

TOM DENEIRE

## The Philology of Justus Lipsius's Prose Style\*

*Summary* – Justus Lipsius's prose style, while famous in both Early Modern and present-day literary criticism, has never been studied satisfactorily from a philological standpoint. The present contribution aims to remedy this remarkable lacuna. After a methodological introduction, it studies Lipsius's prose style on the level of sound, lexicon and syntax to reach a general conclusion on the nature and effect of this paradoxical style that has puzzled so many of his readers and commentators alike.

### 1. Preliminary remarks

The Overijse born humanist Justus Lipsius (1547–1606) is widely known as one of the great innovators of Latin prose style. Modern scholarly literature abounds with contributions on the particular position of this *stilus Lipsianus* in Neo-Latin literary history and has characterized it with a kaleidoscopic range of different hallmarks such as Attic, Laconic, nervous, abrupt, elliptic, hopping, paratactic, witty, plain, affected, brief, concise, terse, lapidary, pithy, pointed, sententious, obscure, archaic, Plautine, Senecan, Apuleian, Tacitean, or Sallustean.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, Lipsius's idiom has never been subjected to a formal stylistic study, which in 1999 prompted Terence Tunberg to conclude: 'despite the fame and notoriety of Lipsius's prose style, we entirely

---

\* This paper consists of a revised section of my "Laconicae Cuspidis Instar". The Correspondence of Justus Lipsius: 1598. Critical Edition with Introduction, Annotations and Stylistic Study (Leuven: Unpublished PhD thesis, <http://hdl.handle.net/1979/2616>, 2009), 2 vols + CD-ROM and was partly written in the context of the FWO-project Power and Passion, Prince and People. Justus Lipsius' *Monita et exempla politica* (1605) as a Bridge between Political Philosophy and the Ideal of the Christian Ruler (KULeuven, October 2005 – December 2009, OT 05.18 & F.W.O. G. 0344.06). I wish to thank my supervisor Prof. D. Sacré, Prof. T. Tunberg and all members of the doctoral committee for their valuable corrections and suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> For a critical assessment of the secondary literature, a study of Lipsius as a figure of late sixteenth-century literary history and an edition of Lipsius's own statements in treatises and letters on style, see my 'Justus Lipsius's Prose Style', in: J. De Landtsheer (ed.), *A Companion to Justus Lipsius* (Brill, 2013, forthcoming).

lack any study of his style that would satisfy a Latin philologist'.<sup>2</sup> In his short paper, Tunberg made some preliminary explorations of the subject, but 'only hinted (...) at what could be shown by a fully detailed study of the language of a large body of Lipsius's writings'. Accordingly, Tunberg expressly stated: 'Such a work needs to be undertaken'.<sup>3</sup>

The present contribution aims to be such a work and will study Lipsius's prose style from a combination of methodological perspectives from classical philology. While its main structuring principle is the (linguistic) synchronic-descriptive style grammar, best known from Marouzeau's *Traité du stylistique latine*, it also uses the (literary) standpoint of rhetorical analysis, as known from Lausberg's *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, and the textual and functional approach of Von Albrecht's *Meister römischer Prosa*.<sup>4</sup> In this way, it offers both a philological analysis of the formal constituents of Lipsius's style and a literary interpretation of their function. In this way, the characteristics<sup>5</sup> of Lipsius's prose have been analysed on four linguistic levels: Sound, Lexicon, Syntax and Text.<sup>6</sup> Within these levels, stylistic phenomena have been grouped into nine sections: Repetition, Rhythm, Vocabulary, Figurative language, Brevitas, Inconcinnitas, Compositio, Latinitas and (Mala) Affectatio. In a final Conclusion a summary of Lipsius's salient stylistic techniques has been drafted, which identifies several *fil rouge*s, permeating Lipsius's style and therefore typical of it.

The basic corpus that has been used to conduct this research is Lipsius's 1598 correspondence, which consists of some 100 letters, varying from a couple of lines to several dozens of pages. Despite the fact that this could

<sup>2</sup> T. O. Tunberg, *Observations on the Style and Language of Lipsius's Prose: A Look at Some Selected Texts*, in: G. Tournoy - J. De Landtsheer - J. Papy (eds.), *Iustus Lipsius. Europae lumen et columnen. Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven 17–19 September 1997*, *Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 15 (Leuven, 1999), 169–178 (170).

<sup>3</sup> Both quotations are from *ibid.*, 178.

<sup>4</sup> These and other methodological frameworks are accurately described in W. Ax, *Probleme des Sprachstils als Gegenstand der lateinischen Philologie*, *Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft*, 1 (Hildesheim - New York, 1976).

<sup>5</sup> M. Landfester, *Einführung in die Stilistik der griechischen und lateinischen Literatursprachen*, *Die Altertumswissenschaft* (Darmstadt, 1997), 4–6 stipulates some interesting requirements for a stylistic phenomenon to be considered 'characteristic'.

<sup>6</sup> Cp. the interpretation of elements of style as paradigmatic or syntagmatic phenomena on the level of phoneme, morpheme, lexeme, sentence and text, as described in: Landfester, *Einführung in die Stilistik*, 49–51. One should keep in mind that these levels actually interact. For instance, some phenomena of sound (such as alliteration or rhythm) also have an effect of proportion, which translates to the level of syntax (*compositio*) and text (textual progression).

perhaps still be considered a rather limited corpus for a stylistic study of Lipsius's complete oeuvre in prose (1569–1606), there are several arguments to be made against such reservations. First of all, while it is true that the bulk of the texts used stems from the ILE 98<sup>7</sup> corpus, this study comprises many examples from other Lipsian genres as well, such as his dialogues, historical treatises, philosophical tracts, etc.<sup>8</sup> Secondly, from a literary perspective Lipsius's epistolography is arguably the best starting point for a stylistic study.<sup>9</sup> Letter-writing is one of the most heterogenic genres of literature, representing a multitude of genres and their respective stylistic registers. In this way, a stylistic study of ILE 98 reveals not only Lipsius the letter-writer, but also Lipsius the narrator, philologist, historian, orator, philosopher, etc. In fact, studying Lipsius's letters will probably elucidate his full stylistic scope better than studying any one of his other publications in particular.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> ILE stands for the series *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae*, published by the Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten. ILE letters use a system of reverse dating (e. g. 1 January 1603 = ILE 03 02 01). Letters preceded by a Roman numeral refer to already published volumes: I = *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae*, pars I: 1564–1583, ed. A. Gerlo-M. A. Nauwelaerts-H. D. L. Vervliet (Brussels, 1978); II = *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae*, pars II: 1584–1587, ed. M. A. Nauwelaerts-S. Sué (Brussels, 1983); III = *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae*, pars III: 1588–1590, ed. S. Sué-H. Peeters (Brussels, 1987); V = *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae*, pars V: 1592, ed. J. De Landtsheer-J. Kluyskens (Brussels, 1991); VI = *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae*, pars VI: 1593, ed. J. De Landtsheer (Brussels, 1994); VII = *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae*, pars VII: 1594, ed. J. De Landtsheer (Brussels, 1997); VIII = *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae*, pars VIII: 1595, ed. J. De Landtsheer (Brussels, 2004); XIII = *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae*, pars XIII: 1600, ed. J. Papy (Brussels, 2000); XIV = *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae*, pars XIV: 1601, ed. J. De Landtsheer (Brussels, 2006).

<sup>8</sup> In the following, Lipsius's works are referred to in abbreviation: *Admir.* = *Admiranda sive De Magnitudine Romana* (1598); *Adv. dial.* = *Adversus dialogistam liber de una religione* (1591); *Critica* = *Opera Omnia quae ad Criticam proprie spectant* (1585); *De Amphit.* = *De Amphitheatro* (1584); *De Const.* = *De Constantia* (1584); *De Mil. Rom.* = *De Militia Romana* (1595); *De Vesta* = *De Vesta et Vestalibus* (1602); *Inst. Epist.* = *Institutio Epistolica* (1591); *Lovan.* = *Lovanium* (1605); *Mon.* = *Monita et exempla politica* (1605); *Poliorc.* = *Poliorcetica* (1596); *Pol.* = *Politica sive Civilis Doctrina* (1589); *Saturn.* = *Saturnalia* (1582); *Sat. Men.* = *Satyra Menipaea*. *Somnium* (1581). Full bibliographical references can easily be found in *Bibliotheca Belgica*. *Bibliographie générale des Pays-Bas*, fondée par F. Van der Haeghen, rééditée sous la direction de M.-T. Lenger (Brussels, 1964–1975), 3, 883–1125.

<sup>9</sup> The few studies that have embarked upon a philological study of Lipsius's style (i. e. Tunberg, *Observations* and B. Löfstedt, *Zu Justus Lipsius' Briefen, Studii classicae*, 28 [1987], 71–78) exclusively rely on correspondence.

<sup>10</sup> Especially Fumaroli regards Lipsius's letters as the epitome of his characteristic prose style; see e. g. M. Fumaroli, *Juste Lipse et l'Institutio Epistolica*, in: Id. (ed.), *L'âge de*

Furthermore, Lipsius's letters are often credited as the main source of his literary and stylistic influence on Early Modern Europe,<sup>11</sup> which makes a stylistic study of them representative of one of his key literary activities. Thirdly, the rather limited time frame of one year need not be problematic either: studying a late phase of Lipsian writing such as 1598 will reflect the 'adult' or 'fully developed' Lipsius, who had completely mastered the idiom he stood for – the idiom which became so seminal in the history of Neo-Latin and vernacular literatures.<sup>12</sup>

## 2. Sound

### 2.1. Repetition

When analyzing those effects of sound which characterize Lipsius's Latin, it might seem strange that above all figures of repetition are present in his prose. Still Lipsius, who is most often connected with *brevitas*, at the same time shows a great inclination towards repetition, in particular the so-called 'Wiederholung von Wörtern bei gelockerter Wortgleichheit',<sup>13</sup> such as *adnominatio* (*paronomasia*), *polyptoton* and *synonymia*.

Especially the first technique of *adnominatio* – 'ein (pseudo-)etymologisches Spiel mit der Geringfügigkeit der lautlichen Änderungen einerseits und der interessanten Bedeutungsspanne, die durch die lautliche Änderung hergestellt wird, andererseits'<sup>14</sup> – appealed to Lipsius and at the same time explains the apparent contradiction of his choice for *adiectio* (repetition) over *detractio* (*brevitas*).<sup>15</sup> For, the definition of *adnominatio* shows how the tech-

---

l'éloquence: rhétorique et "res literaria" de la Renaissance au seuil de l'époque classique (Geneva, 2002), 159.

<sup>11</sup> Cp. M. W. Croll, *Juste Lipse et le Mouvement Anticiceronien à la Fin du XVI<sup>e</sup> et au Début du XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, in: Id., *Style, Rhetoric, and Rhythm. Essays by Morris W. Croll*, ed. by J. Max Patrick, et al. (Woodbridge, 1989 [= Princeton, 1966]), 40 or H. F. Fullenwider, *Erasmus, Lipsius and the stilus laconicus, Res publica litterarum. Studies in the classical tradition*, 7 (1984), 67.

<sup>12</sup> In this way, this study is only concerned with Lipsius's mature style, the language for which he was famous. The moderately Ciceronian style that Lipsius practised from his childhood years until the mid 1570s has to be considered an altogether different mode of writing which does not pose the same pressing research questions as Lipsius's mature style.

<sup>13</sup> H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft* (Stuttgart, 1990), 322.

<sup>14</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, 322. Cp. J. B. Hofmann - A. Szantyr, *Stilistik*, in: *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, 2, 2/2, § 12.

<sup>15</sup> Additionally, the technique testifies to two other aspects which Lipsius found appealing: it is a form of learnedness and typical of comedy language; see e. g. Landfester, *Einführung*

nique functions through a dimension of *emphasis* – the effect of expressing more in thought than is actually said in words,<sup>16</sup> identified by many scholars as characteristic of Lipsius's style. Indeed, the *adnominatio*'s tension between similarity in form and difference in contents adds an extra element, which is understood, although not expressed. In this way, it appears that while scholars mostly point at Lipsius's brevity for producing *emphasis*, techniques of repetition (such as *adnominatio*, but also others, cf. infra) – in a way the opposite of *brevitas* – can be responsible for the same effect (cf. infra, *Conclusion*).

a) Repetition of words

– Wiederholung von Wörtern bei gelockerter Wortgleichheit<sup>17</sup>

(I.) As stated above, the most conspicuous of Lipsius's *figurae per adiectionem* is his use of *adnominatio*, commonly divided into an organic and inorganic sub-category.<sup>18</sup> The former is found, for instance, in ILE 98 02 06 R: *Sed factum nunc tamen unaque illa epistola mihi satisfactum*, the latter in ILE XIV, 01 10 28: *Testor Numen, oculis imo et osculis tuam [sc. uxorem] nunc libem!*

*Adnominatio* is often introduced (and therefore made more explicit) by such words as *paene*, *immo* or *dicam*, which emphasize the aforementioned tension present in the expression, as in Pol. 5, 1: *qui (...) interfuerunt, imo praefuerunt, bellis* or (...) *sic mihi pectus larga ista humanitate perfusum et paene addam confusum* (ILE 98 05 27 C). A convoluted example (which combines *adnominatio*, *synonymia*, alliteration and *homoeoteleuton*) is present in ILE 98 03 01 A: *Te eligit, qui lapsa erigeres, dilapsa colligeres, exanimata recreares.*

Furthermore, we can point out that Lipsius's *adnominatio* is sometimes more than an ornamental *figura*, by functioning as a structural element in the text.<sup>19</sup> In ILE [98 05 13 / 06 15], for instance, we read: *In domum meam cum*

---

in die Stilistik, 105 (referring to Hofmann - Szantyr, Stilistik, 711).

<sup>16</sup> See e. g. Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik, §§ 578 and 905/906 (where the concept is somewhat less broadly defined due to Lausberg's strict interpretation of it as a trope or a *figura sententiae*).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik, §§ 635–664.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Ibid., § 638 for additional sub-categories of *adnominatio*. The *figura etymologica* (type *voce vocare*) is sometimes considered a type of *adnominatio* as well (e. g. J. Marouzeau, Traité de stylistique latine, Collection d'études latines. Série scientifique, 12 [Paris, 1946], 65).

<sup>19</sup> Strictly speaking, therefore, this element belongs to the textual level (cf. 5. Text); see e. g. Landfester's interpretation of 'Wiederholung von Wörtern und Wortstämmen' as 'Lexika-

*venturus sis (ita uterque volumus) quid praecipui muneris tui futurum non ignoras. Praedixi. A manu, lectione et studiis mihi eris; alius functionis, quae ab ingenio aut instituto tuo discordet, immunis.* Although there are several words in between and the verbal similarity is rather small, it still seems likely Lipsius consciously used the link *muneris* – *immunis* (as literally ‘without *munus*’) for textual progression.

Finally, we have to say a few words about the literary effect of this *adnominatio*. We have already pointed at the overall element of *emphasis* which is often present through the contrast between formal similarity and dissimilarity of content. Accordingly, the nature of the tension embedded in the *adnominatio* often prompts Lipsius to use the figure to embody or underscore (more or less) antithetic movements. For, antithesis is more effective (often close to paradoxical) with verbal similarity than without it. Examples of this technique are *Inst. Epist.*, 11: *Tenta, reperies in levi monito non leve momentum* or *Adv. dial.*, 1: *et tu quoque non multa scripsisti, sed multis.*

Notwithstanding these functional effects of emphasis and antithesis – the combination of which comes close to what has been identified as the *acutum* or *argutum* of Lipsius’s style<sup>20</sup> – Lipsius also often uses *adnominatio* for purely aesthetic or intellectualistic reasons, sometimes up to the point of producing comical effects. Indeed, Lipsius is so fond of such word play that one gets the impression that it is somewhat out of place in certain cases, as in the epitaphs<sup>21</sup> for Ortelius: *brevis terra eum capit, qui ipse orbem terrarum cepit*<sup>22</sup> or for his dog Saphyrus: *plangebatur et pangebatur I[ustus] Lipsius olim, heu, dominus.*<sup>23</sup> It is not so much the technique itself – Neo-Latin literature shows a great fondness for word play –, as the frequency with which Lipsius employed it that gradually contributed to the reproach of (*mala*) *affectatio* (cf. *infra*) which his critics often voiced.<sup>24</sup>

---

lisch-semantische Formen der Textkohärenz’ (Landfester, Einführung in die Stilistik, 149).

<sup>20</sup> Oratorical theory explicitly mentions the *adnominatio* as a figure that realises the quality of *acutum* (cf. Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik, § 540).

<sup>21</sup> Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 66 mentions that *adnominatio* is frequent in pompous epitaphs and offers several examples.

<sup>22</sup> Sweertius, *Athenae Belgicae sive Nomenclator infer[ae] Germaniae scriptorum* (Antuerpiae: apud Gulielmum a Tungris, 1628), 89.

<sup>23</sup> ILE XIV, 01 08 29 R.

<sup>24</sup> As a very conspicuous figure of sound *adnominatio* is in general prone to criticism of affectation; see Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 65. Croll, among others, has deemed Lipsius’s tendency towards wordplay exaggerated (Croll, *Attic Prose: Lipsius, Montaigne, Bacon*, in: *Id.*, *Style, Rhetoric, and Rhythm*, 173).

(II.) Another Lipsian figure of repetition is the *polyptoton* (or *casuum commutatio*). Strictly speaking the term *polyptoton* is reserved for nominal *commutatio*, whereas other types (e. g. verbs) are called *derivatio* (non-nominal *polyptoton*).<sup>25</sup> An obvious example of *polyptoton* – in combination with the previous effect (*adnominatio*) – is found in ILE 99 12 30 H: *atque huc omnem ingenii aciem intendo, omnes animi nervos contendo*.

It is striking that in some of these cases, Lipsius seems to look for the same contrast between resemblance in sound and tension in meaning as found in the *adnominatio*. In ILE 98 03 16 B, for instance, we read *immo animus in me tuus ad maiora animum mihi addat*, where *animus* (love, appreciation) clearly means a different thing than *animum* (desire, courage). In the *derivatio* in ILE 98 05 19 *Memorem te nostri esse nec mentem dividi, etsi multi montes et terrae dividunt, gratum est* we notice the same phenomenon.

As with *adnominatio*, this *polyptoton/derivatio* can also be used with a structural effect.<sup>26</sup> An extensive example is ILE 98 03 10:

*F a c pro tua parte, sed cum mixta quadam et virili gravitate, a qua lascivi et iuvenes illi ioci vel fabellae absint. F a c i a t et illa. Ac scite Solon olim novae nuptae praeceperat gustato Cydonio malo sponso accumbere, non tam levem brevemque illam oris fragrantiam spectans, quam hanc adsiduam b l a n d i aut suaviloquentiam, qua maritum caperet ac teneret. Sed alterum etiam huic Concordiae praeceptum pati quaedam et conivere aut nec videre. F a l l i t u r enim qui in primo isto contubernio omnia ad votum animumque facta exspectat aut exigit. F a l l i t u r et aspera quaedam aut certe acerba intervenient, ut sunt animi et turbidi isti adfectus humani. (...) Sicut equorum domitores ferocientes eos non flagellis exasperant, sed poppymis b l a n d e tractant et demulcent, sic in feminis et praesertim sub initia, crudo adhuc, ut sic dicam, illo connubiali iugo. B l a n d i r e igitur, submitte; mox ipsa utrumque: et imperio tuo firmo in volentem et submittentem utere.*

On the other hand, there are also cases where Lipsius transgresses the boundaries of functionality in his usage of the technique, as in his *testimonium* for Segetus (ILE 97 12 28): *Eo omni tempore probis se probasse ac*

<sup>25</sup> See Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, § 648.

<sup>26</sup> Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 261–276 offers numerous examples of this textual dimension of repetition, either involuntarily arising (267: ‘le mot a une tendance, une fois exprimé, à hanter le souvenir et l’oreille de celui qui l’a employé’) or consciously inserted: ‘La répétition peut être l’effet d’une volonté réfléchie. Elle constitue alors un moyen d’éveiller l’attention du lecteur; elle devient un procédé de mise en relief’ (270), citing an excellent example from Plautus’ *Mostellaria*. This mise en relief can serve both aesthetic and argumentative considerations (272).

*mihī inprimis ob acre et excellens ingenium, ardorem studiumque discendi atque ita profecisse, ut in meliori omni litteratura paucos sibi aequales habeat in aequali aevo. (...) Stirpes istae fovendae et attollendae sunt in commune reip[ublicae] bonum, cui boni omnes studemus.* Indeed, such (affected) repetition was widely recognized as a typically Lipsian technique as the following sentence from Sebastianus Rolliardus, an admirer of Lipsian style, clearly shows: *sed potior illa [sc. humanitas] et te vere digna, qua omnis fis omnibus, ut omnes (libet enim λιψιάζειν) Bonae Divae lucrifacias* (ILE 98 10 25). However, it seems to have been as much the excesses of Lipsius's followers and imitators, especially Puteanus, which earned him the criticism of *mala affectatio* for this technique (cf. infra).<sup>27</sup> Already in Sacco's ILE 98 10 28 we read, for instance: *Hoc amplius, quo nil amplius, amplissimo Lipsio debes, Nicolae Micaulti, decus Belgiae.*<sup>28</sup>

(III.) Especially in more rhetorical contexts, Lipsius is also fond of *synonymia* (again with an emphatic effect), although words are only rarely completely synonymous and the *synonymia* therefore reminiscent of Ciceronian *redundantia*. In Lovan. 1, 1, for instance, we read: *iuvat etiam maiorum nostrorum res, ingenia, mores nosse.* Indeed, *synonymia* is often realised by Lipsius in such asyndetic tricola, other examples being De Const. 2, 5: *Quaere, lege, disce* or Pol. 1, 1: (...) *ut salutaria videam, diiudicem, promam.* Still, *synonymia* is also produced through doubling, as in ILE 98 07 10:

*Christiani sumus et ex hac lege<sub>1</sub> doctrinaque<sub>2</sub> certum prolem tuam in aeternis gaudiis<sub>1</sub> vivere atque inter beatas illas mentes<sub>2</sub>. Quantumvis ad magnam fortunam<sub>1</sub> et opes<sub>2</sub> nata fuerit! Quid ista omnia ad superam illam felicitatem sunt? Si cogitamus<sub>1</sub> et ponderamus<sub>2</sub>, minuatur luctus necessum est et animum a terrenis<sub>1</sub> istis et brevibus<sub>2</sub> ad caelestia<sub>1</sub> et aeterna<sub>2</sub> mittamus. Deum serio rogo, Generose<sub>1</sub> et Nobilissime<sub>2</sub> Domine, ut has cogitationes<sub>1</sub> et sensus<sub>2</sub> tibi det<sub>1</sub> aut firmet<sub>2</sub> iterumque prolem det (quod salutare sit) firmiorem. Voveo<sub>1</sub> et spero<sub>2</sub>, Bruxellae, VI. Idus Iulias ∞.D.XCVIII*

Again there can be a dimension of antithesis on the background of such doubling (e. g. *terrenis* – *brevibus* vs. *caelestia* – *aeterna*). This and other aspects of doubling will be discussed in the section *Compositio*. For now, we

<sup>27</sup> Cp. H. Nikitinski, *De eloquentia latina saec. XVII et XVIII dialogus* (Naples, 2000), 40–42.

<sup>28</sup> It seems that Lipsius mainly restricted his usage to repetition in two words, while Puteanus or other *Lipsiani* often searched for triple effects.



only draw renewed attention to how such repetition goes against the often stressed *brevitas*.

#### Wiederholung gleicher Wörter<sup>29</sup>

(I.) Repetition of identical words is not that frequent in Lipsius, especially when there is no apparent functional reason. We rarely find instances of *geminatio*, for instance, such as *Sparge, sparge salutaria haec velut semina* (Mon., 1, 1). Also rare is *anaphora*, but *epiphora* is not infrequent, either as pure *epiphora* in ILE 98 02 04: *Hoc non adsero, de pecunia adsero* or as interrupted *epiphora* in ILE 98 10 19: *Nam verum amare didici et tales quoque viros amare*. An example which combines both *anaphora* and (quasi-)epiphora, and thus constitutes *complexio*, is ILE 98 04 02: *Vivit amor in mortuum et virtutes eius conciliaverant; vivit in te vivum et amor tuus in epistola olim expressus conciliaverat*.

In general, when repetition of identical words does surface, this technique often seems to produce a similar element of tension as did the 'Wiederholung von Wörtern bei gelockerter Wortgleichheit'. An example of this is the *epanalepsis* in Sat. Men., praef.: *habebit [sc. argumentum meum] tamen fortitan quod te delectet imagine aliqua prisca et non vulgati ritus. Te delectet, iuventutem docet*. In these cases *te delectet* has more or less the same meaning, but still one has the feeling something is added in the second instance, so that the technique almost has the effect of a rhetorical *distinctio*.<sup>30</sup> The same goes for some other examples of *Wiederholung gleicher Wörter*, as in the *redditio* or *inclusio* of ILE II, 85 06 01: *Adfectus in iis (sc. litteris) undique elucet, sed vereor ut adfectus*.

(II.) Another important dimension of repetition of identical words falls under the traditional category of polysyndeton, which is commonly found in Lipsius. Still, the way in which he uses successions of *et, aut* and the likes, and the specific jangling effect they often have, will be better treated in the section *Inconcinntas*.

#### b) Repetition of sound

In general, Lipsius seems less fond of repetition of individual sounds than of repetition of whole words such as *adnominatio* and the likes. Still, instances of alliteration, assonance,<sup>31</sup> *homoeoteleuton*, and others, are far from exceptional in his prose.<sup>32</sup> A few examples will show these techniques.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, §§ 612–634.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, §§ 660–662.

