

CARMINA PRIAPEA

FRANK-RUTGER HAUSMANN

(University of Freiburg i. Br.)

<i>Fortuna</i>	423
Composite Editions	430
I. <i>Carmina Priapea</i>	430
Commentaries.	
1. Bernardinus Cyllelius	
2. Nicolaus Fabritius Sacca	
3. Hieronymus Avantius	
4. Ludovicus Pretinus	
5. Anonymus Perusinus, s. XV-XVI	
6. Josephus Justus Scaliger	
7. Friedrich Lindenbruch	
8. Caspar Scioppius	

FORTUNA

Priapus, patron of gardens and charged with protecting them against thieves, is the subject of mainly obscene poetry in Roman antiquity. A crudely made wooden figure, he was impressive because of his erect phallus, painted red, and the sickle which he held in his hand. Already in Greek literature we find poems about him, and there is even a poetic metre, the double-glyconic or so-called ‘metrum Priapeum’ named after him. Roman Priapic poetry was originally epigraphic in nature and was found mainly on the walls of temples dedicated to Priapus. Later such poems were composed with literary intent and accepted as a literary form.

The principal collection is designated as the *Great Priapea* (*Carmina Priapea* or *Priapea maior*) and originally comprised 80

poems.¹ Some editors (e.g., Franz Bücheler) divide the last epigram into two and consequently present 81 poems. In Renais-

1. The most important modern editions are those by Petrus Burmannus Secundus, *Anthologia Veterum latinorum epigrammatum et poëmatum sive Catalecta poetarum latinarum in VI libros digesta...* (Amsterdam, 1773), tom.II; *Priapeia sive diversorum poetarum veterum in Priapum lusus*. Recensuit Julius Aemilius Wernicke (Toruń, 1853); *Poetae Latini Minores*. Recensuit et emendavit Aemilius Baehrens (Leipzig, 1879), tom.I 54–87; *Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii Carmina. Accedunt Laevii Calvi Cinnae aliorum reliquiae et Priapea*. Rec. Lucianus Mueller (Leipzig, 1885); *Petronii Satura et liber Priapeorum*. Rec. Franciscus Buecheler. Edit. quintam curavit

sance manuscripts and in early editions, we find 83 poems in all. No. 82 ([Inc.]: Vilicus aerari quondam) was discovered near Padua in the 1450's² and subsequently was found in manuscripts of Tibullus; no. 83 ([Inc.]: Quid hoc novi est?) was also attributed to Tibullus, but is mostly included today in the *Appendix Vergiliana* (*Vergili Appendix*).³ Other editions (e.g. Luzian Müller) count even 85 or 86 epigrams. Their nos. 84–86 are identical with the first three poems of the Virgilian *Catalepton*.⁴ Consequently, the

Guilelmus Heraeus. *Adiectae sunt Varronis et Senecae Saturae similesque reliquiae* (Berlin, 1912; ⁶1922); *Poetae Latini Minores*. Ed. Fridericus Vollmer (Leipzig, 1923), tom.II, 2 36–80 (this is my standard reference; for nos. 84–86 cf. *Poetae Latini Minores*. Ed. Fridericus Vollmer, Leipzig, 1910, tom.I, *Appendix Vergiliana*, 127–129); *I Priapea*. Revisione del testo e commento a cura di A. Maggi (Naples, 1923); *Carmina Ludicra Romanorum. Pervigilium Veneris-Carmen de Rosis-Priapeorum libellus*. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam testimonia adiecit Carolus Pascal (Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum 17. Turin 1918; ²1931); *Carmina Ludicra Romanorum. Pervigilium Veneris-Priapea*. Rec. Ignatius Cazzaniga (Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum, Turin, 1959).

2. "Nomine Tibulli in antiquis Tibulli codicibus inveniri, et alii in editionibus suis admonerunt, et nos inter opera Tibulliana in optima scheda reperimus", Scaliger, *Publii Virgilii Maronis Appendix* (Lyons, 1572) 473. Achilles Statius, for example, found it in British Museum Ms. Burney 268, s. XV. According to a circumstantial note in London B.M. Add. 12004 "hoc epigramma a Nophrio Stroza Florentino repertum est in Euganeis montibus prope rus Arquati." (This note was kindly communicated to me by Dr. Michael D. Reeve, Exeter College, Oxford).

3. *Appendix Vergiliana*, edd. W. V. Clausen, F. R. D. Goodyear, E. J. Kenney, J. A. Richmond (Oxford, 1966) 151.

4. P. Vergili Maronis *Libellum qui inscribitur Catalepton*, conspectu librorum, prolegomenis, notis criticis, commentario exegetico instruxit R. E. H. Westendorp Boerma, Pars prior (Assen, 1949).

title *Priapea* has been applied to three things: (a) the 80 or 81 *Carmina Priapea*, (b) the *Priapeum* "Quid hoc novi est?" (also called *Little* or *Minor Priapea*), and (c) the first three poems of *Catalepton*. This ambiguity of nomenclature has led to a nearly inextricable confusion. The present article is directly concerned only with the *Great Priapea*, and the *Catalepton* will be treated in a later article on the *Appendix Vergiliana*.

The metres of the *Great Priapea* change frequently, and each new metre constitutes a special group of poems; there are 38 hendecasyllabics, 34 elegiacs, and 8 choliambhs, but never the 'metrum *Priapeum*'. The collection of the *Great Priapea* is characterized by a certain elegance, so that its individual poems are comparable to those of the best classical authors, but it is also marked by coarseness and obscenity.

There is now general agreement that the poems are the work of a single author as against the earlier opinion that an editor had used the pieces of several poets to form the present collection. The argument for a single author relies primarily upon the thorough composition and the careful structure of the book, as well as on the way in which poems in a particular meter are thematically related. Exactly who the author was, however, is not yet clear. The date of composition is certainly no earlier than the end of the first century A.D., most likely shortly after the *floruit* of Martial (c.40–102 A.D.).

The content of the poems is limited. Mostly they treat the influence and power of Priapus, the punishment of thieves who have intruded into the gardens, and sometimes the gifts offered to the gods. Their poetic appeal results from the varied presentation of similar subjects.⁵

5. M. Schanz and C. Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswork des Kaisers Justinian II* (München, ⁵1959) § 319 (p.274–275); R. Helm in: *RE* XXII, 2 (1954) coll. 1908–1913; Carmelo Calì, *Studi su i Priapea e le loro imitazioni* (Catania, 1894); Richmond

From the Renaissance until the end of the eighteenth century, the *Great Priapea* was often thought to be one of the minor works of Virgil. A reason for so thinking may have been found in the lists of the minor works given by Donatus and Servius, which name the *Priapea* (probably the beginning of *Catalepton*) as a separate work.⁶ Donatus and Servius were perhaps in error, since the more reliable testimony of Suetonius suggests that the *Priapea* were originally part of *Catalepton*.⁷ In fact however, there is no indication that the *Great Priapea* was ever included in the works of Virgil in the medieval manuscript tradition, though this is admittedly scant for the minor poems. We do not know, either, when the *Great Priapea* first appeared together with the *Minor Priapea* (no. 83).

The oldest manuscript seems to be that copied by Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–1375), probably at Monte Cassino, which is now Cod. Laur. 33.31.⁸ Here the *Great Priapea* is

Frederick Thomason, *The Priapea and Ovid: A Study of the Language of the Poems* (Contribution to Education Published Under The Direction of The George Peabody College for Teachers, 89, Nashville Tennessee, 1931); Marcel Coulon, *La poésie priapique dans l'antiquité et au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1932); Vinzenz Buchheit, *Studien zum Corpus Priapeorum* (Zetemata. Monographien zur klass. Altertumswissenschaft 28, München 1962).

6. Donatus: "Deinde catalepton et priapea et epigrammata et diras, item cirim et culicem". Servius: "Scripsit etiam septem sive octo libros hos: Cirin Aetnam Culicem Priapeia Catalepton Epigrammata Copam Diras." Cf. Iacobus Brummer, *Vitae Vergilianae* (Lipsiae, 1912) 4 and 69.

7. Westendorp Boerma (see note 4) p. xxxi.

8. Bandini, *Catalogus* II 124–126; Oskar Hecker, *Boccaccio-Funde. Stücke aus der bislang verschollenen Bibliothek des Dichters, darunter von seiner Hand geschriebenes Fremdes und Eigenes* (Braunschweig, 1902) 35; Guido Biagi, *Riproduzioni di manoscritti miniati. Cinquanta tavole in fototipia da codici della R. Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana* (Firenze, 1914) tav. XLIX; Remigio Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne'scoli XIV e XV* (Biblioteca Storica del Rinascimento 2 and 5, Firenze, 1905, and 1914) I 31 sq., 41 sq., 201; II 244. The Cod. Laur. 33.31 is however not listed in the register of Boccaccio's library, cf. Antonia Mazza, 'L'inventario della "Parva Libraria" di Santo Spirito e la biblioteca del Boccaccio', *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* IX (1966) 1–74; p. 64 "assente dall'elenco del 1451."

not attributed to Virgil but is entitled *Diversorum auctorum Priapea*, though Buchheit (p. 15) says, this ascription is *in rasura*. Thus Boccaccio may be credited with the discovery of the *Great Priapea* and their attribution to Virgil. All extant manuscripts,⁹ according to

Medicea Laurenziana (Firenze, 1914) tav. XLIX; Remigio Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne'scoli XIV e XV* (Biblioteca Storica del Rinascimento 2 and 5, Firenze, 1905, and 1914) I 31 sq., 41 sq., 201; II 244. The Cod. Laur. 33.31 is however not listed in the register of Boccaccio's library, cf. Antonia Mazza, 'L'inventario della "Parva Libraria" di Santo Spirito e la biblioteca del Boccaccio', *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* IX (1966) 1–74; p. 64 "assente dall'elenco del 1451." Boccaccio was well informed about the composition of the *Appendix Vergiliana*. He says in his *Comento sopra la Commedia* (I 137): 'Il qual (sc. Vergilio) non solamente compose l'Eneide, ma molti altri libri, siccome, secondoché Servio scrive, lo Stirina, l'Etna, il Culice, la Priapea, il Cathalecthon, la Ciri, gli Epigrammata, la Copa, il Moreto e altri.'

9. Vollmer (see note 1) p. 40 sq. draws up a list of 32 manuscripts, to which Michael D. Reeve makes the following additions: East Berlin Diez B Sant. 69, Hamilt. 479, 676; Bologna Bibl. Univ. 240; Camerino 23; Cesena S.29.19; Coburg 7; Florence Laur. Aed. 203, Naz. Magl. VII 1120; Holkham Hall 395, 433; London B.M. Add. 12004, 16562, 22013, Egerton 3027, Harl. 2701; Milan Trivulz. 632; Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 34, 126, d'Orville 167, Lat. Class. d 5 ("Oddo Macolinus absoluit Anno Salvatoris MCCCC" XXJ die Mercurij XXIIII Septembr. precedenti (anno) inchoata", the earliest dated manuscript); Padua Bibl. Univ. 527; Vatican Barb. Lat. 135, Chig. H V 169, Ottob. Lat. 1465, 2029, 2112, Pal. Lat. 1055, Urb. Lat. 745; Vienna 3108; Wolfenbüttel August. 4° 10.9. Vollmer's Cassano manuscript, Phillipicus 6901, was last in the possession of Graham Pollard. The following manuscripts are most probably copies of editions: Abbey (Major J.R.) J.A. 3164; Leyden Voss. Lat. F 78; London B.M. Add. 11355, Harl. 2578; New-York Pierp. Morg. M 223; Rome Cors. 43 F 21 (Vollmer's Corsinianus); Turin Reg. var. 190;

Buchheit,¹⁰ are to be classified into four groups, though we still lack a complete study of the tradition, and a verdict on the third and fourth group must await further investigation. These groups are (1) A (Laur.33.31), (2) H (Guelf. 373 [Helmstad. 338]), (3) Rehd. 60, and (4) a miscellaneous group of manuscripts.¹¹

Thus there seems to be nothing in the manuscript tradition to support the ascription of the *Great Priapea* to Virgil, and the notion seems not to have arisen until after the discovery of Boccaccio's manuscript. However the *Great Priapea* were attributed to Virgil in some specimens of the *editio princeps* published at Rome in 1469 (C 5999); a selection of 41 epigrams is found in these specimens on f. 195–199, which were apparently added after the main part of the edition had been finished. The editor, Giannandrea de' Bussi (1417–1475), one of the collaborators of the famous Roman printers Sweynheym and Pannartz and a skillful editor of classical works, expresses some uncertainty about the authorship, though he believes the style worthy of Virgil.¹² The same editor's next

Vatican Lat. 1608, Chig. H V 164, Ottob. Lat. 1374; Wrocław (Breslau) Rehd. 60. If the *Priapea* occur in Naples Naz. IV E 7; Wrocław. IV F 36, and the Virgil in the Archive Capitulaire at Ghent, these too are copies of editions. (I am very much indebted to Dr. M. D. Reeve for giving me detailed information about his *Priapea* studies and for allowing me to publish some of the results of his research).

10. Vinzenz Buchheit in his review of Cazzaniga's edition in *Gnomon* 35 (1963) 34–38.

11. The Guelferbytanus was copied in 1460 by Johannes Carpensis, a notary in Ferrara and well-known scribe, who also copied many other classical manuscripts, cf. Giulio Bertoni, *Nuovi studi su M. M. Boiardo* (Bologna, 1904) 83 sqq., 90, 291.

12. Io. An. Episcopi Aleriensis ad Paulum II. Venetum Pont. Max. epistola, in P. Virgilii Maronis *Opera* (Rome, 1469, C 5999) f. 2: "Priapeam illam quidem spurge nimium scriptam non inelegantem esse fateor. Sed an optimi atque modestissimi sit Vatis, quoniam nonnulli ambigunt,

edition (Rome, 1471, C 6000) supplied all the rest of the *Priapea* but two (nos. 5, 63), and added an epigraphic Priapeum discovered near Padua in the 1450s (no. 82). Thereafter most editions of Virgil up to the eighteenth century included the *Great Priapea*.

But not only Bussi, but many other humanists studied the *Great Priapea* actively. Guarino da Verona (1374–1460) together with his pupils transcribed and glossed Cod. Ambros. D 267 Inf., fol. 86^v – 97^v.¹³ In 1425 Sicco Polenton (1375/76–1445) gave a revealing list of Virgil's early poetry which includes the *Great Priapea* ('de Priapeio liber est unus'), though the *Ciris*, *Catalepton*, and *Dirae* are missing as if Polenton only listed the poetry he knew personally.¹⁴ The work

nequaquam asseruerim. Ea tamen si honesti tantum haberet, quantum latinitatis ostendit, forsitan posset operibus vigilantissimis comparari." Cf. also M. Miglio in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* XV 565–572; M. D. Reeve in *Maia* 27 (1975) 231–247.

