

# CATULLUS, GAIUS VALERIUS

JULIA HAIG GAISSER

(Bryn Mawr College)

<i>Fortuna.</i>	198
Bibliography.	218
Composite Editions.	222
I. Commentaries on the <i>Corpus</i> and on Groups of Poems.	223
1. Antonius Parthenius Lacisius.	
2. Angelus Politianus.	
3. Marcus Antonius Coccius, called Sabellicus.	
4. Hieronymus Avantius.	
5. Palladius Fuscus.	
6. Franciscus Puccius.	
7. Aulus Janus Parrhasius.	
8. Anonymus Vaticanus: Ottob. lat. 1982 ( <i>post-1517?</i> ).	
9. Alexander Guarinus.	
10. Pierius Valerianus.	
11. Anonymus Florentinus: Biblioteca Nazionale, Rinuccini filza 17.	
12. Braccius Ricasulanus.	
13. Marcus Antonius Muretus.	
14. Achilles Statius.	
15. Joseph Justus Scaliger.	
16. Janus Dousa Pater.	
17. Janus Dousa Filius.	
18. Johannes Passeratius.	
19. Theodorus Marcilius.	
20. Johannes Livineius.	
II. <i>Catullus</i> 4.	280
Commentaries.	
1. "Sixtus Octavianus" (= Janus Lernutius and Victor Giselinus).	
III. <i>Catullus</i> 61.	283
Commentaries.	
1. Franciscus Robortellus.	
2. Constantius Landus.	

IV. *Catullus 64.*

286

## Commentaries.

1. Bernardinus Realinus.
2. Marcellus Virgilius Adrianus Minor.
3. Franciscus Bencius.

## FORTUNA\*

## ANTIQUITY

Gaius Valerius Catullus (ca. 82–ca. 52 B.C.) was born in Verona in Cisalpine Gaul.<sup>1</sup> His father was important enough to be on terms of hospitality with Julius Caesar, and the tie was maintained when Catullus came to Rome, although Caesar was offended by his scurrilous verses on Mamurra (Cat. 29, 57; Suet., *Div. Iul.* 73). Other details of Catullus' life are known only through his poetry, an unreliable witness to character, if not also to events, as he himself warns: "me ex versiculis meis putastis, / quod sunt molliculi, parum pudicum. / Nam castum esse decet pium poetam / ipsum, versiculos nihil necesse est" (Cat. 16.3–6). Many of his poems are written to a woman called Lesbia, who is generally identified with Clodia, the sister of Publius Clodius Pulcher and wife of Quintus Metellus Celer (Apuleius, *Ap.* 10). The love affair charted in the poems (like most poetic amours) went badly. Catullus also wrote erotic poetry to a young man named Iuventius (e.g., Cat. 48, 99) and three laments on the death of his brother (Cat. 65, 68, 101). A few dates can be gleaned from the poetry. Catullus mentions serving in Bithynia as a member of the *cohors*

of Gaius Memmius, who governed the province in 57–56 B.C. (Cat. 10), and he refers to two events of the year 55 B.C.: Caesar's invasion of Britain (Cat. 11, 29) and Pompey's second consulship (Cat. 113). The most important biographical details that emerge from the poems, however, are Catullus' interest in poetry based on Alexandrian models and his association with poets of similar tastes such as Licinius Calvus, Helvius Cinna, and Quintus Cornificius.

Catullus and his friends were part of a poetic movement that ostentatiously rejected Roman models in favor of Callimachus and the other Alexandrians. Some say their teacher and catalyst was the Greek poet Parthenius (brought to Rome by Cinna as part of his booty from the Mithridatic war ca. 66–65 B.C.), but perhaps no catalyst was needed.<sup>2</sup> Romans had been traveling east and reading Greek poetry, even Alexandrian poetry, for generations. Whatever the source of their inspiration, the "New Poets," or neoterics (a term used by Cicero in disgust and by modern critics in approbation), turned wholeheartedly and self-consciously to the principles of learning, craftsmanship, and attention to detail sponsored by Callimachus.<sup>3</sup> Like Callimachus, they eschewed epic in favor of smaller genres—particularly elegy, epigram, and epyllion (short erotic "epic" characterized by attention to feminine psychology and use of

\*This article was completed with the assistance of grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the American Philosophical Society.

I wish to express my thanks to my editors, F. Edward Cranz and Virginia Brown, who encouraged me to embark on this project and directed their keen editorial eyes to its completion. It is also a pleasure to thank my *conservus Catalogi*, G. N. Knauer, for his learned and generous assistance at countless points in this study.

1. The best recent discussion of Catullus' biography is that of M. Rambaud, "César et Catulle," in *Actes du Colloque L'élégie romaine: Enracinement, thèmes, diffusion* (16–18 mars 1979). *Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Mulhouse*, fasc. 10 (Paris, 1980), 37–50.

2. For Parthenius see: W. Clausen, "Callimachus and Latin Poetry," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, V (1964), 181–96; T. P. Wiseman, *Cinna the Poet and Other Roman Essays* (Leicester, 1974), 44–58. A more cautious position is taken by N. B. Crowther, "Parthenius and Roman Poetry," *Mnemosyne*, XXIX (1976), 65–71.

