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Varro (116–27 B.C.) was the first Roman polyhistor. He studied grammar and related subjects at Rome with L. Aelius Stilo and philosophy at Athens with Antiochus of Ascalon. Embarking on a public career, he served three times under Pompey's command, namely, in the campaign (76 B.C.) against Sertorius, in the war (67 B.C.) with the Cilician pirates, and in the Civil War (49 B.C.) against Caesar, and attained the rank of praetor. After his pardon by Caesar, Varro lived quietly, devoting himself for the rest of his life to the studies that he had never interrupted, despite his other occupations. The result was a very large number of books on widely different subjects (history, philosophy, agriculture, grammar, rhetoric, geography, jurisprudence, literature, music, medicine, architecture) which firmly established him as the greatest scholar of ancient Rome. He is sometimes called 'Varro Reatinus' (from Reate, his probable birthplace) so as to distinguish him from Publius Terentius Varro 'Atacinus', a poet of the first century B.C. and native of Atax in Narbonese Gaul.

The exact number of his works is not known. According to Aulus Gellius (Noctes Atticae III. 10. 17), Varro remarked in the Hebdomades that, by the beginning of his seventy-eighth year (39 B.C.), he had composed 490 books. On the basis of a catalogue of his writings found in Jerome (Epist. 33. 2), who gives the titles of 48 or 47 single works in 490 books but adds that he has listed scarcely half ('vix medium descripti indicem'), F. Ritschl (Bibliography IV. A) estimated the total to be 74 works in 620 books. This figure has been generally accepted, although there is some disagreement among modern scholars regarding the origin of the catalogue. However, A. Klotz (Bibliography IV. A) has pointed out that, in order to accept Ritschl's calculations in the light of Varro's own statement, it is necessary to assume that from 39 B.C. until his death in 27 B.C. he composed over a dozen books yearly, an achievement which was perhaps not remarkable in his youth but might justly be considered so in his old age.

Of his writings, only the De re rustica, published in 37 B.C., has survived entire. Aimed at a class of solid and prosperous farmers, the manual consists of three books, each dedicated to a different person (respectively, his wife Fundania, Turranius Niger, a friend, and Quintus Pinnius, a neighbor) and dealing with a different aspect of farming (the cultivation of the soil, raising of cattle and sheep, and care of smaller livestock such as poultry, birds, and bees). R. Martin (Bibliography V) suggests that the present form of the treatise resulted from Varro's decision to combine two previous works (book I, written c. 55 B.C., and book II, of undetermined date) with a newly composed third work (our book III) to form a practical handbook.

Next in order of completeness is the De lingua latina, composed between 47 and 45 B.C. and probably published in 43 B.C. before the death of Cicero to whom it is dedicated. From the original twenty-five books six have been preserved, although with considerable lacunae: books V–VII treat the origin of words and more particularly place names and objects in the places (V), words connected with time (VI), and rare and unusual words in poetry (VII); books VIII–X consider the derivation of words from other words, giving the arguments against analogy (VIII), the arguments for its existence (IX), and Varro's solution of the problem in favor of its existence (X). The etymologies are often curious, and many of them are wrong, but the work is important because it contains numerous quotations from the older Latin poets, for whom it is sometimes the only source.

Among the more important of the approximately sixty titles now represented, in most cases, at least by fragments are the following: Saturae Menippeae, written
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probably between 81 B. C. and 67 B. C., in 150 books, of which 90 titles and 600 fragments survive, consisting of humorous essays in prose and poetry modeled on the dialogues of Menippus of Gadara (a Cynic philosopher of the first half of the third century B. C.); Logistorici in 76 books, the majority of which were probably composed around the middle of the first century B. C., consisting of dialogues on a wide range of subjects, with each book having a double title (e. g. Tubero de origine humana); Antiquitates rerum divinarum, dedicated to Caesar and completed in 47 B. C., treating in 16 books such religious questions as priests, temples, festivals and games, and the gods; Antiquitates rerum humanarum, published some time before the Antiquitates rerum divinarum and dealing in 25 books with persons, places, times, and men’s actions; Imagines vel Hebdomades, published in 39 B. C., in 15 books which contained biographies of distinguished Romans and Greeks together with their portraits, thus making the work the first illustrated volume; Disciplinae in 9 books, the first encyclopedia of the liberal arts, embracing grammar, dialectic, rhetoric, geometry, arithmetic, astrology, music, medicine, and architecture; various grammatical works, including De origine linguae latinae in 3 books addressed to Pompey and De sermone latino in at least 5 books dedicated to Marcellus which dealt with orthography and metre; works on poetry, literature, and drama, e.g. De poetatis. De poetis. De compositione saturarum. Quaestiones Plautinae in 5 books containing interpretations of rare words in Plautus, and De comœdiis Plautiniis in which he drew up a list of 21 plays universally regarded as genuine and believed to be the same 21 plays that have reached us from antiquity. The collection of epigrams that circulated in the Middle Ages as the Sententiae Varronis was not composed by him; the date of this compilation, which exhibits reminiscences of Horace, Ovid, Publilius Syrus, and the younger Seneca, is uncertain.

Varro’s erudition and seemingly indefatigable capacity for research, together with his immense output, earned the respect and admiration of contemporaries and writers of the Empire and eventually he became a symbol of general knowledge. In Brutus XV. 60 Cicero refers to him as ‘Varro noster diligentissimus investigator antiquitatis’ and at LVI. 205 as ‘vir ingeni praestans omnique doctrina’. The second edition of the Academica, in which Varro is one of the interlocutors, is also dedicated to him, and Cicero describes with praise (I. 3. 9) the many areas covered in his writings. Other authors who allude to his learning include Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Antiquit. Rom. II. 21. 2), Seneca (Cons. ad Helviam VIII. 1), Quintilian (Instit. orat. X. 1. 95, XII. 11. 24), Plutarch (Vita Romuli XII. 2), and Apuleius (Apologia XLII).

Given Varro’s reputation and the quantity of information which he had assembled through his reading of the Greek and Roman authorities, it was inevitable that he quickly became an authority himself who inspired, whether directly or through an intermediary, numerous and diverse works in classical times. He was, for example, one of Virgil’s principal sources in the Georgics. Although there is some debate regarding the extent of the debt, it is generally agreed that, among other things, Virgil’s invocation of the gods (Georgics I 5 ff.) is modeled on a similar passage in the De re rustica (I. 1. 5–6) as well as the instructions on ploughing (Georgics I 104 ff.; De re rustica I. 29. 2), eulogy of Italy (Georgics II 136–176; De re rustica I. 2. 3–8), discussion of the care of cattle, horses, sheep, and goats (Georgics III; De re rustica III), and the raising of bees (Georgics IV; De re rustica III. 16). Columella (De re rustica I. 1. 12) cites Varro’s De re rustica as an advancement over Cato’s manual, but his references to Varro in books I, III, V, VI, and VIII of his own handbook have to do chiefly with confirmation of a point or information regarding farming conditions in the past. Horace composed his Satires after the manner of Lucilius, but in Epist. II. 1 he demonstrates his awareness of Varro’s literary theories.
Ovid’s *Fasti* relied heavily on the *Antiquitates rerum divinarum et humanarum* and other works of this kind. The fragments of the Roman history in at least 22 books by Fenestella (52 B. C.–19 A. D. or 35 B. C.–36 A. D.) indicate similar antiquarian interests in the Varronian tradition. It has been suggested by B. M. Marti (Bibliography IV. A) that the ‘pseudotragoediae’ mentioned in Jerome’s catalogue served as a model for the tragedies of Seneca. The description of *ludi scaenici* and their origin as reported by Livy (VII. 2), Valerius Maximus (II. 4. 4), and later Tertullian (*De spectaculis* V–XII) seems to derive from Varro whose writings on drama also furnished material for Suetonius’ now lost *Ludicra historia*. In addition, Suetonius certainly drew as well upon Varro’s grammatical treatises for his *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, a division of *De viris illustribus*. Pliny the Elder lists Varro among the authorities for all except books IX, XXIV, XXV, XXVII, and XXXII of the *Historia naturalis*. No exhaustive study of his use of Varro has yet been made, but it appears to have been uneven. In the sections of books XXXIII–XXXVI that deal with art history, Varro is the author most frequently cited and hence is a *Hauptidele* even though there are probably only a few passages where he makes an original contribution and does not merely hand on what he has found in his Greek sources. However, in books III–VI which are concerned with geography, Pliny uses Varro sparingly, and seems to have known directly only the *Legationum libri III* and *De geometria*.

In the post-classical period there is ample testimony that Varro’s works were known and read, although it should be noted that the *De re rustica* was generally overshadowed by the comprehensive treatises of Columella and Palladius. In the *Divinae institutiones* Lactantius describes him as ‘M. Varro, quo nemo umquam doctior ne apud Graecos quidem vixit’ (I. 6. 7) and quotes from the *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*. He also cites Varro often in the *De opificio Dei*, but here he seems to have only a second-hand knowledge. The same may be true of Censorinus who, in the *De die natali*, mentions Varro nine times, referring once each to the *De scaenicis originibus* and book XVIII of the *Antiquitates rerum humanarum*. However, a direct knowledge of Varro may be proposed for at least some of the fourth- and fifth-century writers on grammar whose citation of numerous examples culled from his writings clearly attests their indebtedness. K. Barwick (Bibliography IV. A) has suggested that the first book (grammar) of the *Disciplinae* was a main source for the ‘school-book’ grammars of Donatus, Diomedes, Charisius, Dositheus, and Marius Victorinus. Servius, too, knew Varro at first hand, and his commentary on Virgil contains many references to such works as the *Logistorici*, *Antiquititates rerum divinarum et humanarum*. *De gente populi Romani, De vita populi Romani, De lingua latina*, and *De re rustica*. Macrobius also drew upon some of them, including the *Saturae Menippae*, for the *Saturnalia*. The *Saturae Menippae* and the *Disciplinae* appear to have served as models, the first for style and the second for content, for Martianus Capella’s *De nuptiis Mercurii et Philologiae*, an encyclopedia of the seven liberal arts; the order of books in the *De nuptiis* is identical with that of the *Disciplinae* except that Martianus used the first two books to introduce the allegory and omitted the last two books on medicine and architecture. His abridged version of the *Disciplinae* was the basis of the medieval *trivium* (grammar, dialectic, rhetoric) and *quadrivium* (geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, music).

Undoubtedly the most abundant evidence for the post-classical use of Varro is that provided by Augustine who appreciated his learning (see the eulogy of Varro in *De civitate Dei* VI. 2) and the information contained in his works but deplored the ‘pagan’ errors. According to *Retractiones* I. 6 Augustine, after his baptism in 387, began to compile an encyclopedia of the liberal arts, for which the *Disciplinae* apparently served as both model and source. (Of this early effort, however, there is extant only Augustine’s *De musica.*) Books IV, VI, and
VII of the *De civitate Dei*, which deal with Roman religion, are based to a large extent on *Antiquitates rerum divinarum* I, XIV, and XVI. *Curio de cultu deorum*, one of the *Logistorici*, is also cited in *De civitate Dei* VII. In some instances we owe to Augustine the preservation of all, or nearly all, the fragments of certain works. Cases in point are the *De philosophia*, remains of which are found exclusively in *De civitate Dei* XIX, and *De gente populi Romani* where 26 of the 38 fragments edited by P. Fraccaro (Bibliography I. C) occur in *De civitate Dei*, principally book XVIII.

By the sixth century and throughout the Middle Ages, Varro seems usually to have been known and used only indirectly. A good example of this is Cassiodorus who, in the second part of the *Institutiones*, does not list him among the secular authors to be read and appears to derive through an intermediary his seven citations of Varro and specific references to the *Disciplinae, De geometria*, and *De astrologia*. Isidore, too, knew Varro only at second hand, despite the fairly numerous quotations in the *Etymologiae* from the *De lingua latina* and other works. The citation at *Etymologiae* XV. 1. 63 of Varro’s description of the trilingual ‘Gallo-Scirici’ is repeated by Abbo of Vercelli (885–961) in his commentary on Paul’s epistle to the Galatians (Migne, *PL* CXXXIV. 494A). Varro was known through Augustine to Byrhtferth (Commentarius in Bedae De temporum ratione) in the tenth/eleventh century and in a similar manner to Papias (*Lexicon*) in the eleventh century. He is cited three times as an agricultural authority in the text of the *Geoponica*, a tenth-century compilation based on the Greek treatise of Cassianus Bassus (sixth century), but no direct knowledge was had of the *De re rustica*. In the twelfth century Hugh of St. Victor (*Didascalicon* III. 2) quotes, with only slight alterations, Isidore’s assessment (*Etymologiae* XVII. 1) of the roles played by Cato, Varro, and Columella in the development of the agricultural treatise.

There appear to be few, if any, entries for Varro’s works in the edited catalogues of medieval libraries, and the scarcity of early manuscripts seems to indicate as well that there was little demand for the writings themselves. The sole ancient witness for the *De lingua latina* is Laurentianus 51. 10 (s. XI ex.), copied at Montecassino by a Beneventan scribe and designated as ‘F’ by editors who agree that it is the archetype of the later manuscripts; for the *De re rustica* we have only Parisinus lat. 6842 A (s. XII/ XIII and called ‘A’ in the sigla) which also contains Cato. The lack of manuscripts of any of the other writings suggests that these works may have perished during the course of the Middle Ages, certainly, at any rate, after Augustine who still had access to them. (See, however, M. Simon, Bibliography IV. C, for curious sixteenth-century references to copies of the *De arithmetica*, apparently one of the parts of the *Disciplinae*.)

In connection with Laurentianus 51. 10, it may be pointed out that, if Varro were known at first hand to medieval authors, it was likely to have been in the region of Montecassino with which he had a special association because of his villa at the Roman Casinum. There are at least several indications that he received more attention here than elsewhere, the earliest of which is the inclusion in Parisinus lat. 7530, a Montecassino product in eighth-century Beneventan, of a section from Priscian’s *De figuris numerorum* consisting of an excerpt of *De lingua latina* V. 35. 168–36. 174. Hildericus, a ninth-century grammarian whose treatise is partially preserved in Montecassino ms. 299, cites Varro several times and in one instance gives what appears to be a genuine fragment that is not found elsewhere. This suggests that he either read Varro directly or had a more complete manuscript of Dio- medes, his source for the rest of the passage. In the early tenth century Auxilius, at *In defenseorem sacrae ordinationis papae Formosi* II 11 (‘revera enim pontifex appellatur quod pontem faciat’), may be recalling *De lingua latina* V. 15. 83. In the eleventh century Amatus (*In honorem Petri apostoli* IV. 1. 18) and Leo Ostiensis (*Chronicon Casinense* I. 1) recall Varro’s residence in the
area. Alphanumeric I (d. 1085), archbishop of Salerno, cites Varro in the *Vita s. Christiniae* (Migne, *PL* CXLVII. 1272D). And, finally, Peter the Deacon (c. 1107-post 1159) made a copy of *De lingua latina* V. 7. 41-9. 56 which now comprises pp. 65-67 of Montecassino ms. 361 (Bibliography III. B).

The use of the *De re rustica* by Petrus de Crescentii as a source for his *Ruralium commodorum libri XII* (composed around 1300) marks the beginning of early humanistic interest in Varro. It appears, too, that the *De re rustica* was the first of his works to attract their attention: excerpts are found in Verona, Bibl. Capitolare ms. CLXVIII (155), a florilegium compiled in 1329, and Guglielmo da Pastrenigo (d. 1363) refers frequently to the *De re rustica* in the *De originibus rerum*. Although Boccaccio has been cleared of the longstanding accusation that he was responsible for the removal of F from Montecassino (the culprit seems instead to have been Zanobi da Strada), the manuscript was clearly at one time in his possession, for ff. 4 and 14 contain notes in his hand. That he knew and certainly used both the *De lingua latina* and *De re rustica* is evident from the quotations in his *Genealogiae deorum gentilium libri XV*. He also supplied Petrarch (*Epist. fam.* XVIII. 4) with a copy of Varro’s works. Here mention may be made of the title of F. della Corte’s study of Varro (Bibliography II. A) which derives from the *Trionfo della fama* where Petrarch, placing Varro after Virgil and Cicero, calls him ‘il terzo gran lume romano’ (III. 37-38). Another humanist of this period who was acquainted with Varro was Coluccio Salutati. In letters dated 7 August 1383 (*Epist. V*. 16) and 25 March 1398 (*Epist. X*. 13) he cites *De re rustica* I. 1. 1 (‘homo bulla est’), and in a letter of 26 March 1406 addressed to Poggio Bracciolini (*Epist. XIV*. 27) he uses a phrase (‘pretium quasi *peritium*’) reminiscent of *De lingua latina* V. 36. 177. Various letters (*Epist. VIII*. 7, VIII. 8, XII. 23) show that in 1392 he made several unsuccessful attempts to obtain copies of Varro.