13. Remigio Sabbadini, 'La critica del testo del De Officiis di Cicerone e delle poesie pseudo-vergiliane secondo due novi codici', *Annuario della r. università di Catania* (1888) 36.

14. Sicconis Polentoni *Scriptorum illustrium linguae libri XVIII*, ed. B. L. Ullman (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome VI, Rome, 1928) Lb.III, p. 78 sq.: "Versus ab eo facti per adolescentiam cum iocandum exercendi ingenii causa feruntur multi. Habentur etiam nonnulli qui grati sunt audientibus et quadam eius pro memoria ac reverentia conservantur. Generis huius in Balistam, qui magister ludi ob infamiam latrociniorum lapidibus obrutus esset, disticon fecit: 'Monte sub hoc lapidum tegitur Balista sepultus; nocte die tutum carpe, viator, iter.' Culici quoque, qui pastorem ne a serpente dormiens laederetur aculeo excitasset, disticon scripsit: 'Parve culex, pecudum custos tibi tale merenti funeris officium vitae pro munere reddo.' Versus preterea fecit de Ludo XII, de Monosyllabis 'est' et 'non' quinque et XX, de Viro Bono et Sapiente sex et XX, de Copa Sirisca VIII et XXX, de Rosis unum et L, de Moreto CXXIII. De Priapo liber est unus. De Aethna, monte Siculo, versus etiam scripsisse fertur."

was also studied by Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1459), Giovanni Tortelli (c. 1400–1466), Marino Becichemi da Scutari (c. 1468–1526), Giovanni Rafioni da Brescia (Calphurnius Plancus, 1443–1503), and others. Poets and critics not only studied the *Carmina Priapea*, but they also imitated it in their own works as in the cases of Antonio Beccadelli (Panormitanus or Panormita, 1394–1471), Pacifico Massimi (1410–1510) and Pietro Bembo (1470–1547), from Angelo Poliziano (1454–1494) to Andrea Navagero (1483–1529). Giacomo Costanzi (c. 1473–1517) declaimed the *Carmina Priapea* to his friends; Giovanni Battista Pio (1460–1540) and Bartolomeo Ricci (1489–1549) preferred them to any similar book; Pietro Vettori (1499–1585) wrote that it delighted erudite society, and the Jesuit Orazio Torsellini (1545–1609) is said to have knelt down, whenever he read it, and to have prayed that his soul not be polluted.¹⁵

Very early several learned humanists denied that Virgil was the author of the *Carmina Priapea*, though they did so for different reasons and though they were not in agreement on the true author. When Beccadelli, after the publication of his scandalous *Hermaphroditus*, defended himself against the charge of indecency by arguing that he had simply followed in Virgil's footsteps, Pier Candido Decembrio (1392–1477) replied that Virgil was not the author of the *Carmina Priapea*.¹⁶ Poliziano was convinced

that the *Priapea* betray the style of Ovid rather than of Virgil, an opinion which has advocates even today.¹⁷ Other humanists believed Martial to be the author (e.g. Catania, Bibl. Riunite. Cod. civ. F 35, f. 3), or like Giulio Pomponio Leto¹⁸ (1428–1497), Antonio Costanzi of Fano (1435/36–1490) and an anonymous scribe in Cod. Ambros. H 49 Inf., f. 182, simply denied Virgil's authorship.

During the sixteenth century, the denial of Virgil's authorship was even more widespread; Francesco Florio Sabino (1511–1548), Lilio Gregorio Giraldi (c. 1479–1552), and others may be counted among those who rejected the ascription to Virgil. Likewise Aldo Manuzio (c. 1450–1515), Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609), Kaspar Schoppe (1576–1649), and Biagio Pallai (Blosio Palladio, d. 1550) did not believe that Virgil was the author, whereas Paulus Melissus Schede (1539–1602) wanted to attribute them to Martial, and Janus Gruterus (1560–1627) characterized them as the fifteenth book of Martial's *Epigrammata*.¹⁹

The lascivious content of the *Great Priapea* and the dispute about its authorship may be the reason that it was seldom commented upon. So it is little wonder that the most important Renaissance commentaries on the *Appendix Vergiliana*, the ones by Giulio Pomponio Leto (1428–1497) [C 6059, 6060, 6062, 6066–80 ecc.]²⁰ and Domizio Calderini

15. Calì (see note 5) 3 sqq.; 56 sqq.

16. L. Barozzi and R. Sabbadini, *Studi sul Panormita e sul Valla* (Firenze, 1891) 34: "Tu palam: Virgilii nostri imitatorem esse te, artem aliam nullam facitasse. O hominem nequam et delirum! nonne abunde fuerat te Virgilii imitatorem ex versibus tuis ostendisse, ni insuper clarissimi poetae famam dubia interpretatione confunderes?"—An anonymous invective against Beccadelli, Cod. Ambros. H 49 Inf., f.182^v says: "Fortasse id Virgilium commisisse testaberis, Priapeiam mihi testem adhibebis. Non ex ea re efficies, ut Maronem tantae calumniae auctorem exitisse profitear...."

17. Angeli Politiani *Operum tomus primus, Epistolarum libros XII, ac Miscellanorum Centuriam I, complectens* (Lugduni: apud Seb. Gryphium, 1539), *Misc.* cap. LIX, p.624 sqq. In a 1471 Virgil edition which is today in the Bibliothèque Nationale (shelfmark Inc.Rés.g.Yc. 236(5)), Poliziano scarcely glosses the *Carmina Priapea*, cf. Ida Maier, *Les manuscrits d'Angé Politien* (Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance LXX, Genève, 1965) 353.

18. In Petro Bembo's dialogue *Ad Herculem Strotium de Vergili Culice et Terentii fabulis*, in *Opere* (Venezia, 1729) IV 307.

19. Frank-Rutger Hausmann, See above p. 287.

20. All these editions ascribe the whole com-

(1444–1478) [GW 5894] omit the *Carmina Priapea*.²¹ Apart from a short anonymous glossary (Perugia, Biblioteca Comunale Augusta, Cod. H 63, f. 149–155) and the commentary by Bernardino Cillenio da Peschiera written before 1475 (Paris, BN, Ms. lat. 8257), the most important Renaissance commentary is by Lodovico Pretino da Poppi, a renowned philologist (d. after 1516), and an expert on classical and neo-Latin poetry, who had also copied a manuscript of the *Priapea* (East Berlin, Cod. Ham. 479).²² This commentary was printed around 1500 (HR 13343, f. 12–58v) together with two of his other works. Pretino not only comments upon the various epigrams and draws fully upon other classical and postclassical authors, but at the same time discusses problems of mythology and metre. Fabrizio Sacca da Parma, a professor at Todi (b. 1459, d.?), wrote a commentary of similar quality, which is now preserved in Cod. Vat. lat. 4101. Unfortunately we have little knowledge of Sacca's life so that we cannot fully appreciate his intellectual influence. But it is almost certain that he was an assiduous student of Virgil and tried to emend and gloss his works, among which the *Carmina Priapea* were still counted. Girolamo Avanzi da Verona (d. after 1534), professor of philosophy at Padua and a member of the

mentary to Calderini, who is only the author of parts of it. Some works are commented upon by Pomponio Leto, cf. Vladimiro Zabughin, *Vergilio nel Rinascimento italiano da Dante a Torquato Tasso*, vol. I (*Il Trecento ed il Quattrocento*) (Bologna, 1921) 189 sq. The original of this commentary is Oxford, Bodl. Canon. class. lat. 54, "Julii Pomponii Sabini in Virgilii opera varii commentarii". See also Alessandro Perosa, 'Domizio Calderini', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* XVI 597–605.

21. Augusti Ferdinandi Naekii *Opuscula philologica*, ed. Fr.Th.Welcker (Bonae, 1842) I 134–137.

22. Helmut Boese, *Die lateinischen Handschriften der Sammlung Hamilton zu Berlin* (Wiesbaden, 1966) 324 sq.

Aldine Academy, who had studied and edited the works of many classical authors, also published some *Emendationes in Pryapeias* (HCR 2185; HCR 4766; GW 3098) along with his Catullus emendations. These, however, in the 1495 and 1500 folio editions amount to only one page and therefore scarcely form an independent commentary in the proper sense; nevertheless, some of his conjectures are intelligent and even today worth discussing.

In the sixteenth century Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609) eclipsed all other commentaries on the *Appendix Vergiliana* with his monumental work, first published in 1572, which is characterized by erudite and often ingenious conjectures. Scaliger passionately denied Virgil's authorship not only of the *Great Priapea*, but also of the three *Priapea* at the beginning of *Catalepton*. Moreover, he isolated the *Priapea* from the *Catalepton* and added them to the *Great Priapea*. In his commentary he tried to prove that the *Carmina Priapea* were poems by various authors, such as Catullus, Tibullus, Ovid, Petronius Arbiter, and others. His notes on the *Priapea* are therefore concerned exclusively with attempting to verify the *Priapea* vocabulary in the works of the authors mentioned before; nevertheless they contribute to a better understanding of the text. This commentary was printed several times. In 1595 it was revised by Scaliger's pupil Friedrich Lindenbruch (1573–1648), whom Scaliger himself considered a plagiarist and rather poor philologist. Lindenbruch added some of his own annotations as an appendix to the revised edition.

The last *Priapea* commentary we must deal with was published in Frankfurt in 1606 under the name of Kaspar Schoppe. It was edited by Melchior Goldast (1578–1635) who later claims to have reproduced a commentary which had been given to him by his early friend Schoppe. As soon as Schoppe learned of Goldast's edition he not only disclaimed responsibility for it, but also denied his authorship. His arguments are recorded in the appendix to the *Scaliger*

hypobolimaeus,²³ but they are not convincing, and there is little doubt that Schoppe was the author.

In the seventeenth century the *Carmina Priapea* received little scholarly attention, but the commentaries mentioned above by Scaliger, Lindenbruch and Schoppe were either printed together (1664) or even combined into a single work (1654; 1669; 1731; 1781). Until the commentaries of the nineteenth century they formed the accepted *Priapea* commentary, and they were usually printed as an appendix to editions of the *Satyricon* of Petronius. Niklaas Heinsius (1620–1681) tried, in his 1664 Virgil edition, to improve on the Scaliger-Schoppius commentary, but without much success as his conjectures were too far-fetched. J. Boschius was more successful in his 1687 Amsterdam edition. Konrad Gottlob Anton (1745–1814) and Pieter Burman II (1714–1778) were working at the same time without knowing of each other's work, and both used more manuscripts than their forerunners. Their texts were used by François Noël, counselor of the Paris University and "Inspecteur général d'études" in his *Erotopaegnion* (Paris, 1798) which contained many other poems of the same genre, but Noël, too, was a careless editor. The critical nineteenth

century editions of Luzian Müller (1836–1898), Franz Bücheler (1837–1908), and Emil Baehrens (1848–1888) finally yielded a satisfactory text.

Scaliger was also among the first in a series of several *Priapea* translators, as he translated two epigrams into Greek.²⁴ Toward the middle of the sixteenth century Vincenzo Cartari translated some poems into Italian terza-rima,²⁵ but there were no French or German translations until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.²⁶ Some Italian poets imitated the *Priapea* as a form of social criticism. The most important example of this genre are the malicious *Priapea*²⁷ of Niccolò Franco (1515–1570). This collection consists of 195 very prurient sonnets about the corruption of the Pope and the Roman Court. They are also directed against Pietro Aretino

24. P. Virgilii Maronis *Appendix cum supplemento multorum antehac nunquam excusorum Poematum veterum Poetarum*. Iosephi Scaligeri in eandem *Appendicem Commentarii et Castigationes* (Lugduni: apud G. Rovillum, 1572) 165; 167.

25. *Le Immagini degli Dei antichi* (Venezia, 1556), ed. cit Venezia, 1647, 229.

26. Cl. Fr. X. Mercier de Compiègne, *Origine des puces, et le pucelage conquis. Poèmes libres; et autres pièces du même genre; traductes du Priapeia* (Paris, 1793) 63–73; Petronius, *Bruchstücke eines Sittenromanes aus Nero's Zeit. Als Anhang 43 priapeische Lieder. Nach Bücheler's kritischem Texte übersetzt* (Stuttgart, 1874) 132–146.—Complete translations were not done until the twentieth century, cf. *Carmina Priapeia*. In Nachdichtung von Alexander von Bernus mit einer kritischen Einführung von Adolf Danegger (Berlin, 1905); *Priapea. Die Gedichte des Corpus Priapeorum lateinisch und deutsch*, hrsg. von Carl Fischer mit einer Einführung von Bernhard Kytzler (Salzburg, 1969).

27. *Il Vendemmiatore, poemetto in ottava rima*, di Luigi Tansillo; e la *Priapea, sonetti lussuriosi-satirici* di Niccolò Franco (A Pe-King, regnante Kien-long, nel XVIII secolo).—The first edition of Franco's *Priapea* is Casale di Monferrato: apud I.A. Guidonem, 1541.

23. Gasparis Scioppii Scaliger *hypobolimaeus*. *Hoc est: elenchus epistolae Iosephi Burdonis pseudoscaligeri de vetustate et splendore gentis Scaligerae. Quo praeter crimen falsi et corruptarum litterarum Regiarum quod Thrasoni isti impingitur, instar quingenta eiusdem menda- cia deterguntur et coarguuntur* (Moguntiae: apud Ioannem Albinum, 1607); Jakob Bernays, *Joseph Justus Scaliger*. Neudruck der Ausgabe 1855 (Osnabrück, 1965) 84–86; 212–214; Mario D'Addio, *Il pensiero politico di Gaspare Scioppio e il machiavellismo del Seicento* (Istituto di Studi storico-politici, Università di Roma, Facoltà di Scienze Politiche 4, Milano, 1962) 50 sqq.; Frank-Rutger Hausmann, 'Kaspar Schoppe, Joseph Justus Scaliger und die *Carmina Priapea* oder wie man mit Büchern Rufmord betreibt', *Festschrift für Otto Herding* (Stuttgart, 1977) 382–95.

(1492–1556) and the Italian princes supporting and maintaining him. These parodic sonnets in some respects resemble Ludovico Ariosto's (1474–1533) satires. Of quite a different style are the *Priapea* of Gabriel de Guttery (1586), a French lawyer who had studied in Padua, where he lived for a long time. His work is written in Italian and is meant to imitate Aretino's *Ragionamenti*.²⁸

COMPOSITE EDITIONS

Editions of the *Carmina Priapea* (CP) and their commentaries are described in F.L.A. Schweiger, *Handbuch der Klassischen Bibliographie* II, 2 (Leipzig, 1834) 821–822 (reprinted, with same paginations, as *Bibliographisches Lexicon der gesamten Literatur der Römer*, Amsterdam, 1962); a selection of older editions especially is found in *Carmina Valerii Catonis cum Augusti Ferdinandi Naekii annotationibus , cura Ludovici Schopeni* (Bonnae, 1847) 329–432.

