

## A Book (or Two) from the Library of La Boétie

John O'Brien

The copy of the Greek *editio princeps* of Cassius Dio, now in Eton College, has long been recognized as formerly belonging to Montaigne (figure 1).<sup>1</sup> It bears his signature in the usual place and in his usual style. The book itself came into Eton in 1743 as part of a larger gift of books made by John, 5<sup>th</sup> Baron Berkeley of Stratton (1697-1773).<sup>2</sup> Of the eight titles he gave the College in that year, a number, including the Cassius Dio, bear the armorial bookplate of Charles Ford (1681/2-1743), a friend of Dean Swift who first brought the manuscript of *Gulliver's Travels* to its London printer in 1726. Other owners of the Cassius Dio with an ex libris on the flyleaves include Thomas Wrightson (1668-1716), perhaps the one who attended Eton in 1683-87 and shortly afterwards became a Fellow of King's College, Cambridge (1690-99). Another interesting particularity of this copy of Dio is that near Montaigne's signature on the title page, it carries a code which is not dissimilar in character and in the same hand as his copy of Appian, now in Cambridge (figures 2 and b).<sup>3</sup> It seems that both these books were once in the same place; whether in a library or in a private collection or in a bookseller's catalogue or elsewhere yet remains to be determined.

What has not previously been noticed about the Eton Cassius Dio is that, before it came into Montaigne's possession, it had belonged to La Boétie. The recent research by Alain Legros has alerted us to the tell-tale signs that particular works came to Montaigne from La Boétie's bequest.<sup>4</sup> The most obvious sign is the letter "b," followed here by a stop, in the top right-hand corner of the title page (figure 3). It bears close comparison with the eighteen other volumes from Montaigne's library all with the letter "b" in the same place, as illustrated in Legros' articles.<sup>5</sup> Of these, Legros notes that fifteen volumes deriving from La

Boétie’s library also have the “b” followed by a stop.<sup>6</sup> More important still, while the Eton Cassius Dio has annotations in more than one hand, it certainly contains some manuscript notes in La Boétie’s hand. Once again the identification of his handwriting can be made through comparison of samples in Legros’ work. As often with his books, La Boétie’s annotations are an exercise in humanist philology, in this case consisting of a number of emendations to book 39 of Dio.<sup>7</sup> All these are within two pages of each other in the 1548 Dio. I list below his proposed corrections to the text printed by Estienne, with references to the page and line in the 1548 Dio and their modern equivalents.

- 1 p. 60, ll. 28-29 = book 39, chap. 10.2: βιβλίον μέντοι τι ἀπόρρητον συνέθηκε· καὶ ἐπεὶ ἐπέγραψεν αὐτῷ (“nevertheless he composed a secret little book; and when he inscribed in it...”). La Boétie underlines ἐπεὶ (“when”) and in lefthand margin comments: “lego ἔπη scripserat enim Cicero versibus tres libros de suis temporibus quos non putavit edi oportere vt ipse testatur in epistolis ad Lentulum p. 13” (“I read ἔπη (‘verses’) for Cicero had written three books in verse about his own times which he did not think should be published as he himself testifies in the letters to Lentulus p. 13”) (figures 4 a and b). La Boétie thus understands the second half of the Greek sentence to mean: “and he inscribed verses in it.” The reference La Boétie makes is to Cicero’s *Ad Familiares* 1.9, 23 in which Cicero writes to Lentulus: “scripsi versibus tres libros de temporibus meis, quos iam pridem ad te misissem, si esse edendos putassem” (“I wrote three books in verse about my times, which I would long since have sent you, if I had thought they ought to be published”). This letter to Lentulus, written in 54 B.C., itself refers to a lost poem by Cicero, *De temporibus meis*.<sup>8</sup>
- 2 p. 60, l. 34 = book 39, chap. 11.1: καίτοι τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἀνειμένον (“even though dedicated to freedom”). La Boétie underlines ἀνειμένον (“dedicated”) and over it and

in the left-hand margin writes: Σ. (in both cases followed by a full stop; see figures 5 a and b). Normally one would expect a capital sigma of this kind, without further indication, to refer to scholia. However, there are no scholia of Dio. If, then, alternatively, the capital sigma is a reference to the Byzantine encyclopaedia, the Souda (“Suidas”), the entry there under ἀνειμέναι cites ἀνειμένον in the sense of a place “dedicated to” or “consecrated to,” which is how La Boétie understands the term here.

