

Order and Command: On the use of “*Imperium*” in the *Politica* of Justus Lipsius

Samuel Garrett Zeitlin

Corpus Christi College, University of Cambridge^o

In the historiography of his political thought, Justus Lipsius (1547–1606) has been hailed with many epithets. Labeled as the “Sospitator Taciti” (Saviour of Tacitus),¹ “the central figure in the revival of Tacitus,”² “the sixteenth-century Belgian scholar and rhetorician,”³ “the great antiquarian,”⁴ “the great classical scholar,”⁵ “zu seiner Zeit ein Fürst der abendländischen Wissenschaft,”⁶ “one of the premier editors and teachers of his day,”⁷ “des hervorragenden spät-humanistischen Gelehrten, Justus Lipsius,”⁸ and “the Fleming Joest Lips,”⁹ “des niederländischen Philologen Justus Lipsius”¹⁰ has been indexed as an exponent of “Protestantische Philosophie in Deutschland”¹¹ and numbered amongst “professional scholars of the severest type,”¹² as well as placed under the heading of “Latin-writing German bourgeois authors of the late sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries.”¹³

While some historians have read Lipsius as “Der Begründer des Neustoizismus,”¹⁴ other scholars have read Lipsius primarily as an expositor of “Tacitus, to whom, with Seneca, he devoted the whole of his scholarly career.”¹⁵ The classical scholars T. J. Luce and A. J. Woodman claimed that “[w]hen Lipsius, the great

^oThe author is thankful to Richard Avramenko, Annabel Brett, Christopher Brooke, Erin Dolgoy, Kinch Hoekstra, Svetozar Minkov, Joanna Williamson, and two anonymous reviewers for the *Political Science Reviewer* for helpful comments on earlier versions of this article.

sixteenth-century editor of Tacitus, was seeking material for his *Politica*, a handbook of practical wisdom for princes and their advisers, it was above all to Tacitean *prudencia* that he resorted.¹⁶ Other scholars have claimed that Lipsius's *Politica* marks the beginning or origin of this kind of political thought, claiming that "the publication of Justus Lipsius' *Six Books of Politics* in 1589 marked the beginning of the rise of Tacitism as the distinct study of political prudence."¹⁷ The most recent editor of Lipsius's *Politica* took a broadly similar view, claiming that "Tacitus is the most important source of the *Politica*,"¹⁸ further asserting that the work is best comprehended as "a Tacitean political treatise."¹⁹

A number of the aforementioned epithets are mutually exclusive, and a number of the historiographic claims, such as the assertion that Lipsius "devoted the whole of his scholarly career"²⁰ solely to Seneca and Tacitus, are of broad scope. Such claims and epithets may give readers and historians cause for caution, which can be paired with cautions given by Lipsius himself.²¹ Lipsius begins his *Politica* with two dedicatory letters, followed by two prefaces. In the first epistle dedicatory, Lipsius addresses the typographer who would reprint the *Politica*: the typographer is not to reprint the work without express permission from Lipsius himself, which will be withheld if the typographer has altered the work in the slightest detail. Lipsius claims not to have misplaced a single point, interval, note, or verbal distinction; punctuation, spacing, and italicization serve to structure Lipsius's argument and demarcate variations of narrative voice.²² Lipsius takes up this theme again in the first preface, where he claims to have instituted a new stylistic genus such that the whole of the *Politica* is in some sense "our own," and yet in some sense "nothing" of "ours."²³ The *inventio* of the work and its order (*ordo*), Lipsius states, are wholly "ours," but the citations are the concatenated utterances of others²⁴—which Lipsius has plucked, and, occasionally, pruned. However, even where the utterances belong to others, the connectives that conjoin them are "words of our own."²⁵ Lipsius speaks in his own name in the definitions that he gives near the beginnings of chapters.²⁶ The definitions, not the citations, are the places where Lipsius articulates his

political vocabulary most clearly *in propria persona*. To the preface on form, Lipsius joins a preface of caution admonishing potential critics of the *Politica*.²⁷ Only those well experienced in civil matters and those well experienced in the discourses of Roman antiquity may deign to critique the *Politica*,²⁸ and even such readers, Lipsius warns, may criticize him only after thorough and numerous readings of the *Politica* conducted over extended periods of time.²⁹ Such warnings, addressed to Lipsius's contemporaries, may serve also to caution contemporary historiographers from reducing his text to one or two of its myriad sources or reducing his thought to a moniker.

These cautions occasion a closer examination of the text of the *Politicorum sive Civilis Doctrinae Libri Sex, Qui ad Principatum maximè spectant* (1589) as well as of the terminology of the work. The term *imperium* is not without import in the works of Tacitus. A thoroughgoing Tacitist reading of the *Politica* would not neglect *imperium* as a term in Lipsian political thought. Thus, as a test of this reading, and as a way into Lipsian political thought, this article examines *imperium* as the term is deployed in the *Politica* (1589) and as it was translated by Lipsius's vernacular translators in the 1590s. Without presuppositions as to the meaning of *imperium*, what might *imperium* mean and what work might it be doing within the *Politica*?

The Polyvalence of *Imperium*: Vernacular Translations of Lipsius in the 1590s

One approach to the question of what Lipsius meant by *imperium* in the *Politica* is to look at what it was taken to mean. What did Lipsius's contemporaries, his Latinate readership, understand by the term? One index consists in the vernacular translations of the *Politica* into English, French, and German published in the Europe of the 1590s, within the first decade of the appearance of the *Politicorum sive Civilis Doctrinae Libri Sex* (1589).

Latinate readers and translators read and translated Lipsian *imperium* multifariously in the 1590s—failing to ascribe a univocal referent or monolithic meaning to the term. Discussing the play of

fatum in the leveling of empires in the sixth book of the *Politica*, Lipsius writes that “Deum velut sollemniter magna imperia perdere per hanc viam,”³⁰ which William Jones renders into English with “God doth as it were with solemnitie destroy mightie Empires after this manner.”³¹ Further in Book VI, writing of those who invoke the name of liberty (*libertas*) in the service of sedition (*seditio*), Lipsius claims in his margin that “[*l*]ibertas et tutela publica praetexti solita.”³² But these pretexts of liberty and public wardship (*tutela publica*), Lipsius maintains, are false, and they serve to overturn *imperium*.³³ Conveying this sentiment in English, Jones molds the English such that the seditious libertines “do openly couer themselves with this word libertie, and other glorious names. But how falsely is this? For to the intent they may overthrow the estate, they prefer libertie.”³⁴ *Imperium* is here carried over into English as “estate.”³⁵ When Lipsius lays out the means of dissipating such seditious disturbances, he claims that “*si imperium detractetur, bello certandum*,”³⁶ which conditional, in Jones’s 1594 English, reads “if they refuse to obey thee, thou must fight it out.”³⁷ Later in Book VI, *imperium* is given as “gouvernement”³⁸ in Jones’s rendering of the Lipsian definition of tyranny and in translating the Lipsian exhortation to bear the yoke set on by tyrants, as it is more lenient than the misery of civil war.³⁹ Even in very close contexts—a single line or sentence apart—Jones translates *imperant*, the third-person plural indicative form of *imperare*, divergently: in one sentence of *Politica* V.xiv, *imperant* is rendered “commaund absolutely and by soueraigne authoritie,”⁴⁰ and in the very next sentence *imperant* is given as “gouverne.”⁴¹ Jones shifts between “commaund absolutely and by soueraigne authoritie,”⁴² “gouverne,”⁴³ “empire,”⁴⁴ “estate,”⁴⁵ “to obey,”⁴⁶ and “gouvernement”⁴⁷ in his translations of Lipsian *imperium* and Lipsian *imperare*.