<sup>31</sup> In traditional Latin rhetorics, alliteration and assonance are not individual *figurae*; they are regarded as instances of *adnominatio* (cf. *Ibid.*, 885).

<sup>32</sup> Especially alliteration seems to have appealed to him. It is, after all, a popular technique

(I.) First of all, we see a tendency to use a sort of ‘structural’ alliteration or assonance, i. e. at the beginning of two cola/commata, creating a structuralizing and balancing effect,<sup>33</sup> which is rather surprising for Lipsius, who is usually bent towards the distortion of such balance. Yet consider these examples: ILE 98 10 19: *dedisse dicis, scito serio* or the dedicatory letter of the *De Militia: regna regnis adiicere, nullo nisi armorum iure*.

On the other hand, there are also examples where Lipsius employs the technique with the opposite effect. In ILE 98 11 02 BA *Solida si spectes, superstrues famam firmam*, for instance, there is imbalance between colon A (*s s s*) and colon B (*s f f*), but the alternative would have been almost Gorgian: *Solida si spectes, facies famam firmam*. A more complicated example is ILE 98 09 24: *Nescio enim quomodo facilius haec diiudico et arbitror nitide excusa a vobis quam confuse a me scripta. Non enim exscripta et primam fere manum nostram semper habes*. The ear links up *confuse* with *excusa*, which, however, have very different syntactic value (the ellipsis of *tam* adds to the same effect). Moreover, the following *exscripta* reminds one of *scripta*, but also reveals to the reader that he had perhaps not fully grasped the full meaning of *scripta*. Before *exscripta* one merely understands ‘which I have written confusedly’; with *exscripta* one realises that *scripta* meant ‘to write by hand’ as well. Again, such imbalance through sound will be dealt with more extensively below in the section *Inconcinntitas*.

(II.) Evidently, there are many instances of alliteration/assonance as pure phenomena of sound as well, such as *Pol. 3, 1: Prudentiae telam ordior, quam ut felici pectine percurram et percutiam, te vera Minerva nostra invoco, o aeterni patris aeterna proles*, which is headed by the title *Prudentiam Principi pernecessariam*; the extreme *homoeoteleuton* in ILE 98 09 30 M: *singulae suae columnae inscriptae*<sup>34</sup> or the effects of 98 12 29: *vos vigetis in ipso virente aevo et Deus tales servet teque semper meum*, where 1/3 of the sounds is a *v* or *e*.

---

in archaic Latin (cf. A. Courtney, *Archaic Latin Prose*, American Philological Association. American Classical Studies, 42 [Atlanta, 1999], 6), which Lipsius had a clear taste for.

<sup>33</sup> In Ciceronian Latin this function is largely reserved for the *homoeoteleuton* (cp. Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 291/292; and Landfester, *Einführung in die Stilistik*, 79). Hofmann - Szantyr mentions such ‘Alliterationen bei koordinierten Gliedern’ in *Stilistik*, § 9, B) e).

<sup>34</sup> Such extreme *homoeoteleuta* are also attested in classical Latin; see e. g. Tac. *Ann.* 15, 40: *ignis patulis magnis urbis locis* (Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 51/52).

### c) Conclusion

The most important conclusion regarding Lipsius's use of repetition – and especially repetition of words – is that while he uses it very often, he virtually always mitigates the relative parallelism which the similarity in repetition is bound to create, by realising a degree of dissimilarity (in content, sound or syntax),<sup>35</sup> thus creating a kind of emphatic tension in his expression. This will prove to be a recurring and most important constituent of Lipsius's literary technique, which will be extensively dealt with in the section *Inconcinntas*.

In the very first example we quoted in this section – *Sed factum nunc tamen unaque illa epistola mihi satisfactum* – the great formal resemblance of *factum* vs *satisfactum* is met not only by dissimilarity in content (through the *adnominatio*), but also in sound. Lipsius avoided rounding of the cola by *homoeoteleuton* (he could easily have written *Sed nunc tamen factum, unaque illa epistola mihi satisfactum*). In another example quoted above, Lipsius did not write *Vivit amor in eum mortuum, quod virtus eius conciliaverat; vivit amor in te vivum, quod adfectus tuus in epistola olim expressus conciliaverat*, but *Vivit amor in mortuum et virtutes eius conciliaverant; vivit in te vivum et amor tuus in epistola olim expressus conciliaverat*. In this example, the apparent parallelism of *amor* – *et amor* is disproportionate in view of the syntax *vivit amor* – *vivit [amor] in te et amor... conciliaverat*. Lipsius also consciously alternates *conciliaverant* and *conciliaverat* to avoid too much similarity, which – together with the parataxis and ellipsis (*et [id]* instead of the usual *quod*) and *inconcinntas* (*in mortuum ... eius* and *in te vivum* instead of *in eum mortuum* and *in te vivum*), cf. *infra* – makes this a typically Lipsian sentence.

Finally, we can point out that the aforementioned emphatic tension is even present in some instances where repetition is not actually expressed, but where one still notices the tension such an 'elliptic repetition' (so to speak) creates. Examples of this technique are ILE 98 04 06 T: *Sed publica valeant. Si tu, gaudeo; magis, si me amas* (the first *valere* is used figuratively, the second [*valere*] literally, alluding to the correspondent's health);<sup>36</sup> 98 07 22 M: *Ergo animum accipe; ego illa hortensia munuscula, quae tibi et Spiringio adfini tuo simul inscribam*; or ILE I, 81 00 00 S (the letter of dedication of *Sat. Men.*) where we read: *Satyram inscripsi, et verbum minax fe-*

<sup>35</sup> This explains why 'obvious' and 'simple' instances of repetition such as pure *geminatio* are rather infrequent in Lipsius.

<sup>36</sup> The very same is found in ILE 98 09 24: *Sed abeant haec et valeant: ego ut istud ad vos aspiro*, where *ut istud* stands for *ut valeam*.

*cerit imperitis fortasse terrorem. Frustra, quia sine dente, sine felle est: levi tantum sale inspersa. Eoque adeo non bono: ut verear ne priusquam in manus tuas venerit, putiscat* (obviously both the literal and transferred meaning of *sal* are present here). In a very paradoxical way, these last few examples take us back to our starting observation on Lipsius's repetition and illustrate how *brevitas* and repetition can separately, and even in combination, create typically Lipsian *emphasis*. Therefore, both *brevitas* and repetition appear only second to a larger consideration, viz. of *emphasis* – an observation which considerably nuances the traditional stress on brevity in Lipsius's style (cf. *infra*).

## 2.2. Rhythm<sup>37</sup>

In an unpublished essay 'De Lipsianismo iudicium' an anonymous Jesuit author wrote the following on Lipsius's rhythmicity: *Numeros fere negligit. Oratio eius semiplena, hians, concisa dissecta, curta, nec aequabili, continuo et moderato passu, sed quasi subsiliendo et restitendo incedens (...)*.<sup>38</sup> It is clear that the author is quite depreciative, but still it is not easy to interpret such a passage. It seems that the notion of rhythm appearing from this fragment concerns not only quantitative prosarhythmus, but also compositional effects, such as structural weight and balance. And quite rightly so; Wilkinson quotes Cicero when defining 'rhythm' broadly as 'whatever can be somehow measured by the ear': *quicquid (...) sub aurium mensuram aliquam cadit*.<sup>39</sup> Moreover, he points at a degree of subjectivity in these matters, which is even more conspicuous in Sonnenschein's definition of rhythm:

'Rhythm is that property of a sequence of events in time which produces on the mind of the observer the impression of proportion between the durations of the several events or groups of events of which the sequence is composed (...) without asserting or implying that the sequence is itself proportioned with mathematical or metronomic exactitude; some sequences may be so proportioned, some not'.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>37</sup> One could say that, in essence, rhythm is an element of repetition as well (or rather: functions through repetition). Still, the phenomenon deserves a separate treatment.

<sup>38</sup> [Anonymus], *De Lipsianismo iudicium* (= Rome, Bibl. Nat. Vict. Em., ms. Fondo Gesuitico 1349), 24 (edition in preparation by Dirk Sacré).

<sup>39</sup> Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry*, 89 (referring to Cic. Or. 67).

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.* (referring to Sonnenschein, *What is Rhythm?*, 16).

Such stretchability of the concept implies that the term 'rhythm' can be used in many senses. Applied to prose, Wilkinson (with de Groot) distinguishes two main types: 'metric': 'the arrangement of long and short syllables' and 'periodic': 'the arrangement of similar, sometimes corresponsive, parts of sentence into a rhythmic whole, the 'period''.<sup>41</sup> In this way, aspects of accentuation and stress, syllabic quantity, repetition, compositional weight and balance, text-structure and so on are in fact all integral parts of what we call 'rhythm'. Accordingly, the following section will deal with two different rhythmical aspects of Lipsius's Latin, i. e. his metric *prosarhythmus*, and the periodic balance of his composition.

#### a) Metric rhythm

(I.) The most recognized element of rhythm in prose is the ancient practice of using rhythmical cadences in sentences. Especially Cicero's practice of *clausulae* at the end of his sentences will be commonly thought of, but ancient as well as modern literature abounds with theories about the usage of fixed patterns of quantity in all positions of the sentence.<sup>42</sup> In Lipsius's case, the *communis opinio* is that he did not care much for such regulated *prosarhythmus*.<sup>43</sup> Indeed, the Leuven professor remains completely silent on this markedly Ciceronian technique in both his *Epistolica* and his *Oratoria Institutio*.

Accordingly, in his practice, we are occasionally struck by his complete lack of attention for the matter. The very first sentence of *De Constantia*, for instance, begins with *Ante annos aliquot*, which is the first part of a hexameter (*hemiepes*). Oratorical theory explicitly states that poetical rhythms are to be avoided in prose<sup>44</sup> and Lipsius could just as easily have written *Ante aliquot annos*, which is after all the *rectus ordo*<sup>45</sup> one would expect.

<sup>41</sup> Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry*, 135 (referring to A. W. De Groot, *Der antike Prosarhythmus. zugleich Fortsetzung des Handbook of Antiquae Prose-Rhythm* (Groningen, <sup>2</sup>1967 [= Groningen, 1921], 13/14, 16).

<sup>42</sup> The different scholarly discussions and opinions on *numerus oratorius* or *clausulae* need not be rehearsed here (for such a *status quaestionis*, see e. g. A. Primmer, *Cicero Numerosus. Studien zum antiken Prosarhythmus*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, 257 [Wien, 1968], 103–158 or J. Aumont, *Métrique et stylistique des clausules dans la prose latine. De Cicéron à Pline le Jeune et de César à Florus*, *Travaux de linguistique quantitative*. Publiés sous la direction de Charles Muller, 56 [Paris, 1996], 11–58). For a good bibliography on prose rhythm in Neo-Latin, see Marc van der Poel's webpage <http://www.let.ru.nl/m.v.d.poel/BibliographicalAid.htm>.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Kühlmann, *Mutatam genus dicendi* (n. 98 below), 221: Es verschwinden die ciceronischen Klauseln.

<sup>44</sup> Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 76 (see e. g. Quint. Inst. 9, 42, 72).

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, §§ 952/953.

More importantly, *Ante aliquot annos* constitutes a *paean primus* (– ∪ ∪ ∪), according to Aristotle the best way to start a sentence.<sup>46</sup> Another example is ILE 98 10 07 BA in which the sentence *novi et os vidi in Batavis et semper amavi* almost constitutes a full hexameter (only the short syllable *et* deviates from the scheme). Similarly, ILE 98 02 06 R contains a full iambic senarius in *aliter litare se putent in his sacris*. Examples of such rhythmical *faux-pas* are rare in classical literature, and generally interpreted as problematic.<sup>47</sup>

(II.) This aspect, together with a tendency to break the general flow of sentences and texts (cf. *infra*), probably explains why already during his life Lipsius's rhythmicity was criticised. Still, no study has ever really investigated Lipsius's actual practice in, for instance, the *clausulae* of his sentences. Accordingly, I have scanned the eight last syllables of 500 sentences from ILE 98<sup>48</sup> using the method of internal comparison as developed by Janson and Aili in the late 1970s.<sup>49</sup>

#### Distribution (*N*) and probability (*p*) of syllables in all *clausulae*

position	<i>N</i> <sub>long</sub>	<i>p</i> <sub>long</sub>	<i>N</i> <sub>short</sub>	<i>p</i> <sub>short</sub>	<i>N</i> <sub>sum</sub>	<i>p</i> <sub>sum</sub>
7	328	0,656	172	0,344	500	1
6	303	0,606	197	0,394	500	1
5	293	0,586	207	0,414	500	1
4	331	0,662	169	0,338	500	1
3	332	0,664	168	0,336	500	1
2	362	0,724	138	0,276	500	1
final = anceps						

<sup>46</sup> Ar. Rhet. 1409a10.

<sup>47</sup> Mart. Cap. 34, 517 gives several examples from Cicero, who usually pays close attention to his prose rhythm.

<sup>48</sup> I. e. (rhetorical) ILE 98 03 01 A; 98 03 10; 98 05 19; 98 05 27 C; 98 05 31 R; 98 07 10; 98 07 22 M; 98 [07 22] P; (conversational) ILE 98 02 04; 98 02 22 B; 98 03 16 D; 98 03 27 B; 98 04 [13] M; 98 04 22 D; 98 [04 07 / 06 05(?)] ; 98 05 13 M; 98 06 15; 98 08 02 B; 98 08 10; 98 11 21 B; 98 12 03; 98 12 14; 98 12 25 M and (part of) 98 12 25 R. There is (more or less) a fifty-fifty ratio in this corpus between the volume of more rhetorical (or formal) and more conversational (or familiar) letters.

<sup>49</sup> T. Janson, *Prose Rhythm in Medieval Latin from the 9<sup>th</sup> to the 13<sup>th</sup> Century*, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Studia Latina Stockholmiensia, 20 (Stockholm, 1975) and H. Aili, *The prose rhythm of Sallust and Livy*, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Studia Latina Stockholmiensia, 24 (Stockholm, 1979). I owe special thanks to Prof. Dr Tunberg and Miller Stanley Krause for introducing me into this method. The latter's *Prose Rhythm in the Orations and Epistles of Marcus Antonius Muretus*, Lexington (KY): unpublished MA thesis, 2009 is an exemplary treatment of the matter.

Expected and observed frequencies<sup>50</sup> of *clausulae*

	<i>clausulae</i>	expected frequencies (%)	observed frequencies (%)							
			Lips.	Lips.	Cic. Or.	Sall. Cat.	Sall. Iug.	Sen. Ep.	Tac. Dial.	Tac. Agr.
DT	- U - x	16,1040768	16,6	25,3	12,2	10	11	17	16,5	16,4
C+S	- U -   - x	9,521841805	8,4	16,2	3,6	5,2	28,5	18,5	7,5	10
DC	- U -   - U x	3,043743956	3,2	8,3	7,2	5,6	18,5	8	5,5	5,2
PQ+S	U U U -   - x	2,650451788	1,8	2,9	1,8	2,8		2,5	0,5	1,8
PP+S	- U U U   - x	2,062849334	2,2	4,7	1	1	1,5	1	0	0,6
T+PP	- U   - U U x	1,540207785	0,8	2,8	1	1,8	8,5	3	5	3
Tr+PP	U U U   - U U x	0,344477892	0,2	0,1	0,2	0,4		0,5	1	0,2
PP+C	- U U U   - U x	0,662817954	1,2	0,4	0,4	1		1,5	0	0,6
M+C	- - -   - U x	4,308294585	3,4	9,7	3,6	6,2	5	4	4,5	3,2
H	- U   - U x	3,629873395	5,2	4,9	2,8	2		3,5	7,5	5,6
P	U U U x	3,1344768	2,8	2,3	6,8	3,6		2	2,5	4,6
D+C	- U U   - U x	1,554056582	1,4	1,2	1,6	3,2	1	0,5	3	2
D	- U U   - x	4,818281395	5,2	1,9	11,8	12,2	5	2,5	5,5	6
DS	- - - x	31,8247232	33	6,4	23	27,6		20	26,5	22,6
S+Tr	- -   U U x	3,597526195	3,6	1,8	9	9,4		5,5	6,5	8,2
Ch+S	- U U -   - x	4,076583207	4,4	1,4	4,6	3,4		2,5	3,5	2,8
Ch+C	- U U -   - U x	1,298181911	0,8	2,3	1	1,6		0,5	0,5	0,6
C+DT	- U -   - U - x	2,439121926	2,8	4	2,8	1,4	3	3	2	2,8
C+DS	- U -   - - - x	4,820169521	5,2	1,5	4	6,4		4	3	4,6

(III.) These results show several things. First and foremost, we can confirm that in general Lipsius's observed frequencies of metric *clausulae* do not differ much from the expected frequency of such patterns occurring. This

<sup>50</sup> The expected frequency of any of Lipsius's *clausulae* scanning as, e. g. - U U U | - U x = expected probability.  $N_{sum} = 0,00662818 \cdot 500 = 3,314089772$  (in % =  $3,314089772/5 = 0,662817954\%$ ). The expected probability of any of Lipsius's *clausulae* scanning as, e. g. - U U U | - U x =  $p_{7long} \cdot p_{6short} \cdot p_{5short} \cdot p_{4short} \cdot p_{3long} \cdot p_{2short} = 0,656 \cdot 0,394 \cdot 0,414 \cdot 0,338 \cdot 0,664 \cdot 0,276 = 0,00662818$ .

means that there are no significant instances where Lipsius's sentences shows a certain *clausula* more often than said *clausula* is bound to turn up in his writing. Therefore, Lipsius does not consciously look for *clausulae* when ending his sentences. Accordingly his frequencies are very similar to those found in Tacitus (especially in his *Agricola*), who is also said to have been more or less indifferent about metric *clausulae*. Moreover, that Lipsius's frequencies are very close to the natural occurrence of *clausulae* in Latin, does not only mean that he is not Ciceronian in his *numerus*, as was to be expected, but also that he does not consciously imitate Sallust's, Seneca's or even Tacitus's practice in this matter. For, Lipsius does not mirror Sallust's distaste for the (Ciceronian) double trochee or his allowance of a large number of dactylic ends, nor does he follow Seneca's clear predilection for the cretic + spondee or double cretic. And even if his frequencies come close to Tacitus's practice in the *Agricola* or *Annales*, this does not imply that he consciously imitates him. For instance, Tacitus can still be shown to search for the double cretic and to avoid the double spondee, which we do not see in Lipsius.

#### b) Periodic rhythm

(I.) The section on *Repetition* has already shown that Lipsius has a clear tendency to disrupt parallelism, similarity and indeed any form of regular expectation. The same tendency is also present as far as the progression or periodic rhythm of Lipsius's sentences and texts is concerned. When we have a look at the first part of ILE 98 03 04 O, for instance, it appears that several words have been deliberately introduced to interrupt the steady flow of the colon or to upset the balance between two cola:

*Argonautica tua, scite facta, accepi donum a te, mi Orтели, et video nec in languore te languere aut cessare. Nam tristis sane hoc audivi, valetudinem tibi ab aliquot septimanis parum ex nostro et publico voto esse. Sed recuperabis illam veterem, spero, tum tua industria et continentia, tum et benigni Veris auxilio, quod genitrici tuae auras aspirabat. Alioqui homines sumus, id est non diu sumus et, cum vel ad exitum vitae terminum venimus, quam breve id est?*

While subtle, the phenomenon<sup>51</sup> is often noticeable in Lipsius's texts. In general, he regularly appears to use particles, interjections, adverbs, and

<sup>51</sup> This phenomenon closely resembles the so-called 'accumulation of grammatical terms' of Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 109 – 115 who analyses that 'une sorte de disproportion apparaît entre la place qu'ils occupent dans l'énoncé et le rôle qu'ils y jouent (...) nous sommes portés à trouver encombrants (...) des termes grammaticaux même courtes,



other small words or word-units for this purpose, such as *ecce, heus, inquam, etiam, sane*, etc. in contexts where they are not really necessary. Examples are ILE 98 02 04: *In theatro aliquo cum maxime tunc mihi esse videor et spectare non comoediam, sed mimum aut Atellanas*, ILE [98 05 13 / 06 15]: *Locus alter dicat Iuris interpretes in minutis occupari, scrutari in contractibus apices litterarum et puncta verborum, quia nempe ambigua saepe haec ista et ad anteriora aut sequentia ducenda*, or *ibid.*: *De istis avebas discere et quamquam ad quaedam in publico Dictata te remitterem, tamen ecce ipse operam hanc tibi iterum subii et scripto complexus sum quidquid huius rei, pro meo sensu, esset*, where Lipsius seems to avoid ending up in a period by breaking the periodic rhythm with these short words (and also the parenthetical *pro meo sensu*).

(II.) Another technique which contributes to this effect, is Lipsius's tendency to start *in medias res*, both logically and stylistically. This appears, for instance, from the *incipits* of Lipsius's letters. Browsing through Gerlo – Vervliet's *Inventaire*,<sup>52</sup> one finds numerous letters opening with *An, Sed, Denique, Ergo, Itaque, Nam*, etc. which are all (more or less) elements of secondary, enclitic nature, i. e. usually only occurring *after* a pendant such as *utrum (... an), quidem (... sed)*, etc. Lipsius's use of them in an opening position breaks the rhythm of the text even before it has really started, as these words seem to throw the reader into the *apodosis* of a sentence without *protasis*.

### c) Conclusion

In conclusion, we can say that while Cicero, the classical paragon of prose composition, tends towards a more or less regulated prose rhythm, both metrically and periodically – at least in his oratorical writings –, Lipsius shows much more of a tendency to disrupt rhythmical expectation and proportion. In a Ciceronian sentence, the reader half expects a clause to end in one of the familiar *clausulae*, and the sentence to show at least some balance – in whatever proportional distribution – between *protasis* and *apodosis* or main clause and subordinate units. One could almost say that the rhythm of Cicero's Latin is mostly the same and that the only difference between individual sentences or cola is one of *tempo*, i. e. speed, not rhythm. Lipsian

---

s'ils se trouvent accumulés dans une même phrase' (109). The phenomenon seems especially frequent in vulgar and more colloquial Latin (e. g. Cicero's letters, Plautus, Catullus, et al.).

<sup>52</sup> A. Gerlo - H. D. L. Vervliet, *Inventaire de la correspondance de Juste Lipse, 1564 – 1606* (Antwerp, 1968).

rhythmicity, on the other hand, shows no metric regularity, little periodic balance or proportionality of *protasis* and *apodosis* – if there is such a double structure to begin with. There is only arrhythmia, angularity or a jangled rhythm at best, which must indeed have greatly disturbed the ear of many of his Jesuit critics.<sup>53</sup>

### 3. Lexicon

#### 3.1. Vocabulary

In dealing with the particularities of Lipsius's vocabulary, it will be fruitful to distinguish between an analysis of the nature and scope of his lexicon on the one hand, and its functionality and the character it lends to a body of text on the other hand. Whereas the latter aspect will be treated under the section (*Mala Affectatio*) of the textual level, this section deals with the former and analyses the different categories and constituents of Lipsius's lexicon, namely classical vocabulary, archaic and post-classical influences and neologism/*fictio*.

##### a) Classical vocabulary

The first constituent category of Lipsius's vocabulary is the classical lexicon. And while such an observation may seem to state the obvious, it will serve to nuance the great emphasis the *communis opinio* puts on the importance of archaic, learned or rare vocabulary in Lipsius's language. Frequent as they may be, Lipsius by no means systematically uses words from these uncommon registers. When we look at the lexicological category of adverbs, for instance, we may notice that Lipsius sometimes employs the unusual *rare* (ILE 98 02 24) – Varro considered it bad Latin,<sup>54</sup> but it is attested in Lucretius and Columella –, or the Plautine *serio* (ILE 98 02 11), the Plautine and mainly post-Augustan *here* (ILE 98 05 29), or the rare *fortassis* (ILE 98 06 15), yet for the most part, Lipsius simply uses the classical variants *raro*, *serie*, *heri* and *fortasse*. In this way, it appears that Lipsius's vocabulary should not really be called archaic, learned, etc. in nature, even if

<sup>53</sup> For a good survey of references on the stylistic quarrel between the Societas Jesu and Lipsius and the later *Lipsiani*, see R. Ferro, Federico Borromeo ed Ericio Puteano. Cultura e letteratura a Milano agli inizi del Seicento, Accademia di San Carlo, Fonti e studi, 6 (Milan, 2007), 300/301 (esp. n. 51) and particularly H.F. Fullenwider, Die Kritik der deutschen Jesuiten an dem lakonischen Stil des Justus Lipsius im Zusammenhang der jesuitischen Argutia-Bewegung, *Retorica*, 2/1 (1984), 55 – 62.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Varro L.L. ap. Gell. 2, 25, 8.

the percentage of such words is much higher than one would expect in classical Latin.<sup>55</sup>

b) Archaic influences

(I.) The influence of archaic vocabulary on Lipsius's lexicon is quite obvious. In particular his texts (especially the *epistolae*) abound with words and expressions of Plautine origin.<sup>56</sup> To name but a few examples: *porrecta fronte* (ILE 98 08 31) is a *hapax legomenon* from Plautus (actually Plaut. Cas. 281: *porrectiore fronte*). The expression *corde amare* (ILE 98 05 18 M) is classically not attested outside of Plautus, as are words like *consuadeo* (ILE 98 08 02 M). Other examples are less exclusively Plautine, but still significant. *Ilicet* (ILE 98 02 03) is first attested in Plautus and present in Terence and Virgil as well, but never found in classical prose (Caesar, Cicero, Nepos, ...). *Altrinsecus* (ILE 98 02 03) is present in Apuleius and Church Fathers like Lactantius, but much more frequent in Plautus. The expression *bene velle* (ILE 98 09 05) is found in ante-classical poetry in general, but by far most often in Plautus' plays. A word like *peregre* (ILE 98 09 30) is attested in archaic Latin in Naevius, and used by Livy, Cicero, Seneca rhetor, etc., but nowhere as much as in Plautus.