- 3 p. 61, l. 10 = book 39, chap. 12.3: ὥστε ὑπάτου (“so that of [the] consul”). Here La Boétie underlines ὥστε and proposes the correction: ὡς διὰ ὑπάτου (“that through [the] consul”), initially writing an acute accent on διὰ, then correcting it to a grave. (Figures 6 a and b.)
- 4 p. 62, ll. 26-27 = book 39, chap. 19.1: τοιόςδ᾽ε τις ὄν, συνεκβοῶεν, ὅτι πομπήϊος (“...whoever it was, they should all cry out, that Pompey...”). La Boétie deletes the printed comma after συνεκβοῶεν (“they should all cry out”). The sense now flows better: “‘Whoever it was [who had done or said something],’ they should all cry out, ‘Pompey’”. (Figure 7.)
- 5 p. 62, l. 29 = book 39 chap. 19.2: καὶ λεγόντων ὅτι πομπήϊος χλευασία πολλῇ συνέβαινε (“and crying that Pompey incurred much jeering”). La Boétie inserts a comma after πομπήϊος, and, usually for him, without underlining the defective reading,<sup>9</sup> corrects the dative to the nominative, writing χλευασία πολλῇ (“much jeering”) in the left hand margin.<sup>10</sup> The correction gives far better sense: “and when they cried, ‘Pompey,’ much jeering occurred.” (Figures 8 a and b.)
- 6 A more doubtful case occurs in the index on p. 478 *ad* 49.4: “... adeò vt cum Caesare pascisci ea conditione voluerint, vt regionem aliquam illis assignaret” (“to such a degree that they were willing to make an agreement with Caesar on condition that he

allotted them some territory of their own”). The first “s” of the infinitive “pascisci” is crossed through with double oblique lines to give the correct infinitive “pacisci” (“to make an agreement”). Despite the old ink of the correction, there is nothing to say this is indubitably La Boétie’s handiwork, although it would be characteristic of his careful eye for philological detail. (Figure 9.)

Whence did La Boétie derive these readings? Estienne’s 1548 Dio is based on Codex Parisinus Graecus 1689, a fifteenth-century manuscript containing books 36-60 of Dio. Editors differ as to the relationship between this manuscript and its fellows. Boissevain was of the view that it derived from two other, earlier manuscripts, Codex Laurentianus 70, 8 (*saec.* X), for the earlier books of Dio, and, for the later books, from Codex Laurentianus 70, 10 (*saec.* XV, but partly copied from 70, 8 and from a still older manuscript, Codex Marcianus Graecus 395 (*saec.* IX/X), known as M in the modern philological tradition).<sup>11</sup> The most recent editor of Dio, Lachenaud, is less forthright. He states cautiously, “il se peut que Parisinus Graecus 1689 soit sorti du même atelier que Laurentianus 70,10”;<sup>12</sup> he does not make the former depend on the latter. The corrections to Parisinus Graecus 1689 that Estienne himself supplies in the text or in the addendum and errata to his edition do not contain any of La Boétie’s readings; the two sets of emendations are independent of each other. In 1551, Robert Estienne also published the *Epitome* of Dio made by the Byzantine historian Xiphilinus. However, this abridgement is particularly compressed for books 37-42 of the *Roman History* and no help for La Boétie is likely to have come from that direction;<sup>13</sup> indeed, Lachenaud states unequivocally, “Le texte de Xiphilin ne peut être considéré comme un véritable résumé des livres 38, 39 et 40.”<sup>14</sup> Equally, if La Boétie had seen other manuscripts of Dio, he might be expected to have noted that fact by using an abbreviation

such as “leg[itur]” which commonly indicated variant readings; he does not do so, even though he uses similar terms elsewhere in annotations on other works.<sup>15</sup>

