VALERIUS MAXIMUS

DOROTHY M. SCHULLIAN

Fortuna

1. *The Exemplum as a Literary Genre.*
2. *Ancient Testimony.*
4. *Versifications.*
5. *Quotations and Citations.*
7. *Imitators.*
8. *Translations and Vernacular Commentaries.*

Bibliography.
Composite Editions.
1. *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem* 324
   Commentaries.
   1. Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri.
   2. Milianus de Spoleto.
   3. Frater Lucas.
   5. Conradus Walchauser.
   6. Petrus de Muglio.
   7. Johannes de Ravenna.
   8. Lucas de Penna.
  13. Johannes de Floremontis.
  15. Pallacinus (Omnibonus Leonicenus?)
  17. Theophilus Chalcondyles.
  18. Johannes Sulpicius Verulanus.

287
LATIN AUTHORS

19. Antonius Mancinellus.
22. Michael Mackius.
23. Henricus Loritus Glareanus.
25. Claudius Mitalerius.
27. Christophorus Colerus.

Spurious Work

II. De praenominibus.

Commentaries.
1. Stephanus Vinandus Pighius.
2. Claudius Mitalerius.

FORTUNA*

Probably in the third and fourth decades of the first century Valerius Maximus record-
ed in his Factorum et dictorum memorabil-
lium libri novem almost a thousand examples of virtues to be fostered and vices to be
shunned. Intended for the use of rhetoricians
and orators, they run the gamut from brav-
ery, patience, and moderation to avarice,
cruelty, and lust and are culled from Roman,
Greek, and other civilizations. The sources
were writers like Livy, Cicero, and Varro. The
work itself is the best evidence for the time of
its composition: it is dedicated to Tiberius,
and its denunciation of Sejanus (IX 11, ext.
4) leads to the assumption that it was at least
finished after that conspirator’s downfall in
the year 31. The work is also the best, if scanty,
evidence for the life of its author, revealing
not only the excellence of his education but
also the fact that he was friend and protégé of
Sextus Pompeius (II 6, 8 and IV 7, ext. 2),
consul in the year 14 and about 27 proconsul
of Asia, on which mission Valerius accom-
panied him.

Often repeated is the statement made almost
a century and a half ago by Barthold Georg
Niebuhr in his Historische und philologische
Vorträge an der Universität zu Bonn gehalten,
that the text of Valerius was regarded through-
out the Middle Ages as the most important
book next to the Bible. Few scholars today
would go as far, but the nine following sec-
tions of this Fortuna should demonstrate that
his influence in the Middle Ages and later
was indeed enormous. Documentation for
these sections is provided in Section III of the
Bibliography.

1. THE EXEMPLUM AS A LITERARY GENRE

The literature of exempla is a vast one which
has been too little investigated. It is vast be-
cause the urge to pattern conduct on an exam-
ple, whether written or not, is universal. Who-
evver watches a little girl as she instinctively
balances a teacup on its saucer in imitation of
her mother understands the importance of
example in the learning process. The animal
world illustrates the same truth. In the Thes-
aurus linguæ latinæ I, Kapp and G. Meyer
had to devote in the second fascicle of volume V full twenty-five broad columns to the word *exemplum*. And when the *exemplum* is written, and mankind uses it in its narrowed, specific, literary sense which is the ultimate manifestation of its popularity, then all history becomes in one sense a series of *exempla*, and the literature progresses steadily from early Eastern and pagan times straight through to William Francis Shaw's *The Preacher's Promptuary of Anecdote: Stories, New and Old, Arranged, Indexed, and Classified for the Use of Preachers, Teachers, and Catechists* (London, 1884) and even, for example, to the subject index of a late edition of John Bartlett's *Familiar Quotations*.

This is not a kind of writing, however, which is necessarily or perhaps even desirably belittlingistic; it is a literature of convenience, a literature for someone hunting in history an illustration of courage, or perfidy, or humility. When Erasmus has Nosoponus remark scathingly in the *Ciceronianus* that Valerius Maximus in his style resembles Cicero as a mule resembles a man he ignores the purpose of a collection of *exempla*, which is practicality.

2. **ANCIENT TESTIMONY**

Valerius had had his predecessors in other worlds and in the Roman world; he has had his imitators, conscious and unconscious, for nineteen centuries since. We must remember, however, that parallel passages in ancient authors can deceive and that whether Valerius is named or not—in Pliny the Elder, Lucan, L. Annaeus Seneca, Frontinus, Plutarch, Gellius, Apuleius, Aelian, Lactantius, Ammianus, Macrobius, Symmachus,—the possibility of a common source must be considered. The reader is referred to modern studies on the matter for considered judgments. It is unfortunate that a doctoral dissertation on Aelian's borrowings from Valerius was under way three decades ago with Warren E. Blake at the University of Michigan was lost to scholarship when the candidate became timorous and shifted, *nolente* Blake, to another subject.

The concept of the common source will operate very often also in the Fortuna of Valerius, as will the question of indirect transmission. Does a writer, actually naming Valerius, draw from him directly or from an anthology or collection of excerpts? Does the anthologist or collector of excerpts, actually naming Valerius, use him directly or indirectly through an earlier anthologist or collector of excerpts? Each case must eventually be decided, when it can, on the basis of the individual circumstances peculiar to it, and it is well that in recent years scholars have examined more closely the part played by florilegia in the transmission of ancient authors.

3. **EPITOMES. ANNOTATIONS. FLORILEGIA. EXCERPTS**

The contribution of Valerius was known in the period which is mistakenly called the Dark Ages. Julius Paris, who perhaps as early as the fourth century had epitomized his huge bulk, and Januarius Nepotianus, who set down a shorter epitome probably before the sixth century, are accorded separate articles in this volume even though they lack commentators; commentators, as is understandable, concentrated on Valerius himself. In the ninth century Sedulius Scottus excerpted him, and Servatus Lupus set down in Bernensis 366, s. IX, those marginalia the identification of which remains one of the great achievements of the sciences of palaeography and textual criticism. As Lindsay put it, 'At one touch of Traube's magic wand, this Berne MS has become one of the most precious monuments of mediaeval learning.' Heiric, in turn, bearing witness to the excellent teaching of Lupus, recorded selected excerpts which have been transmitted in nine manuscripts. This tradition of teacher-to-student, a Leitmotiv, is happily prominent in all the Fortuna of Valerius and especially, of course, in Renaissance Italy, as will be seen below, where it flowered from humanist to evolving humanist.

The tradition of annotating manuscripts of Valerius also continued. Among the densest and most competent representatives are the annotations of Johannes Caballinus de Cer-
ronibus; they were probably completed by 1350 and are treated in the section on commentaries. Similar annotations, appearing as marginal and interlinear glosses in several hands, are carried in Ottobonianus latinus 2843, s. XIV-XV; in Ambrosianus D. 81 Inf., anno 1407, to f. 55v, Book IV 1, 5 (for photographs which have jogged my memory I would express my appreciation to Donald Yates of the Ambrosiana Cataloguing Project, University of Notre Dame); and in Ambrosianus H.25. Inf., s. XV. Annotations by Gasparinus Barzizius in Vaticanus latinus 7229, s. XIV, might lead to the assumption that their author contemplated a commentary on Valerius. As Cesare Colombo, whose early death halted his important work on the correspondence and library of Barzizius, has stated, the margins are crammed with these glosses; in addition Barzizius must have had available a copy of the commentary of Johannes de Ravenna, who is treated below; he owned Ost Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Hamilton 649, s. XIV, containing the commentary of Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri; he had access probably to other manuscripts of Valerius; and he mentions in his letters the difficulties presented by the text of Valerius. Colombo believed, however, that in the letter to Giovanni Cornaro, written from Padua in the period 1411–1415, which is printed on Colombo’s pages 22–23, Barzizius is not necessarily referring to a formal commentary on Valerius; the many and detailed annotations in Vaticanus latinus 7229 may represent his principal contribution to the elucidation of Valerius. A century and more later, Michael Mackius set down remarks which are treated below in the section on commentaries.

In the later Middle Ages the popularity of Valerius is abundantly witnessed also by the citations in catalogues of mediaeval libraries of manuscripts of his text which are now lost and by the hundreds of manuscripts which have descended intact from that and ensuing periods. Authors using his material include Fulbert of Chartres, to whom he was Valerius Rufus, Gauzlin of Fleury, Wibald, Peter of Blois, Petrus Cantor, John of Salisbury, Giraldus Cambrensis, and Saxo Grammaticus. Several manuscripts of the twelfth century transmit an anonymous anthology of Valerius and Gellius. Valerius is represented in the Florilegium angelicum and the Florilegium morale oxoniense. Early florilegia like these became the models of such later collections as Hieremias de Montagnone’s Compendium moralium notabilium, compiled about 1300 and published first at Venice in 1505, and Johannes Basilius Herold’s Exempla virtutum et vitiorum atque etiam aliarum rerum maxime memorabilium futura lectori supra modum magnus thesaurus (Basileae, 1555).

And the epitomes continued. Anonymous epitomators are represented, for example, in Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, 166 Gud. lat. 4°, s. XII, and Roma, Accademia dei Lincei, Biblioteca Corsiniana, 43. D. 27, s. XIV. The contribution of the great Bolognese jurisconsult Johannes Andreae, who died in 1348, is preserved in a half-dozen manuscripts of the fifteenth century, for example, Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vaticani latini 5817 and 7320. In the mid-fifteenth century the humanist Nicolau Vulpes of Vicenza, who taught at Bologna from 1440 to 1460, set down an epitome which, preserved in Firenze, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 735, s. XV, and Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Suss. I. 51, an. 1453, adapts and selects from the text of Valerius with some freedom. That of Robert Duval appeared first at Paris as an undated incunabulum (R 1888; Pellechet 4538) and that of Joannes Honorius Crispus ("nullius ut videtur pretii" according to Fabricius) was published at Leipzig in 1503. In 1566 at Lyon Antonius Gryphius published the Collectanea, id est, selecta exempla edited by Robertus Constantinus (d. 1605), pupil of Julius Caesar Scaliger.

4. Versifications

A curious phenomenon was the urge to commit the text of Valerius to verse. This arduous effort was undertaken in the eleventh century by Rodulfus Tortarius, a Benedictine monk of Fleury, whose elegiacs are contained, with other works of his, in Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reginensis lati-
nus 1357, s. XII. Three centuries later the activity of a scholar and poet of Fano produced an epitome of Valerius, again in elegiacs, which was dedicated to Federico da Montefeltro (1422–1482), duke of Urbino, and is carried anonymously in Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, F.68 Sup., s. XV, and N.138 Sup., an. 1481. It would be pleasant to attribute this unconditionally to Antonius Constantius Fannensis (1436–1490), who as a pupil of Guarinus Veronensis may have been exposed early to Valerius. This identification was in fact suggested by Remigio Sabbadini in 'Il Fanense e Nicola Volpe,' Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XLVI (1905), 75–77, and was put forth as certain by the same authority in 'Antonio Costanzo e Valerio Massimo,' Classici e umanisti da codici ambrosiani (Firenze, 1933 [Fontes Ambrosiani, II]), 119–122; Kristeller (Iter I, 299, 302) seems to accept it. I hesitate for two reasons. Augusto Campana in 'Scritture di umanisti,' Rinascimento, 1 (1950), 238, felt that Sabbadini's reworking of his first article had resulted in a 'rielaborazione più ampia, forse meno prudente,' and in 1951 in Milano Giuseppe Rotondi, for whose scholarship and modesty I have much respect and whose early death in 1953 was a great loss (Aristide Calderini provided an obituary and a bibliography of 47 items in Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, Rendiconti, LXXXVI [1953], Parte Generale e Atti Ufficiali, 141–144) told me that he knew the two manuscripts at the Ambrosiana but, believing the proof on Constantius insufficient, preferred to continue to regard the work as anonymous. It still attests, however, to the interest of a gifted writer from Fano in Valerius about the year 1480.

One versifier was unable to complete his unenviable task: after the death of P. Carolus a S. Wenceslao, of Litomyšl in Bohemia, his versification, also in elegiacs, was edited, enlarged by more than half, and published in 1722 at Rastatt by the Viennese Piarist Martinus a S. Brunone (1622–1734), author of other poetical works.

5. Quotations and Citations

Several lifetimes would not suffice to collect quotations and citations from Valerius in authors, and they are legion, of mediaeval, Renaissance, and modern times. Certainly not all are from the full text; some are undeniably at second hand, but all attest to the usefulness of Valerius over many centuries. He was known in the thirteenth century, for example, to Jacobus de Cessolis and Vincent de Beauvais and to the compiler of the Novellino; in the fourteenth, to Giordano da Pisa, Giovanni Villani, Thomas Hibernicus, Robert de Basevorn, John Ridevall, Richard Auger ville de Bury, Michele da Massa Maritima, Cola di Rienzo, Johannes de Columna, Thomas Waley, Robert Holcot, Piero di Dante Alighieri, Guglielmo da Pastrengo, Thomas de Ringstead, Lapo da Castiglionechio, Geoffrey Chaucer, Honoré Bonet (who mentions him as 'magnus Valerius' in a speech which, as James John graciously informs me, was transcribed by John Hus in 1399), Coluccio Salutati, Giovanni de Lodovicius, Jean de Montrevil; in the fifteenth, to Cino Rinuccini, Pierre Flamenc, Enrique de Villena, Giovanni Dominici, Clemente Sanchez de Vercial, John Boston of Bury, Georgius Stella, Sicco Polenton, Vittorino da Feltre, Nicolaus de Cleman giis, Franciscus Philelphus, Angelo Poliziano, Lauro Quirini, Gregor von Heimburg, Dominius Calderinus, Antonio de Lebrija, Bartholomeus Fontius, Johannes Whetamstede, Albrecht von Eyb, Joannes Cynicus, Hartmann Schedel, John Russell, Petrus Crinitus. The geographical representation is equally comprehensive in the sixteenth century, witness Johannes Cuspianius, Aldus Manutius, Thomas Pentzeldt, Andreas Meinhardi, François Rabelais, Gregorius Bontius, Juan de Valdés, Johannes Lubranski, Titus Sempronius Hieronymus Castellioneus, Niccolò Franco, Jacobus Schegkius, Marc Antoine Muret, Michel de Montaigne, Franciscus Modius, Caspar Cunradus, Joseph Scaliger, Tommaso Campanella. All names, to be sure, but not 'just names,' for most are very prominent and those which are humble are perhaps even more convincing witnesses to the popularity of Valerius. In the seventeenth century he leaves traces in Ben Jonson, Baltasar Gracián, Gerardus Vossius, Christian Daum, Petrus Lambecius,
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Charles Sorel, Jean Hardouin, Philippe Labbé, Johannes Conradus Dietericus, Pompeo Aldrovandi, Francesco Maria Cervelli, and in the eighteenth, in Cotton Mather, Charles Louis de Montesquieu, Johann Georg Schelhorn, François Vavasseur, James Boswell; as late as 1960 the *Penguin Dictionary of Quotations* listed the appeal (VI 2, ext. 1) from Philip drunk to Philip sober.

I have reserved one category which more specifically illustrates the popularity of Valerian through the centuries but reveals also a decline as Latin became familiar to fewer people. Perhaps in my other role as historian of medicine I may be permitted the observation that physicians used to take a degree in *Arts and Medicine*. Rare is the physician today who has a background in languages and humanistic studies, though E.R.N. Grigg in 1955 (*Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, X, 74), in a review of tuberculosis in the mentally ill, was able to call attention to the disease of Antochus which is related by Valerian (whom he terms 'rhetor and syco-phant') in V 7, ext. 1. Many and eminent were the earlier physicians who, trained in *Arts and Medicine* and competent to handle the Latin language, displayed a knowledge of Valerian—Niccolò Leonico, Hieronymus Brunswig, Antonio Guainerio, Girolamo Cardano, André Du Laurens, Hieronymus Fabricius ab Aquapendente, Girolamo Mercuriale, Francesco Redi, Marco Aurelio Severino, Ralph Bathurst, Giovanni Maria Lancisi, Giorgio Baglivi, Johann Gottfried von Berger, Jean Jacques Manet, Giambattista Morgagni, François Leuret, and P. Gratioso. Certainly the great Lancisi in his *De subitaneis mortibus* (Romae, 1707), I, 5, looked with greater favor on Valerian than did Dr. Grigg: making the point that sometimes the blame for sudden death is assigned to certain factors which accompany but do not necessarily contribute, he cites the words of Valerian (and I quote from the translation of Paul Dudley White and Alfred V. Boursy [New York, 1970], pages 11–12) that 'since the end of our life is accessible to various and occult causes, certain factors assume at times unwarrantedly the honor of final arbiter, when they are by far more incidental to the time of death, than the cause of death itself' (IX 12, 8). Saul Jarchow, one of the rare Latinists and physicians of modern times, reminded me of this tract in connection with the sudden death of Pope John Paul I on 28 September 1978 (*Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, XXXIV [1979], 91), and I am in turn reminded of Lancisi's remarks in his *Dissertatio de recta medicorum studiorum ratione instituenda habitu ad novae academiae alumnos, et medicinae tyriones in Archinosocomio S. Spiritus in Saxia* (Romae, 1715) that, in the unpublished translation of Howard B. Adelmann, 'there are a great many who study medicine only six months and acquire no skill even in the Latin language, to say nothing of mathematics, and no knowledge of chemistry, botany, zoology, or anatomy. . . . As for Latin, it is not so much a mark of distinction to know it as it is disgraceful not to. The man who knows no Latin cannot understand what others have written and cannot write what will be intelligible to foreigners and to posterity. Perhaps, therefore, to end this digression on the education of physicians, we should say, 'Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose.'

6. COPYISTS, OWNERS, BORROWERS

Let us return to relations which from one point of view are closer and consider the copyists who penned the manuscripts of Valerian, the persons, scholars or not, who owned or annotated manuscripts and printed editions, and the scholars who, unable or unwilling to purchase a manuscript or printed edition, borrowed the text from friend or library. Here in subscriptions, in inscriptions of ownership, in lists of manuscripts in private and public libraries is a vast mine from which to assess the popularity of any author. It is a mine as yet relatively unworked, and the few examples cited here for Valerian will serve to indicate also the rich veins available for all authors. A Johannes, for example, copied at Verona in 1328 *Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vaticanus latinus 1917* and proudly signed his name; it is the opinion of Sabbadini (II, 193) that he was not Johannes.
de Matociis, called Mansionarius, but in a more modern age Rino Avesani, himself Veronese, favors Mansionarius. We are happy to read in West Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lat. fol. 585, of the involvement of Benedictus de Pileo with this manuscript in 1416: 'Finis Valerii Maximi, qui lectus est in Constancia civitate tempore generalis concilii per dominum Benedictum de Pileo poetam laureatum anno videlicet Domino 1416.' Franciscus Nutus wrote in 1423 the manuscript Ost Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Hamilton 648/I, which Zeno da Castiglione, bishop of Bayeux from 1432 to 1459, gave to the duke Charles d'Orléans; in 1453 Nicolaus Astesanus, secretary to Charles, wrote Hamilton 648/II. Three years later the jurist Johannes Pirckheimer (d. 1501), father of Biblialdus, wrote at the age of sixteen London, British Library, Arundel 256; the manuscript was purchased in 1636 in Nürnberg with others from the son's library by Thomas Howard, earl of Arundel, and came to its present home in 1828.

Among owners we call to mind representatives of princely and noble families like Lodovico Gonzaga, who lent his Valerius to Aldobrandino III d'Este for copying and then was asked to send next the commentary of Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri; Cosimo di Giovanni de' Medici, for whose library at the Badia di Fiesole Vespasiano da Bisticci obtained, classed with histories, a manuscript of Valerius which was transferred to the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence in 1783 and is Fiesole CLXXVIII there; Piero di Cosimo de' Medici, who owned what is now LXIII.24 there; and Giovanni di Cosimo de' Medici, who bought from Poggio Bracciolini what is now LXIII.26 in the same library. We remember physicians like Amphilochius Ratinek, whose rather slight holdings in Valerius went in 1412 with his generally rich library to Erfurt; Giovanni Marco (d. 1474) da Rimini, who listed a Valerius in his will; Antonio Benivieni, pioneer of pathological anatomy in his publication De abditis nonnullis ac mirandis morborum et sanationum causis (Florentiae, 1507), who included a Valerius in a list of his books on 25 December 1487; and John Caius, whose Valerius was recorded in an inventory made on his death in 1573. We recollect ecclesiastics like Jacques de Comborn, who annotated the manuscript of Valerius and his commentator Dionysius which is now at Clermont-Ferrand, Arch. dép. du Puy-de-Dôme, F.O.88; Domenico Cardinal Capranica, who owned both the full Valerius and the epitome of Johannes Andreae; William Grey, probably the first Englishman to attend the lectures of Guerinus Veronensis, who owned a copy of Dionysius which is now Oxford, Balliol College Library, CXXII; John Gunthorpe, also a student of Guerinus and likewise representative of the teacher-to-student tradition, who possessed the only printed edition (Strassburg, not after 1475) in Latin of Dionysius; Jean Crabbé, abbé des Dunes from 1457 to 1488, who commissioned the French translation by Simon de Hesdin and Nicolas de Gonesse which is now MS. 157–159 in the library of the Grootseminarie of Bruges; Johannes Durbrius, whose richly annotated manuscripts of Valerius are now, with the rest of his library, in the Biblioteka Jagiellońska at Kraków; and Solomon Stoddard, first librarian of Harvard College and distinguished pastor at Northampton, Massachusetts, for whose library at Harvard the Frankfurt, 1627 edition of Valerius was registered in 1664.

Other scholars, bibliophiles, and publishers owned copies of Valerius. In 1335 Oliviero Forzetta of Treviso listed ancient authors whose texts he wanted to obtain; Valerius was among them, and Valerius he obtained. The jurist Pietro da Monteforte annotated Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vaticanus latinus 1919, s. XIV. Jan de Wilde (1389–1419), alderman of Bruges, owned a manuscript of Valerius. Petrus Matthaeus de Marco of Civitā Castellana annotated in 1418 the manuscript which is now Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Acq. e Doni, 440. Pearl Kibre's listing of the library of Giovanni Pico della Mirandola includes copies of Valerius. Giampietro Stella, Venetian grand chancellor from 1517 to 1522, mentioned in his will his printed Valerius. Federicus Cerutus, commentator of Persius (CTC III, 297–298) received as a gift what is now Città del Vati-
cano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Regi-
ensis latinus 876. The poet Gabriel Harvey
annotated the Estienne edition of Valerius
which is now in the Cambridge University
Library. An inventory of the printer Roger
Ward’s Shrewsbury stock made in 1585 includ-
ed two editions of Valerius. The bibliophile
Hélie du Fresnoy’s copy of an edition of Vale-
rius bound in red morocco brought £170 at a
sale in Paris in 1957. And in Philadelphia
James Logan, secretary to William Penn and
chief justice of the Supreme Court, possessed
the Leiden, 1660, and Rotterdam, 1671 edi-
tions.

These are a selected few of individuals who
owned the text of Valerius. In the fashion of
owners who inscribed their books ‘Ad usum
mei et amicorum’ many, like owners today,
leant them generously to friends. But perhaps
nowhere does the act of conscientious bor-
rowing shine more brightly than in the first
two registers of loans from the Vatican Library
which have been so splendidly edited by Maria
Bertòla. On 22 May 1479 the Florentine Lu-
ca Dolci, cameriere of cardinal Domenico
della Rovere, borrowed an annotated parch-
ment manuscript of Valerius which was duly
returned on 21 April. On 5 January 1481
Pietro Ghirarducci, presbyter of Parma and
from 1476 apostolic acolyte, borrowed a Vege-
tius and a Frontinus and left as surety his
own Valerius. On 7 July 1483 Carlo Bucconi,
secretary to the cardinal bishop of Parma and
in 1495 himself a bishop, borrowed a paper
manuscript of Valerius, bound in leather,
which was subject to recall on request; he
returned it on 13 September.

7. Imitators

The imitators, conscious and unconscious,
direct and indirect, were many; the extent,
form, and quality of their imitation varied.
John of Salisbury and Saxo Grammaticus,
who have already been mentioned, borrowed
directly. Nicolaus Hananus, patriarch of Je-
rusalem who died in 1291, assembled exempla
of virtues and vices from both the Old and
the New Testament; his work was actually
published with that of Valerius at Basel in
1555, and with them in that florilegium com-
plied by Johannes Basilius Herold are, appro-
priately, the following representatives of the
same literary genre: the pseudo-Aristotelian
Oeconomarum dispensationum exempla,
Heraclides Lembus’s De politis, and the Ero-
tica of Parthenius, all three of which, of course,
preceded Valerius; the Strategemata of Front-
inus and the Varia historia of Aelian, which
have been mentioned before; the De dictis
factisque memorabilibus collectanea of Bap-
tista Fregosus (Fulgosus), who was doge of
Genoa from 1478 until he was banished in
1483 by his uncle Paolo Cardinal Fregoso;
the Exemplorum libri decem of Marcus Anto-
nius Coccius, called Sabellicus; the De religi-
gose vivendi institutione per exempla of Mar-
cus Marulus of Spalato, which was first pub-
lished in 1513; and the De rebus humanis vari-
orum exemplorum liber of Guy de Fontenay
of Bourges, written in 1516. And in England
in the century of Hananus John of Wales (Wa-
leys, Wallensis) ‘armed his readers,’ in the
words of Beryl Smalley, ‘with a new Valerius
Maximus brought up to date, vastly elabo-
rated and expanded’; his ‘outstanding charac-
teristic . . . particularly in the Compendilo-
quium and the Breviloquium de virtutibus is,’
according to W. A. Pantin, ‘his constant use
of quotations and anecdotes from the pagan
classical world for the purpose of moral edifica-
tion.’

In the fourteenth century two luminaries in
the literature of all mankind took their course
in part from Valerius. The epitome of the juris-
consult Johannes Andreæ has been mentioned
above. On 27 December 1343 Petrarch infor-
mixed him (Fam. V.7) that he had in process a
Liber memorandarum rerum. Petrarch’s
affinity for Valerius may be due to his close
relations with the commentator Dionysius de
Burgo Sancti Sepulchri. Valerius was among
his favorite books, marginalia citing Valerius
which he entered in other manuscripts show
that he had ready access to the text, and he
possessed at least from 1335 a twelfth-century
copy of Vaticanus latinus 4929, which carries
the epitome of Julius Paris. There are many
traces of Valerius in the Familiaræ and even
in so short a work as the tenth eclogue, Lau-
rea occidens. Petrarch may object (Fam. IV.15) that Valerius is not his favorite moralist and that Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and Seneca rate before him, but Valerius had an important place among those who furnished the exempla so necessary to him. He admits (Fam. VI.4) his overuse of exempla, saying that he could indeed use fewer, that he could as a matter of fact simply not write, but in this letter to Giovanni Cardinal Colonna, to whom Dionysius dedicated his commentary, he quotes Juvenal’s ‘Difficile est satyram non scribere’ and finds the ills of the world so discouraging that it is hard to be silent; nothing moves him like the examples of eminent men. He will therefore, he adds, continue to cite them, and after all, if there are those who do not like exempla, they need not read; he forces no one to read him. For his Rerum memorandarum libri, as Giuseppe Billanovich points out, Valerius was both source and model.

The second luminary illustrates the teacher-to-student tradition. Giovanni Boccaccio was immensely influenced in Naples by Dionysius, his library contained manuscripts of the commentary of Dionysius and the text of Valerius, and he is now credited with translating Valerius into Italian (see below, p. 297). In his Latin works he shows a firm acquaintance with Valerius, but especially in the Filocolo is the contribution of the ancient author ‘presente e viva,’ as Quaglio states. It induced him to set down episodes and events in the tradition of the mediaeval anthologies, it opened the gates to a world where the heroes of the past returned to walk the earth of his day, and it provided repeated instances even of close verbal similarity.

As in the case of Petrarch, the fact that the distinguished humanist Johannes de Ravenna (Giovanni da Ravenna, Giovanni di Conversino, 1343–1408), wrote a Memorandarum rerum liber implies at once an acquaintance on his part with the work of Valerius Maximus, an acquaintance perhaps inspired by Petrarch and fostered under his teacher Petrus de Muglio. This imitation, together with his newfound commentary on Valerius, is treated in the section on commentators, as is Petrus de Muglio. ‘Maestro’ Marzagaia, an obvious imitator, I also reserve for that section. Meanwhile and in successive centuries numerous works were composed the very titles of which ring of Valerius and the content of which in greater or lesser degree recalls Valerius and the whole genre of exempla. Christine de Pisan (ca. 1363–ca. 1431) wrote Le livre des faits et bonnes meurs du sage roy Charles V, Le livre des trois vertus, Dits moraux ou les enseignements que Christine donne à son fils, and Le livre des faits d’armes et de chevalerie. According to her biographer Marie-Josèphe Pinet almost all her more important prose works owe much to Valerius, and she herself refers to the part played by Charles V in the French translation by Simon de Hesdin and Nicolas de Gonesse which is listed below. Antonius Beccadelli, called Panormita, celebrated Alfonso V in 1455 in De dictis ac factis Alphonsi regis Aragonum libri IV, the chapters of which according to Gianvito Resta in the Dizionario biografico degli italiani were keyed to such adverbs as iuste, modeste, fortiter; it was published first at Pisa in 1485, was often translated, and was supplied with a commentary by Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (1405–1464), Pope Pius II, who also began Commentarii rerum memorabilium, quae suis temporibus continguerunt. The humanist, physician, and astronomer Galeottus Martius (1427–probably 1497), who studied at Padua, taught at Bologna, and was first director of the royal library at Buda and secretary to Matthias Corvinus of Hungary, extolled that king in De egregie, sapienter, icose dictis ac factis regis Matthiae ad ducem Iohannem eius filium; Martius was teacher of Georgius Merula, who is mentioned below under the commentator Oliverius Arzignanensis. Les faictz et dictz of Alain Chartier, who died before 1463, was published in several editions. The contribution of Baptista Frigosus has been mentioned at the beginning of this section. And in Spain Diego Rodriguez de Almella published in 1487 Valerio de las estorias escolasticas y de España, which appeared also in later editions. But there is an exception which proves the rule, as it were, and attests to the need for constant caution. The Liber de dictis philosophorum antiquorum, which was originally compiled by Mubash-
shir ibn Fātik in Arabic in the eleventh century, enjoyed a rebirth in this period; translated into French in the fourteenth century by Guillaume de Tignonville and into English in the fifteenth by Anthony Woodville, earl of Rivers, it was printed in 1477 by William Caxton as *The Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers* and quite apart from its content holds a lofty, honored, and envied position as the first dated book printed in England. In Ezio Franceschini, Curt F. Bühler, and Giuseppe Billanovich it has had in recent decades observers and promoters worthy of its importance. It is precisely in such a work that borrowings from Valerius might be expected, but they quite simply do not occur. From it, by contrast, Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri drew for his commentary on Valerius.

In the sixteenth century in France Guillaume du Bellay was composing *exempla* of French history in imitation of Valerius, and the *Sententiae & exempla ex probatissimis quibusque auctoribus scriptoribus collecta* of Andreas [Rodrigues] Eborensis appeared at Lyon in 1557. Lodovico Domenichi furnished *Historia de 'detti e fatti degni di memoria di diversi principi et huomini privati, antichi e moderni* (Vinegia, 1556), Lodovico Guicciardini, nephew of the historian Francesco, wrote *Detti e fatti piacevoli et gravi di diversi principi, filosofi, et cortigiani* (Venetia, 1565), and Luigi Contarin's *Il vago e diletttevolo giardino, ove si leggono gli infelici fini di molti uomini illustri. I varij, & mirabili essemi di virtù, & vitii degli uomini* was published first in Vicenza in 1589. Switzerland too was represented: in 1580 the work *De rebus et factis memorabilibus loci communis historici* of Richardus Dinothus was published at Basel.

Franciscus Schottus, nephew of the better known Andreas Schottus and Franciscus Schottus, bridges the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; his *Centuria exemplorum sententiarii et quibusque ex optimis quibusque auctoribus cum sacris tum profanis collecta* appeared at Douai in 1605. Karl Kempf has suggested in his 1888 edition of Valerius that the uncle Andreas may have known at Stavelot the important manuscript of Valerius which is now Laurentianus Ashb. 1899. The *Facetiarum exemplorumque libri VII* (Romae, 1518) of Lucius Domitius Brusonius actually received at Frankfurt in 1600 the title *Rerum memorabilium insignium sententiariarum, historiarum, miraculorum, apopthegmatum, exemplorum facetiarumque . . . libri VII*. Balthasar Exner provided a *Valerius Maximus christianus: hoc est dictorum et factorum memorabilium unius atque alterius seculi imperatorum, regum, principum, imprimis christianorum, libri novem* (Hanoviae, 1620; for a precursor see p. 388 below). In London in 1624 Thomas Heywood, unwitting precursor of the present age, published nine books on women, each book named for a Muse and the whole modeled on Aelian and Valerius. Joannes Franciscaus Lauradanus (1607–1661) pledged, according to Fabricius, to set down 'dicta et facta Venetorum illustria in imitation of Valerius, and in a kind of geographical spread Nicolaus Vernulaeus published *Virtutum augustissimae gentis austriaeae libri tres, solis caesarum, regum, principumque austriaeae exemplis adornati unacum monitis ethici politiciisque* (Lovanii, 1640), Otto Sperling (1634–1715) left in manuscript nineteen books of a *Valerius Maximus danicus*, and Johannes Schefferus celebrated the Swedish people in *Memorabilia suericae gentis exemplorum liber singularis* (Hamburgi, 1671).

In the eighteenth century the imitators, conscious and unconscious, continued especially in France. Pierre Antoine de la Place published at Paris in 1672 *Valère Maxime français*. Claude-Louis-Michel de Sacy prepared eight volumes (Paris, 1769–72) entitled *L'honneur français, ou Histoire des vertus et des exploits de notre nation*. Of the same genre are the avocat Rossel's *Histoire du patriotism français* (Paris, 1769, 6 vols.) and Jean-Baptiste-Louis Brayer de Beauregard's *L'honneur français, ou Tableau des personnages qui, depuis 1789 jusqu'à ce jour ont contribué . . . à honorer le nom français* (Paris, 1808, 2 vols.).

8. **Translations and Vernacular Commentaries**

We come to actual translations. Certainly by the first half of the fourteenth century trans-
lations of the nine books were necessary if the work was to continue popular, and the onerous task was not shirked. It was performed sometimes entire, sometimes with commentary added in the vernacular, sometimes in partial or epitomized form. As was to be expected, the author's own land was first in the running. Among the earlier renditions was that of Accursu Di Cremona in the Messinese dialect which is preserved in Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 8820 (X 103), an. 1428 (stopping in VIII 13, ext. 1) and 8833 (X 104), s. XIV, and has only very recently been published. It is dedicated to Pietro II (1305–1341) as locum tenens for his father Federico III (d. 25 June 1337), who created him King of Sicily on 19 April 1321 with the stipulation that the son be associated with him under the title king in all public pronouncements. The translation is a fairly literal one and as such not only disseminated the text of Valerius at that time to a public versed in the vernacular alone but also preserves now to the modern scholar a copious testimony on the history of that vernacular.

But it was a Tuscan translation which for qualities of language and form became and has endured as a testo di lingua. Unsigned, it has long been ascribed to the Florentine notary, translator, and publicist Andrea Lancia (ca. 1280-ca. 1360), to whom are attributed also translations from Vergil, Ovid, Quintilian, and Seneca. Recent scholarship, however, doubts that he was responsible and even suggests instead the father of classic Italian prose, Giovanni Boccaccio, whose familiarity with Valerius Maximus has been mentioned above. The translation is preserved in numerous manuscripts but is not represented in printing of the fifteenth century. The first edition was published in a slim and elegant folio by Albertinus de Lisona in Venice in 1504. Editions of 1509, 1526, and 1537 followed; the Accademia della Crusca cited from it in the several editions of its Vocabolario; a tiny Saggio and Secondo saggio del volgarizzamento antico di Valerio Massimo citato dagli Accademici della Crusca per testo di lingua appeared, accompanied by the Latin text, at Bologna in 202 copies in 1862; and in 1867–68 Roberto de Visiani edited the version from the manuscripts in two volumes which were published at Bologna in the series Collezione di Opere Inedite o Rare dei Primi Tre Secoli della Lingua, Pubblicata per Cura della R. Commissione pe’ Testi di Lingua nelle Provincie dell’Emilia.

Meanwhile Giorgio Dati, canonicus Florentinus of the sixteenth century, provided a Tuscan translation which was dedicated to Nicolò Cardinal Ridolfi (d. 1550) and first published in Rome in 1539 and then in Venice in 1547, 1551, 1555, 1564, 1573, 1586, and 1605. ‘Se io mi persuadesi,’ he says, ‘di haverla [the work of Valerius] così ben tradotta in Toscano, come egli in latino la compose, visto, che hora mai la Lingua Toscanca comincia non molto à vergognarsi dalla latina, io crederei, che lo haverla giudicata degna di publicarla sotto il nome di V. S. R. non fusse in parte alcuna biasimene. Ma io confesso bene, considerato la difficoltà, che è di trarre d’una lingua & porre in un’altra, & similmente la insufficienza del mio ingegno, che io stile, che io ho tenuto nel tradurla, manca assai di quella dignità & splendore, che nella Latina si riconosce . . . ‘There is not one word about the earlier translation.

Except for Dati’s edition of 1605 the seventeenth century is barren of translations in Italian, and I find none for the eighteenth. In 1821 Michele Battagia, who in the second, third, and fourth decades of the nineteenth century contributed several learned monographs on Venetian history and is often cited by Emmanuele Antonio Cicogna in his great compilation of Venetian inscriptions, published a translation at Treviso in two volumes, whereupon a revived Giorgio Dati sprinted and came from behind, as it were, in a corrected edition issued at Milano in 1826 in two volumes and at Venice in 1839. A modern translation by Rino Faranda was published in 1971, with Kempf’s Latin text from the edition of 1966, by UTET of Torino in the series Classici Latini, Collezione Fondata da Augusto Rostagni, Diretta da Italo Lana. Until a critical edition of the abbreviated German translation and/or commentary of Heinrich von Mügeln appears, together with critical editions of the Latin commentaries
which he used, his relations with his sources will remain doubtful, but it is probable that he knew the commentary of Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri and possible that he knew that of Conradus Waldhauser. He dedicated the work in 1369 to a Hertneid von Pettau (Stiermark); twenty manuscripts of it are listed by Heribert A. Hilgers, and it was published in 1489 in Augsburg by Anton Sorg as *Valerius Maximus. Die Geschichte der Römer* (H 4104 = 11632; Goff D-243). Heinrich’s laudatory mention in other works of John (1296–1346), king of Bohemia, of his son Charles IV (1316–1378), Holy Roman Emperor, who held his court mainly at Prague, of Rudolf IV (1339–1365), duke of Austria, and of Louis I (1326–1382), king of Hungary, bespeaks travels to royal courts, and it would be tempting to search a connection with Petrarch during that humanist’s mission to Charles IV in Prague in 1356. To Heinrich’s outstanding reputation as a poet of aphorisms and maxims is due the interest lately evinced in him by Johannes Kibelka, formerly of Köln and now of Hamburg, and his students, who are also investigating the work on Valerius and supply in their publications the bibliography for both it and Heinrich’s other prose and poetic contributions. The work is of additional interest as a testimony to early German humanism.

Several versions in German followed that of Heinrich von Mügeln. The poet Hans Vintler (d. 1419) borrowed from him almost word for word for the numerous extracts which he included in *Die Pluemen der Tugent*. In 1533 and again in 1535 and 1541 Jakob Kammlander published in Strassburg the abbreviated version of Petrus Selbet, ‘beider Rechten dess geystlichen und weltlichen Licentiat,’ who included the missing episodes from J 1, ext. 4 to I 4, ext. 1 which are supplied by modern editors from Julius Paris and Januarius Nepotianus and who may indeed have been following an epitomizer rather than the full text of Valerius. His text was ‘gebessert’ by Niklas Heiden in an edition published at Frankfurt am Main in 1565 by Sigmund Feyerabend and Simon Hütter.

In the seventeenth century the polyhistor Eberhard Werner Happel (1647–1690) provided a translation which appeared at Hamburg in 1676 and 1678 in defiance of the difficulties, so manifest to any textual critic or translator, which he set forth in the following words in his letter to the reader: ‘Ich habe mich unternommen nach meinem gar geringem Verstande gegenwärtigen sehr schweren Autorem, den Valerium Maximum ins reine Teutsche zu übersetzen; Nun muss ein jeder der nicht die Witz allein gefressen freilich bekennen dass dieser Autor nicht allein sehr schwer wegen seiner ungebührlichen ja offtmalen gar veralteten und gleichwohl auch hochstrebenden Redens-Art sondern weil der Text durch die Verschiedenheit der Schriften ehe der Druck erfunfen über alle massen sehr verderbet und fast kein einziges Manuscryptum zu finden das mit dem andern überein käme.’

In the following century Georg Christian Eberhard Westphal, who translated into German as Geschichte der Königl. Pariser Bibliothek (Quedlinburg, 1778) the abbé Jourdain’s Mémoire historique sur la bibliothèque du Roy (Paris, 1739, in Catalogue des livres imprimés de la Bibliothèque du Roy), published Des Valerius Maximus denkwürdige Beispiele ins Deutsche übersetzt (Lemgo, 1780). A German translation appeared at Frankfurt am Main in 1805–1807, and in 1828–1829 Friedrich Hoffmann, ‘Diaconus zu Balingen im Königreich Württemberg’ and author of Pastoral-Grundsätze (Stuttgart, 1829) published at Stuttgart in five small volumes continuously paginated the Sammlung merkwürdiger Reden und Thaten of Valerius, which he based on the Latin editions of Vorstius, Torrenius, and Kapp. It was his engaging opinion that ‘Das Werk des Valerius Maximus ist nicht ohne innern Werth.’

In France the beginnings in the vernacular came somewhat later. In honor of Charles V (1337–1380) Simon de Hesdin started in 1375 a French translation and commentary which he carried into Book VII and which Nicolas de Gonesse, beginning with Chapter 6 of that book, completed in 1401; over sixty manuscripts are known, there were several editions in the fifteenth century, and at least one appeared in the sixteenth. The commentary, interspersed with the translation and almost over-
whelming it, leans on Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri and Lucas de Penna and was perhaps known to Benvenutus de Imola; it deals with historical rather than grammatical points. The work was the basis of the Castilian translation by Hugo de Urriés cited below, and a portion of it was excerpted in 1497 for a French edition of Aristoteles, Secreta secretorum (GW 2489).

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fr. 2118, an. 1463, contains an epitome in French written by Jean de Hangest, 'seigneur de Genly,' while he was in Paris 'en arrest par le roy Loys'; it too stems from the translation of Simon de Hesdin and Nicolas de Gonesse. The Latin epitome of Robert Duval was translated into French by Guillaume Michel of Tours and appeared at Paris in 1525 and 1541. Likewise the section of Valerius on dreams and their interpretation (I 7) was published in 1555, 1571, 1581, 1595, and as late as 1634 with the French translation, by the Parisian Charles Fontaine (b. 1515), of the five books of Artemidorus Daldianus on dreams. Fontaine was pupil and friend of the poet Clément Marot. But of greater influence and endurance, and of special interest because they were not always by professional classicists, are the full translations into French which followed that of Simon de Hesdin and Nicolas de Gonesse. Jean Leblond (d. 1553), 'cure et seigneur de Branville,' dedicated his to Henry II (d. 1559) with the verses '... mea Roma Lutetia nunc est/ Henricus mihi rex, et mihi Caesar erit; it appeared in editions of 1548, 1557, 1567, 1572, 1579, 1581, and 1615. That of Nicole de Maillly is preserved at Chantilly, Bibliothèque de l'Institut, Musée Condé, 835–837, an. 1545; it had been requested in 1541, at a price, by the bookseller Galliot Du Pré and was based on the Latin text published by Simon de Colines in 1535. Jean Claveret (d. 1666), friend and then enemy of Pierre Corneille, published his translation in 1647; editions of 1656, 1659, 1665, and 1700 followed. The next century was less active. One Tarboicher, 'avocat en nôtre cour de parlement de Paris,' received from Louis XIV on 5 June 1712 a privilege (which he ceded to 'Sieur Brunet libraire à Paris') for a translation which appeared at Paris in two small volumes in 1713 from the publishing house of Michel Brunet, and much later, in 1796, René Binet, 'dernier recteur de l'ancienne Université de Paris,' provided a second translation in two volumes. Revealing are the comments of a later translator, C. A. F. Frémion, on his predecessors Claveret and Tarboicher. The translation of the first is, he says, 'come celles de l'époque, assez peu fidèle; mais il s'en faisait alors de plus infidèles encore.' As for Tarboicher's, 'elle n'est pas tout ce que j'attendais d'un auteur qui dit dans sa préface, en parlant de celle de 1665: Il seraif difficile d'en lire une page sans dégoût. Quand un écrivain parle ainsi de ses prédécesseurs, il devrait, ce me semble, être irréprochable... And yet some of Tarboicher's general remarks on translators in his preface have penetrating validity today. 'Je me suis fait une règle et je la crois bonne,' he says. 'C'est qu'un traducteur est obligé d'imiter le stile de son original, d'étudier son tour, ses manières, et de le représenter s'il se peut avec tant d'art, qu'on ne trouve entre eux que la différence de la langue... Les commentateurs ont un grand avantage. S'ils trouvent en leur chemin quelque endroit difficile, ils se detournent et marchent par des sentiers plus aisés. Un traducteur n'a pas cette infidèle facilité. Il doit aller par tout, le flambeau à la main, et se faire jour au travers des obscursités les plus épaisses.'

Activity was more vigorous in the nineteenth century. The translation of Charles Hubert Peuchot and E.-P. Allais appeared in two volumes at Paris in 1822. Our above-mentioned C. A. F. Frémion, 'professeur au Collège Royal de Charlemagne,' prepared three volumes which were issued in Paris in 1827–28 in C. F. L. Panckoucke's series Bibliothèque Latine-Française, Collection des Classiques Latins avec la Traduction en Regard, publiée par Jules Pierrot; the translation was reissued in 1834–35 and, by Garnier Frères, in 1864. In 1841 and again in 1850, 1864, and 1879 appeared the version, based on Hase's Latin text, of that almost professional translator Théophile Baudement in the huge volume Corneilius Nepos, Quinte-Curce, Justin, Valère Maxime, Julius Obsequens of the series Collection des Auteurs Latins avec la Traduction en Fran-
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ian enjoyed a direct translation from the Latin; Diego Lopez, a true classicist who was occupied also with Caesar, Vergil, Persius, and Juvenal, provided one, with commentary, which was published at Sevilla in 1631–32, and at Madrid in 1647 and 1655–54. His lofty opinion of his author is expressed in his preface in such sentences as 'Ningun Istoriarod Gentil se à de poner con Valerio Maximo, porque si la Istoria . . . es la maestra de la vida, y un tesoro de lo pasado, todo esto se halla en Valerio, porque no dexa virtud moral, en parte alguna de la vida humana de que no trate. . . . Cada uno de sus libros es un teatro, en que se representan varias tragicomedias. . . . Inflama los animos generosos a enprender grandes cosas. Refrena los sobervios, con el freno, y riendas de la moderacion. . . .' Lopez knew and praised the work of Stephanus Pighius (see below, p. 391) on Valerius.