1595, Lugduni Batavorum (Leyden): ex officina Plantiniana, apud F. Raphelengium; P. Vergilii Maronis *Appendix* with comm. of Scaliger and Lindenbruch. *Leiden Imprints 1483–1600 in Leiden University Library and Bibliotheca Thysiana. A short-title catalogue*, Niewkoop, 1974, 104, BM; BN; (NjP).

(*) 1617, Lugduni Batavorum (Leyden): apud J. Maire. Repr. of ed. 1595 with new title *Catalecta Virgilii*, 2 parts in 1 vol.; BM; BN; (NjP).

1654, Traiecti ad Rhenum (Utrecht): typis Gisberti a Zyll et Theodori ab Ackersdyck. Part 2 of T. Petronii Arbitri *Satyricon curante S. A. Gabbema*, is the *Diversorum poetarum lusus in Priapum*, with comm. of Scaliger, Schoppe, and Lindenbruch. Graesse 5.238; NUC. BM; BN; (MH).

1664, Patavii (Padua, i.e. Amsterdam): apud Gerh. Nicolaum V.; with comm. of Scaliger, Schoppe, and Lindenbruch; Schweiger II, 2 829; Graesse 5.441; NUC. BM; BN; (MH).

28. Emile Picot, *Les français italianisants au XVI^e siècle* II (Paris, 1907) 198.

1669/71, Amstelodami (Amsterdam): apud I. Blaeu, part 2 of T. Petronii Arbitri *Satyricon . . . concinnante Michaele Hadrianide*, is the *Diversorum poetarum lusus in Priapum* with comm. of Scaliger, Schoppe, and Lindenbruch; Graesse 5.239; NUC. BM; BN; (MH).

(*) 1731, Lipsiae (Leipzig): apud Casp. Fritsch, reprint of ed. Patavii 1664; Schweiger II, 2 725; Graesse 5.239.

1853, Thoruni (Toruń). *Priapeia* with comm. of Scaliger, Lindenbruch, P. Burmann II, and J. E. Wernicke. BM

I. CARMINA PRIAPEA

COMMENTARIES

1. BERNARDINUS CYLLENIUS

Bernardinus Cyllenius, a neo-Latin poet, notes in his Tibullus edition (Rome, 1475, HC 15522) “iamdudum Priapeiam meditationem edidisse, nisi me quorundam severiorum amicorum rigiditas inhibuisset” (1,27); hence the commentary on the *Carmina Priapea* seems to have been composed before 1475, but it was never printed. The only copy which could be traced is in Paris, BN cod. lat. 8257, f. 52–97v. (I am very much obliged to Dr. M. D. Reeve, Oxford, for allowing me to profit from his identification of the manuscript). This manuscript is studded with mistakes for which the scribe is responsible. It seems incomplete since a postface, which is announced in the commentary's preface, is missing. This postface was to prove the authorship of the *Carmina Priapea*. Cyllenius clearly believed that Virgil was the author of the *Carmina Priapea* (see the opening of the commentary), and almost all references to classical authors are to Virgil. The commentary itself is far from instructive, as Cyllenius restricts himself to paraphrasing the single epigrams and explaining difficult words. The result of this procedure is rather insipid and childish. A later reader has repeated names and terms, which interested him, on the margin of the manuscript. Cyllenius most probably was

encouraged to write this commentary by his own attempts at poetry.

Introduction. Bernardini Veronensis commentum in Priapeia. [Inc.]: (f.52) Quoniam huius commentarioli nostri finem claudet epistola, quae magnorum virorum opinionibus sententiisque plena declarabit, quoniam auctore tam elegans tamque artificiosum carmen factum sit, perutile fore omnibus tam gravis libelli materiam intellecturis existimavi, si ante omnia brevi pertigisse, qua de causa maiores nostri Priapum esse hortorum numen voluerunt, tum quali simulacro exprimere conati sunt, unico ut aiunt verbo annotassem. Haec enim duo faciliorem legentibus aditum praestant.

Priapus igitur ex Lampsaco Hellesponti urbe fuit oriundus, quam rem sensisse videatur Maro libro secundo *Geor.*, “Hellespontiaci servet tutella Priapi” (G. 4,111). Hic, ut praedictum Virgilii locum Servius exposuit, ob membra obscenitatem, qua frequens oblectabantur feminae, exulavit, unde teste Lactantio Firmiano in *Divinarum institutionum* opere (*Divin. inst.* II,4) hortorum qui fecundi sunt deus effectus est. Eius autem forma talis fuisse dicitur: simulacrum ex ligno rudi, hoc est non levigato sed raptim dolato, conficiebatur, cuius caput umbrosa tegebatur harundine. Corpus nullo velo iam aut a frigore aut aestu defendebatur. Falcem ligneam dextra tenebat, qua furibus minabatur aut aves terrebat, ut voluit Tibullus libro *Elegiarum* primo, “Pomosisque ruber custos ponatur in hortis, // Terreat ut saevas falce Priapus aves” (*El.* I,1,18). Penis in columnae modum stabat, quam turpiter pueri haluscula (*sic*) vel poma sublegentes per impudica patiebantur, verum Moderatus Columella libro *De re rustica* undecimo, “Sed truncum forte dolatum//arboris antiquae numen venerare Priapi//Terribilis membra medio qui semper in horto//inguinibus puero praepondi falce tuetur (mod.ed. minetur)” (mod. ed.X, 31-34). Horatius autem libro *Sermonum* inquit, quaecumque a me superius dicta sunt fieri comprehendens, “Olim truncus eram ficulnus; inutile lignum// Villicus (mod.ed. cum faber) incertus scamnum

faceretne Priapum, // maluit esse deum. Deus inde ego, furum aviumque// maxima formido: nam fures dextra coercet// obscenique ruber porrectus ab inguine palus// Ast importunas volucres in vertice harundo// terret fixa novisque vetat considere in hortis” (S. I,8,1-7).

Sed iam ad expositionem operis veniamus, si prius tum intellexeritis templum Priapi Romae in suburbano extitisse, in quo Virgilius haec reposuit epigrammata, ut ipse testis est dicens, “Ego equidem quod otiosus templi parietibus tuis dicavi” (mod. ed. notavi, and the beginning Ergo quicquid id est, quod) (*CP II*,9-10).

Commentary. [Inc.]: (f.52v) *Carminis* (*CP I*,1). Excusaturus Maro Virgilius suum libellum admonet lectorem mollissimi carminis, ut severitatem deponat, quippe quod nihil iocosum et ad libidinem spectans tractatur. (f.53) Quare quisquis in hoc tristis esse voluerit, se procul abdicet, ut quibus oculis ista legere non potest. Effigiem Priapi ne conspiciat aut si conspexerat, versus etiam hosce perlegere non erubescat. Latenter itaque hoc dicit decorem ubique servandum, cuius ratione homines ad temporis locorum personarum qualitatem sese debent accommodare. *Lusus procaces* (*CP I*,1). De re libidinosa exercitationes. Ludere enim est poetice scribere, ut in *Buc.* Virgilius “Ludere quae vellem calamo permisit aggressi” (E. 1,10).../(f.97v) [*Expl.*]: *Adesse* (*CP LXXXI*,1). Enim significat favere et accedere et tunc regit actionem vel adverbium ad locum, ut Virgilius in *Buc.*, “Ades, o formose puer” (E.2,45). Significat etiam praesentem esse, ut ubique legitur; est fave homini adoranti tuum nomen. *Tener nervus* (*CP LXXXI*,2). Nervosum penem tentum habens. Insulsam relinquo expositionem, quam multi huic epigrammati addere consueverunt; obtundor quibusdam stultorum expositionibus.

Manuscript:

(Micro), Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat.8257, s.XV-XVI, 113 fols., miscellaneous manuscript. On f.1-51^v a commentary on Ovid, *Ibis* by Berardus Morettus; f.52-97^v the Cillenio commentary; f.98-99 blank;

f.100–113 the *Priapea*. The BN manuscript is apparently identical with the one Labbe describes from the library of Gabriel Naudé. (Philippi Labbei Biturici S.J., *Nova Bibliotheca Mss. librorum*, Paris, 1653, 236; *Catal. Bibl. Regiae* IV, 442).

Biography:

Bernardinus (Berardinus) Cyllenius (Cilienio) originated from Peschiera on the Lago di Garda near Verona, from where he gets his name “Veronensis.” Later he lived in Rome where he probably was a professor at the “gymnasium”. Unfortunately we do not know the exact dates of his lifetime, but he lived in the second half of the fifteenth century. In a dedicatory poem to the later cardinal Giovanni Battista Orsini (d.1503) in the 1475 edition of his Tibullus commentary he writes to his patron, who supported many a humanist, “sustinui dura puerum nigre-scere barba” and “non possum studio subolem nutrire frequenti,// res est parva domi, turbaque multa premit.” We learn from this that he has a large family so that he must be at least about thirty years old. He is mostly known as a neo-Latin poet and praised as such especially by the learned humanist Girolamo Bologni (1454–1517).

Works:

He edited a commentary on Tibullus (Rome, 1475, HC 15522), which was reprinted several times. In 1610 Goldast edited in his *Catalecta Ovidii* certain *Epistolae amorum ad Julianam* falsely attributed to Cyllenius which were later correctly attributed to Ottavio Cleofilo da Fano by Janus Gruter in his *Deliciae Poet. Ital.* II, 136–145. Verses of Cillenio are to be found in Cod.Vat.Urb. lat.1193 and Vat. lat.3352.

Bibliography:

Chevalier I,928; Cosenza 2, 1166–1167; Fabricius BLMA I, 586–587; Jöcher I col. 2269; Melzi, *Dizionario di opere anonime e pseudonime* (1848) I 207, 215.

Adolfo Cinquini, “Il Codice Vaticano-Urbinate Latino 1193”, *Classici e Neolatini* VI (1910) 83–87; 87–88; Giambattista Carlo Conte Giuliari, *Della letteratura veronese al cadere del secolo XV e delle sue opere a stampa* (Bologna, 1876) 58–59; 132; 134;

139; 171; 187; 217; 261–262; S. Maffei, *Verona illustrata* II (1731) 106–07; Giovanni Mercati, *Codici latini Pico Grimani Pio* (Studi e testi 75, Città del Vaticano 1938) 269,no. 244; Onuphrius Panvinius, *De urbis Veronae viris doctrina et bellica virtute illustribus* (Veronae, 1621) 55.

2. NICOLAUS FABRITIUS SACCA

Sacca, a diligent student of Virgil toward the end of the fifteenth century, begins his commentary (which is preserved in Cod.Vat. lat.4101), like many later commentators, with a discussion of Priapus' origin, a definition of the ‘metrum Priapeum’ and of the metres utilized in the *Carmina Priapea*, and finally the description of their composition. After this Sacca inserts a very interesting list of 118 textual emendations. The commentary itself is a traditional one and consists of glosses on difficult passages of the text. At the end is an epilogue to the reader with a ‘captatio benevolentiae’.

Introduction. [Inc.]: (f.1) Priapeia non uniformiter flexa appellatio ut Bucolica, Georgica quare nuncupentur, neminique utique est in obscuro, cum Priapus, unde Priapeiorum nomen flexit, a veteribus illis, qui pro meritis heroas caelo dicare consueverunt, receptus et ipse fuerit inter numina. Huius autem cultus origo varia esse traditur. Alii Priapum patriam habuisse Lampsacum, quae civitas est in Hellesponto, commemorant, unde pulsum propter magnitudinem virilium a civibus in numerum concendisse Deorum factumque hortorum tutelam....(f.1^v) Haec de titulo. Quod ad qualitatem attinet idest speciem, quae duplex, finita et infinita, metrum est derivatum, non principale. Nam principalia metra secundum Servium (*De Centum Metris*, Keil vol. IV 456 sq.) octo esse deprehendimus: iambicum, trochaicum, dactylicum, anapaesticum, choriambicum, antispasticum, ionica duo, quamvis grammaticorum alii scripserunt generalissimas principalium metrorum formas primo repertas iambicam et dactylicam, quibus reliqua accessisse.... Constat igitur opus elegio carmine, phalaecio,

iambico; at quia et priapeum metrum lectum est et inter confusanea numeratur.... De numero librorum nemo dubitat, quippe unus est, nec item ordine. In ambiguo tamen duo relinquuntur epigramma illa, quae librum claudunt "Dedicatio" scilicet "templi" (*CP* LXXXII) et "Querela numinis" (*CP* LXXXIII), quando neutrum in vetustis sit codicibus et prius etiam Patavii in antiquo marmore nunc conspiciatur. Sane illud notandum interea, quod ad cognitionem operis plurimum confert, ad sacra Dei adhiberi solitos sacerdotem, ut qui curam haberet sacrorum.... (f.2) Una sequitur expositio, nam vitam poetae, quae primo fuerat loco ponenda, plures explicuerunt.—Subdidimus ea, lector, quae depravata apprime aut obscuriora nos impulerunt, ut totum opus post emendationem locorum interpretarem tibi: "Conveniens Latio pone supercilium" (*CP* I,2).... "Licebit hoc multus auferas semel" (*CP* LXXXIII,39).

Commentary. [Inc.]: (f.4) *Carminis incompti lusus lecture procaces, / conveniens Latio pone supercilium* (*CP* I, 1-2) Carmen est elegiacum, in quo habitu praecipui apud Graecos Callimachus et Philetas, apud nos Tibullus claruit, Catullus, Propertius, Ovidius, Gallus, a lamentationibus ductum, quae in funeribus mortuorum olim coepitae. "Postetiam inclusa est voti sententia compos", ut Horatius inquit in *Arte Poetica* (v.76), ubi illud addit agitatam litem, qui elegos inveniret auctor a grammaticis, quae adhuc pendeat sub iudice, quamvis Pollux assignet Eteocli Naxio. Sed in hoc omnium primo epigrammate, veluti propositione operis, rigidum lectorem a suis legendis summonet poeta, quod de numine agatur in libello, quod iocis gaudere manifestum.... /.../[Expl.]: (f.103^v) *Quid hoc novi est* (*CP* LXXXIII).... *Venus iocosa molle ruperit latus* (v.45) Concubentes enim languescunt ex parte magna ob semen, quod omnium membrorum secretio est. Et ut aedificii constructio, inquit Aristoteles, sic corporis decadente semine compactio quatitur. Unde est in superioribus "defecit latus et periculosa(!), cum tussi miser expuo salivam" (*CP* XXVI,12); Martialis "Et iuvat admissa rum-

pere luce latus" (*Epigr.* XI,104,6); Juvenalis "Nec (!) lateri parcas" (*Sat.* VI,37).

