

VITRUVIUS

by LUCIA A. CIAPPONI
(Chapel, Hill North Carolina)

<i>Fortuna.</i>	399
Bibliography.	402
I. <i>De architectura.</i>	403
Commentaries.	
1. Gulielmus Philander.	
2. Daniel Barbarus.	
3. Lost or doubtful commentaries.	
a. Bernardinus or Gaudentius Merula.	
b. Adrianus Anzuti, or Azovii.	
c. Iohannes Norchiatus.	
d. Hieronymus Cardanus.	
e. Antonius Lupicinus.	

FORTUNA

Very little is known about Vitruvius, who seems to have become famous only after his death.¹ His treatise *De Architectura*, the only ancient handbook of this kind that has reached us, dates from the age of Augustus; arguments for a later date, including those of Ussing (1896), are now universally rejected.

Vitruvius' full name is unknown. The few ancient writers who mention him call him simply Vitruvius: Pliny, who cites him as a source for books XVI, XXXV, XXXVI of his *Naturalis Historia*; Frontinus (*De Aquaeductibus* 25); Servius (*Ad Aen.* VI 43); Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epp.* IV 3, 5; VIII 6, 10). The name Vitruvius Pollio is found only at the beginning of the epitome of the *De Architectura* by Caetius Faventinus. Recently Paul Thielscher in

1. He himself declares (VI pr. 5) that he was not well known at the time when he was writing his book late in life, but he expects that his treatise will make him known to posterity.

his article in Pauly-Wissowa supported with new arguments an identification earlier proposed by Müntzer of Vitruvius with Mamurra, Caesar's infamous *praefectus fabrum*. Ruffel and Soubiran, in a long and detailed article replying to Thielscher, have shown that there is no evidence for such an identification.

The little information we have about Vitruvius' life is found in his own treatise: he tells us that he received an education, both technical and liberal, thanks to his parents (VI pr. 4); that he had worked under Julius Caesar (I pr. 2) and finally, that though old and in ill health, he hoped his work would satisfy Augustus, to whom he had been recommended by Octavia (I pr. 2; II pr. 4; VI pr. 5). A passage from Frontinus (25, 1-2) seems to suggest that Vitruvius was employed in some official capacity on the aqueducts. He mentions only one building built by himself, a basilica at Fanum (V 1, 6-10),² of which only

2. Krohn believes that this passage in Vitruvius is an interpolation: Vitruvius, *De Architectura libri decem*, Leipzig 1912, pp. iii-vi.

scant and uncertain traces have been found, but some scholars believe that further excavations may be fruitful.

His fame rests on his treatise *De Architectura* in ten books. The date of the *De Architectura* is by no means established. Schanz-Hosius put it around 25-23 B.C.; Pellati thinks that it was written in two phases: books I-VI would have been presented to Augustus in the year 27, the others would have been finished perhaps around 16-15; Thielscher would like to come down to 14, while Ruffel and Soubiran seem to incline toward the time around the battle of Actium.³

The text of the *De Architectura* was epitomized by Caetius Faventinus in the III cent. In the IV cent. Servius mentions the architect Vitruvius, misquoting him (*Ad Aen.* VI 43), and by the time of Sidonius Apollinaris (V cent.) Vitruvius had become the architect of the past (*Epp.* IV 3, 5; VIII 6, 10). The *De Architectura*, a very difficult text because of the large amount of material covered, its technicalities, and Vitruvius' style, was known throughout the Middle Ages, even if it was not well understood. For instance, Einhard asked for an explanation of some difficult Vitruvian words; Alcuin quoted him; Petrus Diaconus copied the *De Architectura* at Montecassino in the XII cent.; in the XIII cent. Albertus Magnus quoted Vitruvius in his *De natura locorum*, as did Thomas Aquinas, although indirectly, while Vincent of Beauvais has long excerpts from the *De Architectura* in his *Speculum doctrinale*, and others are in the *Biblionomia* of Richard de Fournival. Strangely enough the treatise seems to be unknown to the Italian cultural centers of the Middle Ages, with the exception of Montecassino: the pre-humanists, such as Benzo d'Alessandria or Guglielmo da Pastrengo, do not seem to know the *De Architectura*. Vitruvius is absent from the catalogues of the old Italian libraries of Verona, Bobbio, Nonantola, and Pomposa, while it was present, for example in the libraries of Reichenau and Murbach in the

IX cent., at Gorze, at Toul and in an unknown library, perhaps French, in the XI cent.; at Cluny and Rouen in the XII, at Bamberg in the XIII, at Regensburg, at Fulda, at Canterbury, at the Sorbonne and in Avignon in the XIV cent.

There is no complete census of Vitruvian manuscripts, but their number seems likely to be about one hundred. Only three date from the IX-XI cent.; more were copied after the XII and a larger number after the XIV cent. The manuscript tradition of Vitruvius is fairly complicated and has always presented problems to the editors. It has been established that all the manuscripts derive from one archetype, which suffered the transposition of a folio perpetuated in all the extant manuscripts. Rose and Mueller in their edition of the *De Architectura* (Leipzig 1867) divided the manuscripts into two primary families: one, very numerous, would derive from the ms H (Harleianus 2767) IX cent., the other, very small, from E, an epitome with extracts from the text of Vitruvius, and G (Gudiani 132 and 69 respectively), X and XI cent. A new manuscript S (Sélestat 1153 bis), found by André Giry in 1879, was considered with some hesitation by Rose in his second edition (1899) as being a member of the H family with some collations from the EG family. Krohn in his edition of 1912 seems to think that S is close to H with readings of its own. Degering in a series of articles expressed his opinion that S was the representative of an independent family, as were two other manuscripts overlooked by Rose and Krohn, W (Vat. Regin. lat. 2079, XIII cent.) and V (Vat. Regin. lat. 1328, XV cent.). Recently Ruffel and Soubiran in their fundamental study of the manuscript tradition of Vitruvius have followed Degering's suggestions and come to the conclusion that the manuscripts must be divided into five primary families: H, EG, S, W, V. More recently Chausserie-Laprée, taking as the starting point of his study the work of Ruffel and Soubiran, has come to a different conclusion: he proposes going back to the division into the two primary families suggested by Rose and Krohn; on one side

