

## LUCRETIUS CARUS, TITUS

by WOLFGANG BERNARD FLEISCHMANN  
(Montclair State College)

*Fortuna.*

Bibliography.

### I. *De rerum natura*

Commentaries.

1. Johannes Baptista Pius
2. Dionysius Lambinus
3. Obertus Gifanius

### FORTUNA<sup>1</sup>

The only known work of T. Lucretius Carus (ca. 98-55 B. C.) is a poetic exposition of Epicurean doctrine in six books, the *De rerum natura*. The poem apparently did not undergo a final revision. Among Lucretius' contemporaries, only Cicero praises the beauty of this work, of which he may have been the first editor. Cicero's editorship is asserted by the 'Borgian vita' of Lucretius, written in 1502 by Hieronymus Borgius (Girolamo Borgia) and discovered by J. Masson in 1894. This brief biography is probably concocted from scraps of information amplified by Borgia's imagination, but has been conjectured to derive either from Suetonius or from Pomponius Laetus. Cicero in a letter to his brother Quintus (*Ep. ad Quintum Fratrem*, II, 10(9), 3 admires the *De rerum natura* as perceptive philosophical thought in the guise of great poetry ('Lucreti poëmata. . . ita sunt,

356

multis luminibus ingenii, multae tamen artis').<sup>2</sup>

Vergil and (in his *Satires*) Horace imitated some lines of Lucretius, yet an influence of his poem on Epicurean strains in their thought remains a matter for conjecture: Neither poet either explicitly mentions Lucretius or acknowledges a debt to his poem. The admiration for Lucretius expressed in Ovid's *Amores* (I, xv, 23-24) does not indicate a philosophical indebtedness. Manilius imitated didactic, 'scientific' expositions from the *De rerum natura*, but for his own purposes. Velleius Paterculus and Vitruvius in the first century A. D. named Lucretius as an author of Cicero's literary stature. Quintilian, Statius, and Pliny the Younger simply recognized the *De rerum natura* as an important and striking poem. Seneca, quoting from the poem four times, makes ornamental use of Lucretian phrases.

1. The author wishes to extend cordial thanks to the Editorial Board of the *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum*, to the staffs of the British Museum, Leiden University, Vatican, Firestone, and Houghton Libraries, and to his colleagues of the year 1965-66 at the Institute for Research in the Humanities at the University of Wisconsin for substantial help in the preparation of this article. He acknowledges his debt to the University of Wisconsin Graduate School for underwriting a major part of the research and travel expenses connected with its completion.

2. I follow the text presented by H. Morrica and A. Morrica-Caputo in *Epistularum ad Quintum fratrem libri tres* (Torino, 1955) and its interpretation, as convincingly presented by J. Martin in 'Lukrez und Cicero', *Würzburger Jahrbücher für Altertumswissenschaft*, IV (1949), 1-52, cf. especially pp. 15, 17. Another recent reading of the text by Paavo Numminen in *Quo Modo Cicero de Lucretio (et quodam Sallustio) iudicaverit*, *Annales Universitatis Turkuensis*, Ser. B., XLIV (1953), cf. especially p. 38, qualifies Cicero's admiration for those parts of the *De rerum natura* in which the teachings of Epicurus are set out, without notable poetic ornament.

In the second half of the first century, Lucretius was evidently regarded as a classic : According to a fragment of Suetonius, M. Valerius Probus then prepared a critical edition of the *De rerum natura* (now lost).<sup>3</sup> In the second century, Fronto echoes the earlier, essentially literary admiration of Lucretius on the grounds of poetic sublimity and excellent diction. Both Aulus Gellius and Marcus Aurelius refer to Lucretius ; the former quotes from the *De rerum natura* six times. It is probable that the descriptive headings found in the manuscripts of the *De rerum natura*, which demonstrate an excellent understanding of Epicurean physics, are the work of a second century commentator. These headings, found in many surviving manuscripts of the *De rerum natura* probably go back to a point in time prior to the composition of their lost archetype (4-5th c.). Later readers of Lucretius were thus aided by a succinct and knowledgeable explication of the physics and cosmology developed in his poem. Some parallels between the proemium to Book I of the *De rerum natura* and the rhetoric of the *Pervigilium Veneris* (2-4th c.) have been noted.<sup>4</sup>

Between the fourth and the ninth centuries, the *De rerum natura* continued to be read, cited, appreciated, and emulated. Although the fourth century *Adversus nationes* of Arnobius and the *Divinae institutiones* of his pupil Lactantius attack the doctrines of Lucretius from a Christian point of view, these works demonstrate a good understanding of the poetry of the *De rerum natura*. Lactantius consistently used Lucretius' wording, in combating his doctrine ; Arnobius echoes the language of Lucretius' homage to Epicurus (*De rerum natura* III, 1-30) in a eulogy of Christ. Both Fathers make greater imitative use of the *De rerum natura* than any earlier Latin writers. Saint Ambrose and Saint Jerome still demonstrate, in the late fourth century, a good understanding of Lucretius. Jerome (*apol. c. Rufin.* 1,16

3. Cf. A. Reifferscheid, *Suetoni Reliquiae* (1860), pp. 137-138.

4. James J. Wilhelm, *The Cruelest Month* (New Haven and London, 1965) pp. 25, 48f.

[Migne PL 23, 410], cf. Schanz-Hosius I [1959] 280, 282) mentions a commentary on the *De rerum natura*, which he does not further identify. He is also responsible for perpetuating the legend of the poet's suicide ('postea amatorio poculo in furorem versus') which did not advance Lucretius' literary respectability and may account for the paucity of quotations from the *De rerum natura* in the works of such sixth century Christian transmitters of the classical tradition as Boethius and Cassiodorus. Nonetheless, Priscian's writings (late 5th - early 6th c.) feature many such quotations to illustrate grammatical and lexicographical points, as had those of Nonius Marcellus and of Macrobius (both 4th c.). Paulus Diaconus' (8th c.) digest of Festus' abridgment of Verrius Flaccus' *De verborum significatu* continues to cite Lucretius. Isidore of Seville's (7th c.) treatise *De natura rerum*, which demonstrates familiarity with Lucretian physics and cosmology, inspired the Visigoth King Sisebut (d. 621) to write a hexametric poem on the eclipses of the sun and moon in direct stylistic imitation of the *De rerum natura*.<sup>5</sup> Echoes of Lucretius in Hrabanus Maurus' (9th c.) *Liber de laudibus crucis* and *De rerum naturis* in all likelihood are not only derived from Isidore of Seville but also directly from the *De rerum natura*. Continued interest in Lucretius is also demonstrated by the oldest surviving Ms. of his poem, the *Oblongus*, which was copied during the ninth century. Over 60 passages in this Ms. were corrected by a corrector Saxo vel Hibernicus.<sup>6</sup> Also the Quadratus and the Copenhagen and Vienna fragments were copied in the ninth century. Scattered Lucretian quotations also occur in the (9th c.) grammatical writings of Mico of St. Riquier and of Hrabanus' pupil Ermenrich von Ellwangen. Lucretius was also known to Eugenius Vulgarius, to the author of the *Liber Pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis*, to the anonymous author of

5. Cf. J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Seville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique* (Paris, 1959), Index, s. v. 'Sisebut'.

6. Cf. E. Chatelain, *Codex Oblongus phototypice editus* (Leyden, 1908).

the Modena poem, and appears in a Bobbio inventory of the same period.<sup>7</sup>

It would seem to be an exaggeration, however, to speak of a 'Lucretian Renaissance' in the ninth century. Before the *De rerum natura* was to be virtually forgotten during the next six hundred years, ninth century poets and grammarians instead repeated feebly what had been done to and with Lucretius' poem since the poet's death: They cited passages for purposes either of poetic imitation or of grammatical illustration and occasionally followed Lucretius' 'scientific' didacticism. Among Pagan writers, the imitation of Lucretius was at times accompanied by explicit praise of his work. Early medieval Christians, in imitating Lucretius, imply some appreciation of his work, but an open admiration was excluded for religious reasons, as shown by Jerome's biographical gloss as well as by Arnobius' and Lactantius' condemnation of the poem. It should be stressed, however, that no evidence (short of manuscript headings) survives from the period 55 B. C. to 900 A. D. which points to a comprehensive appreciation of Lucretius' work as a philosophical and poetic whole. First steps toward such an appreciation were taken only in the Renaissance.

There is almost no evidence that Lucretius was copied or read between the ninth and the fifteenth centuries;<sup>8</sup> quotations from the *De rerum natura* as they appear in philosophical and literary works of the twelfth

and thirteenth centuries seem to have had their sources in Priscian, other grammarians, and in Florilegia. There is but scanty evidence that Lucretius was responsible for a knowledge either of Epicurean doctrine or of atomism in the twelfth century. However, it has been recently shown that early in the fourteenth century Lovato and Mussato were acquainted with Lucretius (Guido Billanovich, i.e. 182-90).

A new epoch in Lucretius' *fortuna* begins in 1417, the probable date of Poggio Bracciolini's discovery of a complete Ms. of the *De rerum natura* in Germany. In discussing the further history of the poem to 1600, we must consider the MSS., editions and commentaries of Lucretius, the critical attitudes evinced towards the work, and some literary imitations and paraphrases of the poem, both in Latin and in vernacular languages. No complete vernacular translation of the *De rerum natura* was published in that period, and none has been found in manuscript. The Ms. found by Poggio is lost, but several direct or indirect copies of it are extant, including one in the hand of Niccolò Niccoli (Laur. 35, 30), two that are closely connected with Pomponius Laetus (Basel F VIII 14 and Naples IV E 51), and one that was owned and probably copied by Machiavelli (Vat. Ross. 884).