The fairly large number of manuscripts produced in the fifteenth century attests that knowledge of and demand for his writings were quite widespread. The *De lingua latina* and *De re rustica* are represented by approximately 60 and 30 codices respectively. In keeping with the pattern established in the Middle Ages, each work pursued a separate path, and it was not usual for a single manuscript to contain both of them, as is the case with Vaticanus lat. 3310 which, in addition to the *De re rustica* and *De lingua latina*, has also the *De re rustica* of Cato. The *De lingua latina* often appears alone (Copenhagen G1. Kgl. S. 1987, 4°, Escorial O. III. 29, Laurentianus 51. 6) or is combined with the works of such authors as Festus (Escorial S. III. 8, Leipzig Rep. I. 20 27, Riccardianus 3597) and Asconius Pedianus (Gotha Mbr. II 118). It is rare, however, for codices to contain only the *De re rustica* as does Oxford, Bodleian Lat. class. d. 2 which, since (according to the colophon) it was written in 1454 at Ferrara in the home of Guarinus Veronensis, was probably copied for a specific purpose. Generally the treatise appears in manuscripts exhibiting also the manuals of Cato (British Library Add. MS. 19355, Laurentianus 51. 1 and 51. 2) and/or Columella (British Library Arundel 81, Escorial R. I. 7, Vaticanus lat. 1524). It may further be noted that, because of apparent greater interest in the *De lingua latina*, manuscripts of this work display frequent corrections and marginalia, particularly for books V-VII, while manuscripts of the *De re rustica* seldom show signs of annotation. Scholars and collectors usually did not own the surviving *opera omnia*, for their libraries as a rule included either the *De lingua latina* or *De re rustica* but not both. Some owners of the former are Fulvius Ursinus (Vaticanus lat. 3308 and 3309), Augustinus Patricius Piccolomini (Chigi H. VII. 219) and Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (Chigi L. VI. 205) and, for the latter, Cardinal Bessarion (Venice Z. lat. 462), Federigo, Duke of Urbino (Vatican Library, Urbinas lat. 1328), and Francesco Sassetti (Laurentianus 30.10).

The first work of Varro to be printed was the *De lingua latina* which was published at
The first commentary on Varro was the work of Julius Pomponius Laetus who lectured on the *De lingua latina* to the ‘Academia Romana’ in 1480 and 1484–85. Four manuscripts preserve his annotations on books V–VII in the form of notes recorded by various students. MS. Vaticanus lat. 3311, written in its entirety by Laetus, contains the text of books VIII–X with his comments in the margin. Numerous leaves have been lost from the codex, and the lacunae are supplied by MS. Vaticanus lat. 1522 which was copied from the autograph by an unidentified scribe while the former was still complete. Vatican Library, Inc. IV 136 displays the commentary to books VIII–IX in the form of handwritten marginal entries. Two manuscripts, Naples IV A 1 and Trier 1110 (2037), contain the text of books V–X as well as the commentary on them. In the grammars which he composed from 1466 to 1474, Laetus had cited Varro as an authority, and thus his interest in the *De lingua latina* extended over many years.

Michael Bentinus composed the next commentary, also on the *De lingua latina*. He describes his annotations as *castigationes*, and they were published at Basel in 1527 in the same volume with Nicolaus Perottus’ *Cornucopiae* and the treatises of Festus and Nonius Marcellus.

In 1541 Petrus Victorius published the first commentary on the *De re rustica* in a companion volume of *castigationes* to his edition of the ‘Scriptores rei rusticae’ (Cato, Varro, Columella) which had appeared in 1541. The printer’s copy of his commentaries is now Vatican Library, Reginensis lat. 1502. In the Dedictory epistle of the edition, addressed to Cardinal Marcellus Cervinus, he explains that he had ‘cleansed’ (‘purgado’) the *De re rustica* of Varro first, and then turned to the manual of Cato at the request of Johannes Casa (Giovanni della Casa, 1503–1556). Information regarding manuscripts consulted is given in the Introduction to the *castigationes*. Victorius states that he used three witnesses for his work on Varro: one codex written ‘litteris Gallicis’ and containing Cato and Varro (Laurentianus
30. 10); a codex copied at Ferrara in the home of Guarinus Veronensis (possibly Oxford, Bodleian Lat. class. d. 2, cited on p. 456 above); and a ‘vetustissimum volumen’ originally containing Cato, Varro, Columella, and Gargilius Martinus (see p. 227 above for further details) and thought by modern editors to be the archetype of all extant manuscripts of the De re rustica of Cato and Varro. Politian collated the ‘vetustissimum volumen’ in 1482, when it was still complete, and entered its readings in his own copy of the editio princeps, now Rés. S. 439 in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Hieronymus Lagomarsinus’ copy (dated 1737) of Politian’s collation is found in Piacenza, Bibl. Comunale MS. 117 (Landi 4) and Vaticanus lat. 11646.

Before the close of the sixteenth century there were produced six more commentaries on the De lingua latina and four more commentaries on the De re rustica. The annotations of Marcus Vertranius Maurus on the former appeared in 1563 and were followed in 1565 by the ‘Coniectanea’ of Joseph Scaliger and in 1566 by the ‘Commentarii et emendationes’ (for books V-VII) of Adrianus Turnebus. The 1573 edition of Varro included an ‘Appendix’ by Scaliger to his ‘Coniectanea’, his commentary on the De re rustica, and a second commentary by Turnebus on the De lingua latina consisting of passages (on books V and VII) excerpted from his Adversaria (Paris, 1564-65). Still another commentary on the De lingua latina appeared when, in 1585, Dionysius Gothofredus published his ‘Notae’. More work on Varro was done by Petrus Ciacconius who, towards the end of his life, ‘collaborated’ with Fulvius Ursinus in a commentary on the De re rustica. The project was halted by Ciacconius’ death in 1581, but Ursinus published their ‘joint’ effort in 1587. A comparison of the autograph manuscript (Copenhagen 828, 4to) of Ciacconius’ annotations with the commentary in the 1587 edition indicates that Ciacconius was responsible for the thrust and scope of the commentary, contributing, indeed, most of the material, while Ursinus’ role was primarily editorial. During approximately the same period Ciacconius was also occupied with the De lingua latina, and his notes on this treatise are found in Vatican Library, Stamp. Barb. K. II. 100.

The credit for the first commentary on the fragments belongs to Ausonius Popma whose observations on the Sataeae Menippeae, Logistorici, and Prometheus were issued in 1589. The revised and expanded edition of his work on the fragments, together with commentaries on the De lingua latina and De re rustica, was published in 1601 and has been included in this article because the Dedicatorial epistle is dated 29 July 1600 and Popma was undoubtedly involved in the project well before this time. He still remains the only scholar ever to edit and comment on all the surviving works that constitute the corpus Varronianum, and the 1601 edition is important because it was the first collection of the Opera omnia under the same covers.

In addition to the commentaries, there were, of course, during the sixteenth century and later, various manifestations of interest in Varro which took the form of editions, textual and grammatical studies, and practical handbooks. In 1510, for example, Johannes Baptista Pius edited the De lingua latina along with the works of Festus and Nonius Marcellus. Johannes Jocundus produced texts of the agricultural treatises of Cato, Varro, Columella, and Palladius for the Aldine press in 1514, and in 1515 Nicolaus Angelius edited the Giuntine version of the same authors. Angelius’ edition (reprinted in 1521) also contained his ‘Enarrationes super nonnullis dictionibus’ which are tacitly based on the ‘Enarrationes’ of Georgius Merula (see p. 227 above). Petrus Victorius, though he never edited the De lingua latina, rendered a valuable service to modern editors when, in 1521, he and Jacobus Daciaetus collated F with a copy of the editio princeps and entered the variants therein. Since that time a number of leaves have been lost from F, and thus their collation,
preserved in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl. 4° Inc. s. a. 1908 (formerly 4° A. lat. b. 6794), has the value of a manuscript for De lingua latina V. 25. 119–VI. 7. 61.

F, unfortunately, did not serve as the basis for the influential edition prepared by Antonius Augustinus, with the assistance of Angelus Colotius, Octavius Pantagathus, and Gabriel Faernus, which was published at Rome in 1557 and followed by all but a few editors until the nineteenth century. Augustinus used a poor manuscript, as yet unidentified, and had, therefore, to introduce unnecessary emendations in the text; he also tried to standardize the orthography, and, in addition, supplied a separate list of conjectures which was included in many succeeding editions. Although Augustinus’ work was severely criticized by Marcus Vertranius Maurus and Joseph Scaliger, it can be said in his favor that he was the first to recognize that the surviving De lingua latina consisted of six books and introduced accordingly a consecutive numbering. Previous editors, misled by Varro’s remark at VIII. 1. 1 that he had shown the tripartite division of speech in the first three books and would discuss the question of analogy in the next three books, had given the titles ‘De lingua latina libri III’ to books V–VII and ‘De analogia’ to books VIII–X. In this error, it should be pointed out, they were abetted by the manuscripts, which exhibit a similar division. Also worthy of mention here is Scaliger’s list of ‘Verborum etymologiae perperam a Varrone tradita’ which was placed after the ‘Coniectanea’ on the De lingua latina in the 1565 edition and reprinted in subsequent editions of the ‘Coniectanea’ and ‘Appendix’. Henricus Stephanus published Scaliger’s commentary on two occasions (1573 and 1581) and, in 1591, issued his own Ad M. Ter. Varronis assertiones analogiae sermonis latini Appendix. In this work Stephanus defends the principle of analogy whose cause, he felt, had been but poorly advanced by Varro in the De lingua latina.

The fragments, however, had earlier attracted the attention of Stephanus, for in 1564 he published the Fragmenta poetrarum veterum latinorum, quorum opera non extant (Renouard, Estienne 123) which included the first edition of the Saturae Menippeae. The title page notes that he had put into order the fragments assembled by his father, Robertus. Brief notes follow each fragment, but they have not been considered sufficient to constitute a commentary because, in nearly every instance, they give merely the sources which have preserved the fragment. Antonius Riccobonus’ work on the fragments was on a larger scale. His De historia commentarius (Venice, 1568) included remains from some twenty compositions of Varro (Antiquitates rerum humanarum et divinarum, Logistorici, Imagines, Epistulae etc.) accompanied by scholia which, as in the case of Stephanus, have to do chiefly with the sources of the fragments and hence have not been reckoned as a commentary.

Varro, through the De re rustica, was a principal source for the books on farming that were written in the sixteenth century. Like Cato (see p. 228 above), he was consulted by Giovanvettorio Soderini, Luigi Alamanni, William Lambarde, Theodorus Zwinger, and Olivier de Serres. Conrad Heresbach’s Rei rusticae libri IV (Cologne, 1570) has the form of a dialogue after Varro, whom he often quotes. As in the case of Cato’s manual, the De re rustica was not translated into the vernacular until near the end of the eighteenth century when C. F. Sabourieux de la Bonneterie (Paris, 1771) and Johann Friderich Meyer (Nuremberg, 1774) published French and German versions respectively. A second German translation was produced by Gottfried Grosse in 1788, and in 1800 T. Owen rendered the De re rustica into English.

From the eighteenth century onwards there has been much concern with the preparation of better editions. The turning point for the De re rustica came in 1735 when J. M. Gesner published the corpus of ancient writers on farming (Cato, Varro, Columella, Palladius). For this edition Gesner used,
indirectly, Politian's collation of the lost 'vetustissimum volumen', and he followed the division of the text into chapters as indicated in the unfinished edition of Christian Schoettigen (1687-1751). The second edition of Gesner's text appeared in 1773 and was the basis for the editio Bipontina of 1787. J. G. Schneider's edition of 1794 was accompanied by a long and very useful commentary which dealt with agricultural commentary and remained the only one to do so until the recent (1973) commentary of B. Tilly on selected passages from the De re rustica. H. Keil, in his editions for the Teubner series (1884 and 1889), investigated the manuscript tradition and put the text on a sounder palaeographical basis; in keeping with his interests, his commentary (1891) is concerned with textual problems and stylistic observations, and contains many references to humanist editors (Merula, Angelius, Victorius, Scaliger, etc.). The more conservative edition of G. Goetz was published in the same series in 1922, and the second edition of 1929 remains the latest edition of the entire treatise. J. Heurgon has recently published in the Budé series his edition of De re rustica I.

The milestone for the text of the De lingua latina was undoubtedly L. Spengel's edition of 1826. He was the first to compare the merits and defects of previous editions and to rely on the readings of F, using the collation of Petrus Victorius and Jacobus Diaci- tius in place of consulting the manuscript itself. To Spengel is also due the credit for being the first editor to perceive the correct numbering of the books. At De lingua latina V. 1. 1 Varro observes that he had already addressed three books to Septimius, and thus book V appears as book IV in the manuscripts. Previous editors, unaware that book I consisted of an Introduction and that the books dedicated to Septimius thereby constituted books II-IV, followed the numbering given by the codices and referred to books 'IV-X' until Spengel restored the proper numbering of 'V-X'. Worthy of mention here is the fact that the correct numbering had been ascertained approximately 350 years earlier by Julius Pomponius Laetus, not in his edition but in his commentary as given in Naples IV A 1 (see p. 000 below).

Spengel continued to work on a second edition of the De lingua latina until his death in 1880, and it was finally published in 1885 by his son Andreas. The Teubner text, edited by G. Goetz and F. Schoell, appeared in 1910. Editions of one or more books have been published by H. Dahlmann (1940, 1966), H. J. Mette (1952), J. Collart (1954), and A. della Casa (1969).

Since Ausonius Popma's 1601 edition of the collected fragments (reprinted in the editio Bipontina of 1788), there have appeared editions of separate works only or works of a similar character. Editors include A. Riese (Saturae Menippeae), P. Fraccaro (De gente populi Romani), H. Funaioli (fragments of the grammatical treatises), and B. Riposati (De vita populi Romani). The editing of the fragments has also been the subject of dissertations prepared by students of H. Dahlmann.
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Both the De lingua latina and De re rustica were published in editions containing more than one commentary. Until the nineteenth century, the latter was usually printed with the agricultural treatises of Cato, Columella, and Palladius. A chronology and brief description of editions produced from the fifteenth through the eighteenth centuries is given in the editio Bipontina of the Scriptores rei rusticae veteres latini, vol. I (Zweibrücken, 1787), pp. cxxxi–cxliv. The text is that of Gesner (Bibliography I. B), and the Bipontine list of editions is an enlarged version of those noted by him in vol. I, pp. xliii–xlviii (1st ed.) and vol. I, pp. xlix–lii (2nd ed.). A list of editions of the De lingua latina for the same period is found in the 1788 editio Bipontina of this work, vol. I, pp. xxviii–xxxviii. Of the editions given below, eight exhibit more than one commentary on the De re rustica and six have more than one commentary on the De lingua latina.

confirmant. Nonnulla contra diversa sunt ab is vel apertius aut etiam doctius dicuntur. Quae manum extremam et limam commentarii illis defuisset indicat et argumento esse possunt quanto meliores in hunc Varronis librum commentarios habemus si ipsum eos edidisset.’ NUC; Ed. Bipont. I (1787) cxxxix; Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxxvii; Renouard, Estienne 140, 407-408; Adams V-282. BM; BN; Vatican Library; (MH; CaOTU).

1581, [Geneva]: [Henricus Stephanus] (ed. Joseph Scaliger). This is the third edition of Scaliger’s commentary on the De lingua latina (hence ‘editio tertia’ on the title page) and second edition of his commentary on the De re rustica; for the remaining contents see the 1573 edition. However, it should be noted that only the passages on the De lingua latina from Turnebus’ Adversaria have been included in the 1581 edition. A note to the reader explains that his earlier commentary has been excluded on the grounds that it had been suppressed by Turnebus during his lifetime and hence ought not to be considered ‘worthy’ of the author whose more ‘mature’ observations appear in the Adversaria: ‘Henricus Stephanus lectori. Has Adriaeni Turnebi annotationes in Varronis De lingua latina libros multo magis tanto viro dignas esse quam ceteras et me multis de causis contentum his esse debuisse persueam habeas velim. Has maturum fetum, illas (si ea excipiis quae et inter habentur) abortivum vocare possimus; in his deus, in illis πρωτας φροντίδας esse scimus. Illas denique (nam quid verbis opus est?) licet multis ante annis scriptas, tamen ab auctore suppressas et nonnisi post eis obitum editas, has vero ex iis Adversarium eius libris esse excerptas, qui ipso et vivente et assentiente in lucem prodierint, te ignorare nolo. Vale.’ NUC; Ed. Bipont. I (1787) cxxxix-cxl; Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxxvi; Renouard, Estienne 140, 148; Adams V-283. BM; BN; Vatican Library; (MH; CaOTU).


1587, Romae (Rome): In aedib. S. P. Q. R. apud Georgium Ferrarium. With the text of the Kalendarium rusticum Farnesianum, Fragmenta inscriptionum Fratrum Arvalium, Junius Philargyrius (commentary on the Eclogues and Georgics of Virgil), Vellius Longus (De orthographia), commentators of Fulvius Ursinus on Cato (De re rustica), Kalendarium rusticum Farnesianum, Fragmenta inscriptionum Fratrum Arvalium, and Servius (commentary on the Eclogues and Georgics of Virgil), ‘joint commentary’ of Fulvius Ursinus and Petrus Ciacconius on Varro (De re rustica), and notes of Fulvius Ursinus on Columella. Ed. Bipont. I (1787) cxI; Adams U-74. BM; BN.

1619, Dordrechti (Dordrecht): Ex officina Ioannis Berewout. Apart from the fact that the text of the fragments of Varro has been added, this edition appears to be based on the 1581 edition (q. v. for contents). NUC; Ed. Bipont. I (1787) cxI; Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxxviii. BM; BN; Vatican Library; (MH).