The British Isles lagged. A half-century after the first edition (1555) of the French translation, with Artemidorus Daldianus, of the section on dreams an English version (1606) appeared in London. The full translation of the nine books waited longer, until in 1678 the divine, Samuel Speed (1631–1682), gave to the press Romae antiquae descriptio. A View of the Religion, Laws, Customs, Manners, and Dispositions of the Romans, and Others: Comprehended in their most Illustrious Acts and Sayings Agreeable to History; it was dedicated to the Lord High Chancellor of England, Henage Finch (1621–1668), 'the far-excelling Tully of our Age,' and was reprinted in 1684. A portion of an English translation from Book VII is preserved in London, British Library, Sloane 848, s. XVII, ff.2–7v. Ebert, under no. 23350, mentions as announced in 1814 an English translation by a Charles Lloyd, of which I have not traced a copy. British possessions in the Western hemisphere are not represented, and for the United States I find no record.

By contrast the Low Countries contributed the translations of Conradus Mirkiinus (Rotterdam, 1614) and of Abraham Bogaert (Amsterdam, 1721, and Leiden, 1729). A Russian version by Ivan Alekseev, translator also of Diodorus Siculus, was published at St. Peters-

çais, publiés sous la Direction de M. Nisard. Gien, Bibliothèque Municipale, 32, preserves a translation by Adolphe Bréan, who in the second half of the century published on Roman authors and ruins and, in several editions, a drama on Vercingetorix. Finally, in 1935, Pierre Constant, 'agrégé de grammaire, proviseur honoraire,' contributed to the series Classiques Garnier two volumes, French text facing the Latin, of a 'Traduction Nouvelle avec Introduction et Notes' based on Kempf's Latin text of 1888. It was by then a more modern age, an age which could be very brutally frank, and Constant could remark (vol. I, p. XIII) on his chosen author that 'les mérites de Valère Maxime suffisent à peine à lui assurer dans l'histoire littéraire une place à la suite et à bonne distance des grands noms. Historien sans vues d'ensemble, moraliste sans véritable élévation d'esprit, il n'est qu'un écrivain d'un rang secondaire, parce qu'il a traité un sujet sérieux sans conviction profonde, avec la frivolité d'un bel esprit. Moins préoccupé du fond des choses que de leur expression, il semble avoir ignoré que l'art qui se voit trop manque son but et il a dépensé une réelle habileté de plume à des riens, en sacrifiant pour un succès éphémère les conditions mêmes d'une gloire durable. Aussi est-ce moins peut-être par la vertu de ses qualités littéraires que par la nature de son contenu que son livre a été sauvé de l'oubli.'

Such translations were paralleled by those in other countries. It was apparently Catalan which provided the first one in Spain when in 1395 Antoni Canals (d. 1419) completed the version which, represented by several manuscripts in Spain and France, was published only in 1914. He seems to have known the French translation of Simon de Hesdin and Nicolas de Gonesse, on which certainly the Castilian translation of Hugo de Urriés (Zaragoza, 1495, HC 15797, Goff V-46; also Sevilla, 1514, and Alcalá de Henares, 1529) was based. It is worthy of notice that Hugo de Urriés, who went to England as ambassador of Aragon in 1466 and later served also in Burgundy and Flanders, could successfully combine his talents as statesman and his avocation of translator. After him it was a century before Castil-
burg in two volumes in 1722. Portions translated into Icelandic by Thorstein Petursson appear in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bor. 99, an. 1783. A Danish translation by Anders Krag Holm (1767–1851) was issued at Copenhagen in 1797. A Swedish translation of the year 1907 by Samuel Erik Melander (b. 1875) is carried, with translations of Julius Paris and Januarius Nepotianus, in Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, Vö 16:45.

Valerius Maximus, it can be seen, did not lack translators to disseminate his exempla in the vernacular.

9. Editors

There would have been no translations without the editors of the Latin text. The line of these stretches long and unbroken to the twentieth century and is marked by some of the most eminent names in the history of classical scholarship. Actual editing had of course begun long before the invention of movable type. In a sense every scribe who copies a manuscript edits it, whether for good or for bad. This process, initiated probably by Valerius himself and by the scribe who first copied the archetype, would have continued down the years. It is very certain that many of the persons who in one way or another altered the text were not of the caliber of scholars like Servatus Lupus and Heirc. But the mere fact that almost two millennia after it was composed the work of Valerius is extant in more than eight hundred manuscripts in a variety of forms—in the full text, in epitomes, annotations, florilegia, excerpts, versifications, translations, together with the commentaries which provide the body of this article—bears witness of course to its popularity with readers but also to intense labor by a host of conscientious scholars. Not the least of these were indexers like the Augustinian Junta de Sancto Geminiano, who realized that for ready consultation of a text of such bulk a finding aid based on the alphabet was necessary. His subject index is extant, for example, in the fourteenth-century manuscripts London, British Library, Add. 11798, New Haven, Yale University, The Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Marston, 37, and Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vaticanus latinus 7229. It is also contained in the fifteenth-century manuscripts Lucca, Biblioteca Governativa, 339 (B.242); Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale, IV.D.7; Sankt Paul in Kärnten, Stiftsbibliothek der Benediktiner, XXV.2.5; and Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M. ch. q.22. It is introduced by the statement 'Maximi Valerii verborum suavitas me inducit et quorundam dilectorum fratrum caritas me compellit ut operi [Valerii] iungam ego Frater Junta de Sancto Geminiano Fratrum Heremitarum Ordinis Sancti Augustini inventarium sive tabulam.' A Junta de S. Gimignano, but Dominican, is recorded for the year 1288 at Florence. Giuseppe Billanovich would identify our indexer with the Augustinian who is mentioned in the acts of his convent at San Gimignano for 4 February 1318, 28 November 1324, and 1 November 1343 and who also compiled a Tabula of Seneca which is carried in Parisinus latinus 8544. A Junta de Sancto Geminiano was the author of a life of St. Bartolo (d. 12 December 1300) which was published at Florence in Tuscan translation in 1575. An extension of the index concept, whether conscious or not, is the alphabetical anthology, under such headings as Abstinencia, Adversitas, Adulatio, Alexander, Ambitio, Amicitia... Usio, Utia, Uoluntas, Uoluptas, Utensilia, Utilitas, Uxor, which is preserved in Vaticanus latinus 1932, s. XV; it was compiled by the Benedictine Joannes de Fayt (d. 1395), who for forty-five years served as abbot of St. Bavo's in Ghent and compiled also a Tabula of the De consolatione philosophiae of Boethius.

Here too with the conscientious scholars of the manuscript period we must number the representatives of the teacher-to-student tradition, teachers especially in the humanistic era who lectured on Valerius and students who learned from them the rudiments of textual criticism. Some have already been mentioned in this Fortuna, others will be found with the commentators. Johannes Lamola, student himself of Guarinus Veronensis, is recalled in Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reginensis latinus 786, s. XV,
for his ‘Oratio... pro principio lectionum suarum, a quodam discipulo suo recitata,’ an oration on Cicero, Valerius, and Horace. In 1456 Peter Luder was lecturing on Horace and Valerius in Heidelberg, and München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 424, s. XV, carries an oration on Valerius which was delivered by the student Udalricus Gossenbrot of Augsburg, who died in Rome in 1465. Joannes Baptista Valentinus Cantaliensis, student of Gaspar Veronensis (who had probably studied under Guarinus), used more than once an introductory lecture on Horace and Valerius which is found in Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, LXXX. Sup. 24, s. XVI, and excerpts from which were translated by Eva M. Sanford. An excellent example is Petrus Mochius of Siena, who taught at Venice toward the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century and whose work De cruciato exilique Cupidinis (Paris, 1537; Venetiis, 1545) the Inquisition condemned. Evidence of his activity is Padova, Biblioteca Universitaria, 206, written in 1517–18 and containing a number of rhetorical letters and a series of prefaces to the study of classical authors. From folio 24, indeed, which transmits the preface of one Melchiore Allegretti on Valerius Maximus, we learn that this student was expounding selected passages of Valerius. His short preface, which is entitled ‘Praefatio Melchioris Allegretti cum Valerii Maximi electorum commentarios auspiciatus est per Petrum Mochium,’ begins ‘Sento, studiosissimi adolescentes et condiscipuli suavisissimi, onus Aetna gravius hac luce mihi demandatum,’ and ends, on the verso, ‘Verum ne ad incultum ieiunumque sermonem meum tedium quoque longitudinis accedat, iamiam velim ad ipsam expositionem descendere, quam vos et iucundam et utilem fore confido. Urbis Romae exterarumque gentium facta simul ac dicta memoratu digna, quae apud alios latius diffusa sunt (1 Prooemium) Et cetera.’ Professor Kristeller informs me that Basel, Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität, O. IV. 12, s. XVI, preserves an oration on Valerius by Nicolaus Maria Paniciatius.

With the invention of printing it was predictable that publishers would turn early to a text already so popular in manuscripts and in the schools. The first printed edition appeared in Strassburg from the press of Johann Mentelin (HC 15773; Goff V-22); it cannot date after 1470. No less than twenty-five editions are recorded for Germany, Italy, and France through the year 1500. But one notes a wariness, a diffidence, a reluctance among their publishers to give credit to the scholars who furnished the text. Dedicatory letters are not always present, sometimes the publisher and his corrector bore the entire responsibility for the text, there was probably piracy from one edition to another, and in at least one case the name of an editor (see s. Oliverius Arzignanensis) was changed in successive copies of a single edition. We do know that Bonus Accursius was responsible for the editions issued at Milan in 1475 by Antonius Zarotus (HC 15777; Goff, V-27), at Venice in 1478 (HCR 15781; Goff V-30) by four successors who are designated in the colophon only by their initials, and at Milan in 1480 by Leonardus Pachel and Ulrichus Scinzenzeler (HC 15783; Goff V-31). This was Accursius of Pisa (d. ca. 1485), student of Franciscus Philephus; he busied himself with several Greek and Latin authors. For the editions which carried also the commentary of Oliverius Arzignanensis the reader is referred to that commentator.

With the sixteenth century editions proliferated, and here again in many cases the publisher functioned without the services of an editor, at least in the modern sense of that term, a scholar-editor, that is, outside his establishment whose text of an author a publisher accepts or rejects as economic and other considerations dictate. The beginning of the century was marked by two startling innovations. The twenty-four exempla missing from Book 1 (1, ext. 4–4, ext. 1) were supplied apparently first in the Leipzig edition issued by Martinus Herbipolensis in 1501 and then by Aldus Manutius in 1503 in a kind of supplement inserted in some copies of his 1502 edition. In his prefatory letter of April 1503 to Johannes Cuspinianus (Johann Spiesshaymer, 1473–1529), who was born at Schweinfurt in Franconia but removed to Vienna where he was professor of rhetoric and medicine and had
access to what is now the great Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Aldus states that Italian editions and manuscripts which he had seen lacked these _exempla_ and that Cuspinianus has sent them to him 'perhumaniter'; Aldus has thanked him privately, but does it publicly, because, as he says in effect, 'of your own accord, when you heard that I was publishing Valerius, you indicated to me "vidisse te in praeclara urbe Vienna, cum publice studia humanitatis inibi profitereris, Valerium antiquissimum, in cuius principio quaedam nunquam ante a te visa haberentur, titulosque omnium scripseris, ut si ea mihi non essent, facerem te certiorem, quandoquidem ad me illico ea esses datusurus. Quod et factum est. . . ."'"<1>Id vero mi Cuspinianus fuit mihi longe gratius, quam si auri multum gemmarumve misisses muneri; illud impenditur, consumitur, disperit, hoc etsi omnibus impertitur tamen aequi apud impertinentem ac impertitum divino excursorio munere manet aesternum, hoc et viventis et posteri perpetuo habeunt utrique nostrum plurimam gratiam. . . ."'"<2> Aldus was the mover also of the second innovation. As with his editions of other classical authors his pocket-sized text of Valerius, so great a departure from the cumbersome folios of the previous century, printed in a clear and easily legible italic type, a convenient manual and bible for scholar and schoolboy alike, at once enhanced the popularity of its author; it appeared in numerous genuine editions by Aldus and his successors, was brazenly counterfeited in Lyon, and was emulated consciously and unconsciously year after year, decade after decade, by scores of printers far beyond the confines of Venice and indeed of Italy. It was the remote ancestor of the modern _tascabile_, with the differences that it was printed on good paper, was possessed of ample margins, was sewn through the folds, and opened flat.

In a slow trickle, the names of scholar-editors begin to appear. Bartholomaeus Matthaeiatus Marosticus was busy with the Venice, 1503 and 1505 editions by Albertinus de Lisona which carried the commentary of Olivarius Arzignanensis, and Antonius Lenas, 'praeclares indolis adolescentes,' with the Milan, 1508, edition by Nicolauus Gorgonzola which carried also the index by Franciscus Puteolanus of Parma (Francesco Pozzo, d. 1490). In Paris Nicolauus Beraldus (Nicolas Béraud, 1473–1550), friend of Erasmus and teacher of the admiral Gaspard de Coligny, prepared for Joannes Parvus editions of 1512 and 1517. A 1513 edition by the same publisher included a preface by Joannes Maurus of Coutances (Jean Le Mor, d. 1550), who was himself printer and professor of grammar. Antonius Francinus of Montevarchi, _corrector_ of numerous editions of classical authors for the Junte press of Florence, actually furnished the dedicatory letter for the 1517 edition published by that press and again in 1523 in Venice by Melchior Sessa and Petrus de Ravannis; the Junte press issued it once more in 1526 and Victor a Ravannis in 1539. Speaking of those who wrote 'res memoratu dignas' Franciscus compares Valerius to the busy bee and says, 'Quantum autem hoc scribendi genere Valerius meruerit omnes qui eius scripta legent facillime cognoscere, cum hic egregia dicta factaque, quae caeteri tum graci, tum latini auctores sparsim per innumeris libros scripserunt (apes certe imitatus, quae ex variis floribus herbisque mella sua colligunt) tam eleganter, tam breviter tamque dilucide degerit, ut equidem nullum ex latinis auctoribus maiorem legentibus utilitatem afferre posse affirmaverim, vereque omnium maximus appellare potest.' It is of interest that Francinus dedicated his 1520 edition of the _Vocabularium_ of Julius Pollux to the English physician Thomas Linacre, graduate of the University of Padua.

Venice still held power on the far side of the Adriatic when the _canonicus_ Lucas Panetius of Dulcigno, modern Ulcinj, dedicated to the Augustinian Antonius Contarenus (d. 1524), 'Venetiarum patriarcha,' the edition of Valerius and Oliverius which issued in Venice from the press of Augustinus de Zanis in 1518, in Milan from the house of Nicolauus Gorgonzola in 1522, and in Venice from the press of Gulielmus de Fontaneto in 1523; the physician Georgius Valla, friend of the physician Alexander Benedictus, was teacher to Panetius. Here again the reader finds a paean of praise to Valerius, but Panetius is aware also
of the need for a certain amount of textual criticism. ‘Congessit utique,’ he says (ed. of 1522), ‘gravissimus author omnia gesta, omnia monumenta, omnia vetustatis exempla non domestica solum sed etiam externa, quae cum facultatem summam ad res gerendas confiare, tum etiam hominem promptum atque idoneum ad facillime suapte natura operandum reddere solent, nihilque quod ad morum scientiam, et civilem doctrinam attinet, nihilque quod est homine libero dignum, a tanto docere omis- sum est, sed ut uno verbo absolvam, inter moralis doctrinae praeceptores quibus humana vita instituitur et docetur, nulli profecto Vale- rius cedit. Cuius quidem divina scripta, quamquam multorum impressorum labefacta te- merritate in perniciem lapsa sunt adeoque magnis scatent erroribus, ut quam plures doc- tos ab eorum avertant lectione, collatis in unum omnibus exemplaribus, quae invenire potui, multa restitui, distinx, annotavi, ut vel eruditum quemque ad se allectare possent. Qua in re nunc illud de Valerii scriptis pleno ore affirmare asim, multo omnium esse eme- dentatissime, quam quae ad hunc usque diem excussa circumferuntur, quod cuique cognitum facillimum erit, qui hanc nostram emendationem cum caeteris conferre voluerit. . . .

In the North by a strange quirk Ortuin Gratius (1491–1542) of Deventer, best known, if perhaps unjustly, as opponent of humanism and as addressee of the satirical Epistolae obscurorum virorum, was responsible for the edition published in Köln by the house of Quentell in 1519. Johannes Cauchius (Johann Kukius, Jan van Cuyck, d. 1566) of Utrecht edited the text issued by Lazarus Schurerius at Schlettstadt in Alsace in 1520; he worked also on Cicero and Ausonius. At Frankfurt near the middle of the century Petrus Brubachius published an edition which had been supervised and corrected by Jacobus Micyl- lus (Jacob Moltzer, 1503–1558) of Strassburg, worthy student of Eobanus Hessus and Philipp Melanchthon and editor of the editio princeps of Hyginus (Basilaeae, 1535). The Swiss polymath Henricus Loritus Glareanus was busy on annotations which constitute in effect a selective commentary and are treated below.

Meanwhile in the South, Joannes Andreas Straneus (Juan Andrés Strany) of Valencia was occupied, according to Nicolaus Antonius in Bibliotheca hispana nova, at about this period with annotations which were apparently never published. Sebastianus Corradus (d. 1556) of Reggio Emilia, student of Baptista Egnatius (whose observations on Valerius were attached to the commentary of Oliverius Arzignanensis) and professor at Reggio and Bologna, published in 1545 from the house of Vincentius Valgrisi in Venice a text which attained such popularity that later editions of it appeared from various presses in Italy and France in 1551, 1553, 1554, 1559, 1564, 1575, 1579, 1587, 1590, 1601, 1605, and 1612. It is supplied with brief marginalia calculated to aid the reader; they consist largely in references to authors who carry the tales which Valerius tells and in textual emendations. In his lengthy letter to the reader, after singing the praises of history which ‘juvenes ad maiorum instituta instituit, et sic exemplis instruit ut cum senibus saepe prudentia et rerum cognitio- nem contendat; quae senibus ipsis nihil non, quod opus sit ad Rempublicam bene sapien- terque regendam, suppeditat quae privatos magistratibus dignos facit; quae imperatores non minus ad rem militarem erudit, quam ad immortalem gloriarm horatent et inflammant; quae milites timidos et saepe abiectos excitat, victores et ob id ferociores in officio retinet, victos vero consolatur; quae bonos ad laudem et gloriarm ut primo vocavit, sic etiam semper confirmat, et improbos poenae et infamiae metu a sceleribus deterret; quae denique nulli non hominum generi et ordini prodest,’ Cor- radus offers Valerius, in whom ‘nihil . . . pos- sisi desiderare, praeter latinam magis elocuti- onem, quam tamen ille vel contemptis, con- tentus, ut inquit, res ipsas exemplis demons- trare vel certe non magni fecit . . . Latinos Catomen, Pictorem, et Pisonem imitatus, unamque dicendi laudem putavit esse brevi- tatem, in qua Graecos omnes et Latinos longe superavit, novem duntaxat libris hisque admo- dum brevibus facta ac dicta omnium pene gentium et populorum memorabilia comple- xus. In qua scribendi ratione viris doctis ita probatus est ut eum Baptista Fulgosius et M. Antonius Sabellicus superioribus annis sint.
imitati, et nunc Egnatius vir magni nominis imitari dicatur.' For Corradus too Valerius imitates the bees, which 'de tot tamque variis floribus optimos colligunt, ex quibus favos fingunt: sic vir prudentissimus, quum videret innumerales pene res ab aliis scriptas, quae ad historiae continuationem potius et ordinem quam ad vitae institutionem pertinente, nec ulli tantum temporis concedi, ut eas omnis possit perlegere, ex omnibus ille optimas quaque selegit, et... ipse in genera et capita ita digessit, ut, quod diu multumque tibi quaerendum fuisset, hinc petere nullo negotio possis (ed. of 1545, ff. 6b–7a, 8b, 9a). My reader will note how Corradus, recognizing that the Latinity of Valerius was scarcely Ciceronian, made of this failing a virtue. And a generation later, in 1571, Joannes Gryphius published in Venice the edition of Augustinus Ferentilus, which again was supplied with brief marginalia which are close to those of Corradus. Ferentilus, editor also of Benedictus Varchius, wrote on creation and universal history. He too sings, for page after page, the glories of history, than which (ff. 3b–4b) 'quid enim... in hac vita non diocuicundius, sed etiam utilius existimari potest, cum illa nihil aliud sit, quam vitae optime instituenda exemplisque aut confirmandae aut corrigendae nitidissimum speculam? ... Historia enim pectus humanum reddit instructum scientia multarum rerum, atque non solum beneficendi, sed et optime iudicandi exempla passim proponit, quibus totam possimus vitam in utrunque fortunae casum sapientissime instituire praemunireque. Quare non defuerunt qui eam Dei opus esse putarint, quod parum aut nihil a coelo et terra maximis eius operibus differat, cum ad summam eius gloriae praedicationem, quatenus eamasse liceat, pertineret... Historiae enim viva et clara vox, et vere animatum ac vocale praecox ad omnem pertinet posteritatem. ...

In none of these editors does the modern editor discern any overwhelming attention to the manuscript tradition of Valerius. Manuscripts are rarely mentioned, identification of any used would be difficult, those used, except in the case of the one containing the twenty-four new exempla of Aldus, were probably those closest geographically to the editor, and all too often it was a previously printed text which was pressed into service for a new edition. But in 1567 Stephanus Vinandus Pighius (1520–1604) of Kampen took a long step toward modern text criticism in the edition published in Antwerp by Christophorus Plantinus; its annotations lift it into the province of commentaries, and it is treated below, as are the contributions of Claudius Mitalier which became attached to it and those of Jusus Lipsius (see below, pp. 391, 395, 396).

This tradition of attention to the manuscripts, of collation of their readings, continued in the seventeenth century on the principles formulated by Pighius. The editors were increasingly from north of the Alps. There was the philologist and jurist Christophorus Colerus, whose octavo edition (Francofurti, 1601) repeats the notes of Pighius and Lipsius, takes account of Mitalierus and Corradus, uses 'vetustissimum V. Cl. Petri Danieli I. C. exemplar' which is probably our Bernensis 366, and provides his own 'Animadversiones' (see below, pp. 399). There was the Danish physician Johannes Isacius Pontanus (1571–1639), student also of Martial, Petronius, L. Annaeus Seneca, Florus, Curtius Rufus, and Tacitus, who 'ex museo [su]o' furnished a Valerius 'manualem ac portatilem' which beginning in 1625 was issued several times in the seventeenth century in those tiny editions popularized by the Elzevir and Janssen presses in Amsterdam. There was Antonius Thysius (1565–1640), born in Antwerp and professor of theology at Harderwijk and Leiden, who in 1651 at Leiden, and in three later editions, dedicated to Queen Christina of Sweden an octavo text 'cum selectis variorum observationibus,' a Valerius 'valentem iterum et detera nube tenebrarum nitidum atque fulgentem.' For the first time the notes appear as footnotes at the bottom of the pages, almost full circle around, that is, from the commentaries which in incunabula editions enclosed the text on three and four sides. We are today unfortunately full circle once more to notes which follow on texts in a separate section.

As if to herald that the states of Italy were
still in the running a mysterious Evangelista Oriens had appeared as the lone 'new' representative south of the Alps. He was operating in a Venice which continued to look across the Adriatic and even to the Aegean, but neither his 1638 nor his 1670 edition helps to pierce his identity; no dedication is present, no preface, no privilege, no commentary, only a page of elegiac verse at the end of the second edition written in praise of Valerius by T. Sempionus Hieronymus Castelloneus and lifted probably from one of the editions of Sebastianus Corradus published at Venice in the sixteenth century. There was also an edition at Treviso in 1654. Evangelista was clearly not a Manuele Crisolora or a Giorgio da Trebisonda or a Costantino Lascaris; in his mystery he almost recalls rather the Greco-Venetian family Apostulos, and in particular Aglaour Apostulos, so vividly presented by Ippolito Nievio in Le confessioni d’un italiano. In about the same period, however, Gaudenzio Paganini (1596–1649), native of the Valtellina and for twenty-two years professor at Pisa, displayed critical acumen when he set down in Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Urb. latinus 1600, s. XVII, 'Varietas lectionis in Valerium Maximum et Martialem expensa.'

The 1662 edition of Johannes Minellius (d. 1683), preceptor and rector in Rotterdam, enjoyed the support of the famous Rotterdam publisher Arnoldus Leers; its text is enclosed on three sides by notes, that is, as Minellius states in his letter ‘Erudito Lectori, ‘‘brevioribus quibusdam et succinctioribus annotatio-nibus, ex multis prolixioribusque in hunc autorem commentationibus magna ex parte excerptis . . . non alio fine quam ut studiosis adolescentibus aliqua ex parte commodarem . . . Verba difficiliora aut synonymo notiore aut periphrasis explicco; aliquando et integras sententias alius verbis reddo; quae per ellipsis deerant, addo.’ Three more editions appeared at Rotterdam in that century, and in the eighteenth it was reprinted at Copenhagen, Venice, and Paris.

It was in the following year, 1663, that Christophorus Adamus Rupertus (1612–1647), professor of history at Altdorf, published in two parts in neighboring Nürnberg his Disserta-

iones observationesque mixtae ad Valerium Maximum et C. Velleium Paterculum. Those on Valerius run to 584 octavo pages, cover all nine books, and as was to be expected are historical in emphasis. And in 1679 the French Jesuit Petrus Josephus Cantel (1645–1684), native of Les Iufs, contributed the Delphin edition (‘in usum Serenissimi Delphini,’ who was the Grand Dauphin Louis [1661–1711], son of Louis XIV [1638–1715], destined not to ascend to the throne); it was magnificently published in quarto in Paris by the widow of Claudius Thiboust and by Petrus Esclassan. Cantel used in particular the commentaries of Oliverius, Theophilus Chalcondyles, Badius, Pighius, and Lipsius and the notes of Colerus and Thysius, and he succinctly characterizes each one in his preface. He set down, as he had for Justinus, ‘interpretationem, chronologyam et notas, sed omnia hic multo uberi-ora quia Valerius Justino et obscurior est, et brevier; quare, quae ille dixit obscure, nos clarius, quae brevieter, nos fuisse explicamus,’ Variant readings he avoided wherever possible, asking, ‘Quid enim aut voluptatis habit aut utilitatis, modo scriptura et integra sit et sincera, obtrudere saepius? Ita Campensis co-dex. Sic Gemblacensis. Paulo alter Sambuci manuscriptus liber.’ He almost had a point. This statement was first of all a blow at Pighi-us, whom he praises elsewhere. At the beginning Cantel discourses on Roman names and families, on classes and magistrates, on priests, on the militia, and at the end he furnishes, without a modern computer and in 82 pages, each in three columns of tiny type, an ‘Index vocabulorum quae in Valerio Maximo leguntur,’ with reference by page and line. The next ‘Delphin’ edition was to appear in 1823; it lacked a genuine dauphin, was published in London, in three volumes, in Abraham Valpy’s series Delphin and Variorum Classics (London, 1819–30, 183 vols.), was based on Johann Kapp’s 1782 Leipzig edition, and took account of Cantel.

But on variant readings Cantel was a throwback. A new era in editing, recalling to some degree that initiated by Pighius, was signaled by Johannes Vorstius (1623–1676) at Berlin in 1672. He had found two manuscripts of
Valerius in the Electoral Library of Brandenburg, an electorate which was flourishing then under the Great Elector Friedrich Wilhelm (1640–1688); these he collated for an octavo volume running, with notes, to well over seven hundred pages, and his text was followed substantially in the 1783 edition published at Zweibrücken and, in two volumes, at Strasbourg in 1806, both editions from the press of the Bipontine Society. Vorstius was schoolmaster and librarian, theologian and student of Latin style; he worked also on Cornelius Nepos, Sallust, Vergil, Justinus, and Sulpicius Severus, and it is a measure of his versatility and certainly of his courage that he dared to publish, though under the pseudonym Janus Orchemus, De generatione animantium conjectura, observationi cuidam Harveanae, ne vetus purgatataque omnium gentium opinio per hanc concidat submissa a Jano Orchamo (Coloniae Brandenburgicae, 1667). This, 58 pages in length, was answered two years later by Georg Friedrich Rall, De generatione animalium disquisitio medico-physica, in qua celeberrimonial viorum, D. D. Guilelmi Harvey et Anton. Deusingii sententia a nuperis J. Orchami instantiis vindicatur, ipsumque generationis opus juxta recentiorum observata succinte exponit (Stetini, 1669, 379 p.).

The work of Vorstius was incorporated in the huge quarto edition edited by Abraham Torreynius and published at Leiden by Samuel Luchtmans in 1726. Torreynius, unlike a certain brand of young scholar today who, arrogant but self-deceiving, looks with scorn on all that has been done by earlier scholars, acknowledged his obligations to his predecessors and in fact included at the beginning of his volume dedications and prefaces by Aldus and Paulus Manutius, Henricus Loritus Graeanus, Justus Lipsius, Stephanus Pighius, Christophorus Colerus, Johannes Iacius Pонтanus, Johannes Vorstius, and others. The book is also furnished with their 'notis integris . . . nec non selectis aliorum observationibus, quibus accedunt emendationes ineditae Casparis Barthii, Francisci Guyeti et Marquardi Gudii, item notae et observationes perpetuae Jacobi Perizonii, ut et Antonii Schultingii, JCTi et antecessoris, Exercitatio ad Val. Max. Lib. VII. Cap. VII. De testamentis re-sciissis.' This was a large order, which Torreynius conscientiously filled; in addition, 'Ad plurimorum MSS. idem opus recensuit, et notas [suas] adjicit.'

Of the scholars known to Torreynius, the critic Caspar Barthius (Caspar von Barth, 1587–1658, CTC III 335–336) was more concerned with poets—Vergil, Statius, Claudian—, but the variety of his publications was wide and he had been occupied with a glossary of Valerius; Torreynius prints two passages from his Adversaria (Francoforti, 1624) which deal with Valerius. The commentator and poet Franciscus Guyet (1575–1655) of Angers had edited and commented on several Greek and Latin authors. The philologist Marquard Gudius (1635–1689) of Rendsburg, professor at Duisburg and Deventer, had transcribed manuscripts and inscriptions from Paris to Rome; the manuscripts which he collected, Valerius among them, are now, of course, one of the shining glories of the Herzog August Bibliothek at Wolfenbüttel. The Dutch jurist and philologist Antonius Schultingius (Schultingh, 1659–1734), professor of law at Harderwijk, Franeker, and Leiden, was quite properly concerned with broken wills. Torreynius acknowledges the work of other scholars, earlier and contemporary, including Gerardus Joannes Vossius (1577–1649), born near Heidelberg but of Dutch parents, who was rector at Dordrecht and Leiden and professor of history at Amsterdam and who published on grammar, rhetoric, and the Greek and Latin historians; Johann Friedrich Gronovius (1611–1671) of Hamburg, editor of Livy, the Senecas, Tacitus, and Gellius; Johannes Schefferus (1621–1679) of Strasbourg, librarian at Uppsala, editor of Aelian and other classical authors, and investigator of the history of Sweden; Cornelius Tollius (1628–1654), professor of eloquence and Greek at Harderwijk, who according to Jöcher 'volte . . . den Valerium Maximum ediren'; Petrus Burmannus (1688–1741), professor at Utrecht and Leiden, who edited the Latin classics, both prose and poetry; Henricus Snakenburgius (1674–1750) of Leiden, editor of Curtius Rufus; Arnoldus Drakenborchius (1684–1748), professor of history and
eloquence at Utrecht and editor of Livy; Franciscus Oudendorp (1696–1761), editor of several Latin authors; Matthaeus Klokkius, ‘antiquae linguae studiosior, quam Valerianae eloquitionis peritor’; Michael Benedictus, colleague of Torrenius, who did his Index Verborum et Locutionum by book, chapter, and exemplum number.

Torrenius is especially proud that in this edition he can rescue some of the unpublished contributions of Jacobus Perizonius (1651–1715), professor of history and eloquence at Franeker and Leiden. It is another indication of the intense activity in the Netherlands that the Bibliotheca der Rijksuniversiteit at Leiden possesses two Valerius manuscripts of Perizonius and six manuscripts of his collations, variant readings, glosses, emendations, annotations, and indexes; five Valerius manuscripts of Vossius including a portion of the commentary of Lucas de Penna; and one manuscript each of the collations of Gronovius and Ouden- dorpius. Torrenius was familiar also with the many editions, from the fifteenth century on, which had preceded his. He lists twenty-five and more manuscripts of Valerius and his commentators. In addition he knew and used the account of Valerius in the first edition of the Lutheran theologian Johann Albert Fabriciuss’s (1668–1736) Bibliotheca latina, published at Hamburg in 1697. I too would salute Fabricius, who continues to be useful to me in the Venice. 1728, edition, the second volume of which, containing Valerius, a beneficial fortune ordained that I purchase in 1933 at the Rag Market in Rome (and for two lire, when the lira had a value of five cents).

In 1753 Johann Peter Miller (1705–1781), philologist and rector at Ulm, published an octavo edition which carried as footnotes short citations of sources and parallels gleaned from his predecessors; he expressed the pious hope that his index would be useful. It is a working edition for student or for hasty consultation. The next significant advance was provided by Johann Kapp (1739–1817), who taught at Erlangen and who in preparation for his Leip- zig edition of 1782, in octavo, consulted his predecessors and ‘ex his quae ad Valerium illustrandum facere videbantur, diligenter ex- cerps[1],’ but ‘omissis iis, quae ad ostentandam tantummodo eruditionem dicta essent, aut auctoris lectionem nihil iuvarent.’ He followed Torrenius in large part, and he states that he will be satisfied if, ‘licit vix quarta pars variantium lectionum ex Torreni spisso volumine relicta sit, ... lectores ex mea farragine vel dimidiem partem notatu dignam judicent.’ He supplemented his notes with an Index Scriptorum a Valerio Maximo Citatorum, an Index Geographicus, an Index His- toricus, an Index Latinitatis, an Index Rerum et Verborum Quae in Notis Explicantur, an Index Graecus, an Index Auctorum in Notis vel Emendoratorum vel Illustratorum, and an Index Scriptorum in Margine Citatorum. It was his ‘animus,’ indeed, ‘talem parare editionem, quae et omnibus subsidis ad intelligendum Valerium instructa esset, et omnia ab interpretibus dicta contineret, quo lector inoffenso pede pervagere posset, neque opus habe- ret, evolvendi multis libris tempus perdere, sive criticam, sive historiam, sive chronolo- giam, sive geographiam, sive antiquitatem, sive denique latinitatem spectaret.’ His readers, he knew, would be of more than one kind, ‘Diversus enim est lectorum scopus, diversa cognitio, diversum studium. Alii brevitatem amant, alii copiam, alii in facioloribus haerent, aliiis fere nihil negotii occurrit; aliiis nil nisi critice placet, aliiis crisin ne tantillum quidem aestimant. Hos omnes ante oculos habui, his studui satisfacere, ita tamen, ut quoad fieri potuit, prima lex esset brevitas.’ The edition was repeated at London in 1819 and in expanded form in three volumes in 1823 in the Delphin edition mentioned above. In 1799 Johann Theodor Benjamin Helfrecht issued an octavo edition at Stadt am Hof which was also based on Torrenius; Helfrecht too, especially with a biography of Tycho Brahe (Hof, 1798) demonstrated like Vorstius a certain versatility.

In the nineteenth century the German Karl Benedict Hase (1780–1864) enjoyed a career in a foreign country similar in some respects to that of the Italian Antonio Panizzi (1797– 1879) at what is now the British Library. Born at Sulza bei Naumburg and trained at Jena and Helmstedt, Hase went to Paris in 1801 where he became in time conservator of manu-
scripts at the Bibliothèque Nationale, collaborator on its Notices et ExtrAits, editor of the Journal des Savants, member of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, and Chevalier de la Légion d'Honneur. Along the way he taught modern Greek, palaeography, and comparative grammar and found time to edit Suetonius and other authors and to participate in the preparation of the first volume of the new edition of Henri Estienne's Thesaurus graecae linguae (Parisiis, 1831). His Valerius, to which were added Julius Obsequens with Conradus Lycosthenes, the De ostentis of Joannes Lydus in Greek and Latin, the Roma luxurians sive De luxu romanorum of Joannes Meursius, the De somniorum uidiciis of Astramyscus in Greek and Latin, the Oneirocriticon of Nicephorus in Greek and Latin, and the Oracula magica of Zoroaster in Greek and Latin, was issued in Paris (colligebat Nicolaus Eligius Lemaire) in 1822-23 in the series Bibliotheca Classica Latina sive Collectio Auctorum Classicorum Latino-

rum. Since the second volume consists of two parts, the work issued actually in three fat physical volumes, in octavo. Hase was following substantially the text of Vorstius from the 1806 Bipontine edition, but he profited from the work of many predecessors, and whereas Helfrecht, he says, 'solis . . . dissentium rationibus consuluit,' he thought it would be helpful to prepare an edition 'qua omnibus subsidiis ad intelligendum Valerium undique instructa, dissentium et docentium commodis aequae serviret.' His footnotes are supplemented, in the first part of the second volume, by indexes running to more than three hundred pages, the bulk of which are occupied by the Index Verborum et Locutionum. It is already clear that concordances could be conscientiously and competently prepared before the days of the modern computer. The second part of the second volume is occupied by the other authors mentioned above, by the prefaces of Hase's predecessors, and, on pages 421-449, by Antoine Alexandre Barbier's useful index of editions (see Bibliography). The learned bibliographer Barbier (1765-1825), born at Coulommiers, was librarian of Napoleon and was responsible for the first edition (Paris, 1806-09, 4 vols.) of that classic work beloved of bibliographers, the Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes et pseudonymes.

The first half of the nineteenth century numbered additional scholars occupied with Valerius. The several translators have already been listed; they rather regularly ran a Latin text below their translations or on facing pages. Angelo Cardinal Mai (1782-1854), like Achille Ratti after him scriptor of the Ambrosiana and prefect of the Vatican, does not, to whom we owe the science of reading palimpsests and the exciting discovery of the De re publica of Cicero, included in his series Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio (Rome, vol. III, pt. 3, 1828, 1-89 and 93-115) the epitomators Julius Paris and Januarius Nepotianus. Johann Friedrich Duebner (1802-1867), who was concerned with more than a score of Greek and Latin authors, edited Valerius at Gotha in the Thirties. The edition of J. Salvini de Lennemas appeared at Paris in 1836-37 in two volumes in the series Scriptorum Latinorum Bibliotheca of Charles Louis Fleury Panckoucke. Jean Pierre Charpentier (b. 1797) employed its text and notes in the Paris, 1845, edition. Charpentier has the dubious distinction of having attempted to decide, in 1828, whether French literature owed more to Greek or to Latin literature. Tauchnitz editions began to appear at Leipzig in 1830.

We have arrived at our own age, for the text which was first issued in 1854, and in revised form in 1888, has not been superseded; in fact, in the current scarcity of classical texts the first edition was reprinted photographically in 1976 (Hildesheim, Georg Olms Verlag) and the second by stereotype in 1966 (Stuttgart, Teubner). Karl Friedrich Kempf (b. 1819), director of the Friedrichs-Gymnasium in Berlin, was a young man of thirty-five when his 1854 edition appeared in Berlin. He was even younger when he prepared it. It had been more than three years in the hands of the printer, he had been in military service, and it was only 'pacato rei publicae statu' that he could return to his studies, and even then, involved in teaching, he could 'nonnulli subsecivas horas de nocte saepe detrahendas huic libro impendere.' He disparages his pref-
ace, which is, however, a careful job of 99 octavo pages under the headings, 'De Valerii Maximi vita et scriptis,' 'De fontibus Valerii Maximi,' 'De Valerii Maximi auctoritate et fide historica,' 'De Valerii Maximi stilo et dicendi genere,' 'Historia critica Valeriani operis,' 'De Iulio Paride, Valerii Maximi abbreviatore,' 'De Ianuario Nepotiano et aliis Valerii Maximi abbreviatoribus,' and 'De Valerii Maximi codicibus manuscriptis.' He uses Bernnensis 366, Vindobonensis 196, Berolinenses Lat. fol. 46 and 48, Guelferbytani 61 Gud. lat. 2°, 39 Gud. lat. 2°, and 166 Gud lat. 4°, and Paris and Nepotianus. The variant readings are indicated by line number at the bottom of each page of text, and below them he provides footnotes by exemplum number. The volume runs to 790 pages plus two pages of Addenda et Corrigenda. From an editor especially of his years it was a major contribution. His devotion to Valerius continued throughout his life; in the same year he published De incerti auctoris fragmento quod inscribitur De praenominibus (Progr. d. Berl. Gymn. zum Grauen Kloster, 30 p.) and in later years, in addition to his 1888 text, Novae quaestiones Valerianae (Progr. d. Berl. Gymn. zum Grauen Kloster, 1866, 35 p.), 'Zu Valerius Maximus' (Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik, CXXXIII, 1886, 49–64), and 'Bericht über die neuere den Valerius Maximus betreffende Litteratur' (Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, LXXIII, 1890, 254–286).

Also in 1854 Karl Felix von Halm (1809–1882), to whom more than seven columns are devoted in the National Union Catalog, published at Munich thirty-two pages of Emendationes Valerianae. Halm edited several Latin authors, was an early proponent of a Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, worked also in Greek syntax and etymology, and is perhaps best known to classical scholars today as one of the editors of the Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis. His Emendationes gave indication of what was to come. In 1865 B. G. Teubner published at Leipzig his edition of Valerius, Paris, and Januarius Nepotianus. It was a small volume of XXII and 554 pages, equipped, in the Teubner tradition, with variant readings but no other notes, with Paris printed in full at the bottom of each relevant page and Januarius printed at the end of the volume; these epitomators Kempf had used without furnishing their texts.

In his preface Halm sets forth the reasons for and the methodology of his edition. He felt that greater attention was due the two epitomators and the later hands of the Bernensis. He went to Bern to determine whether he could adopt Kempf's readings for the most part, but he found so many sins of omission and commission that further perusal was necessary, and the authorities at the library 'mihi roganti facile concesserunt, ut codicum primarium Monachium perferrem et düm liber typis expressus esset domi haberem.' This is rightly a privilege no longer accorded scholars. Halm used for Paris Vaticanus latinus 4929, where Kempf had cited from Mai's edition, and he records a few readings also from the editio princeps of Valerius.

But in the end two factors beyond the control of either man, age and a new manuscript, combined to give Kempf precedence. Halm was well past his half-century mark when his edition appeared in 1865, and he died in 1882; Kempf at the age of sixty-nine was still abundantly able to publish his second edition in 1888, an edition which Teubner in Leipzig must have undertaken with alacrity especially because it used a manuscript which Halm had not known. In 1882 Laurentianus Ashb. 1899, which Guglielmo Libri had procured at Gand in 1847, was not yet in the public domain; it was purchased in 1884 by the Italian government. Kempf puts the case dramatically: he was almost at the point of transmitting his copy to the printer when 'ecce venit nuntius perantiquum Valerii codicem eo usque in Britannia in bibliotheca viri inl. Ashburnham latentem et publico usui subtractam, iam vero cum magno librorum manuscriptorum numero un regno Italiclo emptum Florentiam, in bibliothecam Laurentianam esse translatum' (pp. XX–XXI). Theodor Stangl had examined it in Florence and shared his notes with Kempf; Bruno Keil, also in Florence and then aged twenty-five, undertook 'hoc in se negotium . . . omnem lectionis varietatem mihi descri-
bendi' (p. XXI), and Laurentianus Ashb. 1899 assumed its late but rightful and important place in the transmission of Valerius.

Kempf had not neglected Bernensis 366. Once again it traveled bravely north, this time to Berlin, by permission of the authorities of its library and after friends of Kempf’s in Bern had informed him that not all Halm’s strictures were justified. They ranked: he acknowledged that as a young man he was not sufficiently skilled in collating manuscripts, that he was pressed for time, etc. etc., but on examining the manuscript in Berlin he noticed that ‘plures quam suspicatus eram ab Halmio . . . commissos esse errores. In quo praeclipe mirabar qui accidere id potuerit homini in legendis veterum scriptoribus libris versatissimo’ (p. IV). Books could of course be written on the pitiful alterations of scholars, but here there could be no rejoinder from Halm, and Kempf indeed gave credit where credit was due, saying, ‘Haec habui quae dicerem de Halmiana scripturae varietate et Bernensi libro excerpta, magna ex parte levia illa quidem, si tamen quicquam leve est in hoc genere maxime in locis corruptis, sed profecto non omnia nullius momenti in restitundis Valerii verbis. In qua re unum illud deprecor, nequissim me haec tam sedulo collegisse opinetur ad detractanda insignia praestantissimii illius viri praevisertim iam defuncti merita. A quo pravo consilio me longissime abesse et olim in Novis quaestionibus meis Valerianis . . . professus sum, cum acriss ab eo obiurgat excusare studerem quae in describendis codicis illius lectionibus pecassem, et hodie profiteor ab ipso Halmio edoctus quan sit illud negotium difficile, postquam intellexi vel diligentissimo veterum librorum perscrutatorum et in legendis iis versatissimo talia posse evenire’ (p. XIII).

Kempf’s is still the standard Teubner edition of Valerius, on whose text follow the texts of Paris from the collation of H. Kruse and of Januarius, the Index Auctorum a Valerio Laudatorum, and the Index Nominum et Rerum, XXXIV, 672 pages in all. The text was run by Pierre Constant and by Rino Faranda on pages facing their respective translations and is the basis for the lexicon by Enrique Otón Sobrino which is currently appearing (Madrid, 1977–, 2 vols. to date).