Jones’s French counterpart was similarly polyvalent in the vernacular renderings of *imperium* in Lipsius’s *Politica*. A French translation of the *Politica*, published in a combined volume with a translation of *De Constantia*, appeared in 1594 at Tours under the title *Les Politiques ou Doctrines Civile de Iustus Lipsius, Ou il est discoursu de ce qui appartient à la Principauté*,⁴⁸ copies of

which remain in the permanent collections of the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. On the frontispiece, the translator is unnamed.⁴⁹ When the 1594 French translator of Lipsius poses the Lipsian question “*Quid Principatus?*”⁵⁰ as “Que c’est que principauté?”,⁵¹ the translator gives Lipsius’s answer of “UNIUS IMPERIUM”⁵² as “le commandement d’un seul.”⁵³ The chapter heading of *Politica* II.i in the 1589 Latin reads “*De imperio universe dictum*”⁵⁴ whereas the same chapter heading in the French translation reads “Du gouvernement et empire universellement.”⁵⁵ Lipsius’s division of society into “*Commercio et Imperio*”⁵⁶ has become a division between “Commerce & le Gouvernement,”⁵⁷ while only several lines later the marginal “*Definitio Imperii*”⁵⁸ has been rendered “Definition d’Empire.”⁵⁹ Describing the *imperium* of religion in *Politica* I.iii, Lipsius claims *in propria persona* that “[m]agnum eius in animos imperium,”⁶⁰ which the French translator of 1594 gives as “son empire & sa puissance est grande sur les esprits des hommes.”⁶¹ Here five words (“son empire & sa puissance”) are given to translate *imperium*. In the 1594 French translation of Lipsius’s *Politica*, “gouvernement”, “commandement”, “empire,” and “puissance” are all deployed to render *imperium*.

Under the pen of Melchior Haganaeus⁶² and under the imprint of the Forster press at Amberg, a German translation of Lipsius’s *Politica* appeared in 1599 bearing the title *Von Unterweisung zum Weltlichen Regiment: Oder, von Burgerlicher Lehr, Sechs Bücher Iusti Lipsii, So fürnemlich auff den Principat oder Fürstenstand gerichtet*.⁶³ *Imperator* is translated by Melchior Haganaeus as both “Kaiser”⁶⁴ and “Römischer Kaiser,”⁶⁵ as well as “Regent.”⁶⁶ In the course of Lipsius’s discussion of *In Divinis Prudentia* in the second chapter of Book IV of the *Politica*, Haganaeus has rendered “*Ad augmentum etiam Imperii*”⁶⁷ as “Darnach auch zu erweiterung seines Regiments.”⁶⁸ In the first chapter of Book III of the *Politica*, where Lipsius has translated a quotation from the *Cyropaedia* of Xenophon substituting *imperium* for ἀρχην,⁶⁹ Haganaeus has given “*et homines in nullos magis insurgunt, quam in eos quos imperium in se adfectare sentiscunt*”⁷⁰ with “Und wie Xenophon bezeugt/so

leynen sich die Menschen gegen Niemand mehr auff/als es eben den jenigen/so sich Regiments gegen ihnen anmassen und unterfangen wollen.”⁷¹ Here, Haganaeus has rendered *imperium* with “Regiment.”⁷² In the two following quotations, Haganaeus gives *imperitare*⁷³ as “regiren”⁷⁴ and *imperitantis*⁷⁵ as “Regenten.”⁷⁶ Haganaeus nonetheless gives polyvalent renderings of *imperium*. Two chapters later in Book III, Haganaeus takes a Lipsian quotation from Sallust⁷⁷ and renders *prosperum imperium habuisse* as “einen glücklichen fortgang gehabt.”⁷⁸ In rendering *imperium* as “fortgang,” Haganaeus understands something more expansive—that which is progressing, processing, advancing, over-literally “forth-going.” In the fifth chapter of Book IV, taking a quote from Seneca (“noster Sophus”),⁷⁹ Lipsius puts it down that “*Nemo bene imperat, nisi qui ante paruerit imperio*,”⁸⁰ which Haganaeus translates as “Keiner wol gebieten werde, der nicht auch zuvor dem gebiet unterthan und gehorsamb gewesen sey.”⁸¹ Here, rather than “Regiment” and “regiren,” Haganaeus has taken different choices: *imperat* is translated “gebieten,” while *ante paruerit imperio* is given as “zuvor dem gebiet unterthan und gehorsamb gewesen sey.”⁸² In the 1599 German translation of the *Politica*, *imperium* was rendered as “Regiment,”⁸³ “gebiet,”⁸⁴ and “fortgang,”⁸⁵ while forms of *imperare* were translated as both “gebieten”⁸⁶ and “regiren.”⁸⁷

William Jones, Melchior Haganaeus, and the anonymous translator of the French *Politiques* published at Tours in 1594 translate *imperium*, *Imperator*, and *imperare* in various ways. All three translate the term multifariously over a broad semantic field; in no case do these 1590s vernacular translators of Lipsius’s *Politica* translate *imperium* univocally as “Empire,” “l’empire,” or “Reich.”

This polyvalence of Lipsian *imperium* as handled by Lipsius’s contemporaries elicits the investigation of another context within which to situate Lipsius’s text—that of Latin philology and Lipsius’s *métier* as a Latin philologist.⁸⁸ An investigation of the Latin philology, to which Lipsius devoted himself, suggests that this polyvalence corresponds to the Roman roots of *imperium*.

**The Use and Usages of *Imperium*: Latin Philology
and Lipsius's Roman Inheritance**

In recent philological studies⁸⁹ aggregating all surviving usages of the term *imperium* in republican and post-republican Rome as the term is deployed in Latin literature, the classical philologist John Richardson writes that the term “*imperium* had a more general sense of an order and of power than historians and legal theorists sometimes take cognizance of. Moreover *imperium* as an order remains a normal usage throughout classical Latin literature: Cicero uses it in this sense, as do all the authors of the late Republic and the first and second centuries AD.”⁹⁰ More broadly, Richardson presents four genealogical claims about the developing semantics of *imperium* from the early Roman republic to post-republican Rome. First, Richardson claims, on the basis of examining all usages of *imperium* in the comedies of Terence and Plautus, and in the semantics of the early Roman republic, *imperium* and “empire” are not semantic equivalents.⁹¹ Second, Richardson claims, *imperium* bears a close relation in its early Roman republican usage to either (a) an order or command from a superior to an inferior, from the dominant to the dominated, or (b) an instance of exerting particularly *paternal* power—over slaves, over children, or over women.⁹² Third, Richardson claims that while “*imperium* as an order remains in normal usage throughout classical Latin literature,”⁹³ the sense of *imperium* as “an order from a superior to an inferior”⁹⁴ in the early republic expands in meaning to the more general sense of a “power”—particularly the power of a *magistratus*—by the late Roman republic.⁹⁵ Fourth, Richardson claims that from the late-republican period to the post-republican period, *imperium* shifts its meaning to take on a territorial referent that it did not have in the republican period.⁹⁶

In his history *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*, David Armitage outlines the Roman origins of the concept of *imperium* in a manner consonant with these claims. Drawing support from and, in part, explicitly basing his claims on earlier versions of Richardson's philological studies of *imperium*,⁹⁷ Armitage summarizes the conceptual change in the term:

In its original Roman sense, *imperium* denoted the authority of a magistrate to act on behalf of Rome and its citizens, whether at home (*domi*), in the city of Rome, or abroad (*militiae*). The people donated *imperium* to their magistrates; they, in turn, acted only in so far as they represented the people collectively. No one but a magistrate could command such authority, and such authority could only be vested in a magistrate. *Imperium* was thus formally restricted, even though it was potentially unlimited in its extent outside the city itself.⁹⁸

For Armitage, the distinction between *imperium domi* and *imperium militiae* situates *imperium* as a limit-term. *Imperium domi* supervened on the internal or domestic space of the city, while *imperium militiae* shaped the martial space outside the city walls. *Imperium* delimited what fell within and what without, the civic sphere. *Imperium* set the limits of the city.⁹⁹

As outlined by Armitage and Richardson, the pre-Augustan discourse of *imperium* has two principal facets. First, pre-Augustan *imperium* is defined interpersonally, in terms of order, power, or command, rather than territorially. Second, pre-Augustan *imperium* preserves a distinct dichotomy between *imperium domi* and *imperium militiae*. Lipsius's usage of the term *imperium* in his *Politica* is broadly consistent with both of these facets of pre-Augustan Roman discourse.