3. On the term "neoteric" see: Cicero, *Att.* VII.2.1; N. B. Crowther, "OI NEOTEROI, Poetae Novi, et Cantores Euphorionis," *Classical Quarterly*, XX (1970), 322–27; R. O. A. M. Lyne, "The Neoteric Poets," *Classical Quarterly*, XXVIII (1978), 167–87.

obscure mythology). Catullus' poetry includes these genres as well as a large number of lyric poems in various meters—his so-called polymetrics, the majority of which are written in hendecasyllabics, which were much in vogue with the New Poets.<sup>4</sup> The lyrics, too, are Alexandrian in their conception: their apparent simplicity is in fact the product of Callimachean and neoteric technique.<sup>5</sup> The first poem in the collection, a dedication to the historian Cornelius Nepos, is also a programmatic statement: "Cui dono lepidum novum libellum / arida modo pumice expoliturum?" (Cat. 1.1–2). *Lepidus* and *novus* are catchwords in the neoteric vocabulary; *expoliturum* puns on the polish given the papyrus roll and that applied to its contents by the artful poet; the diminutive *libellus* announces that Catullus plans a work on a small (i.e., Alexandrian) scale.

For both artistic and practical reasons, however, the program poem cannot have been intended to introduce the Catullan corpus as it now stands. Catullus' characterization of his poems as *nugae* (Cat. 1.4), though appropriate for the polymetrics, does not fit the longer and more ambitious epithalamia, elegies, and epyllion.<sup>6</sup> The length of the corpus also presents a problem. The text in Thomson's edition contains 2,289 lines, a sum that takes into account neither lost verses nor intervals between poems.<sup>7</sup> The facts of ancient book production make it virtually impossible that a poetic work of this size was ever accommodated on a single papyrus roll. Single books of poetry were written on separate rolls (e.g., a book of the *Aeneid*, a book of Horace's *Odes*), with a typical length of about 750 lines

and an upper limit of around 1,100. There are some exceptions: the books of the *De rerum natura* range between 1,092 and 1,455 verses; Book IV of Apollonius Rhodius contains 1,779 verses.<sup>8</sup> By simply adding more lengths of papyrus it would have been possible to manufacture a roll to contain a poem much longer than even Apollonius IV, but the result would have been almost impossibly cumbersome for a book of poetry. It has been calculated that a roll for the whole of Catullus would have had to be at least thirty-eight feet long, a length theoretically possible but well past the thirty-five feet usually taken to be the upper limit for classical papyri.<sup>9</sup> This hypothetical roll certainly could not have been described as a *libellus*.

It seems likely, therefore, that Catullus' poems appeared originally in several (probably at least three) *libelli*, which were joined together when the work was transferred from roll to codex, and that the dedication originally intended for a single *libellus* was used for the whole. The exact contents and arrangement of each *libellus* are unknown, but there are some probabilities. The work easily falls into three sections which might well have appeared in separate *libelli*. Poems 1–60 (848 lines in Thomson's edition) contain the polymetrics, 61–64 (795 lines) ambitious Alexandrian set pieces (epithalamia, the Attis poem, the epyllion), and 65–116 (646 lines) elegies and epigrams. Whether these groups were arranged and published as books by Catullus or another is open to question. Catullus died young, and it is possible that the *libellus* announced in Cat. 1 (surely the polymetrics) was the only one published in his lifetime. The book shows signs of careful arrangement, but it may also include poems of Catullus added by an editor after Catullus' death.<sup>10</sup> There are no dedications for the other groups of poems, which perhaps were arranged posthumously. It is likely, for example, that the epyllion (Cat. 64) originally occupied a roll by itself.

4. W. Clausen, "Catulli Veronensis Liber," *Classical Philology*, LXXI (1976), 39.

5. J. P. Elder, "Notes on Some Conscious and Subconscious Elements in Catullus' Poetry," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, LX (1951), 101–36. The prosody of the hendecasyllabics shows neoteric metrical experimentation. See O. Skutsch, "Metrical Variations and Some Textual Problems in Catullus," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, XVI (1969), 38–43; M. Skinner, *Catullus' Passer: The Arrangement of the Book of Polymetric Poems* (New York, 1981), 21–23.

6. A. L. Wheeler, *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry* (Berkeley, 1934), 20–21; Clausen, "Catulli Veronensis Liber," 38.

7. D. F. S. Thomson, *Catullus: A Critical Edition* (Chapel Hill, 1978). Thomson prints six verses of fragments; these have not been counted.

8. T. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen* (Berlin, 1882), 291–93.

9. F. G. Kenyon, *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome*, 2d ed. (Oxford, 1951), 54–55.

10. Clausen, "Catulli Veronensis Liber," 39–41. Clausen suggests that poems 51–60 are fragments and poetic experiments gathered by the editor from Catullus' papers. See also T. P. Wiseman, *Catullan Questions* (Leicester, 1969), 1–31; and Skinner, *Catullus' Passer*.

It is possible that Catullus wrote more than has come down in the manuscript tradition. He has frequently been credited with *priapea*, and it is probable that a quatrain preserved by Terentianus Maurus and two one-line fragments found in Nonius and Porphyryon are genuine.<sup>11</sup> A comment by the elder Pliny has been used as evidence that he wrote an imitation of Theocritus' *Pharmaceutria*: "Hinc Theocriti apud Graecos, Catulli apud nos, proximeque Vergilii incantamentorum amatoria imitatio" (*N.H.* XXVIII.19).<sup>12</sup> It is more likely, however, that Pliny is referring to a brief love charm, perhaps contained in one of the *priapea*.<sup>13</sup>

There is a modern study called *The Catullan Revolution*, whose title aptly describes the effect Catullus and his friends had on Roman poetry.<sup>14</sup> Individual Catullan poems were admired and imitated by the Augustan poets, and the Callimachean and Alexandrian literary ideas he had naturalized became their dominant poetics. No doubt the other New Poets played a role, for their few fragments have a disproportionate number of echoes in Augustan poetry.<sup>15</sup> The Greek Parthenius also had close ties with Cornelius Gallus and Vergil in the next generation.<sup>16</sup> Nevertheless, the influence of Catullus himself is decisive. It may well be that the elegy of Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid owes its origins to an amalgam of Catullan epigram and elegy, perhaps developed by Gallus in his *Amores*.<sup>17</sup>

11. Terentianus (*Grammatici latini* VI.406); Nonius, vol. I, p. 195 (Lindsay) s.v. *ligurrire*; Porphyryon, *Ad Horatii carmen* I.16.22.

12. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, 404; F. Della Corte, *Due studi catulliani* (Genoa, 1951), 34–36.

13. M. Zicari, "A proposito di un 'altro Catullo'," *Scritti catulliani* (Urbino, 1976), 38–40 (= *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo*, LXXXV [1952], 255–56).

14. K. Quinn, *The Catullan Revolution* (Melbourne, 1959).

15. W. Morel, *Fragmenta poetarum latinorum* (Stuttgart, 1963); A. Traglia, *Poetae Novi* (Rome, 1974).

16. Clausen, "Callimachus and Latin Poetry."

17. The origins of Latin elegy are controversial, but Catullan influence is generally accepted. For references to Catullus in the elegists see the testimonia collected by L. Schwabe, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, 2d. ed. (Berlin, 1886), vii. A new collection of testimonia is needed, which would include, for example, the echoes noted by B. L. Ullman, "The Transmission of the Text of Catullus," in *Studi in onore di Luigi Castiglioni*, II (Florence, 1960), 1027–57, and Giuseppe Billanovich, "Dal Livio di Raterio al Livio del Petrarca," *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, II (1959), 164–65. For a recent collection of references to Catullus in ancient

The basic situation of elegy (love-struck poet and faithless mistress) is certainly Catullan, as is the self-conscious preoccupation with writing poetry in the Alexandrian style. Horace, though he conspicuously fails to acknowledge it, owes many debts to Catullus.<sup>18</sup> Vergil uses Cat. 64 in the *Aeneid* and in the *Fourth Eclogue*;<sup>19</sup> his most famous echo is Aeneas' moving protest to Dido in the underworld, which is modeled on a line from the frivolous *Lock of Berenice* (Cat. 66): "invitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi" (*Aen.* VI.460); "invita, o regina, tuo de vertice cessi" (Cat. 66.39). It is also possible that Vergil is the author of *Catalepton* 10, which is based on Cat. 4 and is one of the few literary parodies from antiquity.<sup>20</sup>

Catullus' popularity continued through the Silver Age,<sup>21</sup> but his greatest imitator, Martial, was interested less in neoteric poetics than in models for his own hendecasyllabic and elegiac epigrams. Martial seems to have called the book of polymetrics the *passer*, from the subject of its second and third poems, and it may have been known thus generally in antiquity: "Sic forsan tener ausus est Catullus / magno mittere Passerem Maroni" (Mart. IV.14.13–14). There is some further support for this, since the younger Pliny, who frequently cites Catullus as a precedent for his poetic efforts, jestingly calls his own poems *passerculi* and *columbulae* (*Ep.* IX.25.3). Pliny and Martial are typical of their age both in their interest in the polymetrics and epigrams and in their neglect of the longer poems. The favorite poems were Cat. 2 and 3, on Lesbia's sparrow,<sup>22</sup> and the latter was used as a

authors see T. P. Wiseman, *Catullus and His World* (Cambridge, 1985), 242–62.

18. E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), s.v. "Catullus" in index; C. J. Fordyce, *Catullus: A Commentary* (Oxford, 1961), xxiii. Influence is most obvious in c. 1.22, which uses the structure and language of Cat. 11 and Cat. 51. Horace's only reference to Catullus by name is slighting: "neque simius iste nil praeter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum" (*Serm.* I.10.19).

19. Dido has some characteristics in common with Catullus' Ariadne. For Catullus and the *Fourth Eclogue* see W. Berg, *Early Virgil* (London, 1974), 158–77. Some other Vergilian echoes are listed by Fordyce, *Catullus*, xxii.

20. *P. Vergili Maronis Catalepton*, ed. R. E. H. Westendorp Boerma (Assen, 1963), II.28–48.

21. Testimonia in Schwabe, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, viii–x.

22. See, for example, Sen., *Apoc.* XI; Juv. VI.7–8; Mart., *Ep.* I.7, 109, IV.14, VII.14, XI.6, XIV.77.



model *epicedion* not only by Martial but also by an anonymous poet whose verses are preserved in a second-century inscription at Auch.<sup>23</sup> Not surprisingly, allusions to the longer poems appear principally in other *docti poetae* like Statius, who imitates Cat. 64 in his epithalamium, and the poet of the *Ciris*, who has lifted large segments from Cat. 64 for his strange epyllion.<sup>24</sup>

The prose testimonia place the same emphasis on the lyrics and epigrams at the expense of the longer poems.<sup>25</sup> In some we can discern a scholarly or critical approach. Suetonius and Apuleius are sources for our few biographical details.<sup>26</sup> The elder Pliny quotes Cat. 1.3–4 for the dedication of the *Natural History*, changing the word order in line 4 to avoid the iambic opening which made its author seem *duriusculus* (Plin., *N.H.* I, *praef.* 1).<sup>27</sup>

From Aulus Gellius it is clear that Catullus was still widely read and discussed in the second century and that some of his poems, at least, were read and appreciated by Greeks (*Noct. att.* XIX.9.7). Gellius' own interesting and sympathetic interpretations of Catullus are based on his conception (which was not always perfect) of Catullan usage. He defends the word *deprecor* in Cat. 92 and presents an interpretation of the poem (*Noct. att.* VII.16). On Cat. 27.4 he argues for the reading *ebria acina* on the basis of euphony and imitation of Homeric hiatus, but he is also aware of at least two variants, which he attributes to corrupt exemplars (*Noct. att.* VI.20.6).<sup>28</sup>

After about the middle of the second century

23. Mart., *Ep.* I.109; *Carm. epigraph.*, 1512. For a discussion and bibliography of CEL 1512 see K. R. Walters, "Catullan Echoes in the Second Century A.D.," *Classical World*, LXIX (1976), 353–60. The identical lines 4 and 7 of this inscription have been used to emend Cat. 3.16 (G. P. Goold, "Catullus 3.16," *Phoenix*, XXIII [1969], 186–203).