The activity of Kempf and Halm evoked numerous contributions from scholars eager to improve specific points in the corrupt text, to assess the manuscripts, to trace the history of a printing, to investigate the sources of Valerius and how he in turn was used as a source. Their contributions are duly recorded in the Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft and, for more recent years, in L’année philologique; it is not difficult to assemble a bibliography on Valerius. Criticism began of course much earlier. In the nineteenth century familiar names like August Reifferscheid, Alfred Fleckesen, Johan Nikolai Madvig, Franz Buecheler, Ludwig Traube and his student Joseph Schnetz, for whom Bernensis 366 traveled north a third time in 1898, Wilhelm Heraeus, Max Ihm, and Johannes Vahlen occur. For the twentieth I would mention here only Rudolf Helm’s convenient survey of Valerius in Pauly-Wissowa (see Bibliography).

The Leitmotiv of teacher-to-student testifies to the constant use of Valerius in the schools. James John points out to me that Jakob Wimpeling (1450–1528) recommended Valerius in Isidoneus Germanicus de erudienda juventute [Strassburg, about 1498, H 16179, Goff W-37; the first edition, H 16177, Goff W-36, appeared at Speier after 22 August 1497], chapter 21, ‘De lectione poetrarum et oratorum.’ Valerius was indeed thumbed in the schools through many centuries before and after Wimpeling. It is pleasant therefore to record here finally those modern editions of selections calculated to attract the young. The Latin of Valerius is a poor second best to Caesar’s, but presumably the variety of his subject matter was considered more appealing. No less a figure than William Ralph Inge (1860–1954), Dean of St. Paul’s, whose works in the classics and in theology occupy six columns in the Catalogue of Printed Books in the British Museum, published at London in 1890 selections amounting to almost half the entire work, 228 pages, and appended his notes on pages 231–314. I am indebted to Michael Kasper of Amherst College Library for information on this edition. ‘The selection has been made.’
the Dean states, 'on the principle of choosing the liveliest stories and omitting the more vapid moralisings: a few pages have been omitted on account of the desperate condition of the text. . . . The editor has felt severely the dearth of literature on Valerius. Lexicographers have neglected him as much as commentators, and there are dozens of cases where even the newest lexicons are silent on a usage found in this author. And the old commentators embodied in Torrenius are not very helpful, frequently passing over the most serious difficulties.' In America Charles Sidney Smith, whose 1910 thesis at the Johns Hopkins University was entitled *Metaphor and Comparison in the Epistulae ad Lucilium of L. Annaeus Seneca*, published fifty selections with notes and an introduction in Boston in 1895 in The Students' Series of Latin Classics. Charles Henry Ward and his publisher Macmillan & Company were perhaps the most daring with *Selections from the Anecdotes of Valerius Maximus Adapted for the Use of Beginners* (London, 1897, in the series Elementary Classics). The *General Report of the Classical Investigation, American Classical League*, Part I (Princeton, 1924, p. 149) recommended Valerius as an author for the fourth semester of high-school Latin, and A. M. Rovelstad discussed 'Valerius Maximus as an Author in the High-School Course' in the *Classical Journal*, XXIV (1929), 578–584. But fifty and more years have gone by, and whether desirable or not, it does not seem likely that Valerius will very soon become again a favored teaching medium.

Such has been the popularity of Valerius Maximus over almost two millennia. This *Fortuna* has hit only the higher spots; numerous scholars and editions have gone unlisted. The popularity is attested also by the more than eight hundred manuscripts, scattered the world over but of course concentrated mainly in Europe, which I have newly listed in *Miscellanea Augusto Campana*, II (Padova, 1981 [Medioevo e umanesimo, 45]), pages 695–728. But nowhere is that popularity better exhibited than in the mediaeval and Renaissance commentators who follow. Their contributions should, however, be judged for each age not in isolation but against the wider activity which this Fortuna has tried to portray.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**I. Editions**

The *editio princeps* is assigned to [Strassburg: Johann Mentelin, not after 1470] (HC 15773, Goff V-22); the first Aldine appeared at Venice in 1502. As detailed in the Fortuna, important critical editions before the nineteenth century were those of Pighius (Antverpiae, Christophorus Plantinus, 1567), Vorstius (Berolini, Ernystus Gohlius, 1672), and Torrenius (Leidae, Samuel Luchtmans, 1726). Useful for lists of editions are the general catalogues of the several national libraries, the edition 'ex editione Johannis Kappii, cum notis et interpretatione in usum Delphini, variis lectionibus, notis variorum, recensu editionum et codicum (Londini, A. J. Valpy, 1823), III, 1389–1407, and Antoine Alexandre Barbier's 'Index editionum Valerii Maximi auctori Fabriciano et in quattuor aetas digestus ex editione Argentoratensi Societatis Bipontinae anno 1806 in lucem emissa excerptus' in the edition of Karl Benedict Hase (Parisii, Nicolaus Lemaire), II.2 (1823), 421–449. More modern critical editions are those of Karl Friederich Kempf (Berolini, 1854), Karl Felix von Halm (Lipsiae, 1865), and Kempf's second edition (Lipsiae, 1888). The last two are Teubner editions; for citations I have used that of 1888.

**II. General Treatments**


**III. References**

To lessen printing costs I have assembled here references to the Fortuna which would otherwise have been cast as footnotes. The sections correspond to the sections in the Fortuna. I have tried in general to omit the more obvious references (to Petrarch, for example) and to illuminate those subjects and figures
which are less familiar. I have also, for the sake of convenience and sometimes for one or another particular reason, included in the text itself references which did not interrupt unduly the flow of thought. The text provides in some detail a bibliography of editors (and editions) of Valerius, and references given here for that section are accordingly limited. Numerous quotations from the sources which might normally be treated as footnotes I have incorporated into the text itself in order to recreate, as it were, the period and circumstances under discussion and vivify the activities of earlier scholars; the modern scholar will read these, even when they are in another language, as part of the English text and will require no translation.

1. The Exemplum as a Literary Genre


2. Ancient Testimony


3. Epitomes, Annotations, Florilegia, Excerpts


Heinic: Heinic, *I Collectanea, a cura di Riccardo Quadri* (Friburgo, 1956 [Spicilegium
LATIN AUTHORS


Nicolaus Vulpes: Angiogabriello di Santa Maria, Biblioteca e storia di ... scrittori così della città come del territorio di Vicenza (Vicenza, 1772–1782, 6 vols.), II, Parte prima (1772), CXIV–CXX; Cosenza, IV, 3714, V, 1909; E. D'Agostino, 'Corrispondenti di Giovanni Tortelli: Nicola Vulpes (Tesi di laurea, Università degli Studi, Roma, 1966–67; I have not seen this thesis); Lodovico Frati, 'Di Nicola Vulpes. (Appunti biografici),' Studi e memorie per la storia dell'Università di Bologna, IX (1926), 199–212; Mariangela Regolosi, 'Nuove ricerche intorno a Giovanni Tortelli. 2. La vita di Giovanni Tortelli,' Italia medioevoale e umanistica, XII (1969), 165–172, 176–178, 180, 183–184; Remigio Sabbadin, 'Il Fanense e Nicola Vulpes,' Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XLVI (1905), 77, and 'Antonio Costanzo e Valerio Massimo,' Classici e umanisti da codici ambrosiani (Firenze, 1933 [Fontes Ambrosiani, II]), 120; Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3908 preserves letters of Vulpes to Tortelli which were used by D'Agostino, Frati, and Regolosi.

4. VERSIFICATIONS

Rodulphus Tortarius: Manitius, III (München, 1931), 872–877; Rodulphus Tortarius, Carmina, edited by Marbury B. Ogle and Dorothy M. Schullian (Rome, 1933 [Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, VIII]).


Martinus a S. Brunone: Valerii Maximi dictorum, factorumque memorabilium, olim obiter, et strictim versus expositionum libri novem, opus posthumum, ex umbriis in lucem solerter vindicatum; juvandaeque tantisper claritatis gratia, amplius dimidio versusnum sparsim adactum: nec non ad calcem cujusque libri indiculo instructum, opera, et studio Martini a S. Brunone austriaco-vene-
nensis, Scholastum Piarum presbyteri (Rastatt, 1722). I have used microfilm of the copy in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien.

5. Quotations and Citations

Standard editions of many of the authors mentioned in this section are readily found; from these, from catalogues of the authors’ libraries, from mention of them in other authors or in modern criticism I have gleaned through the years evidence of their acquaintance with Valerius. The Honoré Bonet-John Hus manuscript is preserved in the Universität Knihovna at Praha, XIII. F. 16.

6. Copyists, Owners, Borrowers


Cosimo di Giovanni de Medici: Vespariano da Bisticci, Le vite. Edizione critica con introduzione e commento di Aulo Greco, II (Firenze, 1976), 188.


William Grey: Robert Weiss, Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century (Ox- ford, 1941), 94, n. 3.


Johannes Dubravicus: To the references in


Luca Dolci, Pietro Ghirarducci, Carlo Bucconi: Maria Bertola, I due primi registri della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Codici Vaticani latini 3964, 3966, pubblicati in fototipia e in trascrizione con note e indici a cura di Maria Bertola (Città del Vaticano, 1942 [Codices et Vaticanis selecti quam simillime expressi, XXVII]), 17, 21, 27.

7. IMITATORS

John of Wales: For his work and influence see Andrew G. Little, The Grey Friars of Oxford (Oxford, 1892 [Publications of the Ox-


8. TRANSLATIONS AND VERNACULAR COMMENTARIES

Accursi Di Cremona: Valeriu Maximus translatau in vulgar messinisi per Accursi Di Cremona a cura di Francesco A. Ugolini (vols. I–II, Palermo, 1967 [Collezione di testi siciliani dei secoli XIV e XV, 10–11]; a third volume carrying additional material on Accursi, an examination of the later manuscript of 1428, a statement on editorial practices, and a comparison of the Latin and vernacular texts has been promised); F. A. Ugolini, 'Un nuovo testo siciliano del Trecento: il Valerio Massimo in "vulgar missinosi,"' Bollettino del Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani, I (1953), 185–203; Giuseppe Di Stefano, 'Tradizione esegetica e traduzioni di Valerio Massimo nel primo umanesimo francese,' Studi francesi, n. 21 (1963), 401–402.

(1977-78), 55-107, and 'Una primitiva redazione del volgarizzamento di Valerio Massimo,' *ibid.* 41-54. The selections of 1862 appeared as Dispensa XXIV of Scelta di Curiosità Letterarie Inedite e Rare dal Secolo XIII al XIX, edited by Luigi Barbieri, who printed chapters VI 1 and II 1; portions from Book IV were published by Cesare Segre, *Volgarizzamenti del Due e Trecento* (Torino, 1964, Ristampa riveduta [Classici italiani, 5]), 447-466, 'Valerio Massimo in un volgarizzamento anonimo.'

Giovanni Dati: Cosenza, II, 1189, V, 603; the 1826 edition appeared with Velleius Paterculus in the series Biblioteca Storica o Tutte Le Nazioni, the 1839 edition in the series Biblioteca degli Scrittori Latini col Testo a Fronte, with notes by the abbot Pietro Canal (1807-1883; see *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, XVII, 676-681) which run to II 8 and were finished by Federico Brunetti after 1854.


Niklas Heiden: Jöcher, II, 1441.


Simon de Hesdin and Nicolas de Gonse: Investigation of the translation and commentary has been frequent in the twentieth century and especially intense in recent years. See E. Bellone, *La traduzione francese di Valerio Massimo fatta da Simon de Hesdin e Nicolas de Gonse*. Tesi di laurea, inedita, presentata all'Università di Torino nell'anno accademico 1958-59 (I have not seen this thesis); Marjorie Alkins Berlincourt, *The Commentary on Valerius Maximus by Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri and Its Influence upon Later Commentaries* (see below s. Commentaries, Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri, *Editions*), 22-35 and (1972) 370-376; Giuseppe Di Stefano, 'Tradizione esegetica e traduzioni di Valerio Massimo nel primo uma-
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Charles Fontaine: Michaud, XIV, 312–313.


Jean Claveret: Michaud, VIII, 374; *Nouvelle biographie générale*, X, 718.


Diego Lopez: *Enciclopedia..., XXXI, 110*, and Beardsley, pp. 12 and 84–85, no. 175. I have not studied several manuscript translations of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in Castilian, at least one of which (El Escorial, Biblioteca Reale de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, h.I.10, s. XIV), antedating that of Hugo de Urriés, was translated from the Catalan. Zaragoza, Biblioteca Universitaria, 157, s. XVII, carries a Spanish translation by Diego Felipe Vezcaño.


Conradus Mirkinius: Mirkinius died before 12 December 1633; see Nieuw nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek, I, 1340.

Abraham Bogaert: Bogaert lived from 1663 to 1727; *ibid.*, III, 131–133.


9. EDITORS


Johannes Vorstius: Proponents and opponents of William Harvey’s *De motu cordis* were listed by E. Weil in ‘The Echo of Harvey’s *De motu cordis* (1628) 1628 to 1657,’ *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, XII (1957), 167–174.

COMPOSITE EDITIONS

(*) s.d., Medioli (Milan): Johannes Jacobus et Fratres, de Lignano. Commentaries of Oliverius Arzignanensis and Theophilus Chalcondyles, with contributions by Hermolaus Barbarus, Georgius Merula, Marcus Antonius Sabellicus, Janus Parrhasius, Raphael Regius, and Baptistia Egnatius. Perhaps before 1503, since it does not contain the twenty-four exemplar published by Aldus Manutius at Venice in that year and by Martinus Herbipolensis at Leipzig in 1501. Luigi Balsamo, however,
makes it [1509–1511] and assigns it to Scinzenzeler in Giovanni Angelo Scinzenzeler, tipografo in Milano (1500–1526) (Firenze, 1959), no. 199. BN.

1508, 24 October, Venetiis (Venice): per Bartholomaeum de Zanis, de Portesio. Commentaries of Oliverius Arzignanensis and Theophilus Chalcondyles, with contributions by Hermolaus Barbarus, Georgius Merula, Marcus Antonius Sabellicus, Janus Parrhasius, and Raphael Regius. The privilege to publish, requested 3 December 1503, is listed by Rinaldo Fulin, ‘Documenti per servire alla storia della tipografia veneziana,’ Archivio veneto, XXIII (1882), 152–153. Panzer VIII, 390, no. 428; Max Sander, Le livre à figures italien depuis 1467 jusqu'à 1530 (Milan, 1942), no. 7453; NUC. BL (DLC; MH; Dorothy M. Schullian, hereafter abbreviated DMS).

(*) 1508, 31 October, Mediolani (Milan): Nicolaus Gorgonzola. Commentaries of Oliverius Arzignanensis and Theophilus Chalcondyles. Panzer VII, 385, no. 62; Adams V-86; NUC, where the one and only attribution, MH, is incorrect. BL, BN.


1513, 5 March, [Paris]: Venundantur ab Ascensio et Ioanne Parvo. Commentaries of Oliverius Arzignanensis and Jodocus Badius Ascensius. Panzer VIII, 2, no. 616; Renouard III 319; Adams V-90, 91; NUC. BL; BN; Cambridge, Trinity College (NCC; DMS).


1517, 28 March, Luteciae (Paris): in aedibus Wolphangi Hopyl [or] Joannis Parvi. Commentaries of Oliverius Arzignanensis and Jodocus Badius Ascensius. Panzer VIII, 37, no. 920; Renouard III 319–320; Adams V-95, 96; NUC. BL; BN; Cambridge, St. John's College, University Library (MH; DMS).

(*) 1518, 6 February, Venetiis (Venice): Gualtherus de Fontaneto. Commentaries of Oliverius Arzignanensis, Theophilus Chalcondyles, and Jodocus Badius Ascensius. Panzer XI, 516, no. 932b; Renouard III, 320 (perhaps edition of 6 February 1523, reading XVIII instead of XXIII?).

(*) 1518, 20 May, Venetiis (Venice): per Augustinum de Zannis, de Portesio. Commentaries of Oliverius Arzignanensis, Theophilus Chalcondyles, and Jodocus Badius Ascensius. Renouard III 320; Sander no. 7456; NUC. BL. (CSmH).


1523, 6 February, Venetiis (Venice): impressum per Gulielmum de Fontaneto Montisferrati. Commentaries of Oliverius Arzignanensis, Theophilus Chalcondyles, and Jodocus Badius Ascensius. Renouard III 321; Sander, no. 7458; NUC. BL (MH; DMS).

1531, 1 April, Venetiis (Venice): per Gulielum de Fontaneto sumptibus Lucae Antonii Juntae. Commentaries of Oliverius Arzignanensis, Theophilus Chalcondyles, and Jodocus Badius Ascensius. Panzer VIII, 522, no. 1584; Camerini I, no. 341; Renouard III 322; Sander no. 7461. (DMS.)


1536, Venetiis (Venice): Commentaries of Oliverius Arzignanensis, Theophilus Chalcondyles, and Jodocus Badius Ascensius. Renouard III 322; NUC. BL (DL; Cy; DMS).


(*)1548, Venetiis (Venice). Commentaries of Oliverius Arzignanensis and Jodocus Badius Ascensius. Fabricius, BL (1728) II 393 and Barbier, 436; see Bibliography.


(*) 1588, Lutetiae (Paris): apud Joannem Macaeum. Commentaries of Oliverius Arzign-
nanensis and Jodocus Badius Ascensius. Renouard III 324–325. BL. It is stated on the title page that this edition is provided with ‘Nicolai Beraldi familiarissima ac plane dilucida expositione.’ Dennis E. Rhodes, Deputy Keeper, Rare Books Section, of the British Library, graciously informs me that the edition contains indeed a much earlier dedicatory letter of Beraldus but no section of commentary which can be ascribed to him.


1601, Francofurti (Frankfurt): typis Wechelianis apud Claudium Marnium et haeredes Ioannis Aubrii. Commentaries of Stephanus Vinandus Pighius, Justus Lipsius, and Christophorus Colerus. Bibliotheca Belgica, 1st series, XXV. BL (two copies, one with manuscript notes by Richard Bentley). (DMS; I cannot resist adding that I purchased this copy from a dealer in Philadelphia in 1933 for $1.50.)

(*) 1601, s. 1. [Genevae]: apud Iacobum Chouët. Commentaries of Stephanus Vinandus Pighius and Justus Lipsius. Bibliotheca Belgica, 1st series, XXV. BN.

(*) 1602, s. 1. [Genevae]: excudebat Samuel Crispinus. Commentaries of Stephanus Vinandus Pighius and Justus Lipsius. Bibliotheca Belgica, 1st series, XXV. BN.

(*) 1606, Lugduni (Lyon): Commentaries of Stephanus Vinandus Pighius and Justus Lipsius. BL.


(*) 1607, Lugduni (Lyon): apud J. Pillehotte. Commentaries of Stephanus Vinandus Pighius and Justus Lipsius. BN.

(*) 1608, Venetiis (Venice): apud Nicolaum Misserimum. Commentaries of Oliverius Arzignanensis, Theophilus Chalcondyles, and Jodocus Badius Ascensius. NUC. (NNC.)


(*) 1612, Lugduni Batavorum (Leiden): ex officina Plantiniana Raphelengii. Commentaries of Stephanus Vinandus Pighius and Justus Lipsius. BL.


LATIN AUTHORS


(*) 1652, Francofurti (Frankfurt). A Varior um edition, with notes from several scholars, cura Christophori Coleri. Kapp III, 1400; Barbier, 441.


(*) 1799, Curiae Regnitiorum (Stadt am Hof): sumtibus Godofredi Adolphi Grau. A Variorum edition with notes from several scholars and those of Johannes Theodorus Benjamin Helfrecht. Kapp III, 1402; NUC, BN (ICU).


1823, Londini (London): curante et imprimente A. J. Valpy. 3 vols, A Variorum edition, with notes from several scholars. NUC. BN (CtY; DMS).


(*) 1845, Paris. A Variorum edition, with notes from several scholars. NUC (CU; PU)

I. FACTORUM ET DICTORUM MEMORABILIA LIBRI NOVEM

COMMENTARIES

1. DIONYSIUS DE BURGO SANCTI SEPULCHRI

The commentary was completed after 18 December 1327, since it is dedicated to Giovanni Cardinal Colonna, who received the purple on that day, and before 31 May 1342, on which day the author’s successor as bishop of Monopoli was confirmed. The finishing
touched can be assigned to his years 1339–1342 in Naples, since he mentions archaeological ruins of that vicinity (Cerereique etc. [I 1, 1]) . . . [Avelia] civitas antiqua fuit, cuius adhuc vestigia prope Salernum apparent; *Sed quid externa* [IV 7, 1] . . . Gracce quia potentiam suam saluti patriae praetulerat merito eius inimicus existimatus est. In hoc cum propo-
site pravo amicum constantem habuit Bloisium Cumanum de civitate posita in Campania cui-
us vestigia prope Neapolim adhuc haec est; *Mitridacesque quoque rex* [V 2, ext.2] Hic rex Mitridaces pro uno milite suo qui fuerat suae libertatis custos navali pugna excepto, id est, capto omnes captivos quo de Rhodis habebat commutavit, satius id est melius exis-
timans ab inmississimis id est inimicos et odio-
sis circumveniri quem benemerito militi grat-
tiam non referre. Gratitudinem istius grati
regis in casu consimili imitatus fuit bona
memoriae illustris Karolus rex Siciliae qui in
redemptionen domini Reynaldi de Avella
militis strenui et sibi fidelissimi quem rex
Fridericus tenebat captivum primo captivos
Siculos quo habebat et demum Yschiam Ca-
preas Procidam insulas sui regni notabiles in-
super castrum abbatis insigni locale quibus
acerrime suum regnum poterat circumveniri
contulit et dedit potius volens praedictis quam
hani militis et tam fidelis carere praesidio).
The bulk of the commentary, however, was
probably composed during his years at Avi-
gnon (about 1330–1338), where Petrarch doubt-
lessly knew it. A manuscript of it has been cre-
dited to the library of Boccaccio, who certainly
knew Dionysius in Naples.

*Dedication* (ed. of [Strassburg, not after 1475]) [R]everendo in Crislo patri et suo
dominio speciali, domino Iohanni de Colonna,
divina providentia Sancti Angeli dyaco-
cardinali frater Dionisius de Burgo Sancti Sepul-
chri ordinis fratrum heremitarum sancti Augus-
tini cum omni subiectio et reverentia filiali
se totum. [Inc.]: Moralius philosopherum attestante sententia ad vitae humanae pra-
cavendas insidias et hominum versutias dis-
cernendas virtus quae prudentia nominatur
dinascitur prae ceteris ymo convincitur neces-
saria. Ea siquidem, clementissime pater, falli
non potest, fallere non vult. Homo prudentis
scit qua via egregi debeat et cito agenda diu-
dicat; hinc praeterita memorantur, dispensan-
tur praesentia, providentur futura ut vere tali
virtute dotatum sit oculos corpus plenum intrin-
secus aut extrinsecus ante et retro per totum,
ut prophetica visio et Iohannis revelatio mani-
festant. Sane librum Valerii Maximi pro sui
brevitatem modernis obscurum temporibus (in
quo virtutem reliucer exempla et quodam
modo singulare prudentia ipsa refugiet) decla-
randum assumpti, ut legentibus clarum fiat
quod difficile primitus apparebat. Hoc autem
nullatenus facere potuisse nisi gesta Romanor-
um ac alienigena per antiquos auctores diver-
sis in locis narrata serie perlegissem, qui quod
ipse Valerius breviter diffuse narravit ac pro-
lixe ego hic annotare curavi ut operi certior
fides detur nec labor videatur inanis tantorum
testimoni comprobatus. Sunt autem praedicti
auctores quo necessario oportuit inuerti: Titus
Livius principaliter et egregii doctores Augustini,
Gregorius, Ambrosius, et Ieronimus,
quorum dicta maxime Augustini libro de ci-
vitate dei et leronimi [sic] in chronicis et episto-
lis fuerunt plerumque necessaria. Quandoque
etiam de biblia et a magistro historiarum ac
etiam de decreto et de Iohanne Crisostomo
alia pro maiore declaratione propositi sunt
accepta. Praeterea hic inserta assumpta sunt
de Hugone libro de sacramentis, de Ysidoro
libro ethymoloyarum, de Pape, de Huguici-
one, de Prisciano, de Josepbo libro historia-
um antiquarum, de Orosio, de Lactantio, de
Macrobio libro de somno Scipionis, de Poli-
crato [Ioanne Sarrisberiens], de Suetonio, de
Bohecio, de Sedullo [Scotto], de Cassiodoro
libro variarum, de Seneca, de Tulio, de Pla-
tone, de Aristotile, de Averro, de Avenena
libro naturalium, de Varrone, de Iuvenali, de
Vegecio, de Solino, de Plinio, de [F]rontino,
de vita philosophorum, de rethorica Grilli, de
computo, de Fabio historicio, de Salustio, de
Paulo Longobardorum historiographo, de
Fustino [Iustino] et de Iuli Florio [L. Annaee
Florio]. Fuit autem necessarium poetas inspi-
cere, sicut Virgilium, Lucanum, Oratium, Per-
sium, Ovidium, Iuvenalem, Eustachium [Eu-
stratium], Venusinum [Ricardum de Venusia?] qui
sub nomine poetae [i]ntroductur et Plau-
tus Ytalie nominatur, Iulium Caesarem et eius
poetriam, Statium, et Alexandri hystioriam tam metrice quam prosayce scriptam. Insuper oportuit cronicas intueri videlicet cronicam Helinandi, cronicam Atheniensium, Hyspanorum et Gallorum ac etiam annalía Romanorum quorum autor non habetur, et cronicam Petri [not Godefri?] Viterbiensis quae pantheon appellatur et etiam plures alios rerum gestarum et particularum narratores. Praefatur igitur opus, pater reverende, vestro ingeniо corrigendum submittto, ut qui origine urbis, dignitate orbis princeps existitis utriusque gesta vestri examinis discreto iudicio discernatis, ac ex varietate praeterita, praesentia ordino, possitis futurum notitiam arbitrari et tandem vita feliciter usi illius (qui laborentibus datur in praemium et a quo et laboris initium et consumationis finem accepit) possitis gloriae sociari.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (Urbis Romae 1 Prooemium) etc. Valerius huic operi suo primo prohemium ponit, in quo suum propositionem ostendens auditores benivolos facit. Secundo tractatum proseQUITUR in quo quae in prohemio promiserat per ordinem declarantur, ibi Maiores (1 1, 1). Prohemium ipsum dividitur in duas partes, quia primo intentionem suam praemittit, secundo ad Caesarem pro auxilio recurrit, ibi Te igitur (1 Prooemium) . . . Maiores status etc. (1 1, 1) Finito prohemio proseQUITUR tractatum, qui habet novem libros partiales, in quorum octo tractato de virtutibus, in nono de viciis ut patebit . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (Idem barbarum (IX 15, ext. 2) . . . isto supplicio Caesar impedire coegit. Igitur ut principium et finis huius libri idem esset Valerius in proloco Caesaris auxilium postulavit et in fine cum Caesare divo Iulio terminavit, qui (ut Suetonius dicit) iustiissim servavit, quae non aliu est, dicente Seneca [cf. Epist. ad Lucil. 90, 3], quam lex divina et vinculum societatis humanae, in qua veritas religio tue tur et ipse deus colitur, in cuius quidem culto sacerco earn vita promittitur in saecula saecularum. Amen.


Manuscripts:


(Photo) Arezzo, Biblioteca della Città di Arezzo, Biblioteca della Fraternità di Santa Maria, 345, s. XIV, f.128v. Commentary on Book 1 1, 4. (Mazzantini VI [1896], 230 and letter of Edoardo Mirri, 15 October 1976).

(*) Avignon, Musée Calvet, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1213, s. XV. The manuscript is incomplete at beginning and end. (Cat. Gén. Fr. Dept. Octavo XXVII [1894], 532–533; Giuseppe Di Stefano, 'Dionigi da Borgo S. Sepolcro, amico del Petrarca e maestro del Boccaccio' [See Bibl. below], 301, assigned this to Petrus Herardi, but I accept his later designation ['Tradizione esegetica e traduzioni di Valerio Massimo nel primo umanesimo
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francese,' Studi francesi, n. 21 (1963), 414] of Dionysius).


(*) Berlin (Ost), Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Hamilton 649, s. XIV. (Élisabeth Pellegrin, La bibliothèque des Visconti et des Sforza duc de Milan au XVe siècle [Paris, 1955], 356; Helmut Boese, Die lateinischen Handschriften der Sammlung Hamilton zu Berlin [Berlin, 1966], 317–318. This is the manuscript described in Giovanni Benedetto Mottarelli, Bibliotheca codicum manuscriptorum Monasterii S. Michaelis Venetiarum prope Muria num [Venetiis, 1779], coll. 328, 1174–1176, which Larkin, xxxii, believed unavailable).

(*) Berlin (West), Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lat. fol. 437, s. XIV, ff. 1–88. (This is located by Zumkeller, respectively 544 and 576, in the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin Ost. Ludwig Bertalot describes it in Bibliofilia, XXIV (1922–23), 261–264, reprinted in his Studien zum italienischen und deutschen Humanismus, herausgegeben von Paul Oskar Kristeller [Roma, 1975 (Storia e Letteratura, Raccolta di Studi e Testi, 130] II, 303–306).

Bressanone, Biblioteca del Seminario Vescovile, A.12, an. 1399. (Known to Zumkeller but listed by Larkin, xxxiii, as unavailable, I consulted it in 1953. It is duly included in Kristeller, Iter, I, 37).

(*) Burgo de Osma, Catedral, s. XV. (Letter of Larkin, 7 April 1969; Timoteo Rojo Orcajo, Catálogo descriptivo de los códices que se conservan en la S. Iglesia Catedral de Burgo de Osma [Madrid, 1929], no. 24; Grubbs II [1933], 86).

(*) Clermont-Ferrand, Archives Départementales du Puy-de-Dôme, F.O.88, s. XV. (Letter of Di Stefano, 1 February 1966; André Bossuat, 'Jacques de Comborn et son secré-


Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Conv. Supp. 423, s. XVI. (Listed by Larkin, xxxv, as unavailable, I consulted it in 1951. It is duly included in Kristeller, Iter, I, 73).

Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Conv. Supp. 483, s. XV. (Listed by Larkin, xxxv, as unavailable, I consulted it in 1972 after finding it listed in Kristeller, Iter, I, 73).

Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Conv. Supp. I.VII.12, ff. 107–201, s. XV. It contains the commentary only for Books VI–IX; that for Books I–V is stated in an early hand to be in another volume which remained 'in Catalonia.' (Listed by Larkin, xxxv, as unavailable, I consulted it in 1954; a live worm dropped out as I was using it. It is duly listed in Kristeller, Iter, I, 162. In Berthold L. Ullman and Philip A. Stadter, The Public Library of Renaissance Florence [Padova, 1972 (Medioevo e umanesimo, 10)], 186, it is dated s. XIV).


Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, R.66 Sup., s. XV. Stops on f.51r in II 6, 8. (Cf. Kristeller, Iter, I, 309, where the commentary is left anonymous).

New Haven, Yale University, The Beinecke Rare Books and Manuscripts Library, Marston MS. 37, ff. 6–142, s. XIV (Bond, 68; in 1962, when this catalogue was published, the manuscript was still in Mr. Marston's possession. Professor Ullman called it to my attention on 2 May 1960).

(*) Nürnberg, Stadtbibliothek, Solg. 45.2°, s. XV. (Listed by Larkin, xxxiii, as unavailable, it was confirmed as at hand in a letter of
LATIN AUTHORS

4 August 1976 from Elisabeth Becker).

(*) Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. F. infra 1.1, s. XV, Books IV-IX only (Madan and others, II, Part I, 364–5).


(*) Pamplona, Biblioteca Catedral, 27, s. XV (Letters of Larkin, 7 April 1969, and of José Goñi Gaztambide, 2 May 1976; A. S. Hunt, 'The Library of the Cathedral of Pamplona,' Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, XIV [1897], 287, no. 27; Grubbs, II [1933], 61).

(*) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 14634–5, s. XV (Léopold Delisle, Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, XXX [1869], 32, [two copies]; Di Stefano, 'Tradizione esegetica e traduzioni di Valerio Massimo nel primo umanismo francese,' Studi francesi, n. 21 [1963], 416).

(*) Poitiers, Bibliothèque Municipale 240 (135), s. XV, containing both the commentary by Benvenutus de Imola (Cat. Gén. Fr. Dept. Octavo XXV, 69) and the commentary of Dionysius for Book I (Berlincourt [see below s. Editions], 37–38).

(*) Praha, Universitni knihovna, 1152 (VI.F.13), s. XV (Letter of Di Stefano, 1 February 1966; Truhlář, I, 464, left the commentary unidentified).

(*) Sevilla, Biblioteca Capitular y Columbina, 7-4-14 (AA 144.2), s. XV (Haenel, col. 981; letter of director, 15 February 1975).


Vaticano, Città del, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1846, f.4r, an. 1349. Portion of dedicatory letter to Giovanni Cardinal Colonna. (Nogara, 297).

Vaticano, Città del, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1927, f.94v, s. XIV. Dedicatorary letter only. (Nogara, 358).

Vaticano, Città del, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1931, s. XIV. Only Books VIII-IX, according to Di Stefano, letter of 1 February 1966; I would add VII. (Nogara, 360, who does not identify it).

Vaticano, Città del, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 8895, ff. 18–346v. Di Stefano, letter of 1 February 1966, identifies the commentary as that of Dionysius.

(*) Wroclaw, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, Rehdig, 133, an. 1416, was lost during World War II (letter of the director, 20 May 1976; cf. K. Ziegler, Catalogus codicum latinorum classicorum qui in Bibliotheca Urbica Wratislaviensi adscivantur [Breslau, 1915], p. 107).

Editions:

[Not after 1475, Strassburg: the R-Printer (Adolph Rusch)]. GW 8411; HC 4103*; Goff D-242. (DLC; MH; NIC).

1954, Proemium and I 7 only, in Marjorie Alkins Berlincourt, The Commentary on Valerius Maximus by Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri and Its Influence upon Later Commentaries, Diss., Yale University, 184 pp. (microfilm may be requested; the dissertation is repeated in shortened but not fully updated form, without the two Latin appendices, and under the title 'The Relationship of Some Fourteenth Century Commentaries on Valerius Maximus' in Mediaeval Studies, XXXIV [1972], 362–387, Appendix I, 95–147).

1967, Book I only, ed. Larkin, see above. Father Larkin, who died 5 April 1977, had hoped to edit the commentary for all nine books.

Biography:

Dionysius (Dyonisius) de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri (Dionysius, philosophus et astrologus, Dionysios a Burgo, Dionysius a Burgo Sancti Sepulchri, Dionysius Burgensis, Dionysius de Arretio, Dionysius de Burgo, Dionysus de Rubertis, Dionysius Tuscus; Denys de Borgo San Sepolcro, Dionigi da Borgo San Sepolcro, Dionigi de' Roberti, Dionigi Roberti da Borgo San Sepolcro, Dionisio di Borgo San Sepolcro, Francesco Dionigi, Francesco Dionisi).

Dionysius was born about 1280 at Borgo San Sepolcro, near Arezzo, and died in Naples early in 1342. In his native town he studied with the Augustinians and was received into that order; at Paris he studied theology, was occupied (1316–1317) with the first two books of the Sentences of Petrus Lombardus, became Baccalaureus (about 1318) and Magister (1323 or 1324), and served as General definitor at
the convention (1329) of his order. In the years that followed he was probably based in Avignon, but he spent a short period (September 1329) in Todi, served again as General defi- nitor at the conventions of his order in Venice (June 1332) and Grasse (1335), was twice Pro- vincial of his home province, Vallis Spoletana, and was in Florence in 1338. In that same year he went to Naples and served until his death at the court of King Robert; he was professor of Canon Law and in 1340 was named Bishop of Monopoli.

Boccaccio was his pupil in Naples, and Gio- vanni Villani was his friend. He had especially close relationships with Petrarch, whom he met probably in Avignon, to whom he was father-confessor, to whom he presented a copy of the Confessions of St. Augustine, whom he recommended to King Robert for the honor of the laurel crown, from whose correspondence comes much of our knowledge of his life, and who dedicated to his memory the famous letter on the ascent of Mont Ventoux.

**Works:** Dionysius edited the *Compendium logicae* of Aegidius de Columna and wrote commentaries on Aristotle’s Politics and Rhet- oric, Vergil, Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, and Seneca’s tragedies. The works reveal an acquaintance with numerous Greek, Latin, Arabic, and patristic authors.

**Bibli:**: Chevalier I, 1173; Cosenza II, 1231– 1236, V, 622; Fabricius BLMA I, 447; Sab- badini, Scalpe I, 36–44; Tiraboschi (Milano, 1833–36) X, 12–20.


Here, for the first commentator of the four- teenth century, I would record my deep regret that I was unable to consult at the University of Padua Leandro Zancan’s dissertation ‘Valerio Massimo nel Trecento.’ Padua does not film its dissertations.

**2. Milianus de Spoleto**

I owe to Helmut Boese my introduction to this incomplete commentary which was written by the Dominican Milianus de Spoleto probably, according to Dr. Boese’s calculations, in 1338, that is, at about the time that Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri was finishing his.

**Commentary. [Inc.]:** [C]um plurium patrum et fratrum meorum plurimus rotationibus pulsatus ut histories librorum seu voluminis Max- ximi Valerii, alto quidem et facundo necnon subtilli et obscuro stilo conscriptas, plano bas- so ac plebeio sermone elucidarem, volens eor- rum votis parere devote necnon et vitare cupiens tristitiae spiritum ostium qui excitat medullas et ossa et docet malitiam multam . . . ego frater Milianus de Spoleto minimus fratum Predicatorum opus agrediar ingeni- olo meo nimis arduum et difficile, utilitati tamen legentium predicantium et conversan-

[Libr. primus habet 6 capitula. Verum est tamen quod a quibusdam distinguitur in 7, nam sextum capitulum quod est de miraculis distinguitur etiam in capitulum de monstris. Primum ergo capitulum est de religione, id est de cultu divino vel de cultu qui exhibebatur diis. Secundum capitulum est de neglecta religione, id est de negligentia commissa erga cultum divinum quae vere a diis exstitit vindicata. Tertium capitulum est de omnibus sine ho . . . Exponam quidem omen quando pertractabo capitulum. Quartum capitulum est de prodigis. Quintum est de somniis. Sextum est de miraculis, et septimum est dividendo istud sextum capitulum de monstris. Primum autem capitulum quod est de religione sive cultu exhibendo diis habet xv paragraphos, in quibus omnibus intendit ostendere quam exquisita et solertia cura Romani erant dediti deorum suorum cultui et divinationi. In quo exemplum habemus quod ex quo pagani et gentiles sic attente et omni diligentia apposita et negligentia deposita suos venerabantur deos immo, ut verius dicam, demones. Quanto magis nos Christianis et fideles cum omni mentis et animi devotione et attentione omniomoda debemus Deum verum unum in essentia et trinum in personis venerari et colere. (1 1, 1) In isto autem primo paragrafo qui incipit sic maiiores statas sollempr(ne[s] ceremonias etc. breviter autem ipse autor ponit. 5(?)) Nota hic super hoc vocabulo statas quod tripliciter potest intelligi, uno modo ut per statas intelligantur vigiliae seu excubiae quae fiebant in honore deorum, alio modo ut per statas intelligantur hostiae pacificae quae offerebantur diis ad pacificandos eos, tertia modo ut per statas maiores intelligantur hostiae quae offerebantur Iovi deo. Jupiter dicebatur olim stator vel deus quia quando pervenitur ad
valerius maximus

ipsum aut deos statur in ipso tamquam in supremo. Nam ut dicit Augustinus de civitate
dei libro quarto capitulo 9° Jupiter apud paganos erat sumnum et maximus deorum. Majores ergo stitas id est ceremonias et hostias
maiores quae deo iovi offeruntur ... / ... [Expl.]: (III 2, 3) ... cum Octaviano Augusto
in templo dicti dei Feretri quod vetustate erat consumptum.

Manuscript:
(micro.) Berlin (Ost), Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Diez C qu. 50. s. XIV. Books I-III 2, 3
only (Letter of Helmi Boese, 4 May 1961,
and kindness of the director of the Handschriftenabteilung, Dr. Hans-Erich Teigte, who sent
film a second time when the first package was
damaged in the mails).

Biography:
The name of Milianus (Aemilianus, Melianus) de Spoleti, O.P., appears in documents
of his order for the years 1311 (Viterbo), 1313
(Orvieto), 1332 (Rome), 1338 (Prato), 1339
(Arezzo), 1340 (Pisa), and 1341 (Perugia). He
is the compiler of "Extractiones de libro Ethicorum
secundum ordinem alphabeticum."

Bibl.: Acta capitulorum provincialium provinciae Romanae (1243–1344) edidit Thomas
Kaeppeli O.P. auxiliante Antonio Dondaine
O.P. (Romae ad S. Sabinae, 1941 [Monumenta
Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum historia
volumen XX edunt socii Instituti Historicorum Praetorium Praedicatorum ad S. Sabinae in Urbe]),
182, 189, 276, 297, 313, 326; Kaeppeli, Scrip-
tores Ordinis Praedicatorum mediæ ævi, III
(Romae ad S. Sabinae, 1980), 137.

3. Frater Lucas

As early as 1948 Thomas Kaeppeli had
noted in Reims, Bibliothèque Municipale,
1333–34, s. XV, references to the Latin
commentaries of Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri, of a Frater Lucas Ordinis Praedicatorum,
and of Lucas de Penna and to the French
commentary of Simon de Hesdin and Nicolas
de Gonesse. He had shown that because the
commentary in the Reims manuscript men-
tions Dionysius it cannot be, as it had been
catalogued, his. Giuseppe Di Stefano in sev-
eral later articles mentioned Frater Lucas, in
1963 assigned the anonymous commentary in
the Reims manuscript to Petrus Herardi, and
in 1971, at the First International Congress
of Neo-Latin Studies, the proceedings of which
were published in 1973, performed the very
useful act of quoting the passages from both
Lucas de Penna (Auch, Bibliothèque Munici-
pale, 8, s. XV) and Petrus Herardi (the Reims
MS.) in which Frater Lucas is cited; the latter
passages were derived from Lucas de Penna
and are secondary.

These passages have enabled me to corrobo-
rate the identification, which I owe to the
kindness of Martin Steinmann, of Basel, Öffent-
liche Bibliothek der Universität, E.II.15, an.
1442, as the commentary of Frater Lucas. It
ordinarily appears in the manuscripts as anony-
mous; in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat.
5866, s. XV, a later hand, which has provided
marginalia, introduces it with the note "interpre-
tatum Faciat(?) Lodovico." The commentary
would seem to fall in date between Dionysi
us and Lucas de Penna and to be connected with
the circle at Avignon. Its author provides his
information, which is largely on historical
points, in straightforward and workmanlike
fashion, in facile Latin, with cross references
to other passages of Valerius, and with cita-
tions from pagan and Christian authors such as
Aristophanes, Aristotle, Cicero, Sallust, Var-
ro, Vergil, Livy, the Younger Seneca, Lucan,
Suetonius, Justinus, Vegetius, Orosius, August-
tine, and Isidore. But his identity eludes us.

Frater Lucas had already been studied, as I
have stated, by Father Kaeppeli from the
Reims manuscript of Petrus Herardi. Lack-
ing the commentary itself he was able none-
thless, on pages 249–250 of the article cited
below, to make the attractive suggestion that,
since Dominican writers of the name Lucas
are very few and since Luca Mannelli in his
commentary on Seneca cited Valerius Maximus
often, he may be the Frater Lucas of the
commentary on Valerius. To the suggestion
was added the caution that it would be neces-
sary to examine all citations from Frater Lucas
in the Reims manuscript and make sure that
they were not derived from the commentary
on Seneca.

With the commentary on Valerius firmly
attributed to a Frater Lucas Ordinis Praedicatorum it will now be possible to comb the entire work for hints on the identity of this Lucas. Certainly for the commentary on Seneca Mannelli was using, with many ancient authors (Kaeppli, p. 263), Sallust, who appears in some manuscripts of the commentary on Valerius at I I (in others the reference is to Cicero) and occurs elsewhere in it, and he was using 'maxime' Valerius. In Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 6467, s. XIV, which is the manuscript of his Compendium moralis philosophiae dedicated, probably before May 1344, to Buzio Visconti, natural son of Luchino, he is depicted offering the tract to Visconti in the presence of personages labeled Valerius, Seneca, Aristotle, St. Thomas, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine. It may be added that in the dedicatory epistle and incipits cited by Kaeppli for the commentary on Seneca Mannelli is indeed referred to as Frater Lucas, Ordinis Praedicatorum, without the cognomen, but usually also with the designation 'Episcopus Auximane dyocesis.' He was named bishop of Osoimo on 5 November 1347.

Giuseppe Billanovich and Di Stefano have looked with some favor on Mannelli's hypothetical authorship of the commentary on Valerius, but Father Kaeppli informed me in a letter of 7 October 1976 that he had 'abandoned the suggestion of an attribution of Lucas to Luca Mannelli' and was awaiting my possible solution of the problem. This I regret I cannot furnish now. The biography below and its bibliography are, however, of Luca Mannelli, who for his knowledge and use of Valerius has a solid place in that author's Fortuna. In 1980 Kaeppli listed among Mannelli's works 'Expositio Valerii Maximi, Facitorum ac dictorum memorabilium libri IX (prooemium).

