

I

PROCOPIUS, FROM MANUSCRIPTS
TO BOOKS: 1400–1850

Brian Croke

Abstract: The path from mainly 13th- and 14th-century Byzantine manuscripts of Procopius' *Wars*, *Secret History* and *Buildings* to a modern critical edition of all three works together was long and winding. At different points along the way from manuscripts to books the text of Procopius acquired its organised division into numbered Books, chapters and sections, while his writings were successively exploited by European scholars for purely contemporary purposes, which explains Procopius' role in the history of scholarship. In the 15th century Italian humanists such as Bruni and Biondo acquired manuscripts of Procopius from Constantinople and elsewhere but only used them in translation. Books 5 to 8 of the *Wars* became popular immediately because they told the Italians about their sixth-century past which was otherwise dimly perceived a millennium later. The Persian and Vandal wars (*Wars* 1 to 4) barely rated interest, the *Buildings*, which excluded Italy, was unpublished, and the *Secret History* presumed lost. By the 16th century the centre of scholarly effort had moved into the German states of the Holy Roman Empire where Procopius became a highly valued source for the early history of the Goths and Vandals (Peutinger, Beatus, Cuspinian). This role lent him respectability and provided a new witness to bolster the antique identity of Germans but especially of the Swedes. The period from 1590 to 1650 was the great era of philological effort and acumen applied to Procopius at Paris and Leiden, to a lesser extent at Rome and Augsburg, by the foremost scholars of the time including Scaliger, Casaubon and Grotius. The first edition of the *Wars* was published at Augsburg in 1607 (Hoeschel), followed by that of the *Secret History* at Lyons in 1623 (Alemanni), a version of the *Buildings* having already appeared at Basel in 1531 (Beatus). Only in 1662/63 did the first complete edition of all Procopius' works (Maltretus) appear in Paris. This enabled Procopius to be seen for the first time as a historian and writer of the age of Justinian, thereby facilitating his use by 18th-century historians such as Edward Gibbon. By 1850, with the modern techniques of textual and historical scholarship now being codified, Proco-

pius still lacked the proper edition and the serious scholarly attention that was eventually to come, Dindorf's edition (1833–8) having turned out to be another lost opportunity.

Keywords: history of scholarship, texts, Byzantine, Procopius, manuscripts, libraries, Bruni, Biondo, Peutinger, Beatus, Cuspinian, Vulcanius, Scaliger, Casaubon, Heinsius, Hoeschel, Grotius, Holsten, Peiresc Vulcanius, Gibbon, Niebuhr, Dindorf, Haury

CONTENTS

Introduction

1. Byzantine writers and manuscripts of Procopius' text
2. Procopius comes to Italy: Bruni and Biondo
3. The first Latin and Italian translations
4. German and Gothic history: Peutinger, Beatus Rhenanus and Lazius
5. Procopius in Paris: Bodin, Pithou and new translations
6. Procopius in Leiden: Vulcanius and Scaliger
7. Hoeschel and the first edition of *Wars* (1607)
8. Alemanni's edition of *Secret History* (1623) and its critics
9. Incomplete Improvements: Heinsius and Grotius
10. The Louvre Corpus and Maltretus' edition (1662/3)
11. Using Procopius as historian: Ludewig, Lebeau and Gibbon
12. Niebuhr, and the 'Bonn Corpus' edition (1833/8)

Conclusion

Appendix: Procopius texts and translations, 1400 to 1850

Bibliography

Introduction

Verona is one of the most European of Italian cities. In 1345 its key role in the development of European culture and scholarship was highlighted when Francesco Petrararch (1304–1374) discovered in the cathedral chapter library there a copy of Cicero's letters to his childhood friend Atticus. Thus began the modern understanding of Cicero as Roman orator, philosopher and politician, but particularly letter-writer. Subsequent discoveries inspired by Petrararch eventually led to the formulation of what came to be called 'humanism', the *studia*

humanitatis, to which Cicero was pivotal.¹ The only problem was that neither Petrarch himself, immediately copying the letters at Verona, nor those he inspired, could make sense of the bilingual Cicero's various Greek quotations, as testified by their poor attempts to transcribe the Greek.² Petrarch learned some Greek but not much. He was once gifted a manuscript of Homer's *Iliad* which he admired but was unable to read. Homer only became accessible to Petrarch and his literary friend Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–1375) at Florence when a Latin translation was commissioned from the southern Italian Leontius Pilatus.³ At the same time, in far off Constantinople, Greek was still a living language for the people who called themselves 'Romans' but who were manifestly 'Greeks' to anyone in Italy. They were still being educated according to essentially the same purposes and criteria as in Cicero's day. The educated man (and sometimes woman) was schooled in classical writers such as Homer and Demosthenes with a view to becoming a competent writer and speaker. In Constantinople the ancient Greek writings, including the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides, also continued to be read and copied. Among the other historians whose works attracted interest in the fourteenth century was Procopius of Caesarea who, in the same city eight centuries earlier, was writing his accounts of the emperor Justinian's *Wars* and *Buildings*, complemented by a more enigmatic invective best known by its misleading modern name of *Secret History*.

¹ On the unique importance of the Cathedral Chapter library at Verona: Weiss (1969) 21–2; for a recent explanation of Petrarch's approach to Cicero, beginning at Verona: Eisner (2014) 755–90, and for a definition of 'humanism' as a narrow preoccupation with classical Latin style and eloquence, rather than anything more social or political, along with humanism's scholarly history and controversy: Baker (2015); and for Petrarch's influence on historiography in particular: Kelley (1998) 130–6.

² Reeve (1996) 33.

³ Homer translation: Wilson (1992) 2–6; Forrai (2014) 59–62; Gittes (2015) 159.

Doubtless many valuable and older manuscripts of Procopius' works were lost during bonfires arising from the sack of Constantinople by the crusading western soldiery in 1204 and its aftermath.⁴ With the restoration of Byzantine control of the city and hinterland from 1261, the works of Procopius could be read and copied again. While for Petrarch Greek remained 'a promised land from which he was excluded',⁵ his contemporary Nicephorus Gregoras (1295–1360), for instance, not only wrote an extensive history of his own times in the manner of Thucydides and Procopius but also possessed and copied manuscripts of Procopius.⁶ Later, these manuscripts arrived in Italy where they aided in the rediscovery of Procopius up to a millennium after he had spent time there himself in the 530s as the secretary of Justinian's general Belisarius.

This is the story of the progressive modern understanding (from 1400 to 1850) of Procopius and his works as a witness to his era and culture, but the example of Procopius also illustrates the development of European historiography and textual scholarship more broadly. It highlights the fact that the value of any text, Procopius' works in this case, lay in the changing contemporary purpose scholars found for it. The modern preoccupation with textual purity was always a secondary consideration. Procopius was deployed and discussed in translation in Europe for over a century before the first published edition of his *Wars* in 1607, followed by the *Secret History* in 1623, with a version of the *Buildings* first appearing in Greek decades earlier in 1531. Thereafter, various attempts were made to provide an improved text for scholarly and general historical purposes but even by the more scientific philological and editing standards of 1850,

⁴ Runciman (1970) 99; Wilson (1992) 162.

⁵ Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1982) 23.

⁶ Nicephorus copied extracts from Procopius' *Wars*, identified as being from his own hand, in *Pal. Gr.* 129, ff. 117–18 (Heidelberg) and *Buildings* in *Laur. Plut.* 70.5 (Florence) with Fryde (2000) 360; Bianconi (2005) and Clérigues (2007) (establishing Nicephorus as scribe, not just owner, of these manuscripts, plus others).

the works of Procopius were seriously wanting. Indeed, by 1850 the modern scholarly study of Procopius as author and historian of the age of Justinian had hardly begun.

1. Byzantine Writers and Manuscripts of Procopius' Text

Procopius' writings in the 540s and 550s, the *Wars*, *Buildings*, and the so-called *Secret History*, were preserved and copied throughout the subsequent centuries, especially at Constantinople.⁷ Writing in the 590s at Antioch, the church historian Evagrius used Procopius' *Wars* extensively and highly praised his work.⁸ Later, when engaged on his complex chronicle (c. 810–815), Theophanes made use of a manuscript of Procopius' *Wars*.⁹ Some decades after that (c. 845), Photius recorded in his *Bibliotheca* that Procopius' 'useful and valuable historical work' had ensured that he 'left behind an undying renown amongst all lovers of learning'.¹⁰ Photius had read at least the eight books of Procopius' *Wars*, going on to explain that the author was an eyewitness of the events involving the general Belisarius before summarising only the first two books (Persian Wars).¹¹ Certainly, a copy of the *Wars* was kept in the impe-

⁷ Byzantine users of Procopius are listed in Rubin (1957) 589–90, to which can be added several passages in Leo the Deacon's eleventh-century history in Talbot and Sullivan (2005) 17, 19, 23. cf. Kaldellis (2012) 80. Treadgold (2013) 243 n. 70) has identified another passage (from *Wars* 1.7.18–19), and another user as the 10th-century author of the *Life* of Basil I (ibid. 176).

⁸ Evagrius, *HE* 4.12–27, with Whitby (2000) xxvi–xxxii.

⁹ Theophanes, AM 6026 (AD 533/4) with Scott (2015) 254–7. Left aside here is the question of whether material such as extracts from Procopius had already been prepared for Theophanes by Syncellus whose chronicle he was continuing, with details in Treadgold (2013) 38–77 and (2015) 9–30.

¹⁰ Photius, *Bibl.* 160 = Henry (1960) 122 (entry on Choricus of Gaza).

¹¹ Photius, *Bibl.* 63 = Henry (1959) 64 (entry on Procopius). Photius cites Procopius from the 'first book' (p. 64.25) and the 'second book' (p. 72.27).

rial library at Constantinople, so that when emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus set about extracting the imperial library's manuscripts of the historians for his systematic collection in the 10th century the compilers were able to identify and copy what they found relevant in Procopius.¹² These extracts were themselves later utilised in the composition of the *Suda* which otherwise made extensive use of Procopius. Further, its author also listed and utilised what it labels the 'so called *Anecdota*', meaning literally 'unpublished matters'. While this title may have been its Procopian original, the satirical work may have actually been entitled the 'ninth book of the Wars' as the *Suda* implies.¹³

Procopius: from Caesarea in Palestine, *illustris* [in rank]. Rhetor and sophist. He wrote a Roman History, that is, the wars of Belisarius the patrician, the actions performed in Rome and Libya. He lived in the time of the emperor Justinian, was employed as Belisarius' secretary, and accompanied him in all the wars and events that he recorded. He also wrote another book, the so-called *Anecdota*, on the same events; both works [combined] constitute nine books. The book of Procopius called *Anecdota* contains abuse and mockery of the emperor Justinian and his wife Theodora, and indeed of Belisarius himself as well, and his wife.¹⁴

¹² *De leg. Rom.* (de Boor I.90); *De leg. gentium* (de Boor I.489), cf. Haury (1905) LIII–LIV; Nemeth (2013) 239–40; Treadgold (2013) 156–65.

¹³ As pointed out by Haury (1906) XXV suggesting 'supplement to the Books of the Wars'. Since the *Suda*, Π 2479 notes 'both works constitute nine books' this may suggest the *Secret History* was titled 'Wars Book 9' in some manuscripts or at least the *Suda* was closely linking the two works as Procopius does himself (*Secret History* 1.1–3). While the *Suda* is the earliest certain reference to the *Secret History*, there is a possibility that it was known to Evagrius, *HE* 4.30–1 although this is discounted by Whitby (2000) 233 n. 86. Haury (1906) XXVI was less certain: 'utrum e Procopio hauserit necne, in medio relinquo'.

¹⁴ *Suda*, Π 2479.

There are no extant manuscripts, or even fragments, of any of Procopius' works from the sixth to the tenth centuries. The earliest known manuscript (*Escorial*, B. I. 04, 11th century) was destroyed by fire in 1671, while the earliest extant manuscripts (*Athos Lavra*, H-73, *Vat. Gr.* 1690, both covering *Wars*, Books 5–8) are from the 13th century.¹⁵ A great many more, from the 14th century, were copied mainly in Constantinople and survive to this day in European libraries.¹⁶ As with most Latin and Greek manuscripts, they had no title page nor a consistent and accurate nomenclature. Many manuscripts and later writers label as separate works both the *Secret History* (e.g. *Suda*) and the *Buildings* (e.g. Symeon Metaphrastes, *Vita Sabae*: 'fifth book'). However, they do not always do likewise for the *Wars*. Procopius himself generally refers to just his 'Wars' (*polemoi*).¹⁷ Later writers refer generally to the 'Wars'¹⁸ too, but sometimes they are described as the 'Wars of Belisarius'¹⁹ or 'Wars of Justinian'.²⁰ Although Procopius evidently

¹⁵ A couple of other 13th-century manuscripts include a brief extract from Procopius: *Par. Gr.* 39, fols. 239–241 (*Buildings*) and *Escorial*, *Real Bibl.* Chi.I.13, fol. 254v (*Wars*), owned by Nicephorus Gregoras, and *Vat. Gr.* 1841, fols. 109–16.

¹⁶ Although surprisingly incomplete at times, details of manuscripts of Procopius' works can be traced through *Pinakes/Πίνακες: Textes et manuscrits grecs*, the website of the *Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes* (Paris) at <http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/recherche-generale/results/page> (search 'Procopius Caesariensis'), but note that it dates *Athos Lavra* H-73 to the 14th century rather than the 13th, as shown by Kalli (2004) 19.

¹⁷ Proc. *Secret History* 1.1 ('Wars'), 1.1.3 ('previous books'); *Buildings* 1.1.6 ('books of the Wars'), 1.1.20 ('books of the Wars'), 1.10.3 ('books of the Wars'), 2.1.4 ('books of the Wars'), 3.2.8 ('books of the Wars'), 3.7.7 ('books of the Wars'), 5.8.2 ('books of the Wars'), 6.1.8 ('books of the Wars'), 6.6.9 ('books of the Wars'); *Wars* 5.2.14 ('history of Italian events'), 8.1, 8.3, 8.18 ('previous books'), 8.22 ('previous books').

¹⁸ Theophylact, *Hist.* 2.3.13; Phot. *Bibl.* 63; *Suda* Π 2479; Zon. 14.7; Cedrenus 1.649, 1.

¹⁹ Evagrius, *HE* 4.12.

²⁰ Agathias, *Hist.* 1.11; John of Epiphaneia, *Hist.* (*FHG* IV.273), Const. Porph. *de thematibus* 1.2.

produced seven books of the *Wars* at the same time (551), with an eighth book some years later (c. 553/4)²¹, the manuscript tradition shows no trace of the original seven-book version. Instead, the *Wars* is strictly divided into separate ‘tetrads’ with each tetrad containing four books numbered successively, such as ‘first tetrad of the eight-book history, fourth book’ which is what today is called, on no manuscript evidence at all, the ‘second book of Vandal wars’.²² Where manuscripts contain titles it is very difficult to be certain whether they are earlier, contemporary to the manuscript, or later additions, or some combination of all three.²³

Nicephorus Kallistos (*HE* 17.10) in the 14th century labels the first tetrad ‘Persica’ and the second tetrad ‘Gothica’ which may well reflect the manuscript he was using, or perhaps just a colloquial contemporary usage. In other words, although Procopius mentions the different geographical war theatres covered in his history (*Wars* 8.1.1), the strict separation and labelling of the *Wars* into their three separate fronts, with two books each for the Persian and Vandal wars (Africa) and four books for the Gothic war

²¹ For details: Greatrex (1994) 101–14 and (2003) 45–67; Treadgold (2007) 186–90.

²² Byzantine writers generally used only the first tetrad (e.g. Nicetas Choniates in the 13th century), but sometimes the second tetrad (e.g. Cinnamus in the 12th century), while only the imperial library contained a copy of both tetrads (Treadgold (2013) 477).

²³ At the beginning of each book of the *Wars*, Haury (1905) reports the manuscript titles where they exist. For example (Haury, 417), the second book of what nowadays is called the ‘Vandal Wars’ is headed ‘the fourth of the Persica of Procopius of Caesarea’ (*Vat. Gr.* 152) and ‘of the same Procopius of Caesarea the fourth of the first tetrad of his eight book history’ (*Par. Graec.* 1702). However, one of the oldest manuscripts which covers only the second tetrad (*Laur. Plut.* 69.8, 14th cent.), refers to the ‘Gothic wars’: ‘Procopius of Caesarea’s Gothic wars which the great Justinian fought through his general Belisarius divided into four books, beginning of the first volume’ (Haury (1905) 1), but the same manuscript later reverts to ‘sixth (‘seventh’, ‘eighth’) Book of the history of Procopius’ (Haury (1905) 147, 294, 484). Some manuscripts (e.g. *Par. Gr.* 1702) have a simple running head (‘Wars’).

(Italy), with each area numbered successively, is a relatively modern invention and not the work of their author. As the successive Procopian editors Hoeschel (1607), Maltretus (1662–3) and Dindorf (1833) had done before him, Haury (1905) retained the chapter headings by tetrad and book but throughout (unlike his predecessors) he more accurately retained the title ‘Wars’ in the heading of the Greek text. At the same time, again more accurately, on the facing pages he put the modern running heads in Latin in square brackets, thus ‘[Procopii de bello Persico II.8]’. The division of books into numbered chapters was only initiated in the edition of Maltretus (1662), while the further division of chapters into numbered paragraphs first appeared in Haury’s edition (1905) and has been used in modern translations based on this edition ever since. As for what has come to be called the *Secret History*, the manuscript tradition does not ascribe a title to it either, but it may have been headed the ‘ninth book’ of the *Wars*,²⁴ thereby emphasising the close and natural link between the two works which Procopius himself and later Byzantine writers who knew the *Secret History* evidently presumed. Too often, modern scholars have mistakenly detached and isolated these two works from each other.

The extant manuscripts of Procopius from the 13th to the 15th centuries were all originally written in the east, that is, in Constantinople, Thessalonike, and Mt Athos mainly. The so-called ‘Palaeologan Renaissance’ or ‘Palaeologan Revival’ (defined as the period from 1282 onwards) saw a succession of educated emperors with literary and philosophical interests, major centres of scholarship and learning such as the Chora monastery in Constantinople and increased contact with the West through Venice and gradually other Italian cities. Not only were Greek rhetoricians and dramatists copied and studied but scholars such as Maximus Planudes, Thomas Magister and Theo-

²⁴ See above, n. 13.

dore Metochites also paid attention to historians.²⁵ Scholars read, declaimed for their audience and had copied in whole or part the main Greek historians namely Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon.²⁶ Scholars also included later historians such as Procopius. Nicephorus Gregoras, for instance, not only left or copied personal manuscripts of Thucydides, Herodotus and Xenophon but also of Zosimus (*Vat. Gr.* 156, Vatican) and three of Procopius: *Real Bibliotheca, Chi.* 1.13, f. 254v (Escorial); *Pal. Gr.* 129 (Heidelberg); *Laur. Plut.* 70.5, ff. 192–194v (Florence).²⁷

The oldest surviving manuscripts of Procopius also emerged from these literary circles although, with few exceptions including Gregoras, it is not possible to trace their original Byzantine owner or copyist.²⁸ The oldest manuscript of the *Wars* (unknown to Haury in 1905) is *Athos Lavra H-73* from the 13th century. It covers only the second tetrad (*Wars*, Books 5 to 8) but is incomplete. This manuscript is around the same age as *Vat. Gr.* 1690 (Haury's 'K'), and is closest to the 14th century *Laur. Plut.* 9.32 (Haury's

²⁵ Runciman (1970) 1–2 sums up the paradox succinctly: 'In strange contrast with the political decline, the intellectual life of Byzantium never shone so brightly as in those two sad centuries'. For details: Fryde (2000) 307–21, Wilson (1983) 229–72 and Gaul (2011).

²⁶ Bianconi (2005) 391–438, Perez-Martin (2002) 143–7 and Croke (2010) 50–2.

²⁷ Cf. Bianconi (2008) 360.

²⁸ Known Constantinopolitan or other eastern scribes of manuscripts of Procopius before c. 1453 include: Gabriel Kritopoulos (14th century) responsible for Vatican's *Chi R.IV.12* (*gr.* 12), 3–4v and 176r (*Wars*); John Severus Lakedamonios for *Par. Gr.* 1941, 147–178* (*Buildings*); Stephanos, metropolitan of Medeia for *Vat. Gr.* 1904, 167v (*Wars*); Theodore (14th century), notary and deacon, for *Par. Gr.* 1703 (*Wars*); Kaisar, strategos, for *Genav. Gr.* 43 (*Buildings*); Manuel Pankratios (14th century) for *Marc. Gr.* ζ 398, 4–204v (*Wars*); Nikolaos (15th century) for *Par. Gr.* 1699, 1–339* (*Wars*); Andronikos Kallistos (15th century) for *Modena Univ., a. U.* 9.10, fol. 10 (*Buildings?*); Antonius Damillas (15th century) and Manuel Gregoropoulos (15th century) for *Laur. Plut.* 71.5 (*Buildings*); John Chortasmenos (14/15th century) for *Vat. Gr.* 16 (*Buildings*). The Procopian manuscripts copied by Gregoras (14th century) are *Laur. Plut.* 70.5, *Pal. Gr.* 129 and Escorial X. 1.13.

‘L’).²⁹ Also copied in the east in the 14th century was *Ambrosianus A. 182 sup.* (Milan), which contains the same lacuna as *Laur. Plut. 9.32* from which it was copied, but the lacuna was filled by a contemporary scribe, probably at Constantinople, using another manuscript then added back to this copy (Haury (1905) XLVI). Further, there is another 14th century Milan manuscript (*G. 14 sup.*) where Procopius’ *Wars* is included along with works of Themistius (4th century) and Planudes (13th/14th century). Also copied in the 14th century were *Vat. Gr. 152* (from *Vat. Gr. 1690*, 13th century) and *Vat. Gr. 1301* (from *Vat. Gr. 152*).

Many of these manuscripts of Procopius, and other later ones, contain marginal signposts to particular letters and speeches in the text of the *Wars* or to character attributes and actions of Belisarius in particular. Such scribal habits doubtless made it easier for later writers to compile extracts from Procopius, as the excerptors for Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ project had earlier done for embassies (*de legationibus*), revolts (*de insidiis*), sayings (*de sententiis*) and a host of other categories. One 14th-century manuscript originally brought to Florence by Janus Lascaris (1445–1534) in the 1480s extracted letters from Procopius’ text.³⁰ In another case, as we shall see, a later scholar (Goulart 1594) was able to compile a ‘gnomologica’ or set of sayings from Procopius and other writers, doubtless relying on manuscripts, or just Latin translations, where these were signalled marginally.³¹

²⁹ Kalli (2004) 21. Another early (1323) manuscript is *Par. Gr. 1601* (= Haury’s ‘q’ (1905)] XXXVIII, a fragment of *Wars* 1).

³⁰ *Par. Gr. 1038*, fols. 186–190 (= Haury’s ‘t’ (1905) XXXIX), later copied before being relocated from Florence to Paris in the 16th century in *Vat. Barb. Gr. 181*, fols. 43r–47r (= Haury’s ‘ti’ [1905] XXXIX). The lost 13th century Escorial manuscript (*Scorialensis I.Z.1.*) also included extracts of letters. Other 14th- and 15th-century manuscripts of *Wars* include extracts: *Par. Gr. 1601*, fol. 151r–v (= Haury’s ‘q’ (1905) 38); *Par. Gr. 1703* (= Haury’s ‘b1’ and ‘b2’ (1905) XLVI–XLVII) and *Par. Gr. 1310*, fols. 408v–410 (= Haury’s ‘h’ (1905) XLIX) which belonged to John Lascaris (Haury (1905) XLIX).

³¹ Such a manuscript is Naples *BN II.C.32* (= Haury’s ‘v’ (1905) XXXIX), as is *Matrit. reg. 116* (= Haury’s ‘epsilon’, (1905) LI), a 15th-

All these manuscripts reflect Procopius' 14th- and 15th-century reputation as a model writer and their extracts are located in manuscripts with comparable extracts from other so-called classical Greek writers. After all, Procopius was a *rhetor* by education and later Byzantine writers and audiences always appreciated his rhetorical skill, just as they did for his literary exemplar Thucydides.³² For centuries, Procopius was judged by style alone, not content.

Not only the *Wars*, but also Procopius' *Buildings* was used by Palaeologan scholars, with its earliest manuscript (*Vat. Gr.* 1065) being 13th century, plus five from the 14th century³³ and three from the 15th century.³⁴ There are also excerpts preserved in another 13th century manuscript (*Par. Gr.* 39 ff. 239–41). As for the *Secret History*, the earliest manuscript is from the 14th century (*Vat. Gr.* 1001) with a copy of it (*Vat. Gr.* 16) made perhaps by John Chortasmenos (1370–1437) at Constantinople and brought to Rome after 1443. There are in addition other 14th-century manuscripts at Milan (*Amb. A* 182 *sup.*, fols. 225–248; *G* 14 *sup.*, fols. 125–158v) and Paris (*Par. Suppl. Grec.* 1185, fols. 1–62) but none from the 15th century. All these manuscripts and others originated in Constantinople and other parts of the Greek east and progressively made their way into Italy, where they opened up the text and times of Procopius to western scholars and historians over the succeeding centuries up to the present day. Unlike in Byzantium, for most of the 15th and 16th centuries the attraction of Procopius in western

century manuscript which Constantine Lascaris (c. 1435–1501) brought to Italy from Constantinople, Rhodes or Corfu and *Vat. Gr.* 1353, fol. 220r–v (= Haury's 'p' (1905) L1) copied by Lascaris at Milan in 1462.

³² Wilson (1983) 269; Treadgold (2013) 477; Reinsch (2006) 759–78; Whately (2017) 700–3.

³³ *Laur. Plut.* 9.32, ff. 177–124v (Florence), *Laur. Plut.* 70.5, fols. 192–194v (Florence), *Vulc.* 56, fols. 9–86v (Leiden), *Amb. A*.182, fols. 185–225 (Milan), *Benaki Museum* 4, fols. 1–38v (Athens).

³⁴ *Cod. Genav. m.g* 43 (Geneva), *Laur. Plut.* 71.5 (Florence), *Par. Gr.* 1941, fols. 147–178 (Paris), Gonville and Caius College Library 76, fols. 176–185v (Cambridge).

Europe was his content, not his literary style, which went unappreciated and misjudged. Most of the later manuscripts of all Procopius' works come from the 16th to 18th centuries and were copied in the west, mainly but not entirely from the earlier manuscripts brought to Italy. Textual scholars may eliminate them easily, but no copy of a manuscript such as Procopius' *Wars* was ever a casual or capricious undertaking. These later manuscripts remain important as scribal artefacts relevant to the intellectual and literary culture of their times. They also constitute an instructive episode in the scholarly tradition on Procopius.

2. Procopius Comes to Italy: Bruni and Biondo

As the Turkish dominance of the former Byzantine realm gradually expanded in the generation after Petrarch, Greek scholars increasingly found themselves exchanging their eastern homelands, especially Constantinople, for Italy. Many had the potential to be teachers of Greek, authoritative scribes and copyists of Greek texts and translators of those texts into Latin.³⁵ Venice was a key link with the Greek East, but a crucial step occurred in Florence in 1397 when Manuel Chrysoloras (from Constantinople via Venice) accepted the invitation from the humanist Florentine chancellor Coluccio Salutati (1331–1406) to become the city's teacher of Greek. During his mere three years there, before departing for Milan, one of his keenest pupils was Leonardo Bruni (1370–1444) who considered the opportunity to learn Greek too important to pass up, claiming it was 700 years since Greek had been taught properly in Italy³⁶. Bruni also singled out certain of his

³⁵ Monfasani (2012) 31–78 (itemised lists of Greek scholars and copyists in Appendices I–III, pp. 56–78) and Hankins (2007) 329–39.

³⁶ Bruni, 'Memoirs', 24 in Bruni (2007) 320–1. Bruni's oft-repeated claim, e.g. Giovius (1557) 25, was wide of the mark since there had been continuous and regular study of Greek and copying of Greek manuscripts in southern Italy and its monasteries. For details: Setton (1956) 1–76, Geanakoplos (1989) 40 and Thomson (1966) 63–82.

fellow-pupils, all around the same age: Guarino da Verona (1370–1460), Paolo Vergerio (1369–1444) and Palla Strozzi (1372–1462) in particular. Chrysoloras' three years at Florence, followed by another three at Pavia, were decisive for the learning of Greek by Latin humanists but their access to a wide variety of Greek literature was very restricted, although they were all particularly interested in historians.³⁷ Bruni put his Greek to regular use in a series of Latin translations beginning with Plutarch, which he had learnt from Chrysoloras, before moving to Rome to deploy his literary skills in the chancery of successive popes.³⁸ Guarino moved to Constantinople to master the language and literature, spending five years with Chrysoloras and collecting Greek manuscripts, although many of those he acquired were lost at sea, a calamity that turned his hair grey overnight, so it was claimed.³⁹ He later taught at Venice, then Ferrara.⁴⁰ Strozzi stayed in Italy but ordered a large number of manuscripts from Greece,⁴¹ while Vergerio returned to Padua, where his influential treatise on education (c. 1402/3) included an exhortation on history. He pointed out that much Italian history had been lost and could only now be found in Greek historians, but Greek was known only by a few people, meaning himself, Strozzi, Guarino, and Bruni among others.⁴²

Whether Vergerio had Procopius in mind as one of the Greek historians of Italy is not known. Nor is it likely that a manuscript of the *Wars* was available in Florence by the time Bruni was first covering the sixth-century Italian wars in his *History of Florence* (Book 1.60–3), written in 1415/16.⁴³

³⁷ Fryde (1983) 26–7.

³⁸ Ianziti (2012) 23–43.

³⁹ Wilson (1992) 25. Among the perished manuscripts was a full Herodotus.

⁴⁰ Geanakoplos (1982) 28–30.

⁴¹ Wilson (1992) 9.

⁴² Vergerio (2002) 46–7 with Geanakoplos (1989) 45–6. Still useful background in Woodward (1899) 14ff.

⁴³ Cf. Bruni (2001) 74–81 with 489 n. 54; Haury (1896) 135.

Even so, Bruni's *History* is regarded as a crucial development in modern historiographical method and criticism. While that may be true of Book 1, the later Books (2 to 12) are more conventional historical narration based on elaborating a single previous source. Bruni's history was so popular, however, it was said that wherever you walked in Florence you came across someone making a copy of it.⁴⁴ If Bruni was making history popular, the tendency was reinforced by his treatise on the study of literature that advocated strongly for history.⁴⁵ Scholars such as Bruni were now on the lookout for new Greek manuscripts as much as Latin ones. Hence when Giovanni Aurispa (1376–1459) arrived in Florence in 1418 he found a ready reception among the local humanists for the Greek manuscripts he had acquired in Constantinople. Aurispa was a Sicilian who may have grown up with some of the local Greek dialect, but it was a stint in Chios in 1413–14, as private tutor to a Genoese merchant's family, that allowed him really to master Greek.⁴⁶ At the same time, he discovered that there was a new market in Italy for manuscripts of Greek works he could obtain in Chios. For the rest of his life he remained very much the entrepreneur, locating and selling Greek manuscripts to others, rather than utilising them himself and building his own library. An ally of emperors and popes, Aurispa had many opportunities to benefit from his enterprise.

In 1418 he was in Constantinople and brought manuscripts, especially those of the Christian scriptures and patristic writers, to the papal court then at Florence. In 1421 Pope Martin V sent him back to Constantinople as an interpreter for a papal envoy to the scholarly emperor Manuel II Palaeologus (ruled 1391–1425), but he ended up as secretary to Manuel's son, later his successor as John VIII

⁴⁴ Davies (1996) 53. Bruni's *History of Florence* is in Bruni (2001), (2004), and (2007).

⁴⁵ Bruni (2002) 108–9 (*de studiis et litteris liber*, 18).

⁴⁶ Bigi (1962).

(ruled 1425–1448). Aurispa subsequently accompanied John on his visit to western courts in search of support against the Turkish threat to Constantinople (as Manuel himself had once done), but settled in Venice in 1423 with a large collection of 238 Greek manuscripts.⁴⁷ He sold many of them and kept some, before moving to Florence (1425–7) where his manuscripts could be made available to scholars like Bruni who appreciated them and wanted to make copies. Most importantly, among Aurispa’s Greek manuscripts brought to Florence in 1425 (rather than earlier in 1418) was one of Procopius’ *Wars* (*Laur. Plut.* 69.8). Moreover, the Procopius manuscript was a gift to Aurispa from emperor Manuel himself. As such, it may have been copied from the Procopius manuscript in the imperial library, if there was still such a collection.

By the 1420s and 1430s, Florence was the centre of learning and manuscript production, especially in Greek. Its current ruler (from 1434) Cosimo de Medici and his wealthy family were keen patrons of this cultural and scholarly activity. Besides Aurispa, in 1427 Francesco Filelfo (1398–1481) brought forty manuscripts from Constantinople including one of the *Suda*, whose entry on Procopius’ works included specific notice of the *Secret History*.⁴⁸ Filelfo’s library was subsequently (1480) purchased by Lorenzo De Medici (1449–1492), the ‘Magnificent’, which brought all the manuscripts to Florence.⁴⁹ A few years after Aurispa and Filelfo, the council (1435–8) convoked at Ferrara, then Florence, to seek doctrinal unity between the churches of Rome and Constantinople, as a prelude to a combined assault on the encroaching infidel Turks, provided yet another local impetus for Greek and Greek manuscripts. The enormous delegation from Constantinople included many leading

⁴⁷ Sabbadini (1996) 46–7; Wilson (1992) 25; Reynolds and Wilson (2013) 149–50.

⁴⁸ Sabbadini (1996) 48; Wilson (1992) 49–53. On manuscripts, translations and printed versions of the *Suda* in Renaissance Italy: Botley (2010) 55–7.

⁴⁹ Cf. Fryde (1983) 159–214.

scholars such as the great student of Plato, Gemistus Plethon, and Basil Bessarion (1403–1472). Large numbers of manuscripts, many already centuries old, accompanied the eastern delegation not only for the purposes of the council and the historical issues it would be discussing but also for Greek culture and history more generally.⁵⁰ Again, it is possible that other Procopius manuscripts came to Italy, especially Florence, at that time.

In any event, it must have been at Florence in precisely this period that Bruni first encountered Procopius among Aurispa's collection.⁵¹ Bruni was still one of the few locals capable of reading a manuscript of Procopius *Wars*, which thus provided the basis for his own separate history of the sixth century war, *De bello Italico*, written in 1441. Almost immediately and for a long time later Bruni's history became popular and controversial, in both its original Latin as one of the first printed books in Italy (Foligno, 1470) and in Italian translation (1456, printed Florence 1526). Bruni used the manuscript (*Laur. Plut.* 69.8) brought to Florence by Aurispa, which had a lacuna covering the death of the Gothic king Totila in 552 (*Proc. Wars* 8.32.27–8). Bruni was fully aware of this and his marginal notes remain in the manuscript.⁵² Over the years Bruni had produced a range of translations into Latin of Greek texts, beginning with Plutarch's *Mark Antony* in 1402/3, and histories based on Greek texts. His popular history of the First Punic War (1422), for instance, was based exclusively on Polybius, but in more or less paraphrasing and translating Polybius, he claimed to be doing precisely what a good ancient historian like Livy had done before him, that is, to find and follow a

⁵⁰ Geanakoplos (1989) 243.

⁵¹ More detailed background in Croke (forthcoming, *b*).

⁵² Explained in Fryde (1983) 84–7, cf. Haury (1896) 132–7. The lacuna in Bruni's manuscript (at Haury (1905) II.642.24 to 662.19 = *Wars* 8.29.2–33.5) originated in Constantinople and is manifest in several other manuscripts covering *Wars* Book 8 (*Basileensis graecus D IV 6* (Haury's 'k' (1905) XLIX–L), *Mon. gr.* 87 (Haury's 'n' (1905) L), *Matritensis regius* 38 (Haury's 'gamma' (1905) LI).

single reliable source.⁵³ Similarly with his *Commentarii* on fourth-century Greek history (1439), based on Xenophon.⁵⁴ So when it came to the *De bello italico* Bruni deployed the same technique with Procopius.

While Bruni had access to a manuscript of Procopius' *Wars* at Florence, the work was not widely known, not even among scholars. Forced to defend himself, or perhaps to anticipate a likely criticism, Bruni explained in a letter to Cyriacus of Ancona (31 August 1441)⁵⁵ that 'This work is not a translation, but a work which I myself have compiled, just as Livy drew material from Valerius Antias or Polybius and ordered it according to his own judgement'.⁵⁶ Bruni began by teasing that while Cyriacus was off making sensational new discoveries in Greece and Asia Minor, he was himself making new discoveries about the history of Cyriacus' home town of Ancona, but without going anywhere. He explains that he had been studying the *Wars* of Procopius and there he found a good deal about Ancona (Proc. *Wars* 6.11, 13, 24; 7.30; 8.23) which was not currently known. That is why Bruni considers his new work to be justly called a 'history' and not merely a 'translation' of Procopius. Certainly he was making no secret of the fact that Procopius was his main source in his history, even though his preface to the *De bello Italico* does not specifically mention Procopius. Instead, so he says, it is constructed 'from the commentaries of the Greeks' thereby implying that he has used the sixth-century account of Procopius as merely one source for contemporary information rather than treating it as a fully-formed history in its own right. Many were not convinced. In another letter to Giovanni Tortelli (1400–1466), a fellow-

⁵³ Ianziti (2012) 13–16, 61–88, with Momigliano (1977) 79–98.

⁵⁴ Ianziti (2012) 239–56.

⁵⁵ Among the manuscripts Cyriacus acquired in the east, one contained a fragment of the *Wars* (1.4): *Chig.* R IV 12 (Gr. 12), ff. 3–4v, 176v. He also copied a section of the *Buildings* as part of another manuscript (*Par. Gr.* 2489, ff. 13–22 = Haury's 'p3' (1913) VI).

⁵⁶ Bruni (1741) 149–50 (*Ep.* 9.5) cf. Botley (2004) 32 and Ianziti (2012) 18, 279.

Aretine and papal official who was a serious Greek scholar himself having recently spent some years in Constantinople, Bruni went further. In response to a question about his recent history (1442) he explained more precisely that:

I have written them not as a translator but as a creator and author. If I were to write on the present war I would hear of events from others, but the plan and arrangement and the words would be my own, and they would be carefully set down according to my own judgement. I have taken only the events from Procopius in just this way and left behind everything else (i.e. digressions, speeches) since his only virtue is that he was present during this war: in every other way he is a contemptible writer.⁵⁷

Among other things, what Bruni meant was that while Procopius imitated Thucydides, he was not to be judged in the same league as his model when it came to composing speeches. Then, in a letter to Francesco Barbaro (23 August 1443), Bruni is again very critical of Procopius' style and imitation of Thucydides. The acknowledged value of Procopius to Bruni was that he was essentially a reliable eyewitness of events in Italy in the 530s, rather than a great writer, as had been his Byzantine reputation for centuries.⁵⁸

As with his previous histories, Bruni's *De bello Italico* quickly became popular and to the few who knew Procopius it looked as if Bruni had more or less translated Procopius' text. Even so, he made into an 'Italian war' the same one that Procopius described as 'Justinian's war against the Goths'. Despite his close adherence to Procopius, Bruni never once cites him by name. Almost immediately, this reluctance was taken as deliberate concealment on Bruni's part. The accusation was repeated in later generations, as we shall see, but despite Bruni's own claims about his work

⁵⁷ Bruni (1741) 156–7 (*Ep.* 9.9) with Botley (2004) 33 and Ianziti (2012) 19.

⁵⁸ Ianziti (1998).

not being a translation, there remains what Ianziti calls a 'lingering stain'.⁵⁹ The oft-repeated claim that Bruni was deliberately playing on the ignorance of his educated audience by trying to conceal his debt to Procopius is without foundation. The real issue is how he actually used the manuscript of Procopius in his *De bello Italico*.⁶⁰

Bruni sent a copy of his history to King Alfonso V of Aragon who was then seeking to recapture control of the former Greek parts of Italy, namely the south and Sicily. This gift had an instant effect because Procopius' account of how Belisarius captured Naples after a long siege in 536 (*Wars* 5.10.1–26) provided Alfonso with the idea of how to capture it himself, which he accomplished in 1442, so Bruni noted with satisfaction.⁶¹ Such satisfaction was short-lived, however, because a few months later in 1443 Alfonso also received a manuscript copy of another new work covering sixth-century Italy. This was by Flavio Biondo (1392–1463) and entitled *Decades* (written 1439–1443, published 1483). It has been deemed 'a milestone in modern historiography',⁶² and Biondo is often said to be the first historian to formulate the notion of decline in the Roman empire from the fifth century. The sustained preoccupation with tracing a period of decline over centuries raises the question of pinpointing when such decline began (Biondo opts for 412, following the Goths' sack of Rome), then of how the Roman empire of

⁵⁹ Ianziti (2012) 20. The bluntest statement came a century later from Paolo Giovio (1488–1552) in his *Elogia virorum* (Florence 1546, repr. Antwerp) relying on the earlier (1480s) judgement of Procopius' translator Christopher Persona: 25 (Bruni), '... quod ei nullo pudore fuit, furti damnatus est, quod gothicam historiam suppresso Procopii nomine publicasset, accusante Christophoro Persona, qui aliud exemplar nactus, et Gothicam et Persicam simulatque Vandalicam, et Graeci authoris titulum ingenue profitendo transtulerit'; cf. 244 (Persona), '... Procopium latine loquentem fecit, non dubia in Leonardum Aretinum conflate invidia, qui suppresso Graeci authoris nomine ... nullo pudore nuncuparat'.

⁶⁰ Botley (2004) 36; Cochrane (1981) 18.

⁶¹ Bruni (1741) 165–6 (*Ep.* 9.18).

⁶² Thomson (1966) 492; cf. Connell (2012) 352–3.

the fifth century related to that of the empire of Charlemagne, and his current successors, as well as the ongoing Roman empire in the East.⁶³ For centuries, the focus of political rhetoric and historical explanation was that the Roman empire had not so much declined as simply been translated, the first ‘*translatio imperii*’ being to Charlemagne in 800 through the continuity of papal authority in Rome. The contemporary Holy Roman Empire was merely the latest manifestation of that imperial continuity.