24. D. Vessey, "Aspects of Statius' Epithalamium," *Mnemosyne*, XXV (1972), 178, 184. R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Ciris* (Cambridge, 1978), 48–56, places the *Ciris* after Statius and suggests a date in the second or even in the third century.

25. Six of the seven citations by Quintilian listed by Schwabe, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, viiii, refer to lyrics or epigrams.

26. Suet., *Div. Iul.* LXXIII; Apul., *Apol.* X.

27. This metrical variation was probably a neoteric experiment. See Skinner, *Catullus' Passer*, 21–23.

28. For Gellius' discussions of Cat. 27 and 92 see the commentary of Fordyce, *Catullus*, ad loc.

A.D. there is scarcely anyone for over a thousand years who can be securely identified as a reader of Catullus. Catullus was no school author; no doubt there was little demand for his poems, and few copies were made. We can be sure that fewer still were among the works of ancient authors transferred from roll to codex in the fourth century. Festus (late second century) discusses some hard words in Catullus, but he was only epitomizing the *De significatu verborum* of the Augustan scholar Verrius Flaccus. Porphyry (third century), Aelius Donatus (fourth century), and Nonius Marcellus (fourth century) quote single verses. The metricians Terentianus Maurus (late second century), Atilius Fortunatianus (fourth century), and Marius Victorinus (fourth century) cite verses from Catullus as examples; their source seems to have been the first-century poet and metrician Caesius Bassus. And so it goes among poets and philosophers as well. In the fourth century Ausonius uses Cat. 1 as a tag in his own dedications. Claudian echoes Catullan phrases. Martianus Capella in the fifth century, Boethius in the sixth century, and Isidore in the seventh century quote single verses, all evidently from grammarians and other intermediate sources.<sup>29</sup>

## THE MIDDLE AGES

Catullus has left few traces in the Middle Ages. He is mentioned by name only two or three times in the period between Isidore and the end of the thirteenth century, and he is listed in no medieval manuscript catalog.<sup>30</sup> There are two pieces of direct evidence, however, that Catullus was being read in France and northern Italy, as well as some indirect and possibly related evidence in the form of echoes and allusions.

The oldest manuscript of Catullus is Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 8071, called T after a sixteenth-century owner, Jacques-Auguste de Thou. Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 8071 is a late ninth-century florilegium that contains Cat. 62,

29. See Schwabe, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, xi–xiii. For a good discussion see A. Manzo, "Testimonianze e tradizione del 'Liber' catulliano nella letteratura esegetico-scolastica antica," *Rivista di studi classici*, XV (1967), 137–62.

30. Schwabe, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, xiii–xiv; Ullman, "Transmission," 1035.

various minor works, and selections from Martial, Juvenal, and Seneca's tragedies. Except for Juvenal its contents were copied from another florilegium, Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 277, which probably dates from the late eighth or early ninth century. Vienna 277 is now incomplete and contains no Catullus, but most scholars assume that it once did and that its now missing Catullus was the exemplar for the Catullus portion of Paris lat. 8071.<sup>31</sup> Both Paris lat. 8071 and Vienna 277 are French in script, and the latter, at least, may be connected with Tours.<sup>32</sup> Ullman suggests that the archetype of Paris lat. 8071 and Vienna 277 might have been the book of verse that Venantius Fortunatus says (c. IX.7) was lent to him by Gregory of Tours between 573 and 576. He points to Fortunatus' use of the very rare word *hiulco* (used three times in Latin literature) and rarer collocation *agros hiulco* (used only twice) as evidence for Fortunatus' knowledge of Catullus.<sup>33</sup> This is less straightforward than it seems, for in c. IX.7 Fortunatus is apparently describing not a collection of poems but a metrical treatise containing examples of the various meters. Furthermore, as Ullman acknowledged, the combination *agros hiulco* appears not in Cat. 62 but in Cat. 68. We must conclude that if Fortunatus knew Catullus his source was not the archetype of T. Ullman also suggested that Heiric of Auxerre in the ninth century read and imitated Catullus on the basis of several close echoes; here, too, the passages imitated are not confined to Cat. 62.<sup>34</sup> Heiric's manuscript was

not Paris lat. 8071 or its exemplar but probably a full text of the poems.

Our second piece of direct evidence is contained in a sermon delivered by Bishop Ratherius of Verona in 966. Ullman paraphrases (the omissions are mine): "What can I say about myself . . . if I meditate day and night on the law of God, while I read Catullus never read before or Plautus long neglected, while I explain music, though I know nothing about mathematics?"<sup>35</sup> Ratherius' Latin is difficult, and it is not clear whether he is claiming to have read Catullus and Plautus himself or is simply adducing their study as an example of frivolous behavior. The distinction is probably unimportant. It seems evident that someone in Verona was reading Catullus and that the action was not only frivolous but exceptional: *Catullum nunquam antea lectum*. The someone may have been Ratherius himself, for a sermon he delivered in 963 contains a possible echo of Cat. 58b.2.<sup>36</sup>

It is tempting to suppose that Ratherius (if it was he who was reading Catullus) found a manuscript of Catullus in the Chapter Library of Verona, where it lay undisturbed through most of the Middle Ages until it came dramatically to light at the end of the thirteenth century and became the archetype (V) for all subsequent manuscripts.<sup>37</sup> This would fit with the identification of much earlier Catullan echoes in verses probably written in Brescia by the monk Hilde-  
mar, who was at S. Faustino in Brescia from 841 to 845, and it is safe to presume that Hilde-  
mar had access to the nearby Chapter Library in Verona.<sup>38</sup> There is, however, no direct evidence

31. See, for example, Ullman, "Transmission," 1028–29; Thomson, *Catullus*, 10; B. Richardson, "Pucci, Parrasio and Catullus," *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, XIX (1976), 285–87.