3. See the discussion in *Pallas* 11 (1962) 144 n. 30; 148.

we would have EG, on the other HSWV and derived manuscripts.

The tradition of Vitruvius, as we have it, points toward north-European origins. In fact, the oldest extant manuscripts are all from northern Europe. Only after the XIV cent. do manuscripts of Vitruvius appear in Italy. The *De Architectura*, like many other ancient works, became known to the Italian humanists through Petrarch and his friends. Petrarch obtained a Vitruvius probably around 1350, but he did not seem to be much interested in this author, whom he quotes only three times. More enthusiastic was his friend Boccaccio who is known to have owned a manuscript of Vitruvius bound with his Tacitus, now lost, and who frequently quotes the *De Architectura* with readings typical of Petrarch's text in his works written between 1350 and 1360. Giovanni Dondi, another friend of Petrarch's, owned a Vitruvius (bound with a Pliny), now also lost, and quotes the *De Architectura* with readings that again lead to Petrarch's text. At about the same time a Vitruvius appears in the catalogue of books of Nicola Acciaiuoli; later Jean de Montreuil is known to have obtained from Italy a copy of the *De Architectura* together with Cato, Censorinus and the *De rustica* of Varro. In 1416 Poggio Bracciolini found a *De Architectura* at St. Gall, but by this time the text was already well known in humanistic circles. Vitruvius was very influential in the Italian Renaissance: from Francesco di Giorgio Martini to Raphael the *De Architectura* was considered the basic handbook of the art of building, and a modern work of the same type, the *De re aedificatoria* of Leon Battista Alberti, published in 1485, was openly inspired by it.

In the Quattrocento and the Cinquecento Vitruvius was printed several times. The text of the *De Architectura*, followed by the text of the *De Aquaeductibus* of Frontinus, appeared for the first time in Rome (C 6268) edited by the grammarian Sulpicio of Veroli. Printer and date are unknown: Proctor suggested Georgius Herolt 1486, but BMC attributes this work to Eucharius Silber and dates it between 1483 and 1490, while the *Short title catalogue of books print-*

ed in Italy attributes it to Silber but with the date 1495 (?). In the second edition (C 6269), perhaps by Christophorus de Pensis, the text of Vitruvius is followed by the *De Aquaeductibus* of Frontinus and the *Panepistemon* and the *Lamia* of Politian. It has two colophons: one, at the end of the *De Architectura*, has the date Florence 1496; the other, at the end of the *Lamia*, has Venice 1495. The third edition was printed in Venice in 1497 by Simon Bevilacqua (H 5451, GW 7123): here the *De Architectura* is preceded by Cleonides, *Harmonicum introductorium* and followed by Frontinus, *De Aquaeductibus* and the *Panepistemon* and the *Lamia* of Politian. Both the second and the third editions lack the name of their editor.

In 1511 the Venetian printer Giovanni of Tridino published a new edition of the text of the *De Architectura* only, with illustrations. This beautiful edition in small folio was prepared by the famous architect, philologist, and epigraphist Fra Giocondo of Verona. Although it does not have a commentary, the beautiful woodcuts, which were used to illustrate the text for the first time, the captions to the woodcuts themselves, the lexicon and the final note which attempts to explain the meaning of the mathematical symbols used by Vitruvius, as well as many corrections to the text, several of which due to the use of a different manuscript family, show that Giocondo did not limit himself to copying the text from a manuscript while making some conjectures of his own here and there, but tried thoroughly to understand and interpret it. The text of Giocondo was reprinted, this time with the *De Aquaeductibus* of Frontinus, by Filippo Giunta in 1513; again in Florence by the Giunta brothers in 1522 and in Lyon in 1523.⁴ There are a few fifteenth-century Italian translations preserved in manuscripts, and it might be noted, for instance, that in a manuscript in Munich the Italian version of Fabio

4. These are some results of my research on the early editions of the *De Architectura* and especially of that of Giocondo, which I hope to publish in the near future.

Calvo Ravennate has marginal notes which have been ascribed to Raphael.⁵

The first commentary on Vitruvius was written in Italian by Cesare Cesariano, one of the architects of the Duomo of Milan, to accompany his Italian translation; his work was finished by Bono Mauro and Benedetto Giovio and was printed in Como in 1521. It represents a big step forward in the direction indicated by Giocondo. It has very beautiful and sophisticated illustrations. This publication was followed by a large number of Italian translations with or without commentary, nearly all based on Giocondo or Cesariano, if not copying directly from them. After 1540 a number of translations into French, German, and Spanish also were printed.

