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Appendix I. The Renaissance Vitae of Silius unaccompanied by commentary.

1. Sicco Polentonus.
2. Anonymus.
5. Raphael Volaterranus.
6. Ambrosius Nicander.
7. Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus.

Appendix II: The Manuscripts of the Punica.

I. Punica.

Commentaries.

1. Anonymus A.
2. Anonymus B.
3. Anonymus C.
4. Anonymus D.
5. Petrus Odus Montopolitanus.
6. Iulius Pomponius Laetus.
7. Domitius Calderinus.
9. Hermannus Buschius.
11. Daniel Helnsius.
12. Doubtful commentaries.
   a. Bartholomaeus Fontius.
   b. Antonius Volscus.
   c. Galeatius Ponticus Faccinus.
   d. Cynthiaus Cenetensis.

Spurious Works.

II. Ilias Latina.
It is doubtful that Silius Italicus wrote the *Ilias Latina* (see below, p. 398). That he is the author of a poem on the Second Punic War is clear from Martial IV 14. 2-5. This epic in 17 books, the longest Latin poem, is most often called *Punicum* in the Ms. (all of the 15th century or later) but occasionally *De Secundo Bello Punico* or something similar. The Ms. regularly give the poet’s name as Silius Italicus (with spelling variations); only the Cesena Ms. (Mal. S. XII, 3) has for his praenomen Publius. The name appears as Silius Italicus in Pliny *Ep.* III 7, our main source for his life, and in *Tacitus Hist.* III 65. 2. Martial, whose frequent mention of him provides more details about his life, calls him Silius or Italicus. A fuller form of the name, Ti. Catius Silius Italicus, is found in the Fasti sodalium Augustalium Claudialium (CIL VI 1984, 9 = ILS 5025; cf. also 9059 Ti. Catius). An inscription from Aphrodisias yields the five names Ti. Catius Asconius Silius Italicus.1


Pliny notes in the letter cited above that he has just (*modo*) heard of the death of Silius. This probably occurred A.D. 101 or 102; so Silius would have been born A.D. 25 or 26 since he died in his 76th year (cf. Pliny’s *annum quintum et septuagesimum excessit*). His birthplace is uncertain. Several of his Renaissance biographers say that it was Italicum in Spain (though some state that his forebears came from there but that he was born in Rome). But the ethnic from the Spanish *Italia* would be *Italicensis*, as it would be from *Italia* or *Italicum*, the name given by the Italians to Corfinium in the Social War (some have argued for this town as Silius’ birthplace). Furthermore, if Silius had been from Spain, we would have expected Martial to refer to him as a fellow-countryman. Maybe Silius was from Patavium or some other Cisalpine place. The description of Pedanius, both warrior and poet, from Patavium and of his exploit in *Punicum* 212 ff. was probably intended to evoke Q. Asconius Pedanius. Silius may have been related to Asconius, and Asconius was a common name around Patavium. But if Silius was from the Cisalpine area, it is curious that Pliny does not say this in *Ep.* III 7 (to Caninius Rufus, an ‘equestrian dilettante from Comum’ — Sherwin-White).2

In any case, Silius spent much of his time in Rome. He was an orator and practiced in the centumviral court. He was the last consul appointed by Nero (in 68). He had damaged his reputation under that emperor, says Pliny, since he was believed to have been an informer; but in his friendship with Vitellius, while being obliging, he had

---


behaved in a wise way. Cluvius Rufus and Silius were the two witnesses of the negotiations between Vitellius and Sabinus, Vespasian's brother, in 69; cf. Tacitus Hist. III 65. 2. Silius had won renown as proconsul of Asia [in c. 77], Pliny continues, and wiped out the stain of his earlier activity (industriae, presumably his delation) through the praiseworthy way in which he spent his retirement. People came to pay him their respects; when not writing, he had learned conversations with his many visitors and sometimes recited from his work in progress to get their reaction. In his later years (Novissime ita suadentibus annis — Pliny) he withdrew to Naples and was not induced to return to Rome even by the accession of the new emperor (doubtless Trajan). He had several villas in Campania, all stocked with books, statues, and pictures. He seems to have owned the property on which Virgil's tomb was, and he treated the tomb as a shrine and kept Virgil's birthday more scrupulously than his own; he also possessed an estate of Cicero's, maybe his Cumanum. 3

Pliny (loc. cit.) notes that Silius ended his life through starvation on his Neapolitan estate because of an incurable claues. 4 He was fortunate and happy until his last day except that he had lost the younger of his two sons (the older, an ex-consul, survived him). Silius' suicide is one of the testimonia external to the Punic a for his Stoicism (for objection to this see Bolaffi, loc. cit.); another is his connection with Cornutus and Epictetus (but the name cited in these instances is only Italicus). 5

It must have been after A.D. 68 when Silius began writing the Punic a; cf. Martial VII 63. 9-12: Postquam bis senis ingentem fascibus annum / Rexerat adserito qui sacer orbe fuit, / Emeritos Musis et Phoebi tradidit annos, / Proque suo celebrat nunc Helicona foro. Maybe he did not start it until after his proconsulate. In any case, Martial IV (published in December 88 according to L. Friedlaender in his edition of Martial (Leipzig 1886; reprinted Amsterdam 1967)) 14 implies that Silius was busy with his Punic a; and Martial VII (published in December 92 according to Friedlaender) 63, beginning: Perpetui numquam moritura volumina Sili / qui legis, et Latia carmina digna toga, that it had come out, at least partially. The encomium of the Flavians, and of Domitian in particular, in Punic a III 594-629 seems to have been written about 84. 6

Pliny's verdict (Ep. III 7. 5) on Silius is well known: Scribebat carmina maio re cura quam ingenio. But Martial, a client of Silius, is glowing in his praise: for instance, he calls both the poet and his work immortal (Epigr. VI 64. 10, VII 63. 1) and the poet not inferior to Virgil (Epigr. XI 49. 4). There are also phraseological parallels between Martial and Silius (though not particularly in epigrams where Martial mentions Silius), maybe most of them imitations by Martial of Silian passages that were published or that he had heard at recitations. 7

Silius is never mentioned by Statius in his Silvae, the likely place for such a reference (we would hardly expect it in the Thebaid or the Achilleid), but there are many parallels between the Punic a and Statius' works. It is difficult, however, to decide who is imitating whom because of the uncertain 8

4. A neoplasm or tumor according to E. Bolaffi, 'Appunti di storia della medicina', Giornale italiano di filologia XIII (1960) 156-161 at 160-161.
6. On the whole problem see E. Wistrand, Die Chronologie der Punic a des Silius Italicus (Göteborg 1956).
7. See the 'Reminiszenzen und Ankänge' compiled by E. Wagner in Friedlaender's Martial and, for a literary analysis of correspondences in the two poets, A. Zingerle, Zu spätern lateinischen Dichtern, II (Innsbruck 1879) 12-40 (II: 'Zu Lucan, Silius, Martial').
relative chronology. There are a few slight echoes of the \textit{Punica} in Juvenal, though he never refers specifically to Silius as he does to other epic poets (e.g., Statius in VII 83).\footnote{See F. Vollmer's edition of the \textit{Silvae} (Leipzig 1898); L. Legras, \textquote{Les Puniques et la Thébaïde}, \textit{Revue des études anciennes} VII (1905) 131-146, 357-371 (who argues that \textit{Punica} I-XII are contemporary with the \textit{Thebaid} or even antedate it a little, and that the \textit{Punica} was finished at 96 in the latest, that Statius seems to have imitated Silius more than \textit{vice versa}, but that, in sum, these two contemporary epics did not influence each other a great deal); P. Venini, \textquote{Studi sulla Tebaide di Stazio. L'imitazione}, \textit{Istituto Lombardo, Rendiconti, Classe di Lettere e Scienze Morali e Storiche} XCV (1961) 371-400 at 372-373, n. 1; Bassett, \textit{op. cit.}, 268-270 with n. 38. For instances of parallels see Vollmer, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. x-xiv (in Add. et Corr.), \textquote{Auctores Imitatores} under text, Comm. \textit{passim}, and p. 595; G. B. A. Fletcher, \textquote{Imitationes vel loci similes in poetis latinis}, \textit{Mnemosyne}, tertia series, I (1933/34) 192-213 at 194; O. A. W. Dilke's edition of Statius \textit{Achillid} (Cambridge 1954) 114, 122; Bassett, \textquote{Regulus et the Serpent in the Punica}, \textit{Classical Philology} L (1955) 1-20, \textit{passim}; Silius \textit{Punica} 6. 1-53, \textit{ibid.} LIV (1959) 10-34, \textit{passim}; \textquote{Scipio and the Ghost of Apollus}, \textit{ibid.} LVIII (1963) 73-92, \textit{passim}; L. Håkanson, \textit{Statius' Silvae}: \textquote{Critical and Exegetical Remarks with Some Notes on the Thebaid} (Lund 1969) 47, n. 61.}

After the younger Pliny and Martial refer to Silius by name, he is not mentioned again in Latin literature until the fifth century. Then Sidonius, in a list of names and authors that he says that his friend Felix must not expect to find in his (Sidonius') \textit{nuae}, writes: Non Gaetulicus hic tibi legetur, / Non Marsus, Pedo, Silius, Tibullus, / Non quod Sulpicia locus Thaliae / scriptis blandiloquum suo Caleno / . . . (IX 259ff.). There seem also to be several imitations of Silius by Sidonius in his writings.\footnote{See the \textquote{Loci similes auctorum Sidonio anteriorem'} in C. Luetjohann's edition of Sidonius, \textit{Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auct. ant. VIII} (Berlin 1887; reprinted \textit{ibid.} 1961) 353-416 at 384-416 (for Sidonius' carmina). For instance, Sidonius' caput aurea rumpunt cornua (Carm. XXII 26-27) echoes Silius XIII 332: \textquote{ac parva erumpunt rubicunda cornua fronte.}}

But before giving some references for Silian imitations in those centuries we should note that there are many names from Silius in Vibius Sequester's \textit{De fluminibus, fontibus, lacubus, nemoribus, paludibus, montibus, gentibus per litteram} (of the fourth or fifth century). They all come from \textit{Punica} XIV. Whether Vibius knew only that book of Silius' poem (perhaps through an anthology) or more is uncertain. Nor is there certainty about whether a commentary on the \textit{Punica} was available to Vibius in the composition of his geographical handbook.\footnote{11. A. Päschel in his thesis \textit{De Vibii Sequestris libelli geographiche fontibus et compositione} (Halle 1907) 34-37 does not accept the theory of a commentary but considers it very likely that Vibius used a geographical lexicon or glossary to explain the names not intelligible from Silius' text itself. M. Kiessling, on the other hand, in his review of Päschel, \textit{Berliner philologische Wochenschrift} XXX (1910) 1469-1476, argues for the existence of ancient Silian scholia. Klotz considers the idea uncertain; cf. Pauly-Wissowa 2. R. III (1927) 91. See also the summing up of the question by W. Strzelecki \textit{ibid.} VIII (1958) 2457-2462 at 2460-2461 and the editions of Vibius by A. Marsili (Pisa 1960; \textquote{Scientia Veterum'} 9) 17-18, P. G. Parroni (Milan-Varese 1965) 10-14, and R. Gelosmino (Leipzig 1967) xlvii.}
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9. L. Friedlaender in his edition of Juvenal (Leipzig 1895; reprinted Darmstadt 1967) cites parallels with Silius only twice (ad I 169, VI 238) (pp. 162, 310). More are given by C. Weyman in his review of Friedlaender, \textit{Blätter für das Gymnasial-Schulwesen} XXXIII (1897) 270-277: \textquote{ad Juv. III 280, XIII 16, XIV 97, 222 (pp. 272, 276, 277).}
Among the imitators of Silius in the fourth century are Juvenecus, Ausonius, Symmachus, and Ammianus Marcellinus. Late in the fourth century and early in the fifth we find echoes of Silius in Claudian, in the

12. Our list of authors from the fourth to the sixth century is selective. The modern literature cited includes references to loci similis, which may sometimes be accidental or incidental (e.g., if Claudian echoes Virgil and Silius follows the same Virgilian passage) as well as to more definite borrowings.

13. See J. T. Hatfield, A Study of Juvenecus (Bonn 1890) 47; H. H. Kieviit, Ad Iuveneci Evangeliorum librum primum commentarius exgeticus (Groningen 1940) passim; J. de Wit, Ad Iuveneci Evangeliorum librum secundum commentarius exgeticus (ibid. 1947) passim.


16. See H. Hagendahl, Studia Ammianea (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1921, Filosofi... 3) 141 (Index) and E. L. B. Murig Davies, ‘Notes on Ammianus Marcellinus’, Classical Quarterly XLII (1948) 113.

17. See the fonts given beneath the text in T. Birt’s edition, Claudii Claudiani carmina, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auct. Ant. X (Berlin 1892; reprinted ibid. 1961). See also A. Cameron, Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius (Oxford 1970) 506 (Index s.v. Silius) and Heplateuchos of Cyprian (Cyprianus Gallus), in Rutilii Namatanianus, Claudius Marius Victorius (or Victor or Victorinus?), and Orientius. In Dracoultius (late fifth century) there may be some imitation of the Punica. In the sixth century the verse


18. See the parallels cited in R. Peiper’s edition of the Heplateuchos (CSEL XXIII (1891) 275-299 (Auctores imitatores) at 275, 279, 280, 291, 293, and the additional one given in the review (by Wölfelin) of Peiper, Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie VII (1892) 619-620 at 620: Leoticus 140: at cum triticeas tondet iam messor aristas; Sil. VIII 61: Atque ea, dum flavas bis tondet messor aristas.

19. See the Index locorum in E. Castorina’s edition of Rutilius (Florence 1967).

20. See the Auctores et imitatores (under the text) and the Index scripatorum gentilium, p. 281 of P. F. Hovingh’s edition of the Aletheia (with J. Martin’s Commodianus in Corpus Christianorum, Ser. Lat., CXXXVIII, Turnhout 1960).


22. See B. Barwinskis, Quaestiones ad Dracoultium et Orestis tragodiae pertinentes. Qvaestio I: De genere dicendi (Göttingen 1887) 17, 101, 102.
of Arator and Corippus shows indebtedness to Silius.

There seem to be some echoes of Silius in the *Anthologia Latina* and in the *Carmina Latina epigraphica*.


24. See R. Amann, *De Corippo priorum poeta- rum Latinorum imitatore* (Oldenburg 1885) 29-30. Amann declares (p. 29) that Corippus owes less to the Flavian epic poets than one might expect (quam quis putaverit) but gives (p. 30) several parallels between Corippus and Silius. Note from these especially *Ioh. VI* 447-451: proelia posce... Inquirens; Sil. I 483-485: proelia posce [correct to positc]. . . inquire (the parallelism goes beyond that with Verg. *Aen.* X 661: in proelia positc) and the number of similarities collected from *Ioh.* I 357-406 and Sil. IV 34-56. Add to Amann’s parallels one noted by J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear in their edition of the *Iohannis* (Cambridge 1970) 93 (ad V 28) and the following, kindly pointed out to us by U. J. Stache: *Iust.* I 199: exactam nocem primi sensere volucres; Sil. XIV 594: vim primi sensere canes.


There are no extant medieval commentaries on the *Punica*, and traces of MSS. of the poem in the Middle Ages are slight. The 32 with which we are familiar are all of the Renaissance; see below, p. 364 (Appendix II of Fortuna). The codex which L. Carrion and F. Modius saw and collated in the Cologne cathedral library in the 16th century and which the former assigned to the time of Charlemagne is now lost.

To our knowledge Silius is represented in only one fragment of a medieval library-catalogue, of the 10th century. The pertinent entry is *Item Ovidii metamorfo- seon; Sili et Staci volumen I*. The catalogue fragment forms part of Ms. Donaueschingen 191. Unfortunately, the name of the library whose holdings are listed is not stated in the fragment and has been much debated. Von Lassberg quotes I. von Arn for the theory that the library was St. Gall but is inclined himself to favor Constance. But Lehmann (p. 262) presents strong arguments for Reichenau.


28. Cf. also Manilius, *Handschriften antiker Autoren in mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen* (Leipzig 1935) 125 and J. Autenrieth, *Die Dom- schule von Konstanz...* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geleitgeschichte N.F. III, Stuttgart 1956) 18-20. For various problems connected with the entry (e.g., whether Ovidii metamorfoseon is a mistake for Manilius, connections between this Ms. and Madrid Ms. M 31 (now 3678) and X 81 (now 8514)), see P. Thielischer in *Philologiae LXVI* (1907) 85-134, LXXXII (1927) 167-180, *Hermes* LXXXIV (1956)
SILIIUS ITALICUS

Two indications of familiarity with Silius in the Middle Ages are the following: 1. In the miscellaneous Ms. Bern. 363, s. IX, there is written over the beginning of Chirius Fortunatinus’ Ars rhetorica, in the same hand as the text: Silius Italicus XV liber de bello Punicis; Fortunatinus is referring to deliberations of the Roman senators early in Punica XV as an example of the first circumstantia. 2. In a Bede Ms. of the 9th century in Stuttgart, HB VII 38 (Weing. B53), the Silian verse: Ipsa quidem virtus sibimet pulcherrima merces (XIII 663) and other material have been copied in by a hand of the 11th century; the copist has been identified as a priest named Wolderaod.

In addition to these items concerning Silius in the Middle Ages there may be imitations of passages of the Punica in various authors of the ninth to the twelfth centuries. There may be a few such imitations in the Waltharius and in the Novem Vitae Sanctorum metricae. .. Ex codicibus...


29. Throughout our article we give the material from the Ms. and quote from early printed editions in a standard modern orthography and punctuation and expand abbreviations; hence here liber instead of lib. We do, however, retain any spelling that seems particularly important or interesting as, e.g., silus for Silius.

30. Throughout this paper the line-references to the Punica follow L. Bauer’s ed. (2 vols.; Leipzig 1890-92).

31. Cf. J. Delz, Die Überlieferung des Siliius Italicius; Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philologie im 15. Jahrhundert (Basel Habilitationsschrift 1966; to appear later in print) 7 and n. 4; this work will be referred to hereafter as Delz I.

32. See in W. Burchard, ‘Ergebnisse der Waltharius-Forschung seit 1951’, Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters XXIV (1968) 16-45 at 25 a parallel between the two works noted by Schumann and another by Wallach.

33. See W. Harster’s edition of these texts (Leipzig 1887) 182 (in Index Scriptorum Laudatorium). Note from the four parallels aded by Harster the following: VI (Vita S. Cassiani) 115: Blasphemus tenbres postquam properavit Avernas, and Silius XV 76: degeneres tenebris animas damnavit Avernis; VII (Passio S. Arnulfii) 330: Qualis ubi pluviae per caeca silentia noctis, and Silius VII 350-351: Navus abire timor, dumae aeca silentia dunque maiores umbrae. O. Occioni, Scritti di letteratura latina (Turin etc. 1891) 185-186 questions the Silian imitation in all four of Harster’s passages.

34. See W. Harster’s edition of the Vita (Munich 1878) 22, where he corrects the suggestion of Silius made in his study Walther von Speyer, ein Dichter des X. Jahrhunderts (Speyer 1877) 20. See also P. Vossen, Der Libellus Scolasticus des Walther von Speyer: Ein Schulbericht aus dem Jahre 984 (Berlin 1962) 39 (text of vs. 100 with Sursulus), 89 (n. ad loc.: Sursulus = Statius). The long account of the fate of Regulus (vss. 21-68 of Profeatio ad invitandum lectorem idonea of the Vita Christophori) just possibly reflects Walther’s familiarity with Silius, but it is a vague recollection of the Regulus episode with a confusion of Carthaginians with Parthians. This confusion is probably due to Horace Odes III 5, where the exemplum of Regulus is opposed to that of Crassus. See Harster’s study (1877) 20 and cf. his edition (1878) 8. For opposition to Harster’s view see Manitius, Geschichte II 504; Occioni, op. cit. 186-188.

35. See Manitius, Geschichte III 844 n. 6.

36. K. Rossberg in his edition of Thlofrid’s Vita Willibrordi Metrica (Leipzig 1883), after citing many Latin authors known to Thlofrid, says (p. xvii): ‘Allorum etiam scriptorvm ut Cieronis, Silii Italici, Ausonii, loci interdum animo eius obversati esse videntur’. Rossberg has confronted six
Châtillon,\textsuperscript{37} and in the \textit{Bucolica} of Marcus Valerius.\textsuperscript{36}

The idea that Petrarch owned a Ms. of Silius seems completely unfounded despite Lefebvre de Villebrune’s description of a ‘fragment’ of the \textit{Punica} as: \textit{quod sibi minus verecunde, nonnullis mutatis, vindicaverat, suoque poemati Africæ lib. VI. adsuere non est veritus Fr. Petrarcha.} The ‘fragment’ clearly belongs to the \textit{Africa}, but Lefebvre shamelessly added it to his editions of Silius (i.e., the Latin one and the one containing the Latin text with a French version; both Paris 1781) and accordingly called the Latin one \textit{Operis integri editio princeps}.

L. Arrigoni described in his \textit{Notice historique et bibliographique sur 25* MSS. . . ayant fait partie de la bibliothèque de François Petrarque} (Milan 1883), No. 1, pp. 21-23 a Silius Ms. (Marston Ms. 220 of the Yale Library; De Ricci, \textit{Suppl.} 226) that he stated had belonged to Petrarch and contained autograph notes by him. But this statement must be rejected. The presentation inscription (f. 184'\textsuperscript{v}’: Ioannes Columna Francisco Petrarche: Mnemosynô) is forged and of the 16th century; many of the 19th-century documents attached to the Ms. merely show how unscrupulous certain scholars could be.\textsuperscript{38}

That Amplonius Ratinck (c. 1365-1434/35) of Rheinberg possessed two Mss. of the text of the \textit{Punica} and one of glosses on it is very questionable. We know of these Mss. only from a list of codices given by Ratinck to the University of Erfurt;\textsuperscript{39} the Mss. themselves have all disappeared. The titles all refer to Lucan (Libri Lucani de bellis punicis, etc.); it seems more reasonable that \textit{de bellis punicis} should be changed to \textit{de bello civili or de bellis ciivilibus} than that Lucan should be changed to \textit{Sili Italic}.

Whether a Silian Ms. existed containing VIII 144-223 plus two lines omitted in modern editions is doubtful. The 82 lines first occur in print in the \textit{Collectaneorum hecatosys prima} (Fano 1508) of Iacobus Constantius (Giacomo Costanzi) (1473-1517), and VIII 144-223 (and one of the other verses) in the Aldine edition of Silius (1523). Constantius says (cap. 92): . . . duos et octoginta versus deficere Baptista Guarini silius. . . ostendit: quos e gallia sibi cum alis quamplurimis rebus scitu dignis missos fuisse dicebat.\textsuperscript{40}

37. See the passages from the \textit{Punica} and from Walter’s \textit{Alexandreis} cited by H. Christensen, \textit{Das Alexanderlied Walters von Châtillon} (Halle 1905) 210 (in the ‘Verzeichnis der aus antiken Dichtern entlehnnten Stellen’). If some of these correspondences are accidental, Walter’s audendum est aliquid, quod nos . . . hostibus expulsus . . . coronet (\textit{Alex.} IX 96) certainly looks like a copy of Silius XV 549-551: Magnum aliquid tibi, si patriae vis addere fata, / Audendum est, quod, depulso quoque moenibus hoste, / Victores fecisse tremant.


41. For more details and for the question of whether the lines are genuine see O. Rossbach in his review of the first volume of Bauer in \textit{Deutsche Litteraturzeitung} XI (1890) 1869-1871 at 1871; W. E. Heitland, ‘The “Great Lacuna” in the Eighth Book of Silius Italicus’, \textit{The Journal of Philology} XXIV (1896) 188-211; Sabbadini, op. cit. 1 (Florence 1905) 180-182. Rossbach considers the verses a forgery by Guarino, Sabbadini looks upon them as a forgery of Costanzi, Heitland thinks that they are genuine and from the St. Gall Ms.
SILIUS ITALICUS

The medieval Ms. of Silius which is now lost (as is the Cologne Ms.) but from which all extant Ms.s. descend was discovered by Poggio in 1417 at the time of the Council of Constance, but the exact place of the discovery cannot be ascertained (many scholars have favored St. Gall, and the codex is often called Sangallensis). For the abundant evidence dating from the 15th century for the find see Delz I 10-28 and nn. 1-26. The earliest testimoniun is Francesco Barbaro's letter of congratulation to Poggio (July 1417). The next is a letter of Poggio's from Constance to Barbaro (1417 or 1418). Poggio observes there that the Ms. needs to be first corrected and then copied by a scholar; so he asks Barbaro to have this done and the result sent to Niccolò Niccoli in Florence. An epistle of Poggio to Niccoli (1425) implies that the latter has a Silius for copying. In his oratio funebris for Niccoli (1437) Poggio says that the inspiration and impulse for ferreting out so many texts, including the Silius, was from Niccoli. Sicco Polenton (1375-76 — 1446-48) in the second version, completed in 1437, of his Scriptorum illustrium Latinae linguae libri XVIII states that a Ms. of Silius' poem had recently been discovered at Constance and gives an account of Silius' life; Sicco was the first to bring Pliny's letter (III 7) into connection with the newly found Silius.

Many other lives of Silius, not accompanied by a commentary on the Punica, were written in the 15th and 16th centuries. Maybe the next one after that by Sicco is the work of Agostino Dati (1420-1478?). See for these lives our Appendix I: The

42. See Francisci Barbari et aliorum ad ipsum epistolae (ed. A. M. Quirini, Brescia 1743) 1-8 (Ep. 1) at 2; also in Poggios Bracciolini, Opera omnia (ed. R. Fubini, Turin 1969) 57-64 at 58.