32. It is likely that Vienna 277 was brought from France to Naples by Sannazaro around 1502, for it closely fits the description of his French trophies given by Summontius in the preface to Pontanus' *Actius* (1507). (The description does not mention Catullus.) It is Summontius who mentions Tours: "ex Heduarum usque finibus atque e Turonibus dona quaedam mirum in modum placitura literatis viris." See M. Haupt, *Ovidii Halieutica Gratii et Nemesiani Cynegetica* (Leipzig, 1838), xxiii–xxiv; Richardson, "Pucci, Parrasio and Catullus," 285–87.

33. Fortunatus: *per hiulcatos fervor anhelat agros* (c. VI.10.6); Catullus: *aestus hiulcat agros* (Cat. 68.67) (Ullman, "Transmission," 1029).

34. Ullman identified echoes of Cat. 1, 40, 63, 67, 68 (*ibid.*, 1030–31).

35. "quid de me dicere, quid valeo cogitare (et ut turpia subsidens honesta solum, prohibita licet, depromam), si in lege Dei, ut debitorem me fore non nescio, die meditor et nocte, Catullum nunquam antea lectum, Plautum quando iam olim lego neglectum, musicam quando sepe rogatus expono, cum nequeam (primo arithmetico scilicet cassatus auxilio)" (*Sermo de Maria et Martha* IV.9–13, in *Sermones Ratherii episcopi Veronensis*, ed. B. R. Reece [Worcester, Mass., 1969], p. 86). See Ullman, "Transmission," 1031.

36. R. Ellis, *Catulli Veronensis Liber* (Oxford, 1878), viii; Ullman, "Transmission," 1032–33. Ratherius, *Sermo I de Ascensione*, II.7–8, ed. Reece, p. 30: "non pennigero, ut poeticus ille noster . . . volatu." (Cf. Cat. 58b.3–2: "non Ladas ego pinnipesve Perseus / non si Pegaseo ferar volatu.")

37. Giuseppe Billanovich, "Dal Livio," 164–65; Giuseppe Billanovich, "Terenzio, Ildemaro, Petrarca," *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, XVII (1974), 58–59.

38. Billanovich, "Terenzio," 43–60.

for a Catullan manuscript in Verona. Ullman argues that the archetype V was probably related to Paris lat. 8071 and that it, too, was probably French.<sup>39</sup> One might also point out that Hildemar himself was French, perhaps from Corbie.<sup>40</sup> Ratherius left Verona for Lobbes in 968, but the fate of the Catullus manuscript is unknown. A Cologne manuscript of Priscian dated to the eleventh century (Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesanbibliothek 202) contains a correct citation of Cat. 37.18, which is corrupt in other Priscian manuscripts, and it is presumed that the scribe used a manuscript of Catullus for his reading. Cologne is not far from Lobbes or from Aulne or Haumont, where Ratherius also lived in the last years of his life.<sup>41</sup> Alternatively, the scribe of Cologne 202 may have had access to a different manuscript altogether, while Ratherius' copy remained in Verona.

The last medieval "sighting" of Catullus is connected not with Italy or France but with Britain. The echo is found in the twelfth-century *De gestis regum Anglorum* of William of Malmesbury. It is difficult to know what to make of this because William apparently never left England and there is no other evidence connecting Catullus with Britain before the fifteenth century.<sup>42</sup>

#### THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

It was suggested by Guido Billanovich in 1958 that the Paduan poets Lovato Lovati (d. 1309) and Albertino Mussato (d. 1329) read Catullus and that there are some echoes in Lovato that can be dated as early as 1268.<sup>43</sup> In spite of Ullman's skepticism, the suggestion was widely and uncritically accepted, but Ludwig has demonstrated that the passages in Lovato adduced by Billanovich do not demonstrate knowledge of Catullus and that most can be

traced to other, more familiar models.<sup>44</sup> If Lovato knew Catullus, the fact is not reflected in his poetry.

Catullus was discovered once and for all, however, at some time near the end of the thirteenth century or the beginning of the fourteenth. The date and circumstances, as well as the identity of the finder, are obscure, and little light is shed in the epigram (ca. 1303–1307) of Benvenuto Campesani of Vicenza<sup>45</sup> that commemorates the discovery:

Ad patriam venio longis a finibus exsul;  
causa mei reditus compatriota fuit,  
scilicet a calamis tribuit cui Francia nomen  
quique notat turbe pretereuntis iter.  
Quo licet ingenio vestrum celebrate Catullum,  
cuius sub modio clausa papyrus erat.

Whatever else it says, however, Benvenuto's epigram argues against the idea that the manuscript had remained through the Middle Ages in the Chapter Library at Verona:<sup>46</sup> after a distant exile Catullus has been returned to his homeland by a fellow countryman.<sup>47</sup>

The manuscript (usually called V) soon disappeared, but not before it had been copied at least twice. Of the three fourteenth-century manuscripts, O (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. Class. Lat. 30) seems to have been copied directly from V, and G (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 14137) and R (Vatican Library, Ottob. lat. 1829) were made from another direct copy, X, now lost.<sup>48</sup> Benvenuto's epigram probably

44. Ullman, "Transmission," 1055–56. J. Granarolo defended Billanovich's claim: "Un classique latin au moyen âge avant le xiv<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Annales de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines d'Aix*, XXXVI (1962), 63–75. See also L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 2d ed. (Oxford, 1983), 110–11. For the refutation see W. Ludwig, "Kannte Lovato Catullus?" *Rheinisches Museum*, CXXIX (1986), 329–57.