In his *Epistolica institutio*, composed shortly before the *Politica*,¹⁰⁰ Lipsius advocated a return to the Latin style and language typical of early Roman republican comedy.¹⁰¹ As E. Catherine Dunn argued in her reading of the *Epistolica institutio* (1587), "The admiration for Plautine Latin was one of the most controversial aspects of Lipsius's tempestuous career. He not only advocated this kind of Latin for letters but considered it appropriate for other types of prose as well."¹⁰² Lipsian usage of *imperium* in the *Politica* is consistent with his philologic and stylistic advocacy of Roman republican language in the *Institutio*. Lipsius uses *imperium* without the territorial referent that, according to Richardson,

accrued to the term during the Augustan and post-Augustan era; in this sense, if the most recent philological studies are accurate,¹⁰³ Lipsius in his usage of *imperium* is stripping the term of its Roman imperial semantic accretions and restoring *imperium* to its republican semantic field—the order, command, or power of a superior over an inferior with, Lipsius adds, a view to judging and obeying. In this respect, the Lipsian usage of *imperium* is similar to that of other late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century political thinkers, who do not necessarily define terms like *imperium*, *summa potestas*, or “state of nature” with reference to territory. As Luc Foisneau has recently argued, terms in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century political thought, like *imperium*, are not necessarily used in relation to geographic or territorial referents. Foisneau argues that such structuring terms as “state,” “state of nature,” or *imperium* refer not to territory or geographic space but to the status of the relations between persons or groups of persons.¹⁰⁴ At times, Lipsius explicitly refers to *imperium* as a status¹⁰⁵—with the use of a judicious personal pronoun (“Ego”) to claim a Tacitean turn of phrase about the “*status imperii*” as his own.¹⁰⁶ Lauren Benton, in her recent historiography,¹⁰⁷ makes two claims similar to those advanced by Foisneau—one more general, the other more specific. More specifically, Benton claims, Jean Bodin (a contemporary of Lipsius) gave not a territorial but an interpersonal or relational definition of the marks of sovereignty in *Les six livres de la République*.¹⁰⁸ More generally, Benton argues, to think that terms like “sovereignty” or *imperium* had a primarily territorial referent in the sixteenth or seventeenth century is to involve one’s analysis in an anachronistic imposition—pressing a nineteenth-century figure on sixteenth-century matter.¹⁰⁹ Lipsian *imperium* is not referentially or semantically tied to territory.

In addition to omitting the territorial referent that accrued to *imperium* in Augustan Rome, Lipsius retains, or restores, the pre-Augustan dichotomy between *imperium domi* and *imperium militiae*. Discussing the importance of subsuming martial *imperium* under a single head, Lipsius writes that sometimes the prince should go to battles in person, sometimes he should send

subordinates—nothing impedes sending plural subordinates to direct battle if the *imperium militaris* rests with only one.¹¹⁰ Similarly, without an *Imperator*, soldiers (*militēs*) are of no value.¹¹¹ For Lipsius, an *Imperator militiae* is a necessary condition for soldiers of value. Lipsius adheres to the Ciceronian pre-Augustan distinction between *imperium domi* and *imperium militiae* equally in those parts of the *Politica* where Lipsius draws on sources, like Marcus Aurelius,¹¹² that postdate Augustus. In his *Notae* to chapter 9 of the third book of the *Politica*, Lipsius, drawing on Marcus Aurelius,¹¹³ states that “the *Imperator*, who remains at home, knows not the truth.”¹¹⁴ Whereas Lipsius preserves the distinction between *imperium domi* and *imperium militiae*—via a distinction between *Imperator domi* and *Imperator militiae*—he nonetheless elevates the status of the *Imperator* who does not remain at home—the *Imperator militiae*. Thus, while retaining the republican Roman idiom of *imperium*, Lipsius, in his *Notes* to the *Politica*, raises the status of external *Imperatores* over that of internal *Imperatores*—creating a space within the republican idiom for external, martial expansion.

Ἀρχή and Imperium

When Lipsius quotes from Greek authors in the *Politica*, he generally quotes them first in the original and then provides a Latin translation, never naming a translator. In the same preface where he claims the whole of the *Politica* to be both “our own” and, in some sense, “nothing” of “ours,”¹¹⁵ Lipsius rebuts potential slander (*calumnia*) of his misappropriation of the passages of other authors by further claiming, without exempting translation, that if he has quoted, cited, twisted, torqued, or rendered¹¹⁶ passages inexactly, this is not to be construed as an objection to his *Politica*, for such alterations have always been licit in this genre and will always be licit.¹¹⁷ If, then, Lipsius used translations other than his own, it remained within his ample powers to amend them as he saw fit or thought prudent.

Some deployments of *imperium* in Lipsian translations of Greek quotations are consistent with the pre-Augustan Roman

notion of *imperium* as an order or command. In the last chapter of Book V, Lipsius exhorts martial victors to make their peace (*Victores ad Pacem*),¹¹⁸ as well as to keep it, quoting a golden dogma (*dogma aureum*)¹¹⁹ of Polybius for this purpose. In giving the quotation from Polybius III.xii in Greek, followed by a Latin rendering of his choosing, Lipsius deploys *imperant* in translating παραγγέλλωσιν, a form of παραγγέλλειν (to command by messages, to give orders).¹²⁰ Justifying his right to write on matters military and claiming his acquaintance with history and historians as grounds for so writing, Lipsius quotes a kingly maxim attributed to Iphicrates by Plutarch.¹²¹ When asked of his competence in similar matters, Iphicrates claimed, and Lipsius through him indirectly claims, that he was neither a horseman, nor an archer, nor a peltast, nor a footman, but a knower of how to command all of the above.¹²² In giving the Greek quotation in Latin, Lipsius translates ἐπιστάμενος ἐπιτάττειν¹²³ as “*novi imperare*.”¹²⁴ *Imperare* here translates a word that means “to put upon one as a duty . . . order one to do.”¹²⁵