43. See A. C. Clark, 'The Literary Discoveries of Poggio', Classical Review XIII (1899) 119-130 at 125; reprint of p. 125 in Fubini, op. cit., p. 239.

44. See T. de Tonellis, Poggii Epistolae I (Florence 1832, reprinted Turin 1963) 149-150 (Lib. II, Ep. XXIII) at 150.


Renaissance Vitae of Silius unaccompanied by commentary.

These Renaissance biographies of Silius and the number of Renaissance Mss. of the Punica show that Silius became popular after he was 'rediscovered' by Poggio. One reason for his popularity was probably the great interest that men of letters had already taken in Scipio and the great respect that they had for his character. Scipio's 'life and deeds played a prominent role throughout Dante's work', and 'Dante's lofty view of Scipio's divine mission is reflected in the fact that he has St. Peter himself eulogize the Roman hero in his Paradiso (Par. XXVII 61 ff.)'. Petrarch considered Scipio a personification of virtue and even cites him along with Christ. The authority and popularity of Petrarch, the biography of Scipio that he wrote, and what was known about the Africa (never finished by Petrarch and not to be published until 1501) will go far to explain the popularity of Silius after his text was found again. People were interested in the Second Punic War; the 14th century had already seen this as the summit of Roman history and achievement and had already debated whether Scipio or Hannibal was greater.

There was a 15th-century debate over Scipio and Caesar, a controversy over which of the two had served his country better and whether the Roman Republic or the Roman Empire was to be preferred. Behind it was a conflict between the republican and the monarchical ideals prevailing in the Italian states at the time. The principal figures in the debate at its beginning in 1435 were Poggio, favoring Scipio and the Florentine ideal of the republic, and Guarino, favoring Caesar and the monarchical courts. Silius is occasionally invoked in the controversy. Guarino declares in his attack on Poggio that Caesar was not responsible for the death of Latin eloquence and literary


47. Cf. Bernardo, op. cit., p. 73.
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studies as Poggio had maintained in a letter to Scipione Mainenti of Ferrara. Guarino cites as evidence a number of authors in various genres: grammarians, poets, historians, etc. Of the poets he writes: ‘Quid de poetis? Dicerem de Catullo, Claudiano, Ovidio, Lucano, Statio, Silo Italico, cuius in lucem revocandi exitistit, nisi omnes eos suo splendore dignitate admiratone unus Virgilius obumbrasset’.\(^{49}\) (Cf. Pietro Tommasi's remark, made in a letter of c. 1419 to Guarino and referring presumably to the art of Silius, Statius, and others who had been recently discovered: ‘...qui meo judicio sine multa nostra lectura adhuc late potuissent’.\(^{60}\) Poggio's reply was his famous _Defensio secunda contra Guarium Veronensem_, actually addressed to Francesco Barbaro. Here Poggio notes that Latin authors from Livy, Valerius Maximus, Seneca, and Silius to St. Augustine all testify to Scipio's virtues and great services to the state. He says of Silius (p. 368): ‘Silius quoque Italicus cum Caesarem multa cognosceret gessisse ex quibus sumum poema ordiri potuisset, tamen quia sciebat virtuibus fere vacuata et in perniciem patriae redacta, Scipionem delegit, in quem cum propter eius praeclara in patriam merita multas laudes congressisset, tandem in fine sui operis cum meritis et laudibus aequat Romulo et Camillo, alteri conditori Urbis, alteri restitutori’\(^{51}\).

\(^{49}\) See R. Sabbadini, _Epistolario di Guarino Veronese_ II (Venice 1916) 221-254 (No. 670) at 224.

\(^{50}\) Sabbadini, _op. cit._ I (Venice 1915) 664-666 (No. 474A) at 665.

\(^{51}\) For the documents see Poggii Florentini... _opera._ (Basel 1538, reprinted Turin 1964) 357-365 (letter to Scipione Mainenti), 365-390 (the _defensio secunda_), 356-357 (letter to Francesco Barbaro accompanying the _defensio secunda_; also in T. de Tonellis, _Poggii Epistolae_ II (Florence 1859, reprinted Turin 1963) 9-11 (Lib. V, Ep. II) and E. Walser, _Poggii Florentini: Leben und Werke_ (Leipzig-Berlin 1914) 437-438 (ined. 9, reprinted in Poggii Bracciolini, _Opera omn._ IV (Turin 1969) 441-442) (letter to Leonello d'Este accompanying the _defensio secunda_). For description and discussion of the controversy see H. Baron, _The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance._ (Prince-

In Poggio's _Disseptatio de anaritia_, finished in 1428, Bartolomeo da Montepulciano illustrates from Lucian and ‘ab Silio Italicus Poëta nobili’ the commonplace that all one's wealth is of no avail against death; he says: ‘Silius vero cum defunctum in bello divitem avarum dixisset, hos edidit versus’ and then quotes _Punica_ V 261-267: ‘...modo quem Fortuna fovendo / Congestis opibus donisque referis opinis / Nudem Tartarea portabit navita cymba’.\(^{52}\)

Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472) shows familiarity with Silius. There are several quotations from the _Punica_ in the _Interconiales_, which Alberti worked at over many years from his youth to c. 1438.\(^{53}\)

---

\(^{52}\) See _Poggii Florentini... opera._ (Basel 1538, reprinted Turin 1964) 1-31 at 31.

53. Cf. E. Garin, ‘Venticinque Interconiales inedite’ _Belfagor_ XIX (1964) 377-396 at 380. For Alberti's text with the Silian quotations see E. Garin, ‘Leon Battista Alberti: Alcune intercionali inediti’, _Rinascimento_ ser. 2, IV (1964) 125-258 (= _Quaderni di Rinascimento_, 1965, 9-142). On p. 193 (= 77) in the part _Fatum et poter infelix_ of Book VIII, Sil. V 406-407 are quoted with slight variations (the passage is not assigned by Garin; Alberti does not refer it to Silius but says: _ut sapientes aiant_), Sil. III 134-135 are cited with variations (the passage is assigned by Garin, though his lemma has _Sylius_ for _Silius_; Alberti says: _ut inquit Sylius_), and Sil. V 75-76 are quoted with _igitur_ added and _superius_ instead of _superi_ (the passage is unassigned by Alberti, though Garin's punctuation suggests attribution by Alberti to Herodotus; it is assigned correctly by Garin). On p. 204 (= 88) in Book IX: _Nauphragus_ the sentence with ‘Silio poete ut assentiari’ may possibly contain an echo of Sil. II 620 as Garin states, but Garin has missed Sil. II 472-473 in the next sentence (the passage is exactly quoted, and with _etiam_ added, by Alberti; Garin's punctuation spoils the sense).
At least by the 1450’s university lectures on Silius were being given. Petrus Odus Montopolitanus, who succeeded Valla at the Studio in Rome in 1457, lectured on Silius there, though maybe for only one year in the period 1457-1462. But there are traces of lecturing on the Punica (we do not know the names of the lecturers) before that period; see our account of anonymous commentators A-D below, pp. 365-69. (In 1464 Galeotto Marzio, then professor of rhetoric and poetry in the Studio Bolognese, invokes several verses of Silius to correct a false quantity recurring in Francesco Filetto’s Sphortias. For their exchange of invectives and for Filetto’s quest for the Silius Ms. of Bartolomeo da Montepulciano see Delz I 14-22 and nn. 14-15). Petrus Marsus in the dedicatory epistle to his edition of Silius with commentary (Venice 1483) lists as those who had expounded Silius before himself Petrus Montopolita and then his own teachers Pomponius [Laetus] and Domittius [Calderinus]; see below, pp. 387. It is likely that Pomponius commented on Silius while he was in Venice in 1467-68, just before he was deported to Rome and imprisoned; he was doing some copying of or commenting on the Punica while he was a prisoner in the Castel S. Angelo in 1468-69; he lectured on that poem at the Studio after his return to his professorial chair there c. 1470. Domizio Calderini was appointed professor of rhetoric at the Studio in 1470 and lectured on the Punica there during the three-year period 1470-73, expounding the whole work; he prepared his lecture notes for publication, but they apparently never got into print.

The long list of printed editions of the Punica begins in 1471. The editio princeps came out in that year in Rome; it was quickly edited by Giovanni Andrea Bussi, Bishop of Aleria, (‘recognitionem absolvit diebus circiter XV’) and printed by Sweynheym and Pannartz. In the same city and the same year (in fact, only a few weeks later) a better edition, prepared by Pomponius Laetus, was published. The year 1481 saw two more editions: one by Petrus Justinus Philileius came out in Milan and one by an unknown editor in Parma. At Venice in 1483 the first edition with a commentary (by Petrus Marsus) appeared; this edition was reprinted at least three times.54

54. The 15th-century editions:

1471, n.b. April 5, Rome: Sweynheym and Pannartz; ed. Giovanni Andrea Bussi. (H *14733, Goff S-503). There are copies containing also the text of Calpurnius Sicius and of the Latin version of Hesiod’s Opera et dies by Nicolaus de Valle. The three works were ‘evidently intended to form one whole’ (BMC IV 13).


(1474, Rome. Doubtful. Not in Hain, but listed by Fabricius BL II 174).

(1480, Rome. Doubtful. Listed by Fabricius ibid.) (H 14735).

(Cf. Rupert I, p. lvi for the problem of these two editions and his theory that N. Heinsohn’s readings from a Roman edition are from one or the other of them).

1481, November 7, Milan: A. Zarotheus; ed. P. I. Philelphus. (H 14736, Goff S-505).

1481, November 16, Parma: Printer of Jerome; Epistolae, 1480’ (BMC VIII 942) rather than Andreas Portilia. (H 14737, Goff S-506).

1483, Venice: Baptista de Tortis; with Petrus Marsus’ commentary. (H 14739, Goff S-507).

(c. 1490, Venice: I. de Paganinis Brixiensis; with Petrus Marsus’ commentary. Doubtful.) (H 14738).

1492, Venice: Bonetus Locatellus for Octavianus Scotus Modoetienis; with Petrus Marsus’ commentary. (H *14740, Goff S-508).

1493, Venice: Johannes Tacuinus; with Petrus Marsus’ commentary. (H 14741, Goff S-509).

(1495, Venice; with Pius’ commentary. Doubtful.) (H 14742).

For the history of the printed text and lists of editions see Fabricius BL II 174-177 (editions through 1717) and several of the editions themselves, esp. those of A. Drakenborch (Utrecht 1717), Praefatio; G. A. Rupert (2 vols., Göttingen 1795-1798) I xli-lv (Praefatio Drakenborchi) lv-lxx (editions through 1791); and N. E. Lemaire (2 vols., Paris 1823) II 432-446 (Praefatio Drakenborchii), 446-462 (editions as in Ruperti and continued through 1797). For a list of all the editions through Petrucci’s of 1947 see M. von Albrecht, Silius Italicus: Freiheit und Gebundenheit römischer Epoche (Amsterdam 1964) 215-220.
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For the university courses of Fonzio and Volso on the Punic in the 1480’s and for the possibility that Faccino and Cynthia Genetens were commenting on it within that period see below, pp. 396-98 (12. Doubtful commentaries. a-d).

There is evidence for a good deal of lecturing on Silius at Bologna in the late 15th and early 16th centuries.

Philippus Beroaldus (Filippo Beroalde or Beroaldi) the Elder (1453-1505) interpreted Livy and Silius Italicus during at least one academic year between 1472 and 1475 or between 1479 and 1491. His commentary on these authors may not have been published; we have not been able to find it, in any case. Some, if not all, of it is perhaps meant by the items cited by Aldosi: ‘13 In Liium lib. a 6 [correct to ab] origine orbis, & praetipue I. 4. 8. 22. 28’ and ‘35 In Silium [sic] Italicum’. What we have seen, however, is the oration introductory to his lectures on Livy and Silius; it is extant in many printings. We have seen it first in a collection of Beroaldo’s writings (orationes, etc.) Bologna 1491, sig. avil-bii (H *2949); then Paris 1499, sig. bil-bv (HC *2954) and Bologna 1500, sig. bili-bvii (H *2955). It regularly appears also in

__55. For Beroaldo’s career; his beginning to teach rhetoric and poetry in the Studio of Bologna in 1472; his absence from Bologna for lecturing in Parma, Milan, and Paris in 1475-78; etc. see A. Corradi, Notizie sui professori di latinità nello studio di Bologna... in R. Deputazione di Storia patria per le province di Romagna, Documenti e Studi II (Bologna, 1886) 353-529 at 471-78; U. Dallari (ed.), I rotoli dei lettori... dello studio bolognese dal 1384 al 1799 I (Bologna 1888); L. Frati, ‘I due Beroaldi’, Biblioteca de ‘L’Archiginnasio’, Ser. I, Vol. II: Studi e Memorie per la Storia dell’Università di Bologna II (Bologna 1911) 207-228 at 210; M. Gilmore, ‘Beroaldo, Filippo, senior’, Dizionario biografico degli Italiani IX (1967) 382-384 at 382; and G. Zaccagnini, Storia dello Studio di Bologna durante il Rinascimento (Geneva 1930) 122-128. See also the biobibliography of Beroald p. 188 above.

56. G. N. P. Aldosi, I (or Li) dottori bolognesi di teologia, filosofia... (Bologna 1623) 64 and 65.

57. A 1490 printing may be a ‘ghost’ despite Orations, Praelectiones, Praefationes et quaedam Mythicae Historiae Philippi Beroaldi (which are followed by items by other authors and more items by Beroalde); we have seen it in the following editions of this collection: Paris 1508, sig. avil-biv; Paris 1509 (a Magistro Johanne Galthero), fols. vii-ixv; Basel 1509, sig. Avv-Avii; Basel 1515, fols. v-vii; Paris 1524, fols. vii-ixv.54 Beroald also quotes incidentally from Silius in his Annotationes in Servium, sec. 28 and Appendix annotamentorum, chap. XX; see below, p. 355.

In the oration the two ancient authors are compared, but much more attention is given to Livy than to Silius; for instance, the remarks on Silius are all on sig. bl-biv of the Paris 1508 edition of the Orations, Praelectiones...: Ceterum cum sapientis sit servire temporibus, nos quoque temporibus serviamus, quibus cum arma vigante, bella horrida perstrepant, cum omnis Italia hellicis tumultibus saevidat... idoneum esse videtur ut scriptores eos potissimum legamus qui bella describunt. Ambo eadem bella facundissime narrantes ille soluta oratione, hic versus heroico, qui non minus historicus quam poeta judicandus est, qui stilo cohurnato et charactere grandiloquo tonare ac fulminare videtur... Sed quid plura? Livii et Silii facundia, vires, ingenium, eruditio, ceteraque virtutes eximie sese nobis quotidiana enarratione exihibebunt...


58. For other editions of the Orations, Praelectiones... and for other collections of Beroaldo’s works which may contain the oration in question see Mazzuchelli, loc. cit.; G. Fantuzzi, Notizie degli scrittori bolognesi II (Bologna 1782; reprinted ibid. 1965) 121-122; and Index Aurellensis, prima pars, A/12 (1969) 86-98. The reference in M. Lipen, Bibliotheca realis philosophica [not theologica with Mazzuchelli and Fantuzzi] I (Frankfurt am Main 1682; reprinted Hildesheim 1967) 666 to Paris 1573 for our oration may be to a printing of it by itself.
Ioannes Baptista Pius (Giambattista Pio) (15th and 16th centuries) of Bologna gave a course on Silius and Livy in that city. He refers to the lecturing on Silius in Chapter CLV (CLVI in Gruterus) of his Annotationes posteriores (or Annotationes linguae Latinae Graecaeque): Ego publico auditorio Bononieae Silium anno praesenti endodas docui. The introduction (in hexameters) to the course is called Praefatio De re militari habita in principio enarrationis Silii Italicii et Titii Livii De secundo punico bello; it is contained in the Praefationes Gymnasticae Ioannis Baptistae Pii Bononensis allique varii sermones (Bologna 1522; Panzer VI 333, 117), pp. 58-63. How often this set of lectures was given we do not know. The year specified in the Annotationes posteriores might be 1505, when those notes seem to have been printed for the first time. But it might be somewhat earlier if these Annotationes were published without much revision from lecture notes that Pio had had on hand for some time, but doubtless not before 1496, when the Annotationes priores were apparently first published. 59

Pio refers to and quotes from Silius in at least one other of his praefatio, the Praefatio habita in enarratione Epistolarum Ciceronis ad Atticum et Silvarum Stati, op. cit., pp. 6v-7.

The Silian notes of Pio are on three isolated passages of the Punica and make up three of the 205 or more chapters of the Annotationes posteriores. (Both Ascensius and Gruterus have errors in the numbering at various points and seem to have lost a chapter or two. Ascensius has also after his Chap. CL, but not affecting the numbering, Pio’s notes on Cicero’s Lucullus, which is called ad Hortensium). Silius is quoted incidentally in at least one other chapter: Punica III 336 in Chap. XXXV; and very early in the dedicatory epistle to Francesco Soderini Punica III 145 is quoted and then followed by a paraphrase from Pliny, Ep. III 7, the letter which is the main source for the life of Silius. The three chapters are, in Ascensius’ edition, XXXI (fols. CXXXIII-CXXXIV): Silii Italicii carmen enarratum de Mamertinis (on Punica I 662-664), CLV (fol. CLVII): Disceptatum numquid balista Phocaius vocetur a Silio propter populos Massilenses simulque carmen Italicum discessum contra omnia hastenus opinionem (on I 335) (here Pio says: Ego publico auditorio... docui balistant Phocaei dixi simpliciter pro Saguntina, and elaborates his argument with references to Silius’ allusive manner), and CXCII (fol. CLXV): Evaluandum, modice, validum significare carmen Italicum emendatum. Inibique alius eiusdem receptum ad interiorem leonum moram (on I 552, 555-555; to explain the action of Hannibal in vss. 553-555 and justify reading adversus, not aversus, in vs. 555 Pio invokes Pliny’s description in NH VIII 50 of the courage shown in danger by lions).

Retraictiones to the Annotationes posteriores are found at the end (sigs. &v and &vi) of the Lucretius with Pio’s commentary, Bologna 1511 and Paris 1514.

Pio’s notes on Silius show a concern with the whole poem, its worth, and the difficulties in it. Chapter XXXI, for instance, begins: Silius Italicus duriusculus a pluribus omnibus poeta nuncupatur, quem censet Caecilius Plinius versus maiore cura quam ingenio composuisse. Ego heroicae gravitatis cum epigrammatico vate nec omnino insuavem reor. At acerbam immitemque aspeditem illi afferunt frequentes maculae, quibus penitus obruitur. Whether Pio planned a commentary on the whole Punica or an edition of it is not known. In any case, there is no good evidence for the existence of an edition of Silius with a commentary by Pio (H 14742). As Fabricius observes (BL II 177), ‘similiter [he has just referred to a catalogue of Mss. where Silius’ name got in by mistake for that of Statius] frustra aliquid quaerat Silium cum commentariis Pii, qui in Bibliothecae Bar-

59. For the various years, beginning with 1494-95, when he was professor of rhetoric and poetry at Bologna see Dallari, op. cit., I and II (Bologna 1888 and 1889). For his having started to lecture at the age of 19 see Ann. Post., Chap. XIII, which is concerned with Persius, not Sidonius, pace Fantuzzi; but the date of his birth is uncertain. For more details about him see Corradi, op. cit., 484-487; W. B. Fleischmann, CTC II 351, 356-359 (with bibliography); and Zaccagnini, op. cit., 120.
beriae Catalogo [Rome 1681 ; II 387] memoratur editus Venetis 1495. fol'. The Barberini entry may possibly be due to confusion of Pio's lecturing on Silius, or composing notes on selected passages, with an edition; but perhaps it is rather a mistaken description of some book, printed or manuscript, and has nothing to do with Silius or Pius.

Pio's Annotationes posteriores were printed at Bologna in 1505 (Panzani VI 324, 43), at Paris in 1511 in the Annotationes doctorum virorum of Badius Ascensius (with Pio's Annotationes priores and works of other authors such as the Annotata in varios and Praelectiones variae of Iacobus a Cruse) (Panzani VII 552, 444), and in Janus Gruterus, Lampas sine pacto artium liberalium I (Frankfurt am Main 1602) 386-583 (with the Annotationes priores on pp. 353-386).

Pio refers to the Annotationes posteriores at the end of the dedicatory epistle as annotamenta (haec quantulumque annotamenta nostra inculta fortassia et rudia), and they are so titled on the fly-leaf of the 1505 edition. But this is also found for another work of Pio's, the Annotamenta in Plautum, Sidonium, Fulgentium (Panzani VI 324, 42 and presumably H 13025). For more details about Pio's writings see Fabricius BLMA V 285 and Fleischmann, loc. cit.

Iacobus a Cruse (Giacopo dalla Croce)60 (d. c. 1527) of Bologna lectured on Silius and Livy in that city and completed a few notes on Silius. This lecturing may have been for an academic year or more than one. We do not know the exact year or years. But it was doubtless 1495 at the earliest.61

Of his lectures we have only the introductory one to three sets: the Praelectio in Livium et Silium Italicum (although his extant notes on Silius may derive from later lectures of that set), one to Boethius, and one to Juvenal and Valerius Maximus.

In the first of these introductions Iacobus gives more attention to Silius in relation to Livy than Beroaldo did; among other things he provides a certain amount of information about Silius' life. The praelectio is in Ascensius, op. cit., fol., excviii-cc, with the Sillian material on cc... Silli Italici Punica exponere et narrare hoc anno constituitmus... opus inquam evigilatum et accutissime [sic] elaboratum. Namque in prima aetate Silius facundissime declamavit, clientibus affuit, in foro centumvirale [sic] exercuit... Ad carmen dehinc conversus cum urbe relecta Neapolim sequisset, Maronem religiosissime coluit... Cumque aetas hominis in senium vergeret, historiam Hannibalium et Scipionis maluit ore Ingenti detoneare quam fabulas veteres et nimis antiquas referre. Et meherculc eo opus hoc ceteris excellentius est et angustius quo bellum hoc Punicum quod Hannibale duce Carthag. cum P. R. essesse maximum et difficilissimum reliqua antecelet et preponderat, quanto se nisis aetas in qua haec cecini juvenil impetu gravior est et pensatior. Sillo adlunegus T. Livium...

Iacobus' Sillian notes make up one chapter or section (no. 9 according to Gruterus' Index scriptorum locorumque of his Annotata (or Annotationes) in varios. Five isolated passages of the Punica are discussed there: I 66-67, 56-57, 89, 273-275, and III 22-23; Silius is cited incidentally in at least one other place in the Annotata (chan. 20, 'in Donatun', for the etymology of Bonoia).

Iacobus may not have given a title to his remarks on various Latin authors; in the dedicatory epistle to Anton Galeazzo Bentivoglio he refers to them as anotatiunculae et observationes. They were generally cited as Annotata (or Annotationes) in varios or in Ovidium, in Virgilium, in Persium... (in various arrangements of the authors' names).62 To call them Annota-
tiones centum (Cosenza and Malagola, locc.
citt.) or Annotationes centum in varios Au-
thores (Fantuzzi, op. cit., III 236, referring
to Bumaldi, Biblioth. Bononien.) may be
right. Iacobus is so prone to comment on
passages just incidentally (cf. in the Sillian
chapter 'Necon in transcurso locum in
quarto Metamorphoseos corrigimus. . .') that
it is hard to say precisely how many count
towards the total and the title. But what
is more likely to be correct is Centum et
sexaginta Annotationes in varios auctores;
this is what appears on the fly-leaf of the
Bologna 1503 edition, and the distich on
sig. Fiii of that edition begins: Haece sexa-
ginta et Centum observata Iacobi. In Fab-
ricius BLMA IV 10 Mansi refers to this line
as proof that there are 160 'animadver-
siones', but he quotes it with a redundant
centum that is apparently a printer's error.

Iacobus' notes and praelectiones were
printed together at Bologna in 1503 (Pan-
zr IX 411, 27b; cf. Fantuzzi, loc. cit.).
They are both found in Ascensius, op. cit.,
fol. clxxxv-cc (the chapter of Sillian notes
on cxeli²-cxelv). The notes without the
praelectiones are in Gruterus, op. cit., I 648-
697.

Many writers and scholars in the late
15th and in the 16th centuries quote Sillius
incidentally or discuss a passage from his
poem. See the references to Sillius in the
Indices to Gruterus, op. cit., I-V. In the
Index to the first volume, for example, in
addition to Ioannes Baptista Pius' Anno-
tationes post, and the notes of Iacobus a
Cruse the following works are cited: the
Annotationes in Servium and Appendix
annotamentorum of Philippus Beroaldus,
the Auctarium of Pius Antonius Bartolinus,
the De rebus per epistolam quaesitis of A.
Ianus Parrhasius, the Collectanea of Lucius
Ioannes Scoppa, the Centuria of Ptolomaus
Flavius Anconitanus, and the Miscellanea
of Angelus Politianus.

An instance of familiarity with Sillius in
northern Europe is supplied by Jacob Locher

Bentivolus, Antonius Galeatius), taken from C.
Malagola, . . . Antonio Ureo. . . (Bologna 1878) 244)
must be due to confusion with the notes by Giamb-
battista Plo.

(Philomusus Suevus) in the Stultifera Navis
(1497), his Latin adaptation of the Narrens-
chiff of his teacher and patron Sebastian
Brant. The part called Concertatio Vir-
tutis cum Voluptate of the Stultifera Navis
shows much verbal borrowing from an
episode of the Punica (XV 18-128). That
episode is Sillius' version of the old story of
Hercules' Choice, with Scipio substituted for
Hercules. Sillius, Locher, and the woodcuts
accompanying the Concertatio have
apparently influenced a painting of the young
Raphael, which Panofsky would call 'The
Choice of the young Scipio Africanus'
rather than 'The Dream of the Knight'.