45. R. Weiss, "Benvenuto Campesani (1250/55?–1323)," *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova*, XLIV (1955), 129–44.

46. E.g. by Giuseppe Billanovich, "Dal Livio," 164–65.

47. Weiss, "Benvenuto Campesani," 141; Ullman, "Transmission," 1036; O. Skutsch, "The Book under the Bushel," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, XVII (1970), 148.

48. For the manuscripts see Ullman, "Transmission," 1038–55; Thomson, *Catullus*, 3–38, and "A New Look at the Manuscript Tradition of Catullus," *Yale Classical Studies*, XXIII (1973), 113–29; M. Zicari, "Ricerche sulla tradi-

39. Ullman, "Transmission," 1031–32.

40. Billanovich, "Terenzio," 52.

41. Schwabe, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, xiv; Ullman 1033.

42. *De gestis regum Anglorum* II.159: "virginem sane nec inelegantem nec illepidam;" cf. Cat. 6.2 and 10.3. Ellis, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, ix; Ullman, "Transmission," 1033–34.

43. Guido Billanovich, "Veterum vestigia vatum nei carmi dei preumanisti padovani," *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, I (1958), 155–243, esp. 155–70 and 191–99.

appeared in X because it appears in both R and G but not in O.

Before its disappearance V seems also to have been studied in Verona by several anthologists. The most important of these was the Paduan judge Hieremias de Montagnone (ca. 1255–1321), whose *Compendium moralium notabilium* contains seven quotations from Catullus.<sup>49</sup> The *Compendium* was compiled between 1295 and 1310,<sup>50</sup> but Hieremias added to his work over the years and perhaps incorporated Catullus as late as 1310–15. It seems, moreover, that the Catullus sections were not added all at once, for at least one manuscript contains only five of the seven.<sup>51</sup> Hieremias' selections all have a moralizing or proverbial air, and it is probably not significant that half a dozen fifteenth-century Catullus manuscripts single out several of them with braces or pointing fingers, especially since most of these manuscripts also distinguish other passages in the same way.<sup>52</sup> More interesting is the fact that five of Hieremias' seven passages are marked in Ottob. lat. 1829<sup>53</sup> and two in Paris lat. 14137. Hale concluded from the notations in Ottob. lat. 1829 that the passages had been marked in V by Hieremias himself as he was looking for suitable quotations, but (especially since none of the passages is noted in Oxford Canon. Class. Lat. 30) it is more likely that the notations were present in X, or that early readers

of Paris lat. 14137 and Ottob. lat. 1829 noted in their manuscripts passages that they had found quoted in Hieremias. The popular *Compendium* was no doubt readily available.<sup>54</sup>

Benzo of Alessandria (d. ca. 1330) probably also consulted V in Verona around 1310, for he quotes Cat. 35.1–4 in his encyclopedic *Chronicle*. The error *occilio* for *cecilio* (Cat. 35.2), found elsewhere only in Oxford Canon. Class. Lat. 30, V's direct and most faithful descendant, confirms that Benzo took his quotation from V itself.<sup>55</sup> The compiler of the *Flores* of 1329 quotes Cat. 22.19–21.<sup>56</sup> This is from one of the poems cited by Hieremias, but the passages are not identical, since Hieremias quotes verses 18–20. Moreover, the compiler gives the title *Ad Varum*, which suggests that he was looking at a Catullan manuscript, probably V.<sup>57</sup> Guglielmo da Pastrengo (d. 1362) quotes Catullus directly (Cat. 1.5–7) in his *De originibus rerum* and gives glosses nearly identical with those in Oxford Canon. Class. Lat. 30, which probably appeared also in V.<sup>58</sup>

Guglielmo's friend Petrarch quotes or discusses Catullus several times, but it is not certain whether he was consulting a florilegium or actually owned and perhaps even corrected his own manuscript.<sup>59</sup> Ullman argues that Petrarch owned

zione manoscritta di Catullo," *Bollettino del Comitato per la preparazione dell'edizione nazionale dei classici greci e latini*, VI (1958), 79–89 (= *Scritti catulliani*, 79–104). As this article was going to press, I learned that D. S. McKie has argued in his unpublished dissertation (Cambridge University, 1977) that X and O were not copied directly from V but from an intervening copy of V.

49. Cat. 22.18–20; 39.16; 51.15–16; 64.143–48; 66.15–16; 68.137; 76.13.

50. R. Weiss, "Geremia da Montagnone," in *Il primo secolo dell'umanesimo* (Rome, 1949), 26.

51. B. L. Ullman, "Hieremias de Montagnone and His Citations from Catullus," in *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 2d ed. (Rome, 1973), 82–83. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. Class. Lat. 212 contains no Catullus; Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 312 lacks 66.15–16 and 76.13.

52. The following manuscripts designate at least two of Hieremias' selections: Brussels IV.711 (= Schlögl 143); Edinburgh, National Library, Adv. 18.5.2; Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana 33.11; London, British Library, Egerton 3027; Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana I 67 sup; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 7989; Vatican Library, Barb. lat. 34. I have not checked all the manuscripts.