While at Rome, Biondo had come to be familiar with the history of Procopius at the same time as Bruni was writing, but unlike Bruni he could not read the original history. Instead, he had commissioned a Latin translation of those parts of the *Wars* which he required for his history of Italy in the sixth century (*Decades* 1, Books 4–5). Neither the name of the translator nor his work, not to mention the manuscript he used, is known.⁶⁴ Given that Biondo was writing in Rome, it is most likely that he sought local help made possible by a local manuscript such as *Vat. Gr.* 152.⁶⁵ Biondo’s prime use for the anonymous Procopian translation was as a source alongside other known writers such as Jordanes, Cassiodorus, Paul the Deacon and Agnellus of Ravenna. In this respect, Biondo was approaching Procopius far more critically than Bruni had done. Biondo first cites Procopius ‘at the beginning of the war against the Goths’ for the death of Symmachus (*Wars* 5.1.34) then on queen Amalasuetha ‘according to the author Procopius’. It is at the beginning of the fourth book (First *Decade*) that Biondo pauses to explain that Procopius will be helpful in part for the Italian war against the Goths but that he will also be an obstacle at times.⁶⁶ Procopius, so

⁶³ For details: Pellegrino (2007) 273–29, Pocock (2003) 89–202. Still useful is Mazzarino (1966) 77–84.

⁶⁴ Ianziti (2012) 281 n. 14; Delle Donne (2016) 55–88.

⁶⁵ Haury (1896) 137, 158–9 (suggesting possibility of *Vat. Gr.* 152).

⁶⁶ Biondo (1531), *Decades* 1.4: ‘partim multum adiuvabit, partim non levia alicubi afferent impedimenta’.

Biondo notes, was from Caesarea, was attached to the army of Belisarius, a medical doctor but versatile in his skills, and wrote histories. None of the Latin writers on Justinian to date, so Biondo continues, appear to have used Procopius, and while he is fortunate to have a little Greek himself, he has had to have the books on the Gothic war translated, but only for the purpose of using the history in his *Decades*. Then he turns to Bruni, ‘a most distinguished writer of our age’, carefully noting that from the beginning to the end of his *De bello Italico* Bruni used nothing but Procopius and used him whole.

For immediate purposes, Biondo was as critical of Procopius’ information as Bruni was of his style. Procopius was a Greek, Biondo emphasises, and so he did not necessarily have an authoritative knowledge of Italy, citing as an example the fact that Procopius claims that he found Ravenna surrounded by water and divided by a marsh (*Wars* 5.1.18). The water, says Biondo, never divided Ravenna at all because it was 12 miles from the city itself. He does concede, however, that the mistake may not be Procopius’, but the fault of the translation he had commissioned, particularly since it is clearly defective in other parts, and lacks both a beginning and end. Elsewhere, he points out what he considers shortcomings of Procopius, including his omission of Belisarius’ second expedition into Africa in 536 (*Wars* 4.15) and of Vitigis’ support from the Burgundians (*Wars* 6.12.38–39). At the beginning of Book 5 (First *Decade*) we find: ‘We are obliged at this point, as we promised earlier, to refute at greater length the mistakes made by Procopius which we overlooked’. The ‘mistakes’ Biondo had in mind were rather strained. First, he argues incorrectly that the Narses who led the expedition to fight the Goths in 552 was not the same Narses as the one who was in Ravenna in 539, then that the quarrel between Belisarius and Narses had nothing to do with the loss of Milan. Even so, there is no evidence that Milan was actually destroyed, nor is there any evidence other than Procopius

that Belisarius was offered the Italian throne by the Goths in 540.⁶⁷ Unlike Bruni, Biondo was using his other sources as a check on Procopius.⁶⁸ Biondo went on to produce pioneering works of topography and archaeology covering both Rome (*Roma Instaurata*, 1444–1448) and the whole of Italy (*Italia Illustrata*, 1453) as well as a major work on Roman life and customs (*Roma Triumphans*, 1479). While he never cites Procopius directly in these works, in the *Italia Illustrata* he does refer back to sections of his *Decades* for which Procopius had been the ultimate source.⁶⁹

By the time Biondo was writing in the 1440s Rome was beginning to re-emerge as a centre of learned activity now that the papacy had once again permanently settled there. Pope Nicholas V (1379–1455) had plans for a large Vatican library, as well as for a project to translate Greek works into Latin. Moreover, just as Bruni had served recent popes, so Biondo and others like him found employment for their advanced skills in Latin in the papal chancery.⁷⁰ One of them was the Neapolitan Lorenzo Valla (1407–1457), famous for his scholarly exposure of the *Donation of Constantine* as a medieval forgery (1440), which was also produced under the patronage of Alfonso and alienated him from the papacy. Now Valla translated Herodotus and Thucydides at papal request⁷¹ and in 1449 a translation of Procopius' *Wars*, at least the second tetrad covering the Gothic war, was slated for the new collection. Giovanni Tortelli, who

⁶⁷ Fryde (1983) 21 for some of these issues.

⁶⁸ Pellegrino (2007) 288.

⁶⁹ *Italia Illustrata*, quoted by Biondo (2005) at 1.24 (68–9): Narses at Luca; 2.28 (162–3): appointment of Pope Silverius; 3.3 (242–3): Pesaro destroyed by Totila and rebuilt by Belisarius; 3.4 (224–5): Belisarius gains Urbino; 3.15 (260–1): defence of Ancona lifted by Narses; 4.7 (284–5): Goths besiege Rimini; and Biondo (2016) at 5.7 (10–11): Narses defeats Totila; 5.39 (60–1): Milan surrenders to Goths; 6.40 (148–9): Totila's father at Treviso; 7.57 (262–3): Benevento destroyed by Totila.

⁷⁰ Various chapters in Grafton (1993*b*) especially 3–46 (Grafton) and 47–86 (Hankins).

⁷¹ Wilson (1992) 71.

had been part of the humanist circles of Bruni and Biondo, and may have been the Procopian translator for Biondo, was now working at Rome for Pope Nicholas V. At that time he sent a manuscript of Procopius' *Wars* (perhaps *Vat. Gr.* 152) to Lianoro Lianori (1425–1477), inviting him to translate it into Latin for the papal collection. Lianoro had been a student at Ferrara of both Guarino and Theodore of Gaza (1400–1475), and so was well qualified for the task. In September 1449 Lianoro prepared a sample translation of part of Procopius and asked Tortelli to personally recommend it to the pope. For whatever reason, or reasons, Lianoro never accomplished the full translation.⁷² The opportunity was lost and study of Procopius in Italy was held back for decades.

Meanwhile, unlike Biondo's complex but more scholarly history, Bruni's *De bello Italico* acquired an ever expanding audience to follow his earlier *History of Florence* but was still in manuscript form in 1470. Demand for it led to its translation into Italian, first in 1456 by Ludovico Petroni (1409–1478), who dedicated it to the son of the Sforza duke of Milan.⁷³ A further translation of Bruni's Italian war was credited to another busy Florentine humanist, translator, teacher and civic official named Bernardo di Francesco Nuti (Nutius, Nuzzi). This was probably executed in the 1450s or 1460s.⁷⁴ Not for the last time in the story of Proco-

⁷² Bachelli (2005) with Fryde (1983) 27. It is possible that, for the purposes of a sample translation, Lianori was only ever provided by Tortelli with extracts from a Roman manuscript of Procopius, rather than a complete manuscript. If so, these extracts were later transcribed by the Florentine philologist Angelo Poliziano on a visit to Bologna in 1491: cf. Daneloni (2013) 9–30. Poliziano certainly knew at least Procopius' account of the Gothic war because in Letter 1.2.3 (Poliziano (2006) 13) he quotes *Wars* 7.5.1 on the ineffectiveness of the Goths against Florence.

⁷³ Turrini (2015).

⁷⁴ Details on Nuti are hard to find but see Marchesi (1900) 15–20, Maxson (2013) 266 and id. (2014) 71–8. Whether the Italian history of the Croatian student at the papal court, Nicholas of Modrus (1427–1480)

pius did two translations of the same work appear close together, evidently unbeknownst to their separate authors. Only Petroni's came eventually to be printed (1526). Following the interest in Procopius' account of the wars in Italy created by Bruni and Biondo in manuscript, by 1500 other scholars were seeking out copies of Procopius' *Wars*. One was Bartolomeo Scala (1430–1497), another Chancellor of Florence who in the 1490s set about writing a history of the city (*Historia Florentinorum*) which he never completed and which was not published until 1677. Central to his account of Florence in the sixth century, however, is its siege by Totila in 542. While using Bruni, Biondo and much material besides Procopius, on one occasion he does cite Procopius directly (*Wars* 7.5.1).⁷⁵ What cannot be ascertained is whether Scala used the same local Florentine manuscript as Bruni had done (*Laur. Plut.* 69.8) or some other.

By 1450 known manuscripts of Procopius in Italy included those used by Bruni, Biondo, and Lianoro, but there were others that had found their way from Constantinople and elsewhere and were now in the possession of various private collectors and scholars, but were otherwise unknown. Among them was the collection of the now Cardinal Bessarion at Rome, the 'most valuable library of Greek MSS in the entire Renaissance',⁷⁶ which he bequeathed in 1468 to what became the Marciana library at Venice. This collection contained a manuscript of Procopius' *Wars* which was originally copied at Constantinople in 1360 and later acquired by Bessarion and brought to Italy.⁷⁷ The eventual capture of Constantinople by the Turks in May 1453 suddenly stemmed the flow of scholars and

utilised sections of Procopius through Petroni, Nuti or Bruni is not clear (cf. Forrai (2016) 215).

⁷⁵ Scala (1677) 28–35 (Book I), 43–4 (Book II), with Wilcox (1969) 182–94.

⁷⁶ Geanakoplos (1989) 66.

⁷⁷ *Marc. Gr.* ζ. 398, f. 4–204v: *Wars* 1–4 = Haury's 'k' (1905) XXVI–XXXVII.

manuscripts from east to west. The renowned humanist Aeneas Piccolomini (1405–1464), later Pius II, could only express a collective fear that manuscripts not already in Italy or Greece might now be lost forever: ‘what shall I say of the countless books, as yet unknown to the Latins, which were there [in Constantinople]? Alas how many names of great men will now perish! ... the fount of the Muses has been destroyed.’⁷⁸ Parts of Greece, Cyprus and Venetian Crete continued to flourish as centres of copying and reading of Greek texts but the western rediscovery of Procopius was now at risk. Those fleeing Constantinople as the Turks entered included the family of John Lascaris (1445–1535). He ended up in Venice as a student of Bessarion, then was taken up by Lorenzo de Medici at Florence. Lorenzo twice sent Lascaris to seek for manuscripts from Constantinople because he and the Turkish sultan Bayezid II (ruled 1481–1512) were well disposed to each other and shared a common interest in literary culture.⁷⁹ About 200 manuscripts were accumulated. On Lorenzo’s death, Lascaris secured a position with the French king (Louis XII) and was a key influence in the establishment of the royal libraries in Blois (1496) and Fontainebleau (1524). He spent his latter years at Rome where he is buried in the Church of S. Agata dei Goti. Among Lascaris’ manuscripts which ended up in Paris were two of Procopius’ *Wars*: *Par. Gr.* 1038, fols. 186–90 (letters only) and *Par. Gr.* 1699. Both these manuscripts were copied for Lascaris, most likely at Florence, from earlier originals. These copies were later owned by Lorenzo’s nephew the young Cardinal Niccolo Ridolfi (1501–1550), whose manuscripts were subsequently acquired by another relative Piero Strozzi in France. The manuscripts then became the property of his cousin and Lorenzo’s great-granddaughter, Catherine de Medici (1519–1589).⁸⁰ At fourteen, Catherine

⁷⁸ Aeneas Piccolomini to Pope Nicholas V, 12 July 1453 quoted in Ady (1913) 125.

⁷⁹ Giovius (1557) 68 (elogium for ‘John Lascaris’).

⁸⁰ Haury (1896) 142–7 and (1905) XXXVI.

was married to the son of king Francis I of France. Her command of Greek and Latin marked her out, while her personal life also connects with the path of the extensive Medicean manuscript collection from Florence to Paris.⁸¹ Thus Procopius reached Paris by 1550. Another Constantinopolitan refugee from 1453 was Constantine Lascaris ‘Byzantinus’ (1434–1501) who acquired manuscripts in Rhodes and Corfu, before arriving in Italy and taking a position teaching Greek at the court of the Sforza dukes at Milan, ending up in Sicily (Messina) where he died. Constantine’s manuscripts, including one that contained an extract from Procopius’ *Wars*,⁸² were then mainly bought for the new national library in Madrid. Thus Procopius arrived in Spain.

3. The First Latin and Italian Translations

Besides manuscripts of Procopius, there was now a demand for translations. Not only were there two separate translations of Bruni’s paraphrase of Procopius’ *Gothic War* by the 1460s, but there were soon two separate, near simultaneous (early 1480s), translations from the original Greek: one was into Italian by Niccolo Leonicensi (1428–1524) at Ferrara, and one into Latin by Christopher Persona (1416–1486) at Rome. They appear to have been undertaken and completed independently, and without knowledge of each other. While Leonicensi’s translation remains unpublished to this day,⁸³ Persona’s appeared posthumously, nearly

⁸¹ Wilson (1983) 95; id. (1992) 98–100.

⁸² *Matrit.* 4637, 2r–3v. Another manuscript fragment of the *Wars* copied by Constantine was later owned by Fulvio Orsini (1529–1600) at Rome where it became *Vat. Gr.* 1353, 220r–v, when Fulvio’s extensive library became part of the Vatican collection in 1602. Yet another, copied in the 14th century from *Vat. Gr.* 152, was *Vat. Gr.* 1301 (Haury (1896) 163–4).

⁸³ It survives in four separate manuscripts: Milan, *Ambrosiana*, codex A 272 inf.; Bologna, *Bibl. Univ.* 2(1); Modena, *Estens. Ital.* 463 (a H 4 2); Rome, *Bibl. Naz.* 1778. Catalogue details are collected at

three decades later (1506). Procopius was an unusual venture for Leoniceno at Ferrara who had devoted most of his philological activity to translating medical texts, especially those of Galen.⁸⁴ Presumably it arose from a particular request from the renowned patron of the arts Duke Ercole d'Este of Ferrara, to whom it was dedicated. Persona, on the other hand, was a prefect of the growing Vatican library and a well-known humanist. At the time of his translation he was prior of Santa Balbina on the Aventine. His work was accomplished between October 1481, when he borrowed from the Vatican library the Procopius manuscript (*Vat. Gr.* 152), secured with its attendant chain, and September 1483, when he returned it.⁸⁵ However, he must also have used some other manuscript as well, since he includes the section on the last battle and death of king Totila which is absent from *Vat. Gr.* 152. With his gaze firmly fixed on Italy and the Gothic war, Persona actually syncopted Procopius' account by moving seamlessly from *Wars* 7.40 (end of Book 7) to *Wars* 8.21 (where Procopius resumes the war in Italy) but he included all of this under the rubric of 'Book 3'. What this means is that Persona entirely omitted a whole section (*Wars* 8.1–19) as not being relevant to Italy. Nor did he mark any transition to a fourth book of the Gothic war. This would cause considerable confusion to later translators and scholars. By contrast, Leoniceno's translation covered all four books of the Gothic war, including the complete Book

http://www.ilritornodeiclassici.it/enav/index.php?type=opera&op=fet_ch&id=452&lang=it. A further copy (linked to that in Rome), originating in Modena and dated to February 1500, was available for sale in 2008 (details in *Libreria Philobiblon* (2008) 58–61).

⁸⁴ Wilson (1992) 118–20. Niccolo was evidently critical of Bruni (Pertusi (1967) 13).

⁸⁵ Bertola (1942) 24: 'Ego prior S. Balbinae accipi a domino Bartholomaeo Aristophilo bibliothecario Procopium historicum ex papyro in nigro cum catena die xxv Octobris 1481. Restituit vi Septembris 1483', cf. Haury (1896) 160–1.

4, to judge only from part of its title in the Milan manuscript, ‘divisa in quattro parte’.⁸⁶

From 1484 Persona’s translation may have been accessible to others. One suggested, but unlikely, user is Francesco Maria Settala.⁸⁷ Another possible user of a manuscript of Procopius’ Gothic war was the leader of a local Roman academy of scholars and university teachers named Pomponio Leto (1428–1498). He was a serious student of Roman antiquities but never a serious student of Greek. Among his works was a biographical compendium of Roman emperors that included an entry on Justinian. If Pomponio used Procopius for this particular entry, which is possible, then his only source would have been a Latin translation.⁸⁸ Whether Persona made his manuscript translation available at Rome or not, he may never have envisaged that twenty years later it would appear posthumously in the new book form. The eventual publication of Persona’s translation in 1506 under the title *De bello Gothorum* led the publisher to explain in his foreword how long he had sought to get it into print. The book was dedicated to Thomas Ingeramius, also known as ‘Phaedrus’ and from Volterra, a distinguished humanist and later prefect of the Vatican library (1510–1516).⁸⁹ Thus from 1506 the original text of Procopius, previously relied on by Bruni in his *De*

⁸⁶ Milan, *Ambrosiana*, codex A 272 inf.: *Historia de le guerre gottice facte da Justiniano imperatore per mezo de Belisario suo capitano, divisa in quattro parte, traductione facta de greco in vulgare da maistro Nicolo da Lonigo*.

⁸⁷ As proposed by Miletta (2015). It has to be said, however, that Miletta’s arguments that (i) the appearance of a boar on the coat of arms of Benevento in 1489 can only have come from a studious reading of Procopius *Wars* (798) and (ii) that in Rome Settala ‘became conversant’ with Persona’s manuscript translation of Procopius and later ‘decided to divulge it’ locally at Benevento (803), are extremely tenuous.

⁸⁸ Leto (1500): Leto’s apostrophe to Rome (Book II, XXXVI) may have been inspired by Belisarius’ plea to Totila not to destroy such an important city as Rome when the Goths captured it in 546 (*Wars* 7.22.8–16). Leto offers the contemporary observation that parts of the city were destroyed by the Goths and never yet rebuilt.

⁸⁹ D’Amico (1983) 36.

bello Italico and through a customised translation by Biondo in his *Decades*, was now available in the new printed form for closer study by those interested in sixth century Italian history.⁹⁰ Precisely what manuscripts of Procopius' *Wars* were used by Leonicensino remain unknown because nobody evidently considered it important enough to note. Leonicensino may have deployed a local Ferrara copy of the *Wars*. He could perhaps have acquired one from Guarino da Verona, who taught at Ferrara from 1429 to 1460 but had earlier brought manuscripts with him from Constantinople where he studied for some years. Of course, Procopius (like Herodotus) may have been one of the manuscripts swallowed up by the sea on his voyage back to Venice. Another possibility would be Theodore of Gaza, one of the most significant Greek scholars to settle in 15th century Italy and a key influence at Ferrara, partly overlapping with Leonicensino.⁹¹ Theodore was involved in translations from Greek to Latin and may well have pointed Leonicensino to a local manuscript of Procopius, just as he may have done earlier (1449) for his former student Lionaro. At different points Theodore was acquainted with known owners of Procopian manuscripts (Aurispa, Bessarion).

As for Persona, he definitely used a local Vatican manuscript (*Vat. Gr.* 152) for his Latin translation but supplemented it from some other. This translation was the first appearance of any part of Procopius in book form. Publication of Persona's translation of Procopius' account of Justinian's Gothic war now raised the question of access to his other works known in late 15th and early 16th century Italy, that is, his histories of the other wars of Justinian against the Persians and Vandals or what stood in manuscripts as the 'first tetrad'. Enter Raphael Maffei (1451–1522), otherwise known as Raphael of Volterra after his hometown. He may have known Persona at the papal court and certainly his fellow-Volterran Thomas Ingeramius.

⁹⁰ Wilson (1992) 82.

⁹¹ On Theodore's scholarly career: Geanakoplos (1989) 68–90.

Raphael was born and educated at Rome and became a *scriptor* at the papal curia as well as a prolific scholar and translator. After he returned to Volterra in 1506, he remained there for the rest of his life turning it into a monastic centre of scholarship and discussion. Maffei's main interests were theology and philosophy with a penchant for church reform before and after Martin Luther, but he came to notice with his vast encyclopaedic *Commentariorum urbanorum libri* (Rome 1506, then reprinted regularly) which was divided into three separate sections: Geography, Anthropology and Philology.⁹² One of the sources of information for Maffei was Procopius. The text is referenced or quoted on a range of topics such as the origin of individual nations, the fate of Florence under Totila, which Scala and other previous historians had dwelt on, and the fact that Procopius also wrote a work called the *Secret History* which had not yet turned up in the Vatican library that Maffei knew so well.⁹³

One of Raphael Maffei's projects in Volterra was translating the four books on the Persian and Vandal Wars which were as yet unknown to most Italians. Since the time of Bruni and Biondo (early 1440s) the only work of Proco-

⁹² On Maffei: Romagnani (2006) and D'Amico (1983) 81–5 (Rome), 189–211 (Volterra) and 221–6 (church reform), Weiss (1969) 82–3.

⁹³ Maffei (1506), *Geographia* Book II (8): sees Goths, Vandals and Alans as originally Sarmatians (from Procopius, *Wars* 3.3.1); *Geographia* III (15): on Britons and Britain (*Wars* 8.20.4–6); *Geographia* V (53): Totila spares Florence (*Wars* 7.5.1–4); *Geographia* VII (83): describes Belisarius' defeat of Gelimer in Africa and subsequent triumph; *Geographia* VII (8): Heruli on Bosphorus kill their aged and sick; *Geographia* VII (85): origin of Bosporan Huns, Utrigurs and Kutrigurs defeated by Justinian; *Geographia* VIII (86): Slavs first enter Roman world in Justinian's time; *Anthropologia* XVIII (214): Procopius of Caesarea was an orator and sophist who wrote about what Belisarius did in Justinian's reign in the East, the West and in Africa. He also wrote another work, as cited in the *Suda*, entitled the *Secret History* (*Anekdotia*) that is, not just unpublished but not even aired. 'At present we notice this author has not been restored to the Latins in the Vatican library'. *Anthropologia*, 271: on the death of Valentinian III; *Philologia* XXVII (223): on the gold coinage of Justinian.

pius widely known was the recently translated Gothic War. In March 1509 there appeared the publication of Maffei's Latin translation of the Persian Wars and Vandal Wars. The actual title of the work was *De Bello Persico*, so the Vandal Wars appear as Books 3 and 4 of the Persian Wars in effect. In doing so, Maffei was simply following the rubrics of the Vatican manuscript at his disposal.⁹⁴ Unlike the translation of *Persona*, which at least utilised the same manuscript (*Vat. Gr.* 152), Maffei's translation was relatively unadorned, with sparse marginal headings. Perhaps it was Ingeramius of Volterra, a recipient of *Persona*'s translation, who had urged the work on Raphael. In any event, accompanying publication was a papal veto from Julius II on anyone else publishing the same work for 25 years. Set down at the end of the work, this was one of the first such statements of copyright ('privilege'), although it was ineffective, to judge from the fact that seven years later (1516) another publisher (Jacob Mazzochi, the funder of *Persona*'s translation in 1506) in Rome produced the very same work. As Paolo Giovio was moved to comment later (1546), Maffei's translation had done a great service, even if clarity rather than brilliance was its defining feature.⁹⁵ Many other later Renaissance Italian historians also made some use of Procopius in the course of their works, all of them presumably relying on the Latin translation of *Persona* for Italian events rather than original Greek manuscripts that they could not read.⁹⁶ Notable among them were Leandro Alberti (1479–1552) who, used Procopius extensively for his description of Italy, Giuseppe Tarcagnola (1490–1556),

⁹⁴ Even so, he made his own heading for the third book ('Procopii de bello Vandilico liber tertius per Raphaellem Volterranum conversus') although for the fourth he used simply 'liber quartus'.

⁹⁵ Giovio (1557) 246: '... sincere potius quam splendide convertit'.

⁹⁶ Those noted in the thorough survey of Cochrane (1981) comprise: Francesco Adami (218: published in 1591), Bizzarri's *History of Genoa* (246: 1525), Giovan Battista Pigna (263: 1572); Pompeo Pellini (264: 1594), Giovan Thomas Minadoi (327), Girolamo de Bardi (397), Pier Angelio Bargeo (431; 1517–96). There may be others.

whose volumes on the antiquities of Rome and Naples relied on Procopius, and Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527), who drew on his knowledge of Procopius in both his *Discourses on Livy* and his *History of Florence*.⁹⁷

By the end of the fifteenth century the new technology of book printing was starting to spread rapidly in Italy, and classical Greek and Latin texts were in unprecedented demand. The Greek publishing venture of Aldus Manutius (1449–1515) at Venice was at the heart of this revolution. Although Manutius collaborated closely with Procopius' translator Leonicensio on medical texts such as the herbal handbook of Dioscorides (1499), Procopius' works were not a priority for the new industry, however. By 1500 not only was there no published text of any part of Procopius, there was no published translation either, although there would be within a few years (Persona 1506, Maffei 1509). Also by 1500, manuscripts of Procopius' history which were already available in Italy were slowly finding their way from purely private possession into the newly established libraries in Florence, the Vatican and Venice, in particular. Even so, these manuscripts were still hardly known.

4. German and Gothic History: Peutinger, Beatus Rhenanus, and Lazius

From the centre of Greek teaching and publishing at Venice in 1502, Aldus Manutius observed that

people are keen on the study of literature and indeed increasingly enthusiastic that, despite the wars,⁹⁸ literary studies submerged and at a low ebb for many centuries are reviving. Not just in Italy, but also in Germany, France, Hungary, Britain, Spain and almost every place where the language of the Romans is read,

⁹⁷ Details in Croke (forthcoming, *b*).

⁹⁸ The wars were those involving Naples and the north Italian states, following the French invasion of 1494.

here is great enterprise to study Greek and not only among adolescents and young people but also among the elderly.⁹⁹

Although he failed to include his Austrian neighbour, Manutius may have had in mind here people like Johannes Cuspinian (1473–1529). The intense young man, famously depicted around this time by Lucas Cranach Senior, that is, before the artist settled in Wittenberg and befriended Martin Luther, was fully engaged in scholarly and, increasingly, diplomatic business. Originally qualified in medicine but with keen literary and historical interests, Cuspinian had as his anchor the University in Vienna, where emperor Maximilian I (1459–1519) was based. He was one of the first scholars to include serious study of late Roman and Byzantine texts and history.¹⁰⁰ In 1513 Maximilian sent Cuspinian to Buda to the court of the Hungarian king Vladislav. While there, he visited the celebrated library, earlier built up by King Matthias Corvinus (1443–1490), where he came across a manuscript of Procopius' *Wars*. As Cuspinian explained himself, 'In the Royal library at Buda when I was sent there as Emperor Maximilian's envoy to King Vladislav, I found a Greek Procopius of extraordinary age, which the king provided to me on loan. When I compared it with the Latin version I noticed that much was missing. As has often been remarked, [Procopius] became so mangled and deficient in the hands of the translator'.¹⁰¹ While this manuscript of 'extraordinary age', which may mean before the 13th cen-

⁹⁹ Aldus Manutius, preface to Stephanus Byzantius, *On Cities* (18 March 1502), in Wilson (2016) 90–1.

¹⁰⁰ Joachimsen (1910) 210.

¹⁰¹ Cuspinian's recollection is contained in his *De consulibus Romanorum commentarii* (1553) 528: 'Budae in bibliotheca regia, dum illic ... mirae vetustatis Procopium graecum reperi, quem mihi rex mutuo dedit: in quo, cum conferrem cum latino, multa desse observavi. Tam lacer et mancus venit ad manus interpretis, quod et crebro lamentatur'; cf. Weiss (1969) 87.

ture, was far superior to that used by Persona and Maffei (*Vat. Gr.* 152) it can no longer be traced.

Cuspinian evidently returned the Procopius manuscript, unlike those of Zonaras and Diodorus Siculus which he also borrowed but kept, so it was lost when the Bibliotheca Corvinia was destroyed by the Turks in 1528.¹⁰² In any case, Cuspinian possessed a thorough familiarity with Procopius and made regular use of the *Wars* in his two major (and posthumous) works, a history of the Roman emperors (1540)¹⁰³ and the consuls of the Roman realm (1553).¹⁰⁴ Both the *Caesares* and the *Consules* were well advanced when Cuspinian borrowed the Procopius manuscript from Buda in 1513, and so he may have been able to use it for his work, although he drew mainly on the translations of Persona and Maffei.¹⁰⁵ Indeed, his dependence on the translation of

¹⁰² Pertusi (1967) 30. It is wistfully noted by Ankwicz-Kleehoven (1959) 119 that the clearly valuable Procopius manuscript would still be accessible had not Cuspinian returned it to the library.

¹⁰³ Cuspinian (1540): 92 ('libro secondo belli Persici'), 147 ('de bello Vandalico'), 153 ('lib. iii belli Vandalici ... de bello Vandalico lib. iii'), 167 ('lib. primo Belli Gothici'), 171 ('libro primo de bello Persico'), 173 ('libro primo de bello Persico'), 177 ('in fine libri primi de bello Persico'), 204 (libro ii [Persici]), plus references to 'Procopius' without citing either book or work (pp. 151, 153, 154, 159, 160, 166, 168, 173, 175, 178).

¹⁰⁴ Cuspinian (1553): 416 (s.a. 530): 'in bello Persico'; 430 (536): 'in tertio Vandalico'; 451 (544): 'Procopius'; 454 (546): 'in tertio belli Vandalici'; 464 (549): 'teste Procopio'; 475 (554): 'libro tertio de bello Vandalico ... libro primo de bello Gothorum'; 498 (561): 'lib. I belli Persici ... in fine libri'; 499 (561): 'libro primo de bello Persico'; 508 (563): 'lib. I belli Gothici'; 523 (570): 'lib. I belli Gothici'; 524 (570) 'lib. I belli Persici'; 528 (572): 'lib. tertio de bello Gothorum'. In the same volume Cuspinian also cited Procopius in parts of his commentary on the 4th-century *Epitome* of Rufius Sextus, best known as Festus: 48A ('libro primo de bello Persico'); 49B (Procopius); 54B ('belli Persici libro secundo').

¹⁰⁵ The *Consules* was in hand by 1509 and both works were near completion by 1512 (Ankwicz-Kleehoven (1959) 101–4, cf. 297) but their paths to publication were lengthy and delayed (*ibid.*, 269–84; Joachimsen (1910) 294–5). Cuspinian's annotated copy of Persona is held in the Austrian National Library in Vienna (Ankwicz-Kleehoven (1959) 305 n. 20). It may repay detailed study.

Maffei (1509) is evident from his regular citation of the ‘third book’ of the Vandal Wars, meaning the third book of Maffei’s *De bello Persico*.¹⁰⁶

Another of the new German humanists who may have been on Manutius’ mind in 1502 was Cuspinian’s friend Conrad Peutinger (1465–1547) who had earlier spent much time in the world of Italian humanism at Bologna and Florence, then Rome. He remains famous, however, for the Roman imperial road map, the so-called *Tabula Peutingeriana*, a work he neither discovered nor published, although he once owned it.¹⁰⁷ At Augsburg, Peutinger built a large library of valuable texts including Procopius’ *Wars*. By the 1520s he was a distinguished local lawyer and civic official, correspondent of Erasmus (1466–1536) and in touch with the Holy Roman Emperor, first Maximilian at Vienna, then the Spanish Habsburg emperor Charles V. Augsburg was one of Maximilian’s imperial cities and had become the most productive centre of the German book trade.¹⁰⁸ Among Peutinger’s manuscripts was Procopius’ *Wars*, at least in the Latin translation of Persona. Indeed, he wrote in 1513 that he had been collecting books on German history for twenty years and they could now be copied without undue expenditure of money or time.¹⁰⁹ Two years later (1515) appeared his edition of Jordanes’ *Gothic History*, although Cuspinian had already completed an edition himself,¹¹⁰ as well as Paul the Deacon’s *History of the Lombards*. However, Peutinger’s manuscript of Procopius’ *Wars* languished. During the famous imperial assembly

¹⁰⁶ Cuspinian (1540) 153; id. (1553) 554 (s.a. 475), 516 (s.a. 454), 536 (s.a. 430).

¹⁰⁷ On Beatus: Künast and Müller (2001) 282–4. On the *Tabula Peutingeriana* see Talbert (2010).

¹⁰⁸ Künast (2011) 320–33.

¹⁰⁹ König (1923) 217 (*Ep.* 126, 25 July 1513). A few weeks before (13 June) he advised Beatus that he had a copy of Persona’s Latin translation of Procopius’ Gothic war (Horowitz and Hartfelder (1886) 58 (*Ep.* 33)).

¹¹⁰ Ankwicz-Kleehoven (1959) 130.

(Diet) at Augsburg in 1530 Peutingger led his city's case against Luther's reformed confession. Also present at the Diet was his friend Beatus Rhenanus (1485–1547), who knew Erasmus at Basel very well, becoming his initial biographer,¹¹¹ and the Protestant humanist printer Johann Herwagen (1497–c. 1558), who had only recently set up his own publishing house there. At the time of the Diet, Beatus was arranging for the publication of his major work, the *Res Germanicae* (1531) which was to become an influential text and a significant statement of what it now meant to be German.¹¹² Not long before, Willibald Pirckheimer (1470–1530) explained to Beatus that the German nation was the origin of all the various subsequent nations, even though they now possessed names such as 'Goths'. Among the sources cited for advancing this thesis of German and Gothic priority was Procopius.¹¹³

Although Beatus' *Res Germanicae* was to be published in Basel by Froben's press, where Herwagen himself was previously employed, Herwagen's idea was to publish a companion volume that gathered together the main supporting texts for Beatus' German history not otherwise easily available. Hence there also appeared Beatus' *Procopii Caesariensis*.¹¹⁴ Its dedicatory letter to the jurist Boniface Amerbach (1495–1562) makes clear that Beatus' agenda was the promotion of and pride in the German nation, notwithstanding the Germans' role in displacing Roman sovereignty. The only reason Procopius' histories have been read to date, so he begins, is because they narrate the wars of the Goths and Vandals in Italy and elsewhere. As a Greek, however, Procopius was naturally disinclined to investigate too far into the origins of the Vandals. He goes

¹¹¹ Mansfield (1979) 17–21.

¹¹² D'Amico (1988) 185–205, (1993) 260; Völkel (2012) 328–9. Not to be overlooked is Mazzarino (1966) 87–9. On Herwagen: Bietenholz (2003) 186–187.

¹¹³ Horowitz and Hartfelder (1886) 381 (*Ep.* 271).

¹¹⁴ D'Amico (1988) 183–4.

on to explain that ‘we give too much attention to the histories of other peoples whereas there are, on the other hand, remarkable deeds of our own which in some cases may be considered worthy not only to be known but even to be imitated. For the triumphs of the Goths, the Vandals and the Franks are our triumphs. The states set up by these peoples in the splendid Roman provinces ... are a proof of glory for us’.¹¹⁵ A new purpose, highlighting the ‘remarkable deeds of our own’, had now been found for Procopius.

The prefatory letter to *Procopii Caesariensis* also notes that Beatus himself was rather hesitant as regards this companion volume, but eventually yielded to the wishes of the publisher.¹¹⁶ Moreover, a letter from Herwagen (Basel) to Beatus (Selestadt) makes clear that in earlier discussions of the title page Peutinger had been promised due acknowledgment of his Procopius manuscript, if it were used. In requesting the title page of the ‘Procopius volume’, Herwagen seems to imply that the original intention was to publish just the translated histories of Procopius, although he clearly planned to add more himself: first, Agathias’ histories in Christopher Persona’s translation (1477), which Herwagen thought should be positioned straight after the Gothic war of Procopius, except it was evidently too late for that already; second, Jordanes’ *Romana* was added to his *Getica*, thereby becoming the first ever edition of the *Romana*. It appears that Herwagen had hoped to add yet more works, but was unable to locate suitable copies: the ‘laws of the Goths’, the ‘Ursberger Chronicle’, Paul the Deacon’s Lombard history, plus others.¹¹⁷ These all constituted the

¹¹⁵ *Preface*, cf. Louthan (2012) 306–7.

¹¹⁶ Horowitz and Hartfelder (1886) 404 (*Ep.* 283, 27 August 1531): ‘porro, vir ornatissime [Amerbach], quando me diu reluctantem invitumque tandem coegit Hervagius, ut in volume istud historiae Gothicae praefarer, non modo non recognitum a me, sed ne lectum quidem antea ...’.

¹¹⁷ Horowitz and Hartfelder (1886) 400–1 (Beatus, *Ep.* 281, 29 July 1531). Peutinger owned the only copy of the ‘Ursberger chronicle’, and also Paul the Deacon, but perhaps not at this point, or Herwagen did not inquire.

‘other historians of the Middle Ages’ mentioned in the title, to which was added Bruni’s *De bello Italico*. Beatus says that Herwagen included works he had never known or read himself, although he agreed it was right that Procopius’ Persian and Vandal wars should have come before Agathias. On the other hand, Herwagen wanted to include Cassiodorus’ *Variae*. Even though a copy was not readily available,¹¹⁸ the real issue is that it would have made Beatus’ volume totally unwieldy in terms of length. As for Procopius’ *Secret History* or *Anekdotia*, Beatus knew of its existence from the report in the *Suda* (translated into Latin 1515) but considered it no longer extant, ‘for good reason’.¹¹⁹

When it appeared in 1531, however, Beatus’ volume included one other work tacked on to the end with completely separate pagination (pages 1–46). It was obviously just as it looks—an afterthought, probably of Herwagen himself and nothing to do with Beatus at all. This work was the *Buildings (de Aedificiis)* of Procopius. Not only was it previously unknown, but it was now being published in Greek. Indeed, this was the first appearance of any of Procopius’ works in their original language. While Bruni’s extensive paraphrase of the Gothic war had been available for over a century, since 1506 there had been a Latin translation (Persona) of Procopius’ text, while the Persian and Vandal wars were also accessible in Latin since 1509 (Maffei). Original manuscripts of Procopius were known here and there, but only now were there published translations that provided any direct access to Procopius. The immediate question, therefore, is where did the Beatus/Herwagen manuscript of the *Buildings* come from, and is it one of those still extant?

While it is difficult to be certain without a detailed analysis, it is likely to have come from Peutinger’s collection. We know that Beatus relied on him for other manuscripts,

¹¹⁸ Horawitz and Hartfelder (1886) 404B (*Ep.* 283, 27 August 1531).

¹¹⁹ Horawitz and Hartfelder (1886) 405 (*Ep.* 282, 17 August 1531): ‘Utinam ta anekdota illius extarent, quorum Suidas meminit. Sed opinor librum iam olim non sine causa suppressum’.

including Persona's Latin translation of Procopius, but he owned many Greek manuscripts and one of Procopius' *Buildings* is not unlikely. Indeed, Beatus seems to suggest this origin himself when he anticipates the question of where Herwagen obtained the manuscript.¹²⁰ Certainly it belongs to the family of *Buildings* manuscripts (catalogued as 'z' by Haury (1913)) that contains the shorter preface and the shorter content, but it may not be any of the extant manuscripts so classified. While these have usually been taken as later summaries, adaptations and derivative versions from the original larger work, it is now proposed by Montinaro that they actually represent a separate earlier edition of the *Buildings* which Procopius himself later expanded.¹²¹ The identification of Beatus' text of the *Buildings* is worth closer research, keeping in mind that it was probably a manuscript from the library of Peutinger that Herwagen insisted on printing as an appendix to Beatus' volume. Most of Peutinger's library ended up in Munich, but no manuscript of Procopius can be traced there at that point.

Peutinger himself had only learned Greek as an adult and for a great many scholars and readers Greek was still a formidable barrier, so a translation of the newly published *Buildings* was a likely *desideratum* after 1531. In the lands of the Holy Roman Empire, confronted by advancing Turks, the *Buildings* struck a chord because much of it covered familiar territory in central and south-eastern Europe. Before too long there were actually two Latin translations of the same work, one by Francis Craneveldt (Paris 1537) and one by

¹²⁰ D'Amico (1988) 181. Montinaro (2012) 103 n. 46 has tentatively suggested, however, that the manuscript used here may have been *Par. Gr.* 1941 but this is unlikely since in the 1520s it formed part of the collection of Francis I at Fontainebleau, later (from 1529) Paris: Haury (1896) 176.

¹²¹ Montinaro (2012) *passim* and (2015) 191–206. Whether or not Beatus' edition and the other manuscripts of the shorter version of the *Buildings* represent an earlier edition, or a later summary, is still an open question.

Arnoldus Vuesaliensis, or Arnold from Wesalia (Munich 1538). Both translations were undertaken separately and appeared too close together to cause concern or any need for retraction or justification to either translator. Craneveldt was a distinguished scholar who moved in high circles.¹²² He dedicated his translation to Nicolas Perrenot de Granvelle (1486–1550), chancellor of the then Holy Roman emperor Charles V. As Craneveldt confessed in his preface, he took seriously ill one winter (probably 1533/34) and was confined to his house at Mechelen (near Leuven) on medical orders. This gave him the leisure to read as he pleased and in reading Procopius' *Buildings* (presumably in the 1531 edition of Beatus) he came to realise the barrier being caused to the Greekless by the absence of a Latin translation of the *Buildings*. He therefore set about his own translation and in his dedicatory letter to Perrenot he explained that Emperor Justinian was a man of peace as much as of war, so that there is value in contemplating the extent of his constructions and how they were funded. Just as Procopius had glorified Justinian for his extraordinary constructions at Constantinople and elsewhere, so contemporary European monarchs might think of emulating him in preferring to be renowned as builders rather than warriors.¹²³ One of the striking features of this translation is the historical and geographical notes prepared for each book by the author's friend Theodoric Adam Sualleberg (1470–1540), scholar of Roman and Byzantine law. Meanwhile, the distinguished linguist and theologian and canon of Cologne cathedral, Vuesaliensis, was compiling his translation at precisely the same time, completing it (cast as 'six speeches' [*logoi*]) and its elaborate preface before his unexpected death in 1534. In the end, the publication was executed by his son but the consequent delay resulted in his work appearing later than that of Craneveldt, rather than

¹²² Leijenhorst (2003) 344–5.

¹²³ 'utinam principes Christiani omnes his atque similibus exemplis veterum principum ad simile stadium accendantur, ac aedificatores appellari malint quam bellatores' (*Epistula Nuncupatoria*).

earlier. In both cases, the translation was their author's only excursion into Procopius' works and they both evidently used the only available edition (Beatus 1531).¹²⁴

Procopius' *Buildings* did not include a section on Justinian's buildings in Italy, and so the work was of lesser interest there. Even so, a decade after the two Latin translations they were complemented by an Italian one (1547) from Benedictus Aegius/Benedetto Egio (d. 1567). This meant the *Buildings* could now enjoy a much wider audience than any of Procopius' writings. At the same time, Egio had been producing separate Italian translations of Procopius' Gothic war (1544, from Persona 1506), and the Persian and Vandal wars (1547, from Maffei 1509).¹²⁵ Underpinning all these translations was a clear statement of privilege granted to the publisher Michael Tramezzino by Pope Paul III and the local Venetian authority. It was to bar anyone from republishing the work for ten years under threat of excommunication and civil force if required. Tramezzino himself also provided a dedication to Giovanni Soranzo in which he explains the point of reading the *Buildings* (siting, method of construction, magnificence). By 1550, then, there was a single Greek text of Procopius' *Buildings*, although it was not known that it was only a shorter and probably summary version of the work, and three separate translations from it. There were known to be other manuscripts of the same work in the Royal Library at Fontainebleau and elsewhere, several of which provided a different and more extensive text to that already printed and translated. Once they were compared there would be a major textual challenge to be solved.