Commentary (Basel, Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität, E.II.15). [Inc.: Urbis Romae (1 Prooemium) Cassiodorus super historiam tripartitam [Historia ecclesiastica vocata tripartita, in Migne, Patrologia latina, LXIX (1848), col. 879] dicit sic. Utiliter nimis in capite libri praefatio ponitur ubi futuri operis qualitas indicatur. Quid enim commodius quam prius per eam aliquid discere ne dictio possit inopinata confundere? Qua propter Valerius Maximus libro suo prologum praemitit in quo exprimit in quadem [quodam modo] generalis qualitatem et conditionem eorum quae tractantur in libro videlicet de vitii et virtutibus et de omnibus quae digna sunt memoriam. Et in isto prologo reddit auditorem benevolum, docilem, et attentum, quae tria in praefatione cuiuslibet libri debet implere auctor ut patet per Tullium in Rhetorica [Cicero, De inventione, I 15]. Benevolum quidem reddit Caesarem cui hoc opus scribit ipsum laudando in favore virtutum et exterminio vitiorum et ipsum adaequando patri et avo, qui pater et avus relati fuerant in sidera id est fuerunt deificati et secundum hoc videtur scripisses librum Tiberio imperatori cuibus pater adoptivus fuit Caesar Augustus et avus Iulius Caesar, qui ambo fuerant auctoritate senatus deificati. Et quod temporibus Tiberi scripsit librum probatur titullo De censoria nota, ubi dicitur [II 9,6] Claudius Nero et Livius Salinator secundi punici belli temporibus post victorias habitas de Asdrubale se ipsos mutuo exilio damnaverunt. Et dicit ibi textus 'Quibus viris si quis caelestium significationem futurum ut eorum sanguis illustrium imaginum serie deductus in ortum salutaris principis nostri confluueret, depositis inimicitiae artissimo se amicitiae foedere iuxterunt, servatam ab ipsis patriam communi stirpi servandam relicui.' Vult dicere quod Tiberius fuit istorum duorum communis stirps videlicet quia ex patre fuit de Claudii de quibus fuit Claudius Nero suprapositus et mater eius fuit Livia uxor Caesaris Augusti de qua domo fuit Livius Salinator suprapositus, et secundum hanc allelegationem scripsit Tiberio Caesaris hunc librum. Et huic sincere consonat quod scribatur libro quinto capitulo quarto De pietate erga fratres ubi scribatur [V 5, 3] quod Tiberius uno comite solo contentus ivit in Germaniam ad videndum fratem suum Drusum Germanicum infirmum et dicit ibi textus 'Tantum enim amorem princeps parensque noster insitum animo fratri Drusi habuit' etc. Eceo vocat Tiberium principem et patrem patriae. Scilicet in contrarium est quod scribatur libro ultimo titulo De his qui infimo loco nati clarissimis se familiis inserere conati sunt [IX 15] capi-
tulo quinto. Dicitur ibi 'Nec divi quidem Augusti etiam nunc terram regentis,' ex quibus verbis patet quod tempore quo scripsit Valerius iustum librum Caesar Augustus Octavianus praesidebat mundo . . . / / . . . [Expl.]: Et Tullius primo de officiis dicit [I 7, 20] quod iustitia [?] est splendor maximus ex quae praecepit viri boni dicuntur, inter partes autem iustitiae religio tenet primum [munus]. Maiores statas (I 1, 1) Vult dicere quod maiores id est antiqui Romani (nam isto modo loquendi utitur Tullius in Catellinario [Cicero, Cat. I 5, 11, II 2, 12]) et dicit Valerius quod ipsi maiores repulserunt libros portentorum, id est horribilium signorum, et omnia ad religionem suam pertinentia voluerunt explicari doctrina etrusca id est Tuscie, quia ista gens praecipe vacabat cultui deorum et ideo accepert nomen a thure ratione officii quod offurtur in altari, et dicit quod ad sequendum ritus Tuscorum inducebantur scientia pontificum, quae scientia est rerum bene gerendarum. Ad hoc enim sacrificialia et alia pontificialia ordinabant ut res eorum feliciter et prosperiter gerentur . . . [Expl.] Idem (IX 15, ext. 2) Quidam barbarus homo robustus et ignotus erat valde similis Ariathes regis Capadocie et fingens quod esset Ariathes petebat Capadocie regnum et omnes illi de regno sibi favebant et volebant ipsum in regem. Quia luce clarius erat quod ille Ariathes rex a magistro equitum Iulii Caesaris fuerat occasus et Iulius Caesar ipsum damnnavit et mori fecit. Et nota quod Valerius in fine libri sui ut principium et finis idem esset in prologo Caesaris adiutorium postulavit et in fine cum Iulio Caesare librum terminavit. Et iste Iulius Caesar ut dicit Suetonius [Divi Iulius 45, 48] etiam in rebus domestricisc ditcipiam severam servavit, qui statuta excelsae carode candidus fuisset, quod erat exactor disciplinae gravissimus cum hostes in proximo erant, et merito, quia iustitia dicente Seneca [cf. Epist. ad Lucil. 90, 4 and Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri, above] quid aliud est quam lex divina et vinculum societatis humanae, per ipsam naturam religios veritatis tenetur et ipse deus iusto servitio colit cum in cuius cultu sincerus eterna vita promittitur in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

Valerius Maximus


Manuscripts:

(*) Basel, Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität, E.II.10, s. XV. (Letter of Martin Steinmann, 5 April 1976).


(*) Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 7540 (X.96), s. XIV/XV. (Grubbs, no. 5, p. 127; Élisabeth Pellegrin, ‘Manuscrits des auteurs classiques latins de Madrid et du Chapitre de Tolède,’ Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes, Bulletin d’information, II [1953], 9; and letter of Manuel Sánchez Mariana, 29 April 1976).

(*) Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 8818
LATIN AUTHORS


Vaticano, Città del, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1931, s. XIV. Books I-IV are Frater Lucas, V-VI are garbled and incomplete, VII-IX (Giuseppe Di Stefano in a letter of 1 February 1966 had already identified VIII-IX) are Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri. (Nogara, 360, who does not identify the commentaries).

Biography:

Frater Lucas (Lucas) Ordinis Praedicatorum (Frater Lucas de Mannellis; Luca Mannelli, Luca [Lucha] de’ Mannelli [Manelly]).

Frater Lucas de Mannellis (if he be this Frater Lucas) was born about 1294 in Florence and died in Fano before 8 November 1362, when his successor as bishop of Fano was appointed. He entered the Dominican order early in Santa Maria Novella and was prior of San Domenico in Pistoia and ‘predicatore generale’ of the province. He came in contact with the papal court at Avignon and was named bishop of Lamia (Zituni) in Greece on 28 May 1344, of Osimo on 5 November 1347, and of Fano on 24 January 1358. Clement VI appointed him also apostolic nuncio in Tuscany and the Kingdom of Naples.

It is probable that Frater Lucas governed the first two dioceses from Avignon. He knew Giovanni Cardinal Colonna, to whom Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri dedicated his commentary on Valerius. Giovanni Mannelli, brother of Lucas, enjoyed friendly relations with Malatesta II.

Works: Frater Lucas de Mannellis wrote the Compendium moralis philosophiae mentioned above, in which also he cites Valerius Maximus, and on request of Clement VI the Tabulatio et expostitio Senecae. There is mention also of a ‘Sermon quem fecit quarta dominica adventus anno Domini MCCCXLVI in capella domini nostri papae Avenione coram ipso et dominis cardinalibus reverendus pater dominus frater Lucas, episcopus ordinis Praedicatorum, familiaris domini cardinalis de Columpna.’

Bibl.: Chevalier II, 2989, Fabricius, BMLA IV, 563, Jöcher, III, 105.

Kaeppeli (see above), 238–264 and Scriptorum Ordinis Praedicatorum mediæ aevi, III (Romae ad S. Sabinae, 1980), 89–90; Giulio Negri, Istoria degli scrittori fiorentini (Ferrara, 1722), 384; Jacques Quétif and Jacques Echard, Scriptorum Ordinis Praedicatorum I (Paris, 1719), 652.

4. JOHANNES CABALLINUS DE CERRONIBUS

Originally Johannes Caballinus de Cerronibus had been treated in the Fortuna of this article. He is transferred here at the request of the Editor in Chief, and I am happy to give him by this means the greater visibility which he unquestionably merits; however, his contribution is still not a genuine commentary and is not easily cast in the mold set for this project. It has no real form, and it provides nothing which can properly be called an incipit or an explicit. It consists of sometimes scattered, sometimes tightly packed annotations in the margins and between the lines of the text of Valerius Maximus which is transmitted in Vaticanus latinus 1927, s. XIV. They are called glosses and scholia by the Vaticana’s cataloguer. They were probably begun in the third decade of the fourteenth century and finished by 1350. Many are illegible because of the moisture to which the manuscript has been subjected; ‘totos codex madore labefactus, maculis ubique scatet,’ continues the cataloguer, and he points out that the ‘scholia complura, interdum evanida,’ are mostly in two hands of the same period and name Caballinus as author. On f.1 we read that the manu-
script is 'liber Valerii Maximii Johannis Caballini de Cerronibus de Urbe [Roma], scriptoris domini papae et canonici Sanctae Mariae Rotundae [in the Pantheon] de dicta urbe.' On f.93v he wrote in his own hand 'Librum istum Valerii correxit Johannes Caballini de Cerronibus de Urbe scriptor domini papae cum Valerio reverendi patris et domini domini Johannis archiepiscopi panormitani de genere Ursinorum de Campoflore et aliquas concordiantias apposuit manu sua ex dictis Titi [Livii] et Tullii et plurium aliorum historiographorum.' The scribe of the manuscript was 'Radulphus plenus amoris.'

Caballinus, therefore, not only provided annotations but also emended the text of his manuscript from one belonging to the Roman noble Giovanni Orsini, archbishop of Palermo from 1320 until his death in 1333. On f.95v one annotation mentions the war between the Orsini and Colonna families in the year 1335, when on 3 September the Orsini destroyed the two central arches of the Pons Aemilius. The annotations probably had their origin in the favoring atmosphere of Avignon, where Caballinus was papal scriptor. He alludes frequently to contemporary personages and events, furnishing his reader in the process with autobiographical details. He knew the commentary of Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri, the dedicatory letter of which appears on f.94v of this manuscript, and his acquaintance with Valerius would seem to have influenced the work 'Polistoria: De virtutibus et dotibus Romanorum libri X' which is ascribed to him in Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, 47 Gud. lat. 2°, s. XIV, is preserved also in other manuscripts, and is mentioned by him in his annotations on Valerius.

It would appear that Caballinus, annotating Valerius, used some passages almost as pegs on which to hang his references to contemporary personages and events and indeed at times his own very strong opinions. Sabbadini cites, for example, a passage on f.20v (Valerius Maximus III 2, 4) where we read, 'Nota contra Thebaldum de Sancto Eustachio [Sant'Eustachio is a church of the twelfth century situated just a block or two from Santa Maria Rotonda; of the original structure only the campanile remains today] et illos de genere suo qui assidue spoliabant altare Sanctae Mariae Rotundae' and likewise (f. 90v, Valerius IX 11, 6) 'Sed Thelwallus de Sancto Eustachio vivit mala vita auferendo et spoliando altare ecclesiae Sanctae Mariae Rotundae'; on f. 76v (Valerius VIII 6, 3), 'Nota contra papam Benedictum XII [1334–42], qui imperavit episcopis et prelatis ad eorum episcopatum reddire et ipse sedem Petri apostolatu vacuum despicere visitare'; and on f.85v (Valerius IX 2, ext. 1) 'Supple Fredum de Parione de Urbe cum cuius periculo simulazione ac perfidia truculenta est tetius dimicare quam hostibus manifestis . . . ; sic hostes Johannis Caballini corruunt dictum Fredum evidenter fallacem.' He had his enemies certainly, and he had also a passion for his native land, so that on f.55v, where in Valerius VI 2, 3 the tribune Gaius Papirius Carbo exclaims 'Taceant quibus Italia severa est' Caballinus lists Italy's riches and cries out, 'Ergo taceant quibus Italia tot dotibus plena habetur severa. Sed quia virtus sibi parat invidiam, non est mirum si Italici et Italia paradisi terrestris socia ab alii nationibus brutali more viventibus novercatur.'

All this does not particularly elucidate Valerius himself, but it does characterize the annotations and it affords a refreshing insight into the times which could produce them and into human nature. Repeated references to Roman and Christian authors also characterize them; Livy and Cicero are cited most frequently, and Sabbadini lists a score of other Roman writers, mostly of prose, and ten Christian authors. Caballinus obviously had access to a library rich in manuscripts. And were it not a little like wondering what would have been the course of history had the Greeks been defeated at Marathon one might speculate on the relations between him and Dionysius. Just how did Caballinus learn of the dedicatory letter to the commentary of Dionysius? Did the two know one another at Avignon in the fourth decade of the fourteenth century? Did they discuss their mutual friend Valerius and exchange ideas concerning him? Did one borrow from the other or was there a scholarly interplay which benefited both? Did both of
them, and not Dionysius alone, know Petrach, also a student of Valerius, at Avignon? Some of these questions may eventually be answered from a careful comparison of their contributions.

Manuscript:
(micro.) Vaticano, Città del, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vaticanus latinus 1927, s. XIV. (Nogara, 358). I saw this manuscript briefly before I knew that Caballinus would be included here as a commentator.

Biography:
Johannes Caballinus de Cerronibus (Giovanni Cavallini de’ Cerroni) was born in Rome, probably near the end of the thirteenth century, to a middle-class but prominent family among whose members was numbered the painter Pietro Cavallini (1250–1330). He had undoubtedly an excellent education for his ensuing ecclesiastical career, which was marked by two principal phases, the first in Rome where he served until 1325 as canon of the church of Santa Maria Rotonda and the second as papal sceptor at Avignon. He died in Rome.

It is clear that Caballinus was a fervent bibliophile. He was not occupied with Valerius Maximus alone; he owned the famous manuscript of the Liber pontificalis which belonged to Landolfo Colonna, in which Augusto Campana has recognized the hand of Caballinus and which is now Vaticanus latinus 3762, and he had in Sabbadini’s opinion a knowledge surprising for his day of manuscripts at Monte Cassino: he knew that the second decade of Livy was not common but that Monte Cassino possessed it (Vaticanus latinus 1927, f. 88v: ‘Liber Livii de bello punico primo comuniter non habetur sed reperitur Hodie in Monasterio Monticassinatis’) and that the monastery possessed also a manuscript of Cicero’s De re publica (ibid., ‘ubi etiam consistit liber Tullii de re publica sex libros continens’).

Caballinus records in Vaticanus latinus 1927, f. 52, the defeat of the Colonna by Cola di Rienzo at Porta San Lorenzo on 20 November 1347. The document transferring to his successor the benefits of Santa Maria Rotonda, which he had retained at Avignon, is dated 9 September 1349. He died perhaps not long before that date.

Works: Caballinus wrote Polistoria de virtutibus et dobitibus Romanorum ipsorumque imperatoris et papae singularibus monarchiis ac alii incidentis eorumdem, which is mentioned with abbreviated title above. It was dedicated to Clement VI (1342–52) and in its descriptions of events, places, and customs lauds imperial and Christian Rome and manifests again its author’s love for the ‘City.’ To date only some topographical extracts from it have been published.

Bibl.: Chevalier I, 739; Cosenza, I, 750–751, V, 360–361; Fabricius, BMLA, IV, 348; Remigio Sbabadini, Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne’ secoli XIV e XV, II (Firenze, 1914), 47–50, 267. Sabbadini, who must have had the manuscript long at hand, transcribed with beautiful accuracy; I have checked his passages quoted above against microfilm and have made no changes except to normalize the spelling and expand a few abbreviations.


The reader is referred to the documentation in Billanovich, Diener, and Palma for
additional references.

5. CONRADUS WALDHAUSER

My knowledge of the commentary of Conradus I owe in large part to Heribert A. Hilgers, who studied him in connection with his doctoral work on Heinrich von Mügeln and who has identified three anonymous manuscripts as related to the two in which Conradus is named. Dr. Hilgers is now engaged in further investigation of the commentary and its author. It is a commentary which exhibits an applicatio moralis, an applicatio sententiarum Valerii Maximii ad theologiam, or sententiae Valerii Maximii ad theologiam applicatae, as beffited its Augustinian author, and it was composed before 28 December 1369, the date of his death. We have indeed in the correspondence of Johann von Neumarkt references to the interest of Conradus in Valerius during the decade of the Sixties, references which may well allude to this very commentary; Johann in an undated letter written to him perhaps about 1360 uses the words 'sicud dielectus tibi testatur Valerius,' and Conradus in answer says, '... talibus tamen carminibus omnimodis occupari formido, ipsa quia foro meo non tam fructuosa quam laboriosa (excepto divo, ut fatear, theologicae narrationis Valerio) esse cognosco.' I cannot account for the date 1387 in Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3140, f lv. The commentary occurs sometimes with the full text of Valerius and with that of the German commentary of Heinrich von Mügeln, leans very heavily on Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri, and may have been known to Heinrich.

Commentary (letters of Dr. Hilgers, 26 August 1970 and 18 February 1976 [from Göttingen, Stiftsbibliothek, 160]). [Inc.]: Urbis Romae exterarumque gentium facta simul ac dicta memoratu digna (1 Prooemium) Schiendum quod hic ponentur notabilia de Valerio Maximo et stilo facili paene omnia digna memoria quae in libro suo posuit quem ut dicit in prohemo tempore Tiberii Caesaris ad aedificationem morum posuit, illius inquam Tiberii qui fuit filius adoptivus Octaviani et successor et nepos Iulii, tertius scilicet post Iulium monarchiam tenens. Hi duo imperatores scilicet Iulius et Octavianus viri gloriosi et quasi divini modo humano fuerunt. Nam maxime deorum cultum pagano more loquendo auxerunt, praecipue Octavianus, ut in sua cronica legitur. Dicebat Popilius quod fuit vir non imperito deo putatus similis. Comparat igitur Valerius Tiberium avo suo Iulio et patri suo Octaviano, cuius ipse fuit adoptatus, quamvis fuerunt multum dissimiles. Quia sicut dicit Iosephus in xviii° Antiquitatum Tiberius fuit in cunctis negotiis morosus, et sicut in cronica dicitur inerat ei scientia litterarum multa. Habuit eloquia clara et in cogitatione rei publicae multum continuus, tamen fuit ingenio pessimus, crudelis, avarus, insidiosus, simulans ea se nolle quae volebat, responsionibus repentinis melior quam meditatis. Primum ergo memoria dignum dicit auctor volens probare quod Caesar Tiberius praevaletet deis, dicit 'Deos accepimus, Caesares dedimus' quasi diceret 'Beatius est dare quam accipere.' Nam Romani provincias subiugantes deos provinciarum Romam portabant, sed non sic de Caesare quia aliunde non venit sed in Roma incepit. Sed nota, si queratur quare beatius est dare quam accipere respondeo quod ex hoc quod aliquid dat duo concurrunt: videacet actus virtutis quia dare ad libertatem pertinet et ipsa libertas quia ex hoc quod aliquid alteri dat non est minus liber immo forte plus, sed recipiens etsi virtuose profece recipere eo ipso tamen quod recipit obligatur ei a quo recipit si non ingratus, unde Aristoteles quinto Ethicorum dicit quod proprium est gratiae ut pro gratia retribuetur gratia... Maiores statas (1 1, 1) In hoc primo capitulo libri primi schiendum quod totus liber Valerii habet novem libros partiales in quorum octo tractat de virtutibus in nono de virtutibus ut patebit. In primo ergo huius libri capitulo tractat Valerius de cultu et religione deorum. Et schiendum quod per religionem non solum iste auctor sed etiam philosophi et sancti cultum divinum intelligunt qui est virtus quaedam moralis qua quilibet homo in se ipso deo se ligat. Unde Augustinus [in] libro de vera religione [55 (113)] "Religet nos religio uni omnipotenti deo." In hoc ergo quod Valerius librum suum a divino
cultu incipit qui heu fuit paganus virtuosisor multis malis Christianis quorum prob dolor infinitus est numerus est notandum quod nos Christiani in omnibus nostris operibus primo debemus quae reque regnum Dei. Cultum divinum praemittendo Valerius hoc primo capitulo narrat quod Romani circa prima tempora non fuerunt circa sacrificia deorum certi sed quasdam superstitiones observabant mediantibus quibusdam signis et divinationibus quae dicebantur portenta. Tusci vero artem sacrificandi plene habuerunt. Videntes ergo Romani quod Tusci eos in sacrificiis praevalebant abiecerunt libros quos habebant de portentis et a Tuscis volebant habere artem sacrificandi. . . . [Expl., with some question, from Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3140] (IX 15) Cuius mendacium tanto est nequius quanto ad nocendum efficacius, et ideo mendacium a sanctis omnibus omnium vitiorum fundamentum.


Manuscripts:

(*) Melk, Stiftsbibliothek, 543 (49), pp. 1–214, an. 1459. The commentary is anonymous here. (Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum qui in Bibliotheca Monasterii Mellicensis O. S. B. servantur. I [Vienna, 1889], 94).
(*) Praha, Knihovna Metropolitní Kapituli, G. 37, s. XV (used by Dana Peknová; see the article cited above).
(*) Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3119, ff. 1–104, s. XV. The commentary is anonymous here. (Letter of Dr. Hilgers, 26 August 1970; Endlicher 86–87, no. 178; and Tabulae II, 201).
(*) Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3140, ff. 242–250, s. XV. (Letters of Dr. Hilgers, 11 January 1966 and 18 February 1976 and his book, cited above, 73–76; Endlicher, 87, no. 179; Tabulae II, 213; and Menhardt II, 880, according to whom f.1 carries the information 'Hic notandum est, Quod in unum opus dicta Valerii Maximi primo ponitur corpus in se, secundo moralitas seu moraliter applicatus per dominum Conradum de Waldhausen anno domini 1387, tertio Hainricus de Mügeln vulgariter translato. . . .')
(*) Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3149, ff. 1–88, s. XV. The commentary is anonymous here. (Endlicher, 235–6, no. 337; Tabulae II, 215).

Biography:
Conradus Waldhauser [Walthausen] (Conradus [Konradus] in Waldhausen [Walthausen], Conradus Walduhausus, Conrad de Wald-
hausen, Konrad von Walhausen).

Conradus was born in Upper Austria about 1326 and died in Prague on 28 December 1369. Augustinian, priest, penitential and reform preacher, he was active in Vienna, in Prague on more than one stay, in Leitmeritz and Saaz, and presumably also in Bavaria and Salzburg. He had relations with Charles IV (1316–1378), Holy Roman Emperor, and with Rudolf IV (1339–1365), duke of Austria. His sermons were delivered in German or Latin and included strictures against simony in the mendicant orders. In 1364 he was accused of heresy by the Dominicans and wrote an apology in defense. He is sometimes considered a forerunner of John Hus.

Works: Conradus wrote the Apologie mentioned above, Postilla studentum sanctae universitatis pragensis, and Prothemata sermonum, Accusationes mendicantium.

Bibl.: Chevalier II, 4732–4733; Franz Heinrich Reusch in Allgemeine deutsche Biographie XL (1896), 700.


6. PETRUS DE MUGLIO (Not Found)

A missing commentary is that of Petrus de Muglio. An investigation of this by Luciano Gargan was promised in 1964 and 1974 and is eagerly awaited. 'Sono in grado,' he wrote me in 1975, 'di dimostrare che Pietro commentò Valerio Massimo, grazie a due note marginali di un codice trecentesco dove si fa espressamente il nome del maestro.' The manuscript is stated by Giuseppe Billanovich in Italia medioevale e umanistica, XXII (1979), 372 to be Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barberinius latinus 122, s. XIV, where on folios 94v and 95r the opinion of Petrus is adduced in two marginalia. Billanovich speaks truly and wisely when he says, 'Se continueremo a scavare nella tradizione sterminata di Valerio, troveremo certo molto di più.' It is not yet clear how formal the commentary of Petrus may have been; it was prepared certainly, as were his comments on other authors, for his students, and it may have taken the form only of lecture notes set down by him or by his students.

Biography:

Petrus de Muglio (Pietro da Moglio, 'Pietro della Retorica') was Bolognese in origin, was born probably in the early years of the fourteenth century, and died of the plague on 13 October 1383. New and sustained activity in recent years on the part of Billanovich and his circle has combined with the solid contributions of earlier scholars to provide a wealth of detail on Petrus which can only be skimmed here. He was probably a pupil of Giovanni del Virgilio. He taught grammar and rhetoric privately at Bologna until 1362, and he taught at Padua until 1368. He then returned to Bologna, where he is listed in the rotuli of the Studio for 1370–71, 1376–77, 1378–80, and 1381–82. Friend and correspondent of Petrarch and Boccaccio, he figures in the correspondence of his student Coluccio Salutati and was teacher also of Johannes de Ravenna, who followed him in commenting on Valerius, of Francesco da Fiano, and of Francesco Piendibeni. He knew also Benvenutus de Imola, whose commentary is treated below. Two manuscripts of Valerius bear on his biography: at the end of London, British Library, Arundel 7, ca. 1400, are four hexameters by him which constitute his own epitaph; two of these appear also in Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vaticanus latinus 1925, s. XIV.

Works: In addition to writing a poem of 249 hexameters based on Ovid's Fasti, III 523–554 and entitled De Anna sorore Didonis and to making metrical summaries of the tragedies of Seneca (a hexameter for each tragedy) and the comedies of Terence (an elegiac couplet for each comedy, with a final couplet in recapitulation), Petrus commented to his students on these tragedies and comedies, on Cicero's De inventione and the pseudo-Ciceronian Rhetorica ad Herennium, on the De quattuor virtutibus of the pseudo-Seneca, on the Consolatio philosophiae of Boethius,
on bucolic texts old and new including those of Vergil, Dante, and Giovanni del Virgilio, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, and on the Poetria nova of Galfredus de Vino Salvo ("Lo morrerà presto,") stated Billanovich in 1979, "Dino Punctch").

Bibl.: Giovanni Fantuzzi, Notizie degli scrittori bolognesi, VI (Bologna, 1788), 127–130; Umberto Dallari, I rotoli dei lettori legisti e artisti dello Studio Bolognese dal 1384 al 1799, IV (Bologna, 1924), 4, 5, 6, 7.


7. JOHANNES DE RAVENNA

Another commentary was still 'missing' when this article was in galley. The familiarity of Johannes de Ravenna with Valerius Maximus was already clear to us from his Memorandum rerum liber (see above, p. 295). The interest may have been inspired by Petrarch and encouraged by his teacher Petrus de Muglio. This work was set down in his old age; never finished, autobiographical in large part and far from notable in literary quality, short and consisting of only twenty-two sections which offer modern rather than ancient exempla, the 'book' still groups its virtues and vices under headings like those of Valerius and reveals his influence throughout.

Earlier too, in the summer of 1374, Johannes drew several times on his knowledge of Valerius in his letter on the death of Petrarch to his teacher and friend Donatus de Albanzani (ante 1328-post 1411), through whom he had first met the poet. The familiarity with Valerius had certainly been of long duration, and Johannes shared it repeatedly with his students. An interpretation of his is cited by Benenventus de Imola, who knew him in Bologna, and the notes of Gasparinus Barzizius (see above, p. 290) on the text of Valerius in Vaticanus latinus 7229, s. XIV, also cited Johannes. Giuseppe Billanovich in his magisterial treatment of the Valerius manuscript Vaticanus Palatinus latinus 903, an. 1397, which he assigns to Poggio Bracciolini as copyist, reproduces the marginal note on f.18r which credits a reading to Johannes. Johannes quotes from Valerius in De dilectione regnantium and Dragmalogia.

But in particular a statement by Giovanni degli Agostini reveals that whether as formal commentary or as students' notes compiled from his lectures the contributions of Johannes to the text of Valerius were transmitted to his successors: a manuscript of 1449 carries the explicit 'Expliciunt feliciter recollecet Valerii Maximi sub reverendo viro Magistro Johanne de Ravenna olim digno Cancellario
domini paduani, quas explevi ego Jacobus Barbo grammaticorum minimus die 24. Decembris in vigilia nativitatis domini nostri Jesu Christi hora 22. 1449. 'This manuscript, Venezia, Museo Correr, cod. Correr 855, s. XV, Professor Kristeller discovered in October 1983. He has generously suggested that I announce his find here. To the subscription he adds 'Habui exemplar a Ser Marco Engaldeo (?) cive Justinopolitano tunc cant. (Cancellario?) Chersi cuius filium Vitalem tenebam in domo et instruebam artem grammaticae, habebam etiam in domo Antonium et Donatum fratres et filios Ser Stefani de Buchina de Cherso.' In the eighteenth century the manuscript was in the library of S. Maria di Murano. It begins with the Aristotelian passage 'Historiae antiquorum utiles sunt ad danda bona consilia,' which was used also by Benvenutus de Imola (see page 348 below). The explicits are also familiar. Further particulars must be set down later, possibly in the Addenda of Volume VI.

Sabbadini believed that Johannes was commenting on Valerius in 1364 in Bologna; the Recollectae, whether his own or a student's notes, may be later. Benjamin D. Kohl points out that the location of the manuscript of which the one of 1449 is an apograph is unknown today.

Biography:

Johannes de Ravenna (Johannes Conversinus or Conversanu, Giovanni Conversini or Conversano, Giovanni di Conversino da Ravenna [the form adopted by Kohl], Giovanni grammatico, Ivan Ravenjanin).

Johannes de Ravenna was born in 1343 not in Ravenna, but in Buda, where his physician father Bonattus Conversinus, of Frignano in the Modenese Apennines, was in the service of King Louis I of Hungary. An uncle, Thomas, a Franciscan, pursued an ecclesiastical career and in 1378 was created cardinal by Urban VI. The life of Johannes is richly documented not only by his autobiographical Rationarium vitae and the Memorandarum rerum liber but also by archives of the various towns and cities in which he lived or which he visited, by his own letters, and by the testimony of friends and students. As a boy he was befriended and educated, through the intervention of his uncle, by the nuns of the convent of San Paolo in Ravenna, to whom he expressed his gratitude by adopting as a young man the name Johannes de Ravena. Early grammatical studies in Bologna were so unsuccessful as to make a runaway of him; he returned to Ravenna in 1353, but later, beginning about 1359, he pursued his studies at Bologna and Padua.

His teachers included Donatus de Albanzani and Petrus de Muglio. They shaped him well for the career as humanist, historian, and notary for which we know him. It was a restless career, spread over much of Italy and extending also into Dalmatia. In addition to Buda, Ravenna, Bologna, and Padua we can trace him during his lifetime to Ferrara, Cesena, San Piero a Sieve, Treviso, Florence, Conegliano, Belluno, Rome, Dubrovnik, Udine, Muggia, and Venice. The stays in some of these towns and cities were often repeated and long. He died in Venice in 1408.

It was a career productive not only of the works listed below but also of such eminent students as Benvenutus de Imola, Guarinus Veronensis, Franciscus Barbarus, Franciscus Philolocus, and Siccus Polentonus and of such friends as Petrarch, Boccaccio, Marsilius de Sancta Sophia, Coluccio Salutati, and Petrus Paulus Vergerius. We can regret that of the Angevin library of King Robert which was confiscated by King Louis I and given to the father of Johannes the portion which passed to his uncle and finally to him was so reduced that in Sabbadini's time only two codices could be identified ('che...appartenessero al fondo angioino, non mi pare improbabile').

Works: Johannes wrote (I follow the chronological and geographical indications established by Professor Kohl) De miseria humanae vitae (Belluno, 1377?), De Christi conceptu (Belluno, 1377?) De fato (Belluno, 1378), Dialogue inter Johannem et Literam (Belluno, 1378; addressed to his uncle on his elevation to the cardinalate), De primo eius introitu ad aulum (Dubrovnik, 1385), Historia Ragusii (Dubrovnik, 1387), De fortuna aulica (Padua, 1396), Dolosa astus narratio (Padua, ca. 1396), Violatae pudicitiae narrat-
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tio (Padua, ca. 1396), Apologia (Padua, 1399), De dilectione regnantium (Padua, 1399), De lustro Alborum in urbe Padua (Padua, 1400), Rationarium vitae (Padua, 1400; Kohl reports that Luciano Gargan has an edition in progress), Hymnus Sancti Johannis Evangelistae (Padua, 1401), De consolatione in obitu filii (Padua, 1401), Familiae Carriensis natio (Venice, 1401; 'but a version finished in 1379'), Dragmalogia de eligibilis vitae genere (Venice, 1404); edited with introduction, translation, and notes by Helen Lanneau Eaker and Benjamin G. Kohl (Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, 1980 [Renaissance Society of America, Renaissance Texts, 7]), Conventio inter podagaram et araneam (Muggia, 1407), Memorandarium rerum liber (Venice, 1408; unfinished). Portions of these works are included in Sabbadini's biography. Ninety letters survive and are carefully listed by Kohl, who has in progress, with James Day, an edition of De primo eius introitu ad aulum, De fortuna aulica, and De dilectione regnantium for the Renaissance Texts series of the Renaissance Society of America and who writes me that he hopes to publish an article on the copyists, owners, and readers of the works of Johannes. It is of some interest that of the ninety letters written by this son of a physician fifteen are addressed to physicians.


8. LUCAS DE PENNA

The commentary is dedicated to a Pope Gregory, that is, Gregory XI (Pierre Roger de Beaumont), last of the French popes, who was elected 30 December 1370, entered on his pontificate at Avignon 5 January 1371, left for Rome 2 October 1376 and arrived there 17 January 1377, thus ending the Babylonian captivity of the popes, and died in Rome on 27 March 1378. Giuseppe Di Stefano, in the second of his articles listed below, dates at least the early part of it more precisely by identifying with it a work which Lucas, writing to Petrarch from Avignon on 3 February 1374, says he has undertaken at the request of the Pope. Lucas, who was writing at about the same time as Simon de Hesdin, knew the commentary of Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri and also that of Frater Lucas, with whom he is sometimes confused. It is probable that Nicolas de Gonesse in turn and Petrus

342
Herardi drew on him.

_Dedication_ (Auch, Bibliothèque Municipale, 8) Sanctissimi in Christo patri et clementissimo domino domino Gregorio digna Dei providentia sacrosanctae romanae ac universalis ecclesiae summo pontifici Lucas de Penna, legum doctor et minimus vestrae beatitudinis secretarius devota pedum oscula beatorum. [Inc.]: Ut philosophiae princeps Aristoteles in principio suae Metaphysicae scribit . . . . [Expl.]: quoniam si ea laboriosum est legere, fuit laboriosius invenire laboriosissi-que [sic] est brevia provideri quam porrecta succidi ut ait Cassiodorus libro quinto Varrarum.

_Commentary. [Inc.]:_ Urbis (1 Prooemium) Sicut dicit hic magister Dionysius qui hunc librum exposuit prohemium dictum est quod pro aemulis in libris apponitur ut multi qui scriptoribus saepe detrahere conantur ipso prohemo reprimantur. Haec alias praefatio quae, prout notat hic frater Lucas de ordine prae- dicatorum qui melius, ut asserit, exposuit, inducens Cassiodorum super Historia Triparti- tita, utiliter nimis in capite libri ponitur ubi futura libri qualitas indicatur . . . . [Expl.]: Summa autem iustitiae pars est religio erga Deum ff. [Digesto] de iustitia et iure veluti animo modo conditione eius, scilicet cultus deorum qui est religio. Maiores (1 1, 1) Quorum est optimum sequi vestigia si recte pro- cesserunt et non quod circa deorum cultum etrusca viguit disciplina hoc dictum principium istud . . . . [Expl.]: (IX 15, ext. 2) Idem Caesar barbarum quendam robustum et igno- tum Auriates proprium nomen regis. clarius luce paene fere quasi caput illius barbari sup- plicio quia fecit eum occidi. Audivi Valerium plures his adieisse libros quod puto verum. Materia quippe copiosa erat cum multo plura sint vita quam virtutes.


_Manuscripts:_

(photo.) Auch, Bibliothèque Municipale, 8, s. XV. (Cat. Gén. Fr. Dept. Octavo, IV [1886], 396; Di Stefano, 'Tradizione esegetica e traduzioni di Valerio Massimo nel primo umanesimo francese,' _Studi francesi_, n. 21 [1963], 411–413).

(Leiden, Bibliotheca der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. lat. F. 89, s. XIV. Books I–III 2, 16 only. (Fabricius, BL [1728], II, 393; Bibliotheca Academiae Lugduno-Batavae, _Catalogus_, Deel 14 [1932], _Inventaris van de Handschriften_, Eerste Afdeeling, 5; Di Stefano, 412; Karel Adriaan de Meyier, _Codices vossiani latini_, Pars I [Leiden, 1973], 198–199).

(Reims, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1332, s. XIV. It breaks off in VII 2, ext. 1. (Cat. Gén. Fr. Dept. Octavo XXXIX [1904], 478; Berlincourt [see above]; Di Stefano, 412. Mrs. Berlincourt contends that only the introduction and dedication to Pope Gregory are from the commentary of Lucas de Penna and that the remainder of the commentary is anonymous, Di Stefano that it is Lucas de Penna's).

_Biography:_

Lucas de Penna (Luca da Penne).

Lucas was born about 1320 at Penne in the province of Pescara, in the Abruzzi, and died in 1390 in Naples. He had as jurisconsult a career so eminent that in the account of Penne in the volume for Abruzzi and Molise of the _Guida d'Italia_ of the Touring Club Italiano he is mentioned as a native son. It is perhaps
due to Penne near Toulouse and to French editions of his legal commentaries that he is sometimes mistakenly designated ‘Doctor Tholosanus’ and ‘Doctor Gallicus.’ He took his legal training at the University of Naples, where Henricus Accozaioc de Ravello and Simon de Brussano were his teachers and from which he was graduated in 1345. Never apparently appointed to an academic post, he is nonetheless styled in editions of his works ‘urtiusque juris professor egregius.’ Several passages refer to his activity as lawyer and judge, and he served the papal court. It was Paulus Perusinus who pointed out to him that the last three books of Justinian’s Code, X-XII, had never been properly studied. Lucas as he wrote the commentaries on them took care to state that the commentaries were not set down for the public or to rank with works of other jurists, but his views nonetheless quickly won vast influence and are repeatedly quoted. Throughout he reveals a wide acquaintance with Cicero and Valerius Maximus. He was buried in the town of his birth, where Mutius Pansa’s inscription of 1625 to him terms him a jurisconsult ‘eminentissimus’ whom ‘Penna in Samnio genuit, Parthenope excoluit, sibi aemula adscripsit Gallia, universa suspexit Europa.’

**Works:** His main work is *Commentaria in tres posteriores libros Codicis Justiniani imperatoris*, which Ullmann (page 15) states is not merely a commentary but ‘rather a complete exposition of the fundamental legal principles and juristic rules relating to all departments and ramifications of the law.’ Glosses of his were included with glosses of other jurists in editions of *Constitutiones Regni Neapolitani* and *Capitula Regni Sicilieae*. He left in manuscript *De juris interpretatione* and *De præsumptionibus juris*.

**Bibl.:** Chevalier II, 2910; Cosenza, III, 2018, V, 1028–1029.


9. Marzagaia

I owe to Rino Avesani my introduction to the work *De modernis gestis* in which the Veronese teacher and grammarian Marzagaia (d. about 1430) revealed his extensive acquaintance with Valerius. He had interpreted Valerius earlier to Antonio della Scala (d. 1388), for he states in this work (I 8, 3) that Antonio ‘Continuam . . . eius ystorici [Valerii Maximi] dictis suam indulgentiam temperatam, mea vigili tradente cura.’ The work was written in the later years of his life and mentions events of the period 1410–12, when Venice already held dominion over Verona. Set down in four books in a style which is twisted, obscure, and difficult (‘strano e raviiluppato’ to Scipione Maffei; ‘lussureggiante, ricercato’ to Avesani; Billanovich speaks of Marzagaia’s ‘zoppo latino.’), it is a free and imperfect imitation of Valerius and has similarly a moral and philosophical purpose. Many chapter headings are borrowed from Valerius, but the content of the chapters is drawn largely from the events of Marzagaia’s own epoch, and the work has accordingly a certain historical value for that epoch. That Marzagaia was esteemed by his contemporaries is clear from the poem which Guarinus Veronensis addressed to him in praise and admiration.

With this background of acquaintance with Marzagaia it was to me a great joy to find, as I endeavored to identify the commentary carried in Assisi, Biblioteca Comunale, 303, s. XV, which is followed by anonymous commentators on Strabo, Persius (CTC III 228), Sallust, and Horace, that Marzagaia had apparently actually committed to writing the interpretation of Valerius which he provided to Antonio della Scala. It is not a title, an incipit, or an explicit which transmits this information: the dedication, though not in epistolary form, is to a Scaliger whose praises he sings and to whom he expresses his gratitude, he speaks of ‘me, Marzagaia’ in it, and he appears in the
canzone which follows the work. It is possible that he mentions himself elsewhere in the commentary; certainly its involved style at least in the earlier sections rivals that of the De modernis gestis. But the commentary does not cover all nine books: he himself states in the dedication that only the first two books are supplied with exegesis and that for the remaining books he has set down only a compendium. The last four paragraphs, for example, are little more than summaries of IX 15, 4-ext. 2.

The scribe was Italian and did not hesitate, for example, to delete storic when he wrote it inadvertently and to delete it with hystoric. The text presents other problems in addition to its involved thought and style and the difficulties of the script. If it was set down at the time of the lessons, the reference in the dedication to impending blindness, if literal, is striking. If, on the other hand, it was set down in the early decades of the fifteenth century, when Marzagaia was still writing, it could not have been dedicated to Antonio della Scala, and the references to the 'very learned' Gaius Antonius, to whom Marzagaia submitted it for correction and who is mentioned in the dedication, in the work itself, and in the canzone, cannot be to Antonius de Gaio of Legnago, who died in 1384 and who is treated in Book II 1, 8 of the De modernis gestis. To the various problems Rino Avesani, who tells me that he had known of this manuscript through Father Cesare Cenci, is unable to address himself at the present time. It is eagerly to be hoped that he can examine them later.

Dedication (Assisi, Biblioteca Comunale, 303). [Inc.]: Omnes aequa participacione benigna fecundo Phoebi radio aequaliter potiuntur. In nothi [note] caliginosa intemperies humanis visibus opponatur et vestris aliquid semper quidem iuri parcat divisius haurire praepositis auribus ad sua iusta proposita potiuntur. Atque locum semper in illis licet vero vacuis vox aequa reperuit. Meritum enim increpari possem, o pie inter divos ac serenisime, nullitatis quia alte nimium praesumptionis fulgine tactus sim in gratiam vestri misericordem avitte abianiste[?], quod Scaliger divinitati consimilis est, in quam nedum mei atavi quinimmo maiores procubuerunt ardentius ad procumbendum accedere. O quam optimum veterum vestigia imitari ubi recta fuerunt, amarissima enim sorte configor si quos pios meorum tantopere servile iugum emisit mea parvopere dementia non reservet. Quis enim divo memoratu serenissime stirpis decus piissimum non adoret, utique enim praeecessorum vestro scidens [?] per tristia utcumque iactus adhesi et ad gratiae vestrae portum vestro propitio quidem misericorditer asperum tollit in prospera numine favente enatobo, cuius me tanto serenissimae Pietatis fulgor oblectat ut quicquid ad vestrae genera potie tuae culmine dignum fore suspicio totis sinceris viribus cordis ad superos precari non desino, ut et sequiterum apicem augendo conservent. Omnis proiectus est divini muneri. O quam iocunda est rei publicae gubernatio cum pro principi disciplinis contingit famulari. Quid obesse liquet ut michi cui caecitas imminet non minuenda vestri divina claritas elucescat? Praestet ergo vestrae decus divae pietatis egregium dulce iter ad patriam. Nusquam iocundior est vita quam ubi incept. Pium equidem est miseris subvenire, piissimum vero eorum ordinis occurrere et honestae mortis genere cum eterna immortalitatis scilicet fama ita agere ut amici beneficio potentiam sentiant, hostes vero inuiiis factum [?] equidem iudico peccantibus ita ignoscere ac si remissis peccatis foret deorum imitatus vestigia qui beneficium misericorditer conferunt. Non quippe deus iracundiam novit, misericordia iustitiam foveat, leges peccantem timere faciat, innocentia vero fortunam tribuere gratia divinae majestatis auxilium michi tantillo vestrae sincera serenitas cuius quidem serenitatis principatui quoniam historiarum seriem et utilem et iocundam fore decreti prout [3 words cancelled] strenuorum hisdem militando viguit. Ideo aliquid prout vires meae valuerunt ad Valerii declarationem quamquam et alii melius dixerint vestrae majestati narrare proposui, et quaequam disertissimo viro vestro Gaio Antonio corrigenda disposui quae forte minus bene posita permuta historiorum considerans quasi Ethicorum tertio philosophos dicit Historiae utiles sunt ad danda bona consilia civitati. Civitas quippe fortitudinis rigore et con-
silii vigore bene geritur quod primum primo Moralium [I 32, Migne, *Patrologia latina*, LXXV (1849), 547] beati Gregorii satis enucleatius apparat dum dicit 'Et valde fortitudo destruitur nisi per consilium fulciatur, quia quo plus se posse conspicit, eo virtus sine ratione moderamine deterius in praeceps ruit' et quia nec principari hominem dominus sed rationem consideravit lucentississimus auctor noster Valerius quia princeps custos est iusti et aequi ad bonos mores pro quibus capiendum est consilium quoniam quosdam preces vincunt et meae vestrae augastam vincent magnificientiam me patria frui quidam consiliis instant ut nunc pro me Marzagaia diserat iste libellus, qui se coram vestra diva magnificientia pro me offeram in quo licet diffusius super primo et secundo narraverim tamen solum historiam narrando per ceteros levius pertransibo gratia brevitas et ut citius sub compendio capiantur historiae.

*Commentary. [Inc]: Urbis (I Prooemium)*

Tam subiectae materiae quam auctoris qualitatem commendatione praeterrissa, mi Gai, prae ceteris quem amplexor ad eius declarationem condescendendo libri divisionem aggregior pleraque tamen ad tituli primordium praelibabo qui tali debet gloriaris splendore. Valerii Maximi factorum dictorumque memorabilium ad Tiberium Caesarem liber primus incipit. In quibus quidem verbis tangitur primo causa efficiens, secundo causa materialis, tertio causa formalis. Primo enim tangitur causa efficiens cum dicitur Valerii Maximi, adverte hic, Gai, brevissime quia Valerius est nomen primum et cognomen cum fuerunt de domo Valeriiorum... opera iam fatetur. Maximus praenomen est antonomastica. Causa materialis cum dicitur dictorum factorumque series tam Romanorum quam Graecorum ad quaehue et singula praesposita applicabilius ut per illa discurrendo patebit. Causa formalis cum dicitur liber primus, ideo illa est duplex scilicet tractandi et tractatus divisiva videlicet in libris, et in [ex] libris ex [in] capitula ex capitulis in paragraphos singulis exempla singula collocando. Cause finales huius illustrissimi auctoris licet non principalis est diligentissimas vetustorum curas moralium ad nostram benevolenturam rerum formam adducere nos ad illorum mores per exempla luculentissima ex aliis electa cohortando; ad nos quidem Aris tuba resonat, opus mortale suscepimus, non ut sciamus sed ut boni fiamus. Hoc igitur opus moralis philosophiae supponitur quia nunc ethicis nunc politicis nunc economice huius utilitas est virtutum vitiorumque cognition (ac quorum deleted) ac quorumcunque agibilium fere notitia cum vero in titulo dicitur ad Tiberium Caesarem tangitur tempus principis sub quo viguit auctor de quo multi dubium facti sunt sed quidem tempore Tiberii nulli debent incurrire dubium licet in VIII Augustum nominare sentiatur ut patet cum dicit *divi Augusti culium imperio* hoc alibi diffusius tangerat testum discurrendo.