Obviously, Lipsius was well aware of his own predilection for Plautus' lexicon, and so were his correspondents.<sup>57</sup> Accordingly we see that he frequently uses Plautine expressions with explicit reference to the author, as in *De Mil. Rom.* 2, 1: *Dies alter erat et is iam medius atque ad umbilicum mortuus, ut iocatur pater leporum Plautus*. In other cases, Plautus is not mentioned *plenis litteris*, but the context of Latin comedy is still on the background, as in ILE 98 11 21 B: *Sed tamen vereor (immo scio) quod haec fabula suum plaudite semel habebit et inopinato aulaea tollentur et scabella concrepabunt*.<sup>58</sup> Still this should not suggest that Lipsius always consciously used words from the Umbrian playwright.<sup>59</sup> The opposite is more likely, as through years of reading Lipsius would have been completely imbued in the Plautine (and the general archaic) lexicon (cf. *infra*).<sup>60</sup>

<sup>55</sup> For a similar observation on Lipsius's morphology, cf. *infra* under (*Mala*) *Affectatio*.

<sup>56</sup> On Lipsius and Plautus, see M. Van der Poel, Lipsius as a Defender of Plautus, in: Tournoy - De Landtsheer - Papy (eds), *Iustus Lipsius. Europae lumen et columen*, 179 – 185.

<sup>57</sup> In ILE 98 10 25, for instance, Sebastianus Rolliardus, a great admirer of Lipsius and his style, uses quite a few Plautine expressions himself, obviously to please Lipsius.

<sup>58</sup> See e. g. Plaut. Am. fin.: *nunc, spectatores, Iovis summi causa clare plaudite*.

<sup>59</sup> Whether or not this is a deliberate choice is a different issue. For the problematic notion of *Wählbarkeit* of style, advocated by Marouzeau, see Ax, *Sprachstil*, 35 and 43 – 53.

<sup>60</sup> One category of Plautine vocabulary that Lipsius stays away from, is the kind of extreme

(II.) A second archaic influence is that of the so-called *antiquarii*, who imitated Plautus, Terence,<sup>61</sup> Varro and other representatives of early Latin. Of these writers – the traditional triumvirate is Apuleius, Aulus Gellius and Fronto –, especially Apuleius seems to have had an influence on Lipsius.<sup>62</sup> Charles Nisard even went as far as identifying an Apuleian *mania* in Lipsius.<sup>63</sup> While this is surely exaggerated, we do indeed notice several instances of Apuleianism in Lipsius's lexicon. Tournoy - Tunberg, for instance, have shown that Lipsius's use of *se penetrare* is not a Germanism, as Löfstedt would have it,<sup>64</sup> but typical of Apuleius and the *antiquarii*.<sup>65</sup> His use of *scaevus* in *Saturn.* 1, 1 and the nominative *vegetis* instead of *vegetus* in *De Mil. Rom.*, praef. is Apuleian as well, and in ILE 98 02 22 B we even see Lipsius preferring the Apuleian *cavillum* over the Plautine *cavilla*. The personal use of *adlubescere* in ILE 98 09 07 M is exclusively Apuleian. *Quaquaversus* of ILE 98 09 30 is in classical Latin only attested in Apuleius and still only very rare in Christian times or Neo-Latin. The same can be said about *devergere* (ILE VIII, 98 08 09 C; once in Tertullian as well). *Ultro-neus* (ILE VIII, 95 08 14 R) is another favourite word of Apuleius, but became more popular in Christian times (esp. Hieronymus, Cassiodorus, Beda) and Neo-Latin.

Influence exercised by Aulus Gellius is found, for instance, in ILE VIII, 95 07 16 M, where Lipsius uses the latinized *diatribis*, a *hapax legomenon* from Aulus Gellius. A similar example may be ILE VIII, 95 07 15 H<sup>2</sup> with *isagogen*, another *hapax*, but also attested in later times (Cassiodorus, Isidorus Hispalensis, ...). Still, the significance of Aulus Gellius as a lexicological

---

word composition one finds in the famous example Pers. 702 – 705: *Vanioloquidorus, Virginesvendonides, | Nugiepiloquides, Argentumextenebronides, | (...)*; on which see Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 136 – 138.

<sup>61</sup> Specific influence of Terence in Lipsius is hard to detect, as expressions are often common in both Terence and Plautus, so that it might be more likely that Lipsius knew them from the latter author (e. g. *arioli* in ILE VIII, 95 08 06 L or *logi* in ILE XIV, 01 04 23 C are frequent in both authors).

<sup>62</sup> Influence of Fronto is non-existent, as apart from some spurious material, nothing of his hand was known in Early Modern times. What remains of his writings was only discovered by A. Mai in 1815.

<sup>63</sup> C. Nisard, *Le triumvirat littéraire au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Juste Lipse, Joseph Scaliger et Isaac Casaubon (Paris, 1852), 41. On Apuleianism North of the Alps, see my *Apuleianismus Transalpinus: Fact or Fiction?*, *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance. Travaux et Documents* 73/1 (2011), 7 – 31.

<sup>64</sup> Löfstedt, *Zu Justus Lipsius' Briefen*, 75.

<sup>65</sup> G. Tournoy - T. Tunberg, *On the Margins of Latinity? Neo-Latin and the Vernacular Languages*, *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 45 (1996), 155/156.

influence on Lipsius does not reside in individual words. Much more important is that an archaizer such as Lipsius would have found a general source of archaic inspiration and information in the *Noctes Atticae*. Accordingly, we notice how he eagerly employs the work throughout his literary corpus. In ILE 96 04 22, for instance, he uses the epitheton *trisaeclesenex* for Nestor, a word from Laevius, which is only known through Gellius (Laev. ap. Gell. 19, 7). The same happens in ILE [98 05 13 / 06 15], with his use of *novicius*, a word from Alfenius, again known exclusively through Gellius (Alfen. ap. Gell. 6, 5, 1).

(III.) Finally, it should be noted that Lipsius's archaic influences are by no means limited to Plautus and the *antiquarii*. On the contrary, we see him employing words and expressions from Varro (as *mutuiter amare* in ILE I, 80 04 11),<sup>66</sup> Quintus Novius (*panno purpuram* in ILE II, 84 01 03 G),<sup>67</sup> Lucretius (*hilum* in ILE 98 05 31 R), Accius (*redhostire* in ILE VIII, 95 06 11 O) or Lucilius (*austellus*, in ILE VIII, 95 05 27 B). Still, there is a clear difference in usage between material from Plautus and the *antiquarii* on the one hand, and other archaic vocabulary. Whereas Lipsius mostly draws from the former category unconsciously, as an automatic dimension of his *copia verborum* (cf. *infra*), material from Ennius, Lucretius and others is more often used in the form of quotations, or at least fairly literal allusions,<sup>68</sup> and therefore an element of more deliberate stylistic *ornatus*.

### c) Post-classical influences

From his allowance of the archaic lexicon besides the classical one, it already appears that Lipsius supported a lexical freedom which the *Ciceronis simii* would not allow. In the same vein, he freely admits words of post-classical nature in his texts,<sup>69</sup> although less frequently than archaic words. This post-classical dimension of Lipsius's vocabulary is of a very large range: from the rare *effigiaturus* (first attested as future participle since Apuleius, e. g. *Flor.*, 1) and *subsultim*, a *hapax* from Suetonius (ILE XIII, [00] 00 00), early Christian usage such as the diminutive *verbulum* (*De Mil.*

<sup>66</sup> Löfstedt, Zu Justus Lipsius' Briefen, 72.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

<sup>68</sup> ILE VIII, 95 04 21 M, for instance, abounds with quotations from Ennius.

<sup>69</sup> One might suspect that someone who spent his entire life studying the texts of Tacitus and Seneca should reasonably show influence in his vocabulary of these two authors. However likely such an assumption may be, it is difficult to prove. Rare, unequivocal examples are found in ILE XIV, 01 10 13 V: *turbamentum* (only attested in Sallust, Tacitus and Ammianus Marcellinus) or [01] 11 05 V: *turturillas* (a *hapax* from Sen. Ep. 96, 5).

*Rom.*, 4, 1, first in Pseud.-Augustin. ep. 18), over medieval words such as *vagarius* (ILE VI, [93] 06 14 H), to vocabulary frequent in Neo-Latin: *adstes* (ILE XIII, [00] 00 00).<sup>70</sup>

#### d) Neologism and *fictio*<sup>71</sup>

The second edition of Hoven and Grailet's *Lexique de la Prose latine de la Renaissance*<sup>72</sup> – which checked ILE I–III, V–VII, XIII and tomes I, III/IV of Lipsius's 1637 *Opera Omnia* – contains over 150 entries of words which are only attested in Lipsius. Whether these are true neologisms, i. e. coined by Lipsius, or whether he might have known them from other sources, is difficult to decide on due to our partial knowledge of and access to the complete body of Neo-Latin texts. On a rare occasion, we have some indication that Lipsius himself invented a word, as might be the case with *catapulticus* ('launched from a catapult'),<sup>73</sup> as the adjective of *catapulta*, instead of the existing *catapultarius*, as attested in Plaut. Curc. 689. Had Lipsius remembered this passage from his beloved Plautus, he would perhaps not have felt the need to invent *catapulticus* instead of the Plautine *catapultarius*.

When we try to get a general picture, we can at least state that Lipsius frequently uses words which could be new to the Neo-Latin language.<sup>74</sup> These include normal or so-called 'plausible' cases of *fictio* such as *diminutiva* (e. g. *deunculus*)<sup>75</sup> or compositions (e. g. *semiluna*), transliterations of Greek words such as *aristocraticus*, or the usage of ancient words with new meanings, such as *subducere* ('to underline'). Moreover, Lipsius often coins adverbs in *-tim* (e. g. *dentatim*) and derivations in *-turire*.<sup>76</sup>

#### e) Conclusion

In conclusion, we can state that Lipsius's vocabulary shows a very wide lexical range, which is not hampered by traditional classicist or Ciceronian reservations. It will be stressed in the section on (*Mala*) *Affectatio* that this

<sup>70</sup> Tunberg, Observations, 171 and 173.

<sup>71</sup> On neologisms, see e. g. Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik, §§ 547–551; Hofmann-Szantyr, Stilistik, § 29 or Landfester, Einführung in die Stilistik, 68–78.

<sup>72</sup> R. Hoven, *Lexique de la prose latine de la Renaissance // Dictionary of Renaissance Latin from prose sources*, second, revised, and significantly expanded edition, assisted by L. Grailet, English translation by C. Maas, revised by K. Renard-Jadoul (Leiden-Boston, 2006). – I thank my good friend Laurent Grailet for granting me digital access to part of the *Lexique*'s data.

<sup>73</sup> See Hoven-Grailet, *Lexique de la prose latine de la Renaissance*, sub voce.

<sup>74</sup> See also Tunberg, Observations, 171/172 and Löfstedt, Zu Justus Lipsius' Briefen, 75–77.

<sup>75</sup> *Deunculus* is present in ThLL, but as an adjective, and only in *glossaria*.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Löfstedt, Zu Justus Lipsius' Briefen, 77 for examples.

wide *copia verborum* more often than not serves the functionality of Lipsius's *electio verborum*, which makes this element of his style more than a whimsical inclination towards Plautine vocabulary, learned words or neologisms. At any point in time, Lipsius seems to have had the vocabulary of the whole Latinity at hand, which he exploited to the fullest extent. A final example to illustrate this point is the *Oratio Ciceronis in Correctores* from Lipsius's Menippean satire *Somnium*. In the *ad lectorem* of the work Lipsius warns his readers that such inserted *Orationes* closely follow the style of the speaker: *Orationes, quae insitae, proxime ad stylum cuiusque, ut potui, effinxi*. However, let us consider Cicero's oration for a moment:

*Etsi meae partes sunt, P[atres] C[onscripti], magis exquirendae sententiae, quam dicendae, tamen in hac tanta re publica quae agitur, necessario praedicenda quaedam videntur. Memoria tenetis, quod gaudium omnium nostrum fuerit, cum ante paucos annos in Europa renatum vidimus nomen litterarum. Legebamur, colebamur, e situ et tenebris eruebamur: adnitente in Italia Leone, in Galliis Francisco, divina quadam virtute viris. Quid multa? In spem, immo fiduciam ingressi eramus recipendae pristinae dignitatis, cum ecce exortum est genus hominum audax, inquires, ambitiosum, qui Correctores se dicunt. Incredibile est, P[atres] C[onscripti], quam stragem et quam late dederit ista lues. Philosophi Rhetoresque olim a maioribus nostris urbe pulsati sunt ob suspicionem non maleficae, sed novitiae doctrinae. Nos Tarquinius istos impune grassari patiemur? At enim nequid praeter legem, inquiunt, et clementiam maiorum. Habemus vero, P[atres] C[onscripti], habemus eiusmodi legem, sed tamquam gladium in vagina reconditum, cuius aciem patimur hebescere. An non lex Cornelia de sicariis est? Non sicarii isti? Quoties ergo prehensi cum stilo et telo sunt vocis iugulandae caussae? Sedete et exspectate exemplum Caligulae, ut graphiis in Curia discerpant unum aliquem Senatorem. Augeo haec scilicet et invidiae flammam subicio viris bonis. Utinam? Sed quis ex istis nos adit, nos legit, nisi urendi secandique caussa? Id enim vocant corrigere. Hoc rectum est, hoc non rectum. Hoc non implet aures meas. Hoc non Latinum, etiamsi Cicero ita locutus sit. Stigmatias hic locus, hic mutilus. Bene et in tempore acclamastis, P[atres] C[onscripti], crucem illis. Postremi hominum, vos consularibus viris, claris per tot imagines maiorum, frontem faciemque signetis per ludum et iocum? Nosipsi, P[atres] C[onscripti], quoties istorum telis et insidiis appetiti sumus? A viginti iam annis Correctorum notis distrahor, laceror, et minutis ictibus cottidie ferior, ut sentiam me mori. Nam illud miserimum est, quod honeste saltem occumbere non licet et defungi una plaga. Thuscus aliquis in me saevit; Thusco successit Venetus; illi Gallus; Gallo*

*nescioquis e Frisiis et Thuringis. Et tamen hi hostes nostri inter nos vivunt. Vivunt? Immo etiam in Senatum veniunt, notant et designant oculis ad lanienam unumquemque nostrum. O Dii immortales, in qua urbe vivimus? Hic, hic sunt, in hoc ipso consessu nostro, qui de meo vestrumque omnium exitio cogitarunt.*

It is striking that while Lipsius does indeed do his best to mimic Cicero's style, composition and rhythm,<sup>77</sup> and winks at more than a few Ciceronian *loci*,<sup>78</sup> several words and expressions nevertheless strike one as un-Ciceronian (as do some other aspects of composition<sup>79</sup>). *Fiduciam ingredi* with a *gerundivum*, for instance, is an expression not attested in Cicero.<sup>80</sup> The singular *strages* is found only once in his prose (it is absent from Caesar), as is *lues*. The verb *grassari* is not attested in either Cicero or Caesar, as is the adjective *inquires* which is found in Sallust, Tacitus and Apuleius. The expression *in tempore*, for 'at the proper time, in time', seems an un-Ciceronian alternative for *mature* or *opportune*.

In particular, though, the Plautine word *laniena*, not attested in Cicero, is conspicuous, especially since it was jammed into a semi-quotation of passages from the Arpinate (Cic. Cat. 1, 2 and 1, 9). In this way, it appears that while Lipsius tried to produce a Ciceronian style, he was still unable to shut down his instinct to use expressive words from all eras of Latinity or to prevent some of his characteristic *compositio* to surface.<sup>81</sup> In a lecture on Lipsius's style, Dirk Sacré has ventured the thought that Lipsius turned away from Ciceronian writing simply because he was unable to produce a strict Ciceronian idiom. This might be true, although the motivation for this choice is

<sup>77</sup> Lipsius seems to have paid attention to Ciceronian *numerus* in this *oratiuncula*. See e. g. cretic + dichoree in *praedicēndā quaēdām vidēntur* or *urendī sēcāndiquē caūssa*; molossus + dichoree in *vidimūs nōmēn lītterārum* or *lanienām unūmquēmquē nōstrum*; cretic + spondee in *aliquēm Sēnātōrem*; and double cretic in *appētītī sūmus* or *sēntiām mē mōri*.

<sup>78</sup> The most obvious are, of course, the references to Cic. Cat. 1 (esp. 1, 2; 1, 4 and 1, 9).

<sup>79</sup> Consider, for instance, the very Lipsian *inconcinntas* of the phrase *quam stragem et quam late dederit ista lues* or the 'legal' sounding *brevitas* in *At enim nequid praeter legem, inquit, et clementiam maiorum*, which somewhat reminds one of the style of the *Senatusconsultum de Bacchanalibus* and similar juridical texts.

<sup>80</sup> In general, Lipsius seems to like the *gerundivum* and its possibilities for concision, which inspire him to use it in less straightforward syntactic contexts; see e. g. the *dativus finalis* in ILE 98 05 27 C: (...) *in adflicto hoc rei Christianae statu nuper maximos duos Reges pacificasti atque utinam inter se iunctos religioni et reipublicae instaurandae!*

<sup>81</sup> Other literary considerations, such as Lipsius trying to demonstrate the Erasmian argument 'Were Cicero here with us, he would use different words today than in his time', could also be at the background.



probably not Lipsius's lack of knowledge of Ciceronian Latin,<sup>82</sup> but rather his unwillingness to lose the full expressiveness and *copia* of the Latin language.

### 3.2. Figurative language

#### a) Maritime imagery

Most conspicuous in Lipsius's use of figurative language is the dominance of one range of imagery. Besides images of a military,<sup>83</sup> natural or religious kind, especially those from the maritime world or nautical sphere are frequent.<sup>84</sup> One example will immediately elucidate the way in which Lipsius most often employs the image of the sea: *Est mare quoddam haec vita. Fluctus in ea assidui, saepe tempestates, et iterum malacia aliqua et tranquillitas distinguit. Felices, qui, ut periti et duriores nautae, assueverunt nec ad singulas concussiones nauseant et aegrescunt.*<sup>85</sup>

For Lipsius the sea is always a markedly negative element of uncertainty, unrest and danger – an attitude which he seems to share (whether or not deliberately, one cannot tell) with Horace and Tibullus. These two poets, who obviously had tremendous influence on all stages of later Latinity, show a negative attitude towards the sea,<sup>86</sup> which seems Greek rather than truly Roman.<sup>87</sup> Nevertheless, the Romans loved the land more than the sea,<sup>88</sup> and especially the image of the shipwreck(ed) – again far from uncommon in Lipsius<sup>89</sup> – is universally portrayed as horrendous.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>82</sup> When in doubt, one should read his sharp observations on Cicero in the *Variae Lectiones* or in his judgement on the authenticity of the *Consolatio*.

<sup>83</sup> Cp. A. U. Sommer, *Vivere militare est*. Die Funktion und philosophische Tragweite militärischer Metaphern bei Seneca und Lipsius, *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte*, 43 (2001), 59 – 82.

<sup>84</sup> Cp. M. Morford, Lipsius's 1605 Edition of Seneca, in J. De Landtsheer-Delsaerdt (eds), *Iam illustravit omnia*. Justus Lipsius als lievelingsauteur van het Plantijnse Huis (Antwerp, 2006 [= De Gulden Passer, 84]), 245, n. 23 and Rühl, Lipsius und Gryphius: ein Vergleich (Berlin: Unpublished PhD thesis, 1967), 82 – 87.

<sup>85</sup> ILE 98 08 04.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. E. De Saint-Denis, *Le Rôle de la Mer dans la Poésie Latine* (Paris, 1935), 283 – 285 and 298 – 299.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 300 – 302. Other Latin poets portray the sea in a frame of sentimentality and luxury (Catullus) or of general great fascination (Virgil, Ovid, Seneca).

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 480 and 483.

<sup>89</sup> See e. g. ILE 98 08 02 T: *ne in virtutum et artium bonarum isto naufragio diutius iactaretur* or XIII, 00 01 01: *Subinde e Musarum amoenis viretis ad mare eo aut ad litus, ut sic dicam, legum et ruptas disiectasque naufragi iuris tabulas rimor.*

<sup>90</sup> De Saint-Denis, *Le Rôle de la Mer dans la Poésie Latine*, 481.

Having a look at only a few examples of such nautical imagery will immediately show how fond Lipsius was of it, using it for all themes that were dear to him. In ILE VII, 94 11 02 T, for instance, he calls upon it to express a core element of Stoicism: (...) *ut meae quidem res atque et[iam] spes sunt, qui modica optavi semper et in hoc vitae cursu legi, ut sic dicam, litus.*<sup>91</sup> Lipsius also very often uses the image in a political context, which is hardly surprising since the classical *topos* of the Ship of State<sup>92</sup> aids such a connection. In ILE I, 82 03 15 S, for instance, the context is the struggle of the Low Countries: *Nam nos in Batavis agimus apud Oceanum, vere undosum, iactati publica tempestate tibi non ignota.* Lipsius's delicate health, another of his ubiquitous subjects, also frequently inspires him to use nautical imagery, as in ILE 98 04 22 D: *Sane deficere incipio et faticere et cymba nostra spectat portum.* Or, when advising his former students, we find the same usage, as in ILE 98 09 05: *Ut enim maior dolor est, cum navis onusta perit et in ipso portu, sic nobis iure, si tu ad alia eas aut mutes, qui in virtute et litteris sic promovisti.*

#### b) Formal observations

First of all, it need not surprise that Lipsius uses the *metaphora* more often than the comparison.<sup>93</sup> Lausberg, with Quintilian and Cicero, explains the technique as 'die *brevitas*-Form des Vergleichs',<sup>94</sup> which makes it much more fitting in Lipsius's concise style than the longer *simile*. That is not to say that the latter technique is not found. In fact, the difference is not too marked, yet still several scholars have concluded that Lipsius's language is richer in metaphor than in comparison.<sup>95</sup>

<sup>91</sup> See ILE VII, 94 11 02 T, 5 for the Stoic background of *litus*.

<sup>92</sup> See (mainly) Alc. fr. 6 and 208a; Plato, Republic, book 6 and Hor. C. 1, 14. Another well-known instance of the use of nautical imagery in describing political circumstances is Cic. Clu. 138: *Ex quo intellegi potuit id quod saepe dictum est: ut mare, quod sua natura tranquillum sit, ventorum vi agitari atque turbari, sic populum Romanum sua sponte esse placatum, hominum seditiosorum vocibus ut violentissimis tempestatibus concitari.*

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik, §§ 558 – 564.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, 285. Landfester, Einführung in die Stilistik, 88/89 speaks similarly of the 'der paradoxe Charakter' of the *metaphora*, in which he also situates its aesthetic value.

<sup>95</sup> See e. g. Croll, *Juste Lipse et le Mouvement Anticicéronien*, 30 (in his opinion a typically 17<sup>th</sup>-century technique) or A. Borowski, *Justus Lipsius and the Classical Tradition in Poland*, in: G. Tournoy - J. De Landtsheer - J. Papy (eds), *Iustus Lipsius. Europae lumen et columnen*. Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven 17 – 19 September 1997, Suppl. Humanistica Lovaniensia, 15 (Leuven, 1999), 7. Lipsian metonymy is not explicitly discussed in this section, as it is not very conspicuous. However, some metonymical elements will return in Croll's analysis of the *stile coupé* (1.A.3.c – d), cf. *infra Compositio*.

Furthermore, Lipsius's use of figurative language hardly ever comes across as construed or far-fetched. On the contrary, as will be concluded with regard to some elements of his lexical usage (cf. infra (*Mala Affectatio*)), Lipsius takes care to embed his imagery in the semantic framework of his text, in other words: it is used isotopically.<sup>96</sup> In ILE 98 03 27 S, for instance, he writes: *Et in eorum scriptis vestigia notamus maioris cuiusdam pedis. Nobis non hoc, non proximum datum: μονάμπυκες πῶλοι sumus, ut ait ille, et soli peragimus hunc cursum.* All three images (*vestigia ... pedis; μονάμπυκες πῶλοι* and *cursum*) belong to the same equine sphere. The same can be noticed in the dedicatory letter of his *De Militia Romana* (ILE VIII, [95 04 21] P), where we read:

*Praeest iamdiu maximus Regum pater tuus tot regnis; in utroque orbe iura reddit, veteri et novo; atque ecce novam ad potentiam viam fortuna nuper aperuit, adiecta Lusitania: quae sola adhuc lacinia deerat pulcherrimae et solidae Hispaniarum vesti. Adsuta est, et una cum ea Africae et Asiae portus et insulae (...).*

*Lacinia* and *vesti* are both part of the semantic sphere of clothing, and rather obvious, but one wonders how many contemporary writers would have continued the metaphor into *adsuta est*, and not simply repeated *adiecta est*?

## 4. Syntax

### 4.1. Brevitas

Brevity is arguably one of the most conspicuous characteristic of Lipsius's style and without doubt the one most insisted upon by readers<sup>97</sup> and scholars.<sup>98</sup> In 1598 already Sébastien Rolliard spoke about Lipsius's *prae-*

<sup>96</sup> Strictly speaking, this element belongs to the textual level (cf. 5. Text).

<sup>97</sup> See e. g. an unedited letter from Franciscus Clevius (?) to Johannes Heurnius (dated 28 August 1592): *Stilum eius ut nimis concisum, et ut sic dicam totum gemmeum, non (quod decentius est) gemmis distinctum, pauci ex iis quos ego novi, probabant* (Leiden, Univ. Lib., ms. March 3 [C]). I thank my colleague Dr Jeanine De Landtsheer for sharing this text with me.