X; and De instrumento fundi liber of Ausonius Popma. The commentaries on Varro are not given in their entirety, and Gesner has arranged them according to his own system. NUC; Ed. Bipont. I (1787) cxliii–cxliv. BM; BN; (MH; CaOTU).

1773, Lipsiae (Leipzig): Sumptibus Caspari Fritsch (ed. Johannes Matthias Gesner). This is a second edition; for contents see the 1735 edition. According to the entry in the editio Bipontina, Johannes Augustus Ernesti revised and enlarged the second edition, most notably by contributing a preface, correcting typographical errors, and adding variant readings to the text of Columella (from Leningrad MS. F. v. Class. 1) and Palladius. NUC; Ed. Bipont. I (1787) cxliv. BM; BN; (MH).

1788, Biponti (Zweibrücken): Ex Typographia Societatis. With the text of the De lingua latina and fragments, commentaries of Joseph Scaliger and Ausonius Popma on the De lingua latina, Ausonius Popma on the fragments, appendix to Scaliger’s commentary on the De lingua latina, passages on the De lingua latina from Adrianus Turnebus’ Adversaria, and emendations of Antonius Augustinus for the De lingua latina. (The commentaries and observations on the De lingua latina have been combined; only Popma’s commentary on the fragments, which is taken from the 1601 edition, appears separately.) NUC. BM; BN; Vatican Library; (MH; CaOTU).

Doubtful Edition:

1569, Henricus Stephanus. A reference to this edition occurs in Ed. Bipont. I (1787) cxxxix and Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxxvi and is repeated by R. G. Kent, p. xxx (Bibliography I. A); it seems to have its origin in a statement by Fabricius, Bibliotheca latina I (Leipzig, 1773) 123: ‘igitur in praesenti dumtaxat memorabo illas horum librorum editiones, quibus utroque solius Varronis scripta continentur, ut sunt editiones H. Stephani a. 1569, 1573 et 1581 cum Ioseph Scaligeri in libros de latina lingua coniectaneis et appendice coniectaneorum, Antonii item Augustini emendationibus notisque Turnebi, non posthumis illis, sed ex Adversariorum opere excerptis, et in libros de re rustica notis eiusdem Scaligeri, et qui codicibus quatuor MSS. usum se profitteretur, egregii viri Petri Victorii.’ No copy of the edition has been located, and the reference is puzzling in any case since the title page of the 1573 edition claims that Scaliger’s Notae on the De re rustica are non antea editae. Renouard, Estienne 167 points out that the mention by Fabricius of a 1569 edition must be erroneous: ‘La Bib. Lat., I. 121, d’où je fais cette citation (sc. 1565 edition of Scaliger’s commentary on the De lingua latina), announce le volume de manière à faire entendre qu’avec les notes de Scaliger se trouve le texte de l’auteur…. Ce qui n’est pas exact, non plus que la mention, p. 123, d’une édition de H. Est. de 1569. La première du texte (sc. Varro’s De re rustica) est celle que l’on voit à l’année 1573.’

I. De lingua latina

Commentaries

1. Julius Pomponius Laetus

Although Laetus’ edition of the De lingua latina appeared at Rome c. 1471 (HC 15852*), it was not until much later that he prepared a commentary, which is still unpublished. Of the nine witnesses presently known to contain the commentary or parts of it, three give some information on the date of composition: Trier 1110 (2037) which exhibits on f. 154⁺ ‘Pomponii in M. T. Varronis de lingua latina librum primum commentarii finiunt foeliciter. 1480. VIII°. Six. Pon. Max. XVIII kJ Jul’; Vaticanus lat. 3415 whose titulus (f. 2) is ‘Pomponii viri clarissimi in Varronem dictata. 1484’; and Escorial g. III. 27 with a colophon (f. 44) reading ‘Finis interpretationis… Anno domini MCCCCLXXXV die Junii XV in Academia Romana’. Thus, the commentary is to be placed in 1480 and 1484–85 when Laetus was expounding Varro to his students.

Two manuscripts, Trier 1110 (2037) and Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale IV A 1, contain
Laetus' observations on all six surviving books of the *De lingua latina*. The former was copied by Richard Graman of Nickenich and was in the possession of the Jesuit College of Trier in 1598 (cf. f. 1). The Naples codex formerly belonged to Aulus Janus Parrhasius who entered occasional comments in the margin, usually in the nature of running titles, and it contains the text of books V–X accompanied by an interleaved commentary in a different hand. The arrangement of certain material in the Introduction and initial lemmata involves some repetition and differs slightly from the order found in the Trier version and in four other manuscripts which preserve the commentary on books V–VII in the form of class notes recorded by various students. Of these, Laurentianus 47. 15 and Vaticanus lat. 3415 appear to be the most important: both exhibit the Introduction (which survives more fully in Laurentianus 47. 15) and a lengthy commentary. Next in order of completeness is the Escorial codex mentioned above which begins with a comment at *De lingua latina* V. 15. 85; at the end of this book there follow the annotations on books VI and VII. Rome, Biblioteca Angelica 1348 (T 4. 13) displays a much abbreviated Introduction and notes on book V only. In addition to the Naples and Trier manuscripts, there are three more witnesses to the commentary on books VIII–X: Vaticanus lat. 3311, an autograph of Laetus, contains the text, with lacunae, of books VIII–X and comments written in the margin; Vaticanus lat. 1522 was copied by an unidentified hand from Vaticanus lat. 3311 before the latter suffered the loss of numerous leaves, and so displays the annotations now missing in the autograph; an unidentified hand entered in Vatican Library, Inc. IV 136 a condensed form of the Introduction and annotations on books VIII and IX which are sometimes fuller and more numerous than those in Vaticanus lat. 3311 and 1522.

Given his interest in antiquarian lore, it is not surprising that Laetus devoted the larger portion of the commentary to an explanation and description of the places, customs, and institutions treated in book V, for his remarks on this book far outnumber those on books VI–X. Discussions of grammatical points are generally reserved for passages in books VIII–X. There appear to be only a few references to manuscripts with variant readings.

None of the manuscripts contains a Dedicatory epistle.

a) The commentary on books V–X

pari domino” (quamquam quo iste dominus)—sed tamen quam a dispari tenebantur. Studiorum enim suorum M. Varro voluit esse illud, non libidinem deversorium. Quae in illa villa ante dicebantur, quae cogitantur, quae litteris mandabuntur! Iura populi Romani, monumenta maiorum, omnis sapientiae ratio omnisque doctrina.’ Quintilianus, lib. X [Instit. orat. X. 1. 95]: ‘M. Terentius Varro vir Romanorum eruditissimus plurimos hic libros et doctissimos compositus, peritissimis linguae latinae et omnis antiquitatis et rerum graecarum nostrarumque, plus tamen scientiae collaturus quam eloquentiae.’ Plinius, lib. VII [Historia naturalis VII. 30. 115]: ‘M. Varronis in bibliotheca, quae prima ab Asinio Pollione de manubii publicata Romae e<s>t, unius viventis posita imago est, haud minore, ut equidem reor, gloria pricipve oratore et cive ex illa ingeniorum quae tunc fuit multitudine uni hanc coronam dane quam cum eidem Magnus Pompeius piratico ex bello navalem dedit.’ Ex tanto cumulo librorum tria volumina de agri cultura integra, sex dumtaxat volumina mutilata et corrupta de lingua latina et analogia existant; quae si ut fuere corrigenda forent, revocandus esset ab inferis Varro. Nos in praesentia non adeo temerarii sumus ut omnia aut corrige aut interpretari policeamur. Verum ea quae penitus inscitia ne depravavit, si pervenire eo poterimus, exponere conabimus; si vero tanti nos ingenii vim non attigerimus, ignoscite, obseco. Laudabilius est in Olympio aliquam partem stadii conficere quam territum in ipsis carceribus, ut aiunt, desistere.


Manuscripts:

(micro.) Trier, Stadtbibliothek 1110 (2037), ff. 104–190. The commentary was copied by Richard Graman of Nickenich in 1480 (cf. f. 154v, at the end of the annotations on book V: ‘Pomponii in M. T. Varronis de lingua latina librum primum commentarii finiunt foelicter. 1480. VIIIvo Six. Pon. Max. [sc. Sixtus IV, 1471–1484] XVIIIi k Ju†’), and thus this manuscript is the oldest dated witness. The codex also contains Graman’s copies of other works by Laetus, namely, his ‘Tractatus introductorius rethorices’ (ff. 62–66v) and commentaries on Sallust’s Bellum Jugurthinum (ff. 78–104) and Tacitus’ Germania (ff. 193–198v); Graman signed his name on f. 104: ‘Pomponii Achademia Romane principis in Salustii Jugurthinum bellum explanationes finiunt. Collecte per me Ricardo Graman de Nekennich Rome anno MCCCCCLXX. Finis.’ A printed edition of the De lingua latina ([Rome,?] c. 1474; Hain 15853*), with running titles and other marginalia in Graman’s hand, occupies ff. 1–59. My attention was called to this manuscript by Professor P. O. Kristeller.

publicata fuit.' Consummatus vir et Romanorum litteratissimus; auctore Fabio Quintiliano [Instit. orat. X. 1. 95]; 'peritissimus linguae latinae et omnis antiquitatis et rerum graecarum nostrarumque, plus scientiae tamen collaturos quam eloquentiae.' Vixit supra centesimum annum. Eius libertus fuit Dionysius Halicarnasseus historicus, cuius indicio historiae scripsit. M. Tullius cum multis in locis tum praecipe in quarto Academicon libro [I. 3. 9] in haec verba doctrinae Varronis testis locupletissimus est: 'Nos in nostra urbe peregrinantes errantesque tamquam hospites, tui libri quasi domum deduxerunt et ut possemus aliquando qui et ubi essessem agnosce. Tu aetatem patriae, tu descriptions temporum, tu domesticam et bellicam disciplinam, tu sedes regionum, locorum, tu omnium humanarum divinarumque rerum nomina, genera, officia, causas aperuisti, plurimumque et poetis nostris omnino latinis et litteris et verbis luminis attulisti, atque ipse varium et elegans omni fere numero poema fecisti, philosophiamque multis locis incohasti.' Et (sic) tanto cumulo librorum tria volumina de agri cultura integra et sex dumptaxat mutilata et corrupta de lingua latina et analogia exstant; quae si ut fuere corrigenda forent, revocandus esset ab inferis Marcus Varro. Nos in praesentia non adeo temerarii sumus ut omnia aut emendare aut interpretari policeamur. Verum ea quae penitus incititia non depraevavit, si pervenire eo poter <i> mus, aperire conabimur; si vero tanti viri ingenii viri non attigerimus, ignoscite, quaeo. Laudabilius enim est in Olympicis aliquam partem stadii conficere quam territum in ipsis carceribus, ut aiunt, desistere.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (f. 105) Quemadmodum vocabula essent (V. 1. 1). Quintilianus volumine primo [Instit. orat. I. 6. 28–29] sic ait: Nimimum 'etymologia, quae verborum originem inquirit, a Cicero, diecsta dicta est "notatio" quia nomen eius apud Aristotelem inventit σῶμβολον, quod "nota" est vel signum. 'Nam verbum ex verbo ductum, id est veriloquium, ipse Cicero qui finxit reformidat. Sunt qui vic potius intuiti quam vocem originactionem vocant. Haec habit aliquando usum necessarium, quotiens interpretatione res de qua quaeritur eget, ut cum Marcus Caelius esse hominem frugi vult probare, non quia abstinentis sit (nam id ne mentiri quidem poterat), sed quia utilis multis, id est fructuosus, unde sit ducta frugalitas. Ideoque in definitionibus assignatur etymologiae locus.' Est igitur etymologia vera ratio sermonis. In ea perquirendae Graeci multum insistunt. A quibus rebus (V. 1. 1). Hoc est de origine verborum... [Expl.]: (f. 190') Nequam (X. 5. 81). Quod nihil sit et quod nihilis pensi habet. M. Varronis analogiae commentarioli finiunt.


b) The commentary on books V–VII

Introduction (Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana 47. 15, f. 1ser). Pomponius Laetus, In Varronem De lingua latina commentariolus. [Inc.]: <M> arcus Terentius Varro graecis et latinis litteris longe omnium eruditissimus habitus est. Militavit piratico bello sub Pompeio a quo ob res bene gestas navali corona donatus est. Bello civilis dux exercitus fuit. Publicis negotiis occupatus studia litterarum non praetermissit. Omne genus scribendi tentavit; quo nemo umquam apud nos excepto Didymo Chalcentero plura scripsit. In singularis doctrinae praemium 'viventis Varronis imago in bibliotheca posita est quae prima', ut inquit Plinius [Historia naturalis VII. 30. 115], 'de manubis Romae ab Asinio Pollio publicata fuit.' Consummatus vir et Romanorum litteratissimus et auctore Fabio Quintiliano [Instit. orat. X. 1. 95] 'peritissimus linguae latinae et omnis
antiquitatis et rerum graecarum nostrarumque, plus scientiae tamen conlatum (sic) quam eloquentiae.' Vixit supra centesimum annum. Eius libertus fuit Dionysius Halicarnasseus historicus. M. Tullius cum multis in locis tum praevertim in quarto Academiciorum libro [1. 3. 9] in (iiij MS.) haec verba doctrinae Varronis testis locupletissimis est: 'Nos in nostra urbe peregrinantes errantesque tamquam hospites, tui libro quasi domum deduxerunt ut possemus aliquando qui et ubi essumus agnoscre. Tu aetatem patriae, tu descriptiones temporum, tu domesticam, tu bellicam disciplinam, tu sedes regionum, locorum, tu omnium humanarum divinarumque rerum nomina, genera, officia, causas aperuisti, plurimumque et poetis nostris omnino latinis et litteris et versibus luminis attulisti, atque isipse varius et elegans omni fere numero <poema> fecisti, philosophiamque multis locis incohasti.' Plinius, lib. VII [Historia naturalis VII. 30. 115]: 'M. Varronis bibliotheca, quae prima ab Asino Pollione de munibus publicatis Romae e <s> t, unius viventis posita imago est, haud (aut MS.) minore, ut equidem reor, gloria prinpe oratore et cive ex illa ingeniorum quae tunc fuit multitudine uni hanc coronam dante quam cum eidem Magnus Pompeius piratico ex bello navalem dedit.' Ex tanto cumulo librorum tria volumina de agri cultura integra, sex dumtaxat volumina mutilata et corrupta de lingua latina et analogia exstant, quae si ut fuere corrigenda forent, revocandas esset ab inferius Varro. Nos in praesentia non adeo temerarii sumus ut omnia aut corrigere aut interpretari polliceamur. Verum ea quae penitus inscitia non deprivavit, si pervenire eo poterimus, exponere conabimur; si vero (non MS.) tanti vim ingenii (ingenio MS.) non attigerimus, ignoscite, obsecro. Laudabilis est in Olympum aliquam partem stadii conficere quam territum in ipsis carceribus (-bris MS.), ut aiunt, desistere. Quintilianus [Instit. orat. I. 6. 28-29]: Nimimum 'etymologia, quae verborum originem inquirit, a Cicerone <dicta est> notitio (sic) quia nomen eius apud Aristotelem inventur (inveruntur MS.) αὐμβολὸν, quod est "notata" (sic).

Nam verbum ex verbo dictum, id est verilquium, ipse Ciceron qui finxit reformidat. Sunt qui virum potius intuisti originationem vocari <n>t. Haec habet aliquando usum necessarium, quotiens interpretatione res de qua quaeritur eget, ut cum M. Caelius <se> esse hominem frugi vult probare, non quia abste <n> ens (nam id ne mentiri quidem poterat), sed quia utilis multis, id est fructuosus, unde sit ducta frugalitas. Ideoque in definitionibus assignatur etymologiae locus.' Estigitur etymologia vero ratio sermonis. Graeci in ea inquirenda multum insistunt.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (f. 1r) Demptione litterarum et syllabarum (V. 1. 6). "Columella." Publius Varro Atacinus dixit [Argonautica IV (Morel, fr. 10, p. 96)]: 'Tum te flagranti deiectum fulmine, Phaton' pro 'Phaeton'.../...[Expl.:] (f. 71) Deliquium (VII. 5. 106) solis a 'deliquando' quod sol in suo cursu deliquatur. Accipitur autem pro 'defectu'. Et in urbe locus <erat> (cf. Vaticanus lat. 3415, f. 119; Escorial g. XIII. 27, f. 43*) ad aedem deum Penatium—'deliquia' (sic; cf. Plutarch, Moralia 275 C δὲ λαξύνα) appellantur—in quo appropinquatibus Gallis Seno[no]nibus ad excidium urbis sacra quaedam***

Manuscripts:


Vatican Library, Vaticanus lat. 3415, an. 1484, ff. 1*-119*. Part of the Introduction, which is very close to the version in Naples IV A 1 and Laurentianus 47. 15, appears to have been lost. The initial lemmata and comments are briefer and quite different from those in the Naples, Trier, and Florence codices, resembling instead the annotations at the beginning of Angelica 1348 (T 4. 13) (see below).

Introduction (f. 1r). Marci Terentii Varronis vita. [Inc.]: M. T. Varro longe omnium nostrorum eruditissimus habitus est graecis et latinis litteris. Bello piratico sub Pompeio

Commentary. Pomponii viri clarissimi in Varronem dicitae. 1484. [Inc.]: (f. 2) Quem admodum (V. 1. 1), a qua re (V. 1. 2). Id est ‘unde’...[Expl.]: (f. 119v) Illis (VII. 6. 109). Prioribus.