Istis praelibatis ad litterae expositionem descendit. Iste liber prima sui divisione dividitur in partes duas, in prohemium et tractatum. In prima aperit suam intentionem de quo principaliter tractare intendat, in secunda prosequitur quod intendit, secunda ibi *Maiores*. Istud prohemium dividitur in duas partes. In prima dicendorum praepositis materiis, suam intentionem aperiendo, in secunda ad sincersimum Tiberii principis serenissimi recurrit imperium, eius favorem sollemniter invocando. Ibi secunda *te igitur*. In prima duo facti, primo namque ut debitum est dicendorum praepositis materiis, in secunda huius suae intentionis finalem causam adducit, in tertia parte antiopporam subiungendo vel ut meius propositis suum quod assumptis probat rationabile fore duplci ratione, secunda ibi *ut longe*, tertia ibi *nec mihi*... / ... [Expl.: *Idem* (IX 15, ext. 2) ... Unus qui fingebat in esse regem Capodociae Ariatem propter similitudinem formae qui fuerat mortuus et Antonium sed Caesar videns quod hoc modo regnum occupare conabatur fecit mactari illum. Fuit mortis et eius suffultum munitum suffragii quia favebatur illi a cunctis Orientalibus etc. Incepit librum unum a commendatione Augusti nunc in fine terminat librum etiam in laude. Amen.

Soperna possanza che tuete duce/Septe mote sieme per suo governo/Com armonia de canto si eterno/Cha hanimante sempre vita luce/Dispose de te per suave foce/Gaio gentile mo si cume cerno/Cha tuete le muse de
suo Piero/Cum Orpheo celano loro voce/Que dolce pensiero grave de faconda/ Marzagia condusse cum labore/No so se vero o falsita feconda/La mie[sic] mente regge senza furore/Nobel costumo bmm chalcum diffon- da/Dispose de noie alternar amore/Ma zo senza dolore/Picta [pietà] me move piena de dolceza/De voi cantare somma gentileza/El pater nostro collave Maria/Sempre per voi diro com voce pia . . .

Manuscript:
(photo) Assisi, Biblioteca Comunale, 303, s. XV, ff. 1–74 (Mazzatinti IV 69; Kristeller, iter, I 4–5).

Biography:
Marzagia was son of the notary Ser Careto, who was still living in 1389 but was dead by 1399. His works reveal that he was possessed of a certain classical education. He taught in Verona and Cividale. In Verona, where he was already living in 1372, he was close to the court of Antonio della Scala; he probably followed him into exile when Gian Galeazzo Visconti deprived him of power (1387) and returned to Verona some time after Antonio’s death (1388). Marzagia’s last years were devoted to writing; he was still living in 1425 and probably in 1430, but was dead by 1433.

Works: Marzagia wrote also the De modernis gestis mentioned above and three Opuscula, the first on the Scaligers and Verona, the second on the wives of woman, and the third an invective against someone unnamed.


10. BENVENUTUS DE IMOLA

That a polished copy of the commentary was being set down in the last years of its author’s life is clear from the letter which Pier Paolo Vergerio wrote on 17 June 1390 to Ugo da Ferrara; he had heard, apparently late, of the death of Benvenuto, and he wondered whether the commentary had been completed (Audivi heri illud summum eloquentiae sidus, Benevenutum de Imola, eclipsim passum, ita tamen ut in se nullum lumen amiserit; imo maius longe acquisierit, si qui virtuti post mortem deberi credimus; nobis autem occultatum. Sibi congadeo, nobis condoleo, qui- bus tantum lumen sublatum est. Fama erat quod super libro magni Valerii opus nulli priorum cessurum cudebat: quod qui eventus exceperit dubium est. Creditur quod nondum in totam personam exierat. Si quid super hoc tibi notum fuerit, michi scribe et amicum solare merentem).

But the commentary obviously was circulat- ing in some form earlier, for Benvenutus
had lectured on Valerius in Bologna two decades before; some of our manuscripts preserve student's notes, are entitled Recollectae, transmit a varying text, and are dated earlier; and only a few provide the formal, dedicatory letter to a marquis who is thought to be Nicolò II d'Este and other formal passages. Benvenutus lectured on Valerius also at Ferrara. Of special significance is the fact that he cites not only Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri, whose work he corrects and supplements, but also (1 1, 1) Johannes de Ravaennae (Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale di San Marco, lat. X. 19 [3651] Ego intellexi a reverendo viro magistro Ioanne de Ravaennae, quod deebat dicere 'statatas' pro 'statutatas,' cui puto fore credendum magis), whom he knew in Bologna. His knowledge of Valerius Maximus is displayed also in his Romuleon and other works.


Bibl.: Berlincourt (see below), 36–48 and (1972) 376–381; Kristeller, Iter I, 225, II, 517 (but the commentary in Firenze, Biblioteca Riccardiana 3603, s. XV, attributed to Benvenutus by Berta Maracci, is instead that of Johannes de Floremonis); Sicco Polenton, Scriptorum illustrium latinae linguae libri XVIII, edited by B. L. Ullman (Rome, 1928), page 272, lines 20–24; Remigio Sabbadini, Giovanni da Ravenna, insigne figura d'uma-nista (1343–1408) (Como, 1924, and Torino,

Manuscripts:


(*) Berlin (West), Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lat. fol. 540, s. XIV. I am grateful to Professor Kristeller for having identified as this manuscript the one described in Annibale Teneroni, Catalogo ragionato dei manoscritti appartenuti al fu conte Giacomo Manzoni, Quarta parte (Città di Castello, 1894), 28–29.

(*) Burgo de Osma, Catedral, ms. 28, s. XV (Timoteo Rojo Orcajo, Catálogo descriptivo de los códices que se conservan en la S. Igle sia Catedral de Burgo de Osma [Madrid, 1929], p. 91; Grubbs II [1933], 169).

(*) Escorial, El, Biblioteca Reale de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, n. 11, 13, s. XV. Books I–IV only. (Antolin, III [1913], 137–138, and Grubbs, V [1935], 58, both of whom attribute it to Omnibonus Leonicenus).

(*) Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Strozzi 59, an. 1420 (Bandini, Suppl., II, coll. 396–397).

Imola, Biblioteca Comunale, A. B. 5.27 (132), an. 1415 (Romeo Galli, I manoscritti e gli incunaboli della Biblioteca Comunale di Imola [Imola, 1894], LXXXVII, no. 106).

(*) Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 416 (CC. II. 10), ff. 204–225, s. XV. A Tabula only, which the scribe attributes to Benvenutus with the words ‘Haec Parisius per magistrum Bene ventum de Ymola, historiographum eximum, cuius expositionem scribere non valeo’ (Wislocki, 137).

Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, C. 100 Inf., s. XV. Lacks Book IX. Stated by Ambrogio M. Amelli, O.S.B., Rivista delle biblioteche e degli archivi XX (1909), 161, to be the commentary of Oliverius Arzignanensis, s. XLI (Kristeller, Iter I, 281, where it is not identified).

Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, E. 81 Inf., s. XV (Kristeller, Iter I, 289, where it is not identified).


(*) München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 16220, s. XV (Catal. CL.M., II.3, 61).

Padova, Biblioteca Universitaria, 655, s. XV (Kristeller, Iter II, 14, where it is not identified).


(*) Poitiers, Bibliothèque Municipale, 240 (135), s. XV (see above s. Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri, Manuscripts).

(phot.) Siena, Biblioteca Comunale degli Intronati, K V 20, s. XV. Books I I, 2-IX 7, 4. (N. Terzaghi, ‘De codicum latinis philologici qui Senis in Bibliotheca Publica adservantur,’ Bulletino senese di storia patria, X (1903), 409; Kristeller, Iter II, 156).

(*) Soest, Stadtbibliothek, 22, s. XV. I owe this entry to the kindness of Professor Kristeller, and I thank the Stadtbibliothek for further information from preliminary studies by Norbert Eickermann for a catalogue of the library’s mediaeval manuscripts. The MS. contains also a ‘Tabula Valerii Maximi facta per Dominicum Silvestri de Fflorentia.’

Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale di San Marco, lat. X. 19 (3651), an. 1399 (Valentinelli, VI, 29 [Class XXII, no. 52]; Kristeller, Iter II, 230).

Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale di San Marco, lat. X. 20 (2988), s. XV (Valentinelli, VI, 30 [Class XXII, no. 54]; Kristeller, Iter II, 230).

Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale di San Marco, lat. X. 183 (3589), s. XV. Books I and II 1–7 only (Valentinelli, VI, 26–27 [Class XXII, no. 49]).

Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale di San Marco, Zanetti lat. 380 (1908), an. 1406 (Zanetti, p. 155; Valentinelli, VI, 29–30 [Class XXII, no. 53]; Kristeller, Iter II, 213).
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(*) Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3142, an. 1472 (Tabulae II, 214; Unterkircher, III Die datierten Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek von 1451 bis 1500 [Wien, 1974], 66).

(*) Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, 121 Gud. lat. 2°, s. XV. (Heinemann, Vierte Abtheilung, F. Koehler und G. Milhsack, Die Gudischen Handschriften, 148).

Edition:
1954, 17 only, in Marjorie Alkins Berlincourt, The Commentary on Valerius Maximus by Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri and Its Influence upon Later Commentaries (see above s. Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri, Editions), 148-184.

Biography:
Benvenuto de’ Imola (Benvenuto de Rambaldis, Beneventus de Imola, Magister Imoleensis, Magister Benvenutus quondam Compagni quondam Archibensis; Benvenuto da Imola, Benvenuto Rambaldi, Benvenuto de’ Rambaldi).

Benvenuto was born at Imola probably after 1320 and died at Ferrara not in 1390, as the letter of Pier Paolo Vergerio cited above might indicate, but probably between 1387 and 13 August 1388, at which date his heirs already appear in a document. Little is known of his training; after Imola he may have continued his studies at Bologna, and he may have visited Rome during Holy Year 1350. He was in Bologna in 1361-1362 with Gómez Albornoz, nephew of Egidio Cardinal Albornoz, and by 1364 he had composed for him his Romuleon, which immediately revealed his vast acquaintance with historical literature. In 1365 he was sent to Avignon on an unsuccessful embassy to Urban V against the activities of the Alidosi, with the result that after they became pontifical vicars in Imola his native city was closed to him. He taught privately in Bologna for some years, lecturing on Vergil, Valerius Maximus, and Lucan, and began there the work on Dante which was to bring him his greatest fame. He knew Petrarch there or in Imola; he knew Pietro da Moglio there and through him Coluccio Salutati; he attended in Florence in 1373 or 1374 Boccaccio’s lectures on Dante. Professional rivalries in Bologna drove him after a decade to the protection of Nicolò II d’Este in Ferrara, where he lectured again on Vergil, Valerius, and Lucan, worked on the tragedies of Seneca, and completed his commentary on the Divina Commedia.

Works: Romuleon, a history of Rome from the destruction of Troy to Diocletian; Libellus Augustalis, a short history of Roman emperors from Julius Caesar to Wenceslaus; Comentum super Dantis Aligherii Comediam; commentaries on Vergil, Lucan’s Pharsalia, and Petrarch’s Bucolicum Carmen.


1752), 27–28.

11. Frater Petrus

Linked also in some insistent way with Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri is the commentary of a Frater Petrus, O.P., of whom Quétif can say only that, so called in what is now Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 5864, s. XV, he ‘non aliusunde mihi notus est.’ Two of the manuscripts are stated to be of the fourteenth century, and the number of those now or formerly in France shows that the commentary was well known there. We remember that Innocent V (d. 1276) of Tarentaise was earlier called Frater Petrus in ordine Praedicatorum, but certainly in his work In IV. libros Sententiarum commentaria he displays no ready knowledge of Valerius. Nor can I find evidence for activity in this field by a Petrus, frater Dominicanus, who Mario Cosenza thought was probably Pietro Calò di Chioggia and who wrote a letter in hexameters on three lion cubs born in the portico of the Doge’s Palace on 12 September 1316. Thomas Kaeppele makes Frater Petrus a native of southern France and says that he flourished in the second half of the fourteenth century; both conclusions are based on the statement in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 5864, that he had seen the bishop of Mende, whose dogs guarded him at night and were fed only by his hand. Father Kaeppele identifies this bishop as Guillaume de Chanac, who became bishop of Mende in 1371 and in the same year was created cardinal by Gregory XI; he died at Avignon in 1383. To Maria De Marco, and to Beryl Smalley following her, it seemed that Dionysius may have had the commentary of Frater Petrus in mind when he wrote his own; Helmut Boese felt instead that our commentator, anonymous in the Berlin manuscript, was drawing on Dionysius, shortening him and polishing his style to such a degree that the reader might expect to identify him in humanistic circles and perhaps even with the scribe of that manuscript, Nicolaus Astesanus.

Clearly a close examination of the commentary and of its relation to that of Dionysius is needed. Long passages parallel Dionysius with only slight changes of wording. Dedictory letter and commentary on the prooemium are absent, but it is of interest that in the Modena manuscript the commentary is followed by a list of chapter headings of Valerius and then by the following passage which, harking back to the four causes of Aristotle, occurs similarly in the commentaries of Dionysius and of Lucas de Penna on the prooemium of Valerius and in echoes in other commentaries: Huius autem libri quadruplex causa assignatur, videlicet: efficiens qui est ipse Valerius qui hunc librum efficiens edidit; causa materialis, quae sunt facta et dicta Romanorum atque aliarum gentium et universaliter virtutes et vitia de quibus, ut ipse testatur, in toto processu est dicturus. Causa formalis duplex est, videlicet forma tractatus et forma tractandi. Forma tractandi est ipsam veritatem breviter et lucide tradere. Sed forma tractatus est divisio libri in partes vel in speciales libros, quia sunt novem libri partiales ut patet in processu, et libros in capitulo dividere. Causa finalis est homines ad virtutes inducere et a vitii removere. Nam hoc intendit Valerius in toto opere suo: homines a vitii retrahere et virtutibus informare. Ex his sequitur quod iste liber supponitur ethicae, cuius est virtutes cognoscere et de ipsis docere et scientiam tradere. Quare sicut loquitur de subiecto libri Ethicorum Aristotelis ita per omnia de huius libri subiecto loquendum est. Suum ergo opus Valerius incohans a causa materiali et subiectiva exordium sumit, dicens: Urbis Romae. 

Commentary. (Modena, Biblioteca Estense, lat. 694 [c. W. 8. 9]). [Inc.]: Romani (1 1, 1) cum primo deos coherent quibusdam divinationibus quae portenta appellabant non sacrificabant nec immolabant aliquod animal. Tusci vero qui tunc appellabantur Estrusi [Etrusci] artem sacrificandi habeant. Videntes ergo Romani quod Tusci eos in sacrificando praevalent abiecerunt libros quos habeant de portentis et arte sacrificandi acceperunt a Tuscis. Et hoc fecerunt maiores Romanorum moti primo scientia legali quae est scientia bene gerendarum rerum, item auctoritate augurum et moti monitione Apollinis et praedicatio vatum id est sacerdotum suorum et pon-
tificum. Et omnem modum quem habebant sacrificandi abierunt et acceperunt modos Tuscordi deos suos. Primus modus erat cum templum alicuius dei intraban et se ipsose ac sibi conjunctos ei commendabant. Secundus modus erat cum precibus multis effusis a deo aliquid petebant. Tertius modus erat cum solvabant promissa et fiebant gratiae de praeteritis cum laetitia. Quartus modus erat omnibus sollemnior scilicet cum deus aliquid in intestinis et carnibus animalibus honorabatur. Et iste modus maxime fiebat quando aliquid arduum imminebat. Similiter Romani divimum cultum ampliare volentes de senatus consilio decem filios principum miserunt in Tusciam ut ibi instruerentur de modo honorandi deos et sacrificandi. Et ut videtur magna cura eis fuit quod de tam nobili civitate sicut est Roma decem filii principum ad addiscendum modum sacrificandi mitteretur... /... [Expl.]: Item (IX 15, ext. 2) fuit unus rex in Cappadocia qui vocabatur Arietes. Hic rex movens bellum contra Romanos a Marco Antonio magistro cultum acetum Caesaris interfactus est et hoc luce clarius erat. Fuit tamen quidam barbarus id est homo robustus et fortis qui secundum corpus illi regi similis fuit et regnum Cappadociae a Caesare petebat et habuit favorem illorum qui erant de dicto regno et auxilium fere totius orientis quia omnes ipsum regem volebant et sibi suffragabantur. Nichilominus tamen ipsum sic falsum et suffragis circumdatum Iulius Caesar quamvis similitudinem regis haberet caput eius absubit et mori coegit et iusto supplicio. Igitur Valerius principium libri sui finem annectens ut principium et finis idem essent in prologo auxilium Caesaris postulavit et in fine cum divo Iulio Caesare terminavit. Quo Iulius ut dicit Suetonius in rebus domesticis disciplinam severam servavit, qui statura excelsus colore candidus, qui tunc erat exactor disciplinae gravissimus cum hostes in proximo erant et benemerito quia iustitia di cente Seneca [cf. Epist. ad Lucil. 90, 3 and Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri et Frater Lucas above] nil aliud est quam lex divina et vinculum societatis humanae, per ipsum namque religio veritatis tuetur et ipse deus iuste colitur in cuius cultu sincero eterna vita promittitur in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

Manuscripts:

(*) Avranches, Bibliothèque Municipale, 158, ff. 1–111v, s. XV. (Cat. Gén. Fr. Dept. Octavo X [1889], 76–77, where it is not distinguished from the commentary by Diony sius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri which follows on ff. 112bis–258. It was identified by Giuseppe Di Stefano in 'Ricerche su Nicolas de Gonesse traduttore di Valerio Massimo,' Studi francesi, n. 26 [1965], 217, n. 6. John William Larkin, S. J., A Critical Edition of the First Book of the Commentary of Dionigi da Borgo San Sepolcro on the Facta et dicta memorabilia urbis Romae of Valerius Maximus [New York, 1967; see above s. Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri, Manuscripts], xxii, states that it is 'a commentary on Valerius Maximus, not by Dionigi.').

(*) Berlin (Ost), Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Hamilton 648/II, an. 1453 (Helmut Boese, Die lateinischen Handschriften der Sammlung Hamilton zu Berlin [Wiesbaden, 1966], 317, where it is anonymous; I was unable to identify it when Dr. Boese wrote me on 21 March 1961).

Modena, Biblioteca Estense, lat. 694 (a. W. 8. 9), s. XV, (Kristeller, Iter, I, 373, where it is ascribed to Franciscus Petrus, O. P.).


(photo.) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 9689, s. XV. The commentary is anonymous here. (Léopold Delisle, 'Inventaire des manuscrits conservés à la Bibliothèque Impériale sous les nos. 8823–11503 du fonds latin,' Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, XXIII [1862], 481).


(*) Toulouse, Archives Départementales (Haute-Garonne), 8 (F. 5), ff. 14–189, s. XIV (Ministère de l'Instruction Publique et des Beaux-Arts, Catalogue des manuscrits conser-

Vaticano, Città del, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 1704, s. XIV (Kristeller, Iter, II, 418; Maria De Marco, 'Un nuovo codice del commento di "Frater Petrus, O. P." a Valerio Massimo,' Aevum, XXX [1956], 554–558. The manuscript was written in France.)

Biography:
See above p. 351.


12. PETRUS HERARDI

The influence of Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri was continued also in the commentary of Petrus Herardi of Reims, who according to the subscription completed it on 1 August 1409 ([Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 1592] Opitulante Deo praecepto reverendissim in Christo patris et domini domini Guidonis de Roia, Remorum archipraesulis, ego Frater Petrus Herardi Remensis Ordinis Fra trum Praedicatorum volume instud confeci quo textus Valerii Maximi correctior et clarior haberi potest et historiarum eiusdem func
dus et origo perplene cognosci. Quod manu propria cursorie tamen scripsi. Complevi illud Dei gratia prima Augusti die anno Domini Mm CCCV° IX°, quo anno dictus dominus meus et Remensium reverendissimis pergens ad consilium Pisanum Deo spiritum reddidit. Amen. Deo gratias"). It had been commissioned by the bibliophile Guy de Roye, archbishop of Reims, who was assassinated at Vol tri, now a fraction of Genoa, on 8 June 1409 on his way to the council of Pisa. Since the commentary mentions Lucas de Penna it is of some interest that Guy de Roye had owned Reims, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1332 (see above s. Lucas de Penna, Manuscripts), which carries the incomplete commentary of that author. The familiarity of Petrus Herardi with the commentary of Frater Lucas may well have been, as Giuseppe Di Stefano points out, at second hand through the work of Lucas de Penna. He knew at first hand the French translation and commentary of Simon de Hesdin and Nicolas de Gonesse and even supplied, at the end of his own commentary on Valerius, several extraneous exempla which Nicolas de Gonesse had adopted from Boccaccio's De casibus. Di Stefano terms his work an expostio textualis: he paraphrases Valerius paragraph by paragraph but comments only sparsely.

Commentary (Reims, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1333–34). [Inc.]: Urbis Romae (I Pro oemium) [I]ncipit primi libri Valerii Maximi prohemium, quod secundum magistrum Dionysium de Burgo, huius libri expositorem, pro aemulis ponitur qui consueti sunt librorum auctoribus detrahere ad eos reprimendos. Cui alludit Frater Lucas, Ordinis Praedicatorum, praesentem textum pulchre declarans, pro hemium praefationem vocans quae utiliter nimis in capite libri ponitur ubi et futura libri qualitas indicatur. Quid enim commodius pro hemio discere ne possit etiam sequens dictis inopinatum confundere? Praemittit igitur Valerius operi suo toti generaliter sed primo libro specialiter prohemium propter [proprie?] dic tum, in quo sicut in ceteris communiter prohemium immo rebus omnibus occurrunt quatuor causae, materialis, formalis, efficiens, et finalis. Materialis est dicta et facta Romanorum
primo et principaliter, deinde et ceterorum quos exterros vocat, et generaliter virtutes et vitia et horum circumstantiae sunt huius libri materia. Formalis causa duplex est, forma tractandi et forma tractatus. Forma tractandi est breuis et nobilis Valerii scribendi stilus atque praegnans quoad hoc differens a stilo ceterorum doctorum qui de unica materia prol[iss]ime scripsent. Nam eloquentissimis omnium Titus Livius Romanorum gesta triginta decadibus digessisse narratur. Trogus etiam Pompeius Orientalium gesta in 4 et 40 libris disseruit. Similiter Sallustius in Catilinario et Bello Iugurthino, Victor [Vitensis] de historia Africanaorum, Methodius [Saint, Bishop of Olympus] de principio et fine saeculi, Iulius Celsus [Constantinus] de bellis Iulii Caesari, Pompeius Trogus de Pompeio Magno, Phrogius [Dares Phrygius] de Troia, Phulchus [Frequilus] de Assyrias sua materia considerata proluxius sumpsentur. Hic autem paucis novem videlicet vel decem brevibus libris materia amplissimam de vitius et virtutibus videlicet stilo compendioso deducit. Forma tractatus est divisio libri sui in libros, librorum in capita, capitulorum in paragraphos. Causa finalis est exemplis ad omne fere propositum audientes et legentes inducere ad sequelam virtutum et fugam vitiorum, unde clare liquet quod liber iste sub philosophia moralis reponendus est, qui suum studentem citius et cum minori labore sanctum prudentemque reddat. Causa efficacis fuit Valerius Maximus, dictus ex cognomine tantum et non per excellentiam Maximus, ut dicit Frater Simon de Hesdinio, Ordinis Sancti Ioannis Iherosolimitani, magister in theologia, qui praesentem de Latino transluit in Gallicum. . . Valerius more quo iuvenes Romani virtuosi moralesque maxime sunt effecti, audiendo videlicet maiorum et illustrium gesta plurima imitatione digna . . . philosophorum et aliorum Romanorum principaliter et primo ceterorumque qui virtutibus multum studueunt et illorum etiam qui dediti vitis se a virtutibus averterunt exempla nobis relinquere curavit, quia qua ratione laudabilia virtutum exempla iubemur imitari eadem vitiorum dampnabiliia detestari debemus. Ad hoc igitur Valerius electa diligenter et extracta de libris doctorum sollemnium Orosii, Titi Livii, Sallustii et aliorum . . . ad evitandum etiam labiariosae inquisitionis taedem et ut reddat huius libri delectabile studium antiquorum non omnia dicta similiter et facta non omnia sed quae tantum memoratu digna sunt et quam brevius commode fieri potest determinat se traditurum, non tamen clariori stilo vel dictamine praestantiori vel cura vehementiore quam ceteri scripsent libros suos auctores, quod dicit ex humilitate sui et ipsius difficultate rei . . . [Expi]: qua a cultu deorum principiari in eius animo fuit cuius potissima pars est religio. Maiores statas . . . voluerunt (1 1, 1) [1]ncipit liber primus cuius sententia est quod a cultu deorum patriali et solito non est inconsultum recedere aut subito . . . [Expi]: (IX 15, ext. 2) se dicebat Ariatham fore et regem Cappadociae cui quamquam faverent pene totius Orientis et omnium civitatum populi nichilominus eius caput mendozae iusto tormento adfixit idem Iulius Caesar. Et hic terminat Valerius librum suum finem eius correspondere facientem principio, nam in principio Caesaris numen, quem deificatum credebant, imploravit, et iustitias eius recitant hic finem imponit operi.

VALERIUS MAXIMUS

67–100 and in particular page 90, no. 147.

Manuscripts:

(*) Dole, Bibliothèque Municipale, 385, s. XV. Books V–IX only. (Cat. Gén. Fr. Dept. Octavo, XIII [1891], 449.)

(photo.) Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 1592, s. XV. Books IV–IX only (Auguste Molinier, Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Mazarine, II [1886], 126).

(photo.) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 6151. Designated 'seemingly' s. XVI in Catal. Bibl. Regiae, IV (1744), 208; I gladly accept the confirmation of James John that it was written ca. 1500. Anonymous, truncated, garbled, lacking the text of Valerius, the commentary on the prooemium, the exempla adapted from Boccaccio, and the subscription, I place it here because for the first and last chapters it is very close to the tradition of Petrus Herardi. Who culled these 'Notulae' is not revealed.

(micro.) Reims, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1333–34, s. XV. Kaeppele, 'Luca Mannelli (†1362) e la sua Tabulatio et expositio Senecae,' Archivium Fratrum Praedicatorum, XVIII (1948), 249–250, recognized that neither the incipits of the prooemium and commentary nor the explicit accorded with those in the commentary of Dionysius and that it was instead an anonymous commentary whose author cited the commentaries of Dionysius, Frater Lucas, and Lucas de Penna and the French translation of Valerius by Simon de Hesdin. In 1954 Marjorie Alkins Berlincourt, who did not know Kaeppele, concluded in The Commentary on Valerius Maximus by Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri and Its Influence upon Later Commentaries (see above s. Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri, Editions), 61 and (1972) 385–386, that it was the work of one or more anonymous commentators and was based principally on Simon de Hesdin and the commentary in MS. 1332 in the same library, which with Di Stefano I have ascribed to Lucas de Penna. The identification of the commentary as that of Petrus Herardi was made by Di Stefano in 'Tradizione esegetica e traduzioni di Valerio Massimo nel primo umanesimo francese,' Studi francesi, n. 21 (1963), 413–416. (Cat. Gén. Fr. Dept. Octavo, XXXIX [1904], 479–480, where it is ascribed to Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri.)

Biography:

Pierre Hérand.

I have not found elsewhere Petrus Herardi of Reims. He is not, of course, to be confused with the earlier Petrus of Reims (d. 1245), who was bishop of Agen and wrote on theological subjects. His acquaintance with Guy de Roye, archbishop of Reims, has been mentioned above.

13. JOHANNES DE FLOREMONTIS

Also involved with the Alidosi, like Benvenutus de Imola, but favorably, was Johannes de Floremontis, whose commentary can at present be dated only from the fact that it is dedicated to Ludovico Alidosi (d. 1430; see G. De Caro, 'Alidosi, Ludovico,' Dizionario biografico degli italiani II [1960], 376–377), who came to joint power in Imola with his brother Lippo in 1391 and to sole power, on the death of the brother, in 1396. It is reasonable to think that the author was a native of Imola and also that the dedication was made before 24 February 1424, on which date the forces of Filippo Maria Visconti occupied Imola and took Ludovico prisoner; freed after two years, he never found it possible to return to Imola, and he died in Rome. Indeed, the tone of the dedication is such that it seems addressed to a young person, to a Ludovico who is still a student and who is being urged by a preceptor to follow the right path throughout his life.

It is not possible to identify the author with either the Johannes de Imola who taught logic at Bologna in 1385–86, logic and philosophy 1386–87, logic and moral philosophy 1387–88, moral and natural philosophy 1388–89, moral philosophy and medicine 1392–93, and medicine 1395–96 (Umberto Dallari, I rotoli dei lettori legisti e artisti dello Studio Bolognese del 1384 al 1799, I [Bologna, 1888], 7. IV [Bologna, 1924], 12, 14, 17, 19) or the scholar often so called, Johannes de Nicoletis, who was juristconsult and canonist at Bologna, Ferrara, and Padua and died in Bologna in 1439
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An Augustinian Joannes Antonius de Imola, whose *In libros Posteriorum Analyticorum Aristotelis* is contained in a manuscript at Imola, is listed in David Aurelius Perini, O.E.S.A., *Bibliographia augustiniana cum notis biographicis. Scriptores italici*, II (Firenze, 1931), 136. Benjamin G. Kohl suggests a possible connection with the Florimontius family of Perugia; according to Agostino Oldoini, *Athenaeum augustum in quo Perusinorum scripta publice exponuntur* (Perusiae, 1678; reprinted Farnborough, 1969), 21, 104, 110, three members of this family in the seventeenth century were writers. Galeazzo Florimonte (d. ca. 1565), bishop of Aquino and Sessa, is recorded in Kristeller, *Iter*, I and II.

The influence of Benvenutus de Imola is already apparent in the introduction. It is accordingly of some interest that while Vaticanus latinus 9936 names the commentator Johannes de Floremonis, and while other manuscripts fail to name him, the incomplete manuscript at Cremona calls him rather Johannes de Camerino and carries earlier in its folios the commentary of Benvenutus on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* of Vergil. This manuscript, which gives the impression of a copybook, belonged to the Augustinians at Cremona and may have been set down by one of them. It will be remembered that Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri was an Augustinian; Johannes draws also on Dionysius. A Johannes de Camerino in the Greek form of the name (with Καυαπάδιου), Dominican, occurs in Vaticanus latinus 927, s. XIV (*Cod. Vat. Lat.*, *Codices* 579–1134, recensuit Augustus Pelzer, p. 339) and one of the same name, jurisconsult, in Vaticanus latinus 10726, s. XV med. (*Cod. Vat. Lat.*, *Codices* 10701–10875, recensuit Johannes Baptist Borino, p. 130).

The well-known Franciscan Johannes de Camerino who is commonly called Johannes Camers (see, for example, Cosenza II, 1819–1821, V, 926–927, VI, 149 and CTC III 54), who edited several Latin authors and who died in 1546, does not seem chronologically possible here as author, but he may in his youth have been copying from Johannes de Floremonis. I owe to Giacomo Boccanera, director of the Biblioteca Valentiniana at Camerino, in a letter of 2 March 1976, the suggestions Johannes de Camerino, a Dominican, who took his doctorate in theology at the University of Ferrara on 19 December 1461 (Giuseppe Pardi, *Titoli dottorali conferiti dallo Studio di Ferrara nei secoli XV e XVI* [Lucca, 1901], 38), Johannes de Camerino who on 14 June 1474 wrote from Florence to Lorenzo the Magnificent, and the Franciscan Johannes de Camerino who took his doctorate in theology at Ferrara on 5 October 1497 (Pardi, 102); these too seem late. Francesco Novati, *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati*, II (Roma, 1893), 484–486, was similarly troubled by the Johannes de Camerino to whom Salutati wrote an undated letter, perhaps in the period 1392–1396. Giuseppe Billanovich, ‘Il Petrarca e gli storici latini,’ *Tra latino e volgare per Carlo Dionisotti*, (Padova, 1974 [Medioevo e umanesimo, 17–18]), 78 names the commentator Giovanni Fiorentini da Camerino.

*Invocation* (Vaticano, Città del, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 9936). [Inc.]: Valerii Maximi expositionem aggressurus in nomine individuae trinitatis exordia mihi sumam, eius primo invocando favorem ut quae procellis evitatis ad portum pervenire tranquillum. Da rerum omnium creator deus huius libri me profundas indicaret sententias. Caerulum princeps ad vota mea confidingescens bequem facundium tribuenus ut discentium mentes ab ignorantia tetra quasi caligine sententiarum exuan fulgore. Da pater omnipotens invovorum linguas vitare molestas. Da illius cuius amore hoc opus ago gratam benevolentiam mihi posse vindicare ac etiam alius posse complacere legentibus.

*Dedication*. [Inc.]: Ex Alidosiorum spectabilis prosapia, generose mi domine Lodovice, claram cui ducis originem, quia ex nobili genere ortus es et conscientia sit bonorum hono-rabilium iuxta philosophum in libro De anima, ideo tibi nobili expediet ingenti cupiditate moveri ut scientiarum flores capias et intellectum aquas. Disciplina, mentis perspicacitas, in te viget ac virtutis industria simul cum nobilitate generis in te sedem collocavit. Sperne igitur delectationes sensuales et intellectualibus
adhæreas quibus degustatis intrinsecusque susceptis senties quid meli florum. Esto dissimilis illis qui delectationes sensuales solum gustantes intellectuales ignorantes verum non percipiant dulcem quia qui mel non degustavit non percipit mellis dulcedinem . . . [Expi]: Quare hortor te mi domine nobilem origine et generosum animo bonis intellectualibus inhaerere, vana et ludica deserendo, quod ut agas zelo tuae graeae dilectionis eximio commentum praefati libri expositionemque ad tui honorem et gloriam condito prout tua grata providentia a me flagitatavit ut iugiter in hoc libro insulando fructus pulcherrimos colligas post laborem.

Introduction. [Inc.]: His igitur praemissis ad propositionem opus prosequens intemum. Sed tamen antequam ad expositionem libri deveniam primo praemitto quaedam universalia quae in prohemiib lurum tangi consuevero, secundo ad specialia et particularia condescendam. Igitur circa hoc sublimes opus sunt aliquo principali inquirenda, primo quae sit huius libri materia sive subjectum, secundo quis fuerit auctor, tertio quae fuerit auctoris intentio, quarto quae utilitas, quinto quis libri titulus, sexto cui partis philosophiae supponatur. Materia autem sive subjectum huius libri est dicta et facta romanorum et aliarum gentium, hoc est historiae peregrinæ in quibus continetur quid viri illustres gesserunt et qualia operati sunt. Auctor autem fuit Valerius ex nobili prosapia romanorum oriundus qui antiquorum prolixitates et historias famosas prolixæ ab antiquis traditas sub compendioso stilo recollegit . . . [Expi]: quæretur cui partis philosophiae supponatur. subiacet autem hic liber ethicæ philosophiae quia docet nos vivere moraliter.

Commentary: [Inc.]: His extrinsecus praetactis ad divisionem libri condescendo. Dividitur itaque hic liber in duas partes, in prohemi et tractatum. Et primo ponit prohemium in quo auditores praeparat ad audientiam quae sequuntur. In secundo ponit tractatum . . . [Expi]: quia primo ponit intentionem secundo antipophorizat id est . . . nec mihi cuncta. Urbis Romæ (I Prooeomium) Dicit primo quod proposuit describere dicta et facta urbis Romæ scripta ab aliis auctori-

bus authenticis diffuso modo, ipse autem scribet breviter . . . [Expi]: in primis venerare deos. Maiores statas (I 1, 1) Posito prohemio ponit hic executionem et tractatum in quo continentur virtutes et vitia antiquorum virorem . . . [Expi]: (IX 15, ext. 2) Populus romanus credendo ipsum fore regem consentiebat quod restitueretur sibi regnum. Sed Caesar hoc cognoscens iussit eum maestari etc.

Bibl.: Marjorie Alkins Berlincourt, The Commentary on Valerius Maximus by Dionysius de Burgu Sancti Sepulchri and Its Influence upon Later Commentaries (see above. s. Dionysius de Burgu Sancti Sepulchri, Editions), 49–54 and (1972) 381–383.

Manuscripts:
Cremona, Biblioteca Statale, Fondo Governativo 109, s. XV, ff. 177–190v. Incomplete, it stops with I 1, 21. (Mazzatinti, LXX, p. 83).
Firenze, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 3603, s. XV, ff. 1–104, attributed according to Kristeller, Iter II, 517, to Benvenuto de Imola by Berta Maracchi.

(micro.) London, British Library, Harley 2504, s. XV. I would express my appreciation to T. S. Pattie, Assistant Keeper, Department of Manuscripts, for his assistance on this manuscript. (Catal. Harleian MSS., II 696).


Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, G. 133 Inf., s. XV, attributed by Novati, 484, n. 1, Giuseppe Di Stefano, ‘Ricerche su Nicola de Gonesse traduttore di Valerio Massimo,’ Studi francesi, n. 26 (1965), 217, n. 6, and Billanovich to this commentator (Kristeller, Iter, I, 291, where it is not identified).

(*) Sevilla, Biblioteca Capitular y Colombina, 5–7–2, s. XV (Haenel, col. 981, and letters from the director, 15 February 1975 and 6 May 1976).

(*) Soissons, Bibliotheque Communale, 25, an. 1445 (Cat. Gén. Fr. Dept. Quarto III [1885], 79).

Biography:
See above, p. 355.
14. GUARINUS VERONENSIS

The commentary of Guarinus Veronensis is almost certainly an end-product of his teaching, and probably of his later teaching. A classroom aura emanates from it as word after word, phrase after phrase, is selected for explanation, and it may very well be, indeed, that for the commentary as we have it entire in the Paduan manuscript, entitled quite simply ‘Guarinus Veronensis in Valerium Maximum,’ we are indebted to a student’s notes.

The interest of Guarinus in Valerius endured over a long period and has long been known. It was not necessarily sparked by the influence of Marzagaia in Verona and of Johannes de Ravenna in Padua. The allusions to Valerius as indexed in Sabbadini’s edition of the Epistolario begin only with the year 1412 and run into 1456. In 1415 Guarinus wrote of inserting Greek words in a manuscript of Valerius for his friend Ugo Mazzolato, and his activity with the text of Valerius is revealed also in Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, LXIII.27 and Belluno, Biblioteca Lolliniana, 55. One lexicon which he compiled drew on several authors, Valerius included. In his ‘Corso grammaticale’ Valerius was a fundamental text. The inaugural oration for this is a paean to the study of history, quotes in slightly altered form the famous passage in Cicero, De oratore II 9, 36 (Historia vero testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memoriae, magistra vitae, nuntia vetustatis), and presents Valerius as one who ‘ex rebus gestis ita singula virtutum genera exactis ut non tam erudire mortales quam eos bonos reddere velle visus sit’; the oration has survived in numerous copies (for example, Ferrara, Biblioteca Comunare Ariostea I.62, an. 1773, f.11v–12v, II. 19, s. XV, ff. 5v–6r, II. 110, s. XV, ff. 104v–105r, II. 135, s. XV, ff. 60v–61r; München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 78, s. XV; Reggio Emilia, Archivio di Stato, Biblioteca, B.a.29 (già M.b.4), s. XV, f. 7; Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense, 286, s. XV, ff. 29v–30v and 868, s. XV, f. 78; Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, CCLXIII [235], s. XV, ff.131–132v).

Friends and students of Guarinus evinced a corresponding interest in Valerius. On 13 December 1406 Guglielmo Capello finished writing Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale di San Marco, Zanetti lat. 380 (1908), which contains the commentary of Benvenutus de Imola. Gioacchino Castiglione mentions Guarinus in a prolusio to a course on Valerius which he delivered while still a student and before he left Ferrara in 1435. To Antonio Costanzo is sometimes assigned an epitome of Valerius in verse. Pietro del Monte (d. 1457), also a student of Guarinus, borrowed in his letters no more from Valerius than from other classical authors, but the treatise De virtutibus et vitis which he wrote in England may recall Valerius. It is preserved, for example, in Cambridge, University of Cambridge Library, 2136 (L1.1.7) and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. F.5.26; he stated in a letter of 1439 to John Bostock, abbot of St. Albans, that he had written it the year before; and its dedication to Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, was published by Mandell Creighton, bishop of Peterborough, in ‘Some Literary Correspondence of Humphrey, duke of Gloucester,’ English Historical Review, X (1895), 101–103.

Commentary (Padova, Biblioteca del Seminario, 142) [Inc.]; (1 Prooemium) Valerius iste civis Romanus fuit, homo militiae et Sexto Pompeio non mediocri familiaritate coniunctus, sub quo etiam militasse acceperat. Scribit autem hoc opus ad Tiberium Caesarem, tum post Octavianum Augustum imperatorem, qui quidem ex gente Claudia ab Octavianiano adoptatus imperium obtinuit. Solet saepe numero inter legentes quaedam subordini dubitatio annalesne scribat vel historiam; non magis autem historiam scribere videtur. Titulus huius operis est Valerii Maximii dictorum factorumque memorabilium liber primus incipit. Valerius proprium est ipsius scriptoris, Maximus cognitionis nomen, dictorum factorumque memorabilium operis materia. Liber primus ad aliorum differentiam; scriptis enim VIII libros, quorum in primis octo ea quae ad solam virtutem pertinent tractare videtur, in ultimo vero in hominum vitia invehitur. Urbis hic abusus est vocabulo. Urbis moenia sunt. Civitatis autem dicere debuit, quum etiam non murorum gesta tractare intendat. Civitas est multitudo civium congregata eodom.
Valerius Maximus


Manuscripts:
Firenze, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 3607, s. XV, ff. 81–149. Books I-VII 3, ext. 1 only. The commentary is anonymous here.

Padova, Biblioteca del Seminario, 142, s. XV, ff. 1–39. The manuscript belonged to Jacopo Facciolati. (Apostolo Zeno, Dissertazioni Vossiane, I [Venezia. 1752], 219; Tammaro de Marinis, La legatura artistica in Italia nei secoli XV e XVI; notizie ed elenchi, II [Firenze, 1960], 67, n. 1475, without mention of Guarinus; Kristeller, Iter, II, 9).

Biography:
See CTC I, 207–208; II, 229; III, 257; IV, 295–296.

LATIN AUTHORS


Note: Remigio Sabbadini’s *Vita di Guarino Veronese* (Genova, 1891) and *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Guarini Veronese* (Catania, 1896) were reprinted in one volume, entitled *Guariniana* and edited by Mario Sancipriano, at Torino in 1964; Sabbadini’s edition of the *Epistolario di Guarino Veronese* (Venezia, 1915–1919, 3 vols. [R. Deputazione Veneta di Storia Patria, Miscellanea di Storia Veneta, Serie terza, vols. 8, 11, 14]) was reprinted at Torino in 1959.


15. Pallacinus (Omnibonus Leonicensus?)

On 18 June 1482 Joannes de Gregorio, de Forlivi, published in Venice a commentary assigned to Omnibonus Leonicensus (CTC I, 208–209, III 257–258). This first edition, one of four, is apparently the only one to carry a dedicatory letter by Raphael Regius (CTC III, 269–270, IV, 338). In some copies it is addressed to Bernardinus Martinengus (see on him *Storia di Brescia*, promossa e diretta da Giovanni Treccani degli Alfieri [Brescia, 1963–1964, 5 vols.], II, 171 n. 4, 201 n. 1, 222, 223 n.5; Augusto Campana has pointed out to me that the Vatican’s copy [Inc. III. 27] of the text of Valerius Maximus published at Venice 1 July 1478 by P. F., B. R., S. F., Z. F. [HCR 15781, Goff V-30] has this letter in manuscript through ‘illustrium viorum’ on f.1b). In other copies, as the cataloguer of the British Library remarks (BMC V 339), it is addressed instead to Antonius Moretus (Cosenza III, 2369, V, 1210–1211; Moretus was press corrector and later a printer in Venice and a member of the Academia Veneta), and the unsigned leaves which carry it occur sometimes at the beginning, sometimes at the end. The copy in the Free Library of Philadelphia, about which Howell J. Heaney has courteously informed me, carries the letter, addressed to Moretus, at the beginning. In the letter, which is transcribed below, Regius states that Moretus (who edited the commentary of Olivierius Arzignanensis published in Milan by Leonardus Végius on 28 February 1513) had wrested the commentary of Omnibonus from those who were hiding it and when Regius had deleted what was superfluous had attended to the printing.

Certainly Regius had an interest in Vale-
VALERIUS MAXIMUS

rarius which continued after 1482. Observations of his are said to be included in the edition of the commentary of Oliverius Arzignanensis published in Venice by Bartholomaeus de Zanis on 24 October 1508, and in his well-known quarril with Johannes Calphurnius (CTC IV, 416; Cosenza I, 794–797, V, 381–382) he devoted one tirade in his Epistolae Plinii enarrationes [with other tracts] (Venice, Guilelmus Anima Mia, Tridinensis, 23 May 1490; cf. CTC IV 338), ff. c2b–c3, to Calphurnius’s interpretation of Valerius Maximus I 1, 1. ‘Hebetissimo es ingenio et penitus iudicio cares,’ he says to Calphurnius in photocopies furnished to me by William H. Bond from the copy in the Houghton Library, ‘... at dices, “Mei praeeptores ita semper exposuerunt.”’ Quasi vero debeat eum qui se mundi primum hominem esse iactet, alienae expositiones sequi fatuas praesertim, ac non modo sensu sed ipsum quoque verborum contextum pervertentes. Cum igitur in iis tam puelliter turpiterque labaris quae ad grammaticam spectant in quisque frustra aetatem contrivisti, quid in iis quae ad rhetoricam pertinent facere es iudicandus?’

In view of his acquaintance with Valerius we should accordingly like to accept the belief of Regius that our commentary is that of Omnibus Leonicensus. And yet, and yet—why does his letter appear only in the first edition, and why, even then, is it addressed sometimes to Martinengus, sometimes to Mortetus, and placed sometimes at the beginning, sometimes at the end? Let us turn to Oliverius Arzignanensis for additional evidence and consider portions of the dedicatory letter to the first edition of his commentary, which appeared from the press of the same publisher on 8 March 1487; the Latin is transcribed below the letter. The letter is addressed to Petrus de Brutis, bishop of Kotor (Cattaro) in Dalmatia from about 1474 to 1493. Oliverius, a loyal student of Omnibus Leonicensus, states that he wrote the commentary at the repeated request of the son of Omnibus, Jacobus. The obligation to publish became even greater when the commentary which Oliverius ascribes not to Omnibus Leonicensus but to a certain Pallacius was published on 18 June 1482. This commentary Oliverius considered inferior; he even terms it nugae, and Johannes Calphurnius, also a student of Omnibus, had heartily condemned it when it was submitted to him and had refused to correct it, saying that he would prefer to write a new one. In his reply to this letter, dated from Vicenza 22 December 1486, the dedicatee Petrus de Brutis praises the work of Oliverius, calls him a second Omnibus, and expresses no surprise that the earlier and arid commentary had been issued by men greedy for money. It is not clear why, when Oliverius and Petrus de Brutis denigrated the printers of the first commentary, Oliverius entrusted his to the same house.