The first commentary on Lucretius was published by Johannes Baptista Pius in 1511. Pius also published a *Praelectio in Titum Lucretium et Suetonium Tranquillum* (Hain 13027; the copy at CtY has a manuscript dating as 1501). The short volume of 8 folios contains an oration and a poem, neither of which deals explicitly with Lucretius. Dionysius Lambinus' 1563 edition of Lucretius was the first to profit from a collation of the so-called *Codex Quadratus* (now Leiden University Library, Ms. Voss. Lat. Q. 94 [168]) which in the sixteenth century was at the convent of St. Bertin, near St. Omer. The *Oblongus* (Leiden, Ms. Voss. Lat. F. 30), as important as the *Quadratus* for the modern text of Lucretius, was by 1479 part of the Mainz Cathedral Library. There is a chance that Obertus Gifanius, the third and last Renais-

7. Manitius GLL I (1911), pp. 473-74 (on Mico's *Exempla diversorum auctorum*) and 497-98 (on Ermenrich's *Epistola ad Grimaldum*); also Lucretius ed. Josefus Martin (4th ed., Leipzig 1953) pp. III-IV. Guido Billanovich, 'Veterum vestigia vatum' *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 1 (1958) 155-243 at 165-68.

8. Manitius GLL III, p. 340, cites the exception to prove the rule: A manuscript of *De Rerum Natura* was probably read at the Abbey of Gembloux in the late eleventh or early twelfth century. The same author's *Handschriften antiker Autoren in mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen* (Leipzig, 1935), p. 42 lists a total of six Lucretius entries, remarked upon as unusually sparse.

sance commentator on the *De rerum natura*, made use of this Ms.

The first three printed editions of the *De rerum natura* take over, with minor variations, the explanatory headings from the MSS. of the 'humanistic' family on which they are based. The *editio princeps* was published c. 1473 at Brescia by Thomas Ferrandus. The second was published in Verona (Paulus Fridenperger, 1486). The third edition (Venice, Theodorus de Ragazzonibus, 1495) contains a poem by C. Lycinius : Ad Nicolaum Priolum Hieronymi filium patricium illustrem et bonarum artium cultorem. . .Ex foelicissima tua Murani Academia, virtuti et posteritati datum. In these last two editions the *De rerum natura* is followed by a cento on Lucretius and his poem. Another edition (Milan, 1491, Hain 10286), said to contain a commentary by Omnibonus Leonicenus must be considered as a 'ghost' (Gordon, p. 273); the listing is probably due to a confusion of Lucretius with Lucan (Hain 10239). The fourth edition, by Hieronymus Avancius of Verona (Venice : Aldus, 1500) features the humanist explanatory headings in an analytical table of contents, a practice followed in many other editions of Lucretius down to the middle of the sixteenth century - the Giunta edition of 1512-13, the second Aldine of 1515 with its Basel (1531) and Lyons (1534, 1536, 1540, 1546, 1548, 1558) reprints, and the Vascosan of 1543. Avancius's first Aldine is also the main source of the text for Pius' commentary. The textual parts of the commentaries by Lambinus of 1563-64 (2nd. ed., 1570) and by Gifanius of 1565-66 (2nd. ed., 1595) were the basis for the texts of many other editions printed in the later sixteenth century. Candidus' Giuntina of 1512-13, however, which made careful use of the text of Andreas Avancius, as well as of the textual criticism of Iovianus Pontanus, Angelus Politianus, and Michael Marullus (some of which Avancius had already been aware of) was the source for Naugerius' second Aldine of 1515 which, in turn, was followed by most editions of Lucretius published prior to Lambinus' first commentary. Whether Pius' use of Marullus' notes rests entirely on Avancius' earlier collation is an open question.

For the period 1473-1600, twenty-eight different printings of the text of the *De rerum natura* can be identified. This total includes annotated editions and editions without commentary. The relative paucity of Lucretius editions, as compared with the numerous editions of Vergil, Horace, and Cicero published during the same period, is best explained by the fact that Lucretius was not then a *scriptor classicus*, in the sense of being regularly read in school. There is but scanty evidence that the *De rerum natura* was part of the school curriculum at that time. Indeed, the Florentine synod of 1517 prohibited the reading of the poem in secondary schools : 'Ut nullus de caetero ludi magister audeat in scholis suis exponere adolescentibus poemata aut quaecumque alia opera lasciva et impia, quale est Lucretii poema, ubi animae mortalitatem totis viribus ostendere nititur' (Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova. . .Collectio* 35, 1902, col. 270 ; cf. F. Gilbert, 'Cristianesimo, umanesimo e la Bolla "Apostolici Regiminis" del 1513', *Rivista storica italiana* 79, 1967, 976-990, at p. 978). In the early years of the *cinquecento*, lectures on Lucretius were given under private auspices by Erasmus' friend Egnatius (Giambattista Cipelli) at Venice. We know that Lambinus publicly lectured on Lucretius in Paris, at the Collège de France, in the early 1560's. During the same period, Francesco Vimercato's lectures at the same institution (published as *Aristotelis Meteorologicorum Commentarii*, 1556 ; and as *Principes de la Nature*, 1596) reflect Lucretius' views on physics and meteorology. Beyond these isolated instances, no record of the use of Lucretius in courses has survived from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Two reasons may be suggested for the exclusion of Lucretius from the curricula of Renaissance schools : His unequivocal assertion of the soul's mortality, and what the age considered the archaic, rough and prose-like character of his style. As opinions on Lucretius held by well-educated men go, John Calvin's dismissal of the poet as an 'impure dog' is eccentric and, for the period, extreme. Yet even Isaac Casaubon who elsewhere eulogizes Lucretius as 'Latini-

tatis auctor optimus' is so shocked by his arguments on the soul's mortality in *De rerum natura* III, 417-829 that a copy of the 1576 Lambinus edition (now University of Leiden, 755. H. 9) exhibits marginalia to these passages in which Casaubon calls Lucretius 'stultissimus'; Epicurus, 'diabolus'. Montaigne's tolerant rehearsal of Lucretius' arguments against immortality in the *Apologie de Raymond de Sebonde* (1580) ends with their total rejection. In his dedicatory epistle to Charles IX, Lambinus mentions Lucretius' denial of the immortality of the soul as the primary reason why contemporaries would object to a reading of the poet. Petrus Crinitus' short life of Lucretius in his *De poetis latinis* (1504), reprinted in the 1512-1513 Giuntina and several other sixteenth century editions, is responsible for an evaluation of Lucretius' hexameters as 'duriores... et quasi orationi solutae similes'. This judgement became a commonplace. Strengthened by a *locus classicus*, Quintilian's remark (X 87) that Lucretius' poetry though 'elegans' was 'difficilis', Crinitus's statement may well have done as much to keep the *De rerum natura* away from sixteenth-century schools as the materialism and impiety of the poem.

By way of contrast, it may be said that early Renaissance criticism of Lucretius tends to praise the poetic merits of the *De rerum natura*. For Pontanus, Politianus, and Marullus, Lucretius' stylistic excellence rather than the philosophic content of his poem was a subject of admiration. Marsilio Ficino's positive interest in the ideas of Lucretius is highly unusual for the fifteenth century. In a letter of 1457 to Antonius Seraphicus, Ficino anticipates by some fifty years the notion that the ethical tenets proposed in the *De rerum natura* are compatible with Stoic and Christian doctrines. This compatibility was generally accepted in sixteenth-century criticism of Lucretius. Not only Crinitus, and the commentators Pius, Lambinus, and Gifanius speak of the *De rerum natura* as a great poem inciting to true virtue, but a number of critical books on poetry repeat this notion. Among these, Francesco Filippo Pedemonte's *Ecphrasis*

*in Horatii Flacci Artem poetica* (1566), and Antonio Possevino's *Tractatio de poësi et pictura ethnica, humana, et fabulosa collata cum vera, honesta, et sacra* (1593) may be cited. In vernacular literature, the later poetry of Ronsard and the *Essais* of Montaigne (1580-1595) accept Lucretius as a moralist. Oddly enough, neither Lorenzo Valla's treatise *De voluptate* (ca. 1433) nor Erasmus' colloquy *Epicureus* (1518), each a notable early Renaissance argument for the compatibility of Epicurean and Christian ethics, makes allusion to Lucretius. There is no evidence that Valla knew his poem. With the exception of an enigmatic note on the inner fly-leaf of Politian's copy of the *De rerum natura* (now Laurenziana, Laur. 35. 29 - the note is evidently not in Politian's hand) to the effect that Erasmus, along with Cicero and Cornelius Nepos, had praised Lucretius, there is no record of Erasmus' acquaintance with the poet.