The first commentary in Latin appeared quite late, in 1544, the work of a Frenchman, Guillaume Philandrier, who seems to have taken advantage of the studies of Giocondo, Cesariano and the others, to which he added work of his own. In the list of the authors that he claims to have used in his commentary, there appear most of the men of the Renaissance who had been interested in Vitruvius. After Philandrier, the Venetian Daniele Barbaro published first in Italian then in Latin an edition of Vitruvius with commentary. In 1612 Bernardino Baldi published in Augsburg a *De verborum Vitruvianorum significatione, sive perpetuus in M. Vitruvium Pollionem commentarius*. Despite the title, it is an alphabetically arranged Vitruvian lexicon and not a real commentary. Interest in the *De Architectura* continued throughout the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and at least the studies of Poleni (XVIII cent.) and Marini (XIX cent.) should be mentioned

5. Munich, Staatsbibliothek, cod. ital. 37 and 37a (s. XVI). Cod. 37 has the note: In Roma in casa di Raffaello di Giovanne di Sacte (sic) da Urbino et a sua instantia; see *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis* VII (Munich, 1858; reprinted 1971) 284, nos. 1034 and 1035. The traditional ascription of the marginal notes to Raphael has been questioned by R. Weiss, *Lettere Italiane* XI (1959) 94, note 43.

here. The *editio maior* of Rose-Mueller of 1867 gave a renewed impulse to Vitruvian studies, which have continued to flourish up to this day, enlisting philologists, archeologists, and practicing architects in editing, commenting, and translating the text and in explicating particular passages.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Modern Editions.

F. Krohn, Leipzig, 1912 (Teubner); F. Granger, London, New York, 1931-34, with English translation (Loeb Classics); J. Soubiran, Paris, 1969, only Book IX to date (Budé).

Vitruvius in the ancient world.

P. Thielscher, *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* IX A (1961) 419-89 (especially 427-62); F. Müntzer, 'Faba minus und Faberius scriba,' *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 36 (1916) 1316-20; P. Ruffel-J. Soubiran, 'Vitruve ou Mamurra?' *Pallas* 11 (1962) 123-79; F. Pellati, *Vitruvio*, Rome 1938; the same, 'La basilica di Fano e la formazione del trattato di Vitruvio,' *Rendiconti d. Pont. Accad. di Archeol.* 23-24 (1947-49) 153-74; G. Berardi, *Fano Romana. Basilica di Vitruvio*, Fano 1967.

Vitruvius in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

F. Pellati, 'Vitruvio e la fortuna del suo trattato nel mondo antico,' *Rivista di filol. e d'istruz. class.* 49 (1921) 305-335; 'Vitruvio nel Medioevo e nel Rinascimento,' *Boll. d. R. Ist. di arch. e st. dell'arte* 5 (1932) 111-32; H. Koch, *Vom Nachleben Vitruvs* (Deutsche Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft I) Baden-Baden 1951; L. A. Ciapponi, 'Il "De Architectura" di Vitruvio nel primo umanesimo,' *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 3 (1960) 59-99 (espec. 59-62); C. Herselle-Krinsky, 'Seventy-eight Vitruvius Manuscripts,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 30 (1967) 36-70. On the manuscript tradition: A. Giry 'Notes sur un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque de Schlestadt,' *Revue de phil.* 3 (1879) 16-18; H. Degering, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 20 (1900) 8-16; 27 (1907) 1564-68; 32 (1912) 581-86; 35 (1915) 418-20; P. Ruffel-J. Soubiran, 'Recherches sur la tradition manu-

scrite de Vitruve,' *Pallas* 9 (1960) 5-154; J. P. Chausserie-Laprée, 'Un nouveau stemma Vitruvien,' *Revue des études latines* 47 (1969) 347-77. On the origin of the archetype: F. Granger, 'The Harleian Ms. of Vitruvius (H) and the Codex Amiatinus,' *Journal of Theological Studies* 32 (1930-31) 74-77, and 'The Provenience of the London Vitruvius,' *Speculum* 11 (1936) 261-64; L. W. Jones, 'The Provenience of the London Vitruvius,' *Speculum* 7 (1932) 64-70; the same, *The Script of Cologne from Hildebald to Hermann*, Cambridge, Mass. 1932, 65-66; the same, 'More about the London Vitruvius,' *Speculum* 12 (1937) 257-63; C. H. Beeson, 'The Manuscript Problem of Vitruvius,' *Class. Phil.* 30 (1935) 342-47; B. Bischoff, 'Die wiedergefundenen Schlussblätter des Vitruvius Harleianus,' *Phil. Woch.* 62 (1942) 504.

Editions :

A useful list of older editions in G. Poleni, *Exercitationes Vitruvianae primae*, Padua 1739 (also Udine, 1825). Less accurate B. Ebhardt, *Die zehn Bücher der Architektur des Vitruv und ihre Herausgeber. Mit einem Verzeichnis der vorhandenen Ausgaben und Erläuterungen*, Berlin 1918 (also Ossining, N. Y. 1962).

De architectura.

COMMENTARIES.

1. GULIELMUS PHILANDER

a) The edition of 1544.

Gulielmus Philander published his first commentary on Vitruvius separately from the text of the *De Architectura* in 1544, when he was in Rome with his patron George d'Armagnac. The commentary appears to have been finished in 1541 (see the explicit of the commentary) and is dedicated to Francis I, king of France. In his letter of dedication Philander declares that Rome seemed to him the right place to work on Vitruvius. Although the style of the passage is involved, it appears that the Pope and some cardinals were interested in his work and were urging him to publish it. He was dubious and, although he had been working on it for three years, he would

not have published it but for his protector George d'Armagnac. On this occasion, however, Philander published only his commentary. It was issued by Ioannes Andreas Dossena who, in the publisher's advertisement prefixed to the work, affirms that the commentary contains much information of general interest and also promises to publish in a short time the text of the *De Architectura* with Philander's emendations, commentary and new illustrations, which will be the best edition ever printed, better than the one recently printed in Basel. I have not been able to find any edition whatsoever published in Basel at this time, but Dossena may be misinformed and allude to the edition of Strasbourg of 1543. Dossena was not able to print the promised edition.