53. W. G. Hale, "Benzo of Alexandria and Catullus," *Classical Philology*, V (1910), 62.

54. Ullman counted thirty manuscripts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries: "Hieremias de Montagnone and His Citations from Catullus," 105ff. Weiss, "Geremia da Montagnone," 29–30, lists a dozen more. Unfortunately, Ullman's census of the library of Coluccio Salutati, the first owner of Ottob. lat. 1829, lists no manuscript of the *Compendium*: Ullman, *The Humanism of Coluccio Salutati* (Rome, 1958), 129–212.

55. Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana B 24 inf.; Catullus is cited on fol. 94r. See R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli xiv e xv*, 2d ed., II (Florence, 1967), 128–50; Hale, "Benzo of Alexandria," 56–65.

56. Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare CLXVIII (155); Catullus is quoted on fol. 10v. See Sabbadini, *Le scoperte*, 90–97.

57. R. Ellis, *Catullus in the XIVth Century* (Oxford, 1905), 6.

58. ed. 1547 (Venice), 16a, 18b. Ellis, *Catullus*, 14–16; Ullman, "Transmission," 1041–42.

59. Petrarch's quotations are listed by U. Bosco, "Il Petrarca e l'umanesimo filologico," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, CXX (1942), 108–16. Bosco, *ibid.*, and Zicàri, "A proposito," 35–36, believe that Petrarch had a florilegium that included the Ariadne episode of Cat. 64. Ellis, *Catullus*, 16–23, and Ullman, "Transmission," 1043–45, argue that he owned a manuscript. Recently two further quotations (Cat. 39.19 and 16.5–6) have been discovered in Petrarch's glosses in Vat. lat. 2193. The second is cited with

X, the lost exemplar of Paris lat. 14137 and Ottob. lat. 1829, and that it was from Petrarch's literary executors that Coluccio Salutati acquired access to it.<sup>60</sup> In any case, X was copied twice: first by Antonio da Legnago, the scribe of Paris lat. 14137, who dated it October 1375, around a year after Petrarch's death;<sup>61</sup> and then on the orders of Salutati, who also corrected his new manuscript (Ottob. lat. 1829). Salutati's manuscript is the ancestor of most fifteenth-century manuscripts, and Salutati himself must have the credit for being the first Renaissance critic of Catullus.<sup>62</sup>

#### THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

Salutati's manuscript was copied more than once in the early years of the fifteenth century, but its earliest and perhaps most important student was Poggio, now identified as the scribe of M (Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, Marc. lat. XII 80 [4167]), which should probably be dated ca. 1398–1400.<sup>63</sup> Other manuscripts belonging to the period 1400–1430 are Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria 2621, written by Hieronymus Donatus in 1412 and subsequently owned and corrected by Hermolaus Barbarus; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 7989 (copied in 1423), which is apparently the earliest manuscript in which Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius are brought together, and contains later annotations indebted to the 1496 commentary of Palladius Fuscus (see p. 239 below);<sup>64</sup> Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana 36.23 (ca. 1425); and Siena, Biblioteca Comunale H.V.41 (ca. 1425).

Catullus' first Renaissance imitator seems to have been Leonardo Bruni, a protégé of Coluc-

cio Salutati and friend and colleague of Poggio. Bruni produced an obscene pastiche of Cat. 41–43 perhaps between 1405 and 1415 and certainly before 1421 (the date of the earliest manuscript in which it appears).<sup>65</sup> Neither the poem nor Bruni's authorship of it became well known, and some years later (perhaps in the last half of the fifteenth century) an unknown forger made a few changes in it and tried to pass it off as the work of Cornelius Gallus.<sup>66</sup> Catullan imitation began in earnest only a generation after Bruni's youthful effort, when Cristoforo Landino composed imitations of Cat. 8 and 11 in elegiac couplets for his *Xandra* (1443–44).<sup>67</sup>

Bruni perhaps had access to the manuscripts of Salutati and Poggio, but other readers and poets were not so lucky, for manuscripts were still scarce in the first quarter of the fifteenth century. Thus, Panormita (Antonius Beccadellus) in the *Hermaphroditus* (1425) asks a friend's help in finding a manuscript of Catullus for his importunate mistress. Whatever one thinks about the literary enthusiasms of Panormita's mistress, the interest of the poet himself would not be surprising. He owned a manuscript of Catullus' great imitator Martial, made corrections to the text, and imitated Martial studiously in his own scandalous epigrams in the *Hermaphroditus*. It seems unlikely, however, that he managed to acquire a manuscript or studied Catullus, for although some Catullan echoes have been identified in his correspondence and in the *Hermaphroditus*, they do not demonstrate close familiarity with his poetry.<sup>68</sup> The *Her-*

the title *Ad Aurelium*, which points to Petrarch's use of a manuscript. See C. Tristano, "Le postille del Petrarca nel Vat. lat. 2193," *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, XVII (1974), 414–15.

60. Ullman, "Transmission," 1045–50.

61. Giuseppe Billanovich, "Dal Livio," 163–69.

62. Ullman, "Transmission," 1040–41; Thomson, "New Look," 113–29; D. F. S. Thomson, "The Codex Romanus of Catullus: A Collation of the Text," *Rheinisches Museum*, CXIII (1970), 97–110.

63. A. C. de la Mare and D. F. S. Thomson, "Poggio's Earliest Manuscript?" *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, XVI (1973), 179–95.

64. A. C. de la Mare, "The Return of Petronius to Italy," in J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibson, eds., *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to Richard William Hunt* (Oxford, 1976), 240–51.

65. Bruni's poem has been published and discussed by J. Hankins, "The Latin Poetry of Leonardo Bruni," *Humanistica lovaniensia*, XXXIX (1990), 19–30. It appears under the title "endecasyllabi Leonardi Aretini" in Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale VIII G 45, fol. 130r. The manuscript, which contains other works of Bruni, is dated June 1421.