<sup>98</sup> See e. g. W. Kühlmann, *Mutatum genus dicendi: Klassizismus und Modernismus in der Stildiskussion des Späthumanismus*, in: Id., *Fürstenstaat und Gelehrtenpolitik. Entwicklung und Kritik des deutschen Späthumanismus in der Literatur des Barockzeitalters, Studien und Texte zur Sozialgeschichte der Literatur*, 3 (Tübingen, 1982), 220/221; Fullenwider, *Erasmus, Lipsius and the stilus laconicus*, 66 and particularly J. Jansen, *Brevitas. Beschouwingen over de beknoptheid van vorm en stijl in de Renaissance* (Hilversum, 1995), 2 vols.

*cellenti stilo, qui Laconicae cuspidis instar viam sibi, quacumque non inveni-  
nerit, facit* (ILE 98 10 29). This is an early example of an interpretatorial  
tradition that is responsible for the *stilus Lipsianus* to be dubbed ‘Spartan’ or  
‘Laconic’, an association which Lipsius himself never made.<sup>99</sup> Still, in his  
own reflections on style, such as ILE I, 77 06 13; II, 86 04 01 VI, or chapter  
7 of his *Institutio Epistolica*, Lipsius himself testified to the great importance  
of brevity in his stylistic ideas, albeit often warning against excesses.<sup>100</sup> In-  
deed, the shortness of the Lipsian style even prompted Federico Borromeo to  
liken the *Lipsiani* to asthmatics who lack the air to complete a full sen-  
tence.<sup>101</sup> Yet for all its notoriety, this supposed key notion of Lipsius’s style,  
remains a vague concept in more than one respect.

For one, the terminology used in theoretical treatments of the concept is  
manifold and confusing. Ancient literary theory does not treat it as a separate  
quality of style – except for the Stoic tradition –, but still identifies its effects  
in authors like Sallust, Seneca or Tacitus. In the modern tradition – in par-  
ticular the book of Jansen – a dichotomy is made between *perspicua* and  
*obscura brevitatis*,<sup>102</sup> the former being used for Horatian and Senecan (even  
Ciceronian) concision, and the latter for Sallust’s and Tacitus’ truncation.<sup>103</sup>  
In the case of Lipsius, both have been used to describe his style, together  
with other appellations, such as ‘charming’, ‘pregnant’ or ‘sententious’ bre-  
vity. Such identifications have led to Lipsius’s *brevitas* being categorized as  
Senecan or Tacitean by Croll and Wilkinson respectively, whereas people

<sup>99</sup> Fullenwider, Erasmus, Lipsius and the *stilus laconicus*, 66. Cp. Id., Die Kritik der deut-  
schen Jesuiten an dem lakonischen Stil.

<sup>100</sup> Cp. with Lipsius’s statements in his autobiographical ILE 03 11 03 to Johannes Woverius:  
(...) *Eloquentiam: quae in sermone aut stilo aliqua fuit, atque ea facilis et profluens,  
quod in stricta et arguta brevitate nec habeat quivis nec credat. Illa ipsa brevitatis, quod  
imputo, sine tenebris fuit: et multa paucis sic dixi, ut influant et se diffundant, et vel plura  
videar dixisse.*

<sup>101</sup> Borromeo, *Miscellanea adnotationum variarum*, 120: *Questi lipsiani, nello stile gli  
comparo agli asmatici che non hanno fiato che basti per finire un periodo* and Id., *De  
absoluta Collegii Ambrosiani in litteris institutione*, 66: *Hinc qui eiusmodi brevitate utun-  
tur, a quodam asmaticis recte comparantur, qui spiritum difficulter excipiunt*, as cited in  
Ferro, *Federico Borromeo ed Erico Puteano*, 279 and 309 respectively.

<sup>102</sup> See mainly Jansen, *Brevitas*, 1, 62 et passim.

<sup>103</sup> On *obscuritas* in ancient literary theory, see e. g. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen  
Rhetorik*, 436 or Kivistö, *The Concept of Obscurity in Humanist Polemics of the Early  
Sixteenth Century*, in: R. Schnur, et al. (eds), *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Bonnensis. Pro-  
ceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies Bonn 3–9 August  
2003, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies*, 315 (Tempe (AZ), 2006), 429–438.

like Mouchel or Jansen speak of an emphatic brevity which seems to combine components of both.<sup>104</sup>

Secondly, the term *brevitas* covers a multitude of linguistic realisations of concision. In oratorical manuals<sup>105</sup> we find a whole series of *figurae* (both *figurae elocutionis* and *figurae sententiae*) that are explained as techniques of *breviloquentia* or *brachylogia*, such as *asyndeton*, *zeugma*, *ellipsis/syllipsis*, *percurtio*, *praeteritio*, *reticentia*, etc. Jansen has tried to group them into three categories, distinguishing between an inventional (brevity of content), dispositional (brevity of organisation) and elocutional (brevity of words) type, but still the difference remains somewhat unclear.<sup>106</sup>

Finally, brevity is also a problematic notion in the history of literary criticism. It has clear ties with the Stoic tradition<sup>107</sup> and the ancient controversy between Asiaticism and Atticism, and in the Early Modern debate it was

<sup>104</sup> C. Mouchel, *Lipse et le style de l'adhérence*, in: Id., *Cicéron et Sénèque dans la rhétorique de la Renaissance*, *Ars Rhetorica*, 3 (Marburg-Lahn, 1990), 197/198 and Jansen, *Brevitas*, 1, 174/175.

<sup>105</sup> See e. g. Hofmann-Szantyr, *Stilistik*, §§ 52–57 (Einfachheit und Kürze) or Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, §§ 688–711 and 880–889. For an Early Modern point of view, see D. Carabin, *Henri Estienne, érudit, novateur, polémiste: étude sur Ad Senecae lectionem proodopoeiae*, *Études et essais sur la Renaissance*, 66 (Paris, 2006), 215–223 (Aspects de la brieveté) who describes the different types of brevity that Estienne analysed in his *Ad Senecae Lectionem proodopoeiae*.

<sup>106</sup> Jansen, *Brevitas*, 1, 62–65. Cicero explains the difference between dispositional and elocutional brevity very clearly as follows: *ac multos imitatio brevitatis decipit, ut, cum se breves putent esse, longissimi sint; cum dent operam, ut res multas brevi dicant, non ut omnino paucas res dicant et non plures, quam necesse sit. Nam plerisque breviter videtur dicere, qui ita dicit: 'Accessi ad aedes. Puerum vocavi. Respondit. Quaesivi dominum. Domi negavit esse'. Hic, tametsi tot res brevius non potuit dicere, tamen, quia satis fuit dixisse: 'Domi negavit esse', fit rerum multitudine longus. Quare hoc quoque in genere vitanda est brevitatis imitatio et non minus rerum non necessariorum quam verborum multitudine supersedendum est* (Cic. *Inv.* 1, 20, 28). While it keenly illustrates the difference between *dispositio* and *elocutio*, Cicero's example also shows that absence of dispositional brevity need not imply absence of elocutional brevity. Stylistically (= elocutionally) speaking, the sentence *Accessi ad aedes* is just as concise as *Domi negavit esse*. Of course, the line between both types of brevity – which is essentially based on whether two expressions are (completely) synonymous or not, i. e. whether or not a new topic is opened – can remain rather vague.

<sup>107</sup> A. D. Leeman, *Orationis Ratio. The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians and Philosophers* (Amsterdam, 1963), 1, 39. In traditional Latin rhetorics, *brevitas* is not a *virtus dicendi* (unless as a dispositional quality of the *narratio*), and more often connected with the *vitium* of *obscuritas* (cf. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, § 1068).

hardly a neutral concept either.<sup>108</sup> Modern scholarly literature involves the concept with (seemingly) contradictory psycholinguistic considerations of vividness and spontaneity versus intellectualism and rhetorics.<sup>109</sup>

In view of this terminological and theoretical confusion, the aim of this section is to offer a cross-section of the different stylistic forms and shapes in which Lipsius's brevity occurs. In this way, only elocutional brevity will be treated, i. e. brevity as the occurrence of fewer words where more were expected. Dispositional or intentional brevity will only be discussed in their relation to elocutional *brevitas* (cf. infra). Evidently, these other types can (but need not) go hand in hand with elocutional *brevitas*. Lipsius's regularly used formula *plura coram*, for instance, is a combination of elocutional brevity (it is short for *plura coram deliberabimus* or something along those lines), dispositional brevity (Lipsius signals that he will not say more on this theme)<sup>110</sup> and intentional brevity (Lipsius states that this topic will not be dealt with).

#### a) Techniques of concision

(I.) Of the different techniques Lipsius uses to produce an effect of *breviloquentia*, ellipsis<sup>111</sup> is the most prominent, being noted by scholars like Croll, Williamson, Morford, Chatelain, and others.<sup>112</sup> Lipsius's texts abound with ellipses of all kinds of words, not only of implied or easily supplied elements (such as instances of *esse* or the personal pronoun) – where the Latin language naturally allows a substantial level of ellipsis –, but also of other words where ellipsis is more unusual. It occurs in various degrees as well, both quantitatively (i. e. how many or how often words need to be supplied) and qualitatively speaking (i. e. how much ellipsis deviates from the expected plenitude of form). Examples range from a very classical type like

<sup>108</sup> See e. g. Er. Adag. 2, 1, 92; 2, 10, 49; 4, 5, 25.

<sup>109</sup> See Mouchel, *Lipse et le style de l'adhérence*.

<sup>110</sup> An important element of dispositional *brevitas* in Lipsius's technique is his use of *sententiae, exempla*, maxims, citations, etc., in short a marked aphoristic tendency.

<sup>111</sup> In the following discussion of ellipsis, we do not distinguish between ellipsis and zeugma, as e. g. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, §§ 688–708 does. Both 'Suspensive *detractio*' (ellipsis) and 'Klammerbildende *detractio*' (zeugma) have the same basic technical (*detractio*) and stylistic (*brevitas*) characteristics.

<sup>112</sup> Croll, *Style, Rhetoric, and Rhythm*; Williamson, *Lipsius his Hopping Style*; M. Morford, *Stoics and Neostoics: Rubens and the Circle of Lipsius* (Princeton, 1991), 77 and J.M. Chatelain, *Juste Lipse cicéronien: rhétorique et politique de l'éloge du Cardinal de Granvelle dans les *Variae lectiones**, in: C. Mouchel (ed.), *Juste Lipse (1547–1606) en son temps. Actes du colloque de Strasbourg, 1994, Colloques, congrès et conférences sur la Renaissance*, 6 (Paris, 1996).

*Vale, mi Scaliger, et non moris aut dicis caussa tuum ama* (ILE 98 07 04, [me] tuum), over the slightly more elliptic *Tacita obiurgatione te verbero, quod illic tamdiu et tam prope et sine adloquio nostri* (ILE 98 02 06 R, quod ... [fuisti]), to extreme cases such as *Mihi nefas sit hunc dimittere sine litterulis, etsi properantem; subito enim eunt, qui cum praesidio eunt et paucis ante horis gnari* (ILE VI, [93] 05 15 D, [tantummodo] paucis ante horis gnari [fuerunt sibi proficiscendum esse]).<sup>113</sup> In such cases, it is sometimes difficult to decide whether or not even to suppose a misprint. In ILE XIV, 01 03 22 AU, 6 the editor raised this question about the sentence *Magni oneris aut avocamenti numquam imponam*, where she suggests [*Quicquam*] *Magni oneris* .... Indeed, such a case can be interpreted as ellipsis, but one clearly sees how thin the line is between elliptical and incorrect Latin.<sup>114</sup>

Finally, we can identify a very specific language usage which borders the technique of ellipsis, namely Lipsius's use of *etsi* or *quamquam*<sup>115</sup> with participia, adjectives, adverbs, etc., instead of *etsi* or *quamquam* introducing a full subordinate sentence. Traditional grammar states that this occurs only sporadically in classical Latin, yet often in later Latin.<sup>116</sup> With Lipsius, it seems almost a general rule not to express a verb with *etsi* or *quamquam*, either by using them with participia etc. (e. g. *De Const.* 2, 4: '*Quam* [sc. *vitam*] *utinam parte aliqua imitari mihi fas et per vestigia ista serpere, etsi longo intervallo*) or by using ellipsis in the subordinate clause (e. g. *De Amphit.* 3: (...) *Romam dico, cuius reliquias et velut cineres adhuc vides, etsi crematae non uno busto, eversae non uno fato*).

<sup>113</sup> Example from Tunberg, *Observations*, 177.

<sup>114</sup> Gaspar Schoppe in his *Minerva Sanctiana* rejects such ellipses (type *Ego amo Dei*, i. e. [*praeeptum*] or something similar) as ungrammatical Latin (cf. G. Scioppius, *Minerva Sanctiana. Hoc est Francisci Sanctii Brocensis de Causis linguae Latinae Commentarius cum Observationum Scioppianarum Auctario* [Padua, 1663], 262). Schoppe is not explicitly referring to Lipsius here, but knowing his background and position towards Lipsius, one does strongly feel he is thinking of Lipsian concision. For Schoppe's very bulky treatment of the phenomenon ellipsis, see *ibid.*, 262–376.

<sup>115</sup> It is striking to find that Lipsius largely prefers *etsi* over *quamquam* (e. g. 61 vs 10 in *De Mil. Rom.*). Nevertheless, authors such as Sallust, Seneca or Tacitus all clearly favour *quamquam* (in Tacitus the ratio is 16 vs 168 instances), whereas *etsi* is mostly attested in archaic Latin, Cicero and Caesar (who never uses *quamquam*). Source: Library of Latin Texts – Series A ([www.brepolis.net](http://www.brepolis.net)), cp. Hofmann-Szantyr, *Stilistik*, 671 and Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 198. Cf. supra, *Vocabulary, Classical vocabulary*.

<sup>116</sup> R. Kühner-Fr. Holzweissig, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, 2 Teile in 4 Bände (Darmstadt, 1982 [= Hannover, <sup>2</sup>1912]), § 221, Anm. 4.

(II.) Ellipsis may be the most prominent technique of *detractio*, there are still several other techniques of Lipsian *brevitas* which add to the effect of concision.

\* One is the very frequent use of *en* or *ecce* with ellipsis of a verb. Similar in frequency and technique is starting a sentence with a loose *Quid si* or *Quid (est) quod*.<sup>117</sup> Both are combined in ILE [98 13 05 /15 06]: *En momentum, quod in Sermone habet: quid si maius etiam in Scripto dicam?*

\* Another technique is asyndeton, as in ILE [98 13 05 /15 06]: *A manu, lectione et studiis mihi eris; alius functionis, quae ab ingenio aut instituto tuo discordet, immunis* (for *sed alius* or *alius vero*). Technically the asyndeton consists in ellipsis of a connective word, either a paratactic or a hypotactic one, but always results in paratactic expression. Since asyndeton is therefore better explained within the context of Lipsius's general predilection for parataxis, the technique will be discussed in full in the section *Compositio*.<sup>118</sup> For now, we can conclude with another example, such as ILE 98 04 13 W: *Tribus verbis tamen salutandum te censui, mi Velsere, hunc librum mittendum, nescio an ultimum meorum operum, nisi Deus alias vires brevi donet*, in which case more traditional Latinists would have written *et hunc librum*, or at least *item hunc librum*.

(III.) A final phenomenon resulting in *breviloquentia* is Lipsius's (heavy) usage of verbs.<sup>119</sup> Verbs are usually of high semantic value and because of their syntactic valency they often express and suggest more than is actually said.<sup>120</sup> In this way, Lipsius's use of verbs creates *emphasis*, an often stressed quality of his Latin, which operates per definition through an effect of brevity.<sup>121</sup> Consider, for instance, *De Const.*, 2, 1: *Ut ii qui febriunt, iactant se*

<sup>117</sup> Cp. Estienne's remarks on this *Quid* in Seneca's style (cf. Carabin, Henri Estienne, 220).

<sup>118</sup> This does not mean that parataxis always produces brevity (cf. Tunberg, *Observations*, 176, n. 23).

<sup>119</sup> Pace Grafton, (Reappraisal) *Portrait of Justus Lipsius*, *The American Scholar*, 56 (1987), 382: 'that pointed Latin prose, poor in verbs but rich in inkhorn terms'.

<sup>120</sup> Cp. Landfester, *Einführung in die Stilistik*, 97: 'Im allgemeinen kommt in den antiken Sprachen dem Verbum zentrale Bedeutung im Aufbau des Satzes zu' or Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 138: 'Les verbes donnent au style le mouvement et la vie' (cp. *Ibid.*, 153/154 on the use of 'intense' words in the lapidary style, with the example of Tacitus' 'brièveté mystérieuse' [154]). Of course, the ellipsis of *esse* is normal, even wanted in this context of heavy usage of (pregnant) verbs (cf. *Ibid.*, 214/215).

<sup>121</sup> All *emphasis* is also *brevitas*, while *brevitas* is not necessarily *emphasis*. Of course, in all concise expressions more is meant than actually said, but there is still a difference between the mere suggestion of the implied in *brevitas* (e. g. ellipsis) and the *je-ne-sais-quoi*



*inquieta et versant, et lectum subinde mutant vana spe levamenti, in eadem caussa nos, qui terram terra frustra mutamus, aegri scilicet mentis. Aperire enim hoc est morbum, non tollere: fateri internum hunc calorem; et non mederi.* Another example is ILE 98 03 10: *Ut patris in filiam aut, ut melius dicam, ut animi in corpus hoc nostrum esse debet. Ecce haeret utraque ista pars: ille regit, sed et curat; ad honesta ducit et vocat, sed nec laedit aut deserit renuentem; suadet magis quam cogit*, where the verbs, especially those used absolutely, produce no small amount of *emphasis*. A specific realisation of the technique is exemplified in the phrase *Si pax coit, huc te transfer: ambulabis, videbis, excerpes* (ILE 98 02 22 B), which shows an asyndetic tricolon of pregnant verbs (one is almost reminded of *Veni, vidi, vici*<sup>122</sup>). Such instances have already been treated in the section *Repetition* (*synonymia*) and will also return in the section *Compositio*.

#### b) Quality of concision

Discussions of *perspicuitas* or *obscuritas* in Lipsian brevity – both in present-day and in Early Modern literature on the subject – largely depend not on the amount of concision, but on the degree of it (for the difference, cf. supra). In this way, it might be instructive to elucidate the range in quality of concision one can come by in Lipsian prose.

Smaller degrees of concision are ubiquitous, as in ILE 98 01 23 P: *Quae tu porro in me nimis benigno corde et ore laudas, scito pauciora omnia esse, dare tamen operam ut sint imprimis Modestia et Probitas, quas ego aestimo et tollo super nomen omne litterarum.* For a traditional class of Latin composition, one would certainly stress that *me* cannot be left out in the AcI construction *dare ... operam*, yet still the ellipsis is easily understood. Something similar, with a slighter more concise quality, is found in ILE 98 07 22 M: *Nam et illis haec [sc. curae et patientia] intervenient (mone tuos) et genus id vitae largiter admittit*, where the subject of one sentence becomes object of the next. Even more concise is an example such as ILE 98 12 16: *Gratulor tibi, ipsi, mihi et Deum precor, ut haec bona, si non auget (augebit tamen), servet. Te una, Amp[lissi]me et Nob[ilissi]me Domine, communi bono*, where *Idem precor ut servet* should be supplied before *Te ... bono*.

On the other side of the spectrum, Lipsius's reader is regularly confronted with cases of extreme concision like *Quem commendasti, cupio et faciam*,

---

added in *emphasis*. In this way, Jansen's and Mouchel's 'emphatic' brevity is somewhat misleading. Perhaps 'concise *emphasis*' would have been better.

<sup>122</sup> See, for instance, ILE 98 01 30 R: *Amp[lissi]me et Nob[ilissi]me Domine, abi, perfice, redi.*

*ubi occasio erit* (ILE 98 05 31 P). Such a phrase (which is just as abrupt in the original context as here) is still intelligible, but one has to admit that it transcends normal Latin *consuetudo* as one actually has to read: *Virum, quem tu commendasti, et ego cupio in hunc locum venire; ideoque faciam quod rogasti, id est eum commendabo, ubi occasio erit*. Here, we also notice how *brevitas* sometimes goes hand in hand with an element of upsetting expectation, i. e. *inconcinnitas* (in a broad sense). Another very short, but striking example is ILE 98 11 20, a *consolatio* to Ortelius who is mortally ill at the time, where one is confounded to read *Vale aut revallesce, mi Orтели*. It seems Lipsius is almost rude here and should have written *Vale et revallesce, mi Orтели*. Actually, *aut* is short for *aut potius* here, virtually synonymous with *immo*. Numerous other cases where Lipsius's use of brevity also generates the effect of *inconcinnitas* will be discussed in the next section.<sup>123</sup>

### c) Conclusion

With regard to Lipsius's previously ill-defined and ill-understood brevity, several conclusions can be formulated.

A first, almost coincidental discovery, is that through studying Lipsius's elocutional brevity we notice that his style is not characterized by dispositional brevity. Especially Lipsius's usage of verbs (see e. g. the sentences quoted from *De Constantia* or ILE 98 03 10) as a technique of brevity makes clear that it is precisely his diction which is short, not his treatment of subjects. This explains the seemingly contradictory observations made elsewhere that Lipsius, who is always connected with *brevitas*, does not steer away from rhetorical effects *per adiectionem*, such as repetition, *synonymia*, etc.<sup>124</sup> A similar observation will be made in the section *Compositio* on Lipsius's use of doubling. Therefore, it appears that the traditional stress on brevity *tout court* voiced in the *communis opinio* on Lipsius's style, has to be considerably adjusted by limiting brevity to elocutional *brevitas*.<sup>125</sup>

<sup>123</sup> This aspect of *brevitas*, and more specifically of ellipsis in Lipsius's Latin, is strongly stressed by Tunberg, *Observations*, 176.

<sup>124</sup> In this way, it is difficult to agree with Croll's analysis of Lipsius's habit 'd'éviter volontairement, et avec quelque affectation, les détours polis des préfaces, des apologues, et des exordes cicéroniens' (Croll, *Juste Lipse et le Mouvement Anticicéronien*, 29; cp. Köhlmann, *Mutatum genus dicendi*, 221: 'Exordialtopik ist ihm fremd, er kommt sogleich zur Sache'). For a concrete counter-example, see ILE 98 03 01 A (*praefatio* to the *Admiranda*).

<sup>125</sup> And even then, there are examples (e. g. in the usage of *synonymia* or doubling) where one feels Lipsius's lack of dispositional brevity expands into the elocutional aspect as well (see e. g. the examples quoted from ILE 98 07 10 in *Compositio*).

Secondly, we have found that Lipsius's *brevitas* mostly has three effects: (1) neutral concision (economy of text), as mainly in his use of ellipsis; (2) *emphasis*, as mainly found in his usage of pregnant verbs, but also in suggestive techniques as *Quid*; and (3) sometimes *inconcinuitas*, a jangling of symmetry which the next section will deal with *in extenso*.

Thirdly, it has been shown that Lipsian *brevitas* comes in different degrees as well as different forms. So while it may be interesting from a genetic standpoint to analyze with Mouchel stages of *perspicua* or *obscura brevitatis* in Lipsius and accordingly different literary effects such as speed and spontaneity (*perspicua*) or intellectualism and persuasion (*obscura*),<sup>126</sup> we notice that Lipsius employs a very diverse *breviloquentia*, of which all kinds, degrees and effects can reasonably be expected in all periods of his mature writing. Lipsius's style does not choose between *perspicua* or *obscura brevitatis*, it uses both in a general tendency towards concision.

Finally, we see from this versatility of Lipsius's *brevitas* that the debate between Croll and Williamson about whether Lipsius is mainly Senecan or mainly Tacitean in his writing – which largely depends on the character of his brevity –,<sup>127</sup> is basically a non-issue.<sup>128</sup> Lipsius most likely valued both equally and certainly used both (and mixed) forms of concision to their best effect. Besides, why stop at the question of Senecan pregnant *brevitas* versus Tacitean obscure *brevitas*? For a full comparative view, one should also look into Sallust's technique with its characteristic truncation or Cato, Celsus, and

<sup>126</sup> Mouchel, *Lipse et le style de l'adhérence*.

<sup>127</sup> See e. g. Croll, *Juste Lipse et le Mouvement Anticicéronien*, 28: 'Son style montre l'union de ces deux qualités; il est expressif, nerveux, elliptique et précis, mais, comme dans Sénèque, la phrase est nettement esquissée, les ellipses se comprennent facilement' and G. Williamson, *Lipsius his Hopping Style*, in: Id., *The Senecan Amble. A Study in Prose Form from Bacon to Collier* (London, 1948), 148: 'it is in Tacitean rather than Senecan imitation that Croll's 'asymmetry' should arrive at the dignity of a principle' and 'The 'hopping' of Lipsius, for example, suggests the more extreme appositive style of Tacitus, which is more elliptical than Seneca's, less given to balanced phrasing, more like Sallust as described by Seneca'.

<sup>128</sup> From a comparative-descriptive perspective, both are right and both are wrong. Of course, Seneca is a major influence for Lipsius, but it is true that the latter is far bolder in his concision and more prone to asymmetry, which puts him closer to Tacitus. On the other hand, there are also markedly Tacitean techniques of *breviloquentia* which Lipsius does not use (or at least far less frequently), such as dropping prepositions, the *simplex pro composito* or the *ablativus absolutus* without subject (type Tac. Ann. 3, 2, 1: *Miserat duas praetorias cohortes Caesar, a d d i t o ut*). The reason for this is probably that these are rather poetical constructions, which in general do not seem to appeal to Lipsius.

other writers known for their brevity.<sup>129</sup> Still, in the end, nothing tangible would come of such research, apart from a diffuse survey of *possible* influences for the *actual* techniques as analysed above.

