

PREFACE

The editors are pleased to be able to present the third volume of the *Catalogus* only five years after the publication of the second. Credit must go to the individual contributors who successfully completed difficult assignments, to the Editorial Board and in particular to the Section Editors who read and commented upon the articles submitted, and above all to the 'founding fathers' who labored so diligently during the early years of the Project in sowing the seed for the harvest we are now reaping.

For the general plan of the work, readers are referred to the Preface to v. I. In the reviews of v. II questions were raised about certain specific features of the plan, and it may be useful to respond to some of these here.

One group of questions concerned the chronological limits of the Project. While the primary aim of the *Catalogus* is to treat translations and commentaries of authors who lived before 600 A.D., it also includes later works, when these were believed to be 'ancient' during the Middle Ages or the Renaissance, as in the case of ps. Theodolus in v. II. Further, some exceptions may be made for Byzantine authors who were of particular importance for the history of classical learning.

As far as the Latin translations are concerned, we plan to cover Latin translations made before 600 A.D., such as Rufinus' translation of Gregorius Nazianzenus in v. II and the translations of Dionysius Periegetes by Priscian and Avienus in the present volume. We also wish at least to mention any lost ancient translations of Greek authors into Latin; we have incorporated into the Addenda on Aeschylus the translations of Ennius and of Accius which were called to our attention by F. Lasserre in his review in *Erasmus* XXIV (1972) 42-43.

At the other end of the time scale, the *Catalogus* includes all Latin translations and commentaries written before 1600 A.D. It remains an option of the individual contributor to include some slightly later works. Such inclusion is particularly justifiable when the author belonged to that remarkable generation of scholars centered in the Low Lands whose work began in the later sixteenth century but often did not reach its culmination until the early years of the seventeenth.

Another question concerned the inclusion of Olympiodorus in the *Catalogus*; the reviewer believed that Aristotle commentaries were excluded. Two points should be made in reply. In the first place, the original exclusion applied only to Latin commentaries on Aristotle. The Greek commentators will be treated like other authors, as in the cases of Alexander Aphrodisiensis in v. I and Olympiodorus in v. II. Secondly, we are glad to report that while the Latin commentaries of Aristotle were at one time excluded, largely for practical reasons, the *Catalogus* now has plans to publish a volume or volumes devoted entirely to the Latin translations of and commentaries on Aristotle. The general responsibility for the work was accepted by Charles H. Lohr, of the Raimundus-Lullus Institut in Freiburg, and Charles B. Schmitt, of the Warburg Institute is now associated with him, specifically for the translations (for a fuller description of the volume, see the remarks of Lohr in *Traditio* XXIX [1973] 94).

Finally, there is the perennial question of where to draw the line between commentaries and glosses. We believe that a commentary should have two essential marks. It should be continuous and extend over the whole work; it should have been planned as a unity and not have simply grown through the accretion of glosses. In many ways, this view corresponds with what H. Silvestre has called a 'haut-commentaire' as against a 'bas-commentaire' (see his review of v. I in the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* LXV [1961] 482). But no abstract definition can

PREFACE

tell us exactly where to make the break in the unbroken continuum which extends from isolated interlinear and marginal glosses right through to the commentary as an independent work, separated from the text. In order to be able to deal adequately with the commentaries treated, the general policy of the Executive Committee has been to recommend the exclusion of borderline cases, though exceptions may be made where factors such as date or authorship lend them special interest, or where the evidence on an author is so limited that it seems advisable to include all of it.

The choice of the articles for the present volume does not reflect any systematic plan. As in the past, we have published those which were available when enough material had been accumulated to constitute a volume. In the first two volumes, the Greek authors outnumbered the Latin; here the Latin authors are more numerous, so a kind of rough balance has been achieved.