Epilogue. [Inc.]: (f.104) Ad lectorem. In calce nostrarum emendationum et interpretationis te, benignissime lector, oro obtestorque, ut primum si ex litterarum falsa coagmentatione syllabarumve ordine praepostero quid offenderis, quod non placeat (id enim minimum est et nescio qua negligentiola solvet evenire) transverso calamo notes nec vito dederis; postea quicquid est, legas sine discrimine necque inhibeat rei turpitudo, quod urticae proxima saepe rosa, ex procacissimo libello nostros mores nequam vellicans, "nam lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba." Vale.

Manuscript:

(Micro) Vatican City, Biblioteca Vaticana, Vat.lat.4101, s.XV, 121 fols., miscellaneous manuscript. Commentary on the *Carmina Priapea* (commentary only) f.1-104; commentary on the *Moretum* (Carmen herbosum) vv.35sqq., f.105-121. (Kristeller, *Iter II* 325a).

Biography:

Nicolaus Fabritius Sacca (Saccha), the son of Biagio and Genenza Sacca, was probably born on Sept. 10, 1459 in Parma, and he was christened on Sept. 13 in the Parma cathedral (*Registri battesimali della Cattedrale di Parma*, Anno 1459, Reg.I^o, anni 1459/1486, f.36; information kindly supplied by Drs. Dall'Acqua and G. Rabotti, Archivio di Stato, Parma). Later he must have been a professor in Todi, where he studied and taught, especially Virgil. We learn this from three laudatory poems on f.121^v of the manuscript of his *Priapea* commentary. One is by Ioannes Baptista Offredutius, "Inscia Manthoi lacerarat turba Maronis/Carmina, divino vaticinata sono./ Sunt modo Fabritio tutissima redditia lector....", and two others by Felix Ceccolinus Tuders, "Edocuit clara qui iam probitate Tudertes/ Fabritius....", and "Est est doctior omnibus magistris/ Hic quem Fabritium vocant parentes...." Unfortunately we do not know any other facts about his life.

3. HIERONYMUS AVANTIUS

During the time that Avantius taught

philosophy in Padua he came into close contact with his colleague Augustinus Moravus Olomucensis (Augustinus Bemus or Käsenbrod, 1467–1513), a professor of canon law and learned in the liberal arts, who encouraged his philological studies. Moravus himself was the author of a renowned *Dialogus in defensionem poetices* (Venice, 1493, GW 3057) and a treatise *De modo epistolandi* (Venice, 1495, GW 3058). Avantius, who was later to edit the works of many classical authors, was, at the beginning of his career especially interested in Catullus and tried to correct forty passages. For nearly three years he abandoned Catullus, and poetry in general, in order to study philosophy. As his friend Cristoforo Papalli lent him an ancient Catullus manuscript, he finally continued his work. His aim was to complete and correct the Catullus edition of Johannes Calphurnius (Giovanni Planza Rufioni, c.1443–1503; Vicenza, 1481, GW 6389) and the commentary of his former teacher Antonius Parthenius Lacisius (Brescia, 1486, GW 6391). At the same time we learn that many of his colleagues and pupils at the University of Padua were interested in Catullus and were planning to publish editions and commentaries. Avantius discovered that the Catullus texts were corrupt and that consequently the versification was faulty. He believed that Catullus had adopted certain metrical liberties from the *Carmina Priapea* and therefore decided to study these epigrams under the same aspects as Catullus'.

Avantius wrote his commentary during a sojourn in his native town Verona and in the surroundings of Lake Garda. Here he met Domizio Calderini's nephew Paolo with whom he discussed his work. Later he sent his commentary in form of a letter to Moravus who went to the trouble of publishing Avantius' results, as Avantius himself, apparently, was too modest to do so. But this could also be one of the notorious humanists' stratagems designed to diminish their editorial responsibility.

Moravus, in a prefatory letter, dedicates the Avantius commentary to every young man intending to study the classics. Before pub-

lishing the emendations of Avantius, Moravus, in his capacity as editor, submitted them for criticism to his friend, Johannes Aurelius Augurellus Ariminensis (c.1440–1524), professor of Greek in Florence, to Count Jacobus Juliarius Veronensis, an expert in poetry, and to his Paduan colleagues Johannes Calphurnius and Nicolaus Leonicus Thomaeus (1456–1531).

The emendations of Avantius appeared for the first time in 1495. This edition (a) includes many personal remarks, e.g. polemics against Angelo Poliziano and a defence of Domizio Calderini (1446–1478), Avantius' compatriot, who had been attacked by Poliziano. The notices concerning Calderini's library, more than ten years after his death, as well as a survey of his philological remains, are very interesting, so that they are cited in detail. In 1500 there appeared a completely revised, but authorized second edition (b), which is more concise and suppresses all polemical remarks.

a) The edition of 1495

Preface of Augustinus Olomucensis (ed. of Venice, 1495). Augustinus Olomucensis Iuris Pontificii et liberalium artium professus studiosae iuventuti, s.p. [Inc.]: (f.a1^v) Quom nihil praestabilius in rebus humanis inveniatur nihilque divinus, quam et prodesse multis et—in quo deficere ceteros videas—operas in commune largiri, id quod a summis saepe viris factitatum invenimus, qui tum se demum boni aliquid assecutos arbitrabantur, si id in utilitatem plurimorum collocatum iri sensissent, non ut id intra privatos parietes contineant, quod miseri semper ac sordidi ingenii existimatum est, non in his modo, quae in usum traducendae vitae comparata sunt, sed in eis et ex quibus tanquam penetralibus quibusdam et vitae nostrae institutum optimum et excolendis ingenii fructum uberrimum eruere possimus. Quod ipsum quanto studio antiquitas curarit, ut legendi scilicet optimi cuiusque auctoris commoda cuivis facultas daretur, cum liberalitas principum per ea tempora tum bibliothecae sumptuosissimae tanta bonorum diligentia comparatae ostendunt,

ut mihi non mirum sane videatur, tot viros eruditissimos, tot praeclarissima ingenia uno semel tempore effloruisse, ubi ea excollendi ingenii quasi armamentaria quaedam publicitus exponerentur.... In quo aevo nostro non gratulari et quidem vehementissime non possum, quod extincto iam prope bonarum litterarum splendore in ea rursum tempora redierit, ut exuta barbarie in pristinum illud decus denuo aspiret taleque congerendis optimorum auctorum libris studium adhibeat, ut id brevi cum his quae diximus temporibus vitae configgere possit. Sed neque fidelissimi interpres deesse nobis videntur.... Solus poetarum Catullus, quo nemo suavior, nemo iucundior, nemo tertiior fuerat, scabra adhuc rubigine consitus detinebatur, cui ad temporum iniuriam ne id quidem defore potuit, quominus a litteratoribus quibusdam stigmatibus inelutilibus inureretur.... Verum enimvero rerum natura parens diutius tantam iacturam non sustinens, quom aliquandiu poeta iucundissimus situ marcoreque squaleret, quomodo tandem hunc etiam in lucem reduceret enixa est, idest ud civium ipsius inveniretur aliquis, qui eum et a barbarie vindicaret et ubi aliqua vel mendosa vel abstrusa essent, emendaret, explicaret atque digereret. Is est Hieronymus Avantius Veronensis, cuius vigiliae eximiaeque in civem suum pietas id tandem effecisse perspiciuntur, ut ex obsculo nitidum, ex lacero solidum et ex barbaro denique Latinum denuo efficeret.... Verum tanta fuit hominis modestia, tanta ingenii vivacissimi diffidentia, ut eas vigilias suas non nisi paucis et his quidem amicissimis, quom ruri rediret, exhiberet, ut vel arrogantiae omnem a se suspicionem amoveret vel aemulorum obtrectationibus, qui praeclara omnia ogganiunt, occasionem omnem adimeret. Ego vero, cui iam annis duobus eas vigilias suas, utpote qui currentem eum, sicuti aiunt, plerumque impuleram, singulari humanitate sua dedicaverat, neve menstruos illos labores, sic enim eos appellabat, ederem, una etiam iniunxerat, considerans mecum, quantum studiosis omnibus gloriaeque Catulli consulerem, si in publicum quandoquem emitterentur. Malui amicitiae nostrae discrimen

subire praevaricatorque videri, quam ea intra scrinia continens Catullum ita, sicuti erat, scabrum sentumque intra studiosorum manus relinquere, quum praesertim Hieronymi etiam gloriae non parum consultum iri vidisem quumque haec scripta Leonicus Patavinus, Iacobus comes Iuliarius Veronensis, Aurelius Ariminensis, Calfurnius Brixensis, nulla non laude maiores, sedulo perlegerint ac mire commendarint, quom et ingenii ipsius dexteritas talisque in civem suum pietas vulgo studio suorum innotesceret.... [Expl.]: Has itaque emendationes Catullianas laetis animis, iuvenes studiosissimi, accipite atque Catullum ipsum ita vobis restitutum tali deinceps cura diligentiaque exutite, ut et sales ipsius habitumque generosi huius carminis, id quod facturos vos non ambigo, penitus imbuatis. Patavii tertio Nonas Martii Anno Christi Domini MCCCCXCIII.

Dedication. Hieronymus Avantius Veronensis Augustino Moravo Olomucensi S.P. [Inc.]: (f.a2) Scribis Augustine, eruditorum humanissime, tibi renunciatum esse, quemadmodum hac publica studiorum remissione depositis altioribus studiis Valerii Catulli lusus retractem rogasque, ut tibi Catullianas dictiones mancas aut inversas seu epigrammata incautius congesta transverso calamo illinire velim. Et si onus supra vires meas iniungis, turpissimum esse duxi tuae voluntati morem non gerere, quem tantopere et colo et observo. Malui potius audentior videri quam ullam a me repulsam acciperes, immo et libentius, quid in mentem succurrit, te auspice observabo, expectaturus tuum de meis omnibus annotationibus simplex iudicium ac nudum examen, cum praesertim ea te comitate praeditum sciā, ut stilum rudem, quo haec condita erunt, in bonam partem accepturus sis cumque probe cognoscas iam ab hinc annis quinque me humanitatis, studiis paene renunciasse et philosophorum dogmata, quae nostro tempore horrida sunt et inculta, prosecutum fuisse. Cur autem hac tempestate mansuetissimas musarum delicias recole, paucis accipe. Priusquam philosophorum sacris initiarer, impensissime, haud vera tacebo, conatus

sum Catulliana pleraque loca abstrusissima percipere ac potissimum vatem hunc a syllabarum praevericatione, qua maxime notabatur, vindicare. Ceterum tunc tenuitate ingenii vix quadraginta loca aut paulo plura perversa offenderam ac anxius restitueram, ut coram te annotavimus eo die, quo Patavinam prefecturam initit Sebastianus Baduarius, nostrorum studiorum recidivum decus ac singulare ornamentum. Nunc quum intermissis severioribus studiis in agellum meum, ut apud me essem, secedere vellem, Christoforus Papallis, iuvenis non minus poeticae quam legum peritus, Catullum satis bonae vetustatis mihi sub certa fide commendavit, inibi dum singula regustarem ac diligentius perscrutarer conferremque exemplaria et meum praesertim iamdiu manu exaratum, nonnulla alia restitui loca. Qua industria id effeci, ut me haud laboris poeniteat... Quis enim ante laboriosissimam Calphurnii castigationem Catilli scripta non stomachosus attingebat? Hic porro, quantum humani vires ingenii passae sunt, uno mense elaboravit; quin vir iste uti morum gravitate (et) integritate, sic virtutum amore ac eximia eruditione spectatissimus, dum quatuor illa poetarum volumina impressoribus festinatibus emendaret, non negabat plerasque apud Catullum esse mendas, quae tam in circumciso tempore vix corrigi possent. At singulis lectionibus, quas in frequentissimo Gymnasio Patavino profitetur, plures Catulli sensus latentes atque ad hoc aevi non perceptos in dies, ut dicitur, recognoscit, edocet, quae omnia, ut habeamus, hortor et rogo. Nihil enim ex eius officina non exultissimum prodit. Alii praeterea pariter lectioni Catullianae suffragantur.... (He names Augustinus Beneus, Hieronymus Bagolinus, Mattheus Rufus, Johannes Antonius Pantheus, Baptista Guarinus the Younger, Petrus Bravus, Johannes Franciscus Burana, Donatus Avogarius, Alovixius Zendrata, i.e. Ludovicus Cendrata)... Quorum omnium castigationibus ac inventis prorsus candorem suum reparabit vatum doctissimus Catullus. Parthenius quoque, ne longe abeam, plura loca in suis commentariis reformat et multis aliis locis lucem daturus erat, nisi amicorum

assiduis et precibus et adhortationibus editionem paene praecipitare coactus fuisset. Verum nunc, ut accepi, festinationis iacturam mora ac diligentia resarcire nititur. Ego interim, ut pro viribus nostris tibi mos geratur, quicquid vel ex veterum codicum praesidio vel ex assidua nostra versuum libratione observaverim, brevibus explicabo.... (Then the commentary on Catullus follows, f.a2-a5) In calce epistolae tuae pleraque inquiris loca non a me, qui vix per triennium in haec studia incubuerim ac eadem iam dudum sequestraverim, sed depromenda aviro, magnam cui mentem animumque Delius inspiret vates. Sed quo tamen vinculo inhibeo, ne saltem aliqua te auspice attingam, malo equidem tecum inscitiae quam improbi stuporis argui. Quare quom, quae supra annotavimus, ad te mittere maturuisse, decrevi rem hanc paululum differre, ut aliquibus quae sit tuis, nam eorum multa superius enarrata invenies, a me uberiori satisfactum iret. Tuis igitur optatis inhiens Benacum accessi, non studio visendi lacum alioquin amoenissimum, sed ut convenirem Paulum Calderinum, quem certe avunculus eius, non minus Angeli Politiani probris indignus quam eiusdem Angeli laudibus dignissimus, et rerum et virtutum haeredem constituit, apud quem, ut huius comitatem, frugalitatem scias ac desideres, habeas nusquam dulcius, nusquam hilarius, numquam maiori cum voluptate me dies composuisse.... (f.a5') Quare ut ad phrasim tandem redeam: in eius montis olentissimis herbis fragrantissimo vertice cum Paulo meo ex his, quae cunctabar, multa una advertimus. Ipse quidem plura probe vidit, plurima optime recognovit. Quod tamen nec multa me admiratione afficit: hic avunculi fere omnes libros, si septem cadaveris comites excipias, tam Graecis quam nostris litteris nactus est, quos quom intuetur, quasi praceptorum semper invenit. Domitius namque nihil animadvertisendum praelegebatur, quod non in codicum margine signaret atque cum aliis auctoribus conferret, ut quaeque promptuaria teneret, cuius rei brevi locupletissimos testes reliquisset, nisi acerba nimis mors eum praevenisset. Nam quom his die-