#### 4.2. Inconcinnitas

##### a) Definition and quality of *inconcinnitas*

(I.) In his book on Pindar Ilja Leonard Pfeijffer offers a description of the phenomenon *inconcinnitas*, more generally called ‘asymmetry’ as well:

‘*Inconcinnitas* is the use of unlike syntactical constructions to express ideas which are parallel with respect to their contents. (...) The ancient grammarians regard *inconcinnitas* as characteristic<sup>130</sup> for the ἀσθηρὰ ἄρμονία and as aiming at an imitation of natural, i. e. unstudied and simple, speech, as opposed to the neatly balanced antitheses of periodical style. Dornseiff says that Pindar avoids syntactical symmetry in order to effect ποικιλία. There is an element of truth in both explanations. Syntactical asymmetry is both a stylized imitation of the unpremeditated structures of *ex tempore* speech, and one of the most obvious examples of Pindar exerting himself to avoid the obvious. Thus Pindar’s frequent use of *inconcinnitas* ties in both with his concern for creating the illusion of spontaneity (on the level of the fiction of the poet creating his text spontaneously on the very spot) and (on the level of the poet who actually composes his texts with great skill, carefully calculating their effects upon his audience) with his general tendency towards unpredictability and, by making high demands upon the concentration of his audience, heightening of its attentiveness and its active involvement in the performance’.<sup>131</sup>

Such a literary technique of naturalness and spontaneity immediately rings a bell for scholars of Lipsius’s style. Both aspects occupy a prime position in his concept of style as, for instance, analysed by Mouchel.<sup>132</sup> And indeed, *inconcinnitas* is probably the most salient characteristic of Lipsius’s Latin, even if in secondary literature it is largely eclipsed by the attention devoted to *brevitas*. Still, Lipsius’s contemporary critics were very attentive

<sup>129</sup> See e. g. Leeman, *Orationis Ratio*, 1, 35 and 261.

<sup>130</sup> *Correximus e, characteristic*’.

<sup>131</sup> I. L. Pfeijffer, *Three Aeginetan odes of Pindar: a commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III, and Pythian VIII, Mnemosyne*. Supplements, 197 (Leiden, 1999), 51/52. Cp. the description of Landfester, *Einführung in die Stilistik*, 132: ‘Inkonzinnität besteht in der unterschiedlichen Gestaltung koordinierter Satzteile und Teilsätze. Sie bedeutet Verzicht auf Symmetrie, wie sie im Parallelismus und anderen Wiederholungsformen dargestellt wird’.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. Mouchel, *Lipse et le style de l’adhérence*.

of it, as is clear from a line of Scaliger's alluding to Lipsius: *et dum legentis haeret expectatio, | intelligendum quam legendum plus ferent* [sc. *nonnulli litterati*].<sup>133</sup> Whereas the second verse clearly concerns Lipsius's *emphasis*, the first is a description of his *inconcinntitas*. Scaliger's phrasing is rather vague; his *expectatio haeret*<sup>134</sup> is much less specific than the definition Pfeiffer offered. This need not surprise, however, since Lipsius's concept is indeed broader than the *inconcinntitas stricto sensu* which Pfeiffer describes, essentially the clash of syntactic and logical balance.<sup>135</sup> Lipsius does not stop at such cases. On the contrary, his Latin is packed with expressions of all kinds which have only a broad notion of *inconcinntitas* in common: the deliberate failure to meet a previously created expectation of similarity, or indeed any expectation in general.<sup>136</sup> Accordingly, when we have a look at the few scholars of Lipsius's style who do explicitly<sup>137</sup> mention the aspect of *inconcinntitas*, we see that they define it in such broad terms as well. Croll wrote:

‘Lipse évite les phrases qui se répondent, il évite le parallélisme, la similitude et tous les autres procédés de la « concinnité » cicéronienne. Il cherche plutôt à rompre le rythme en arrêtant brusquement ses phrases, manquant ainsi, comme des critiques hostiles l'ont dit, à ce que l'oreille attendait de lui.’<sup>138</sup>

<sup>133</sup> From Scaliger's poem *De stilo et caractere*, quoted in E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance* (Stuttgart, <sup>5</sup>1958 [= Leipzig, 1898]), 2, 777. Cp. Croll, *Juste Lipse et le Mouvement Anticicéronien*, 33 and Jansen, *Brevitas*, 715/716.

<sup>134</sup> Cp. Landfester, *Einführung in die Stilistik*, 132/133: ‘Inkonzinnität kann zum anderen Ausdruck für die Negation von Symmetrie sein; sie setzt die Existenz und Geltung einer ausgebildeten Konzinnen Sprachkonvention voraus. Die Variation enthält auf dem Hintergrund einer Formtradition ein Moment der Überraschung oder Verfremdung’.

<sup>135</sup> For a good overview of the different appearances of such *inconcinntitas*, see Hofmann-Szantyr, *Stilistik*, § 49 (Konzinnität und Inkonzinnität).

<sup>136</sup> Cp. Marouzeau's chapter ‘détours d'expression’: ‘Cette disposition d'esprit est en rapport avec le goût instinctif que nous avons de l'énigme et du problème. Nous nous plaisons à livrer à l'interlocuteur non pas ce que nous avons à lui dire, mais ce qui est propre à lui faire deviner. Goût du signe, du symbole, satisfaction commune à celui qui propose l'énigme et à celui qui la résout. C'est là le principe de ce qu'on peut appeler le décalage d'expression’ (Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 253).

<sup>137</sup> Cp. Kühlmann, *Mutatam genus dicendi*, 221: ‘Es verschwinden die ciceronischen Klauseln wie auch die zierliche Konzinnität der Satzglieder. Nicht das Bemühen um Ausgewogenheit und Harmonie steht im Vordergrund’. Others seem to come close to it without realising its full bearing; see e. g. Nisard, *Le triumvirat littéraire au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 42 and Williamson, *The Senecan Amble*, 148 in his notion of ‘asymmetry’.

<sup>138</sup> Croll, *Juste Lipse et le Mouvement Anticicéronien*, 29.

Tunberg opined (in the context of syntax):

‘Lipsius likes striking and arresting modes of expression. This not rarely includes unconventional constructions, and sometimes he seems to strain the possibilities of Latin syntax to its limits and even a little beyond.’<sup>139</sup>

and (in the context of *brevitas*):

‘Abruptness deserves more comment, since ‘brevitas’ in the writings of Lipsius usually seems to be linked closely with a kind of abrupt ‘inconcinnitas’. In large part Lipsius gains this effect from a studied and assiduous use of ellipsis or ‘detractio’ (to use the Latin term) and a distinct tendency to dispense with connective words, especially connective relatives.’<sup>140</sup>

Now, whereas both Croll’s and Tunberg’s characterization have the undeniable merit of attracting some attention to this fairly neglected aspect of Lipsius’s prose, both descriptions are still somewhat incomplete. Croll seems to interpret Lipsius’s lack of ‘concinnity’ primarily as an element of rhythm,<sup>141</sup> and although it is definitely true that the jangling effect of *inconcinnitas* is rhythmic in many cases, there are many cases where it is rather syntactic in nature. Tunberg, on the other hand, does regard it largely as a syntactic technique, but immediately connects *inconcinnitas* with *brevitas*. Now, we have seen some examples at the end of the previous section where *brevitas* did indeed produce an effect of *inconcinnitas*, yet there will be more examples in the following pages where *inconcinnitas* does not imply brevity, and is on the contrary even preferred over expressions which are more concise.

(II.) By considering a few examples of Lipsian *inconcinnitas*, we can perhaps get a better grip on the phenomenon in general.

\* First, there is traditional *inconcinnitas* which one can describe as false parallelism, i. e. parallelism in content, but not in form, or *vice versa*.<sup>142</sup> The former is nicely exemplified in *Poliorc.* 1, 1: *hanc noctem clementem et cum quiete habui* (instead of *clementem et quietam*). The easiest example of the latter is a typical case of *tractio*, as in ILE 98 04 22 D: *De aliis si curas, omitte omnes has curas*, where there is parallelism (even identity) of form, but not of content.

<sup>139</sup> Tunberg, *Observations*, 174.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*, 176.

<sup>141</sup> Following the ancient interpretation of *concinnitas* (e. g. Cic. *Orat.* 220); see Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 287.

<sup>142</sup> I am unsure why Pfeiffer seems to exclude the latter possibility in his description of the technique (cf. *supra*).

\* On the other hand, there are examples of *inconcinnitas* which are of a mixed nature, which is often rather difficult to analyse or define. In ILE II, 85 06 01, for instance, we read: *Quid hoc aevo? Cum imperitissimus quisque, audacissimus et iudicii hunc calculum sibi sumit quilibet e litteraria plebe*. The best way to show how much Lipsius disappoints the reader's expectations is to rewrite this sentence into standard Latin: *Quo aevo imperitissimus quisque, etiam audacissimus et quilibet e litteraria plebe hunc sibi calculum iudicii sumit*. In this way, one notices how the position of *et* and the disturbance of the tripartite construction *imperitissimus, audacissimus* and *quilibet ...* (where the last element is formally unexpected as well due to the *homoeoteleuta* in *-issimus*), jangles the reader's expectations and truly produces a striking, arresting mode of expression (*legentis haeret expectatio*).<sup>143</sup>

(III.) Within the spectrum of these two types of *inconcinnitas* there are examples to be found of different qualities.

\* Sometimes *inconcinnitas* can be achieved by very small means indeed. Consider this fragment (ILE 98 04 26): *Hodie [urbs Ptolemais] in ruinis quaeritur, sed errant qui cum Ioppe confundunt, inter eos Nicetas Choniates*. One is struck by Lipsius's use of *sed* here. In fact, one would expect *et* or possibly even a consecutive clause (*ut*). Also possible was a construction such as *etsi sunt qui errant et cum Ioppe confundunt ...*. Yet Lipsius makes a mental leap. One should understand something along the lines of: *Hodie in ruinis quaeritur, [attamen nonnulli urbem perseverare adfirmant], sed errant, ut qui cum Ioppe confundunt, inter eos Nicetas Choniates*. Rather than interpreting this as an extreme case of ellipsis, we can analyse the example as a matter of asymmetry between the *quaeritur* and *errant* clause, created by *sed*.

\* Apart from different degrees in the means to achieve *inconcinnitas*, there are also different degrees in the effect of *inconcinnitas*. The difference is easily illustrated with two examples of *inconcinnitas* produced through the same technique, viz. polysyndeton (cf. infra). In *Sed recuperabis illam veterem [i. e. valetudinem], spero, tum tua industria et continentia, tum et benigni Veris auxilio, quod genitali sua aura iam aspirat* (ILE 98 03 04 O), the degree of *inconcinnitas* produced by breaking the parallelism *tum ... tum ...* due to the insertion of a superfluous *et* after the second *tum*, or rather an *et* which is asymmetric to the previous *et*, is not so great. But when we read *Deus tibi pergat dare gaudia ex tuis et paullatim etiam curis liberari et in*

<sup>143</sup> Cp. Nisard, *Le triumvirat littéraire au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 42: 'on ne lit guère sans être arrêté'.

*ipsos transferre* (ILE 98 07 20), the effect is much more disconcerting. At first sight *pergat* is perfectly logically followed by three infinitives *dare*, *liberari* and *transferre*. Yet, upon trying to understand the sentence, one comes to the baffling conclusion that only *dare* is to be connected to *pergat*, whilst *liberari* and *transferre* depend on *dare*.

b) Techniques of *inconcinnitas*

(I.) The first technique Lipsius uses to create *inconcinnitas* has already been mentioned in dealing with his figures of repetition. Obviously, the mere occurrence of repetition creates an expectation of parallelism, which can then easily be disappointed. Apart from the few cases mentioned above, we can point at the following examples.

\* In *Sat. Men.* 1, 1 we find an instance of *traductio* and *adnominatio* where the parallelism is only valid on the level of form, not of logic or syntax: *Curae sint hae curae illi, qui supra nos curat*. There are also more drastic examples such as *Ab aliis de te cur audio, quae non a te audio?* (ILE 98 [04 07 / 06 05(?)]), where the second colon is completely unexpected. Instead of writing *Ab aliis de te cur audio, non a te ipso?*, Lipsius chooses hypotaxis over his more usual parataxis and moves the antithesis from *ab aliis – a te* to *de te – a te*, while installing a pseudo-parallelism *audio ... audio*.

Truly puzzling is the following sentence from ILE 98 07 22 M: *Similis ipsi aeri, quem ducimus et in quo versamur, ut modo sudum, modo udum sit tempestas, serenitas et gaudiis praeviae aut sequaces curae*. In this example, the repetition of *modo ... modo ...*, *tempestas, serenitas* (with *homoeoteleuton*) and *praeviae ... sequaces*, creates three antithetical doublets, the first and second of which overlap and the third of which is broken because of the similarity in sound between *praeviae* and *curae* so that the whole impression of parallelism immediately crumbles up.<sup>144</sup>

Furthermore, as pointed out in the section *Repetition*, this effect can also go hand in hand with ellipsis, however paradoxical it might seem. In ILE 98 02 11, which deals with Lipsius's *Admiranda* and ends in *Res tibi dicet me in meis* [sc. *Admirandis*] *vera dicere et mox videbis. Nam habebis certe inter primos, tu me serio inter tuos*, we notice how there is not only a tension between *inter* that is used in two different syntactic contexts (first in connection with the subject, then in connection with the object), but also bet-

<sup>144</sup> Virtually the same is found in ILE 98 09 24: *Semper ego non apud vos solum hilarior, sed a vobis melior redeo*, where all kinds of antithetic notions have been mixed: *ego* vs *vos*, *apud vos* and *a vobis*, *hilarior* vs *melior*, [*maneo*] vs *redeo*.



ween *habebis* and an elliptically used [*habe*] in the second colon, which differ in meaning as well (literally 'to have, receive' vs 'to consider').

\* The most important sub-group of this *inconcinntas* through repetition is Lipsius's use of polysyndeton, where series of *et*, *atque* and the likes create pseudo-parallelism. Again it is obvious how such repetitions of the conjunction would create an impression of similarity and commensurability, only to be disappointed, often in a rather disconcerting way. A small, but telling example is found in ILE 98 02 22 B: *Imo et ego iuvenesco et vide exemplum*, where not only the transition between the indicative and imperative mode is unexpected, but mainly the fact that the balance *et ... et ...* is completely fake: one would always expect to read *Imo (et) ego iuvenesco; modo vide exemplum* or even *ut vides exemplo*. Another very clear example is *Iuvat tamen et me ea cogitatio, et bona fide inclino* (ILE 98 05 19), where the polysyndeton *et ... et ...* suggests parallelism of *cogitatio* and *bona fide*, which is logically sound, but syntactically odd. Actually, *et me* stands for *me quoque*, while the second *et* connects *iuvat* and *inclino*. In the case of ILE 98 08 02 T: *Nam et amicitia iam inter nos vetus satis et certe fida coaluerat, et raritas ibi nunc talium a clade ista funesti belli*, we notice how a longer succession of *et* can confuse the reader's sense of both syntactic and logical balance. At first sight one connects *et raritas* back to *et amicitia*, yet the ellipsis of the final colon abruptly makes clear that the colon is to be interpreted independently.

A final example illustrates not only the way in which polysyndeton can create *inconcinntas*, but also how many of the above examples are in fact choices of *inconcinntas* over *brevitas*. In ILE 98 04 06 T: *At nunc et pacis benignior spes adfulsit et res (spero et opto) brevi erit*, we are confronted with more or less the same *et ... et ... inconcinntas* as in the first example of *Imo et ego iuvenesco et vide exemplum*. Still, the fact that Lipsius repeats the element of 'hope' in the second colon by inserting the parenthesis *spero et opto*, proves that even he had the more usual expression *spes adfulsit ut res brevi sit* in mind, which was a much more concise expression, but also a much more expected one.

(II.) The second category of *inconcinntas* has also been dealt with already, namely in discussing Lipsius's *brevitas*. Techniques such as ellipsis or asyndeton (which basically is a form of ellipsis) can often have not only

an effect of concision, but also of abruptness and *inconcinnitas*.<sup>145</sup> For an example of *inconcinnitas* through ellipsis, a few other examples may suffice. In ILE 98 02 22 B: *Ecce iterum meam manum. Quid tu ais? Haec non emendari cum annis? Imo et ego iuvenesco et vide exemplum* one is slightly perplexed not to read *Hanc non emendari ...*, yet the sentence is short for *Haec quae mea manu scripta sunt, non emendari ...*). Another instance is ILE 98 05 31 P: *Dupliciter dolui epistola tua lecta: primum quod invaletudo te haberet, quae adurgeret Spadam ire; deinde quod mihi comitem esse non liceret, uti tu. Quid tu? Imo et ego vellem*, where the ellipsis in *uti tu* [sc. *voluisti*] is at first quite confusing.

(III.) A third category comprises examples of syntactic nature, namely where a syntactic anticipation is created, which is subsequently not met with the expected resolution.

\* A good example is found in ILE 99 12 30 H: *ita amanter, immo ardentem scripta* [sc. *epistola*] *me quoque talem fecit*, where the usual syntactic expectation *ita ... u t...* is disappointed and replaced by parataxis. A similar case is found in ILE 98 11 20, where we read about the death of Philip II: *Etsi non occidisti, sed in filio tuo isto PHILIPPO TERTIO vivis et lucas, quem vovemus salubrium consiliorum tuorum, ut potentiae atque opum, heredem. Quidni autem erit? Tali stirpe, educatione, indole: immo ut novum et salutare sidus exortum eum speramus ad illustrandum et vegetandum utrumque orbem*. In the last sentence, one expects *Tali* to be followed by *ut* or *qui* or something similar. However, this is not the case, or rather the *ut* that does appear, has a different function, thus for a moment confusing the reader's expectations.

\* The biggest sub-group of such syntactic *inconcinnitas* is made up of a rather common technique, namely the continuation of a syntactic unit after its syntactic anticipation was resolved. Most of the time, this is achieved by supplementing bipartite or tripartite expressions with an extra, unexpected element, as in ILE 98 05 08: *In ipsa invaletudine mea, quae insolenter me adfligebat, tua inspexi, mi Meursi. Quid nisi optimi ingenii et rarioris industriae, item notae?* (where *notae* is a continuation of *rarioris*)<sup>146</sup> or ILE 98 04 22: *Multa vel suggerere potes vel recidere fortasse aut immutare, atque interiore meo voto coram hoc fecisses*, where all syntactic anticipation was

<sup>145</sup> Landfester, Einführung in die Stilistik, 128 affirms the same in the context of Tacitus's and Seneca's use of *asyndeton*: 'für Seneca und Tacitus ist sie ein verbreitetes ästhetisches Mittel der Prägnanz und Kürze bis hin zur Paradoxie'.

<sup>146</sup> It is interesting to see that some later editors read *notas* at this point, their refusal of *notae* as a correct reading probably being caused by the fact that they were not familiar enough with this technique.

resolved after *vel ... vel ...*, but still a third element *aut immutare* is added (with *aut*), which is of the same syntactic level as *vel suggerere ... vel recidere*. The same can happen in a tricolon, as in *Sat. Men.: inde ut, fluctus e mari, paullatim surgere visa ingens multitudo pallentium, exsanguium, maculentorum, et a quibus Caesar iure timuisset*, where the *a quibus ...* colon is not expected after the tricolon of genitives.

In a more extreme way, such syntactic *inconcininitas* can also involve the disruption of bipartite or tripartite constructions (which comes close to *inconcininitas* through word order), as in ILE 98 12 19 S: *infinitum easdem* [sc. *linguas*] *mutasse, variasse, multiplicasse, ut gentes hominum confusae mixtaeque inter se fuerunt et iterum propagatae*. Here we clearly notice in the addition of *et iterum propagatae* – schematically (a b)q(c) – how this syntactic *inconcininitas* (*confusae mixtaeque ... fuerunt* sufficed as a syntactic unit) also has a rhythmic effect. The sentence, which is uncharacteristically long for Lipsius, threatened to turn into a full-blown period and ending it in *fuerunt* would just be too predictable in a rhythmical sense as well. This effect is noticeable in most of the above cited examples too.

\* Sometimes syntactic *inconcininitas* can be somewhat vague to define and in certain cases it merely consists in the contamination of several constructions to produce a striking expression. This is, for instance, found in the *incipit* of ILE 98 04 06 T: *Vir Nobilissime, iam diu factum, cum ad te nihil dedi*. Instead of writing the expected *Iam diu nihil ad te dedi*, Lipsius elaborates in the sense *Iam multum tempus praeterit, cum nihil ad te dedi*, using the general expression *diu factum esse* instead of the more concrete *multum tempus praeterit / transit / ...* and *cum* in the sense of ‘during which time’.<sup>147</sup> Another example is *Lovan. 1, 1: Fama tenebat et tenet arcem illic veterem fuisse, alii a Iulianis, alii a Normannicis temporibus, cuius vestigia exstarent*, where the syntaxes *fama tenet* + Acl and *alii ... alii* [dicunt] + Acl permeate and thus break up the concinnity of the sentence.

(IV.) Finally, we are left with various other forms of *inconcininitas* which occur only now and then.

\* Sometimes *inconcininitas* is produced by an element of morphology. In ILE 98 01 23 P: *Ab eo tempore – credes mihi hoc, Pontane – et memoria tui inhaesit et probatio, atque ideo facile accendere hanc materiam igni sic paratam* one easily mistakes *accendere* for an infinitive, while it is in fact a perfect indicative. In this case, Lipsius could easily have removed the *incon-*

<sup>147</sup> Cp. with Pontanus's more usual: *Diu est, cum te secundis* [sc. *litteris*] *interpellavi* (ILE 98 05 27 P).

*cinnitas* by using a synonym or writing *accenderunt*, still he chose not to, which proves his deliberate choice of *inconcinnitas* over *perspicuitas*.

\* Another possibility is *inconcinnitas* produced through word order. A rather easy example is ILE 98 02 24: *Et quomodo tam lente (non enim tu) hoc illi curant?*, where the comma *non enim tu* still has the reader a bit puzzled, because of its position in the sentence at a point where one cannot really understand the nominative case of *tu*, nor (more importantly) the explanation offered by *enim*. In any case, the usual mode of expression would surely be: *Et quomodo illi (non enim tu) tam lente hoc curant?*

\* Furthermore, there is also a purely logical or content-related *inconcinnitas*. In ILE 98 03 01 A to Albert of Austria, Lipsius compares him to Scipio and cleverly writes *nec alium iustius tecum conferam* instead of the expected *nec cum alio te iustius conferam*. In this case, the *inconcinnitas* adds to the laudatory effect of his panegyric letter.

\* Finally, it will come as no surprise that different techniques are often combined into one global effect of *inconcinnitas*. In *De Const.*, 1, 1, for instance, we read: (...) *Eburonum urbem. Quae nec longe a via, et in qua amici, quos salutare more suadebar et amore*. In this sentence, one notices subtle impressions of both parallelism and the contrary. Parallelism seems to be present in *quae, in qua* and *quos* and is heard in the *adnominatio* of *more ... amore*. Yet, upon closer inspection *Quae* is a pseudorelativum, and *in qua* and *quos* do not correspond. Furthermore, the first instance of *nec* suggested a negative polysyndeton (*nec ... nec ...*), but this expectation is marred by *et*. And finally, there is syntactic *inconcinnitas* in *et amore*, since *suadebar* had already resolved all syntactic tension.

### c) Conclusion

In this way, we see how different kinds of *inconcinnitas* recur in many aspects of Lipsius's Latin. All in all, we can confirm a remarkably strong and conscious tendency in Lipsius to disrupt – taking care to stress that this may often be rather subtle – all kinds of phonic, syntactic, rhythmic or other expectation instilled in the reader's mind from his experience with 'normal' Latin. A final example may illustrate how the amalgam of such effects can produce a sort of *inconcinnitas* which is situated on the textual level: a most general, almost gnawing feeling of estrangement from the Latin one is facing. The dedicatory letter of Lipsius's *Manuductio ad Stoicam philosophiam*, ILE 04 02 27, starts off as follows:

*Manuductionem meam facere, vides quod ego nuper feci, Illustrissime Princeps, id est ad te venire. Uterque merito. Ego, ut adventum in haec loca*

*et afflictam patriam gratuler, tuis etiam consiliis erigendam; itemque gratias agerem pro benivolentia qua me iam pridem eximia quadam honestasses. Facit utrumque hoc idem Manuctio: et causas easdem habet. An non et alteram magis propriam? Opinor. Servit ipsa et facta est ad lucem Hispani scriptoris, Annaei Senecae, itaque decore viam ad Hispanum Principem affectat, eius se arbitrio ac tutelae permissura.*

In this piece of text, we find *inconcinnitas* of all levels and kinds. At a first level, *Uterque merito. Ego ...* suggests a second element such as *Opus* or *Manuctio*. Still, it takes quite long until such an element is found, and by repeating the element of *uterque* (*utrumque hoc idem*) before *Manuctio* the strong opposition with *Ego* is lost. On a second level, syntactic anticipation is finished after *gratuler*; but this expectation is broken twice, once in *erigendam* which is to be connected with *patriam* and also in *agerem*. On a third level, *idem* is somewhat superfluous in connection with *utrumque hoc* (where *hoc* is superfluous as well *stricto sensu*). Still, it is probably inserted to build a fake parallelism with *easdem* of the second colon. On a fourth level, the occurrence of *An non et alteram magis propriam* mars whatever is left of the bipolar symmetry in *Ego ... Manuctio* and the two *causae* by suddenly bringing up a third reason.