¹²⁴ Montinaro's claim ((2012) 90) that there were translations of the *Buildings* before Beatus' edition in 1531 would therefore seem baseless. In the west there was no known interest in, or even knowledge of, the *Buildings* earlier, although there may already have been manuscripts in Italy at least.

¹²⁵ Following Maffei (*de bello Persico*), the Vandal Wars was part of the Persian Wars so begins in the middle of a page (Egio (1547) 105).

A sign of the future could be found in the pioneering posthumous volumes of Pierre Gilles (1490–1555) on the Thracian Bosphorus (1561) and the topography of Constantinople (1562), products of his travels in and around the former Byzantine capital which were sponsored by the French king Francis I, and with a remit to recover Greek manuscripts for the king's library at Fontainebleau. Although he would have known its manuscript of the *Buildings* (*Par. Gr.* 1941), it was actually at Rome that Gilles found a fuller version of Procopius' *Buildings*, in the library of Cardinal Georges d'Armagnac (1501–1585).¹²⁶ In a long letter from Aleppo (April 1549) to 'a friend' Gilles described his journey thus far across Asia Minor and beyond, noting Procopian placenames from time to time, especially when struck by the sight of Justinian's magnificent bridge over the Sangarius river, with Agathias' epigram carved upon it, which he recognised from the textual version.¹²⁷ In the *Thracian Bosphorus* he cites Procopius' *Buildings* with reference to the name of the promontory on the Asian Bosphorus opposite modern Arnavutköy. It was once called 'Proochthoi' but now it is 'Brochoi', so says Procopius (*Buildings* 1.8.3). Gilles goes on to note 'another manuscript' which reads 'Crochoi' but in antique lettering in its margin is found 'Cronyichion or Bronychion'.¹²⁸ In his *Constantinople* Gilles twice indicates his use of d'Armagnac's manu-

¹²⁶ This manuscript may, or may not, be the current *Par. Coisl.* 132 which was copied from *Vat. Gr.* 1065 (13th century), cf. Haury (1913) XIX, cf. id. (1896) 175. On the other hand, it may have been a separate manuscript lost earlier. When an inventory of d'Armagnac's library was compiled after his death there was evidently no trace of any Procopius manuscript, as reported by Peiresc to Jacques Dupuy (*Ep.* 170, 25 November 1636, in Tamizey de Larroque (1892) 608).

¹²⁷ Burman (1727) 232–5 (*Ep.* 15), noting 'iuxta hunc locum Justiniani pontem vidimus, celebratum Procopio, et Agathii epigrammatibus, adhuc excisis in ponte exstantibus, et etiam in florilegio Epigrammatum edito in vulgus' (232).

¹²⁸ Gilles (1562) 234–5 (III.8): 'haec quidem Procopius cuius in altero codice leguntur Crochi et in margine quidam literis antiquis eundem locum notat Chronyichion sive Bronychion'.

script, once to locate the Hospice of Sampson between the churches of Hagia Sophia and Saint Irene, and on the other occasion to identify the portico at the church of Saint Acacius.¹²⁹ At the same time, in the volume on the Thracian Bosphorus Gilles provides the earliest extant use of the *Secret History*, which he quotes at length in showing the connection of the Bosphorus to the Sea of Marmara, going on to repeat Procopius' accusation of Justinian's rapacity in extorting tolls from merchants using the straits.¹³⁰ In this case, it is impossible to identify the manuscript of the *Secret History* which Gilles was using, unless it is the same manuscript of D'Armagnac which contained the *Buildings* (today *Par. Coisl. 132*). Gilles is a very important witness to Procopius.

By the time of Gilles in the mid-sixteenth century scholars who sought to make use of Procopius' *Wars* in their own works still had to rely on the various translations. Most notable among these scholars were Wolfgang Lazius (1514–1565) and Onophrius Panvinius/Panvinio (1529–1568). Not unlike his close predecessor Cuspinian, Lazius was to become a distinguished physician and historian, particularly as an advocate for Austria as part of the Holy Roman Empire and its capital Vienna. His father had been a friend of Beatus Rhenanus, so presumably Lazius had access to

¹²⁹ Gilles (1561) 82 (2.8): 'postquam superiora ex Procopio edito scripsissem, incidi in Procopii manuscriptum Codicem declarantem Xenodochium Sampsonis fuisse medium inter aedes Sophiae et Hirene'; 177 (3.9): 'iam antedicta verba Procopii desunt Codici aedito; itaque studiosius addidi'.

¹³⁰ Gilles (1562): I.1 (p.14): 'in libro inscripto *περὶ τῶν ἀνεκδότων* inscripsit quem scripsit contra Iustinianum contraque eius uxorem Theodora'. Otherwise, in this work Gilles used the *Buildings* on several occasions: 1.2 (18, from *Buildings* 1.5); 1.4 (43 < 1.5.1), 1.5 (45 < 1.5.9); 2.2 (67 < 1.6.9), 2.4 (76–7 < 1.6.2), 2.10 (100 < 1.8.2); 3.6 (213 < 1.9.11); 3.6 (216 < 1.9.13); 3.8 (324); 3.11 (253–4 < 1.3.10). He also utilised the *Wars* citing a passage (7.35.1–8) which he found missing from Persona's translation: 3.4 (p. 197): 'afferam illa: quae ex libro tertio Procopii de bello Gothorum vertere omisit interpres, cum ad cognitionem locorum, tum maxime ad cognoscendam necessaria fortunam Belisarii, quam Tzetzes ignorasse videtur secutus opinionem vulgi. Sic enim scribit Procopius ...'.

Beatus' *Procopii Caesariensis* from an early age. Among his diverse works are two large and learned tomes, one on Roman history¹³¹ and one on the 'barbarian invasions'.¹³² Both works are systematic and clearly presented surveys, based on all the available historical reading at the time, plus epigraphic and numismatic sources. In the 'Roman history' he cites Procopius on several occasions usually with reference to the particular book of the *Wars*, as Cuspinian had done.¹³³ Likewise, in the 'Migrations' he regularly cites, and occasionally quotes, from Procopius, usually with the actual book number, so we can see that for Lazius the Gothic, Persian and Vandal wars were treated as three discrete fronts rather than a total of eight books of the *Wars*. The complication, however, is that he twice refers to the 'third book of the Vandal Wars'. This shows that, again like Cuspinian, he is working from Maffei's Latin translation (1509), either directly or more likely from its reprint by Beatus (1531), because Maffei treats the Vandal and Persian Wars as a single entity (*De bello Persico*) in four successive books. 'Book 3 of the Vandal Wars' in Maffei's translation is what is otherwise known as 'Book 1'. In any event, Lazius mainly quotes Procopius' books of Gothic history. Only

¹³¹ Lazius (1551) but quoting below from a revised and corrected edition (Frankfurt, 1598); on Lazius: Horawitz (1883).

¹³² Lazius (1557), but quoting below from the corrected edition (Frankfurt, 1600). Its full title is *De gentium aliquot migrationibus, sedibus fixis, reliquijs, linguarumque initijs & immutationibus ac dialectis, libri XII, in quibus praeter caeteros populos, Francorum, Alemanorum, Svevorum, Marcomanorum, Boiorum, Carnorum, Tauriscorum, Celtarum'que, atque Gallo Graecorum tribus primordia et posteritas singulorum, quaeque ex his insigniores principum comitumque ac nobilitatis totius pene Germaniae, Latiique et Galliae stirpes processerunt, diligenti examine historiae denique autorum annaliumque, cum lectione tum collatione traduntur atque explicantur.*

¹³³ Lazius (1551): xiv ('de Gothica historia'), 4, 11, 14 ('libro tertio historiae Gothicae', 'libro secundo Gothicae historiae'), 69 ('libro primo de bello Gothico'), 102, 103, 110, 212 ('libro tertio belli Vandalici') 358, 359, 665, 688 ('libro 4 Goticae historiae') 689, ('libro 4 Gothicae historiae'), 716, 740, 915 ('libro secundo Persici belli'), 932, 937 ('lib. 3 rerum Gothicarum'), 943 ('libro I. Gothicae historiae'), 960, 1003.

once across both works does he cite the Persian wars and twice the Vandal wars.¹³⁴ In fact, Procopius was used by Lazius as part of asserting the Gothic claim to ethnic antiquity with its modern associations involving both Sweden (as the Goths' original homeland) and the ruling Habsburgs.¹³⁵ Ever since the Council of Basel in 1434 when Swedish bishops had insisted on seating priority because Sweden was the Gothic homeland, and the Goths predated other nations, the question of comparative German/Swedish antiquity had been a live one in the lands of the Holy Roman Empire. Texts such as Jordanes and Procopius were increasingly drawn into the argument.¹³⁶

Like Cuspinian and Lazius, Panvinio was steeped in the full range of Roman history and all its available sources but with a focus on establishing its chronology over a long period. He was an Augustinian monk from Verona who spent a scholarly life in Roman libraries and archives, especially at the Vatican library where he was employed, but died in just his thirty-ninth year. Even so, his output was prodigious. Panvinio was a friend of the Italian translator of Procopius, Benedeto Egio from Spoleto, to whom he dedicated part of his book on the Roman *fasti* and list of

¹³⁴ Lazius (1557): 118 ('lib.1'), 131 ('libro I'), 218 ('libro tertio Gothicae historiae'), 223 ('libro secundo Gothicae historiae'), 358, 363, 513 ('in Gothica historia'), 537 ('libro tertio Gothicae historiae'), 541, 544 ('libro secundo'), 545 ('libro 3 Gothici belli'), 548, 550-1, 553 ('libro primo Gothici belli'), 544, 547 ('in gothica historia'), 548 ('lib. I Gotticae historiae'), 550 ('libro tertio Gothicae historiae') 553, 562 ('in historia Gothica'), 565 ('lib.1 Goth. Historiae'), p. 595 ('tertio Gothicae historiae lib. '); 597, 602, 603, 604 ('libro tertio Gothicae historiae'), 608, 610, 612 ('lib 3 Vandalici belli'), 613, 627 ('lib.2 historiae Gothicae', 'lib.1 rerum gothicarum'), 631, 634 ('lib. 2 Gothicae historiae'), 635, 636 ('libr. 3 rerum Gothicarum'), 637, 638 ('libro Gothicae historiae tertio'), 639, 640 ('libro 2 gothicae historiae', 'libro tertio Gothicae historiae'), 643 ('in commentariis rerum Goticarum'), 644, 646 ('libro secundo Gothicae historiae'), 647 ('lib.1 Gothicae historiae'), 648 ('libro secundo historiae'), 649.

¹³⁵ Neville (2009) 224-5.

¹³⁶ Neville (2009) 217.

consuls.¹³⁷ In his dedicatory letter to Egio (December 1557, Venice) which heads the third book, Panvinio acknowledges Egio's significant contributions to the period he is now covering (Constantine to Charlemagne), especially his Italian translation of the 'Greek author Procopius' who is such an important source on the fifth and sixth century Roman consuls and Gothic kings.¹³⁸ Procopius is regularly cited in the *Fasti*, sometimes by book of the *Wars*,¹³⁹ and Procopius is also listed as part of the massive research underpinning his *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum* (Louvain 1573) from Caesar to the contemporary Maximilian II,¹⁴⁰ as well as his posthumous local history of the city of Verona that includes the sixth-century Gothic war.¹⁴¹

Both Lazius and Panvinio knew Procopius' *Wars* only through translations. Relying on translations of Procopius was equally standard for writers of literary fiction. Among them, most famously, was the Italian dramatist, diplomat and humanist Gian Giorgio Trissino (1478–1550), who produced *L'Italia liberata dai Goti* (1547/8).¹⁴² It was a vernacular poem of Homeric proportions (27 Books) dedicated to emperor Charles V, often in Homeric language and covering the Gothic wars of Belisarius and Narses in Italy (535–553). Trissino's sustained poetic effort was largely based on

¹³⁷ Panvinio (1558) *Fasti libri V* (Venice). On Panvinio: Bauer (2014).

¹³⁸ Panvinio (1558) 56.

¹³⁹ Panvinio (1573) 303, line 15–16 (ad 446): 'de eo plura scribunt Procopius'; 303, l. 45 (ad 455): 'libro primo de bello Vandalico'; 307, ll. 19–20 (ad 475): 'libro 1 de bello Gothico'; 309.15–16 (ad 515): 'ex Procopio digessi, qui in libris de bello Gothorum horum nationem facit (i.e. Anthemius as eastern consul and Florentinus (515) and Peter (516) as western consuls); 309.44 (ad 525): 'de quo [Symmachus] scribit Procopius'; 311, l. 7 (ad 538): 'libro I. belli Persici'; 363, l. 1: 'libro III [meaning 'II'] de bello Vandalico'; 311, l. 7 (ad 538): 'libro I. belli Persici'.

¹⁴⁰ Panvinio (1573) 52–3.

¹⁴¹ Panvinio (1688) 31E, 122B.

¹⁴² On Trissino, see Guerrieri-Crocetti (1937). The text of *L'Italia Liberata* is available at <http://ww2.bibliotecaitaliana.it/xtf/view?docId=bibit001420/bibit001420.xml>

the account of the wars by Procopius, who even plays a role in the drama, including dialogue with Belisarius. Trissino may well have been relying on a combination of the Italian translations of both Bruni's *De bello Gothico* (Petroni 1526) and Procopius' *Wars* (Persona 1506, Egio 1544). However, because he was a student of Leonicenso's at Ferrara at one stage, it is possible that Trissino first encountered Procopius there and had a copy of Leonicenso's unpublished Italian translation of the *Gothic Wars*. On the other hand, because he had also been a student of Greek with Demetrius Chalcondyles (1423–1511) in Milan, and was competent in the language, he may well have read Procopius in an original unspecified manuscript, perhaps that used by Leonicenso at Ferrara.

5. Procopius in Paris: Bodin, Pithou, and New Translations

In the mid-sixteenth century Paolo Giovio (1483–1552) lamented that 'by some mystic celestial change' the cold bleak land of the rough-hewn Germans had come to usurp not only the military glory of the Romans centuries earlier but now their intellectual supremacy as well, having stolen them 'from sleeping Italy (what a shame!)'.¹⁴³ He could have said much the same for France at this time, for in France the new humanism had also put down roots although there was not the incentive to deploy Procopius in any contemporary political or religious cause, as there was in Germany and Austria. Instead, the preoccupation was with Roman law or 'legal humanism' as it came to be called.¹⁴⁴ Lorenzo Valla had already applied his philological and antiquarian skills to the quest to reconstruct the actual laws behind Justinian's *Digest* in particular. The humanist successors of Valla, especially in France, saw their task as stripping away the accretions of the medieval commentators and glossators

¹⁴³ Giovius (1557) 277: '... ac Italiae dormitanti (quod pudeat)'.

¹⁴⁴ For background on what follows: Kelley (1970).

on which the modern interpretation and practice of the Roman law had come to depend. They were not so much recovering and rediscovering new texts as applying new methods and insight to the familiar legal texts brought together by Justinian in the time of Procopius. Like Petrarch confronted with Cicero's Greek, humanists dealing with Justinian's *Digest* also created a need to better understand its Greek sections, especially the laws of Justinian which were actually issued and preserved in Greek. One of the key targets seen as the cause of so much interpolation and adaptation of the original Roman law was Tribonian. No longer was he the essential legal arm of Justinian but he, and not Justinian, was the corrupter of Roman law. Treatises such as François Hotman's *Anti Tribonian* (1567) summarised the antagonism towards Tribonian.

One of the leading humanist lawyers setting the record straight was François Baudouin /Balduinus (1520–1573) with his *Justinianus siue de iure novo* (1560). Already Baudouin had been one of the first to cite both Procopius' *Wars* and *Buildings* in the context of Justinian's legislative works,¹⁴⁵ while in Paris Jean Bodin (1530–1596) became one of the most important scholars and writers of his time. He was a participant in the Parisian *parlement* during the most intense period of religious conflict and discussion on the nature of government and monarchy. Both Baudouin and Bodin advanced understanding of historical methodology and interpretation of history, with Bodin writing a foundational treatise on *The Method for the Easy Comprehension of History* (1566).¹⁴⁶ This was built on Bodin's wide command of all the written sources available for the study of the classical and medieval world, including Procopius.

In his summary list of historians in different geographical and historical categories it would appear that the Procopius

¹⁴⁵ Baudouin (1548) 34 (citing Book III of the *Buildings* and Books I/II of the *Wars*, on Justinian's Armenia); Baudouin (1560) 118 ('Procopius, lib. 3, de bello Goth.'), cf Kelley (1970) 116–148 and Grafton (2007), 83–140.

¹⁴⁶ Bodin (1566) with quotations (= Bodin (1945)).

Bodin knew was the author of Justinian's wars in the Latin translations of Persona (1506) and Maffei (1509), plus the adaptation of Bruni (published 1470). Among historians of the 'Chaldeans, Egyptians, Persians, Phoenicians, Hebrews and Parthians' he lists two books of Procopius' Persian war (450 = (1945) 370); under 'historians of the Greeks' comes '7 books of Procopius' history under Justinian' (451 = (1945) 371); under 'historians of the Romans and Carthaginians and of Italian history' (453 = (1945) 372, correcting 'twelve' to 'seven') comes the 'seven books of history under Justinian which ought to be joined to the writers above' (Polybius, Livy, Tacitus, Herodian). Then, to the specific category of the history of the 'Danes and Swedes or Goths', an area that was to become even more important to the study of Procopius before too long, comes the 'three books of Procopius on the Gothic wars' (457 = (1945) 375). That he refers to the 'three books' of the Gothic war and the 'seven books' of the *Wars* in all points to his use of the translation of Persona (1506), the only option available to Bodin in 1566. Being in Paris and moving in literary circles he might have been exposed to manuscripts of Procopius, although libraries and catalogues were not easily accessed. The Florentine manuscripts acquired by Catherine de Medici, for instance, were now in Paris, although the Royal library which did house manuscripts of Procopius was located at Fontainebleau.

In his chapter on individual historians Bodin cites Procopius, expressing disapproval for an orator turned historian who can only praise, but never blame, Belisarius.¹⁴⁷ Echoing earlier criticism from Bruni and Biondo, He later noted that Procopius:

apparently did not know the ornaments of history and the purity of Greek speech, or else neglected them; he did however commemorate the details pertaining to the subject, and with great zeal he pursued the most trifling

¹⁴⁷ Bodin (1566) 46 = (1945) cf. 54 = (1945) 53.

matters. Since he was the perpetual companion of Belisarius in managing affairs and shared the whole public counsel, he also undertook embassies for the state rather often; finally, he was moderately informed on the theoretic side, so that I should not hesitate to count him among the chosen few

Bodin is therefore singling out Procopius as a useful historian because he wrote about events in which he had been a participant or had first-hand knowledge, going on to say, ‘but because he described the separate letters, decrees, alliances, speeches in various types and styles of speaking, he afforded good evidence of a most truthful writer, except that he overwhelmed Belisarius oftener than is fitting with praises for the most part stupid’. Bodin concludes his brief evaluation of Procopius by dismissing his excusing of Belisarius for the murder of Constantine (*Wars* 6.8.1–18) as well as for many of the prodigies he records including the report of ash from Mt Vesuvius reaching Constantinople (*Wars* 6.4.27). ‘These prodigies’, Bodin concludes, ‘smack of Greek vanity and often destroy confidence not only in profane but even in ecclesiastic historians’.¹⁴⁸ Bodin introduced his final chapter with the claim that ‘No question has exercised the writers of histories more than the origins of peoples’. This was certainly a question where Procopius was being adduced already (Beatus, 1531), and later (Grotius 1655).¹⁴⁹ Bodin was one of the first to evaluate Procopius as an historian.

At various points in the course of his work, the student of Roman law and government Bodin engaged with another distinguished student of Roman law and government, Carlo Sigonio (1523–1584). Sigonio had been an occasional friend and correspondent of Onofrio Panvinio in the 1550s when together they were pioneering the study of Roman chronology and government, but in 1578 he published the

¹⁴⁸ Bodin (1566) 83 = (1945) 77.

¹⁴⁹ Bodin (1566) 403 = (1945) 334, cf. 439 = (1945) 361: Procopius reports Scandinavian Slavs overrunning Pannonia in Justinian’s time.

first major annalistic account of any period of Roman history, that from AD 284 to 565, in his *Historiarum de Occidentale libri XX*.¹⁵⁰ Indeed, it has been labelled the ‘first modern work that fully deserves the name of history’.¹⁵¹ Inevitably, Sigonio was obliged to use Procopius’ *Wars* as a source of information. Occasionally, he cites Procopius and at times quotes him directly (apparently from the Latin translation of Persona).¹⁵² Towards the end, Sigonio justifies making fuller use of Procopius (and Agathias) than of the later writers preferred by Biondo (e.g. Paul the Deacon, Agnellus), because Procopius was a participant in so much of his history (‘huic bello interfuit’).¹⁵³ In the same year that Sigonio’s *History* appeared at Bologna, Guillaume Paradin (1510–90) published at Lyons a French translation of the Gothic war which proclaimed on its title page that it was a history that was ‘memorable et intimable’ to all noblemen. It was dedicated (late February 1578) to the local Lyonnais governor François de Mandelot with a letter explaining that when a tall and sturdy tree falls to earth the neighbours all gather around to appropriate different parts of it. Thus it was with the Roman Empire, suggests Paradin, thereby enabling the French to emerge as such a great kingdom—‘very powerful and very Christian, the foremost and most noble on which the sun has ever shone’ (4). Belisarius, so he goes on to explain, was the very model of a virtuous guide for all modern nobles. Paradin’s book was already being printed when he received a letter (1 March 1578) from Jean de Chevigny Beaunois who explained that when he heard Paradin was publishing a translation of Procopius he

¹⁵⁰ Sigonius (1578). Because Sigonio covered the period of Constantine and later church history, he incurred the wrath of the papal censors at many points but strongly defended his account (details in McCuaig (1989) 259–86). On Bodin and Sigonio: McCuaig (1989) 224–37; on Panvinio and Sigonio: McCuaig (1989) 30–33.

¹⁵¹ Sandys (1908) 145.

¹⁵² Procopius directly: Book 11 (p. 187.39); 13 (209.33–9); 16 (269.25, 270.49); 17 (298.8, 300.16–21); 18 (314.24); 19 (316.54, 335.38).

¹⁵³ Book 20 (351.29 ff).

thought it might be useful to have the comparative chronological table to 553 which he had previously compiled. Paradin accepted the offer and printed the letter and table at the end of his volume. While the author proclaims that this is a translation, he does not indicate whether or not he is translating from the only published version (Persona's Latin translation, 1506). That Paradin's French translation covered what he called the 'three books' of the Gothic war implies that he was working from Persona's translation only. If he completed the translation of the later books of the Gothic war, as he expressly hoped in his preface, it was never published.

Perhaps Paradin realised that his translation was already being superseded by that of a royal official, Martin Fumée (1540–1590), which appeared with royal privilege in 1587. Unlike Paradin, who was relying on the incomplete Latin translation, Fumée declared that he was translating directly from a Greek original of Procopius (and Agathias). This fact would make it the very first translation of the *Wars* after those of Persona and Maffei to be undertaken freshly from the Greek original, but it is very misleading. Following a brief introduction ('Au Lecteur'), he begins with the Vandal wars (2 books) then the Gothic war (5 books) numbered successively but, like Persona before him, he incorporates only the Gothic war material in *Wars* 8 (commencing at 8.21) into the previous book.¹⁵⁴ At the end of Book 5 (320) the translation moves from Procopius to Agathias, at least those parts of Agathias covering the Gothic war, but there is no indication in the text of any change of author. Rather, it

¹⁵⁴ Fumée commences with a comprehensive index (*Table alphabétique contenant les matières principales des six livres d'histoire de Procope Césaréen*). Immediately there is a confusion because the table covers the pagination of all seven, not six, books including the two of Agathias. The layout of books is as follows: *Book* 1 (1) = Vandal wars, 1; *Book* 2 (42) = Vandal wars, 2; *Book* 3 (91) = Gothic war, 1; *Book* 4 (153) = Gothic war, 2; *Book* 5 (217) = Gothic War, 3 and 4 (commencing 291). Then follows Books 6 and 7 from Agathias but headed 'history of Procopius of Caesarea 6th book' (320) and '7th book' (42). The work concludes with brief geographical notes for each book.

is printed as Book 6 and Book 7 of ‘The history of Procopius of Caesarea’. Whether this is clumsiness on the part of the translator or publisher, or whether the original was a manuscript in which the latter books were in fact attributed to Procopius, cannot be known. Both the title page and the prefaced advice to the reader imply that Fumée knew he was translating Agathias too. As for the manuscript itself, the translator does not say, but it may have been one of those now in Paris and therefore potentially identifiable.¹⁵⁵ Prepared as it was in the wake of the devastating wars of religion in France from the 1550s to the 1580s, Fumée saw the contemporary relevance of Procopius’ history. It provided a parallel to increasing contemporary wars between Catholics and heretics, but the sixth-century historian added value because he also cast light on the origins of the French people and nation. Procopius was now a key historical record for the French too.

In 1579, meanwhile, almost without anyone noticing, there appeared the first publication of the Greek original of any part of Procopius’ *Wars*. It formed an incidental section of a much larger work, namely the edition of a range of texts related to the Goths and their Law code by Pierre Pithou (1539–1596). Among other texts Pithou included a section of Book 4 (= *Wars* 8.5) on the origin of the Goths from the Pontus. The full title of this extract, without citing any manuscript from which it is copied, is ‘From the Description of the Pontic Euxine missing from the fourth book of Procopius’ Gothic War, the last of the eight books of history’. Pithou had been struck by its absence from Persona’s Latin translations of the Gothic war (‘quam inter caetera eius auctoris Latine edita tamdiu desiderari miror’). In fact, Persona had deliberately excluded non-Gothic history altogether. Shortly before, in 1576, Johann Leunclavius (1541–1594) had opened up the study of Zosimus by

¹⁵⁵ So perhaps *Par. Gr.* 1703 (15th century) for the Gothic war which formed part of the original Royal library at Fontainebleau, and for the Vandal wars maybe Catherine de Medici’s manuscript (*Par.Gr.*1699) not yet in the Royal Library.

producing a Latin translation of the *New History*, again before any edition of the Greek text. Yet it formed only a minor part of a very large volume which also comprised many other later texts including the Latin translations of Procopius' *Persian and Vandal Wars* (Maffei, 127–243), *Gothic War* (Persona, 246–421), and *Buildings* (Vuesalius, 422–456). These were further followed by Agathias (Persona's translation, 1494: 457–558), the *Romana* (559–595) and *Getica* (596–634) of Jordanes and, lastly, Bruni's *De bello Gothico* (664–70). There were separate indexes for Zosimus and the other writers with Procopius, Agathias and Bruni combined together. Leunclavius had produced another great omnibus collection like that of Beatus in 1531. There are also some notable features of the Procopian material in Leunclavius' volume. Firstly, he carefully followed Persona's translation of the Gothic war with an eye on the actual text of Procopius.¹⁵⁶ This enabled him to note things like: 'this section is not intact' (322), 'this should read' (344). In the case of the *Buildings*, he has clearly compared the translation with some manuscript to which he had access and notes variations in the margin of the translation. So we find comments like 'this whole entry [on Dara] is badly translated' (430), 'from the Greek manuscript we've added in square brackets these notes left out by the translator' (344).¹⁵⁷

A similar venture appeared in 1594, this time under the general title of 'History of Justinian Augustus' and comprising nearly 1,200 pages, although the contents were much

¹⁵⁶ It appears he was able to draw on a Paris manuscript (probably *Par. Gr.* 1699) to judge from advice given by Syllburg at Frankfurt to Fulvio Orsini at Rome that a Paris manuscript is being sent to Leunclavius (Letter, Syllburg to Orsini, 18 April 1588: Nohac (1886) 442).

¹⁵⁷ Further examples are *Wars*: 423 ('the translator omits this'), 424 ('This is missing in the Greek'), 427 'there is no mention of cabbages [*brassicae*] in the Greek'), 435 ('this is corrupt in the translation'); *Buildings*: 437 ("metropoli" should be read, not "metropolis"), 444 ('read "neglecting [*negligens*] the collapsed building" not "envying [*invidens*] the collapsed buildings"). Throughout, Leunclavius suggests 'book' for 'oration' (Arnold of Wesalia's translation of Procopius' *logos*).

the same: Agathias and Jordanes as well as the Latin translations of Procopius' *Wars* and *Buildings* and Bruni's *De bello Italico*. The anonymous compiler of this collection was Simon Goulart (1543–1628) who dedicated it to Nicholas Pithou (1524–1598), brother of the recent editor of the Gothic laws and the fragment of Procopius' *Wars* (1579). Goulart was one of the most prolific scholars of a prolific generation in the late 16th/early 17th century. Teaching and writing as a Calvinist in Calvinist Geneva, he turned to another local who was a hardly less prolific biblical and historical scholar, David Chytraeus (1530–1600) who contributed a chronology to Goulart's *Justinian*. In his dedicatory letter to Pithou (dated 11 February 1594) Goulart explains that recently he completed the fourth volume of his imperial history (also anonymously), a sequence of imperial biographies called *Historia Augusta*. The fourth volume runs from Gratian to Alexius I Comnenus (1056–1118) and includes Justinian. His biography of Justinian, as for most emperors, is based entirely on Zonaras but also adds a section from Paul the Deacon. At one stage, however, Goulart reflects that 'Procopius who describes the Persian Vandal and Gothic war at length is still extant in many books. Conscious of the need for brevity we have left that volume untouched.'¹⁵⁸ Still, Goulart clearly felt he had not done justice to the historical sources for Justinian's reign, especially Procopius' 'clear and well written *Wars*', so set about producing a separate volume that would bring them all together. 'In my customary manner for making the reading easier and more pleasing', so he says, 'I have added brief summaries to each book with marginal notes that are partly moral and partly political'. Next, in his prefatory 'Advice to the loyal and studious reader of histories', Goulart drew attention to the deficiencies of both the translation and notes in Leunclavius' volume and consciously sought to improve on it.

¹⁵⁸ Goulart (1593) 232.

In Goulart's large tome there at least is recognition for the first time that the unifying thread for all these texts is the person and reign of Justinian, rather than just the missing history of Italy (Bruni, Biondo), or the ancient history of the Goths (Peutinger, Cuspinian, Beatus), or the origins of France (Paradin, Fumée). The volume is conceived as a companion piece to volume 4 of the *Historia Augusta*, with each volume published a year apart. The cover pages for Goulart's *Justinian* and the *Historia Augusta* look remarkably similar because they have the same publisher (F. de Preux), same place (Lyons), same layout, and same typeface. The author also concludes with a collection of sayings ('gnomologica', p. 905), along with an index of speeches, public assemblies and letters (p. 910), constructed from Procopius, Agathias and Jordanes especially for this volume. In dealing with Procopius, in particular, Goulart took over the marginal corrections and improvements in Leunclavius' version but, for the first time, introduced paragraph numbers inside each book. While they helped to break up the text, they were placed rather idiosyncratically and did not last. No subsequent student of Procopius ever sought to replicate them.

6. Procopius in Leiden: Vulcanius and Scaliger

While the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were attracted by what Procopius had to say about Italian, then German, then Gothic (and Vandal) history, by the 1570s the scholarly centre had moved to Paris, later still to Leiden. Libraries were still not settled and accessible, not even in Paris where so many scholars planned and shared their work, irrespective of whether they called themselves Protestant or Catholic. In the reign of Louis XIII Jacques Auguste De Thou (1553–1617) reputedly had the largest private library in Paris but was also librarian of the King's library and dominated the scholarly circles which included Goulart, Pithou and Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609). He therefore had the best overview of locally available manuscripts of Procopius including those in the library of the late queen-

mother Catherine de Medici but which de Thou only secured for the Royal Library in 1599.¹⁵⁹ In 1593 Scaliger left behind de Thou and Goulart. He moved to Leiden where he discovered a new world and where he had evidently taken copies he had made of some Paris manuscripts of Procopius. Linking Paris and Leiden, as well as many other centres such as Augsburg, Geneva and Rome, was the so-called ‘republic of letters’, the community of like-minded scholars sharing expertise, manuscripts and all manner of literary news.¹⁶⁰ This active community is exemplified by the involvement of nearly all its leading figures between 1594 and 1608 in the slow progress to an initial edition of Procopius’ known works which can be traced in their correspondence.¹⁶¹

On 25 April 1594 Isaac Casaubon (1559–1614), then at Geneva, wrote to Richard Thomson (1569–1613), then at Leiden with Scaliger and with the university’s Professor of Greek, Boniface Vulcanius (1538–1614), seeking a manuscript copy of Procopius’ only published work at that point, namely the *Buildings*.¹⁶² Clearly there were none known or accessible at Geneva, although Goulart had recently completed his *Justinian* there and included a translation of Procopius’ *Buildings*. Still, Casaubon was aware that there was such a manuscript in Scaliger’s possession or nearby because Thomson had earlier told him.¹⁶³ It was over a year

¹⁵⁹ Weber (1949) 94.

¹⁶⁰ Grafton (2009) 9–34.

¹⁶¹ Full details, including use of important unpublished correspondence, in van Miert (2010) 361–86, with Montinaro (2018) 253–257.

¹⁶² Goulart and Scaliger: Grafton (1993a) 494.

¹⁶³ Botley (2016) 168 (Letter, Thompson to Casaubon, 27 December 1593). Scaliger boasted possession of an unpublished manuscript of the *Buildings* (Scaliger (1669) 281). While there is now a manuscript of the *Buildings* in Geneva (*Genav. gr.* 43, 15th century), it would appear to have only reached there in 1742 (cf. Haury, (1913) V). Casaubon may have been referring to a large 14th century manuscript owned by Vulcanius (*Leid. Vulc.* 56) which included Procopius’ *Buildings* (fols. 9–86v). If so, what Haury (1913) IV described as the emendations by a ‘very acute scribe’ may be those of Scaliger.

later (August 1595) that Thomson advised Casaubon that a copy of the *Buildings* was on its way.¹⁶⁴ Whether or not this was Scaliger's Leiden one (*Scal.* 9), probably copied from the 13th century manuscript owned by Vulcanius (*Vulc.* 56), or a copy of it, cannot be determined. In any event, Casaubon was applying his already vast learning and textual prowess to the only published text of Procopius (*Buildings*), but it is not clear whether he was planning a new edition or tackling the question of the longer and shorter versions of the work which were now known. As it happens, Casaubon never mentions the *Buildings* again, not even during his years in the King's library at Paris (1600–1610), where several Procopian manuscripts were under his nose. Before long, however, Scaliger was reporting back to de Thou in Paris that Vulcanius was himself now setting about an edition of Procopius' *Wars* and that he had lent Vulcanius his own manuscript, *Scal.* 5, copied from the manuscript previously owned by Catherine de Medici and now *Par. Gr.* 1699.

By 1597 Vulcanius re-published at Leiden the fragment of the Gothic war (*Wars* 8.4.7–5.26) which first appeared in 1579 in Pithou's collection, heading it on the title page 'Fragment of Procopius concerning the former locations and migrations of the Goths, in Greek and Latin'. That is, he added a Latin translation to Pithou's text. It formed part (239–46) of Vulcanius' omnibus edition of Jordanes' *Gothic History* and certain other texts related to the history of the Goths (Isidore's *History of the Goths, Vandals and Suevi*; Jordanes' *Romana*).¹⁶⁵ In the preface he explained that the enthusiastic response to his edition of Agathias two years earlier had emboldened him to do the same for Procopius. In fact, Procopius was more important, and so he made a

¹⁶⁴ Botley (2016) 202 (*Ep.* 177, Thompson to Casaubon, 9 August 1595).

¹⁶⁵ Its full title was *Jornandes, episcopus ravennas, de Getarum sive Gothorum origine et rebus gestis. Isidori Chronicon Gothorum, Vandalorum, Suevorum et Wisigothorum. Procopi fragmentum de priscis sedibus et migrationibus Gothorum. Graece et lat. Accessit et Jornandes de Regnorum et temporum successione. Omnia ex recognitione et cum notis Bon. Vulcanii, Brugensis.*

new translation of the *Wars* (designed to replace the incomplete and inaccurate ones of Persona and Maffei). The manuscript of the *Wars* which Vulcanius used for his translation was supplied, so he tells us, not by Scaliger but by de Thou, who had transcribed it from a Paris manuscript, presumably what is today *Par. Gr.* 1703.¹⁶⁶ While collating this manuscript with what he calls the ‘old Procopius’ (perhaps *Par. Gr.* 1702, 14th century), Vulcanius noticed gaps in the manuscript when compared to Maffei’s translation, rather as Cuspinian had done over eighty years earlier in Buda. Besides this preface he actually wrote to de Thou on 18 September 1597 not only to thank him for sending the Paris manuscript of the *Wars*, but also to explain how it led him to certain conjectures in the preface to the whole work (*Wars*, Book 1). His clever conjectures proved worthless, however, when he later read a better and more complete manuscript sent him by Gian Vincenzo Pinelli (1553–1601) at Padua. This led Vulcanius to exclaim, so he says, ‘O, the dumb conjectures of critics!’¹⁶⁷ Given the scholarly demand, however, for his new volume Vulcanius just translated and printed what was necessary for the history of the Goths. That was the burning and popular question requiring knowledge of Procopius.¹⁶⁸ The rest of the Gothic War, he foresaw, would be published in the near future and include a new translation of the complete work, from which he now published a small extract.¹⁶⁹ He was also aware by now of many more manuscripts of Procopius in Italian libraries with which Pinelli had offered to help him.

Around the same time (1598), while passing through Padua, Thomson had called on Pinelli and inspected his

¹⁶⁶ The readings in this extract correspond to the main manuscript in the Vatican Library (= Haury’s ‘K’), although in the apparatus he does not report manuscripts descended from it such as *Par. Gr.* 1703.

¹⁶⁷ Letter Vulcanius to de Thou, 18 September 1597 (in Anonymus (1733) 31–2).

¹⁶⁸ ‘Preface’, fols. 2–5.

¹⁶⁹ Vulcanius (1597) 264, cf. Vulcanius’ advice that more will be said about the Heruli in the notes to his ‘history of Procopius’.

famous library, as so many other scholars did from time to time. Pinelli had there a copy of Procopius' *Secret History*, so Thomson reported to the current editor of Procopius, namely his former teacher Vulcanius. Moreover, probably knowing that Pinelli had previously offered every assistance to Vulcanius with manuscripts of Procopius, Thomson now proposed to Vulcanius that he contact Pinelli to obtain a copy of the *Secret History* for himself.¹⁷⁰ What Thomson saw in Pinelli's library was surely the 14th century manuscript of the complete work (Ambrosiana, Milan *Cod. G. 14 sup.*, Haury's 'S'). Pinelli employed two skilled Greek copyists, Camillo Veneto and Manuel Moro. As a result, his extensive library later also contained other copies of the original 14th century manuscript of Procopius' *Secret History* or parts of it.¹⁷¹ Pinelli's library was to become the core of the Greek manuscript collection of Milan's Ambrosiana (founded 1602). While at Padua, Thomson may also have met one of Pinelli's students, Nicholas Claude Fabri sieur de Peiresc (1580–1637), who went on to become one of the great scholars and antiquarians of his time. Indeed, for one of the greatest modern students of antiquarianism himself, Peiresc

¹⁷⁰ Letter Thompson to Vulcanius, 5 February 1600 (Botley (2016) 222–5). Pinelli's library contained no less than three Procopian manuscripts, two being copies made locally of an eastern original (Grendler (1980) 386–416). On the unique scale but unfortunate aftermath of Pinelli's library: Pettegree (2011) 327–8.

¹⁷¹ Listed in Grendler (1980) 413–414: Amb. C. 118 *sup.* (Haury's 'c', copied by Veneto), c. 121 *sup.* (Haury's 'd', copied by Veneto), C. 171 *inf.* (Haury's 'e', copied by Veneto), P 74 *sup.* (Haury's 'f', copied by Moro). Haury's 'a' (Amb. A182 *sup.*), the only manuscript to contain the complete first part of the *Secret History*, was not owned by Pinelli and came separately to the Ambrosiana, perhaps through Catherine de Medici, including a copy of the *Secret History* derived from the Vatican manuscript (Haury's 'G'). The other main manuscript of the *Secret History* (Par. *Suppl. Gr.*1185, Haury's 'P') was only discovered in the 19th century on one of the voyages of Emmanuel Miller (1812–1886) in Greece. It may have been located at the Vatopedi monastery on Mt Athos at that time because part of Miller's collection was acquired there. Miller's manuscript later passed to the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris where it was first used by Haury ((1913) XVI).

was ‘that archetype of all antiquarians’.¹⁷² He was already a prodigious talent with full access to Pinelli’s famous library and to the scholar himself.¹⁷³ Also in Padua and Venice c. 1600 was Aloysius Lollino (1547–1626), later bishop of Belluno. Lollino was a humanist aristocrat from Venetian Crete who was a keen collector of Greek manuscripts that later became part of the Vatican library and among them was a very important 13th century manuscript of Procopius’ *Wars* 5–8 acquired in the East, indeed the only extant one with the text in double columns on the page (*Vat. Gr.* 1690).¹⁷⁴

Thomson was in Paris in 1599 where, as a former pupil of Vulcanius, he found himself defending his teacher against the Parisian scholars’ criticism of his tardiness with Procopius.¹⁷⁵ Meanwhile, back in Leiden, Scaliger too was disconcerted by the progress being made by Vulcanius, whom he considered a lazy drunkard. He expressed disquiet on 12 February 1597, and another eighteen months later (9 September 1598) there was still nothing to report although in 1597/1598 Vulcanius had been having manuscripts supplied, or copied, by de Thou in Paris and Pinelli in Padua. When Scaliger asked for his manuscript back, Vulcanius burst into tears because he was offended and wanted to keep it.¹⁷⁶ Scaliger’s solution was now to print the Greek text of the first ‘tetrad’ of the *Wars* (Books 1–4) from his own transcript of *Par. Gr.* 1699, with a corrected and supplemented version of Maffei’s 1509 Latin translation. The text, he explained to De Thou, is quite corrupt and requires significant thought.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷² Momigliano (1990) 54.

¹⁷³ Gassendi (1657) 249.