Nonetheless, in the majority of cases where Lipsius deploys *imperium* or *imperare* or *Imperator* in his translation of Greek terms into Latin in the *Politica*, he uses them to translate the noun ἀρχή, the verb ἄρχειν, and the noun ἄρχων.¹²⁶ Taking up the theme “De Faeminarum imperio”¹²⁷ in his *Notae* appended to the *Politica*, Lipsius translates the phrase καὶ γυναικας ἄρχειν ἀνδρῶν¹²⁸ as “*etiam faeminas imperium in viros exercere*”¹²⁹—where women rule over men, they exert or exercise *imperium* in or upon such men as come under their suasion.¹³⁰ While under the Roman usage outlined by Richardson *imperium* had been associated in pre-Augustan Rome with specifically *paternal* power, Lipsian *imperium* can be exerted by women as well.¹³¹ In treating *De Tyrannide*¹³² in Book VI of the *Politica*, Lipsius translates μοναρχίας παρανόμου—extra-legal or degenerate monarchy—with two terms in the Latin, where the Greek has only one: μοναρχίας παρανόμου¹³³ is “*tyrannide sive iniusto imperio*.”¹³⁴ Reading *sive* as an “or” of equivalence, Lipsius identifies tyranny (*tyrannide*) with unjust *imperium* (*iniusto imperio*).¹³⁵ On occasion, ἄρχειν is translated by Lipsius

with forms of *regere*¹³⁶ or *gubernare*,¹³⁷ and on occasion ἄρχοντος is translated as “*Principis*,”¹³⁸ while elsewhere ἄρχοντας is given as “*imperantes*.”¹³⁹ This constellation of translations ties *imperium* and *imperare* directly to idioms of rule, governing, power, and domination—ἀρχή in Greek covers a broad semantic field—encompassing not only political command, hierarchy, and subordination but also premises in arguments, the principles or propositions from which one reasons, and beginnings more generally. On the one hand, in translating the Greek ἀρχή with the Latin *imperium*, Lipsius follows a tradition of translation dating at least to Leonardo Bruni’s translation and commentary on the pseudo-Aristotelian *Oeconomica*.¹⁴⁰ On the other hand, *imperium* as a term plays a structuring role or architectonic role in Lipsian thought—*imperium* is the term through which *principatus*, *virtus*, *vitio*, *clementia*, *maiestas*, *militaris disciplinae*, and *tyrannide* are defined.

Lipsian Definitions and the Place of *Imperium* in Linguistic Legislation

Lipsius speaks *in propria persona* in his definitions, whereas his voice is more ambiguous in his quotations and citations—both his own and not his own. The terminological definitions are important moments in the *Politica*—they are moments where Lipsius speaks in his own name, and they are the moments where he defines his terms. The focal terms with which Lipsius constructs his definitions are of no small importance for specifically Lipsian political and moral thought.

Lipsius defines *imperium* as one of the two things in which society consists—the other being *commercium*.¹⁴¹ While Lipsius translates the Greek phrase τῆς ἀγορᾶς, in a quotation from the third chapter of the third book of Aristotle’s *Politics*, as “*a commercii*”¹⁴²—giving the term *commercium* some connection to marketplaces—Lipsius nowhere defines *commercium* within the *Politica*. *Imperium*, in contrast to *commercium*, is defined.¹⁴³ *Imperium* is a certain, fixed or settled order in judging and obeying.¹⁴⁴ In the *Politica*, Lipsius claims both that *imperium* and *commercium* are distinct and that *commercium* is the subject for

another argument not to be found in the *Politica* itself.¹⁴⁵ The rapidity with which Lipsius makes these distinctions may conceal their radicality—for by fully distinguishing *imperium* and *commercium*, Lipsius in effect claims that relations of *commercium* are not relations of *imperium*; and by further excluding *commercium* from definitive treatment within his major political work, Lipsius effectively claims that *commercium*, for the most part, falls outside the systematic treatment of the subject of politics.

In the *Politica* Lipsius deploys the term *imperium* in his definitions of other political and moral terms. In the third chapter of the second book of his *Politica*, Lipsius asks in the margin, “*Quid Principatus?*”¹⁴⁶ Lipsius answers this question by defining *principatus* as “UNIUS IMPERIUM, MORIBUS AUT LEGIBUS DELATUM, SUSCEPTUM GESTUMQUE PARENTIUM BONO.”¹⁴⁷ William Jones translated this definition as “the government of one, imposed according to custome, and lawes, undertaken, & executed for the good of the subjects.”¹⁴⁸ In Lipsius’s political thought, tyranny, too, is defined relative to *imperium*.¹⁴⁹ In writing “*De Tyrannide*,” Lipsius defines tyranny as the violent *imperium* of one, against customs and laws.¹⁵⁰ Here Lipsius modifies the definition of principate, given in II.iii (*unius imperium*): tyranny is principate (*principatus*) violently inflected, the *imperium* of one with customs discarded and laws countermanded.

A set of moral and political attributes are defined relationally to *imperium*. In chapter 12 of the second book of the *Politics*, Lipsius gives his definition of clemency (*Clementia definita*),¹⁵¹ doing so through a reference to *imperium* coupled with a metaphor of luminence: clemency is another light to the prince (*Principi lumen alterum*), the moon of *imperia* (*Imperatorum Lunam*).¹⁵² The regal or princely attribute of *maiestas* is defined instrumentally in relation to *imperium*—indeed, *maiestas*, for Lipsius, is quite a sharp implement or weapon (Acre...telum) in service of *imperium* (ad imperium).¹⁵³ *Imperium* figures also in Lipsius’s descriptive definition of “*Militaris Disciplinae*”: the first ornament and support of *imperium*, the most tenacious bond of military discipline.¹⁵⁴ In Book IV of the *Politica*, both political virtue and political vice are

defined relative to *imperium*.¹⁵⁵ Political or regal vice is the opposite: political vice is defined by Lipsius as a depraved or noxious sentiment toward the *imperium* of the king.¹⁵⁶ Political virtue, by contrast, is a laudable sentiment that is useful for the *imperium* of those bearing rule.¹⁵⁷

The term *imperium* and the verb *imperare* structure Lipsius's differentiation of classes of *duces*.¹⁵⁸ In chapter 14 of the *Politica*, after a pair of quotations in which *dux* and *imperator* are deployed as synonyms,¹⁵⁹ Lipsius introduces his discussion of “twofold dukedom” or “twofold leadership” (*Duplici discrimine Duces*)—a binary view of leadership whereby leaders or commanders (*duces*) are divided into primary *duces* and secondary *duces*. Primary *duces* are those who command (*imperant*) the whole affair, matter, or thing and carry the matter (*rem gerunt*) under their own auspices and leadership.¹⁶⁰ Secondary *duces* are those who command (*imperant*) by the will or order of another and carry the matter (*rem gerunt*) under others' leadership.¹⁶¹ Secondary *duces* are subordinate to primary *duces* and are subject to the discretionary or wilful command of their primaries. This distinction, which is explicitly a distinction of classes,¹⁶² or a differentiation of kinds, is structured by the various modalities with which the *dux* exercises *imperium*. Thus the adverbial character of a leader's exercise of *imperium* determines whether that *dux* is to be classed among the *primarii* or the *secundarii*.¹⁶³

Imperium also serves to frame the Lipsian treatment of internecine strife and the causes of civil war (*bellum civile*). Lipsius distinguishes between remote and proximate causes of civil war.¹⁶⁴ The remote causes of civil war, for Lipsius, form a dyad: *fatum* and *luxus*—fate and luxury.¹⁶⁵ Against *fatum* even the prudent can do very little.¹⁶⁶ By contrast, the proximate causes of civil war, for Lipsius, form a triad: *factio*, *sedition*, and *tyrannis*—faction, sedition, and tyranny. Both *sedition* and *tyrannis* are causes of civil war described or defined relative to *imperium*.¹⁶⁷ Alone among Lipsius's three proximate causes of civil war, *factio* has no reference to *imperium*.¹⁶⁸ *Imperium* has conceptual connections to unity and ordered units in the *Politica*,¹⁶⁹ while faction is the severance and

the splitting of such ordered unity and regimentation. Some unity and some *imperium* persist, for Lipsius, in instances of sedition and tyranny, while *factio* splinters the hierarchies of command and obedience. Quoting from the beginning of the third book of Cicero's *De Legibus*, Lipsius restates in his own voice that "[s]ine imperio enim,"¹⁷⁰ before citing Cicero's claim that "*nec domus ulla, nec civitas, nec gens, nec hominum universum genus stare, nec rerum natura omnis, nec ipse mundus potest.*"¹⁷¹ "Without *imperium* therefore, neither any house, nor city, nor people, nor the universal human genus may stand, nor the nature of all things, nor may the world itself." *Imperium*, in this view, is that which makes cities, peoples, and even the nature of things stand (*stare*)—that is, *imperium* is required for these ordered units to exist and persist. *Imperium*, for Cicero and for Lipsius, is a property in virtue of which ordered units (households, cities, *gens*) stand (*stare*) and in the absence of which they fall.