Along with the sixteenth-century appreciation of Lucretius as a great poet and moralist, the *De rerum natura* was accepted as a treatise on the nature of things. The faithfulness with which copyists and editors of early editions preserved the manuscript headings attests to this acceptance, as does the exclusively 'scientific' nature of some imitations of the *De rerum natura* that appeared prior to 1550. The *Rusticus* (1483) of Politianus echoes Lucretius V, 737-747, on the change of seasons, the *Urania sive de stellis* (1495) of Pontanus is indebted to descriptions of nature from the same book of the *De rerum natura*. The *Hymni naturales* (1497) of Marullus employ Lucretian imagery as they take up questions of astronomy and physics. More comprehensively, Scipione Capece's didactic poem in two books, the *De principiis rerum* (1534), is a stylistic imitation of the *De rerum natura* which strives faithfully to approximate Lucretius' methods of argumentation and exposition. Capece's subject matter, however, is entirely astronomical and geological; his few philosophical passages emphasize Christian dogma. Aonius Palearius' (Antonio della Paglia) *De immortalitate animorum* (1536) is a refutation, in three books imitative of the

verse scheme and imagery of the *De rerum natura*, of Lucretius' materialistic doctrines on the soul. Palearius' argumentation parallels, in many places, a brief treatise on the immortality of the soul appended to a Latin paraphrase of *De rerum natura*, Books I-III, published by Raphael Francus in 1504. Crinitus' *De poetis latinis*, Mirandula's *Flores*, Possevino's *Tractatio*, and Tommaso Campanella's *Poetica* (1595) all express high regard for Lucretius' understanding of the workings of nature. Last but not least, Giordano Bruno's didactic poem *De immenso et innumerabilibus seu de universo et mundis* (1591), while not in any strict sense an imitation of Lucretius, occasionally employs astronomical phraseology from the *De rerum natura*. Lucretius' poem also served as an important source for the cosmology of Bruno's Italian dialogues, particularly for *De l'infinito, universo e mondi* (1584). Where a number of indictments of the poem on the grounds of impiety and materialism survive from the sixteenth century, only one document of the time, Gifanius' letter to Sambucus of 1565-66, as reprinted in Gifanius' commentaries on Lucretius, explicitly denounces the poet's account of the nature of things as fraudulent and false. Even Gifanius, however, accepts Lucretius' meteorology, while rejecting his atomism and astronomy.

While a general praise of the *De rerum natura* on stylistic grounds was recorded from the mid-fifteenth century on, poetic imitation of Lucretius' grand style as demonstrated by the invocation to Venus or the exhortations against the fear of death in *De rerum natura*, Book III, was not attempted until a hundred years later. Such imitation was attempted in French by the Pleiade poets, notably Ronsard and Du Bellay, and in English by Spenser (*Faerie Queene*, 1590, 1596) rather than in Italian or in Latin. A late sixteenth century Italian text, Girolamo Franchetta's *Breve spositione di tutta l'opera di Lucretio* (1589) contains a prose resumé of the six books of the *De rerum natura*, in as many chapters. Franchetta's seventh chapter is a prose commentary on Lucretius' 'Invocation to

Venus,' very strongly indebted to the comments of Lambinus on *De rerum natura*, I, 1-58. This essay represents the only presently known evidence that Lucretius' invocation may have been of special interest to Italian readers of the time. A recent study by Bertelli shows, however (Cf. Bibliography, III, C.) that many questions relating sixteenth century Italian thought to Lucretius still remain to be investigated. In particular, Machiavelli is shown to have probably either owned or copied a manuscript of the *De rerum natura*. A curious passage in the 1510 manuscript version of Agrippa of Nettesheim's *De occulta philosophia* suggests an early anticipation of the nineteenth century idea that Lucretius' alleged insanity may be considered a token of his poetic genius (e.g. as in Tennyson's 'Lucretius' poem). Agrippa specifically mentions Lucretius when he associates melancholy, frenzy, and poetic creativity in a manner derived, in outline, from Ficino (cf. Bibliography, III, C. R. Klibansky et al.).

In the era of the revival of classical learning, the position of Lucretius in the literary canon may be seen to have substantially improved not only by the standard of the early Middle Ages but also of Roman antiquity itself. The *De rerum natura*, within the period 1417-1600, is not only admired as a great work of literature and made the subject of Latin and vernacular imitations, but the poem is recognized in many quarters as a serious account of the nature of things. More than this, an attempt is made by Italian and French humanists to reconcile the philosophic content of the *De rerum natura*, notably its ethics, with accepted tenets of Christian morality. It was this attempted reconciliation, as it survived the sixteenth century by way of Lambinus' excellent commentary on Lucretius (partially the result of collaboration with Adrianus Turnebus, cf. below) and of Montaigne's *Essais*, which won the *De rerum natura*, in the two following centuries, an interested reading public, not yet capable of understanding the full anti-religious impact of the poem. While

Gassendi's mid-seventeenth century scientific Epicureanism made use of Lucretius' atomism as one source among several, the science in the *De rerum natura* was to lose its last admirers by the end of the century, when its account of natural phenomena had become outmoded.<sup>9</sup> The *Anti-Lucretius* (1747) of Melchior de Polignac is less an attack upon the scientific tenets of Lucretius than a defense of Cartesian physical hypotheses against Gassendi, Newton, Locke, and Spinoza. At least two of Polignac's nine books of Latin poetry in the style of the *De rerum natura* were completed before 1700.<sup>10</sup> Didactic poetry without moral content, in turn, was unacceptable to seventeenth and eighteenth century readers. It was precisely such a moral content, however, which Lucretius' humanist critics provided for his poem, no matter how false may have been their understanding of the intentions of the *De rerum natura*. It should, of course, be noted that the Renaissance attempt to reconcile Christ with Epicurus is a trend in the history of ideas of which the rehabilitation of Lucretius was only a part; Valla's treatise and Erasmus' colloquy, both unaware of the *De rerum natura*, are evidence for this.<sup>11</sup> By contrast, if Lucretius' poem was not solely responsible for early Renaissance Epicureanism, it bore the brunt of the forces directed against this movement: Theological indictments of Lucretius were not limited to Calvin's. The two most extensive poetic imitations of the *De rerum natura* in the age — Capece's and Palearius' — are anti-Lucretian in spirit. Very few critical statements about the poem contain unqualified and comprehensive praise. Moreover, the stature of a *scriptor classicus*, of a school author, was denied Lucretius in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

9. Cf. Robert H. Kargon, *Atomism in England from Hariot to Newton* (Oxford, 1966) pp. 65-69.

10. Cf. W. B. Fleischmann 'Zum Anti-Lucretius des Kardinals Melchior de Polignac,' *Romanische Forschungen*, LXXVII (1965), 42-63.

11. W. B. Fleischmann, 'Christ and Epicurus,' in *Comparatists at Work*, ed. Stephen G. Nichols, Jr. and Richard B. Vowles (Waltham, Mass., Blaisdell, 1968) 235-246.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. THOUGHT AND WRITING OF LUCRETIUS

J. Mewaldt, 'Lucretius (17)' *Pauly-Wissowa* XIII (1927) 1659-1683; Important modern editions of the *De rerum natura*: H. A. J. Munro (Cambridge, England, 1893); W. A. Merrill (New York, 1907); H. Diels (Berlin, 1923); W. E. Leonard and S. B. Smith (Madison, Wisconsin, 1942); C. Bailey (Oxford, 1947); A. Cinquini (2nd ed., Rome, 1948); J. Martin (5th ed., Leipzig, 1963). For general background: E. Paratore, *Storia della Letteratura Latina* (2nd ed., Florence, 1962) 266-280; P. Boyancé, *Lucrece et l'Épicurisme* (Paris, 1963).

### II. TEXTUAL TRADITION AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

H. A. J. Munro, *T. Lucretii Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex* (Cambridge, England, 1893) = Munro; J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* (3rd ed. reprint New York, 1958, Vol. I) = Sandys; K. Büchner, 'Lukrez' in M. Meier *et al.*, *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung I* (Zurich, 1961), 386-389; C. A. Gordon, *A Bibliography of Lucretius* (London, 1962) = Gordon; F. Brunhoelzl, 'Zur Ueberlieferung des Lukrez,' *Hermes* XC (1962) 97-104; P. O. Kristeller, *Iter Italicum* (Leiden, 1963-67), s.v. 'Lucretius.' Gordon's *Bibliography* offers accurate descriptions of all complete editions and most translations of the *De rerum natura*, published in printed form within the period 1473 (*princeps*) to 1961.

### III. INFLUENCE

#### A. General.

Bayle, s.v. 'Lucrèce'; J. C. Gottsched, 'De Poetis Philosophis Commentatio' in M. de Polignac, *Anti-Lucretius sive de Deo et natura* (Leipzig, 1748) xxv-xlviii; G. D. Hadszits, *Lucretius and his influence* (New York, 1935); W. Schmid, 'Lukrez und der Wandel seines Bildes', *Antike und Abendland* 2 [1946] 192ff.; G. Highet, *The Classical Tradition* (Oxford, 1949) 188-189; Boy-

ancé, 316-327 ; W. B. Fleischmann, *Lucretius and English Literature 1680-1740* (Paris, 1964) = Fleischmann.

#### B. Late Ancient and Medieval.

Anon., 'The Life of Lucretius' in *T. Lucretius Carus of the Nature of Things in Six Books* (London, 1714), unpaginated ; J. Philippe, *Lucrèce dans la théologie chrétienne du III<sup>e</sup> au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1896) ; Manitius GLL I (1911) ; H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics* (Göteborg, 1958) ; J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique* (Paris, 1959), 2 vols.