¹⁷⁴ Haury’s ‘K’ ((1905) XLIII–IV), cf. Haury (1896) 152.

¹⁷⁵ Botley (2016) 63.

¹⁷⁶ Scaliger (1669) 281.

¹⁷⁷ Letter Scaliger to de Thou, 9 September 1598 (letter 106 in Tamizey de Larroque (1879) 321).

Scaliger was not the only one copying manuscripts of Procopius in the later 16th century. Another was Andreas Darmarios (c. 1540–1587), a prolific Greek scribe based in Venice who copied Greek manuscripts for both Causaubon and Andreas Schott (1552–1629), among others, and was responsible for several 16th-century copies of Procopius.¹⁷⁸ Another copyist within Darmarios' circle was Jacob Episcopoulos from Crete who copied part of Procopius' *Wars* in a manuscript in the imperial library at Heidelberg which was transferred to the Vatican in 1622 (*Pal. Gr.* 413, ff. 109–145); yet another was Christophe Auer who was employed as a copyist of Greek manuscripts at Rome by d'Armagnac in the 1540s.¹⁷⁹ He appears to have copied in the folios missing from *Par. Gr.* 1702 originally copied in the 14th century by Joseph 'the monk', as well as Paris *Coislinianus* 132 (*Buildings, Secret History*).¹⁸⁰ There were other copyists of Procopian manuscripts in 16th century Italy,¹⁸¹ especially

¹⁷⁸ Pattison (1892) 35 cf. Kalli (2004) 134, elucidating *Ambrosianus A*, 52, 53, 54 and 55 (Haury's 'c' (1905) XLVII–VIII, *Wars* 5–8). Other relevant copies made by Darmarios are *Amb. C.* 118 *sup.* and 121 *sup.* (sections of *Secret History*), *Scoraliensis R. III.* 13 and *R. III* 14, *Amb. N.* 135 *sup.*, f. 490r (copied 1574): excerpts from *Wars*. Around the same time is dated another fragment of Procopius included in diverse collections from various preceding manuscripts (Vatican, *Cod. Ottobonianus Graec.* 192, ff. 198–201 = Haury's 's' [1905] LI). On Darmarios' wider scribal activity, a search of *Pinakes* under 'Andreas Darmarios' reveals a total of 964 manuscripts copied or attributable to him and now extant in libraries all over Europe. See also Vogel and Gardthausen (1909) 17–23, plus Gamillscheg and Harlfinger (1981) 29–32 (Britain alone). I am grateful to Elizabeth Jeffreys for these two references.

¹⁷⁹ Delisle (1867) 154.

¹⁸⁰ As noted by Haury ((1913) XIX), Auer copied into *Par. Coisl.* 132 both the *Buildings* (fols. 1–115 from *Vat. Gr.* 1065) and the *Secret History* (fols. 121–210, from *Vat. Gr.* 1001). The insertion of whole folios from another 14th century manuscript (*Marc. Gr. Z.* 398) is nicely illustrated by *Par. Gr.* 1702, fols. 92–93 (accessible at <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10721701n/f97.item.r=Procopius.zoom>).

¹⁸¹ Known scribes include: Antonius Kalosynas (second half of c.16), responsible for Basel University *D. IV* 06, copied 1574 = Haury (1905) XLIX (*Wars* 5–8 with gap at Haury, 642.24–668.16); Constantine Mesobotes (16th century) for Gonville/Caius (Cambridge) *fonds princ.* 076, ff.

the two Greek scribes who worked for Pinelli at Padua, Camillo Veneto (responsible for copying Ambrosiana, *C.* 118 *sup.*, *c.* 121 *sup.* and *C.* 171 *inf.*) and Manuel Moro (Ambrosiana, *P* 74 *sup.*). All these are copies of Procopius' *Secret History* taken from a 14th century original (*Amb. G.* 14 *sup.*) owned by Pinelli. These professional scribes played a significant role in expanding knowledge of Procopius by making copies of his works more widely available. Despite all that, there was still no settled or published text (except for the Augsburg version of the *Buildings*).

In Italy, meanwhile, the first attempt at a critical evaluation of any part of Procopius came from the pen of Bernardino Baldi (1533–1617) in 1604, published posthumously by his nephew in 1627. Baldi was a virtual caricature of the 'Renaissance man'. From a noble family, he formed part of the courtly world of the Montefeltre of Urbino being simultaneously mathematician, geographer, theologian, poet and literary critic, and the biographer of Copernicus.¹⁸² In taking issue with Biondo's interpretation of the 'calumnies of Procopius' (*Decades*, I.4), Baldi was taking up the historian's cause. Making no concessions to the reader, Baldi launches his discursive and erudite attack over ninety pages pausing for breath only at the end. Along the way he defends Procopius against the charges of Biondo that he misrepresented and distorted. Baldi makes much of relying on Procopius as contemporary, at times participant, of the events he describes. Indeed, as Baldi argues, this warrants much more respect than the venerated historians Livy and Tacitus, who were distant from most of what they describe. Throughout his discussion Baldi could only rely on the

176–185v (*Buildings*); Petros Karnevakas (16th century), a prolific copyist at Monemvasia, for *Bibl. Angelica Gr.* 25, ff. 235–44 (extract of letters from *Wars* 5–8, not used by Haury (1905) XL) originally owned by George of Corinth (c.1485–1551+) at Crete then Venice, later by Cardinal Guido Sforza (1518–64). The Fuggers (Augsburg) and Pinelli (Padua) purchased other parts of Gregory's library: Pingree (1977) 353–6.

¹⁸² Amatauro (1963).

published Latin translation of the Gothic war (Persona 1506). While that had been sufficient for all those primarily interested in Procopius as testimony to sixth-century Italy, it was inadequate for the serious humanist scholar.

In some ways that need began to be filled in the massive and detailed *Annales Ecclesiastici* of Cardinal Baronius (1538–1607) which was organised annually and has been described as ‘beyond the comprehension of the unlettered and beyond the tolerance of the lettered’.¹⁸³ Baronius’ efforts were focussed on justifying the actions of orthodox emperors and popes throughout the centuries, but his historical learning was thorough. At root, he was answering the challenge issued by the so-called ‘Magdeburg Centuriators’ who had earlier produced an anti-Catholic history organised by centuries and which had been designed to demonstrate thirteen centuries of continuity from the early church to the reforms being proposed by Luther, Calvin and others. Central to the Magdeburg histories was the Lutheran scholar Flacius Illyricus. The volume covering the sixth century (1562) inevitably made use of the available translations of Procopius’ *Wars*, but they were of little use for the centuriators’ polemical purposes. Baronius, by contrast, arguably made more extensive use of Procopius, both the *Wars* and the *Buildings*, than any scholar before him although he had no Greek. Regularly he quotes from Procopius and otherwise refers to him directly (e.g. ‘as Procopius says’) with a precise reference to work and book number placed in the margin. The chronology of Procopius’ *Wars* is not easy to follow but Baronius made the best of it.¹⁸⁴ At the time of compiling the *Annales* Baronius was

¹⁸³ Pullapilly (1975) 173.

¹⁸⁴ All references are cited from volume 7 of the revised edition (Baronius 1603). Sometimes he provides a reference in the text: e.g. 28 (‘secundus belli Gothici’), 136 (‘libro secundo de bello Gothorum’), 317 (‘quartus belli Gothici’), 356 (‘ad finem belli Vandalici’). Procopius’ organisation of the *Gothic War* by war years (following Thucydides) made matters easier for Baronius: 124 (‘while he counts each year of the Gothic war’), 319 (‘[Procopius] counts the years through the chronology of the Gothic war’). He then regularly cites events according to Gothic

the librarian at the Vatican library. What he did not know at that stage is that within the library there were two undetected manuscripts of Procopius' *Secret History*, a work known as the *Anekdotia* from the Byzantine biographical dictionary called the *Suda* but still presumed lost in the 1590s. Clearly, Pierre Gilles' *de Bosporo Thracio* (1561) in which he quotes the *Secret History* was not widely known, or at least appreciated. Indeed, on one occasion Baronius explains that the empress Theodora who was 'solely focussed on the defeat of the orthodox faith' died in 547. However, he continues, it is not known what disease carried her off (although Victor Tonnenensis, otherwise well-used by Baronius, specifies 'cancer'). Procopius is silent on the matter, Baronius continues, but he may well have explained more in the work described by the *Suda* in which he pilloried the Empress and her husband concluding 'since we lack this work of Procopius nothing more can be said about Theodora'.¹⁸⁵

At the same time (1593) the great jurist and student of Roman government Guido Panciroli (1523–1599) was producing his edition of the *Notitia Dignitatum*. There are two entries in the *Suda* which treat Justinian's augmentation of the palace guard at Constantinople¹⁸⁶ and, in his commentary on the *scholae palatinae*, Panciroli notes that both these entries were taken by the *Suda* from the *Secret History*.¹⁸⁷ In the same book there is another passage, this time the commentary on the head of the imperial household (*comes domesticorum*), where Panciroli appears to be quoting ('inquit') a longer passage from the *Secret History* which

war-year: pp. 351 (14th), 344 (8th), 369 (11th), 393 (4th and 14th), 398 (15th), 404 (16th), 419 (7th).

¹⁸⁵ Baronius (1603) 392: 'sed cum eiusmodi a Procopio scriptis libris careamus ...'. The later accusation that Baronius, as Vatican librarian, deliberately chose to ignore or suppress the *Secret History* is baseless.

¹⁸⁶ *Sigma* 1797, 'scholarios' (< *Secret History* 24.15–16); *upsilon* 230, 'hyperarithmoi' (< *Secret History* 24.15, 19).

¹⁸⁷ Panciroli (1593) 43: 'Haec a Procopio anekdotois mutuatus videtur ubi idem ferme scribit'.

cannot be traced to the *Suda* but only to the *Secret History* directly. At least in this case Panciroli either had a copy, or had this particular passage (from chapter 24) copied for his use from an unknown manuscript of the *Secret History*.¹⁸⁸ Not long before—the precise year is not known because the work was only published posthumously almost a century later (1689)—the lawyer Pierre Pithou was completing his commentary on the *Code* and *Novels* of Justinian. In 1579 he had published a section of Procopius' *Wars*, but for this work his reading and extracting, done in conjunction with his brother Francis, included the *Secret History* of Procopius. Because Pithou was part of the circles of De Thou and Scaliger at Paris, it is likely that the manuscript he used was *Par. Suppl. Gr.* 1185, about which at least de Thou would have known at the time. Pithou quoted whole passages of the *Secret History* (as 'Anekdotois') in his commentary,¹⁸⁹ but the availability of Procopius' work went unnoticed because Pithou's commentary remained unpublished. By the turn of the 17th century, therefore, the *Secret History* was not unknown but it remained only in manuscript form.

7. Hoeschel and the First Edition of *Wars* (1607)

It was in Peutingen's city of Augsburg, now a key imperial city for the Holy Roman Emperor, that the study of Byzantium first took serious hold in the West. With no university at Augsburg there was no natural centre of scholarship, as at Leiden for instance, but patronage of scholars was a prime concern for the richest local family, the Fuggers, who had replaced the Florentine Medici family

¹⁸⁸ Panciroli (1593) 57 (verbatim from *Secret History* 24.24): 'De his ita Procopius anekdotois, sunt, inquit, et alii in Palatio longe praestantiores, quoniam maius ipsis stipendium solui consuevit, ac digniore militariae nomine honestantur. Hi domestici, et protectores vocantur, et a cura rerum bellicarum longe absunt. In palatio enim conscribi solent, ut fit ordo, qui tantum personae operam praestet. Horum aliqui Byzantii, alii in Galatia nonnulli alii in locis statuuntur. Hactenus Procopius.'

¹⁸⁹ Pithou (1689) 448, 455, 459, 461, 475, 638.

as Europe's large scale bankers and investors. Like Cosimo and Lorenzo de Medici in previous generations, Johann Jacob Fugger (1516–1575) was a patron of scholars who also bought Greek manuscripts, or had them copied in Italy, but in 1571 he sold his large library to the Duke of Bavaria in Munich and it passed eventually into what became the Bavarian State Library. Previously, one of the bankers' officials, Hieronymus Wolf (1516–1580), a man of humanist interests and abilities, had collected from Venice for Johann Fugger numerous manuscripts of later Byzantine authors. He was therefore able to respond when asked to edit manuscripts the banker had acquired in the East. Further, he conceived the proposal for making them into a veritable library of Byzantine historians under the label of *Corpus Historiae Byzantinae*. Wolf was also head of the city's St Anne's school and one of his foremost pupils was David Hoeschel (1556–1617) who succeeded him as principal. Another wealthy local business family with imperial support and cultural clout, the Welsers, set up a printing press at Augsburg in 1590. This venture enabled the regular appearance of Byzantine and patristic writers, including Hoeschel's pioneering editions of Photius (1601), Constantine Porphyrogenitus' fragments on embassies (1603) discovered at the Escorial library in Spain and which included extracts from Procopius, then Procopius in 1607.¹⁹⁰ Hoeschel had been in regular correspondence with de Thou, Scaliger, Casaubon and others. In the end, it was not at Paris or Leiden that the first edition of Procopius' *Wars* was published, but at Augsburg.

While Hoeschel was progressing with his publications from 1601 to 1607 Vulcanius' projected edition of Procopius languished. Scaliger appears to have thrown his support behind the competing venture at Augsburg. In May 1601 the humanist Augsburg publisher Markus Welser (1558–1614) informed Scaliger that Hoeschel was now ready to

¹⁹⁰ Reinsch (2010) and (2015); cf. Beck (1958) 76–9; Sandys (1908) 268–72; Pertusi (1967) 52–3; Pfeiffer (1976) 140.

take on Procopius but was anxious not to tread on Vulcanius' toes.¹⁹¹ Indeed, Scaliger advised Hoeschel to get on with the edition since Vulcanius appeared to have given up.¹⁹² Now in Paris, Casaubon was thinking likewise but he preferred conjecturing amendments to a single manuscript rather than collating several of them in order to establish a more reliable text.¹⁹³ It was therefore left to Scaliger to pronounce in favour of Hoeschel, who expected to have a text ready by the spring of 1602 and was perfectly happy to utilise Vulcanius' new Latin translations if they could be made available.¹⁹⁴ Hoeschel then inquired about Scaliger's proposed emendations to Procopius.¹⁹⁵ On 12 January 1603 Scaliger wrote to de Thou in Paris that 'your Procopius' [presumably meaning the Paris manuscript of the *Wars*, *Par.Gr.* 1700, sent earlier by de Thou] was now being printed by Welser at Augsburg while Vulcanius was threatening to print a version of the *Buildings* that was twice the length of that already known, and likely to form a part of the Augsburg edition (from *Leid. Vulc.* 56, Haury's 'ℓ').¹⁹⁶ Scaliger was unconcerned, dismissing Vulcanius as 'all talk and no action'.¹⁹⁷ Even so, Hoeschel now slowed. Firstly, he came across a new manuscript of the *Wars* in the ducal library at Munich (*Monac.* 48) which appeared to be superior to the one from which he had been working. It was probably one of those acquired by Fugger in Venice, where

¹⁹¹ 16 May 1601, 5 September 1601 (Tamizey de Larroque (1879) 376 n. 53); Scaliger (1627) 128 (*Ep.* 23 to Dousa).

¹⁹² Scaliger (1627) 738 (*Ep.* 390).

¹⁹³ Pattison (1892) 456.

¹⁹⁴ Pattison (1892) 378.

¹⁹⁵ Scaliger (1627) 739 (*Ep.* 392, October 1602). He is probably referring to the amendments preserved in *Scal.* 52 (Leiden).

¹⁹⁶ Scaliger (1627) 741 (*Ep.* 395, March 1603). Later in the year, Hoeschel evidently discovered that Vulcanius' Leiden edition was being printed after all but he claims not to be offended. It is for the greater good of making Procopius available (letter, Hoeschel to Gottfried Jungemann, 15 May 1603, in Meelius (1700) 456 (*Ep.* 19).

¹⁹⁷ Scaliger, *Ep.* 115 (Tamizey de Larroque (1879) 350)

it was copied from *Par. Gr.* 1702¹⁹⁸ and which passed from Augsburg to Munich in 1571. Then Scaliger finally got his own manuscript copy back from Vulcanius and forwarded it to Hoeschel, but Vulcanius' intentions were still unclear. Casaubon, meanwhile, in November 1605 was offering to collate a Paris manuscript for Hoeschel.¹⁹⁹ In the years leading up to the edition by Hoeschel at Augsburg, Scaliger found himself in the middle of a complex web at Leiden: Vulcanius showed him a proof of his projected edition of the *Buildings*, declaring his intention to publish; Casaubon asked Scaliger when Vulcanius' *Buildings* would appear (12 May 1605); Hoeschel suggested to him that Vulcanius should publish his edition of the *Buildings* with the notes of Casaubon; Vulcanius accepted from Scaliger a manuscript from Heidelberg (either *Pal. Gr.* 129 or *Vat. Pal. Gr.* 413, then at Heidelberg, but at the Vatican since 1623). Scaliger had also been in correspondence with Peiresc at Aix, although they had never yet met. In 1606, however, Peiresc called on the great scholar in Leiden. At first he pretended to be someone else but Scaliger recognised his handwriting so he quickly threw off the mask. What Peiresc discovered in befriending Vulcanius at Leiden was that he was working on Procopius.²⁰⁰ Among them all, plans for a text of Procopius would have been an unavoidable topic of conversation.

Against this uncertain background Hoeschel proceeded to complete his edition of the *Wars* relying on local manuscripts supplemented by those recently copied at Paris.²⁰¹ He sent printed extracts in advance to Scaliger in

¹⁹⁸ Haury (1896) 149–50.

¹⁹⁹ Casaubon (1656) 484 (*Ep.* 421): 'Codicem Procopii qui in bibliotheca conferemus cum tuis libris, si aliquot folia miseris'.

²⁰⁰ Gassendi (1657) 104.

²⁰¹ The manuscripts Hoeschel deployed: *Mon. Gr.* 48 (c. 16) and *Par. Gr.* 1700 (c. 17) for the first tetrad (Books 1–4, Persian and Vandal Wars); *Mon. Gr.* 87 (c. 16) and *Par. Gr.* 1701 (c. 17) for the second tetrad (Books 5–8, Gothic war).

July 1606 and January 1607.²⁰² When Hoeschel's *editio princeps* of the Wars appeared in 1607/8 the dilatory Vulcanius was livid not to find himself mentioned at all, and even more livid to discover the editor's gratitude to Scaliger on display. Instead, Hoeschel dedicated his volume to several local dignitaries, his 'lords and patrons' who had subsidised its publication. Justinian, so he explained, was the centre of this work and the frontispiece illustration highlights that too. In particular, Hoeschel links the account of Procopius wars' to Justinian's other activities, especially the laws for which he had long been known, emphasising the link between the wars and laws to be found in the *Novels* published long ago (1531) by the young Gregory Holoander (1501–1531). All he says of Procopius is that he was secretary to Belisarius and witness of most of what he describes in the *Wars* and *Buildings*. In his separate prefatory note to the reader, Hoeschel advises that he has worked with several manuscripts of Procopius' *Wars* with a view to providing a fuller and more correct text. He was assisted by an incomparable set of advisers: Johann Georg Herwart von Hohenburg (1553–1622) a counsellor for the Duke of Bavaria sent him a manuscript from the Ducal library at Munich (now *Mon. Gr.* 87), when he heard that Hoeschel was planning to edit Procopius. Another came from Scaliger (Leiden, *Scal.* 5), 'emended by him throughout', and a third from Casaubon now in the Royal library at Paris, a manuscript which contained the neat marginal comments of the young Peter Chabaneaus (*Par. Gr.* 1700 = Haury's 'o'). Hoeschel then confesses that he primarily followed the 'Bavarian MS' (*Mon. Gr.* 87) but where the readings differed, especially in Book 8, he resorted to the 'royal MS' (*Par. Gr.* 1700, 1701). He was critical of the incomplete earlier translations and at least aware of textual variations in manuscripts and the need to compare them where possible. Although his chapter headings, following the manuscripts,

²⁰² Scaliger (1627) 742 (*Ep.* 396, July 1606); 744 (*Ep.* 398, January 1607).

list only book numbers of the *Wars*, the running heads indicate separately Persian, Vandal and Gothic wars.

As for the *Buildings* in particular, its clearly subsidiary status on the title page with smaller lettering and the proclamation that this edition was ‘almost twice as large as the previous one’ (that is, Beatus 1531), combined with its separate pagination and general approach, suggests it was less of a priority for Hoeschel. Further, it was only printed separately after the *Wars* was complete and was ready by November 1606, although its preface was only added much later still.²⁰³ Hoeschel essentially took the 1531 edition of Beatus, to which he added material from other manuscripts in square brackets. He tells us that Casaubon corresponded with him generously and provided a copy which the learned Roman and Byzantine lawyer Charles Labbaeus or Labbé (1582–1657) had earlier copied ‘from an old manuscript’. Casaubon had been seeking manuscripts of the *Buildings* for some years, but there is no indication that his researches on Procopius’ text ever came to much. This manuscript appears to be another Scaliger copy (*Scal.* 9), presumably the one he considered the ‘good manuscript’ of the *Buildings*.²⁰⁴ So the new version was much larger than the previous version (1531). In a separate later note to the reader (dated February 1608) Hoeschel explains that since he had acquired the *Buildings* manuscript of Friedrich Lindembrog (1573–1648), another former student of Vulcanius and Scaliger at Leiden, and a keen collector of manuscripts, he had many more corrections to make to the text, which he proceeds to list.²⁰⁵ That section contained brief textual notes

²⁰³ Letter Hoeschel to Gottfried Jungemann, 25 November 1606, in Meelius (1700) 462–463.

²⁰⁴ Scaliger (1669) 281. This is the manuscript most likely copied from that of Vulcanius (*Vulc.* 56).

²⁰⁵ Hoeschel (1607) ‘Lectori’ explaining that he had not originally intended to publish corrections or further amendments to his work but various reasons had made it now possible. He had already included emendations made by letter from Scaliger and Casaubon (Scaliger (1669) 155). He cites readings from Lindembrog’s manuscript as ‘m.s. Fr. L.’ (at 9, line 44; 10, 1; 10, 36; 12, 1; 13, 13; 19, 37; 24, 43; 31, 40; 33, 18;

to the whole work and a separate index for both *Wars* and *Buildings*.

Scaliger, who had done so much to encourage Hoeschel's edition of Procopius, lived to see and annotate a copy of it but died not long after (1609). Even so, Scaliger considered Hoeschel 'not so much a brilliant Greek scholar but extremely diligent'.²⁰⁶ He knew, therefore, that there was immediate work to be done to improve on Hoeschel's text and it was his pupil Daniel Heinsius (1580–1655) who had already taken up the task. Essentially Heinsius inherited the mantle of Vulcanius and his efforts to produce a text in the 1590s and later. Blindness afflicted Vulcanius in his later years and Heinsius became his diligent and erudite helper until Vulcanius' death in 1614. The translation of the *Wars* produced by Vulcanius was corrected and improved by Heinsius. It was to accompany an edition which was already long in the making but appeared to be close in 1628, probably to be published by Elzevier at Leiden.²⁰⁷ Hoeschel's edition had more or less disrupted the much anticipated Leiden publication even though it had acquired Scaliger's blessing. By modern standards, however, Hoeschel's method was unsatisfactory and restricted. Given the constraints of his time and place, he had resorted to the most accessible manuscripts rather than search for the best

35, 25; 36, 16; 36, 22; 40, 34; 43, 10; 44, 22; 45, 7; 45, 8; 45, 42; 47, 23; 48, 27; 54.24); or 'm.s. Frid. L.' (7, 3). Other manuscripts cited by Hoeschel are variously described: 'apographum Lebbei' (13, 30); 'tam ex Gallicano, quam m.f. Codice Frid. Lindenbrogii patet' (4, 5), 'm.s.Fr. L recte ut et apographum C.I.C. Caroli Lebbei' (21, 23); 'in cod. Ioannis Leunclaii' (21, 15); 'probe coniecit clariss. Isaacus Casaubonus' (28, 8); 'cum Leunclavio et m.s.Fr.L.' (29, 45); 'in m.s. Gallicano' (36, 33); 'm.s. cod. Aug' (53, 10). The Beatus edition (1531) is referred to as 'Basiliensis editio' (3, line 43) and 'prior editio' (4, 5).

²⁰⁶ Scaliger (1669) 155.

²⁰⁷ Deduced from undated letter, Holsten to Elmeshortius, in Burmann (1697) 290 (*Ep.* 226); '[Heinsius] Procopium intra biennium abhinc proximum vix dabit'. Vulcanius' substantial surviving work on his edition and translation of Procopius is held in the Netherlands Imperial Library at the Hague (first-hand details in Forrai (2016) 229–30).

ones.²⁰⁸ Indeed, Haury remarked in 1895 that subsequent editors of Procopius (Maltretus 1662/3 and Dindorf 1833/8 principally) had not done anything more sophisticated than Hoeschel.²⁰⁹ Still, it constituted the first published edition of the *Wars* (pp. 1–376) and the longer version of the *Buildings* (pp. 1–56, separately). The *Secret History* remained unpublished in 1607/8 but not unknown.

8. Alemanni's Edition of *Secret History* (1623) and its Critics

The Suda explicitly lists and explains the *Secret History* of Procopius as the ninth book of the *Wars*, so that when a Latin translation of the Suda appeared in 1516 it increased awareness of the lost *Secret History*. Yet its existence in Italy was not widely known, although it had been cited by Gilles, Pithou, and Pancirolo, who clearly had access to copies of it and could identify it as the work of Procopius. Apart from the manuscripts of the *Secret History* in Pinelli's collection at Padua which were shown to Thomson in 1600 and to Peiresc at Aix-en-Provence not long after, the earliest reference to the wider availability of the work would appear to be in 1620 when Peiresc was evidently expecting Heinsius in Leiden to send him Vulcanius' translation of Procopius. In a letter dated 4 November 1620 Peiresc wrote the following to Jerome Aleander (1574–1629) at Rome:

I have just read a letter from Daniel Heinsius who withdraws the offer he had made to send Vulcanius' version of Procopius, corrected by him, saying that Fr Andre Schottus had offered him the Greek text of Procopius' *Secret History* to get printed in Holland, together with the rest of the works of this author

²⁰⁸ The whole question of Hoeschel's edition of the *Buildings* now needs thorough re-examination in light of Montinaro (2012) 96.

²⁰⁹ Haury (1896) 125.

under certain conditions and especially that nobody should say the copy was taken from Rome.

This last cryptic sentence may indicate that Schottus, one time participant in the circle of Scaliger in Paris (1580s/90s) and correspondent of Casaubon,²¹⁰ but now in his native Antwerp, was actually working from the recently discovered Vatican manuscript of the *Secret History* but copied without due permission, a fact to be concealed in any edition. Peiresc was certainly concerned enough to explain to his correspondent at Paris that the papal librarian (Cardinal Scipione Cobelluzzi) had promised to send him a copy of the *Secret History* manuscript discovered in the Vatican library (*Vat. Gr.* 1001). After all, Peiresc had long been interested in Procopius' work and was one of the few who had perhaps already read the *Secret History*, while at Padua with Pinelli c. 1600. Now he was evidently worried that he might be taken to be the source of Schottus' copy, or that Heinisus at Leiden might suspect him. Rather than accept a copy direct from Cobelluzzi, Peiresc thought it best to wait and see whether Schottus would come good with his edition, concluding 'I beg you thus to inform his esteemed lordship with all your usual shrewdness, and to get despatch of the copy made for me delayed. I would be greatly indebted to you'.²¹¹ Peiresc wanted clean hands to deal with any publication of the *Secret History*, a sure sign there were obvious sensitivities around its circulation.

By 1620 Peiresc was probably well aware that another of his Roman correspondents Niccolo Alemanni (1583–1626), now a papal librarian, had in fact produced an edition of the *Secret History* but was holding it back. In fact, that may be what Cardinal Cobelluzzi was wanting to send to Peiresc. On 7 December 1620 he was informed by Aleander at Rome that Alemanni, especially as a servant of the Vatican, was hesitating about publication 'because we are

²¹⁰ Pattison (1892) 396–9.

²¹¹ 4 November 1620 in Fauris de Vincens (1819) 55.

in very suspicious times' and there might be widespread consternation at discovering that Procopius had really seen Justinian as the 'devil incarnate'.²¹² In any event, as Alemanni's manuscript lay unpublished, he actually sent a copy to Peiresc in 1622²¹³ before it finally appeared the following year (1623). It was published by the Roman bookseller Andreas Brugiotti, but in Lyons where it secured local ecclesiastical and royal approval. Alemanni was then prefect of the Vatican library, as well as of the secret papal archive located at Castel St Angelo at the time. He had the advantage of being a native speaker of Greek, educated in Greek at the College of St Athanasius at Rome and an active player in the group of local Greek humanists for whom patristic and Byzantine writers were as important as classical Greek texts. His new publication was a major development in the study of Procopius.²¹⁴

Alemanni had discovered two manuscripts of the unpublished work in his Vatican library: (1) *Vat. Gr.* 1001, f. 1–100 (14th century) followed (in the same hand) by Procopius' *Persian Wars* (f. 101–187); and (2) *Vat. Gr.* 16, f. 137–180* (14th/15th century). The latter was copied from the former and both manuscripts were part of larger volumes which lacked both a title and author as well as the beginning portion of the Procopian text. That is probably the explanation for them passing unnoticed by earlier scholars and librarians.²¹⁵ Given the state of even the best libraries and their catalogues by the early seventeenth

²¹² Paris, *Par. Gr.* 9541, 177r, cited in Herklotz (1995) 187 n. 49.

²¹³ Gassendi (1657) 208, acknowledged it would appear by letter from Peiresc on 25 November 1622 (Tamizey de Larroque (1889) 15).

²¹⁴ Details in Mercati (1960); Croke (forthcoming, *a*).

²¹⁵ Their lack of title, authorship, and beginning was noted by Alemanni ((1623) xiv) so he took the title *Anekdotia* from the *Suda* entry (II 2479: 'Procopius'). Similarly, the *Secret History* as the '9th book of the Wars' he also surmised from the *Suda* entry on Procopius although this may originally have been the author's manuscript heading. Alemanni does not doubt that Baronius searched unsuccessfully for such a manuscript earlier ((1623) *praef.*).

century, that is no surprise. Alemanni was clearly nervous about the impact the *Secret History* would make on the long-established legal and ecclesiastical image of Justinian. Alemanni's edition begins with a dedication to his former Greek student, the 27-year-old Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisi (1595–1632), followed by two prefatory sections, one on Justinian (i–xii), the next on Procopius and the edition (xiii–xxiii). Then comes the text with Latin translation (1–135), continuous with no section numbers, and next there are extensive historical notes by the author (1–116) plus textual notes (117–42), concluding with useful but separate indexes (pages unnumbered) for both the text and the prefaces/notes. The publication of the *Secret History* in 1623 transformed understanding of both the author Procopius and the emperor Justinian. An immediate scholarly challenge was posed.

Alemanni was breaking new ground in his *Secret History* and his introductions are worth pausing over. In the course of explaining what other contemporary, and near contemporary, sources say negatively about Justinian the man and his religious policy in particular, Alemanni has no doubt the work will find some incredulous readers unconvinced by its genuine hate and deep-seated malevolence (i). Those who draw attention to Justinian's achievements in peace and war rate him one of the great emperors and, Alemanni duly notes, his greatness and reputation for eleven centuries as a law-giver and codifier is irreproachable (ii). There are those who can brook no evil of this Justinian so Alemanni predicted that the history would offend the lawyers, at least those less familiar with other ancient literature (iii). As an example of severe judgement by a scholar who did not know the *Secret History* he cites the words of Cardinal Baronius on both Theodora and Justinian (iv). Even so, when Alemanni was setting up the text of the Vatican manuscript of the *Secret History* for publication he resolved to hold back the most lascivious sections covering Theodora's early life (chapters 9.10 (ed. Haury, 57.19–58.2) and 9.14–25 (ed. Haury, 58.18–60.22)). They are clearly pencil-marked

in the original manuscript, presumably an indication that they were not to be included.²¹⁶

A detailed consideration of the various claims made by Procopius in the *Secret History* leads Alemanni to propose that they are beyond doubt, except for what he has to say about Justinian's religion (xii). In turning to Procopius himself, and the study of his works, Alemanni discusses Bruni's use of the *Wars* in his *De Bello Italico* while 'toying with his readers' by not admitting he was using Procopius. Then comes Biondo and the translations of Persona and Maffei plus the other editions prior to 1623. There are two manuscripts in the Vatican library, one older than the other and copied from it, but they are disfigured in part and have hardly been used. Alemanni then advises that he knew of two other manuscripts of the *Secret History*: one had been acquired by Lorenzo de Medici, presumably brought from Constantinople by Janus Lascaris in the 1480s and should have been part of the collection which passed to Catherine de Medici, but it had disappeared. At present, the French are searching for it in foreign libraries. Such a manuscript may never have existed. No wonder they failed to find it.²¹⁷ The other was that of Pinelli (*Amb. G.14 sup.*) which he presumed was lost at sea between Venice and Naples, and which he considered was the very manuscript used by Pithou and Pancirolo. Alemanni concludes his introductory material by dating the work towards the end of Justinian's reign (xv), then explaining the style of the translation and the notes at the end, both textual and historical, particularly that he has collated the entries used from the *Secret History* by the *Suda* with his own text (xvi). These notes, prepared by Alemanni, were a rich and novel collection of materials and judgements which continued to be reprinted by subsequent

²¹⁶ A claim based on personal inspection of the manuscript (*Vat. Gr.* 1001, fols. 32–3) at Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (23 November 2015). Alemanni's initials ('N.A.') appear throughout the manuscript to mark corrections, conjectures and content divisions although these are not used in his edition.

²¹⁷ Haury (1896) 144–6. Alemanni was therefore misinformed.

editors right down to Dindorf (1838) and were used extensively by Haury (1913). They still have their value.

One of the most striking and influential aspects of Alemanni's new edition was the very title he gave it: 'Secret History' ('Historia Arcana'). There is no manuscript basis for any title other than *Anekdotia* ('Matters Unpublished') which may well be original to Procopius. It was also that used by the Byzantines, at least as evidenced by the *Suda*. Moreover, *Anekdotia* is the title by which the work is cited by those scholars who had previously been able to locate and read a manuscript of it: Gilles (1561), Pithou (1580s, pub. 1689), Panciroli (1593). Why Alemanni chose to translate *Anekdotia* as 'Secret History' is not stated. Perhaps he gave it little thought, choosing only to justify the title *Anekdotia* (*Notes*, p. 2) but not his translation of it. The result, however, was monumental. Calling it a 'Historia Arcana' (rather than, say, 'Res Gestae Ineditae' or similar) added an immediate frisson of scandal, suppression, and double standards. In fact, in English and French at least it inspired the development of a whole literary genre called 'Secret History',²¹⁸ a title characterised by emotion and partisanship. Such was the contemporary impact of Alemanni's title and thus it remains to this day.

The breadth and detail of knowledge of all sorts of literary and physical sources and antiquities which Alemanni had demonstrated in his *Secret History* were now brought to bear on the restoration of the Lateran basilica. He was commissioned by Cardinal Francesco Barberini (1598–1679) to advise on the restoration of an earlier *triclinium* which contained some interesting mosaics dating from the time of Pope Leo III and depicting together both the pope himself and Charlemagne, whom he crowned Emperor in 800. Another mosaic on the *triclinium* represented Pope Sylvester and Constantine. Alemanni told the whole story of the mosaics and how they should be

²¹⁸ Bullard (2009) 1–45; Burke (2012a) 276 (acknowledging the explicit example of Procopius' *Secret History*) and (2012b).

interpreted in what has come to be a landmark volume published for local consumption in 1625, although the author ensured that Peiresc was sent a copy.²¹⁹ The following year, while working in the damp St Peter's basilica to advise on the erection of the baldachin over the tomb of St Peter, Alemanni suddenly took ill and died unexpectedly before he could ever engage with any of his critics. Indeed, the recently deceased scholar was soon under attack on both fronts: for the Lateran treatise and for his *Secret History*. If there was any connection between them, it was the way they appeared to subordinate lay imperial power (Justinian, Charlemagne) to papal power, but for the most part the critics were separate.²²⁰ Peiresc was exceptional in having a long and informed interest in both topics, that is, he had possessed and studied a copy of the Charlemagne mosaic and had been dealing with the *Secret History* since his student days at Padua.

Peiresc's solid support for Alemanni's Procopius volume was shaken on reading the first serious critique of it which came from Thomas Ryves or Rivius (1583–1652). He was an advocate of the English monarch and was now defending Justinian in a treatise dedicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose intellectual and literary interests included Justinian.²²¹ Ryves' treatise was difficult to obtain in Aix and so, before sending it on to Rome, Peiresc copied the whole work out in order to have his own copy to keep with his copy of Alemanni's edition.²²² The new English work was entitled a 'Defence of the Emperor Justinian

²¹⁹ Letter Peiresc to Dupuy, 8 April 1627 (*Ep.* 47 = Tamizey de Larroque (1888) 197) referencing his copy of Alemanni's *de lateranensibus parietinis ab illustriss. et Reverendiss. Domino D. Francisco Cardinale Barberino restitutis dissertatio historica*.

²²⁰ Details in Herklotz (1995) 175–96.

²²¹ Peiresc's unpublished letters from the time are referenced in Herklotz (1995) 188 n. 56 and 189 n. 59.

²²² Letter Peiresc to Dupuy, 5 June 1627 (*Ep.* 56 = Tamizey de Larroque (1888) 265), with notice of letter to Aleandro on 4 June 1627 enclosing 'book of Rivius' (Tamizey de Larroque (1889) 56).

against Alemanni' but written in Latin. Justinian was its main focus and Alemanni its author's main target. He certainly construed the priest Alemanni's introduction and notes as an attack on secular lay power. Ryves proceeded by querying the validity of the title *Historia Arcana* ('Secret History'), taking on specific accusations made in the *Secret History* and echoed by Alemanni, such as the murders of Amantius in 518 and Vitalian in 520: according to Ryves, Justin and not Justinian is to be blamed for Amantius if anyone (14), and Vitalian was simply a proven rebel and traitor who did not deserve to live (17–18). By contrast, argued Ryves, the natural clemency of Justinian has been ignored: how he treated Hypatius and Pompeius initially during the Nika Riots in 532 (27), how he dealt with the Roman officials who murdered the Laz king Gubazes in 555 (49). Justinian was responsible for a vast number of new towns and buildings, says Ryves, but 'I don't recall reading that he destroyed any' (55). Although Ryves' work could be critiqued at length, a sense of his style and approach can be gained from two brief extracts. The first takes up the accusation of Procopius that Justin was like a stupid donkey and Justinian no better (*Secret History* 8.1–11):

For, what would you say if Justinian were summoned back from the dead to show you not only the corpus of civil law he created in which he seems to exceed the capacity of human knowledge but also the churches, basilicas, public streets, harbours, walls, aqueducts, and other buildings constructed by him, immense in size countless in number, impressively skilful and admirably beautiful, and to ask whether those appear to be like the works of a stupid beastly man pulling a harness? Surely you would free him by your pronouncement from the notion of stupidity?' (29–30).

The second comes at the end of a long discussion of the propriety of Justinian's religion in dealing with popes and councils and briefly says: 'Go through all the deeds of that council [Constantinople 553], Alemanni. In none of its

pages will you find one that does not confirm the most proper faith of Justinian during that whole period' (42).

The true image of Justinian is to be found in his laws, so argued Ryves the lawyer.²²³ As for Procopius, Ryves considers at times that Alemanni is responsible for exaggerating or distorting Procopius and for being too credulous of the writer's satire (23, 57, 70), but he does not dismiss or even query the authenticity of the *Secret History* as others were inclined to do. In fact, he says little about Procopius himself although he does puzzle over why the overall view of the *Anekdotia* should take precedence over the later and more favourable approach of the *Buildings* (93–4), and why such an author would be so ungrateful after the emperor had heaped honours and positions on him (praef. 46). Alemanni's predicted backlash from the lawyers wedded to their high view of Justinian was on full display in Ryves' treatise. Less pointed and more diffuse was that of the French lawyer Gabriel Trivorius who dedicated his book (1631) to his monarch (Louis XIII) and cast it 'both against Procopius and recent authors, old and new heretics even'.²²⁴

It was to be another decade before the dust settled on Alemanni's challenging volume. By that stage, the previous proposal at Leiden to edit the *Secret History* had resurfaced. The example of Alemanni's edition and its reaction prompted Lucas Holsten (1596–1661) to advise the Leiden publishers (Elzevier) in 1636 that they would need to tread carefully with any new edition of the *Secret History*, now that its contents were widely known and the subject of vigorous literary and political debate. The Catholic Holsten had been a student at Protestant Leiden with Heinsius, and had recently spent time working in Paris where he came to know the Dupuy brothers. Now he was settled in Rome, from where he sounded the following warning:

²²³ Rivius (1626) 37: 'nam si veram Iustiniani imaginem videre vis ... iuris ciuilis corpus inspice'.

²²⁴ Trivorius (1631) 18 ('iniquus obtrectator Procopius in Anecdosis'), 24, 49, 164–67, 171, 191.

In the new edition which you are preparing I would advise first of all that you take care nothing finds its way into your prefaces or notes which might offend the ears and mind of Catholics and might exclude the work itself from Italy and other Catholic provinces which I judge would not benefit your private interests. So, I warn you that, if it should appear to be riddled with any of Alemanni's observations that learned men consider to favour the calumnies of Procopius and oppress the reputation of the very great emperor Justinian, the views of the distinguished D. Heinsius or another learned man should be expunged instead of indirectly drawing the sword of calumnies at Alemanni's side against the Catholic church. I regret that has been done by Ryves and others.²²⁵

Whether Holsten's warning was the reason or not, the Elzevier edition stalled, but not attention to the *Secret History*. There next came a new edition in 1654 by Joannes Eichel (1621–1688), jurist to the House of Brunswick, who attacked Alemanni and what he considered the absurdity of the *Anekdotia*, although he essentially re-published his original text and translation because they were of the highest standard and not in question.²²⁶ The subtitle is indicative of its content—'convicted in many places of falsity by the evidence of the *Anekdotia*'; that is to say, Eichel uses the testimony of Procopius' work itself to demonstrate where it errs in fact and judgement. For Eichel the problem was Alemanni's general approach and interpretation of the information contained in the *Secret History*. The lengthy and discursive introduction (4–104) covers a wide range of issues beginning with a disquisition on the nature of history writing (Sections 1–9), explaining the translation of the title *Anekdotia* as 'unpublished things' not 'Secret History' (§§10–

²²⁵ Boissonade (1817) 264–5 (*Ep.* 42, Holsten to Louis Elzevier, 15 May 1636). On Holsten in Rome: Rietbergen (2006) 256–95.