Such are the quarrels of scholars and of publishers in competition fair or foul. It would seem that the four editions of the commentary attributed to Omnibus Leonicensus in catalogues of incunabula should be ascribed instead to Pallacius of Brescia. Another version of events, however, attaches less blame to Pallacius; it is in fact he who becomes the injured party in the dedicatory letter to the senate and people of Brescia with which Johannes Britanicus (CTC I, 231–232, III, 267–269) introduced his commentary on the Satires of Persius (Venice, Bartholomaeus de Ragazonibus, 17 January 1492/93); he is issuing the commentary, Britannicus says, in haste lest that befell him still living which befell his learned fellow-citizen Pallacius. Pallacius had written no less fluently than wisely on Cicero’s De officiis and on Valerius Maximus but was prevented by death from publishing, and his efforts were then appropriated by men who had no conscience, were suppressed for a time, and were later published by these men as their own. The Latin reads, ‘Festinantius itaque editionem maturavi quae erat in animo, veritus ne id mihi viventi accideret, quod nuper mortuo accidit Palacino municipi meo viro singularis doctrinae, qui cum in Officia Ciceronis et Valerium Maximum non minus diserte quam sapienter quaedam scripsisset, eadem morie praeventus edere non potuit, quae ab is excepta, qui gloriari alieno partam labore et periculo in se libenter transferunt, supprimuntur, ut successu temporis ipsi pro
suis edant, in iuriam profecto Palacini manibus facturi maximam’ (text available also in Angelo Maria Quirini, Specimen variae literaturae quae in urbe Brixia ejusque ditione paulo post typographiae incunabula floreat, scilicet vergente ad finem saeculi XV., usque ad medietatem saeculi XVI . . . [Brixiae, 1739], pt. 1, 126).

It is not clear precisely where the full truth lies. I here tentatively transfer the commentary ascribed to Omnibonus Leonicenus to Pallacinius and trust that evidence may be discovered in the future to clarify the matter. My teacher Eva M. Sanford (d. 1954), who invited me (in 1946!) to survey the commentaries on Valerius for this project, stated (CTC I 209) that commentaries on both Lucas and Valerius are falsely attributed to Omnibonus.

Dedication of the entire edition (ed. of Venice, 1482, from the copy in the Free Library of Philadelphia). Raphael Regius Antonio Moreto salutem. [Inc.]: Percurri perquam libenter quae mihi tradidisti corrigenda Omniboni Leoniceni erudissimi viri accurata in Valerium Maximum commentaria, quo tecum grammaticorum turbæ Valerii collectanea semper fere non immerito in scholis lectitantium aliqua ex parte prodessemus. Ea namque Valerius ex priscis historicis collegit, quibus non solum orator instrui verum tota hominum vita facile institui possit. Quae enim praestantes philosophi de moribus argue subtiliterque disseruerunt, ea Valerius illustrium virorum exemplis sequenda vitandave ornate copioseque indicavit. Quae enim est praelara virtus, cuius vim atque naturam exemplis a Valerio selectis facile non valeas comprobare? Quod extat insigne vitium, cuius malignitatem iisdem exemplis non possis destetari? Huc accedit quod non contentus facta memoranda collegisse adiicit etiam dicta, ac quicquid apud omnes gentes praecleri unquam event, operi sui inserere pulchrum putavat. Id vero opus si quod aliiu diligenti indigebat enarratione, tum propter concisum dicendi genus ad multa brevi colligenda maxime accommodatum tum vero propter historiae tam nostrae quam peregrinae varietatem. Hanc tu, mi Antoni, difficultatem in operes esse intelligens omni diligentia luculentissimas Omniboni expositiones a manibus quorundam eas occultantium extorsisti, ac postquam quae superflua videbantur resecavimus imprimendas curasti, ut haberent omnes Valerianii operis studiosi quo confugere possent si quid in eo forte difficultatil ostendisset. Sed quoniam Valerius nomen sibi a collegiendis historiis peperisse videtur nonnulla de historiis ratione brevi commemorare non ab re esse duxi. Historia igitur est rerum gestarum dilucida enarratio. Huius species quattuor esse constat: alia enim dictur topic ubi loca describuntur, cuius auctoribus pro qualitare materiae nunc cosmographi a totius mundi complexu, nunc geographi, nunc chorographi a regionum descriptione appellatur; alia chronica qua temporum rationem supputamus atque discernimus quales sunt Eusebii libro de Temporibus; alia genealogica, quae nobilium virorum genus et vitam exponit; alia pragmatica, quae vel sola merito historia est cognominanda ut in qua gesta ipsa et hominem consilia ac denique loca tempora illustrum virorum genera comprehenduntur. Hanc ita commendat latinarum eloquentiae parenz [Cicero, De oratore II 9.36], 'Historia vero testis temporum, lux veritatis, vitae [vita] memoria [memoriae] magistra vitae, nutria vetustatis qua voce alia nisi oratoris immortalitati commendatur.' In huiuscemodi historia conscribenda complures tam apud graecos quam apud latinos diversis temporibus floruer e quorum operibus pulcherrima quaeque in volumina sua transitit Valerius ac collectione factorum dictorumque memoratu dignorum composit. [Expl.]: Quod quidem ante postque eum fecisse nonnullos constat in primisque A. Gallium, qui et ipse plurimas ex priscorum voluminibus excerptas historias elegantissime referit. Sed de hoc satis atque etiam niumium. De Valerii autem vita quae comperti paaula haec accipe.

A Vita follows: [Inc.]: Valerius Maximus patricius Romanus fuit . . . . [Expl.]: Comperta haec habui, mi Morete, quae de Valerio scriberem, reliqua quae a nonnullis iactantur ut sunt incerta ita fortasse falsa atque ideo mihi minime litteris committenda. Vale.

Commentary (ed. of Venice, 1485). [Inc.]: Urbis Romae exterarumque gentium (1 Prooemium) Primo quidem domestica dicta, postea exterorum, id est Graecorum vel bar-

rum veteres praedicationes, Apollinis vatnum libros, portentorum explanationes Etruscorum disciplina contineri putarunt.' Bene gerenda- rum et auctoritates, pro rebus bene gerendis sacrificia fiebant ut eorum rerum dii essent auctores. Augurum observatione, quia cum augures captassent auguria sua dixissentque esse sacrificandum pro aliquo negotio si illud prosperum fuisset in usum tale sacrificium veniebat. Apollinis praedictiones vatnum, id est oraculo accepto a Phoebabidis quibus sacrificiis dii irati placari possent. Libris por- tentorurn depulsiones, id est spretis et longis habitis libris majorum a quibus Romani longi alieni fuere. Etrusca disciplina, id est secundum Etruscam disciplinan. Prisco etiam insti- tuto, ostendit Romanos non solum Etrusca consuetudine sed etiam maiorum suorum ritu sacrificare solitos, rebus divinis opera datur, id est sacrificatur... /[Expl.]: Idem (IX 15, ext. 2) Caesar. Iusto impedere supplicio, id est iustum subire supplicium coegit.

Editions:
(*) 1482, 18 June, Venetiis (Venice): impressum per Johannem de Forlivelio et socios eius. HC 15786; Goff V-33; NUC. BL; BN; (MH; CSmH; PP).

1485, 20 April, Venetiis (Venice): per Dionysium et Pelegrimum [de Pasqualibus] Bononiensi. HC 15787; Goff V-34; NUC. BN; (DLC; MH; DMS).

(*) [not after 1485], Venetiis (Venice): [Joannes und Gregorios de Gregorio, de Forlivelio?]. HC 15785; Goff V-35; NUC. BL; (DLC; ICU).

(*) 1487, 7 May, Venetiis (Venice): Leonardus Pachel und Ulricus Scinzenzeler. HC 15789; Goff V-37; NUC. (DLC; CtY; VtMIM). Roger J. Tienens graciously checked the LC copy for me; Ballistreri (see below) states that Oliverius Arzignanensis set down in this edition what he recalled having heard from Omnibus. From photocopies sent me from the copy in the Egbert Starr Library of Middlebury College, through the special kindness of Ronald Rucker, it is again clear that the commentator is not Oliverius Arzignanensis, as H 15789 had stated. Goff points out the double entry for the same place, printer, and date, H 15788 with the commentary of Omnibus Leonicenus and H 15789 with the commen-
tary of Oliverius Arzignanensis.

Biography:
I find no further information on the life of Pallacinus. A search of sources at Brescia is desirable.

Bibl.: For Pallacinus see Cosenza III 2553–2554, V 1303. Marjorie Alkins Berlincourt, The Commentary on Valerius Maximus by Dionysius de Burg Sancti Sepulchri and Its Influence upon Later Commentaries [see above s. Dionysius de Burg Sancti Sepulchri, Editions], 65–66, accepts without question the ascription of the commentary to Omnibonus Leonicensus. In addition to the works already cited see for Omnibonus Gianni Ballistreri in Dizionario biografico degli italiani, XII (1970), 234–236 (s. Bonisoli, Ognibene) and Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. lat. 1808 and Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale di San Marco, lat. XIV, 109 (4623), both s. XV, which transmit his oration on Valerius Maximus. The oration is printed in Karl Müllner, Reden und Briefe italienischer Humanisten (München, 1970, reprint of the edition of Wien, 1899 [Humanistische Bibliothek, Abhandlungen und Texte, Reihe II, Texte, Bd. 1]), 142–144.

16. OLIVERIUS ARZIGNANENSIS

Oliverius Arzignanensis, as is clear from the preceding section on Pallacinus, was a loyal student of Omnibonus Leonicensus (CTC I, 208–209, III, 257–258) and states in his fulsome dedicatory letter to Petrus de Brutis, bishop of Kotor (Cattaro) in Dalmatia from about 1474 to 1493, that he wrote his commentary at the repeated request of the son of Omnibonus, Jacobus. Appalled by the discredit done the memory of Omnibonus when the inferior and paltry commentary of Pallacinus was published under the name of Omnibonus on 18 June 1482, he bent every effort to publish a solid, substantial, and reliable commentary which would constantly and faithfully reflect the excellent training he had received from Omnibonus.

It appeared in Venice on 8 March 1487 from the press of Joannes and Gregorius de Gregoriis, de Forlivia, preceded by a ‘Compen-
diosa vita Valerii Maximi,’ Petrus de Brutis, replying to the dedicatory letter on 22 December 1486 from Vicenza, praises the commentary fulsomely but quite justly. Occupied largely in interpreting difficult words for his reader and in amplifying historical points from other sources, Oliverius had over the earlier commentators the advantage of familiarity with Greek, and at the end of his dedicatory letter he lists ‘supra centum et viginti’ Greek, Latin, and Hebrew authors—historians, poets, orators, grammarians, philosophers—whom he uses and conscientiously cites in the body of his work. The result is a comprehensive augmenting of Valerius designed to satisfy the reader’s every query in philological and historical matters.

The popularity of the commentary was at once evident as edition after edition issued from the press—eight from Venice for the incunabula period and some thirty from Italy and France during the sixteenth century. From the list of editions appended below it is also evident that the observations of other humanists were soon attached to the commentary of Oliverius. The contributions were of varying importance; some, if actually made, are quite thoroughly hidden and some were perhaps furnished in lecture rooms or in personal communications between students of Valerius. To the commentaries of Theophilus Chalcondyles and of Jodocus Badius Ascensius I devote sections below in their own right. To wrench Theophilus from Oliverius, even in order to give him independent rating, is almost unnatural, and readers are urged to peruse carefully the following article on him if they want as full a story as can now be told of the fortunes and misfortunes of the commentary of Oliverius. The other scholars, who would normally have been treated in the Fortuna of this article, I list here instead in the order in which their names occur on the title page of the edition of Valerius and Oliverius published at Venice on 24 October 1508 by Bartholomaeus de Zanis, de Portesio, which carries a woodcut of Valerius at his desk, flanked on his right by Oliverius and on his left by Theophilus, and states grandly that the text of Valerius is offered ‘cum laudatis Oliverii ac Theo-
philici commentariis, Hermolai Barbari, Georgii Merulae, Marci Antonii Sabellici, Iani Parrhassi, Raphaelis Rhegii, multorumque prae-
terea novis observationibus. These scholars then, some mentioned by Oliverius, some by Theophilus, some already departed in 1508 but remembered for their work on Valerius, are the following:

Hermolao Barbaro (1453 or 4–1493), friend of Georgius Merula who follows here, perhaps best known as commentator of Arist-
tote, Pliny, and Pomponius Mela. In spite of the attribution on the title page it is difficult to state exactly what his relation to this Venice, 1508, edition may have been, but we know from the citation below that notes of his, as of so many other scholars, were widely circulated. See on him CTC IV, 343–344, Cosenza V, 193–194, VI, 31, and for recent articles Emilio Bigi in Dizionario biografico degli italiani, VI (1964), 96–99; Vittore Branca, Ermolaio Barbaro and Late Quattrocento Venetian Humanism in John Rigby Hale, ed., Renaissance Venice (Totowa, New Jersey, 1973), 218–243; and Aubrey Diller, The Library of Francesco and Ermolaio Barbaro, Italia medio-
evale e umanistica, VI (1963), 253–262. Branca has edited his Epistolae, orationes et carmina (Firenze, 1943, 2 vols.) and De coelibatu, De officio legati (Firenze, 1969) in the series Nuova Collezione di Testi Umanistici Inediti o Rari, V, VI, and XIV.

Georgius Merula (1430/31–1494), who is cited by Theophilus Chalcondyles in his observations on I 1, I. See on Merula CTC I, 134, 221–223, IV, 265–266, 418; Cosenza III, 2296–
2302, V, 1171–1172, VI, 182.

Marcus Antonius Coccius (1436–1506), called Sabellicus, the Venetian historian whose admiration of Valerius was such that in imitation he wrote ten books of exempla which were posthumously published. See on him CTC II, 336, IV, 347–348; Cosenza VI, 252; Agostino Pertusi, pages 204–208 in ‘Le fonti greche del De gestis, moribus et nobilitate Civitatis Venetiarrum’ di Lorenzo de Monacis cancelliere di Creta (1388–1428), Italia medio-
evale e umanistica, VIII (1965); and my note on Baptista Egnatius below. Fabricius, BL (1728), II, 392, states that he edited the 1487 edition.

Aulus Janus Parrhasii (1470–1521) of Cosenza, who is cited as authority a score and more times by Theophilus and Oliverius. His importance is clear from the unsigned, un-
dated dedication of this 1508 edition: ‘Ad ornatiss. Adulescent. Stephanum etc. [Inc.]: Valerium Maximum publice privati		
tque praesegit hoc anno Ianus, ex eo quam tetra rerum verborumque portenta collatis exemplaribus ingenii solertia sustulerit, quam varia passim loca Cimmeriis (ut aiunt) obdacta tenebris utriusque linguae excessus auctoris illustrarit, ipse testis es optimus . . . Libuit haec efflagitata toties impressoribus edenda tradere in communem studiosae iuven-
tutis utilitatem tibique nuncupare quem Ianus ex omnibus suis auctoris plurimi ( nec in-
ijuria) facit [praise of Stephanus and his father Augustinus]. . . . Habebis interea Parrhasii tui non minus accurate emendata quam lucu-
lenter exposita quaedam Valerii loca, quae tuo nomine publicavimus. Additis in Corol-
larium si qua caeteri quoque nostri temporis grammatici professeors eius generis emiserunt, quae sui quaequae nominibus et auctoritati reddidimus, ne quenquam sua laude fraude-
mus idemque nobis eveniat quod nuper impressori cuidam Minutiano qui quem bonam partem Livianarum castigationum quas trien-
nio iam Parrhasii (ut scis) ex bello Macedonico frequenti promulgavit audtorio pro suis eddissset . . . [Expl.]: Operae pretium me tulisse existimabo si tu fraterque tuus hilari-
et ameni puer ingenii Nicolaus, quibus labor hic noster desudat aque bonique consuletis. Id si feceritis (ut spero) forsan ad maiora mihi adicietis aculeos. Vale.’ Another edition of Theophilus and Oliverius, published a week later in Milan by Nicolaus Gorgonzola under the editorship of Antonius Lenas, states that ‘Codicem Theophilus Chalcondyles emendavit ab antiquo fidellissimoque exemplari Jani Parrhasi.’ It will be remembered that Parrhasius married the daughter of Demetrius Chalcondyles. Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale, IV.D.3, s. XV and V.D.15, s. XVI, contain a preface by Parrhasius on Valerius and XIII.B.14, notes by him on Valerius, s. XVI. His work is men-

365
tioned also in the dedicatory letter, by Nicolaus Beraldus, to the edition of Valerius and Oliverius published at Paris by Joannes Parvus in 1517. See on him CTC III, 102–105 (to which Cosenza V, 1328–1329 and VI, 212, should be added), 126–127, 164–167, 448–449, and for recent articles Mine Milla Ferrari, pages 153–161 in 'Le scoperte a Bobbio nel 1493,' Italia medioevale e umanistica, XIII (1970), and Brian Richardson, 'Pucci, Parrasio and Catullus' in the same journal, XIX (1976), 277–289. Mrs. Carlotta Griffiths read a paper on Parchusius at the international conference 'Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 1500–1700,' held at King's College, Cambridge, in April 1974, but the paper was not included in the proceedings edited by R. R. Bolgar and published at Cambridge in 1976.

Raphael Regius (d.1520), whose short-lived dedicatory letter and whose celebrated quarrel with Johannes Calphurnius have been mentioned above s. Pallacinus. See on him CTC III, 269–270, IV, 337–338. Aldus Manutius in his dedicatory letter, October, 1502, to his edition of Valerius speaks of him as 'Raphael Regius noster, homo fide plenus et doctrina.'

Perhaps one of the 'multorumque' is Battista Egnatius (1478–1553), the one name not listed on the title page of our Venice, 1508, edition but included on the one published at Milan, without date, by Joannes Jacobus et Fratres, de Lignano, perhaps in the period 1509–1511. Egnatius, whose real name was Giovanni Battista Cipelli and whose published works are many, continued the Libellus Augustalis of Benvenuto de Imola and wrote nine books, posthumously published, De exemplis illustrium virorum Venetiae civilitatis atque ali- rum gentium. Rivalry between him and the much older Marcus Antonius Sabellicus was at once ended when in 1506 that scholar, dying, entrusted to Egnatius his unfinished Decem exemplorum libri; this work Egnatius brought to publication in 1507, and he also delivered the funeral oration on Sabellicus. See on him CTC IV, 49; Paul Lehmann, 'Das Buchinventar eines italienischen Humanisten von etwa 1471,' Italia medioevale e umanistica, III (1960), 323–324; Egidio Mioni, 'Cipelli, Giovanni Battista,' Dizionario biografico degli italiani, XXV (1981), 698–702; Agostino Pertusi, 'Giovanni Battista Egnazio (Cipelli) e Ludovico Tuberone (Crjeva) tra i primi storici occidentali del popolo turco (riassunto),' in Venezia e Ungheria nel Rinascimento, a cura di Vittore Branca (Firenze, 1973 [Civiltà veneziana, Studi, 28]), 479–487; Silvia Rizzo, 'Congetture di Battista Egnazio ad orazioni di Cicerone,' Miscellanea Augusto Campana, II (Padova, 1981 [Medioevo e umanesimo, 45]), 671–680; and James Bruce Ross, 'Venezian Schools and Teachers, Fourteenth to Early Sixteenth Century: A Survey and Study of Giovanni Battista Egnazio,' Renaissance Quarterly, XXIX (1976), 521–566.

It remains to notice finally a humanist not listed on our title page of Venice, 1508, but mentioned in the text (see below p. 376). Antonius Urceus (1446–1500), surnamed Codrus, professor of grammar and eloquence at Bologna, delivered probably in 1484–85 a 'Sermo de virtute in Valerium Maximum.' A consequence of his teaching, it begins 'Postquam cunctis fere nostris auditoribus et mihi quoque placuit, ut ego Valerii Maximi libros hoc anno publice profiterer . . . ' and ends ' . . . Sed iam me satis audivistis, deinceps ipsum Valerium audietis. Dixi.' The works of Codrus were published at Bologna in 1502; I have quoted here from the edition of Valerius published at Strassburg in 1521. See on Urceus CTC III, 198–199, Cosenza IV, 3513–3520, V, 1815.

I am informed by Professor Cranz of other complications in the convoluted story of Oliverius Arzignanensis and his service to Valerius Maximus. Another edition for the year 1508 appeared just a week later, on 31 October, from the press of Nicolaus Gorgonzola in Milan. Its title speaks of 'paucis annotationibus quas Arcadicus ille [unidentified] sub Theophili nomine marginibus inspersit. Id Antonius Lenas praecellae indolis adolescentes recognovit, eo videlicet consilio, ut per eam occasionem bicipitis illius monstrui latratus et plus quam cerbeream rabiem coereret, sed praecipitos modestiae obtaperans ab incepto destitit, gravitate vindictae praesentem lenitatem compensaturs. In quo quidem operes si quae memoratum digna facile invenire cupis index quem Franciscus Puteolanus [see above
p. 303] excogitaverat sine ullo errore commons
trabit. Accedit et alter index vocabulorum qui
in proxima editione promissus non praestatur.
Vale Lector.' I am grateful to Dennis E.
Rhodes for checking the copy in the British
Library. The exact role of Antonius Lenas
(Cosenza, III 162, V 997) in all this is not
clear, and the intrigue thickens as we perse
the edition published by Leonardus Vegius on 16 and 28 February 1513 and real-
ize that it displays substitutions and accretions.

Here, in fact, the verso of the title presents
a letter by Oliverius himself dated 1492. It is
addressed to Antonius Moretus of Brescia, to
whom, as we remember, the dedicatory letter
of Raphael Regius is directed in some copies
of the first edition of Pallatinus (see above
p. 362); it reads, in high dudgeon, 'Nicolaus
ille lenson sive quis alius est fuerit, qui novum
hunc scribendi modum invenit, boni ne an
mali plus literiae reipublicae attulerit, nec
satis scio, nec si sciam, dicere ausim. Quippe
qui videam quamplurimos huius artis inven-
tores divinis laudibus extollere quod parvo
admodum aere eorum librorum sibi facta sit
copia, quibus comparandis magni principes
vix pares antea fuissent, contra alios id inven-
tum maxime vitaeperaret (sic), quod per illud bon-
rum artium studis maximas calamitates invectas
videant. Nec mirum, Nam qui tali artificio
praesunt, literarum penitus expertes existunt,
eamque tractant arte cuius nullam prorsus
notitiam habeant, et qui talium officinarum
mancipes sunt, nihil praeter lucrum curare
videantur, paratioptimos quoque libros con-
taminare ut eos populares faciant, et dumm
quamplurimus placere student, ea plerumque
bonis libris addant quae litterarii viri maxime
fastidiant. In hac igitur sententiarum varietate
sicut iudicium meum non interpono, ita hoc
affirmare non dubito, nonnullorum librarior-
um temeritatem laboribus nostris plurimum
obfuise. Nam cum in Valerium commenta-
torios seorsum ab ipso (ut tu non ignoras) au-
thore primum edidissem ea sobrietate concin-
natlos qua in reliquis nostris operibus uti con-
suevimus, audacissimis ille quisquis fuerit
verbosissimos fecit, qui ut volumen maius et
proinde preciosius redderet, historias pleras-
quy suppressio scriptorum nominibus Valerii
marginibus adaptavit, cum earum ego ipse
locos tantum commostrassem quod maiori studi-
osis librorum copia quaeeretur, et inquirendi
locorum studio plura legerent, sicque docti-
ores indies fierent. Quam quidem contume-
liam ne et ipse probasse videar, primam meam
editionem ad te mitto, ut primo quoque tem-
pore illam tuis libraris describendam tradas,
sperans ex officinis tuis ita sinceros, puros,
et integros exituros, quemadmodum in fide tua
reponendum existimavi, quod literatus sive
egregieque intelligas non oportere in alienis
libris ingensiosos esse. Quod si alii qui huic
negocio praesunt, similes tui essent, libri nulli
ex parte muti a libraris emitterentur. Quod
alter nunc fieri, minime mihi mirum est, quod
praestantissimam haec ars ab illis (ut dixi) potis-
simum tractetur, qui illam neque norunt ne-
que ingeniis culpa nosse queunt. Vale. Ex
Vincentia anno a Christi natali, Mccccc.xcii.

Two editions had been published between
the first edition of 1487 and this letter of 1492,
both in Venice, by Bernardino de Benaliis on
9 November 1488 and by Guilielmus Anima
Mia, Tridinensis, on 12 August 1491. I am
indebted to Roger J. Trienens and Marjorie
G. Wynne for photocopies of the first few
folios of these from, respectively, copies at
the Library of Congress and at the Beinecke
Rare Book and Manuscript Library of Yale
University. Neither edition carries an addi-
tional dedicatory letter of editor or publisher in
explanation of events. The edition of 1488 is
no longer sober and chaste like the first edi-
tion of 1487; its margins are cluttered with
key words or names repeated or adapted from
the text of Oliverius to serve as reminders or
finding aids to the reader, and it is apparently
these which especially offended Oliverius. They
should all be carefully examined to ascertain
whether his tirade against printers (pace Ni-
colas Jenson) is wholly justified. They were
dramatically reduced, if we can judge by the
first few folios, in the edition of 1491, but
they reappeared in later editions.

Moretus preserved the letter of Oliverius
which he received in 1492. The action he took
on behalf of him is recorded in the letter which
he wrote two decades later to Alexander Minu-
tianus and which appears in the edition of 16
and 28 February 1513 on the verso of the title page directly below the letter of Oliverius. ‘Cum proxime Mediolani essem,’ says Moretus, ‘mecumque de re librarix verba faceres, dixisti Leonardum generum tuum a nonnullis bibliopoli efflagitari Valerium cum Oliverii commentariis suis opificibus imprimendum tradet. Ego qui memoria tenebam Oliverium ipsum de nonnullorum temeritate olim coram apud me conquestum, qui suos commentarios contemerassent, egisseque mecum postea per epistolam, eos quae ipse primum edidisset, prima quaque occasione iterum invulgarem, impressionem eam tantisper sustineret, oravi, dum Venetiis ego exemplar transmitterem quo haec generi aeditiio iuvaretur, et amici quamvis sero desiderio satisficeret, quod quidem cum tu mihi benignissime promisses, cum primum Venetias perveni, scedas quas huius generis innumeras habeo, omnes excussi queque Oliverii commentarios ad te mitto ut aeditiio vestra iuvetur, et amici manibus satisfiat. Vale. Venetiis, M.D.XII. Pridie calendas octobris.’

The edition has been cleared of the marginal notes which were so offensive to Oliverius. Instead (but see also the following paragraph) the letters A, B, C, etc. serve as reference aids to blocks of text and the exempla have been numbered.

It remains at the present time to point out that Alexander Minutianus (Cosenza III 2322–2323, V, 1185, VI, 184), whose son-in-law Leonardus Vegius published this 1513 edition in Milan, had been denounced (see above p. 365) in the unsigned, undated dedication of the edition of 24 October 1508 as a printer who had pirated the corrections of Parrhasius on Livy. He was of course first and primarily a scholar. Born about 1450 at San Severo in the province of Foggia, he studied under Georgius Merula in Venice, tutored in Milan for some years, began to print only in 1498, and continued printing until 1521. The Livy matter is discussed by A. M. McDonald in CTC III 448. In our edition of 16 and 28 February 1513, which on ff. II, III, XXX, and XXXI only includes remarks designated in the margins ANT[onius] LENS[as] and ARC[adicus] AS[inus] (where THE[ophilus] had sometimes stood before; THEO., however, appears elsewhere), Minutianus is mentioned as teacher of Antonius Lenas and the mysterious Arcadicius becomes ‘asinus.’ See for example f. IIa, ‘Quem quidem locum priusquam morum hic corraptor gymnasio nostrum infecisset Minutianus meus et distinxit et exposuit ex Merulae praeceptoris sui exactissima diligentia’; f. IIIa, ‘Oliverius, ut ex ipsius archetypo olim amicus Minutiano meo ostendit ex [Dionysii] Alicarnasii [Antiquitates romanae, II 64, 2–3] sententia a flameo dictum scripsit licet ostentatores ut noster est Asinus ubi flammae flamma posuerit quod sic corrupte apud Dionysii interpretam legisset. Sicque Minutianus meus dum Valerium proxime enarrat ipsius commentarios emulavit, Dionysius tamen a flameo etc. inferius et infurarem quas adhuc ferunt flammae vocantes etc. Ubi Arcadicius asinus non magis in litteris constans quam in vita continens arguitur . . .’; f. XXXa, ‘Haec a Minutiano reperta sibi iactabunda cornicula vendicavit’ and ‘. . . Haec Hermolaus [Barbarus]. Priusquam Hermolai annotationes fuissent inulgae prae preto Erethum Minutianus in suo codice ex Strabonis [Geographia V 3, 1] authoritate posuerat.’

This must end our remarks on the later editions of Oliverius. It would almost appear that, though no Shakespeare or Isaac Newton, he needs a Variorum edition. Certainly all editions of his commentary should be scrupulously compared. The texts which follow are from his first edition.

Dedication (ed. of Venice, 1487). Ad reverendissimum in Christo patrem et dominum Dominum Petrum de Brutis benignitate divina episcopum Catharensem Oliverius Arzignanensis. [Inc.]: Quamquam mihi negatum erat otium, Reverendissime Pater, ut inter graves et continentes erudiendiæ iuventutis aliarumque rerum multarum occupationes, nihil a me promi, nihil ediri posse videretur, quod elabo- ratum ingenio lucubratum industria in litterario senatu digni recti reprobare posset, negare tamen ipsa non potui nec fas esse duxi Iacobò Leoncino, clarissimi viri Omniboni filio et mihi spirituali quadam necessitidine coniuncto, praesertim a me iusta petenti et praeclara cupienti, ut Valerii Maximi monumenta, quae volumine brevi comprehensa mul-
tis interdum obscuriora videri solent quacumque possem ratione explicarem in mediumque proferrem ad humanitatis et disciplinae propagationem ad communem studiosorum hominum utilitatem. Cui quidem hoc a me saepius efflagi tanti multum ac diu relucatum fuisset non negaretum, quoniam suspicere tanti auctoris interpretationem, quam non modo facultate consequi, sed etiam cogitatione completi difficile foret, quippe ubi omnia ferme omnium rerum exempla multis et paene innumeralibus tam Graecorum quam Latino rum voluminibus essent non minus diligenter inquirenda quam fideliter referenda, non meum esse sensebiam, qui vererer reprehensionem doctorum hominum atque prudentum, sed eorum qui maiori oti o, acriori ingenio, exquisitori doctrina, praestantiori facundia de se talia profiteri et consequi possunt. Sed cum huisscmodi rei nuper facta esset ab impressoris editio quaedam temeraria satis ut arbitror, et ea falsa quidem Omniboni oratoriis eximii titulo adumbrata, ut eius auctoritate venalior fieret ac pretiosior, id mihi necesse quodammodo duxi, quod Iacobum Leonicenum magnopere velle intelligerem, nec aliter boni viri gratique discipuli officium tueri posse videbam nisi praeceptorem optimum de me, de patria, de litteris, de lingua nostra, de Romana dignitate optime meritum quibus sem studio et industria vindicassem, et turpissima qua videbatur inustus nota tersisses. Nam cum boni si quid in nobis est id totum ab uberrimo tanti praeceptoris fonte manarit, haec quoque commentaria nostra si quid valent ad eum referantur necesse est. Et cum eo malignitatis et impudentiae quaerundam impressorum accesserit avaritia, ut dum suae utilitati consulant aliae dignitati insidiari non dubient, quippe qui Pallacini cuiusdam imperiti hominis nugas a docissimo viro Calphurnio non solum damnatas sed ita reiectas cum eius limatissimae correctioni traderentur, ut diceret se malle nova componere quam tam mendoza corrigere, has inquam nugas tanto viro ascribere iussi [ausi] fuerunt, satius esse duxi periclitari quid possent exiguae ingenii mei vires, quam rei magnitudine deterritum ab officio omnino desistere; nam si minus quantum velis afferas boni, at quantum possis attulisse laude non careat; neque enim ubi sunt sua praemia debent studia nostra languescere, quod non eo perveniamus quo voluntas ferat, sed multo magis intenti ut officiosi homines aliquo potius numero videamur fuisset quam nullo. Itaque feci eoque propensius, quo rem istam non solum honestam et utilium, sed prope necessarium esse iudicarem, ne praecelara adolescentem ingenia obscuris aliorum ambagibus vel ut verius dicam deliramentis in maximos deducerentur errores turpissimae rerum ignorantiam, falsas et fictas historias lecti tando. . . . Hoc enim opere suo [Valerius] (ut praeceptoris mei verbis utar) complexus est divinarum humanarumque rerum praecipua queaque ut ab egregius illa quidem viris edita deligi potuere. . . . Ubique omnis generis imaginis collocatae sint, illae quidem multo expressiones et imitari potius quam intueri iocundae, quas non aere aut marmore Phidias aut Apelles sive Lisip pus, sed tantum librī suis scriptor diligentissimus reliquerit incorruptis litterarum monumentis perpetuo duraturas, quas impudentissima quadam temperatibus nescio quis attingere ausus dum spectandas hominibus illustriores se reddere posse putat, maximde deformes et obscurissimam reddidit, quare nos multorum et clarissimorum hominum tam Graecorum quam Latinorum hortatu compelli et eorum ope atque opera adiuti, illas in suum pristinum decorum revocare ac restituere curaverimus, quod et feliciter satis nos assecutos esse speramus. Hoc igitur opus nostrum quaecumque est tuae reverendissimae dominationi dedicatum ad te mittimus . . . / . . . [Expi.]: Quos autem in hoc opere sum auctores imitatus quoque dictorum meorum testes adduco historicos, poetas, oratores, grammaticos, atque philosophos, Graecos Latinos et Hebraeos, numero supra centum et viginti omnes hic breviter collecti oculis tuis subiciuntur. . . . (There follows a list in tabular form of the authors used.)

Reply to Dedication. Petrus Brutus episcopus Catharensis Oliverio suo oratori clarissimo Salutem Plurimam Dat. [Inc.]: Lectis litteris tuis, doctissime Oliveri, mecum coepi animo volutare comici nostri sententiam: bone deus homo homini quid praestat [Terence,
Eunuchus, 232] . . . Non cado tamen animis lectitans in Valerium Maximum commentaria illa tua. Quod litterarum bene olentibus floribus aetate iam ingravescente ipse non exornari queam, quando quidem et Cato ille Censorinus senior iam effectus litteras Graecas discere non erubuerit. In ipsis namque commentariis maius orbis nostris praeclassimae gesta tam Graecis quam Latinis cum quadam dicendi elegantia et venustate ita aperte atque dilucide complexus es ut pro adipsicendis litteris, pro instituendis moribus, pro vita bene agenda unicum et rectum vestigium inde facile sibi excipere quisque possit. Quamobrem omnes si te optimis instituitis tuis, si ingenio, si doctrina atque virtute alterum Omnibonum doctorem tuum praedicat et admirantur, non eos quidem fallit opinio, quando his temporibus nihil dignius nihilve conducibilis studiosissimae litterarum affere potuisse. Nam quae vel longius vel ob nimiam brevitatem obscursius aliis consipserunt, tua haec profecto egregia enarratio clarius in paucis accuratissimae rediget et unico ferme argumenta singula mirifice complectitur, neque quod ad veritatem historiae atque cognitionem attinet praetermissi quisquum. Praetulisti sane vim quandam hominis naturae ad se virtutibus omnibus ornandum, ut quem tecum in omni litterarum genere conferre possim habeam neminem. Quod enim praeclassius aut maximarum rerum aut virtutis aut sapientiae actum quod a te viro doctissimo discussum non sit et illustratum quantusque in ipsis splendor sit virtutis atque gloriae quantusque admirablem fructus rerum omnium ostenditur legentibus accurate. Neque de moribus solum et vita hominum (quod quidem eximium est), sed de virtutum natura et rebus humano sensu paene occultius cum omni disserendi ratione et dignitate monumenta in ipsis tradita cognoscentur, et ad felicitatem comparandam et ad beatitudinem consequendam nihil magis accedere potuit. Haec tua profecto inter alia quae legerim omnia facundia quadam et dignitate praeclara longe eminunt et excellunt, quae si quis praecclare simul et recte domique et foris tam in rebus secundis quam adversis sibi ipsi consulere cupiat, assidua lectione pertractet arbitreturque in primis divinum hoc opus scribi non ad fideum historiae faciundam solum, sed ad contemplandum effigiem omnis virtutis et humanarum divinarumque rerum exemplum stabile atque firmum. Quam gratum igitur et iocundum id muneris litterassimis omnibus futurum sit, vel ex hoc maxime cognosci potest quod te oratum voluerint totiens, ut haec editio a te fieret, ne ad bene beateque vivendum mortalibus aliquid deesse videretur. Quaproprier, mi Oliveri doctissime, hic tuus labor, haec tua industria haud minus profecto, sed plus multo quam eorum qui ante nos fuerunt viri peritissimi civitatem nostram Vicentinam exultat et decoravit, tam etsi nihil fuit aut ad humanum usum aut ad divinum cultum aut ad immortalem gloriam obtinendum quod Vicentini nostri viri clarissimi non discutent, non illustraverint. . . . Si de te tantum, mi Oliveri, dixerim quod de viro probissimo dici potest, qui non minus eruditione quam facultate ingenii pollens tantum hac nostra aetate ceteras praestas ut te non inferiori decore atque gloria insignitum velitium firmissimum omnium virtutum fundamentum ratione et vi quadam naturae omnes te inquam observent et quasi venerentur. Quod autem altera editio minus erudita, vel potius arida et inulta ab impressoribus nuper facta Omniboni titulo ascribatur, non est cur quisquam admiretur, cum et deteriora agere non pudeat auri sacra fame [Vergil, Aen., III, 57] (ut ille ait) temerarii impressores et doles ita factum, parce quaeo huic dolori quandoquidem Omnibonos suopote ingenio singulari eloquentia et admirabilia doctrina sese tueatur atque defendat. Non latent (mihi crede) litterassissimos omnes in omni dicendi genere orationes Graecae atque Latinae huiusmodi praeclassimae viri et illud in primis in Ciceronem de oratore scriptum immortalis laude dignum, et qua ingenii magnitudine, qua via orationis, qua elegantia et maiestate fuerit elucubratum, fugit profecto neminem. Ex quo illius nomen in omni aetate celebrabitur perpetuum et immortal, et immortalis gloria extolletur. Haec est vera hominum laus, haec illustres viros in caelo tollit, haec brevitatem vitae nominis immortalitatem compensat. Quod autem narrations tuas tuo Bruto episcopo Catharensi dicare censueris, ago tibi gratias et habeo, et
VALENIUS MAXIMUS

tanti munenier non immemor, spero me tibi quandoque relaturum. Opus quidem mihi peculiare est et gratum et periundum, sua-vissimuque erit atque dulcisimum otium mihi. Stude igitur, mi Oliveri, et eniteri, si me diligis, si me gratum existimas, ut diligentissime atque rectissime imprimitur ne impressorum incura et imperitia quoq frequentius fieri solet verborum stilum atque orationis seriem, nec non et dignitatem operis pervertant atque contaminent . . . . [Explan.] Sed mit[t]am haec et id exequar quod officium suadet obscurans omnes qui litterarum studia delectantur, qui disciplinis, qui virtutibus et vitae bene institutae faveant, hoc opus sanctissimum amplactantur, huic omni studio incumbant, hoc legant et perlegant saepius et in gymnasio suo atque bibliotheca sive quocunque se contulerint de manibus nunquam ponant, ut in praeistantissimis ingenii atque viris illustribus se adeaqueverint, gloriuntur quandoque immortaliitate nominis sui. Tu igitur, mi Oliveri, da operam et incumbe ut id operis quamplum imprimatur ut admirandae doctrinae tuae atque virtutis testimonium omnes valeant perhibere. Tu vale et me ut soles ama clarissimum sidus Vicentini agri. Vicentiae, XI. kalendas Ianuarii.

A Compendiosa Vita follows: [Inc.]: Valerius Maximus civis Romanus patricio genere natus omnem pueritiam et magnam adolescentiae partem litteris percepisse et honestis artibus dedit . . . . [Explan.] Genus vero suum paternum a gente Valeria, maternam a Fabia duxisse furtur, unde Valerius Maximus ex utraque familia ei nomen est, de cuius morte certi nihi potest afferi.

Commentary. [Inc.]: Urbis Romae exterarumque gentium facta simul ac dicta memo-ratu digna, quae apud alios latius diffusa sunt (1 Prooemium). In hac praefatione Valerius servat quod proprium est exordii, ut attentionem capet et docilatatem. Proponit enim quibus de rebus dicturus sit et se rem utilem scripturum polliceretur idque quam brevisissime facturum. Benivolientiam quoque comparat a persona sui, cum officium suum sine arrogantia laudet, extenuat quoque meritum suum, cum dicat se non tantum ingenio et industria valere, ut omnia complecti possit, neque con-


Editions:
1487, 8 March, Venetiis (Venice): arte et impensis Joannis [de Gregoriis] Forliviensis Gregoriique fratrum. CR 5928; Goff V-36; NUC. BL; BN; (CSpH; CTY; DMS).
(*) 1488, 9 November, Venetiis (Venice): arte et impensis Bernardini de Benalii. HC 15790; Goff V-38; NUC. BL; BN; (DLC; CSpH).
(*) 1491, 12 August, Venetiis (Venice): Guelelmus [Anima Mia] Tridinensis. HC 15791; Goff V-39; NUC. BL; BN; (DLC; CSpH; CTY).
(*) 1493, 30 April, Venetiis (Venice): impressum arte Boneti Locatelli, sumptibus Octaviani Scoti. HC 15792; Goff V-40; NUC. BL; BN; (DLC; CSpH; CTY).
(*) 1494, 16 July, Venetiis (Venice): [Philippus Pincius]. HC (Add) 15793; Goff V-41; NUC. BL; (DLC; CSpH).
(*) 1496, 26 March, Venetiis (Venice): HC 5929. BN.
1497, 22 March, Venetiis (Venice): per Bartolomaeum de Zanis. H 15795; Goff V-42; NUC. BL; (DLC; DMS).
(*) 1500, 5 July, Venetiis (Venice): per Albertinum [Rubeum] Vercellensem. C 5930; Goff V-43; NUC. BL; (CSpH; MnU).
(*) 1503, 14 December, Venetiis (Venice): per Albertinum de Lisona Vercellensem. Panzer VIII, 365, no. 211. The edition is listed in Rinaldo Fulin, 'Documenti per servire alla storia della tipografia veneziana,' Archivio veneto, XXIII (1882), 151. NUC. BM; BN; (NCC).
(*) 1505, 22 May, Venetiis (Venice): per Albertinum de Lisona, Panzer VIII 377, no. 318. NUC. BL; (MH).
(*) 1505, 31 July, Medioliani (Milan): apud Alexander Minutianum. NUC. BN; (NCC).
1508, 24 October. See Composite Editions. 1508, 31 October. See Composite Editions. 1510, 29 April-5 June. See Composite Edi-
tions.
1510, 31 July. See Composite Editions.
1512. See Composite Editions.
1513, 16 and 28 February. See Composite Editions.
1513, 5 March. See Composite Editions.
1513, 20 August. See Composite Editions.
1513, 30 December. See Composite Editions.
1517, 24 March. See Composite Editions.
1517, 28 March. See Composite Editions.
1518, 6 February. See Composite Editions.
1518, 20 May. See Composite Editions.
1522, Mediolani. See Composite Editions.
1523, See Composite Editions.
1531. See Composite Editions.
1535. See Composite Editions.
1536. See Composite Editions.
1541. See Composite Editions.
1546. See Composite Editions.
1547. See Composite Editions.
1548. See Composite Editions.
1558. See Composite Editions.
1565. See Composite Editions.
1568. See Composite Editions.
1569. See Composite Editions.
1575. See Composite Editions.
1588. See Composite Editions.
1590. See Composite Editions.
1598. See Composite Editions.
1608, Venetis. See Composite Editions.

Biography:
Oliverius Arzignanensis (Oliviero da Arzignano, Olivier d’Arzignano).
Arzignano is a small town in the province of Vicenza, numbering today perhaps eighteen thousand inhabitants. Oliverius clearly had an excellent education there and under the guidance of Omnibonus Leonicenus in Vicenza. Angiolgabriello di Santa Maria quotes a notarial document of 1468 according to which he was the son of a grammarian Joannes Arzignanensis; his family background therefore may have been a factor in his education and in his choice of a career. A Joannes Arzignanensis was a pupil of Guarinus Veronensis. This document makes Oliverius, like his father, a professor of grammar. His loyalty to the memory of Omnibonus is at once clear from the dedicatory letter of his commentary, as is his acquaintance with Bishop Petrus de Brusis.

Works:
In addition to the commentary on Valerius the cataloguer at the Bibliothèque Nationale (BN CXXVII, col. 11) credits to Oliverius the edition (BN CLXXXV, col. 611) Théodore Prodrome [Prodromus, Theodorus in NUC], Homeri . . . De murium felsique bello comedia ab Hieronymo Soncino . . . graecanis latiniisque literis impressa et ab Oliverio poeta auxianensi fideliter interpretata . . . [Edidit Aristobulus Apostolius] (Ortonae, 1518). Ancient Auxanum or Ansanum is, however, modern Lanciano, which archbishopric in the Abruzzi was connected with Ortona, and this poet Oliverius would seem to be distinct from Oliverius of Arzignano in the province of Vicenza. To Oliverius Lanzanensis the NUC (CCCCXXIIX 624) attributes an Artis grammaticae perutile opusculum (Venetiis, 1505).

Bibl.: Chevalier II, 3413; Cosenza III, 2505–2506, V, 1276; Fabricius, BLMA V, 155; Jöcher III, col. 1604, V, col. 1081; Mazzuchelli I, pt. 2, 1147.

Giovanni degli Agostini, Notizie istorico-critiche intorno la vita, e le opere degli scrittori viniziani, I (Venezia, 1752), 496; Angiolgabriello di Santa Maria, Biblioteca et storia di . . . scrittori così della città come del territorio di Vicenza II (Vicenza, 1782), CCLI–CCLVIII; Marjorie Alkins Berlincourt, The Commentary on Valerius Maximus by Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri and Its Influence upon Later Commentaries (see above s. Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri, Editions), 66–67.