bus a Paulo inquirerem, quod opus in manibus Domitii versaretur ante immaturum et nunquam satis conclamatum diem suum, tunc ille nihil ultra, sed iure illachrimans et scrinia codicibus referta recludens, aperuit mihi librum non absolutum, quem observationum ac recognitionum vocabat Domitius et Pausaniam, qui Domitii benigno labore de Graecia in Italiam migrabat. Verum vix tertiam partem gloriosi itineris tenebat, cum trigenaria Domitii nece—heu naturae dedecus—vix suos in Pelasgos agnitus remansit. Iisdem diebus Ciceronis ad Atticum epistulas, non nobis minus quam Attico fuerant cognobiles, reddebat; itidem commentaria in Silium Italicum, libros Fastorum Nasonis, politica Ciceronis officia ac pleraque alia partim fere absolverat, partim inchoaverat. Sed huius nonnulli labores, proh fulta robore atque unco animadvertisenda, alium dominum sortiti sunt. Caesarum vitas a Suetonio derelictas conditissimo stilo exorsus fuerat. Iis igitur institutionibus ac praeclaris monumentis Paulus imbutus, quid ignorabit, quum ille insuper assiduo studio beatissimae memoriae ac miro ingenio suffragetur? Ipse igitur me suadente immo deprecante dialecticorum maeandris, quibus interceptus erat, inducias indixit, ut una huiusmodi amoeniores artes reviseremus. Nostras has in Catullum meditatiunculas huic ostendimus ac placuisse sic gratulamur, ut aliorum iudicium audentius aliquando subiturus sim. Nimis multis sermo esset, si velim omnia, quae una per scrutati sumus, referre. Sed de multis satis sit, quid super quaedam Catulliana quae sita tua Paulo annuente censem. In primis non meam, sed variam lectionem accipies illius . . . At quom postremo quaeras, an me iudice liceat nobis in faleucio endecasyllabo abuti primo pede, ut Catullus solet, pace aliorum dixerim: nequaquam decet . . . / . . . [Expl.]: Quod autem noster ille citet Priapeiarum auctoritatem, credo interim Nasonem vel si mavis Maronem aliquando trochaeum et iambum locasse in prima sede faleucii. Num tandem sibi tantum arrogabit, ut autem sibi, quid et Maroni vatum praecellentissimo, licere? Ceterum si perspiciet intimius, non modo in prima sede faleucii apud Ma-

ronem alium a spondeo non reperiret, sed in toto Priapeiorum opusculo alioquin obscenissimo, nullam syllabam perperam positam inveniet, nisi Maro, ut vulgo fit, ex prava inscriptione legatur. Ego enim, ut hanc rem penitus perciperem, totam hanc Maronis paginam perlegi ac fere omnium syllabarum quantitatem ponderavi omniumque dictionum inversionem depravationemque accommodavi, quae omnia tibi explicare constitui, quia me tibi minimum hactenus satisfecisse videor: omnia prius persolvissem, si ad te has nugulas nostras ante preces tuas missem. Quare ut a nobis aliquid accidat precibus tuis, audi quid in Maronem castigatione dignum animadverterim:

Commentary. [Inc.]: (f.5a') In primo carmine legerem, “aut quibus hanc oculis” (*CP* I,8), casu quarto, non autem “hoc”. Infra legerem, “cum teret obsessas” (*CP* III,4) a verbo *tero*, non autem “*tenet*”. Unde Tibullus “nec amplexus aspera barba terit” (*EL*.I,8,32), vel lege “*tenet*” pro “*tenebit*”. Infra legerem “tormento cytharaque tensiorem”, non “tomento” (*CP* VI,5). Sic Apulegius in prima apologia vocat capillum tormento assimilem (*A*.4, 29).../... [Expl.]: (f.a6) Infra “immanem stomachum mihi videtis”, non autem “mihi stomachum” (*CP* LXXVII,1). Infra legerem “negent amicae cunnilinge vicinae” (*CP* LXXVIII,2), non autem “amicos cunnilingi”, loquitur enim “cunnilingum suaे vicinae”, ibidem. Legerem “puella fortis”, non “foris” (*CP* LXXVIII,3). Adde igitur “t”. Ibidem legerem “impingeo celer passu”, “celer” casu recto (*CP* LXXVIII,4). Infra legerem “fascino gravis tento”, non “tenero” (*CP* LXXVIII,1). Sequens versus est principium pulcherrimi dialogi, qui continetur quinque disticis. Mirabar cur in opusculo meo alioquin integerrimo deficere epigramma illud “Rusticus aerari quondam etc.” (*CP* LXXXII), quod passim in aliis imprimitur. Ecce Aurelius Ariminensis vates nostro aevo illustris idemque Graecis ut Latinis litteris praestantissimus indicavit mihi carmen hoc in quodam hortulo Patavino insignitum marmore satis vetusto, cuius carminis ultimus versus erat: “Hunc tu sed tento – scis

puto, quod sequitur.” At triviales doctores carmen hoc Maronianis inseruere, argutulum sensum ignorantes pro tento taceo supposuere. In ultimo epigrammate legerem “tepente” (*CP LXXXIII,3*), ibidem legerem “destitutor inguinum” (*ibid.14*), ibidem “o saeve pennis”, non “o scelest” (*ibid.19*). Legerem ibidem “canis vel ille saevus usque ait tibi fricabit obliquum et lutosum aper latus” (*ibid.17/18*). Infra legerem “mobilem ratem”, potius quam “nobilem ratem” (*ibid. 23*), ut illud “instabilem qua vehit arte ratem, etc.”

Haec saltuatim percurrimus, non ut opus illud alioquin obscenissimum explanarem, sed ut ex gratissimo sudore meo luce illustrius videas Maronem, cuius testimonio contra opinionem tuam et eandem optimam nitebatur Regulus ille, nunquam alium pedem a spondeo in prima sede faleucii recepisse, immo eius pertinaciae omnino tribuendum est... Simul et humanarum divinarum quoque legum pelago secedere, quod ante omnes equales tuos gloriosius transfretasti, revise precor his praesertim quasi Halcyonidum diebus mansuetissimas ac nobis quondam familiares amoenis-simasque musas nostrasque has meditatiunculas, si digna deponscimus, perlegas, recognoscas atque pro arbitrio castiges. Vale, et Olomucensium gloriam, quae per omnes proavos tuos tibi dudum florentissima ac integerima reservata est, geniali studio ac peculiaribus virtutibus observa. Iterum vale, Avantii tui memor, pridie Idus Octobris (October 14) MCCCCXCIII.

(b) The *edition of 1500*

The Preface of Augustinus Olomucensis is repeated from the 1495 edition.

Dedication. (ed. of Venice, 1500) Hieronymus Avantius Veronensis Augustino Moravo Olomocensi S.P. [*Inc.*]: (f.01^v) Scribis, Augustine, eruditorum humanissime, tibi renunciatum esse, quemadmodum hac publica studiorum remissione sepositis altioribus studiis Valerii Catulli lusus retractem... Priusquam philosophorum sacris initiarer, impensissime conatus sum Catulliana pleraque loca abstrusissima percipere

ac potissimum vatem hunc a syllabarum praevericatione, qua maxime notabatur, vindicare nec autem, cum intermissis severioribus studiis in agrum meum, ut apud me essem, secesserim, nonnulla alia restituvi loca. Qua industria id effeci, ut me haud laboris poeniteat; meretur profecto Catullus, quem A.Gellius, ut scis, vatum elegantissimum appellat et omnes prisci uno consensu doctissimum nominant, eruditorum manus, quarum, ut sic dicam, lima sordes omnes deponat, ut suum pristinum nitorem et cultum resumat. Quare laetor hoc saeculum acutissimis ingenii florere, quorum pia cura, non posthabitis tamen his vigiliis nostris, Catulli legitimus libellus, qui tot annis barbarorum manibus deturpatus eminentium poetarum consortium erubuit, posthac in lucem prodire non dubitabit.../... [*Expl.*]: Quod autem noster ille ex Priapeiarum auctoritate credat in faleco (*sic*) endecasyllabo posse abuti prima sede, credo interim Nasonem vel si mavis Maronem (meo quidem iudicio fuit multorum poetarum farrago) alium a spondeo pedem usurpasse, num tandem sibi tantum arrogabit, ut autem pluries sibi licere, quod semel Ausonio semelque Priapeiarum auctori placuit, quod opus tibi obsequens percurri et in eo haec connotavi.

Commentary. In Priapeias emendationes. [*Inc.*]: (f.03) In primo carmine legerem, “aut quibus hanc oculis”, non autem “hoc” (*CP I,8*); infra legerem “cum teret obsessas”, non autem “tenet” (*CP III,4*), unde Tibullus, “nec amplexus aspera barba terit” (*El.I,8, 32*). Infra legerem, “tormento cytharaque tensiorem”, non “tomento” (*CP VI,5*); sic Apuleius in prima apologia vocat capillum tormento assimilem (*A.4,29* “Stuppeo tormento adsimilis”).../... [*Expl.*]: In ultimo carmine legerem “tepente”, non “repente” (*CP LXXXIII,3*), legerem “erat ventus”, non “Venus erat” (*ibid.4*); legerem “o saeve pennis” (*ibid.19*); legerem “licebit aegro languentior” (quinque syllabarum) (*ibid.32*); legerem “paratur”, legerem “compleas” (*ibid.34*); legerem “licebit hoc inultus”, non “multus” (*ibid.38*); legerem “quid est iners” (*ibid.37*).—Habes,

Augustine amantissime, quid his genialibus diebus rure morans meditati simus, quae tametsi non praecipi calamo reponenda fuerant a me praelestum, qui sub Parthenio vix per triennium in haec studia incubuerim ac eadem per quinquennium fere sequestra verim. Malui tamen a te castigari, quam ignaviae accusari. Tu igitur nostras has meditatiunculas perlegas, recognoscas ac pro arbitrio castiges. Vale, pr.Idus Octobris (October 14) 1493.

Editions:

(Micro) 1495, Venetiis (Venice): Johannes Tacuinus de Tridino. H 2185; GW 3098; BMC 5.530; Indice Generale 1102; Goff A-1407. BM; (MH).

1500, May 19, Venetiis (Venice): Johannes Tacuinus; as an appendix to the edition of Tibullus, Catullus, and Propertius, with several commentaries; the revised second edition. H 4766; BMC 5.535; Indice Generale 9668; Goff T-374. BM; (MH).

(*) 1520, Venetiis: Guilielmus de Fontaneto; same authors as in ed.1500; BM; BN.

Biography:

Hieronymus Avantius (Girolamo Avanzi) was born in Verona. Unfortunately no exact facts about his life are known. He studied in his native town (c.1488) under Antonius Parthenius Lacisius. Later (c.1493) he held a professorship in Padua, where he calls himself "artium doctor, artium scholasticus et medicinae doctor, theoreticam extraordinarie legens." He was a member of the Aldine Academy and a friend of Bartholomaeus Merula, who sent him verses by Ausonius which had been discovered by Franciscus Nursius. He died after 1534.

Works: He edited or commented on Aristotle, Ausonius (1496), Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius (1502), Cn.Cornelius Gallus, Lucretius (1500), Pliny the Younger (1502), Quintilian, L.Annaeus Seneca, Statius (1498). He edited Gualterius Burlaeus *Expositio in Aristotelis Physica* and the Poesie of Lidio Catto da Ravenna; he wrote a treatise on iambic verse.

Bib.: Cosenza I 349-350; Giambattista Carlo Conte Giuliani, *Della letteratura*

veronese al cadere del secolo XV e delle sue opere a stampa (Bologna, 1876) 197-199; 206-207; Scipione Maffei, *Verona illustrata* II (ed.1731) 292; Onuphrius Panvinius, *De urbis Veronae viris doctrina, et bellica virtute illustribus* (Verona, 1621) 55 sq.

4. LUDOVICUS PRETINUS

Pretino's *Priapea* commentary is the only extensive one printed during the Renaissance. It appeared around 1500, together with two of his other works, *Ordo ac doctrina in Kalendis ac Idibus* (f.59-65^v), and *In Comparationes variorum auctorum ordo et utilitas legentium quam componebat et opus (sic)* [f.66^v-92^v], although the exact date of its publication is unknown. Pretino must have given university lectures upon the subject as he calls his commentary several times "oratio". The commentary is mainly devoted to the explanation of difficult words, but it also includes mythological explanations of the origin of Priapic worship, a discussion of the work's author (Pretino uses rather surprising arguments for ascribing the *Carmina Priapea* to Virgil), and a metrical analysis not only of the 'metrum Priapeum' but also of the metres used in the *Carmina*. Pretino's knowledge of classical, post-classical, and even mediaeval authors is noteworthy. It is rather difficult to determine to what extent he had studied his predecessors, and nearly impossible to decide by whom his commentary was used in later times, as there are very few references to it.

Preface. [Inc.]: (f.12) Cum saepe mecum ipse diu animo volutaverim, quantis in laboribus versetur genus humanum, merito naturam homini illos dedisse fatendum est, quippe quae ingenia ad exercitationem meditationemque duceret et ut immortalitatis gloriam adipiscerentur neque per summum otium aliis alium contemneret, tamquam si auxilio nullius indigeret quisquam. Eo igitur labore quemque participem ipsam fecisse iure asserendum est. Ego autem natus ad idem nefas et alienum duxi, si ingenii mei meditationem in promptu et ad utilitatem legentium haec nostra qualiacum-

que in lucem minus protulisse, non ductus aliquo gloriae stimulo et aliquorum (sic!) laboris nostri praemio, sed voluntarie huic editioni me addixi, opus tandem magis admirandum quam contemnendum. Et quod neminem nostris temporibus ausum cognoverim in huius expositione vel territum difficultate vel carminis procacitate deserentem, ego vero alienus ab huiusmodi hominibus magis censui a rabulis et indoctis viris velle taxari et a sapientibus et eloquentissimis viris laudari quam in otio vitam degere. Est enim in hoc poeta tanta vis dicendi et ingenii sagacitas, ut quisque profecto admirari possit, licet in sua iuventute hoc genere carminum sit ipse oblectatus nec tamen a doctis repressus. Quapropter a multis hortatus, ut omnino haec nostra commentaria in Priapea ederem, minus accusari aut reus trahi debeo, cum tantum etenim utilitatis ex hisce commentariis nostris poterit abunde a quovis docto et mediocris doctrinae viro percipi, ut omnium undique affatim laudes meritas adipiscar. Et ut haec magis elucescant nec per tenebras gradiamur, comites habemus, quos minus ausim ullo tempore accusare, non modo Latinos, verum etiam et auctores Graecos, disciplinarum omnium inventores, quibus sine difficulter lingua Latina extare posset, salva tamen Ciceronis reverentia.... Ego merito volui Priapeam exposuisse, quam latratu aliquorum tantum opus reliquisse et vigilias meas utiles omnibus non me impartitum aliis fuisse. (Habes enim in his Pretini commentariis et utilitatem sensus Maronis, quibus profecto mea sententia nihil est desiderandum, tum denique auctorum copiam et dicendi ubertatem). Nullus equidem locus sine testibus relinquitur. Auctores vero, quos in hoc opere sum secutus, hic in partem descripsero et inter legendum inveneris. Et imprimis poetarum est Vergilius, Ovidius, Horatius, Lucanus, Claudianus, Lucretius, Iuvenalis, Statius, Persius, Syllius (i.e. Silius), Martialis, Plautus, Terentius, Homerus, Pindarus, Euphronius, Chrysostomus poeta, Hesiodus. Deinde sum secutus Strabonem, Varronem, Macrobius, A. Gellium, Plinium, Solinum, Eutropium,

Livium, Appianum, Diodorum Siculum, Iginum (i.e. Hyginum), Pomponium, Suetonium, Asconium Pedianum, Eusebium, Iosephum, Herodotum, Fenestellam, Isidorum, Servium grammaticum, Donatum, Acronem, Porphyrium, Quintilianum, Priscianum, Laurentium Vallam, Focam (i.e. Phocam), Diomedem, Caprum, Nestorem, Plutarchum, Iustinum, L. Florum, Caesarem in commentariis, Valerium Maximum, Vitruvium, Ciceronem in omnibus suis operibus, Aristotelem, Platonem, Firmianum Lactantium, Papinianum, Senecam, Nonium Marcellum, F. Pompeium (Festum), Tortellum, Boccaccium, Iunianum (Maium), Suidam, Simonem Iauensem, Avicennam, Papiam Conciliatorem et alios permultos, qui lectitabuntur in opere. Hisque omnibus etsi non seriatim posuerim, credo tamen satis abunde nostra commentaria et vigilias muniisse. Reliquum est purgare opinionem negantium Priapeam non extare opus Virgilianum, quam in primo epigrammate amovebo. Epigrammata huius operis sunt LXXXIII. Nunc vero de ortu et vita Priapi, a quo nomen habet opus.