Might the corrections have come indirectly from Xylander’s Latin translation of Dio, which appeared in 1558, five years before La Boétie died? We have no indication of when La Boétie annotated his Dio, so that influence cannot be ruled out. Like Estienne before him, Xylander recognizes that the manuscript used for the 1548 edition (Parisinus Graecus 1689) is in serious need of emendation.<sup>16</sup> To take the examples La Boétie selects, at 39, 12.3, the difficult phrase ὥστε ὑπάτου was emended by Xylander who translated it as “à Spinthere Consule” (“by Spinther the consul”).<sup>17</sup> In his “Annotationes” to the text of Dio, at the back of his translation, he comments that in place of ὥστε ὑπάτου, he reads ὥστε δι’ ὑπάτου (“so that through [the] consul”).<sup>18</sup> This is very similar, although not identical, to La Boétie’s proposal ὡς διὰ ὑπάτου (“that through [the] consul”). Yet in respect of the remaining readings, La Boétie and Xylander differ. In the case of 39, 19.1 and 2, Xylander’s translation implicitly disagrees with La Boétie’s change of punctuation and the switch from the dative case to the nominative case for γλευασία πολλή; he translates “subsannatio in Pompeium ... exorta est” (“derision arose against Pompey”) which is closer to Estienne’s Greek text than to La Boétie’s proposed emendation.<sup>19</sup> At 39, 10.2, likewise, Xylander perceives the problem with ἐπεὶ (“when”), but simply omits it in his translation, rather than retaining it or interpreting it as ἔπη (“verses”), as La Boétie does. (Modern editors bracket ἐπεὶ.<sup>20</sup>) As is clear from his marginalia, La Boétie saw a reference at this point to the lost epic poem by Cicero, “De suis temporibus,” which covered Cicero’s triumphant return from exile in 57 B.C. and his restoration.<sup>21</sup> Xylander, however, translates: “librum occultum quendam conscripsit, cuius erat inscriptio, De suorum consiliorum rationibus” (“he composed a secret book, whose title was, ‘On the Reasons for his Policies’”).<sup>22</sup> Xylander thus believes that this passage in Dio

alludes not to “De temporibus suis,” but to another work by Cicero of which only fragments remain, “De consiliis suis.”<sup>23</sup> Nearly all modern critics and editors of Dio agree in seeing here a reference to “De consiliis,” which Marinone describes as an “opera postuma, di cui restano frammenti.”<sup>24</sup> Lachenaud and Millar, among many other critics, also think this work identical to the “liber ἀνέκδοτος” (“unpublished book”) or more simply ἀνέκδοτα (“unpublished accounts”) alluded to in *Ad Atticum* 2.6.2 and especially 14.17.6.<sup>25</sup> Only Marinone is more circumspect and makes no clear connection between “De consiliis” and the “liber ἀνέκδοτος,” describing the latter as “uno specie di diario segreto di contenuto polemico, non destinato alla pubblicazione, per lo più unificato con ἀνέκδοτα ... prob. solo progettato.”<sup>26</sup> From the evidence, it is clear that there is little common ground between La Boétie and Xylander on this point. Indeed, on the whole, while an as yet undiscovered influence cannot be ruled out, La Boétie seems to be the source of his own emendations. We shall return to the significance of this point later.

La Boétie’s marginalia also increase our understanding of his own library. The first of them carries a reference to p. 13 in an unnamed edition of Cicero’s letters. The only corresponding page number this can be is in the third volume of Robert Estienne’s great 5-volume folio edition of Cicero’s complete works, published in 1538-39. As Elizabeth Armstrong notes,<sup>27</sup> this was a reprint of Vettori’s edition completed a year previously and published at Florence by Giunta in 1537. However, the page numbering in the Florentine edition of Cicero’s letters does not match that of Estienne’s, so we can be sure that La Boétie is using Estienne rather than Giunta.<sup>28</sup> It is likewise not unreasonable to suppose that La Boétie not only knew Estienne’s edition of Cicero, but also owned it; his reference to p. 13 is an owner’s typical note to himself. This was not the only time he wrote such a note in his marginalia.<sup>29</sup> Thus this copy of Cicero may still survive, as yet unrecognised, because La

Boétie was not in the habit of signing his books. There are implications also for Montaigne's library. Surprisingly, no copy of Cicero features among the essayist's surviving known books,<sup>30</sup> but if La Boétie's Cicero was bequeathed to his friend and were to be discovered, it too could, in due course, be counted among his books. A further dimension is raised by the presence of the Estienne Cicero in La Boétie's library. He owned more than one edition published by the Estienne printing family. In addition to Cassius Dio and now (probably) Cicero, there was also Appian and Dionysius Periegetes.<sup>31</sup> The physical lay-out of these works may have been an important consideration for him. In the case of Cicero, for example, Robert Estienne swept away the block of text immersed in a sea of commentary that still characterized Vascosan and Petit's editions of Cicero. He produced a spare, elegant text printed in Garamond typefaces for Latin works and in "grecs du roy" for works such as Cassius Dio. Was there anything more to La Boétie's preference for Estienne editions than personal liking for the modern scholarly text they offered? We have no evidence to date of any link between the Estienne family and La Boétie, and any possible connection remains hypothetical, if attractive.