²²⁶ Mazzarino (1966) 104–5.

12), the difficulty of having Procopius appear to retract the calumnies of the *Anekdotia* in the *Buildings* written later (§13), the use of the work by later writers and how it was kept hidden (§§15–16). Then Eichel treats the religion of Procopius, namely, as a pagan devoted to auspices, oracles, fortune and spirits rather than a Christian heretic or sceptic (§§17–27), how and in what ways Procopius has exaggerated in the *Anekdotia* (§§28–39), Alemanni’s commentary and how he distorts testimony especially for papal history (§§40–50), and how Alemanni has treated other earlier scholars (§§51–55). The introduction concludes with a list of ‘elogia of the emperor Justinian’ from contemporary and later authors upon whom Eichel has drawn, as Alemanni had drawn on contemporary authors to bolster Procopius’ claims. Following all of that come the text and translation (105–91), not using chapters but numbering Procopian paragraphs from 1 to 571 (there being no chapter or other divisions in the manuscript, nor in Alemanni’s edition), and finally the detailed and separately paginated ‘animadversiones’ or reproaches (1–304), that is, in Eichel’s heading, ‘reproaches by which falsehoods reported against the emperor Justinian in many places in the *Anekdotia* of Procopius of Caesarea, which Alemanni wrongly calls the Secret History, are detected and refuted’ (1). Like Ryves, Eichel occasionally addresses Alemanni directly, employs extensive quotation and learning, concluding with a useful index. It is in the detail of this dense section that Eichel displays his knowledge of Roman law and legislation in arguing the case for Justinian, and against Procopius and his editor.

Eichel’s edition in turn provoked another distinguished German jurist and philosopher Christianus Thomasius (1655–1728), who planned a new edition of the *Secret History*, incorporating Alemanni’s and Eichel’s notes but identifying where they both erred.²²⁷ Other scholars were variously critical of the *Secret History* and many even doubted its authenticity. Within the thirty years between the edition of

²²⁷ Thomasius (1695) v. His planned work never eventuated.

Alemanni (1623), the riposte by Ryves (1626) and the more extensive critical introduction and notes by Eichel (1654), the *Secret History* had become the most intensely studied and commented on of any of Procopius' works. It had brought to the fore questions about the author and his disposition towards the Emperor Justinian, questions that would soon be extended to the *Wars* and *Buildings* too. Moreover, it opened up the central problem of identifying and defining the 'real' Procopius which has been a quest of Procopian scholarship ever since. Across different countries Ryves, Trivorijs, Eichel and Thomasius in particular were all distinguished lawyers and students of Roman law. The Justinian they knew best was the lawgiver and codifier, the model by which they evaluated what Procopius offered in his *Secret History*.

One of those newly complex questions was the personal belief and religious outlook of Procopius. Previously he had been considered a loyal and orthodox Christian supporter of emperor, court and church. Now the scholarly judgement had been made more complicated and controversial. Yet most of the critiques stimulated by Alemanni were more about Justinian than Procopius. They really did not advance understanding of the historian at all, except to identify that Procopius' patently disparate accounts had to have an explanation in terms of author, era or politics. That is why one of the first attempts to sum Procopius up, that by François de La Mothe le Vayer (1588–1642), doubted his authorship of the *Secret History* altogether, but focussed on his religious beliefs and sincerity.²²⁸ Another summation came from the great Leiden Greek professor Gerard Vossius (1577–1649), who in 1651 produced an amended and extended version of his pioneering volume on Greek historians, which was published posthumously. He was now able to make reference to Alemanni's edition of the *Secret History* and could add that the *Suda* had actually made extensive use of

²²⁸ Mothe le Vayer (1646) 166–91.

it across many of its entries.²²⁹ The original edition of Vossius' work had appeared at the same time as Alemanni's edition (1623), a time when the *Secret History* was considered the ninth book of the *Wars* (following the *Suda*) but was entirely lost ('ista perierunt, ut arbitror').²³⁰ Between 1623 and 1651 the world of Procopian scholarship had radically changed. What Vossius retained unchanged in the revised 1651 edition was his severe criticism of the 'totally inept' Christopher Persona's translation of the *Gothic War*, calling it a perversion rather than a translation ('si vertisse et non pervertisse dici is debet') because he left so much out and made up so much. Hoeschel, by contrast was an 'excellent man' ('egregius vir') and his edition of Procopius was all the more useful because it shows how the various Latin translations had differed so much from the full Greek text.²³¹

A separate response to Alemanni's *Secret History* was the quest to fill the gaps he deliberately left in the text, based on considerations of prudence and propriety. The easy way to fill these would be to consult the Vatican manuscript separately or some other manuscript of the *Secret History* which surely contained them, the only one then known being in Milan (*Amb. G. 14 sup.*). Before long, however, it emerged that copies of the lascivious sections were being circulated in scholarly circles although the time was not right for them to be incorporated into an actual edition of the *Secret History* for more than another two centuries (Orelli 1837). In 1627 Peiresc was making inquiries at Rome about the missing sections of the *Secret History* and was seeking to

²²⁹ Vossius (1651) 269. On Vossius: Sandys (1908) 308–9. Other additions made by Vossius to the section on Procopius were citations of Procopius by later writers such as Evagrius, Agathias, Photius and Nicephorus Callistus, plus an explanation that Procopius was an orthodox Christian, largely in response to Mothe le Vayer (1646).

²³⁰ Vossius (1624) 215.

²³¹ Vossius (1624) 270.

obtain a copy,²³² which was done by Pierre Dupuy in Paris and was gratefully received by Peiresc in February 1628.²³³ A week later he still had not had time to savour them,²³⁴ and by July 1628 he was still pursuing the critics of Alemanni's edition but found the new commentary of the short-lived François Guinet (1604–1632) rather inadequate.²³⁵

By April 1629 Peiresc was further advising Dupuy about the missing excerpt from the *Secret History*, but now others wanted a copy too. For instance, Peiresc learned that the English envoy's secretary Sir William Boswell was having fun with those Procopian supplements. The information came from the famous artist, antiquarian and diplomat Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640) who had been a fellow-student with Peiresc in Padua in 1600 and, like Peiresc, was possibly introduced to the *Secret History* by Pinelli at that time. Now Rubens told Peiresc that Boswell had promised to send him 'the different passages of the *Secret History* of Procopius touching the debauchery of Theodora which are missing in Alemanni's edition, having been suppressed through modesty and decency no doubt and which have been retrieved from a Vatican manuscript'.²³⁶ Peiresc then relayed Rubens' information to Paris.²³⁷ A few months later (January 1630), Rubens again asked Peiresc for a copy of the

²³² Letters of 11 July 1627 (*Ep.* 5 = Tamizey de Larroque (1888) 282); 13 August 1627 (*Ep.* 66 = Tamizey de Larroque (1888) 380); 19 September 1627 (*Ep.* 73 = Tamizey de Larroque (1888) 371).

²³³ Letter Peiresc to Dupuy, 26 February 1628 (*Ep.* 98 = Tamizey de Larroque (1888) 542).

²³⁴ Letter Peiresc to Dupuy, 4 March 1628 (*Ep.* 99 = Tamizey de Larroque (1888) 554).

²³⁵ Letter Peiresc to Dupuy, 28 July 1628 (*Ep.* 129 = Tamizey de Larroque (1888) 681), with reference to letter from Peiresc to Cardinal Barberini, on 20 June 1628 (Tamizey de Larroque (1889) 79). Guinet's work was entitled *Commentaire sur Justinien avec un discours sur l'étude de droit* (Paris 1628) (*non vidi*).

²³⁶ Letter Rubens to Peiresc, August 16 (*Ep.* 616, in Ruelens (1907) 152). For background: Jaffé (1989).

²³⁷ Letter Peiresc to Dupuy, 2 September 1629 (*Ep.* 36 = Tamizey de Larroque (1890) 175 with Rubens quoted at 176 n. 1).

Procopian passages that he presumes Dupuy could copy for him.²³⁸

Meanwhile, another copy of the missing excerpts had been undertaken by Isaac Vossius (1618-1689) for Adrian Beverland (1650-1716), who had accompanied Isaac to England as his secretary. Isaac was the son of Gerard and also educated at Leiden, especially by his father. In a letter to Nicolaas Heinsius (1620-81), another Leiden contemporary and son of Daniel Heinsius who was responsible for the new Elzevier edition of Procopius at precisely that time, Nicholas says that 'Vossius gave me the fragment of Procopius about the infamous licentiousness of Theodora, which Alemanni did not dare to publish.'²³⁹ Beverland too was educated at Leiden but his main interest was collecting and cataloguing pornography, so Theodora's story obviously appealed to him. Yet another copy came into the possession of La Mothe le Vayer by 1646,²⁴⁰ although it was not until 1693 that these supplementary passages which had been circulating among scholars for their personal amusement actually came to be published. This was accomplished by another learned French scholar and litterateur, Gilles Ménage (1612-1692), who made his own copy of the missing sections of the *Secret History* directly from the Vatican manuscript. They were published in his *Menagi-*

²³⁸ Letter Peiresc to Dupuy, 17 January 1630 (*Ep.* 42 = Tamizey de Larroque (1890) 223). Rubens' letter does not survive, so Peiresc's is printed in his correspondence instead (Ruelens (1907) 266-7).

²³⁹ Bodleian, MS *D'Orville* 480 p. 8. On his death Beverland's library was bought in whole by the Earl of Sunderland (Charles Spencer) at Althorp, who a decade earlier already had what was described as the 'finest library in Europe'. Later his library was relocated to Blenheim, then dispersed. It is possible that the British Library's Procopian fragment (*Sloane* 1144, item 1) was actually that previously in Beverland's library and which somehow turned up in Sloane's collection.

²⁴⁰ Mothe le Vayer (1646) 178 with Bullard (2009) 32-4.

ana, where he claimed that no real case could now be made for excluding them.²⁴¹

9. Incomplete Improvements: Heinsius and Grotius

Notwithstanding the ongoing objections, Alemanni's edition of the *Secret History* marked a watershed in the study and interpretation of Procopius. Not only did it turn attention to the author and his relationship to his emperor Justinian and his employer Belisarius, but the quality of Alemanni's editorial accomplishment also highlighted the inadequate state of current editions of Procopius' other works (*Wars* and *Buildings*). Perhaps another consequence was to sharpen the realisation that Rome, at least the Vatican library, was a source of important manuscripts at a time when the comparison of manuscripts was becoming more imperative than finding a single adequate one, even though that is more or less what Alemanni had done. For whatever reason, the projected edition of Procopius by Vulcanius which had so frustrated Scaliger and which had fallen to Daniel Heinsius long before Vulcanius' death in 1614, suddenly came to life again at Leiden. Whether this was the initiative of the publisher (Bonaventure Elzevier and his nephew Abraham) or the editor (Heinsius) is a moot point.

As always, Peiresc at Aix-en-Provence was well informed about Procopius everywhere and activities at Leiden in particular. He was now a sort of nerve-centre in the 'republic of letters' linking Rome, Paris and Leiden, and his many letters to the brothers Dupuy in Paris are particularly informative on progress with plans for new editions of Procopius. By September 1627 a project was afoot in Paris to collect and publish from the known manuscripts the material additional to what had already been published,

²⁴¹ Monnoye (1715) 347–51. Ménage's copy of the extract may be that contained in the 18th century manuscript *Florentinus Magliabecchianus gr.* XXIII.6.88 (Haury (1913) 19).

that is in Hoeschel's edition of the *Wars*. Lucas Holsten at Rome considered it more profitable to actually collate, or send, whole manuscripts to Heinsius, the only declared editor of Procopius at that time.²⁴² The brothers Dupuy agreed.²⁴³ Even so, Peiresc told them they should write to Holsten to get him to mark on a copy of Hoeschel's edition the variations and additions to be found in the Roman manuscripts.²⁴⁴ While the Dupuy brothers thought this was a sound idea, they were not confident that Holsten, whom they knew from his recent Paris sojourn, would have time to provide such a service. It had been difficult enough to get anyone interested in collating the local Parisian manuscripts.²⁴⁵ Before long Holsten was at work, but Peiresc thought he was under the wrong impression that he was just looking for the supplements to the *Secret History* and not the *Wars* too,²⁴⁶ although at least the omitted parts of the *Secret History* were now with Peiresc.²⁴⁷

From 1628 to 1634 there followed another hiatus in activity. Responding to the *Secret History* was possibly taking precedence. Yet the publishers Bonaventura Elzevier and his nephew Abraham in Leiden were pressing on with the Procopius edition once more. By 1634 in Rome Holsten was

²⁴² Letter Peiresc to Dupuy, 18 September 1627 (*Ep.* 72 = Tamizey de Larroque (1888) 356).

²⁴³ Letter Dupuy to Peiresc, 5 October 1627 (*App.* 30 in Tamizey de Larroque (1892) 866).

²⁴⁴ Letter Peiresc to Dupuy, 16 November 1627 (*Ep.* 79 = Tamizey de Larroque (1888) 420–1). He then advised Holsten accordingly: Letter Peiresc to Holsten, 25 November 1627 (*Ep.* 3, Tamizey de Larroque (1894) 249).

²⁴⁵ Letter P. Dupuy to Peiresc, 27 December 1627, *App.* 40 in Tamizey de Larroque (1892) 891–4). Dupuy noted that Nicholas Rigault (1587–1644) had already profitably collated some pages of the Procopian manuscript in the Royal Library of Louis XIII where he presided. This was possibly Catherine de Medici's manuscript (*Par. Gr.* 1699).

²⁴⁶ Letter Peiresc to Dupuy, 8 January 1628 (*Ep.* 87 = Tamizey de Larroque (1888) 485).

²⁴⁷ Letter Peiresc to Dupuy, 26 February 1628 (*Ep.* 98 = Tamizey de Larroque (1888) 542).

responding to their request for a collation of the local manuscripts of the *Wars*,²⁴⁸ while they had despatched young Louis Elzevier to examine the Vatican manuscripts of the *Wars* for Heinsius and, precisely as the Dupuy brothers had proposed from Paris, noting variations in a copy of Hoeschel's edition (1607), including several large lacunae. The quest was to produce an edition of at least the *Wars* that improved on Hoeschel. At the same time (April 1636) it now became clear that Heinsius' edition would also include the *Secret History*.²⁴⁹ Heinsius and his Roman emissary were therefore advised that a better manuscript than the Vatican one used by Alemanni was to be found in the Ambrosian library in Milan (originally belonging to Pinelli) and that yet another manuscript, which was once part of Cardinal d'Armagnac's library, could be sourced from Peiresc.²⁵⁰ It was Holsten who then obtained a copy of the Ambrosian manuscript and forwarded it to the Elzeviers.²⁵¹ As noted above, he had earlier written to Louis Elzevier to remind him of the religious sensitivities involved in any edition of the *Secret History* in particular (May 1636).²⁵² Later

²⁴⁸ Letter Holsten to Dormalius, 9 December 1634 (*Ep.* 105 in Boissonade (1817) 486).

²⁴⁹ Letter Holsten to Peiresc, 30 April 1636 (*Ep.* 108 = Boissonade (1817) 492).

²⁵⁰ Letter Holsten to L. Elzevier, 13 May 1636 (*Ep.* 42 = Boissonade (1817) 263–4). The only known Procopian manuscript in d'Armagnac's possession at any time was one of the *Buildings* and *Secret History* (*Par. Coisl.* 132). Otherwise, this may be a reference to Catherine de Medici's manuscript of the *Wars* (*Par. Gr.* 1699), cf. Haury (1896) 145.

²⁵¹ Letter Holsten, 6 September 1636 (*Ep.* 43 = Boissonade (1817) 273). This was probably *Amb. Gr.* 14 *sup.* (14th century), originally owned by Pinelli and thought to be lost by Alemanni.

²⁵² Letter Holsten to L. Elzevier, 13 May 1636 (*Ep.* 42 = Boissonade (1817) 262–7). Holsten evidently provided a copy to Peiresc (Peiresc to Holsten, 2 October 1636 (*Ep.* 60, Tamizey de Larroque (1894) 457) who assured him that it was the same manuscript which Pinelli once had in Padua and from which he now took the two passages that Alemanni had deliberately omitted on the licentious jauntiness of that 'infamous princess' (Theodora).

in the year, the Dupuy brothers with their dominant knowledge of Parisian library holdings were looking to Leiden for the new edition, offering any kind of help required.²⁵³ Silence was the only response from Leiden.

No wonder Peiresc was driven to despair. He had been interested in Procopius and engaging with manuscripts of his works since a student at Padua with Pinelli in 1600, and at Leiden where he first met Vulcanius, Scaliger, and Grotius, but not Heinsius, who was absent at the time. Still, he had since then supported Heinsius' edition. Moreover, he had studiously avoided getting entangled in competing ventures such as that of Schottus in 1620, although it came to nothing. Finally, on 2 October 1636 Peiresc poured out his frustration to Holsten: 'I don't know that I'll live long enough to wait for [the projected Elzevier edition], it being already 30 good years since Mr Heinsius promised this edition without having shown anything'.²⁵⁴ It was an understandable frustration because by 1636 Heinsius was preoccupied elsewhere and feuding with Claude Saumaise or Salmasius (1588–1623). In addition, like his mentor Vulcanius, Heinsius had a drinking problem which seriously impeded his work. In fact, the imbibing habits of Dutch scholars at Leiden had always proved uncomfortable for Scaliger with his more refined French lifestyle.²⁵⁵ They may equally have disconcerted his French successor, Saumaise.

Meanwhile, Holsten was approached by another former student of Scaliger at Leiden, who was also engaged in improving Hoeschel's published text of Procopius' *Wars*. This was Hugo Grotius (1583–1645) also then at Paris. A prodigious and prolific scholar, Grotius demonstrated from an early age a level of philological mastery that attracted the

²⁵³ 25 November 1636 (*Ep.* 170 = Boissonade (1817) 608–9).

²⁵⁴ Letter Peiresc to Holsten, 2 October 1636 (*Ep.* 60 = Tamizey de Larroque (1894) 457).

²⁵⁵ Grafton (1988) 126; Nellen (2015) 502–6.

interest of Scaliger.²⁵⁶ Completing his doctorate in France at age 15, the next year he executed an edition of Martianus Capella's complex *Marriage of Philology and Mercury*. Grotius had always been aware of Procopius from the contemporary endeavours of Scaliger, Vulcanius, Hoeschel, Heinsius, and others which he witnessed at Leiden, but most of his life's work since then had been concentrated on legal rules of war and peace, along with the formulation of the doctrine of natural justice. In his later years Grotius was ensconced in Hamburg and Paris, at one stage as ambassador to France for the Swedish monarchy. Along the way he had coolly exchanged his Dutch citizenship for Swedish. In fact, there had long been close ties between Leiden scholars and the Swedish court. Heinsius himself had accepted from Gustavus Adolphus (1594–1632) in 1618 a commission to write up the emperor's deeds as 'royal historiographer' although he never carried it through.²⁵⁷ Rather, Grotius' great legal and historical acumen were harnessed to buttress the case for the Gothic antiquity of the Swedish nation. The extant historical sources were also being construed to tell a story of Gothic greatness and for Grotius that story included a passage of Procopius on the origins of the Goths in his *Wars*, yet in all the versions to date it had been suppressed or ignored. Grotius insisted on resurrecting it. Now working in Paris, Grotius was essentially interested in producing a new Latin translation of the books covering the Gothic and Vandal Wars, but based on the best possible understanding of the text. He was keen to identify the best manuscripts, particularly to ensure that gaps in the current Hoeschel edition could be covered. Dismissing the previous published translations of Persona (1506) and Maffei (1509) as totally inadequate, he produced fresh translations of his own. Vulcanius had earlier done so

²⁵⁶ Basic details in Sandys (1908) 315–19. Scaliger's cultivation of the teenage Grotius shows he was a 'discerning talent-spotter' (Grafton (1993*a*) 390).

²⁵⁷ Sellin (1968) 52–60.

too, but his translation would now need to be revised in the light of Hoeschel's text and later manuscript discoveries.

Peiresc may have been despairing about Heinsius and his edition, but he knew by now that Grotius was also working on improving at least part of the text of Procopius. By 8 April 1636 Grotius had translated afresh *Wars*, Books 1–4 (from Hoeschel) 'in honour of the nation which adopted me', so he told Peiresc.²⁵⁸ He then continued to press on, writing a significant letter on 18 August 1636 to the Swedish lord high chancellor Axel Oxenstiern, telling him that the modern expansionist Sweden based on the military exploits of the late Gustavus Adolphus is not properly understood elsewhere, and that this has driven him back to elucidating the Swedish past as the homeland of the Gothic nation. 'Of all the Ancients', Grotius writes, 'Procopius has best handled the History of the Goths and Vandals: he was an able man, was secretary to Belisarius, had been on the spot, and speaks not only of what happened in his own time, but also of the facts which happened before his time.' Then Grotius proceeds to explain his approach to the text of Procopius, and why it had been necessary to produce a new translation: 'The Latin version [of *Persona*] is very faulty, imperfect and inelegant. I have made a new translation from the Greek edition of Hoeschel; with the assistance of two manuscripts in the King's library [unspecified, perhaps *Par. Gr.* 1700, 1701], which enabled me to make several corrections in the text; others I made by conjecture'. Next he explains that he has been advised to 'extract all that has relation to this subject from the *Secret History* of Procopius printed by Alemanni [Lyons 1623], and from Agathias. Since I understand', he continues, 'that the manuscript of the history of the Goths and Vandals in the Vatican library [probably *Vat. Gr.* 152] was more complete than what Hoeschel followed, I have asked my friends at Rome to fill up the gaps in the printed copies, which I hope they will

²⁵⁸ Letter Grotius to Peiresc, 8 April 1636 (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 572, 225).

do'.²⁵⁹ This was a reference to Holsten principally. Other relevant texts (e.g. Jordanes) are then listed as part of Grotius' enterprise, along with a request for relevant inscriptions and laws to round out the picture. He concludes by entreating the Chancellor to accept his assurances that he will do everything 'not only to procure the advancement of Sweden but also to contribute to her glory'. As previous generations had done, Grotius' appropriation of Procopius for contemporary purposes was absolutely clear.

Holsten, meanwhile, had been asked by Grotius to act as guide to the 'ruins of ancient Rome and the splendour of modern Rome' for two friends, a Swedish official named Schmalchius and his own cousin Reygersbergius.²⁶⁰ In the same letter Grotius explained, but in more detail, the same approach to Procopius which he had outlined to Oxenstiern: 'I have translated the Gothic and Vandal wars of Procopius from the Greek edition of the distinguished Hoeschel. I have compared it with two manuscripts from the royal French library, one of which [either *Par. Gr.* 1700 or 1703] I notice was used by Hoeschel. Partly from them and partly from my own ability, as usual, I have corrected many things overlooked by Hoeschel in his haste'. Grotius says further that the gaps in the Hoeschel edition have needed filling in. They existed not only in the Latin translation of Persona, but were also evident in the manuscripts used by Hoeschel. He then says he has sent a list of these gaps to 'our common friend' Peiresc to get him to ask you [Holsten] to fill them in, adding the advice that the Dupuy brothers in Paris have told him that the Elzeviers are publishing a supplement to Hoeschel's edition covering the missing parts identifiable in the Vatican manuscripts. 'I

²⁵⁹ Letter Grotius to Oxenstiern, 18 August 1636 (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 641, 259). With similar sentiments later in the year to G. Vossius, 12 December 1636 (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 692, 285), and to his brother William the same day (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 864, 383).

²⁶⁰ Letter Grotius to Holsten, 10 September 1636 (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 645, 263).

am not envious', says Grotius, 'and will wait for their edition if it is not delayed too long'. He concludes the letter by leaving it to Holsten's judgement whether it is worth his while to check the manuscripts on Grotius' behalf or whether to advise him that it would be redundant in the light of the Elzevier edition.

Within weeks, Grotius' cousin was in Rome busily collating manuscripts on his behalf, presumably under the watchful eye of Holsten.²⁶¹ Noting Grotius' earlier advice, Holsten now found himself collating the same Vatican manuscripts of Procopius for two separate scholars educated at Scaliger's Leiden, Heinsius and Grotius. Somehow they had to be co-ordinated. So he suggested to Peiresc, who perhaps had the most extensive knowledge of the habits and intentions of both Heinsius and Grotius, that Grotius should be persuaded to also complete translations of the *Persian Wars* and the *Buildings*.²⁶² Thereby the new Elzevier edition of Heinsius could include a contemporary translation of all the works by the same author, Grotius, rather than rely on the outdated version of Vulcanius which Heinsius was intending to use alongside the Greek original. Whether a joint Heinsius/Grotius edition and translation was ever possible was not the prime concern of Grotius at this point. While he wanted to provide the most scholarly and reliable translation of the Gothic and Vandal Wars, his interest in them was strictly as a source for ancient Swedish history.

When, over a year later (October 1637), the expected invitation came from the Elzeviers to send his translation to them, Grotius sought advice first of all from his brother William, who was closer to hand in Holland.²⁶³ Leaving nothing to chance, the Elzeviers asked the distinguished

²⁶¹ Letter Holsten to Peiresc, 4 December 1636 (*Ep.* 44 = Boissonade (1817) 279).

²⁶² Letter Holsten to Grotius, 30 November 1636 (*Ep.* 44 = Boissonade (1817) 279).

²⁶³ Letter Hugo Grotius to William Grotius, 16 October 1637 (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 872, 410); similar report in letter to G. Vossius, 10 November 1637 (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 859, 377),

Leiden professor, Saumaise, a former protégée of Casaubon and Scaliger's eventual successor, to petition Grotius, which he did (13 October 1637).²⁶⁴ It is interesting that Saumaise was prepared to co-operate because he had become seriously estranged from Heinsius, not only because he was originally preferred over Heinsius for what had been Scaliger's position, but also because of their differing views of the *New Testament* which Heinsius was editing in the 1620s and early 1630s. In fact, as university librarian, Heinsius went so far as to ban Saumaise from the library and refuse him access to books. Now Saumaise was effectively advocating on Heinsius' behalf with Grotius, telling him that the Elzeviers 'publishers known to you have recently approached me and asked that I write to you concerning the translation of Procopius they hear you have prepared for publication'. He then adds that 'Since they are on the cusp of publishing the entire works of Procopius in Greek themselves, supplemented in many places by a collation of manuscripts from the Vatican library, they consider, and deservedly so, that their edition will be crippled to a certain extent without your translation ...'. 'Since they are aware of our friendship', Saumaise continues, 'they have entrusted me with the task of disturbing and imploring you' to consider offering them the Procopian translation. A further fillip offered to Grotius is that 'such an excellent translation' will be displayed in the Elzevier typefaces 'which surpass all others in their elegance'.²⁶⁵

Grotius was not tempted. In reply, he explained to Saumaise that while the Elzeviers might be right to flatter him, 'my work has not yet reached a publishable point'. The Elzeviers, so Grotius says, are desirous of a good Greek text and Latin translation from the learned Greek scholar Vulcanius whom 'the great Scaliger has often readily

²⁶⁴ On Saumaise: Sandys (1908) 285–6.

²⁶⁵ Letter, Saumaise to Grotius, 17 October 1637 (Saumaise (1656) *Ep.* 1, 267). For the tense and jealous relationships between Saumaise, Heinsius, and Grotius, of which the Procopius edition became part, see Nellen (2015) 506–17.

attested and I most earnestly endorse' because he was always helpful. He then notes that his own agreed volume is concentrated on enlightening the antiquities of the Goths and related nations, and he is committed to highlighting how Scandinavia is 'the parent of the Goths'. Grotius advises Saumaise that he supports the Elzeviers' project and that he will 'move mine slowly forward through various tasks and God willing bring it to a conclusion one day'.²⁶⁶ The Swedish chancellor Oxenstiern already had a copy of Grotius' translation, as well as the preface,²⁶⁷ and now received another letter setting out the current situation: 'The Elzeviers, publishers at Leiden, are preparing a new edition of Procopius from the version of Vulcanius which D. Hensius is said to be correcting. They want to have my translation. But I have not translated the Persian Wars nor the *Buildings* of Justinian, since I intend only to do the Gothic and Vandal wars of Procopius'.²⁶⁸

While that was the end of the matter for Grotius, he remained curious about the Elzeviers' plans, even if he was never really sure of progress on the edition. A year later, for example, Grotius was obliged to seek advice from his brother again, repeating the request month after month: 'if you have any knowledge of the edition of Procopius ... pray tell me'²⁶⁹. Another year passed and by now (8 October

²⁶⁶ Letter Grotius to Saumaise, 21 October 1637 (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 854, 375).

²⁶⁷ Letter Grotius to Oxenstiern, 14 June 1637 (Grotius 1687: *Ep.* 869, 402), with another updated report to Oxenstiern on 2 September 1637 (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 825, 360).

²⁶⁸ Letter Grotius to Oxenstiern, 5 December 1637 (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 873, p. 384). Peiresc had been similarly informed months earlier: letter Grotius to Peiresc 8 April 1637 (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 737, p. 314). This was the response he told Holsten he was awaiting (Letter Peiresc to Holsten, 9 April 1637, (*Ep.* 63, Tamizey de Larroque (1894) 469).

²⁶⁹ Letter H. Grotius to W. Grotius 16 October 1638 (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 880, 439). Repeated in another letter to his brother William on 13 November 1638 (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 880, 441): 'I want to know when the Elzeviers are bringing out the Procopius edition', and again on 4 December 1638 (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 881, 444).

1639) Grotius was on the lookout for the ‘Leiden Procopius’, sensing it must be close, as Saumaise had also stated in 1637.²⁷⁰ Presumably they would continue to use the translation of Vulcanius (amended by Heinsius) for the *Wars*, 1–2 (Persian wars) and *Buildings*, utilising a local copy (*Scal.* 9). Yet, another two years on, Grotius is uncertain what has happened to his own edition as well. He has also developed doubts now about the quality of the Leiden version, if it were to be based on that of Vulcanius. Without even seeing it, Grotius had concluded that Vulcanius’ translation must be virtually useless and riddled with mistakes. The reason for his confidence was that he himself had to make no fewer than 600 corrections to Hoeschel’s text on the basis of the Paris manuscript alone, while other huge gaps had to be filled in from the Vatican manuscript, thereby drawing attention to the diligence of his own translation.²⁷¹ Doubtless Grotius discussed some of his emendations with Saumaise when he showed him the manuscript of his work in Paris late in 1640.²⁷²

The silence from Leiden persisted. The Elzeviers may have given up on Heinsius too, and their potential solution in Grotius had come to nothing. Some were starting to accuse the publishers of being dilatory, others considered them distracted by other priorities more potentially lucrative than an edition of Procopius. Then Jacques Dupuy wrote to Holsten (1642) that the Milan manuscript of the *Secret History* he arranged to send the Elzeviers some six years earlier had not seriously been worked on.²⁷³ Yet another five years on (1647), Holsten must have been wondering what had become of all his efforts in assisting the work of both Heinsius and Grotius on Procopius, now more than a decade ago. There was no sign of any edition or

²⁷⁰ Letter H. Grotius to W. Grotius (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 1255, 570).

²⁷¹ Letter Grotius to Mylonas, 7 September 1641 (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 1517, 688).

²⁷² Leroy (1983) 127–9; Nellen (2015) 691.

²⁷³ J. Dupuy to Holsten, 13 June 1642 (*Ep.* 6 = Pélissier (1887) 96–8).

translation from either of them. Grotius was now in his grave, while Heinsius was an embittered defunct scholar. It is no surprise that Holsten was receptive to the idea that a projected new Paris collection of the Byzantine historians might include Procopius, if only a reprint of the new Heinsius edition.²⁷⁴ When contacted about the idea, Holsten readily concurred, only to be advised within a few months that Procopius would have to wait for another day. There were more urgent priorities for the Paris collection.²⁷⁵

Grotius was working in 1644 on the indices to his volume.²⁷⁶ On his death a few months later the great tome lay complete, but was not published for another decade (1655), actually by Elzevier at Amsterdam, where it went by the full title of *Historia Gotthorum, Vandalorum et Langobardorum. Procopii Vandalica et Gothica Emendata plurimis locis: accedentibus supplementis e manuscriptis: et sic versa Latine Excerpta ex arcana Procopii historia ad res vandalicas et gothicas pertinentia*. What the literary public then saw was that Grotius provided a full translation of the Vandal wars (Books 3–4) and the Gothic war (Books 5–8), but without specifying the Greek manuscripts he had used. Nor are they divided into chapter and sections numbers, just book and page numbers. They were followed by the extract from the *Secret History* (at 519–28) designed to throw light on the history of the Goths in particular. Next came Agathias (529–73) and a reprint of Vulcanius' edition of Jordanes' *Getica* (607–703) and Isidore of Seville's *Gothic History* (704–40). The latter part was a fuller version taken from the library of Isaac Vossius who had come to Sweden as Royal Librarian after Grotius's death. Then came Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum* published by keeping faith with the relevant manuscripts. Lastly, there was Procopius' continuator Agathias (574–604)

²⁷⁴ Letter J. Dupuy to Holsten, 26 July 1647 (*Ep.* 10 = Pélissier (1887) 110–112). Holsten's reply to this letter is lost.

²⁷⁵ Letter J. Dupuy to Holsten, 11 October 1647 (*Ep.* 11 = Pélissier (1887) 113).

²⁷⁶ Letter Grotius to I. Vossius, 12 November 1644 (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 1698, 733).

and an index of Gothic, Vandal and Lombard names and objects.

As Grotius had explained to his Swedish master years earlier, the preface was long but necessary. There were two particular reasons for doing so: (1) his Leiden contemporary and fellow-pupil of Scaliger, Philip Cluverius (1580–1622), had remained in Leiden and gone on to publish pioneering works on ancient geography in which he discussed the ancient origins of the modern Dutch and Germans, but Grotius considered these inadequate. Through either envy or bribery, Cluverius had derided the Swedes to the advantage of the Danes, and located the origin of the Goths in his native Danzig; (2) too much attention is paid to self-serving local accounts, whereas Cluverius had himself gathered external sources to argue the same point about national antiquity. The evidence now marshalled would lay these falsehoods to rest.²⁷⁷ The stupendous learning on display in Cluverius's *Germania Antiqua* (1616) included extensive use of Procopius' *Wars*, generally quoting him in Greek (with his own Latin translation) from Hoeschel's edition.²⁷⁸ Since Peutinger's *editio princeps* of Jordanes' *Getica* in 1515, Jordanes had been used to establish the ethnic priority of the Goths, which enhanced the place of Sweden in relation to the Germans and the Holy Roman Empire. Now Procopius was added to Jordanes to prove that Sweden could be construed as the progenitor of the Goths and other tribes. It therefore deserved pride of place in the European tradition. This was a singular discovery of modern scholarship on the late antique texts including

²⁷⁷ Grotius to Oxenstiern, undated (Grotius (1687) *Ep.* 780, p. 334), cf. Krebs (2011) 136–41

²⁷⁸ Cited in Cluverius (1616) 1.14 (p. 118); 1.17 (152); 1.19 (169); 1.20 (180); 1.28 (243); 1.31 (252); 1.31 (262); 1.34 (286); 1.35 (291); 1.35 (293); 1.35 (300); 1.35 (306); 1.40 (327); 1.44 (357); 1.44 (361); 1.53 (395); 1.53 (396); 2.36 (177); 3.26 (103); 3.27 (106); 3.34 (129); 3.35 (143); 3.38 (162); 3.39 (163); 3.39 (167); 3.40 (170); 3.41 (175); 3.44 (194).

Procopius, whose value as an essential source for Goths and Vandals was also enhanced.²⁷⁹

By the 1630s, in however inadequate a form, all Procopius' works including the *Secret History* were now available for use by scholars such as Paganino Gaudenzi (1595–1649).²⁸⁰ Born into a prominent Calvinist family, Gaudenzi was educated in law and theology at Basel, Ratisbon and Tübingen, whereupon he returned home as a pastor. An unpopular conversion to Catholicism saw him exiled to Rome, where he acquired papal and Jesuit patronage. As a writer and polemicist, especially given his command of eastern languages and patristic writings, Gaudenzi produced an enormous number of works on theology, ritual and history. His erudition extended to Procopius. In his unpublished *De Procopii palinodia* he attacked the credibility of the *Secret History*, suggesting it should never have been published,²⁸¹ but he did use it in another work on customs and practices in the reign of Justinian, *Liber de Iustinianaei seculi moribus nonnullis*. This work, published in Italy (Florence 1637) and then in Germany (Strasbourg 1654) consists of a series of short discussions on particular questions that the author formulates for the reign of Justinian and proceeds to answer mainly with reference to Roman law. Typical are 'Were Christian dead buried in the ground in the time of Justinian?' (chap. 1.26, 34); 'It was not customary for Roman pontiffs to attend church councils in Greece' (chap. 2.2, 60); 'Was power divided between Justinian and Theodora?' (chap. 2.9, 69); 'Did the senate of Rome or Constantinople have greater authority in Justinian's time?' (chap. 2.13, 74); 'Could Christians teach philosophy in

²⁷⁹ Mengelkoch (2012); Neville (2009) 213–34. For a modern critique: Goffart (2006) 56–72.

²⁸⁰ Brunelli (1999).

²⁸¹ The hand-written manuscript survives only as an autograph version in the Vatican library (*Urb. lat.* 1546) with content details in Stornajolo (1912) 415. It is available online (http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Urb.lat.1546) and might be worth deciphering.

schools in Justinian's day?' (chap. 2.26, 89). In dealing with the circus factions, however, Gaudenzi also drew on Procopius' *Secret History* (with due reservation concerning its credibility) to illustrate how Justinian dealt with the accusation that he was blindly promoting pagan practices.²⁸²

In summary, by 1655 when Daniel Heinsius died with his long-anticipated edition of Procopius still unpublished, there was a Greek edition of the *Wars* and *Buildings* (Hoeschel, 1607), plus a separate one of the *Secret History* (Alemanni, 1623). The *Wars* remained unsatisfactory because soon after Hoeschel's edition it was realised that better manuscripts were available than the ones he had used. In the end, however, Heinsius' edition never appeared, while Grotius did not produce a new edition either. His interests primarily lay elsewhere, although in the course of producing his Latin translations he made hundreds of emendations in the text, marked in his copy of Hoeschel but not utilised until the edition of Dindorf (1833). His translations were now the most reliable guide to Procopius *Wars*, Books 3–8 (Vandals and Goths). There were also now known to be other manuscripts of the *Secret History* which potentially might lead to a better edition than that of Alemanni and they had been collated, probably by Alemanni himself, in preparation for an updated edition. In 1681 there were two copies of Alemanni's edition of the *Secret History* in the Barberini library at Rome and both of them were annotated, which presumably was the result of using other manuscripts.²⁸³ As for the *Buildings*, it was continuing to fall between the editorial cracks. Neither Vulcanius' projected new edition based on a fuller manuscript than that used by Hoeschel, nor its presumed later version by Heinsius, ever appeared. Nor does the

²⁸² Gaudenzi (1654) 104–5 (chaps. 2.35 and 2.36). The only other occasion Gaudenzi cites Procopius (*Secret History* again) is 59–60 (chap. 2.1), where he takes up matters of religious policy.

²⁸³ Both may have been the work of Alemanni himself in 1623–1626 (*Indicis Bibliothecae Barbarinae. Tomus secundus* (Rome 1681) 249: 'in utroque exemplari adsunt varia Addit. mss. eiusdem Alemanni').

Buildings ever feature in the diverse correspondence which touches on Heinsius' endeavours. Grotius had no interest in the *Buildings* either. The relationship between the longer and shorter versions remained unaddressed. Still, over the years from c. 1600 to 1650 the publishing house of the Elzeviers had acquired the most up-to-date materials for an edition of Procopius. With no Heinsius or Grotius any more, there is no sign they knew what to do with it all. There was a danger that half a century of expectations and efforts at Leiden, inspired originally by the philological giants Scaliger and Casaubon, would be suddenly eclipsed by a new edition of Procopius at Paris.

10. The Louvre Corpus and Maltretus' Edition (1662/3)

Scaliger, Vulcanius, Hoeschel, Heinsius, and Grotius were all Protestants at a time when editing secular classical texts was prized, but by 1650 the bright scholarly star of Leiden was on the wane. By contrast, in the aftermath of the Council of Trent (1563) Catholic scholars began to emphasise the continuity and similarity of the Catholic and eastern Orthodox traditions. This provided new impetus to the study of the church fathers and early church history in general, leading to many new editions of patristic and later Greek texts.²⁸⁴ Foremost among the new generation of Greek scholars were French Jesuits, who played a central role in the first truly organised and supported project to produce a set of Byzantine texts, namely the so-called Louvre collection, the *Corpus byzantinae historiae*. At the court of Louis XIV (1638–1715) and earlier there emerged the idea of producing a series of volumes incorporating all the major historical texts required for the study of Byzantine civilisation, and it was executed by the Jesuits of the institution called (until 1682) Clermont College in Paris. Louis' cultured courtier Jean Baptiste Colbert (1619–1683),

²⁸⁴ Pertusi (1967) 68–76, cf. Dindorf (1838) XXXIII.

who possessed one of the largest private libraries at the time, entrusted the overall direction to Philippe Labbé, SJ (1607–1674), a renowned authority on historical, geographical and philological questions. Between 1648 and 1711, a total of 24 volumes appeared. The classically educated Jesuits were natural conscripts and were adept in securing distinguished dedicatees.²⁸⁵

Among the planned volumes was Procopius. In his prospectus for the project (1648) Labbé cited the current editions (Hoeschel, Alemanni) and translations (Persona, Maffei), but invited anyone who felt they could contribute a new Greek text, a new translation or additional notes, to write to him at Paris as soon as possible. He then went on to explain that (1) the Royal library has a manuscript of the *Buildings* (*Par. Gr.* 1941) and four of the *Wars* (*Par. Gr.* 1699, 1700, 1702, 1703) which, so he has heard, have been translated by Grotius (remembering Grotius' translation had not yet appeared); (2) there is a manuscript of the *Buildings* in the library of Cardinal Mazarin (1602–1661) which its librarian Gabriel Naudé (1600–1653)²⁸⁶ assures can be made available to anyone wanting to compare it with the Basel text (Beatus, 1531) or other editions (Hoeschel, 1607); (3) only 'a few days ago' Pierre Séguier (1588–1672), who was chancellor to Louis XIV, sent from the library of the Archbishop of Toulouse a lovely copy of a manuscript of the *Buildings* (*Par. Coisl.* 132) to be compared to the one in the Royal library. Finally, Labbé adds, more or less triumphantly, while working through these issues 'I was informed by letter from Toulouse' that Reverend Father Maltret, SJ (Claudius Maltretus, 1621–1674), was already devoting his heart and learning to a fresh edition of all of Procopius' works except for the *Secret History*.²⁸⁷

²⁸⁵ Pertusi (1967) 82–93.