#### C. Renaissance.

F. A. Hallbauer, 'Dissertatio de vita fatis et meritis Aonii Palearii' in *Aonii Palearii Opera* (Jena, 1728) 13-56 ; M. Lehnerdt, *Lukrez in der Renaissance* (Königsberg, 1904) ; R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci II* (Florence 1914) 233 ; E. Greenlaw, 'Spenser and Lucretius,' *Studies in Philology* XVII (1920) 439-464 ; C. A. Fusil, 'La Renaissance de Lucrèce au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle,' *Revue du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, XV (1928) 134-150 = Fusil ; C. T. Harrison, 'Bacon, Hobbes, Boyle, and the Ancient Atomists,' *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* XV (1933) 191-219 ; 'The Ancient Atomists and English Literature of the Seventeenth Century,' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* XLV (1934) 1-80 ; E. Belowski, *Lukrez in der französischen Literatur der Renaissance* (Berlin, 1934) ; G. R. Hocke, *Lukrez in Frankreich von der Renaissance zur Revolution* (Köln, 1935) ; P. O. Kristeller (ed.), *Supplementum Ficinianum* (Florence, 1937) II, 81-87 ; the same, *The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino* (New York, 1943), 24 n. ; D. C. Allen, 'The Rehabilitation of Epicurus and his Theory of Pleasure in the Early Renaissance,' *Studies in Philology* XLI (1944) 1-15 ; J. H. Wagenblast, *Lucretius and the Epicurean Tradition in English Poetry* (unpubl. diss., Harvard, 1946) ; E. Pellegrin, 'Le Codex Pomponii Romani de Lucrèce,' *Latomus* 7 (1948) 77-82 ; S. Bertelli, 'Noterelle Machiavelliane,' *Rivista storica italiana* 73 (1961) 544-553 ; 76 (1964) 774-792 ; R. Ridolfi, 'Del Machiavelli, di un codice di Lucrezio e d'altro ancora,'

*Biblio filia* 65 (1963) 249-259 ; idem, 'Errata-corrigere machiavelliano' *Biblio filia* 70 (1968) 137-141 ; B. Weinberg, *History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago, 1961) ; S. Fraisse, *L'Influence de Lucrèce en France au Seizième Siècle* (Paris, 1962) = Fraisse ; W. Kaiser, *Praisers of Folly : Erasmus, Rabelais, Shakespeare* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963) ; R. Klibansky, E. Panofsky, F. Saxl, *Saturn and Melancholy* (London, 1964) 356 ; S. Bertelli, 'Un codice Lucreziano dall' officina di Pomponio Leto,' *La parola del passato*, fasc. 100 (1965), 28-38 ; C. R. Thompson, trans., *The Colloquies of Erasmus* (Chicago, 1965) xiii-xxxiii, 535-551 ; N. W. Gilbert, 'Francesco Vimercato of Milan,' *Studies in the Renaissance* XII, (1965) 188-217 ; J. J. Wilhelm, *The Cruelest Month* (New Haven and London, 1965) 25, 48f. ; W. B. Fleischmann, 'Zum Anti-Lucretius des Kardinals de Polignac,' *Romanische Forschungen*, LXXVII (1965), 42-63 ; R. H. Kargon, *Atomism in England from Hariot to Newton* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 65-69.

#### I. De rerum natura

##### COMMENTARIES

###### 1. JOHANNES BAPTISTA PIUS.

Date of the first edition : 1511.

*Prologue.* (ed. Bologna 1511). R. Episcopo Quinqueecclesiensi Pius. [Inc.] : Mitratos inter proceres, venerande Georgi. . . . [Expl.] : Juppiter et faciat sic rata vota Jovis.

*Dedic.* Reverendo ac augusto antistiti Domino Georgio Cassovio Regis illustrissimi Pannonii ac Boiemici supremo secretario episcopo Quinqueecclesiensi patrono colendo Joannes Baptista Pius Bononiensis. [Inc.] : Aristophanes antiquae comoediae princeps, sacrosancte Georgi dei optumi maxumique signifer et explorator fidei solertissime, in Ranis Bacchum inducit ad inferos descendere molientem, ut Euripidem aut eximium quempiam vatem inveniret. Apud superos enim neminem reperiebat nisi malum. . . Totus Lucretius nodosus, mordosus, impervius. . . Multi qui ante nos Lucretium attenterunt

fulgur ex pelvi minitantes echinatam demum doctrinam aversati canes Nilotici facti sunt et desperatione suborta rhipsaspides. . .[Expl.] : an quod di omen obruant labores mei displiceant aut potius digitum levandum censeas, innue. Vale aeternum felix clientis tui memor. (At the bottom of the page :) Omnia orthodoxe fidei subiicio.

*Introduction.* In Carum Lucretium de rerum natura interpretatio auctore Joanne Baptista Pio Bononiensi ubi vita auctoris inseritur. [Inc.] : (f. 1) Hieronymus libro contra Rufinum primo scribit se vidisse commentarios in Lucretium et Plautum. . .nunc cum Lucretio auctorum difficillimo congredior. . .Lucretius. . .qui postea amatorio poculo in furorem versus cum aliquot libros per intervalla insaniae conscripsisset. . . Constat amatorio versum in furorem ab uxore, sed quo nomine diceretur illa, plurimum ambigitur. Sunt qui Lucilium velint iis Hieronymi verbis adducti. . ./. . .[Expl.] : (f. 1v) quippe verum est id Thucydidis in secundo loquente Pericle: Qui novit neque id quod sentit explicat perinde est ac si nesciret.

*Expositio in Lucretium auctore Pio.* [Inc.] : (f. 1v) Ad absolutam et integrum cognitionem poematis Lucretiani expedit summatim carpitique dignoscere Empedoclis dogmata, quem litus variis ingenii luminibus Lucretius poeta sectatur in plurimis, qui nedum sedulo sectam Agrigentini philosophi identidem sequitur, sed et carminibus utitur Empedoclis flatum spiritumque referentibus . . . Sed quoniam ad poema Lucretianum pertinet Epicuri dogma scire, quoniam auctore Lactantio libro *de opificio* Epicuri sunt omnia quae delirat Lucretius. . ./. . . [Expl.] : (f. 2v) sed quia multos ad populare nomen voluptatis invitat, et reliqua quae sequentur scitu certe dignissima.

*Enarratio codicis.* [Inc.] : (f. 3) Sed prius quam ulterius progrediamur, pensius animadvertendum praenomen auctoris esse Titus. . . [Expl.] : Columbatim labra inserens labris, et columbari est pruritum columbinum imitari.

*Commentary.* [Inc.] : (f. 3) *Aeneadum genetrix.* In principio operis naturales res amplectentis poeta Romanus rerum naturalium genetricem et effectricem Venerem invocat. . ./. . .[Expl.] : (f. 215v) Idem fune-

ris socios aqua pura purgabat ramusculo oleagino prompta dicebatque illicet hoc est ire licet. Itidem vale dicebatur post tumuli peracta solemnia. Finis Commentarii in Lucretium auctore Pio Bononiensi.

*Epilogue.* Eidem R. ep. salutem Pius idem. [Inc.] : (f. 216) Haec sunt antistes et archiflamen eminentissime, quae studiosorum impensisimis precibus intentissima cura nec sine animi summa trepidatione non dico edidimus, sed edebamus. . ./. . .[Expl.] : inventis autem multas habere gratias. Vale faustiter terque et amplius vir divine feliciter et Pii lucubrationibus nomini et numini tuo dicatis applaude. Finis.

*Second epilogue.* (f. 217v). Joannes Baptista Pius Ludovico Gesilardo Bononiensi Theseo suo S. Plautinae retractationes. [Inc.] : Nemo, Lytavice cultissime, adeo cunctis industriae virtutumque numeris excelluit. . .[Expl.] : quando ex altera Euripidis Iphigenia colligitur pares calculos adeptum in Areopagitico iudicio evadere superiorem. Vale.

There follow Retractationes on Plautus and and other authors.

#### *Editions :*

1511, Bononiae (Bologna) : Hier. Bapt. de Benedictis Platonicus. (NjP ; NNC) ; Panzer VI 326, 60 ; Graesse IV 287 ; Brunet III 1218 ; Munro I 4-5 ; Gordon 73, 76-77 ; cf. F. J. Norton, *Italian Printers 1501-1520* (London 1958) 7-8.

1514, Paris : Badius Ascensius and Joh. Parvus. (MH ; NNC) ; BM ; Panzer VIII 12, 702 ; Graesse IV 287 ; Munro I 5 ; Gordon 77-78 ; Fraisse 33-36 ; P. Renouard, *Badius* III 28-29. This edition adds the following preface : Nicolaus Beraldus illustrissimo viro Francisco Deloino Regio Consiliario felicitatem. [Inc.] : (f. A 1 verso) Scripsere primum latino carmine res physicas illustres poetae duo Empedoclis exemplum secuti, Varro Attacinus Narbonensis Gallus et Carus Lucretius Romanus. Quorum alter Pythagoreum dogma secutus dicitur, sicut hic noster Epicureum, quod et Hieronymus in Ruffinum testatur et Lactantius in eo libro cui titulus est de opificio dei apertissime confirmat. . .Lucretii vero libri sex numero ex antiqua illa ac publica literarum clade reliqui ac velut e naufragio electi, obscuri primum mutili luxati et a doctis parum

antehac intellecti Merulae primum (ut audio),  
dein Beroaldi diligentia locis emendati com-  
pluribus, mox a Baptista Pio vetustatis  
diligentissimo ac plane antiquario interprete  
restituti nobis ac illustrati...[Expl.]: quo  
me cotidianum paene convivam excipis,  
et quoties Lucretium in manus sumpseris,  
toties Nicolai tui fac apud te memoria  
reviviscat. Vale. Lutetiae idibus Augustis.  
The edition also adds the following poem  
(f. A 8 verso): Jodocus Badius Ascensius  
Francisco Deloino Regio Consiliario pruden-  
tissimo et omnis literature peritissimo S.D.  
[Inc.]: Quandoquidem priscas recolis Fran-  
cisce Camoenas...[Expl.]: Haec tibi sacra-  
tem dogmata laudo meum (cf. Renouard, l.  
c.).

