

## PREFACE

Much more time has elapsed since the publication of our first volume than we had hoped or anticipated, and in apologizing for this delay, we should like to put the blame on the great difficulty of our undertaking. For the reasons of this difficulty, and for the general scope and purpose of our work, I should like to refer the reader to the preface of our first volume. I am glad to state that our purpose has been well understood, if not by all scholars with whom we were in correspondence, at least by the reviewers of our first volume. We are especially grateful to those of them who proposed valuable corrections and additions, as to Emilie BOER (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*), Harry CAPLAN (*Renaissance News*), the late W. Leonard GRANT (*Manuscripta*), Claudio LEONARDI (*Bullettino dell' Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano*), M<sup>lle</sup> Suzanne MANSION (*Revue Philosophique de Louvain*), J. MONFRIN (*Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*) and the late Lynn THORNDIKE (*Isis*). We have specifically used their suggestions for the additions and corrections to Volume I—given at the end of this volume—as well as for the bibliography. We also appreciated and utilized the corrections to our list of Latin authors that were communicated to us by Prof. Robert Dale SWEENEY (Vanderbilt University) and that are the result of his preliminary work for his planned *Catalogus Codicum Classicorum Latinorum*. We have not been able to accept the suggestion that we change the typographical style of our work since this would have involved a considerable increase in the cost of printing. We are grateful to our publisher, the Catholic University of America Press, since they have kindly agreed to publish this volume without subsidy.

The articles contained in this volume, like those of the first, do not reflect any special choice. We are merely publishing those articles that happen to be completed at this time. Several more are well advanced but did not reach us in time for inclusion. We hope that they will find their place in the third volume, and that it will not be delayed as long as the second has been. We have arranged the articles according to the sequence of our lists of Greek and Latin authors. The articles are very different in size and content, and the Greek authors are again more numerous than the Latin. We hope the selection is at least representative, especially if taken together with the articles of the first volume. Greek philosophy is again represented by Olympiodorus and Theophrastus, and by important additions to Alexander of Aphrodisias; and Greek science, by Pappus, Stephanus Byzantius, Strabo, and again by Theophrastus. For the first time, Greek poetry is represented by Aeschylus, Greek rhetoric by Demetrius and ps. Longinus, Greek patristic literature by Theophilus and, above all, by Gregory Nazianzen to whom the largest single article in this volume—or for that matter in either volume—is dedicated. Pausanias and the *Vita Secundi* do not fall under any of these classifications, but are of great interest, each in its own way. Latin poetry is represented by Lucretius, and by the pseudo-ancient and actually Carolingian Theodolus; Latin prose, by Apicius and Martianus Capella.

The length of the articles dedicated to these various authors in our project does not reflect their intrinsic importance, as judged by modern classical scholarship, but the relative popularity they enjoyed in the West during the Middle Ages and during the Renaissance, or even during smaller sections of these larger periods. Among the Greek texts here treated, only the short *Vita Secundi* owed its popularity in the West to a medieval translator, but this is a very interesting case since it illustrates the role, not too widely known, played by the Abbey of St. Denis near Paris as a center of Greek studies during the twelfth century. The Latin tradition of Pausanias, Stephanus Byzantius and Strabo begins with

the fifteenth century, and that of Aeschylus, Longinus and Olympiodorus only with the sixteenth (a fact most easily explained by the difficulty of the latter authors). All these writers were completely unavailable to the medieval centuries. Demetrius was translated in the early fourteenth century, and again nine times in the sixteenth. Since the medieval translation survives in only one manuscript, we must conclude that this author was practically unknown before the sixteenth century. The same must be said of Pappus. His commentary on Euclid, a fragmentary translation from the Arabic made in the twelfth century, survives in one manuscript, whereas his commentary on Ptolemy, and above all, his major work, the *Collectio*, was translated only in the sixteenth century. Theophilus' only authentic work was not translated before the sixteenth century, whereas the Middle Ages knew another work attributed to him but surely not correctly, and perhaps not even a translation from the Greek. Of Theophrastus, the Middle Ages knew only a fragment of uncertain origin cited by Jerome and three citations by Carolingian scholars from the *Peplus* attributed to him, whereas his *Characters*, his botanical works, his philosophical and scientific fragments were all made available by translators of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Especially significant, among the articles in our volume, is the case of Gregory Nazianzen. His extant writings consist of 45 orations, 245 letters and 406 poems, including apocrypha, that is, of a total of 696 pieces. Of this impressive Corpus, the Middle Ages had nine orations in the widely known ancient translation of Rufinus, two orations, one poem and two letters in Carolingian versions, and four letters in a fourteenth century version. Most of the remainder, that is, all orations, most of the letters and half the poems were made available by a host of translators in the fifteenth and especially in the sixteenth century, Italians and Northerners, Catholics and Protestants. Some of these translations covered but one or few pieces, but some very many. Some were buried in single manuscripts or rare editions, some widely diffused in several well known printings.