Introduction. *Ludovicus Pretinus de Puppio in Priapeam Virgilii Maronis, sed prius narranda vita.* [Inc.]: (f.14) Priapus vir Lampsacenus ex urbe Hellesponti ortus et propter magnitudinem virilis membris pulsus, quoniam saepius feminae cum illo delectabantur nimis. A Graecis vero pro numine habitus et propter fecunditatem hortorum deus existimatus.... /... [Expl.]: (f.14^r) Alii dicunt deum hunc ortum fuisse ex Orneis deis Corinthi, et dicebatur Belphegor, idest simulacrum ignominiae; dicitur idolum, fuit enim Moab cognomento Boa super montem Phogor, quem Latini Priapum vocant deum hortorum. Nunc vero ad expositionem epigrammatum veniamus, ne nostra nimis evagetur oratio (Cf. *Belphegor* in RE III,1, col.185; Hieronymus in Os. II,9, Migne PL VI 896).

Commentary. (f.15) Epigramma primum (the complete text follows). [Inc.]: Varia et multiplex est nonnullorum opinio dicentium hoc opusculum non sapere virtutem

Virgilianam, sed variorum poetarum affirmant poema, qui in Priapeam Maecenatiani horti custodem emodulati sunt, quibus paene adhaesi, ni rationibus essem fulctus, argumentum ut crederem verba Senecae ex lib. II divisionum dicentis “Scaurus, non tamen discretus homo sed venustissimus, qui nullius umquam impunitam stultitiam transire passus est” (Seneca maior, *Controv.* I,2,22). Statim paulo post dicens, ut est illud Ovidianum (*Frg. 8,8*), “dum timet alterius vulnus inepta loci”, cum hic versus sit in tertio epigrammate huius Priapeae (*CP III, 8*). Sed quoniam potuisset errare in allegando, non moveor illo carmine dumtaxat, cum Servius grammaticus, tantae doctrinae et autoritatis vir, commentator operum Virgilii, dicat in eius vita in Aeneidos lib. primo (ed.Thilo/Hagen, p.1): “Nam impatiens libidinis fuit. Primum ab hoc distichon factum est in Ballistam latronem: ‘Monte sub hoc lapidum tegitur Ballista sepultus/Nocte dieque tutum carpe viator iter.’ Scripsit etiam septem vel octo libros hos: Cirinnam, Ethnam, Culicem, Priapea, Catalepton, Epigrammata, Copam, Diras.” Et antequam veniret Romam, scripsit Priapea, nam Romae perfecit Bucolica, Georgica et Aeneida imperfectam. Verum non est argumentum ad rem, nam multa carmina Vergilii sunt iisdem verbis apud Martialem et apud Ovidium de multis variisque rebus, tamen Vergilius fuit ante Martialem: “Ride si sapis, o puella, ride” (*Epigr. II,41*) lib. II in Maximiam; Vergilius Epigr.X (*CP X,6*): “Insulsissima quid puella rides”, et infra: “Spectas me tamen et subinde rides.” Velim igitur scire, qua ratione rabulae moveantur contra tantum virum; etiam Antonius Panormita poeta insignis in epistula ad Pogium Florentinum dicit Priapeam esse Maronis (ed.Barozzi/Sabbadini, *Studi sul Panormita*, p.8). Item Iohannes Andreas Cyrneus, episcopus Aleriensis, suo tempore ad Pomponium Infortunatum affirmit eandem esse Virgilii (ed.Virgil, Rome, 1471, C 6000, f.2), et multi alii maximae auctoritatis viri. Fuit enim Maro impatientissimus libidini et deditus pueris, amavit Cebetem Alexim, quemadmodum dicit Servius et alii. Et Ovi-

dium constat abhorruisse ab huiusmodi vitio, ut ipse in secundo de arte amandi (*A.A. 2, 681-84*): “Illis sentitur non irritata voluptas/ Quod iuvat, ex aequo femina virque ferant./ Odi concubitus qui non utrumque resolvunt/ Hoc est cur pueri tangor amore minus.” Quod videtur aliquantis per taxare Virgilium confirmo, assero et comprobo atque laudo salibus lascivis plenum. Nec expetit rugosum lectorem aut Saturninum, immo solutum a curis reipublicae et imperii labyrintho.... (f.16^v) *Carminis incompti* (*CP I,1*) operis non ornati, non convenientis ad opus excultum. Contus enim dicit “pertica” vel “sudes”, quae a Graecis dicitur κόμαξ, translatio sumpta a nautis; cum ipsi navigent sine conto, non bene rates tendit iter per mare velivolum vel cymba per flumina more piscantium, vel ἀπὸ τοῦ κοσμέω, orno, alias κόσμος, ornamentum, quem Latini mundum vocant. *Inconti*, inhonesti; *lusus*, versus istos a ludendo dictos. Ludum enim poetae carmina sua veluti pro verecundia dicere consuever.../[Expl.]: Priapi quaerela.... *Quid hoc novi* (*CP LXXXIII*) ... (f.58^v) *Dum Venus* (*ibid. 44*) dea amoris et ipsa libido; *ruperit* egredi fecerit; *iocosa* cum iocis et blanditiis, ut illud Juvenalis in “Credo pudicitiam” (*Sat. VI,1*), ζωὴ καὶ ψυχὴ, vita et anima mea. *Mihi Priapo; molle latus* luxuriosum latus, dum perfecero voluptatem coeundi. Nam plurimum potest sermo blandus in coitu. Sic Catullus lib. primo ad Camerium (*Carm. LV,17-20*): “Num [!] te Lacteolae tenent puellae/ Si linguam clauso tenes in ore/ Fructus proiciens amoris omnes/ Verbosa gaudet Venus loquela etc.” Finis commentariorum Ludovici Pretini de Puppio in Priapeis.

Edition:

(Micro) s.d., s.l. (c.1500, Venetiis: Johannes Tacuinus ?). HR 13343; Indice Generale 8044; Géza Sajó and Erzébet Soltész, *Catalogus incunabulorum quae in bibliothecis publicis Hungariae asservantur*, 2 vols. (Budapest, 1970) II no.2828. Venezia, BN Marciana.

Biography:

Ludovicus Pretinus (Ludovico Pretino) surnamed “alaster”, i.e. the astrologer, was

born in Florence. His ancestors originated from Poppi near Arezzo. Precise facts about his life are lacking. He studied in Florence, Siena, Pisa, and Rome, where he later lived as a "philosopher". The autograph manuscript of his *Liber epithetorum* is dated Rome, July 21, 1516, and this is the last precise date we have (Cod. Vat. Ottob. lat. 2255, f.352 [439]); the manuscript contains the following entry: "[Liber] Ludovici Pretini alastri Florentini nati et oriundi in oppido casentinati Puppio, Aretinae diecesis et educati Florentie Senis et Pisis et Rome...". His *In differentias Guarini Veronensis interpretatio* (HC 10314) was printed in Brescia, Sept.4, 1484. He must have had contact with the Papal court, since his prose treatise *Iudicialis dialectica et modi omnes disputationis* (Perugia, BC Augusta, Cod. F 68) is dedicated to Pope Julius II (1503-1513).

Bibl.: Chevalier II col.3816; Mazzatinti V 125,no.494; Giovanni Mercati, *Codici latini Pico Grimani Pio* (Studi e Testi 75, Città del Vaticano, 1938) 249, no.38.

5. ANONYMUS PERUSINUS, s.XV-XVI

An anonymous commentary dating from the end of the fifteenth or the beginning of the sixteenth century is preserved in Perugia, Biblioteca Comunale Augusta, Cod. H 63 (f.149-155), a codex which also contains commentaries on Persius, Ovid, and Tibullus. The manuscript is full of mistakes and often illegible. The *Priapea* commentary is a very short commentary on all the epigrams; it summarizes their contents and explains the mythological names and the most difficult words. At the beginning there is a discussion of the origin of the god Priapus. The manuscript gives no hint as to the identity of the author, but he clearly possessed a good knowledge of classical literature.

Introduction. (f.149) Priapus fuit ex Lampsaco urbe Hellesponti, a qua teste Servio super II.Geor. (mod.ed. *Comm. in Verg. Georg.*IV,111) propter virilis membra magnitudinem pulsus est et ob fecunditatem hortorum numen dictus est; Virgilius "custos es pauperis horti" (*Ecl.* 7,34) et quarto Geor.

(*Georg.* IV,110-111) "Et custos furum atque avium cum falce saligna/ Hellespontiaca servet tutela Priapi". Huic erat asellus victima, Ovidius primo Fastorum (F. 1,391 sqq.). Cum dii omnes ad festum musaeum convenissent et epulis satiati essent, noctem herbis (ms.hedis) ducebant. Lotidem vero nympham somnus arripuit, cuius pudicitiae Priapus insidiatus est, sed rudente asello, quo Silenus vehebatur, excita est. Priapus desiderio frustratus est. Veritus vindictam Lampsaceni, asellum illi litare statuerat, Ovidius primo Fastorum (F. 1,539-540) "morte dedit poenas auctor clamoris et haec est/ Hellespontiaco victima grata deo"; idem (F. 6,345) "Lampsacos hoc animal solita est mactare Priapo", etc.

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: (f.149) *Vesta* (CP I,3) a vi et stando, Ovidius VI.Fastorum (F. 6,299-300) "stat vi, terra sua: vi stando Vesta vocatur/ caussaque par Graii nominis esse potest." *Incompti* inornati; *procaces* lascivos, improbos; *supercilium* severitatem; *Latium* quod ibi Saturnus latuit, Vergilius VII.Aeneidis (AE. VII,323 sq.) "Latiumque vocari/ maluit is quoniam latuisset tutus in oris". Ovidius primo Fastorum (F. 1,235-238) "Hac ego Saturnum memini tellure receptum/ Coelitibus regnis ab Iove pulsus erat./ Inde diu genti mansit Saturnia nomen,/ dicta quoque est Latium terra latente, Deo." *Soror* Diana; *sacello* diminutum a sacro; *dea* Pallas; *ruber* Priapus a rubeo; *aequo* iusto; quando habet primam brevem et scribitur sine (ms. secundum) diphthongo, significat animal. *Custos* Ovidius primo Fast. (F. 1,415) "at ruber, hortorum decus (ms. deus) et tutela, Priapus"; *praetende* antepone hanc mentulam..../[*Expl.*]: Auctor quod mulieres malae optent longum penem (CP LXXX): *Stat* erecta est; *crassa* grossa et mollis; *mensura* magnitudo; *aliud* donum; *eo sensu* quod cito erigatur; *utilior* fuit; *Tideus* filius Oenei regis Calidoniae ex Periboea (ms. Euriboeae); Servius VI.Aeneidis (*Comm.in Verg.Aen.* 6,479) vel ex Althaea uxore, ut alii asserunt. Qui cum venando fratrem Menalippum inadvertentem occidisset, furorem populi extimescens relicto paterno regno ad Adrastum Argivorum

regem confugit, et fuit unus ex septem ducibus, qui contra Thebas iere: Alystes, Adrastus, Policines (*sic*), Capaneus, Hippomedon, Amphiaraus, Parthenopeus. *Dum vivis* qui dicat illud Theocriti: “viventes sperent sine spe decet esse iacentes” (*Idyll.* 4,42), id est mortuos.

Manuscript:

(Micro) Perugia, Biblioteca Comunale Augusta, Cod. H 63, s.XV-XVI, 175 fols., miscellaneous manuscript. Comm.on Persius, Ovid, Tibullus and others; the *Priapea* commentary is on f.149-155, the text of the epigrams is missing. (Mazzatinti V 153, no.578; Kristeller, *Iter II* 58a).

6. JOSEPHUS JUSTUS SCALIGER

Scaliger had completed a commentary on the Virgilian *Catalecta* (i.e. *Catalepton*) by 1567. This commentary was to be supervised through publication at Paris by his friend Petrus Pithoeus (Pierre Pithou, 1539-1596), but the civil wars made this impossible, and Pithoeus returned the manuscript to Scaliger. About 1571 Scaliger wrote from Valence that he hoped to publish the commentary at Lyons, where he was planning to go with his friend Iacobus Cuiaci (Jacques Cujas, 1522-1590), to whom the edition as a whole was later dedicated (See *First Dedication*). In this dedication Scaliger puts the entire responsibility for the publication on Cujas and seems very nervous that he will be attacked for it. Scaliger had in the meantime completed other Virgilian commentaries (i.e. on the *Appendix Vergiliana*), which were to be published together with the one on the *Catalepton*. He was still at Lyons in August 1572 when his work was finally printed. It also contains a commentary on the *Great Priapea*, though Scaliger does not believe Virgil to be the author. The only aim of this part of the commentary is to demonstrate that all the lexical components of the *Carmina Priapea* can be found in epigrams of Catullus, Tibullus, Ovid, Petronius Arbiter, and others, poets who had written Priapic poetry. It is up to the reader to draw the right conclusions: Virgil cannot be the author of the *Carmina Priapea*;

the author is presumably one of the poets mentioned before, or several or even all of them.