*Note*: Bertelli's praise of Pius as an innovating editor must be qualified in the light with of Munro's earlier analysis of Pius' text, which Bertelli seems unfamiliar (See above, under Bibliography II and III C). Munro shows convincingly that Pius follows, with minor departures, Avancius' first Aldine of 1500. Avancius had already used Marullus' textual notes to the *De rerum natura* (now lost) which both Pius and Candidus (for the 1512-1513 Giuntina) assert they have used. While it is possible that Pius and Candidus may have used a different set of Marullus' notes than did Avancius, credit must be given the latter (given the strong resemblances among Avancius', Pius' and Candidus' editions) for first incorporating Marullus' readings into a published text of Lucretius.

*Biogr. :*

Johannes Baptistus Pius (Gian Battista Pio). Was b. Bologna ca. 1460-1464 ; d. Rome, ca. 1540-1548. Studied at Bologna under Filippo Beroaldo the Elder and Bartolomeo Bianchini, received a degree from the University of Bologna in 1494. He taught rhetoric there from 1494 to 1495, and subsequently opened a grammar school at Bologna. This venture was a failure. Pius left for Milan, where he taught Latin grammar and literature until 1500. In that year, he returned to the University of Bologna as professor in the chair of oratory and poetry, a post which he kept—combined with intermittent teaching engagements at Bergamo and at Mantua - until 1510. It was during

this period, in 1506, that Erasmus attended a lecture by Pius at Bologna, but was poorly impressed by his affected and archaizing Latinity. From 1510 to 1514, Pius served as a lecturer at the University of Rome. He was recalled to the University of Bologna in 1514, staying on the university rolls until 1527. Subsequently (1527-37), Pius moved to a teaching engagement at Lucca : Some accounts have him move there as early as 1524, a year in which academic rivalry with Romolo Amaseo threatened his tenure at Bologna. In 1537, after a brief return to Bologna, Pius went to Rome, where he assumed a chair of rhetoric at the *Collegium Sapientiae*. Among his pupils were Thiloninus Cunradus, Isabella d'Este, M. A. Flaminio, Diomedes Guidalottus, Franc. Tissardus, and Bernardo Tasso.

*Works* : He is responsible for the first edition of Sidonius Apollinaris (Milan, 1498) and for editions of Placiades Fulgentius' *Mythology* (Milan, 1498), Plautus (Milan, 1500), Lucretius (Bologna, 1511, repr. Paris, 1514), and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Venice, 1518). Notes on Plautus, Sidonius, and Fulgentius are collected in his *Annotationes linguae latinae graecaeque* (Bologna, 1505) ; on Cicero, Columella, Horace, Lucan, Valerius Flaccus, etc., in *Variarum annotationum Sylloge* (Frankfurt, 1602). He edited *P. Victor*, *Pomponius Laetus et al. de urbe Roma sribentes* (Bologna, 1520) and published *Praefationes gymnasticae, aliique varii sermones quorum sermonum partim prosa, partim metro scriptorum sunt libri sex* (Bologna, 1522). His *Elegidia* (Bologna, 1500) were reprinted there (1509) and at Geneva (1608). He translated the *Strategematicon* of Sextus Julius Frontinus into Italian (Bologna, 1504).

*Bibl.* : C. G. Jöcher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon* (Leipzig, 1751) III 1608 and *Ergänzungsband* VI (Bremen, 1819) 325 ; G. Fantuzzi, *Notizie degli Scrittori Bolognesi* (Bologna, 1789) VII 31-40 ; Hoefer XL 290-291 ; Michaud XXXIII 389 ; P. de Nolhac, *Érasme en Italie* (Paris, 1888) 21-22 ; U. Dallari, ed., *I Rotuli dei lettori legisti e artisti dello Studio Bolognese dal 1384 a 1799* (Bologna, 1888-1923) II, 1494-1495, 1500-1510, 1514-1527 ; *British Museum Cata-*

*logue of Italian Books 1465-1600*, s.v. 'Pio'; M. Cosenza, *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300-1800* (Boston, 1962) IV s.v. 'Pio'. On Georgius Cassovius (Georg Szakmary, Bishop of Fünfkirchen 1509-1523) to whom Pius' Lucretius is dedicated, Gordon 77 refers to Keller, *Historia Episcopatus Quinte ecclesiensis* (Budapest, 1782-1812).

## 2. DIONYSIUS LAMBINUS

Dedication to commentary carries date: Paris, November, 1563.

*General Dedic.* (ed. of 1564). Dionysius Lambinus Karolo Valesio Nono Regi Christianissimo atque augustissimo. [Inc.]: Si quod est in his paucis scriptorum veterum tanquam ex naufragio reliquis litterarum genus, Karole Rex Christianissime, unde multae magnaeque utilitates ad nos permanarint, poëmata sunt. Poëtae enim, qui iidem philosophi fuerunt, primos illos homines rudeis, impolitos, feros erudierunt, expoliverunt, a feritate ad hunc humandum et civilem victum cultumque traduxerunt. Iidem et melius quam plerique minuti philosophi virtutis pulchritudinem descripserunt eiusque amore nos inflammarunt et gravius a vitiorum turpitudine nos absteruerunt; iidem non ut historici ex veris rerum gestarum narrationibus singulariumque personarum dictis, factis, eventis (sic), sed philosophorum more rebus verisimilibus excogitatis, personis fictis, casibus cuique personae consentaneis ad extremum subiunctis nos et praeceptis utilissimis instituerunt et moribus optimis imbuerunt. . . At Lucretius animorum immortalitatem oppugnat, Deorum providentiam negat, religiones omneis tollit, sumnum bonum in voluptate ponit. Sed haec Epicuri, quem sequitur Lucretius, non Lucretii culpa est. . . Non enim si multis locis a Platone dissidet, non si multa cum religione nostra pugnantia dicit, idcirco ea etiam, quae cum illorum et Christianorum sententia congruunt, spernere debemus. . . non dubitanter affirmabo, nullum in tota lingua Latina scriptorem Lucretio Latine melius esse locutum, non M. Tullii, non C. Caesaris orationem esse puriorem. . .

[Expl.]: Ita igitur vivas et valeas et regnes, Karole, ut litterarum ac litteratorum virtuteque praestantium virorum columen et praesidium et perfugium multas aetates esse possis. Lutetiae, anno ab humano genere servato 1563 Kalendis Novembris.

*Preface of Book I.* Dionysius Lambinus Monstroliensis Errico Memmio Parisiensi supplicum libellorum in regia magistro S. D. [Inc.]: Quamobrem hunc primum T. Lucretii Cari de natura rerum librum tibi donarim, Errice Memmi, causae multae concurrerunt. Movit me primum magnus inter nos usus et summa necessitudo satis longo convictu neque parva aut brevi consuetudine constituta ab illo iam tempore, cum ego, tu et frater tuus Io. Iacobus Memmius, Io. Maludanus, homo doctissimus idemque vir optimus, studiorum vestrorum socius et quasi moderator (ex cuius morte nec opinata atque immatura mihi nuper ab Aurato nostro nunciata incredibilem hausi dolorem) Tolosae una commorabamur. Qua in urbe tametsi omne fere nostrum studium in iure civili ponebamus, horas tamen aliquot pomericianas et vespertinas et subsecivas (sic) ad Graecos et Latinos quosdam scriptores legendos conferebamus. . . tua omnium Graecorum et Latinorum librorum, non modo e typis expressorum verum etiam manuscriptorum, quos. . . conquisisti et collegisti. . . bibliotheca; ex qua depromptum unum T. Lucretii Cari exemplar pervetustum cum mihi commodato dedisses. . . Adriano Turnebo interea et Io. Aurato collegis meis. . . adhibitis et consultis. . . [Expl.]: Nunc T. Lucretii Cari de natura rerum a me summa (quod te non fugit) diligentia maximoque labore ad veteres membranas emendati atque ex carie, situ et squallore in suam pristinam formam nativumque habitum ac nitorem propemodum vendicati librum primum tibi tuo merito libentissime dono. Vale Lutetiae anno e genere humano servato MDLXIII. Kalendis Sextilibus.

*Ad lectorem:* Idem eruditio Lectori. [Inc.]: Fuit mea semper haec sententia, lector erudite, eos qui scriptores veteres vel difficileis atque obscuros explanant atque illustrant vel iniuria temporum depravatos codicum manuscriptorum auctoritate freti in antiquum statum pristinumque ac nati-

vum splendorem restituunt, de bonis literis honestisque disciplinis melius mereri quam qui aut poemata aut orationes aut libros artem aliquam iam ante a veteribus traditam atque explicatam complectenteis scribunt et componunt. . . Usus autem sum in eo restituendo Romae quidem tribus libris manuscriptis, uno Vaticano, altero qui fuit Gulielmi Faerni, tertio quem Scipio Tethius Neapolitanus mihi commodato dedit, Lutetiae vero duobus, uno Memmiano, altero Bertiniano, quo ex coenobio D. Bertini. . . ad P. Gallandum. . . missus est, deinde Adriano Turnebo a P. Gallandio eius copia facta est. Atque ego (ne mentiar) Bertinianum codicem, quem in meis scholiis saepe commemoro, non vidi, sed librum Adriani Turnebi e formis plumbeis expressum cum illo exemplari manu scripto diligentissime et accuratissime usque ad librum sextum duntaxat comparatum habui. . . Ne vulgatos quidem libros aspernatus sum. Quin omnes, quos potui, undique conquisi et corrogavi, Parisienses, Lugdunenseis eosque binos, Venetos item binos, unos antiquiores, alteros recentiores, Florentinos, Vicetinos (sic), Bassiliensis. . . [Expl.]: Quod si qua alia inter legendum animadvertes, quae nos fugerint ac latuerint, fac memineris nos homines esse discasque rebus humanis concedere oportere. Vale.