The many 16th-century editions of the
Punica present little in the way of exegesis
(Petrus Marsus' commentary is reprinted
once, and Hermannus Buschius' scholia
are printed three times) and much that is
problematical textually.

63. For the editions, translations, and adapta-
tions of the Narrenschiff see E. H. Zeydel, The
Ship of Fools by Sebastian Brant. . . (Records of
Civilization: Sources and Studies 36, New York
1944) 21-31. Brant tells the story of Hercules'
Choice (from Basil the Great) as an exemplum in
Chap. 107, Von Ion der wisheit, of the Narrenschiff;
it does not appear in the corresponding chapter of
Locher, who omitted it there because of his Con-
certatio coming later. See in E. Panofsky, Hercule
am Scheidewege. . . (Studien der Bibliothek War-
burg XVIII, Leipzig-Berlin 1930) esp. 33-40 (ac-
count of the woodcuts in the various editions and
translations of the Navis), 53-54 (Basil as the so-
urse of Brant's account of the Choice), 70-75 (parallels
from Sillius and the Concertatio), 86-97 (connections
between the Stultifera Navis and the Hercules
play (1512) of 'Arvianotor', who was probably
Brant; Schwenter's Histori Herculis (1515) larg-
ely a translation from 'Arvianotor'), pls. 17-19.
See also D. Wuttke, Die Histori Herculis des
Nürnberger Humanisten. . . Pangrats Bernhaubt
gen. Schwenter (Beihefte zum Archiv für Kultur-
geschichte 7, Cologne-Graz 1964) passim, esp. 120-
129 (Enea Silvio Piccolomini and Hercules' Choice;
possible influence from Piccolomini or even the
Punica itself on Raphael rather than from Locher;
a parallel between Schwenter and Sillius).

64. The 16th-century editions:
1504, Leipzig: Martinus Herbpolenais (Martin
series is the Leipzig edition of 1504, containing Buschius' *argumenta* to each book of the poem but not his scholia. An edition was brought out in Paris in 1508 without notes. Another came out there in 1512 with Petrus Crinitus' *Vita* of the poet (which had first appeared in his *De poetis Latinis libri* V in 1505) and Marsus' commentary. At Lyons in 1514 B. Troth published an edition prepared by Damianus Benessa. Ruperti gives it high praise (I, p. lix): 'Post editionem Pomponii optima inter veteres, si fides habenda Lefeb. [i.e. Lefebvre de Villebrune] qui eam contulit. Critica certe cura et subtilitate

Landsberg of Würzburg); with Hermannus Buschius' *argumenta*.

1508, Paris: Radulphus Laliseau.

1512, Paris: Nicolaus de Pratis, for Poncius Probus (Ponset le Preux) and Franciscus Regnault; with Petrus Marsus' commentary and Petrus Crinitus' *Vita*.

1514 (perhaps also 1513; cf. Baudrier VIII 425), Lyons: Bartholomeus Troth; ed. Damianus Benessa.

1515, Florence: Philippus Junta; ed. Ambrosius Nicander, with his *Vita* and *catalepses*.

1522, Basel: Thomas Vollius; with Hermannus Buschius' *argumenta* and scholia.

1523, Venice: Aldus and Andreas Asulanus; ed. Franciscus Asulanus; with Petrus Crinitus' *Vita*.

1531, Paris: Simon Collinaeus; with Hermannus Buschius' *argumenta* and scholia.

1543, Basel: Henricus Petrus; with Hermannus Buschius' *argumenta* and scholia.

1547, Lyons: Sebastianus Gryphius; ed. Franciscus Asulanus; with Petrus Crinitus' *Vita*.

1551, Lyons: Sebastianus Gryphius; ed. Franciscus Asulanus; with Petrus Crinitus' *Vita*.

1566, Antwerp: Philippus Nutilus; ed. Franciscus Asulanus; with Petrus Crinitus' *Vita*.

1568, Antwerp: Philippus Nutilus; ed. Franciscus Asulanus; with Petrus Crinitus' *Vita*.

1578, Lyons: Antonius Gryphius; with Hermannus Buschius' *argumenta*, Ambrosius Nicander's *catalepses*, and Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus' *Vita*.

1598, Lyons [Geneva]: Antonius Candidus (Antoine Blanc); with Hermannus Buschius' *argumenta* and Ambrosius Nicander's *catalepses*.

1600, Leyden: Christophorus Raphelengius; ed. Daniel Heinsius, with his notes, the *Crepundia Siliana*, of 1601 appended.

Bessen omnes cum saeculi XV. tum XVI. editores superavit. Cf. Praef. Drakenb. He condemns (ibid.) the edition prepared by Ambrosius Nicander that issued from the Juntine Press the next year and laments, as Drakenburch had before him, that it formed the basis of the Aldine text of 1523; furthermore, he explains, other editors followed that text, so that interpolation was rampant in Silius until Drakenburch's edition, despite some good efforts in the 16th and 17th centuries at improvement: 'Nicander inconstant et temeraria mutandi corrigendi que libidine Siliani carminis contextum quavis fere pagina foede corrupit. Vide Varr. Lectt. et Praefat. Drakenburch. Nihilo secius eius vestigia legit Aldus, quem deinde Nutius alique securi sunt. Quo factum est, ut interpolatio grassaretur in omnes fere editiones ante Drakenb. typis expressas, qui primus cuncta quasi vulnera a Nicandro carmini inflicta sanavit, totque maculas ei adsper- sas, delevit; etsi iam ante eum opera Car- rionis, Modii, Barthii et Dan. Heinsii non infelicitur in emaculando Silio stabuloque, ut ita dicam, Augiae purgando versata est'. In 1522 an edition appeared in Basel with the marginal scholia of Buschius for the first time and with his *argumenta*. The scholia are described on the titlepage as 'quae vice uberiis commentarii esse possunt', but they are scarcely that and often not much more than captions or summaries of the narrative. The Aldine edition was the first one to give the verses VIII 144-223 (cf. above, p. 348 and n. 41), which were printed in practically all editions after that. Both the Paris edition of 1531 and the Basel one of 1543 have Buschius' *argumenta* and scholia.

During this period of the early 16th-century editions knowledge of Silius was not confined to professional scholars; there are various indications of his finding a place in general or polite education. There is a life of him in the encyclopedia-like work of Raffaelo Maffei of Volterra, the *Commentarius urbanorum libri* XXXVIII (first edition, Rome 1506); see below, p. 363. There is a large section devoted to Silius in Octavianus Mirandula’s book of quotations, the *Vridarium illustrium poetarum*, which went through several editions (first edition,
Venice 1507) and had an even greater vogue in its later form as a collection of *sententiae*, the *Illustrium poetarum flores* (first edition, Strassburg 1538). Silius is even mentioned in Castiglione’s *Cortegiano*, which is supposed to represent conversations held at the ducal palace in Urbino in 1507. As for England, ‘Vives recommends Silius ‘in the plan of studies which he wrote for the young Charles Mountjoy in 1523’; and Sir Thomas Elyot in his book on education, *The Gouvernour* (1531), says: ‘The two noble poets, Silius and Lucane, be very expedient to be lerned’, the first of these because he ‘setteth out the emulation in qualities and prowess of two noble and valiant capitaynes... Scipio the Romanes, and Hanball duke of Cartaginensis’. There is an account of Silius in Lilio Gregorio Giraldi’s *Historiae poetarum tam Graecorum quam Latinorum dialogi decem* (first edition, Basel 1545), and Silius is alluded to and quoted in his *Historiae deorum gentilium syntagmata XVII* (first edition, Basel 1548); see below, pp. 363-64.

Editions of Silius printed by Sebastianus Gryphius at Lyons in 1547 and 1551 reproduced the Aldine text and Crinitus’ *Vita*. Special mention should be made of Carrion and Modius, who prepared collations of the Cologne Ms. between 1564 and 1584 and are our sole authorities for its readings; cf. also below, p. 359.

---

65. See below, p. 358 for how common a school text the *Flores* were later in the century in England.

66. It was first printed in 1528. The mention of Silius is in Book I, Chap. 38: In a discussion of language and style Messer Federico recommends imitating the best authors, Petrarch and Boccaccio in Italian rather than others, just as in Latin one should try to imitate the language of Virgil and Cicero rather than that of Silius and Tacitus; the Conte then raises the question whether the language of Silius and Tacitus is greatly different from that of Virgil and Cicero.


68. For details about this Ms. and their use of it see Blass, *op. cit.*; Delz I 136 ff. and nn.; and P. Lehmann, *Franciscus Modius als Handschriftenforscher* (Munich 1908) 96-98.

Ludovicus Carrion (Louis Carrion) (c. 1547-1595), born at Bruges, edited a number of Latin texts and published several other works. One of these is his *Emendationum et observationum libri II* (Antwerp 1576, Paris 1583), with each book divided into 19 chapters. Here, along with discussion of many other ancient authors, Silius is often studied and his text emended from the Colonienis (though Carrion ‘minus triginta poëtae locos sanavit’; whereas Modius emended ‘plurimos’—Bauer, *op. cit.*, [n. 30], Vol. I, p. ix). This work of Carrion’s is in Gruterus, *op. cit.*, III, 2 (1604) 90-185 and in the incomplete new edition of Gruterus, published in Italy, IV (Naples 1751) 126-215. See the chapter headings to Carrion’s text and Gruterus’ *Index auctorum locorumque* for the Silian material.

Franciscus Modius (François Modius) (1556-1597), born at Oudenbourg near Bruges, published commentaries on several Latin authors and wrote many other works. One of these is his *Novantique lectiones* (Frankfurt am Main 1584). It is a vast work, a discussion of passages in many Latin authors, with much reference to textual problems, in the form of 133 letters (or ‘tributae in epistolae centum, et quod excurrat’, as Gruterus has it). In 40 letters 242 passages of the *Punica* are discussed and emended, or added to our text, from the Colonienis; two Silian passages are also emended from that Ms. in Modius’ edition of Curtius Rufus (1579) and five in his edition of Livy (1588). Modius gave his information about the readings of the Colonienis to the scholarly world in this way, though he had originally planned to publish an annotated edition of Silius. The *Novantique lectiones* are reprinted in Gruterus, *op. cit.*, V 1-339.


70. The 40 letters are listed in Lehmann, *op. cit.*, 97 n. 5 and von Albrecht, *op. cit.*, 230; cf. also Gruterus’ marginalia.

71. The *Silius Italicus de 26º bello punico factus a Modio M.S.*, cited in the library catalogue of Richard de Pan, is lost; cf. Lehmann, *op. cit.*, 97 and 98 with n. 1.
In Antwerp in 1566 and 1568 Philippus Nutius brought out editions of Silius that reproduced the Aldine text and Crinitus' Vīta. Many emendations of Silius were proposed by the Antwerp canon Johannes Livineius (c. 1549-1599). He did not publish these but entered them in his copy of the Basel 1543 edition of the Pūnica (which is now in Wolfenbüttel). This is the book from which Nicolaus Heinsius copied them down; and though he says of them: 'ea satis sunt ieiuna, ut quod res est, dicam', he did not disdain to cite some of them as his own. Finally, they appear in print in Drakenborch's edition.  

72 Petrus Paganus (Peter Dorfheilgen(r)) expounded some of Silius' poem, perhaps only the first book, at Marburg, where he was a professor from 1561 to 1576; his exposition, dated 1567, of the first book is one of the items bound together as Ms. Bernensis 663; see below, pp. 392-93. In Lyons in 1578 Antonius Gryphius printed an edition of Silius containing Buschius' argumenta, Nicander's catalepses, and Gyraldus' Vīta. The section of the Pūnica on Scipio's Choice was printed in Paris in 1595 by Fredericus Morellus under the title Dialogismus seu colloquium Volutatis et Virtutis cum Scipione Afric. ex Silii Italicī poetae lib. XV. In 1598 in Geneva, though with a Lyons imprint, Antonius Candidus brought out an edition of Silius with Buschius' argumenta and Nicander's catalepses. The Leyden edition of 1600 was prepared by Daniel Heinsius and is especially important because, on Joseph Justus Scaliger's recommendation, he used in preparing his text the variant readings of the Colonienensis reported by Modius in his Novantiquae lectiones. Heinsius' printer, Raphelengius, begged him to produce some explanatory notes to the text also; Heinsius promptly complied, and his notes, under the title of Crempundia Siliiana, appeared in 1601 as a kind of appendix to the edition proper; see below, pp. 394-95.

Joseph Justus Scaliger's father, Julius Caesar Scaliger, was perhaps largely responsible for the disfavor which Silius has often encountered. As von Albrecht notes: 73 'Gehörte es doch seit Scaligers "Poetik" zum guten Ton, keine hohe Meinung von Silius zu haben'. Julius Caesar Scaliger in his Poetices libri septem (1561) wrote thus of Silius: 'Antequam Statinum aggregiamur, Silium expediambus. quem equidem postremum bonorum poetarum existimo: quin ne poetam quidem. non nervos, non numeros, non spiritum habet. adeo vero ab omni venere alienus est, ut nullus inveniustor sit...'. Still, Silius was commended as well as condemned in the later 16th century. 'The Elizabethan schoolboy became somewhat familiar with Silius in two ways: either directly through the occasional provision made for reading some of the Pūnica in the upper forms of a few schools or, more often, indirectly through some such anthology as the Flores of Octavianus Mirandula read at an earlier stage... Mr. T. W. Baldwin has made an elaborate study of how common a grammar school text it was in Shakespeare's youth'. 74 Francis Meres in his Palladis Tamia (London 1598) cites Virgil, Ovid, Horace, Silius, Lucan, Lucretius, Ausonius, and Claudian as superlative Latin authors. 75

The Bipontine edition of the Pūnica (1784) contains (pp. x-xviii) an Index Editionum C. Silii Italicī divided into four periods: Aetas I Natalis 1471-1514; Aetas II Juntino-Aldina 1515-1600; Aetas III Modio-Heinsiana 1600-1695; Aetas IV Celario-Drakenborchiana 1693-1781. Aetas III

73 Von Albrecht, op. cit., 10. See his whole section (pp. 9-14) on the reputation of Silius through the centuries (on Pliny's criticism, on the Scaliger passage, on Cellarius' view that Silius had 'more historic than poetic value', etc.).  
74 Quotation from Bassett, op. cit., 157.  
75 P. 280, in the section called 'A comparative discourse of our English Poets, with the Grecian, Latine, and Italian Poets': As the Greek language 'is made famous and eloquent' by Homer, Hesiod, etc., and the Latin language by the authors listed, so the English language is made resplendent by Sidney, Spencer, Shakespeare, etc.
is appropriately named, for it is a period in which the variant readings from the lost Cologne Ms. and questions of textual criticism in general are great issues. The first edition of Silius to give these readings is that of Daniel Heinsius (Leyden 1600), who derived them from the *Novantiquae lectiones* of F. Modius (Frankfurt 1584). Heinsius also produced explanatory notes on the *Punica*, his *Crepundia Sitiana* of 1601 (see above, p. 357, for the vast number of Silian passages emended by Modius, and the smaller number by Carrion, from the Coloniensis; see below, I 11, for Daniel Heinsius).

A number of texts of Silius, usually without exegetical notes, came out in the first half of the 17th century. An outstanding one that does have some commentary is by the canon of Tournai, C. Dausque (Paris 1615; in many copies the date was changed to 1618). As later editors note, it is a good edition in many ways but marred by animosity towards Modius and Daniel Heinsius and consequent rejection of readings from the Cologne Ms.; as Ruperti says (Vol. I, p. lxi): . . . saepeius meliora vidit et probavit; sed nihilum secus frugibus inventis glandibus veseli, et Nicandri somnia defendere maluit, quam veritati manus dare. Daniel Heinsius’ text, without the *Crepundia*, was reprinted by Raphelengius at Antwerp in 1618.

Silius has now become a standard author, appearing in many of the *Corpora*. So the *Punica* is found in all the editions of the *Corpus omnium veterum poetarum Latinorum* (Geneva 1603, 1611, 1627, 1640) and in the *Corpus poetarum Latinorum* (Lyons 1616). Many passages of the *Punica* are examined in the *Adversariorum commentaria libri LX* (Frankfurt 1624, 1648) of Kaspar von Barth, mainly on the basis of the excerpts that he had from the Oxford Ms. (Queen’s College 314). Daniel Heinsius’ son Nicolaus (Nicolaas) (1620-81) entered readings from the Coloniensis in an edition of Silius that he had (1531, Paris: Simon Colinaeus) and discussed them in notes added to his copy of Dausque’s edition; these two sets of material were eventually printed in Drakenborch’s edition.

There is a dearth of editions of Silius in the second half of the 17th century; to our knowledge there is none from 1640 (in the Geneva *Corpus*) until 1695, when the important one of Cellarius appeared. (Daniel Heinsius’ *Crepundia* were reprinted at Cambridge in 1646 without the text of the *Punica*). But the text of Silius was still being carefully studied, and J. F. Gronovius’ *Observationum libri* (Deventer 1652, Leyden 1662) contains a section *Observationes in Silium*.

The Aetas IV of Silian editions begins with that of Christophorus Cellarius (Leipzig 1695). It is a noteworthy edition that pays much attention to geography and has maps. Cellarius considers Modius, Nicolaus Heinsius, and Gronovius the leading Silian scholars and follows them primarily. He refers rhapsodically also to emendations which Nicolaus Heinsius had written into his copy of his father’s text, which he (Cellarius) was able to see. But Drakenborch discovered that they were not Nicolaus’ own proposals but those of Josephus Justus Scaliger, to whom Drakenborch duly assigned them in his edition.

A. Drakenborch’s edition of Silius (Utrecht 1717) is the first one with a commentary of any scope. It is also the first real variorum edition; its title-page reads: Caji Silli Italicci *Punicorum Libri Septemdecim, cum excerptis* Ex Francisci Modii Novantiquis Lectoribus, Et Casp. Barthii Adversarisiis, tum Danielis Heinsii Crepundii Silianis, *Et postumis notis* Nicolai Heinsii, nunc primum editis, curante Arnoldo Drakenborch, *Cujus etiam annotationes passim additae sunt*. Drakenborch’s great guide was Nicolaus Heinsius, whom he followed *passim nisi ubi genius linguae Latinae vel poëtae alid flagitare mihi videbat, quod tamen pauciissimis in locis accidit* (Praef., p. ***2). Drakenborch notes in his Praefatio that he had seen two collations or sets of readings from the Oxford Ms. (Queen’s College) and carefully set out for the reader the places where the two collations differed. He also observes there that it has been his aim in his edition to prove other scholars’ conjectures, or readings from the Ms., by the testimony of the best authors; he will
keep a received reading if that seems better and will illustrate from the editions how Silius' text has been spoiled by scribes, printers, or critics. Another aim of his has been to point out accurately Silius' famous *imitatio Maroniana*; he will also explain difficult passages that might cause the tyro trouble. Drakenborch's edition is a landmark in establishing the text of Silius, if not in interpretation of the poem or the appreciation of Silius' art; cf. Ruperti, Vol. I, p. ixii. It became the standard text of the *Punica* for some time; it is reproduced, for instance, in the Bipontine edition.

A curious edition appeared at Paris in 1781, that of Lefebvre de Villebrune. Actually, it is a double edition, one in three volumes with a French translation and another in one volume of just the Latin text (with critical notes). It is an important edition in many ways; Lefebvre de Villebrune made use of the two Paris Mss. as well as of the variant readings from the Oxford and the Cologne Mss. as reported by Carrion, Modius, and Barth; he used also several early editions (e.g., the second Roman one, 1471). But he indulged in a good deal of wild conjecture and is full of animosity towards Nicolaus Heinius and Drakenborch. Since he gives the verses of Book VIII which were first added to the text of the *Punica* in the Aldine edition (see above, p. 356) and which many editors and Silian scholars rejected, and since he attached to his edition a passage from Petrarch's *Africa*, he had the temerity to call his edition 'opeonis integri editio princeps.'

Lefebvre's is the latest edition of the Bipontine Aetas IV. Two 18th-century editions of the *Punica* after that one are particularly significant. The first in time is that of J. C. T. Ernesti (2 vols.; Leipzig 1791-92), whose text is basically that of Drakenborch. What is especially important in his edition is his concern with the art of Silius, or *interpretatio*. So there is a longish essay in his edition on Silius' art, 'Disquisitio de carmine Siliano' (Vol. I, pp. viii-xxxii). He notes in his Praefatio that textual matters are important and that 'lectionem et interpretationem emendatio antecedat necesse est' but that practically all the work done on Silius since the re-discovery of his poem has been merely textual, so that in a sense he has been neglected. Ernesti explains his own approach as follows: *Itaque in duabus potissimum rebus, primum in interpretatione, deinde in carminis indole et consilio poetae recte aestimando, omnis opera editionis instruendarae mea versata est. The second of these editions is that of G. A. Ruperti (2 vols.; Göttingen 1795-98). It is concerned with textual matters and has an apparatus criticus of some scope; it is also concerned with the art of Silius, or *interpretatio*, and has an extensive commentary. Ruperti is a great expositor of Silian diction and style; the lengthy Index Rerum et Verborum appended to his second volume (pp. 1-170) is a storehouse of information on grammatical and stylistic points and is followed by an Appendix sive diatribe de stilo poetico et potissimum Siliano (pp. 171-186). Ruperti's is the last commentary on the whole *Punica* and perhaps the best.

Ruperti's text and commentary are reproduced, with a few additions, in N. E. Lemaire's edition (2 vols.; Paris 1823). Particularly noteworthy in 19th-century Silian scholarship is the study of the text again, with a closer analysis of the Coloniensis tradition (e.g., how reliable all the reported readings of the lost Cologne Ms. are) and the recording of more and more Mss. of the Sangallensis tradition; see, for example, G. Thilo, *Quaestiones Silianae criticae* (Halle 1858) and the articles of H. Blass, G. Wartenberg, and L. Bauer cited at the end of Appendix II. Bauer is the editor of the Teubner text of Silius (2 vols.; Leipzig 1890-92), which, though based on only four Mss., counts as the standard text today. It is followed in the main by W. C. Summers in his edition of Silius in J. P. Postgate's *Corpus Poetarum Latinarum* (Vol. II, fasc. 4; London 1904), but Summers thought the text through afresh (and he did himself inspect Ms. O) and improved on Bauer's text in many places.
SILVIUS ITALICUS

APPENDIX I

The Renaissance Vitae of Silius unaccompanied by commentary (with cross-references to Vitae in commentaries).

1. Sicco Polentonus (Sicco Polenton) (1375-76 — 1446-48) in the fourth book of his Scriptorum illustrium Latinae linguae libri XVIII states that a Ms. of Silius' poem had recently been discovered at Constanza and gives an account of Silius' life; there are also incidental references to Silius in Sicco's work. Sicco's vast opus was completed after 25 years of labor in 1437, as he tells us in a letter of that same year. An earlier version of part of it, six books and the beginning of a seventh but not containing a section on Silius, is extant in a manuscript written around 1426 and now in Florence (Ms. Ricc. 121); cf. R. Sabbadini, 'Storia e critica di alcuni testi latini,' Museo italiano di antichità classica III (1890) 318-476 at 318. The Riccardiana Ms. was owned by Cribito and Varchi; cf. Kristeller, Iter I 185-186, and for Cribito see below. For changes in the plan of Sicco's work, the letter of 1437, and the evidence for an intermediate edition, and for a printed copy of the complete text see B. L. Ullman's edition, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome VI (1928); the life of Silius is on pp. 121-122. Ullman follows Sicco's autograph Ms., 'in which he made his final additions and corrections', Vat. Ottob. lat. 1915.

The facts in Sicco's life of Silius are all from Pliny, Ep. III 7. The order of the details in Pliny's account is shifted somewhat in that of Sicco. The latter's phraseology is very Plinian at some points, less so at others. There is some expansion of Pliny's statements, but no serious distortion of them; for instance, Sicco says: Villas quidem illo in loco atque Neapolitano in agro et multas et magnas habuit, whereas Pliny writes: Plures isdem in locis villas possidebat. As these facts of Sicco's are all from Pliny's letter and the Punica is not quoted anywhere in the Scriptorum illustrium libri, Sicco had probably not seen the Ms. discovered in 1417 or a copy of it; cf. D. M. Robathan, The Sources of Sicco Po-
lenton's 'Scriptorum Illustrium libri' (typescript, diss., Chicago 1929), 107 (cf. 74, 125).

Sicco's life of Silius is reproduced with slight changes in the Parma (1481) edition of the Punica (HC 14737), fols. 171r-172; it was copied from there by the scribe of Ms. D, 70 fols. 176-177; cf. Delz I 14.


(For the life of Silius by commentator see below, pp. 366).

2. There is a Renaissance life of Silius of uncertain authorship. It is one of the items (fol. 138v) in Ms. Flor. Naz. II X 43, which is labeled on the spine Aug. Dati Elegantiae & Opusc. Varia. Maybe the life is by Augustinus Dat(h)us (Agostino Dati) (1420-1478?). But the genitive Aug. Dati of the spine is probably meant to refer only to Elegantiae. It cannot apply to all the opuscula; actually, the last scholar to whom something is assigned before the Silian item is Guarino Veronese (1370-1460); see the list of contents in Mazzatinti XII 41-42. The same Vita of Silius is found in a miscellaneous Paris Ms., Bibl. Nat. lat. 10806, fol. 49; for a description of the Ms. with list of contents see A. La Penna, 'Studi sulla tradizione di Properzio (Continuazione e fine),' Studi italiani di filologia classica N. S. XXVI (1952) 5-36 at 30-31 and 30 n. 1; the last scholar to whom something is assigned before the life of Silius is Angelo Tifernate (15th century). This same S-

76. For our sigla for Mss. of Silius see Appendix II.
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lian *Vita* is also in Pomponius' edition of the *Punica* (HCR 14734; see below) and was copied from there into our Ms. F, fol. 174.