Rome, Bibl. Angelica 1348 (T 4. 13), s. XV, ff. 1–97v. This manuscript contains the last section of the Introduction found in Laurentianus 47. 15 and the annotations on book V only.

Introduction. [Inc.]: (f. 1) Quintilianus volumine primo [Instit. orat. I. 6. 28–29] sic ait: Nimirum ‘etymologia, quae verborum quaerit originem, a Cicerone dicta est “notatio” quia nomen eius apud Aristotelem inventur συμβολον, quod est “nota”’. Nam <verb> ex verbo ductum, id est verilium, ipse Cicero qui fixit reformidat. Sunt qui <vim> potius intuisti originationem vocant. Haec habet aliquando usum necessarium, quotiens interpretatione res de qua quaeritur eget, et (sic) cum M. Caelius esse hominem frugi vult probari, non quia abstinentis sit (nam id ne mentiri quidem poterat), sed quia utilius multis, id est fructuosus, unde sit ducta frugalitas. Ideoque in definitionibus assignatur etymologiae locus.’ Est igitur etymologia vera ratio sermonis. In ea perquirenda Graeci multum insistent.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (f. 1) In quibus (V. 1. 1). Tribus libris primis...[Expl.]: (f. 97v) Vestigium (V. 36. 183). Signum aedis Saturni sub Tarpeia rupe, in cuius porticus pendebat trutina sive statera ubi pendebatur aes, et ibi fuit aerarium populi Romani.
Aerarium appellatum est ab aere, locus ubi aera servabatur. Hoc Tullianum Tulliani locus separatus in carcere erat; qui dicunt ‘carcer Tullianus’ errant.


(micro.) El Escorial g. III. 27, an. 1485, ff. 1-44. Now missing from the manuscript are the Introduction and a large portion of the commentary (down to V. 15. 85). The annotations on books VI and VII are more numerous and often longer than corresponding comments in Laurentianus 47. 15 and Vaticanus lat. 3415. F. I of the Escorial codex has apparently suffered some damage, and the Incipit given below has been deciphered with the help of a similar passage in Vaticanus lat. 3415, f. 45.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (f. 1) *Fratres Arvales* > (V. 15. 85)*; spicæa corona pro insigni omnes (sic) uti voluit. Coronas finito sacrificio in gremio Laurentiae locandas iussit ut illa penitus numquam maesta esset... [Expl.]: (f. 44) *Spicilegium* (VII. 6. 109). Spicæa quae relinquentur in campo. Finis interpretationis Marci Terentii Varronis de tribus libris de lingua latina per Pomponium Laetum. Anno domini MCCCCLXXXV die Junii XV in Academia Romana.


c) The commentary on books VIII-X


Commentary. [Inc.]: (f. 1) *Rectum* (VIII. 1. 1) dicitur impositio, *obliquum* (VIII. 1. 1) quicquid ab eo deducitur, non solum in una voce sed in omnibus... [Expl.]: (f. 39v) *Tabula* (X. 2. 22) XII scuporum (sic) qui latrunculi vocantur. In eo lusu plurimum excelluit P. Mucius Scaevola, ut scribit Quintilianus, lib. XI [Instit. orat. XI. 2. 38] et Cicero, lib. I *De oratore* [I. 50. 217].

Manuscripts:

Vatican Library, Vaticanus lat. 3311, s. XV, ff. 1-39v. The codex, which also contains excerpts from Livy and Claudian, is an autograph. Laetus copied books VIII-X of the *De lingua latina* and placed his comments in the margin. The folios containing VIII. 39. 76 *deest ut dulecis-* IX. 42. 71 *qui dam male dicunt* et X. 2. 24 *et scopae* are now missing from the manuscript. For the annotations of the missing sections, see Vaticanus lat. 1522 below. (P. De Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* [Paris, 1887; rpt. Geneva, 1976] 203-204; Kristeller, *Iter II* 318).

Vatican Library, Vaticanus lat. 1522, s. XV, ff. 47-99v. This portion of the manuscript is a copy of Laetus’ autograph text of books VIII-X with comments, now Vaticanus lat. 3311 (see above). The copy was made before the exemplar suffered the loss of a number of leaves, and thus Vaticanus lat. 1522 is important because it preserves the missing annotations.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (f. 47) Rectum (VIII. 1. 1) dictur impositio, obliquum (VIII. 1. 1) quicquid ab eo deducitur, non solum in una voce sed in omnibus.../...[Expl.]: (f. 99v) Id genus (X. 5. 79). Pro ‘huius’, vel ‘generis’.


Vatican Library, Inc. IV 136 (formerly Arm. 367. 1209), ff. 44v–65. This edition of Laetus’ text of the De lingua latina (Venice, 1474; H 15858 [1], C 5953) contains his Introduction and annotations to books VIII and IX in the form of marginal notes entered by an unidentified hand of the fifteenth century. For books V–VII there is marginalia on the order of running titles by at least two hands.


Commentary. [Inc.]: (f. 45) M. T. Varronis Analogiae liber primus. Quemadmodum in casus vocabula declinantur. Quomodo oratio natura tripartita (VIII. 1. 1). Quemadmodum ratio vocum et vocabulorum et verborum duce natura.../...[Expl.]: (f. 65) Rura (sic) cesa (sic) (IX. 60. 104). Materiae pertinens ad causas centumvirales de hereditatibus; sunt ‘ruta caesa’ et ‘sarta tecta’.


Biography:
See CTC III 379–382.

2. Michael Bentinus

Bentinus’ commentary on Varro, which first appeared together with his commentaries on Festus and Nonius Marcellus in the Basel 1526 edition of various grammatical works, consists of brief observations on books V–IX. To judge from the ‘Epistula lectori’, in which he describes his annotations as castigationes, he seems to have been principally concerned with his work on Nonius Marcellus, for he never mentions Varro or Festus.

In keeping with his conception of the role of a castigator, Bentinus offers as solutions to textual difficulties in the De lingua latina readings from other manuscripts or similar passages from other authors (particularly Festus and Nonius Marcellus). He is also concerned with the identification of various quotations, and occasionally comments on Varro’s etymologies. Throughout he frequently refers to Petrus Crinitus (Pietro
Crinito, 1465–1505), whose *De honesta disciplina* is quoted in the Incipit (‘ex Criniti commentariis’) and alluded to in the Explicit.

There is no Dedictory epistle by Bentinus. *Ad lectorem* (ed. of Basel, 1526). Michael Bentinus lectori s. [Inc.]: Optarim sane, candide lector, si fieri posset, felicis aliquid argumentum et amoenius quo tibi ingenii mei specimen et studiorum quantulumque fructum probarem quam ut his viserimis et molestissimis castigandi laboribus perpetuo alligatus, semperque idem saxum volvens nec umquam me humo attollens, semper sordida nescio quae tractarem. Verum cum ita visum sit deo optimo maximo ut semel eo detruerem nec inde avelli possim, praesertim iamdudum coepto opere, flagitiosum foret, arbitror, etiam in minutissimis ordinem deserere et susceptae provinciae pro viribus non satisfacere. Quamquam meo quidem iudicio non minimae operae res sit neque adeo paenitendae fideliter castigare bonos auctores, non ut vulgo fieri videmus, uno aut altero verbo forte au ætore quopiam decerpto, et cum apparatu enarrato cristas tollere et ingeniosum videri velle. Id enim est fucum facere lectori, non castigare. Is mihi vere castigator dicendus est qui ad motis vetustis codicibus, si usquam inveniri possint, diligentissime auctetur germanam in scriptore lectionem, nihil temere de suo addens, nihil detrahrens, etiam si non omnia ad unguem videantur quadrare. Quod si ut abiectum quiddam et se indignum non aspervati fuissent nostrae memoriae viri docetissimi, quibus certe suppedita copia veterum codicum, si illis, inquam, non fuisset grave ad parva illa se demittere et in pulvere et squalore reptare, ac denique si tam studiose alia fuisserant castigata edere quam sua obtrudere, nihil fuisset opus his nostris commentationibus. At cum aut perierint maxima ex parte optima quaeque exemplaria aut ita adserventur ab ipsis qui publicae utilitati parum faventes tam anaxie illis incubant, ut nemini communicari sustineant, quod unum potuimus in tanta penuria, collectis qui pererir poterant codicibus excusis, Nonii Marcelli commentarios aggressi castigavimus, si non omnia, certe non paucu, etsi in tanta portentorum colluvie paucha videri queant. Nam quid faciat unus Hercules adversus tot excertas? Scio quantum debeamusaldo aut socero eius Asulano qui quod potuit praestitit, aut si quis alius in eo opere bonam operam navavit; at is fatetur ingenua multa ab se consulto praeterrmissa quod non esset otium accuratius omnia discutendi. Unde apparat et aliis reliquisse campo quern exerceruntur. Itaque oneri succedentes restituimus ex leviusculis innumerat, ex difficilioribus plurima, sed in primis ea quae ex Nonio ipso et aliiis veteribus grammaticis aut quorum monumenta adhuc non prorsus interierant castigari commode poterant. Cetera quae nec exstant nec citantur ab alioque non contingenda quidem duximus donec nobis fieret copia antiqui codicis. Quod propediem futurum condido opera honestissimis et docetissimi viri Johannis Sichardi, qui nullis neque sumptibus neque laboribus parcens nuper in studiosorum communem gratiam non gravatus est antiquissimas per Germaniam bibliothecas excutere et probatisimos quoque auctores e situ et tenebris in lucem producere, omnem scilicet movens lapidem ut bonae litterae et saniora studia quam latissime propagentur... /[Expl.]: Sed nec annotationes quidem illae quas passim aspersim us et variabunt codices inutiles videri debebunt, etiam si integerrimum futurum sit exemplar, immo vero eo magis necessariae quo ex multis inter se collatis quae potissimum eligenda sit lectio magis perspicuum fiat. Quod unum in hoc instituto opere spectarium, nihil immutantes nisi quae competissima essent, sed anseum dumtaxat praebeatne qua facile quidvis postea emendari posset. Id utinam tant feliciter aliis cedat quam illis ex animo elaboravi, cupiens vel illis subsicivis horis, quibus forte a iusto labore otium erat, studiois gratificari et meo labore illorum laborem sublevare. Hoc itaque studium in te meum, amice lector, si sensero te boni consulere, reddes me profecto ad maiora tentanda alacriorem. Vale. Basileae, anno MDXXVI, mensae Septembris.

*Commentary. Michael Bentinus, In Marcum Varronem De lingua latina et De ana-*

Editions:

1526, Basileae (Basel): Apud Valentinum Curionem. With the text of the Cornucopiae of Nicolaus Perottus, De lingua latina of Varro, De verborum significatu of Festus, De compendiosa doctrina of Nonius Marcellus and commentaries of Bentinus on these works. NUC; Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxxii; Adams P-724. BM; BN; (IU; PPL; NcU; NjP).

1527, Venetiis (Venice): In aedibus Aldi et Andreae Asulani socii. For contents see the 1526 edition. The Aldine press had published editions of the Cornucopiae in 1499, 1513, and 1517 (Renouard, Alde 19, 63, 81), and a 'Nota ad lectorem' in the 1527 edition alludes to the earlier printing and draws attention to the inclusion of Bentinus' commentaries: 'Ad lectorem. Cornucopiae commentarios olim a me summam diligentia et cura editos iterum emittimus, studiosissime lector, meliore quidem fortunae eventu, non maiore studio. Siquidem et Graecarum dicitionum indicem adiunximus, quando id utile futurum erat tibi, et Michaelis Bentini in Nonium annotationes neque non in Festi fragmenta et Marci Varronis De lingua latina libros qui (sic) nuper ex ipsa Germania ad nos venere. Dedit scilicet operam Bentinus ut nonnihil ingenio, multum sane industriae tribueret suae cum veterum codicum secutus laboriosissimam fidem multa foede lapsa in his omnibus restituerit. Nos vero, quod nostrum erat munus, reliqua ita concinnata et absoluta reddidimus ut aemulari alii posthac facilius possint quam imitari. Vale.' NUC; Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxxii–xxxiii; Renouard, Alde 103; Adams P-725, 726. BM; BN; Vatican Library; (MH; CtY; MoU; PBL).


1529, Parisiiis (Paris): Apud Simonem Colinaeum. With the text of the De lingua latina. NUC; Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxxiii; Renouard, Colines 144; Adams V-285. BM; BN; (CtY).


1532, Basileae (Basel): Apud Valent. Curionem. For contents see the 1526 edition. NUC; Adams P-727. BN; (MH; CSmH; Dfo).

(*) 1534, Lugduni (Lyons): Apud Seb. Gryphium. For contents see the 1530 edition. Maittaire II 567; Baudrier VIII 78.

1535, Lugduni (Lyons): Apud Seb. Gryphium. For contents see the 1530 edition. Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxxiv; Baudrier VIII 86. BM; BN; Vatican Library.


1536, Basileae (Basel): Ex officina Ioannis Valderi. For contents see the 1526 edition. NUC; Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxxiv. BM; (MH; MsG).

Doubtful Edition:

1492, Venetiis (Venice). According to Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxx–xxxi (following Fabricius, BL I 120), this edition contained the Cornucopiae of Nicolaus Perottus and Bentinus' castigationes to Varro and Nonius Marcellus. Since Bentinus 'Epistula lectori' is dated 1526, the Ed. Bipont. entry is erroneous unless it means that a copy of his commentaries was bound with the 1492 edition (H 12700) of the Cornucopiae.

Biography:

Michael Bentinus (Bentinius, Bentzius,
Bentius) was born in Flanders c. 1495 and died of the plague at Basel in November 1527. Little else is known of his life. In 1520 he was employed at the Froben press in Basel where he helped to prepare critical editions of Latin texts and was involved in the Froben editions of Erasmus’ *Adagia* and translation of the Greek grammar of Theodore of Gaza. He may have been in Flanders in March 1524, but returned to Basel where he joined the press of Valentinus Curio, taking part in the production of Curio’s second *Lexicon graecum* (Basel, 1525). He married in the fall of 1524. Having attached himself to the Reformers, Bentinus suggested to Anémon de Coct that they start a press to publish French translations of the Gospels (according to Coct’s letter to Guillaume Farel of 2 September 1524). Afterwards Bentinus went to seek his fortune at Zürich and Lyons but was unsuccessful, and he returned to Basel and his work with Curio. He was apparently connected with the press of Andreas Cratander in some way since he and Cratander produced a joint edition of the opera omnia of Cicero which was published after Bentinus’ death.

**Works:** Besides his work on Cicero (Basel, 1528) and commentaries on Varro, Festus, and Nonius Marcellus, he produced notes on Nicolaus Perottus’ *Cornucopiae* (also in the Basel 1526 edition), editions of Horace (Basel, 1527) and Claudian (Basel, 1534), and composed religious tracts. He may be responsible for the verse translations of the epigrams in Valentinus Curio’s edition (Basel, 1524) of Traversari’s Latin version of Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers.*


3. **Marcus Vertranius Maurus**

His edition of the *De lingua latina* and accompanying commentary and life of Varro were all published for the first and last time in 1563. Preceding the commentary is a letter addressed to Andreas Pena (André Peña, a jurisconsult and conseiller at the Parlement of Aix in 1556, 1558, 1565, 1571, 1579, 1587, and 1589) and dated 1561 in which Maurus gives the circumstances of the commentary’s origin. Briefly, they are as follows.

In 1560 (‘anno superiore’) Maurus had discussed literary topics, among them the life and writings of Varro, with Blaesius Cauletius at the latter’s estate near Tarascon. Within a few days their conversation regarding Varro was organized by Maurus into the form of a *libellus* which, upon their return to Aix-en-Provence, he sent to Cauletius along with notes based upon the collation of ancient books at Florence and Rome. These ‘notae’ (presumably his commentary) were intended to explain his *castigationes* to the text of the *De lingua latina*. (Maurus’ letter to Cauletius at the beginning of the *Vita M. Terentii Varronis* adds that the untimely arrival of visitors interrupted their discourse at Tarascon, much to his and Cauletius’ regret.)

Cauletius received the work warmly, and seems to have suggested that it be dedicated to him (‘... is se mihi pro amico suavi, quae erat hominis humanitas, testem honorificum studiorum meorum praeberet...’). Maurus gladly agreed but, while the book was being printed, Cauletius died suddenly. Thus, although Pena is not the dedicatee, Maurus writes that he is sending the book to him by reason of Pena’s own philological interests and friendship with Cauletius.

The textual character of the commentary confirms Maurus’ statement that the ‘notae’ were designed to provide the rationale for his editorial emendations. The text established by Antonius Augustinus (Rome, 1557) served both as model and guide, and he cites it as an authority, though introducing also a large number of corrections. With regard to other predecessors, he refers a few times to the edition of Pomponius Laetus (I. 1) and the annotations of Michael Bentinus
(I. 2). In keeping with his reference to the examination of ancient books at Florence and Rome, the commentary includes numerous mentions of manuscripts (some 'pervetusti') that have been consulted, but no particulars are given which could lead to identification of specific codices. It should be noted, too, that, although he commented on all six surviving books of the De lingua latina, the length and character of the annotations indicate that Maurus was more interested in books V, VI, and VII.

The dedication to Blaesius Cauletius is placed after the Explicit of the commentary.