Jo. Auratus in Lucretium a Dionysio Lambino restitutum. [Inc.]: Immortalia si mortalibus ex elementis. . . . [Expl.]: Flumina miremur, pietas sua foedera servet.

Philippus Galterus Rovillius Typographus lectori S. D. [Inc.]: Hoc plerunque fieri videmus, lector humanissime, ut quorum maiores aut propinquai aliqua ex arte ac virtute laudem sint consecuti. . . . [Expl.]: alacritatemque adferes plura in posterum tempus et maiora conandi, quae et tibi grata et Reipublicae utilia esse possint. Vale.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (p. 2) *Aeneadum Aeneadarum*, id est Romanorum, qui ab Aenea prognati sunt. Profert hunc primum versum Prisc. lib. 7. . . . [Expl.]: (p. 559) *Quam corpora deserentur*. Quidam legendum censem: quam ut corpora deserentur. Finis.

*Preface of Book II:* (p. 99) Dionysius Lambinus P. Ronsardo poetarum Gallorum

principi. [Inc.]: Cum primum T. Lucretii Cari librum de natura rerum Errico Memmio propter gravissimas et iustissimas causas dicasse, Ronsarde, hunc secundum me tibi donare debere non levioribus causis adductus iudicavi. . . [Expl.]: His igitur causis impulsus hunc secundum librum, in quo de primorum corporum motu, de figuris eorum variis et tamen finitis, numero infinito, natura simplicissima omniumque colorum atque adeo omnium primarum qualitatum experte, de mundis innumerabilibus, qui fortuito illorum corpusculorum concursu (rideamus licet Epicuri deliria) et oriuntur et intereunt, hunc (inquam) librum amicitiae nostrae testem futurum sempiternum tibi libens atque ex animo dono.

*Preface of Book III:* (p. 190-191) Dionysius Lambinus Germano Valenti Pimpuntio viro doctissimo Regio in Curia Suprema Parisiensi Consiliario S. D. [Inc.]: Cum multis ac magnis de rebus philosophos illos veteres quaesivisse atque inter se dissensisse non ignoras, Germane Valens, tum de animorum origine, sede, et natura, hoc est unde orti, in qua parte corporis locati sint, quid sint, utrum sint mortales an immortales, tam variae sunt inter eos tamque discrepantes sententiae, ut cum eas collegeris et sub uno quasi aspectu posueris, non illi veri inveniendi, sed contradicendi studio hac de re inter se concertasse videantur. . . [Expl.]: Hunc igitur tertium librum, Germane Pimpunti, centum quinquaginta et eo amplius locis a me ex auctoritate codicum calamo exatorum emendatum et scholiis fortasse non inutilibus explanatum tibi dono, mei quidem amoris meaeque erga te observantiae pignus certissimum, nostrae autem mutuae amicitiae monumentum, ut spero et opto, immortale ac sempiternum futurum. Vale.

*Preface of Book IV:* (p. 273-274) Dionysius Lambinus M. Antonio Mureto S. D. [Inc.]: Si quis est ex iis, quibuscum aliqua mihi necessitudo intercedit, cui unus aliquis e sex T. Lucretii Cari de natura rerum libris a me ex auctoritate codicum manuscriptorum emendatis et explanatis debeatur, tu profecto, Marce Antoni, non in postremis dignus es, qui tuam quoque huius munusculi iustum partem consequare. . . [Expl.]: Hunc igitur librum tibi promissum et debitum, ac paene

dicam tuum, tibi non dono, sed optima fide reddo. Vale Lutetiae, anno a salute generi humano data 1563, pridie idus Septembbris.

*Preface of Book V* : (p. 373-374) Dionysius Lambinus Adriano Turnebo S. D. [Inc.] : Ex T. Lucretii Cari libris sex, Adriane Turnebe, quattuor iam sunt consumti et quattuor magnis et claris viris donati. Restant duo, quintus et sextus iampridem tibi et Io. Aurato collegis meis, viris doctissimis nostraeque Galliae ornamenti, et praeter collegii ipsius necessitudinem mihi amicissimis desponsi ac destinati. . . [Expl.] : Hunc igitur librum pulcherrimarum (ut scis) disputationum plenum, tibi iam promissum ac desponsum vel ultiro dono vel optima fide persolvo. Vale. Lutetiae Parisiorum, anno MDLXIII pridie Kalend. Novemb.

*Preface of Book VI* : (p. 466-467) Dionysius Lambinus Io(anni) Aurato S. D. [Inc.] : Vellem hoc natura rerum tulisset, Ioannes Aurate, ut quemadmodum eorum, quibus superiores libros dicavi, neminem eruditione et doctrina tibi antepono, ita pari omnium gradu ordineque servato tibi et illis suum cuique librum dicare potuissem. . . [Expl.] : Veruntamen finem facere satius est, ne in re nota, clara, et tot hominum conscientia sermoneque testata nostrae quoque orationis testimonium minime necessarium adhibere voluisse videamur. Vale Lutetiae, pridie idus Octobris anno MDLXIII.

*Editions :*

1564, Paris : G. Roville. (NjP ; NNC) ; BM ; Graesse IV 287 ; Brunet III 1219 ; Munro I 14-15 ; Sandys II 189-190 ; Gordon 78-83 ; Fraisse 53-59 ; Fleischmann 58-61. Some copies have 1563 on the title page.

1570, Paris : Jean Bienné. (NjP ; NNC) ; BM ; Brunet III 1219 ; Munro I 16 ; Gordon 79, 83-84 ; Fraisse 68-69 ; Fleischmann 62-63.

Ad lectorem 2 (eds. Paris, 1570, Frankfurt, 1583, only) : Idem tertiae editionis lectori S. D. [Inc.] : Fuerat olim (eruditus lector) a pictore quodam praestantissimo atque excellentissimo tabula pulcherrime picta. Eam tabulam mali pictores longo post tempore vetustate aliquantum obscuratam et propemodum obsoletam nacti non solum novis et alienis coloribus contaminarant verius quam illustrarent, verum etiam coeno et sordibus conspurcarant. . . quicquid est

in eius (Gifanius', cf. *infra*) Lucretiana editione rectum et laudabile, paucis exceptis ex mea editione sumsit, sive sit hoc in contextu verborum Lucretii sive in commentariis. . . [Expl.] : Haec te, lector, scire volui prius quam hanc tertiam mei Lucretii editionem legeres, partim ne tu inter legendum in digressiunculas quasdam stomachosiores et amariores incidens, quibus istius improbitatem retundo, tacitus apud te quaereres, quid hae verborum velitationes sibi vellent et quorsum pertinerent ; partim ut intelligeres me non potuisse istius iniuriam tacitam atque inultam relinquere, nisi laudem magno meo labore, quem in emendando Lucretio suscepi, partam amittere ac proiicare vellem, quod neminem experientem et fortem virum fuisse probaturum certo scio. Vale. Lutetiae. a.d. VIII Novembries. anno MDLXX.

*Vita auctoris* (eds. Paris, 1570, Frankfurt, 1583, only) : T. Lucretii Cari patria, genus, vitae studium, ingenium, mortis genus et tempus, librorum ab eo scriptorum numerus, consilium poetae, argumentum et inscriptio operis, D. Lambino auctore. [Inc.] : Cum de T. Lucretio Caro nihil fere litteris mandatum sit a veteribus aut certe pauca admodum eaque incerta, atque idcirco qui eius vitam conscribere antea conati sunt, ii mihi artem quandam divinandi factitasse viderentur, non putaveram olim mihi quidquam in ea re studii temporisve ponendum, quae vani cuiusdam arioli potius quam diligentis explicatoris operam desideraret. . . alii furore percitum, in quem Lucilia sive uxor sive amica amatorio poculo porrecto eum imprudens adegerat, cum ab eo amari, non ei necem inferre aut bonam mentem adimere vellet. . . . [Expl.] : Haec habuimus, quae de T. Lucretii Cari patria, genere, vitae studio, ingenio, mortis genere, librorum ab eo scriptorum numero, consilio poetae, argumento operis et inscriptione librorum scriberemus. Nunc Lucretium naturam rerum gravissimis atque ornatissimis explicantem audiamus.

De C. Memmio gemello. [Inc.] : Admonitus a typographo paginam unam atque alteram vacuam fore, nisi quid quo expleretur ei suppeditarem, haec subito de Memmiis scripsi. . . [Expl.] : in unum colligere et sub

unum quasi adspectum promere super-vacaneum esse putavimus.

Jac. Helius Marchianus in hanc tertiam T. Lucretii Cari a D. Lambino de integro emendati editionem. [Inc.] : Prodiit ante tua, Lambine, Lucretius arte. . ./. . .[Expl.] : Quae nox, quae tenebrae iam superesse queant.