²⁸⁶ Unless the library holdings were more complete then, either Naudé or Labbé was mistaken here. The only manuscript in the Mazarin library (*Bibl. Maz.* 4462, 15th century) is of the *Wars*, not *Buildings*.

²⁸⁷ Labbé (1648) 7–8.

As noted above, in 1647 it was being considered by some that a practical option would be to take into the new Louvre Byzantine series the latest and best edition of Procopius, namely the still unpublished one by Heinsius, now with the Elzeviers at Leiden, rather than duplicate it.²⁸⁸ As the years passed without publication, especially after Heinsius' death in 1655, this possibility receded. Labbé makes no mention of any such option but indicates in 1648 that the new edition of Procopius was being undertaken by a Jesuit teacher and scholar at Toulouse, Claude de Maltret. His edition was dedicated to Séguier who, like Colbert, had always been a serious collector of Greek manuscripts throughout the East. His personal library was outranked only by that of the king and later became part of the French National Library as the Coislin collection, which boasted a manuscript (*Par. Coislin.* 132) of Procopius' *Secret History* and *Buildings* at one stage owned by Cardinal d'Armagnac. Séguier had often had literary works dedicated to him. Not only was it a mark of honour for author and dedicatee but doubtless also an important step in bringing the work to the notice of the literary public.

Maltretus knew that in dedicating his *Procopius* to Séguier he could call on no higher patronage, complimenting him accordingly. Further, in his authorial preface ('Lectori') Maltretus explains the background to his *Procopius*, deferring to the subsequent volume details of the sixth-century historian and his immediate background to be found in Alemanni's preamble. He offers no separate discussion himself of Procopius as historian or writer. Instead, he lays out the sad story to date of Procopian studies, especially the inadequacy of the early translations plus the failures of Vulcanius and then Heinsius to produce a Greek text. This is the gap he sets out to fill, leaving aside the *Secret History*, which Alemanni has done well. Maltretus then goes on to say that he has followed Philippe Labbé's further advice and

²⁸⁸ Proposed in letter from Dupuy to Holsten, 11 October 1647 (printed in Pelissier (1887) 111).

hence Procopius' works are neatly divided for the first time into chapters but not paragraphs. As Heinsius and Grotius had emphasised, Hoeschel's edition has so many and such large gaps as to be superseded, amounting to half a book by Maltretus' calculation. Now there are only a few gaps remaining, so he claimed. Also like Heinsius and Grotius, Maltretus resorted to the assistance of Holsten for the Vatican manuscripts (*Vat. Gr.* 152, 1650) which he combined with two Paris manuscripts (*Par. Gr.* 1699 and 1702). To Peter Possinus (1609–1686) he owed 'whatever a pupil can owe his best and most learned teacher' for his work in Rome collating local manuscripts with Hoeschel's edition, as others had done in previous decades, and it was another Jesuit, John Fayonus, who saved him from many errors. He concludes his advice to readers by promising (he failed) to include later an edition of texts related to the *Buildings*, namely the poems of Paulus Silentarius and epigrams from the Palatine Anthology (discovered at Heidelberg 1606, in Rome from 1623) sent to him by Holsten. Later still, Maltretus concludes, the readers can expect editions of Corippus and the works of George of Pisidia supplied to him by Holsten.

Maltretus' two volumes appeared in 1662 and 1663, noting on the title page that it was 'augmented by the Vatican additions and emended in certain places'. The *Wars*, divided according to the manuscript tradition into first and second 'tetrads' (i.e. Books 1–4, Persian and Vandal Wars, and 5–8, Gothic War) included lists of emendations with variant readings (249–55) followed by extracts from the *Suda* (256–8), as Alemanni had done for the *Secret History*. In the case of the Persian War (Books 1–2), Maltretus added the summaries of Procopius contained in Photius' *Bibliotheca* with the translation of André Schott, SJ.²⁸⁹ For the *Secret*

²⁸⁹ Schott's translation of Photius' *Bibliotheca* shared the same year (1607), place (Augsburg), and publishing house ('ad insigne Pinus') as Hoeschel's *Procopius* (Augsburg, 1607). Maltretus copied his versions of Photius, *Bibliotheca* 63 on Procopius (vol. 1, pp. 27–30 [Maltretus 81–4]: epitome of Book 1, and pp. 30–31 [Maltretus 172–4]: epitome of Book 2).

History, not only could he rely on Alemanni's edition but he also tells of the time when he was just a pupil and Possinus came into possession of Séguier's manuscript. Maltretus watched in awe as his mentor proceeded to collate it immediately with Alemanni's text. Possinus now provided Maltretus with both his comments on the manuscripts and a copy of the important Ambrosian manuscript, originally owned by Pinelli at Padua, which Alemanni had presumed lost at sea between Venice and Naples. Maltretus was therefore able to improve slightly on Alemanni. Again, a list of emendations was included (384–5). As for the *Buildings*, Maltretus had the opportunity to compare and collate the several available manuscripts and knew of Séguier's one (*Par. Coislin.* 132), but he chose to base his edition on the local one at Toulouse where he lived and worked. This was the manuscript cited by Labbé fifteen years earlier and which Maltretus considered 'fuller than before and more emended', again listing it regularly among his variants (477–480).²⁹⁰ He also made use of Gilles' volume on Constantinople that drew on Cardinal d'Armagnac's manuscript, possibly the same as that currently owned by Séguier (*Par. Coislin.* 132). However, as with Hoeschel before him, the opportunity to think through the relationship between the longer and shorter versions of the *Buildings* was foregone. In terms of clarity, layout and completeness, Maltretus' *Procopius* was a major step forward, providing together for the first time all of Procopius' works both in the original Greek and with Latin translation.

In and around the court of Louis XIV and his officials were a number of scholars and litterateurs who flourished in its cultured atmosphere. This was the era when the Byzantine lexicographer and scholar Charles DuFresne

In 1620 Schott was understood by Heinsius to be completing an edition of the *Secret History* but none ever appeared.

²⁹⁰ The Toulouse manuscript of the *Buildings* is lost. Even so, many of its readings are recorded by Maltretus and it provided the text for Dindorf's edition (1838), yet the manuscript was never considered by Haury (1913).

Ducange (1610–1688) forged close ties with Colbert and had his researches supported,²⁹¹ as did François Combéfis (1605–1679) who immediately (1664) reproduced Maltretus’ edition of the first chapter of the *Buildings* as part of his collection of texts on Constantinople (283–91, with notes 292–5). Linked to this same broad movement was the quest of Louis Cousin (1627–1707) to make available in French translation the Byzantine texts published in the Louvre edition, making him in effect the ‘first Byzantine historian’.²⁹² Cousin was preceded, however, by Léonor de Mauger, who also set about producing French translations of Procopius’ works. In the preface to the first volume, he justifies putting both books of the Persian Wars (1669) together before the Vandal Wars (1670) rather than split them up, then explains that the Gothic War will be treated in small individual volumes along with the *Secret History* (1669). He makes the point of refusing to say too much about Procopius except to emphasise that he has been unjustly accused, especially by critics of the *Secret History*, and to justify his own approach. The mistakes in his work are not so much the fault of Procopius as of human weakness since, says de Mauger, ‘we know nothing is perfect in this world except the Supreme Being and that the most famous and perfect historians have not been able to prevent themselves from lacking in certain things because, clever as they might be, some scholars could not cease to be men. Consequently they were not infallible’. As for *Buildings*, de Mauger dismisses the work as not worth translating at all because it would not offer much of use or entertainment to the 17th-century French reader. Still, he does reflect that the day may come when he has the leisure and inclination to translate it.²⁹³ While de Mauger claims to translate from the Greek, he never specifies which text he is using. However, it was presumably Maltretus’ edition since he was working so soon after its publication, but it need not

²⁹¹ Spieser (2000).

²⁹² Pertusi (1967) 104–5.

²⁹³ Preface (1669) a ii.

have been. For the *Gothic War*, however, he was evidently not using a Greek text at all but the original three-book Latin translation of Persona (1506).²⁹⁴ In any event, de Mauger and Cousin appear to have worked in ignorance of each other's simultaneous efforts.

When Cousin came to Procopius, he had a clear plan to work exclusively from the Maltretus edition supplemented by that of Alemanni for the *Secret History*. Moreover, he dismissed as unread the original Latin translations (Persona 1506, Maffei 1509) because scholars had by now so disparaged them. They also paid no consideration to Grotius' translation of the Vandal and Gothic wars, which was much superior to any others. He also dismissed the earlier French translation of the Gothic war on the grounds of reputed inelegance. This is probably a reference to Paradin (1576) or perhaps Fumée (1587). Cousin had originally intended to include all of Procopius in a single volume but it became too large to print, so a second volume was called for. Although both volumes were approved for printing the same day, the publication dates put the second volume first, even if it was only a matter of weeks between them. The first volume (1672) included *Wars* Books 1 to 7, as Procopius had originally published them in 551, leaving for the second volume (1671) the so-called 'mixed history' or 'histoire mêlée' (= *Wars* 8), along with the *Secret History* and *Buildings*, then concluding with Agathias. As for Procopius himself, Cousin explained that he was a clear and stylish writer of history and places, showing sound and balanced judgement. In fact, Procopius 'saw most of what he wrote about, which makes him more credible'.²⁹⁵ This personal autopsy was the now well-established historiographical verdict of Grotius and others on Procopius, even if they barely discussed him as a writer and historian.

Meanwhile, the English had been forced since 1563 to rely on the translation by Arthur Golding (1536–1606) of

²⁹⁴ Cf. Fabricius (1726) 252.

²⁹⁵ Cousin (1671) 'Avertissement'.

Bruni's *De bello Italico*. It was almost a century later in 1653 that they were first treated to their own translation of Procopius' *Wars* by Sir Henry Holcroft (1586–1650), published by Humphrey Moseley, who specialised in drama and poets such as Milton and Donne. Holcroft, a long-serving member of the House of Commons, had not lived to see his work in print. The anonymous preface begins by explaining some of the history of the modern study of Procopius, deriding Bruni but not the early Latin translations by the papal officials (Persona, Maffei), and deriving Holcroft's own translation from the text of Hoeschel. Indeed, the frontispiece of the volume is simply that of Hoeschel adapted for it being 'Englished by Hen: Holcroft Kt'. The preface goes on to add that even in Hoeschel's edition there are gaps which can be filled from the Latin translations that clearly used fuller manuscripts of the Greek original, presumably meaning those of Maltretus and Grotius. Moreover, the whole translation has been checked by Edmund Chilmead (1610–1654), distinguished Oxford musicologist and Greek scholar, the actual editor of the Chronicle of John Malalas recently discovered in an Oxford manuscript but not published until 1691.²⁹⁶ It was probably Chilmead who actually wrote the preface,²⁹⁷ and who knew that Holcroft had also translated the *Secret History*, although it was never published and there is now no trace of it. That is to say, unless it is the anonymous English translation of the *Secret History* published by John Barkesdale in London under the title *The secret history of the court of the emperor Justinian written by Procopius of Cesarea; faithfully rendred into English* (1674). That work contains no preface or other extraneous remarks, just pure translation, so it could be that of Holcroft. Anonymity of translator only compounded the mystery of the volume, which itself inspired a whole generation of works called 'Secret History', covering the

²⁹⁶ Croke (1990) 317–20.

²⁹⁷ Bullard (2009) 196 n. 23.

scandalous recent and contemporary history of the Stuart monarchs in England.²⁹⁸

By the 1670s Byzantine historiography was starting to penetrate general histories of Greek historiography, as earlier for Vossius' *Greek Historians* (1624, 1651). Thus scholarly opinion on Procopius was being formed and laid down in reference volumes such as that of the Breslau scholar Martin Hanke (1633–1709), who used in detail both Byzantine and modern works to cover the various aspects of Procopius' life, outlook, and individual works, citing modern students such as Bodin and Sigonius in addition to the editors and translators. In fact, Hanke was the first historian of Byzantine historiography.²⁹⁹ After that came the learned handbook of writers on Christian history to the 14th century by the English divine and early church scholar William Cave (1637–1713). Cave argues that Procopius deserves a place in his volume because he was at least a Christian at heart.³⁰⁰ Thereafter, serious attention to Procopius stalled for decades, along with any quest to improve the quality of the available texts. That was reserved for an era more sensitive to the importance of the text and more advanced in the art and science of textual criticism. Yet Procopius could now be used reliably by historians and

²⁹⁸ Bullard (2009) 29–38, cf. above, n. 218. If not Holcroft, the translator may well be the publisher's cousin Clement Barksdale, as argued by Bullard (2009) 35–6. The translation was republished in 1682 (London) under the title *The Debaucht Court, or the Lives of the Emperor Justinian and his Empress Theodora the Comedian*, with 'comedian' signalling the toning down in English of Procopius' explicit detail on Theodora's stage act (as explained in Swenson (2017) 118–9).

²⁹⁹ Hankius (1677) 145–63, with Beck (1958) 89–90 and Pertusi (1967) 103–4.

³⁰⁰ Cave (1688) 400. Cave explains the varying religious opinions of Procopius in the *Wars* and *Buildings* but is less inclined to believe the *Secret History*, noting that many learned scholars consider it misattributed to Procopius, given it displays such a lust for reproach gushing out everywhere and brazen lies 'so foreign to the customary seriousness of Procopius'.

other scholars as a source of information for the sixth century, guided by the summary evaluations of the author to be found in Vossius (1651), Hanke (1677), Cave (1688), and, soon, Fabricius (1726).

11. Using Procopius as Historian: Ludewig, Lebeau and Gibbon

The availability by the 18th century of a Greek edition of all of Procopius' works, despite ongoing lacunas in individual books, and translations into the major languages of most of them, enabled attention to turn to Procopius as a writer and a source of information for the sixth century in particular. Reference works, such as that of J. A. Fabricius (1668–1736), provided a detailed outline for a historian considered to be accurate, learned and elegant.³⁰¹ He devoted special attention to the contested issue of Procopius' religion opened up by the publication of the *Secret History* a century earlier, but Fabricius makes clear that Procopius can only be a sincere Christian.³⁰² Meanwhile, the great Italian scholar Ludovico Muratori (1672–1750) spent many years in creating his monumental collection of sources for Italian history, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores ab anno aere christianae 500 ad annum 1500* (28 volumes, 1723–1751) as well as his chronological volumes of Italian history (*Annali d'Italia*, 12 volumes, 1744–1749). The first volume of the *Scriptores* (1723) included Procopius' *Gothic History* which was introduced as *Procopii Caesariensis Historiarum sui temporis de bello Gothico libri quatuor ex interpretatione Claudii Maltreti Societatis Jesu historiae byzantinae inserta accessit Hugonis Grotii explicatio nominum et verborum Gothicorum, Vandalicorum ac Langobardicorum*.³⁰³ So Muratori

³⁰¹ Fabricius (1726) 250.

³⁰² Fabricius (1726) 248–9.

³⁰³ Muratori (1723) 243.

did not publish an Italian translation but reprinted the Latin translation from Maltretus' edition. In fact, he explained why he preferred the translation of Maltretus over those of Persona (1506) and Grotius (1655), after justifying why he should even include Procopius in a collection of writers on Italian history, namely because he was a unique eye-witness of the Italian events he described.³⁰⁴

Shortly afterwards, in 1729, the original edition of Maltretus that Muratori used was republished in Venice as part of the original Louvre Byzantine series. Again, the opportunity was lost to improve on the text of Procopius. Publisher Francis Halmaam (Utrecht) had wanted to use for the revised *Corpus Byzantini* the material gathered for Heinsius' Leiden edition earlier in the previous century, along with other relevant material. They had all come somehow into the possession of Peter Francus (1645–1704), professor of Greek at Amsterdam. At the auction of Francus' library (Amsterdam 1703) could be bought: (1) a copy of Hoeschel's edition with Vulcanius' marginal emendations; (2) a copy of Hoeschel collated with/corrected by the Vatican manuscript, as Elzevier had requested of Holsten at Rome; (3) the Latin translations of Persona and Maffei amended by Vulcanius; (4) a new Latin version still unpublished (possibly that of Vulcanius); and (5) a copy of Alemanni's *Secret History* with notes from other manuscripts by David Blondelus.³⁰⁵ This looks like the full repertoire of the materials collected by the 1650s for the Elzeviers' edition of Procopius. However, it is not clear where these valuable materials ended up following the auction. They were not available to Dindorf (1833, 1838) who used other such materials, and have not been uncovered since. They may still be discoverable somewhere.

³⁰⁴ Muratori (1723) 245–6.

³⁰⁵ Details of the auction in Fabricius (1726) 257.

Among the histories that utilised Procopius were those of Ludewig (1731), Tillemont (1738), and Lebeau (1757). In 1731 there appeared a learned work in which Procopius played a more central role than previously. This was the *vita Justiniani* by the professor of law and history at Halle, Johann von Ludewig (1668–1743) but it was more than the first imperial biography of Justinian. The title page is packed with telling detail reinforced by the messages in its frontispiece illustration. The title runs: ‘The life of Justinian the Great and Theodora *Augusti*, as well as Tribonian; the stage for Justinian’s Jurisprudence, through the trustworthiness of contemporary writers, Latin and Greek, of coins, councils, laws, literature, petitions, stones, pictures, artefacts, and other monuments; for both understanding the history of the legislation and the body of law and as a defence of the architects of the new law; repudiating the errors and calumnies of writers in all kinds of sciences’. The frontispiece would appear to be inspired by that of Hoeschel (1607), recycled by Holcroft (1654). The difference is that here Justinian appears as emperor but enthroned with Theodora, a clear statement of her perceived status. Belisarius appears representing the conquering general, but not Narses. Instead, there is the jurist and prefect Tribonian cradling a copy of the ‘Corpus Iuris Civilis’ (the *Digest* and *Code* of Justinian), beside whom is an architectural plan of Hagia Sophia at Constantinople. While Hoeschel was focussed primarily on Justinian’s *Wars*, Ludewig’s starting point is Justinian as the great lawgiver, which explains the centrality of Tribonian. If nothing else, here is a statement of rehabilitation for Tribonian as a facilitator of Roman law, not the corrupter that had characterised his reputation for generations. Beneath this imperial tableau is a collection of grotesque figures emptying their bags. These are labelled the ‘Furies of Procopius’, meaning his *Secret History*. Thus Ludewig aims to deploy the military and civil achievements of Justinian and Theodora to defend them from the libels

and accusations of Procopius. He assiduously pursues this task for all 727 pages of his *vita Justiniani*, accompanied by no less than 1,331 learned and mainly lengthy notes. By the time he came to his work on Justinian Ludewig was an experienced professor of law and history, as well as being an acclaimed numismatist, who already had produced a prolific series of learned treatises. In justifying the reputation of Justinian he was not only forced to consider the wide range of materials from his reign, including laws and coins, but he also had to confront the testimony and attitude of Procopius. As rhetor and as Belisarius' adviser, he finds Procopius a valuable eyewitness reporter (324, 342, 346 n. 353), so it is difficult to accuse him of error when required (429 n. 476). 'Again and again', says Ludewig (474 n. 554), 'he is to be commended for what he tells us about the Gothic war which is sought in vain in other writers'. However, Procopius could also be outrageous, as he was in his account of Theodora, which raises the question of whether he really believed in God at all (172). The question of Procopius' religious beliefs was not closed after all.

One of Ludewig's professorial rivals at Halle was Nicholas Gundling (1671–1729) who also wrote on Justinian and Theodora. He noted that in the *Secret History* Procopius depicted Justinian, Theodora, and the whole imperial court in such 'dark and overdone' terms that many consider he 'strayed from the path of truth through a lust for lying and back-biting'. He notes further that details on Theodora were omitted from Alemanni's edition, but there is a full manuscript in the Vatican. There are, says Gundling, those who think that the name of Procopius is falsely inscribed on this 'horrific work' but there are also others who make much of highlighting Procopius' beliefs to 'traduce him as a pagan or atheist'. Gundling dismisses these writers as 'completely corrupt' because they ignore Procopius' explicitly Christian statements in the *Buildings* while praising his *Wars*. He singles out Eichel (1654), who, 'I know, has several

admirers’, as the ‘harshes persecutor of Alemanni’ but who displays ‘an unrefined judgement of Procopius in most things’.³⁰⁶ At Halle, then, leading scholars such as Ludewig and Gundling laid the foundations for rebuilding Procopius’ historical reputation. Their lead was taken up by Johann Ritter (1709–1775), an academic philosopher and historian at Leipzig, Wittenberg, and Leiden. In his ‘Historical Observations’, reflecting the sentiment to be found in the reference works of Cave and Fabricius, Ritter set out an unequivocal assessment of Procopius: ‘If you discount what he poured out with dark bile against Justinian and the whole Constantinopolitan court in the *Secret History*, I consider that first place among Byzantine historians should be accorded to Procopius’. Ritter bases his award on Procopius’ historical judgement and the fact that he is ‘a diligent and accurate recorder of events that happened in his time’.³⁰⁷

Almost all his adult life, Le Nain de Tillemont (1637–1698) had been working on his large-scale *Histoire des Empereurs*, along with its companion history of the church over the same period. Although written in the 1690s, the final sixth volume covering most of the fifth century (emperors Theodosius II to Anastasius) did not appear until 1738 after being reconstructed from his papers. Tillemont’s detailed annalistic summary of events with full citation of known sources proved very useful to later historians of a more philosophical bent, such as Gibbon, as they tried to make sense of the detail. While most of the events recorded in Procopius’ history lay beyond Tillemont’s plan, he did make good use of Procopius here and there in his final

³⁰⁶ Gundlingius (1737) at 203–4. Gundling, like Ludewig, is able to cite in detail all the diverse records of Justinian’s reign in covering Theodora’s origins and family (202–9), background (209–23), vices as Justinian’s empress (223–40), virtues (240–9) and death (249–54).

³⁰⁷ Ritter (1742) XVIII.

volume but without critiquing the author himself. By then the massive (35 volume) ‘History of the Late Empire’ of Charles Lebeau (1701–1778), was appearing and he used Procopius mainly in volumes 8 (1764), 9 (1766), 10 (1766) and 11 (1768). Lebeau cites Procopius regularly as his source of information but only rarely provides any critical comment. On one occasion, he argues that the vitriolic attitude adopted by Procopius towards Belisarius and Justinian is best explained by a fit of pique arising from their failure to pay him on time. Hence undue emphasis on the *Secret History* distorts Procopius’ picture of Justinian and more weight should be given to the *Wars*.³⁰⁸

In many ways, however, Lebeau was a prelude to the more critical and no less ambitious history of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* of Edward Gibbon (1737–1794) which began to appear in 1776 and which is still published and read to this day. By the time Gibbon came to his history in the 1760s he was well familiar not only with Tillemont and Ludewig, if not yet Lebeau, but with all Procopius’s works and became even more intimate with them as he wrote about the precise period they covered. In his *Autobiography* he recounts his childhood historical reading including ‘a ragged Procopius from the beginning of the last century’ which, remarkable as it may seem, can only be the 1607 edition of Hoeschel.³⁰⁹ In later years, Gibbon’s library

³⁰⁸ Lebeau (1766) 10–11. Curiously, in Pocock’s vast and detailed six volumes of background study to Gibbon’s *Decline and Fall* (*Barbarism and Religion*, Cambridge, 1999–2016), never once does he cite Lebeau. One reason for underestimating him may be because Gibbon himself rarely cited him and did not own a copy of his *Histoire*. Yet he knew Lebeau personally and judged him a ‘gentleman and a scholar’, as explained by Bowersock (2009) 37–8.

³⁰⁹ Bonnard (1966) 42. Averil Cameron (1997) 35 is inclined to think Gibbon must be referring here to a translation of Procopius, but there was no translation in the first half of the 17th century. He may have erred chronologically and meant to refer to Holcroft’s 1653 translation

contained the editions of both Hoeschel and Alemanni, but not that of Maltretus nor any other editions of Procopius.³¹⁰ ‘The literary fate of Procopius has been somewhat unlucky’, so Gibbon concluded, accusing Bruni of plagiarism and the first translators (Persona 1506, Maffei 1509) of textual mutilation and of failing to ‘even consult the MS. of the Vatican library, of which they were prefects’.³¹¹ Elsewhere, after praising Procopius’ books on the Vandal war as ‘a regular and elegant narrative and happy would be my lot, could I always tread in the footsteps of such a guide’, Gibbon shows that he has also resorted to the translations of Cousin (1672) and Grotius (1655) but found them wanting as well: ‘From the entire and diligent perusal of the Greek text, I have a right to pronounce that the Latin and French versions of Grotius and Cousin may not be implicitly trusted; yet the president Cousin has been often praised, and Hugo Grotius was the first scholar of a learned age’.³¹² In other words, Gibbon was well attuned to the text and textual tradition of Procopius and studied it closely, including the accuracy of the various translations. He was really the first serious student of Procopius as an historical source for his time. Gibbon’s critical scholarship should never be under-estimated.

In the relevant chapters of the *Decline and Fall* (written at Lausanne, 1783–1787), Gibbon explained his understanding of Procopius, how the modern historian might approach the

of the *Wars* although his library contained no Holcroft volume. Hoeschel is not impossible.

³¹⁰ Keynes (1950) 231. Gibbon considered that Maltretus’ edition ‘was imperfectly executed by Claude Maltret, a Jesuit of Toulouse (in 1663), far distant from the Louvre press and the Vatican manuscript, from which, however, he obtained some supplements. His promised commentaries, &c. have never appeared’ (Gibbon (1898) 210 n. 14).

³¹¹ Gibbon (1898) 210 n. 14) perhaps relying here on Alemanni (1623) xiv.

³¹² Gibbon (1898) 85 n. 1

sixth-century historian, and certainly demonstrated his propensity to give explanatory priority to the *Secret History*.³¹³ He begins with a clear summary of his evaluations worth quoting in full:

From his elevation to his death, Justinian governed the Roman empire thirty-eight years, seven months, and thirteen days. The events of his reign, which excite our curious attention by their number, variety, and importance, are diligently related by the secretary of Belisarius, a rhetorician whom eloquence had promoted to the rank of senator and prefect of Constantinople. According to the vicissitudes of courage or servitude, of favour or disgrace, Procopius successively composed the history, the panegyric, and the satire of his own times. The eight books of the Persian, Vandalic, and Gothic wars, which are continued in the five books of Agathias, deserve our esteem as a laborious and successful imitation of the Attic, or at least of the Asiatic, writers of ancient Greece. His facts are collected from the personal experience and free conversation of a soldier, a statesman, and a traveller; his style continually aspires, and often attains, to the merit of strength and elegance; his reflections, more especially in the speeches, which he too frequently inserts, contain a rich fund of political knowledge; and the historian, excited by the generous ambition of pleasing and instructing posterity, appears to disdain the prejudices of the people and the flattery of courts.³¹⁴

He then explains the need for a more nuanced approach to Procopius, beginning with the *Buildings*:

³¹³ Gibbon (1898) 211, with n. 19.

³¹⁴ Gibbon (1898) 7–8.

The writings of Procopius were read and applauded by his contemporaries; but, although he respectfully laid them at the foot of the throne, the pride of Justinian must have been wounded by the praise of an hero, who perpetually eclipses the glory of his inactive sovereign. The conscious dignity of independence was subdued by the hopes and fears of a slave; and the secretary of Belisarius laboured for pardon and reward in the six books of the Imperial edifices. He had dexterously chosen a subject of apparent splendour, in which he could loudly celebrate the genius, the magnificence, and the piety of a prince who, both as a conqueror and legislator, had surpassed the puerile virtues of Themistocles and Cyrus.

Then Gibbon goes on to consider the *Secret History*:

Disappointment might urge the flatterer to secret revenge; and the first glance of favour might again tempt him to suspend and suppress a libel, in which the Roman Cyrus is degraded into an odious and contemptible tyrant, in which both the emperor and his consort Theodora are seriously represented as two demons, who had assumed an human form for the destruction of mankind. Such base inconsistency must doubtless sully the reputation, and detract from the credit, of Procopius; yet, after the venom of his malignity has been suffered to exhale, the residue of the anecdotes, even the most disgraceful facts, some of which had been tenderly hinted in his public history, are established by their internal evidence, or the authentic monuments of the times.³¹⁵

Gibbon's account of the reign of Justinian commences with the character and history of Theodora including what, he noted, 'must be veiled in the obscurity of a learned

³¹⁵ Gibbon (1898) 8–9.

language'.³¹⁶ He cites in full the *Secret History's* missing chapter 9 from the *Menagiana*, justifying 'the most naked tale in my history' by asserting that 'the vices of Theodora form an essential feature in the reign and character of Justinian'.³¹⁷ Otherwise, he is circumspect about the *Secret History*: 'Such a character has been justly accused by the voice of the people and of posterity; but public discontent is credulous; private malice is bold; and a lover of truth will peruse with a suspicious eye the instructive anecdotes of Procopius'.³¹⁸ Unmentioned by Gibbon, curiously enough for someone so fond of the output of the Royal French Academy, was a presentation to them by Pierre-Alexandre Levesque de La Ravalière (1697–1762), who attempted to show that the *Secret History* was not from the pen of Procopius. Instead, it was from another orator of Caesarea because the work is not mentioned by Agathias and does not surface until 400 years later (*Suda*). Moreover, it ends in the late 550s, that is to say, well after Procopius' other works and probably his lifetime, in fact probably later still, because the *Secret History* gives the impression of being written after the death of Justinian in 565.³¹⁹ Without knowledge of Ravalière's intervention many of these arguments were recycled in later years before being refuted.

At the very time Gibbon was making maximum use of Procopius in his chapters on Justinian, there appeared a book on the reign of Justinian by a young Roman lawyer

³¹⁶ Gibbon (1898) 213.

³¹⁷ Bonnard (1966) 193 n. 60; cf. 182, with Gibbon complaining that 'the reproach of indecency has been loudly echoed by the rigid censors of morals'.

³¹⁸ Gibbon is at least being conscious of applying a 'suspicious eye' to the exaggerations of the *Secret History*, but he carries on: 'Ambiguous actions are imputed to the worst motives; error is confounded with guilt, accident with design, and laws with abuses; the partial injustice of a moment is dexterously applied as a general maxim of a reign of thirty-two years' (Gibbon (1898) 236 with his n. 85; 'The Anecdotes (c. 11–14, 18, 20–30) supply many facts and more complaints').

³¹⁹ Levesque de La Ravalière (1753).

Filippo Inverniz(z)i (d. 1832), *de rebus gestis Iustiniani Magni* (1783). This book does not appear in Gibbon's library and was evidently unknown to him at that time. Invernizi dedicated his book to a great Roman collector of books, coins and medals, Cardinal Francis Xavier de Zelada (1717–1801), then papal librarian, acknowledging his own house as a learned repository and the Cardinal as a student of Justinian's law. He then began by noting that he was 'really angry and distressed' (VIII) to discover that it had not occurred to any of the 'most distinguished men' who were actively gracing his age to write about Justinian. He therefore decided to embark on the task himself although a mere novice, with limited learning and no reputation (IX). Invernizi further confesses that he profited most from Ludewig and followed him closely. His account of Justinian appears to be the first which actually exemplifies the familiar modern format entrenched by Procopius, that is, successive chapters on the Persian, Vandal, and Italian wars followed by others on the laws and buildings of the emperor. Even so, he makes surprisingly little direct use of Procopius compared to other contemporary and later accounts.³²⁰ Like so many previous and current students of Justinian including Ludewig, Invernizi's foremost interest was Roman law. This was the first book by Invernizi, who went on to produce a series of detailed studies of Roman and ecclesiastical law as well as beginning a major edition of Aristophanes (1794).

Another contemporary of Gibbon, Johann Paul Reinhard (1722–1779), was a distinguished historian and numismatist, especially in the history of France.³²¹ Among his many works was a translation of Procopius' *Secret History* (1753) prefaced by an account of the author and his works (Erlangen, November 1752), in which he singles out the

³²⁰ Procopius is cited by Invernizi (1783) at 12, 81 n. 7, 89 n. 11, 121, 128 ('in primo libro'), 130 ('libro secundo'), 146 ('hic enim primum orator fuit, Comes deinde et scriba Belisarii, Urbis tandem Praefectus et Senator'), 149.

³²¹ Wegele (1889).

edition of Maltretus as being of particular value. Reinhard then goes on to explain where the *Secret History* fits in Procopius' works and how it is best handled as a work of satire and vituperation. In the course of his discussion he considers the additions to Chapter 9 omitted by Alemanni and first published among the works of Ménage. He decided to include them in his translation although they had not yet appeared in any edition. Finally, he noted that there were other works called 'Secret History' before Procopius. Reinhard actually produced the first German translation of any of Procopius' works. It was to be decades before a German translation of the *Wars* appeared (Kanngiesser, 1827) while the *Buildings* had to wait until 1977 (Otto Veh).

When Peter Kanngiesser (1774–1833) was engaging with Procopius in the 1820s he was rector of the University of Greifswald, where he had been a professor of History. Indeed, history and classical philology had been the backbone of his formation, earlier teaching and research.³²² Kanngiesser explains in his preface that it was his original intention to produce a three-volume edition of the text, improved and expanded from the standard edition of Maltretus (1662/3). Given the difficulties of this, he decided instead to publish just a German translation. It was in fact the first German translation of the *Persian Wars* (1827), *Vandal Wars* (1828), and the *Gothic War* (1831). Only in the preface to the final volume does he acknowledge that, for the text, he has followed a combination of the editions of Hoeschel (1607) and Maltretus (1662–3).³²³ While Kanngiesser was shying away from a fresh edition of Procopius, the Zurich scholar and cleric Johann Orelli (1787–1849) was at the same time producing the first complete edition of the *Secret History* (1827). Orelli's volume began with Alemanni's introduction to the *Secret History* (iii–xx) followed briefly by Orelli's own (xxi–xxii). The text and translation followed (2–216), then extracts from the *Wars* related to the plague (217–

³²² Pyl (1882).

³²³ Kanngiesser (1831) VII–VIII.

53), the notes of Maltretus (258–301) and Alemanni (305–435), and concluding with quotations from the work contained in the *Suda* (436–42). Ever since the section of Chapter 9 of the *Secret History* from the Vatican manuscript in 1693 had been omitted by Alemanni, a new edition was inevitable. Orelli finally supplied it in 1827, conceding that although Procopius was ‘not the sort of author to be read by adolescents’ they could find more scandalous things in Petronius and Juvenal while Gibbon’s open use of the missing portion of the *Secret History* forty years earlier now justified its inclusion in the text.³²⁴

12. Niebuhr, Dindorf, and the ‘Bonn Corpus’ edition (1833/8)

By the time Orelli (*Secret History*) and Kanngiesser (*Wars*) were publishing their volumes of Procopius, making many of his works more accessible to German readers at least, Germany had become the centre of both theory and practice of academic scholarship on ancient texts and artifacts. The domain of ‘Altertumswissenschaft’ developed at the Universities of Halle, Göttingen, Leipzig, and elsewhere in the 18th century had set new standards for any historical work, while Wolf’s pioneering *Prolegomena to Homer* (1795) inspired a further goal for all students of ancient texts. Against this background was initiated a plan to produce a new and accessible text of all Procopius’ works as part of the *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae* (CSHB) under the organisational hand of Barthold Niebuhr (1776–1831), now in Bonn. Niebuhr had long harboured an interest in Byzantine history and texts dating from his first encounter with Theophanes and Liutprand as a young student in Copenhagen in 1798.³²⁵ He had since become a celebrated Roman historian at the new University of Berlin (1810–

³²⁴ Orelli (1827) 272.

³²⁵ Niebuhr, letter to his parents, 2 February 1798, in Gerhard and Norvin (1926) 181 (Ep. 85), with Irmscher (1978).

1811), then diplomat at Rome, but by 1826 was back in Bonn. There he quickly took up various projects including a new edition of his already famous history of early Rome. At the same time, Niebuhr planned and set about the production of a series of Byzantine texts to update and replace the 17th-century Paris corpus, now considered inadequate by current philological and textual norms, not to mention its ‘detestable’ Venetian reprint a century earlier.³²⁶ This was something he had actually long planned but without finding a publisher he considered ‘active and courageous enough’.³²⁷ As an intellectual and diplomat, Niebuhr had long been well-respected and well-connected throughout Europe and he saw his Byzantine project as capitalising on his network of libraries and scholars. Moreover, this was a time when manuscripts could still be lent by libraries to be worked on elsewhere, and when it was common to rely on a third party to copy or collate a local manuscript for an editor. Accordingly, in Niebuhr’s letters for 1827 to 1829 we can trace the lineaments of the project organiser and his editorial method, including for the new edition of Procopius’ works by Karl Wilhelm Dindorf (1802–1883).

Unlike later German philological projects of renown which continue to this day, such as the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (MGH) and the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (CIL) for example, Niebuhr saw himself as the centre of a collective enterprise in which all the main texts would be prepared more or less simultaneously, the requisite materials gathered collectively and then individual editors entrusted with finishing off specific works using those materials. The organisation belonged entirely with him and his trusty publisher Eduard Weber. The need for speed was financial viability. There were no government, institutional, or private subventions involved and the publisher needed

³²⁶ Details in Walther (1993) 551–5, and Wirth (1984) 211–39. For the ‘detestable Venetian reprint’: Niebuhr (1983) 260 (Letter 1004, 19 February 1828).

³²⁷ Niebuhr (1983) 260 (Letter 1004, 19 February 1828).

advance subscriptions to the whole series to make it feasible. Subscribers were therefore promised numerous volumes in rapid succession. Niebuhr's labour was free, as he liked to remind those whose favour he was begging.³²⁸ Hence both Niebuhr and Weber worked incredibly fast and with a carefully defined task, namely to correct and improve the flawed Louvre texts by checking them against the original manuscripts and taking advantage of more recently discovered ones. Yet this was also a world in which modern stemmatic methods had still to be perfected and where, without reliable catalogues everywhere, the manuscripts content of even the major libraries was only partially and patchily known. Accordingly, scholars and librarians, far and wide, were pressed into service. In April–May 1827 Niebuhr sent three of his best students on a mission of locating, checking and, where necessary, copying manuscripts in northern European libraries. In some cases they were to bring manuscripts and annotated books back to Bonn for closer study by Niebuhr himself. The young scholars' remit covered a wide range of Byzantine texts including Procopius.

Leiden was an obvious target for Procopius in particular and the university's librarian, Jacob Geel (1789–1862), was an old friend of Niebuhr. In introducing his project, Niebuhr assured Geel that if a full collation of Procopius manuscripts was called for, the publisher would be happy to pay for the requisite labour.³²⁹ Later correspondence with Geel illustrates that Niebuhr was lent Scaliger's manuscript of Procopius *Wars* (*Scal.* 5 copied from *Par. Gr.* 1699),³³⁰ along with Scaliger's annotated and corrected copy of Hoeschel's edition (1607),³³¹ as well as Grotius' annotated copy of Hoeschel's edition (1642).³³² Dindorf later

³²⁸ Niebuhr (1983) 261 (Letter 1005, 19 February 1828, to Peyron).

³²⁹ Niebuhr (1983) 121–2 (Letter 919, 17 April 1827, to Geel).

³³⁰ Niebuhr (1827) 362.

³³¹ Niebuhr (1983) 174–6 (Letter 953, 12 August 1827, to Geel).

³³² Niebuhr (1983) 165–6 (Letter 947, 2 August 1827, to Geel).

acknowledged the ‘friendship’ of Geel in getting both a copy of Scaliger’s manuscript and Grotius’ emendations.³³³ It was as much from the emendations of these great scholars as from collating the manuscripts afresh that the new edition of Procopius took shape. At the same time, Niebuhr was arranging for a sample collation of Procopian manuscripts in Rome and Paris.³³⁴ What followed quickly was a full collation of a Paris manuscript.³³⁵ With its Royal Library and other collections, Paris was clearly a key centre for many Byzantine manuscripts and it was the publisher Weber who despatched there two of the young scholars who had earlier worked in Holland and Belgium, C. D. Schinas (1801–1870) and E. M. Pinder (1807–1871). Again, they were to locate and copy a range of manuscripts of various texts, including Procopius. Twice a week they were to report their collations to the printer, rather than the editor,³³⁶ although Niebuhr seems to have kept close tabs on their activities. For example, at one stage he directed them to spend more time on Procopius, which was clearly warranted,³³⁷ and to see if a manuscript could be taken away. Niebuhr assured them that his own experience had taught him that you can work much faster if you have a manuscript at home, for the simple reason that more than one person can work on it at the same time.³³⁸

As the various manuscripts, copies, and other materials now accumulated in Bonn, as they had once accumulated at Leiden for the Elzeviers, Niebuhr sought to interest scholars in taking on the work of finally editing the

³³³ Dindorf (1833) v–vi.

³³⁴ Niebuhr (1983) 110 (Letter 913, 22 March 1827, to Pertz); 127 (Letter 921, 17 April 1827, to Hase); 134–5 (Letter 926, 27 April 1827, to Hase).

³³⁵ Niebuhr (1983) 151–5 (Letter 938, 8 July 1827, to Geel); 156 (Letter 939, 9 July 1827, to Hase).

³³⁶ Niebuhr (1983) 159 (Letter 941, 14 July 1827); 165 (Letter 946, August 1827, to de Serre); 207 (Letter 964, 10 September 1827).

³³⁷ Niebuhr (1983) 582–7 (Letter 960, 1 September 1827).

³³⁸ Niebuhr (1983) 586 (Letter 972, 21 September 1827).

Byzantine texts. He expressed his pleasure at the growing support he was finding, although the foremost Berlin textual scholar at his disposal August Immanuel Bekker (1785–1871), was a reluctant starter.³³⁹ His team of editors included the Dindorf brothers at Leipzig, whom Niebuhr considered ‘eminently capable’.³⁴⁰ Wilhelm, three years older than his brother Ludwig (1805–1871), had accomplished an extraordinary number of editorial feats at a young age, especially editions and lexica of Greek dramatists and scholia to Sophocles, as well as completing Invernizi’s index to Aristophanes.³⁴¹ It was Wilhelm who opened the eyes of the printer B. G. Teubner (1784–1856) to the need for a modern, affordable collection of classical texts and in 1824 provided its initial volume (Xenophon, *Anabasis*).³⁴² So prolific was Wilhelm that many thought his brother Ludwig was merely fictional and created to explain how one person could produce so much detailed and painstaking scholarship. In the case of Procopius, the edition was just another assignment for the young Wilhelm and was intended to be published as the second volume in the series (1829), behind the first (Fragmentary historians, 1829) and before the third (Agathias, 1828).³⁴³ By February 1828 Niebuhr was writing to the papal librarian and renowned decipherer of palimpsest manuscripts, Cardinal Angelo Mai (1782–1854) in Rome, seeking his support for a copy of the ‘excellent’ Vatican manuscript of Procopius’ *Wars* that Maltretus had used.³⁴⁴ A few months later it was planned to send a young scholar to the Vatican to examine its manu-

³³⁹ Niebuhr’s generous dedication to Bekker of the first volume (Niebuhr (1828)) might be seen as a lure of commitment or encouragement.