In conclusion, we see how in this section a multitude of disrupting and generally estranging techniques have been discussed, which may be employed in different degrees, but appear almost ubiquitously in Lipsian prose. From this aspect, Lipsius's style derives a quality of disconnection, suddenness and strangeness which more than anything else characterizes his particular style (cf. *infra*, *Conclusion*). Therefore, it is very odd to see how even during Lipsius's life, and in modern scholarly literature as well, this quality of *inconcinnitas* was completely overshadowed by *brevitas*. Still, from a typically Lipsian passage such as the one quoted from the *Manuctio*, it appears how little *brevitas* alone explains its peculiar style and how important, on the other hand, *inconcinnitas* proves to be in its analysis. For, on the technical level, only *inconcinnitas* explains how Lipsius's Latin can combine *adiectio* in bicolon or tricolon on the one hand, and elocutional brevity on the other. It is by disrupting the symmetry of such parallel constructions that Lipsius dissolves the contradiction of multiple cola and brevity of style. To boot, there are several examples where Lipsius clearly sacrifices elocutional brevity to produce *inconcinnitas*,<sup>148</sup> and even in his choice

<sup>148</sup> E. g. ILE 98 04 22 D: *De aliis si curas, omitte omnes has curas. Versum meum tu claudum fecisti. Nam ipsi negant et exemplar meum pedem donat. Parce scripturienti plu-*

of means to produce brevity, we have noticed a tendency to use it to obtain *inconcinnitas*.<sup>149</sup>

Finally, I think that there is again (cf. supra, *Brevitas*) not much point in trying to categorize this technique as Sallustean or Tacitean, two figures who are traditionally connected with *inconcinnitas*. Whereas some examples do indeed remind us of Tacitus, his style still comprises several other techniques of *inconcinnitas* which we do not find (or certainly not as regularly) in Lipsius. Among these are his use of neuter adjectives instead of nouns, the *abstractum pro concreto*, abruptly switching from personal to impersonal constructions, etc.

### 4.3. Compositio

Although much of Lipsius's characteristic turn of phrase has already been explained from the analysis of *brevitas* and *inconcinnitas*, several things still remain to be said about his *compositio* as a whole, if only to elucidate some of the statements made about it in the past. Indeed, Lipsius's *compositio* was heavily criticized in his own time. Lipsius's detractor Schoppe wrote: *Desunt autem Perspicuitas, Aequabilitas, Collocatio, Iunctura (...). Itaque Oratio est obscura, (...); comprehensio obscura, compositio fracta et in particulis concisa*. At the same time, this statement is typical for the language generally used to describe Lipsius's syntax, both by his contemporaries and some modern scholars. His composition is called *fracta*,<sup>150</sup> commatic, loose, even 'hopping' (Williamson),<sup>151</sup> yet it has only rarely been analysed in its formal components and characteristics. Only Croll made an attempt to do so and accordingly it seems best to start this section from his observations.

---

*ra, sed ob imbecillitatem non scribenti et me ama, ut semper, mi pater*, which could easily (but without the effects of repetition) be rephrased into *De aliis si curas, omite* (emphasis + brevity) and *Parce ob imbecillitatem non plura scribenti*.

<sup>149</sup> In ILE [98 05 13 / 06 15], for instance, *Ea quae veteribus fuerit, quaerunt; ego amplius, an fuerit, quaero* is short for *Ea quae veteribus fuerit, quaerunt [alii]; ego amplius, an fuerit, quaero*. By choosing to leave out *alii*, but not *quaero*, Lipsius succeeds in creating a kind of *inconcinnitas* which consists in the resemblance of *quaerunt – quaero* versus the estranging effect of the ellipsis [*alii*] – *ego*. The alternative *Ea quae veteribus fuerit, quaerunt alii; ego amplius an fuerit* is more concise, but does not contain such an effect of dissimilarity.

<sup>150</sup> Cp. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, 2, 776: 'zerhackten pointierten Satzbau' or Croll, *Juste Lipse et le Mouvement Anticéronien*, 29: 'style haché, fait de phrases courtes'.

<sup>151</sup> Williamson, *Lipsius his Hopping Style*. Cp. Scaliger: *Quae per salebras saltitant, non ambulat* (quoted in Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, 2, 777) and Croll, *Juste Lipse et le Mouvement Anticéronien*, 33.

## a) Croll: curt style and loose style

(I.) In his 1929 paper *The Baroque Style in Prose*, Morris Croll describes two forms of Baroque style: the concise, serried, abrupt *stile coupé* or curt style, and the informal, meditative, and 'natural' loose style.<sup>152</sup> However, he takes special care to point out 'that in the best writers these two styles do not appear separately in passages of any length, and that in most of them they intermingle in relations far too complex for description'.<sup>153</sup> We should therefore be careful in our identifications of one author with one compositional style. Still, it will be fruitful for analytical purposes to have a look at Croll's description of the two modes.

1. Curt Style – *stile coupé* (211–219)

## A. Characteristics

## 1) studied brevity of members

'each member is as short as the most alert intelligence would have it'

## 2) hovering, imaginative order

'the first member is likely to be a self-contained and complete statement of the whole idea of the period (...) But it does not exhaust its imaginative truth or energy of its conception. It is followed, therefore, by other members, each with a new tone or emphasis, each expressing a new apprehension of the truth expressed in the first'

## 3) asymmetry, produced by

a) 'varying length of the members within a period'

b) 'a succession of members with different kinds of subject words'

c) 'a change from literal to metaphoric statement, or the reverse, or by a change from one metaphor to another'

d) 'a leap from the concrete to the abstract form (...), an eminently characteristic feature of the *stile coupé* because this style is always tending towards the aphorism'

## 4) omission of the ordinary syntactic ligatures

<sup>152</sup> Croll's styles seem somewhat inspired by the traditional distinction *oratio soluta* (διαλελυμένη λέξις) and *oratio perpetua* (ειρομένη λέξις); see e. g. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, §§ 916–922.

<sup>153</sup> M. Croll, *The Baroque Style in Prose*, in: Id., *Style, Rhetoric, and Rhythm. Essays by Morris W. Croll*, ed. by J. Max Patrick, et al., Woodbridge, 1989 (= Princeton, 1966), 229/230.

## B. Violations

The full effect of the style depends upon the union of these characteristics, but we may also observe that sometimes a partial violation of the rules produces an eminently characteristic effect of 17th-century prose:

1) ‘we often find a period of two members connected by *and*, *or* or *nor*, which evidently has the character of the *stile coupé* because the conjunction has no logical *plus* force whatever’.

2) asymmetry ‘is sometimes partly violated inasmuch as these members begin with the same word or form of words (...). It is to be observed, however, that the members that begin with this suggestion of oratorical pattern usually break it in the words that follow’.

C. The typical *période coupée* need not always be short. ‘On the contrary, it may continue, without connectives and with all its highly accentuated peculiarities of form, to the length of five or six members’.

## 2. Loose Style (219–229)

A. The Loose Style is more difficult to describe and analyse as a complex of different traits, probably precisely because of its loose, self-exploring character. By nature, only two forms are distinctive of it:

- 1) co-ordinating conjunctions
- 2) participle construction

B. Still, other modes of connection are not excluded. On the contrary, the loose style ‘obtains its characteristic effects from the syntactic forms that are logically more strict and binding (...) by using them in a way peculiar to itself. That is to say, it uses them as the necessary logical means of advancing the idea, but relaxes at will the tight construction which they seem to impose; so that they have exactly the same effect as the loose connections previously described’.

C. Furthermore, the order of the connected members (which in fact ‘determines the character of the connections rather than the reverse’) is to be considered. Opposed to the circular motion of the Ciceronian period, the loose period has a different purpose, namely ‘to express, as far as may be, the order in which an idea presents itself when it is first experienced. It begins, therefore, without premeditation, stating its idea in the first form that occurs; the second member is determined by the situation in which the mind finds itself after the first has been spoken; and so on’. It is ‘like a philosophical scientist making notes of his observation as it occurs’.



D. Finally, it can be observed that even in cases where the natural meditation of the author has involved him 'in a suspended construction from which he cannot escape (...) he still proceeds in the Anti-Ciceronian manner, and succeeds in following, in spite of the syntactic formalities to which he commits himself, his own emergent and experimental order'. He does so by a great variety of means, such as anacoluthon, a peculiar way of punctuation, etc.

(II.) According to Croll, Lipsius is an early practitioner of the *stile coupé* (just like Montaigne), which is in essence a Senecan style.<sup>154</sup> Indeed, the description of compositional characteristics given under the curt style does sound a lot like Lipsius. Characteristic 1.A.1 – Lipsius's famous *brevitas* – has already been dealt with. 1.A.2 makes a very interesting point which seems to hold true for Lipsius as well. Having a look, for instance, at ILE 98 02 22 B, we see what Croll means:

*Ecce iterum meam manum.*

→ *Quid tu ais?*

→ *Haec non emendari cum annis?*

*Imo et ego iuvenesco*

→ *et vide exemplum.*

*Oculi iterum belle habent*

→ *et lemae illae,*

→ *an glaucomata aut quidquid fuit, in malam rem abierunt*

→ *et maneant aeternum.*

*Utinam tua res sic procedat,*

→ *illa Iunonia, quae me tecum exercet.*

*Quidquid dissimulas, amas*

→ *et negantia tua verba apud me adfirmant.*

*Sed cum modo;*

→ *nimis amare insanum malum est;*

→ *et ne incide*

→ *aut eripe te, si incidisti.*

<sup>154</sup> Ibid., 215.

In the above schematic representation of the first lines of ILE 98 02 22 B arrow-signs have been used to signal where a self-contained and complete statement containing the whole idea of the period is followed by other members which only add new tone or emphasis. Croll rightly points out this aspect, which is very often present in Lipsius, yet one should still retain some caution in identifying it as truly characteristic of Lipsian *compositio*. It seems to be a general technique of Anti-Ciceronian, i. e. unperiodic prose, as periodicity *ipso facto* delays the completion of the period until the end of the sentence.

Characteristics 1.A.3.a/b are somewhat less readily connected with Lipsian style. 1.A.3.c seems to point in the direction of techniques we have discussed under *Inconcinntitas*, while the aphoristic tendency of Lipsius's Latin (1.A.3.d) is well known.<sup>155</sup> Finally, with 1.A.4 Croll touches upon asyndeton, the omission of syntactic ligatures, which produces Lipsius's favoured parataxis. Still, asyndeton is only one means towards paratactical construction, as will become clear from the discussion below.

Moreover, Croll rightly allows two violations to these characteristics, which we have addressed under the sections *Inconcinntitas* and *Repetition*, with especially Lipsius's use of the *polysyndeton* to produce effects of imbalance (1.B.1) and with *adnominatio*, where formal resemblance is contrasted by tension *qua* content (1.B.2).

Finally, Croll's observation that the typical curt period need not be short (1.C), holds true for Lipsius as well, but only to a certain degree. Especially in rhetorical letters Lipsius will allow his sentences to gain some length, but for the most part they remain rather short. Indeed, it is one of the reader's first observations when comparing Lipsius to Tacitus that for all the resemblance in techniques of *detractio*, discontinuation and disproportion, the latter's sentences are often much longer than Lipsius's.

(III.) Apart from these aspects of the curt style, it has to be added – as Croll himself allows –, that Lipsius's composition shows many signs of the loose style as well. This need not surprise, as some techniques of this style are very similar to those of the curt. There is, for instance, notable similarity between 2.C and 1.A.2 which both depart from the idea of a natural, associative way of thinking and therefore writing. On a more technical level, 2.A.1 is a mirror of violation 1.B.1, which we have already discussed. Moreover, we recognize Lipsius in the use of the participle construction (2.A.2), which after all more often than not implies a dimension of *brevitas*. To quote only

<sup>155</sup> Cf. supra *Brevitas*.

one example: *Sed animos divellere non vis, non hostilitas potest, fidei illo adamante colligatos* (ILE 98 04 02); this is a technique which is found *passim* in Lipsius, who uses *gerundiva* and the likes similarly.

Finally, we also notice characteristic 2.D in Lipsius, viz. the tendency to proceed in an Anti-Ciceronian manner even if the natural meditation of the author has involved him in a suspended construction. Consider, for instance, ILE 98 05 27 C: *Est haec communis laus vestra, illa tua propria, quod in adflicto hoc rei Christianae statu nuper maximos duos Reges pacificasti atque utinam inter se iunctos religioni et reipublicae instaurandae!* The suspension created from *Est laus ... quod* was not even that great, but still Lipsius chose to end the sentence almost in an exclamation with a loosely connected *utinam* and dativus finalis. Another example is found in ILE 98 03 01 A: *Quod magis sentio et in animum demitto, cum in ipsa potentia et magnitudine infirmitatem istorum video aut brevitatem.* The position of *aut brevitatem* again ends the sentence in an unperiodic fashion through syntactic *inconcinntas*. Very reminiscent of Tacitus is the progression of ILE [98 05 13 / 06 15]: *Peto igitur atque absens rogo uti hunc in occasione adiutum velitis, favere animis, consiliis, factis; bene locaturi beneficium, quodcumque in eum conferetis.* With *velitis*, Lipsius grew tired of the periodic flow and changed the syntax of *rogo ut* to an AcI (with *rogo* or *velitis*), ending the sentence with a loosely connected future participle *locaturi*.

To conclude, we can point at an almost systematic syntactic trait in Lipsius, which distorts periodicity even before it can arise. We find inversion of the verb rather often in Lipsius, a technique not uncommon to Cicero's or Seneca's letters, which does not prevent periodic suspension, but creates a rather different periodic rhythm than the usual Latin SOV-word order.<sup>156</sup> Consider, for instance, the better part of ILE 98 04 [13] M:

*Gaudeo et gratulor de filio omnia sic serie et honeste transacta. Similia tibi gaudia Deus in aliis liberis plura donet. Ego Bruxella redux statim in morbum incidi. Videtur catarrhus esse, sed posset ad tabem ire et nunc etiam perseverat. Valde me debilitat, in adsidua tussi. Accepi plura exemplaria et sufficiunt. Velim in Hollandiam quam primum mitti per alium aliquem nautam vel nuntium. Nam Christina nondum hic fuit: ergo procul a reditu, nisi fallor. Adiunxi epistolam ad Vivianum itemque ad Velsorum. Tu utrique exemplar unum adiunge. Vidi libros DE CRUCE impressos et credo idem fore in aliis nec impedire possumus. Bonum esset*

<sup>156</sup> The semantic value of verbs themselves (cf. supra *Brevitas*) as well as their position create an additional effect of *emphasis*.

(*et plures mecum egerunt*) *te praevenire et opera mea simul recudere. Velle ante mortem fieret.*<sup>157</sup>

b) Other characteristics

Having identified constituents of Lipsius's *compositio* in both the curt and the loose style, we can now look at some other characteristics of Lipsian sentence structure, which were not covered in Croll's paper.

– Asyndeton and parataxis

(I.) We have already touched upon the importance of asyndeton in Lipsius's composition.<sup>158</sup> Under 1.A.4 Croll pointed out that the omission of ordinary syntactic ligatures is characteristic of the curt style and indeed, asyndeton is frequent in Lipsian style. Besides a great number of varying uses, it is often found in triple (mostly verbal) expressions such as *abi, perfice, redi* (ILE 98 01 30 R) or *inspiciam, noscam, colam* (ILE 98 04 22 S). Yet although Lipsius is quite fond of such asyndeta, he often adds a fourth element with *et* (sometimes *aut*) to the phrase, which again has an effect of discontinuity and imbalance (cf. supra *Inconcinnitas*). This is the case in *inspexi, collegi, descripsi et hic habes* (ILE 98 04 26) or *vide igitur, lege, explica et a te, siquid opus, adde* (ILE 98 04 26). Both types can also be combined as in *Quis [em]p[or]a, turbas, fraudes etiam nescit? Eripiuntur, aperiuntur, abiciuntur et fit misellis, quod ipsis hominibus solet, ubi fides non est et candor* (ILE 98 08 02 B). Now, since such an added connector mitigates the effect of the asyndeton, it appears that while he is fond of it, Lipsius's main concern is not asyndeton itself. Indeed, as stated above, the omission of ligatures always leads to parataxis, and it is especially parataxis that seems to have appealed to Lipsius. This is best illustrated by some examples where Lipsius introduces *et* or a similar conjunction precisely to obtain or stress parataxis, as in Lipsius's revision of *Filius tuus ad te redit mandato tuo* into *Filius tuus ad te redit et id mandato tuo* (ILE 98 11 02 BR, version one vs version two).<sup>159</sup>

(II.) The great general appeal which Lipsius found in parataxis is also evident from cases where he prefers the (archaic) fashion of paratactic expression, with its (natural or artificial) quality of spontaneity and vividness,<sup>160</sup>

<sup>157</sup> A similar example is found in *De Const.* 1, 3.

<sup>158</sup> Cf. supra Repetition (with *synonymia*) and *Brevitas*. Cp. Tunberg, *Observations*, 176.

<sup>159</sup> This example also shows how parataxis can add to the effect of *compositio fracta*; see elsewhere in the section *Compositio*.

<sup>160</sup> See Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 229/230.

over classical hypotaxis, which is far more usual, even natural<sup>161</sup> in the Latin language.<sup>162</sup> See e. g. ILE 98 02 27: *Sum in hac scaena et Fama produxit, sed ego illam desero et hanc sperno* (instead of *scaena, in qua Fama produxit*); or 98 08 10: *ADMIRANDA parata sunt, sed mittam fortasse cum parte pecuniae et includam, nisi tu aliam rationem nosti tutiorem* (instead of *quam includam*). A final example is a striking sentence from ILE 97 12 28, where Lipsius shows how even hypotaxis can have the effect of parataxis. In *Sed ut in urbe, ubi lues est, si agas, vites domus aut vias totas ea infames, sic hic moneo: fugere te homines et loca vitiis nota et infecta*, we see him opting, not for his usual paratactic syntax (which would be *sic hic moneo: fuge homines ...*), but for the rare AcI-syntax with *moneo* which had a more loose effect than the usual *ut/ne*-object clause. Of course, Lipsius again has matters of *inconcinnitas* at the back of his mind<sup>163</sup> (as in many cases where parataxis is chosen above the expected hypotaxis),<sup>164</sup> since *sic hic moneo, ut fugias homines ...* would have realised obvious periodic anticipation and resolution.<sup>165</sup>

#### – Compositio fracta

A second element of composition which seems to be lacking or not fully detailed in Croll's paper, is Lipsius's tendency towards the commatic style

<sup>161</sup> See *Ibid.*, 233.

<sup>162</sup> Neo-Latin is said to show a general 'tendency towards a more analytical and paratactic phrase structure' (J. IJsewijn-D. Sacré, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies. Part II. Literary, Linguistic, Philological and Editorial Questions, Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 14 [Leuven, 1998], 410), but Lipsius's Latin is even more prone to this tendency than other authors.

<sup>163</sup> Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 232 also points at the element of *inconcinnitas* in such cases of parataxis where one often tends to punctuate with a colon: 'Un cas particulier de l'emploi de la parataxe est celui où le sujet parlant se sert de l'intonation pour marquer le rapport entre les divers membres de l'énoncé. Il y a coordination pour la forme, mais subordination pour le sens'. Marouzeau, *ad locum*, offers several examples, notably from Plautus and Terence, such as Plaut. *Pers.* 44: *Quaesivi: numquam repperi*.

<sup>164</sup> See e. g. the 'parahypotaxis' (cf. Stotz, *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters. 4: Formenlehre, Syntax und Stilistik, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 2/5* [Munich, 1998], 470) of ILE 98 08 02 B: *Quae nescio quomodo exterorum fovens et insitam hanc benignitatem habe* vs the expected *Quae (...) fovens insitam hanc benignitatem habet*.

<sup>165</sup> One systematic exception to Lipsius's paratactic tendency is the way in which he concludes his letters, as appears from ILE 98 03 01 S: *Sequentur tum illa, si Deus dabit, qui te, mi Schotte, tueatur et servet. Lovanii, Kal[endis] Martiis ∞.D.XCVIII*. Still, this is nothing out of the ordinary, as we notice a distinct evolution in Latin epistolography towards more elaborate (and therefore hypotactic) parting formulas.

or *compositio fracta*,<sup>166</sup> as mentioned above. In this style, syntactic units tend to be short (*commata*) and rather disconnected from the rest of the sentence, whereas periodic composition comprises longer units (*cola*), which are organically embedded in a frame of syntactic anticipation, suspension and resolution.

(I.) The difference is readily illustrated by one of Lipsius's favourite means to create this commatic impression, namely his extensive usage of *prolepsis*, in traditional rhetorical handbooks more often interpreted as post-position of introductory words.<sup>167</sup> Granted, this technique is far from exceptional in Ciceronian Latin, but Lipsius seems to use it especially frequent and also more far-reaching than the usual *Caesar, cum ...* instances. In ILE 98 02 27, for instance, which deals with text critical issues, one reads *Tamen, in libro meo scripto cum reperiam nullaue fumosa, suspicari etiam incidit an non (...)*. In this sentence, the position of *tamen* is unusual and the unit that would have been produced by *Cum tamen ... reperiam* is broken. A slight effect of estrangement is produced by the sudden realisation that *in libro meo scripto* will not be supplemented by *lego* or *reperio*, but is actually part of a subordinate clause. In ILE 98 03 01 A, we find an example of *prolepsis* which Lipsius uses to produce *chiasmus*: *Omitto beneficia in patriam publica, in me privata. Ipse titulus et argumentum palam ad te ducebant. ROMANI imperii descriptio cui potius aut iustius debebatur quam Principi e tot ROMANIS Imperatoribus nato? From a purely communicative perspective one would expect *ad te* to be followed by *Cui enim potius aut iustius debebatur* etc., but this marred the chiasmic effect of *ROMANI imperii – cui vs Principi – ROMANIS Imperatoribus*. A similar effect is found in the same letter in: *Iam et ADMIRANDORUM ille titulus, annon ad te traheret, in varia virtute sic ADMIRANDUM?* In these cases, the unity of the *cola* is disrupted – (a)q(b) instead of q(a, b) – and accordingly periodic suspense is mitigated.*

<sup>166</sup> The term is originally Quintilian's, cf. Quint. Inst. 8,3,57.

<sup>167</sup> Cf. still Landfester, Einführung in die Stilistik, 115, who on the other hand affirms: 'Häufig tritt ein für die Aussage des Satzes wichtiges Nomen vor das satzeinleitende Wort, so daß die Nachstellung der semantischen Hervorhebung dient. Die Semantik des Satzes erhält dadurch Vorrang vor seiner Syntax'. The term *prolepsis* is better known as the Greek counterpart of the rhetorical figure *anticipatio*. Still, it is fitting, as the technique effectively puts a word (group) in the emphatic first position of the sentence and accordingly influences (i. e. stresses or changes) the communicative theme-rheme perspective (see e. g. D. Panhuis, Latin Grammar [Ann Arbor, 2006], 185/186).

(II.) Another technique which produces a commatic style or disrupts syntactic units, is Lipsius's use of parentheses, which are common in a style that aims at liveliness and uses parataxis.<sup>168</sup> Indeed, Lipsius is famous for his parentheses; Croll affirms that one can even recognize his imitators by them.<sup>169</sup> To quote only one example, lengthy parentheses of full sentences such as *Mon. 2, 9: Sed dixi utiliter, imo necessario (quid enim si res subtilis aut in legum ambiguitate sit?) Adsessores adhiberi* are quite common.

\* One specific type of parenthetical syntax is the exclamation, which is often found in Lipsius, both within sentences (thus breaking syntax) and as independent sentences in texts (thus breaking periodic rhythm). In ILE 98 02 04, for instance, we read *Inter eos sororis filium, qui uxorem duxit et quidem (o meam bonitatem!) in meam domum*, where Lipsius combines a paratactic construction with a parasitic *et* and a parenthetical exclamation. Exclamations breaking up periodic rhythm have already been discussed in the section *Rhythm* (use of *Quid* and *Ecce*). In this section, we can add sentences such as *O institutionem vestram olim mihi utilem!* (ILE 98 01 23 P) or *Beatos vos, qui haec auditis tantum!* (ILE 98 04 04), which consist entirely of *accusativi exclamationis*.

\* Moreover, we notice that Lipsius's loose *compositio*, which we dealt with above, often produces a 'parenthetical' effect even in sentences and cola which are strictly speaking not parenthetical. When we take a second look at ILE 98 02 22 B, already discussed as an example of the curt style, we notice Lipsius's frequent use of *an*, *aut*, appositions, etc. which give a parenthetical 'feel' to the sentence (i. e. one is often tempted to punctuate as – ... –):

*Ecce iterum meam manum. Quid tu ais? Haec non emendari cum annis? Imo et ego iuvenesco et vide exemplum. Oculi iterum belle habent et lemae illae, an glaucomata aut quidquid fuit, in malam rem abierunt et maneant aeternum. Utinam tua res sic procedat, illa Iunonia, quae me tecum exercet. Quidquid dissimulas, amas et negantia tua verba apud me adfirmant. Sed cum modo; nimis amare insanum malum est; et ne incide aut eripe te, si incidisti. "En", inquires, "etiam rideor?" Magis priusquam perages et nuptias semper praecedunt isti Fescennini. Sed extra iocum aut cavillum; avunculum hunc tuum cense, nisi quid mater aut filia (sed illa potius) instillent aut mutent. Sed mutant, tu fac idem et alio transfer adfectum. Si pax coit, huc te transfer: ambulabis,*

<sup>168</sup> Hofmann - Szantyr, *Stilistik*, 728.

<sup>169</sup> Croll, *Juste Lipse et le Mouvement Anticicéronien*, 30. Cp. Williamson, *The Senecan Amble*, 242.