The Rome, 1544 edition begins with Vitruvius' description of the character of the architect. (*De architectura* I 1, 7)

Architecti virtutes ex Vitruvio. [Inc.]: Architectus magno sit animo, non arrogans, sed facilis et aequus et fidelis. . ./. . .[*Expl.*]: suam tueatur dignitatem bonam famam habendo, rogatus, non rogans, suscipiat curam.

Publisher's Introduction. Iohannes Andreas Dossena studiosis salutem [*Inc.*]: Ego nihil hominis natura decentius magisve proprium existimandum puto quam. . . Et quamvis optime cognoscam Vitruvium ipsum a paucis legi. . . animadverti hunc doctissimum virum [Philander] sexcentas in hisce annotationibus res scitu dignissimas aspersisse. . . . Quod si, ut spero evenerit, vobis paucos post menses Vitruvii opus universum me impressurum polliceor pristino candori ab eodem Philandro restitutum ac infinitis mendis quibus nunc titubare videtur castigatum, variis insuper ac novis figuris exornatum, quale nullae adhuc officinae ediderunt, nec ea quidem quae opus illud hoc anno Basileae excusum proposuit, quae impressio non solum doctorum iudicio castigatior non videtur, sed deterior certe, aliquanto corruptior. . .[*Expl.*]: ut vo<bi>s ostendat se non parum studii et diligentiae in his libris primum declarandis, deinde corrigendis, adhibuisse. Valete.

Auctores quos in hoc opere Philander et ii per quos ipse profecit sequuti sunt et

citant [*Inc.*]: Apollonius mathematicus, Athenaeus, Aristocles. . . [*Expl.*]: Verrius, Xenophon, Zenodotus.

Dedication. Francisco Valesio regi potentissimo et christianissimo Gulielmus Philander Castilionius victoriam. [*Inc.*]: Fuisse tempus cum in montibus ac sylvis dispersi dissipatique homines. . . . Itaque rei difficultate deterriti qui libros Vitruvii habebant, nolebant legere, quorum se cognitionem assequi posse diffidebant. Ex illo fluere et retro sublapsa referri architectonice ut qui aedificarunt novis ineptiarum deliramentis appareat delectatos, nisi forte hoc ineptire non est, posthabitis probatissimis laudatissimorum operum rationibus, inepta atque otiosa ornamenta, ne dicam a rerum natura abhorrentia, frustra et ambitiose comminisci et his officiis ac praestigiis a probis abducere et fucum facere. Neque enim audiendi sunt qui pro cuiusque libidine variam et mutabilem esse aedificiorum formam dicunt. Iactari enim et alio atque alio deferri necessario esset, nisi quo tendendum cognitum nobis prius ac perspectum fuerit. Sed commune hoc, inquit ille, ignorantiae vitium est, quae nescias nequicquam esse profiteri. Haec cum ita essent, non poteram facere quin de emendando Vitruvio, idque Romae ubi antiquitatis vestigia adhuc nonnulla reliqua erant, et saepe et diu cogitarem. Itaque iam tertius actus est annus cum per aestatem successivis operis summopere contendi ut ea restituerem quae mihi depravata, luxata et mutila videbantur. Paucis mensibus tot mendis purgavi ut auisim omni asseveratione adfirmare, praeter unum atque alterum locum quae neque ipse Apollo sanaverit, parum abesse quominus hic auctor quam emendatissimus in manus hominum veniat. Inter emendandum multa sese offerebant difficilia et obscura, quae si scholio illustrarem, videbar facturus operae precium. Id a nobis pro viribus est factum. Illud quodcunque fuerat laboris, cum intelligerem Pont (ifici) Max(imo) probatum et <cum> me aliquot huius sacrosancti purpuratorum patrum collegii principes viri ceu a tota paene Italia duos annos incredibili cum desiderio expectatum ut aederem hortarentur, si facerem, gratificaturum me in primis Romanis, qui literarum

et virtutis ergo nihil minus sperantem aut expectantem civitate donavissent, sub cuius nomine (si quam fortasse ea re utilitatem studiosis adferre possem) sinerem in vulgum prodire, dubitabam. . . . Dum animi penderem, vicit autoritas mecoenatis mei Geor. Armeniaci Ruthenorum episcopi, tuae [of king Francis I] maiestatis apud Max. Pont. Paulum prudentissimi, vigilantissimi et integerrimi legati. . . . [*Expl.*]: de textrina quaeque radio quaeque laeis idest pondusculis perficitur, tandem aliquando absolvam. Valeat tua maiestas. Roma calendis Augusti MDXLIIII.

Vitruvii vita ex ipso opere per Philandrum collecta. [*Inc.*]: M. Vitruvii Pollionis quae fuerit patria video in dubium revocari, quibusdam Romanum. . . . [*Expl.*]: fuisse ingenii, libri septimus, nonus et decimus argumento esse queant. Hactenus quod astruere possumus.