The Greek authors included illustrate how varied the *fortunae* of ancient authors are. Arrian and the *Musici graeci*, though read and studied in Byzantium, were virtually unknown in the Latin Middle Ages and became available to the West only in the Renaissance; the *Musici graeci*, however, also had an active *fortuna* in Arabic and Jewish scholarship. Of the two works of Priscianus Lydus, the *Metaphrasis* reached the West only with the translation of Ficino. By contrast, the *Solutiones* were translated into Latin in the late ancient period; the Greek text is lost and does not appear to have been known to the Byzantines. The small treatise by ps. Thessalus on astrological botany had an interesting, if narrow, tradition in the Byzantine world, in the Latin Middle Ages, and in the Renaissance. Finally, Dionysius Periegetes was early translated, or paraphrased, into Latin by both Priscian and Avienus, and he was studied throughout the Middle Ages both in Byzantium, as evidenced by the commentary of Eustathius, and in the West. In the Renaissance one may almost speak of three traditions, the two adaptations of Priscian and of Avienus, and the new translations and commentaries relying directly on the Greek. Dionysius continued as a very popular textbook on geography well into modern times, and the Greek text was still being 'revised' in the seventeenth century in order to include more up-to-date information on China and America.

Among the Latin authors, Caesar makes an interesting companion piece to Livy, treated in v. II. Columella and Palladius are the first of the *Scriptores rei rusticae* to appear in *Catalogus*. The technical treatise of Vitruvius, *De architectura* was little studied during the Middle Ages or the early Renaissance, and the first Latin commentary did not appear until almost the middle of the sixteenth century. In contrast to the usual development for literary or philosophical works, an Italian commentary on the *De architectura* was earlier than any Latin one, and even in the late sixteenth century the vernacular tradition of Vitruvian scholarship is dominant. The remainder of the articles on Latin authors are devoted to important literary figures: Persius, Petronius, Silius Italicus, and Claudian.

Out of the large amount of material presented in the first three volumes of the *Catalogus*, the long articles on Persius and Juvenal (v. I, 175-238, with the Addenda in v. II, 425-6 and below p. 432-45) may serve to illustrate something of what has already been accomplished and of what may be expected in future volumes. The *fortunae* of Persius and Juvenal were closely connected; their writings are frequently found together not only in manuscripts but also in printed editions. Persius and Juvenal became school authors early in the Middle Ages and held that position well into modern times; whenever there was any scholarship at all, men read and studied both authors. Hence a mass of commentary is available; in the case of Persius, for example, even if we count the vulgate tradition as only a single commentary, there are over sixty separate commentaries still extant from the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Doubtless, new commentaries on Persius will continue to be discovered, as they have been for Juvenal since the *Catalogus* article on him was published in 1960; it seems unlikely that any such discoveries will fundamentally change the outlines of the story that has already emerged.

Thus the detailed information in the *Catalogus* articles enables us to establish the broad outlines of the history of Persius and Juvenal scholarship through 1600, a history which is

PREFACE

quite independent of large speculations about the Middle Ages or the Renaissance. The medieval origins of such scholarship in the West lie in the Carolingian period. By and large, the work then accomplished falls under the familiar rubric of *Renovatio*; what ancient material survived was sifted and consolidated to become the starting point for later developments. With the general renewal in the eleventh century, a slightly more independent approach emerges, and the scattered commentaries of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries reflect something of the intellectual innovations of those ages. A kind of lull follows and when it ends, Persius and Juvenal scholarship has been reoriented. A new kind of commentary begins to appear in the fourteenth century and comes to flower in the numerous commentaries of fifteenth-century Italian humanism and of the few non-Italian participants in the movement. Again a kind of lull follows, from the beginning of the Reformation to about 1565; publication of text editions and reprints of the old commentaries continue at a slackened pace, but there are almost no new commentaries. Then in the second half of the sixteenth century we see another flowering of Persius and Juvenal scholarship, with a new scene and another reorientation of method. The leadership has shifted to the North, with the unquestioned center of scholarship in the Low Countries. The method of the commentaries is now that of the early modern science of philology in contrast to the broader posture of the humanists. And while the later story lies beyond the limits of the *Catalogus*, it seems that this flowering ends early in the seventeenth century, to be followed by another comparative lull. After about 1615, we find numerous reprints and also the great Variorum editions of the middle of the century; there were almost no new commentaries until near the end of the century.

Where the *Catalogus* has thus outlined the history of the reading and interpretation of Persius, Juvenal, and many other authors, we hope that scholars will go on to trace these histories in greater detail and to relate them to the larger history of which they are a part. Further, and perhaps even more important, the data provided by the *Catalogus* open the way to further studies of what these authors meant, of where their actuality lay, during the various earlier ages which read and thought about them so seriously.