*videbis, excerpes. An spes aliqua est? Nobis magna, sed nescio an certa. Accepi heri a magnis quaedam, quae alio eunt. Itaque si non aliter, Iulii filius ad me; vereor ut serum sit aut ut umquam.*

\* A similar ‘pseudo-parenthetic’ technique is Lipsius’s exceptionally frequent usage of *addo/adde (et)*, which can again be used both within sentences and independently. A simple example is ILE 98 10 07 BA: *Vendibilior liber et, addo, utilior esset*. The word *addo* is redundant here (*et utilior esset*), but by adding it the sentence gains in emphasis and also the syntactic unit *et ... esset* is broken up, thus producing Lipsius’s typical compositional style. An example of the technique as an independent element is found in ILE 98 02 11: *Faciunt et merita tua ac beneficia plura in rem litterariam et communem. Addo virtutem et probitatem, omnium ore laudatam.*

\* Something rather similar to Lipsius’s *addo (et)* is his frequent use of *id est, et id, or idque*. In *Pol., De consilio et forma nostri operis*, we read: *Cum enim inventio tota et ordo a nobis sint, verba tamen et sententias varie acquisivimus a scriptoribus priscis. Idque maxime ab Historicis: hoc est, ut ego censeo, a fonte ipso Prudentiae Civilis.*

(III.) One final example can readily illustrate how especially the combination of several techniques can produce a heavy effect of *compositio fracta*. In ILE 98 11 02 BA Lipsius says of the Paris *typographi* illegally reprinting his Tacitus edition: *Pergant cum bono Deo, si coeperunt, et haec tamen pauca, seorsim quae scripsi, tu videbis et (nisi serum sit) intexes et rescribes*. In this sentence, especially the latter part *et haec ... rescribes* strikes one as commatic, because of several effects. Not only the *prolepsis* in *seorsim quae* or the parenthesis in *nisi ... sit*, but especially the parataxis in *videbis et ...* allows Lipsius to dislodge the sentence and give it an impression of what has been called the *guttatim*-style, a frequent effect of archaic *compositio*.<sup>170</sup> Obviously, one would expect something along the lines of *et tu vide, si quae pauca seorsim scripsi, intexere vel rescribere possis*. Yet Lipsius’s paratactic formula allows this expression to be taken apart, further imparting a rather estranging effect on the sentence because of the connection one makes of *haec* with *videbis*.

– Doubling

(I.) A third, important addition to the compositional insights of Croll is the fact that while Lipsius is often seen as the undisputed champion of *brevitas*, he does show a great tendency towards doubling, which is often

<sup>170</sup> Cf. Courtney, *Archaic Latin Prose*, 4.



interpreted as *padding*, a markedly periodic technique.<sup>171</sup> Still, for all its Ciceronian and classical appearance, such 'Synonymenhäufung' (cf. supra *Repetition*) is more frequent in ante-classical authors such as Plautus or Cato, or later Latin such as Livy or Seneca,<sup>172</sup> thus in keeping with Lipsius's literary taste. Examples of this doubling are mainly found in more rhetorical texts,<sup>173</sup> yet consider, for instance, ILE 98 02 11, a letter written in a plainly familiar context to a good friend of Lipsius's, Marcus Welser:

*Semel excusavi silentium<sub>1</sub> meum, mi Velsere, et adfectum adfirmavi<sub>2</sub>, quem scire debes augere<sub>1</sub> in dies et calere<sub>2</sub>. Amor tuus in me hoc facit, quem magis magisque exseris. Faciunt et merita tua<sub>1</sub> ac beneficia plura<sub>2</sub> in rem litterariam<sub>1</sub> et communem<sub>2</sub>. Adde virtutem<sub>1</sub> et probitatem<sub>2</sub>, omnium ore laudatam. Sed omittamus ista, quae tamen a Lipsio<sub>1</sub>, non ab amico<sub>2</sub> dicuntur. Utinam tam fideliter tu miratus fueris mea ADMIRANDA! Sed Schotti nostri adfectus primum ipsi<sub>1</sub>, deinde tibi<sub>2</sub> imposuit. At mihi crede haud multa in eo opere vobis doctioribus probanda praeter ordinem aliquem<sub>1</sub> et argumentum ipsum<sub>2</sub>, cui non humaniori gratum? Res tibi dicet me in meis vera dicere et mox videbis. Nam habebis certe<sub>1</sub> inter primos<sub>1</sub>, tu me serio<sub>2</sub> inter tuos<sub>2</sub>. Lovan[ii] III. Idus Feb[ruarias] ∞.D.XCVIII.*

(II.) Still, such an example is rather rare. More often than not, Lipsius's doubling is mitigated by two effects: *inconcinnitas*, which was abundantly discussed above, but also antithesis,<sup>174</sup> which was already touched upon in the section on *Repetition* – an effect which Lipsius was very prone to and which (in combination with brevity) earned his prose the epithet 'pointed'. Examples are, of course, found *passim*, for instance in ILE 98 02 06 R:

*Scribis N[on] N[ominati] libros te vidisse atque in iis quaedam de me, alia in me. (...) At vide quam ego curiosus: audieram iamdiu a nostro Orano, neglexi inspicere et nec nunc quidem te momente vidi. (...) At ille bonus etiam defensione nostra offenditur in CRUCE, quae tamen nuda defensio est et scutum modo praefert, gladium non stringit. (...) Tu et Schottus noster ADMIRANDA valde probatis, sed ego ipse iam nunc quaedam improbo et editio altera*

<sup>171</sup> See e. g. H. C. Gotoff, *Cicero's Elegant Style. An Analysis of the Pro Archia (Urbana-Chicago - London, 1979)*, 234.

<sup>172</sup> Cf. Hofmann - Szantyr, *Stilistik*, 787/788.

<sup>173</sup> Cp. supra *Repetition* for the *synonymia* in ILE 98 07 10.

<sup>174</sup> The first is often analysed as a Tacitean, the second as a Senecan characteristic of style (see e. g. Williamson, *The Senecan Amble*, 148).

*emendabit. (...) Comprime meo nomine non amorem eius, sed laudem.*<sup>175</sup>

(III.) A final way in which such doubling is sometimes mitigated is using such disrupting words as discussed with regard to periodic rhythm. In ILE 98 09 07 V, for instance, Lipsius avoids a Ciceronian opening such as *Magnam tibi gratiam, Vir Clarissime, me ore animoque et debere et habere fateor pro ista cura ac benevolentia tua erga me*, by writing *Gratiam tibi debeo, V[ir] Cl[arissi]me, atque etiam habeo (ore quidem et animo) pro ista benevolentia mei, immo et cura*, where *etiam*, *quidem* and *immo* disrupt the symmetric movement of the doubling in *debeo ... habeo, ore ... animo* and *benevolentia ... cura*.<sup>176</sup>

### c) Conclusion

In conclusion, it might be fruitful to cite two other examples. In ILE 98 06 21 we read *Ventum, fumum, nugas [sc. nos homines] esse sciebat atque utinam non vere addam fraudem, fucum, scelus*, which effectively combines many of the compositional elements discussed above. The sentence shows two asyndetic tricola, one of which has the characteristic addition with *atque*. To boot, it contains two of Lipsius's parenthetical constructions, namely *utinam* and *addam*, which effectively break up the syntactic unit. Finally, it shows that Lipsius did not shun repetition and *synonymia*, but that he virtually always uses these in combination with techniques of *inconcinnitas*, i. e. the imbalance between the first asyndetic tricolon and the second because of the difference in syntax (*esse sciebat* vs *utinam non addam*).

In a second example we read: *Ah omitte: non ego ille Palmatus Scipio et tu, quantum ab ista faece abes, μουσῶν καὶ χαρίτων τρόφιμος, et hoc quoque Deo et animo isto iudice vel teste* (ILE 98 12 25 R). In this sentence, elements of the curt and loose style are combined. Curt are the omitted ligatures (apart from the allowed *et*), the hovering order (with the self-contained *omitte* up front) and effects of brevity and especially asymmetry, as the sentence is effectively constructed as an assembly of four different sentences: 1) *Omitte* (i. e. *talia, quibus me effuse laudas*); 2) *Non ego sum Scipio*; 3) *Quantum ab ista faece abes, tu μουσῶν καὶ χαρίτων τρόφιμος?* and 4) *Hoc*

<sup>175</sup> It is clear that Lipsius actively sought out these antithetical effects, as appears, for instance, from ILE 98 05 27 C: *Hominem certum ultro ad me mittis visendi a te et salutandi causa*, where a *te* is redundant in view of *mittis*, but obviously serves only to create antithesis in *ad me* vs *a te*.

<sup>176</sup> Cp. the effect of words like *vel* or *et* in doublings such as *Nos (...) scimus hunc omnium aevi morem (an morbum) aemulari aut et calumniari* (ILE 98 12 25 M).

*verum est Deo et animo isto tamquam iudice vel teste*. The Lipsian sentence is in fact an amalgam of an imperative sentence, a declarative sentence first person singular, an interrogative sentence and a declarative sentence with ellipsis in combination with an *ablativus absolutus*. Such a construction really does produce the effect of 'an "exploded" period', as Croll put it.<sup>177</sup> At the same time, an element of the loose style is present, viz. the order of the members and the addition of *Deo ... teste*, which is similar to the participle construction.

These two examples show us the true nature of Lipsian *compositio*. It is primarily a heteroclitical whole, where the separate elements have been glued together either asyndetically or with parataxis rather than subordination. In this way, it tends more towards the curt style than the loose, but still contains elements of both. Especially in rhetorical contexts, it uses the characteristic techniques of the loose style to wriggle free from periodic rhythm. Although short in length and commatic in construction, it is not contrary to repetition, doubling and redundancy, yet in these cases it virtually always combines this with effects of antithetical nature and of *inconcininitas*.

## 5. Text

### 5.1. Latinitas

#### a) Introduction

Lipsius's *Latinitas* is hardly uncontested, especially in his letters. Scaliger once famously proclaimed: *O le meschant Latin que la Centurie de ses Epistres, il a peu de livres*<sup>178</sup> – a scolding remark which is echoed throughout Early Modern statements in the Lipsian controversy. Lipsius's Latin constituted a break from Ciceronianism, which was normative in humanist literary criticism, and his language was accordingly considered bad Latin and unfit for *imitatio*. Only his Ciceronian orations met with some approval. In Heineccius's words: *Lipsii orationes elegantiores purioresque sunt eius epistolis, adeo ut eas nonnulli Lipsio suppositas existiment*. In a similar fashion Scaliger stated: *Orationes de duplici concordia et in obitum Ducis Saxoniae latinissimae sunt et aliis Lipsii operibus latiniore*.<sup>179</sup>

<sup>177</sup> Croll, *The Baroque Style in Prose*, 209.

<sup>178</sup> Josephus Justus Scaliger, *Scaligeriana sive Excerpta ex ore Josephi Scaligeri per F.F.P.P.* (Hagae-Comitis: Adrianus Vlacq, 1666), 204.

<sup>179</sup> From Heineccius' *Fundamenta stili cultioris* and Scaliger's *Scaligeriana*, quoted from K. Halm, *Ueber die Aechtheit der dem Justus Lipsius zugeschriebenen Reden: eine litterarhistorische Untersuchung*, *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologischen und his-*

It is not always easy to decide what people like Heineccius or Scaliger meant with Lipsius's 'poor Latinity'. Still, from more detailed discussions it seems that especially his vocabulary and periodic rhythm were criticized in this context, while there was much less attention for matters of syntax. Indeed, contemporary grammatical education almost exclusively focussed on matters of morphology, vocabulary and idiomatic expression, while there was virtually no systematic treatment of syntax, which students basically mastered through long hours of prose composition in imitation of the classical authors. In this way, humanist syntax usually adheres to Ciceronian-Caesarean practice when it comes to matters such as complementary clauses (AcI, *ut, quod*, etc.) or *consecutio temporum*, yet at the same time discrepancies, transgressions and variations are by no means infrequent.

The following section, which will focus on some syntactic elements of Lipsius's *Latinitas*, should therefore be understood purely from the perspective of a modern researcher compiling a synchronic-descriptive synthesis of Lipsius's Latin. It is not a list of syntactic 'errors', but merely points out certain phenomena where Lipsius deviates from Ciceronian-Caesarean syntax. As it is true that our humanist does so with considerably more *licentia* than many of his contemporaries, this element too constitutes a factor of his individual employment of the Latin language, which is a legitimate part of the concept 'style'.

Lipsius's use of archaic, learned, post-classical or neological vocabulary, which was definitely criticized by humanists as lacking *Latinitas*, will be treated in the next section on (*Mala*) *Affectatio*. For, while it is indeed closely tied up with matters of propriety or impropriety (*Latinitas*), this aspect of Lipsius's language is in literary terms rather a transgression of the *ornatus*, in favour of an affected, over-embellished style.

#### b) Elements of *Latinitas*

(I.) A first category of phenomena we can mention here, are those where Lipsius slightly transgresses the boundaries of classical Latin, at the same time remaining well within the limits of the Latin idiom. One example is an *incipit* such as *Gaudeo in Italiam incolumem venisse, gaudeo in domum magni Pinelli admissum, quem virum, aevo et gloria iam veterem, Italia vel inter veteres suos praeferat et iactet* (ILE 97 12 28). For a class of Latin prose composition, we would point out that one should really mention the subject *te* explicitly. It is a case of ellipsis unallowed by traditional grammar,

---

torischen Classe der k. b. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München, 2, 1 Munich, 1882, 12.

but certainly fathomable in Sallust, Pliny or Tacitus. A second example is when Lipsius uses the syntax *vereor ut* in ILE 98 02 22 B, 13/14 both in the sense of the *vereor ne non* and *vereor ne*. This is already more difficult, as here the danger of confusion lurks, but strictly speaking both usages are Neo-Latin. A bold expression such as the concise *Id vero fuerit omnibus consiliis nostris, si non turbandis, certe tardandis* (ILE 98 09 07 B) is unparalleled in classical Latin, but not outside the possibilities of the idiom's syntax, or for instance Tacitus' practice. Another case is the medieval imperfect subjunctive *Cuperet* for a present *potentialis* (instead of *Cupiat* or even *Cupit*) in *Cuperet in eius locum venire atque ego virum celebrem et egregium commendo, veteri tamen mea lege, ut in talibus onus non imponam* (ILE 98 05 29). Moreover, Lipsius occasionally allows hybrid subjunctive constructions such as 98 11 21 B: *Longum hoc negotium nec pro ingenio Italo vel Gallicano. Sed non displiceat tamen differri, si modo certa spes Pacis adfulgeret*, which need not surprise, as they are found even in the more classical Erasmus.<sup>180</sup>

Indeed, in general Lipsius's use of the subjunctive often does not seem according to our expectations; see e. g. such sentences as ILE 98 04 [13] M: *Ego Bruxella redux statim in morbum incidi. Videtur catarrhus esse, sed p o s s e t ad tabem ire et nunc etiam perseverat. Valde me debilitat, in adsidua tussi* or 98 04 26: *Ego vero, ut litteras tuas accepi, paravi me ad parendum. An aliter p o s s e m in voluntate, id est praecepto, Principum? Itaque inspexi, collegi, descripsi et hic habes*. Still, this is a general phenomenon of later and Neo-Latin,<sup>181</sup> which is present in Lipsius's contemporaries as well.<sup>182</sup>

One final, more or less systematic deviation from Ciceronian composition is Lipsius's tendency to use the interrupted *non ... solum – sed ...* instead of the classical *non solum – sed ...*, a technique which also adds to the disruption of commatic balance (cf. supra). Examples are *legio*; one letter (ILE 98

<sup>180</sup> Cp. the example *At mea sententia non merito sibi Deum devincirent, si in deligendis Ecclesiae praefectis et animum et iudicium adhibeant christianum* cited in IJsewijn-Sacré, Companion to Neo-Latin Studies. Part II, 411.

<sup>181</sup> Research on Neo-Latin syntax is still scarcely out of the egg, yet suggests that, for all its Ciceronian-Caesarian inspiration, the use of the subjunctive was much more free (as it was in later Latin writers of Antiquity such as Sidonius Apollinaris or Augustinus) than we might think (cp. Ibid., 410/411 which mainly speaks of subjunctives in subordinate clauses). Indeed, even in Cicero and Caesar the use of the subjunctive is much more erratic than traditional school grammars portray it.

<sup>182</sup> Cp. Stotz, Handbuch, 320: 'Bei der Anwendung des Konjunktiv's in potentialen/irrealen Sinne wird der Tempusgebrauch seit alters oft recht frei gehandhabt. So kommen vielfach imperfektische Formen vor in Fällen, in denen man präsentische erwarten würde'.

05 31 R) even has three: *Caussa profecto iusta est, si fuit umquam, cum rem perfeceris et arduam et non Belgicae solum, sed Europae optabilem et salutarem. (...) Itaque non tibi solum hunc titulum et splendorem, sed etiam posteris tuis gratulor; qui hanc nobilem famam et velut ius imaginis inter cetera a parente suo habebunt. (...) O non pertinaces solum, sed male sagaces!* This ‘rule’ of Lipsian Latin – one hardly finds an example where *non* and *solum* are placed together – is only regularly attested in classical Latin since Livy.<sup>183</sup>

(II.) A second string of examples consists of syntactic cases which are more conspicuous, as they seem further removed from grammatical *consuetudo* and accordingly testify even more of Lipsius’s *licentia*.<sup>184</sup> One instance is ILE 98 03 16 D: *Meum hunc [sc. nuntium] cum vides, facile opinaris quod et meas literas, sine quibus nefas sane eum venire.* Such an un-Ciceronian (we find it in Plautus, Suetonius and Caesar) and suspiciously medieval-sounding *quod*-construction with a *verbum putandi* does occur in humanist Latin, but it is not very common.<sup>185</sup> A similar instance is ILE 98 11 21 B: *Sed tamen vereor (immo scio) quod haec fabula suum plaudite semel habebit et inopinato aulaea tollentur et scabella concrepabunt,* where *quod* classically fits neither *vereor* nor *scio*.

Sometimes, we can see how Lipsius arrives at such constructions. In search of stylistic effects such as *inconcinntas*, the line between a striking mode of expression and grammatical confusion is sometimes crossed. Consider, for instance, ILE [98 07 22] P: *Hanc nisi advocas et totum adfectui te permittis, quis Deus adiuverit?* In this sentence, Lipsius succeeds in halting the reader’s comprehension by contaminatively annexing *et ... permittis* to a *nisi*-clause (the meaning is: *Si hanc non advocas aut si ... te permittis*), but such a construction is not allowed by traditional Latin grammar.<sup>186</sup> An even clearer example is ILE 98 08 02 T, where *Triste mihi auditu fuit de Hadriani fratris tui morte* contains an impossible *fuit*, as it has no subject. In Latin the supinum II is either combined with an AcI or with an indirect question, both of which can function as the subject of an impersonal *est*. In this way, the above sentence is an incorrect alternative for *Triste mihi fuit audire de Hadriani ...* or possibly *Triste mihi auditu fuit Hadrianum obisse*. Still, Lip-

<sup>183</sup> Hofmann - Szantyr, *Stilistik*, 518.

<sup>184</sup> Defined by Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, § 469 as the decisive criterion for *Latinitas*.

<sup>185</sup> L. Wirth-Poelchau, *AcI und quod-Satz im lateinischen Sprachgebrauch mittelalterlicher und humanistischer Autoren* (Lettland: Riga, Diss. Dokt., 1977), 106–169.

<sup>186</sup> Cf. Kühner - Holzweissig, *Ausführliche Grammatik*, 2/2, § 220.

sius's version might be explained from a kind of deliberately unsophisticated and sudden language (as if he were in shock), which better suited his purpose of offering condolences.

Such a choice of stylistic expressiveness over grammatical orthodoxy is not exceptional in Lipsius. It is a literary license which we observe in all writers, even Cicero. Another good example is found in ILE 98 02 04: *Inter eos sororis filium, qui uxorem duxit et quidem (o meam bonitatem!) in meam domum*. Instead of the more usual *in domo mea*, Lipsius uses *in* with the accusative case as a sort of wink to the movement implied in *uxorem ducere*, which might stretch the language, but is much more vivid than *in domo mea*. Even more daring ILE 98 09 30: *Sed ecce, quae te velut adventicia excipiat, Dissertatiunculam nostram super Cursoribus, quam in sermone per occasionem discessus tui agitatum misi te petente in scripta et, si vacas, hic lege*, where Lipsius again seems to prefer *in* with accusative case (instead of *in scriptis*) to suggest movement.

### c) Conclusion

These last few examples already show how this category of Latinitas (in fact *barbarismus* and *soloecismus*) contributes to the general character of the *stilus Lipsianus*, where stylistic effects such as archaism, disproportionality and unexpected expressions or turns of phrase take precedence over traditional concerns of *perspicuitas* and *Latinitas*. Other elements that might be mentioned in this context will be treated in the next section, or have already been dealt with in *Compositio* (e. g. Lipsius's large allowance of parenthesis). These too can be interpreted in the same way as contributing to the feeling of *je ne sçay quel Latin c'est* (Scaliger)<sup>187</sup> which Lipsius's prose sometimes exhibits.

## 5.2. (Mala) Affectatio<sup>188</sup>

### a) Introduction

In contemporary and later criticism of Lipsius's style, one of the more often heard reproaches is the one of *mala affectatio*.<sup>189</sup> We have already seen

<sup>187</sup> From Scaliger's Scaligeriana, quoted from M. Morford, Life and Letters in Lipsius's Teaching, in: G. Tournoy - J. De Landtsheer - J. Papy (eds), Iustus Lipsius. Europae lumen et columnen. Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven 17–19 September 1997, Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 15 (Leuven, 1999), 107–123 (122, n. 60).

<sup>188</sup> In general, I prefer to put the element *mala* in brackets, as it is often found in ancient oratorical writings, but not in Early Modern theory (which tends to condemn *affectatio* in general).

how Lipsius's abundant use of *adnominatio* was interpreted in this sense, but many other aspects of his vocabulary, syntax and style were also criticized as artificial or *recherché*. The learnedness of his style, his love of archaic Latin and his intellectualistic style<sup>190</sup> cause Lipsius to transgress the traditional *decorum* of the *poeta doctus* or the effect of *antiquitas*, and create *mala affectatio* or κακόζηλον, which is defined as the exaggerated use of *ornatus*, resulting in *corrupta* or *apparata oratio*.<sup>191</sup> Lipsius himself was well aware of this reproach and was therefore quick to warn against it himself, as in ILE 91 06 14 W (second version) on the use of *antiquitas*, or in ILE 97 02 11, in a more general context.<sup>192</sup> Accordingly, his admirers too felt the need to defend Lipsius against this blame, as Rolliardus did in the already cited ILE 98 10 29: *Ita sine fuco nitor eius [sc. orationis] splendet, ut Romana potius quam civitate donata; tam curiosa, ut vernacula tamen iudicetur; tot sales, tot veneres, tot lepores simul profundat, ut eius inadfectatam iucunditatem nullius adfectatio consequi possit.*<sup>193</sup>

Similarly to the section *Latinitas*, the aim of this treatment of (Mala) *Affectatio* is not so much to put the finger on the *vitia* Lipsius might show in this respect, as it is to describe the different stylistic aspects of Lipsius's Latin that could cause this impression of affectation. Strictly speaking all elements of *ornatus* can be exaggerated and thus create κακόζηλον, but several are mentioned in oratorical theory as especially prone to it. The phenomena Lausberg cites remind one of the terminology used by Lipsius's critics: *verba impropria*, obscure metaphors, *ambiguitas*, exaggerated use of *figurae*, especially *adnominatio*, complicated *zeugmata* or *compositio fracta*.<sup>194</sup> Some of these have already been dealt with in previous sections.<sup>195</sup>

<sup>189</sup> Cf. Cleuius: *Stilum eius (...) ut sic dicam totum gemmeum, non (quod decentius est) gemmis distinctum* (cf. supra, n. 98).

<sup>190</sup> Cp. Hofmann - Szantyr, *Stilistik*, 768: 'Als bewußtes literarisches Stilisierungsmittel ist er [sc. der Archaismus] nahe verwandt mit dem Neologismus (§ 29): beide sind Ausdruck einer individuellen künstlerischen Hochkultur, die sich vom Alltäglichen abwendet'.

<sup>191</sup> Cf. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, § 1073.

<sup>192</sup> It is easy to see why Lipsius was especially offended by this criticism of *mala affectatio* in his style. Oratorical theory explicitly mentions this *vitium* as a threat to the *robur* quality of the *ornatus* (cf. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, § 540), an aspect which Lipsius was particularly keen upon; see e. g. Inst. Epist. 11: *fiatque oratio stricta, fortis et vere virilis*.

<sup>193</sup> For a similar defense of Lipsius by Fredericus Taubmann, cp. Jansen, *Brevitas*, 1, 162.

<sup>194</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, 516.

<sup>195</sup> For the other elements, see the sections *Figurative language* (obscure metaphors), *Brevitas* (*ambiguitas* and *zeugmata*), *Repetition* (*adnominatio*) and *Compositio* (*compositio fracta*).



Accordingly, mainly matters of affectated vocabulary and some elements of syntax will be analysed here.

### b) Vocabulary

A first element which earned Lipsius's prose the reproach of *mala affectatio* is the exaggerated use of *ornatus* in his vocabulary, more specifically the overuse of archaisms and, less often, neologisms. Although traditional rhetorics do allow a small amount of *antiquitas* or *fictio* for ornamental purposes,<sup>196</sup> overusing *verba obsoleta* or neologisms threatens the orator's *Latinitas*.