Commentary. [Gulielmi Philandri Castilionii Galli civis Romani in primum lib. M. Vitruvii Pollionis de Architectura annotationes cap. primum]. [*Inc.*]: *Graphidos scientiam habere.* Graphis est linearis deformatio sive designatio. Non desunt tamen qui. . . . [*Expl.*]: Hoc tamen testatum volumus labores hos nostros maiores fuisse quam visum iri speremus. Finis. Haec Philander commentabatur Roma III Calendis Augusti MDXLI, suadente impellenteque et adiuvante mecoenate suo Georgio Armeniaco Ruthenorum episcopo, tum regio ad Paulum III Pont. Max. legato.

Errata

Index dictionum quae in his annotationibus Graece leguntur.

Index eorum quae habentur in annotationibus in Vitruvium copiosissimus.

Editions:

1544, Rome: apud Io. Andream Dosse-
nam Taurinen.; Graesse VI 2, 377. BM.

1545, Paris: ex officina Michaelis Fe-
zandat, in domo Albretica e regione divi
Hilarii. Graesse VI 2, 377. BM; BN. This
edition does not have the list of errata, but
the corrections were properly introduced
into the text.

(*) 1545, Paris: apud Iacobum Kerver.
Graesse VI 2, 377. BM; BN.

1550, Strasbourg : ex officina Knoblochiana per Georgium Machaeropiaeum, with Frontinus *De Aquaeductibus* and Cusanus' *Dialogus de staticis experimentis*. Adams V-907 ; Graesse VI 2, 377. BN ; (MH).

(*) 1557, Venice : ex officina Stellae ; Graesse VI 2, 377.

b) the edition of 1552

The text of Vitruvius corrected by Philander and his commentary were published in Lyon in 1552 by Iohannes Tornaesius. The colophon of this edition states that the commentary has been enriched by one third. Since Francis I had died, Philander dedicated this edition to George d'Armagnac. In his dedication Philander himself claims that he had thoroughly revised his work. The incipit and explicit of the commentary are the same in both editions, but there are changes in their texts, and new pieces are added besides the new dedication to Armagnac. The list of the authors used by Philander is richer. The life of Vitruvius is partially redone. A table on the mathematical symbols used by Vitruvius taken from the 1511 edition of Fra Giocondo is added. There is a portrait of Philander himself with two epigrams, one in Greek and one in Latin by F. Tirlerianus in honor of Philander. An epitome of Georgius Agricola's *De mensuris et ponderibus* by the same Philander follows the work on Vitruvius.

New dedication : Illustriss. et reverendiss. d. Georgio Armagnacio S. R. E. cardinali mecoenati et patrono suo Gulielmus Philander Castilionius S. [Inc.] : Annotationes in Vitruvium Pollionem quas ad Franciscum regem P. P. ac bonarum litterarum assertorem. . . Opus prope totum interpolavi : mutata pleraque, addita plurima, aliquanto tersiora omnia. Supervacuum enim foret in studiis longior labor, inquit ille, si nihil liceret melius invenire praeteritis. . . [Expl.] : a quibus te coli putas principem locum velle obtinere. Vale. Lugduno in aedibus Ioannis Tornaesii typographi, Calendis Ianuarii anno quinquagesimo secundo supra sesquimille-nium.

Dedication to Francis I : see 1544 ed.

Authors used by Philander : (some changes) [Inc.] : Apollonius mathematicus, Athenaeus,

Aristoteles, . . . [Expl.] : Zenodotus, Zeno Myn-dius, Zonoras.

Vitruvii vita ex ipso opere per Philandrum collecta (some changes). [Inc.] : M. Vitruvii Pollionis quem reperi ab aliquo Veturii Ruffi nomine ad testimonium vocatum. . . [Expl.] : et id genus anno MCCCCXCIIII inventum in coenobio quodam ad Bobium oppidum. Hactenus quod astruere possumus.

Inscriptiones omnium capitum M. Vitruvii Pollionis librorum decem de Architectura.

Mathematical table. [Inc.] : Lectori. Ex his quae libro decimo M. Vitruvius habet atque ex veterum autorum Graecorum. . . [Expl.] : significare contenderet si ut tradita fuerunt incorrupta ad nos conservata haberentur.

Architecti virtutes ex Vitruvio : see 1544 ed.

Portrait of Philander.

Greek epigram by F. Tirlerianus : γράφαι μὲν χαλεπὸν μορφὴν δὲ νόον δὲ Φιλάνδρον, / ἀλλ' αὐτὸς πράττει φαινόμεν' ἀμφοτέρω.

Latin epigram by F. Tirlerianus : Hoc opus ingenii vires animumque Philandri, / Ista refert vultum corporis effigies.

Commentary : [Gulielmi Philandri Castilionii Galli, civis Romani in decem M. Vitruvii Pollionis de Architectura libros annotationum liber primus. In caput I annotationes]. [Inc.] : Graphidos scientiam habere. Graphis linearis est deformatio sive designatio. Non desunt tamen qui. . . [Expl.] : Hoc tamen testatum volumus labores hos nostros maiores fuisse quam visum iri speremus. Haec Philander Romae primum commentabar III Calendis Augusti MDXLI suadente impellenteque et adiuvante mecoenate meo Georgio cardinale Armagnacio regio tum ad Paulum tertium Pont. Max. legato.

Epitome of Georgius Agricola's De mensuris et ponderibus.

Index in decem Vitruvii libros atque annotationes Gulielmi Philandri copiosiss.

Index dictionum Graecarum quae in his Vitruvii libris atque Philandri annotationibus sparsim leguntur.

Errata to the Epitome.

Excerpt from the imperial privilege.

Editions :

1552, Lyon : apud Ioannem Tornaesium, with the epitome of Agricola's *De mensuris et*

ponderibus. Adams V 908 ; Graesse VI 2, 377. BM ; BN ; (MH).