Introductory epistle (ed. of Lyons, 1563). M. Maurus Andreae Penae V. C. senatori s. [Inc.]: Quamvis amicitiae tuae iam pridem propiorem nuxem cuperem mihiue optatius nihil esset quam occasione data significare quanti ego te propter summam doctrinam tuam et modestiam singularem meritissimoque facio, huius tamen generis mallem materiam nondum intervenisse, quod esset si Blaesius Cauletius, idem tuus et idem meus, mortem vitae non commutasset. Illi ego summae probitatis summaeque eloquentiae viro, propter eximias eius virtutes amicissimus et propter studia communia et artes quas colimus, in cotidiana vita coniunctissimus fui, cum ipse in me, ex quo primum huc ex Italia redii, officiosissimus esset nullumque locum laudandi me sid ne orandi quidem praetermitteret. Et pro ea quae mihi cum illo familiaritas intercedebat, anno superiore in agro Tarasconensi villisque suis inter sermones de litteris, quibus ipse se animumque suum virtuti conscerarat, post multa de studiis nostris in M. Varronis omnium hominum qui ad hunc usque diem nati sunt eruditissimi monumenta rerumque gestarum mentionem incidimus. Qua de re sermones habitos cum intra paucos dies scripsissem amboque Aquas Sextias redivsumus, libellum illi de vita rebusque Varronis communicavi, simul et notas Florentiae et Romae pontificis libris veteribus collatis exaratas, quae meas in Varronem castigationes explicarent. Quae cum ab illo iam fere publicum accepsissent et is se mihi pro amico suavi, quae erat hominis humanitas, testem honorificum studiorum meorum praebetur, quod desiderare visus est, id ego illi cui nihil negassem facile non invitusque concessi. Sed dum liber excuditur, interea Cauletium aetate florentem, honore conspicuum, gloria splendidum, summis et imis iuicundum, civibus exterasque gratiosum immaturam mors rapit, quae tamen non vitae ornatum sicut animam abstulit. Itaque defuncti cum apud te maneat assidua recordatio inhaeretique oculis imaginis eius memoria, libellum illi destinatum ad te philosophiae studiosissimum Cauletiiique amantisimum mitto, ut eo fruare quo diutinam ipse cupiebat sitim explere. Non erit ea res mihi damno si, quod vehementer cupio, Varronem relegeris, vitam eius recensueris notasque meas pro tua scientia excellenti notaveris. Hoc certe Cauletius noster de caelo, si quis rerum humanarum sensus est, quasi a seipso factum gaudebit. Ego felicia nostra putabo sive tua manu dispungantur sive tuo iudicio probentur. Vale. Aquis Sextis. Idib. Octobris. MDLXI.

Vita M. Terentii Varronis. M. Veranius Maurus, Ad Blaesium Cauletium de vita M. Terentii Varronis. [Inc.]: Memini cum Tarascone apud te sermones inter nos confreremus homines nonnullos parum temperosos intervenisse, qui de Varronis studiis colloquium nostrum abruperem, cum tu velles ex me audire egoque averem dicere quae ex auctorum varia lectione de illius rebus et monumentis comperta iampridem habeo. Eorum nos adventum animo iniquo passi sumus, qui id in animum induximus quod C. Plinius vere credit, maius nullum specimen felicitatis esse quam super omnem scire cupere qualis vir aliquis fuerit. Quod igitur tum institueram ex veteri memoria repetere neque sum postea in congressu cotidiano persecutus, illud nunc ad te cum meis notis ad Varronem mitto, ut quod olim desiderare videbaris digestum habeas et pariter litterarum studiosi, si quem ex opera nostra fructum capiunt, eius tibi communicent quam mihi habituri sunt gratiam.../...[Expl.]: Cetera quae de his libris dici possent, non brevem commentarium hanve nostram dispositionem decent, sed iustum potius volu-
men desiderant. Ego vero vitam resque M. Varronis et de studiis eius priscia testimonia dumtaxat in unum conferre, notas quae fidem mearum emendationum facerent redderent-que suis in locis rationem ad eius reliquis De lingua latina libros accommodare animum induxi. In his tamen quae scribo, non ut Albucius ille rhetor quicquid possum, sed quicquid debo, dico. Quo plura expetet, modo ne in his quae tradidi officium meum diligentiamve requirat, nihil me suo desiderio movebit. Tu veterum amator et admirator, Cauleti, videris satisne recte Cornelios illos Nepotem, Tacitum, aut Tranquillum, aut Plutarchum sim imitatus an pro dignitate casus hostis nostri Varronis scribendo expresserim. Quod si factum meum ut illustre in tantis tenebris antiquitatis illo iudicio probas, quo ea quae recta sunt acutissime perspicis, id erit mihi gratissimum, sed gratius multo, si cum semel probaris, his semper utare pro tuis.

Commentary. M. Vertranius Maurus, Ad M. Varronis libros De lingua latina notae. Ad librum IV. [Inc.]: In quo non debet pertendi et pertenditur (V. 1. 2). Quod grammatici veteres apud Lucilium, Pacuvium, Naevium, Turpilium, Lucium et Marcum Accios, Enniium, Pomponium, Quadrigariam nostrumque Varronem observaverunt, ut agentia verba ponerent pro habentibus patiendi figuram, ne quis Nonio et A. Gellio assuetus hoc in loco annotandum existimaret, ubi codices habuerunt pertendit ego scribendi pertenditur autor fui.../...[Expl.]: Ut ex 'non' et 'velo' 'nolo' etc. (X. 5. 81). Paulo aliter ex libris De lingua latina haec verba refert A. Gellius, libri VII capite 2, et sic habet: 'ut ex "non" et "velo" "nolo" fit, sic ex "ne" et "quicquam" media extrita syllaba compositum est "nequam" ' [VI. 11. 8]. Varroniani libri plus A. Gellianis habent: 'item'; A. Gellii codices: 'fit' et 'compositum', cum prius Varroni deficiat et posterius sit in alii verbum commutatum. De utro rectius quid sit, quisque sibi viderit; ego nihil statuo. Hae fere sunt ad M. Terentii Varronis de latino sermone superstites libros scriptae notae quae, si non magnum Varroni lucem aut studiosis utilitatem afferunt, at certe decla- rant nostram, quod magis petimus, adivuan- dis eorum studiiis propensam voluntatem. Etsi vero nihil dubito paene infinita esse quae huic tractationi inseri potuerint, ea tamen quae maxime visa sunt necessaria memoria (sic) tradere satis habui. Qua qui- dem in re quod facere potui, pro virili parte praestiti, ne quis meam diligentiam desideret ubi quae officerent luminibus auctoris nostri tollere despondi. Secum potius quisque reputet veteres, qui sunt habit morta- lium sapientissimi, multa scisse dictos, non omnia; mihi prudentiam cunctarum rerum ab usu, nedum divinationem, a natura tri- butam minime fuisse. Ceterum singula et minuttissima quaeque persequi curae minu- tioris duxi et eorum qui nulla ratione duce sibi ipsi auctores facti in veteribus libris nurtant vel ab ingeniosis viris reperta mutant sicque, dum librarium inscitiam accusant, suam ipsi profitentur. Ego sane semper eiusmodi studium abhorri ut sit aliquando quod placeat aut certe quod non improbetur, et ipsa emendatio finem habeat.

Dedication. [Inc.]: Marcus Vertranius Maurus scripsi tibique, B. Cauleti, dicavi, quo neque mihi gratiorem neque meo iudicio qui philologiam studiosius amplexatur religiosusve colat nostra quemquam provincia tulit. Quae lecturis, si modo fuerint qui dignentur ista cognoscere, index amoris in te mei clausula et peracti operis esto.

Edition:


Biography:

Practically nothing, not even his vernacular name, is known of Marcus Vertranius Maurus except that he practised law in France around the middle of the sixteenth century. He was reckoned among the most knowledgeable amateur antiquarians of Lyons, and is thought to have been employed as a corrector in a printing firm.

Works: He also published 'notae' on the Annales and Historiae of Tacitus (Lyons,
1560) and composed a *De iure liberorum liber singularis* (ed. Philibert Bugnyon; Lyons, 1558).

*Bibl.:* Eckstein 362; Hoefer XXXIV 431-432; Michaud XXVII 354; Pökel 170.

4. JOSEPHUS JUSTUS SCALIGER

The *prima Scaligerana* (s. v. 'auctores') gives this information regarding his work on Varro: 'Confect Coniectanea in Varronem anno aetatis vigesimo. *Et lors, dit-il, estois-je fou comme un jeune lièvre. Notas in lib. De re rustica anno 25.' Thus Scaliger (1540-1609) would have composed the commentary or 'Coniectanea' on the *De lingua latina* during 1559-60 and the commentary on the *De re rustica* in 1564-65. In each case, publication took place several years later, and the 'Coniectanea', supplemented by a list of his corrections to Varro's erroneous etymologies, finally appeared in 1565. 

(For the 'Notae' on the *De re rustica* see p. 491 below.)

Dedicated to his patron, Ludovicus Castanaeus Rupipozaeus (Louis Chasteigner de La Rocheposay, Count of Abain, 1535-1595), the 'Coniectanea' are among Scaliger's earliest scholarly writings and the first to be printed (according to the 'Schriftenverzeichnis' given by J. Bernays, *Joseph Justus Scaliger* [Berlin, 1855], pp. 269 ff.). He remarks in the Dedictory epistle that originally he had intended to publish them together with similar work on other authors ('multa eiusmodi in alios bonos auctores'), but decided instead on a separate edition so as not to lose the opportunity of expressing his good will without delay. (It should be remembered that the association with Count de La Rocheposay had begun only in 1563.)

In 1573 there appeared Scaliger's edition of the *De lingua latina* and *De re rustica* which also contained an 'Appendix in Coniectanea'. No Dedictory epistle precedes these addenda, and it is not known when they were composed. Bernays (ibid., p. 269) remarks that they belong to a more mature period: 'In der, jetzt fast allein gangbaren, Bipontiner Ausgabe [published 1788] sind die Conjectanea vermengt mit der gleich... zu erwähnenden Appendix, welche aus schon viel reiferer Zeit stammt und absichtlich von Scaliger als für sich bestehend und aus einem andern Tone redend nicht in die Conjectanea eingereiht wurde.' Except for the *edito Bipontina*, all other editions containing the 'Coniectanea' and 'Appendix' have presented them as separate works, each with its own title.

Like his predecessor Marcus Vertranius Maurus (I. 3), Scaliger annotated the six surviving books of the *De lingua latina*, but his comments in both the 'Coniectanea' and 'Appendix' show that he too was much more concerned with books V-VII. Similarly, he often refers to the edition (Rome, 1557) of Antonius Augustinus when explaining textual problems; unlike Maurus, however, he adopts a much harsher tone, disagreeing quite frequently both with Augustinus' text (which he describes in the Dedactory epistle as full of errors) and with the emendations of Maurus, whom he did not regard highly. He also cites numerous readings proposed by Adrianus Turnebus with whom he had discussed certain difficulties; cf. the comment at *De lingua latina* V. 2. 15 *Ab eo praeco dicitur...: '...et, nisi valde fallor, memini olim quoque ita sensisse doctissimum Adrianum Turnebum cum haec cum illo communicarem' (pp. 4-5 in the 1565 edition). However, given Scaliger's evident liking and admiration for Turnebus, there is a noticeable and respectful restraint in his manner of disagreeing with the latter. (See p. 483 below for his opinion of the Turnebus commentary published in 1566.)

A copy of the Basel 1526 edition of Perottus' *Cornucopiae* and grammatical treatises of Varro, Festus, and Nonius Marcellus, now in the University Library, Leiden with the shelf mark 761 A 10, contains notes in Scaliger's hand on books V-VII (cols. 1057-93) of the *De lingua latina*. For the most part the entries consist of underlinings in the text, single words in the margins, and references to similar passages in other parts of the work. In the few cases where the comments are longer, Scaliger has given a
a. The Coniectanea of 1565.

Dedicator epistle (ed. of Paris, 1565).

Nobilissimo ac eruditissimo iuveni Ludovico Castanaeo Rupipozaeo s. [Inc.]: Non dubito quin haec Coniectanea in M. Varronem maturius edenda erant quod a quibusdam ea cupide expectari sciebam; materia autem ea est ut vel studiosos iuvare, summos etiam viros delectare possit. Tamen non defuerunt causae quae me quasi currentem primo presserunter. Extiterunt enim nonnulli qui obtrectarent me actum agere: eum auctorem emendatissimum Romanae olim edidit esse: quid alius quam me infeliciter versari in ea provincia quam magna cum laude summus vir Antonius Augustinus suscepisset? Alii vero negare bonas horas in his minutis animadversionibus collocare esse eius qui aliquod nomen in litteris consequi ac in hominem luce versari vellet. Haec sane sat non erant ad deterrendos animos eorum qui norunt et horum prava iudicia et illorum malignas obsercationes. Tamen tantum apud me valuerunt ut fatendum mihi sit, quod illis crediderim, potius in eo requirendum iudicium meum quam quod Varronem emendarim reprehendendum. Nam quod aiunt isti, post Antonium Augustinum frustra illud negotium a me suscepit esse, primum alterutrum aut profitionem, aut temeritatem suam, qui audeant prae-stare illam editionem quam ipsi legisse non videntur, aut supinenatem, qui si legerunt non vident in ea tot mendoisos locos relictos, non paucos etiam perperam mutatos esse, ut mihi videantur magnam iniuriam facere optimo viro qui eius magnitudinem ingenii haec una editione volunt aestimari. Deinde tanta non est eius editionis vel auctoritas vel fides ut deterruerit similis conatus Vertranii viri eruditi, quem honorifice appello.../.../[Exp.]: Nam auctores bonos recognoscere, contra quam isti maligne vellicant, etsi non summi ingenii est, non tamen mediocris operae est. Et tametsi in eo negotio interdum falli necesse est, non tamen ita omnino luditur opera ut non laude dignus sit qui magnum auctorem iuvare voluit. Hoc me multum consolatur. Nam et tot maculis scatet Varro ut, in quo me deceperit iudicium meum, eae soleae possint sustinere causam defensionis meae. Et quod caput est, is est auctor quem vel tantum edidisse plausibile sit apud studiosos, nedum castigatorum edidisse aliquid laudis mereatur. Deinde quia necesse fuit in multis coniectare tantum, difficile est autem in omnibus praestare posse coniecturas; securi sumus sapientiurn iudicum rationem. Ipsi quod perpetuo iure non possunt, arbitrio decidunt. Idcirco cavimus nobis titulot et ‘Coniectanea’ inscripsimus ut non habeant isti quid cavellent in eo qui tantum partes dubitantis susceperit. Haud enim facile concoquere possunt quod post editiones duas Augustini et Vertranii aliquid novi me profferere sperem quod illos latuerit. Et tamen qui nostras cum illorum animadversionibus compararit non solum dictet nos vidisse quod ipsos fugerit, sed etiam aliquid praeterea monuisse de quo ipsis numquam in mentem venit. Neque hoc dictum vel tamquam ignem quantus vir sit Augustinus, quem sane eruditissimum ex suis scriptis expertus sum, sed ut sciant isti longe felicius eum potuisse tractare hoc negotium si voluisset. Tolerabile enim erat quod in ea editione corrupta multa præterita sunt, nisi ex emendationibus pleraque in peius mutata essent. Cum igitur, Ludo-vice Castanaeae, iuvenis nobilissime et eruditissime, in animo habuissem haec Coniec-tanea saltem sola non edere quod multa eiusmodi in aliis bonos auctores habeam et poterant una cum illis publicari, tamen placuit haec in gratiam tuam edere, quia ea iudicarim melius in nomine tuo apparere quam si in aliu tempus premerentur et tam bonam occasionem utrique amitteremus, illa talem patronum inveniendi, ego meam in te voluntatem significandi. Quod quidem multis de causis facio, tum quod ex
nobilitate nostra non potui invenire magis litterarum amantem quam te, cuius ingenium tale est ut etiam sine litteris videatur cultum esse potuisse; tantum autem litterarum consequitus es ut vel satis ad summam gloriam esse possit. Tum, si quis quaerendus erat cui multum me debere fatear, tu profecto unus occurristi, cuius et plurima in me extant beneficia, et quotidie magis ac magis eam de te sem facis ut cuius liberalitati multa accepta refero, eius etiam virtutem admirari cogar. Vale, ex Castro tuo Rupipozaeorum, IIII Idus Decemb. MDLXIII.


Editions:
1565, Parisiis (Paris): Ex officina Rob. Stephani typographi Regii. NUC; Ed. Bispont. I (1788) xxxv–xxxvi; Renouard, Estienne 167; Adams S–558. BM; BN; Vatican Library; (IU; MH).

(*) 1569. See above, Composite Editions (Doubtful).

1573. See above, Composite Editions.
1581. See above, Composite Editions.
1585. See above, Composite Editions.
1619. See above, Composite Editions.
1623. See above, Composite Editions.
1788. See above, Composite Editions.

b. The 'Appendix' of 1573

Appendix (ed. of Geneva, 1573). Joseph Scaliger, Appendix ad Coniectanea sua in libros M. Terentii Varronis De lingua latina. [Inc.]: Proper tis quaternas causas (V. 1. 6). Quidam locum mendosum suspiciati sunt; ego tantum mutilum quovis pignore contendam. Nam cum contrarie opposuerit litterarum demptionem additionem, traictationis seu traicitionis commutationem, syllabarum productioni quod opponat non addit…/…[Expl.]: Ut scala, falera (X. 4. 73). Non in feminino quidem dicitur singulari sed neutro dicitur, ut 'falere' apud eundem Varronem De re rustica [III. 5. 14, 16].