*Inc. (Ms. Flor. Naz. II X 43]*): *Vita Silii Italici.* Siliius Italics, cuius maiores Italica Hispaniae urbe orti fuere, prima aetate declamavit. Mox foro vacavit. Inter primores urbis sine potentia, sine invidia fuit. . . . *[Expl.]*: Taedio insanabilis clavi in Neapolitano abstinentia cibi (corrected from abi) vita defunctus est annum agens LXX.

The last sentence is followed immediately in Pomponius' edition by: Opus iam neglectum Pomponius recognovit. Anno domini MCCCLXXI VI Calend. Mai. Romae. The scribe who copied the life into Ms. F also added Opus. . . . recognovit; then, when he came to the date, stopped, realizing that he had gone beyond the life itself.

(For the life of Silius by Pomponius Laetus see below, pp. 375, 378).

3. Marcellus Virgilius Adrianus (Marcello Virgilio Adriani) (1464-1521) prepared a life of Silius, possibly some time during his lecturing at the Studio in Florence between 1494 and 1503 (for these dates, other details of his career, and references see G. Miccoli's art. on him, *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* I (1960) 310-311). This *Vita* as it occurs in Ms. Flor. Magl. XXXVIII 117, no. 8 is of some length (fols. 84-85*). A version printed by W. Rüdiger, *Marcellus Virgilius Adrianus aus Florenz* (Halle 1897) 57 is much shorter and lacks the quotations from Martial's *Epigrams.* Rüdiger introduces one serious error: a *Nerva consul creatus for a Nerone c. c.* Rüdiger does not state the Ms. source of his version. The last Ms. that he cites (55 n. 2) before he gives his Silian life is *Classe VII, Cod. 396, bibl. Nazionale zu Florenz* — for Marcello's Latin glosses on *Iliad* 1-3; this must be a Magliabechianus, but Magl. VII 396 has nothing to do with Homer or Silius, and the text proper is actually in Italian; see Mazzatinti XIII 258. Rüdiger's source must be Magl. XXXVIII 117 since he goes on to quote some of Marcello's life of Lucan and to describe his account of Horace, both of which are found in that Ms. His handling of Marcello's life of Silius is similar to his treatment of the Statian material in Ms. Magl. VII 973 (which is not stated as his source); cf. A. Wasserstein, 'Politian's Commentary on the *Silvae* of Statius' [W. rejects Marcello as author of the commentary], *Scriptorium* X (1956) 83-89 at 86 n. 13: '. . . in transcribing passages from the MS. he changes and leaves out words for the sake of shortening the passages, without noticing that thereby he ascribes activities and works to P. P. Statius which Politian had properly ascribed to Statius' father.'

*Inc. (Ms. Flor. Magl. XXXVIII 117, fol. 84]*): Silius Itallicus Romanus civis et nobilis a (corrected from sub) Nerone consul creatus tanta comitate sapientiaque se gessit ut nullo ab eo quisquam optimi consulis munus desideraret. Huius in consulatu Nero e vita sublatus est, ut Plinius junior in tertio libro epistolaurum ostendit, et Martialis libro VIII ita scribens: Postquam bis senis ingentem fascibus annum / Rexerat, asserto qui sacer orbe fuit. The next two lines are added in the margin: Emeritos Musis et Phoebu tradidit annos / Proque suo celebrat nunc Helicona foro *Epigr.* VII 63. 9-10 and 11-12]. . . . *[Expl. (ibid. fol. 85*]*)]: Belli Punicci secundi decem et septem scripsit libros, de quibus idem in quarto ait: Sili Castalidum decus sororum / Quí peruria barbarī furoris / In genti premis ore, peridosque / Fastus Hannibalis levesque Poenos / Magnis cedere cogis Africanis *Epigr.* IV 14. 1-5.

The account of Silius breaks off at the bottom of the page, and fol. 86 begins in the middle of a *Vita Lucani.*

Rüdiger's version of the life (op. cit., p. 57) is: Silius Italicus, civis Romanus nobilis, a Nerva consul creatus, tanta comitate sapientiaque se gessit, ut illius consulis munus optimus quisque desideraret. Pro consul Asiarn sortitus, ea rexit moderatione, ut maximam gloriam rettulerit, prona aetate foro et causis et eloquentiae Ciceronis maxime studuit, deinde publicis curis depositis in villis litterato ocio vacabat. Composuit Punicia. Saeptius eius meminit Martialis.

4. There is a life of Silius in the *De poetis Latinis libri* V of Petrus Crinitus (Piero Del
Hicco Baldi) (1476-1508). This work by Crinitus on the Latin poets was first published at Florence by itself in 1505 and then together with his De honesta disciplina libri XXV and his Poematum libri II elsewhere several times. For details about Crinitus' life and bibliography see the Introduction to C. Angeleri's edition of the De honesta disciplina (Rome 1955). The life of Silius, extracted from the De poetis Latinis, is reproduced in several editions of the Punica: e.g., the Paris edition of 1512, the Aldine of 1523 (pp. 3-4), the Lyons editions of 1547 and 1551 (pp. 4-6), the Antwerp editions of 1566 and 1568, the Bipontine of 1784 (pp. III-V), Ernesti's Leipzig edition of 1791-1792 (I liv-lv), and Lemaire's Paris edition of 1823 (II 473-474).

[Inc. (Aldine ed., p. 3)]: Silius Iaticus heroicus ex Hispania oriundus traditur, deducto genere ab Italica urbe nobili, unde cognomen reportavit. Sed Romae natus est, ut creditur, atque etiam educatus, neque obscura fama est... [. . .] [Expl. (ibid., p. 4)]... neque dubium est eundem ad extremam paene senectutem devenisse, ut qui maior septuagenario vitam finierit. Nam morbo detentus insanabiliis clavi singulari constantia obitum praeposuit, felix propemodum, et beatus usque ad extremum diem, ut copiose relatum est a Plinio in epistolis (the last two words omitted by Lemaire).

5. There is a brief account of Silius' life in Book XIX of the Commentariorum urbanorum libri XXXVIII of Raphael Volaterranus (Raffaele Maffei of Volterra) (1451-1522), and Silian verses are often quoted in the geographical parts of the work. The Silian Vita is in the 'anthropological' part; i.e., Secundus Tomus Anthropologiam habet hominim clarorum omnium temporum linguarum gentium libris VIII... The work is a kind of encyclopedia which first came out in Rome in 1506 and went through many editions (e.g., Paris 1511 and 1515, Basel 1559). For more details about Raphael Volaterranus see Sister Agnes Clare Way, C. D. P., CTC II 144.


6. Ambrosius Nicander (Ambrosio [de Victoria]) (16th century) of Toledo, in his edition of Silius published by Junta at Florence in 1515, gives along with the text a fairly lengthy prose life of the poet (pp. 2v-3v) and summaries (catelespes) of two hexameters each at the beginning of each of the 17 books of the poem. Nicander's catelespes have been printed in many editions after his own, usually all together rather than at the beginning of each book and usually accompanying Buschius' argumenta (also in one block): e.g., in the Lyons editions of 1578 and 1598 (sig. *5-*6), Drakenborn's edition (sig. ****), Rupertis's (I xci-xcii), and Lemaire's (II 494-496). The Vita reads thus:


(For the life of Silius by Buschius see below, p. 390).

7. There is an account of Silius by Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus (Giglio o Lilio Gregorio Giraldi) (1479-1552) in the fourth dialogue of his Historiae poetarum tam Graecorum quam Latinorum dialogi decem (Basel 1545,
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pp. 527-529); the life of Silius is related at some length, and then there is mention of the discovery of the Silian Ms. during the Council of Constance and of Domizio Calderini’s dealing with the text. See also Giraldi’s Operum quae extant omnium. . . tomi duo (Basel 1580), II 177 and Opera omnia. . . (Leyden 1696), II 239-240. Silius is referred to and lines from his poem are quoted in Giraldi’s Historiae deorum gentilium syntagmata XVII (first printed Basel 1548). The Silli Italici Vita in the Lyons 1578 edition of the Punica is ex L. Greg. Giraldo.

[Inc. (1545 ed. of the Historiae poetarum. . ., p. 527)]: Suberat imago Syllii Italici, sic, ut quidam arbitrantur, appellati ab Italica, Hispaniae civitate, ex qua oriundum illum fuisset tradunt, quod parum mihi fit verisimile, cum nullus eius, ut Hispani, scriptor meminerit. . ./. . .[Expl. of Vita proper (ibid. p. 528)]: Sed maiorem, ut ait Plinius, florentem atque etiam consularem reliquit. Inter cetera, Punicum bellum secundum septem et decem libris scrispit, qui nunc passim leguntur.

Giraldi’s dialogue then goes on: Sed nolim, inquit Piso, in recensenda Syllii vita plus temporis conteramus, cum eam . . . in tertio Epistolarum volumine C. Plinius . . . descriptam, et grammatici nonnulli. Illud vero libentius ego / (p. 529) et Picus scire velitum, quonam modo eius ipsum, quod ait, Punicum bellum repertum sit, quod per tot saecula delitetur. Tunc ego, Dicam, inquam, quae ab aliis ipsi comperi, tametsi Marullus non sane grandem linguam Latinam facturam factum iri existimabit, si perpetuam delittuisset, dicam, inquam, ut accepit. Eo tempore, quo Christianorum proceserum conventus . . . in Germania habebatur, tum ferunt in quapiam ibi turri fuisset repertum, litteris admodum obsoletis et pervertutis, et cum eo una cariosos quosdam aliorum scriptorum libros. Primus vero Domitius Calderinus illud et emendavit, et interpretatus est, quod si Fr. Petrarcae aetate in luce fuisse, non is certe Africam, tantam provinciam, aggressus esset, sed hae de re satis.

APPENDIX II

The Manuscripts of the Punica

The 32 extant Mss. are the following (we keep the sigla used in Delz I, where full descriptions of the 32 Mss. may be found. For each of the 25 Mss. known to Blass, his siglum, followed by his name, is added in parentheses):

A Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, Acquisiti e Doni 361
B Oxford, Bodleian Canon. class. lat. 116 (B Blass)
D Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, Laur. 37, 14 (L¹ Blass)
E Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, Laur. 37, 15 (L² Blass)
F Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, Aed. 196 (F Blass)
G Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, Laur. (Gadd.) 91 sup. 33 (G Blass)
H London, British Museum, Harl. 4863 (H Blass)
J Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, Laur. 37, 17 (L⁴ Blass)
K Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, Laur. 37, 18 (L⁵ Blass)
L Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, Laur. 37, 16 (L⁶ Blass)
M Venice, Bibl. Naz. di S. Marco, Marc. lat. XII 68 (4519) (M Blass, who wrongly cites the old no. as LXII. 68)
N Oxford, Bodleian Add. c. 192
O Oxford, Queen’s College, 314 (O Blass)
P Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 8066 (P Blass)
Q Bibl. Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1651 (V¹ Blass)
R Bibl. Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3300 (V² Blass)
T Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 8065 (T Blass)
U Bibl. Vaticana, Urb. lat. 358 (V³ Blass)
V Bibl. Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1652 (V Blass)
W Bibl. Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2779 (V⁴ Blass)
X Bibl. Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3301 (V⁵ Blass)
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Y Bibl. Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3302 (V² Blass)
Z Bibl. Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2778 (V⁷ Blass)
Γ Bibl. Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 1258 (O¹ Blass)
Δ Bibl. Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 1441
Θ Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Preussischer Kulturbesitz (West Berlin), Ms. lat. fol. 549 (formerly Tübingen, Universitätsbibliothek on deposit from the Preussische Staatsbibliothek)
Λ Budapest, University Library, Cod. lat. 8
Ξ Cesena, Bibl. Malatestiana, Cod. Mal. S. XII, 3 (M³ Blass)
Π Bibliotheca Vaticana, Borg. lat. 417 (M. VIII 20)
Σ Rome, Bibl. Casanatense Ms. 1064 (M³ Blass)
Φ Oxford, Bodleian Ms. lat. class. c. 4 (M³ Codex Mediomontanus, Blass)
Ψ New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Library, Marston Ms. 220


Punica

Commentaries

1. ANONYMUS A.

A considerable amount of the explanatory material in P and Γ (scribe A) does not correspond; on the other hand, there are many notes which are the same or very similar. They must come from a common source, which we shall call (the explanations of) Anonymus A, who doubtless preceded Petrus Odus and probably expounded Silius in a public or university course. At any rate, when Odus put his own notes into Γ, those of scribe A (the first hand in both text and scholia) were already there. There is similarity not only in the actual explanations which P and scribe A of Γ give but also in the areas covered: in particular, geography, figures and tropes, and the structure of speeches, although the P annotations are frequently incorrect and those of scribe A in Γ more generally reliable. Cf., for instance, in P on fol. 4v (ad I 201): descriptum (with no trace of abbreviation for -ur) mors Athalas, for which Γ shows in the margin: descriptur mons Athalas pulchre (where only the extra vowel is objectionable); Anonymus A must have provided: descriptur mons Ath(a)las. An example of more accurate similarity is Γ, fol. 77v (ad VI 644): Descriptur ducatus Spoletanus sive Umbria; P, fol. 71: Hannibal vertit se in ducatum Spoletanum. As an illustration particularly of the method of Anonymus A we might note the spurious verse III 667A, whether he composed it himself or took it from an earlier source: Advenimus magnis quam laeta fronte sacerdos, written in the margin of Γ on fol. 38v; in P, fol. 34v it is in the text with mente instead of fronte. (It is also in the text of many later Ms., with fronte).

A curious mistake on the part of the scribe of P clearly indicates that he obtained at least some of his material from a handwritten source. On fol. 1v proper names in the text (I 45: Ticine and 52: Außide) have the marginal annotations Ticinum flumen and Außidas flumen(en). Other river-names are similarly reproduced in the margins on fols. 3, 3v, 4, 5, 6v. On fol. 8 vss. I 421-425 are bracketed and against the bracket, in the right-hand margin, is added the word comparatio (comperatio); further over in the margin, opposite I 421 is the note Methonomia flu(men). Lower down, opposite I 436 is the note flumen Methono[:]. From here on until fol. 19(a) (the foliate of P missed a folium between fols. 19 and 20) the names of real rivers copied in the margins are interspersed with entries such as Sarchamnós fí. Zeuma flú. fol. 9, flú. Sinedoche fol. 9v, Epitheton flú. fol. 17v, ypotalage flú. fol. 19. On fol. 19(a) the note to II 457 fí Methonomia (cp. 19(a)² fí Epiteto and fí Zeuma) makes clear what has happened. The scribe had in his exemplar the abbreviation fí = f(igura), and until 19(a), at which point the light dawned upon
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him, misunderstood it as an abbreviation for f(lumen).

Among the other striking items in P are three quotations fromLeonardo Bruni's *De primo bello Punico* (fols. 33, 71v, and 72 ad III 385, VI 663, and VI 695 respectively). It seems likely that they derive from Anonymus A, such an intellectual approach to his author being almost beyond the scribe of P; and it is possible that Anonymus A was a friend of Bruni's.

The traces of Anonymus A in P and $I$ are far from constituting a continuous commentary and do not start from a common point. The first note of any scope in $I$ is: (on I 24) Iarba fuit rex Africanus qui vendidit tantum territorium (corrected from -us) Didoni quantum ambivit cum uno corio (corrected from lorica) bovis et fuit filius Iovis (not in P); the first note in P is on fol. 2 (I 56): nota Hannibalis conditiones (not in $I$). There are, however, some similarities which may indicate a common origin: cp. (I 119) P fol. 3 sacrificium ad Proserpinam, $I$ fol. 4 sacrificium factum deae Proserpinae, and (I 130) P fol. 3 nota hic quid Carthaginenses dicunt Italian esse occidentem and $I$ fol. 4 the glosses *firmamento occidentali* over aze and *Cartaginensibus* over Sidoniis (I 131).

If Petrus Marsus is correct in his statement that Odus was the first person to expound Silius in Rome, and if Anonymus A is anterior to Odus, then Anonymus A must have been active in another city. Florence immediately suggests itself since the first period in the diffusion of texts of Silius took place there.

**Manuscripts:**


Vatican, Ottob. Lat. 1258 ($I$), fols. 1-210; s. XV. (Blass, *op. cit.*, 177; Delz I 108-118).

2. **ANONYMUS B.**

Many of the explanatory comments in the MSS. A, T, X, and $\Psi$ vary; but there are enough of them that are verbally the same, or very nearly so, for us to posit a common source, which we shall call (the explanations of) Anonymus B. This commentator probably, like Anonymus A, gave a course on Silius; cf. the remark in the margin of A ad VII 313: Notate hic astutiam Hannibalis de qua plurimi meminerunt viri and the comment by scribe A of X on I 73: notabitis quod duo Bell fuere.

Two of the four MSS. in question have a *Vita* followed by a rudimentary *accessus* ($\Psi$ may have had this material too, but the first folium is now lost):

Ms. T, fol. 4 to the right near the beginning of the text. [Vita] Ut de vita Silli referamus, mortuus est voluntarie inedia ob clavum inmedicabilem qui perpetuum et letalem dolorem ei gignebat (ut vid., leg. gignebat). Suo in Neapolitano, annum agens quintum et septuagesimum diem finivit. Ad cuius laudem Martialis multa facit epigrammata, quorum primordia haec sunt [Martial IV 14. 1-3; VII 63. 1-2; and XI 48, all four lines, are then quoted]. [Accessus] et per morem poetae in tria facit in principio: proponit, invocat, narrat [cf. Serv. ad Aen. I 8].

Ms. X, fol. 1 to the right near the beginning of the text. [Vita] Silius mortuus est voluntarie inedia ob clavum inmedicabilem qui perpetuum et letalem dolorem ei gignebat et suo Neapolitano agro diem finivit. Ad huius laudem Martialis multa facit epigrammata id est. [Accessus] Et per more poetae tria facit: proponit, invocat, et narrat [cf. Serv. ad Aen. I 8].

The notes in A, T, and X on the first three lines of the poem, explaining the construction of caelo and the etymology of Oenotria and Carthago, show a fair amount of similarity.

{Ine.} I 1-3 (Ms. A): Dativus pro accusativo; Virg., it clamor caelo. Oenotria a potu oenus, id est, vinum. Kartago interpretatur nova urbs nam proprie Birska vocabatur a corio tauri. [Cf. Serv. ad Aen. I 6, 532, III 165, I 367.] (Ms. T): At first only ad caelum over caelo and Italia in the margin for Oenotria, but then:... rtago interpretatur nova civitas nam proprie Birska vocabatur a corio tauri [cf. Serv. ad Aen. I 367]. (Ms. X): Dativus pro accusativo; VI(r)g., It
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clamor caelo. Oenotria ab enos... Cartago idem est quod nova civitas nam eius proprium nomen est Birsia a corio tauri. [Cf. Serv. ad Aen. I 6, 532, III 165, I 367].

As an instance of an explanation where we have the evidence of the four Mss. we might take the notes on I 72, the first line of the text as we have it in \( \Psi \). The gloss corresponds exactly in A, T, and X except for variations in orthography and abbreviation, for a word crossed out in T, and for the fact that T has \( \text{sarrana} \) in place of the second \( \text{sarrar} \).

I 72 (Mss. A, T, X) : Sarra civitas est quae dicitur Tyros a sar quod piscis quidam est illic abundans quo pannos tingebant. Unde Sarraunam ostrum, id est, Tirium dicitur. Ergo Sarrar a sar pisce ut Sidon quoque a sidone piscem. [Cf. Serv. ad Geo. II 506.]

(Ms. \( \Psi \)) : The writing is blurred at the edge of the folium; what can be made out shows slight differences from the other three Mss., thus: ... a civi... quae Tyrus... a sar quod piscis est... id est, Tyrium... purpura fie... dicitur. Ergo Sarra... sar sicut Sidon... done piscem.

The explanations of Anonymus B have often been taken over into \( \Sigma \). An example of this is the etymology of \( \text{Manes} \) in the glosses on I 82. A, T, and X (scribe A) all have the same wording except for variations in spelling and abbreviating and for the \( \text{manant} \) which T reads instead of \( \text{emanant} \).

I 82 (Mss. A, T, X) : Manes vel per antiphrasim quod non sint boni [cf. Isid. Etym. I 37, 24] nam mane bonum significat vel a manando quod ab inferis emanant. (Ms. \( \Psi \)) : dixi manes, id est, dixi boni aut manis a manando quia ab inferis emanabant. (Ms. \( \Sigma \)) : manibus a manando... manant et abundant ab inferis... superiores vel manando, id est, exeundo dicti manes. For the hand of \( \Sigma \) in question here, the first, see the account of Anonymus C below.

The glosses in A, T, X, and \( \Psi \) do not extend to the same point. The final one, or the final set for each of the Mss., is as follows:

A (ad XVII 651 f.) : Quirino quia ipse fecit moenia et tu conservasti ipsa et nos omnes. \( \text{Camillo qui repulit Senones ferentes signa Romanorum.} \)

T (ad XVII 486) : R]etheius mons apud T]roiam.

X (ad XII 713) : in Aventino habebat (then a word crossed out and now illegible) templum Diana.

\( \Psi \) (ad XVII 651 f.) : quia ipse fecit moenia et tu conservasti ipsa et nos omnes... qui repulit Senones...

The \textit{explicit} of Anonymus B is seen in the common ending of A and \( \Psi \).

The final scholia of A are followed, in the same hand as that of text and commentary, by: Epitaphium. Silii Italicorum poetae / Silius altisono celebravit barbara versu / Proelia : Apollinea Solus in arte potens. / Tempore perpetuo intactum quem gloria servat, / Illius hic durus protegit ossa lapis. // Gregorius Grimalius (?) / . At the end of T, the first hand has copied the two epigrams quoted by Blass, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 180.

At the end of \( \Psi \), a 16th-century hand has added the notorious entry that was forged to show that Petrarch knew Silius' poem: Ioanès Columna Francisco Petrarche / Mne mosyns.

\textbf{Manuscripts}:

Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, Acquisti e Doni 361; s. XV (A). (Delz I 45-46).

New Haven, Yale University Library. Marston Ms. 220, s. XV (\( \Psi \)). (L. Arrigoni, \textit{Notice historique et bibliographique sur 25 MSS. ... ayant fait partie de la bibliothèque de François Petrarque} (Milan 1883) 21-23 (No. 1); W. H. Bond (and C. U. Faye), \textit{Supplement to the Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada} (New York 1962) p. 90 no. 226; Delz I 134-135; B. L. Ullman, ‘Petrarch Manuscripts in the United States,’ \textit{Italia medioevale e umanistica V} (1962) 443-475 at 456 (No. 49).)


Vatican, Vat. Lat. 3301; s. XV (X). (Inventario librorum latinorum Mss. Bibli. Vat. IV 324, Blass, \textit{op. cit.}, 178; Delz I 102-103).
3. Anonymus C.

There are a great many marginal and interlinear explanations in Ms. Σ; though these continue to the end of the poem, they are more extensive in the early books. Three hands are to be distinguished in the main, while there are a few slight traces of other hands. The first annotator (who is also the copyist of the Ms.) seems not to be reproducing notes taken down from a lecturer on the Punica but rather to have gathered explanations from various written sources. In particular, he has borrowed material from Anonymus B (preserved in A, T, X, and Ψ), often embellishing it rhetorically.

Some folia of Σ are lacking, so that its text now begins with line I 60. The first glosses appear above this line: e.g., ordet (as in W) to explain flagrat and aetatis (as in W) to explain aevi. They are the glosses of the first hand (also the copyist of the Ms.), whom we call Anonymus C. His commentary begins on the second line of text thus:


Anonymus C has made some curious mistakes. For instance, at III 592 in the text for extuat he has written extuat (which no other Ms. reads). This he takes as aestuat and writes above it the gloss: id est, galliit et fervet.

An example of what seems to be an expansion on the part of Anonymus C of material from Anonymus B is the following:


Another instance of the rather wordy explanations of Anonymus C (this time without a source in Anonymus B) is:

IX 17: Ni sors alterna iuris: quia illo die erat exercitus in potestate Pauli, quia consules solebant alter uno die gubernare exercitus et alter ali die. Hic dies erat Pauli et propeter hoc retinuit se Varro, quia non erat suus sed Pauli.

The last note of Anonymus C which we find (vss. XVII 645-654 are missing) is:

XVII 642 (over illidit): s(clicet) ipse hiberus crudelis.

Manuscript:


4. Anonymus D.

The notes by the second hand in Ms. Σ offer good explanations of facts and cite parallels not only from a wide range of Latin writers but also from Greek authors. A great many of these notes, sometimes just as they stand in Σ and sometimes in a slightly different form, have been written into a printed text, Vat. Inc. II 427, which is a copy of the 1483 edition of Silius (with the commentary of Petrus Marsus). There are a few instances also where the material added to the Vatican incunabulum corresponds exactly, or almost exactly, to annotations in Ms. Δ. This commentary found in three different places is to be assigned to Anonymus D. The notes represent in it Vat. Inc. II 427 extend from the beginning of Book I to the end of Book XV. The first one that we have is the following:

I 20 (Vat. Inc. II 427): Primordia, id est, causas et origines tanti beli tamque diuturni. Polybius libro terto de causq bellq et principio disserens sic ait [Polyb. III 6. 7]: Equidem ita existimo principia dici primas hominum actiones in rebus quae deliberata [sic] sunt: causas quae iudicum deliberatio-
nemque praecedunt quaeque efficiunt ut ita judicemus deliberemusve [this is substantially Niccolò Perotti's version].