1586, Lyon : apud Ioannem Tornaesium, with the epitome of Agricola's *De mensuris et ponderibus*. Adams V 910 ; Graesse VI 2, 377. BM ; BN.

(*) 1586, Coloniae Allobrogum : apud Ioannem Tornaesium. Adams V 911.

1649, Amsterdam : apud Ludovicum Elzevirium, with excerpts from the commentary of Barbaro and Salmasius' notes and with other works. Graesse VI 2, 377. BM ; BN ; (MH).

Biography :

Gulielmus Philander (Guillaume Philandrier or Filandrier) was born at Châtillon-sur-Seine in 1505 of an old family. He received a good education and in 1533 he became lector of George d'Armagnac then bishop of Rodéz. While in Rodéz, Philander wrote some inscriptions, prepared a commentary on Quintilian (of which a part is lost) and began to apply himself to architecture. Vitruvius became his model. He built several buildings in Rodéz and George d'Armagnac gave him the direction of the construction of the cathedral. When George d'Armagnac was sent as ambassador of Francis I to Venice and then to Rome, Philander followed him. In Rome he was made honorary Roman citizen, and he seems to have studied with the famous architect Sebastiano Serlio. There he worked for three years on Vitruvius, encouraged by George d'Armagnac. Finally in 1544, the same year in which Armagnac was made cardinal, Philander published his commentary on Vitruvius, dedicating it to Francis I. Philander went back to France when George d'Armagnac was recalled and in 1552 Ioannes Tornaesius published in Lyon his edition of Vitruvius with his revised commentary, which he dedicated to his patron Armagnac, since Francis I had died. In 1554 Philander took sacred orders, later became canon of the cathedral of Rodéz ; in 1561 he became archdeacon. He died in Toulouse in 1565 while on a visit to his patron, George d'Armagnac, who had become archbishop of Toulouse.

Works : Besides the work on Vitruvius, Philander published his commentary on

Quintilian (not complete) *Castigationes atque annotationes pauculae in XII libros Institutionum M. Fabii Quintiliani*. . ., Lyon 1535 and the *Epitome in omnes Georgii Agricolae de mensuris et ponderibus libros* which was added to his edition of Vitruvius of 1552.

According to his biographer Philibert de la Mare, Philander had finished two other works, *De sectionibus marmorum et polituris* and *De lapidum coloribus*, and was thinking of writing three others, *De picturis et colorum compositione* ; *De hyalurgia, plasticæ et baphice* and *De umbris*.

Bibl. : The fundamental biography is Philibert de la Mare, *De vita, moribus et scriptis Guillelmi Philandri Castilionii* . . . *epistola*, s.l. 1667 ; others are : A. Baillet, *Jugemens des savants sur les principaux ouvrages des auteurs*, II, Paris 1722, 300 ; A. Cioranescu, *Bibliographie de la littérature française du seizième siècle* (1959), 317 (Filandrier) ; *Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises*, ed. G. Grente, Le seizième siècle, Paris 1951, 566 ; Hoefer, *Nouvelle biographie générale*, XXXIX, Paris 1862, 836-37 ; Michaud, *Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne*, XXXIII, Paris-Leipzig n.d. 43 ; Papillon, *Bibliothèque des auteurs de Bourgogne*, II, Dijon 1745, 148-51 (also Genève 1970).

2. DANIEL BARBARUS

In 1556 the printer Francesco Marcolini published in Venice Daniele Barbaro's Italian translation of the *De Architectura* of Vitruvius with a commentary. In 1567 Francesco de Franceschi published both a revised edition of Barbaro's 1556 work and, for the first time, Barbaro's Latin edition of the *De Architectura* with commentary. It seems, however, that Barbaro produced both his Italian and Latin editions of the text and the commentary on Vitruvius simultaneously. In fact the new publisher, presenting the Italian text to the readers, wrote in his preface : "Volendo io ristampare il Vitruvio con il commento del Reverendissimo Monsignor Daniel Barbaro eletto d'Aquileggia, spesse fiate sono stato in pensiero di non offendere l'animo suo sa-

pendo che sua Signoria Reverendissima era occupata in altri studi convenienti al grado che tiene: però io sono stato molto tempo a dar principio a quello che io desiderava grandemente. Hora che . . . ho preso ardire di scuoprirle il mio desiderio né mi sono ingannato della bontà sua, perché havendosi cortesemente contentato che io lo ristampassi, mi disse che aveva anco apparecchiato il latino, *che egli fece già insieme col volgare* [italics are mine] et che gli aveva aggiunto molte cose et molte figure che non sono nel primo et che mi donarebbe anche il latino." According to de Franceschi changes were made both in the commentary (especially in book IX where Barbaro replaced his own explanation of the solar clocks with the analemma of Commandino, which appeared to be more satisfactory) and in the illustrations. The latter were cut by his partner, Iohannes Crugher: "Là dove havendo io havuto più di quello che haverei saputo dimandare, ho voluto, benigni lettori, ad utilità commune mandar in luce l'uno et l'altro Vitruvio [Italian and Latin] et usare ogni diligenza per rifarli in forma commoda et con figure accuratamente et diligentemente intagliate dal mio honorato compare et compagno in questa impresa M. Giovanni Chrieger Alemanno, et accomodate a questa nuova forma, accioché ognuno possa godere il frutto delle dotte fatiche del sopradetto mio Signore. Il quale . . . havendo veduto che nello Analemma di Vitruvio lo eccellente messer Federico Commandino si ha portato egregiamente interpretando lo Analemma di Tolomeo, che é lo istesso con lo Analemma di Vitruvio, et che il punto é posto in quello et che gli altri che hanno scritto degli horologi non hanno dato nel fondamento loro, giudicando quella esser vera, sola et ispedita via che insegna dimostra et practica una delle parti principali dell'Architettura, ha voluto levare dal nono libro i discorsi già fatti sopra gli horologi et in loro vece riponere questi di Tolomeo et del Commandino agguugnendovi la facilità che é propria sua. Però i lettori del rinovato Vitruvio gli haveranno questo obbligo di più, come anco deono haverlo per molte figure aggiunte et specialmente quelle dei cavedi, che sono