An insight into La Boétie's wider intellectual preoccupations also emerges from his emendations to Dio. Estienne's 1548 Greek text represented a new primary source for the study of Roman history, although there had been vernacular translations of Dio prior to this date.<sup>32</sup> Undoubtedly, the availability of a new source in the original tongue stimulated La Boétie's interest in the late republican era of Roman history and in particular in the restoration of Cicero after his exile, and the background to the friendship between Cicero and Publius Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, who had earned Cicero's gratitude by assisting Pompey in recalling him from exile in 57 B.C. Book 39 of Cassius Dio deals with precisely this period,<sup>33</sup> and offers a different and much broader pattern and interpretation of events from the

personal account Cicero gives Lentulus of the dealings in Rome at this same date in *Ad Familiares* and to Atticus of his return from exile in *Ad Atticum*.<sup>34</sup> The section of book 39 La Boétie annotates covers four episodes in the years 57-56 B.C. The first deals with the secret work in which Cicero criticized Caesar and Crassus, but whose the publication he forbade during his lifetime. The second episode recounts the restoration of Cicero's property, notably his house on the Palatine, which had been razed and replaced by a temple to Freedom. The orator claimed, successfully, that the tribuneship of his enemy, Clodius, who had been instrumental in having his house confiscated, had been null and void, and on that basis he persuaded the *pontifices* to let him recover the site of his property. This is an episode about which we hear more elsewhere in Cicero.<sup>35</sup> The attention in Dio book 39 next shifts to the attempt by Ptolemy XII Auletes to have Lentulus engineer his restoration to the throne of Egypt, which he had left in exile in 58 B.C. to take up residence in Rome. The final episode in this section concerns the mockery that Pompey suffered in the public assemblies in the course of legal proceedings brought by Clodius against Milo, who was protected by Pompey and Cicero. There are traces in these sections of the often negative picture that Dio consistently draws of Cicero:<sup>36</sup> the orator writes a secret book but does not publish it because he has already suffered the consequences of his unguarded speech; he is successful in disposing of his rival, Clodius, for the time being, but Clodius continues to make difficulties for him subsequently; despite his triumphant return to Rome, Cicero little realizes that he is now no more than a pawn in the power struggle between Caesar and Pompey. The paradox of Cicero's position is that despite the restoration of his property and social standing, his political star is waning; and it is precisely this moment that La Boétie is studying.

La Boétie's reading of Dio formed part of a broader reading programme that demonstrably embraced, as we have seen, Cicero's own letters, notably the letters to Lentulus



which occupy the first fourteen pages of Robert Estienne's edition of the *Epistolae*. Overlap between these and the annotated section of Dio is plain: Lentulus's involvement in the affair of Ptolemy Auletes absorbs Cicero's attention from the outset of *Ad Familiares* 1.1 and again in 1.7; in *Ad Familiares* 1.9, he mentions Lentulus's assistance in recalling him from exile, and the friendship he feels for him as a result; Pompey's discomfort at the hands of the Roman mob is recounted in *Ad Familiares* 1.5b. Nor was this the only information available to La Boétie. At the end of Vettori's *Castigationes* in the fifth volume of Estienne's edition is Plutarch's life of Cicero translated into Latin by Achille Bocchi, which offers another source for the study of the Roman orator.<sup>37</sup> More important still, La Boétie also owned a copy of Charles Estienne's 1551 printing of the Greek text of Appian, which later found its way into Montaigne's library, and it is notable that the correction he makes to p. 211 of his copy, as recorded by Legros,<sup>38</sup> is also in a passage of book 2 of Appian's history of the Roman Civil Wars dealing with Cicero's exile and return, and the rivalry between Caesar and Pompey. From Dio to Cicero and Appian, La Boétie thus is reading complementary narratives of the same period of Roman history.<sup>39</sup> For this same period, he may, for all we know, have used a larger number of sources still. In parallel circumstances, Xylander tells us that he himself used a range of writers for the purpose of emending Dio, including Plutarch, Appian, Cicero, Caesar and Suetonius.<sup>40</sup> We may suspect that La Boétie was no less acquainted with the same set of authors; but of this, we have only a partial record for the time being. Nonetheless, even though at present we do not know the larger intention for which La Boétie was undertaking this detailed reading, the evidence he is accumulating suggests sustained rather than passing interest.