The marginal commentary on I 493 is a kind of essay on pudor and occurs also in a shorter form in Ms. Δ:

dedecoris: cuius contrarium impudentia dicitur, quae dux est ad omnem turpitudinem quam ut vir fortis effugiat omnem
dolorem subire debet atque excipere. Unde Aristoteles agens de magnanimo sic ait [EN 1124b8]: Cum in periculo versus vitae suae non parcit; Cicero in secundo de oratore sic scribit [II 85. 346]: Admirabilis laus videri solet tulisse casus sapienter adversos, non fractus esse fortuna, retinuisse in rebus asperis dignitatem. (Ms. Δ): *Pudor est timor iustae vituperationis cuius contrarium impudentia dicitur, quae dux est ad omnem turpitudinem; quam ut vir fortis effugiat omnem dolorem subire debet atque excipere. Verecundia, inquit Vegetius libro primo [Epitoma rei militaris I 7], dum prohibet fugere facit esse victorem. (This is the most important of the annotations in Δ that are more or less identical with those in Vat. Inc. II 427).

The last comment written into the Vatican incunabulum is the following:

XV 719 (Vat. Inc. II 427): *patrius pavor: Timiditas innata atque gentilis.

The first explanatory note in the second hand of Σ reads as follows:

IV 719 (Ms. Σ, second hand): sedem sacratam, id est, Ethuriam... quoniam (E)thurisci a sacrificio... denominati sunt nam thyo G(raece) sacrificio.

The first one which Σ and the Vatican incunabulum have in common is: V 175 (Ms. Σ, second hand): Sarrate [sic] mons est inter Faliscos non longe a Tyberi. In Vat. Inc. II 427 Marsus' explanation has been crossed out and replaced in the margin by: Ethuriae non longe a Tiberi; adhuc retinet nomen.

Another example is the following:

V 470 (Ms. Σ, second hand): Acclinis malo, id est, adhaerens abori navis, Orpheus sono et cantu oblectat Argonautas.

[Though Statius is not named, this is derived from Theb. V 344: acclinis malo mediis intersonat Orpheus]. (Vat. Inc. II 427): Acclinis: adhaerens, sic Papinius in Tebade [sic]: acclinis malo.

The last certain notice from Anonymus D in Σ is:

XVI 593 (Ms. Σ, second hand): qui vindicavit vindictam pub. et privatam.

Manuscripts:

Rome, Bibli. Casanatense Ms. 1064; s. XV (Σ) (as above for Anonymus C, p. 368).

Vatican, Ottob. Lat. 1441; s. XV (Δ). (Inventarii Codicum Manuscriptorum Latino- rum Bibliothecae Vaticanae Ottobonianae Pars I, No. 1441. Delz I 119-120.)

Vatican, Inc. II 427 (a copy of the 1483 edition of Silius with the commentary of Petrus Marsus), notes.

5. PETRUS ODUS MONTOPOLITANUS

The marginal and interlinear annotations added to Ms. W by scribe A (i.e., the first of the four hands found in the text) are at times full enough to amount to a commentary. They immediately give the impression of being lecture notes and prove, on closer study, to come from Petrus Odus Montopolitanus' course on Silius at the Studio in Rome.

The proof consists of the symbol .p. in the margin of W; this accompanies conjectures which we know from I to be those of Petrus Odus. For instance, we read in the text of W at XVII 363 Latii instead of Troiae thus: Ut placet, et cineres Latii Carthaginem regnet und in the margin: sic putat .p. In I ad loc. Odus had already written in the margin: forte Latii regnet in Carthagin cineeres. (The original lacuna in I was ultimately filled by Domizio Calderini with the correct Troiae, which had fallen out of the common ancestor of O, W, I, Σ, Σ, Ψ; for more details see Delz I 100). That the handwriting of these conjectures in I is that of Petrus Odus is established by comparison with two autograph letters in Ms. Vat. lat. 3908, fols. 163 and 166 (we are very grateful to Prof. A. Campana for having drawn our attention to the latter Ms.).

Odus is the chief annotator of I. His glosses and conjectures extend throughout
the Ms., whereas a rudimentary commentary by the first scribe (Anonymus A; see above, p. 365) of the codex stops at fol. 96\textsuperscript{v} and marginalia by Calderini start only at fol. 99 (see below, I 7). Readings proposed by Odus are also taken over from I in \(\Sigma\), with \textit{puto} — or \textit{est melius} if the scribe is strongly in favor of them. Some of his conjectures are also copied into \(\Psi\). In fact, many of them proved so acceptable that they were incorporated into the later Mss. (chiefly D, Q, Y, Z, \(\Theta\), \(\Pi\)) and into the early editions.

Odus’ comments are mostly concerned with geography, history, and mythology — perhaps most often with geography, where he is frequently wrong as will be seen from the examples below (though some of the confusion probably comes from a student’s not having heard, or copied down, correctly).

For a detailed account of missing folia, wrong insertion of a folium, and damaged margins in W see Delz I 98-99. The outer sheet of the first fascicle is missing. The first comment deriving from Odus is therefore the following:

I 61 (Ms. W) : Aegatae [sic] insulae sunt in mari Libyco apud quas ceciderunt Cartaginenses in primo bello Punico. \textit{In Siculo}. Quia illic sunt saxa quaedam apud quae conveniebant Romani et Cartaginenses quando faciebant pacta et conventiones et vocabantur arae eo quod illic occidebant porcam et sacrificabant. Hannibal autem incitatus contra Romanos illic voluit primo congredi ut pacta et foedera omnia mergeret.

Among other annotations stemming from Odus in W we may note:

II 108 (Ms. W) : Massylae populi sunt in Gallia Narbonense et cum Afris venerant contra Saguntum. Inter istos ergo Mopsus spicula mittebat, qui dicti sunt Massylae a Marsilia quae nunc dicitur.


V 281 (Ms. W) : Hircania et Caspia insulae sunt finitimae in mari Mediterraneo ubi sunt tigris et Gryphi, ubi est etiam vena auri sed propter Gryphos tangi non potest.

XIV 686 (Ms. W, over \textit{cura viri}) : diligentia scilicet Vespasiani vel Titi. \(\textit{Scrib A has repeated Odus’ mistake as seen in Ms. I, where Titi vel Vespasiani is written over viri.} \) Silius intended the phrase to refer to Domitian.

In the present state of our Ms., with the margins of fols. 194 and 195 torn off, the last explanation of any scope from Odus is:

XVII 3 (Ms. W, fol. 196\textsuperscript{v} since the first folium of the last fascicle has been incorrectly inserted at the end) : Cum Cybele portaretur a Troia, fuit concilium ubi deheret recipi; et cum esset decretum ut non in alieno templo recipieretur, decreverunt patres ut apud optimum virum recipieretur, ad quod electus fuit Scipio Nasica.

From the more extensive interlinear glosses beyond XVII 3 we might take as a specimen:

XVII 414 (Ms. W) : quas miserat rex Philippus, qui fidem Hannibalis secutus omnem Graeciam adversus Romanos concitavit, ut supra.

\textit{Manuscript}:
Vatican, Vat. Lat. 2779; s. XV(W). (Inventarium librorum latinorum Ms. Bibli. Vat. IV 179; Blass, \textit{op. cit.}, 177; Delz I 98-101).

\textit{Biography}:
Petrus Odus Montopolitanus (Pietro Odi da Montopoli) was born at Montopoli in Sabina (the date of his birth is uncertain); he died (perhaps at Rome) not after 1463. His family name may have been Oddi or, as the regular use of Odus by himself and his contemporaries suggests, Odi (cf. Graziosi, \textit{op. cit.} Infra, pp. 8-9). He generally uses Montopolitianus for his paternal name; cf., e.g., Mss. Vat. Lat. 7192, fol. 403\textsuperscript{v} : Petrus Montopolitianus super Terentium; Milan Ambros. D. 112 inf. and Trivulz. 793 : Petrus Odus Montopolitianus P. Candido; and Vat. Lat. 2769, fol. 1\textsuperscript{v} : Carmen epitaphium ... Petri Odi Montopolitani per F. S. R. He uses both Montopolites and Montopolitanus in Ms. Vat. Lat. 3908, fols. 163 and 166 respectively (all our references to the folia of this Ms. follow the modern number-
ing). Petrus Marsus gives Odus' patrician name as Montopolita (cf. the passage quoted on p. 000 from the dedicatory epistle to his ed. of Silius). Odus calls himself Mundopolitianus in Ms. Vat. Lat. 3908, fol. 223 (a dictated letter but signed by the author) and Paris Lat. 8413, fol. 25v (salutation of a letter), by a pun as we see from the text of the letter in the Paris Ms.: Illud Tullianum probavi Non ullam urbem aliquam sed universum orbem patriam nobis esse habendam ... (he is in exile from Rome).

Another variation in Odus' patrician name comes from a wrong idea of his birthplace. Sabellius, for instance, says in Ennead. X, Lib. VI (at least in Opera... in duos digesta tomos, Basel 1538, II 719 and Opera omnia, ibid. 1560, II 591): Nec Petro Monopolitae minus poeticon fuit ingenium (quam Francisco Philelpho), although he also gives the dative Petro Montopolitano (the same 1560 ed., IV 460; in a letter to M. Antonius Maurocenus). Cosenza (V, card 1271) seems to consider a Monopoli near Bari the birthplace of Odus; but at III 2500 he describes him, with Gregorovius, as 'from Sabine Monopoli.' (In treating of Odus s.v. Pomp. Laet., however, he refers to Montopoli at IV 2913 and on V, card 1459; the Monopolitanus after Odus, Petrus in Kristeller, Iter I 503 [Index] is to be corrected). A Sabine town (in the modern form Montopoli, however) is the correct one as we learn from the description near the end of Book X of the Commentarii rerum memorabilium of Pope Pius II (Enea Silvio Piccolomini): Non procul hic inc wea (i.e., ab arce Farrensi) Monopolis cernitur: unde nostra aetate Petrus Roman venit, non ignobilis poeta, qui heroicis lyricisque versibus multa conscriptit. Desipuit tamen, et furore periclus, in morbum incidit, ex quo nondum senex oblit (ed. Frankfurt, 1614, 274). (Since there is internal evidence that Book XII of the Commentarii was finished by 1463 and since, furthermore, Pius died in 1464, we have a terminus ante quem for Odus' death which makes Zabughin's '1465-1466, circa' [Giulio Pomponio Leolo I 23] too late. Della Torre observes [op. cit. infra, 71 n. 1 on 72] that Odus' death turns out to be previous to 1466). P. de Nolhac, Bibl. de Fulvio Or-
explained the poets and taught grammar and rhetoric.

Another of Odus’ friends was Theodorus Gaza, whose version of the Epistles of Phalaris he emended (cf. Graziosi, op. cit. infra, p. 15). Odus doubtless received his greatest recognition in the pontificate of Pius II (1458-64), and his admiration for Pius is clear from the Epaenetica that he wrote in his honor; aid from Pius, in particular an increase in salary, finally took away some of Odus’ financial worries (cf. Graziosi, op. cit. infra, pp. 16, 27-29, 32; Avesani, op. cit. infra, pp. 25-26).

Odus lectured on Silius at the Studio, but maybe for only one year within the period 1457-62. In the summer of 1462 he was in exile from Rome. The exile may have been self-imposed, and Petrus seems to have suffered from a persecution complex. In any event, in two letters of 1462 he says that an attempt had been made in Rome to poison him. The letters, both written from Olivetum (Alvito, prov. Frosinone; cf. Delz II 437 n. 5), are to a pupil Marinus Turanensis, whom he is going to visit in Salmona, and to Tortelli. The first explains that he had found refuge at Olivetum in a house of the Guantelmi (Cantelmi) family.

Pius II’s report that Odus died mad is consistent with the latter’s assertion, in a letter to Tortelli (Vat. Lat. 3908, fol. 223), that for two years he has suffered because ‘vel... sidera... vel meus genius fortasse perversus vel hominem facinorosa malitia et sceleratae insidiae’ have persecuted him; the letter evinces an ill-concealed fear of madness and ends with a rather feeble rejection of suicide as an escape from suffering. Zabughin was not warranted in deducing that Odus had been assassinated from the epitaph in elegiacs by the Roman jurisconsult Fulgentius Statius (Mss. Rome Angel. 1350, fol. 300; Vat. Lat. 2769, fol. 1°; cf. Graziosi, op. cit. infra, pp. 36-37):... Quicquid enim facili vates resonabat ab ore,/Versus erat magno conditus eloquio./Philosophus rerum causas scrutari omnes/Novetat et summi mystyca sacra dei;/Grammaticus celebre, rhetor clarissimus omni/Hic demum ingenua primus in arte fuit./O dolor, o quanta est Oddo iactura pe-

rempto! Quale decus Latium perdidit ante diem!... Zabughin has either read too much into perempto, or he has taken over material from the poem immediately following in Ms. Angel. 1350 in honor of Mellita of Spoleto. Fulgentius refers to Odus as a poet, philosopher, theologian, grammarian, and rhetorician and as endowed with all sorts of talents and virtues: Non fuit in toto quisquam præstantior orbe/Doctrina, ingenio, moribus, arte, lyra.

Works: He commented on Silius and Terence (what we have of the Terence commentary is in Ms. Vat. Lat. 7192, fols. 403v-406v; see some examples of this in Graziosi, op. cit. infra, pp. 14-15; cf. again Zabughin’s Russian article infra, p. 11, n. 51); there are notes of his in Mss. of Calpurnius Siculus, Ovid, and Martial (cf. Graziosi, op. cit. infra, p. 19; Avesani, op. cit. infra, p. 27, n. 50; and Ruysschaert, ‘Miniaturistes,’ pp. 270-271 and 271, n. 167). He wrote many epistles in both prose and verse and a great deal of other poetry in various meters, and composed a grammatical work. Flavio Biondo says of him (loc. cit. infra): grammaticus Romae celebre Nasonianam Flaccianamque simul in omni carmino genere facultatem facilitatemque est nactus; Giralde (loc. cit. infra) calls him: poeta et orator non incelebris, qui Romae illis temporibus professor est, quibus Pomponius Laetus adhuc iuvenis clarescere coepit, quin et illi aliquamdiu, ut scribit Sabellicus [see the Opera omnia, 1560 ed., IV 460], operam dedit.

Sabellicus’ comparison of the talent of Philelphus and of Petrus (cf. above under Biogr.) continues: extat eis pulsamen ad Calustum pontificem magni quidem profectus index, si longior illa vita contigisset. Where the poem can be found today, if it is still extant, seems not to be known. But of many of Odus’ poems, as of many of his letters, we know the Ms. whereabouts (cf. the references given in Cagni, Campana, Delz, and Kristeller below). These poems (and three prose letters) have now been published by Maria Teresa Graziosi Acquaro (op. cit. infra). Among them are an epigram for Gianozzo Manetti, the Opusculum Magistri Petri Montepollitani Odi in laudem
Pontificis Pii Secundi (485 hexameters), poems in the four (or five) books of Epamin-
tica ad Pium II Pont. Max., a poem to Carlo Marsuppini (in Asclepiadic distichs and
apparently in Odus' own hand), verses to Flavio Biondo, his petition to Nicolas V ut
ex voto liceat ire ad Mariam Loretam (in 66 Sapphic strophes), his Degarba tonsa Pau-
li, and his Ovidias (which he recited at Sul-
mona in 1462). Most of Odus' extant letters are in Ms. Vat. Lat. 3908; the one to Mar-
inus Turanensis from Ms. Paris Bibl. Nat.
8413 is now printed in Appendix B of Delz
II. Flavius Blondus and Fulgentius Statius
may not be thinking of Odus specifically
as the author of a grammar when they call
him grammaticus. But there is a definite
15th-century reference to Odus as the
author of a grammatical work though its
title is not given and we do not know its
whereabouts today. The reference is made
by the author of another grammatical work
(in Ms. Ven. Marc. Lat. XIV. 109) who
presents himself as a pupil of Laurentius
Valla and of Odus; cf. Ruysschaert, 'A
propos des trois premières grammairies
latines de Pomponio Leto,' 69.

Bibl.: Cosenza III 2499-2501, V cards
1271, 1410; Kristeller, Iter II 503 (index) and
II 695 (index); Tiraboschi III (Milan 1833)
199; Voigt I 479 n. 1, II 209 with n. 2.

M. T. Graziosi, Acquaro, 'Petri Odi Monto-
politani Carmina nunc primum et libris manus-
scriptis edita,' Humanistica Lovaniensia
XIX (1970) 7-113+2 pls.; R. Avesani,
'Epanetico towards ad Pium II Pont. Max. libri
Vr, Enea Silvio Piccolomini, Papa Pio II
(Atti del Convegno per il quinto centenario
della morte e altri scritti raccolti da Domenico
Maffei; Siena 1968) 15-97+8 pls., passim,
esp. 25-27; A. Beccadelli (Panormita), Epist.
Gall. IV 12 (ed. Venice 1553, pp. 81 and 82);
Flavio Biondo, Italia illustrata (Basel 1559)
334F; D. Bloch, 'Quelques manuscrits de
Pietro di Celano à la Bibliothèque Nationale
de Paris,' Studi di bibliografia... in onore di
Tammaro de Marinis (Città del Vaticano
1964) I 143-161+8 pls. at 150-152, 158, 159;
G. M. Cagni, 'I codici Vaticani Palatino-
Latini appartenuti alla biblioteca di Gian-
nazzo Manetti,' La Bibliografia LXII (1960)
1-43 at 24 n. 2; A. Campana, 'Il Vat. lat.
3370 e alcuni codici del Sirleto,' Studi
medievali, Serie Terza III (1962) 151-161 at
157 with nn. 22 and 23; J. Delz, 'Ein
unbekannter Brief von Pomponius Laetus,'
Italia medioevale eumanistica IX (1966)
417-440 (we shall refer to this hereafter as
Delz II) at 417, 432, 434, 436-438; A. J.
Dunstan, 'Studies in Domizio Calderini,'
ibid. XI (1968) 71-150+8 pls. at 73, 86-89, 96,
98-99, 105; L. (G.) G. Giraldi, De poetis
nostrorum temporum (1551) (ed. K. Wotke,
Berlin 1894) 19; Graziosi: listed above under
Acquaro; Petrus Marsus in the dedicatory epistle 'ad ill. Principii Virgini-
num Ursinum' of his Silius (for the editions
see the Fortuna above, pp. 351 with nn. 54
and 64, and below, p. 387); R. A. Mynors,
C. Valerii Catulli carmina (Oxford 1958)
x n. 2 on xi; Pius II (Enea Silvio Piccolo-
mini), Commentarii rerum memorabilium,
Lib. X (ed. Frankfurt 1614, p. 274); M.
Regolisi, 'Nuove ricerche intorno a Gio-
Vanni Tortelli,' Italia medioevale e uma-
nistica IX (1966) 123-189+5 pls. at 125, 174-
175, 185-186; F. M. Renazzi, Storia dell'
Università degli studi di Roma I (Rome
1803) 161-162, 229, 238; J. Ruysschaert,
'A propos des trois premières grammairies
latines de Pomponio Leto,' Scriptorium XV
(1961) 68-75; Id., 'Miniaturistie romains
sous Pie II,' Enea Silvio Piccolomini,
Papa Pio II (Atti del Convegno per il quinto centenario
della morte e altri scritti raccolti da Domenico
Maffei; Siena 1968) 245-282+35 pls. at 270-271; A. Coccisi Sabelli-
cus, Ennead. X, Lib. VI (Opera... in duos
digesta tomos, Basel 1538, II 719 and Opera
omnia, ibid. 1560, II 591) and Epist., Lib.
XI, M. Antonio Mauroceno equiti (Opera
omnia IV 458-461 at 460); L. Swoboda, Die
handschriftliche Ueberlieferung des Properz
(typewritten diss., Vienna 1963) 33; A.
della Torre, Paolo Marsi da Pescina (Rocca
S. Casciano 1903) 67-71; V. Zabughin,
Giulio Pomponio Leto (Rome-Grottaferrata
1909-12) I 7, 15-25 with nn. on 272, 275-279;
II, 2 p. 417; Id., 'Julij Pomponij Let,'
Istoricheskoe Obzorienie XVIII (1914) 7, 9-11.

6. IULIUS POMPONIUS LAETUS

That Pomponius Laetus occupied himself
with Silius has always been known. He
was the editor of the second Roman edition of the *Punica*; as we read at the end of it, Opus iam neglectum Pomponius recognovit anno domini M. CCC. LXXI, VI Kal. Maii. Romae. Furthermore, Petrus Marsus gives as the succession of Silian expositors preceding himself Petrus Montopolita, Pomponius, and Domitius; cf. p. 351 above.

Two pieces of evidence from the year 1468-69, when Pomponius was a prisoner in the Castel S. Angelo, indicate his early concern with the *Punica*. (1) He cites Silius in a letter to the castellan Rodrigo Sánchez de Arévalo thus: Postea scribit dignitas vestra quod virtus nisi collata discriminibus quae et quanta sit videri non potest. . . Sic et sentire videtur Silius Italicus cum ait, Ardua virtutem profert via. (For the MSS. containing the exchange of letters between Pomponio and Rodrigo, Cambridge Corpus Christi College 166 and Ven. Marc. XI 103 (4361), see Delz I 42 and n. 5. They are quoted according to the Cambridge Ms. in Creighton, *op. cit.* infra, III 276-284. See also Zabughin, *Giulio Pomponio Leto I* 145 and n. 426, where his 'Sil. Ital. XV, 103-4?' is to be corrected to 11578). (2) In a letter to his patron Giovanni Tbron in Venice (dated April 28 and which must be of the year 1468; cf. Delz I 42, II 422 (where the letter is quoted from Ms. Paris Bibl. Nat. Lat. 8413)-423 and nn. 1-3) he says: . . . historia- rum libros scribo iam tertia fere parte absoluta. . . . Silium et Valerium Flaccum volente Deo finiam.

We have a Ms. of Silius (Y) copied by Pomponius for his pupil Fabio Mazzatosta; there are also marginal notes by Pomponius in the first part (as far as fol. 26v; there are a very few brief glosses after that). Fulvio Orsini, who once owned the Ms., has written on fol. 1: Silio Italico di mano di Pomponio Leto, con sue notationi, in perg.; for Pomponius' hand see Muzzioli, *op. cit.* infra and Delz I n. 84. Notes in his hand likewise occur in two other Silian codices (marginal in Q, marginal and interlinear in II); cf. Delz I 104-105, 87-88, 126-127 and nn.

Parts of commentaries on Silius, without the text, are found in two miscellaneous Ms.: Paris Bibl. Nat. Lat. 8413, fols. 204-208 and 213-221 and Flor. Laur. pliat. 52. 8, fols. 105-146v. There is good evidence that both of these commentaries stem from Pomponius.

Several of the items in the Paris Ms. are signed by Pietro di Celano. Through the handwriting of those items and in some other Ms. (not including any Silius) Pietro is seen to be the copyist of still other material in the Ms. in question, e.g., Pomponius' letter to Giovanni Tron (fol. 175; on the handwriting of this letter in particular see Delz II 420, n. 2) referred to above and the Silian commentary. Pomponius is established as the source of this commentary through similarities to notes that are clearly his in other Silian Ms. (cf. infra). It seems likely, therefore, that Pomponius expounded the *Punica* while he was in Venice in 1467-68, just before he was deported to Rome and imprisoned. We know that Pomponius was the teacher of the sons of eminent families during this stay of his in Venice. We know also that the counts of Celano were in exile at this time from their native seat. Everything combines to explain why we have a letter of Pomponius Laetus to Giovanni Tron and notes of the former on Silius copied into the same Ms. by Pietro di Celano.

The commentary in the Paris Ms. begins with some remarks on poetry, references to certain Latin poets through the time of the Emperor Heliogabalus, a fairly extensive life of Silius (which includes some confusion with Statius), mention of Ennius and Naevius, and a history of the Punic Wars. Then comes the commentary proper, covering *Punica* I 1-89 and III 311-606. The part in Book III shows verbal correspondences with the marginal notes in B (these notes are only on the first seven books and of some scope only in the third). Ms. B, one of the Canonici collection in the Bodleian, comes from Venice; and the scribe must be Paolo Marsi. The attention drawn to forms of *Marsus* and *Marsicus* and to *Fucinus* in the Ms. might suggest either Pietro Marsi of Cese (see the account of him I 8, below) or Paolo Marsi of Pescina. Inspection of autograph, or possibly autograph, Ms. of the two yields the following: Paolo's draft of his *Bembica peregrina* in Ms. Vat. Regin.
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lat. 1385 is in the same book hand as the text of B (the cursive corrections are too few for comparison with the cursive marginal notes in B), whereas even if Ms. Bern. Burgerbibl. 516 is an autograph of Pietro, the script does not match that of B; cf. Delz II 428-430. It seems probable that Paolo, who was in Venice in the first half of 1468, made the copy of the *Punic* (he did not get beyond Book XI) in order to have a text before him during Pomponius’ lectures, which he attended at the same time as Pietro di Celano. As an instance of similar material taken down by the two students cf. B, fol. 26v (on III 320 f.): si quando navigia patiuntur naufragium et ibi pervenientur, Nasamones eos obturancet et comedunt, with Paris Ms. 8413, fol. 213: . . . et si quando navigia naufragium patiuntur et applicant Nasamoniae, Nasamones obturacatis hominibus homines comedunt et pingues eligunt. Note also Martial X 44. 1 quoted *ad Pun.* III 598 in both B and the Paris Ms.