Coda: Two Notions of *Imperium*

An examination of vernacular translations of the *Politica* from the 1590s leaves the reader with the sense that the term *imperium* as read by anglophone, francophone, and Germanic Latinists covered a polyvalent range of meanings—from idioms of rule, order, and command to synonyms for "empire," "estate," and processes more generally (the "fortgang" of Melchior Haganaeus). After situating this research within the historiography of Lipsius's political thought, this article concludes with the suggestion that Lipsius deployed *imperium* across two semantic registers—that of *imperium* as an order or command (pre-Augustan *imperium*) and that of *imperium* as a structuring or architectonic term within his political thought more generally (architectonic *imperium*).

One consequence of this study for the historiography of Lipsius's political thought is that it urges a greater sensitivity to the plethora of sources deployed by Lipsius in the *Politica*—Cicero and Aristotle not least among them. Such sensitivity, in addition to finding support within Lipsius's text, is consonant with the curricular reforms Lipsius advocated while posted at the University of

Leiden. As Willem Otterspeer has argued in discussing Lipsius's proposed academic alterations,

Lipsius also had very specific ideas about the contents and the level of teaching of the arts. He had a great aversion to the scholastics as well as to the followers of Ramus. First of all, he wanted to return to the original writings of classical antiquity, free from the obscure interpretations of scholastic interpreters. He wanted to return to Aristotle, but considered the almost exclusive attention to the *Logica* far too superficial. He advocated the teaching of Aristotle's *Politics*, his *De animalibus* and *Ethics*. He also prescribed other writers such as Plato, Epictetus, Plutarch and Seneca.¹⁷²

Lipsius was neither singularly a Tacitean nor singularly a Senecan; his prominent sources include Cicero,¹⁷³ Sallust,¹⁷⁴ Xenophon,¹⁷⁵ Thucydides,¹⁷⁶ and Aristotle.¹⁷⁷ Another consequence of this study for the historiography is to note that two concepts taken as central in prominent interpretations of Lipsius's political thought—social disciplining (*Sozialdisziplinierung*), in the case of Gerhard Oestreich's neo-Stoic reading, and *prudentia*, in the case of some Tacitist readings of Lipsius—are both defined in the *Politica* through idioms of rule. Oestreich's notion of the prominence of discipline (*Disziplin*)¹⁷⁸ and social disciplining (*Sozialdisziplinierung*)¹⁷⁹ in Lipsius draws heavily on the discussion of building, educating, and disciplining an army in Book V of the *Politica*. As noted, Lipsius defines "*Militaris Disciplinae*" relative to *imperium*.¹⁸⁰ Human prudence or prudence in human affairs (*Prudentia in Humanis*) consists in experience of governing (*gubernandi*).¹⁸¹ Idioms of *imperium* and rule form the conceptual currency with which both *prudentia* and Lipsian discipline are defined in the *Politica*. In these respects, it may be said that idioms of rule, like *imperium*, *imperare*, and *gubernare*, form the terminological fundament of Lipsius's political vocabulary.

In his usage of *imperium* in the *Politica*, Lipsius retrieved two salient features of the pre-Augustan Roman idiom of *imperium*:

first, the absence of a territorial referent for a term of interpersonal order or command and, second, a structured distinction between internal and external *imperium*—*imperium domi* and *imperium militiae*. One reason that Lipsius has preserved the distinction is that he has not ceased to quote and cite pre-Augustan Roman sources, in particular Cicero. This idiom of pre-Augustan Roman *imperium* as an idiom of order, obedience, and command fits with Lipsius's use of *imperium* and *imperare* to translate Greek terms for command—for example, παραγγέλλωσιν¹⁸² and ἐπιτάττειν.¹⁸³ The idiom of pre-Augustan Roman *imperium* also fits with Lipsius's definition of *imperium* in *Politica* II.i: *imperium* is a certain, fixed, or settled order in judging and obeying.¹⁸⁴

Lipsius's definition of *imperium* contains an indefinite modifier (*certum*) and two subjective elements (*iubendo et parendo*), which might provoke his readers to question the definiteness of this definition. Who is to obey whom? Who is to command whom? What type of "certain" order is *imperium* precisely? *Imperium* is deployed by Lipsius with equanimity to define both "principate" and "tyranny"—but not to define *respublica*, a term the *Politica* leaves undefined. The use of *imperium* in the Lipsian definitions of principate, majesty, tyranny, clemency, military discipline, political virtue, and political vice demarcates a second semantic range of the term: *imperium* is an idiom that plays a structuring or architectonic role within Lipsius's political terminology and his practice of linguistic legislation via definition.

For purposes of clarity, to see what Lipsius both is and is not doing, the Lipsian practice of definition and linguistic legislation may helpfully be contrasted with the later practice of Thomas Hobbes. For Hobbes, undefined terms are senseless terms; undefined terms are nonsense.¹⁸⁵ Definitions, for Hobbes, state semantic equivalents, susceptible to lexical substitutions. Where "memory" is defined as "decaying sense,"¹⁸⁶ a substitution of "decaying sense" for "memory" should be possible wherever the latter appears without any corresponding loss of sense. Definitions, for Hobbes, also serve an exclusionary purpose: definitions define unwanted or untoward meanings into illegitimacy.¹⁸⁷ Lipsian definitions do not necessarily aim at these

purposes. First, it is not clear whether Lipsius regards undefined terms (e.g., *commercium*, *respublica*) as nonsense: Lipsius uses undefined terms as if they were sensible and endowed with meaning. Second, it is not clear that Lipsian definitions represent specific semantic equivalences, for one cannot simply substitute the definition of *imperium* (*certum ordinem in iubendo et parendo*) into the definition of *principatus* (*unius imperium*) or *clementia* (*Imperatorum Lunam*) and retain the sense of the latter definitions. Third, it is not clear whether Lipsian definition aims to exclude meanings and delegitimize usages in the manner of other linguistic legislators. The indefinite and subjective elements within Lipsian definitions open up a space of *negotium* sensitive to the negotiation of meaning and sense in which political life, in part, consists. Hobbes argued that with an axiomatic political theory, *scientia civilis* could supplant *prudentialia*.¹⁸⁸ For Lipsius, however, the space of politics that *imperium* serves to articulate remained a space of ambiguity, polyvalence, and prudential negotiation.

Notes

1. C. O. Brink, "Justus Lipsius and the Text of Tacitus," *Journal of Roman Studies* 4, parts 1 and 2 (1951): 33; J. H. M. Salmon, "Cicero and Tacitus in Sixteenth-Century France," in *American Historical Review* 85, no. 2 (April 1980): 326.
2. Arnaldo Momigliano, "Review of *Tacitus in der Romania. Studien zur Literarischen Rezeption des Tacitus in Italien und Frankreich* by Jürgen von Stackelberg (Tübingen: Max Niemayer Verlag, 1960)," *Journal of Roman Studies* 52, nos. 1 and 2 (1962): 283.
3. E. Catherine Dunn, "Lipsius and the Art of Letter Writing," *Studies in the Renaissance* 3 (1956): 145.
4. Salmon, "Cicero and Tacitus," p. 316.
5. Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 1:254.
6. Gerhard Oestreich, "Justus Lipsius als Theoretiker des neuzeitlichen Machtstaates: Zu seinem 350. Todestage (24. März 1606)," *Historische Zeitschrift* 181, no. 1 (1956): 34 (trans. "in his time a prince of occidental science").
7. Max Reinhart, "Review of *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition*, ed. T. J. Luce and A. J. Woodman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993)," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 25, no. 2 (Summer 1994): 474.