difficili, et quelle dei bagni et della palestra bellissime, che portano gran lume alle cose di Vitruvio. Ha similmente aggiunti molti discorsi et molte belle pratiche eccitando gli studiosi della verità a fare qualche bella cosa et a ponere le spalle sotto a questa honorata impresa nella quale molti si sono inutilmente affaticati per essere impresa di persone letterate et pratiche, le quali due conditioni di raro si ritrovano in un sogetto et sono più che necessarie se l'huomo vuole havere et la cosa et il nome di architetto."

The Latin edition of 1567 does not seem to be a mere copy in translation of the Italian version of the same year. First of all, while the latter, as in the 1556 edition, is dedicated to card. Ippolito d'Este, the Latin edition is dedicated to Antonius Perenot Granvelle, card. of Malines. The Latin edition lacks the presentation letter of the publisher, the life of Vitruvius and a formal preface, although there is a kind of introduction before the actual commentary to the Latin text. The dedication to Perenot Granvelle is more scholarly than the dedication to Ippolito d'Este. Differences, not merely due to the language, are apparent right at the beginning and at the end of the two commentaries. For instance, at the end of the Latin commentary Barbaro affirms that he had finished a work on perspective. He does not mention it at all in the Italian version. This work was probably his *La practica della prospettiva di Mons. Daniele Barbaro eletto patriarca d'Aquileia, opera molto utile a pittori, a scultori et architetti*, which was published in Venice in 1569, a couple of years later.

Barbaro's approach to Vitruvius is philosophical-esthetical. Under the pretext of commenting on Vitruvius, Barbaro expresses and develops his theory according to which 'eurythmia' is the fundamental law of any art and finds its full expression in architecture. These ideas are expressed in both versions of Barbaro's work, but it seems to me that the tone set at the beginning of the Italian edition is more didactic and given to details than that of the Latin edition. Due to this approach Barbaro's commentary is different from Philander's. While Philander's commentary is strictly exegetic, Bar-

baro likes first to make a general comment (historical, philosophical etc.) on a full paragraph of the text, then to discuss separate points under the appropriate lemmata. The Italian version of Barbaro's Vitruvius was reprinted several times, his Latin version was published only in this edition of 1567.

Dedication (ed. of Venice, 1567). Illustriss. et Reverendiss. Cardinali Granvellano domino D. Antonio Perrenoto Archiepiscopo Mecliniensi Daniel Barbarus electus Aquileiensis S.P.D. [*Inc.*]: Multa esse cognitio-num genera nemo est qui dubitet, Illustrissime ac Reverendissime Cardinalis . . .

[*Expl.*]: sin minus lectorum benignitatem quaero ut propensam voluntatem meam pro opere habere velit. Vale.

Index eorum quae in toto opere continentur secundum capitulorum ordinem.

Index totius operis.

Errata.

Introduction. [*Inc.*]: Graecorum mos est, si quos sibi authores exponendos ac interpretandos susceperint, praeponere aliqua . . . [*Expl.*]: prudenter quidem tribuit et apte concedit. Hunc igitur in modum ag-grediatur.

Commentary on the preface. [*Inc.*]: Augusti tempore pax universum orbem habuit. Iani fores clausae, imperium unius nutu . . . [*Expl.*]: quae quoniam Vitruvianis ver-bis continentur, ea, Dei Opt. Max. implora-to auxilio, aggrediemur. [*Inc.*]: (I 1, 1) Architecturae nomen a principatu deduc-tum est, quem tenet inter artes omnes. . . [*Expl.*]: Quae a Vitruvio dicuntur in perora-tione facilia sunt. Reliquum est ut Deo gra-tias agam immortales quod ad finem opus laboriosissimum perduxerim et quae pollici-tus sum quantum in me fuerit fide et dili-gentia praestiterim. Opticem autem de qua libro quinto me tractaturum promisi iam absolvi et statim videndam curabo ut etiam in hac parte aliquid utilitatis etiam pictori-bus afferam. Itaque quemadmodum a praeceptoribus meis didici, in sequentibus exponam (X 16, 12) [presumably referring to the following tables].

Tabula longitudinum, latitudinum, par-tium et magnitudinum stellarum.

Tabula declinationis solis.

Tabula reclarum ascensionum.

Editions:

1567, Venice: apud Franciscum Fran-ciscium Senensem et Ioan. Crugher Ger-manum. Adams V 909; Graesse VI 2, 377. BM; BN; (MH).