This discovery of La Boétie's hand in Dio thus adds a further book which can be attributed with certainty to his library: these now total nineteen. Its existence encourages us,

equally, to seek other works with potential annotations by La Boétie, notably Cicero. Materially, the annotations highlight his attention to fine details such as punctuation in order to improve the sense of a text, and provide us with further examples of his Greek hand, including in one case a mysterious capital sigma which is not an emendation as such and is the only instance so far of its type in La Boétie's annotations. Likewise, the Eton Dio affords us more valuable evidence into his scholarly activities as a whole. It confirms, for instance, his liking and aptitude for emendation. He owned books by editors who themselves foregrounded this activity: Vettori, whose edition of Cicero La Boétie at the very least consulted and most likely also owned, was a prominent Italian practitioner of philological emendation and correction; and the 1548 Dio contains the "castigationes" of Robert Estienne's elder son, Henri, in a long appendix to the work his father printed.<sup>41</sup> However, where Vettori corrected texts by discovering better, usually older, manuscripts of his authors, Henri openly declares in the Dio his reliance on conjecture or on comparison of similar expressions and turns of phrase ("exhibita coniectura, similitumque locorum collatione").<sup>42</sup> In general terms, Vettori's approach represents *emendatio ope codicum* ("emendation with the help of manuscripts"), Estienne's *emendatio ope ingenii* ("emendation with the help of one's native wit").<sup>43</sup> The evidence of La Boétie's interventions in Dio, as well as his corrections to other works, suggest that he operated in the same way as his French contemporary, Henri Estienne. Alongside his philological activity, moreover, his engagement with Dio also belongs to a wider spectrum of interest in Roman history, as is also shown by his ownership of Appian and Egnazio's *Cæsarum vitæ post Suetonium Tranquillum conscriptæ*, a work which contains excerpted passages from later books of Dio.<sup>44</sup> Whether, in respect of Dio himself, his attention was drawn to the turbulence of the closing years of the Roman Republic, with its plunge into civil war, or to the analyses of major political figures such as Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus, remains to be elucidated by further discoveries. Dio would

provide ample material for the study of either topic, or both. What can be stated, however, is that the La Boétie who emerges from his marginalia to Dio – a careful philologist who collects and reads the latest humanist scholarship and demonstrates a keen critical interest in promoting the revival of classical literature – goes some way to enabling us to understand Montaigne’s claim that, had his friend lived, “nous verrions [i.e. aurions vu] plusieurs choses rares et qui nous approcheroient bien pres de l’honneur de l’antiquité.”<sup>45</sup>

University of Durham

---

<sup>1</sup> Paris, Robert Estienne, 1548; Eton College: Ba.1.11. I am grateful to the staff of Eton College Library for their help in providing access to and images from this work. In the Renaissance (and in Estienne’s edition), the author is called Dio Cassius. The more common form nowadays, used here, is Cassius Dio (Cocceianus).

<sup>2</sup> See Paul Quarrie, *Treasures of Eton College Library. 550 Years of Collecting*, New York, Pierpont Morgan Library and Eton, Eton College, 1990, p. 49 on the Berkeley Aristotle and related volumes.

<sup>3</sup> As will be seen from the images, the code is written in reverse order on the Appian.

<sup>4</sup> Alain Legros, “Trois livres annotés par La Boétie et légués à Montaigne,” *Montaigne Studies* 16 (2004), p. 11-36 and “Dix-huit volumes de la bibliothèque de La Boétie légués à Montaigne et signalés par lui comme tels,” *Montaigne Studies* 25 (2013), p. 177-88. Legros has collected his transcriptions together on the “Bibliothèques Virtuelles Humanistes” site of the CESR in Tours: [http://www.bvh.univ-tours.fr/MONLOE/LaBoetie\\_AL.pdf](http://www.bvh.univ-tours.fr/MONLOE/LaBoetie_AL.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> For plentiful illustrations of the “b” from other works belonging to La Boétie, see Legros, “Dix-huit volumes,” p. 185-87.

<sup>6</sup> Legros, “Dix-huit volumes,” p. 179.

<sup>7</sup> A modern edition of this work is now available in *Dion Cassius, Histoire romaine: livres 38, 39 et 40*, texte établi par Guy Lachenaud, traduit et commenté par Guy Lachenaud et Marianne Coudry, Paris, Belles Lettres, 2011.