8. Henry F. Fullenwider, "Die Kritik der deutschen Jesuiten an dem lakonischen Stil des Justus Lipsius im Zusammenhang der jesuitischen *Argutia*-Bewegung," *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 2, no. 1 (Spring 1984): 55.
9. D. C. C. Young, "Review of *Justus Lipsius. The Philosophy of Renaissance Stoicism* by Jason Lewis Saunders," *Philosophical Quarterly* 7, no. 28 (July 1957): 284.
10. Oestreich, "Lipsius als Theoretiker," p. 33; Peter N. Miller, "Nazis and Neo-Stoics: Otto Brunner and Gerhard Oestreich before and after the Second World War," in *Past and Present* 176, no. 1 (2002): 145: "The Flemish philologist and antiquarian Justus Lipsius."
11. Wilhelm Totok, ed., *Handbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie*, vol. 3 (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1980), p. 352.
12. Arnaldo Momigliano, "The First Political Commentary on Tacitus," *Journal of Roman Studies* 37, parts 1 and 2 (1947): 98.
13. Wolfgang Weber, "'What a Good Ruler Should Not Do': Theoretical Limits of Royal Power in European Theories of Absolutism, 1500–1700," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 26, no. 4 (Winter 1995): 897. "Latin-writing German bourgeois authors of the late sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries: Arnold Clapmar (1574–1604), Justus Lipsius (1547–1606), Henning Amisæus (ca. 1575–1636), Adam Contzen (1571–1635), Hermann Conring (1606–1681), and others."
14. Otto Brunner, *Adeliges Landleben und Europäischer Geist, Leben und Werk Wolf Helmhardts von Hohberg, 1612–1688* (Salzburg: Otto Müller Verlag, 1949), p. 129 (trans. "the founder of neo-Stoicism"). This passage is referenced in Miller, "Nazis and Neo-Stoics," p. 153n22.
15. Mark Morford, "Tacitean *Prudentia* and the Doctrines of Justus Lipsius," in *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition*, ed. T. J. Luce and A. J. Woodman (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), p. 129.
16. T. J. Luce and A. J. Woodman, "Introduction," in *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), p. xi.
17. Martin van Gelderen, "The State and Its Rivals in Early Modern Europe," in *States and Citizens*, ed. Quentin Skinner and Bo Stråth, 79–96 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 90.
18. Jan Waszink, "Introduction," in Justus Lipsius, *Politica: Six Books of Politics or Political Instruction*, ed. and trans. Jan Waszink (Assen, The Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum [Koninklijke Van Gorcum], 2004), p. 98.
19. Waszink, "Introduction," p. 94. For more recent scholarship on Lipsius, see Christopher Brooke, *Philosophic Pride: Stoicism and Political Thought from Lipsius to Rousseau* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University

- Press, 2012), pp. 12–58; Christopher Brooke, “Grotius, Stoicism and ‘Oikeiosis,’” *Grotiana* 29 (2008): 25–50.
20. Morford, “Tacitean *Prudentia*,” p. 129.
 21. “MONITA *quaedam, sive* CAUTIONES” [“some WARNINGS, or CAUTIONS”], Justus Lipsius, *Politica: Six Books of Politics or Political Instruction*, ed. and trans. Jan Waszink (Assen, The Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum [Koninklijke Van Gorcum], 2004), pp. 234–40.
 22. Lipsius, *Politica*, p. 224.
 23. Lipsius, *Politica*, “De Consilio et Forma Nostris Operis” [“On the Counsel and Form of Our Work”], pp. 230–32.
 24. Lipsius, *Politica*, “De Consilio et Forma Nostris Operis,” p. 232: (in the outer margin) “Concinnata ab aliis.”
 25. Lipsius, *Politica*, “De Consilio et Forma Nostris Operis,” p. 232.
 26. Oestreich, “Lipsius als Theoretiker,” p. 48: “Die Definitionen, die Lipsius jeweils am Anfang der Kapitel gibt, stammen von ihm selbst, sie werden dann durch antike Zitate belegt und erläutert” [“The definitions, which Lipsius gives at the outset of the chapter, stem from Lipsius himself, they are then confirmed and illuminated by ancient citations”].
 27. “MONITA *quaedam, sive* CAUTIONES,” Lipsius, *Politica*, pp. 234–40.
 28. “MONITA *quaedam, sive* CAUTIONES,” Lipsius, *Politica*, pp. 234–40.
 29. “MONITA *quaedam, sive* CAUTIONES,” Lipsius, *Politica*, p. 238.
 30. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.ii, p. 672.
 31. Justus Lipsius, *Six Bookes of Politickes or Civil Doctrine, Written in Latine by Iustus Lipsius: which doe especially concerne Principallitie. Done into English by William Jones Gentleman*. (London: Printed by Richard Field for William Ponsonby, 1594), p. 190.
 32. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.iv, p. 682.
 33. “Sed quam falso! Nam *ut imperium evertant, Libertatem praeferunt; si evertent, ipsam aggredientur.*” Lipsius, *Politica* VI.iv, p. 682.
 34. Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 195.
 35. Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 195.
 36. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.iv, p. 686.
 37. Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 196.
 38. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.v, pp. 688–90, with Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 198.
 39. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.v, p. 696, ll.1–3, with Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 201. For other understandings of civil war in the period, see Samuel G. Zeitlin, “‘The Heat of a Fever’: Francis Bacon on Civil War, Sedition, and Rebellion,” *History of European Ideas* 47. no. 5 (2021): 643–63.
 40. Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, pp. 160–61 (italics in original), with Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiv, p. 606, ll.19–20.

41. Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 161 (italics in original), with Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiv, p. 606, l.21.
42. Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, pp. 160–61, with Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiv, p. 606, ll.19–20.
43. Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 161, with Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiv, p. 606, l.21.
44. Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 190.
45. Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 195.
46. Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 196.
47. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.v, pp. 688–90, with Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 198.
48. Justus Lipsius, *Les Politiques ou Doctrines Civile de Iustus Lipsius, Ou il est discouru de ce qui appartient à la Principauté. Avec le Traite de la Constance Pour se resoudre à supporter les afflictions publiques* (Tours: Pour Claude Montreul et Jehan Richer, et pour Sebastien Molin et Matthieu Guillemot, 1594). Bayerischer Staatsbibliothek, Signatur: Pol.g 1158r. In all references to this source, the 1594 French spelling has been preserved.
49. Lipsius, *Les Politiques*. The translator is also unnamed in the “Exkurs zur Bibliographie von Lipsius” in Oestreich (1989), p. 217. As an anonymous reviewer of the present article notes, Lipsius’s polysemy may allow not so much for a negotiation in the public space as for slippery evasiveness. Lipsius may have converted to Catholicism and Protestantism as convenient. This thoughtful comment by the anonymous reviewer poses larger questions that are beyond the scope of the present article.
50. Lipsius, *Politica* II.iii, p. 300.
51. Lipsius, *Les Politiques*, p. 23.
52. “quem definio, UNIUS IMPERIUM, MORIBUS AUT LEGIBUS DELATUM, SUSCEPTUM GESTUMQUE PARENTIUM BONO.” [“Which I define as the commandment of one alone offered according to the customs and the laws, received and exercised for the common good of all who obey.”] Lipsius, *Politica* II.iii, p. 300.
53. “Que ie definy, le commandement d’un seul deferé selon les coutumes et les loix, receu et exercé pour le bien commun de tous ceux qui obeissent.” [“Which I define as the commandment of one alone offered according to the customs and the laws, received and exercised for the common good of all who obey.”] Lipsius, *Les Politiques*, p. 23.
54. Lipsius, *Politica* II.i, p. 294.
55. Lipsius, *Les Politiques*, p. 20.
56. Lipsius, *Politica* II.i, p. 294.
57. “La Vie Civile est en Societé : la Societé en deux choses, le Commerce & le Gouvernement.” Lipsius, *Les Politiques*, p. 20.