The commentary in the Florentine Ms. is presumably a fair copy of a student’s notes taken down from Pomponius’ lecturing at the Studio in Rome. The time of the lecturing would be the period after his release from prison. (The paper of the codex shows throughout the watermark Briquet 7834 [Rome 1470]; cf. Delz I 39). In any case, the student’s note-taking is proved at fol. 110v (on I 197): trying to copy down the names of the seven mouths of the Nile, he has to give up: . . . tarenticum duo alia. celeritas dicentis praeceperis oppressit. The identity of the teacher is proved by the following: (1) At the end of the second preliminary part of the commentary comes the sentence: Sic fonte illo uberrimo offuscati in antiquarui Iulii ad Silium veniamus. *Antiquarii Iulii* obviously refers to Pomponius, who was something of a specialist in Roman antiquities and topography; and though the syntactic relations in the sentence are rather puzzling, we should note that Pomponius is also called a *fons uber* in a *Carmen in Romae Urbis Genethlion* of Don(ent)ico Palladio Sorano (cf. Delz I 41 and n. 4; Dunston, *op. cit.* infra 87 and n. 8). (2) The note at the end of Book II (fol. 134) reads: iuvat haec collegisse Iulio Pomponio praeceptorre. *O dii immortales quid si mihi notarii manu adderetis, ut Iulianas partes quas in lectione retractat assequi possem...*

The commentary in the Florentine Ms. consists of a life of Silius, some preliminary remarks on history (particularly the history of warfare and events leading up to the second Punic War), and an exegesis extending from *Punic* I 9 to IV 562. (The lines are not always commented on in order; I 635-694 and IV 1-294 are without commentary). The exegesis shows correspondences with the scholia in Mss. Y and II.

The scholia in Y are often only marginal indications of the contents of the poem or brief identifications and practically stop at III 318 (fol. 26v; there are a very few very brief notes after this). The first one (fol. 1 *ad I 2*) reads: Oenotrus filius Lycaonis regis Arcadieae. Sometimes they attempt an explanation and are longer; the one on III 318 reads: Meninx insula Lotophagorum quos tempestate delatus fuit Ulixes qui Neritus erat. Ideo dat illi tragulum quae est genus teli Graeci. There are two noteworthy marginal excurses of some length: one on Curetes, Corybantes, Cabiri, etc. (fol. 12v *ad II 93*) and one on the fountain of Hercules at Gades and tides (fol. 22v *ad III 46 ff*). See Zabughin II 156-157 for mention of these passages and a description of Y (with I, pls. 7 and 9) and II 347-348 nn. 196-197 for a transcription of the second passage, and Wardrop, *op. cit.* infra, pl. 15 for a reproduction of fol. 12v. Correspondence between the explanatory material in Y and that in the Florence Ms. is illustrated by the following: Y on I 277 (fol. 5) gives: Geryon in Eritrea [sic] Hispaniae imperabat cum duobus fratribus. Ideo fingituruisse tricorps (cf. Diodor. IV 17, 2; Lucian *Tox.* 63; Myth. Vat. I 68; Just.-Trog. XLIV 4, 14). The Florentine Ms. has (fol. 113): sequentia quaedam historia scripta declara-vimus. Repeto aliqua. In Eritrea provincia Geryones et Cauriscus et alter frater cuius nomen non reperi adhuc in libris Hispанияm infestabant. *Tris animas.* Ob fratres tres unanimes, Lucretius autem negat fratres istos suisse et negat Herculem. The

The hand of the notes in \( \Pi \), which is not that of the text, belongs to Pomponius' middle period; its characteristics are the same as those of Y; cf. Delz I 126 and Muzzoli, op. cit. infra. The notes only begin at III 531; the three fascicles containing I 1-III 530 are lost. The folia containing IV 74-201 are also lost. (For details about these missing parts and others see Delz I 126). So there are scholia in \( \Pi \) to compare with the commentary in Laur. 52. 8, as there are scholia in Y to compare with that commentary; but we do not have notes in Y and \( \Pi \) to compare with each other. For III 531-714 and IV 295-562 comparison may be made between the material in the Florence Ms. and the notes of \( \Pi \); there are some parallels in the facts adduced, but no striking verbal correspondences.

The interlinear notes in \( \Pi \) are frequent; the marginal ones are also frequent and often fairly full. We begin (fol. 1) with ex qua mole written over the Unde of III 531 and, in the margin: pavescebant repeteret oculus confectum iter. The last marginal gloss is to VI 115 (fol. 26v): Quaesivi mortem dignam patre, non inveni; the last interlinear gloss is quondam nevaverunt written over the patri of VI 116 (fol. 27). (Beyond this point there are only corrections and variae lectiones in the margin, or lines that had been skipped are added, e.g., VIII 391-392 on fol. 52v). The note on VI 109 (fol. 26v) is important as showing that Pomponius apparently had several Mss. at hand: Aunus Fauni filius regnavit in Etruria. Quidam scribunt eumuisse de gente Pelasgica; aliqui codices habent Anni. Among the annotations are many parallel passages from Livy copied out word for word. Correspondence with the notes of the Florence Ms. is illustrated by the reference to Lucretius, whom Pomponius often invokes, at IV 302 (although different aspects of the Lucretian material are cited). \( \Pi \) (fol. 6v) has: Comparatio ab antiquorum venandi studio ut meminit Lucretius: venatores illi incendeabant silvas ut abigerent inde feras quas urge-bant praecipitare aut in fossas propter id factas aut implicate laqueis, interdum cursu fatigabant, nondum erat usus canum. The Florence Ms. reads (fol. 145v): Comparationem facit poeta. Antiqii venatores solebant hoc modo uti in venatione: immitten- bant ignem silvis, exibant in vasta solitudo ferae et exagitabantur (?) . . . Hanc consuetudinem ponit Lucretius libro ultimo. (The Lucretian passage is actually V 1250-1251).

Our Ms. Q, signed by Leonardus lob in 1470, shows corrections in another hand, which has also added marginalia. This new hand is that of Pomponius, the scribe of Y. In fact, Y is a copy of Q; cf. Delz I 87 and n. 60. The marginal notes in Q, infrequent after Book IV, are generally only proper names or brief indications of the contents of the poem. The note on the prophecy at VII 476: O superi. Decipers (fol. 83) is exceptional. The first note (fol. 2 ad I 13) is: propius periculo fuere qui vicere, which we have seen in Y in a different word order (Inc. I 4 gives more of the Livian passage; see infra). The last explanatory note is to XV 668 (fol. 182); in illum per mineos et per densissima; over mineos of the text is written canes. The very last note (textual) is in me written over mine at XVI 651 (fol. 196).

A copy of the editio princeps of Silius in the Vatican (Inc. I 4) has extensive marginal notes, most in one hand but a few in another. Two manuscript folia inserted between fol. 9 and 10 and containing Plin. Epist. III 7 and the epigrams of Martial referring to Silius and his family are in the same hand as that of the bulk of the notes (the major hand). The minor hand is that of Angelo Coloccì (for his handwriting see M. Bertòla, I due primi registri di prestito della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana [Vatican City 1942]). The major hand seems to us to be that of Pomponius and, more specifically, that of his later years, as in Ms. Vat. Lat. 3333 (cf. Muzzoli, op. cit. infra, pl. 33).

The manner and the material in the notes by the major hand in Inc. I 4 certainly correspond with Pomponian notes in the Mss. that have now been mentioned. The first part of the first note (fol. 1 ad I 2): Oeno-
trus Lycaonis regis Arcadiae filius qui Ausones in sinu Campane [sic] Oenotros appellavit is the same, except for the word order, as the first note in Y (quoted above). The note on I 13 (fol. 1) is: Livius ait: Adeo varia bellì fortuna ancepsque Mars fuit ut propius periculo fuerint qui vicerunt (see above for the versions of this in Y and Q; Walters-Conway in their edition give the passage as in our incunabulum except for the order fortuna bellì and periculum instead of periculo). On IV 456 ff. there is a note of some length in the incunabulum (fol. 35) as to whether it was Scipio who saved his father at the battle of the Ticinum (Livy’s Malim equidem de filio verum esse [XXI 46. 10] is quoted) with brief notes also ad 460, 468 (Humeris imposition patrem refert in castra Scipio), and 473. Π (fol. 8v) has an even longer note (with the same quotation from Livy). The Florence Ms. also has a fair-sized note (fol. 146), without the Livy passage but with the statement: Ceteri vero poetae ponunt servatum a filio pubescente. At IV 603 the incunabulum has (fol. 36v): virtus in adversis; Π has (fol. 11): virtus in rebus adversis enitescit. At IV 610 the incunabulum has (fol. 37): Fibrenus elephanto invadit; Π has (fol. 11): Fibrenus audax et intrepidus ad mortem vulneravit elephantum dextro oculo. At IV 628 the incunabulum has (fol. 37): Theraei Cyrenen considerunt qui venerunt e Laconia; Π has (fol. 11v): qui a Lacedaemonii ortum habebat.

Pomponius was interested in geography and natural history and in authors like Strabo. So we find in the incunabulum at the top of fol. 20: De causa fluxus et refluxus Oceani, lege Strabonem libro III and in the margin ad III 45-46 Fluxus et refluxus Oceani, ad 49-50 Causa incrementi, ad 58-59 Alia incrementi causa: a luna. Compare this with Q (fol. 26v) ad III 59-60: Fluxus et [sic] refluxus Oceani secundum lunam apud Posidonium et Strabonem.

There are glosses in both Inc. I 4 and Q on the Plinian life of Silo that is quoted. There are a few correspondences here. Compare in the incunabulum Silio cos. periti Nero with Q (fol. 1v): Silio consule periti Nero cius nece liberatus fuit orbis terrarum, unde Martialis: Asserto qui sacer orbe fuit [Epigr. VII 63. 10]. Note also the attention drawn to the same passage in the Pliny letter by Xerxes illacrumatio in the incunabulum and Xerses rex in Q (fol. 1v).

The last notes in the major hand of Inc. I 4 are (fol. 63v) Classis Punica appulit Caetam beside the text and, at the bottom of the page, a lengthy one: Hannibal ex Allifianis campis movens per Samnium Romam simulat petere. . . Sed frustra monito magistro equtum Romam ad sacra concessit.

The commentaries in the Paris and Florence Mss. have different material more often than the same material. Some items in the Florence commentary give the impression that Pomponius is controverting what we find in the Paris Ms.; he may well be correcting himself. On III 364 the Paris Ms. reads (fol. 215v): Tlepolemus ille qui fuit in bello Troiano, whereas the Laurentian Ms. has (fol. 141v): Tlepolemus scilicet etiam venit populus. Nec est is qui fuit in bello Troiano. On III 396: Arganthoniacos the Paris Ms. gives (fol. 217) a long list of longaei; Laur. 58. 2 (fol. 142) cites just two of these, with the added comment: taceamus exempla.


Introduct. [Inc.]: (fol. 204) Varro in libro de [space in text] tria necessaria: Origo, ars et dignitas [R R II 1. 1]. Canere propriopoeiorum ut meminit Quintilianus in libro de gestu vocis [Inst. or. I 8. 2]. Terentius quidam scriptis dactylico [Terentii given in margin] carmine et combusta fuerunt eius opera volente sic populo [cf. Pli. NH XIII 84 and F. Münzer, 'Terentius (20),' PW VA (1934) 596]. Quis fuerit primus auctor carminis ignoratur. Livius Androni-
cus dedit fabulas Latinis, hoc est, transtulit Homerum. An [?] Silius natus sub fine principatus Tiberii e gente Siliorum primis annis pedestri oratione, post sumpta coniuge suscipit filium et postea Silium Severum [as one sentence in the Ms. despite the anacoluthon]. . . Scripsit puerilia quaedam quae appellantur Silvae propter aestuantem animi affectum [cf. Stat. Silv. praef. 1].

Et Quintilianus in XI° sic ait: Et Papinius quia ut in silvis ex tempore nascetur arbore(s) sic ex tempore nascitur aliquid in nobis in iuventute. Ennius et Naevius scripserunt de secundo bello Punico, quem librum Quintus Argenteus [a mistake for Quintus Vargenteus, and he did not divide Naevius’ poem into books — that was C. Octavius Lampadio — but recited Ennius; cf. Suet. Gramm. 2. 4] divitis in septem libros propterea quod videtur longior. Armis [mistake for annis] XXIII secundum bello Punicum; omnia bella Punicca annis lixi duraverunt. . . Deinde in Cannensi clade paene iteriæ, paene omnes Centenius promittens afferre caput Hannibalis. Hannibal occurrens ei in Campania (blank in text) et ibi interfactus cum milibus XIII (m over XIII) (then something illegible) (cf. Sil. XII 468, Liv. XXV 19. 9 ff.).


[Inc. of second part of commentary, fol. 213]: (III 311 re the lotus): Odore, sapore, suavitate similis est palmae. Conficitur et ex eo fructu vinum quod appellant melilotum. Qui gustant loti fructum non amplius ab arbore discedunt . . . . . [Expl. of second part of commentary, fol. 221v] (III 603-606 re Titus): Erat vaticinium quod ex ea urbe erat orturus vir dominaturus totum orbem. . . Palaestina nunc pro Iudaea et pro avita. Here the notes come to an abrupt stop but then continue in the left-hand margin with: Palaestina regio est pro iudeam [sic] per quam labitur Euphrates et per Iudaeam Iordanis labitur per viarem Ieronon et non habet exitum ad mare. . . eum dicam lacum Sodomae. Contagionem e lacu accipit, neque eius aquam amplius dulcedinem (then an illegible word). Deinde labitur per caicum et non amplius videtur.

See for some of this material quoted from the Paris Ms. Bloch, op. cit., p. 156.

Ms. Flor. Laur. plut. 52. 8.
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Manuscripts:

Florence, Laur. plut. 52. 8, fols. 105-146v; s. XV (not after 1473). (Bandini, Catalogus II [1775] 551-552).

Oxford, Bodleian Canon. Class. Lat. 116, marginal notes; s. XV (s. XVI ineuntis according to Blass) (B). (Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae, pars 3 (1854), col. 158; Blass, op. cit., p. 181; Delz I 47-48b).


Vatican, Nat. Lat. 3302, marginal notes; s. XV (Y). (Inventarium librornum latonorum Mss. Bibl. Nat. IV 324; Blass, op. cit., p. 178; Delz I 104-105; Kristeller, Iter II 318).

Vatican, Inc. I 4 (a copy of the edition princeps of Silius), marginal notes.

Biography:

Iulius Pomponius Laetus (Giulio Pomponio Leto) was born an illegitimate son of the family of the Sansevero at Diano in the province of Salerno in 1428; he died at Rome in 1498. Many variations of the epithets applied to him are found (see Cosenza IV 2906 and V card 1459 for these): e.g., Balbus (since he had an impediment in his speech), Laetus (because of his happy disposition), Infortunatus (because of his imprisonment), Fortunatus (after his release). He went as a young man to Sicily, then came c. 1450 to Rome, where he heard Valla and Petrus Oodus Montopolitanus. He succeeded Oodus as professor of eloquence at the Studio in Rome c. 1464-65.

He was concerned with Latin literature and the text of Latin authors but also with Roman epigraphy, history, and topography; hence his name of Iulius Antiquarius. He almost made a cult of ancient Rome and regularly celebrated the birthday of the city, but it seems doubtful that he knelt daily before an altar dedicated to Romulus (cf. Zabughin I 99). His great regard for ancient Rome did not preclude an interest in his own times, nor did it make him anti-Greek; he had little acquaintance, however, with the Greek language before the age of 40. He founded what became known as the Academia Pomponiana or Romana. Its members were given or assumed classical names, which has caused difficulties in identifying many of them. Several of the members acted in Latin plays (Plautus, Terence, perhaps Seneca, possibly some more modern ones), which were staged and directed by Pomponius; so he is often considered to have re-established the theater at Rome.

Pomponius spent a considerable amount of time in Venice between 1460 and 1465, and it may have been on his way there that he stayed for a while with Cosimo de' Medici in Florence. In the summer of 1467 Pomponius went to Venice again. He was annoyed because his salary at the Studio had been stopped, and he wanted to sail from Venice for Greece and the Orient to learn Greek and Arabic. In the meantime he took private pupils in Venice. The next year a charge of sodomy was brought against him there. In the same year the Pomponian Academy, which had fallen under suspicion (there were rumors of paganism and Epicureanism), was dissolved by Pope Paul II. Many of its members were arrested and imprisoned in the Castel S. Angelo. Pomponius was extradited from Venice and also imprisoned there. There were two trials (1468, 1469). The charges against Pomponius in the first one were: 1. sodomy; 2. connections with Callimachus Experiens (Filippo Buonaccor-
si), considered the head of a conspiracy to
kill the pope; 3. lèse-majesté against the
pope; 4. disrespectful remarks about priests;
5. heresy. The charges against the Pom-
ponians in the second trial were limited to
heresy and impiety. What became of all the
charges of the two trials is not clear,
although the charge of heresy was not
established. In any case, the humanists
were released from prison in 1469-70 but
still confined for a time to the papal palace,
the Vatican, or the city of Rome. The
Academy was re-established along more
Christian lines in 1478 under Sixtus IV.

Pomponius returned to his professorial
chair c. 1470. He made a trip to northern
Europe, especially Russia, that lasted from
June 1472 to the spring of 1473. Another
tour of his in northern Europe extended
from the spring of 1479 to that of 1483;
Avogaro's term ‘legatio Britannica’ may
refer to this, though from sources other than
Pomponius himself or Avogaro we hear
rather of Germany: Pomponius and others
in the retinue of Cardinal Osia di Podio were
to have MSS. in the churches, monasteries,
etc. of Germany copied. Pomponius says
nothing of this aspect of his travels in his
extant writings and notes (his Commentario-
li on his tours are lost). He refers in the main
to the customs of the Russians, and chiefly
in notes on Virgil's Georgics explaining
'Scythian' practices. He may have been
crowned poet laureate in Germany by the
Emperor Frederick III in the winter of
1482-83 before his return to Rome; see
Zabughin I 197 and nn. for references to
Petrus Marsus' funebres oratio and to a pas-
sage in Iacopo Gherardi da Volterra. Marsus
seems, however, to imply a special trip to
Germany for this. Furthermore, what
Gherardi actually says is: recitatum est
ad mensam [the lunch that was part of the
celebration on April 20, 1483 in Rome of
the birthday of the city] Federici III
Cesaris privilegium sodalitium concessum
(presumably the privilege granted to the
Academy of crowning poets); see Gherardi,
op. cit. infra, 117 and Tiraboschi II (Milan
1833) 535. Pomponius' crowning is not
mentioned by either Lancetti or Schotten-
loher, 'Kaiserliche Dichterkrönungen...','
opp. cit. infra under Petrus Paganus I 8.
Before his return to Rome in 1483 Pompo-
nius stopped for a while in Florence; cf.
Sabbadini, op. cit. infra 374. If he ever
got to Bobbio, 1480 or 1482-83 would be a
possible date; cf. Zabughin II 111.

Pomponius finally married, in 1479 or a
little before, and had two daughters, Ni-
gella and Fulvia. Fulvia was well known
for her ability in Italian poetry and in modern
languages. Nigella surpassed her in clas-
sical studies, assumed the name Melanthio
after she had made some progress with
Greek, and seems to have done some Ms.-
copying for her father (Vat. lat. 3295, the
Vespi Martal, may be in her hand). She
may have become the wife of Lelio Antonio
Augusto, who apparently served also as copy-
ist to Pomponius and is perhaps to be iden-
tified with Pomponius' successor Antonio
Baldi at the Studio; cf. Zabughin II 67.

Pomponius himself wrote out many Mss.,
notably a Lucan, a Statius, an Ovid, and
the Silius for his pupil Fabio Mazzatosta.
For a time around 1471 he was the super-
intendent of the press of G. Lauer.

The period after his reappointment at the
Studio was a happy one for Pomponius.
His fame as a scholar brought students to
him even from beyond the Alps. He was
well paid; in 1496 he was drawing an annual
salary of 300 Roman florins. The statement
commonly made about Pomponius' poverty
during these times must be rejected as false.
But he apparently preferred to live simply.
He may not have known how to be eco-
nomical, and he may have spent a great deal
on MSS. and books and on his collection of
inscriptions. He had two small houses on
the Quirinal. His property went to Mat-
thias, a favorite pupil.

Pomponius' teachers were Theodorus Ga-
za, Laurentius Valla, Petrus Odus Monto-
politanus.

For his pupils see Cosenza IV 2913 (4
cards marked 'Pupils') and V cards 1459
and 1460 (cf. also IV 2906, first card:
'Pomponius discipulus'). Note among these
the Silian scholars Hermannus Buschius and
Petrus Marsus.

Works (dates and places, when given,
refer only to the first edition or the first one
that we know of; for further details see Cosenza IV 2907-2914): Of ancient authors besides Silius he edited Donatus, Ars minor (posthumous ed., Venice 1500); Frontinus, De aquis... (with J. Sulpitius, Rome c. 1486); Nonius Marcellus (with Volso and others, Rome c. 1470); Pliny, Epist. libri 1-9 (Rome 1490); Sallust, with a Vita of his own composition (Rome 1490); Terence (Parma in the 1480's); Varro, De lingua Latina (Rome c. 1471). He prepared emendations to Vitruvius that were printed in J. Sulpitius' edition of that author (Rome c. 1486).

He corrected editions of Q. Curtius Rufus (Rome or Venice c. 1470-1471), of Pompeius Festus (Rome c. 1471), and of a Latin version of Dionysius Periegetes (Rome c. 1497-1498). He may have corrected an edition of Nepos (Venice (? in the 1490's) and have corrected or supervised an edition of Martial (Rome c. 1471).

He wrote commentaries and notes on several of the authors above and on many others. Much of this exegetical material is in Mss. which Pomponius had before him in his lecturing (Zabughin's ‘chirografi’) or in Mss. giving his notes as copied down by students (Zabughin's ‘dictata’), some of it is in both; some of it was published, either by itself or in variorum editions. So there are comments by him on Cicero (the Philippicae in Ms. Vat. lat. 3229, various orations in Vat. lat. 3233); Claudian (cf. Zabughin II 226 ff.); Columella, Lib. X (in an edition of several agricultural authors, Bologna 1494); Florus (in Ms. Vat. lat. 3333 and Ottob. lat. 1496); Horace (in Ms. Vat. lat. 2769); Lucan, with a Vita (in Ms. Vat. lat. 3285); Martial (probably H 10805; in Ms. Brit. Mus. King's 32; cf. Fairbank, op. cit. infra); Ovid, Fasti (in Ms. Vat. lat. 3263 and 3264); the first part of Quintilian (Venice 1494); Silius; Statius, Thebaid, with a Vita of the poet and the poet's father (in Ms. Vat. lat. 3279); Valerius Flaccus (in Ms. Vat. lat. 5337; for these notes copied by hand into a printed edition of Valerius (Bologna 1519) see Sabbadini, op. cit. infra); Varro, De lingua Latina (in Mss. Vat. lat. 3415 with a Vita, Escorial. g. III. 27, Angel. 1348, and Laur. plut. XLVII, 15 with a Vita); Virgil, some of the so-called App. Vergiliana plus the Bucolics and Georgics (Brescia 1487; notes on some of the so-called App. Vergiliana and the Georgics in Ms. Vat. lat. 3255) and the Aeneid (Brescia 1487 [?]).

Pomponius' life of Lucan, somewhat revised, was printed in the ed. princ. of Lucan (Rome 1469). His lives of Statius and of Statius' father are given in a revised and expanded form in L. G. Giralddi's Historiae poetarum tam Graecorum quam Latinorum dialogi decem (Basel 1545), pp. 530-535 (in Dial. IV).

Pomponius may have commented on Juvenal; cf. Sanford, loc. cit. infra. The so-called Modestus de vocabulis ret militaris ad Tacitum Aug. may be by Pomponius or by one of his pupils; cf. Schanz IV, 1, 197.

The first printed grammatical treatise by Pomponius (Venice 1484) is a summary of four earlier grammatical studies of his; cf. Ruyschchaert, opp. cit. infra.

Pomponius compiled a sylloge of the inscriptions he had collected. In topography there are the Excerpta a Pomponio dum inter ambulandum cuidam domino ultramontano reliquitas ac ruinas urbis ostenderet in Mss. Ven. Marc. Lat. X 195 (3453); Flor. Bibl. Gall. Uffizi 7 b (formerly V 2), and Stuttgart cod. hist. Q. 316 and a corrupt text of the same (cf. Zabughin II 171) in printed editions called De antiquitatis urbis Romae libellus or De Romanae urbis vetustate (Rome 1510); his poem Stationes Romanae quadragesimali tertio in Ms. Ambros. F. 36. Sup. and in F. Schottus, Itinerarii Italiae... libri tres... e.g., 4th ed. (Antwerp 1625) 505-508; and his regionarium in Ms. Barb. lat. 28, with a 'working copy' in Vat. lat. 3394, a copy in Stuttgart cod. hist. Q. 316, and material gathered by someone of the school of Pomponius in Marc. Lat. X 195 (3453). For a modern printing of the regionarium and the Excerpta and for references to Pomponius see Valentini-Zucchetti, op. cit. infra; for a modern printing of the Stationes, Marucchi, op. cit. infra.

Certain of Pomponius' works came to be printed together fairly often. In the Opera (Strassburg 1515) we have Romanae historiae compendium ab interitu Gordiani Junioris
LATIN AUTHORS

usque ad Iustinum III (first printed ed. Venice 1499, extant also in Ms. Monac. lat. 528); De Romanorum magistratibus, sacerdotis, iurisprudentia, et legibus ad M. Pontagathum libellus (first printed at Venice c. 1490, then by Mazoci at Rome in 1510, and often thereafter); De antiquitatibus urbis Romae libellus; and Epistolae aliquot familiares — along with Sabellicus’ letter to M. Antonius Maurocenus about the life of Pomponius. Pomponius himself preferred the title Caesares for his epitome of Roman history. The scope of the Ms. and the printed versions varies; the Ms. one begins later (with Valentinian I), for instance, and omits the section on Mohammed. That section (De exortu Mahometis) was often printed separately or with other works, e.g., with the Bellum Christianorum principum of Robertus Remensis and other items (Basel 1533).