In the case of our few Latin authors the results are equally instructive. Apicius found only two commentators, and Lucretius only three, all in the sixteenth century. In other words, one of the greatest Latin poets who is also important for the philosophical content of his work was hardly read between the tenth and fourteenth century, and although he was rediscovered, copied, read and quoted during the fifteenth century, a closer study of his work had to wait for the sixteenth. Martianus Capella, to judge from the commentaries, reached his greatest popularity during the Carolingian period, but remained in use during the following centuries down to the sixteenth, and the same may be said of ps. Theodolus whose work was actually composed during the ninth or tenth century.

These facts, based on solid bibliographical evidence, that is, on the testimony of extant manuscripts and editions as far as they could be located, are not likely to undergo major revisions, through the discovery of further manuscripts or editions, or of testimonies concerning lost translations or commentaries. The existence of translations and commentaries, of course, is not the only basis for judging the diffusion of an ancient author. Greek texts were read by some Western scholars in the original and without the help of translations, although such scholars were rare even in the sixteenth century, let alone before. Latin authors were read and even copied without being commented upon, especially when they were not treated as texts in school or university instruction. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to assume that the statistics of translations and commentaries, as established by our investigations, reflect adequately the relative popularity of an ancient author at a given time. Thus we hope that in the future, as a result of our research, certain sweeping judgments about the availability and popularity of ancient authors during the Middle Ages and Renaissance that many historians both of the Middle Ages and of the Renaissance have made will have become more difficult to sustain, and will have to be abandoned or modified on the basis of the hard facts assembled in these volumes. It will no longer be possible to assert that the Middle Ages were ignorant of ancient literature, philosophy or science, or that Renaissance humanism

## PREFACE

made no contribution to the knowledge of ancient science or of patristic literature. On the contrary, the great contribution to these fields made by the translators and commentators of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries may very well be the most important single result of our labors, and it may in turn lead to further studies, made possible by our findings, of the impact the newly translated Greek works had on the literature, philosophy, science and theology of the fifteenth and especially of the sixteenth century.

Concerning the geographical and national distribution of the translators and commentators, our findings tend to confirm the well known facts about the history of classical scholarship during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. During the Middle Ages, most of the contributions seem to come from Irish, French, English and German scholars, and from Italian scholars active in France and in Spain (there happen to be no Sicilian translations among those described in this volume). In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, most of the scholarly work was done in Italy, in France, in the Low Countries and in the German speaking lands, but scattered contributions were also made by Spaniards, Englishmen, Bohemians, Hungarians and Poles.

To those who have occasion to use this volume, as well as the first, it will no doubt become apparent that we have not merely compiled data readily available in other reference works, but have tried to assemble our information, through extensive and often laborious research, from many sources, — often rare and difficult of access. We have drawn on works of recent scholarship in a variety of fields, for this is an enterprise in which scholars from different disciplines cooperate, and many of our results could be obtained only through the combination of work done in more than one field. We have also drawn on many works of older erudition since it is a fact, although not widely acknowledged, that they contain much relevant information that has not found its way into more recent works. Above all, we have tried as much as possible to go back to the manuscripts and early editions which contain the texts in which we are interested. The difficulties involved in locating manuscripts and early editions, and in using them or in obtaining microfilms of them, are known to every scholar who has done research of this kind. In several instances, the very existence of a translation or commentary depends on a single manuscript, or on a single copy of a printed edition. An anonymous fifteenth-century translation of Stephanus Byzantius was transmitted only in a manuscript of the Trivulziana in Milan that was lost during World War II. And a printed translation of an oration of Gregory Nazianzen by no less a scholar than Melancthon now survives in a single copy in Zwickau since two other copies, once extant in the Munich library and still used by O. Clemen for a critical edition of the preface, were also destroyed during the last war. Such cases are ominous, and they create the uncomfortable feeling that our task is not only desirable because it fills a scholarly desideratum, but also urgent because it points up the significance of certain library holdings and may even contribute to their preservation through greater physical protection and through microfilming.