17. THEOPHILUS CHALCONDYLES
The commentary of Theophilus Chalcon-
dyles has been mentioned in the article on Oliverius Arzignanensis, into whose published commentary it was rather consistently inserted from the year 1508 on. He accordingly seems to deserve his place to the left of Valerius in the woodcut provided on the title page of the edition of Valerius and Oliverius published at Venice on 24 October 1508 by Bartholomaeus de Zanis. Here he is called only Theophilus, but the edition published at Milan without date by Johannes Jacobus et Fratres, de Lignano, designates him Chalcondyles. It seems probable that this edition, though lacking the twenty-four exempla which were first printed in 1501 and 1503, can be dated [1509–1511]; see Composite Editions.

Like Johannes de Ravenna, who was supposedly commenting on Valerius in Bologna at the age of twenty-one, Theophilus was not quite twenty when his annotations were first published. They occur in distinct blocks and, when shorter, in one or two lines after the corresponding comments of Oliverius. They are duly credited to Theophilus in the margins and only there. Modest in extent as compared with those of Oliverius, they total 188, some of them merely glosses and others much more substantial (Book I has 39; II, 19; III, 30; IV, 25; V, 20; VI, 18; VII, 13; VIII, 10; and IX, 15). The first observation occurs in I 1, 1, the last in IX 14, 2. The comments are mainly historical, but Theophilus often cites variant readings of Valerius from the manuscripts (‘Alii codices habent . . .’; ‘Vetusti codices habent . . .’; ‘Quidam codices habent . . .’). As the son of the better known Demetrius Chalcondyles, a Byzantine who had been educated in Athens, he was eminently equipped in Greek, and he quotes frequently from Greek authors. Family may have operated in another way; it will be remembered (see above, p. 365) that Theodora, daughter of Demetrius, married Aulus Janus Parrhasius and that Theophilus emended the text of Valerius from a manuscript belonging to Parrhasius.

The title pages of the editions published in Milan on 31 October 1508 and 16 and 28 February 1513 speak of a few annotations by an Arcadicus posing as Theophilus. Are we to consider one hundred and eighty-eight a few?

If the name of Theophilus has been removed on only four folios, as reported in the article on Oliverius, were only the annotations on these four folios those of the Arcadicus, and are all others still correctly assigned to Theophilus in the later editions? It is necessary to add that in the Latin transcribed below, the name of Theophilus was indeed removed in later editions from the portion on I 1, 1; his name occurs for the first time in the 1513 edition, which is posthumous, at the bottom of f. IIIa for the annotation on ‘gracco’ (I 1, 3), and the note corresponds to the passage on f. 3b in the edition of 24 October 1508: ‘Gracco, Graccus et ortus sine aspiratione [add. dici debebre, 1508] Varro [De lingua latina quae supersunt. Accedunt grammaticorum Varronis librorum fragmenta, edd. Georgius Goetz et Fridericus Schoeell (Leipzig, 1910), p. 212, **80 (a fragment from De sermone latino)] ait et ortum quidem quod in eo orientur omnia, Graccum vero a gerendo quod eius mater xii mensibus eum gestavit, vel a gracilitate corporis ut quidam [add. vult graccus, 1508], sed consue tudo etGracchos et hortos cum aspiratione usurpavit. Haec [add. olim Ianus (Parrhasius) . . . recitavit, 1508] ex Charisio [Ars grammatica, ed. Carolus Barwick (Leipzig, 1964, ed. stereotypa), p. 103 (82K)].

Commentary. (ed. of Venice, 24 October 1508; the reader is referred to the article on Oliverius Arzignanensis for preliminary relevant material). [Inc.]: Maiores statas (I 1, 1). Non ab re prisci grammatici inter officii sui partes haud ultimam statuerunt positurae rationem, Nicanorque [of Alexandria, 2nd century] in eo genere studi colloquavit, ut inde στιγματίας appellari meruerit. Emendatus enim codex nisi distinctus esse qui potest? Ecce confuso in hoc Valerii capite textu orationis, aut nullus aut certe insulsus exstat sensus. Accepit haec (ut ad rem veniam) Valerius ex Cicerone cuius in ea quam de aruspicum responsis [9.18] inscrispsit oratione verba sunt haec. ‘Ego vero primum habeo auctores ac magistros religionum calendaram maiores nostros, quorum mihi fuisse tanta sapientia vide tur, ut satis superque prudentes sint, qui illorum prudentiam non dicam assequi, sed, quanta fuerit, perspicere possint, qui status solenis-
que ceremionias pontificat, rerum bene gerendarum auctoritates augurio fatorum, veteres praelectiones Apollinis vatum libris, portentorum explanationes Etruscorum disciplina contineri putarunt etc. Ex eis arbitror apparat alter esse distinguenda commata quam comphalicii magistri consueverunt hoc ordine atque sensu. Maiores nostri statas et sollemnes ceremionias pontificum scientia voluerunt explicari, nam tota sacrificingendi ratio a collegio pontificum petebatur, ut discimus ex Cicerone Liviocoe [cf. XXII 9, 11]. Sed auctoritatem rerum bene gerendarum voluerunt explicari observatione augurum, quippe romani publice nisi auspicato nihil incobabant, ut auctor est ipse Tullius. Præaedictiones et Apollinis oracula vatun, id est Sibyllarum vel Martiorum libris. Depulsa vero portentorum, id est procurationes ad avertendas portentorurn minias Etrusca disciplina explicari voluerunt. Prisco etiam instituto, id est veteri sacrorum consuetudine impartiito sacrificium cum solemni ritu Rebus divinis opera datur, quando prectione aliquid est commendandum, quom est exspescentium voto, quom exolvendum gratulatione, quom inquirendum vel extis vel sortibus, repetendum semper est prisco instituto rebus divinis opera datur per singula commata, sicut illud, explicari voluerunt in superioribus. Haec est elegans et vera Georgii Merulae exposition, quam Doninus [I have not identified Doninus; Juliana Cotton Hill, Name-List from 'A Medical Register of the Italian Renaissance, 1350–1550' (Oxford, 1976), 42 lists a Jacobus de Doninis, of Caneto, Brescia (fl. 1456). Our Doninus is young in 1508, and Antonius Lenas on f. IIa-b of the edition published in Milan by Leonardus Vegius on 16 and 28 February 1513 provides further information: 'Quae ex Donino iuvene vere docto didicisse cum fatetur mentitut audacissime. Conicimus id ex eo quod Georgius (Merula) ut Minutianus dixit pro impartio impetrato legebatur. . . . Neque verum peragendum cancellabat. Sed Minutianus praeproceptor meus, tanquam substititium tollendum censuit, quod sensui prorsus non conveniat. Ubi foedissimus plagiarius induci pro deleri posuit deceptus a (Philippo) Beraldo. . . . Neque iurisconsulti verba stant pro Beraldo quem minime intellexisse Minutia-
nus dum illum discipulus locum expositus luce clarius comprobavit. Tum egregius hic artifex ut nonnullos qui Georgii memoriae adhuc recentem in animis hæbant sibi conciliiaret non ut talem virum laudaret quem semper velicat et lacerat] eruditus admodum iuvenis eius audior excepit et mecum communicavit. Is affirmabat Merulam iussisse induci verbum peragendum, quia sensum destrueret. Aliqua Codrus Urceus [see above, p. 366] et Raphaël Regius [see above p. 366] ad hanc rem produiderunt sed utroque prior ut accepi Merulam promulgarat, et si præventus est editione non propterea sua laude fraudari debet . . . / . . . [Exp.]: Milasium (IX 14, ext. 2). Vetusti codices habent Mylasenum, gentiliter a Mylasis Asiae civitate, de qua Strabo (Geographia XIV 2.22), Tullius in Antonianis (Philippicae V 7.20 and VI 5.13) et Stephanus (Byzantius, s. v. Μύλασσα). Cyniciorurn. Placet ut legas gymniciorum, nam sequitur 'stramenta gymnasiae colligenti.'

Editions:


Biography:

Details of the short life of Theophilus are few, especially in contrast to the wealth of
information on his father Demetrius, who as recently as 1976 (New Haven) was the subject of an entire chapter, pages 231–264, in D. J. Geanakoplos, Interaction of the “Sibling” Byzantine and Western Cultures. Theophilus, according to the ‘Actes de naissance’ written by his father in Parisinus graecus 2023 and transcribed by Legrand, was born in Florence on 5 November 1486, the second of ten children after his sister Theodora, who married Parrhasius. His education at the hands of his father and of Janus Lascaris was thorough and classical. Parrhasius, in a passage quoted by Legrand, speaks of him with enthusiasm as one who revealed ‘tantum probitatis, eruditionis, ingenii, studii, memoriae’ that ‘brevissimi spatio omnia vitae munera peregisse videretur.’ Legrand quotes also from Paulus Jovius, ‘qui ne laisse jamais échapper l’occasion de dénigrer les Grecs’ but who did reproduce the verses of sympathy inscribed to the father by an unknown poet probably on the death of Theophilus, ‘Vivens corona nobilis juventutis/circundabaris undequeque, Demetri-/dum ostenderes iter per Atticos campos./ Certe beatus, si obtigisset morienti/ doctam videre tibi superstitem prolem,/ oculumque claudi languidum a tuis natis,/ aut hoc sepulcrem lacrima illorum spargi.’ Parrhasius, Jovius, and Joannes Pierius Valerianus all comment on his tragic death in 1511, which earned him a place in the De literatorum infelicitate libri duo of Valerianus; in Pavia to prosecute his studies, he was murdered as he returned home after a dinner with friends.

Works:
Theophilus worked on Homer as well as Valerius Maximus.


18. JOHANNES SULPICIUS VERULANUS

A sixteenth-century manuscript at Oxford preserves to us, but only as far as Book II 4, 5, the commentary of Johannes Sulpicius Verulanus. Its presence in England is not explained; Sulpicius did have at least one English student in Rome, but the time was close to the last decade of the fifteenth century, and these do not appear to be a student’s notes. The commentary may, in fact, have been written even before he transferred to Rome. It is distinctly not the strictly grammatical commentary which might have been expected of a grammarian; beginning with a customary paragraph on famous Romans bearing the nomen Valerius, it echoes Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri and other commentators who say that Valerius used the prologue as a device to win the good will of the reader, and it provides frequent references to the texts of ancient authors. It breaks off in the very passage (II 4, 5) which Sulpicius uses in his introductory paragraph.


Commentary [Inc.]: Urbis Romae (I Proemium) In hoc prologo primum attentes dociles et benevolos reddit auditores Valerius, inde confutat quod objici posset, postea Tiberium more poetico invocans laudat et unde se cepturnus ostendit miroque artificio modi [sic] proponit cepyque sui consilium aperit. Ac Tiberio assentando suum invocationis officium ab auctoritate confirmat nec minus ora-
torias quam poeticas leges exequitur. *Urbs Romeae* quia magna et electa pulcherrimaque pollicetur nos facit attinentos, dociles vero quia breviter totius operis summam exponit ac quia in nostrum usum scripsisse se dicit benivolentes captat, ordo autem et sensus hic est . . . De observantia religionis capitum primum (1 1, 1) Anaxagoras ille qui hominem solis et caeli gratia genitum esse inquit [as first editor of Vitruvius, Sulpicius is perhaps recalling the passage in *De architectorum*, VIII praef. I which reads: 'De septem sapientibus Thales Milesius omnium rerum principium aquam est professus, Heraclitus ignem, Magorum sacerdotes aquam et ignem, Euripides auditor Anaxagorae, quem philosophum Athenienses scaci cum appellaverunt, aera et terram eamque et caelestium imbrium conceptionibus insinuam tes genus et omni animalium in mundo procreavisse . . .'] quamquam ab aliquo reprehenditur tamen mihi videtur id sensisse, quod praeicipuum esse debebet officium hominis contemplari divinitatiem religionemque colere, sine qua bene institutus nemo quem esse potest. Nam si nati ad justitiam sumus ut Cicero et omnes philosophi admoent primum eius munus quod est religio obire debemus . . . / . . . [Expl.]: Religiosi quoque dies erant nefasti et infausti dicuntur. Observantia est veneration et honoris exibitio observatio animadversion et annotatio. *Majoris* (1 1, 1) Sumpsit hunc locum Valerius ex ea Cicero nis oratione quae est Pro domo sua [the reference is to Cicero's *De haruspicum responsis in P. Clodium*, 9, 18] ubi sic inquit, 'Ego vero habeo auctores ac magistros religionum colendarum maiores nostros, quorum mihi tanta fuisse sapientia videtur, ut sitis superque prudentes sint, qui illorum prudentiam ne dicam assequi, sed, quanta fuerit, respicere possint, qui statas sollemnesque caeremonias pontificatu, rerum bene gestarum auctoritate, augurio fatorum, veteri praedictione Apollinis, portentorum explanatione Etruscorum disciplina contineri putaverunt.' Valerii autem sensus hic est *Constituere maiores nostri* ut sollemnia atque ordinaria sacrificia fierent ob aliquam harum vii causarum vel quia ita pontifices iuberent vel ut res bene ac feliciter propitiatis diis agerentur aut gestae essent vel quia au


**Manuscript:**

(photo.) Oxford, Bodleian Library, Add. A. 117, s. XVI. Books I-II 4, 5 only. (Madan V OXford, 1905), 554, no. 29076).

**Biography:**

Johannes Sulpicius Verulus (Johannes Sulpicius of Veroli, Giovanni Sulpicio da Veroli) was a grammarian and teacher at Rome in the second half of the fifteenth century. Cosenza gives the birth date 1475, which is not possible; Parks gives the death date 1491. He taught first in his native city, from 1472 at the University of Perugia, possibly then in Urbino, and finally in Rome. The grammarian William Lily (1468?–1522), later the first high-master of St. Paul’s School in London, who registered together with Thomas Linacre (1460?–1524) in November 1490 at the English Hospice in Rome, studied with Sulpicius and Julius Pomponius Laetus (CTC I 238, 317 373–383); the *De constructionis figuris* of Sulpicius was sometimes published with Erasmus’s revision of Lily’s *Libellus de constructione octo partium orationis*. Sulpicius dedicated his commentary on Lucan to Antoniotto Cardinal Pallavicini and his edition of Vitruvius to Raffaele Cardinal Riario. His *Grammatica* was sometimes published with the *Carmen de figuris* of Antonius Mancinellus (on whose commentary see below). He nurtured
a vivid interest in the ancient theater, worked with Cardinal Riario in reviving it, trained his students in it, and presented its plays in his own house and in Rome’s piazzas; Campo dei Fiori, for example, was the setting for a performance of the Younger Seneca’s Phaedra.

Works:
Sulpicius wrote commentaries on Lucan, Quintilian, and Vegetius, edited Frontinus and Vitruvius, and was the author of Grammatice, De componendis et ornandis epistolis, De versuum scansione, and De syllabarum quantitate. By far his most popular work, which went into numerous editions and translations, was a handbook in verse on work on table manners for boys; it was entitled De moribus in mensa servandis libellus or De moribus puerorum carmen iuvenile and is commonly cited as Stans puér ad mansam. It was highly praised by Jodocus Badius Ascensius (see below, p. 383).

Bibli.: Chevalier II, 4350; Cosenza IV, 3348–3350, V, 1722, Fabricius, BLMA VI, 510; Tiaroboschi (Milano, 1833–1836), XVII, 94.


19. ANTONIUS MANCINELLIUS (Not Found)

Rinaldo Fulini in ‘Documenti per servire alla storia della tipografia veneziana,’ Archivio veneto XXIII (1882), 139, published a document from the Archivio di Stato, Venice, Notatorio del Collegio, according to which on 9 January 1500 Johannes Tacuinus de Trodino was granted a privilege to publish several authors including ‘tutte le opere di Antonio Mancinello, con un nuovo commento su Valerio Massimo.’ Fulini was unsuccessful in finding this commentary, and to my knowledge it has not been found since. It is not included in Giuseppe Clerici’s bibliography of the productions of this printer (‘Catalogo delle edizioni di tipografi di Trino nei secolo XV e XVI,’ Giornale delle biblioteche, III–IV [1869–1870], beginning for Tacuinus in III, 157, in the year 1492, and running in sixteen installments into the next volume and to the year 1539), and the edition of the so-called Omnium opera published at Venice in 1502 by this printer is simply a reprint of earlier editions and does not contain it. Mancinellus seems to have mentioned it himself in the ‘Sylva’ of his life, an autobiography in elegiac verse which was reprinted by Meuschen; see the lines on page 44, ‘Lexicon: Emporium: diversa epigrammata: persi/Solini, Aeneidus, glossaque fit Valeri.’ His opinion, indeed, of the editions of Tacuinus, whom he termed ‘linguae latinae extimum,’ was not high; see Apostolo Zeno, Dissertazioni vossiane, II (Venezia, 1753), 363, who mentions on the same page the funeral oration which Mancinellus composed in memory of Ermolao Bar-
baro. For Barbaro’s relation to the text of Valerius see above s. Oliverius Arzignanensis.

It is of a certain interest that some editions of the Grammatice of Johannes Sulpicius Verulanus contained also the De figuris opusculum of Donatus and the Carmen de figuris of Mancinellus.

**Biography:**

See CTC I, 230.


**20. Claudius Massiotus, Praepositus**

This selective and incomplete commentary by a monk of Clairvaux is preserved in one manuscript which seems to postdate the edition of Valerius with which it is bound and to belong to the early sixteenth century. For information on it I would express my gratitude to Mlle. Françoise Bibolet of the Bibliothèque Municipale, Troyes, to Jean-Marie Arnoult of the Centre de Conservation du Livre, Bibliothèque Nationale, and to Jean-François Genest of the Section of Codicologie, Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

The commentary is without dedication. An introduction, straightforward and orderly, discusses methods (this commentator, like the bee, selectis), history, the development of historiography, the difference between annals and history. It is followed by the usual jejune Vita of Valerius; the commentator then proceeds, again in straightforward fashion and fluent Latin, to the commentary itself. He knew earlier commentators, and among authors he cites Aesop, Herodotus, Thucydides, M. Porcius Cato, Q. Fabius Pictor, Polybius, L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi, Cicero, Vergil, Horace, Livy, Lucan, Tacitus, Suetonius, Eusebius, and, from a period close to his own, Marcus Antonius Coccio, called Sabellicus. The commentary stops abruptly at the end of a folio in Book III 3, ext.3.

**Introduction** (Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS. 2592). [Inc.]: Prefatio in commentarios super libros Valerii Maximi factorum ac dictorum memorabilium. [M]irari poterunt qui hos meos conscissos truncos ac mutilos in Valerii Maximi cum iucundam tum utilem historiam commentarios lecturi sunt cur in eorumdone prossequione tam multa exempla inexplicata praetervelare decreverim et non magis perpetuum historiae seriem inoffenso cursu sectari, praesertim cum in hoc veluti exemplorum omnium confertissimo promptuario nihil congestum sit (si compilatori creditur) quod non memoratu dignum sit. Quorum ego perplexe dubitatioum inter interim satisfaciam, fateor et quidem ingenue nihil superflu retinere divinum hoc opus; nihilominus habendamuisse rationem personarum quibus praedictum hoc opus interpretari debui. Quia enim religiosis circa divinum officium tam nocturnum quam diurnum legitime occupatim palam est negari otium, ut suis lectionibus (quas rei divinae haud fas est anteponi) diutius vacare possint, facturum me opera prae- tium arbitratus sum si per singula librorum capita saltuatis discurrens paucu aliqua (qua videbuntr illustroria) exempla de singulis seligerem. . . . Et itaque historia secundum quod communiter diffinitur rerum gestarum expositio vel demonstratio a greco verbo historiae quod video significat vel cognosco, quod verbum quia significat etiam inquirro interrogo disputo narro, ictus generalius diffinitur historia ut dicatur esse quicquid vere et graviter explicatur. Cuius quidem historiculae tale extat apud Ciceronem 2.0. De oratore [II 9, 36] eulogium, ‘Est,’ inquit, ‘historia testis temporum, lex veritatis, vita memoriae, magistra vitae, nuntia vetustatis.’ De inventione historiciae certamen est inter scriptores quibusdam dicentibus Cadmum Milestimus alius vero Phe- rescidem [Pherecydem] inventorem fuisse, ad [at] si Eusebio [Chronica, prae].; see Migne,
VALERIUS MAXIMUS

P. L. XXVII (Parisiis, 1846), 39–41 and P. G. XIX (1857), 103 fides adhibenda est primus historiae scriptorum fuit Moses, quem constat multo tempore ante bellum Trojanumuisse. Quod si de his queras qui primitus historiam in suo ornatu atque artificio erexere puto Thucydidem atque Herodotum inter primos haberi, nam Pherecides et Cadmus magis annalium scriptores dici debent quam historiarum, quoniam monumenta solum rerum et temporae sine ullo ornatu conscriperunt quem-admodum apud Latinos Cato, Pictor et Piso... Differtur [differt] historia ab annalibus sicut genus a specie. Nam annales sunt genus, historia ut species. In hoc autem convenient quod in utrisque rerum gestarum expositio continetur. Differunt tamen quod historia quo consilio quae ratione res gestae sunt demonstrat exercitationes variis affectus habens audito merque commovens. Annales sunt libri id quod factum quoque anno gestumve sit continentem simpliciter et sine ullo ornamento sive fuoco [fuoco] sive affectibus ex quibus conficiantur historiae... [Expl.]: Historia ad fidem quadrifariam dividitur, aut enim tractat de locis ut est geographia aut de temporibus ut cronice aut de generationibus ut genealogia aut de gestis ut annales historiae. De Vita Valerii. [Inc.]: Valerii Maximus a patricio genere originem ducentis ineunte adolescencia militavit sub Sexto Pompeio... [Ex.]: quod eius mater a familia Fabiorum qui senatus decreto maximi dicti sunt originem duxit.

Sancta.


men quia multa legimus ut contemnamus multa etiam ut imitemur ego lectionem hanc Christianis auribus non indignam puto. . . . [Expl.]: propter quod hic habeant quod contemnamus falsam antiquorum superstitionem, hic etiam quod imitemur eorundem scilicet circa deorum cultu [cultum] diligentiam quia nihil praetermittere voluerunt quod ad suam religionem pertinent creditur. Maiores (I 1, 1) Bene maiorum id est antiquorum institutis ac moribus religionis cultum conformari vult quoniam integriores semper fuerunt antiquorum mores. Hinc Apollo Pythius ab Atheniensiibus consultus quas potissimum religions tenerent, "eas," inquit, "quae essent in more maiorum." Hoc Cicero in libris de Legibus [II, 16, 40] Feria Feriarum quaedam sunt statiae sive stativae quae constitutis diebus fiebant ab universo populo, aliae conceptivae quae quotannis magistratibus vel sacerdotibus concipiebantur tam certis quam incertis diebus, aliae imperativae quae a consulis vel praesidibus pro arbitrio imperabantur. Aliae erant solemnes quae singulius annis anniversario sacrificio celebratur agebantur. . . . [Expl.]: (III 3, ext. 3) sub Clearcho tyranno Lacedaemoniorum ista omnia tormenta passus. Nam alius Zeno qui senior dicitur Stoicorum princeps integer et incolinus ad nonagesimum aetatis annum pervenit qui [text breaks off].

Manuscript:

(photo.) Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS. 2592 (bound with 'Inc.' 489), 47 ff., s. XVI. It breaks off abruptly in Book III, 3 ext. 3 at the end of f. 47v. The edition of Valerius Maximus with which it is bound carries on its first title page the information 'Prostat in Dionysiana Roce librarina in vico Sancti Jacobi in intersignio divi Martini' and on a second, 'Prostat in Gormontiana librarisa Eregione collegii Coqueretici ad intersignium gerninarum Cippurarum.' M. Arnoult would date the edition between 1510 and 1516; Brigitte Moreau. Inventaire chronologique des éditions parisiennes du XVIe siècle. II (Paris, 1977) n° 1499 assigns [circa 1516]. It is probable that the MS. postdates the edition. The binding of the volume, according to M. Genest's colleague Mme. Denise Gid, is original and was provided by Macé Panthoul, binder at Troyes at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century. (Cat. Gén. Fr. Dept. Octavo, XLIII [1904] 503).

Biography:

Claudius Massiotius, Praepositus, flourished in France in the first part of the sixteenth century. His interest in Valerius Maximus is demonstrated not only by this commentary but also by the fact that he owned the edition of the text of Valerius with which the commentary is bound. Notations in his hand on the first title page state the he was the third 'Claudius de Parrhisius' and give the surname Prévost. Frequent notes in the same hand appear in the printed text, the front endpaper carries the verses 'Inveniat si quis praesentem forte libellum/ Hunc rursus dominum sinat adire suum/ Et si forte velit proprium cognoscere nomen/ Claudius est dictus nomine Massiotus/ Praepositus,' and the back endpaper the lines 'Liber loquitur./ Claudius est cuius ego nunc sum iure secundus/ Massiot illustri cognomine recte vocatus/ Parrhisii natura in Clara Valle coronam/ Gestat. Bernardi nunc factus servulus almi/ Inspice signa tibi hoc monstrant manalia verum.'

He was accordingly Claudius Massiotius or Praepositus (Prévost), he was born in Paris, and he was a monk of the Cistercian abbey of Clairvaux. Since he was clearly Parisian, and since he was active in the early years of the sixteenth century, it does not seem that he can be equated with either the Claude Pré-

vost of Bourges whose several carmina celebrating the role of Charles IX in the civil wars appeared in that city in 1568 and 1569 or the Claude Prévost of Cahors whose Commentarius de magistratibus populi romani ex variis authoribus collectus... was published...
posthumously at Lausanne in 1579.

M. Genest informs me that he was not yet at Clairvaux in 1472, since he does not figure in the inventory of Pierre de Virey (Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS. 2299), which lists liturgical books at Clairvaux with names of their owners (André Vernet, *La bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Clairvaux du XIe au XVIIe siècle*, I, *Catalogues et répertoires*, publiés par A. V. avec la collaboration de Jean-François Genest [Paris, 1979]). Four other volumes at Troyes, according to M. Genest, carry his inscription of ownership and bear witness to his liturgical and more general interests. These are: 1) Inc. 278, Nicolaus de Lyra, *Postilla super Psalterium*, n. p., n. pr., 1487; 2) Inc. 494, Alexander de Villa Dei, *Doctrinale* (Comm.: Facinus Tiberia) [Paris, Ulric Ger- ing], n.d.; 3) a miscellany containing a) Sciences et Arts 898, Baptista Mantuanus, *De vita beata*, sine nota [Deventer, Richardus Pafraet, about 1495, Goff B-96?]; b) Inc. 501, Johannes Trithemius, *Oratio de vera conversione mentis ad Deum*, n. p., n. pr., 30 August 1500, Hain 15638 (Goff T-450 has [Mainz: Peter von Friedberg, after 20 Nov. 1500], HC 15638), c) Inc. 502, Petrus de Osoma, *Commentaria in symbolum Quinque vult*, Paris, Pierre Levet [about 1490], HC 12120, Goff O-116; 4) a miscellany containing a) Inc. 519, *Liber hymnorum*, sine nota, b) Inc. 520, *Stella clericorum*, sine nota, c) Inc. 521, Hugo de Sancto Caro, *Speculum ecclesiae*, d) Inc. 522, Johannes Gerson, *Opus tripartitum* [French], Paris, Pierre Levet, 26 July 1486, Pellechet 5199. In these the surname Prévost, not Massiotus, appears.

21. JODOCUS BADIUS ASCENSIIUS

The commentary of Jodocus Badius Ascensius is dedicated to Germain de Ganay (d. 1520), *conseiller du roy*, bishop of Cahors in 1509, and bishop of Orléans in 1514. In his dedicatory letter dated 5 June 1510 the author gives due credit to Oliverius Arzignanensis, on whose commentary his own is based; that commentary he has abridged for easier reading and wider diffusion. Appearing first from his own press on 29 April–5 June, his commentary accompanies in this and later editions that of Oliverius and the text of Valerius, and the entire work is preceded, after the title page and the dedicatory letter on its verso, by an alphabetical index of subjects of Valerius, an alphabetical index of chapter headings, and an index in series of chapter headings.

*Dedication* (ed. of Paris, 1510). Germano de Ganaio amplissimorum honorum decori praecipuo Iodocus Badius Ascensius observantiam. [Inc.]: Valerii Maximi multigam, et ut in fronte pollicetur, cum primis memoratu dignorum collectaneam historiam, ab Oliverio Arzignanensi non oscitanter praesertim congruentium historiarum citatione declara- tam, propteram succincta facilique commen- tatione expositionum, Germane splendissimse, quod talem intelleximus desideratam ab ipsis qui altioribus studiis occupatis neque prolixio- reum temere velint, neque difficiliorem (saltem prima lectione) capere possint, simulque ut in claustris pagisque ac oppidulis ab litterario gymnasio seiiuncti habeant quo situm suam sedent si non expleant. Omnes enim tam rudi quam cultiore litteratura praediti variarum rerum cognitione ne semper pueri maneant capiuntur, quam utrum quispiam ubernius com- modiusse ac Valerius noster praestet, affirmare non ausim, siquidem omnium fere et tempo- rum et nationum dicta ac facta tam probanda quam improbando historico filo contexut. Quorum cognitio Christianae pietatis culto- ribus praeter cetera hoc affert boni, quod dum etnicorum, quibus vanum erat ante lucem surgere, animos tam propensos aut in super- stitionem aut in non usquequaque veram religionem videmus, erubescimus tanto et tam altum exorto sole tam oscitanter stertere. Scili- licet illi Voconiae vel Aionis voce aut moniti aut moneri visi, templo arasque erexerint, et nos viva Redemptoris nostri quid dicam praedicatio vocati, immo et morte pretiosissima restituti tam torpentes obscurdescemus, ut nulla religionem excitemur? Illi nihil magni non captis prius auspiciis inchoaverint, et nos quid dicam inconsiderati aut temerarii, immo scel- lestissimi contra apertissima Dei mandata in nefas prouerimus? Illa praeterea pro male persua- suasa religione aut inani gloriora vitam pro- fuderint, et nos animas impedere vero for- midabimus? Illi denique omne virtutum genus
vel vitae pretio emerint, et nos ne voluptati-
bus prinem virtutem omnem flocci pende-
mus? Quin etiam, integer lector, dum aucto-
rem ipsum saeculi sui errore in devia abduct-
tum videbit, ut quando domum Caesarem
nimia prosequitur palpitazione, aut sibi necem
conscisciendi approbat meticulosam (ut vere
cum divino Augustino [cf. De civitate Dei,
XIX 4, 4] dixer)) fortitudinem, aut obscenis-
simam nescio quo pallio tegit turpitudinem,
continuo gratias aget lumini per quod eius
hallucinationem et interdum caecitatem per-
spekerit. Hunc igitur auctorem paucus ex-
planavimus, grammaticas nugellas consulto praec-
tergressi, quod in eo veteranorum potius quam
riterum iudicavimus palaestrum, quippe in
qua non verborum velitationem, sed gravem
sentientiarum (qua animos penetrent) confic-
tationem perspeximus. Quam luxuratiuncu-
lam, Gaiaea, praesidium nostrum dulcissimum
et deus amplissimum, quoniam tuo faustis-
simo suffragio regia maisetis sic respekt ut
privilegio et gratia in fronte praefixis eam
dignata sit, tuae praestantiae ita devovemus,
ut quicumque ea sese adiutos noscent, plus
ou se auspicio quam nostro debere fateantur
conatui. Vale. Ex officina nostra chalcogra-
pha ad Nonas Iunias. M.D.X.

Commentary: [Inc.]: Iodoci Badii Ascensii
familiaris Valerii Maximi expositio. Urbis
Romae (I Proemium). More oratorio quo
ordine rem prosecutur est proposit. Deinde
invetato sui temporis errore invocat non
Deum ipsum patrem luminum unde omne
datum et omne donum perfectum est descen-
dens, sed Tiberium Caesarem, quem recepto
iam tum consensu in divorum parasascit,
quem quidem errorem Laurentium Valla
[cf. Elegantiarum Latinae linguae libri sex,
IV 70] ut acri vir est ingenio acerbe satis de-
testatur. Postremo loco proposita exsequitur
ut suis locis declarabimus. In propositione
redit lectorem ex ordine rerum quo prius
domestica quam extera se scripturum dicit
docilum, ex difficultate suscipi negotii atten-
tum, et ex utilitate et brevitate benivolum,
simulque brevitatem ne vitio detur purgat, ut
cum ordine latius aperiemus quem ab ultima
primae periodi parte auspicabimus, quia fere
in construendo et resolvendo contrarius est
ordo, ut quae hic ultima fuerint, sint illic fere
prima. Ordo igitur est, constitut, id est maturo
consensu et praevia deliberatione statui, dele-
gere, id est de multis legere et decerpere, facta
simul ac dicta urbis Romae et gentium ex-
terarum, id est aliarum nationum extra civi-
tatem Romanam, digna memoratu, id est quae
memorentur, hoc est, recitentur et ad memo-
riam reducantur. Notum est Valla auctore
[Elegantiarum . . . libri sex, IV 20] omnes
urbes oppida posse duci praetor Romam quae
tantum urbs dicitur, usque adeo ut si per se
ponatur urbs Roma intelligatur, quo circa poss-
sit superflua videri apposito, nam satis esset
urbs exterrarumque gentium, verum quia digni-
nitas quaedam ex nobilitate rerum gestarum
accredit Romae, noluit id nomen praetermit-
tere, unde autem Romana dicta sit an ab Romulo
an ab Ruma an ab poiiH in alius auctoribus
ubi plus sermonis quam morum elegantiam
venamur disquirendum censeo. Bene autem
praeponit facta utpo in quibus plus est pon-
deris, et quae plus ad imitantum invitant quam
dicta. Et re vera Romani prius praeclare facere
quam dicere cooperunt, quae scilicet facta et
dicta sunt diffusa. Apud alios, scilicet auctores
seu scriptores, latius, id est extensius et diffu-
sius, quam ut (elegans sermo dici posset etiam
quam quae in eadem elegantia et sententia)
possint cognosci breviir, ut modo cognosci
poterunt, constitui inquit ea deligere, electa,
id est excerpta cum iudicio, ab auctoribus
illustribus, id est claris, nihil ergo triviale aut
protritum adducetur, ideo autem constituit ut
labor longae inquisitionis absit. Volentibus,
id est iis qui volent aut voluerint (credore autem
volentibus dativum esse communem, nam ab-
lativum termini a quo regit ut absun domo
ece, sumere, id est capere per se, documenta,
id est exempla et monumenta quibus monean-
tur quid in faciendo aut dicendo et imitari et
devitare debeant, qui maximus est legendae
historiae fructus, unde Livius in praefatione,
Hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum
salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli docu-
menta in illustri posita monumento intueri,
unde tibi tuaque reipublicae quod imitere
capias, unde foedum inceptu foedumque exitu
quod vites’ etc. Nec (ne forte prolixitate de-
terrearis) cupido, id est cupiditas, complec-
credularum scilicet gentium et civitatum paene totius Orientis, coegit dico impendere iusto supplicio caput, scilicet illius, imminens, id est inhians, demeter, id est cum dementia quadam, imperio, scilicet quod Ariarates obtinerat. Et haec in Valerium.

Editions:
1510, 29 April–5 June. See Composite Editions.
1512. See Composite Editions.
1513, 16 and 28 February. See Composite Editions.
1513, 5 March. See Composite Editions.
1513, 20 August. See Composite Editions.
1513, 30 December. See Composite Editions.
1517, 24 March. See Composite Editions.
1517, 28 March. See Composite Editions.
1518, 6 February. See Composite Editions.
1518, 20 May. See Composite Editions.
1522, Mediolani. See Composite Editions.
1523. See Composite Editions.
1531. See Composite Editions.
1535. See Composite Editions.
1536. See Composite Editions.
1541. See Composite Editions.
1546. See Composite Editions.
1547. See Composite Editions.
1548. See Composite Editions.
1558. See Composite Editions.
1565. See Composite Editions.
1568. See Composite Editions.
1569. See Composite Editions.
1575. See Composite Editions.
1588. See Composite Editions.
1590. See Composite Editions.
1598. See Composite Editions.
1608, Venetiis. See Composite Editions.

Biography:
Add to the bibliography: Marjorie Alkins


22. MICHAEL MACKIUS

The contribution of Michael Mackius has been transferred here from the Fortuna in the hope that greater visibility will call forth some information on his life; we know only, from the title, that he was ‘doctissimus magister’ and that his remarks on Valerius date from October 1535. The manuscript came to the Vatican from Heidelberg in 1623, and he may have been a native of the Palatinate. It is a miscellany, in parchment and paper and of various dates, mainly of ecclesiastical texts; Mackius, on paper, comes last in the small volume and bears on its title page the nota-
tions C.81/556, 833, ‘Ioannes Cron me pos-
sidet,’ ‘Nec facile mutabo dominum’ (sad and
ironic in the light of subsequent events), and
‘Fortuna ubique dominatur.’

The annotations break off in Book II 9,
pref. But even before then Mackius had fal-
tered. His comments, almost entirely histori-
cal and with documentation provided after
each, run with regularity through I 1, ext. 4,
at which point, in place of the missing exam-
ple, he sets down a few scattered exempla
from Paris and then jumps to II 8, 2, II 8, 7,
and II 9, pref. The numbering in some cases
differs from that in a modern text. His docu-
mentation is precise by book and chapter,
copious with several references often for one
exemplum, and of much interest. Among
the ancient writers he knew, whether at first hand
or not, Diodorus Siculus, Cicero in several
works, Vergil, Livy, Ovid, Strabo, Fenestella
(!), Pomponius Mela, Lucan, Pliny the Elder,
Josephus, Frontinus, Appian, Plutarch, Juve-
nal, Suetonius, Gallius, Florus, Lucian, Sol-
inus, Diogenes Laertius, Lactantius, Macro-
bius, and Orosius, and among writers closer
to his own day, Boccaccio, Flavio Biondo,
Politian, Pomponio Leto, Raffaele Maffei
Volterrano, and Guillaume Budé (still living
in October 1535). This is a goodly company,
and we should like to know more about
Mackius himself beyond the facts that he had
an excellent education and that he was ‘doc-
tissimus magister.’

Commentary. Annotationes in Valerium
Maximum adiectae a doctissimo magistro
Michaele Mackio anno MDXXXV mense
Octobri. [A brief Vita follows, and then] In
prologum annotationes [I transcribe these
entire] Nam si prisci oratores ab iove optimo
maximo (I Prooemium) Jupiter a veteribus
Romanis optimus maximus vocatus est, quod
magnitudine et potentia caeteros excedat deos
et quod ipse solus summum sit bonum, in
cuius tutela omnium salus. Boccaccius libro
2 capitulo 2. Cicero in oratione contra Clidium
et libro 3 de finibus honorum et malorum.
Paterno avioque sideri per videtur. Augustus
qui fuit pater adoptivus Tiberii, post obi-
tum Iulii Caesaris ludos Veneri instituit, tum
sidus per septic dies ad horam XI apparuisse
fertur, unde divinitatem patris colligebat. Post
mortem vero Augusti cum in campo Martio
crematus esset vir praetorius effigiem cremati
Augusti in coelum euntem vidisse iuravit. Plinius
libro 2 capitulo 25 et Suetonius in vita
Iulii Caesaris et Augusti. In caput primum
libri primi. Titulus de cultu deorum id est
religione. [Inc.]: (I 1, 1) Religio est vis insita,
qua deorum metu et ceremoniis hominum
ducit. Differt a superstitione quia religio est
verus, superstition, falsus dei cultus. Cicero
libro 2 De natura deorum. Statas solemnesque
ceremonias. Ceremoniae sunt consuetudines
quaedam religionis longo usu confirmatae . . .
/ . . . [Expl.]: Caput quartum de censoria nota.
(II 9, pref.) De censoria potestate. Vide Li-
vium libro quarto decadis prime, Plinium
libro 18 capitulo 3 et 6, Plutarchum in Catone,
Gellium libro 4 capitulo 12 et capitulo 20, item
libro 7 capitulo 22, Budaem in Annotationi-
bus [in quattuor viginti] Pandectarum [libros],
Blondum libro 3 de triumphante Roma,
Fenestella capitulo 17 et Pompeion Laetum
de magistratibus Romanis capitulo 21. Nam
ut opes populi romani. Collatio rei militaris
et censurea [text breaks off].

Manuscript:
(photo.) Vaticano, Città del, Palatinus lati-
nus 863, ff. 128r–148r, an. 1535, breaking
off in II 9, pref. (Stevenson I, 307, Kristeller,
Iter, II, 391). I saw this manuscript before I
knew that Mackius would be included here as
a commentator.

Biography:
See above p. 386.

23. Henricus Loritus Glareanus

The polymath Henricus Loritus Glareanus
wrote in 1550 at Freiburg im Breisgau the
dedicationary letter to his annotations on Val-
rius, which he refused to term a commentary.
It was addressed to Jodocus a Meggen of Lu-
cerne, last of his line, who under Pope Paul
III reestablished in 1548 the elite corps of
Swiss Guards and continued as its captain
under Julius III; he had traveled in Turkey,
Palestine, and Persia, was said to be very well
versed in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, Ital-
ian, Spanish, and Slavic, collected coins and
antiquities, and was possessed of a profound culture in literary matters. In the 1577 edition the text of Valerius is preceded by the 'Sermo de virtute in Valerium Maximum' of Antonius Urceus, surnamed Codrus (see above p. 366) and is followed by 'Exempla christiana multifaria insignium dictorum et factorum in usum christianae iuventutis,' a precursor of the similar work by Balthasar Exner, by the 'Annotationes' of Loritus which are provided with a separate title page and pagination (115 octavo pages), and by a helpful list, with translation, of Greek words occurring in Valerius. The dedicatory letter of and the introduction to what is really a selective commentary speak for themselves. The commentary selects passages from all nine books to the number of 205; of these 55 occur in Book I alone, and the remaining books are shortchanged to totals of only 28, 23, 18, 17, 16, 14, 17, and 17 respectively. The author speaks of using manuscripts, mentions the Aldine codex, and cites the commentaries and work of Oliverius, Aulus Janus Parrhasius, and Jodocus Badius Ascensius. His annotations deal mainly with grammatical points and historical matters and give many references to authors writing before and after Valerius. There was an edition at Leiden, with other commentaries, as late as 1726.

Loritus is frank and honest in maintaining that the 'Annotationes' are not a commentary, 'Non enim commentarium, ut ante diximus, sed difficilium ac corruptum locorum annotationes scribimus' (no. 143) and 'Multa huismodi dissimulam, ne qui annotationes promiserim, me scripturum commentarium proder videar' (no. 172); in admitting the fact when he cannot help. 'Ego quid addam quod placeat, non habeo' (no. 2) and 'Sed locus est corruptus, quem ego nunc sanare non possum' (no. 69) and in leaving the final decision on a point to the reader, 'Lector quod volet, sequatur' (no. 41), 'Mihi sane hae expositiones non satis facient, neque tamen habeo aliam, ideo locum inexplicatum lectori relinquere satius est visum' (no. 56), 'Lector ipse apud authores attendat utrum rectius fuerit. Nam de mea opinione facile concedam in alterius melius sententiam' (no. 119), 'Quare hoc lectori iudicandum relinquam' (no. 123), 'Iudicium sit penes lectorem' (no. 152), and 'Lector quid sequendum sit, dispiciat' (no. 187); in recognizing textual corruptions and the inability of commentators to correct them, 'Post haec verba in plerisque codicibus sequitur caput de neglecta religione, sed in magis emendatis tria hic desunt exempla observatae religionis, quae ad hoc addentur caput de cultu deorum' (no. 15), 'Hic locus haud dubie corruptus est, nec a commentatoribus intellectus' (no. 41), 'Quid dicam candido Lector? Nam libet tecum nunc loqui; tanta author in tot doctorum virorum manibus hodie versatus, a nullo scriptore non citatus, ita corrupte legitur. Non dubito calumnium quorundam me subitum, quod quaedam liberiorum cum in authorem ipsum, tum multo magis in codicem depravatum dixerim. Authorem excusat Romanorum scriptorum negligentiae... Codicem tamen fides magis culpanda videtur. Sed quid prohibet, in omnia errata strenue clamemus? Maiestas illa Romana terribit scilicet hominem Christianum?... Quod verum invenio, etiam ab homine ethico accipio; quod a veritate alienum, nihil ad me attinuerit' (no. 149), 'In calcem huius exempli impudens erratum est commentatorum' (no. 163), and 'Talia multa male a commentatoribus exposita, consulto transilimus' (no. 184); in judging adversely Valerius and other Roman historians, 'Valerius hercle ex officio fidi historici dignum operae pretem facisset, si et locum et tempus et imperatorem, ubi et sub quo pugnatum, vel uno verbo indicasset. Sed ita Romani scriptores Graecorum vincunt diligentiam, scilicet' (no. 88), 'Hic locus arguit non parum Romanorum in scribenda historia negligentiam' (no. 95). 'In tanta igitur Republica in tot milibus exemplorum, Valerius ne unum quidem felicitatem exemplum invenire potuit' (no. 158), 'An non hic liquet, quam nihil pensi habuit Valerius, quid posteri de suis scriptis iudicarent? cum ne hoc quidem loco dignetur addere vel uno verbo de quonam Metello loquatur' (no. 159), 'At nos ea latius persequi noluisse; non enim nos latet, quam saepe rebus variatum sit in Romana historia, ac negligentia Romanorum scriptorum se ipsa ubique prodit' (no. 197); in stat-
valerius maximus

ing for whom he is writing, 'Haec ideo adducta, ut discant iuvenes cum iudicio autores legere ac videant non ita anxiosius fuisset perpetuo, ut quidam existimaret' (no. 130), and in giving credit to a mentor, 'Tractat hunc locum Erasim diligenter in Apophthegmatum lib. 8 [Thrasea, 22] (no. 145) and 'admonuit nos eius rei dominus Erasimus Roterodamus praeciputus noster (no. 190).