Among Pomponius’ other works are poems (e.g., a Sapphic ode on the papal Venetian victory of 1482), letters, commentarioli on his travels, a ‘liber ihonestus’ (cited by the three heads of the Venetian Consiglio dei Dieci), his defense (a copy in Ms. Vat. lat. 2934; cf. also Carini, op. cit. infra), and inscriptions (e.g., one on an inudation of Rome in Ms. Marc. lat. XII, 220).

Bibl.: Cosenza IV 2906-2914, V cards 1457-1460; Eckstein 332; Enc. Ital. XX 976-977; Ersch and Gruber II. Sect. 42. Teil 219-220; Fabricius BLMA IV 480-482; K. Gesner, Bibliotheca universalis (Zurich 1545, reprinted Osnabrück 1966) fol. 568, 568v; Gesner-Simler-Frisius (Zurich 1583) p. 584; Hoefer XL (1862) 725-727; Jöcher III 1679-1680 and Fortsetzung und Ergänzungen VI (Bremen 1819) 582-584; Kristeller, Iter I 490 (Index), II 676 (Index); Michaud, XXXIV (n. d.) 39-40; Nicéron VII 28-40 and X-2, 223-31; Pölzl 155; Rossi (1956) xv, 313-316, 318, 319, 382, 483, 530, 556; Sandys II 92-93, 97, 103, 114, 156; Tiraboschi (Milan 1833) II 532-533, 573, III 87-89, 178-179; Voigt II 237-241, 394; Zedler XXVIII 1415-1417.
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7. DOMITIUS CALDERINUS

Domitio Calderini is known to have lectured at Rome in the Studio on the Punica. He refers to his lectures in the dedicatory epistle to Lorenzo de’ Medici which prefaces the Commentary on Martial (1 Sep. 1473): superiori triennio quo Romae publica mercede docui in Silio, Cicerone, Silvisque Papiniit aliisque quos professi sumus scriptoribus. . . . . What is probably a reference to the conclusion of his course is found in his autograph note, at the end of the text of the Punica, on fol. 210 of Vat. Ottob. lat. 1258, which also contains the ‘St. Gall fragment’ of the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus: Domitii Veronensis totum opus publice exposuit Romae in academia publico salario conductus die VII° Idus Martii MCCCLXXIII (the words publice and die were later erased). Underneath is added, also in the hand of Calderini though in a different ink, codicem hunc habuit in manibus a nono in calceum, in superioribus alter usus est. In point of fact annotations by Calderini are to be found in the manuscript from VIII 498 (fol. 99) onwards: these are, however, mainly corrections of the text, some made after collation of the text with another, others by emendation.

It is clear from the προσφώνησις de observationibus which follows the elucubratio in quaedam Proprietii loca appended, with other items, to the edition of the commentary on the Silvae of Statius (Rome, Sweneyheym and Pannartz, 13 Aug. 1475, HC 14983) that in 1475, though Calderini had prepared his lecture notes for publication, the material had not yet been given to the printers: quibus (sc. commentarii iam editis) si addidero commantationes in epistles ad Atticum, in Suetonium Tranquillum, et in Silium Italicum, quae omnia iam collegimus et composuimus, consilio meo satisfeceret et voluntati amicorum. No printed edition of the Commentary on Sillius is known today, and it looks as if Calderini’s intention was still unfulfilled at the time of his death in 1478.

That it was Calderini’s practice to dictate at least part of his lectures is clear from his note on Juv. I 3 toqtas: here he accuses Sabino of plagiarism, and says inter alia that a passage of Varro (RR III 3. 9) was mentioned but not dictated when Calderini lectured on the passage of Juvenal. . . nam Varronis verba cum publice profiterer Iu-
venalem non dictavi... This practice has made it possible to reconstruct at least part of Calderini's course, for notes taken down by students from the lectures have so far been identified in the *marginalia* etc. of three *incunabula* (copies of the edition of the *Punica* by Pomponio Leto printed, probably by G. Lauer, and published in Rome on April 26, 1471) in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, and in a manuscript of the *Punica* in the Biblioteca Casanatense (Ms. 1064 - D. II. 2). (This material is currently being edited for publication.) It has not been possible to identify the writers of these *marginalia* etc.; that the material stems from Calderini's lectures on Silius can be established from (i) the correspondences with the tenor of the citations of and references to his commentary made by Calderini in his other works and (ii) the resemblance of parts of the subject matter to notes to be found in the other works.

The lecture notes follow the pattern of Calderini's extant commentaries on other authors: a wide range of classical authors is cited, including those in whom Calderini had an especial interest, e.g., Pliny the Elder, the *cosmographi*, Strabo, and Pausanias. There are also numerous instances of the emendation of the texts of these authors by Calderini, many of which were subsequently credited to later scholars. In particular, the commentary can be demonstrated to have substantially influenced the later commentary of Calderini's pupil Petrus Marsus (see I 8, below); for instance, it is now clear that the existence of the 'great lacuna' in Book VIII was first recognized by Calderini.

I. Vat. Stamp. Ross. 1122: notes from *Pun.* I 61 to VIII 540, with gaps.

*Inc.*: (I 61) *Aegatis*. Aegatis insulas apud cosmographos Graecos non invenies. Apud nostros de maioribus loquor. Apud Livium invenies in primo et secundo bello Punico. Eas autem insulasuisse iuxta Lilybaeum in Sicilia inde concecuta assequor quoniam Libius *sic* in primo bello Punico scribit classem Carthaginensiumuisse superatas *sic* ad Gadis insulas et Polybios cum eandem scriberet historiam tradit Carthaginenses victosuisse ad Egussam luita Lilybaeum ut intelligas Galatam, Lepadusam, et Tusam vel Egussam *sic?* allo nomineuisse Aegatisappellatas. Sunt qui diciunt Aegatisacciapi aris Philenorum quae sunt inter Sytestic et Cyramam, ut aut Plinius; id autem mihi non placet... /[Last note of any consequence]: (XII 543) *Illa prima radis.* De luco Martis intelligitnam hiloci erant ad urbem: lucus Facutalis *sic*, Larium, Iunonis, Dianae, Martis, in quo Rhea peperit Romulum et Romulum *sic*; auctores sunt. (The same notes in III and IV, which, more correctly, conclude... et Remum; auctores sunt Dionysius et Trogus).

II. Vat. Stamp. Ross. 1446: notes from III 1 to V 584, with large gaps.


III. Vat. Inc. III. 4: notes, with gaps, from III 540 to the end, Book XVII.

*Inc.*: (III 540) *Jamque super clades.* *Jamque* Gallorummultitudo ut ait Libius *sic*, Allobroges ut narrat Polivius *sic*, qui fuerant duces Hannibalis usque ad radices Alpium, relocto Poeno, immotentes quosdam tumulos Alpium occuparunt Poenisque ascendentibus stragem et fugam dedissent nisi statim apparentes monuissent (*post. delet.*) sese hostes ostendissent. Hannibal et doctus (etdoctus = a correction to *edoctus?*) a translugis loca illa die tantum occupari nocte patere locavit castra... /[Expl.]:
SILIUS ITALICUS


IV. Ms. Casanatense 1064 (Σ) (Silius Italicus), 3rd annotating hand: notes from IX 471 to XII 725.


Manuscripts:


Vatican, Ottob. lat. 1258, annotations (mainly corrections of the text); s. XV (Γ). (Index Alphabeticus Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Ottobonianae, fol. 579v; Inventarii Codicum Manuscriptorum Latinarum Bibliothecae Vaticanae Ottobonianae, Pars I, p. 234v; Blass, op. cit., p. 177; Delz I 108-118 Kristeller, Iter II, 417).

Vatican, Inc. III. 4 (a copy of the edition of Silius by Pomponio Leto), notes.

Vatican, Stamp. Ross. 1122 (a copy of the edition of Silius by Pomponio Leto), notes.

Vatican, Stamp. Ross. 1446 (a copy of the edition of Silius by Pomponio Leto), notes.

Biography:

See CTC I, 218-21. The following biography supplements and corrects, in the light of more recent scholarship, Miss Sanford’s article.

Domenicus (Domitius) Calderinus Vernensis (Domizio Calderini), b. Torri del Benaco, prob. Jan.-Mar. 1446, d. Rome, Jan.-May 1478. Educated at Verona sub communi praeceptore Antonio Broianco (G. A. Panteo, de laud. Veronae, fol. 75, cp. Actio Panthaea: see Levi, op. cit. infra 16-17); studied at Venice under Benedetto Brugnoli da Legnano (Levi 18) and possibly taught there (G. Mercati, Ultimi contributi alla storia degli umanisti, Fasc. II, Rome 1939, Studi e Testi 91, p. 38). A friend of Marcus Aurelius senatus Veneti scriba (Ep. ad Jul. Med. in Juv. comm.). Goes to Rome c. 1467 and becomes secretarius familiaris et commensalis perpetuus of Cardinal Besarion, and thus is in contact with members of the ‘academia Bessarionia.’ Probably at this time adopts the Latin name Domitius, following the practice of the friends and pupils of Pomponio Leto. Appointed professor of rhetoric at the Studio 1470, secretarius apostolicus to Sixtus IV, 1471. Accompanied Bessarion to France in 1472. In 1473 lectures also in Greek at the Studio, and during the year visits Florence (Mart. comm. dedicated to Lorenzo de’ Medici) and uses the Bibliotheca Medicea; meets scholars such as Marsilio Ficino, Bartolomeo Fonzio, and the young Politiano. In 1476 accompanies Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere to Avignon.

Among Calderini’s pupils were M. A. Sabellisco, Pietro Marso (who later edited the Punicus), and possibly, at Venice, Pescennio Francesco Negri (Mercati, op. cit. 38). It seems likely that Aldo Manuzio attended some of his lectures (Levi 41 and especially G. Mandersteig, op. cit. infra, 110-111).

During his lifetime Calderini engaged in bitter controversy with Niccolò Perotti (on Martial) and with Perotti and Angelo Cneo Sabino (on Junenal). An attack on the commentary on Martial was published by G. Merula in the year of Calderini’s death; it was answered by Cornello Vitelli. After
his death his scholarship and veracity were harshly attacked by Poliziano.

**Works:**

(a) Printed:

(i) Commentaries: Martial (with polemic against Perotti); Juvenal (with polemic against Perotti and Sabino); Ovid, *Ibis* and *Epistula Sapphus Phaoni* (= *Her. XV*); Statius, *Silvae* (there seems little authority for Marastoni’s assumption, Teubner edn. Leipzig 1961, introd. p. xliii, that Calderini edited the *princeps* in 1472); Virgil *opuscula quaedam; elucubratio in quaedam Propertii loca; ex tertio libro observationum* (a collection of miscellaneous notes, allegedly extracted by the author from a larger work).

(ii) editions: Quintilian, *Declamationes tres*; Ovid, *Metamorphoses* (?).

(iii) translations: Pausanias, *Attica* and *Corinthiacca*; Ptolemy, *Cosmographia* (*Iacobi Angeli versio latina a Domitio Calderino revisa*).

(b) otherwise extant:

Commentary on Silius; Commentary on Virg. *Aen.* VI (incomplete) (Munich Staatsbibl. ms. lat. 807); in Verona Bibl. Capit. ms. CCLVII (229) are to be found: prefatory remarks to a course of lectures on Cicero, *De oratore* (1474); *epistula ad Bernardinum Messanelum sororis filium; legatio in Galliam Iuliani Card. D. Petri ad Vincula* (incomplete); *interpretatio super Suetonium* (incomplete) and Commentary on Suetonius (incomplete: frags. also in Flor. Ricc. 153, 833, 2127); *in emendationem tabularum Ptolemei Alexandrini, and de Ptolemeis*; prefatory remarks to a course of lectures on Cicero, *De officitis*; *panegyric on Giovanni della Rovere, praefectus Vrbis*; a diatribe, in defense of Plato, against Giorgio Trapezunzio, to Francesco Barozzi; poems (others in Vat. Urb. lat. 1193, Verona, Bibl. Com. 1366, Paris B. N. Lat. 8274, Flor. Ricc. 915); letters (others in Flor. Ricc. 915).

(c) as yet untraced:

Commentary on Cicero, *Ad Atticorum* and *In Verrem*, possibly extant in the form of lecture notes.

*Bibl. (select):* Cosenza I 769-779, V cards 372-373, VI (Suppl.) 64; Eckstein 76; Ersch and Gruber XIV 115; Hoefer VIII (1854) 169-170; Jöcher I (1750) 1559-1560; Kristeller, *Iter* I 461 (Index), II 635 (Index); Michaud II VI (1854) 385; Tiraboschi III (Milan 1833) 265-266.

For the older works of reference see Sanforn, *op. cit.* 221.


Further references to Calderini may, in due course, be revealed in the *secunda*

Since the compilation of this article, Angelo Poliziano, Miscellaneorum Centuria Secunda, ed. V. Branca and M. Pastore Stocchi, IV (Edizione Critica) (Florence, 1972) has appeared (see index s.v. Domizio Calderini), as has Dizionario biografico degli Italiani XVI (1973) (see the entry 'Calderini, Domizio', pp. 597-605, by A. Persoa).

8. Petrus Marsus

I. In his youth Pietro Marsus wrote commentariola on Silius and sent them to Prince Virginio Orsini's paternal uncle Roberto; this fact is stated in the dedicatory epistle of a second commentary. We have not been able to trace the earlier commentary.

II. The later commentary is a revision and expansion of the earlier one. It is found in editions printed in 1483, 1492, 1493, and 1512 (see below for these and for a doubtful edition of c. 1490). It surrounds the text and covers all 17 books of the Punica; it is preceded by the dedicatory epistle to Virginio Orsini, a life of Silius, and a summary of the second Punic War; and it is followed by a postscript or envoi ('Operis conclusio'). In the last item Pietro compares Virginio to Scipio and says that his virtus ought to be celebrated in an epic poem; in the meantime let him accept this Silian commentary and be its protector. In the dedicatory epistle, as we noted above, Pietro mentions Petrus Montopolitius as the first to expound the Punica in Rome and states that his own teachers, Pomponius [Laetus] and Domitius [Calderinus], followed Montopolitius in this.

The editions by Marsi are all the same except that there are variations in orthography and punctuation and the last one contains also the life of Silius by Petrus Crintius. The first edition perhaps has fewer printer's errors than the later ones. Throughout the editions there are occasional discrepancies between lemmata and text (e.g., VI 614, IX 209) and verses may be commented on that have been omitted from the text.

Dedic.: Petri Marsi interpretatio in Silium Italicum ad ill. Principem Virginium Ursinum. [Inc.]: Cum id omne quod in terris gignitur ad usum hominum sit, ut priscis philosophantibus totius naturae peritis visum est... Silii Italicorum divinum poema, ut potui, interpretatus sum. Quod ita undique temporum incuria depravatum erat ut nullam fere utilitatem legentibus affret. Primus patrum nostrorum memoria huius poetae sacros fontes reserare arcanaque ingredi ac publice in hac florentissima urbis Romae academia profiteri ausus est Petrus Montopolita, vir certe id aetatis erudissimus, cuius caeleste ingenium non parum utilitatis post Laurentium Vallam Romanae linguæ allaturum avara fata studiosis invidere et in flore adhuc atque viride rapuere. Secuti sunt viri saeculorum memoria digni ac Romani eloqui sidera et clarum decus, Pomponius et Domitius, praeceptores mei. Qui, multum supra homines ingenio praediti, divino quodam mentis acumine ac splendidio avia Pleridum loco peragrarunt et per Romanæ linguæ, cuibus ab ineunte aetate studiosissimi fuerunt, callæs Getarum Vandalorumque sentibus obsitos et curricula quondam nittida sed barbarorum vepribus obducta equos ita influxere suos ut horum industria et laboribus priscum illud Latinarum litterarum decus iam fere non desideremus, et in hoc opere postissimum laborarunt ut facilius esset interpretibus labor, quod ipse sum expertus et fator ingenue... Miseram, illu. Princeps Virginij, superioribus annis illu. Principi Roberto, patruo tuo, quaedam in Silium commentariola. Quae quoniam juvenili quodam ardore ac primo ingenii calore influxerant castigationem desiderabant et limam. Illa igitur castigata et una cum poemate impressa ad te mitto. Qui quoniam malorum tuorum praeconia, ut par est et te, Romanorum principem et Ursinorum familiae caput, decet, libenter audis ut domesticis vestigiis insistas, hoc opus, in quo principes tu Romani celebrantur, grato animo suscipias.
et manibus tuis ac lectione dignare cum per publica negotia quibus distingueris ut subditorum saluti consulas liceretur. Vale.

Vita. Silius Italicus ait Italic, urbe Hispaniciae, cognominatus a qua originem habuit per suas maiores Romanus fuit... quinque et LXX annos natus in Neapolitano suo inedia vitam finivit magis delicato corpore quam infirmo usuque ad extremum diem beatus felix.

Compendium. Belli Punici secundi compendium. Post primum bellum Punicum quo Carthaginenses victi fuerunt ad Aegates insulas, quae sunt inter Siciliam et Africam, et Sicilia Sardiniaque cerleri desperatione stipendio etiam superimposito amissi, Hamilcar, pater Hannibalis, qui eo beller imperator fuerat, vir ingentis spiritus, angebatur... Scipio pacis condicionibus datis Carthaginem tributariam fecit. Inexercit in naves imposito in Siciliam traeicit et per Italiam non minus laetam pacis quam victoriae, effusis etiam hominibus causa officii ad honores praebendos, turba etiam agrestium vias obsident, Romam venit clarissimoque omnium triumpho urbem et Capitolium invictus est.


Operis conclusio: Auspicis tuis, invictissime Princeps Virgini, huc operi bellicosum extrema manus imposita est, in quo de duobus clarissimis in toto orbe imperatoribus, Scipione atque Hannibale, agitur... Interea haec commentariola excellenciae tuae dicata auspicis tuis legantur, tuoque splendore ac tanti nominis celebritate protegentur et quiescant. Quae iterum atque iterum excellentiae commendo tuae, cuius honoris communque utilitati ad quam tuendam nati sumus hoc opus magna sedulitate, cura, et lucubrationsibus aggressus sum, et ad calcem felici succussu decussum est.

Editions:

1483, May 6, Venetiis (Venice): Baptista de Tortis. HC *14739; Goff S-507; Proctor 4619; BMC V, p. 323; Brunet V, col. 382.


1493, Sept. 20, Venetiis (Venice): [Johannes Tacuinus]. HCR 14741; Goff S-509; Proctor 5425; cf. Brunet, loc. cit.

1512, April 21, Parisii (Paris): N. de Pratis, for Poncius Probus and Franciscus Regnault. Panzer VII, 567, 571. BN.

Doubful edition:


Biography:

Petrus Marsus (Pietro Marsi) was born at Cesa or Cese (near Avezzano) shortly after 1440; he died in 1512 at Rome. Marsus is a name referring to his birthplace (in the territory of the ancient Marsi), not a family name, in his case; so he is not the brother of
Paulus Marsus (Paolo Marsi) of Pescina (cf. Delz II 428). Pietro was an intimate of Pomponius Laetus and of Platina. He was among the first members of the Academia Pomponiana to be arrested in 1468 and was imprisoned in the Castel S. Angelo. Shortly after his release he began studies with John Argyropulos, who arrived in Rome from Florence in 1471. He became one of his favorite pupils and was entrusted with the posthumous publication of his Latin translation of Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics* (Rome 1492).

Pietro became the tutor of Cardinal Ammannati’s nephew Cristoforo Piccolomini in 1472. How long this instruction lasted is not known, though della Torre conjectures that he was still occupied with it when Paolo Marsi returned to Rome from Venice early in 1473 (op. cit. infra, p. 201; cf. p. 225).

Sabellicus in his *De Latinae linguae reparatione* writes (ed. Cologne 1529, sig. C2v; *Opera omnia* [Basel 1560] Tom. IV, col. 334): ‘... Petrus Marsus Cesensis. Is non ad poetas solum explicandos, sed ad oratores quoque et philosophos studium adiecit; extant eius in Silium Italicum commentarii multa eruditione referti, sed longe utiliora quae in Ciceronis opera conscrispsit; eloquens, ut Pomponii auditoirem agnoscas, et quod plus est, propemodum philosophus, sed quantuscumque in philosophia est, eum Argyropuli contubernium effect.’

Volsco (see below, p. 397) violently criticized Marsus’ commentary on Silius. Marsus answered the attack in his second edition of Cicero’s *De officiis* (Venice 1491), announcing a new edition of his Silius ‘sed cum apologia.’ But this new edition apparently never appeared; at least, the four now known to the scholarly world are all the same except for the minor details noted above.

Petrus Marsus entered the priesthood early and was canon of S. Lorenzo in Damaso. He taught in Mantua and at the University of Rome. He was a lecturer on rhetoric and poetry at the Studio in Bologna during the academic years 1478-79 and 1479-80 (so Dallari, op. cit. infra 107 and 110; Verrua, loc. cit. infra, has missed the first reference in Dallari and so gives only 1479-80).

His teachers were Domizio Calderini and Pomponio Leto. He was the friend of, or at least dedicated works to, Ferdinando and Isabella of Spain, Federico I Gonzaga (d. 1484), Francesco Gonzaga (Cardinal of Mantua; d. 1493), Louis XII of France, Baptista Mantuanus, Raphael Riarius, Stephanus Carolus of Milan, and Prince Virgilio Orsini. His revision of Argyropulos’ translation of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, as well as his Silius, is dedicated to Virginius Ursinus.

*Works*: One of his quite early works was a commentary on Ovid’s *Ibis*. It is extant in Ms. Bernensis 516 (fols. 262-289) with the *subscriptio* bearing the date 1472 and the place Viterbo. He commented on many Ciceroonian works, especially the *De natura deorum*, the *De divinatone*, and the *De officiis*. His comments often appear in variorum editions of Cicero; particularly frequent is a combination of his commentary on the *De officiis* with that of Martinus Philleticus on the *De senectute* and that of Omnibonus Leonicensus on the *De amicitia* and the *Paradoxa Stoicorum*. Marsus’ notes on the *De officiis* alternate with those of Iodocus Badius Ascensius in the *Gemina explanatio officiorum Ciceronis* (Lyons 1506).

Marsus was the author of many orations, e.g., an *Oratio dicta in die Ascensionis De immortalitate animae*, dedicated to Cardinal Raphael Riarius; a *Funebris oratio habita Romae in obitu Pomponii Laeti*; and an eulogy of Johannes Argyropulos.


LATIN AUTHORS


9. HERMANNUS BUSCHIUS

Hermannus Buschius composed hexameter summaries or argumenta (14 lines each) to each of the 17 books of Silius, a poem to the reader or kind of accessus in elegiacs (8 couplets), a life of Silius in prose, and marginal scholia in prose on the Punica. The 17 argumenta first appear in the 1504 edition of Silius (Leipzig: Martinus Herbipolensis; Panzer VII 149, 108). But they stem from the notes of students who attended Buschius' lectures on Silius in 1503-4 or 1504 at Leipzig rather than directly from Buschius; cf. H. J. Liessem, Hermann van dem Busche (see below), I. Teil, p. 12. The first argumentum was omitted from subsequent editions; so Daniel Heinisch wrote one in 20 hexameters which is a cento of Silian phrases and lines. Both argumenta to Book I are then often given in later editions (e.g., those of Drakenborch and Ruperti).

When an edition contains the scholia of Buschius (they are first found in the 1522 edition), they are described on the title-page as: quae vice uberis commentarii esse possunt. They cover all 17 books of the poem, but they are hardly like an uber commentarius and frequently not much more than captions or summaries of the narrative. They do not correspond to the marginal and interlinear notes, presumably by Buschius, in the copy of the 1493 Silius which was in the Badische Landesbibliothek (the former Grossherzogliche Bibliothek) in Karlsruhe but was one of the losses of World War II. This was bound up with the handwritten original of Buschius' accessus and argumenta to Silius; cf. Liessem, op. cit., Anhang, p. 6.

For Buschius' having treated of the life of Silius at Marburg see under I 10, below.

Argumenta:
[Inc. Lib. I]: Principio Libycae describitor urbis origo... [Expl. Lib. XVII]:... dux ipse reversus / Alta triumphanti scandit Capitolia curru.

Accessus. Concilio vatum, Musis, et Apoline dignum / Vis opus, et dignam Palladis auri lyram?... Nunc tu, prolixus quia sit, moveare, poeta: / Pondus inest magnis, utilitasque libris. / De magno sic plus impartit amicus aceruo, / Sic plus quam rivi, fluminis unda sapit.

Vita. Silium Italicum sunt quiuisse Hispanum affirment, ex Italiae urbe Hispaniae. Sunt alii qui per suos maiores Romanumuisse dicant, sed generis initium traxisse ab Hispang. / In Neapolitano suo (de quo supra diximus) cum adversa valetudine insanabilis clavi laboraret, inedia vitam finivit. Annos quinque et septuaginta natus, corpore (ut inquit Plinius iunior) delicato magis quam infirmo. Haec de vita Silii.

Scholia:
[Inc.]: (I 8-10) Ter foedifragi Carthaginenses.

(I 21-22) Narrationis initium.
(I 41-49) Verba Iunonis per stomachionem insulantis secundis Romanorum rebus praesagio cladem illis ab Hannibale imminentium... [Expl.]: (XVII 640 ff). Dictum hoc ad laudem Scipionis, quia per ea loca totam Hispaniam ab eo subactam asserit. Octo in mare fluvii iberus labitur. (XVII 651) Haec verba poetae ad Scipionem.