³⁴⁰ Niebuhr (1983) 315 (Letter 1030, 21 May 1828, to Geel).

³⁴¹ Müller (1903).

³⁴² Garzya (1983) 19–20.

³⁴³ Irscher (1953) 362, 370. For the original 1829 date: Niebuhr (1983) 257 (Letter 1001, 10 February 1828, to Geel); Wirth (1984) 236.

³⁴⁴ Niebuhr (1983) 272 (Letter 1011, 25 February 1828, to Mai). Maltretus actually had a copy of *Vat. Gr.* 152 made by Holsten (414 n. 8).

scripts ‘beginning with Procopius’.³⁴⁵ Meanwhile, Niebuhr and Weber had gathered a range of Procopian materials for Dindorf to work with: Scaliger’s amended manuscript, the annotated copies of Hoeschel’s edition by Scaliger and Grotius. In addition, Niebuhr had ascertained that in Paris there was a good manuscript of most of Procopius’ works, while support was still being gathered for a collation from Rome.³⁴⁶ Certainly Niebuhr expected in May 1828 that the completed collation of Procopius’ edition was not far away.³⁴⁷

It was at precisely this time that Giuseppe Compagnoni (1754–1833), towards the end of a long and productive literary life, published his translation of the *Secret History* of Procopius (1828), having previously rendered into Italian both Diodorus of Sicily and Photius.³⁴⁸ As he explains, he was greatly encouraged to this task by his publisher, and the preface to his translation (1–45) takes the form of a long and interesting letter to his lifelong friend Francesco Giovannardi at Bologna. There Compagnoni says that, finding himself with time on his hands, the thought occurred of translating the *Secret History* to make it more available to others. He then goes on to explain at length how it came to be published in the first place by Alemanni (1623) before elaborating on the critical response to Alemanni by Johan Eichel (1654) at Helmstadt. He even insists that, as Eichel saw it, Alemanni had encouraged the negative approach to Justinian. Then Eichel passed to Procopius himself, questioning the authenticity of the *Secret History* or considering it interpolated. Procopius may be a pagan supporter of idols but he knew Justinian better than any 17th-century Helmstadt professor ever could (17). Compagnoni set himself the task of showing that the *Secret History* is not a vendetta-dictated satire, and that its contents

³⁴⁵ Niebuhr (1983) 301 (Letter 102, 8 May 1828, to Mai).

³⁴⁶ Niebuhr (1983) 272 (Letter 1011, 25 February 1828, to Mai).

³⁴⁷ Niebuhr (1983) 316 (Letter 1030, 21 May 1828, to Geel).

³⁴⁸ Gullino (1982).

do not contradict the *Wars*. Although translated in the same volume, not much is said about the *Buildings*. This was the first volume in a series, with the later volumes covering the Vandal and Persian wars (1833) then the Gothic war (1838), undertaken by Giuseppe Rossi. All three volumes relied on the text of Maltretus. Niebuhr's announced edition of Procopius was not yet ready.

By the end of 1828 Niebuhr's various Byzantine text projects had produced a hive of activity. The problem now was how to get so much completed and through the press in a timely fashion. To bolster finances, Niebuhr proposed to his former secretary at Rome, Charles Bunsen (1791–1860), that he get his colleagues and local Roman institutions to all subscribe to the series. One volume, namely Niebuhr's own edition of Agathias (with Vulcanius' 1594 Latin translation and notes), was already available.³⁴⁹ Otherwise, Niebuhr dared claim that his work was largely done. The finalisation of individual editions for the press was a matter for their individual editors and should not take long. 'The Dindorfs are in full flight', so Niebuhr assured Bunsen.³⁵⁰ Wilhelm may have had all he needed to complete Procopius, but the final work was still considerably delayed. At the same time, Niebuhr took the opportunity to ask Bunsen to arrange for an accurate collation of the Vatican manuscript of Procopius' *Wars* (*Vat. gr.* 152) which Maltretus had found incomplete. He requested the same for the key Vatican manuscript of the *Buildings* (*Vat. gr.* 1065),³⁵¹ although it appears that Bunsen was never able to fulfil Niebuhr's

³⁴⁹ The book was published in Bonn in 1828. In his preface Niebuhr explains the novelty of finding in Bonn typesetters and proof readers for Greek, then shows how much he relied on the conjectures and suggestions of others including a local schoolmaster. Moreover, he confesses that he would have preferred not to have included a Latin translation at all and to have followed modern Greek accentual and orthographic norms (Niebuhr (1828) 'Praefatio', VII–XII). Such was the editorial approach of the CSHB, at least in Niebuhr's lifetime.

³⁵⁰ Niebuhr (1983) 414 (Letter 1097, 29 December 1828, to Bunsen).

³⁵¹ Niebuhr (1983) 414 (Letter 1097, 29 December 1828, to Bunsen).

request and, for whatever reason, Dindorf was not successful either.³⁵²

Although Niebuhr's series of Byzantine texts is still called the 'Bonn Corpus', following his death in 1831 responsibility for managing the collection passed from Bonn to the Berlin Academy. When Dindorf's *Procopius* finally began to appear in 1833 its title page therefore proclaimed that it was begun under Niebuhr and completed 'with the authority of the Royal Prussian Academy of Letters'. Dindorf's prefatory explanation was brief: he made use of the lacunose *Par. Gr.* 1702 for the first tetrad of the *Wars* (Books 1–4), *Par. Gr.* 1699 for the second tetrad (Books 5–8) along with Scaliger's annotated copy of it (*Scal.* 5), Holsten's copy of the Vatican manuscript used by Maltretus, Hoeschel's edition and Grotius' notes. Clearly, Dindorf felt constrained having to comply with the publisher's reasons for preparing a preface when collations were still incomplete and some manuscripts still awaited. Despite the delays, the work was eventually published. The third volume (1838) containing the *Secret History* and the *Buildings* involved Dindorf in seeking out further materials, particularly Holsten's copy of the Vatican manuscript of the *Secret History* (*Vat. Gr.* 1001), which he acquired from Antonius van Goudoever (1785–1857) at Utrecht, and J. J. Reiske's annotated copy of Alemanni's *Secret History* edition (1623) which he secured from the Copenhagen library.³⁵³ Finally, the indexes to the Bonn edition were merely those of the Louvre edition with the page numbers changed by Weber, the publisher. As Dindorf rather pointedly explained in the preface, the publishers had cut short his work. He therefore had insufficient time to fully collate manuscripts or to produce a proper Greek index to Procopius.³⁵⁴ Dindorf already had vast experience of such author indexes and knew what Procopius needed at this point.

³⁵² Dindorf (1833) vi.

³⁵³ Dindorf (1833) v–vi; (1838) xxxiii–xxxiv.

³⁵⁴ Dindorf (1838) xxxiii.

Indeed, when it came to the *Buildings*, Dindorf evidently found it easier to avoid what had by now emerged as a complex manuscript tradition in need of a complete reconsideration. The Herwagen/Beatus Rhenanus initial edition in 1531 had been based on a single manuscript of the shorter version of *Buildings* from Peutinger's private library, while Hoeschel based his edition (1607) on supplementing that of Beatus with two separate manuscripts, both apparently of the longer tradition, namely those of: (1) Casaubon, supplied by Charles Labbé, and 'transcribed from an old manuscript', and (2) Friedrich Lindenbrog. Dindorf confesses that since he was unable to get proper assistance to examine the manuscripts used by Maltretus (Vatican, Toulouse) he merely reprinted the published edition, apart from conjecturing some obvious corrections. Rarely did he consult Hoeschel's edition. Finally, he added that the summary version of the *Buildings* in *Par. Gr.* 1941 was used throughout his notes.³⁵⁵ In other words, Dindorf failed to address the complex issues in the *Buildings* text, a task which was left to Haury who found them particularly arduous and even qualified Dindorf's treatment of the *Buildings* with inverted commas—'edition' (Haury (1913) VI).³⁵⁶ Thus they remain.

Dindorf's *Procopius* served for decades as a complete modern edition of all Procopius' works, whereas in fact it was only ever intended to be a corrected version of the 1662/1663 Louvre edition of Maltretus. The rapid and focussed work of Niebuhr in 1827 and 1828 underlines their purpose of sticking closely to the Louvre format which Dindorf strictly followed. Moreover, the translation of Maltretus was not modified to match emendations to the text, and this proved to be quite a problem. By later standards, however, that was never sufficient. As the canons of textual scholarship advanced through the 19th century, not to mention levels of scholarly expectations and thor-

³⁵⁵ Dindorf (1838) xxxiv.

³⁵⁶ Haury (1913) vi.

oughness, the Bonn corpus came to look dated very quickly. While its contributors included prolific and venerable scholars such as Niebuhr and Bekker, their overall approach to the texts printed in the Bonn corpus was no longer adequate. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848–1901), for example, was educated in a more textually privileged era. He was therefore embarrassed to think that his own Berlin Academy, and some of its finest members, should have been associated with such slipshod work, let alone that ‘such treatment was still considered good enough for the Byzantines’.³⁵⁷ Still, the texts were useful and provided a solid basis for the growing interest in both Byzantine history and literature in subsequent decades.

From the 1500s to 1840s, through all the various attempts to produce an improved edition, there was very little critical discussion of Procopius as an historian or writer, except for Alemanni in 1623. One of the first, and arguably most important, contributions to appear after Dindorf’s edition was in many ways an aberration. Wilhelm Teuffel (1820–1878) was an accomplished student of Greek and Latin literature at a young age, with already published monographs on Horace (1842) and Persius (1844), to be followed by others on various Greek plays and most famously his *History of Latin Literature* (2 vols, 1870). He was a close colleague of August Friedrich Pauly (1796–1845) who began his unprecedented *Realencyclopädie* in 1837, but when Pauly died, Teuffel became one of its editors. In the absence of identifying any qualified contributor, the twenty-two year old Teuffel set about writing the due article on Procopius himself,³⁵⁸ with a fuller version published separately in

³⁵⁷ Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1982) 119, and for other informed statements of regret for the series from Bury, Bursian, and von Harnack: Croke (1985) 277.

³⁵⁸ Teuffel (1852). As literature on Procopius to that point Teuffel was only able to cite (86) Fabricius, Hanke, Gibbon, and his own essay (1847) which only accentuates the importance of his contribution. A new and expanded replacement for Pauly’s project by Georg Wissowa, best known as the Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertums-*

advance (1847).³⁵⁹ At the same time, he also researched and wrote the encyclopedia article on Justinian, in which he made extensive use of Procopius and fairly declared that the best modern account of Justinian's reign was that of Gibbon.³⁶⁰ Throughout the rest of his productive career Teuffel never again ventured into the study of any early Byzantine texts or history, except for a companion piece on Agathias which he offered for the inaugural issue of a new journal (*Philologus*, 1864), although his *History of Latin Literature* included chapters on writers from the fourth to the seventh century. Teuffel's essay on Procopius was considered by Felix Dahn (1834–1912) as being 'without any comparison, the most intellectual and best that has been written about Procopius', going on to claim that 'in forty pages it contains more truth about our author, enters into his essence more deeply and explains him better than the whole Procopian literature put together'.³⁶¹ Teuffel relied almost entirely on nothing more than a careful and shrewd reading of Procopius' text yet highlighted key questions such as his sources of information, beliefs and literary intent. Before long each of these topics was being more thoroughly investigated and contested. With Teuffel, the

wissenschaft (*RE*), began in 1890 but did not include its replacement article on Procopius (by B. Rubin) until 1957.

³⁵⁹ Teuffel (1847). This essay and its companion piece on Agathias (published in *Philologus* 1 (1864) 495–511 but probably written in the 1840s) were republished, although never referred to by Teuffel in his introduction, in W. Teuffel, *Studien und Charakteristiken zur griechischen und römischen Litteraturgeschichte* (Leipzig 1871; repr. 1889), 248–313 (Procopius), 296–314 (Agathias). For present purposes, it is only the original 1847 version that is relevant.

³⁶⁰ Teuffel (1846).

³⁶¹ Dahn (1865) 492: 'Ohne allen Vergleich das Geistsvollste und Beste, was über Prokop geschrieben worden' ... 'sie enthält auf vierzig Seiten mehr Wahres über unser Autor, bringt tiefer in sein Wesen ein und erklärt ihn besser, als die gesammte Prokop-literatur zusammengenommen'. One of the few modern scholars to appreciate Teuffel's essay has been Averil Cameron (1966).

modern study of Procopius had begun and was soon to reach its take-off point with Dahn.

By the later 19th century there was a new sense of urgency in relation to the editing of Byzantine texts, including Procopius, driven by several emerging factors: the systematisation and professionalisation of scholarship through specialist journals and meetings, the expansion of universities and academies, the new models of collaboration evident in other philological and documentary projects, the opening up of archives and libraries and the creation of detailed catalogues as essential keys to them. Major studies of Procopius such as that of Dahn (1865) and the production of detailed theses such as that of Braun (1885) revealed new aspects of the man and his historical perspective. At the same time, the more recent beginnings of Byzantine archaeology and topography, especially for Constantinople, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia and the Balkans, brought more critical attention to the *Buildings*. In this world, leading scholars and scholarly organisers such as Theodor Mommsen (1817–1903) were already operating on a completely different plane to that of Niebuhr in the 1820s. Dahn had actually dedicated his major study of Procopius to Mommsen, who was keen for the Berlin Academy to improve the quality of the editions of the main Byzantine historians, including Procopius. He also later claimed he would have included the Byzantine historians such as Procopius in the Academy's *MGH* project, if only he could have found a way of justifying them as relevant texts for German history.³⁶² He was doubtless aware that Beatus (1531) and Grotius (1655) had earlier made exactly that link. Still Mommsen held back. Contemporary political purposes were no longer sufficient in an era where the priority had become scholarly standards. In any event, Mommsen was responsible for authorising funds in the 1870s for Wilhelm Meyer (1845–1917) to travel in France and Italy collating manuscripts of Procopius for a new edition. It was

³⁶² Croke (1985) 278–9.

Mommsen, therefore, who later communicated to Meyer the Academy's displeasure and official termination of his services.³⁶³ All scholars were now expected to deliver. As with Vulcanius and Heinsius previously in the 17th century, another promising modern edition of Procopius came to nothing after considerable labour and research investment.

Finally, when the modern discipline of Byzantine studies was effectively established in the 1890s at Munich, its leader Karl Krumbacher (1856–1909) was clear that the new field's most critical task was a modern edition of Procopius.³⁶⁴ When Meyer was relieved of his editorial task, Krumbacher and Wilhelm von Christ (1831–1907) arranged for Jacob Haury (1862–1942) to step into the breach.³⁶⁵ Editing the different works of Procopius turned out to be a long and difficult task after all, and one can sense Haury's relief at finishing—'I am filled with the greatest joy to have now finally brought to completion a work which I took up 20 years ago'.³⁶⁶ Only with Haury's edition (1905–1913) of the *Wars*, the *Secret History*, and the *Buildings* could the modern scholarly study of Procopius really begin. Only then could the accumulated efforts of scholars to understand Procopius since the 15th century be safely set aside, but that is a later story for the following chapters.

³⁶³ Letter, Mommsen to Meyer, 6 November 1890, in Rebenich and Franke (2012) 449 (Letter 303); cf. Calder and Kirsten (2003) 514 (letter 314). Mommsen had been dealing with Meyer's dilatoriness since at least 1886 (Calder and Kirsten (2003) 373 (Letter 223)).

³⁶⁴ Krumbacher (1891) 45.

³⁶⁵ Haury (1905) LVIII, LIX–LX; cf. Schreiner (2006).

³⁶⁶ Haury (1913) IX. Haury's edition, dedicated to Krumbacher, was revised by Gerhard Wirth in the early 1960s. Most modern translations and scholarship are based on this version. However, while preserving the integrity of Haury's text, the user is required to note the marginal box in the text then look up the proposed specific textual improvement or addition/deletion at the back of the volume, before returning once more to the text.

13. Conclusion

The austere and familiar Teubner pages of the standard modern edition of Procopius' entire oeuvre in four printed volumes (Haury 1905–13) belie the turbulent and disjointed story preceding them. They were produced in an era when the editorial technique of stemmatic recension had proved itself as secure scholarly practice. Unlike so many other major Greek and Latin texts, for each of the works of Procopius (*Wars*, *Secret History*, and *Buildings*) there are several manuscripts written by the 14th and 15th centuries in the East and later brought mainly to Italy. Comparing and collating them all for the first time followed a disciplined pattern bound to establish a more secure result. Throughout Haury's edition of the *Wars* there is a seamless transition, with the eight books in succession clearly marked and divided by book, chapter and, for the first time, by section numbers. Likewise, his editions of the *Secret History* and *Buildings* continue to give textual comfort to all readers and students of Procopius. By 1850, however, Procopius was still far from this state of textual certainty and stability although, with few exceptions, all the relevant manuscripts were now in Western European libraries, mainly at the Vatican, Florence, Milan, Munich, and Paris. Unlike his predecessors, Haury had only to set foot in a few libraries, informed in advance by reliable catalogue entries. Working in Munich, he also had easy local access. Dahn, for instance, in the 1860s could only ever access manuscripts in Munich and Milan.³⁶⁷

Of the 84 known manuscripts of at least some part of Procopius' works, only a single one in Milan (*Amb. A 182 sup.*) contains all the works of Procopius together, but even then it only covers half of the *Wars* (Books 5–8), the other half of the same manuscript (*Wars*, Books 1–4) being in the Vatican (*Vat. Ottob. 82*).³⁶⁸ Most manuscripts of the *Wars* have separate tetrads at best while the *Secret History* and

³⁶⁷ Dahn (1865) 465.

³⁶⁸ Haury (1896) 149 and (1905) XLVI, cf. XXXI.

Buildings have their own manuscript traditions, and so their modern pathways have essentially been quite separate, leading to different translations and interpretation at different times by different scholars. The *Buildings* displays the added complexity of shorter and longer versions which ultimately lie beyond the reach of the stemmatic method. They may represent separate earlier and later editions, or the shorter as a scribal summary of the longer. Only five manuscripts contain more than one separate work of Procopius.³⁶⁹ Most manuscripts prior to 1453 were written in Constantinople and brought to Italy before some were removed to other places in Europe where they were used individually, sometimes as the basis of a translation and only much later as the basis of a text. Other scribes (Darmarios, Auer, Vincenzo, Moro), mainly in the 16th century, made copies from them with these later copies safely eliminated for textual purposes. The first translations were prepared as Latin and Italian manuscripts of *Wars* Books 5 to 8 covering the Gothic war without any intention of being repurposed in the form of a book. One of them never eventuated (Lianoro), another survives only in manuscript form (Leoniceno), and one was published two decades later (Persona). In the 15th and 16th centuries, all the manuscripts of Procopius were in private possession, owned principally by Cosimo, Lorenzo, and Catherine de Medici at Florence then Paris, Bessarion at Rome then Venice, Peutinger and Fugger at Augsburg, De Thou at Paris, Pinelli at Padua, and Orsini at Rome. Scholars made their own copies, as did Peutinger at Augsburg, Scaliger, Casaubon, and de Thou at Paris, Alemanni and Holsten at

³⁶⁹ They are: Ambrosiana (Milan), *A* 182 *sup.* (*Wars*, fols. 1–8v, 25–181v, 184–188; *Secret History*, fols. 224–247v, 17–24v, 9–16v, 182–183v; *Buildings*, fols. 189–223v); Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (Munich), *Gr.* 513 (*Buildings*, fols. 1–27 and *Secret History*, fol. 27*); Laurentiana (Florence), *Laur. Phut.* 9.32 (*Buildings*, fols. 177–214 and *Wars*, fols. 214–224); Angelicum (Rome), *Gr.* 25 (*Secret History*, fols. 235–240 and *Wars* fols., 235–244); Ambrosiana (Milan), *Amb.* 74 *sup.* (*Secret History*, fols. 1–60 and *Wars*, fols. 60–113)

Rome, as well as the polymathic antiquarian Peiresc at Aix-en-Provence. Yet other manuscripts, perhaps better than anything surviving, were lost along the way. They were owned or used by Biondo, Leoniceno, Peutinger, Cuspinian, d'Armagnac, Pinelli, Lindenbrog and Maltretus. Only gradually did manuscripts of Procopius settle into searchable, accessible library locations. Of all the manuscripts known today, some of them were used for the first time by Haury (1905–1913) because they had only recently been discovered or rediscovered.³⁷⁰ Others have only come to light since.³⁷¹

For centuries, readers of Procopius had to rely on translations of the *Wars* (Persona 1506, Maffei 1509) that turned out to be incomplete because they were based on a single Greek manuscript. The immediate quest for better translations (Peutinger, Cuspinian, Vulcanius, Grotius) preceded the need for an actual Greek text, or a manifestly better text in the case of the *Buildings*, which by 1531 had an edition based on a manuscript owned by Peutinger and three translations of it within years (Craneveldt, Vuesalensis, Egio). Progressive awareness of different manuscripts of both the *Wars* and *Buildings*, reinforced by the inadequacies of earlier translations, alerted scholars to the need for a more thorough and comprehensive edition of Procopius' writings leading to the initial edition of Hoeschel (1607). Vulcanius worked for years on a more complete edition of both the *Buildings* and the *Wars*. It never eventuated although his Latin translation of *Wars* survived to be utilised by Dindorf over two centuries later. After half a century (c. 1600–1650) Heinsius' planned edition, building on the work of Vulcanius, also came to nothing. As part of his case for establishing the priority of Sweden as the original Gothic homeland, Grotius translated only the books on wars with the Goths and Vandals, but from unspecified better and

³⁷⁰ For example, *Par. Suppl. Gr.* 1185 (*Secret History*, Haury's 'P') discovered on Mt Athos by Miller in the 19th century.

³⁷¹ Kalli (2004) for the *Wars*, but most are for the *Buildings*: Flusin (2001) 13–14 and Montinaro (2012) 90–1.

fuller manuscripts than those used by Persona and Maffei. He could not be persuaded to take on the rest of Procopius. The text and translation of the *Secret History* appeared simultaneously in the same volume for the first time in the case of Procopius (Alemanni 1623). Throughout these decades, books remained expensive and readers of Greek books remained few, although the nature of the book progressively gave rise to indexes, tables of contents and numbering of pages, chapters and sections. All these developments are on display in the Procopian tradition.

At crucial stages, especially in the period from the 1590s to the 1640s, Procopius benefitted from the attention of some of the most accomplished scholarly minds of the time (Scaliger, Casaubon, Vulcanius, Hoeschel, Heinsius, and Grotius). Yet, too often, the outcome was long years of effort and expertise which eventually yielded nothing and either had to be repeated (Vulcanius, Heinsius, Meyer), or a product that was ultimately cramped and compromised (Dindorf). What survives are many of the notes and annotations of these scholars that may still be worth researching. There survives, for example, Scaliger's annotated edition of Hoeschel, and Reiske's annotated edition of Alemanni. Only Dindorf made any use of what was seen in the 1830s as an informative substitute for a full collation of all manuscripts. Dindorf had actually set himself the goal of improving Maltretus' first full edition of Procopius' works (1662–1663), including a fresh Latin translation of the *Wars* based on his new text. In the end, he merely patched up Maltretus' edition by utilising the unpublished corrections and conjectures of earlier scholars (Vulcanius, Scaliger, Reiske) which came his way but leaving the essential problem of the *Buildings*, its longer and shorter versions, still unresolved. Maltretus had himself taken over the *Secret History* from Alemanni, so Dindorf mainly appropriated both Maltretus and Alemanni, although he knew that more could have been done to improve his edition, had he been able to make time. While Haury was conscious of his own twenty years of effort to produce an edition of Procopius's

works from 1893 to 1913, he more or less had to start from scratch.

For almost all the period from 1400 to 1850, the whole literary output of Procopius was rarely taken together. More rarely still was it exploited to explain and inform the period which it covered (520s to 550s), let alone the writer himself. Instead, Procopius' works (*Wars* especially) were used by the Byzantines for centuries as a model of literary style. When he first became known and read at Florence, Rome, Milan, and Venice in the fifteenth century (through Bruni, Biondo, Leonicensis, Personna), Procopius was merely the historian of the little known sixth century in Italy (*Wars* 5–8). Gradually, for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries he acquired a more nationalistic role as a crucial witness to the origin and early history of the Gothic nation in Germany then Sweden, with the Vandal and Gothic Wars (Books 3–8) appearing regularly but never separately. Procopius only appeared as part of a wider collection of relevant works (Beatus 1531, Leunclavius 1567, Pithou 1579, Goulart 1594, Grotius 1655). It was the publication of the *Secret History* in 1623 that posed the sharp challenge to the contemporary picture of Justinian, derived from generations of lawyers and students dedicated to the sources of Roman law that bear the emperor's name. Thereafter, those encountering Procopius (G. Vossius, Cave, le Vayer, Fabricius) were required to engage with the author himself and the specific question of his religious belief and intellectual sincerity. So too, the Justinian of the *Secret History* had to be reconciled somehow with the Justinian of the *Wars* and *Buildings* on the one hand, and with the familiar Justinian of the *Digest*, *Code*, and *Novels* on the other (Eichel, Ludewig).

As writer and historian, Procopius falls on the Byzantine side of a modern classical/Byzantine divide, but for Byzantine audiences, and for the leading scholars of the formative period of modern European scholarship from the 15th to the 18th centuries, there was no such divide. Procopius was accorded the same serious treatment as his models, Herodotus and Thucydides. As the divide solidified, however, Byzantine authors suffered by comparison. Put

another way, by 1850 the quality of editions and research for Thucydides was far superior to those for Procopius by that time. Likewise, Vulcanius, Scaliger, Casaubon, Pithou, Hoeschel, Lindenbrog, Heinsius, Grotius and Dindorf were each significant contributors to the study of Procopius, but there is no mention of this aspect of their work when their scholarship is discussed in Wilamowitz's *History of Classical Scholarship*, for instance.³⁷² From 1400 to 1850, indeed beyond then to the present day, the works of Procopius provide a striking chapter in the development of modern understanding and interpretation of an ancient text. They illustrate just how recent is the expectation that every text must be comprehensively and critically edited and its author deconstructed from every angle.

*University of Sydney/
Macquarie University*

brian.croke0@gmail.com

³⁷² Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1982) 49–54 (Scaliger); 54–55 (Casaubon); 55 (Pithou); 65 (Hoeschel); 67, 70 (Heinsius); 67–8 (Grotius); 73 (Lindenbrog); 144 (Dindorf). Vulcanius is absent altogether.

Appendix:
Procopius Texts and Translations, 1400 to 1850

(i) Books

It is more instructive to list chronologically the published texts and translations of Procopius from 1400 to 1850, rather than separately by individual works (*Wars*, *Secret History*, *Buildings*). Most of these are also now available on-line (as indicated). Apart from Latin, translations into particular modern languages from 1400 to 1850 are noted here but covered in more detail in later chapters. Beyond the boundaries of this chapter, lie both the first complete and independent text of all Procopius' works by a single scholar (Haury 1905–1913) and the first complete translation of that text into any modern language (Dewing 1914–40). Indented and in italics are the adaptation of Procopius' *Wars* 5–8 by Leonardo Bruni in his *De Bello Italico* (manuscript 1441, published 1470), followed by its later editions and translations.

This chronological sequence enables greater visibility of certain relevant elements in the tradition over time, particularly: (1) the appearance of translations before any text; (2) the particular focus on *Wars* 5–8 (*Gothic War*); (3) the *Buildings* as the first published text (1531); (4) the later appearance of the *Secret History* (1623), but not in a complete form until 1827; (5) separate translations of individual works by different authors; (6) establishing stable book and chapter numbering; (7) different order of successive books of *Wars*; (8) different numbering of books (e.g. BV 1 as BP 3); (9) different methods of dividing *Wars* Book 8 (= BG 4); (9) how only the development of modern textual criteria led to a full text of the *Wars*; and (10) the unresolved question of the longer and shorter versions of the *Buildings*.

For convenience, the following abbreviations are used here: BP = Persian Wars (*Wars*, books 1 and 2), BV = Vandal Wars (*Wars*, books 3 and 4), BG = Gothic War (*Wars*, books 5–8); Aed = *Buildings*; SH = *Secret History*; LT = Latin translation; IT = Italian translation; FT = French translation; ET = English Translation; GT = German translation. Detailed bibliography on the earliest translations can be found in Forrai (2016).

1441 Florence (BG version into LT, manuscript)L. Bruni (Aretino) (1377–1444): *De bello italico*<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k60187c/f22.image>**1456 Florence?** (IT of BG version of Bruni into LT, manuscript)L. Petroni (1409–78), IT of Bruni, *De Bello Italico* from MS supplied by Bruni<http://brbl-dl.library.yale.edu/vufind/Record/3878464>**1450s/1460s?** Florence? (IT of BG version of Bruni into LT, manuscript)B. Nuti (c. 15), *De Bello Italico*

Not available on-line

1470 Foligno (printed publication of BG version of Bruni 1441)L. Bruni: *Leonardi Aretini de Bello italico adversus Gothos (Emilianus de Orsinis et Johannes Numeister)*.[http://bildsuche.digitale-](http://bildsuche.digitale-sammlungen.de/index.html?c=viewer&bandnummer=bs00066107&pimage=157&v=100&nav=&l=en)[sammlungen.de/index.html?c=viewer&bandnummer=bs00066107&pimage=157&v=100&nav=&l=en](http://bildsuche.digitale-sammlungen.de/index.html?c=viewer&bandnummer=bs00066107&pimage=157&v=100&nav=&l=en)**1471 Venice** (reprint of BG version of Bruni 1470, Foligno)L. Bruni: *Leonardi Aretini de Bello italico adversus Gothos (Nicolaus Jenson)*.[https://books.google.com.au/books?id=5qlZG-](https://books.google.com.au/books?id=5qlZG-PmicwC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false)[PmicwC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.com.au/books?id=5qlZG-PmicwC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false)**1480s (?) Ferrara** (IT of BG, manuscript)N. Leonicensis (1428–1524): *Historia de le guerre gottice facte da Justiniano imperatore per mezo de Belisario suo capitano, divisa in quattro parte, traductione facta de greco in vulgare da maistro Nicolo da Lonigo*

(Milan: Ambrosiana, codex A 272 inf.; not available online).

1503 Venice (reprint of BG version of Bruni 1470, Foligno)L. Bruni: *Leonardi Aretini de Bello Gotthorum, seu de Bello italico adversus Gotthos libri quatuor*

(Bernardinum Venetum de Vitalibus).

[https://books.google.com.au/books?id=Miz9o-](https://books.google.com.au/books?id=Miz9o-kTmBwC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false)[kTmBwC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.com.au/books?id=Miz9o-kTmBwC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false)

1506 Rome (BG into LT)

C. Persona (1416–86): Procopius de Bello Gottorum. Opus Procopi de bello Gottorum: Jacobus Mazzochius Ro. achademiae bibliopola T. Phedro Ingeramio S. P. D. per Christophorum Persona Romanum priorem S. Balbinae traductus. Impressum Romae per Joannem Besickem Alemanum, impensa Jacobi Mazzochii romanae Academiae bibliopole. (J. Besicken).

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=jiFDAAAACAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1509 Rome (BP, BV into LT)

R. Maffei (1451–1522): Procopius. De Bello persico. Raphael Volaterranus Mario fratri salutem. Impressum Romae, per magistrum Eucharium Silber als Franck. Castigatum per Andream Mucium, Sedente Julio II, Pont. Max., anno ejus quinto... Anno salutis MDIX, nonis martiis (E. Silber),

http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10140606_00005.html

1516 Rome (BP, BV into LT)

R. Maffei (1451–1522): Procopius. De Bello persico. Raphael Volaterranus Mario fratri salutem. Impressum Romae (Jacob Mazzochi).

Not available online

1526 Florence (publication of 1456 IT of Bruni 1441)

L. Petroni: Libro de la guerra de' Ghotti, composto da M. Leonardo Aretino in lingua latina et fatto volgare da Lodovico Petroni (Heredi di Filippo di Guinta).

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=7zc8AAAACAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1528 Venice (reprint of IT of Bruni 1441)

L. Petroni: Libro de la guerra de' Ghotti, composto da M. Leonardo Aretino in lingua latina, et fatto volgare da Lodovico Petroni. (Nicolo Zoppino da Ferrara).

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=Zg8F3atCSIoC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1531 Basle (reprint of LT of BG (1506), BP and BV (1509), Aed. text)

B. Rhenanus (1485–1547): Procopii Caesariensis de Rebus Gothorum, Persarum ac Vandalorum libri VII, una cum aliis mediorum temporum historicis (Herwagen).

http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10139891_00002.html

1534 Paris (reprint of IT of Bruni 1441)

L. Bruni: *Leonardi Aretini De Bello italico adversus Gothos gesto historia* (Simonem Colinaeum).

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=awFfAAAAcAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1537 Paris (Aed., into LT)

F. Craneveldt (1485–1564): Procopii Rhetoris Et Hystoriographi (C. Wechel).

http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10150962_00005.html

1538 Munich (Aed., into LT)

A. Vuesaliensis (1414–1564): Procopii rhetoris et historici Caesariensis, de Iustiniani Augusti Caesaris aedificiis orationes sex: Latine donatae per doctissimum uirum Arnoldi vuesaliensem, antehac nunc excutae (Ivo Schoefer).

<http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00034987/images/>

1542 Venice (reprint of IT of Bruni 1441)

L. Petroni: *Libro de la guerra de' Ghotti, composto da M. Leonardo Aretino in lingua latina, et fatto volgare da Lodovico Petroni* (Gabriel Jolito de Ferrara).

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=ghEoj9OiLsQC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1543 Paris

B. Rhenanus (1485–1547): Procopii Caesariensis de Rebus Gothorum, Persarum ac Vandalorum libri VII, una cum aliis mediorum temporum historicis.

1544 Venice (BG, from LT into IT)

B. Egio (d. 1567): Procopio Cesariense de la longa et aspra guerra de Gothi libri tre; di latino in volgare tradotte per Benedetto Egio da Spoleti (Michele Tramezzino)

http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10170650_00005.html

-

1547 Venice (BP and BV, from LT into IT)

B. Egio: Procopio Cesariense De la Guerra di Giustiniano imperatore contra i Persiani (Michele Tramezzino).

http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10170652_00001.html

1547 Venice (Aed., into IT)

B. Egio: Procopio Cesariense de gli edifici di Giustiniano Imperatore, di greco in volgare tradotti per Benedetto Egio da Spoleti (Michele Tramezzino).

http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10170651_00001.html

1548 Venice (reprint of IT of Bruni 1441)

L. Petroni: Libro de la guerra de' Ghotti, composto da M. Leonardo Aretino in lingua latina, et fatto volgare da Lodovico Petroni (Gabriel Jolito de Ferrarii).

https://books.google.com.au/books?id=f_pBxYsZRqYC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false

1563 London (ET of Bruni 1441)

L. Bruni, The historie of Leonard Aretine: concerning the warres betwene the Imperialles and the Gothes for the possession of Italy, a worke very pleasant and profitable. Translated out of Latin into Englishe by Arthur Goldyng (Rouland Hall, for George Bucke).

http://eebo.chadwyck.com.ezproxy1.library.usyd.edu.au/search/full_r.ec?SOURCE=pgimages.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=V6275

1565 London (ET of Bruni 1441)

L. Bruni, *A most worthy and famous worke, bothe pleasant and profitable, conteyning the longe and cruell warres between the Gothes and the valiant Romayne emperours, for the possession of Italy. Written in the Italian tongue, and newly translated into English by Arthur Gosling (Wyllyam Hovv, for George Bucke).*

[http://eebo.chadwyck.com.ezproxy1.library.usyd.edu.au/search/full_text?SOURCE=pgimages.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=52633869&FILE=&SEARCHSCREEN=param\(SEARCHSCREEN\)&VID=173919&PAGENO=15&ZOOM=FIT&VIEWPORT=&SEARCHCONFIG=param\(SEARCHCONFIG\)&DISPLAY=param\(DISPLAY\)&HIGHLIGHT_KEYWORD=undefined](http://eebo.chadwyck.com.ezproxy1.library.usyd.edu.au/search/full_text?SOURCE=pgimages.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=52633869&FILE=&SEARCHSCREEN=param(SEARCHSCREEN)&VID=173919&PAGENO=15&ZOOM=FIT&VIEWPORT=&SEARCHCONFIG=param(SEARCHCONFIG)&DISPLAY=param(DISPLAY)&HIGHLIGHT_KEYWORD=undefined)

1576 Basle (reprint of BG into LT, 1506; BP and BV into LT, 1509; Aed into LT, 1538)

J. Leunclavius (1541–1594): *Zosimi Historiae novae libri VI, numquam hactenus editi. Quibus additae sunt historiae Procopii [Raphaele Volaterrano, Christophoro Persona, Arnaldo Vesaliensi interpretibus] Agathiae [Christophoro Persona interprete] Jornandis. Zosimi libros Jo. Leunclavius primus ab se repertos de graecis latinis fecit, Agathiam redintegravit, ceteros recensuit. Adjecimus et Leonardi Aretini Rerum Gothicarum commentarios, de graecis exscriptos. Omnia cum indicibus copiosis (Petri Pernae).*

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=YEf4AHeOuoYC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1578 Lyons (BG 1, 2 into FT)

G. Paradin (1510–1590): *Histoire de Procope de Cesarée e la guerre des Goths faites en Italien (Jean d'Ogerolles).*

https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=6XL_2ekbqvsC&printsec=frontcover&output=reader&hl=en&pg=GBS.PP6

1579 Paris (BG 4, extract, text)

P. Pithou (1539–1596): *Codicis legum wisigothorum libri XII. Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi De Gothis Wandalis et Suevis Historia sive Chronicon. Ex Bibliotheca Petri Pithoei I.C. Procopii Caesariensis Rhetoris ex lib. VIII Histor. locus de Gothorum origine qui in exemplaribus editis hactenus desideratur (Sebastianus Nivellius).*

<http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/resolve/display/bsb10148613.html>

1587 Paris (BV and BG into FT)

M. Fumée (1540–1590): Histoire des guerres faictes par l'empereur Justinien contre les Vandales et les Goths, escrite en grec par Procope et Agathias, et mise en françois par Mart. Fumée, s. de Genillé (M. Sonnius).

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=qW5JAAAAcAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=fumee+histoire+guerres+faicte+par+l%27empereur&hl=en&sa=X&ved=oahUKEwic7ILHppfPAhWBJ5QKHau4CO8O6AEIHjAA#v=onepage&q=fumee%20histoire%20guerres%20faicte%20par%20l'empereur&f=false>

1594 Lyons (reprint of LT of BP and BV (1509), BG (150) and Aed. (1547)

S. Goulart (1543–1628), Iustiniani Augusti historia, in qua bellum Persicum, in Asia, Vandilicum, in Africa, Gothicum, in Europa, clarissimorum ducum, Belisarii praesertim Narsetisque, prudentia & fortitudine ductum atque feliciter absolutum; opera autem & studio Procopii Caesariensis, Agathiae Myrrinaei, Iornandis Alani, libris 13. luculenter descriptum, continetur. Quibus subiuncti sunt Procopii De Iustiniani aedificijs lib.6. & Iornandis De regnorum & temporum successione liber. Nova editio cui accesserunt Breviaria... Notae... Gnomologia... Chronologia... Indices (F. Le Preux).

<https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=OgmYhWktNNsC&printsec=frontcover&output=reader&hl=en&pg=GBS.PP1>

1597 Leiden (BG extract)

B. Vulcanius (1538–1614): Jornandes, episcopus ravennas, de Getarum sive Gothorum origine et rebus gestis. Isidori Chronicon Gothorum, Vandalorum, Suevorum et Wisigothorum. Procopi fragmentum de priscis sedibus et migrationibus Gothorum. Graece et lat. Accessit et Jornandes de Regnorum et temporum successione. Omnia ex recognitione et cum notis Bon. Vulcanii, Brugensis. Lugduni Batavorum (Ex officina Plantiniana, apud Franciscum Raphelengium).

<https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=wIVbAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover&output=reader&hl=en&pg=GBS.PP12>

1607 Augsburg (BV, BP, BG, Aed. text)

D. Hoeschel (1556–1617): *Historiarum Procopii Caesarensis libri VIII. Nunc primum Graece editi. Accessit liber de aedificiis Justiniani, fere duplo quam antea auctior. Opera Davidis Hoeschelii.* (Wechsel)

http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10209758_00001.html

1623 Lyons (SH text and LT)

N. Alemannus (1583–1626): *Procopi Caesariensis, V. I. Anekdotia. Arcana historia, qui est liber nonus Historiarum. Ex bibliotheca vaticana Nicolaus Alemannus protulit, latine redidit, notis illustravit, Nunc primum in lucem prodit triplici Indice locupletata.* (A. Brugiotti).

http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10209760_00005.html

1653 London (BP, BV, BG into ET)

H. Holcroft (1586–1660): *The history of the warres of the Emperour Justinian: in eight books: of the Persian, II, Vandall, II, Gothicke, IV / written in Greek by Procopivs of Caesarea, and Englished by Henry Holcroft, Knight (Humphrey Moseley).*

https://books.google.com.au/books?id=s3FnAAAaAAJ&prints_ec=frontcover&dq=Holcroft++history+of+the+warres+of+the+Emperor&hl=en&sa=X&ved=oahUKEwiM4a3RprfPAhUFE5QKHZIHdWMO6AEIHTAA#v=onepage&q=Holcroft%20%20history%20of%20the%20warres%20of%20the%20Emperor&f=false

1654 Helmstadt (SH, text and LT)

J. Eichel (1621–1688): *Historia arcana Procopii, Nicolao Alemanno defensore primum prolata, nunc plerisque in locis et testimoniis falsitatis convicta, a Joanne Eichelio (H. Muller).*

https://books.google.com.au/books?id=ciBUAAAaAAJ&prints_ec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false

1655 Amsterdam (BV and BG into LT, SH extracts into LT)

H. Grotius (1583–1645): *Historia Gotthorum, Vandalorum et Langobardorum* (pp. 1–518: *Procopii Vandalica et Gothica*; pp. 510–528, *Excerpta ex arcana Procopii historia ad res vandalias et gothicas pertinentia*). (L. Elzevier).

<https://archive.org/stream/historiagotthoruogrot#page/ng/mode/2up>

1662–1663 Paris (BP, BV, BG, SH, Aed.)