58. Lipsius, *Politica* II.i, p. 294.
59. Lipsius, *Les Politiques*, p. 20.
60. Lipsius, *Politica* I.iii, p. 266.
61. Lipsius, *Les Politiques*, p. 5.
62. Justus Lipsius, *Von Unterweisung zum Weltlichen Regiment: Oder, von Burgerlicher Lehr; Sechs Bücher Iusti Lipsii, So fürnemlich auff den Principat oder Fürstenstand gerichtet*, trans. Melchior Haganaeus (Amberg: Forster, 1599). Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/Pol.g. 1171 x. Münchner DigitalisierungsZentrum, VD 16 L 2006. See the unpaginated “Vorrede Iusti Lipsii,” p. 14 of 399 in the digitized version of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, copy, Res/Pol.g. 1171 x. The German spelling of Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*, is adopted here.
63. Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*.
64. Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*. See the unpaginated “Vorrede Iusti Lipsii,” p. 19 of 399 in the digitized version of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, copy, Res/Pol.g. 1171 x.
65. Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*, p. 19.
66. Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*, p. 87 D recto.
67. Lipsius, *Politica* IV.ii, p. 386.
68. Lipsius, *Politica* IV.ii, p. 386, with Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*, p. 99.
69. Lipsius, *Politica* III.i, p. 348.
70. Lipsius, *Politica* III.i, p. 348.
71. Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*, pp. 69–70.
72. Lipsius, *Politica* III.i, p. 348.
73. Lipsius, *Politica* III.i, p. 348: “*omnibus animalibus facilius, quam hominibus imperitare.*” (Quotation from Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, I.i.3)
74. Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*, p. 70 M verso: “Dass man alle Thiere leichlicher regiren möge/als den Menschen.” (German spelling as in original)
75. Lipsius, *Politica* III.i, p. 348: “*Prudentia, imperitantis propria et unica virtus.*”
76. Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*, p. 70: “Dass Klugheit die einzige und eigne Tugend eines Regenten sey.”
77. Lipsius, *Politica* III.iii, p. 354.
78. Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*, p. 73.
79. Lipsius, *Politica* IV.v, p. 402.
80. Lipsius, *Politica* IV.v, p. 402.
81. Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*, p. 109.
82. Lipsius, *Politica* IV.v, p. 402, with Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*, p. 109. (German spelling as in original)

83. Lipsius, *Politica* III.i, p. 348. See also Lipsius, *Politica* IV.v, p. 109, with Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*, p. 109; Lipsius, *Politica* III.ix, p. 370, with Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher* III.ix, p. 87.
84. Lipsius, *Politica* IV.v, p. 402, with Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*, p. 109.
85. Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*, p. 73.
86. Lipsius, *Politica* IV.v, p. 402 with Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*, p. 109.
87. Lipsius, *Sechs Bücher*, p. 70.
88. Oestreich, "Lipsius als Theoretiker," p. 33.
89. John Richardson, "The Meaning of *imperium* in the Last Century BC and the First AD," in *The Roman Foundations of the Law of Nations*, ed. Benedict Kingsbury and Benjamin Straumann (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 21–29. See also John Richardson, *The Language of Empire: Rome and the Idea of Empire from the Third Century B.C. to the Second Century A.D.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Nicole Methy, "Review of John Richardson, *The Language of Empire: Rome and the Idea of Empire from the Third Century BC to the Second Century AD*," in the *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2009.09.68, accessed May 27, 2022, <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2009/2009-09-68.html>.
90. Richardson, "Meaning of *imperium*," p. 22.
91. Richardson, "Meaning of *imperium*," p. 22: "The first and most obvious thing to say about the meaning of *imperium* is that it does not always mean 'empire.'"
92. Richardson, "Meaning of *imperium*," p. 22.
93. Richardson, "Meaning of *imperium*," p. 22.
94. Richardson, "Meaning of *imperium*," p. 22.
95. Richardson, "Meaning of *imperium*," pp. 22–23.
96. Richardson, "Meaning of *imperium*," p. 23.
97. David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 29n13; John Richardson, "*Imperium Romanum*: Empire and the Language of Power," *Journal of Roman Studies* 81 (1991): 1–9.
98. Armitage, *Ideological Origins*, p. 29.
99. Armitage, *Ideological Origins*, p. 29.
100. "Originally composed before June 1587, it was published from a student's copy of Lipsius' lectures; it was printed in 1591, twice at Leyden and once at Frankfurt." Dunn, "Art of Letter Writing," p. 146n3.
101. Dunn, "Art of Letter Writing," pp. 155–56.
102. Dunn, "Art of Letter Writing," pp. 155n40.

103. Richardson, “Meaning of *Imperium*”; Richardson, *Language of Empire*; Methy, “Review of *Language of Empire*.”
104. Luc Foisneau, “Security as a Norm in Hobbes’s Theory of War: A Critique of Schmitt’s Interpretation of Hobbes’s Approach to International Relations,” in *War, the State and International Law in Seventeenth-Century Europe*, ed. Olaf Asbach and Peter Schröder, 163–80 (London: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 178ff. For an alternative understanding of empire in the period, see Samuel Garrett Zeitlin, “Francis Bacon on Imperial and Colonial Warfare,” *Review of Politics* 83 (2021): 196–218.
105. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiv, p. 608, ll. 15–16.
106. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiv, p. 608, ll. 15–16.
107. Lauren Benton, *A Search for Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
108. Benton, *Search for Sovereignty*, p. 288.
109. Benton, *Search for Sovereignty*, pp. 3–4.
110. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiv, p. 608, ll.20–21.
111. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiv, p. 606.
112. Lipsius, *Politica* III.ix, p. 370, ll.19–20 and Lipsius, *Politica*, *Ad III. Librum Politicorum Notae, Caput IX*, p. 770.
113. Lipsius, *Politica* III.ix, p. 370, ll.19–20 and *Politica*, *Ad III. Librum Politicorum Notae, Caput IX*, p. 770.
114. Lipsius, *Politica*, *Ad III. Librum Politicorum Notae, Caput IX*, p. 770, ll.10–12.
115. Lipsius, *Politica*, “De Consilio et Forma Nostri Operis,” pp. 230–32.
116. “Torquere” (twisted, torqued, or rendered) in this “caution” to the reader neither necessarily includes nor necessarily excludes Latin translations of Greek text in the *Politica*.
117. Lipsius, *Politica*, “MONITA *quaedam*, sive CAUTIONES,” p. 238.
118. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xx, p. 658, l. 4.
119. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xx, p. 664, l. 4.
120. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xx, p. 664. “παράγγ-ἔλια” in *A Greek Lexicon*, ed. George Liddell and Robert Scott, rev. Sir Henry Stuart-Jones with Roderick McKenzie (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968 [1843]), p. 1306: “*command* or *order* issued to soldiers . . . generally *order* issued by an authority.”
121. Plutarch, *Kingly Maxims* 187c1.
122. Lipsius, *Politica* V.i, p. 536.
123. Lipsius, *Politica* V.i, p. 536.
124. Lipsius, *Politica* V.i, p. 536.