Editions:

(*) 1569. See above, Composite Editions (Doubtful).

1573. See above, Composite Editions.
1581. See above, Composite Editions.
1585. See above, Composite Editions.
1619. See above, Composite Editions.
1623. See above, Composite Editions.
1788. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:
See CTC II 13–14.

5. ADRIANUS TURNEBUS

There are two commentaries, both issued posthumously. The first appeared in 1566, a year after Turnebus' death, and, in the Dedicationary epistle addressed to Michael Hospitalis (Michel de l'Hôpital, c. 1505–1573), Odo Turnebus explains that the 'commentarii et emendationes' to the De lingua latina had been found among his father's papers. Jacobus Daniel, a former pupil of Turnebus, did not wish the annotations to be lost in the general disarray of the literary remains or to be destroyed, and so enlisted the aid of another pupil, Johannes Furdinus of Rouen. To Furdinus is due the credit of actually editing the commentary; he had been closely associated with Turnebus for a long time and his familiarity with the
latter's script enabled him to put the notes in order.

The second commentary, published by Henricus Stephanus in 1573 in a volume which also contained Scaliger's edition, commentary, and appendix (I. 4), consists of passages excerpted from books XX-XXIV of Turnebus' Adversaria (Paris, 1565). According to the printer's note to the reader (see p. 465 above), some of the passages are identical with those in the 1566 commentary while others are different or expound the same point more clearly or more learnedly. The note concludes with the observation that the first commentary was never revised by Turnebus and would have been of a higher quality if the author himself had prepared it for publication. Scaliger is more blunt, judging the 1566 commentary to be unworthy of Turnebus; in the comment in the appendix to De lingua latina V. 10. 59 sive ut Zenon he remarks: 'Sed inuriom fecerunt manibus eruditissimi et maximi viri, qui nescio quae eius ἀποστολάτρια vel potius abortiva quaedam in Varronem post mortem eius ediderunt, quibus magis traduxerunt eum quam eius nomen commendarunt. Nam quid opus erat ea edere cum ipse ea more suo in Adversaria sua tumultuaria opera infercisset? Sane ne quid amplius dicam, indigna sunt quae tanti viri titulum praeferrent.'

Stephanus' 1581 edition of Varro, which includes only the comments gleaned from the Adversaria, established the pattern followed by all succeeding editions of the De lingua latina containing Turnebus' annotations. In another note to the reader (see p. 466 above), Stephanus justifies the omission of the 1566 commentary on the grounds that it had been composed 'many years previously' ('multis ante annis') and was an 'abortive' ('abortivum') rather than a 'mature production' ('maturum fetum'). The language and tone are reminiscent of Scaliger's comment quoted above, and the latter's remark must have been influential in prompting Stephanus to introduce a note so different from that in the 1573 edition. It should be pointed out that his vague reference to 'multis ante annis' and Odo Turnebus' mention in the Dedicatory epistle of 'hosce in Varronis Lingum latinam commentarios a patre iam olim exaratos' are the only clues we have for the date of the 1566 commentary. Scaliger gives no information at all on this matter, seeming to regard the commentary as ἀποστολάτρια or 'abortiva' in the sense that it is not a finished or revised work. Possibly Stephanus' allusion is an elaboration along the lines that might naturally be suggested by his use of 'abortivum'. In any case, the obvious terminus ante quem is 1565, the year when Turnebus died.

Only books V-VII of the De lingua latina are treated in the 1566 commentary. The passages from the Adversaria are principally concerned with book V, and occasionally troublesome places from book VII are discussed. In both commentaries the emphasis is on textual problems; quotations and parallels from other authors are noticeably more numerous in the Adversaria extracts.

a. The commentary published in 1566.
Dedicatory epistle (ed. of Paris, 1566). Clarissimo et amplissimo viro Michaeli Hospitali Franciaie cancellario Odo Turnebus s.p.d [Inc.]: Cum post parentis obitum omnibus litterarum studiosis gravem ac molestum, mihi fratribusque meus luctuosus et acerbum, in illius bibliotheca conquireremus equid esset quod studia discentium posset adiuvere, multa quidem reperimus sed ita confusa et perturbata, ita situ et pulvere obducta et lituris deformata ut illa facile pro derelictis essesem habituri, nisi nobis in tanta rei difficultate Iacobi Daniellis in comitatu regio consiliarii Franciaeque rectoris auxilium adfuisse. Qui cum se olim parentis nostri praeceptis institutisque formatum et eruditum meminisset, haec doctoris sui monumenta noluit aboleri. Itaque misit Rothomago Johannis Furdition qui veteri cum patre coniunctus necessitudine assidue una iam a multis annis vixerat eique in studio sedulam operam et industrias naveset; illius manuum et scripturam paucis cognitam propter diurnturn usum penitus
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perspectam et exploratam habebat. Huius labore, industria, vigilantia effectum est ut plurima, quasi tempestate disiecta, naufragia colligerentur et quae aliqui funditus erant peritura servarentur. Ecce tibi igitur primum hosce in Varronis Lingua latina commentarios a patre iam olim exaratos, a Furdino et Daniele prope ex incendio servatos, recentis tui beneficici memoriae exhibemus, multa etiam posthac oblaturi; in primisque Adversariorum non exiguae reliquias illius innocentis epistulae comitatu ornatiiores quam tibi dicatum nonnulli lucem aspicere passi non sunt, ut cum paternos librorum fetus tibi devotos et consecratos summa humanitatem et animi alacritate exceperis, librorum etiam orbitatem tuae fidei et clientelae commissam arbitrare quo per te regis liberalitatem frui et ex diuturnis parentis laboribus fructum aliquem percipere possint. Bene vale. Lutetiae Parisiorum Idibus Augusti. 1566.

Commentary. Adrianus Turnebus, Commentarii et emendationes in libros M. Varronis De lingua latina. [Inc.]: Quemadmodum (V. I. 1). Inscriptio horum omnium Varronis librorum generalis esse videtur De lingua latina, in quorum primis tribus, ut ipse scribit in calce libri VI [VII. 7. 109], disserebat de disciplina originis verborum, quae privata eorum trium librorum inscriptio est, ut trium sequentium titulos est 'De verborum originibus', quod librorum eorum argumentum est... [Expl.]: Perpetrata (VII. 7. 110). Perfecta, absoluta. Finis.

Editions:
1573. See above, Composite Editions.
1600, Argentorati (Strasbourgo): Sumptibus Lazari Zetzneri Bibliopolae (Viri clariss. Adriani Turnebi... opera, vol. I). NUC; Adams T–1143. BM; BN; Vatican Library; (MH; CaOTU).

b. The commentary extracted from the Adversaria and published in 1573.

Commentary (ed. of Geneva, 1573). Adrianus Turnebus, Annotationes et emendationes ex eius libris Adversariorum excerptae. [Inc.]: Adversariorum libri XX, caput XXIX. M. Varro lib. IIII De lingua latina [V. 3. 16–17] Asiam et caelum duobus modis dici refert. Nam et caelum dicitur caeli pars summa ubi stellae et aeris plaga tenero terram com- plexus continens... /[Expl.]: Adversario- rum libri XXIII, caput XXIX. Insignis est illa Varronis translatio a fugitivis servis sumpta, sane quam eleganter lib. IIII De lingua latina [V. 1. 5]: 'Quare illa quae iam maioribus nostris ademit oblivio, fugitiva si sedulitas Mucii et Bruti retrahere nequit, non, si non potuero indagare, eo ero tardior'... Homines etiam in locandi explicatione scrupulus male urit cum scribitur 'ab eo praeco dicitur locare, quoadusque id emit' [De lingua latina V. 2. 15]. Ego male coalescentia puto divellenda legendumque censeo 'quoadusque idem it.'

Editions:
(*1569. See above, Composite Editions (Doubtful).
1573. See above, Composite Editions.
1581. See above, Composite Editions.
1585. See above, Composite Editions.
1619. See above, Composite Editions.
1623. See above, Composite Editions.
1788. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:
See CTC I 150 and II 15.

6. PETRUS CIACONIUS

In the biography of Petrus Ciacconius which Andreas Schottus wrote for his Hispanicæ bibliotheca (Frankfurt, 1608), he reports that he has 'seen' commentaries by Ciacconius on the De lingua latina and De re rustica (p. 561): 'In M. Terentii Varronis togatorum doctissimi, quem suo ipse (sc. Ciacconius) saeculo retulisse mihi visus est, libros de lingua latina ad Ciceronem, in rei rusticæ volumina commentarium, ut et in Melam De situ orbis scholia videre memini.' This reference to Ciacconius' work
on Varro is repeated by Antonius, Nova II 183: 'In M. Terentii Varronis libris De lingua latina et De re rustica commentarium se vidisse ait idem Scotus. Harum vero, quae penitus sibi probarentur, vel saltem non improbarentur, edidit Fulvius Ursinus in suis M. Catone, M. Varrone, Lucio Columella, et alis Rei Rusticae scriptoribus Romae publicatis anno 1587 typis Georgii Ferrarii, ut ipse refert Antonio Carrafae cardinali in epistula nuncupatoria.'

Ciacconius' commentary on the De re rustica is preserved in three manuscripts (see p. 492 below), one of which, Copenhagen 828, 4to, is autograph, unfortunately breaking off in the midst of the annotations on the first book. No manuscripts of the commentary on the De lingua latina have yet been located. However, evidence of his work on this text is supplied by Vatican Library, Stamp. Barb. K. II. 100, a copy of Antonius Augustinus' edition of Rome, 1557 which once belonged to Ciacconius (cf. 'P. CH.' on the title page) and was annotated by him. The numerous comments expressed therein in an abbreviated and sometimes cryptic fashion may represent a rough draft which, when written out in full, would naturally exhibit the connected prose style evident in his commentaries on Caesar (CTC III 120, 131-132, 134, 135-136, 138) and the De re rustica. In connection with the latter, it may be noted that Ciacconius seems to have annotated a copy of the 1548 edition of the Scriptores rei rusticae (see p. 493 below), and the existence of other printed books containing his handwritten observations suggests that he was accustomed to enter comments in this manner. (For Ciacconius' notes in printed versions of the Martyrologium Romanum [Vaticanus lat. 8922] and works of Hilary of Poitiers [Vaticanus lat. 11602], see Codices Vaticani latini. J. Ruyschaert, Codices 11414-11709 [Vatican City, 1959] 387-388.)

Although the annotations in Stamp. Barb. K. II. 100 cover books V-X of the De lingua latina, those dealing with books V-VII are much fuller and more intelligible than those for books VIII-X which consist mainly of variant readings and symbols (+ and >). Hence, in this article, only the former are considered sufficient to constitute a commentary. They reveal Ciacconius' concern with textual problems (illustrated by the citation of readings from other manuscripts) and points of style. There are frequent references to parallel or explanatory material in such ancient authors as Apuleius, Ennius, Festus, Livy, and Suetonius. Among the humanists he has recourse to Petrus Victorius and Adrianus Turnebus (Adversaria). A comment at V. 10. 66 Sanctum (sic) (p. 27: 'Anno 1574 in insula Tiberina in fundamentis templi d. Bartholomei reperta fuit marmorea basis cum hac inscriptione...') indicates that at least some of Ciacconius' work on the De lingua latina falls between 1574 and 1581, the year of his death. He may have been engaged at roughly the same time in preparing the commentary on the De re rustica, which falls between 1572 and 1581 (see p. 491-92 below).

Under the entry for 'Pedro Chacon' in the Diccionario de historia eclesiastica de España II (Madrid, 1972) 673, A. Orive lists the following item among Ciacconius' works: 'In M. Terentii Varronis libris de Lingua Latina, De Re Rustica Commentarium, impresos por F. Orsini junto con otros trabajos de Agricultura, Ro. 1587'. However, the miscellany published by Fulvius Ursinus at Rome in 1587 contains only Ciacconius' commentary (as edited by Ursinus) on the De re rustica. Orive's erroneous statement apparently derives from a misreading of the Antonius reference given above in which Antonius uses 'harum' to mean 'the latter', i.e., De re rustica commentarium.

There is no indication in Stamp. Barb. K. II. 100 of a Preface or Dedicatory epistle. The lemma in the Incipit given below was not underlined by Ciacconius, but seems to be the passage referred to in his marginal comment.

Commentary (Stamp. Barb. K. II. 100). [Inc.]: (p. 9) De his tris ante hunc feci quos Septumio misi, in quibus est de disciplina quam vocant ἐτυμολογίαν (I. 1. 1). Intra 112. 20 (sc. VII. 7. 109 'Quare institutis sex
libris, quemadmodum rebus latina nomina essent imposita ad usum nostrum, e quis tris scripsi Po. Septumio...')..../[Expl.]: (p. 113) Parte perpetrata (VII. 7. 110). Festus [De verborum significatu XV (Lindsay, p. 238)]: ‘Perpetrat. Perficit.’

Manuscript:

Vatican Library, Stamp. Barb. K. II. 100, pp. 9-113. This is a printed book (Rome, 1557) containing Antonius Augustinus' edition of the De lingua latina; it formerly belonged to Petrus Ciacconius who wrote his comments in the margins. The title page also exhibits another nota possessoris: ‘Es del Conde de Humanes’.

Biography:

See CTC III 121.

7. Dionysius Gothofredus

Dionysius Gothofredus published in 1585 an edition of the ‘Auctores latinae linguae’ which included commentaries on the De lingua latina of Varro and the remains of Festus and Nonius Marcellus. In the Dedicatoria epistle addressed to Wolfgang Christoph and Wilhelm Christoph von Pappenheim he relates that, during the preparation of his famous edition, with commentary, of the Corpus iuris civilis (Lyons, 1583), he consulted the writings of Varro, Festus, Nonius Marcellus, and Isidore for aid with difficult legal terms, and at that time conceived the idea of publishing these authors in one convenient volume, together with others who had treated the same subjects.

Gothofredus describes his annotations as ‘breves...notas’, and observes that he has paid particular attention to legal points so as to encourage other lawyers to study the ancient texts. To be sure, his commentary does contain information on legal matters, but the general impression it makes is that he has leaned heavily on the work of his predecessors, a debt acknowledged by numerous references to the commentaries of Marcus Vertranius Maurus (I. 3), Joseph Scaliger (I. 4), and Adrianus Turnebus (I. 5) and the edition (Rome, 1557) of Antonius Augustinus. Like them he concentrated mainly on books V-VII of the De lingua latina, and his comments on books VIII-X are very brief, consisting usually of variant readings.

Dedatory epistle (ed. of [Geneva], 1585). Generosi et magnificis DD. Wolfgang Christophoro et Wilhelmo Christophoro mareschalis hereditariis S. R. Imperii dominis in Bappenheym Dionysius Gothofredus IC s. p. d. [Inc.]: Cum meos in ius Romanum commentarios ederem, generosi ac nobilissimi domini Bappenheymi, inter antiquos illos auctores quorum testimonii usus sum ad ea vocabula quae in iure obscura essent illustranda, Varro, Festus, Nonius et Isidorus inter postremos non leguntur. Cepi ab eo tempore consilium de illis omnibus in unum quasi corpus redigen-dis atque ita in publicum emittendis cum alis quibusdam auctoris qui ad superio-rum argumenta facere atque conducere videbantur. Etsi autem me non fugiebat illos auctores seorsim a multis editos, commodius tamen edo coniunctos videbamus ut qui in unum legendo incidisset, alios evolvendi occasionem et in mutua illorum inter se collatione iusti commentarii atque interpretis vicem in ipsis manibus praesentem haberet... Sed cum mutili atque laceri variis locis illi auctores essent, visum fuit breves ad Varro-nem, Festum et Nonium notas adiungere, facta potissimum collatione earum vocum quae ad ius nostrum pertinenter, quod a quoquam alio antehac factum esse non videbamus, ut nostrae professionis homines eo magis ad antiquos illos auctores evolvendos excitarem. Et audenter dicam ad multa in illis auctoris restituenda collationem nostri iuris summopere et quasi necessariam requiri, quae si defuisset, de multorum locorum restituzione quasi desperasse. Haec autem cum a me ita absoluta vel cum aliquo successu viderem, subiit ilico animum meum generosa illa indoles atque comitas quae inter ceteras et maximas virtutes in illa nobili ac vestra adolescence tu elucet, cui hoc animi mei obsequentis indicium atque munus debere me statim intellexi. Idque eo magis quod amplissimae vestrae familiae stemmatis et in imperio Romano ob illus-
trem et hereditariam mareschialiae dignitatem satis superque cognitae, praeter omnium virtutum studia, iuris etiam civilis ac Romani, quae mea professio est, cognitionem adiungitis ductu atque auspicio doctissimi viri Frederici Weckmani praepositoris vestri, ut patriae aliquando non minus virtute quam sapientia civili ornatum atque auxilio esse possitis.../...[Expl.]: Interea tamen ut ad hoc meum opus revertar, ea conditione atque lege id a me sic inceptum ac perfectum ut laudi atque diligentiae eorum, qui me tempore in hoc interpretandi genere antecesserunt, nihil detractum aut velim aut putem. Nam ut illis sua, ita et mihi in quibusdam mutandis sententia peculiaris esse potuit, libera tamen et aperta, discendi ac iuvandi perpetuo cupida sine convicio, sine contumelia et, quod mihi sollemne, brevis, crita affectationem ullam, vitatis prologis qui nihil ad rem conferunt. Vide-rint ista diligentiores, mihi certe neque temporis neque animus fuit rebus otiosis lectorem fallere. Mihi contra curae ac studio fuit nuda et simplicem lectionem varietatem ostendere, auctores auctoribus breviter confere. Neque dubito quin tam grato a vobis (sic) animo hoc meum munus a vobis susceptatur quam a me, generosisissimi domini, sinceriter et in arrham perpetui erga vos obsequi offertur. Ex Musaeo, XV Augusti, 1585.