C. Maltretus (1621–1674):

Vol. 1 (1662): Procopii Caesariensis Historiarum sui temporis libri VIII. Interprete Claudio Maltreto,

Vol. 2 (1663): Procopii Caesariensis Arcana historia qui est liber nonus Historiarum. Ex Bibliotheca vaticana Nicolaus Alemannus protulit, latine reddidit, notis illustravit. Recognovit, varias lectiones adjecit et lacunas fere omnes implevit Claudius Maltretus, et Procopii Caesariensis de Aedificiis Dn. Justiniani libri sex... Interprete Claudio Maltreto.

Vol. 1 (Wars)

<https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=XY26RKT6YsQC&printsec=frontcover&output=reader&hl=en&pg=GBS.PP6>

Vol. 2 (Secret History, Buildings only available online in 1729 reprint)

<https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=FYFcAAAaAAJ&printsec=frontcover&output=reader&hl=en&pg=GBS.RA3-PA392>

1664 Paris (Aed. 1.1 into LT)

F. Combefis (1605–1679): Leonis Allatii De Symeonum scriptis diatriba... Originum rerumque Constantinopolitanarum, variis auctoribus manipulus (Piget)

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=qER7Nm9YOcUC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1667 Paris (BG version of Bruni into FT)

L. de Mauger: Histoire de la guerre des Gots en Italie, composée en latin par Léonard Arétin. Et traduit en françois par L. M. (Guillaume de Luyne).

(not available online)

1669 Cologne (SH text and LT)

N. Alemannus (1583–1626): Procopi Caesariensis, V. I. Anekdotia. Arcana historia, qui est liber nonus Historiarum. Ex bibliotheca vaticana Nicolaus Alemannus protulit, latine reddidit, notis illustravit, Nunc primum in lucem prodit triplici Indice locupletata (Johann Wilhelmum Friessen Juniorem)

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=W-nIucKgfloC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1669 Paris (BP into FT)

L. de Mauger: Oeuvres de Procope de Césarée (Guillaume de Luyne).

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=mNbKNPubLcC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1669 Paris (SH into FT)

L. de Mauger: Histoire secrète de Procope, traduite par L.de M. (Guillaume de Luyne).

https://books.google.com.au/books?id=SMoWAAAAQAAJ&pg=PA288&lpg=PA288&dq=1+de+mauger+procope&source=bl&ots=Q1oJsdEoTg&sig=bboAJn1p_6IzauumAkOeUHgHd48&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjc_7nc28_SAhUFjJQKHT7DBjEQ6AEIjzAD#v=onepage&q=1%2ode%20mauger%20procope&f=false

1670 Paris (BV into FT)

L. de Mauger: Procope de Cesarée, de la guerre contre les Vandales (Guillaume de Luyne).

https://books.google.com.au/books?id=yXvfl4JGyUkC&pg=PA459&lpg=PA459&dq=Mauger,+L%C3%A9onor+de&source=bl&ots=dzS3goPUYa&sig=Vs5B3tr7rBjDcSLEm7BsadUV6Q&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjkNWLv_DOAhVCjpQKHTE5B8UO6AEIIDA#v=onepage&q=Mauger%2C%20L%C3%A9onor%2ode&f=false

1671 Paris (BG 4, SH, Aed., into FT)

L. Cousin: Histoire de Constantinople depuis le règne de Justin jusqu'à la fin de l'Empire, traduite sur les originaux grecs par Cousin, vol. II.

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=w74WAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1672 Paris (BP, BV, BG, into FT)

L. Cousin (1627–1707): Histoire de Constantinople depuis le règne de Justin jusqu'à la fin de l'Empire, traduite sur les originaux grecs par Cousin, vol. I

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=gotBAAAACAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1674 London (SH into ET)

Anon.: The secret history of the court of the emperor Justinian written by Procopius of Cesarea; faithfully rendered into English. (John Barksdale).

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=1OhmAAAACAAJ&pg=PA50&lpg=PA50&dq=The+secret+history+of+the+court+of+the+emperor+Justinian&source=bl&ots=zYCB-fDmAq&sig=FzeyRxXrItyqVmvC4fJExFjugo&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0oahUKEwjgq7rgt4fPAhWDH5QKHxqEAsQ6AEISTAJ#v=onepage&q=The%20secret%20history%20of%20the%20court%20of%20the%20emperor%20Justinian&f=false>

1693 Paris (SH, chapter 9 text and FT)

B. de la Monnoye (1641–1728): Menagiana ou les bon mots et remarques critiques, historiques, morales et d'érudition par Gilles Ménage (Florentin Delaunle), Vol. 1 (1693, repr. 1715), 347–352

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=LL1sZoqs1lwC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1723 Milan (BG into LT)

L. Muratori (1672–1750): Rerum Historicarum scriptores, vol. 1

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=unBEAAAACAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1729 Venice (BG 4, SH and Aed)

C. Maltretus, Procopii Caesariensis Historiarum temporis sui tetras altera, interprete Claudio Maltreto, ... cum supplementis vaticanis et Procopii, ... Arcana historia ... Ex Bibliotheca vaticana Nicolaus Alemannus protulit ... Recognovit ... Claudius Maltretus, Vol. 2:

https://archive.org/stream/bub_gb_f6xnmASiL4C#page/n161/mode/2up

1757 Erlangen (SH into GT)

J. Reinhard (1722–1779): Procopii von Cäesarea. Geheime Geschichte (Gotthard Poetsch)

https://books.google.com.au/books?id=KmAQMa_5mMsC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false

1827 Greifswald (BP into GT)

P. Kanngiesser (1774–1833): Des Prokopius von Cäsarea Geschichte seiner Zeit, vol. 1

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=jmQ-AAAaAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1827 Leipzig (SH, text and trans.)

J. Orelli (1787–1849): Anecdota, sive Historia arcana, Gr. recogn., emendavit lacunas supplevit interpretationem Lat. N. Alemanni eiusdemque et aliorum annotationes criticas et historicas suasque animadversiones adiecit I.C. Orellius. Accedunt descriptiones pestis et famis ex eiusdem Procopii libris de bellis excerptae (C. H. F. Hartmann)

http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10238195_00005.html

1828 Greifswald (BV into GT)

P. Kanngiesser (1774–1833): Des Prokopius von Cäsarea Geschichte seiner Zeit, vol. 2

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=nmQ-AAAaAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1828 Milan (SH and Aed., into IT)

G. Compagnoni (1754–1833): Opere di Procopio di Cesarea, vol. I (F. Sonzogno),

https://archive.org/stream/OpereDiProcopioDiCesarea/Opere_di_Procopio_di_Cesarea#page/n1/mode/2up

1829 Greifswald (BG into GT)

P. Kanngiesser (1774–1833): Des Prokopius von Cäsarea Geschichte seiner Zeit, vol. 3

http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10476437_00001.html

1831 Greifswald (BG into GT)

P. Kanngiesser (1774–1833): *Des Prokopius von Cäsarea Geschichte seiner Zeit*, vol. 4.

https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=oGQ-AAAaAAJ&pg=PA243&lpg=PA243&dq=p.+Kanngiesser+Prokopius&source=bl&ots=Rnp7TqsPnl&sig=aciliM5pljTdB5m1_EGSBN778JA&hl=en&sa=X&ved=oahUKEwivocaBoOTaAhUEC8AKHS_HDKAQ6AEIPTAD#v=onepage&q=p.%20Kanngiesser%20Prokopius&f=false

1833 Milan (BP and BV into IT)

G. Rossi (d. 1842): *Istoria delle guerre persiane e vandaliche. Opere di Procopio di Cesarea*, vol. II (P. A. Molina)

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=8y6gdKTF8MoC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1833 Bonn (BP, BV, BG, text and LT)

W. Dindorf (1802–1883): *Procopius, ex recensione Guilielmi Dindorfii. (Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae)* (E. Weber)

Vol.1 (Books 1–4):

https://books.google.com.au/books?id=FT4TAAAAQAAJ&source=gbs_similarbooks

Vol.2 (Books 5–8):

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=Rj4TAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1838 Bonn (SH, Aed., text and LT)

W. Dindorf: *Procopius, ex recensione Guilielmi Dindorfii. (Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae)*, (E. Weber), vol.3:

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=hD4TAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

1838 Milan (BG into IT)

G. Rossi: *Istoria delle guerre gottiche nuova tradizione con note di Giuseppe Rossi, Opere di Procopio di Cesarea*, vol. III (P.A. Molina)

<https://books.google.com.au/books?id=WCUVAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

(ii) Manuscripts

Most, but not all, manuscripts of Procopius' works can be traced through *Pinakes/Πινάκες*, *Textes et manuscrits grecs*, the website of the Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes at <http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/recherche-generale/results/page> (search 'Procopius Caesariensis').

Many Procopian manuscripts (mainly Paris and Munich) have now been digitised and are also available online. Some can be identified with relevant access links through

https://sdbm.library.upenn.edu/?utf8=%E2%9C%93&facet.sort=index&prefix=Q&search_field=all_fields&q=Procopius+Caesariensis. They can be listed individually with links thus:

Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale)

Gr. 1699 (Wars)

<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10722896b/f7.item.r=Procopius>

Gr. 1702 (Wars)

<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10721701n/f6.item.r=Procopius>

Gr. 1700 (Wars)

<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b107231012.r=Procopius?rk=64378;0>

Gr. 1703 (Wars)

<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b11000247f/f5.item.r=Procopius>

Gr.194I (Buildings)

<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10724304h/f181.item> =

Gr.2489 (Buildings)

<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10722664f>

Munich (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek)

Cod. Gr. 87 (Wars)

<http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/ausgaben/zweiseitenansicht.html?id=00047096&seite=1&fip=193.174.98.30> =

Cod. Gr. 267, ff. 169–228 (Constantine Porphyrogenitus' excerpts from *Wars*)

<http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/ausgaben/zweiseitenansicht.html?fip=193.174.98.30&id=00049960&seite=7> =

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Note: all editions and translations of Procopius' works from 1400 to 1850 are listed in the *Appendix*)

- Ady, C. (1913) *Pius II (Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini) the Humanist Pope* (London).
- Alemanni, N. (1623) *Procopi Caesariensis, Anekdot. Arcana historia. Ex bibliotheca vaticana* (Lyon).
- Amaturo, R. (1963) 'Baldi, Bernardino', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 5:
[http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/bernardino-baldi_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/bernardino-baldi_(Dizionario-Biografico)/)
- Ankwicz-Kleehoven, H. (1959) *Der Wiener Humanist Johannes Cuspinian* (Graz/Cologne).
- Anonymus (1733) *Sylloge scriptorum varii generis et argumenti*, vol. 7, part IX (London).
- Bachelli, F. (2005) 'Lianori, Lianoro', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 65 at:
[http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/lianoro-lianori_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/lianoro-lianori_(Dizionario-Biografico)/).
- Baker, P. (2015) *Italian Renaissance Humanism in the Mirror* (Cambridge).
- Baronius, C. (1603) *Annales Ecclesiastici* (Rome).
- Baudouin, F. (1548) *Commentarii in praecipuas Justiniani imp. novellas sive authenticas constitutiones* (Lyons).
- (1560) *Justinianus siue de iure novo* (Paris).
- Bauer, S. (2014) 'Onophrio Panvinio', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 81 at:
http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/onofrio-panvinio_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/
- Beck, H.-G. (1958) 'Die Byzantinischen Studien in Deutschland vor Karl Krumbacher', in *Chalikes* (Munich) 69–119; repr. in id., *Ideen und Realitäten in Byzanz* (London 1972).
- Bertola, M. (1942) *I due primi registri di prestito della Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana* (Vatican City).
- Bianconi, D. (2005) 'La biblioteca di Cora tra Massimo Planude e Niceforo Gregora : una questione di mani', *Segno e Testo* 3: 391–438.

- (2008) ‘La controversia palamitica : figure, libri, testi e mani’, *Segno e Testo* 6: 337–76.
- Bietenholz, P. (2003) ‘Johann Herwagen’, in P. Bietenholz and T. Deutscher, edd., *Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation* (Toronto) 186–7.
- Bigi, E. (1962) ‘Aurispa, Giovanni’, *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 4 at [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/giovanni-aurispa_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/giovanni-aurispa_(Dizionario-Biografico)).
- Biondo, F. (1531) *Blondi Flavii Forliviensis Historiarum ab inclinatione Romanorum decades* (Basel).
- (2005) *Italy Illuminated*, vol. 1: Books I–IV; ed. and trans. by J. White (Cambridge, Mass.).
- (2016) *Italy Illuminated*, vol. 2: Books V–VIII; ed. and trans. by J. White (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Bodin, J. (1566) *Methodus, ad facilem historiarum cognitionem* (Paris).
- (1945) *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, trans. B. Reynolds (New York).
- Boissonade, J., ed. (1817) *Lucae Holstenii Epistolae ad diversos* (Paris).
- Bonnard, G., ed. (1966) *Edward Gibbon. Memoirs of my Life* (London).
- Botley P. (2004) *Latin Translation in the Renaissance: the Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Gianozzo Manetti and Erasmus* (Cambridge).
- (2010) *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396–1529: Grammars, Lexica, and Classroom Texts* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s. 100.2; Philadelphia).
- (2016) *Richard ‘Dutch’ Thompson, 1569–1613. The Life and Letters of a Renaissance Scholar* (Leiden).
- Bowersock, G. W. (2009) *From Gibbon to Auden* (New York and Oxford).
- Braun, H. (1885) *Procopius Caesariensis quatenus imitatus sit Thucydidem* (Erlangen).

- Brunelli, G. (1999) 'Gaudenzi, Paganino', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 52, at http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/paganino-gaudenzi_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/
- Bruni, L. (1741) *Leonardi Arretini Epistularum*, ed. L. Mehus (Florence).
- (2001) *History of the Florentine People*, vol. 1; ed. and trans. J. Hankins (Cambridge, Mass.).
- (2002) 'The Study of Literature' in C. Kallendorf, ed. and trans., *Humanist Educational Treatises* (Cambridge, Mass./London) 92–125.
- (2004) *History of the Florentine People*, vol. 2; ed. and trans. J. Hankins (Cambridge, Mass.).
- (2007) *History of the Florentine People*, vol. 3; ed. and trans. J. Hankins (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Bullard R. (2009) *The Politics of Disclosure, 1674–1725: Secret History Narratives* (London).
- Burke, P (2012a) 'History, Myth and Fiction: Doubts and Debates', in J. Rabara, et al., edd., *Oxford History of Historiography*, vol. 3 (Oxford) 261–81.
- (2012b) 'The Rise of Secret History', in C. Emden and D. Midgley, edd., *Changing Perceptions of the Public Sphere* (New York 2012) 57–72; repr. in P. Burke, *Secret History and Historical Consciousness from Renaissance to Romanticism* (London 2016).
- Burmans, P., ed. (1697) *Marquardi Gudii et doctorum virorum ad eum Epistolae* (Utrecht).
- (1727) *Sylloge epistolarum a viris illustribus scriptarum*, vol. 2 (Leiden).
- Calder, W. M. III and R. Kirsten, edd. (2003) *Theodor Mommsen und Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: Briefwechsel 1872–1903* (Hildesheim).
- Cameron, Av. (1966) 'The "Scepticism" of Procopius', *Historia* 15: 466–82; repr. in ead., *Continuity and Change in Sixth Century Byzantium* (London 1981).
- (1997) 'Gibbon and Justinian', in R. McKitterick and R. Quinault, edd., *Edward Gibbon and Empire* (Cambridge) 34–52.

- Casaubon, I. (1656) *Isaaci Casauboni Epistulae*², ed. J. Graevius (Frankfurt).
- Cave, W. (1688) *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria* (London).
- Clérigues, J.-B. (2007) ‘Nicéphore Grégoras, copiste et superviseur du Laurentianus 70, 5’, *Revue d’histoire des textes* 2: 21–47.
- Cluverius, P. (1616) *Germania Antiqua* (Leiden).
- Cochrane, E. (1981) *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago).
- Connell, W. (2012) ‘Italian Renaissance Historical Narrative’, in Rabasa, et al. (2012) 347–63.
- Cousin, L. (1671) *Histoire de Constantinople depuis le règne de Justin jusqu’à la fin de l’Empire* (Paris).
- Croke, B. (1985) ‘Mommsen and Byzantium’, *Philologus* 129: 274–85.
- (1990) ‘The Development of a Critical Text’, in E. Jeffreys, with B. Croke and R. Scott, edd., *Studies in John Malalas* (Sydney) 313–24.
- (2010) ‘Uncovering Byzantium’s Historiographical Audience’, in R. Macrides, ed., *History as Literature in Byzantium* (Farnham) 25–54.
- (forthcoming, a) ‘The Search for Harmony in Procopius’ Literary Works’, in M. Meier, ed., *Brill Companion to Procopius* (Leiden).
- (forthcoming, b) ‘Procopius’ Reappearance in Western Europe’ in T. MacMaster and N. Matheou, edd., *Italy and the East Roman World in the Medieval Mediterranean: Empires, Cities and Elites, 476–1204* (Birmingham).
- Cuspinian, J. (1540) *Iohannis Cuspiniani, uiri clarissimi. poetae et medici, ac Diui Maximiliani Augusti oratoris, De Caesaribus atque Imperatoribus Romanis* (Strasburg).
- (1553) *De consulibus Romanorum commentarii* (Basel).
- Dahn, F. (1865) *Prokopius von Caesarea* (Berlin).
- D’Amico, J. (1983) *Renaissance Humanism in Papal Rome* (Baltimore and London).
- (1988) *Theory and Practice in Renaissance Textual Criticism: Beatus Rhenanus between Conjecture and History* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).

- Daneloni, A. (2013) 'Spigolando ancora tra le note di viaggio del 1491: Poliziano, Procopio di Cesarea e altro', *Studi medievali e umanistici* 11: 9–30.
- Davies, M. (1996) 'Humanism in Script and Print', in Krayer (1996) 47–62.
- Delisle L. (1867) *Le Cabinet des manuscrits de la bibliothèque impériale*, vol. 1 (Paris).
- Delle Donne, F. (2016) 'Le fasi redazionali e le concezioni della storia nelle decadi di Biondo: tra storia particolare e generale, tra antica e moderna Roma', in A. Mazocco and M. Laureys, edd., *A New Sense of the Past: The Scholarship of Biondo Flavio (1392–1463)* (Leuven) 55–88.
- Dindorf, W. (1833) *Procopius*, vol. 1 (Bonn).
- (1838) *Procopius*, vol. 3 (Bonn).
- Egio, B. (1547) *Procopio Cesariense De la Guerra di Giustiniano imperatore contra i Persiani* (Venice).
- Eisner, M. (2014) 'In the Labyrinth of the Library: Petrarch's Cicero, Dante's Virgil, and the Historiography of the Renaissance', *Renaissance Quarterly* 67: 755–90.
- Fabricius, J. (1726) *Bibliotheca Graeca*, vol. 6 (Hamburg).
- Fauris de Vincens, A. (1819) *Correspondence inédite de Peiresc avec J. Aléandre etc.* (Paris).
- Flusin, B. (2001) 'Remarques sur le tradition manuscrite de *De Aedificiis*', *Antiquité Tardive* 8: 9–17.
- Forrai, R. (2014) 'Change and Continuity: Italian Culture and Greek Learning in the Age of Dante', in J. Ziolkowski, ed., *Dante and the Greeks* (Washington) 59–62.
- (2016) 'Procopius Caesariensis', in G. Dinkova-Bruun, J. Haig Gaisser and J. Hankins, edd., *Catalogus Translationum et commentariorum. Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries. Annotated Lists and Guides*, vol. XI (Toronto) 211–36.
- Fryde, E. (1983) *Humanism and Renaissance Historiography* (London).
- (2000) *The Early Palaeologan Renaissance (1261–c. 1360)* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne).
- Gamillscheg, E. and Harlfinger, D. (1981) *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800–1600*, vol. 1 A, *Handschriften aus*

- Bibliotheken Grossbritaniens, Verzeichniss der Kopisten* (Vienna).
- Garzya, A. (1983) ‘Il contributo della casa editrice Teubner alla scienza dell’antichità’, in *Ommagio a B. G. Teubner* (Naples) 13–39.
- Gassendi, P. (1657) *The Mirroure of True Nobility and Gentility being the Life of Peiresc*; trans. W. Rand (London).
- Gaudenzi, P. (1654) *Liber de Iustinianaei seculi moribus nonnullis* (Strasbourg).
- Gaul, N. (2011) *Thomas Magistros und die spätbyzantinische Sophistik: Studien zum Humanismus urbaner Eliten in der frühen Palaiologenzeit* (Wiesbaden).
- Geanakoplos, D. (1982) *Greek Scholars in Venice: Studies in the Dissemination of Greek Learning from Byzantium to the West* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- (1989) *Constantinople and the West* (Madison).
- Gerhard, D. and W. Norvin, edd. (1926) *Die Briefe Barthold Georg Niebuhrs*, vol. 1 (Berlin).
- Gibbon, E. (1898) *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*; ed. J. B. Bury, vol. 4 (London).
- Gilles, P. (1561) *De Topographia Constantinopoleos et de illius antiquitatibus libri quatuor* (Lyons).
- (1562) *De Bosporo Thracio* (Lyons).
- Gittes, T. (2015) ‘Boccaccio and Humanism’, in G. Armstrong, R. Daniels and S. J. Milner edd., *Cambridge Companion to Boccaccio* (Cambridge), 155–70.
- Giovius, P. (1557) *Elogia doctorum virorum ab avorum memoria publicatis ingenii monumentis illustrium* (Florence).
- Goffart, W. (2006) *Barbarian Tides: the Migration Age and the Later Roman Empire* (Philadelphia).
- Goulart, S. (1594) *Historiae Augustae*, vol. 4 (Lyons).
- Grafton, A. (1988) ‘Civic Humanism and Scientific Scholarship at Leiden’, in T. Bender, ed., *The University and the City: From Medieval Origins to the Present* (Oxford) 59–78; repr. in A. Grafton, *Bring Out Your Dead: the Past as Revelation* (Cambridge, Mass. and London 2001) 118–40.
- (1993a) *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship, vol. II: Historical Chronology* (Oxford).

- (2007) *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge).
- (2009) *Worlds Made by Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West* (Cambridge, Mass. And London).
- , ed. (1993b) *Rome Reborn. The Vatican Library and Renaissance Culture* (Washington DC 1993).
- Greatrex, G. (1994) 'The Dates of Procopius' works', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 18: 101–14.
- (2003) 'Recent Work on Procopius and the Composition of *Wars VIII*', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 27: 45–67.
- Grell, C. (2012) 'History and Historians in France from the Great Italian Wars to Louis XIV', in J. Rabasa, M. Sato, E. Tortarolo, and D. Woolf, edd., *The Oxford History of Historical Writing: Volume 3: 1400–1800* (Oxford) 384–403.
- Grendler, M. (1980) 'A Greek Collection in Padua: The Library of Gian Vincenzo Pinelli (1535–1601)', *Renaissance Quarterly* 33: 386–416.
- Grotius, H. (1687) *Epistolae* (Amsterdam).
- Guerrieri-Crocetti, C. (1937) 'Trissino, Gian Giorgio', in *Enciclopedia Italiana* at <http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/gian-giorgio-trissino/>
- Gullino, G. (1982) 'Compagnoni, Giuseppe', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 34 at http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/giuseppe-compagnoni_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/
- Gundlingius, N. (1737) 'De Theodora imperatrice Iustiniani Magni Uxore' in *Observationes selectae ad rem litterariam spectantes*, vol. 1 (Halle) 202–254.
- Hankins, J. (2007) 'Greek studies in Italy: From Petrarch to Bruni', in M. Feo, V. Fera, P. Megna, and A. Rollo edd., *Petrarca e il Mondo Greco*, vol. 1 (Florence) 329–339.
- Hankius, M. (1677) *De Byzantinorum rerum scriptores graecis liber* (Leipzig).
- Haury, J. (1896) 'Über Prokophandschriften', *Sitzungsberichte der k. Bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München* 1895 (Munich) 125–76.

- , ed. (1905) *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia*, vols 1 and 2 (*Bella*); rev. G. Wirth (Leipzig 1962–1963).
- (1906) *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia*, vol. 3.1 (*Historia Arcana*); rev. G. Wirth (Leipzig 1963).
- (1913) *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia*, vol. 3.2 (*De Aedificiis*); rev. G. Wirth (Leipzig 1964).
- Henry, R., ed. and trans. (1959) *Photius: Bibliothèque, vol. 1 (Codices 1–83)* (Paris).
- (1960) *Photius: Bibliothèque, vol. 2 (Codices 84–185)* (Paris).
- Herklotz, I. (1995) ‘Francesco Barberini, Nicolò Alemanni, and the Lateran Triclinium of Leo III: An Episode in Restoration and Seicento Medieval Studies’, *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 40: 175–96.
- Horowitz, A. (1883) ‘Lazius, Wolfgang’, *ADB* 18: 89–93.
- and K. Hartfelder, edd. (1886) *Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus* (Leipzig).
- Ianziti, G. (1998) ‘Bruni on Writing History’, *Renaissance Quarterly* 51: 381–91.
- (2012) *Writing History in Renaissance Italy* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Irmscher, J. (1953) ‘Das Bonner Corpus und die Berliner Akademie’, *Kretika Chronika* 7: 360–88.
- (1978) ‘B. G. Niebuhr als Byzantinist’, *Klio* 60: 589–92.
- Jaffé, D. (1989) ‘The Barberini Circle. Some Exchanges between Peiresc, Rubens and their Contemporaries’, *Journal of the History of Collections* 1: 119–47.
- Joachimsen, P. (1910) *Geschichtsauffassung und Geschichtsschreibung in Deutschland unter dem Einfluss des Humanismus* (Leipzig, rp. Stuttgart 1968).
- Kaldellis, A. (2012) ‘The Byzantine Role in the Making of the Corpus of Classical Greek Historiography: A Preliminary Investigation’, *JHS* 132: 71–85.
- Kalli, M. (2004) *The Manuscript Tradition of Procopius' Gothic Wars: A Reconstruction of Family γ in the Light of a hitherto unknown Manuscript (Athos, Lavra H-73)* (Munich/Leipzig).
- Kelley, D. (1970) *Foundations of Modern Scholarship: Language, Law and History in the French Renaissance* (New York and London).

- (1998) *Faces of History: Historical Inquiry from Herodotus to Herder* (New Haven and London).
- Keynes, G. (1950) *The Library of Edward Gibbon* (London).
- König, E. (1923) *Konrad Peutingers Briefwechsel* (Munich).
- Kraye, J. ed. (1996) *Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism* (Cambridge).
- Krebs, C. (2011) *A Most Dangerous Book: Tacitus' Germania from the Roman Empire to the Third Reich* (New York and London).
- Krumbacher, K. (1891) *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur* (Munich).
- Künast, H.-J. (2011) 'Augsburg's Role in the German Book Trade in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century', in M. Walsby and G. Kemp, edd., *The Book Triumphant: Print in Transition in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden) 320–33.
- and J. D. Müller (2001) 'Peutinger, Conrad', *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 20: 282–84.
- Labbé, P. (1648) *De Byzantinae historiae scriptoribus. Protrepticon* (Paris).
- Lazius, W. (1551) *Rei publicae Romanae in exteris provinciis bello acquisitis constitutae commentariorum libri XII. Opus correctum nunc et auctum* (Basel, rp. Frankfurt 1598).
- (1557) *De gentium aliquot migrationibus, sedibus, reliquiis linguarumque initiis et immutationibus ac dialectis libri XII* (Basel; repr. Frankfurt 1600).
- Lebeau, E. (1766) *Histoire du Bas Empire*, vol. 9 (Paris).
- Leijenhorst, C. van (2003) 'Frans van Cranevelt' in P. Bietenholz and T. Deutscher, edd., *Contemporaries of Erasmus: a Biographical register of the Renaissance and Reformation* (Toronto) 354–5.
- Leroy, P. (1983) *Le dernier voyage à Paris et en Bourgogne, 1640–1643, du réformé Claude Saumaise* (Amsterdam).
- Leto, P. (1500) *Romanae historiae compendium* (Venice).
- Levesque de La Ravalière, P.-A. (1753) 'Réflexions contre l'idée générale que Procope est l'auteur de l'Histoire secrète de Justinien', *Histoire de l'Academie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* 21: 73–5.

- Libreria Philobiblon (2008) *Mille anni di bibliografia dal X al XX secolo* (Rome).
- Louthan, H. (2012) ‘Austria, the Habsburgs and Historical Writing in Central Europe’, in Rabasa et al. (2012) 302–22.
- Maffei, R. (1506) *Commentariorum urbanorum libri* (Rome).
- Mansfield, B. (1979) *Phoenix of his Age: Interpretations of Erasmus c. 1550–1750* (Toronto).
- Marchesi, C. (1900) *Bartolomeo Della Fonte* (Catana).
- Maxson, B. (2013) ‘“This Sort of Men”: The Vernacular and the Humanist movement in Fifteenth Century Florence’, *I Tatti Studies in the Italian Renaissance* 16: 251–71.
- (2014) *The Humanist World of Renaissance Florence* (Cambridge).
- Mazzarino, S. (1966) *The End of the Ancient World* (London).
- McCuaig, W. (1989) *Carlo Sigonio: The Changing World of the Late Renaissance* (Princeton).
- Meelius, J., ed. (1700) *Francisci et Joannis Hotmanorum patris et filii et clarorum virorum ad eos Epistolae* (Amsterdam).
- Mengelkoch, D. (2012) ‘A History of the Swedes: Grotius, Procopius, Isidore and Paul the Deacon’, in *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Upsaliensis* (Leiden) 683–92.
- Mercati, S. (1960) ‘Nicolò Alemanni’, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* (Rome) II.148–149, at: [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/nicolo-alemanni_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/nicolo-alemanni_(Dizionario-Biografico)/)
- Miert, D. van (2010) ‘Project Procopius: Scaliger, Vulcanius, Hoeschelius and the Pursuit of Early Byzantine History’, in H. Cazes, ed., *Bonaventura Vulcanius: Works and Networks, Bruges 1538–Leiden 1614* (Leiden) 361–86.
- Miletti, L. (2015) ‘Rediscovering Myths in the Renaissance: The Calydonian Boar and the Reception of Procopius’ Gothic War in Benevento’, *GRBS* 55: 788–811.
- Momigliano, A. (1977) ‘Polybius’ Reappearance in Western Europe’, in *Polybe (Entretiens sur l’antiquité classique 20; Vandoeuvres-Geneva)* 347–72 = id., *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Oxford, 1977) 79–98.
- (1990) *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford).

- Monfasani, J. (1995) *Byzantine Scholars in Renaissance Italy: Cardinal Bessarion and other Émigrés* (Aldershot).
- (2012) ‘The Greeks and Renaissance Humanism’, in D. Rundle, ed., *Humanism in Fifteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford) 31–78.
- (2016) *Greek Scholars between East and West in the Fifteenth Century* (Farnham).
- Montinaro, F. (2012) ‘Byzantium and the Slavs in the Reign of Justinian: Comparing the two Recensions of Procopius of Caesarea’s treatise *On Buildings*’, in V. Ivanišević and M. Kazanski, edd., *The Pontic-Danubian Realm in the Period of the Great Migration* (Paris and Belgrade) 89–114.
- (2015) ‘Power, Taste and the Outsider: The *Buildings* of Procopius Revisited’, in G. Greatrex and H. Elton, edd., *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity* (Farnham and Burlington, Vt.) 191–206.
- (2018) ‘Scaliger’s Lie? A Note on “Project Procopius”’, in C. Lillington-Martin and E. Turquois, edd., *Procopius of Caesarea: Literary and Historical Interpretations* (London) 253–58.
- Monnoye, B. La (1715) *Menagiana*, vol. 1 (Paris).
- Mothe le Vayer, F. de la (1646) *Jugement sur les anciens et principaux istoriens grecs et latins* (Paris).
- Müller, G. (1903) ‘Dindorf, Karl Wilhelm’ in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 47: 705–7.
- Muratori, L. (1723) *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, vol. 1 (Milan).
- Nellen, H. (2015) *Hugo Grotius: a Lifelong Struggle for Peace in Church and State, 1583–1645* (Leiden).
- Nemeth, A. (2013) ‘The Imperial Systematisation of the Past in Constantinople: Constantine Porphyrogenitus and his Historical Excerpts’, in J. King and G. Woolf, edd., *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Cambridge) 239–40.
- Neville, K. (2009) ‘Gothicism and Early Modern Historical Ethnography’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 70: 213–34.
- Niebuhr, B. (1827) ‘Bericht über den Fortgang der Bonner Ausgabe der Byzantiner’, *Rh.Mus.* 1: 359–64.
- (1828) *Agathiae Myrinaei Historiarum libri quinque* (Bonn).

- (1983) *Barthold Georg Niebuhr. Neue Folge: Briefe 1816–1830*, ed. E. Vischer, vol. III *Briefe aus Bonn (1826–1830)* (Bern and Munich).
- Nolhac, P. de (1886) *La Bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* (Paris).
- Panciroli, G. (1593) *Notitia Dignitatum utriusque imperii* (Venice).
- Panvinio, O. (1558) *Fasti libri V* (Venice).
- (1573) *Chronium Ecclesiasticum* (Louvain).
- (1688) *Antiquitates Veronenses libri VIII nunc primum in lucem editi* (Padua).
- Pattison, M. (1892) *Isaac Casaubon 1559–1614* (Oxford).
- Pélessier, L. (1887) ‘Les amis d’Holstenius’, *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire* 7: 62–128.
- Pellegrino, N. (2007) ‘From the Roman Empire to Christian Imperialism: The Work of Flavio Biondo’, in S. Dale, A. Williams Lewin and D. J. Osheim, edd., *Chronicling History: Chroniclers and Historians in Medieval and Renaissance Italy* (University Park) 273–98.
- Perez-Martin, I. (2002) ‘Lectores y publico de la historiografía Griega’, *Estudios Clásicos* 121: 125–47
- Pertusi, A. (1967) *Storiografia umanistica e mondo bizantino* (Palermo).
- Pettegree, A. (2011) *The Book in the Renaissance* (New Haven and London).
- Pfeiffer, R. (1976) *History of Classical Scholarship 1300–1850* (Oxford).
- Pignatti, F. (1993) ‘Egio, Benedetto’, *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 42 at [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/benedetto-egio_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/benedetto-egio_(Dizionario-Biografico)/)
- Pingree, D. (1977) ‘The Library of George, Count of Corinth’, *Studia Codicologica: Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 124: 351–62.
- Pithou, P. and F. (1689), *Iurisconsultorum Observationes ad Codicem et Novellas Justiniani imperatoris per Julianum translatas. Accedit legum Romanarum et mosaicarum collatio notis illustrata* (Paris).
- Pocock, J. (1999) *Barbarism and Religion*, vol. 1: *The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon, 1737–1764* (Cambridge).

- (2003) *Barbarism and Religion*, vol. 3: *The First Decline and Fall* (Cambridge).
- Poliziano, A. (2006) *Angelo Poliziano: Letters, Vol. 1: Books I–IV*; ed. and trans. S. Butler (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Pullapilly, C. (1975) *Caesar Baronius: Counter Reformation Historian* (South Bend, Ind.).
- Pyl, T. (1882) ‘Kanngiesser, Peter’, *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 15: 79–80.
- Rabasa, J., M. Sato, E. Tortarolo, and D. Woolf, edd. (2012) *The Oxford History of Historical Writing: Volume 3: 1400–1800* (Oxford).
- Rebenich S. and G. Franke, edd. (2012) *Theodor Mommsen und Friedrich Althoff: Briefwechsel 1882–1903* (Munich).
- Reeve, M. (1996) ‘Classical Scholarship’, in Krayer (1996) 20–46.
- Reinsch, D. (2006) ‘Byzantine Adaptations of Thucydides’, in A. Tsakmakis and A. Rengakos, edd., *Brill’s Companion to Thucydides* (Leiden) 755–78.
- (2010) ‘The History of Editing Byzantine Historiographical Texts’, in P. Stephenson, ed., *The Byzantine World* (London) 435–44.
- (2015) ‘Hieronymus Wolf as Editor and Translator of Byzantine Texts’, in D. Smythe and P. Marciniak, edd., *The Reception of Byzantium in European Culture since 1500* (Farnham) 43–53.
- Reynolds, L. and N. Wilson (2013) *Scribes and Scholars*⁴ (Oxford).
- Rietbergen, P. (2006) *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome: Barberini Cultural Policies* (Leiden).
- Ritter, I. (1742) *Observationes Historicae* (Wittenberg).
- Rivius, T. (1626) *Imperatoris Justiniani defensio adversus Alemannum* (London); repr. Frankfurt, 1628.
- Romagnani, G. (2006) ‘Maffei, Scipione’, *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 67 at http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/scipione-maffei_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/
- Rubin, B. (1957) ‘Prokopios von Kaisareia’, *RE* XXIII.1: 273–599.
- Ruelens C. (1907) ed., *Correspondance de Rubens et documents épistolaires concernant sa vie et ses oeuvres*, vol. 5 (Anvers).

- Runciman, S. (1970) *The Last Byzantine Renaissance* (Cambridge).
- Sabbadini, R. (1996) *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV* (Florence).
- Sandys, J. (1908) *A History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. 2 (Cambridge).
- Saumaise, C. (1656) *Claudii Salmasii viri maximi Epistolarum liber primus* (Leiden).
- Scala, B. (1677) *Historia Florentinorum* (Rome).
- Scaliger, J. (1627) *Epistolae* (Leiden).
- (1669) *Scaligeriana*² (The Hague).
- Schreiner, P. (2006) 'Prokop, Karl Krumbacher und Jacobus Haury. Vier Briefe an Karl Krumbacher', in V. Lica, ed., *Philia: Festschrift für Gerhard Wirth zum 80. Geburtstag* (Galați) 221–9.
- Scott, R. (2015) 'The First Half of Theophanes' Chronicle', in Jankowiak and Montinaro (2015) 239–60.
- Sellin, P. (1968) *Daniel Heinsius and Stuart England* (Leiden and London).
- Setton, K. (1956) 'The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance', in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 100: 1–76.
- Sigonius, C. (1578) *Historiarum de occidentali imperio libri XX, cum indice copiosissimo rerum et verborum* (Bologna).
- Spieser, J.-M. (2000) 'Ducange and Byzantium', in R. Cormack and E. Jeffreys, edd., *Through the Looking Glass: Byzantium through British Eyes* (Aldershot) 199–210.
- Stornajolo, C. (1912) *Codices Urbinati Latini*, vol. 3 (Rome).
- Swensen, R. (2017) 'Secret History and It-Narrative', in R. Bullard and R. Carnell, edd., *The Secret History in Literature, 1660–1820* (Cambridge) 117–34.
- Talbert, R. (2010) *Rome's World: The Peutinger Map Reconsidered* (Cambridge).
- Talbot, A.-M. and D. Sullivan (2005) *The History of Leo the Deacon* (Washington).
- Tamizey de Larroque, P., ed. (1879) *Lettres françaises inédites de Joseph Scaliger* (Agen).
- (1888) *Lettres de Peiresc aux frères Dupuy*, vol. 1 (Paris).
- (1889) *Mémoires petits de Peiresc* (Anvers).
- (1890) *Lettres de Peiresc aux frères Dupuy*, vol. 2 (Paris).

- (1892) *Lettres de Peiresc aux frères Dupuy*, vol. 3 (Paris).
- (1894) *Lettres de Peiresc aux frères Dupuy*, vol. 5 (Paris).
- Teuffel, W. (1846) ‘Justinianus’, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft* 4: 664–77.
- (1847) ‘Procopius’, *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 8: 38–79, rp. as “Procopius von Cäsarea”, in W. Teuffel, *Studien und Charakteristiken zur griechischen und römischen Litteraturgeschichte* (Leipzig 1871 rp. 1889) 248–313.
- (1852) ‘Procopius 3 (aus Cäsarea)’, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft* 6: 84–86.
- Thomasius, C. (1695) *De naevis jurisprudentiae Romanae ante-justiniana* (Magdeburg).
- Thomson, I. (1966) ‘Manuel Chrysoloras and the Early Italian Renaissance’, *GRBS* 7: 63–82.
- Treadgold, W. (2007) *The Early Byzantine Historians* (London).
- (2013) *The Middle Byzantine Historians* (London and New York).
- (2015) ‘The Life and Wider Significance of George Syncellus’, in Jankowiak and Montinaro (2015) 9–30.
- Trivorijs, G. (1631) *Gabrielis Trivorii I.V. Doctoris et Historiographi Regii Observatio Apologetica adversus quosdam I.C. et Procopii Anecdota* (Paris).
- Turrini, P. (2015) ‘Petroni, Ludovico’, *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 82, at :
http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/ludovico-petroni_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/
- Vergerio, P. (2002) *De ingenius moribus et liberalibus adulescentiae studiis liber*, in C. Kallendorf, ed. and trans., *Humanist Educational Treatises* (Cambridge, Mass.) 2–91.
- Vogel, M. and V. Gardthausen (1909) *Die griechischen Schreiben des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (Leipzig).
- Völkel, M. (2012) ‘German Historical Writing from the Reformation to the Enlightenment’ in Rabasa, et al. (2012) 324–46.
- Vossius, G. (1624) *De Historicis Graecis* (Leiden).
- (1651) *De Historicis Graecis*, rev. ed. (Leiden).
- Walther, G. (1993) *Niebuhrs Forschung* (Stuttgart).
- Weber, B. (1949) ‘Catherine de Medici: A Royal Bibliophile’, *The Historian* 12: 88–95.

- Wegele, F. (1889) ‘Reinhard, Johann Paul’, *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 28: 38–9.
- Weiss, R. (1969) *The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity* (Oxford).
- Whately, C. (2017) ‘Thucydides, Procopius, and the Historians of the Later Empire’, in R. Balot, S. Forsdyke, and E. Foster, edd., *The Oxford Handbook to Thucydides* (New York and Oxford) 691–707.
- Whitby, Michael (2000) *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus* (Liverpool).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1982) *History of Classical Scholarship* (London); Eng. trans. by H. Lloyd-Jones of German original (Leipzig, 1921).
- Wilcox, D. (1969) *The Development of Florentine Humanist Historiography in the Fifteenth Century*. (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Wilson, N. (1983) *Scholars of Byzantium* (London).
- (1992) *From Byzantium to Italy. Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (Baltimore).
- , ed. and trans. (2016) *Aldus Manutius: The Greek Classics* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Wirth, G. (1984) ‘Die Anfänge des Bonner Corpus’, in G. Wirth, ed., *Barthold Georg Niebuhr: Historiker und Staatsmann* (Bonn) 211–39.
- Woodward, W. (1899) *Vittorino da Feltre and other Humanist Educators* (Cambridge; repr. New York, 1963).