Biography:

Daniel Barbarus (Daniele Matteo Alvise Barbaro) was born of an old Venetian family in Venice, on February 8, 1514. He attended the University of Padua, where he studied philosophy, mathematics and medicine. He lived in Padua until 1545. His first ap-pointment from the Venetian government was that of planning and building a botanical garden which would supply experimental material for the students of medicine of the University. In 1548 he was made "provve-ditor di comun", and became engaged in caring for the poor in Venice. He was sent as Venetian ambassador to England, where he seems to have lived for a couple of years, from 1549 to 1551. Meanwhile the Venetian Republic insisted that the then patriarch of Aquileia, Giovanni Grimani, choose a successor for his see, politically so important for Venice. Grimani chose Daniele Barbaro, who, however, never succeeded to the see or resided in Aquileia. In fact he does not seem to have even received any kind of sacred orders; in any case he died before Giovanni Grimani. He took active part, however, in the third phase of the council of Trent where he was directly involved with problems concerning the *Index librorum*, a safe-conduct for the Protestants, and the Eucharist under the two species. The pope tried to push the election of Barbaro to the cardinalate in 1566 and again in 1569 but without success because of the strong opposition of Venice. Barbaro died in Venice on the 13th of April, 1570.

Works: There are several works left by Barbaro, especially on philosophy, math-ematics and theology. His first work is a commentary on Porphyry, *Exquisitae in Porphyrium commentationes*, Venice 1542. He edited and commented several of his uncle Ermolao's works: *Compendium Ethi-corum Librorum Hermolai Barbari*, Venice 1544; *Rhetoricorum Aristotelis libri tres*,

Venice 1544; *Compendium scientiae naturalis Hermolai Barbari*, Venice 1545. [About his stay in England he wrote for the Venetian Senate a *Relazione* which was first published in London in 1796. The *Lettere di Daniel Barbaro*, published in Padua in 1829, are of the same period. He also left the dialogue *Della eloquenza*, Venice 1557, and translated the Catena on the psalms, *Aurea in quinquaginta Davidicos Psalmos doctorum Graecorum catena interpretante Daniele Barbaro*. . . , Venice 1569. His most important work, however, is his *I dieci libri dell'architettura di M. Vitruvio* with commentary of which two manuscripts are in the Biblioteca Marciana of Venice: Cod. Ital. IV 37 (5133) and Cod. Ital. IV 152 (5106). Connected with this work are also *La pratica della prospettiva di Mons. Daniele Barbaro eletto patriarca d'Aquileia, opera molto utile a pittori, a scultori et architetti*, Venice 1569 and two unfinished works *Danielis Barbari electi patriarchae Aquileiensis scenographia pictoribus et sculptoribus perutilis* and *De horologiis describendis libellus*.

Bibl.: The most complete and recent biography of Barbaro (on which the above summary heavily depends) with detailed and copious bibliography is the article by G. Alberigo in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, VI, Rome 1964, 89-95.

3. Lost or doubtful commentaries

a) BERNARDINUS OR GAUDENTIUS MERULA

Both Iohannes Albertus Fabricius in his *Bibliotheca Latina sive notitia auctorum veterum Latinorum*, I, Venice 1728, 341 and Iohannes Poleni in his *Exercitationes Vitruvianae primae*, Udine 1825, 40-41 mention a possible commentary of Bernardinus or Gaudentius Merula of about 1543, quoting Antonius Maioragius as attacking Gaudentius Merula in his *Apologia*: "Sed hoc apud te (Gaudentium Merulam alloquitur) novum non est: in hac arte latrocinandi vetus es ac nobilis gladiator; nam et ea quae vir satis eruditus Bernardinus Merula in Vitruvium commentatus erat, tibi adscripsisti, multisque nugis additis, iactabas te iusta in Vitruvium commentaria conscripsisse." It is not clear however

whether this commentary was in Italian or Latin.

b) ADRIANUS ANZUTI, OR AZOVII

The same Fabricius (*ibid.*, p. 341) mentions also a commentary of Vitruvius and Frontinus, otherwise unknown, by Adrianus Anzuti or Azovii.

c) IOHANNES NORCHIATUS

According to Poleni (*ibid.*, p. 61) Michael Pocciatus in his *Catalogus Scriptorum Florentinorum*. . . , Florence 1589, says of Iohannes Norchiatus, canon of San Lorenzo around 1550, that he started a commentary on Vitruvius which he did not finish: opus arduum et perdifficile aggressus est, in quo omnium instrumentorum ad artifices pertinentium nomina conscribere, eorumque figuras lineamentis declarare nitebatur, sed morte praeventus tantum opus egregia quidem laude dignum absolvere nequivit, ob eamque rem imperfectus pariter remansit commentarius in Vitruvium.

d) HIERONYMUS CARDANUS

Hieronymus Cardanus in his *Liber de libris propriis*, Lyon 1557, p. 27, #17, says that he wrote a commentary on the first two books of Vitruvius, but then decided to use the material in his *De rerum varietate* and *De subtilitate*: "Extant haec velut et duo alia in primos Vitruvii De Architectura quae sunt apud Ferrarium [Ludovico Ferrari]. Destinaveram opus perficere sed commodius visum est ut res potius sectarer et quae tractassem in libros *De rerum varietate* et *De subtilitate* traducerem." And again (p. 83): "Commentaria in Vitruvium. . . meliore, non maiore parte in libros *De rerum varietate* [transtulimus]." In his *Tabula generalis omnium librorum* p. 80 #17 appears the "Commentariorum in Vitruvium libri duo folio. 30." See also Fabricius (*ibid.*, p. 340 and Poleni, *ibid.*, pp. 63-64, who however notes that there is no trace of Vitruvius' work in the book *De rerum varietate*).

e) ANTONIUS LUPIGINUS

Poleni (*ibid.*, p. 78) mentions also a very doubtful commentary by Antonius Lupicinus, who lived around 1560.