Editions:

1585, [Geneva]: Apud Guillielmum Leimarium. With the text of the De lingua latina of Varro, fragments of Verrius Flaccus, Festus, and Nonius Marcellus, Expositio sermonum antiquorum of Fulgentius Plan-ciades, Origines of Isidore, excerpts from various grammarians etc. NUC; Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxxvii; Baudrier I 239; Adams G-897. BM; BN; Vatican Library; (CU; DLC; MIU; CaOTU).

(1595), [Geneva]: Apud Guillielmum Leimarium. For contents see the 1585 edition. NUC; Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxxviii; Baudrier I 239; Adams G-898. BN; (CtY; MIU).

1602, S. Gervasii (Saint-Gervais): Apud Iacobum Chouët. This edition also appears under the names of Haeredes E. Vignon and P. de La Roviére. For contents see the 1585 edition. NUC; Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxxvii-xxxviii; Baudrier I 239. BN; (ICU; MH; NJP).

1622, [Geneva]: Apud Johannem Vignon. This edition also appears under the names of Petrus and Jacobus Chouët and P. de La Roviére. For contents see the 1585 edition. NUC; Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxxviii; Baudrier I 239. BM; BN; Vatican Library; (MH; NJP; VIU).

Biography:

Dionysius Gothofredus (Denis Godefroy) was born in Paris 17 October 1549 and died in Strasbourg 7 September 1621 (Eckstein, Hoefer, Sands) or 1622 (Haag, Nicéron).

Born of noble parents on both sides, he studied law at Louvain with Johannes Ramus and did further work at Cologne and Heidelberg. It is not known when Gothofredus embraced Protestantism, but it is likely that he did so during his time in Heidelberg. Upon completion of his studies he returned to France and, in 1573, married Denise de Saint-Yon who was also of a noble family. Civil troubles forced Gothofredus to withdraw by reason of his religion to Geneva in 1580, and he received the chair of law there in 1585. King Henry IV appointed him bailli of Gex in 1589, and he discharged this office until 1591 when he lost most of his property, including his library, during political upheavals and retired to Basel. Through the efforts of Philippus Glaserus he was offered a chair of law and history at Strasbourg, and he taught there until 1600 when...
Frederick IV, the Palatine Elector, summoned him to Heidelberg to perform similar duties. However, Gothofredus remained in this city only a brief time because of the difficulties caused by the professional jealousy which his reputation excited. He returned to Strasbourg in November 1601 but went back to Heidelberg in 1604 after the atmosphere had become more congenial. He lived there for the next seventeen years, refusing offers to teach at Bourges (1603, 1610), Franeker (1608), Angers (1609), and Valence (1610) because he had decided to make Heidelberg his permanent home. The Thirty Years’ War, however, caused him to change his plans and in 1621 he went to Strasbourg where he died shortly afterwards.

Works: He is best known for his legal writings, numbering nearly twenty, the most famous of which is the above mentioned edition of the Corpus iuris civilis (Lyons, 1583). Besides his commentaries on Varro, Festus, and Nonius Marcellus, his non-legal works include Notae in M. Tullium Ciceronem (Lyons, 1588), Coniecturae, variae lectiones et loci communes sive Libri aureorum in Seneca (Basel, 1590), Pro coniecturis in Senecam brevis ad J. Gruterum responsio (Frankfurt, 1591), and Antiquae historiae ex XXVII auctoribus contextae libri sex (Basel, 1590), in which he inserts the work of fictitious authors forged by Johannes Annius Viterbiensis.


8. Ausonius Popma

The fragments of Varro were Popma’s first concern, and in 1589 he published an edition, with commentary, of the remains of four works (see p. 495 below). His edition of the opera omnia appeared in 1601 and included commentaries on the De lingua latina and De re rustica (see p. 493 below); the Dedicatorie epistle is addressed to his brothers Sixtus and Titus and dated 1600. Popma’s commentary on the De lingua latina contains explanations and emendations of many textual problems and also supplies much information of an antiquarian character. Although numerous parallels from ancient authors are given, there are no explicit references to previous humanistic commentators. The omission is curious in the light of his statement in the Dedicatorie epistle that praise and gratitude are due the earlier scholars who had worked on Varro, and it should be pointed out that some of his annotations echo clearly observations made by Joseph Scaliger (see p. 480 above) and Adrianus Turnebus (see p. 482 above).

Although Antonius Augustinus (Rome, 1557) and Marcus Vertranius Maurus (see p. 477 above) had previously edited the fragments of the lost books of the De lingua latina, Popma was the first to comment on them. Preceding the commentary are his Vita M. Varronis and Bibliotheca Varroniana vel De scriptis M. Varronis liber.

Dedicatorie epistle (ed. of [Leyden], 1601). Ausonius Popma Sixto et Tito Popmis fratribus suis VV. CC. s. d. [Inc.]: Multa et varia fuerunt Marci Varronis opera, quae se exstant et antiquitas memoria non desideraret. Nihil enim actum vel inventum umquam fuit quod ille divinis litterarum monumentis consignatum non reliquit. Sed paucia dumtaxat quaedam ex tanta praestantissimorum scriptorum copia ad nos pervenerunt, etaque ipsa plerumque ita corrupta et perturbata ut vix aliiquid depravatius cogitari possit. Quo nomine magna sane laus debetur doctissimis quibusdam viris qui ad restituendos superstites Varronis libros tantum contulerunt quantum ab hominibus summo ingenio exquisitaque doctrina praeditis expetì par fuit. Quorum ego exemplum seclus secutem
libros accurate recensui, et hoc amplius locupletavi nova accessione fragmentorum quae apud varios auctores dispersa unum in corpus compositi. Erant in iis plurima mendosa, multa item obscura, quorum alia integritati suae restituere conatus sum, alia (sic) dedi operam ut interpretationibus quam potuit (sic) brevissimis illustrarem. In omnibus autem eum modum servavi ut sententiam meam vide ullam ostentatione proposuerim et, cum ab aliis dissentio, sine cuiusquam vel minima reprehensione. Quid effecerim, studiosi rerum litterarumque veterum iudicabunt, et inter illos vos, fratres carissimi, qui optimarum artium studia et reconditam antiquitatem doctrinam cum iuris civilis scientia coniunxistis. Valete. IV Kal. Aug. MDC.


Bibliotheca Varroniana. Ausonius Popma, Bibliotheca Varroniana vel De scriptis M. Varronis liber. [Inc.]: Marci Terentii Varronis scripta prope infinita temporum inuria perierunt, quibus ille plurimarum artium doctrinan et omnem memoriam antiquitatis consignatam reliquit.../...[Expl.]: Idem Atacinus scripsit libros Sequanicorum vel Sequanicelli, quorum testimonia Priscianus aliquotiens utitut. Unde legendum apud Nonium [De copioseopia doctrina III (Lindsay, p. 287)]: 'Varro, Sequanielli lib. II: 'Gallica sporta (sic) carros adcurat (sic) politos' 

Commentary. Ausonius Popma, Notae ad libros M. Terentii Varronis De lingua latina. Ad librum primum. [Inc.]: Aggulus, aggens (Funaioli, fr. 3, p. 185). P. Nigidius in commentariis grammaticis: 'Inter litteram "n" et "l" et "g" est alia vis, ut in nomine "anguis", "angaria" et "ancora", et "increpat" et "incurrit" et "ingenuus". In omnibus enim his non verum "n" sed adulterinum ponitur. Nam "n" non esse lingua indicio est; nam si ea littera esset, lingua palatum tangeret' [Funaioli, fr. 17, p. 167],.../...[Expl.]: Ad librum XIII. Olivo et Osso (sic) (Funaioli, fr. 18, p. 193). Forte 'solido ex Osso'. Etsi aliquando suspicatus sum Varronem scripisses 'Olympo et Ossa', scilicet dici debuisse iuxta analogiam cum tamen sit in usu 'Ossa', sed pro his montium nomenibus Charisium [Institutiones grammaticae I (Keil I 99)] alia nomina repoussisse. Quo in genere ab antiquis grammaticis saepe peccatum est.

Editions:

1601, [Leyden]: Ex officina Plantiniana, apud Christophorum Raphelengium, Academiae Lugduno-Bat. typographum. With the text of Varro (De lingua latina. De re rustica, and fragments) and commentaries on the De re rustica and fragments. Ed. Bipont. I (1787) cxli; Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxxvii. BN; Vatican Library; (CtY.)

1788. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:

See p. 238 above.

II. De re rustica

COMMENTARIES

1. PETRUS VICTORIIUS

Varro was the first of the Scriptores rei rusticae to be annotated by Victorius (see pp. 227, 232 above) whose commentaries were published in a companion volume of castigationes to his edition (Lyons, 1541) of Cato, Varro, and Columella. His observations on all three authors are primarily textual. For the text of Varro he consulted three manuscripts; two of them also figured in his work on Cato, namely, Laurentianus 30. 10 (s. XV; Cato and Varro) and a vetustissimum volument, now lost, which belonged to the library of San Marco, Florence and originally contained Cato, Varro, Columella, and Gargilius Martialis. Unfortunately, by the time Victorius examined this ancient witness, the folios with Columella and Gargilius Mar-
tialis were missing, and the text of Varro stopped at *tubicinum graecum* (sic) (III. 17. 4.) The third manuscript which he used was copied at Ferrara in the home of Guaninus Veronensis; this may be Oxford, Bodleian Library ms. Lat. class. d. 2 whose colophon reads ‘...absolutus apud clariss. virum Guarinum Veronensem Ferrariae. MCCCC- LIIIIO. Idibus Augustis’.

For the text of the Dedictory epistle addressed to Cardinal Marcellus Cervinus and found in the 1541 edition, see p. 232 above. The Introduction and passages from the commentary given below are taken from the manuscript (Vatican Library, Reginensis lat. 1502) of the *castigationes* which was apparently used by the printer. The Introduction, however, breaks off on f. 163 with *positi sunt collo-*, and the remainder has been supplied from the 1542 Lyons edition.

Introduction (Vatican Library, Reginensis lat. 1502, ff. 162v–163). Petrus Victoris, *In M. Varronis Rerum rusticarum lib. I. [Inc.]:* Accessit tribus libris, quorum fidem maxime in Catone expurgando secutus sum, tertius quidam amici et familiaris hominis, qui in Varrone comes illis adiungit et non negligenter a nobis in hoc munere observatus est. Illum autem, quamvis priscis temporibus exaratus non fuerit, parvi faciendum non putavi, nam domi doctissimi et clarissimi viri, ut in eo quoque annotatum est, Guarni Veronensis Ferrariae exscriptus fuit ut facilius etiam a natali loco fides ei habenda sit. Non enim ab isdem exemplaribus, quibus nostri profectus esse potest, aut quando cum libris nostris consentit, quod saepenumbero facit, id astute facere et consilio aliquo fraudis cum illis in toto existimari debet, sed ut incorruptus testis, quod in veritate ab aliis prave discrepare nolit. De aliis plurimis qui aut ex eodem fonte orti aut mendose scripti sunt, mentionem non faciam, nam aut ambitiosus in citandis testibus viderer aut studiois sine uulla utilitate fastidium afferrum. Inscriptionem trium M. Varronis librorum a me in optimis codicibus inventam secutus sum, nam indices, quibus declaratur quid singulis partibus horum sermonum contineatur, non omnes veteres sunt. Primi enim tantum libri in manu scriptis exemplaribus reperiuntur, et ii loco quo a me positi sunt collocati. Secundi ac tertii indicum in iisdem vestigium nullum, et sane si quis accurate animadvertat, non valde elegantes sunt. Quare a recentioribus additos puto; ob iaque ad eos ut adulterinos notam apposui.


Manuscript:
Vatican Library, Reginensis lat. 1502, s. XVI, ff. 162v–248v. This manuscript displays printer’s notations. (Kristeller, *Iter* II 403).

Editions:


(*)1569. See above, Composite Editions (Doubtful).

1573. See above, Composite Editions.

(*)[c. 1580]. Adams V-289, 675.

1581. See above, Composite Editions.
1585. See above, Composite Editions.
1619. See above, Composite Editions.
1623. See above, Composite Editions.
1735. See above, Composite Editions.
1773. See above, Composite Editions.

**Biography:**
See CTC II 35–36 and p. 235 above.

2. **JOSEPHUS JUSTUS SCALIGER**

According to an entry in the *prima Scaligerana* (see 1. 4, p. 480 above), he composed 'Notae' on the *De re rustica* in 1564–65. They were first published in 1573, and this edition is famous for the inclusion on pp. 211–212 of alleged verses by the comic poet Trabea. These were, in fact, the work of Marcus Antonius Muretus who had sent them in jest to Scaliger. The joke, however, was not well received, and removal of the spurious lines was among the corrections effected in the editions of 1581 and 1585.

Scaliger is concerned with textual, stylistic, and orthographical matters in the commentary. He quotes often and with approval the observations of Petrus Victorius and his readings from the lost San Marco codex. Authors cited for parallel language or content include Cato, Columella, Pliny the Elder, Virgil, Plautus, Sallust, Tibullus, Livy, Aeschylus, Plutarch, and the *Geoponica*.

There is no separate Dedicationary epistle for the commentary on the *De re rustica*. The editions in which it appears (except for the 1735 and 1773 printings) contain also his commentary, first published in 1565, on the *De lingua latina* and the Dedicationary epistle for these annotations, which is dated 1564 and addressed to Ludovicus Castaneus Rupipozaeus; for the text of the letter, see p. 481 above.


primae classis auctor ita locutus est. Sed et vetus scriptura, ita ut eam nobis indicavit doctissimus P. Victorius, auget mendi suspicionem cum ea non leviter a vulgari discrepet. Habet enim 'indicabo a quibus scriptoribus reperitas'. Ego nulla dubitatione lego 'reperites'. 'Reperitare' est 'reparare'.../...[Expl.]: In Baiano autem tanta arsit cura (III. 17. 9). Insinitatus est modus loquendi hac in parte et caelo latino inauditus quo utitur Varro. Sed non puto Varro ronianum esse 'tanta arsit cura'. Immo cum veteres codices hic varient, puto reconcinnandum. Illi habent ita 'in Baiano autem ardis tanta ut' etc. Lego 'in Baiano autem arsit tantu ut architecto' etc. 'tantu ut' pro 'tantum ut' quemadmodum supra 'secundu ea' et 'datu iri' [II. 4. 13, s. v. sed eos (sic) cum iam pasci possunt], et talia. Atque hic cum Deo finem faciamus. Finis.

**Editions:**
(*)1569. See above, Composite Editions (Doubtful).
1573. See above, Composite Editions.
1581. See above, Composite Editions.
1585. See above, Composite Editions.
1619. See above, Composite Editions.
1623. See above, Composite Editions.
1735. See above, Composite Editions.
1773. See above, Composite Editions.

**Biography:**
See CTC II 13–14.

3. **PETRUS CIACONIUS**

In the Dedicationary epistle to Cardinal Antonius Carafa in the Rome 1587 miscellany (see p. 235 above), Fulvius Ursinus explains the circumstances of the composition and publication of his own annotations on the *Scriptores rei rusticae* with particular reference to the work of his friend Petrus Ciacconius on Varro. This is our principal source of information for Ciacconius' commentary, and it will be helpful to summarize the account given there.

According to Ursinus, he and Ciacconius began their study of Varro while taking part in the project to re-edit the Septuagint; after their day's work on the latter was finished,
they were accustomed to turn to literary pursuits for the sake of relaxation and devoted much attention to the *De re rustica*. Their efforts centered on the establishment of a better text through the collation of manuscripts and the exchange of conjectures. Unfortunately, however, the premature death (26 October 1581) of Ciaconius prevented the intended publication of their joint labors. The delay proved to be only temporary, for, as Ursinus notes, he felt obliged to make their researches public both as a memorial to his friend and a service to scholarship. Accordingly, the commentary on Varro appearing in the edition incorporates the contributions of both men. Ursinus is careful to point out that, since it did not seem worthwhile to publish all of Ciaconius' observations, he included those which met with his approval or at least did not incur his disapproval ('sed omnia quae Ciaconius in suo chirgrapho ad M. Varronem notasset edere operae pretium visum non est, verum illa tantum ex iis excerpere quae mihi vel penitus probarentur vel saltem non improbarentur').