I should like to conclude with the pleasant task of thanking all those who in different ways have made this volume possible. First of all, I wish to thank the scholars who prepared the articles for this volume for the patience with which they carried out their laborious and often thankless task, and with which they responded to our editorial comments (this applies also to several scholars who spent much time in preparing articles for our project, but did not complete them in time for inclusion in this volume, such as Mr. Thomas G. Schwartz who worked extensively on the Latin grammarians); and my fellow members of the editorial board, especially the section editors and the members of the Executive Committee, and above all F. Edward Cranz, and Bernard M. Peebles, who all spent a considerable amount of time on the editorial reading of the articles submitted, and on other problems connected with the organization of our project. We are greatly indebted to the scholarly bodies that have given their approval to our project: the Mediaeval Academy of America, the Modern Language Association of America, the British Academy, the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, the Académie des Inscrip-

## PREFACE

tions et Belles-Lettres, the American Philological Association, the Renaissance Society of America, and the Unione Accademica Nazionale ; to the Union Académique Internationale which has adopted our work as one of their official enterprises, has received and published our reports, and permitted us to publish our volumes under their auspices ; and the American Council of Learned Societies which has not only adopted us, but also has represented us before the Union Académique Internationale and has paid for most of our current expenses through repeated grants. I am personally indebted to Columbia University through many years, and to the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, during the current year, for their institutional support of my own work on this project, and for a good deal of clerical help and expenses. We are all also deeply obliged to many libraries that have made their material available to us for inspection on the spot, or for use elsewhere through interlibrary loans, microfilms or photos, and that have supplied us with detailed information on their holdings or on bibliographical data. I should like to mention especially Harvard University Library (Mr. W. H. Bond), Yale University Library, Columbia University Library, Princeton University Library, the Huntington Library, the British Museum (Mr. Dennis E. RHODES), the Bibliothèque Nationale (M<sup>me</sup> Anne BASANOFF, M<sup>me</sup> Raymond BLOCH, M<sup>lle</sup> Jacqueline SCLAFER), the Vatican Library (Mons. José RUYSSCHAERT, Dott. Rino AVESANI), the Biblioteca Estense (Dott. Pietro PULIATTI), the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in East Berlin (Herr GITTIG), the Universitaetsbibliothek in Rostock (Herr EBERLEIN), the Herzog-August-Bibliothek in Wolfenbuettel (Dr. H. BUTZMANN), the Staatsbibliothek in West Berlin (Dr. Helmut BOESE) and many others that will be cited in the individual articles. We are also much indebted to individual scholars who have sent us valuable information, especially to Professors William M. CALDER III (Columbia University), J. P. ELDER (Harvard University), F. GILBERT (Institute for Advanced Study), Morton Y. JACOBS (Lewis and Clark College, who supplied information on ps. Theodolus), W. KRENKEL (Rostock), Claudio LEONARDI (Vatican Library, who contributed information on Martianus Capella), O. Neugebauer (Brown University and Institute for Advanced Study), the late William STAHL (Brooklyn College, who contributed information on the same author), I. TRENSCENYI-WALDAPFEL (Budapest), G. VERBEKE (Leuven), Lidia WINNICZUK (Warsaw) and Jerzy ZATHEY (Cracow). The help received from so many different institutions and countries reflects, we hope, the truly international spirit in which this project has been conceived and pursued.

Columbia University and Institute for Advanced Study

February, 1969

For the Executive Committee  
Paul Oskar KRISTELLER