<sup>8</sup> Cicero, *Epistulae ad familiares*, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1977, I: 62-47 BC, p. 74 (text), 315 (commentary).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Legros, “Trois livres,” p. 16 and especially the BVH transcriptions (above, note 3) of La Boétie, p. 1, for the statement that La Boétie always underlines the words or expressions he corrects.

<sup>10</sup> La Boétie seems to have written a double lambda in  $\lambda\lambda\epsilon\nu\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ . The reason for this is unclear.

<sup>11</sup> *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt*, ed. Philippe Boissevain, 3 vols, Berlin, Weidmann, 1895-1901, I, p. XCI.

<sup>12</sup> Lachenaud, p. XCII.

<sup>13</sup> See Christopher Mallan, “Xiphilinus’s *Epitome* of Dio’s *Roman History*,” *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 53 (2013), p. 610-44 at p. 618.

<sup>14</sup> Lachenaud, p. XCV.

<sup>15</sup> See Legros, “Trois livres,” p. 19, nos 42 and 54 (“legit”) and 57 (“leg[eb]atur”).

<sup>16</sup> *Dionis Cassii Nicaei ... libri ... XXV*, trans. Guilielmus Xylander, Basle, Oporinus, 1558, sig.  $\beta$  v<sup>o</sup>: “unico exemplari Parisiensi, eoque (quod ingenuè fatetur Rob. Stephanus, qui id excusit) infinitis locis deprauato, mutiloque, uti coactus sum” (“I was compelled to use the sole Parisian manuscript, one (as Robert Estienne, who printed it, frankly admitted) that was corrupt and mutilated in innumerable places”). Robert Estienne admits the imperfections of the manuscript in his 1548 preface, sig [\*i. v<sup>o</sup>]. Henri Estienne makes similar comments about the corruption of the manuscript and the need for emendation in his own edition of Dio thirty years later: *Dionis Cassii Romanarum Historiarum libri XXV. Ex Guilielmi Xylandri interpretation*, [Geneva,] Henri Estienne, 1591, sig.[\*]. v v<sup>o</sup>].

<sup>17</sup> Xylander, p. 60.

---

<sup>18</sup> Xylander, p. 650, *ad* 60. Turnèbe's copy of the 1548 Cassius Dio, reported in Reimar edition, also bears the same emendation at this point: see *Cassii Dionis ... quae supersunt*, ed. H. S. Reimar, 2 vols, Hamburg, Herold, 1750-52, I, p. 196, textual note f. On Turnèbe's copy, see Reimar, I, p. XXV, §18. It is not referred to by Dio's modern editors since Boissevain.

<sup>19</sup> Xylander, p. 61. In his 1591 edition, Henri Estienne will incorporate all these changes of punctuation into the Greek text itself: Dio (1591), p. 111.

<sup>20</sup> So Boissevain, p. 472 and Lachenaud, p. 87. In 1591, Henri Estienne will retain ἐπεὶ, as was already the case in his father's edition of 1548: Dio (1591), p. 107.

<sup>21</sup> On this work, see S. J. Harrison, "Cicero's 'De temporibus suis': The Evidence Reconsidered," *Hermes* 118/4 (1990), p. 455-63.

<sup>22</sup> Xylander, p. 59-60.

<sup>23</sup> Another early modern reader felt the same. This was Christoph Sigmund Donauer (1593-1655), a minister of religion in Regensburg, who records on the titlepage of his copy of the 1548 Dio that it was a gift to him from Ludwig Kepler, the son of Johannes Kepler, in the year 1638. In the margin of p. 60, next to the Greek words meaning "On the Reasons for his Policies," he writes: "Liber Ciceronis de suorum consiliorum rationibus" (Staatliche Bibliothek Regensburg, Bibliothek C. S. Donauer, call mark: 999/2 Class.137).

<sup>24</sup> Nino Marinone, *Cronologia Ciceroniana*, second edition, Rome, Centro di Studi Ciceroniani; Bologna, Pàtron Editore, 2004, p. 237 entry B 11 under A[nno] 44.

<sup>25</sup> Lachenaud, p. 129, n. 34; Fergus Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1964, p. 49.

<sup>26</sup> Marinone, p. 276.

<sup>27</sup> See Elizabeth Armstrong, *Robert Estienne, Royal Printer. An Historical Study of the Elder Stephanus*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1954, p. 103.