From this letter it is clear that the date for the composition of Ciaconius' commentary falls between 1572 (the election of Pope Gregory XIII who revived the Septuagint project) and 1581 (Ciaconius' death) and is probably to be placed towards the end of his life. Since Ursinus does not specifically acknowledge the comments made by Ciaconius, it would be impossible, on the basis of the Rome 1587 edition alone, to distinguish them from Ursinus' own remarks. There are, however, three manuscripts which contain only Ciaconius' annotations and thus preserve an 'uncontaminated' version of the commentary. One of these is the autograph copy, now Copenhagen ms. 828, 4to, which breaks off at a passage in the first book of the *De re rustica*. A note in another hand at the beginning of the commentary indicates that the lemmata are derived from a copy of the Lyons 1548 edition which Ciaconius owned and apparently annotated. Fulvius Ursinus made a copy of the autograph while it was still complete, and his transcription is now Naples ms. V D 40; in many places it is a page-by-page reproduction of Ciaconius' original, thereby reflecting the zeal with which he also copied Ciaconius' commentary on Caesar (see CTC III 119). The third manuscript with the commentary on Varro is Venice ms. Lat. XIV, 79 (4331), written by several unidentified hands.

There is no Preface or Introduction by Ciaconius in any of the manuscripts.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (Copenhagen ms. 828, 4to, f. 149) *Annus enim octogesimus admonet me* (I. 1. 1). Plinius, lib. XVIII, cap. 3, de auctoribus qui de agri cultura scripserunt, inquit 'sapientes...qui vero complures, quos praeteximus huic volumini, non in grege...nominando M. Var- rone qui octogesimum primum annum vitae agens de ea re prodendum putavit' [Historia naturalis XVIII. 5. 23], ut aut hic 'octogesimus primum' aut illic 'octogesimus' legen- dum esse videatur. Et paulo post voces 'e vita' [I. 1. 1] abundare mihi videntur; satis enim est dixisse 'antequam proficiscor' [I. 1. 1].../[Expl.]: (Naples ms. V D 40, f. 52v) *Hunc quem exposui habeto* (III. 17. 10). Addunt alii libri 'o Q. Pinni', nam ad Q. Pinnom (sic) hunc librum scripsit Varro. Finis.

Manuscripts:

(micro.) Copenhagen, University Library, Arnamagnaeanske Legat ms. 828, 4to, s. XVI, ff. 149-167*. This is the autograph copy which, owing to some disarrangement in the order of the folios, ends on f. 167* with a comment on I. 10. 2 haec porro quattuor...saltus. The manuscript contains Ciaconius' annotations on the first book only, and the last passage to be commented on seems to be I. 59. 2 pavimentaque laudabiliter (sic) faciant (f. 166*).

Ff. 168-173*, written by another hand, contain portions of the commentary which, according to the note at the beginning of f. 168, were not utilized by Fulvius Ursinus in the Rome 1587 edition: 'Addenda haec ex autographo Petri Ciaconi Toletani ad notas quas edidit Fulvius Ursinus Romae anno .MDLXXXVII. suppresso nomine Ciaconii licet in epistola ad lectorem alicuius illi tri-
buat, sed nihil Ursinus ex suo addidit et omnia in Ciaconii autographo inveni.' (For Ursinus' role in the compilation of the commentary see p. 494 below.) These addenda comprise approximately 140 lemmata with comments, beginning at I. 37. 4 quae in sexpartita (sic) and ending at III. 17. 10 et eum recta (sic); a comparison with the 1587 miscellany confirms that they were indeed omitted by Ursinus. Their presence, however, in Naples ms. V D 40 (see below) demonstrates that they were at one time in the autograph.

Further information regarding Ciaconius' work on the De re rustica is supplied by a note in an unidentified hand at the top of f. 149: 'Haec notata sunt ad Varronem de re rustica. Prior numerus paginam, posterior lineam indicat editionis Lugdun. anno 1548 quam habeo ipsius Ciaconii manu exaratam.' This copy of the 1548 Lyons edition of the Scriptores rei rusticae presumably furnished the lemmata for the commentary and seems to have been annotated by Ciaconius; it has not yet been located. (Katalog over den Arnamagnaeanske Håndskriftsamlings II [Copenhagen, 1892] 223).

Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale V D 40, s. XVI, ff. 2–52. This is an autograph of Fulvius Ursinus; it preserves the commentary in its entirety and is often a page-by-page copy of the fragmentary autograph of Ciaconius in Copenhagen ms. 828, 4to. (Kristeller, Iter I 401).

(micro.) Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana Lat. XIV. 79 (4331), s. XVI, pp. 358–510. This portion of the manuscript was written by several unidentified hands and contains the complete commentary. A note in another hand entered in the top left margin of p. 358 reads: 'Petri Ciacconi Tolet. Notae in Varronem de re rustica.' (Kristeller, Iter II 246).

Editions:
1587. See above, Composite Editions.
1735. See above, Composite Editions.
1773. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:
See CTC III 121.

4. Ausonius Popma

His commentary on Cato (see p. 237 above) had appeared in 1590, and thus Varro was the second of the Scriptores rei rusticae to be annotated by Popma, who inserted notes on the latter in his 1601 edition of the opera omnia. As with Cato, Popma, when treating Varro, is concerned with textual problems and points of style, and cites parallels from numerous authors (Columella, Virgil, Pliny the Elder, Valerius Maximus, Horace, Cicero, Sallust, Lucretius etc.). Some attention is also given to geographical and legal questions. It is not surprising that Popma was interested in matters pertaining to law in the De re rustica since, in his mature years, he devoted himself to the study of jurisprudence.

Gesner, in the preface to his edition of the ancient writers on agriculture, intimated that Popma depended rather too much in the Cato commentary on the work of other scholars, and he presses the charge more strongly in the case of Popma's observations on Varro ('sed minus etiam, quam in Catone factum observavimus, candido suo pepercit, ita passim alienis inventis auctore dissipulato pro suis utitur'). Comparisons with similar passages in the commentaries by Petrus Victorius, Joseph Scaliger, and Fulvius Ursinus are adduced to support his allegation. This charge, too, remains to be investigated. It may be pointed out that Popma refers to Victorius and Scaliger occasionally, but never mentions Ursinus.

For the Dedicatory epistle addressed to his brothers Sextus and Titus, see p. 488 above.

Commentary (ed. of [Leyden], 1601). Ausonius Popma, Notae ad M. Varronis De re rustica. Lib. I. [Inc.]: Annus enim octogesimus (I. 1. 1). Plinius, lib. XIX [Historia naturalis XVIII. 5. 23] refert M. Varronem octogesimo primo vitae anno De re rustica scripsisse; in quo vel impressorum codicum vitium vel ipsius memoriae error sit, necesse est, cum omnes libri hic constanter edant 'annus enim octogesimus admonet me ut sarcinas colligam'. . . . [Expl.]: In Batiano

493
autem tanta arsit cura (III. 17. 9). Locus interpolatus qui in nonnullis libris antiquis ita legitur: 'in Baiano aut ardis tanta ut'; ex quibus vestigiis legi posset 'in Baiano haud par sed tanta ut'. Non par, inquit, illi piscinaria cura fuit in Baiano sed maior, et quidem tanta ut mox infra 'eundo suam domum' [III. 17. 10]; fortassis legendum 'eundo suam domum' ut sit integrum illud Ennii 'eundo suam do' [Warmington, fr. 35, p. 460], quod observant grammatici, pro 'in suam domum'. Atque hic finem faciam si unum illud annotavero, hos libros De re rustica non capitibus distinctos aut interrup- tos fuisse sed perpetua quadam tractationis serie contextos nexasque. Id autem duabus rationibus vincitur, et quod in veteribus libris capitum nulla distinctio et quod Nonius in dictione 'olivitas' [De coppendiosa doctrina II (Lindsay, p. 215)] continenter etconiunctim recitat verba et libro primo, quae hactenus capitibus distracta fuerunt.

Editions:
1601, [Leyden]: Ex officina Plantiniana, apud Christophorum Raphaelium, Academiae Lugduno-Bat. typographum. With the text of Varro (De lingua latina, De re rustica, and fragments) and commentaries on the De lingua latina and fragments. Ed. Bipont. I (1787) cxi; Ed. Bipont. I (1788) xxxvii. BN; Vatican Library; (CTY).
1735. See above, Composite Editions.
1773. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:
See p. 238 above.

5. Doubtful

a. Fulvius Ursinus

The circumstances of his collaboration with Petrus Ciacconius regarding the commentary on the De re rustica in the Rome 1587 miscellany have been noted on p. 491 above. There is no doubt as to the character and extent of Ciacconius' contributions since three manuscripts, one of which is autograph, contain his annotations. The role of Ursinus, however, is less clearly defined because no manuscript containing only his comments has yet been located, and, indeed, a note by an unidentified hand on f. 168 in the Ciacconius autograph (Copenhagen ms. 828, 4to) calls into question Ursinus' originality (see p. 492 above).

It is possible to assess Ursinus' share in the writing of the commentary and, at the same time, to determine the truth of the anonymous accusation by comparing the version in the 1587 edition with the manuscripts containing Ciacconius' annotations. An examination of the first twenty-five lemmata and comments for books I–III and the final twenty-five lemmata and comments for book III indicates that Ursinus served as an editor rather than as a joint author. He selected and arranged Ciacconius' material, combining certain portions or expunging others and often compressing into fewer words lengthy observations by Ciacconius. It is interesting to note that he omits Ciac- conius' references to contemporary scholars (Adrianus Turnebus, Petrus Victorius, Latinus Latinius etc.) and 'specific' codices ('codex Bononiensis', 'codex Vaticanus', 'codex Toletanus') and in their places gives merely 'alii opinantur', 'vetus codex' and similar phrases. When the commentary in the 1587 edition contains additional material which, presumably, is to be ascribed to Ur- sinus, this is generally in the nature of further observations on the state of the text, variant readings from other manuscripts, and parallel examples of language and content culled from ancient authors and inscriptions (e.g. the Farnese 'Kalendarium rusticum' published in the same edition). Such instances, however, are not at all numerous, particularly after the first book. Thus, while these findings refute the charge made against Ursinus that he had contributed 'nothing' to the commentary, it does not appear that his contributions were of sufficient weight to justify his being regarded as a joint author.

III. Fragmenta

Commentary

1. Ausonius Popma

In his first edition of the fragments (Fra-
neker, 1589), Popma assembled the remains of the Saturae Menippeae, Logistorici, Prometheus, and De philosophia and published commentaries on all but the last work. The second edition ([Leyden,] 1601) contains these fragments as well as many others (approximately sixty titles are given), together with the De lingua latina and De re rustica. For this more ambitious undertaking, he revised and expanded the commentaries published in the first edition and added observations on the surviving portions of twenty other works.¹ Both sets of commentaries show evidence of extensive reading of other authors.

There is no Dedicatory epistle in the 1589 edition. For the Dedicate epistle addressed to his brothers Sixtus and Titus in the 1601 edition, see p. 488 above. The order in which the commentaries are listed below is in accord with the arrangement of each edition; a reference to a modern edition is supplied in parentheses after the lemma. Gallus Fundanius sive De admirandis, one of the books of the Logistorici, and Περίπλανουs, part of the Saturae Menippeae, occur in separate entries and were evidently considered by Popma to be independent works.

a. The edition of 1589

Saturae Menippeae


Prometheus.


Editions:

1589, Franekeriae (Franeker): Excudebat

¹ De lingua latina ad M. Marcellum, De poematibus, De compositione saturarum, De proprietate scriptorum, Plautinae quaestiones, Epistulae, Disciplinae, Antiquitates rerum humanarum, Antiquitates rerum divinarum, De gente populi Romani, De vita populi Romani, De scaenicis originibus, De actionibus scaenicis, Annales, Ephemeris, Aetia, Imagines, De poetis, De admirandis.
Aegidius Radaeus Ordinum Frisiae Typographus, in Academia Franekerana. *Ed. Bipont. I* (1788) xxxvii. BM; BN.


b. The edition of 1601

*De lingua latina ad M. Marcellum.*


*De poematis.*


*De compositione saturarum.*


*De proprietate scriptorum.*


*Plautinae quaestiones.*


*Epistulae.*


Disciplinae.

De geometria.
Commentary. Ausonius Popma, Ad lib. De geometria. [Inc.]: Huius libri fragmentum vetustum summaque humanitate praeditus Johannes Arceuris, sed ita mutilum et corruptum ut nihil, sane non multum, intuisit aut omnino periisse aut ita lacerum superfusisse. Sic autem inscrivitur: 'M. Barronis (sic) Libellus de geometria ad Rufum Silvium'. Tum sequitur: 'A Casu quae p A nomen habet.../[Expl.]: transit labracrum (sic) significat colles rigora seq—ris (sic)', et reliqua quae sequuntur per ordinem litterarum non minus perturbata (sic).

Antiquitates rerum humanarum.

Antiquitates rerum divinarum.

De gente populi Romani.
Commentary. Ausonius Popma, Ad libros De gente populi Romani. [Inc.]: Plautus vesperuginem (Fraccaro, fr. 5, p. 261.)
Plautus Aulularia [Amphitruo 275]: 'Neque iugula neque vesperugo neque vergiliae occidunt.' Homerus Odyssea [Iliad XXII. 318]: ἔσπερος ὃς κάλλιστος ἦν ὤφραν ὧστατος ἁστήρ. Castor fuit historicus Graecus antiquissimus qui chronica scripsit et ab Eusebio et Suida nominatur. Meminit et Ausoniis [Conmemoratio professorum XXXIII. 7]: 'quod Castor cunctis de regibus ambiguissis'.

De vita populi Romani.


De scaenicis originibus.

Commentary. Ausonius Popma, Ad lib. II De scaenicis originibus. [Inc.]: Appio Claudia (Funaioli, fr. 73, p. 216). 'Appius Claudius Pulcher scaenam varietate colorum adumbravit, vacuis ante pictura tabulis extantem', ut ait Valerius Maximus, lib. II [II. 4. 6]. Ec pertinet hoc fragmentum Varonis.

De actionibus scaenicis.

Commentary. Ausonius Popma, Ad lib. II De actionibus scaenicis. [Inc.]: Galeria (sic) (Funaioli, fr. 82, p. 218). Galearia sunt quae galeae usum aut formam habent. Quadragarius, lib. I [Peter I, fr. 32, p. 217]: 'Prius hisce auctoribus induere reticula galearia'. Sed hic scribendum 'galeria' nominandi casu plurali. Nam ut 'collus collum', 'calamistrus calamistrum' veteres dixerunt, ita et 'galerum', quod Charisius [Institutiones grammaticae I (Keil I 80)] hic observat. Erat autem pilleus capitis non Mercurii tantum sed etiam pontificum et flaminum. Apuleius, Apologia I [XXII]: 'quod impera-

Imagines.


De poetis.

Commentary. Ausonius Popma, Ad lib. I De poetis. [Inc.]: Claudinum (sic) et Tuiditanum (FunaioI, fr. 61, p. 212). De aetate Ennii et Naevii meminit Cicero in Bruto [XV. 60] ubi Varroem laudat auctorem, ut opinor, ex hoc ipso libro primo De poetis. Sed quod Varro tradit, Ennium cum ageret annum sextum et sexagesimum duodecimum Annalem scripsisse, videtur significare Ennii Annalium libros duodecim solos suissae, cum tamen a veteribus grammaticis citentur octo-
Officiorum. Hinc Scaurus inscribitur Varro
nis Logistoricus cuius tractationemuisse
de aedificiis indicat fragmentum de glutino
fabrili materia.

Prometheus.

Commentary. Ausonius Popma, Prometheus. [Inc.]: Humanam quandam (Ed. Bipont. I (1788) 326). Fortasse legendum
'Humanae quandam gentem stirpis con-
coquit;/frigus calore atque humore aritu-
dinem/miscet'; quod postremum sumsit ab
Ennio qui in Epicharmo [Warmington I, fr.
2, p. 410] de mente humana ita loquitur:
'Frigori immiscet calorem atque humor
aritudinem'...[Expl.]: Tum visus
supernus (Ed. Bipont. I (1788) 327). Puto
legendum: 'tum visus supernus cortex ut
cacumina/morimentum in querceto arborum
aritudine;/aeque exsanguibus dolore evires-
cat colos (sic).' Dictum in exsangues et
macilentos quibus supernus cortex, id est
corium simile cacuminibus arborum prae
aritudine morientum. 'evirescat', virere
desinat. Sed fortassis legendum 'exsangui',
et de Prometheo ad Caucasum affixo haec
accienda.

Editions:
1601. [Leyden]: Ex officina Plantiniana,
apud Christophorum Raphelengium, Academiae Lugduno-Bat. typographum. With
the text of Varro (De lingua latina, De re
rustica, and fragments) and commentaries
on the De lingua latina and De re rustica.
Ed. Bipont. I (1787) cxli; Ed. Bipont. I
(1788) xxxvii. BN; Vatican Library; (CTY).
1620, Amstelodami (Amsterdam): Sumpti-
bus Iohannis Commelini Vitudae (Fragmenta
historicorum veterum latinorum, ed. Ausonius
Popma). This edition contains, for Varro, the
text (p. 102) of the Annales only, together
with Popma's commentary (p. 179, mis-
numbered '181'). NUC. BM; BN; Vatican
Library; (TxE; IU; NjP; ICU).
1788. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:
See p. 238 above.

CORRIGENDA TO VOL. III
p. 453, col. 1, line-13,. Read III, 228b.
p. 472, col. 2, lines 7-31 should come be-
fore p. 472, col. 1, line—8.