The history of classical scholarship has sometimes been dominated by unfortunately narrow perspectives. One assumed that there was a single true interpretation of an ancient text, usually that coming out of nineteenth-century philology, and no other reading merited attention. Thus when the great Otto Jahn in 1843 edited the medieval vulgate commentary on Persius, it was not for its own sake but primarily to make available the ancient material, textual or explanatory, which might be useful for a modern philologist. Similarly when F. Buecheler, in 1886 and 1893, and F. Leo, in 1910, reprinted portions of the commentary to accompany their text editions, they endeavored to include whatever reflected ancient learning (*quidquid inest eruditionis antiquae*) and felt free to omit the rest (for Buecheler's programmatic statement of his principles, see below p. 236). Sometimes modern scholars sound almost like Voltaire. They study the Middle Ages only in order to avoid its errors; they are interested only in those points of medieval and Renaissance scholarship which approach the conclusions of modern philology, as if this were the predestined end toward which all things moved.

But the position of the *Catalogus* is a broader one. In the words of Professor Kristeller in the Preface to v. I: ". . . we do not merely wish to find in the past the antecedents of our own interests but also to know and to understand the past in its own interests when they were different from ours" (p. ix). The commentaries on Persius and Juvenal, to remain with the same illustrations, show us that these authors were read during earlier ages with an intensity surely no less than ours. Yet from the articles on them, it must also be abundantly clear that the perspective, the focus, the mode of reception, or whatever phrase we choose to use, were very different. Our own age, more and more aware of the time-bound limitations of its own understanding of the past, should also be more open towards the different ways in which the classic past was received by earlier ages of the West. And if this is so, what K. Krautter says in his review of the first two volumes takes on added significance: "Besonders angesprochen

PREFACE

müssten sich die rezeptionsgeschichtlich orientierten Literaturwissenschaftler fühlen" (*Gnomon* XLV [1973] 195).

To bring out in any sort of detail the richness and vitality of these other perspectives and other modes of reception far exceeds the possibilities of a *Catalogus* article. But a main aim of the *Catalogus* is to make accessible and to organize the evidence from which such studies could start. We look forward to them as one of the many ends toward which the *Catalogus* may serve as means.

In conclusion, it is a pleasure to thank those who have helped to make this volume possible. The first place belongs of right to Professor Kristeller, who served as a guiding spirit of the Project from the beginning, who was Editor-in-Chief of the first two volumes, and who as Associate Editor has continued to make available to the *Catalogus* his unique knowledge and abilities. I would also extend special thanks to Leicester Bradner as Chairman of the Executive Committee for his guidance and support, and to Bernard M. Peebles, both for his work on the Committee and for acting as our liaison with the Catholic University of America Press. The Section Editors have had their usual important role, and for this volume we are particularly grateful to Professors R. P. Oliver and James Hutton, who have cheerfully borne exceptionally heavy loads.

We are grateful for the continuing support of the Union Académique Internationale, under whose auspices the *Catalogus* is published, and to the American Council of Learned Societies for a series of grants which have covered the running expenses of the Project. We have also been helped by the sponsorship of a number of learned societies; the American Philological Association, the Mediaeval Academy of America, the Modern Language Association, and the Renaissance Society of America have been of special assistance in the recruitment of new contributors. Finally we are indebted to the Catholic University of America Press for publishing this volume, like Volume II, without a subsidy.

The *Catalogus* could not continue without the generous help provided by libraries all over the world. We have profited from the existence of many old and new collections of manuscripts and of printed books. To mention two only, the present volume would have been far more difficult, if not impossible, without the Juvenal and Persius collection built up at Yale by Thomas E. Marston and without the remarkable Persius collection of Morris H. Morgan at Harvard.

We thank many, many librarians for their courtesy and helpfulness in providing books, in supplying microfilms and xeroxes of books and of manuscripts, and in answering questions about their holdings. Special thanks are owed to Cora E. Lutz of the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale, to R. G. Dennis of the Houghton Library at Harvard, to P. P. J. Obbema of the Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit at Leiden, and Helen K. Aitner of the Palmer Library at Connecticut College. Further instances of help are acknowledged in the individual articles.

Personally, I am indebted to Connecticut College for help over the years and for a sabbatical leave during 1937-74 as well as to the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation for a Fellowship during the same year.

Connecticut College
July, 1974

For the Executive Committee
F. Edward CRANZ