Editions containing the scholia:
1522, Basileae (Basel): Thomas Wolfius. Fabricius BL II (1773) 175; Panzer VI 234, 448, BN.
1531, Parisii (Paris): Simon Colinaeus. Brunet V 385; Fabricius BL loc. cit.; Panzer VIII 144, 2015; Renouard, Colines 185. BN.
Buschius' *argumenta* appear in many of the editions of Silius from 1504 down to the Tauntnitz one (Leipzig 1834; often reprinted). Library catalogues, under such rubrics as ‘Éd. et Comment.,’ often imply that an edition contains Buschius' scholia when it contains only his *argumenta*, or the *argumenta* plus the *vita* or plus the *accessus* and the *vita*. The *vita* is also in M. Maittaire, *Opera et fragmenta veterum poetarum Latinorum* . . . (London 1713) II 940.

**Biography:**

Hermannus Buschius (Hermann von [van] dem Busche, Busche; usually called Hermann Busch) Pasophilus ('loved by all,' as he ironically called himself in later life) was born of a noble family c. 1468 at the castle of Sassenberg near Warendorf in Westphalia; he died in Dülmen in 1534. At an early age he went to Münster, where his teacher was his relative Rudolf von Langen, in whose house he lived. Later von Langen sent him to Deventer to study with Alexander Hegius. Subsequently he studied under Rudolf Agricola in Heidelberg. He went with von Langen in 1486 to Rome, where he attended lectures by Pomponius Laetus and stayed for five years. On his return to Germany he became a wandering humanist and university lecturer; he visited most of the larger cities of northern and central Germany (e.g., Hamburg, Rostock, Leipzig, Cologne, Marburg), was in France for a while, but never in any place for long. He taught poetry for a year in Cologne and matriculated in law there in 1495. He became a *baccalaureus legum* at Leipzig in 1503; soon after that he turned to areas more congenial to him, humanistic studies and Latin verse composition. His verse includes poems in praise of certain cities (e.g., Cologne, Leipzig); his *Oestrum, sive novorum Epigrammatum libellus*, attacks the Rostock professor Heverling(h). During a visit to England in 1516 he became friendly with Sir Thomas More. In 1526 he was called by the Landgraf Philipp von Hessen (at Luther's suggestion according to Hamelmann) to the newly founded University of Marburg. He accepted, went there in that year or the next, and married there in 1527 at the age of 59.

He sided with Reuchlin, Hutten, and Erasmus in championing humanism and hence was opposed to Ortuinus Gratius (Ortwin von Graes), his former schoolmate at Deventer. But because of his vacillating character his stand was not firm and consistent at first, and in his second edition of Donatus he made certain concessions to Gratius. But later he returned to his true stand and his old friends and compiled an eloquent defence of humanistic studies in his *Valum humanitatis*.

Friends and patrons of his in addition to those noted above were the Grafen Gebhard and Albert von Mansfeld, to whom he wrote panegyrical poems; Hieronymus Emser; and Philippus Novenianus Haffurtinus.

**Works:** Nicéron has 34 entries in his catalogue of the works of Buschius. The more recent *Bibliographisches Verzeichnis der Schriften Hermanns von dem Busche* by Liessem (see below) gives 55 items (with some of Nicéron's 34 excluded). Liessem's items include a preface and notes to Petronius (VII, VIII), the Silian material (XI), an edition of the *Amphitryon* of Plautus (XVI), a biography of the younger Seneca (XXXIII), a commentary on Claudian's *De rapta Proserpinae* (XXVIII), contributions to the *Epistolae obscorum virorum* (XLII), a selection of Cicero's letters for young students (XLIII), collections of Plautine *sententiae* (XLVII, XLVIII), a selection of Martial's *Epigrams* with notes (LI), and a brief commentary on Persius' prologue and first satire (LV).

See also A. von Dommer, *Die ältesten Drucke aus Marburg in Hessen 1527-1566* (Marburg 1892), p. 172 for two items by Buschius.

**Bibl.:** ADB III 637-640 (Geiger); P. N. M. Bot, *Humanismus en onderwijs in Nederland* (Utrecht-Antwerp 1955), passim (see Index); C. Bursian, *Geschichte der klassischen Philologie in Deutschland* (Munich and Leipzig 1883; reprinted New York and London 1965) 128 n. 2, 136-139; D. Clément, *Bibliothèque curieuse* V (Hannover 1754) 452-459; Eckstein 73-74; Ersch and Gruber XIV 137-138; Fabricius *BL* II 175-176; L. Geiger, *Renaissance und Humanismus* (Berlin 1882) 426-428; K. Gesner, *Bib-


10. Petrus Paganus

Peter Dorfheilge(r) (Petrus Paganus) expounded some of Silius' poem, perhaps only the first book, at the University of Marburg, where he was a professor from 1561 to 1576. The only copy that we have been able to trace of his exposition, and of only the first book, is dated 1567. This could be the lecture notes taken down by a student, but the rather formal 'title-page' suggests something coming directly from Paganus. We have not been able to find out how often he lectured at Marburg on Silius.

The copy in question forms the fourth of a group of items bound together as Ms. Bernensis 663; cf. H. Hagen, Catalogus codicum Bernensium (Bern 1875) 497. On fol. 1 of this fourth item, which consists of nine folios, the following information is given: In Primum Syllii Italici Librum de bello Secundo Punico. Autore Petro Paganio Poeta Laureato, Poëseos et Historiarum Professore, In Schola Marpurgensi. Anno 1567.

The notes are fairly extensive but do not form a continuous commentary on Punica I. For the most part they are essays on certain points alluded to by Silius in his first book. They are largely concerned with history, geography, and military affairs. Something is said about the first and third Punic Wars to give a picture of the whole conflict between Rome and Carthage. One note about a folium in length is on the nature of epic poetry.

At the beginning of his notes Paganus says that five points (which are more or less those made by Servius, whom he invokes) have to be considered in expounding authors: 1. Vita autoris. 2. Titulus seu materia operis . . . He then observes that it would be superfluous to go into details about the life of Silius since they had previously been set forth by Buschius at the University of Marburg.

Hagen's description of Ms. 663. 4 ends with the statement: Adiecta sunt excerpta chronologica. These excerpts are presumably
the marginal summaries, which read as follows: (fol. 1º) Vita Silii Italici, Titulus libri, Bella Punicæ; (fol. 2) Primum bellum Punicum, II. Secundum bellum Punicum, Hannibal; (fol. 2º) Saguntus, Clades Romanorum, Urbes ab Hannibale occupatae; (fol. 3) Hastrubal, Fortuna, Scipio in Hispaniam missus, In Africam mittitur; (fol. 3º) Hannibal revocatur ex Italia, Hannibal caesus; (fol. 4) Tertium bellum Punicum, Carthago deleta; (fol. 4º) Heroicum carmen. These marginalia are succeeded by summaries or titles within the text of the next sections as follows: (fol. 5) Foederum faciendorum apud veteres Rom. modus; (fol. 6) Hannibalis descriptio. Livius 1. libro 3. Decadis; (fol. 6º) Plutarchus in Hannibalis vita, Hamilcaris laudes; (fol. 7) Somnia noctu obversantia; (fol. 7º) De tribus orbis partibus; (fol. 8) Phalarica; (fol. 8º) Testudo, Troiae expugnatio; (fol. 9) Ligures, Taxus et picea arbores.


Vita Syllii Italici cum (quantum ex probatis autibus colligi potest) ab Hermanno Buschino in hac schola Marp. quondam poëseos professore sat is luculenter descripsit, ista omnia repetere supervacaneum esset. 2. Titulus autem sat is est de bello Punico secundo, ex quo et materia facile colligitur. Cum Rom. cum Chartag. (sic) tria maxima bella et cruentaesserint (aeumlatione imperii orbis terrarum) diversis temporibus et impari annorum numero, ad differentiam adiciitur in titulo Secundo. . . .

3. Quod autem ad numerum librorum attinet, 17 libris has historias complexus est Syllius. 4. Genus carminis est Heroicum Hexametrum actu (ut ait Servius in explicatione 1 lib. Aeneidos) mixto, nam et ipse Poeta loquitur et alios loquentes inducit. Heroicum vero carmen (ut eum [sic] idem definit) est quod constat ex divinis et humanis personis continens veras et fictas historias. . .

5. Porro Intentio Syllii praecipua fuit imitari Vergilium et potentissimorum populorum res in 2 Punico bello gestas, vera partim narratione describere, partim poetice involucris, et artificiosis fragmentis illustreare, exemplo Vergili, qui et ipsa Caesari Augusto originem descripturus per omnia fer homerus imitatus est et veras historias fabulosis quibusdam immiscuit ad delectationem lectori pariendo. . . .


Manuscript:
Bern, Burgernbibliothek Ms. 663. 4; 1567.
H. Hagen, Catalogus codicum Bernensium (Bern 1875) 497.

Biography:
Petrus Paganus (Peter Dorphalliger); see also F. Gundlach, op. cit. infra, p. 313 for the form Dorphalliger. He was born at Wanfried in Hesse March 30, 1532; he died there May 29, 1576. He attended school at Eschwege; went to the University at Marburg, where he became a Magister in 1550. He travelled to Holland and then by way of Italy to Vienna, where he was crowned poeta laureatus. In 1561 he became professor of poetry and history at Marburg. Here he displayed his talents especially as a writer of Latin occasional verse (e.g., epithalamia and epicedia) and of Latin poems on didactic-philosophical and historical themes.

Works: Thirty-three items by Paganus (the Silius commentary is not among them) are given in the supplement to Jöcher, loc. cit. infra. These include: In Q. Horatii Fl. Odas, Satyras et epist. argumenta (1567), Historia tergeminarum Romanorum et Albanorum fratrum. . . (1571), and the posthumous Praxis metrica. . . (1609). The argumenta to Horace, published at Frankfurt am Main in 1567, are to be assigned with much more likelihood to this Petrus Paganus than to Petrus Paganus (Pietro Paganl) of Belluno, to whom Cosenza (III 2539) assigns them. Petrus Paganus of Belluno may possibly, however, have composed notes rather than argumenta to Horace; Cosenza,

For 12 of the 33 items by Paganus (Dorfheiliger) see also A. von Dommer, Die ältesten Drucke aus Marburg in Hessen 1527-1566 (Marburg 1892) 178.

Bibl.: ADB XXV (1887) 62 (Joachim); Jöcher III 1177-1178 and Fortsetzung und Ergänzungen V (Bremen 1816) 1382-1383; K. Gesner-J. Simler, Bibliotheca... in Epitomen redacta (Zurich 1574) 562; Gesner-Simler-Frisius (ibid. 1583) 678; J. G. T. Graesse, Trésor de livres rares II (Dresden etc. 1862) 349; F. Gundlach, Catalogus Professorum Academiae Marburgensis 1527-1910 (Marburg 1927) 313; V. Lancetti, Memorie intorno ai poeti laureati... (Trin. 1839) 346-347; F. Nigidius Sr., Elenchus professorum Academiae Marburgensis... (Marburg 1591) 12, 52-53; K. Schottenloher, Bibliographie zur deutschen Geschichte im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung 1517-85 II (Leipzig 1935) 114 and VI (ibid. 1940) 438 and ‘Kaiserliche Dichterkrönungen im heiligen römischen Reich deutscher Nation,’ in Papsttum und Kaiserzeit (ed. A. Brackmann, Munich 1926) 648-673 at 669.

11. DANIEL HEINSIUS

In 1600 at the age of twenty Daniel Heinsius prepared an edition of Silius. On the recommendation of Scaliger he used in preparing his text the variant readings of the Coloniensis reported by Modius in his Novantiquae lectiones. As soon as Raphelengius had sent Heinsius’ text to the type-setters, he began to entreat him to produce some explanatory notes to the text. Heinsius promptly complied and gave his notes the name of Crepundia Siliana because of his youth. In the preliminary note to the reader in the Crepundia he observes that his annotations were written ‘paucis diebus, imo horis.’ The notes as published are not all that he had, but he omitted some so that his edition with notes would be ready for the Frankfurt fair. They actually appeared in 1601 but form the last part (pp. 311-504) or a kind of appendix to the edition proper, which is dated 1600.

Heinsius felt no dissatisfaction in later years with his youthful Crepundia Siliana, and many editors of Silius have praised them highly (cf. Drakenborch’s Praefatio ad lectorem). Some scholars, however, have commented rather on the flaws in the Crepundia. In any case, they contain much extraneous material (e.g., Latin verses of his own), and the modest proposals often made in them really mask a certain pedantry. They may be described as notes on selected passages of the Punica. They extend over all 17 books but are much more concerned with the earlier than with the later books.

For Heinsius’ argumentum to Book I see p. 390 above.


Preface of Crepundia: Lectori Daniel Heynsius S. D. [Inc.]: Habes, mi Lector, quae notata mihi in Silio, paucis diebus, imo horis, quem cum praelo mandasset

394
SILIUS ITALICUS

Raphelengius noster, cepit de editione mecum agere, (ut solet fieri) familiaris, et si quae in eo observasssem in medium ferrem, serio obsescrari. Ego, qui ne xegahin quidem, id negare; cum vero instantem suo iure ille, desesse meo munerl nolui. . . Silium igitur dum propeonl opera, in manus sumpsi, obiter percurri, quaedam ad libri mel calcem enotavi, emendavique, quae hic vides. Codicem praetera Modii in contextu expressimus, versus nonvonoctac elecimus, genuinos legitimosque restituiimus, idque magis e consilio Modii, quam nostro (ne quid hic mihi vindicem) quorum omnium rationem reddere id vero actum agere videbatur, præsertim cum id abunde iam olim a Modio præstitum sit . . . [Expl]: Vale, quiosquis es, et quicquid in Graecis scriptoribus hactenus observavimus tum augustiori forma a nobis Silium exspectabils, hic si pusiio meus placuerit, qui inter operas typographicas mihi natus est. Omnia enim qui pauciis a nobis horis praestari potuisse existimat, iniquus alieni laboris aestimatur est.

[Inc.]: (1 6) Gens Cadmea] Ut infra Arces Agenoreas de eadem Cathaginem. Paulo enim longius haec a Silio deducuntur, quamquam ipsa Cathago non solum mani j polis et kakkabē, sed et Kadmēia dicta fuit. Doctissimus Periegetae interpres: [Kakhē-
non] ή πόλις ἀπο Καρχηδόνον τινός ἄν-
drōs Phoikinos, ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ Kadmēia 

(1 9) luratumque lovi foedus] Omne enim ad Iovem, etiamque non invitato eo nomine, pertinbatur iuramentum. Unde ali loco, Deceptum Iovem [VI 693] cum de per-

iurio loquitur, dixit. Atque haec causa cur soli lovis sacerdoti iurare antiquitus apud Romanos per religionem integrum non fuerit, ne scilicet fastas falleret eum quem celebat. . . . [Expl]: (XVII 632) Incoeti corpora Mauri. Incoeti corpora, μελανόχρως, cave enim credas το  ἐν στερητικών esse: Sic antiquis incoetae dicebantur mulieres, quae plus aequo calamistis utebantur.

Atque haec sunt quae nos inter operas Typographicas ad Silium effudimus. Tu vero, mi Lector, si quid boni in tam tumul-
tuario opere sit, id Deo ascribe; si quid secus, id mihi, qui non solum ut homo er-

rare potui, sed ut adolescents, cum venia 
debei; tertiam vero partem paene notarum 
meerum, propter nundinas Francfurten 
se quae instant, omittere necesse habui, ita-
que finem facio si prius de duobus monuero, 
de Omissis nimium et Erratis.

Editiones:

1601, Lugduni Batavorum (Leyden): ex officina Plantiniana Christoplih Raphelen-
gii, pp. 313-504 (Crepundia Siliana, with the text of 1600 preceding).

1646, Cantabrigiae (Cambridge): R. Daniel (the Crepundia Siliana, without the text of the Punica, but bound up with Heinsius' Dissertation de verae criticae apud veteres ortu, progressu, usque. . . and Exercitatio critica demonstrans omne fere Aegyptiorum, Graecorum et Latinorum originem ex Oriente fluzisse. BM.

Heinsius' Crepundia also appear interspersed with the notes of others in the variorum Siliius A. Drakenborch (Utrecht 1717).

Biography:

Daniel Heinsius or Heinsius (Heins) was born at Ghent in 1580 and died at Leyden in 1655. He studied at The Hague, Middelburg, and Franeker, before he went to Leyden, where he was friendly with Janus Dousa and where Scaliger furthered his studies. Scaliger and Heinsius are usually said to have been almost like father and son; for some reservations on this view see ter Horst, op. cit. infra, p. 16. Heinsius began teaching at Leyden in 1602 and succeeded Vellenus as Professor of Greek there in 1610. He became university librarian on the death of Paulus Merula in 1607.

Heinsius' interests were more on the Greek than on the Latin side; Sandys observes that it was through his De tragodiae constitutione, in which he deals with all the essential points in Aristotle's Poetics (which he edited), that he became a center of Aristotelian influence in Holland. He was noted for his classical scholarship and for his ability in Latin verse composition and was held in great esteem both at home and abroad (Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden made him his consiliarius and historiographer; he was decorated by the Republic of Venice). His last years were troubled by bitter dis-
putes with other scholars about the New Testament.

Heinsius took as his motto *Quantum est quod nescimus!* in spite of, or perhaps because of, all he knew. His vast knowledge was acquired by an amazing memory.

His son Nicolaas also became an illustrious classicist; there are posthumous notes on Silius by Nicolaas in Drakenborch's edition.

*Works:* There is a lengthy list of the writings of Daniel Heinsius in Foppens, *op. cit.* infra, pp. 227-228. Marron in Michaud divides them into 1. editions of Greek and Latin classics; 2. verse, mainly Latin; 3. Latin orations; 4. his history of the siege of Bois-le-Duc; 5. *facetiae* (Lais asini, etc.). A collection of his Dutch verse was published by P. Scriverius in 1616.

Among his editions of classical authors, besides Silius and the *Poetics* of Aristotle, are Theocritus, Hesiod, Maximus of Tyre, Seneca tragœdus, Theophrastus, Horace, Terence, Livy, and Prudentius.


12. DOUBTFUL COMMENTARIES

Anonymous D remains anonymous. But the question may be raised of whether he is conceivably to be identified with anybody for whose lecturing on Silius we have fairly good evidence. Two persons who almost certainly gave university courses on the *Punica* in the 1480's (at a time, then, near the first publication of Petrus Marsus' commentary) are (a) Bartholom(a)eus Fon-

**LATIN AUTHORS**

**a) BARTHOLOMAEUS FONTIUS**

Fonzio apparently lectured on Silius in the academic year 1484-85, as we learn from his third inaugural lecture, entitled 'in bonas artis.' His inaugural lectures have always been known and are printed in three *incipabula* (H 7227, 7228, 7229). But C. Trinkaus has now found from careful study that a Wolfenbüttel Ms. (43 Aug.) is more precise than the printed texts; it contains the words *Silium hoc anno interpretantem et, which the incunabula* omit, at the end of the speech: *Vos autem adolescentes optimi et animo meo charissimi, qui me Silium hoc anno interpretantem et vestris studiis incumbentem prosecuturi estis...* See C. Trinkaus, 'A Humanist's Image of Humanism: the Inaugural Orations of Bartolomeo della Fonte,' *Studies in the Renaissance* VII (1960) 90-147 + 1 pl. at 94 ('... on 8 November 1484, when the *Punica* of Silius was the subject of his course, he gave an *Oratio in bonas artis.*)' with n. 15 and 119 with n. 78 (texts with and without mention of Silius). Trinkaus admits the possibility that 'Fontius was inventing a subject and a date in committing the oration to this manuscript copy' (119 n. 78). But, since the oration is the usual type of *praelection* at the beginning of a course, the subject of the course would be properly named but might well be omitted by the printer since the oration dealt in general terms with humanistic studies. Whether Fonzio gave his course on Silius in Florence or in Rome is hard to decide. He succeeded Francesco Filelfo as professor of rhetoric and philosophy at the studio in Florence in 1481 but in 1483 left because of hostilities with Poliziano for Rome, where Sixtus IV gave him the *venia legendi*; he was back in Florence from 1485 on, if not from the end of 1484 on. See Delz I 130 with n. 38; cf. Trinkaus, *op. cit.* p. 94 with n. 14. See also Delz I 67 for the poem to Petrus Guicciardinus in which Fonzio cites Silius among the authors whom he is busy with and for Ms. Riccard. 837, Barptol. Fontii Dictionarium
ex variis auctoribus collectum, where Silius is quoted twice. (The poem is Bartholomeus Fontius, Carmina, edd. J. Fögel et L. Juhász, Bibl. scriptorum medii recentisque aevorum, saec. X V-XVI (Leipzig 1932), No. 18: Inde fueurs recolo divini scripta Maronis, / Vel Sili, Hannibalis qui fera bella canit, / Insani vel me verto ad praecepta Lucreti, / Sive ad Phrixaeae noble carmen ovis). . . [vvs. 43-46]). See also the account of Fonzie by E. M. Sanford in CTC I 227-229.

b) ANTONIUS VOLSCUS

Volso, in the Preface to his annotated edition of Propertius of 1488 or 1489, castigates Pietro Marsi and the latter’s teachers, Pomponio Leto and Domizio Calderini, in the following words: Superioribus annis Sylvii Italici bellum Punicum profitesce cum passim mendas offenderamus, mirati sumus quo pacto qui ante nos legerant eruditissimos professores vel non notasse vel ut incompetas reliquisse. Incideunt tunc in manus novi quidam commentarii qui presbiteri cuiusdam Marsi ferebantur, incertum Vestinus an Marucinus sit; Paulus Marsus vir nostri temporis litteratissimus mihique summa benivolentiæ coniunctissimus Marsum esse negabat. Cum illos diligentius accuratiusque legissem, non modo maculas non tollere sed cicatricosum multis aliis vulneribus invenimus sauciare. Id vero suone an eorum quos iactitatem praecipitorum iudicio fecerit nescio. Illud tamen certissimum est locos centum quinquaginta ferme annotasse qui antea aut nullam habiens mendam aut paulum intricati intelligi faciliumque potuissent: interpres ille acutissimus ingenioso adeo castigavit ut interdum carminum lex non constet, interdum poetae etiam sensa percipi non possint. . .’ For this passage and for various details about Volso and his scholarly activity (e.g., the inclusion of Costanzo among his names is due to confusion with Antonio Costanzo da Fano and must be abandoned; Volso’s Propertius printed in Jan., 1482, is the text only) see C. Dionisotti, ‘“Lavinia venit litora,” Polemica virgiliana di M. Filetico,’ Italia medioevale e umanistica I (1958) 283-315 at 298-301. Cf. also R. Avesani and B. M. Peebles, ‘Studies in Petro Donato Avogaro of Verona,’ ibid. V (1962) 1-84 + 2 pls. at 70 (Avesani).

Perhaps a better case might be made out for Volso than for Fonzie as being the same as Anonymus D. One thing in particular is against Fonzie. In J, the Silian Ms. of which he is the scribe (cf. Delz 165-66 with nn. 34-40), we have at XIV 40 the correct reading e centum (most certainly an emendation by Fonzie since no other Ms. contains it), whereas Σ has in the text heretum and, as the correction of this by the second hand, heteretum in the margin. Furthermore, at XIV 39 instead of the correct duxerat actos we find in the margin of Inc. II 427 duxit et actos; this change is due to the second annotator in Σ (Anonymus D), who comments on duxerat of his text: duxit et puto potius, whereas Fonzie in J keeps the correct reading.

Two other humanists may have been commenting on Silius in this period, (c) Galeazzo Pontico Fac(c)ino (Galeatius Ponticus Fac(c)inus) and (d) Cynthia Senetensis (i.e., Pietro Leoni).

c) GALEATIUS PONTICUS FACCIUS

Ermolao Barbaro says in a letter written to Faccio in 1484: Tu istic Silium absolvis, poeticam exercueris. Branca and Richards interpret the absolvis here as ‘comment on,’ but it may mean only ‘finish copying.’


d) CYNTHIUS CENETENESIS

As for Cynthia Senetensis, Victor Luissens says of him in a letter to Franciscus e
Turre (Feltrensis): Disputat subtiliter, graviter et ornate loquitur, frequenter etiam subtilitates Ciceronis, Plinii, Sylii, Quintilianii, Virgillii, Lucretii, Demostenis, Ausonii, Palladii, Sereni et Sabini, historiasque non-nullas effingit. Again, however, the diction used is not a definite argument for Cynthiaus' commenting on the Punicus; if subtilitates suggests difficulties to be explained, effingit does not seem to be quite the right word for an expositor. See the letter on p. 269 (No. 25) of the special section (pp. 259-269) De Cynthiao Cenetensi appendix cum notis Philippo Artico Episcopo Astensi auctore in G. M. Dozio's ed. of Cynthiae Cenetensis in Virgilii Aeneidem Commentarium (Milan 1845). But certainly Cynthiaus was familiar with the Punicus; he often quotes from it in his Virgilian commentary.

Spurious Works

II. Ilias Latina

That Silius was the author of the Ilias Latina seems doubtful; that it was written by an Italicus, however, perhaps Baebius Italicus, is likely. Cf. F. Vollmer in PW IX (1914) 1057-1060; A. Klotz, ibid., 2. R. III (1927) 91; and Schanz-Hosius II (41935) 505-508. But G. E. Duckworth's metrical studies led him to assign the Ilias Latina to Silius; see his 'Five Centuries of Latin Hexameter Poetry: Silver Age and Late Empire,' TAPA XCVIII (1967) 77-150 at 101-102, 104-105, 107-109, 142, 147 and Virgil and Classical Hexameter Poetry: A Study in Metrical Variety (Ann Arbor 1969) 110-111 and 140. The Ms. tradition of the Punicus is entirely separate from that of the Ilias Latina. The commentaries on the latter work will be discussed in another volume of this series.