Scaliger dedicates his commentary on the *Carmina Priapea* to his friend Sébastien Senneton (See *Second Dedication*), whom he asks to defend the work against any possible detractor. He separates the three *Priapea* from the bulk of the *Catalepton* and integrates them as nos.84-86 into the *Great Priapea*. He also translates into Greek two epigrams (nos.83 and 85) which he ascribes to Tibullus and Catullus respectively.

Scaliger's commentary was reprinted several times. Beginning with the 1595 edition, it appeared in a revised form; the revision was carried out by Friedrich Lindenbruch, who was able to make use of Scaliger's own notes (see below p. 445).

First Dedication (ed. of Lyons, 1573). Clarissimo viro Iacobo Cuiacio Iurisconsulto Iosephus Scaliger Iulii Caesaris Filius S.D. [Inc.]: Cum una Lugduni essemus, Iacobe Cuiaci vir clarissime et eruditissime, et variis inter nos sermonibus de hisce meis in Appendix Virgilianam lucubrationibus ultiro citroque inter nos agitatum esset, tandem eo res deducta est, ut propter eas, quas olim obici mihi meminassem, rationes vel differenda vel prorsus non praecipitanda earum mihi videtur editio. Tu vero ibi contra me hortari, timido calcar addere, diffidentem ac prorsus omni spe deiectum erigere denique illa tua, qua ante omnes mortales plurimum apud me potes auctoritate confirmare. Quibus rationibus hanc editionis necessitatem a me deprecatus sim, quibus tu contra machinis de illa animi pertinacia, quo tanquam unico subrustici pudoris mei praesidio fretus eram, me deieceris, non alienus hic disserendi locus videbatur.../[Expl.]: Esto hoc pignus mei in te amoris et observantiae, esto absentiae nostrae praesentia, remotissimorum corporum fidissima coniunctio, dum interim ego tui desiderium ferre non possum. Vale Lugduni XI Kal. Septembbris (August 22).

Second Dedication (ed. of Lyons, 1573). *In Priapeia diversorum Poetarum Iosephus Scaliger, Iulii Caesaris Filius, Sebastiano Sennetonio suo salutem.* [Inc.]: (p.447) Annus hic est plus minus, mi Senneton, cum liber

iste iam typographorum manibus teritur neque tamen causam mutare potuit. Semper enim eadem illum quae superioribus bellis civilibus tempestas iactavit, semper eandem fortunam iniquam et adversam expertus est. Nam superiorum temporum calamitati expositus fuit, quod et id commune cum hominibus habuit, postea vero et hominum et meae etiam iniuriae. Parum enim abfuit, quin periculo, quod ei homines ultro creaverant, praepostero quodam iudicio, prudens sciensque subscriperim, ut indicta causa paene illum damnarem. Scis enim, quae sequuntur poematia eiusmodi esse, ut eorum omnes fere, nisi si qui penitus pudorem amiserunt, pudeat, pigeatque: flagitiosa, petulantia, obscena. Evidem sic omnia confiteor: scelestissimi, qui haec in vulgus ediderunt. Execrandum porro saeclum illud, in quo turpia scribere hominibus licuerit, cum et turpia facere non prohiberentur. Nam quis haec negare audeat? Cur ergo, inquies, haec vulgas, cur interpretaris, quid minus utile fuit, quam hoc ulcus tangere? Prius dicant velim: an possum ea supprimere, quae tot iam editionibus publicata sunt? deinde quare non licebit mihi, quod omnibus licuit etiam sanctissimis et doctissimis viris? Postremo quid in interpretatione nostra aut ita suspectum est, ut non tecte, aut ita aperte dictum est, quod non necessario dicendum fuerit? Oro te, mi Sennetoni, qui et vitam et mores nostros penitus et in cute notos habes, ut causam nostram defendas, non dico apud doctissimos viros—satis enim illis perspecta et mea et scriptorum meorum integritas atque innocentia—sed apud genus hoc hominum, qui neque menorunt neque scripta mea intelligunt. Hoc pro nostro inter nos amore ac benevolentia facies, certo scio. Cupio enim talem amicitiae nostrae cumulum accedere, ut quem tibi suavissimis moribus tuis antehac praesentem devinxisti, eum etiam sedulitate et officio tuo absentem tueare. Vale. Lugduni, XI.Kal. Septemb. (August 22).

Commentary. [Inc.]: (p.448) Scripserunt huius argumenti poematia plures veterum, Catullus, Tibullus, Ovidius, Petronius Arbiter, alii. Itaque ex illorum epigrammatis totus hic liber concinnatus est et conflatus ab eo, qui

epigramma illud libro praeposuit “Carminis incompti, etc.” et “Ludens haec ego, etc.” Nam ne adscriberent haec Partheniae nostro, poterat eos monere os hominis probum, vita pudica, integrimores. Sane Petronium huiusc argumenti et nominis quaedam lusisse auctor Sidonius, “Et te Massiliensium per hortos/ Sacri stipitis, arbiter, colonum/Hellespontiacum parem Priapo” (*Carm.* XXIII, 155-157). Quidam etiam ex Graecis libros singulares eiusdem materiae scripsere, inter quos maximi nominis Euphronius poeta. Strabo, cum de urbe Orneia scribebat, ait templum Priapi in ea fuisse, “ἀφ' ὅν”, inquit, “καὶ οὐ τά Πριάπεια ποιήσας Εὐφρόνιος Ὁρνεάτην καλεῖ τὸν θεόν” (*Geogr.* 8.6.24).

Carminis incompti (CP I,1) Hinc Ausonius accepit illud prooemium: “Carminis incompti tenuem lectare libellum/ Pone supercilium” (lb.IX, Bissula 2.1). *Obscure poteram* (CP III,1) Est Ovidii hoc epigramma (frg. 8,1), ut ex Seneca (*Contr.* 1.2.22) colligimus, qui illum versiculum ex eo citat: “Dum timet alterius vulnus inepta loci” . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p.478) *Nervos excitet* (CP LXXXIII,42) “Nervos” ἀρχαικῶς pro “nervus” recto casu. “Excitet” vero παθητικῶς, ut Varro(?) “mutat mare”, et Catullus (*Carm.* XXII,11) “tantum abhorret, ac mutat”; non “nutat”, ut in vulgatis. Item Gellius lib.2, cap.23 “quantum stupere, ac frigere, quantumque mutare a Menandro Caecilius visus est.” At editiones hodiernae perperam habent “nutare”. Hic vero “nervus excitet”, est σύνοιτο. At membrana illa fidelissima habebat “Ridente nervus excubet lubidine”, quae vera est lectio: in excubiis sit, sic vulgo Galli, “soit aux aguets”. Non potuit elegantius dici. *Neque mutare* (CP LXXXIII,44) Non constat versus. Vetus illa bona membrana et nonnullae editiones habent: “Neque incitare cesseret”, quod et nos sequuti sumus in nostris iambis Graecis. Totidem enim iambis puris hoc etiam elegantissimum poematum redidimus, quod et ipsum apponemus, si modo tanti est, ut hic locum habere possit. (There follows on p.479 the Greek translations of nos.83 and 85 and the commentary on nos. 84-86....*nutrivi magis* (CP LXXXVI,4) Haec non sunt nauci. Lego Nunc tuor magis.

Deinde sequentem versum puto ita ex-plendum: "Pauperis tuguri, pater filiusque coloni."

Editions:

(*) 1572, Lugduni (Lyons): apud Guiliel-mum Rovillum, Ed. of the *Appendix Vergili-an*a with commentary and emendations. The text of the *Carmina Priapea* is on p.68–91, the commentary on p.447–479. Graesse 6,2.350; Baudrier IX 342. BM; BN.

1573, Lugduni (Lyons): apud Guilielmum Rovillum; reprint of ed.1572. Graesse 6,2.350; Baudrier IX 346. BM; BN; (NJP).

1595. See Composite Editions

1617. See Composite Editions

1654. See Composite Editions

1669/71. See Composite Editions

1731. See Composite Editions

1853. See Composite Editions

Biography:

See CTC II 13 and above p. 289.

7. FRIEDRICH LINDENBRUCH

Scaliger once named his three Hamburg friends Friedrich and Heinrich Lindenbruch and Jan van der Wouver (1574–1612) "les grands plagiaires", because in his opinion they were only poor compilers who depended solely on others. Nevertheless, he always cultivated this relationship, because he considered Friedrich Lindenbruch to be an influential representative of German intellectual life. In order to do him a favor, Scaliger even let him have his own supplements and additions to his *Appendix* commentary, which Lindenbruch was to reedit. Lindenbruch's edition (it is dedicated to Pierre [1539–1596] and François [1543–1621] Pithou) appeared in 1595 and represents a considerable revision of the 1572 edition. Lindenbruch was not always exact when transcribing Scaliger's addenda; whereas in the editions supervised by Scaliger himself, for instance, the *Indices* are always examples of accuracy and planning, in the Lindenbruch edition even major errors are not unusual. But Lindenbruch also added some original notes, among them some references to other classical authors; he also risked

some conjectures. On the whole, however, their value does not appear to be very great.

Dedication (ed. of Leyden, 1595). Clarissi-mis doctissimisque viris Petro et Francisco Pithoeo I. C. Fratibus. [Inc.]: Priscis temporibus, viri clarissimi, cum adhuc virtus placeret, interroganti cuidam τι ἄν τις ποιῶν γλυκὺς γίνεται; sic fertur respondisse philosophus οὐ δύναται ὅλος ἀνθρώπος ποιεῖν. . . . Ceterum, viri clarissimi, cum vos inter primos iudicem, qui rem litterariam ac bonae mentis amatores amant et tuentur, simul ut veri mei erga vos monumentum amoris appareat, hunc vobis librum dicare decrevi. Et mediusfidius vellem maiore aliquo munere me vobis approbare possem, quod quoniam impraesentiarum negatum est, volui saltim hoc libro, iam antea quidem ab illustrissimo D. Iosepho Scaligero emendato et illustrato, nunc autem me curante, plurimis in locis aucto denuoque edito. Cui et ego paucas notas adieci, quod non fecisset, nisi aliis aliter visum fuisse, cum quibus super hac re contentionis funem ducere nefas putavi. . . . [Expl.]: Quas quidem prae aliis ex causa quam dixi com-mittere placuit, viri clarissimi, vobis. "Quibus est amor et prudentia iuxta/ Et labor in studiis semper celebratus inhaeret." Valete feliciter. Lugduni Batavorum III Idus Martii. Vestri nominis diligens cultor Fridericus Lindenbruch.

Preface (ed.of Leyden, 1595). *Lectori.* [Inc.]: (p.288) Cum saepius audivissem, benivole lector, optimi huius libri pauca admodum immo propemodum nulla exemplaria haberi, tandem typographo auctor fui, ut denuo eum prelo committeret. Quod cum ille facere suscepisset, summa ope adnixus sum, ut quantum maxime fieri posset, prioribus editionibus melior et emendatior prodiret; id quod mihi feliciter cessit. Nactus enim sum exemplar, in quo ab illustrissimo domino Iosepho Scaligero, Iulii Caesaris filio, plurima addita, quaedam etiam mutata erant, quae omnia in utriusque nostrum usum hic sedulo exhibeo. Poteram sane solus isto libro frui, sed publice prodesse malui. Qua etiam unica de causa notas hasce meas addi passus sum, non gloriolae dulcedine

instinctus. Hoc te monere volui, ne inscius essem. Vale.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (p.304) *Sed ruber hortorum custos* (*CP* I,5) "Ruber" dicitur propter fascinum rubrum. Catullus: "Sedet revinctus cum rubenti fascino", at alibi in *Priapeis*, "Rubro Priape furibus minare mutino." Horatius lib.I, *Sat.* VIII: "Obscenoque ruber porrectus ab inguine palus." *Cum tenet obsessas invidia barba genas* (*CP* III,4). Malim "ninguida barba", sic infra, "canis cum barba caput albicet capillis" . . . / . . . [Expl.]: *Ennaeae Cererem* (*CP* LXXV, 12) Stephanus *de urbibus* "Ἐννα, πόλις Σικέλιας, κτίσμα Συραχονούσιων, μετὰ δὲ την Συραχονούσων. Ο πολίτης Ἐνναῖος καὶ Ἐνναῖα." Semper apud Iul. Firmicum "Henna" legitur, non "Enna", et male apud Sidonium "Aenna", per "AE". *Hoc est laedere dum iuvatis* (*CP* LXXVII,4) Ovidius *Tristium* lib.I "Tantum ne noceas, dum vis prodesse, memento."

Editions:

- 1595. See Composite Editions
- 1617. See Composite Editions
- 1654. See Composite Editions
- 1669/71. See Composite Editions
- 1731. See Composite Editions

Biography:

Friedrich Lindenbruch (Lindenborg; Lindenbrog; Lindenbrogius) was born in Hamburg on December 28, 1573. He studied law in Leyden. After completing his studies, he travelled through England, France, Italy and Germany and came into close contact with the leading philologists of these countries. In 1608 he became iur.lic. in Basel and went back to his native city, where he practised law and held various public offices. He died on Sept. 9, 1648 and left a considerable library, consisting of his own books, as well as the extensive collection of his father Erpold (1540–1616) and brother Heinrich (1570–1642), to Hamburg.

Works: He edited or commented on Probus (1600), Statius (1600), Terentius (1602), Ammianus Marcellinus (1609), Heliodorus (1610); his annotated edition of

the *Lex Salica* (1602) and the collection *Codex legum veterum* (1613) are famous.

Bibl.: *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* XVIII (1883) 692–693 (Halm); Rudolf von Raumer, *Geschichte der Germanischen Philologie* (Gesch.d.Wiss.in Deutschland, Neuere Zeit IX, München, 1870) 49 sq.; Conrad Bursian, *Geschichte der Classischen Philologie in Deutschland* (Same Collection, XIX,1/2, München und Leipzig, 1883) I 307–308; J.A.Roderich von Stintzing, *Geschichte der deutschen Rechtswissenschaft* (Same Collection, XVIII,1/2, München und Leipzig 1880–1884) I 738; Nikolaus Wilkens, *Leben der berühmten Lindenbrogiorum*, Hamburg, 1723.

8. CASPAR SCIOPPIUS

In 1606 a *Priapea* commentary was published in Frankfurt a. M. (the edition is dated 1506, evidently a printer's error); the dedicatory letter is addressed to a certain Nicolaus Papponius and is dated Ingolstadt 1596. This letter is signed by Caspar Scioppius, to whom the commentary is ascribed by most handbooks. The publication immediately led to a denial by Scioppius of his authorship. The denial is found in a most obscene and perfidious pamphlet, the *Scaliger hypobolimaeus* (Mainz, 1607) in which Scioppius calls into question both Scaliger's alleged noble ancestry and also his moral integrity. Scioppius specifically finds signs of Scaliger's moral corruption in the latter's commentary on the *Appendix Vergiliana* and the *Priapea* (see above, p. 443). Scioppius goes on to deny, in reference to the commentary published under his name in 1606, that he had ever written or published such a commentary himself, and he supports the denial with numerous arguments. He suggests that Melchior Goldast (1578–1635) had pieced together the 1606 commentary and that Goldast had made use of a few observations on the *Carmina Priapea* which could be found in Scioppius' notes.