1583, Frankfurt : Haeredes A. Wecheli. BN ; Gordon 84-85 ; Fleischmann 63 ; (NNC).

*Note* : Lambinus referred to his 1570 as his third, rather than as his second edition, an appellation he reserved for a pocket edition without commentary (Paris : G. Roville, 1565). Cf. Gordon 79, 83 ; Fleischmann 61.

*Biogr.* :

Dionysius Lambinus (Denis, Denys Lambin). Was b. Montreuil-sur-Mer, 1516 ; d. Paris, 1572. Studied at the Collège du Cardinal Lemoine and (1574) at the Collège de Coqueret, where he perfected his knowledge of Greek under the guidance of Johannes Auratus (Jean Dorat). His life-long friendship with the poet Pierre Ronsard dates from that time. Up to 1560, the year of his appointment to a chair of rhetoric at the Collège Royal in Paris, he intermittently taught literature at Amiens and also travelled to Italy in the company of the cardinal de Tournon. In 1561, his teaching responsibilities at the Collège Royal were extended to a professorship of Greek. At the Collège, he found a close colleague and collaborator in Adrianus Turnebus (Adrien Turnèbe). A friendship with Marcus Antonius Muretus (Antoine Muret) ended ca. 1570, with mutual accusations of plagiarism. Lambinus' ill temper and vindictiveness were also vented upon Gifanius (cf. *infra*), the alleged plagiary of his 1563 commentary *De rerum natura* on Lucretius. Lambinus is generally recognized as the most important Renaissance commentator upon the *De rerum natura*.

*Works* : He wrote commentaries on Horace (Lyons, 1561), Lucretius (Paris, 1563-1564, 1570), Cicero (Paris, 1566, 1576, 1577), Cornelius Nepos (Paris, 1569), Demosthenes (Paris, 1570), and Plautus (Paris, 1576). He translated orations by Aeschines and Demosthenes into Latin (Paris, 1565) ; his Latin translations of the 'Ethics' and

'Politics' were included in Isaac Casaubon's edition of Aristotle (1590). He himself wrote *Duae orationes in aula gymnasii Samarobrinensis habitae* (Paris, 1563), *Oratio de laudibus litterarum* (Paris, 1564), *In A. Turnebi obitum naenia* (Paris, 1565), and *De utilitate linguae Graecae* (Paris, 1572). A *Ciceronis Vita ex eius operibus collecta* was published at Cologne, in 1578.

*Bibl.* : Hoefer XXIX 167-168 ; Michaud XXIII 58-59 ; Munro I 14-16 ; H. Potez, 'La Jeunesse de Denys Lambin (1519-1548)', *Revue d'Histoire Littéraire de la France* IX (1902) 385-413 ; Sandys II 208 ; Fusil 136-144 ; *Short title Catalogue of Books printed in France and of French Books printed in other countries from 1470 to 1600 now in the British Museum*, s.v. 'Lambinus' ; Gordon 78-81 ; Fraisse 53-61, 67-70 ; L. C. Stevens, 'Denis Lambin, Humanist, Courtier, Philologist and *Lecteur Royal*', *Studies in the Renaissance* IX (1962) 234-241.

### 3. OBERTUS GIFANIUS

Dedication to commentary is dated : 1565

*Dedic.* : Ob. Gifanii in T. Lucretium ad clarissimum virum Iohannem Sambucum genere et doctrina nobilissimum Caesareae familiae domesticum praefatio. . .[Inc.] : Non eram nescius, clarissime Sambuce, cum Lucreto manum serio demum adhiberem, fore ut hic noster labor et institutum in multorum reprehensiones incurreret. Scio enim esse et in his quosdam etiam summo in loco collocatos, quibus haec discendi ratio, quam nos coniuncta cum gravioribus doctrinis antiquitatis cognitione amplexi sumus, omnino displicet, quique haec studia, quae ab humanitate nomen habent et cum sapientiae gravitate conspirant, non modo excolenda, sed ne attingenda quidem existiment. . . Admirabilis autem et ridicula de minutis illis corpusculis sententia quid habet quaeso periculi, cum nullo negotio refelli possit ? Immo utilitatem hanc ea res adfert summam, quod dum in falsa ea incidimus de rerum obscuritate et natura decreta, accuratius etiam de vero ipso cognoscendo laboremus eiusque rationes melius percipiamus, perceptas memoriae infigamus firmius. . . Certe in hoc poeta omnia gravitatis sunt

plena ; nulla intemperantiae nota aut vestigium. . . quin praeclara in eo continentur multa, multa lectione et observatione dignissima. . . [Expl.] : Verum de tua in eum omnesque boni publici studiosos voluntate nihil addubitans unum hoc praeterea a te privatim oro, vir humanissime, ut quando me multis etiam iam adfecto a te beneficiis in tuorum numerum admisisti, hanc meam in Titum operam, quam gratissimo tibi animo debitam offero licet perexiguam, solita tua benevolentia tractare ac tuendam suscipere velis meque in iis habere semper, quos tui esse noris studiosissimos. Sic enim fiet ut ab gravissimo ac laudatissimo viro laudatus alacrior efficiar ad maiora olim deo iuvante in iure civili, ubi cum aetate iudicium accreverit maius, tractanda tibique ac reipublicae studiose exhibenda. Vale anno salutis restituae MDLXV.

Idem candido et erudito Lectori. [Inc.] : Existimo iam esse perspicuum, candide et erudite Lector, nosque rebus viciisse necessariis ex hoc scriptore utilitates manare non minimas, voluptates honestissimas, ut meriti de republica videantur praeclare, qui ut commodius ille et maiore cum fructu legatur effecerunt. . . Michael Marullus. . . naviter eius operi restituendo paene a barbarie extincto operam dare coepit. . . Verum cum nimis ingenio suo indulgeret, plurima quae corrigere voluit depravavit. Parum enim manuscriptos codices sequebatur quaeque suo (inquit P. Victorius) iudicio probasset, ea recta iudicans multis locis deceptus est. Ex hac deinde Marulli opera mendae innumerabiles Lucretii libros omnes pervaserunt. Quod ex clarissimi Sambuci libro quem ipsius Marulli manu adnotatum magno pretio vir ille praestantissimus paravit, me compersisse supra sum testatus, et Victorius, cuius verba ex Castigat. in epist. Cicer. lib. XI modo attuli, liquido confirmat. Mox Johannes Baptista Pius idem tentavit, non multo sane felicius, additis etiam commentariis copiosis. Tandem . . . Lambinus libros manu descriptos complures felicissime nactus. . . Eorum autem in numero non infimum locum sibi vindicat Ioh. Goropius Becanus, medicus ac philosophus eximus mihique amicissimus. Huius enim humanitate nactus sum non paucas emendationes variasque in poetam

nostrum lectiones, quas vir doctissimus Antonius Goldingamus homo Anglus ex libris calamo exaratis in patria sua. . . studiose ac sedulo collegerat illique amicissime donarat . . . [Expl.] : Quod si, uti spero, obtineam et hic labor scholis bonoque communi utilis iudicetur, praeter ceteros Deo nostro gratiae agendae erunt, cuius permisso, si aetas ac iudicium adoleverit, pluria (sic) et graviora olim praestare conabimur, et brevi C. Caesaris atque Agellium (sic enim noctium Atticarum auctorem appellandum docuimus) ab innumeris mendis restitutos. Vale.

*Vita auctoris.* [Inc.] : Et si ab aliis quibusdam viris sane doctissimis de vita Lucretii sit perscriptum, ea tamen re mihi silentum prorsus non putavi, qui cupio omni ratione studiosis adulescentibus patefacere, qualis et quantus sit ac fuerit poëta. quod certe hac vitae descriptione perspici poterit, ex qua praeter alia quaedam non contempnenda videbunt omnes, qua aetate, quam erudito, inquam, saeculo vixerit, quam egregie sit institutus, quibus usus sit amicis, quanto denique sua etiam aetate in pretio fuerit. . . Sic enim clarissimum fieret, quod saepe soleo dicere, avum esse Q. Ennium, patrem T. Lucretium, P. Virgilium Maronem filium ; hi enim ex epicis poëticis (sic) Latinis triumviri sunt praestantissimi. . . [Expl.] : si hoc prius addidero, non probari recentiorum iudicia, qui Lucret(ium), Lucanum, similes rerum gravium scriptores in poëtarum numero non habent ; nam et veterum in hac re sententiam iis possum opponere, ac de Lucretio nostro quidem Ciceronis ac Nepotis, auctorum minime vulgarium, qui eum non poëtam duntaxat, sed praestantissimum etiam poëtam laudant, et hoc addere, si ea est huius artis condicio et ingenium, ut nisi qui fabulas, amores, et id genus alia nugatoria tractet aut vera rebus obscuris falsisque involvat, in poëtarum ordine consistere non possit, eam artem insuper habendum potius et abiciendam suaserim, qua praeter spurca, nugatoria et figura suavibus leporibus adspersa nihil fere adulescentibus praebeatur.

*De gente Memmia eiusdem prolegomena* [Inc.] : De hac gente quia pauca in veterum scriptis eaque hic illic sparsa supersint, nemoque hoc eruditus saeculo scripse-

rit...[Expl.] : omnia fere quae de hoc genere in Adversaria retulerat nobiscum humanissime communicavit [sc. Jo. Guido Laurinus].

Veterum quorundam de T. Lucretio testimonia...