<sup>28</sup> The passage La Boétie is referring to also appears on a different page in Charles Estienne's folio Cicero of 1554-55, so that too can be ruled out.

<sup>29</sup> See Legros, "Dix-huit volumes," p. 183, transcribing another set of the marginalia, this time to Strabo, where La Boétie locates a source for a particular passage in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, commenting: "meminit Aristotelis lib. 3. Rhethor. f. 341" ("he recalls book 3 of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, f. 341"). For the time being, the edition to which this refers remains unidentified.

<sup>30</sup> See the list drawn up by Alain Legros on the "Bibliothèques Virtuelles Humanistes" website:

[http://www.bvh.univ-tours.fr/MONLOE/14.05.13\\_Librairie\\_Monloe.pdf](http://www.bvh.univ-tours.fr/MONLOE/14.05.13_Librairie_Monloe.pdf). For a more detailed study, see Barbara Pistilli and Marco Sgattoni, "Sulla 'libreria' di Montaigne. Retrospectiva di un inventario al futuro," [http://picus.sns.it/documenti/Montaigne\\_Pistilli\\_Sgattoni.pdf](http://picus.sns.it/documenti/Montaigne_Pistilli_Sgattoni.pdf) on the website of "Philosophical Libraries. Private Libraries of the Philosophers from the Renaissance to the Twentieth Century," Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. These studies effectively update and supersede the classic article by Gilbert de Botton and Francis Pottière-Sperry, "À la recherche de la 'libreria' de Montaigne," *Bulletin du Bibliophile*, 1997, no. 2, 254-79.

<sup>31</sup> Dionysius Periegetes (Paris, Robert Estienne, 1547) is preserved in the library of Christ Church, Oxford. The title page is signed by Montaigne and the letter "b" appears in the top right hand corner.

<sup>32</sup> Notably by Niccolò Leonicensio, *Delle Guerre & fatti de Romani* (1526). Claude Deroziers's *Des Faictz & gestes insignes des Romains* (1542) was a French translation of Leonicensio.

<sup>33</sup> For more on Dio and Cicero, see Millar, p. 46-55; William Rees, "Cassius Dio, Human Nature and the late Roman Republic," unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 2011, p. 102-83, accessed 19 July 2014; for further recent secondary literature on Dio's portrayal of Cicero, see Rees, p. 102, n. 2.

<sup>34</sup> E.g. *Ad Atticum* 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3.

<sup>35</sup> See Reimar, p. 195, n. 50.

<sup>36</sup> For Dio's negativity towards Cicero, see Millar, p. 46; Lachenaud, p. XXXVI and 129, note 4; Rees, p. 103, argues that Dio values Cicero's intellectual achievements, but not his political contribution.

<sup>37</sup> "M. Tulli Ciceronis vita ex Plutarcho" in *Petri Victorii Explicationes suarum in Ciceronem castigationum*, Paris, Robert Estienne, 1538, p. 145-58.

<sup>38</sup> Legros, "Dix-huit volumes," p. 183.

<sup>39</sup> He was not the only reader who thought of so doing. One anonymous owner of another copy of the Estienne edition of Cicero's letters, now preserved in the British Library, has written "Adi Plutarchum, et Dionem" in the margin by the side of the first page of the *Epistolae* (BL call mark: 90.k.11, volume 3, p. 3).

<sup>40</sup> Xylander, sig. [α vi r<sup>o</sup>-v<sup>o</sup>].

<sup>41</sup> Dio (1548), p. 474-98.

<sup>42</sup> Dio (1548), p. 474.

<sup>43</sup> For this distinction, see Sebastiano Timpanaro, *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method*, trans. Glenn W. Most, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2005, p. 45-57; and most recently, Pierre Lardet, "Entre grammaire et philosophie, la philologie, science ou art? Sur l'emendatio à la Renaissance et au-delà," in *Philologie als*

---

*Wissensmodell/La Philologie comme modèle de savoir*, ed. Denis Thouard, Friedrich Vollhardt, and Fosca Mariaini Zini, Berlin and New York, De Gruyter, 2010, p. 35-108.

<sup>44</sup> For the emendations and annotations to Egnazio, see Legros, “Trois livres,” p. 16-21.

<sup>45</sup> *Les “Essais” de Michel de Montaigne*, ed. Pierre Villey and V.-L. Saulnier, Paris, PUF, 1965, p. 184.