The truth of the matter now seems clear on the basis of statements found in letters of

contemporary scholars. The 1606 edition was indeed supervised by Scioppius' childhood friend, Melchior Goldast. Scioppius, once a Protestant, had espoused Catholicism around 1597, and from then on had fought aggressively against his former fellow-believers; Goldast, in turn, intended to use the commentary to show that Scioppius had written extensively about the most lascivious subjects.

Scioppius and Goldast had studied together in Altdorf, and Goldast had been for a while the 'amanuensis' of Scioppius. In this capacity, Goldast was allowed to copy Scioppius' notes and to make full use of them. It appears that the Scioppius commentary on the *Priapea* thus came into his hands and that he published it for polemic reasons in 1606. Scioppius' assertion that Goldast had simply incorporated some of Scioppius' notes is unconvincing, since the commentary is characterized throughout by personal remarks and reminiscences about his youth which could come only from Scioppius. In a letter to Marcus Welser (December 12, 1610), Goldast does not in the least deny that he had supervised the 1606 edition, but he says that Scioppius had authorized him to do so some years before and had then forgotten ever to withdraw the authorization; the letter also proves that there never was a 1596 edition of the commentary as most handbooks assert, though the dedicatory letter seems to be authentic.

As far as the commentary is concerned, it has the lustre and brilliance characteristic of the young Scioppius. He had been a child prodigy, and in the course of his wide classical reading he had found so many passages which he was able to emend successfully that his teacher and paternal friend Konrad Rittershausen (1560–1613) encouraged him to publish these conjectures. Scioppius did so and at the age of 21 submitted to the public his *Verisimilia* (1596) and *Suspectarum lectionum libri*. These books won him wide praise, even that of his later enemy Scaliger, and his conjectures were widely recognized as extremely skillful.

These qualities are also found in the *Priapea* commentary, which however is mainly intended to explain the passages which would be difficult for a reader not acquainted with Latin poetry. The preliminary section on mythology and literature were intended to serve the same purpose. Scioppius has a good knowledge of earlier *Priapea* commentaries and often refers to Scaliger. Scioppius was later charged with lasciviousness, especially because of the commentary on CP XXVI, which is mentioned not only by Bayle in his *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, but also by Goethe in his own *Priapea* notes.

Dedication (ed. of Frankfurt a.M., 1606).
 Gaspar Scioppius Francus Nicolao Papponio suo salutem dicit.[Inc.]: Non eram nescius, amicissime Nicolae, cum Priapeia Virgilii potissimum interpretanda suscipi perem, veniam eius rei praefanti, idem quod A. Albino Viro Clarissimo contigisse legimus, eventurum.... Cum diebus superioribus temere, ut fit, Virgilium in manus sumpsissem, ut mearum me operarum et notarum ad illum adulescentiae delectarem, forte in Catalecta et Priapeia incido et inibi, carminum elegantia a variis auctori bus summo cum studio libatorum delenitus, sortem nostram deplorare coepi, quippe quibus ex tam turbidis fontibus aqua limpidissima, flos nimirum Latinae linguae, hauriendus sit. Et dubitavi primum, si in rem esset, talia adulescentibus et ephebis nostris propinare.... De eruditione hic non necesse habeo dicere, quando ea ex his ipsis commentariis et indice nostro a quovis mediocriter literato intelligi potest. Habent quod petant hinc medici, ut verba quibus partes humani corporis minus severas commode et verecunde appellare possint et alia nonnulla a nobis in commentariis observata. Habent iureconsulti, ad quos suo quodam iure verborum significatio pertinent. Et, quod mireris, habent denique, quod sibi cognitu sit necessarium, theologi. Quo enim modo de horrendis ethnicorum sceleribus, de paedicatione, quam sodomitiam vocamus, vere et certo loqui eamque detestari poterunt, nisi eam ex scriptis illorum cognoverint? Sed quid verbis

opus est, cum carminum horum eruditio non tam testimonio quam obscenitas venia indigere videatur? . . . In iis, quae turpicula et lasciviuscula sunt, ille, qui, ut ait Aristoteles, bona institutione praemunitus est, offendere nequit. Adeo ut molliculos istos, qui vel una tali et altera lectione verberantur et ad nequitiam obducuntur, sua sibi culpa et in Venerem putredine perire videas. Haud secus, ac si terribili obiecta re timidus expavescat, fortis non afficiatur. Et, ut facilius verbis meis fidem arbitrere, summos olim philosophos et Christianae Ecclesiae doctores et episcopos vigilantissimos ac castissimos a me auctoritate sua stetisse, affirmare nihil dubito. . . . Et nos de tantorum virorum pietate et castitate eo dubitabimus, quod obscenos autores frequenter lectitaverint? Dices non eam esse adulescentium rationem, quae virorum, quorum affectus in bonum confirmati non temere labefactari possint. Sed idem de comissionibus, de comoediis et fabulis dicendum videtur. Ad has tamen iuventutem bona institutione praemunitam laudato superius loco Aristoteles admittit, quippe quos ab labo eiusmodi disciplina insontes effecerit. Et liber hic noster talis est, qui vel commentariis illustratus non nisi a grandioribus, quosque intellecta vitiorum turpitudine doctrina absterrere poterit, intelligetur. Praeclare Iosephus Scaliger poetarum lectionem mari comparavit, in qua obscena scopulorum vice sint, ad eos peritum nautam numquam offendere, sed secure praetervehi. . . . Enim, ne longe abeam, his ipsis carminibus opera sua commodare Scaliger non erubuit et emendationibus ac interpretationibus nonnullis illustravit, quas suo quoque loco fideliter auctori transcripsimus. Idem ille Scaliger Catullum, Tibullum et Propertium, qui verecundius Priapo nostro non loquuntur, commentariis suis eruditissimis ante vix intellectos post Muretum explanavit. Idem quoque Ausonium nobis interpretatus est. Ne quid hic de Lambino in Plautum et Horatium, ne de Douzae pro Petronio praecidaneis dicam. . . . [Expl.]: Habes iam, eruditissime Nicolae, quibus et rationibus et exemplis ad commentationes has adductus fuerim. Eas cur tuo potissimum

nomini dare voluerim, nemo, qui nos ambo probius neverit, mirabitur. Ut enim alia omittam, ita amici iam diu vivimus, ut peccarem, si alium tibi anteponerem. Ita de eruditione et doctrina in humanitatis et iuris civilis studio excultum perspexi, ut non nisi cum flagitio alium huic rei iudicem seligerem. Quare librum hunc sic a me accipias velim, ut me et amicitiam nostram coluisse et eruditio nem virtutesque tuas vere aestimasse existimes. Bene vale. Ingolstadio, Anno MDXCVI.

Preface. Conlectanea de Priapo accuratissima, magnam partem ex his Priapeiis desumpta. [Inc.]: Antequam ad ipsam poematis huius interpretationem accedamus, curae nos pretium facturos opinamur, si Conlectaneis de Priapo praemissis operis huius et auctorem et argumentum subiungamus. Inter recentiores ergo, qui de Priapo scripserunt, nullus cum Lilio Gyraldo Ferrariensi, meo quidem animo, contendendus videtur. Alii enim, ut Ioannes Boccatus, Ludovicus Vives in Augustin. de Civit. Dei, Natalis Comes et Vincentius Charderius, praeter quod illa, quae ab Gyraldo inventa iam ante fuerant, in succum et sanguinem convertunt suum, tum ineptis insuper quibusdam sententiis absque ulla iudicii et rationis sinceritate, nobis rerum videlicet omnium ignaris, imponere se postulant. Nos ductum Gyraldi et poematis huius fideliter sequentes, non tam, quid possit, quam quid dici in praesentia debeat, pensi habentes, ad ipsam tandem de Priapo dissertationem nos accingamus. . . . [Expl.]: *Carmin. 34.* puella quaedam, quot viros una nocte experta fuerat, tot verpas salignas Priapo dedicat. *carmin. vid. 37* pro sanato fascino suo quidam tabellam votivam in Priapi sacello suspendit. Eius denique mentulam coronis cingere solebant, *carmin. 40:* "Cingit inaurata penem tibi, Sancte, corona", et 50: "Totam comparibus, Priape, nostris/ Cingemus tibi mentulam coronis."

De auctore operis. [Inc.]: De auctore carminum horum, ut dicamus, res monet. Quod ergo Virgilio a quibusdam tribuuntur, male id fieri existimo et Iovem lapidem iurare ausim, nullum horum a Virgilio factum fuisse, quod et doctis placere video. Mihi

vero simile fit, in horto Maecenatis sacellum Priapo dicatum fuisse et ex iis poetis, qui ad Maecenatem suum quotidie visebant, unumquemque versiculos aliquot iocosos in sacelli parietibus notasee, quod hic confirmari videtur, *carmin.1*: “Ergo, quicquid id est, quod otiosus/ Templi parietibus tui notavi,/ In partem accipias bonam rogamus” . . . / . . .
 [Expl.]: Argumentum autem libelli huius varium est, modo enim vel poeta vel puella aliqua vel viator vel villicus Priapum adloquitur. Interdum immo saepius Priapus furibus masculini et feminini sexus stuprum suadet vel minatur, sortem suam miseratur, de tentigine sua, de furibus, de puellis lascivis super inguina Priapi de nocte molentibus conqueri et alia longe plurima, quae hic recensere infinitum sit et a lectore nullo negotio intelligi facile poterunt.

Lectori salutem. [Inc.]: Monendus es, benevole lector, quisquis eris, cuiatis eris, sicubi dictionem aliquam in commentariis non satis interpretatus fuerim, ad indicem tibi visendum esse. De orthographiae ratione, quam servavi, solicitus esse noli. Illam enim, quam doctis placere et librorum manuscriptorum auctoritate niti intellexeram, non sequi mihi religio fuit. Tantum est. Tu vale, lector, et Priapum nostrum nunc ipsum contempla.

Commentary. *Diversorum poetarum in Priapum lusus. Ad Lectorem.* [Inc.]: Carminis incompti lusus lecture procaces . . . aut quibus hanc oculis aspicis, ista lege (entire text of CP I). *Commentarius.* *Incompti* (CP I,1) scripti nimirum, ut carmine sequenti ait, non nimium laboriose et inornati, nec exacti satis. “Comere” enim est “ornare”; Ausonius (*Carm. de diversis rebus* 26,3) “Come serenatam duplice diademate frontem”, idem “Tu quoque qui Latium lecto sermone Terenti/ Comis et adstricto percurris pulpita socco.” *Lusus.* Ludere dicitur in re, ad quam efficiendam et impetrandam non magno labore usus est, ut carmine sequenti “Ludens scripsi”, et hoc in vulgus etiam notum est, nec pueri ignorant, nisi qui nondum aere lavantur . . . / . . . [Expl.]: Hunc ego iuvenes locum villulamque palustrem . . . Inde sumite, semita haec deinde vos feret

ipsa (entire text of *Appendix Verg., Priapea III*) . . . *Perfecto honore* ait, idest “peracto sacrificio”, qui est honor deorum. Plura suppeditat Brissonius I. Formul. fol. 22. *Vicus* indicat pueris agrum vicinum, unde commodius eripere aliquid possint, quod et dominum divitem habeat et negligentem Priapum.

Editions:

1606 (instead of 1506), Francofurti (Frankfurt a.M.): in officina typographica Wolfgangi Richteri, sumptibus Conradi Nebenii. Schweiger II,2 821; Graesse 5.441 (used copy Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen Auct. lat. I 410). Göttingen, UB; Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek 169 Poet.

(*) 1662/64, Amstelodami (Amsterdam), part I of Scioppius’ *Vérisimilia*. Schweiger II,2 821; Graesse 5.441.

1654. See Composite Editions

1664. See Composite Editions

1669/71. See Composite Editions

1731. See Composite Editions

Doubtful or rejected edition:

1596, Ingolstadt. Kowallek, Ueber Gaspar Scioppius, 479; D’Addio, *Il pensiero politico di Gaspare Scioppio*, 11 and 593.

Biography:

Caspar Scioppius (Gaspare Scioppio; Kaspar Schoppe) was born in Burgteswitz/Oberpfalz on May 27, 1576. He studied law and classical literature in Altdorf, Ingolstadt, and Heidelberg. After completing his studies he travelled to Verona and Prague, where he espoused Catholicism around 1597. From 1598 to 1607 he lived in Rome. Later he was a diplomat in the service of the Emperor. After 1636 he retired to Padua, where he died on November 19, 1649, according to others on October 18. He was one of the most prolific pamphleteers and publicists of his time and took part actively in the events of the Thirty Years’ War. He was a brilliant Latinist and polemicist and left many pseudonymous writings.

Works: For a complete list of his polemical, philosophical, philological, historical, didactic and exegetical works and his controversial sermons see D’Addio, p.593 sqq.

Bibl.: Bayle, *Dictionnaire historique et*

critique IV (1730) 172-180; Nicéron XXXV, 165-230; Jöcher IV coll.421-425; Moréri IX 289; *Biographie universelle* II (1834) 366-367 (Feller); *Biographie universelle ou dictionnaire historique* V (1841) 476-477; *Nouvelle biographie générale* XLIII (1864) coll.581-584; *Biographie universelle* XXXVIII (s.d.) 509-511; *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* XXXIII (1891) 479-484 (R. Hoche); *Jesuiten-Lexicon* (1934) coll. 1571-1574; *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* 9.552 (R.Bäumer); *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* XIV coll. 1571-1574.

Charles Nisard, *Les gladiateurs de la république des lettres au XV^e, XVI^e et XVII^e siècles* II (Paris, 1860) 1-206; H.Kowallek,

'Ueber Gaspar Scioppius', *Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte* XI (1871) 401-482; Mario D'Addio, *Il pensiero politico di Gaspare Scioppio e il machiavellismo del seicento* (Istituto di studi storico-politici, Università di Roma, Facoltà di Scienze Politiche 4, Milano, 1962); Ulrich Helfenstein, 'Caspar Scioppius als Gesandter "Sultan" Jahjahs in der Eidgenossenschaft (1634/35)', *Mitteilungen der Antiquarischen Gesellschaft in Zürich* 42,2(1963); Frank-Rutger Hausmann, 'Kaspar Schoppe, Joseph Justus Scaliger und die *Carmina Priapea* oder wie man mit Büchern Rufmord betreibt', *Festschrift für Otto Herding* (Stuttgart, 1977) 382-395.