainly more refined (p. 190–1), but still the question of the authority of the different voices within a dialogue is not addressed.

More importantly, one wonders whether this collection of articles will prove very helpful for research on Lipsius in general. After all, we hardly need further commemoration of the scholar from Overijse after the appearance of a heap of collections of articles and catalogues of exhibitions around 1997.²

---

All the themes I summed up above have already been treated more or less extensively in these publications. Many articles in the present collection are piecemeal contributions to fields of research which have already been explored: consequently, more wide-ranging studies are wanted at this moment. This applies perhaps most strongly to Lipsius’s life: a modern biography is still a serious desideratum.

In addition, the editing of this collection has been done somewhat sloppily. As a result, there remain quite a few typographical mistakes. To give only three examples: p. 190: „application“; p. 235: „deliberately“; p. 251: „crebra“ instead of „crebrae“. The use of punctuation marks, too, is rather slipshod — for instance, p. 223: „why he did so?“ instead of „why he did so.“

To conclude, I must say that despite its shortcomings there is much to enjoy in Iam illustravit omnia. The articles by Van Hal, Deneire, and Papy are written in particularly clear and elegant scholarly prose. The diverse material guarantees a fine amount of anecdotic elements — such as the poetic exchange between Lipsius and Dousa about the death of Dousa’s favourite hedgehog (p. 5–6), the censor who is primarily concerned with style and spelling mistakes (p. 77), and some unexpected witticisms from the notoriously grumpy Lipsius: a dirty joke about De amphitheatro (p. 5) and mockery of his own motto in the Poliorcetica (p. 134). Furthermore, the reading of the book is facilitated by the table of Lipsius’s life and works (p. xi–xiv), the bilingual summaries at the end of each article, and the index nominum (p. 318–20). Finally, Iam illustravit omnia provides its readers with findings which are relevant to some thriving fields of research in early modern studies — networks of scholars, cultural transfer, textual genesis, organization of knowledge, and the interaction of Latin and the vernacular languages.
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