125. “ἐπιτάσσω, Att. –τω” in Liddell and Scott, *A Greek Lexicon*, p. 664.
126. Lipsius, *Politica* II.vii, pp. 310–312; III.i, p. 348 (three instances: ll.10–12; ll.13–14; ll.15–16); IV.v, p. 402 (three instances: ll.8–9 twice and ll.18–21); IV.xiv, p. 528; *Notae to Liber I, Caput IX*, p. 731; *Notae Ad II. Librum, Caput III*, p. 741; *Notae Ad II. Librum, Caput V*, p. 742. As an anonymous reviewer notes, ἀρχή itself has many ambiguities. It can mean a cosmic principle of order or “dominion over others” in Thucydides III.45. The venture of the city in Diodotus’s speech is “περὶ τῶν μεγίστων, ἐλευθερίας ἢ ἄλλων ἀρχῆς” (cf. the prologue to Schiller’s *Wallenstein*). The author is thankful to the anonymous reader for this observation.
127. Lipsius, *Politica, Notae Ad II. Librum, Caput III*, p. 741.
128. Lipsius, *Politica, Notae Ad II. Librum, Caput III*, p. 741.
129. Lipsius, *Politica, Notae Ad II. Librum, Caput III*, p. 741.
130. Lipsius, *Politica, Notae Ad II. Librum, Caput III*, p. 741.
131. Lipsius, *Politica* II.iii, pp. 300–302; II.xvii, p. 342, ll.20–21.
132. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.v, p. 688.
133. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.v, p. 696. (Quotation from Plutarch’s *Life of Brutus* XII.iii)
134. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.v, p. 696.
135. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.v, p. 696.
136. Lipsius, *Politica* II.i, p. 294, ll.18–20.
137. Lipsius, *Politica* II.xvii, p. 342.
138. Lipsius, *Politica* IV.xi, p. 470.
139. Lipsius, *Politica* IV.xiv, p. 520.
140. Anna Katharina Becker, *Gender and Political Thought in Northern Italy and France c. 1420 – c. 1578* (Cambridge University unpublished doctoral dissertation in history, September 2010), p. 22: “Bruni consistently follows Aristotle in using what we now think of as public language for the domestic sphere. The Greek text says that the *oikonomikē* is a *monarchia*; Bruni describes the head of the household as *imperator* and *rector*. This *imperator* and *rector*, Bruni explains in his comment, is the *paterfamilias*. His very name, so Bruni argues, derives from the fact that he governs and controls. However the difference of *res publica* and *res familia* are conceived, both are characterised by the same activity—ruling/*imperare*”; *ibid.*, p. 23: “The *paterfamilias/imperator* ‘has the power (*potestas*) to command and to punish in the family. His commands one must obey.’ At the same time he is likened to a magistrate: a private magistrate, who, just like his public counterpart, exercises *imperium*.”

141. Lipsius, *Politica* II.i, p. 294: “Vita Civilis in Societate est: Societas in duabus rebus, Commercio et Imperio. Illud alterius argumenti est, hoc mei. quod definio, CERTUM ORDINEM IN IUBENDO ET PARENDO.”
142. Lipsius, *Politica* III.vi, p. 362.
143. Lipsius, *Politica* II.i, p. 294.
144. Lipsius, *Politica* II.i, p. 294.
145. Lipsius, *Politica* II.i, p. 294: “Illud alterius argumenti est.”
146. Lipsius, *Politica* II.iii, p. 300. William Jones translates “*Quid Principatus*” in his margin as “What principallitie is.” Lipsius, *Sixe Bookes*, p. 19.
147. Lipsius, *Politica*, II.iii, p. 300, (all capitals in original).
148. Lipsius, *Sixe Bookes*, p. 19.
149. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.v, p. 688: “*De Tyrannide. quid ea sit, et eius ingenium?*”
150. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.v, p. 688.
151. Lipsius, *Politica* II.xii, p. 324.
152. Lipsius, *Politica* II.xii, p. 324.
153. Lipsius, *Politica* II.xvi, p. 340.
154. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiii, p. 588.
155. Lipsius, *Politica* IV.viii, pp. 416–18 and IV.xi, p. 460.
156. Lipsius, *Politica* IV.xi, p. 460.
157. Lipsius, *Politica* IV.viii, pp. 416–18.
158. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiv, p. 606.
159. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiv, p. 606, ll.9–17.
160. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiv, p. 606, ll.18–20.
161. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiv, p. 606.
162. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiv, p. 606, l.22: “In prima classe, quivis Rex aut Princeps, in suo solo: in altera, ii qui ab his constituuntur Administri bellorum et Legati.”
163. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiv, p. 606.
164. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.ii–VI.iii, pp. 672–74.
165. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.ii–VI.iii, pp. 672–74. Waszink translates *fatum* as both “Fate” and “Destiny,” whilst William Jones translates *fatum* in VI.ii as “Destinie” (see pp. 190–91 of Lipsius, *Sixe Bookes*). Whereas Waszink translates *luxus* as “luxury,” Jones translates *luxus* as “Riot.” Lipsius, *Sixe Bookes*, pp. 190–91.
166. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.ii, p. 674. William Jones translates this passage as “But what remedie is there against them? Against one of them, none at all: Thou doest in vaine strive with Destinie, that is, against the decree

- of God.” Lipsius, *Six Books*, p. 191; cf. Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572–1651* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 54.
167. Lipsius, *Politica* VI.iv, p. 682.
168. There is no mention of *imperium*, *imperare*, or *imperator* in the chapter devoted to *factio* (*Politica* VI.iii).
169. Lipsius, *Politica* II.iii; VI.v; and V.xiii–V.xiv.
170. Lipsius, *Politica* II.i, p. 294, ll.16–17.
171. Cicero, *De Legibus* III.i, in Marcus Tullius Cicero, *De republica; De legibus*, ed. Clinton Walker Keyes (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press [Loeb Classical Library], 1977), p. 460.
172. Willem Otterspeer, “The University of Leiden: An Eclectic Institution,” in *Early Science and Medicine* 6, no. 4, issue concerning “Science and Universities of Early Modern Europe: Teaching, Specialization, Professionalization” (2001), p. 328.
173. Lipsius, *Politica*, “Auctorum Syllabus,” p. 254.
174. Lipsius, *Politica*, “Auctorum Syllabus,” p. 254.
175. Lipsius, *Politica*, “Auctorum Syllabus,” p. 254.
176. Lipsius, *Politica*, “Auctorum Syllabus,” p. 254. For the importance of Thucydides as a Lipsian source, see Kinch Hoekstra, “Thucydides and the Bellicose Beginnings of Modern Political Theory,” in *Thucydides: Reception, Reinterpretation, and Influence*, ed. Katherine Harloe and Neville Morley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
177. Lipsius, *Politica*, “Auctorum Syllabus,” p. 254.
178. Oestreich, “Lipsius als Theoretiker,” pp. 58–62; Gerhard Oestreich, *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 50–54; pp. 73–83; p. 158; pp. 265–72.
179. Oestreich, *Neostoicism*, pp. 50–54; pp. 73–83; p. 158; pp. 265–72. For discussions of Oestreich, see Miller, “Nazis and Neo-Stoics”; van Gelderen, “The State and Its Rivals,” p. 90.
180. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xiii, p. 588.
181. Lipsius, *Politica* IV.v, p. 400.
182. Lipsius, *Politica* V.xx, p. 664. “παράγγ-έλια” in Liddell and Scott, *A Greek Lexicon*, p. 1306.
183. Lipsius, *Politica* Vi, p. 536.
184. Lipsius, *Politica* II.i, p. 294.
185. Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. Richard Tuck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991; eleventh printing, 2008), chap. 4, p. 28.
186. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, chap. 2, p. 16.

187. Quentin Skinner, *Hobbes and Republican Liberty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
188. Noel Malcolm, "Behemoth Latinus: Adam Ebert, Tacitism, and Hobbes," in *Filozofski vestnik*, 24, no. 2 (2003): 116–20; Noel Malcolm, *Reason of State, Propaganda, and the Thirty Years' War: An Unknown Translation by Thomas Hobbes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 92–123.