Dedication (ed. of Basel, 1577). Nobili ac strenuus viro, equiti aurato, domino Iodoco a Meggen Lucerino, sanctissimi Domini Nostri papae Iulii III pontificis maximi a sacra custodia celerumque duci, Glaeareus salutem dicit plurimum. [Inc.]: Si quisquam alius diligentier ac vere de historica ratione disseruit, clarissime domino Iodoce, corte M. Tullii Cicero, Romanae eloquentiae princeps, libro II de Oratore, quonam obiter ac neutiquam ex proposito, elegantem tamen et docte, ut omnibus solet, executus est. Historia, inquit [De oratore II 9, 36] est 'testis temporum, lux veritas, vita memoriae, magistra vitae, nuncia vetustatis.' Haec ille apposite, diserte, ac copiose. Quid enim homini ad vitae huissimae miserimiæ taedia levanda, ad eiusdem emendanda etiam vitia, denique ad aereternae felicitatis gloriam contingere potest utilius historia? Porro quod Gellius alicipi [Noctes atticae, V 18, where Gellius distinguishes between history and annals] etiam inquit, Historiae duplex est modus: alter, qui temporum rationem, magistratuum, procerum ac regum recenset nominam, rem ad historiam quidem necessariam, caeterum ad vitae emendationem non multum adferre utilitatem; alter longe magis ad historiae vic ac energiam pertinet, quo in rebus gestis digna proferreuntur exempla. Hic modus historiae conscribendae plurimum professe legentibus poterit, est enim is verus historiae scopus. Huius hercle modi principem locum obtinet historia evangelica, qua non est alia vel simplicior, vel verior, vel facilior, adeque augustior, in qua ubique amissim (ut duci solet) verba ac facta respondent. Atqui de hac pauca, et cum vereundia loqui fortassis praestiterit. Ad eam porro proxime accedit veteris instrumenti veritas, quonam figuris ac typis inuoluit, ac proinde obscuior. Post divinam vero historiam difficulter dixeris, quam cui praeferas, quam potissimum vel eligas, vel probes. Romanis suam, Graecis itum suam efferentibus, denique alteris alteros de veritatis elogio culpantibus utcumque sunt hominum affectus; mihi quidem nec Graeco, nec Romano, ac proinde huiusmodi affectus haudquaquam obnoxio. Historia profecto a Thucidide ac Herodoto descripta longe eminere videtur, in qua breviter plurima rerum ac eloquentiae mirifica sunt exempla, nullis Livii Salustiive cedentia exemplis, quantumvis brevis hic, ille autem copiosus. Romanis satis visum fuit Graecos mendacii insinulare, leves dicere ac rerum imperitos, cum inter Romanos scriptores mira sit variatio ac velut de singulis rebus digladiatio. Quod qui scire cupiat Salustium Liviumque, ut alios omittam, comparant, ac ipse securi consideret quam diversa de Urbis origine, de Romulo, de aboriginibus, Troianis, Albanis multisque aliis scriptis prodierint. Quam longe circunspectus Dionysius Halicarnasseus in Romana historia homo Graecus omnia digestit. Saepe Livius dimidiatum implet paginam in magistratum nomenclatura, quae nihil sane ad lectorem. Quonam Livium excusare potest Romanorum ambitio, quorum suos quisque gentileis, qui magistratum gessissent, legere in historia voluerit; si quis scriptorum nomina magistratum um omisisset, impune non ferebat. Atqui inde Romana historia omnino portentosa facta est, ac ad lectorem nihil utilitatis adfererat, imo ingenium taedium. Longe felicius Graeci providentia summa tractarunt historiae. Nam quid dicam geographiae studiium? quam negligens ibi Livius, maxime in regionibus, ubi Graecii authoribus destituitur, ut Africis ac occiduis describendaris. Nec minus Sallustius, apud quem nullus propemodum locus geographie, quonam chorographice descriptus est, etiam in Africa, ubi pulchellus ille [P. Clodius Pulcher] raptorem pro praetore se gessit. Contra apud Graecos, quantus geographus Herodotus, qui totum fere terrarum orbe, quantum ei eo tempore innotescere potuit, in illis novem Musis nobis descripsit. Nec minor Thucydidis in locis describendaris diligentia comprobatur. Sed ego haec frustra scribo pluribus, qui invidientia fortassis, non iudicio hoc dici a me falso putabant.
Quare nunc desino et tibi et illis hac de re esse molestus. Caeterum cum Valerius Maximus author celeberrimus, qui et in omnium manu habetur et ubique publice legitur, tam mendo- 
sus vulgo circumferatur, existimavi operae pretium me facturum, si obiter eum perccurrem, ac loca carptim quaedam pernotarem. Id quod ego sedulo feci, ac nunc sub tuo nomine in ora hominum compitorem, quam hacutenus proderit, emittimis. Ducentos enim aut plures naevo aut cicatrices illi ademimus. Sed quae ad authorem reliqua perexigua fuerint mox subiectemus, ne diutius, quam aequum est, te obtundamus. Tu optime Iodoce, me (ut assoles) ama. Cui Deus omnipotens dedit, ut sanctissimo domino nostro papae Iulio III pontifici omnibus modis maximo simul nunc tam charus. ‘Principibus placuisse viris non ultima laus est,’ ut inquit Flaccus [Horace, Epist. I 17, 35]. Id etiam non parvo me afficet gaudio, quod dominus Aegidius Tschudus [the Swiss historian Aegidius Tschudi (1505–1572), who was, like Loritus, a native of Glarus] mihi ut frater colendus, te tam unice deligit, sed similes cum similibus, ut est apud Cicero- nem [De senectute 3, 7, Pares autem, vetere proverbio, cum paribus facillime congregantur] facillime congregetur [sic]. Idem Deus tibi, una cum dilecta uxor et familia tua, quae Luceriae in Helvetii insignis hactenus viguit, meritam det gratiam et incrementum tuis virtutibus dignum, ut honoratum parentem tuum [Wernerus a Meggen, who had participated in the battle of Novara in 1513 and of Marignano in 1515 and served as ambassador to the emperor Charles V] omnium virtutum ornamentis vel aeques, vel etiam superes. Vale felix. Friburgi Brsgoae, anno a Iesu Christi natali D. M. L.


Commentary. [Inc.]: 1. Maiores statas solennesque ceremonias (1 1, 1). Operae pretium est videre quam statim hic initio ac velut in vestibulo laboriosae huius expositionis, et mirifice impingant commentatores et lector ipse dubius, cuius sit sententiae, haereat. Duplex enim est hic lectio, altera quae quaternis clausulis accusativum cum ablativo connectit hoc ordine: Maiores explicari voluerunt statas solennesque ceremonias, pontificum scientia: Maiores voluerunt explicari bene gerendarum rerum authorizationem, augurum observationem, Maiores voluerunt explicari Apollinis praedictionem, vatim libris. Maiores voluerunt explicari portentorum depulsa, Hetrusca
disciplina. Et hanc lectionem Badius sequitur, et placet. Altera est lectio, quae omneis hosce accusativos per ablativos legit, atque ita ple-
rique codicis habent: hoc sensu, Maiores exp-
licari voluerunt statas solennesque ceremo-
nias, pontificum scientia, bene gerendarum
rerum autoritate, augurum observatione,
Apollinis praedictione, vatrum libris, porten-
torum depulsionis Hetrusca disciplina atque ita
legisse Ianus Parrhasius dicitur. Sed quomodo
cerimoniae explicaturs autem bene geren-
darum rerum? Sane meo quidem iudicio Badii
lectio augustior est et magnificior: continet
enim longe plura ad religionem pertinentia.
Certe Oliverius Arzignanensis, qui in hunc
authorem plurimum operarum pretium fecit, ac
multo labore plurima dignissime congressit,
hunc locum neque intellexit neque legit.
Consecut enim aut libris portentorum depulsion,
nox subnectens triplicem expositionem, ut
est focundia ignorantia, quoties recte explic-
care se nequit. Locus videtur sumptus ex Cicer-
onis oratione de aruspicam responsis[9, 18],
set et apud Ciceronem navi distinctio-
um, ut sileam verborum, quae omnia prose-
qui non est huius instituti. 2. Prisco etiam
instituto rebus divinis. Secunda haec pars
prope difficilior, in qua gerundis in DUM
singulari respondunt ablative. Unde et quinque
videntur clausulae hoc ordine. Prisco instituto
rebus divinis opera datur. Primum, cum ali-
quid commendandum est dis, id fit precati-
one (quidam contextus habent placatione).
Secundo quando aliquid expossendum a dis,
id fit voto. Tertio cum aliquid exolvendum,
id fit gratulatione. Quarto, cum quid inquiren-
dum vel extis vel sortibus, id fit impartitio.
Quinto, cum quid solenni ritu peragendum,
id fit sacrificio, quo etiam ostentorum ac ful-
gurum denunciationes procurantur. Quamvis
ultimae duae clausulae possent etiam in unam
ita coecerii. Cum inquirendum est aliquid vel
exitis vel sortibus impartitio, id peragendum
est sacrificio cum solenni ritu, quo etiam osten-
torum ac fulgurum denunciationes procuran-
tur. Ut cum sit praesitio ad ablativum So-
lenni ritu. Badius autem ita ultimas duas parti-
culas ordinat. Cum inquirendum est aliquid,
id fit vel exitis vel sortibus; sed cum quid sol-
eni ritu peragendum, id fit impartitio sacri-
ficio. Qui ordo placeret si adiectivum impar-
tito non nimirum longe a suo substantivio, sacri-
ficio, semotum in contextu estet. Lector sequa-
tur quod volet, participium hercle impartitio,
utut ordinaverimus, ubique negotium faces-
sit, Oliverius connectit to impartitio, cum solen-
ni ritu, ac exponit, adhibito: Badius Diis non
voto, sed iam impenso. Quidam, non diviso,
sine discrimine. Ego quid addam quod pla-
ceat, non habeo... [Expl.]: 205. De
Assidoniis filio falso dicto (IX 15, 5). A secundo
Syllae consulatu usque ad Augusti imperium
37. sunt anni, nimis longum tempus ad uliscen-
dum hunc hominem ideology dubium de
utro Caesare loquatur author, cum tamen
sequentia omnia sint de Augusto.

Editions:
(*) 1553. Basileae (Basel): per Henrichum
Petri. Fabricius, BL (Venice, 1728), II 393;
NUC (NV 0016208). (NNC).
(**) 1562. Basileae (Basel), Henricus Petri.
Graesse, VI 245.
1577. Basileae (Basel), ex officina Henric-
1726, A Variorum edition. See Composite
Editions.

Biography:
Add to the bibliography: (for Wernerus et
Jodocus a Meggen), Dictionnaire historique
et biographique de la Suisse, IV (Neuchâtel,
1928), 703 and Gaetano Moroni, Dizionario
di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica, LXXII
(Venezia, 1855), 153–154.

24. STEPHANUS VINANDUS PIGHIIUS

The edition of Stephanus Pighius published
by Christophorus Plantinus at Antwerp in
1567 broke new ground, as the title quite
accurately indicates when it presents ‘Valerii
Maximi dictorum factorumque memorabilium
libri IX. infinitis mendis ex veterum exempla-
rium fide repurgati, atque in meliorem ordi-
nem restituti per Stephanum Pighium Cam-
pensem. Accedunt in fine eiusdem annotatio-
nes in loca plusquam DCCC.’ The figure is
no idle claim; the notes, of varying length and
rather evenly distributed throughout all nine
books, are numbered beginning with I for
each chapter and run to the eighties and nineties for each of the first seven books and over a hundred each for books VIII and IX, to a grand total indeed of 848. Piglius cites by location five manuscripts at Arras, Gembloux (perhaps our Bruxellensis 5336), Kampen, and Köln (2) and four named for the following scholars: Johannes Cauchius (Johannes Kukius, Jan van Cuyck, d. 1566), an antiquarian and philologist of Utrecht who edited 'Aemilius Probis,' i.e., Cornelius Nepos, and Cicero's De officiis and whom we have met in the Fortuna as an editor of Valerius; Theodorus Pulmannus (Theodor Poelmann, CTC I 234–235, III 293–294), born in 1510 in Kranenburg, who was corrector for the Plantin press and worked on several Latin authors; Jacobus Susius (Jacques de Suys, 1520–1592), humanist, philologist, poet, and friend of Justus Lipsius, on whom see below, p. 396; and that important figure of the Reformation, Heinrich Winckel (1493–1551).

In the dedicatory letter of the complete edition, which was addressed from Brussels on 13 August 1566 to Carolus Philippus de Croy (1549–1613), marquis of Havré in Belgium, then aged seventeen, Piglius discourses, as had his predecessors, on the value of history, praises the eminent contribution of Valerius in setting forth as on a stage the tragicomedy of human life, bemoans the mutilated and contaminated state of his text, and shares with the reader some details of the new edition. He had long wanted, he says, to present the text in new dress, and at the urging of Plantin he expedited matters; however, the task to which he had allotted three months(!) actually consumed six, since he had to start from scratch and there was such diversity in his manuscripts (which he numbered imprecisely 'octo vel decem') that he felt himself in a labyrinth where he knew not which turn to take. No one, he is sure, can appreciate his labors who does not compare his edition with those that have preceded it. He presents a Valerius 'puriore toga indutum . . . , magisque sanum, integrum ac nitidum. Amplius enim quam octingentos naevos insignes emaculavimus, vastas lacunas supplevimus veterum exemplarium auxilio, cicatrices atque ulcera foeda plura sanavimus,' and he has emended only sparingly and only when absolutely necessary.

While some modern editors would take these statements with more than one grain of salt, would see fantasy operating, would accuse Piglius of inventing many readings, would credit him with a host of corrections but still charge him with wholesale corruptions, his edition and its annotations, which I treat as a commentary, constitute undeniably a long step toward textual criticism as we know it today. The edition has a special interest for the modern scholar because its reception, distribution, and the influence which it exerted during his lifetime can be traced in his correspondence and in that of Plantin. The series of editions continued through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and even into the eighteenth.

The commentary itself appears in the 1574, Antwerp, edition on signatures A–E 8 Fl–6 (91 pages newly numbered) after the text of the nine books of Valerius and the so-called Book X, which will be treated below (p. 401). It reveals not only the manuscripts which Piglius was using but also the scholars of his own century, in addition to the four named above, with whom he was in touch concerning Valerius or whose work in classical philology he knew by some other means. These are the following (I record only one occurrence in each instance): (p. 21) Antonius Augustinus (Antonio Agustin, 1517–1586), theologian, historian, and canonist who was successively bishop of Alife and of Lerida and archbishop of Tarragona and who worked on Festus, Verrius Flaccus, and Varro; (p. 11) Jodocus Badius Ascensius, on whose commentary see above, p. 383; (p. 45) Gulielmus Budaeus (Guillaume Budé, 1467–1540) of Paris, the eminent scholar of Greek whose impact on classical scholarship continues powerful today; (p. 2), Sebastianus Corradus, whom we have met in the Fortuna as an editor of Valerius; (p. 53) Sigismundus Gelenius (d. 1554) of Prague, who was corrector for the Froben press; (p. 30) 'Gifanius noster,' i.e., Obertus Giphanius (van Giffen, 1534–1604), the jurisconsult, philosopher, and philologist of Geldern whose edition of Lucretius had been published by the Plantin press in 1565;}
VALERIUS MAXIMUS

(p. 88), Nicolaus Gruchi (Nicolas de Grouchy, c. 1520–1572) of Rouen, who taught at Paris and Bordeaux, worked on Aristotle, and published De comitiis romanorum; (p. 4), Augustinus Hunnaeus (1521–1577) of Mechelen (Malines), theologian who worked on the Church Fathers, logic, and Aristotle and who furnished the Gembloux manuscript; (p. 3) Henricus Loritus Glareanus, on whose commentary see above, p. 387; (p. 13) Johannes Metellus (Matalis, Jean Matal, 1520–1597) of Poligny, jurisconsult and friend of Antonius Augustinus; (p. 30) Johannes Pierius Valerianus (1477–1558) of Belluno, who was occupied with Vergil, Horace, and Propertius and wrote a famous book on the misfortunes of scholars and another on hieroglyphics; (p. 22) Petrus Pithoeus (Pierre Pithou, 1539–1596) of Troyes, who worked on Juvenal, Persius, Phaedrus, Salvian, and Petronius; (p. 7) Carolus Sigonius (1520–1584, CTC II 344–346) of Modena, historian and critic, who was occupied with Livy, ancient chronology, Roman law, and political institutions; (p. 2) Adrianus Turnebus (Adrien Turnèbe, 1512–1565), who was born in Normandy, taught at Toulouse and Paris, was concerned with Greek and Latin textual criticism, and wrote thirty books of Adversaria which explained or emended passages in the ancient authors.

The contributions of Claudia Mitalerius and Justus Lipsius soon became attached to the commentary of Pighius; they are treated separately below. My reader may like to know that just before the index in the 1574 edition the ecclesiastical imprimitur is provided: ‘In his Valerii libris et doctissimis annotationibus nihil continentur quod sanctae Catholicae Romanae Ecclesiae religionem offendat, et ut imprimantur studiosis utilissimum est.’ It was properly executed and attested by Henricus Dunghen, canonicius at Antwerp. Finally, after the index the emperor Maximilian II grants to Christophorus Plantinus a general privilege dated from Vienna 21 February 1565.

Introduction (ed. of Antwerp, 1574); these remarks on the ‘Annotationes’ are included in the dedicatory letter of the complete edition, which begins ‘Illustrissimo principi Carolo Philippo de Croy, domino de Haurech etc., natalium splendore clarissimo adolescenti Stephanus Pighius salutem dicit. Gravis omnino atque perniciosa, Carole princeps generosissime, humano generi res est ignorantia, non solum publicis moribus noxia . . .’ and ends ‘Deum optimum maximum interim precor ut inter huius vitae ambages atque pericula dirigat gressus tuos, teque felicem atque incoluem diu servet. Bruxellae Idibus Augustis, anno M. D. LXVI.’ Adieci insuper in calce operis quasdam nostras annotationes, in quibus cum multa ad auctoris huius explanationem potuisse adducere, ne tamen nimirum prolixus; satis visum fuit emendationum causas redidisse lectori, non omnium tamen, esset enim fastidiosum ac fere infinitum omnia loca mutata persequi, cum in ordine tam verborum quam periodon, tum etiam in propriis nominibus ubique fere corruptis. Quae etiamsi inter octingentos naevos non numerum, et in annotationibus praeterentur; velim tamen persuasum esse, non nisi ex antiquitatis fide atque veterum codicum auctitate ea me mutasse. . . .

Commentary [Inc.]: 1 Urbis Romae externarum gentium (1 Prooemium) Liber manuscripts, quem nobis praestiti D. Iacobus Susius vir omnifaria eruditione ac virtute conspicuus, ita exorditur praefationem: Populi Romani exterararumgentiumactus, Quae quidem lectori placet. Proprie namque magis dicimus facta populi Romani, quam urbis Romae. Sic Livius historiae suae exordio [1] ait, ‘Si res populi Romani persciperis,’ non, Si res urbis Romae persciperis. Et Sallustius in prooemio de coniuratione Catilinae [c. 4] Statui res gestas populi Romani perscibere, non urbis Romae. 2 Mea parvitas Utitur vocabulo Tullius de universitate [De universo, or Timaeus 13, 47] sed in significacione quantitatis. ‘Quae cerni non possent propter parvitatem.’ Valerius autem pro vilitate seu humilitate ponit. Qua in significacione eius primitivo [primitiva] parvus, saepe veteres sunt usi. . . . Capite primo. 1 Maiores nostri statas solemnnesque caeremonias (1 1, 1) Exorditur a primis caeremoniarum Romanarum fundamentis, quem locum habui debio Valerius ex Ciceronis oratione de aruspicium responsis [9, 18] est mutua-
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1601, Francofurti. See Composite Editions.

1601, s.l. [Genevae]. See Composite Editions.

1602, s.l. [Genevae]. See Composite Editions.

1606. See Composite Editions.

1607, Lugduni, apud Antonium de Harsy. See Composite Editions.


1608, Antverpiae. See Composite Editions.

1612, Lugduni. See Composite Editions.

1612, Lugduni Batavorum. See Composite Editions.

1614, Antverpiae. See Composite Editions.

1614, Hanoviae. See Composite Editions.

1618. See Composite Editions.

1620. See Composite Editions.

1621, Antverpiae, apud Ioannem Keerbergum. See Composite Editions.

1621, Antverpiae, apud Henricum Aertisium. See Composite Editions.

1621, Antverpiae, apud Martinum Nutium. See Composite Editions.

1627. See Composite Editions.


Biography:

Stephanus Vinandus Pighius (Étienne Winand Pighius, Stephanus Wynants Pigge) was born Wynants at Kampen in 1520 and took the surname by which he is more commonly known from his celebrated uncle, the theologian Albertus Pighius. Educated first at Utrecht, where he probably knew Johannes Cauchius, and Louvain, where he specialized in Latin studies, he went in 1547 to Italy and under the patronage of Marcello Cardinal Cervini, in 1555 Pope Marcellus II, was able to sketch old buildings and monuments and to transcribe their inscriptions. On the sudden death of the Pope on 10 May 1555 he entered in Brussels, as librarian and secretary of Latin letters, the service of Antoine Perre-
not de Granvelle (1517-1586), bishop of Arras, who had had close relations with the emperor Charles V and with Philip II, king of Spain, and later became archbishop of Malines, cardinal, and viceroy of Naples. It was he who introduced Pighius to Plantin. Remuneration, however, was slim, Pighius was unable to secure benefices, and in straitened circumstances he had cause to be grateful to the assistance of friends like Andreas Masius (1514-1573). Through Masius he accompanied Charles Frederick, elder son of William, Duke of Cleve, in 1571 to Vienna and the court of Maximilian II, where he met such scholars as Johannes Sambucus, Rembert Dodoens, Caro-lus Clusius, and Justus Lipsius. The prince died suddenly in Rome on 9 February 1575; Pighius settled then in Xanten, devoted himself to his catalogues of Roman magistrates, and died there in 1604.

Works: Pighius was the author of Mythologiae ex suis operis vel in anni partes . . . (Lovanii, 1559), on a bas-relief found near Arras; Themis Dea, seu de lege divina (Antverpiae, 1568), on a marble term; and Hercules Prodicius, seu principia iuventutis, vita et peregrinatio (Antverpiae, 1587), on the travels, illness, and death of Charles Frederick. He is better known, however, for his investigations of the annals of ancient Rome in Annales magistratum et provinciarum S. P. Q. R. ab urbe condita . . . (Antverpiae, 1599-1615, 3 vols.), the first volume of which was published during his lifetime, the second and third posthumously under the editorship of Andreas Schottus.

Bibliography: Biographie nationale de Belgique XVII (Bruxelles, 1903), 502-509; Hoefer LX, 219; Jourdan III, 1563; Michaud XXXIII, 310; Sandys (New York, 1958), II, 217.

Stephani Vinandi Pighii Epistolarium, published from the Brussels Copy, Cart. et Man., 187, with introductions and notes by Henry de Vocht (Louvain, 1959 [Humanistica Lovaniensia, 15]). Professor Kristeller notes that the transcription is from Brussels, Archives Générales du Royaume, Manuscripts divers 187, and that Pighius’s large collection of ancient inscriptions survives in Berlin (West), Staatsbibliothek Preussicher Kulturbesitz, Lat. fol. 61, 61a, 61f, and 61h. The editor gives in his ‘List of Personages’ a cross-reference from Maximus to Valerius Maximus, but there is no entry for Valerius Maximus. Searching establishes, however, that Valerius is the or a subject certainly in letters 54 (the dedicatory letter to the 1567 edition), 55, 58, 60, 62, 67, 68, 70, 72, 73, 79, 87, 94, 106, 128, 194, 195, 205, 211, 218, 219, 229, 243, 260, 2811, 282, and 287. See also Christoph Plantin, Correspondance, publiée par Max Rooses (Nendeln, Liechtenstein, Kraus reprint, 1968), I, 17, 62, 183, II, 14.

25. CLAUDIUS MITALERIUS

The influence of Pighius was almost immediately felt. Antonius Gryphius published at Lyon in 1576 the text of Valerius ostensibly edited by Pighius and by Claudius Mitalerius, judge of Vienne, and carrying the annotations of both. In many instances, in fact, those of Mitalerius involve readings of Pighius. In extent, however, they are far fewer; in the 1581 edition they occupy only sixteen quite small octavo pages. The annotations are printed without any reference whatsoever to the chapters or even the books in which the passages annotated (37, unnumbered) occur. Searching establishes that these are as follows, and in the following order: I 1, 1 (3), I 1, 7, I 1, 19, I 1, 20, I 13, 3, 14, 1, I 7, 7, II 5, 4, II 6, 8, II 7, 12, V 3 ext.3, III 2, 23, IV 3, 9, V 6, 4, V 3, ext.3 (3), V 4, 3, V 4, 6, V 4, ext.3, V 10, ext.1, VI 4, 1, VI 5, 5, VI 7, 1, VII 2, 5, VII 2, ext.7, VIII 3, 1, VIII 12, ext.1, VIII 14, 2, VIII 14, ext.1, VIII 15, 7, IX 1, 5, IX 2, ext.2, IX 6, 3, IX 14, ext.3. The annotations precede the text of Valerius; they in turn are preceded by three pages devoted to a life of Valerius and constituting a dedicatory letter which Mitalerius ends with a few remarks on his editing. Short lives of Valerius gleaned from the exempla had been carried repeatedly in manuscripts and printed editions; this one, somewhat longer, is no more satisfying and could not be in view of the paucity of facts available then and still. The edition was reprinted at Lyon in 1587 and 1592, and the Vita appeared, without the remarks on editing, in the edition of 395
Christophorus Colerus at Frankfurt in 1601, in Elzevir editions of the second half of the seventeenth century, and as late as the Leiden edition of 1726. The opinion of Mitalerius on the De praeonominibus is treated below.

Dedication (ed. of 1581). Valerii Maximi vita, C. Mitalerio Vienensis provinciae iuridico auctore, ad Ioannem Buffeventium in suprema Delphinatian curia praesidem [in Dauphiné]. [Inc.]: Valerii Maximi praenomen librariorum incuria iam olim amissum vero propius est, quam ab ipso omissum fuisset. Ridiculum est autem quod maternum genus eius quidam a Fabia gente repetunt cognominis argumento. Nam praeterquam quod id alii quibusdam Romanis gentibus commune fuit, ut Carbiliae, Corneliae, Manliae, constat certe id longe ante in Valeria, quam in Fabia gente fuisset... [Expl.]: Itaque libro IX. inter dictorum improborum factoremque sceleratorum exempla ultio, eum colophonem, loco Seiani (quod recte subodorates est Pighius) suppresso tamen singulari quodam adullandi artificio eius nomine supra omnium flagitiorem conditionem perfidiam audaciamque incessit. Caput seriem atque discretionem Pighianam, quam ille se in veteribus codicibus offendisse scribit, retinuimus. Multas non modo a librariis, verum etiam ab emendatoribus inuiriias acceperat, quarum a pleisque cum acerrima cura, plurimorumque atque optimorum exemplarium ope idem Pighius vindicavit. Nos illis praeidisieti destituuit, si quid forte a potius desidero nostro minus praestitisse videbimur, temporis angustiis munemerumque ac curarum quibus cum privatim tum etiam publice districti tenemur, multitudini intermissisque his tam olim a nobis longo intervallo studiis imputabis. Tuo vero nominii nostrae hoc quicquid est operae nuncupandum duximus, ut quem arctissimo affinitatis vinculo attingeremus, eiusdem testatum suum illum erga nos nostrumque erga ipsum comparem ac mutuum affectum huic velut impressum monumento traderemus. Vale.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (1 1, 1) Majores, etc. Hie locus valde sive librariorunm incuria sive emendatorum imperitia depravatus est, mihi quidem sic restituendum videtur. Maiiores statas solemnesque ceremonias pontificis scien-
tia, bene gerendarum rerum auctoritates, aurgurum observatione, Apollinis praedictione, vatum libris, portentorum, etc. Apollinis enim praedictiones oracula intelligimus... [Expl.]: (IX 14, ext.3) Nec est memoria lapsus Sueto-
nius [Augustus 3, 2] ut quidam vir eruditus censuit, cum Quintum M. Tullii fratre pro-
consulatum Asiae administrasse scripsit, quamvis constet eum praetorio tantum imperio et provinciae praeuisse.

Editions:
1576. See Composite Editions.
1581. See Composite Editions.
1587. See Composite Editions.
1592. See Composite Editions.

Biography:
Claudius Mitalerius (Claude Mitalier) was, as stated above, ‘Vienensis provinciae iuridicus,’ and it is possible that documents on him remain in judicial archives there. His interest in Valerius is clear also from the fact that he owned a fifteenth-century manuscript of Valerius which is now Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reginensis latinus 939.

Works:
Mitalerius wrote also an ‘Opusculum de abusu linguae graecae,’ an ‘Epistola de vocabulis quae Iudaei in Galliam introducerunt,’ which appeared in Henri Estienne’s Hypomneses de gallica lingua... (Genevae, 1582), and an epitaphium, published without indication of place and date and entitled Joannis Refugaei, in suprema cismarinae Britanniae curia senatoris... et Mariae Barptolemaei, Guilelmi Barptolemaei, supremae parisienis curiae senatoris... filiae epitaphium.

Bibl.:
Jöcher III (1751), 556.

26. Justus Lipsius

According to Henry de Vocht in his edition of the Epistolarium of Pighius (Louvain 1959 [Humanistica Lovaniensia, 15]), p. 454, Justus Lipsius wrote notes on Valerius in large
part from information received from Ozier Ghislain de Busbecq (1522–1592) and published them in his *Electorum liber secundus*, which was issued by Plantin in 1585; a few months later, as is clear from the letter of Lipsius to Pighius, 5 September 1585, in pages 454–455, the notes were added to Plantin's 1585 edition of Valerius which reprinted the commentary of Pighius. Appended, then, to this Antwerp, 1585, edition of Valerius, after the 'Annotationes' of Pighius on the nine books and on the so-called Book X, we find 24 octavo pages (h4b–i8a, pages [120–143]) of 'Breves notae' by Lipsius. They are identified not only by book and chapter numbers but also by the page number (with some errors) on which the passages occur in the edition. Lipsius was using two manuscripts at Utrecht the readings of which were furnished by the brothers Hadrianus (poet, d. 1606) and Lambertus (canonicus and historian, 1542–1617) van der Burchius. The first brother is said to have left notes in manuscript on Valerius. Lipsius used also older editions, and there are references to a manuscript from which Johannes Sambucus (1531–1584) sent excerpts. The single marginal note and an 'Additio' reveal that the jurisconsult Theodorus Canerus (1545–1617) was also a member of this informal circle of scholars, already documented by the notes of Pighius, who were occupied with the text of Valerius and communicated with one another in an effort to better it. Canerus, indeed, informed Lipsius by letter that Jacobus Cujacius (Jacques Cujas, 1522–1590) of Toulouse held precedence over him on one reading. It was a circle which trafficked, but not commercially, in scholarship and which conscientiously and unselfishly endeavored, with the means then at hand, to promote it.

The suggestions and corrections of Lipsius, covering spottily all nine books, are couched in friendly terms and constitute a worthy appendage to the work of Pighius. Their whole tone, in fact, is set by the dedicatory letter of Lipsius to Pighius at the very beginning of the edition, which reads 'Iustus Lipsius Stephanus Pighio salutem dico. Paucae et levia quae ad Valerium tuum (jure, tuum: qui valer
tudinem et colorum tibi debet, imo vitam) paene aliud agens notavi, passus sum adiungi tuis, mi Pighi, accuratissimae censurae notis. Passus ideo, quia Plantinus noster cupiebat, quia aliquid in iis fortasse ad usum iuventutis. quia et cum honore tuo id fiebat, cum ex ipsa comparatione horum pravitas et parvitas, tuorum bonitas et granditas elucere. Sane copiosam tu et ubeberem messem ex hoc agro col
gisti, nos pauculas spicas contemptas tibi potius quam non visas. Triumphus igitur hic omnis tuus est, mihi abunde satis, si armillis aut hasta donatus sequar hunc candidae Famae tuae currum. Vale. Nonis Septembris, M.D. LXXXV.' Not surprising, then, are passages like the following in the notes themselves: 'Viri amice Pighi,'... Ita tu Pighi (ignosce) me abnuente, 'Tu sedulo velas mi Pighi: sed velim (pto te non nolente) ...' Non ambiges tu optime censor, quin ... scribendum sit,'... Reiciis ea verba, Pighi, e libris aliquot scriptis: et recte,'Acumina et sentientiolas Valerii nosti.'

The notes are repeated in editions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in the *Opera omnia* of Lipsius, and in the edition published at Leiden by Luchtmans in 1726.

**Dedication** (ed. Antverpiae, 1585), Breves notae ad Valerium. In his notis, vir amice Pighi, scire te et alios volo quibus auxilii sim usus. Ab ingenio nostro pleraque esse fator: quod tamen saepe in viam veri duxerunt libri. Li mihi bini manuscripti: quos Ultraiecti be
nigne curarunt viri clarissimi Lambertus et Hadrianus Vander-burchii, eximium par fra
trum, docti ipsi et in doctos valde proni. Praeterea vetere editiones inspeximus: qua
 hic et in aliis scriitoribus nihil deteriores inve
nimus manuscriptis. Tu aliquo et reipsa judici
bities, 'Opera nobis haec inanis, an in usum
Ad illam enim ego transeo.

**Commentary [Inc.]:** Prologo. *Ab illustribus electa auctoribus deligere constitui (I Prooe
mium) Displacet geminatio, Electa deligere. Scribam omissis verbo altero, *Ab illustribus
auctoribus deligere. Mea parvitas, eo iustius ad favorem tuum decurrerit*. Servillos sermo et ce
llarius. Ego sane parvitateam eam ablegem et
Valerio scribamque expuncitis duabus vocibus:
*ego iustius a. f. t. decurrero*. Lib. I. Cap. I.

Editions:


1585. See Composite Editions.
1592, Antverpiae. See Composite Editions.
1594. See Composite Editions.
1600. See Composite Editions.
(*) 1600. In Lipsius, Opera omnia quae ad criticam propriam spectant, Antverpiae (Antwerp): ex officina Plantiniana, apud I. Moretum. NUC. (ICN; OCU; CTY).

1601. Lugduni. See Composite Editions.
1601, s.l. [Genevae]. See Composite Editions.

1602, s.l. [Genevae]. See Composite Editions.
1606. See Composite Editions.
1607, Lugduni, apud Antonium de Harsy. See Composite Editions.

1608, Antverpiae. See Composite Editions.
(*) 1611, in Lipsius, Opera omnia quae ad criticam propriam spectant, Antverpiae (Antwerp): ex officina Plantiniana, apud viduam et filios Ioannis Moreti. NUC. (CLU; PHN).

1612. Lugduni. See Composite Editions.

1614, Hanoviae. See Composite Editions.
1614, in Lipsius, Opera omnia, septem tomis distincta, Antverpiae (Antwerp): ex officina Plantiniana, apud viduam et filios Ioannis Moreti. NUC. (DCU; NIC; ICN; ICU).

(*) 1615, Antverpiae (Antwerp): apud Ioannem Keerbergeium. Bibliotheca Belgica, 1st series, XXV. BL.


1618. See Composite Editions.
1620. See Composite Editions.
1627. See Composite Editions.

(*) 1640, Lugduni Batavorum (Leiden): apud Franciscum Hegerum. Bibliotheca Belgica, 1st series, XXV; NUC. BN; (MH; IEN; NcU).

1647, Amstelodami (Amsterdam): apud Ioannem Janssonium. Bibliotheca Belgica, 1st series, XXV. NUC. BL; (MH; CTY; ICU; DMS).

(*) 1655, Parisii (Paris): ex officina Cramosiana. BN.

(*) 1660, Amstelodami (Amsterdam): apud Ioannem Janssonium. Bibliotheca Belgica, 1st series, XXV; NUC. BL; (CU; ICU; ViU).

(*) 1665, Amstelodami (Amsterdam), apud Ioannem Janssonium.

VALERIUS MAXIMUS

Editions.

Biography:
See CTC II, 40.


27. CHRISTOPHORUS COLERUS

Christophorus Colerus followed worthily upon Pighius, Mitalerius, and Lipsius. His edition appeared at Frankfurt in 1601, the nine books 'olim a Stephano Pighio emendati, nunc vero post Lipsii et Mitallerii aliorumque spicilegia, ad vetustissimum viri clarissimi Petri Danielis iurisconsulti exemplar collati, adjectis etiam Animadversionibus.' The edition is dedicated from Heidelberg 1 April 1601 to the young nobleman Stanislaus Zelenius Vitellius de Zelanka, with praise of Valerius ('Nam quidquid Graecia quidquid Romana virtus dixit aut fecit egregium, sub unum aspectum, veluti tabella explicavit Valerius, nec id vulgari stilo, sed florido, sed arguto, certe flexanimo orationis generis'), with injunctions to the young man to follow the right path ('Ergo studia tua ex nobilitate metire, ex for- tuna sapere discere'), but with no word on the principles employed in editing.

Commentandary verses by Martinus Aichman and Paulus Melissus follow, with a letter to the absent Colurus, unsigned but apparently from his patient publisher ('Mensis, et quod excurrit, abierat ex Valeriana editione absoluta, cum nobis redditae sunt optatissimae litterae tuae, iam de praefatione sollicitis; redditae sunt autem, non solum cum praefatione quam desiderabamus, sed cum auctario etiam Animadversionum, quo usuram videris illius missae tardius pendere voluisse. Sed illam, uti iubes, editioni praemisimus; hoc, absoluto iam libro, subiecimus, velut appendicum, iucundam lectori studiose et utilem. Exemplar ipsum autem, quod nobis abiens in Polonia reliquisti, secuti sumus accurate, nisi quod . . .') and with a short Vita 'incerto auctore' and the Vita by Mitalerius.

After the text the notes of Pighius are provided on pages 337–462 (followed on pages 462–473 by his notes on the De praenomini- bus; see below, p. 401), those of Lipsius on pages 473–496, those of Colerus himself on pages 496–608, and on pages 609–616 some by Sebastianus Corradus (see above, p. 304) from the edition published at Venice in 1564; these are preceded by a letter from the absent Colerus to his patient publisher Claudius Marnius which reads, 'Reperi in Sarmatia apud amicum editionem Valerianam Sebasti- an Corradi, hominis doctissimi, anno M.D. LXIV. Venetiis excusam, diu illam quidem a

Finally a few other notes of Colerus follow as addenda on pages 617–621, ‘inserenda Animadversionibus Valerianis.’ The edition enjoyed several reprints in the seventeenth century and was influential also in the eighteenth.


Editions:
1601. See Composite Editions.
1627. See Composite Editions.

Biography:
Christophorus Colerus (Christoph Coler), jurisconsult and philologist, was born in Franconia. Details of his life are sparse and sometimes conflicting. He published in Strassburg, Frankfurt, Nürnberg, Amberg, Paris, Krakow, and Hanau. He was teaching at Altdorf in 1597 and 1598. The dedicatory letter of his edition of Valerius Maximus is dated from Heidelberg 1 April 1601, the letter to his publisher, in the same volume, from Krakow 13 June, apparently in the same year. In 1603 he was in Prague. He died in Austria, in ‘1651(?)’ according to the ADB, in 1604 according to Jöcher; the latter date seems more probable since his publishing activity ranged from 1592 to 1603, and the former may be due to confusion with the Silesian scholar of the same name who lived from 1602 to 1658. It is clear that Colerus had highly placed friends in Germany, Poland, and Bohemia.

Works: Colerus published Daphnis transalpinus, carmen pastorale (Argentorati, 1592), an edition and commentary of Alexander ab Alexandro, Genialium dierum libri sex (Francofurci 1594), Sentientiae ex utroque iure, de nudo collectae et in ordinem alphabeti adfabe dispositae (Argentorati, 1595), Parergorum ad varios Pandectarum et Institutionum iuris locos liber singularis (Noribergae, 1597), Salustius, sive de historia veteri oratio (Nori-
II. DE PRAE NOMINIBUS

I approach the *De praenominibus* with something of the feeling J. Wight Duff expressed when he wrote, 'As the summary on names cannot by any stretch of imagination be called literature, there is scant profit in discussing the date of Titius Probus or his relationship to Julius Paris.' Julius Paris is treated above, and we shall say as little as possible about C. Titius Probus. The manuscripts and editions of Valerius Maximus had carried through the centuries, after the nine books, a portion of a tract *De praenominibus* which was supposedly first in a work *De praenominibus, de nominibus, de cognominibus, de agnominibus, de appellationibus, de verbis incerti auctoris liber, in epitomen redactus a Iulio Paride* which is otherwise unknown to us. The portion extant follows as a tenth book, after the epitome of Paris, in Vaticanus latinus 4929 and is said in the subscription to be from an epitome by C. Titius Probus (so far unidentified) entitled 'Epitoma historiarum diversarum exemplorumque Romanorum' and to have been emended probably in the second fourth of the sixth century by Rusticius Heli pidi us Domnulus of Ravenna. It displays good sources, including Varro, and some scholars would like to push it back to the Augustan Age. But authorship and date have been hotly disputed for decades and centuries, and the end is not yet; certainly the commentators listed here were not equipped to furnish solutions.


1. STEPHANUS VINANDUS PIGHIUS

The contributions of Pighius to our understanding of Valerius have been outlined above. He recognized fully that the author of the *De praenominibus* was not Valerius, but he included its text in his edition of 1574. The reasons are presented on page 388 in his letter to the reader, which can fittingly be quoted here entire: 'Veteres libri omnes, quos vidimus, tam manuscripti quam impressi nobis repre sentant Valerii Maximi hoc opus ita libris novem distinctum; in aliquibus tamen reperitum cuiusdam epitomes fragmentum in fine annexum pro libro decimo, prorsus tamen remotum et alienum ab argumento scopoque librorum Valerii Maximi. Nil enim aliud docet,
nisi aliquarum appellantionum seu nominum Romanorum rationes. Quae quidem epitome ex alio antiquo auctore collecta est a Julio Paride, sicut nonnullos produnt codices, cuius fragmentum hoc dumptaxat de praenominibus repertum quidam libario priores Valerio Maximo adiunxerunt, tanquam ex eius libro exemplorum decimo contractum, moti, ut appareat, quod in codem fragmento citetur Valerius, non tamen Maximus. Istud enim non potest affirmari ex simplici isto nomine, sicut in multis exemplaribus reperitur. Sed Antatem citari unum exemplar manuscriptum doctissimi l. Sambuci liquide declarat, quemadmodum suo loco dicemus in annotationibus. Iam addiderunt alium errorem, qui C. Titium Probum, nescio quem, ut huius epitomes auctorem protulerunt, id quod ex huius fragmenti fine temere deprompsisse videntur. Nam id ipsum praefatiiunculae librariorum iudicio diversimode conflictae palam faciunt tam ipso stylo, quam quod alterius, ut suo modo loquuntur, abbreviatoris mentionem adferunt. Eas autem duas imprimes discrepantes, mox cum eodem epitomes fragmento subiungimus, quamvisclare liqueat, non esse Valerii Maximi, et eius auctor verus adhuc in obsuro lateat. Attamen quia sapit antiquitatem non ineruditam, et scholiorum loco studiosis servire poterit ad linguae ac historiae Romanae cognitionem ritusque veteres discendos, id ipsum emendatum ex fide exemplarium manuscriptorum, sicut ante Valerio Maximo fuit annexus, nunc visum est Plantino nostro simul cum eodem libro recedere et publicare. Vale. Vienna Austriae Idibus Ianuarii, anno Salutis nostrae M.D. LXXXIV.‘

The annotations of Pighius appear on the newly numbered pages 91–99 after the text of the nine books of Valerius and the *De praenominibus* and after the annotations on the nine books. The notes are numbered 1 to 29; I give their incipit and explicit here and refer the reader to the earlier treatment for editions, biography of Pighius, works of Pighius, and bibliography. The title pages do not always state which editions carry the *De praenominibus* and the annotations.

Commentary (ed. of Antwerp, 1574). Stephani Pighii Animadversiones in epitomen De nominum ratione, veterum codicum collatione facta ad exemplar impressum Antverpiae anno M.D.LXVI. per Philippum Nucium. [Inc.]: *I In epitomen suam C. Titii Probi prae- fatio* J hic titulus in multis veteribus libris non habetur, et in aliquis, ut dixi, sunt aliae praefatiiunculae librariorum arbitrato compo sitae. At in Campensi codice nulla est praefatio. Quemadmodum enim in aliis novem Valerii Maximi libris, ita et hic solummodo praefiguntur tituli, quos abbreviatores Iulium Paridem omisisset dicunt librariorum praefatiiunculae, et sunt quidem tales. *De nominibus, De praenominibus, De cognominibus, De agnominibus, De appellatioibus potestatum, De verbis Romanae historiae*. Ex quibus facile colligi potest, librariorum fragmentum istud epitomes de nominum ratione non solum, sed at alia quaedam collectanea veluti appendices ad declarandum Valerium eius libris adiecisse, ex antiquis quidem auctoribus deprompta, sed quae posteriores pro suo iudicio male conscinrarunt, mutarunt, et detruncarunt. Nam huic fragmento de nominibus, quod continue post titulos istos sequitur, in Campensi codice annexa est alia quaedam epitome de appellatioibus potestatum, et de Romanae historiae vocabulis, velut arguunt etiam ex dictis titulis duo postremi. Attamen haec ab alio recentiore videtur esse composita, et vix digna luce, nedum Valerio Maximo. Qualiscunque tamen est, non minus prodesse forsas posset imperiioribus, quam illa, quae ex Pomponio iurisconsulto de origine iuris ac magistratum non admodum fideleter est compilata . . . / . . . [Expl.]: *Caiam esse se dicent* . . . Caios autem a gaudio, Titos, ac Titios a tutando nuncupatos volunt, ut ante dictum est; quae idcirco nomina habebantur auspicata, ut et cognomen Probus. Atque ista occasio fortass ista utus vulgata sunt, ut iurisconsulti in suis scriptis quoscumque fere viros, vel Caios vel Titios appellarent, et quas- cuque mulieres Caia vel Titias, cum de controversiis inter personas ortis disserunt et casus exempli causa proponunt.

Editions:
See above, p. 394.

Biography:
See above, p. 394.
2. Claudius Mitalerius

The contributions of Mitalerius to our understanding of Valerius have been outlined above. He followed Pighius in including the text of the De praenominibus in his 1576 edition. His letter to the reader appears directly before this text on page 550; I quote it from the edition of 1581: ‘Hanc Valerii, sive Probi illius, sive, utnonnulli autumant, huius Maximi commentariunculam dignam esse duximus, quae, sicut in quibusdam antiquis codicibus reperta est, ita libelli huius calci annecteretur, elutis insignioribus masculis. Reliquas vero, si quae vel industria vel notitiam nostram effugerant, iis reliquimus, qui magis quam nos et abundarent otiō et in promptu ingenium haberent.’

Directly after the text of the De praenominibus, on pages 554–555, and before the annotations of Pighius on the nine books (those on the tenth book are not present), Mitalerius publishes five unnumbered notes which (but barely) qualify him for inclusion here. I give their incipit and explicit and refer the reader to the earlier treatment for editions, biography of Mitalerius, works of Mitalerius, and bibliography. The title pages do not always state which editions carry the De praenominibus.


Editions:
See above, p. 396.

Biography:
See above, p. 396.