#### – Fictio

In his research<sup>197</sup> Tunberg had already toned down the observation that Lipsius uses (too) many neologisms.<sup>198</sup> In fact, he does not cite any examples of neologisms *stricto sensu*. Still, with regards to *fictio* in a larger sense (ancient words in unattested forms, derivations, new compounds, etc.), Lipsius's works do contain no small amount of instances, as appeared from the section *Vocabulary*, possibly resulting in an impression of overwrought lexical *ornatus*.

Yet stylistically speaking, Lipsius's usage of *fictio* is only seldom haphazard. More often than not, it serves the flexibility or expressiveness of his language. The former is often the case with his use of new *diminutiva* or transliterations of Greek words. Lipsius will not – as Ciceronians might do – turn to circumlocutions to keep within the classical lexicon. If he sees reason to use a word such as *affectiuncula* or *anulatim*, he will not write *parva/minor affectio* or [*in*] *modo anuli* instead. Nor will he speak of a *faber tignarius* (Cic. Brut. 73, 257) if he can use the transliterated *tecton* (from the Greek ὁ τέκτων).<sup>199</sup> Other, more daring instances of *fictio*, rather serve the expressiveness of the text. Lipsius's use of the verbs *fritillare* and *trutilare*, for instance, in ILE I, 75 09 29 are obviously such cases: *Et circumsonant te ac velut salutant chori illi alitum, suaviter fritillantium, trutilantium, minurientium ad quos non aequiparent se tibiae, citharae aut ex arte ulli cantus*.

<sup>196</sup> Cf. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, §§ 546 and 547 respectively.

<sup>197</sup> Tunberg, *Observations*, 171.

<sup>198</sup> See e. g. T. S. Healy, *John Donne. Ignatius his conclave. An edition of the Latin and English Texts with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford, 1969), xvii (quoting the opinion of Gaspar Schoppe). Halm, *Ueber die Aechtheit der dem Justus Lipsius zugeschriebenen Reden*, 13 even spoke of 'Der bizarre und unnatürliche Stil (...) reich an (...) sprachwidrigen neuen Wortbildungen'.

<sup>199</sup> On *adfectiuncula*, *anulatim* and *tecton*, see Hoven - Grailet, *Lexique*, s. v.

– *Antiquitas* and rare vocabulary

Whereas ancient rhetorics only speak of *fictio* and *antiquitas*, it is fruitful to treat not only Lipsius's archaic vocabulary, but also his usage of other kinds of unusual words in this context, even if these words should actually belong to eras of later Latin. For, in this section on (*Mala*) *Affectatio* what counts is the impression of *recherché*, of exaggerated *ornatus* in vocabulary, not a chronological analysis of Lipsius's lexicon (cf. supra *Vocabulary*). *Exempli gratia* we can quote Lipsius's archaic *percupio* (Plautus and Terence) and post-classical *vegetandum* (first attested in Apuleius) in the same letter (ILE 98 11 20). Rather than leaving a separate impression of *antiquitas* and usage of later vocabulary, the words above all remind the reader of the scope of Lipsius's Latin, of the range of his *copia verborum*.

(I.) As already observed, Lipsius's prose is laden with archaic and rare<sup>200</sup> words much more than *fictio*. The amount of such lexical *ornatus* in his prose is much higher than that of his contemporaries, or indeed, than is regular in Latin at large. In De Mil. Rom. 4, 1 Lipsius responds *Flocci et pappi mihi tuae minae*, where he not only uses a reference to the colloquial language of Plautus (*flocci*, e. g. Plaut. Curc. 713), but also the rare word *pappus* ('old man', see Varr. L.L., 7, 29 Müll.). Lipsius could easily have contended himself with only the expression *Flocci non facio tuas minas*. Instead he chose for the syntax *flocci esse* (with ellipsis), which is unattested in ancient literature as an alternative for *flocci facere* or *pendere*, and, which is more, he added the extremely rare *pappi*, which has to be read as *minae pappi* (*tantum*), thus letting his taste for rare vocabulary prevail over considerations of concision. A very similar instance is found in ILE 98 02 22 B: *Sed extra iocum aut cavillum; avunculum hunc tuum cense, nisi quid mater aut filia (sed illa potius) instillent aut mutent*. Again, the very rare *cavillum* could just as easily have been left out.

Such examples obviously have more to do with taste and intellectual pleasure than any other stylistic consideration, as is clear, for instance, from Lipsius's use of *necessum*, which he regularly prefers over the much more usual *nesesse*. Lipsius liked this archaic form, which we clearly see in ILE VIII 95 04 21 R<sup>1</sup> where *manu sua* he changed *quibus involvi nesesse est etiam non bellaces* on numerous occasions into (...) *necessum est* (...). As a final example of this arbitrary usage of uncommon vocabulary, which easily produces an effect of affectation and artificiality, one can quote Lipsius's

<sup>200</sup> Especially on rare words in Lipsius, see Tunberg, *Observations*, 173 and Löfstedt, *Zu Justus Lipsius' Briefen*, 73/74 and 77.

taste for rare adverbs. In *De Mil. Rom.*, 4, 11, for instance, we find *tenuius*, classically only found in *Cic. Inv.* 2, 16, 51, but very usual in Lipsius. Other examples include instances mentioned by Tunberg such as *subsultim* or a taste for adverbs in *-atim* like *pagellatim*, *summatim*, *verbatimim*, etc., the overly enthusiast employment of which made Aulus Gellius voice criticism at the address of Sisenna.<sup>201</sup>

(II.) Yet despite the fact that Lipsius's choices often seem arbitrary, there are usually good reasons for his employment of such words. Indeed, not all instances of a rare adverb in *-atim* are arbitrary. In ILE 98 02 22 L Lipsius writes *Tamen adsurgo et vires ac spiritus recipio pauxillatim*, using a rare alternative for *paulatim*. Yet, one easily feels that due to its physiognomy<sup>202</sup> and volume *pauxillatim* is much more expressive and nuanced than the usual *paulatim*. It was the ideal word for Lipsius to say 'slowly, bit by bit', while retaining an air of discontent with the situation,<sup>203</sup> which is not present in the neutral *paulatim* (the emphatic position of *pauxillatim* at the end of the sentence contributes to this effect as well).

\* So, as was the case with Lipsius's *fictio*, we notice that usage of archaic, rare, learned, post-classical or other uncommon words can be interpreted as stylistic expressiveness. In ILE 98 05 18 R, for instance, Lipsius wrote: *Nam duplex mihi in te amor est. Alter vetus et a fratre tuo, olim meo, Thoma Rhedingero, quasi hereditate in te derivatus, quem cum et coluerim serio et amaverim, certe etiam te debeo non sanguine solum, sed magnitudine animi et honestissimarum rerum artiumque studio vere et germane fratrem*. At first sight, he could easily have found a synonym for the rare *germane*, or even have left it out (cf. *supra*), but he chose against that possibility, opting to use the expressive *germane* (~ *germen*) to describe a true brother.<sup>204</sup> Similarly, Lipsius's extremely rare *depraedicare* expresses his anger in ILE 98 02 06 R: *Quid enim ille nimis amice ADMIRANDA nostra apud Augustanos depraedicavit – ex Velseri litteris vidi – et famam excitavit, quam non sustinebunt?* The more usual *denuntiavit* or *praedicavit* clearly lack the effect of the unusual *depraedicavit*. In two other cases, Lipsius appears to have aimed at alliteration and therefore chose a more unusual word, as *superstrues* in ILE 98 11 02 BA: *Solida si spectes, superstrues famam*

<sup>201</sup> Cf. Gell. 12, 14.

<sup>202</sup> Terminology used by Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 87–95.

<sup>203</sup> The length of the word *pauxillatim* stresses the length of the illness, from which he is recovering.

<sup>204</sup> Lipsius might also have had *Plaut. Men.* 1125 (*Mi[hi] germane gemine frater, salve: ego sum Sosicles*) or other such instance in the back of his mind.

*firmam et sub sidere metuentem* or *mussant* in ILE 98 04 21: *Ego iam dies sedecim in morbo fui (omitto veterem meum languorem) et a quo periculum tabis non abesse medici mussant.*

\* The latter example brings us to a second kind of functionality of these words, viz. the isotopic usage. For, not only does the word *mussant* produce alliteration with *medici*, it is also very fitting in the semantic context. Lipsius's alliterating *medici mussant* probably has its roots in Lucretius' *mussabat tacito medicina timore* (6, 1179) or Pliny's *mussantesque medicos repente vidissem* (Ep. 7, 1, 5), where *mussare* is also used in a medical sense. The word *mussare* is therefore not only expressive *qua* sound, but also very apt in that particular context.<sup>205</sup> Another instance of isotopic usage is found in ILE 98 02 04, where Lipsius employs the rare word *dictio*: *Dictionem retuli exspectandum aliquamdiu esse, donec ex Hispania confirmantes aliae litterae venirent.* The expression *dictionem referre* (instead of something like *responsum accipere*) might seem strange at first, but when the context is considered, it is found to be very apt indeed: *Ecce autem haesitatio est de Titulis et utrum illum Sacrae Purpurae omitemus, quod Rex in litteris suis facit. Consului ipsum Aulae oraculum. Dictionem (...).* The archaic word *dictio* in the sense of *sententia* or *responsum* is found in the specific context of oracular prophecies: see e. g. Pac. ap. Non. 237, 4 (Rib. Trag. 308): *flexa, non falsa autumnare dictio Delphis solet* or Liv. 8, 24, 2.<sup>206</sup> As a final example of this isotopic usage of uncommon words we can refer to the first paragraphs of Lipsius's Mennipean satire *Somnium*. Here even an experienced Latinist will at first be surprised to come across such rare words as *creper*, *vultuose*, *notor*, *hornus*, *interibi*, *furcillo*, *conticinium*, etc. in relatively short succession. Yet, what can be more fitting in a satire on textual criticism than a seemingly endless list of textual treasures from *antiquitatis omnes arcu-lae*?<sup>207</sup>

<sup>205</sup> Similar observations were made with regard to Lipsius's use of metaphors in the section Figurative language.

<sup>206</sup> Cf. LS, s. v. *dictio*. ThLL, s. v. *dictio* seems not completely sure about the possibility *dictio* in oracular contexts (*de oraculo?*).

<sup>207</sup> [Anonymus], De Lipsianismo iudicium 24 in criticism of Lipsius's *verba obsoleta*, probably alluding to Quintilian's advice on *antiquitas: utendum modo, nec ex ultimis tenebris repetenda* (Quint. Inst. 8, 3, 25). Cp. Sergius, in: Nikitinski, De eloquentia latina, 37: *vocabulis temere ab ultima antiquitate depromptis novissima admiscet [sc. Lipsius], stercus denique Ennii atque Pacuvii in adamantinam Taciti pyxidem infundit efficitque, dum modo cum Euandri matre modo cum Ambrosii grege loquitur, ut sermo eius omnium saeculorum chaos quoddam esse videatur.*

\* A final category in which *antiquitas* is used with stylistic functionality, needs little explanation. It consists of those instances where technical vocabulary is used, i. e. rare words for want of another term (*inopia*). It is this kind of vocabulary that Erasmus missed in the Ciceronians, whom he ridiculed for their verbiage when it came to commonplace topics, but their ignorance of everyday kitchen or garden vocabulary, simply because it was absent from Cicero. Examples of such words are especially found in the medical sphere, a semantic field often present in Lipsius, see e. g. ILE 98 02 22 B: *Oculi iterum belle habent et lemae illae, an glaucomata aut quidquid fuit, in malam rem abierunt et maneat aeternum.*

c) Composition<sup>208</sup>

We have already noted in the sections on *Inconcinnitas*, *Compositio* and *Latinitas* that Lipsius very often prefers unusual composition and turns of phrases over the more regular modes of expression, which again suggests *mala affectatio*. A few other examples can be quoted here.

(I.) When Lipsius opens his *De Amphitheatro liber* with the sentence *Cum Romae adolescens admodum agerem, lustrandae et noscendae imprimis antiquitatis, familiaritas mihi fuit sane utilis cum Nicolaeo Florentio*, he deliberately uses the rare ellipsis of *causa* with *lustrandae (...) antiquitatis* for stylistic purposes. The fact that he does so deliberately can be deduced from the fact that it is found in the opening sentence of the work and that is a clear wink to one of the few instances from Antiquity where such an ellipsis of *causa* is attested, Tac. Ann. 2, 59, 1: (...) *Germanicus Aegyptum profisciscitur cognoscendae antiquitatis.*<sup>209</sup> Another example is ILE 98 09 24 where Lipsius writes about pirate printers: *mihi ipsi praeripiunt castigare quaedam aut recensere*, preferring *mihi* and an infinitive group with *praeripere* over a more usual complementary clause with, for instance, *prohibere (ipsi prohibent me castigare)*. Finally, we can point at an instance such as ILE 98 08 02 T: *Sed sive vivo aut morior, vestri amans vivam moriarque*. Here we see Lipsius using the poetical and post-classical *sive ... aut ...* instead of *sive ... sive ...*, which would have made this sentence too classical and too parallel to his taste.

(II.) Crossing over to some cases of syntactic nature, we can, for instance, draw attention to ILE 98 03 16 B, where Lipsius's use of *dare* is peculiar in

<sup>208</sup> See also Tunberg, *Observations*, 172/173 and Löfstedt, *Zu Justus Lipsius' Briefen*, 75/76.

<sup>209</sup> Lipsius would also use it in *Lovan.*, again in the opening sentence: *Ambulatiuncula instituta nobis (...) idque visendae antiquitatis.*

the phrase *Cedo eam quaeso, quantumvis levem et brevem, nam vicarium alium dare aegre possumus, qui eam norit*. Such a usage of *dare aliquem vicarium* (synonymously with *prodere* or *mandare*) is inspired by a passage in Livy (5, 18, 5) and hardly a common usage. Another example is *habere* constructed with *in* and the ablative case in ILE 98 11 20: *Immo credo nobis in pretio paene maiore quam vobis fuisse, ut fere solent in levi (non dicam in vili) haberi viri magni apud notos et populares*, or the use of *bis* in ILE 98 08 10: *Itaque ad bis mille possum tibi mittere, uti nuper inter nos locuti sumus*. We can also cite the rare usage of the *supinum* II with the expression *opus est* in ILE 98 12 19 S: *recensitu opus*. A final example of rare, and in this case archaic syntax, is Lipsius's usage of *ecce* with the accusative case (classically, as in the famous *ecce homo*, with nominative), see e. g. *Admir. 3, 7: Ecce igitur magnitudinem*.

Finally, we can mention one rather systematic syntactic trait of Lipsius's, viz. his fondness of the non-literal use of the *supinum* I + *ire* (more or less in the sense of *velle* with an object or as an alternative for the *participium futurum* with *esse*),<sup>210</sup> as in *Critica, ad lectorem: (...) evenit ut in convivio quopiam Hispani proceres hanc laudem eius delibatum irent et imminutum* or *De Vesta, c. 15, notae: Etsi P[ater] Heribertus Rosweyduz atrocem assertum ibat et convenire Apollini (...)*. A great number of examples of this usage – which is often attested (unsurprisingly) in authors such as Plautus, Sallust and Livy, but seldom in Cicero<sup>211</sup> – can be found all over Lipsius's oeuvre.

#### d) Morphology

Finally, we are left with a few matters of morphology. Tunberg mentions an instance of *allicuerunt* instead of *allexerunt* (ILE VI, 93 05 30 BEN) which he rightly judges 'a deliberate affectation'.<sup>212</sup> Löfstedt mentions the imperative *face* (ILE II, 84 12 17 P) and *inquo* (ILE II, 84 04 21).<sup>213</sup> Other examples of this morphological affectation are, for instance, Lipsius's pronoun *alterae* instead of *alteri* (ILE 98 04 22 D); his nominative *nubis* instead of *nubes* (ILE 98 04 19); *navim* instead of *navem* (ILE 98 04 26), and the verbs *faxit* (ILE 98 02 04 and 98 07 04, second version), *siet* (ILE 98 05 29) or *ausim* (ILE [98 07 22] P). Still, Lipsius only very occasionally – certainly not to the extent of, for instance, Erasmus in his *Colloquia* – uses the vulgarisms *istic, istaec, istuc* (e. g. *Saturn. 1,1*) for *iste, ista, istud* as often found in

<sup>210</sup> Cf. Kühner-Holzweissig, *Ausführliche Grammatik*, 2/1, 722.

<sup>211</sup> *Ibid.*, 723.

<sup>212</sup> Tunberg, *Observations*, 172.

<sup>213</sup> Löfstedt, *Zu Justus Lipsius' Briefen*, 75.

comedy language. All in all, such morphologic affectation is rather rare and Lipsius stays clear from other possibilities, such as genitives in *-ai*, or passive infinitives in *-ier*. He does not use archaic pronouns such as the Plautine *tis* or *ted*, or the rare Ennian *sas*, *mis* or *sis*,<sup>214</sup> nor irregular syncopations such as *prohibessis*, *siris* or *adiuero* as found in these two authors, nor do we find Sallustean orthography like *optumus* or *gerundiva* that end in *-undus*.<sup>215</sup>

#### e) Conclusion

In conclusion of this discussion of *mala affectatio* or κακόζηλον in Lipsius's style, we can observe the following. It is not hard to understand that his contemporaries and many of his later critics found fault in the high amounts of *ornatus* Lipsius imparts on his language, mainly through the use of *figurae*, metaphors, *compositio fracta* and, as analysed in this section, his deliberate choice of unusual vocabulary and syntax. On the other hand, our analysis and functional interpretation has also shown that these elements of style can sometimes be explained in terms of stylistic functionality. Such functionality may consist in the expressiveness of language, but can also create a more general, 'Lipsian' effect of language. As pointed out by Mouchel and others, Lipsius's deliberate use of unusual language also serves to create an impression of naturalness and spontaneity which he wished to impart on his Latin. So even if some or most of these effects seem exaggerated, they serve a functional purpose within Lipsian poetics.

As for Lipsius's often stressed tendency towards archaism, which has especially been dealt with in this section, but also in Vocabulary (cf. supra), we have noticed that while he obviously displays heavy archaisms both in lexicon, syntax and morphology, this usage is not without reason nor without limit. Indeed, Lipsius's *antiquitas* is still quite different from the 'Oscan' prose or poetry of some late 16<sup>th</sup>-century *antiquarii*, whose Latin is veritably laden with archaism of all kinds.<sup>216</sup>

#### 6. Conclusion

The communis opinio on the stilus Lipsianus is clear enough. Brevity (through ellipsis and asyndeton) is said to be the first characteristic of Lipsius's style. In second place, most previous studies have pointed at the

<sup>214</sup> I. q. *suis*, not *sis* < *si vis*.

<sup>215</sup> See e. g. Landfester, Einführung in die Stilistik, 61/62.

<sup>216</sup> Cf. IJsewijn-Sacré, Companion to Neo-Latin Studies. Part II, 416. Cp. my Antiquarian Latin and the Materiality of Late Humanist Culture. The Case of Johann Lauremberg's play Pompejus Magnus (1610), in M. van der Poel - W. Gelderblom, Neo-Latin philology: old tradition, new approaches (2013, forthcoming).

antithetic movement or ‘pointedness’ (*acumina* and *sententiae*) of Lipsius’s language, sometimes allowing the observation to generalize in a rather vague concept of discontinuity, asymmetry or harshness of rhythm. In third place, archaic tendencies have been identified in Lipsius’s vocabulary, and a special liking of the metaphor. Still, the philological interpretation of these three characteristics has always been very diverse, even up to the point of contradiction.<sup>217</sup> In particular scholars have struggled to reconcile the pregnant and obscure aspects of Lipsius’s brevity, with the spontaneity and the affectation of his language. Having studied a corpus of Lipsian texts closely from a synchronic-descriptive view point we can now assess this traditional image and answer Tunberg’s question: ‘What actually are the characteristics of Lipsius’s latinity?’<sup>218</sup>

Throughout Lipsius’s style we can identify four partially overlapping *filis rouges* which are the core of his literary technique.

The first is a series of phenomena which have been grouped under the term *inconcinnitas*. It is what previous studies have tentatively described as asymmetry, discontinuity, abruptness, lack of harmony, etc. This technique of *inconcinnitas* is the most salient feature of Lipsian style as it permeates virtually every other aspect of it. It is not only the *sine qua non* to reconcile Lipsius’s many effects of repetition with his strong tendency of *brevitas*,<sup>219</sup> it is also ubiquitous in his rhythmical and compositional techniques.

A second key element is Lipsius’s archaism, which has to be interpreted much more broadly than in the traditional view. Aside from Lipsius’s lexicon, we can identify archaic inspiration on the level of sound such as alliteration<sup>220</sup> and especially *adnominatio*,<sup>221</sup> and on the syntactic level, where *inconcinnitas*<sup>222</sup> and in particular parataxis are markedly archaic techniques. Even in Lipsius’s *brevitas* an air of archaic Latin can be perceived:

<sup>217</sup> For more information, see my Justus Lipsius’s Prose Style, in: J. De Landtsheer (ed.), *A Companion to Justus Lipsius* (Brill, 2013).

<sup>218</sup> Tunberg, *Observations*, 170.

<sup>219</sup> One can also explain his simultaneous use of the asyndeton and polysyndeton from this perspective.

<sup>220</sup> Particularly frequent in official formulas, prayers, Saturnian verse, archaic dactylic poetry and tragedy; see Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine*, 46/47.

<sup>221</sup> It is often found in Ennius, Plautus and the prologues of Terence (see *Ibid.*, 66/67) and resurfaces in the archaizing Apuleius (M. Bernhard, *Der Stil des Apuleius von Madaura: ein Beitrag zur Stilistik des Spätlateins*, *Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft*, 2 [Amsterdam, <sup>2</sup>1965, = Stuttgart, 1927], 228).

<sup>222</sup> Cf. Landfester, *Einführung in die Stilistik*, 132.



authors like Cato are lauded for their brevity and it was the most important stylistic *virtus* of the ancient Roman annalists.<sup>223</sup>

Thirdly, we have identified a recurring element of *emphasis* in Lipsius's use of the figures of repetition, in his *brevitas*, his choice of metaphor over comparison and even in some elements of his *Latinitas*.

In fourth place, Lipsius's *brevitas* has to be mentioned. Besides being very characteristic of his syntax, it explains his use of metaphora and his comatic composition. In this way, *brevitas* is clearly an important hallmark of Lipsian style, but at the same time only one (albeit a conspicuous) aspect of its four principle characteristics. Indeed, it is clear that it is the least decisive of all aspects. In fact, it is often implied in, or only second to techniques of *inconcinnitas*, archaism and *emphasis*, which are often preferred over *brevitas*.

On the whole, Lipsius's style appears as an ambiguous and paradoxical combination of intellectual and colloquial techniques. As a radical alternative to Ciceronian harmony and *gravitas*, the four main constituents of it lend his prose both a demanding character and an air of unstudied spontaneity. This explains why scholars of Lipsius's style have struggled with a number of paradoxes, such as how pregnant brevity can be combined with *obscuritas*, how a lapidary style can still show affectated *ornatus*, how discontinuity is met by fluidity, how intellectualism functions along naturalness. Of all scholars, especially Mouchel and Fumaroli have pointed at this duality in Lipsius's style.<sup>224</sup> In the words of the latter:

‘Elevé au rang de prose d’art, c’est-à-dire de prose écrite destinée à la lecture attentive, le *sermo humilis* de la lettre lipsienne se tient mi-chemin entre deux périls d’abondance: les effets voyants, amples, périodiques de la grande éloquence orale, et le relâchement, mol, flou, et «comique» de la conversation courante.’<sup>225</sup>

<sup>223</sup> Cf. Leeman, *Orationis ratio*, 1, 35 and 175.

<sup>224</sup> Cf. Mouchel, *Lipse et le style de l’adhérence* and Fumaroli, *Juste Lipse et l’Institutio Epistolica*. It is also suggested in the short analysis of Lipsius's stylistic innovation in J. Papy, *Le sénéquisme dans la correspondance de Juste Lipse. Du De Constantia (1583/1584) à la Epistolarum Selectarum Centuria Prima Miscellanea (1586)*, *Journal de la Renaissance*, 6 (2008), 52.

<sup>225</sup> Fumaroli, *Juste Lipse et l’Institutio Epistolica*, 157. It is less easy to agree with Fumaroli's analysis of the main means to realise this, viz. the *acumen* (*Ibid.*, 158). See also Mouchel's opinions on the balance between rhetoric and spontaneity in Lipsius's style (*Mouchel, Lipse et le style de l’adhérence*, 198–201).

Yet from this philological study, we have seen that rather than keeping *mi-chemin* between eloquence and conversation, Lipsius employs both, indeed without any sense of moderation or shunning the extreme. His prose is characterized by such stylistic phenomena which are at the same time studied effects of rhetoric and leave an impression of colloquialism. In this way, we can effectively solve the apparent contradiction in Lipsius's style by pointing at its unity in stylistic functionality. In the Lipsian mode, *inconcinnitas* evokes natural and simple speech, yet its alienating effect and unpredictability is deliberate and demanding. An archaic effect like *adnominatio* is an affected, deliberate form of word play, but reminds one of the spontaneous wit of Plautus. *Brevitas* facilitates speed and fluidity of language, but at the same time its difficulty halts the reader. *Emphasis* requires careful reflection, but also heightens vividness of style. And if the resulting combination of all this is a paradoxical style, so much the better. After all, strangeness, as most readily exemplified in *inconcinnitas*, is the fundamental character of the *stilus Lipsianus*.

Tom Deneire

Huygens ING

PO Box 90754, 2509 LT The Hague

The Netherlands

Tom.Deneire@huygens.knaw.nl

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

Blijde Inkomststraat 21, 3000 Leuven (PO Box 3311)

Belgium

Tom.Deneire@arts.kuleuven.be