De T. Lucretio opera Ob. Gifanii restituto Jo. Goropii Becani medici ac philosophi epigramma. [Inc.] : Si quid post cineres reliqui tibi Care putasses...[Expl.] : Nunc ferat, ut meruit, nomen ab auxilio.

In eundem Hadr. Junius medicus (poem). [Inc.] : Suffectam memorant Graia pro virgine cervam... [Expl.] : Sidera non feries nobiliore via.

In T. Lucretium ab Ob. Gifanio δευτέρων ἀμεινόνων restitutum Guilelmi Canteri carmen. [Inc.] : Tandem igitur vera est Peligni dictio vatis... [Expl.] : Lucreti, vives orbis ad exitium.

Capita rerum quas Lucretius tractat...

Ad lectorem admonitio. [Inc.] : Potuissem, amice lector, capita facere multo plura et fortasse etiam meliora...[Expl.] : in quo parvulum mendum vel elegantiam vel sententiam vitiat. Vale.

Text with marginal notes. [Inc.] : (p. 1) *Aeneadum genetrix*. Prooemium. Ita v.q. in al. genitrix...[Expl.] : (p. 234) Ita ex v.q. et nost. et etiam vulg. malim, quam quod in al. prius. multus est Lucretius in Athenis laudandis. vulg. repedabat (sic). Greek texts of Epicurus, and passages from Cicero concerning him.

Ob. Gifanii in T. Lucretium index, seu Collectanea potius, in quibus vocabula prisca ac dictiones elegantiores commemo- rantur et adductis aliorum scriptorum testi- moniis saepe explicantur. [Inc.] : (p. 299) A. hanc litteram saepe a veteribus contra vulgat. grammat. canones productam reperio, sed loca plerunque sunt mendis inquinata turpissime... [Expl.] : (p. 469) Lamb. noctibus. Marull. et vulg. nec tristia saecla.

*Editions :*

1566, Antwerp : Plantin. (MH ; NNC) ; BM ; Fabricius I 81 ; Graesse IV 287 ; Brunet III 1219 ; Munro I 15 ; Sandys II 362 ; Gordon 85-86 ; Fraisse 67-70 ; Fleischmann 61-62. Some copies have the date 1565 on the title page (but not in the colophon) ; cf. Ruelens, p. 46, no. 9, and p. 53, no. 4. On the printer, cf. M. Sabbe, *Christopher Plantin* (Antwerp,

1930) ; M. van Durme, ed., *Supplément à la Correspondance de Christophe Plantin* (Antwerp, 1955) 33-34, 72-73, supplies some general information on this 'Lucretius.'

1595, Leyden : Raphelengius. BM ; (NNC) ; Graesse IV 287 ; Munro I 16 ; Gordon 86-87 ; Fraisse 70.

*Note :* Munro (I 16) cites Gifanius' failure to refute Lambinus' charges of plagiarism publicly as particularly damning evidence against Gifanius. Gordon and Fraisse follow Munro's indictment, which includes the charge that a correspondence between Gifanius and Muretus in which the former attempts to incite the latter to a public stand against Lambinus was of a strictly private nature and had, further, been exchanged after Lambinus' death. An examination of the pertinent letters (cf. M. Antonii Mureti ... *Orationes, Epistolae, etc.* Lipsiae, 1623, I 430-445, 485-492) reveals that they were written in 1569-1570, two years or more before Lambinus' death. It was Muretus who then advised Gifanius, very much a junior scholar at the time, to abstain from public controversy with Lambinus : 'Nunc vix credas, quam mihi a toto illo controversandi genere abhorreat animus. Tu quoque, si me audis, non nimis acriter eum insectabere' (*Epistolae, ed. cit.* 440). Gifanius' statement addressed to Muretus, that many similarities between his and Lambinus' readings of Lucretius were arrived at coincidentally and independently, is given further weight by Gifanius' fly-leaf marginalia to his own 1565-1566 *Lucretius* (now Bodleian, Bywater P. 6. 14) in which he alleges to have used manuscripts 'unum in Bibliotheca Magontiacensi...aliud in Bibliotheca S. Bertini,' an assertion which would have had him use not only the *Quadratus* which Lambinus had knowledge of, but also the *Oblongus*, then at Mainz. Gifanius' Rhenish origins make this statement not altogether improbable.

*Biogr. :*

Obertus Gifanius (also Giphani, Giphanius, Giphanius de Buren ; Obert, Hubert, Hubrecht van Giffen). Was b. Buren, Gelderland, ca. 1534 ; d. Prague, 26 July, 1604. Studied at Louvain, with Auratus-Daurat at Paris, at Bourges, and at Orléans, where he catalogued a library for the German

'nation' in 1566 and received a doctorate of Laws in 1567. Between 1567 and 1569, he travelled to Italy at least once, the first and perhaps only time, in the company of the French ambassador to Venice, Paul de Foix. These years also witnessed attempts to discredit him as a scholar, first on the part of Lambinus, secondly, on the part of Janus Douza who accused him of making illicit use of textual notes left, in 1566, by the dying Fruterius. In 1572, he assumed a chair of jurisprudence and philosophy at Strasbourg, moving to a professorship of law at Altdorf in 1577. In 1590, he accepted a chair of law at Ingolstadt, and there he converted to Catholicism. At some time after 1596, he moved to Prague, having been appointed a court councillor by the Emperor Rudolph II. In addition to his friendship with Muret, he also had close ties to Joseph Scaliger and Hubert Languet. Scioppius (Casper Schoppe) was his pupil at both Altdorf and Ingolstadt. Conrad Rittershusius of Braunschweig, his pupil at Ingolstadt, is responsible for a report on an allegedly substantial body of writings displeasing to the Church which Gifanius' son refused to relinquish after his father's death.

*Works* : His *Lucretius* (1565-1566, 1595) was followed by commentaries on Homer's *Iliad* (Leiden, 1572), and on Aristotle's *Politics* and *Nicomachean Ethics* (Frankfurt, 1608). Notes on Eusebius, St. Jerome, Victorius, Paulus Diaconus, Cornelius Nepos, Aulus Gellius, Symmachus, and Prudentius were seen in manuscript form in the early eighteenth century. He is responsible for *Observationes singulares in linguam latinam* (Frankfurt, 1624). Letters may be found among Muretus' *Epistolae* (1587, 1623) and in Antonius Matthaeus' *Sylloge Epistolarum* (Leiden, 1695 ; reprinted as an appendix to Andreas Alciatus' *Tractatus contra vitam monasticam*, Leiden, 1695 ; The Hague, 1740). A manuscript letter of 30 May, 1590, his resignation from Altdorf, survives as *Stadtbibliothek Nürnberg*, Autogr. 789 (formerly Cent. V. App. 34m, Umschl. 39 ; verified by the librarian). Works on law include *Notae in corpus juris civilis* (Ingolstadt, 1594), *Commentarius ad institutiones juris civilis* (Ingolstadt, 1596), *Antinomiarum juris civilis sive disputationum*

*libri* (Frankfurt, 1605), *Lecturae Altorphinae in aliquot titulos digestorum et codicis* (Frankfurt, 1605, contains a treatise 'An Pandectis abrogat Codex,' reprinted in Eusebius Berger, ed., *Codicis Justiniane Illustrationes*, Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1767), *Antinomiae juris feudalis* (Frankfurt, 1606), *Oeconomia juris* (Frankfurt, 1606), *Tractatus de diversis regulis juris antiqui* (Strasbourg, 1607), *Explanatio difficiliorum et celebriorum quaestionum in octo libris codicis occurrentium* (Basel, 1615), *Disputatio de pactis* (Frankfurt, 1620), *Tractatus duo de ordine judiciorum* (Jena, 1624), and *De renunciationibus* (ed. Schilter, Strasbourg, 1701). Treatises on *De sponsalibus* and *De testamentis ordinandis* are alleged to have been published during his Strasbourg period, but no modern bibliographical record of these survives. Historical writings with titles, as follows : 'Chronicon Germaniae, ab ultimis usque temporibus repetitum et ad nostra tempora deductum,' 'Index historicus generalis,' and 'Chronicon scriptorum ac doctorum hominum, veterum et recentiorum, ex omni orbe terrarum' survived in manuscript form, at least until the early eighteenth century. 'Recitationes de iudiciis' (1595) and 'Recitationes de appellationibus (1596)' survive as Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen ms. cart. 804. Diss. Altdorf. Iur. XX in the same library contains thirteen printed theses defended under Gifanius in the years 1588-90 and a ms. of 307 fols. containing explanations on the Digest and the Codex of Justinian, probably written by a pupil of Gifanius at Altdorf, with references to him on f. 149, 172, 299.

*Bibl.* : Bayle VII 75-81 ; J. G. Schellhorn, *Amoenitates literariae* (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1725-1731) XII 587-591 ; G. A. Will, *Nürnbergisches Gelehrten-Lexicon* (Nürnberg and Altdorf, 1755-58) ; Paquot XVI 87-107 ; Hoefer XX 469-471 ; Michaud XVI 429-230 ; C. Ruelens and A. de Backer, *Annales Plantiniennes* (Bruxelles, 1865), 46-47 ; *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (Leipzig, 1879) IX 182-185 ; *Neue Deutsche Biographie* VI (1964) 407, by H. Liermann ; Sandys II 362 ; *British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books*, s.v. 'Gifanius.' ; H. Fischer, *Die lateinischen Papierhandschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen* (Erlangen, 1936), p. 474.