66. The "Gallus redaction" was discussed and published by S. Mariotti, who was unaware of the poem's earlier history; see his "Cornelii Galli Hendecasyllabi" in G. Bernardoni Trezzini et al., eds., *Tra latino e volgare. Per Carlo Dionisotti II* (Padua, 1974), 547–68.

67. For Landino see W. Ludwig, "Catullus renatus: Anfänge und frühe Entwicklung des catullischen Stils in der neulateinischen Dichtung" in *Litterae neolatinae* (Munich, 1989), 170–72.

68. For Panormita's request for a manuscript of Catullus see *Hermaphroditus* II.23, quoted and discussed by Ellis, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, 353–55 and Schwabe *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, xvii and xviii. For Panormita and Martial see F.-R. Hausmann, "Martial in Italien," *Studi medievali*, 3d ser., XVII, 1 (1976), 186–88. Schwabe lists four Catullan

*maphroditus* was almost immediately hailed with enthusiasm by Guarinus Veronensis (1370–1460), who defended its obscenity by quoting (*inter alios*) Catullus: “nam castum esse decet pium poetam,” etc. (Cat. 16.5–9).<sup>69</sup> That the defense was insufficient is shown by Guarinus’ feeble palinode in 1435, in which he pretends to have praised the form but condemned the content of the salacious *Hermaphroditus*.<sup>70</sup> The defense was apparently insufficient also for Catullus, if we may judge from the contemporary reading list of Ugolino Pisano (1436 or 1437): “Publice non legantur Iuvenalis, Persius, Martialis Cocus, Propertius, Tibullus, Catullus, Priapeia Virgilii, Naso de arte amandi et de remedio amoris, sed relinquuntur studio camerario videre eos volentium, ut plurima sciantur, non ut quisquam adolenscens tyro eorum lectione contaminetur.”<sup>71</sup>

Guarinus’ own correspondence contains several Catullan tags, which are repeated with almost embarrassing regularity,<sup>72</sup> but it seems unlikely that he made a close study of the text, even though his name was sometimes linked with Catullus in the fifteenth century. A few manuscripts contain a collection of neo-Latin poems, several of which are associated with Guarinus; the collection probably originated at Ferrara and may have been assembled by one of his pupils.<sup>73</sup> In several manuscripts and early editions the verses of Benvenuto Campesani are attributed to Guarinus;<sup>74</sup> in at least one codex he is identified as the discoverer of Catullus as well as the author of the epigram. This is Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale IV.711 (=Schlägl

143),<sup>75</sup> whose scribe, Johannes von Rabenstein, glossed the epigram in 1465: “Guarinus Veronensis in Francia repperit Catullum et portavit in Italiam ac publicavit sibique haec fecit carmina” (fol. 77r). Both attributions, impossible on chronological grounds alone, probably result from the magnetic power of Guarinus’ name in the fifteenth century to attract credit for philological activity.<sup>76</sup> A similar explanation may account for Sabellicus’ comment in *De latinae linguae reparatione* (1494): “Catullum (Catulum *ed.*) municipem suum situ et squalore confectum lucemque ex diuturnis tenebris reformidantem ita abstersit ut sine maiore rubore in publicum exire non dubitarit.”<sup>77</sup> Schwabe suggested that Sabellicus was confusing Guarinus with his son Baptista Guarinus, who is known to have studied Catullus.<sup>78</sup> Sabbadini once thought that evidence for Guarinus’ study of Catullus was contained in a letter of 1456 to Octavianus Ubaldinus which includes the remark: “Catulum ubi meliorem fecero ad proprios lares remeare compellam.” The letter unfortunately does not contain the name of the sender, but since the manuscript in which it appears contains correspondence of Baptista Guarinus, it seems more likely that the author was in fact Baptista. This was the prevailing view at the time the letter was published, and Sabbadini himself came to accept it.<sup>79</sup>

Baptista Guarinus (ca. 1435–1505) emended Catullus and presented his work to the city of Verona, as we know from several sources, including Baptista himself, for his verses commemorating the event appear both in an edition of his poetry (1496) and in the Catullan commentary of his son Alexander Guarinus (1521). Baptista’s friend Ludovicus Pictorius also wrote

quotations in Panormita’s correspondence: Cat. 16.5–9; 35.7 (twice); 66.32. Each appears also in Guarinus’ correspondence (see n. 72 below).

69. In a letter to Johannes Lamola in 1426. See R. Sabbadini, *Epistolario di Guarino Veronese* (Venice, 1915), I, 505–6 (no. 346).

70. *Ibid.*, 209–14 (no. 666).

71. Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana F 141 sup., fol. 68v. See Sabbadini, *Le scoperte*, I, 201.

72. His favorites are Cat. 1.3–4 (seven times), and Cat. 66.31–32 (seven times). See Sabbadini, *Epistolario*, Index.

73. E.g. Brescia, Biblioteca Queriniana A.VII.7; Leiden Voss. lat. oct. 13; London, British Library, Harl. 2574; Vatican Library, Vat. lat. 4856. See V. Cremona, *Catulli Codex Brixianus A VII 7* (Bologna, 1954), 26; Zicàri, “A proposito,” 97.

74. E.g., Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 7990 and 8232; Vatican Library, Barb. lat. 34; ed. Venice (1472); ed. Venice (1475); ed. Reggio Emilia (1481).

75. J. H. Gaisser, “Schlägl 143 and Brussels IV.711,” *Manuscripta*, XXV (1981), 176–78.

76. Zicàri, “Il codice pesarese di Catullo e i suoi affini,” *Scritti catulliani*, 55 (= *Studia oliveriana*, I [1953], 18).

77. Sabellicus, *Opera* (Venice, 1502), 111.

78. Schwabe, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, 20. The fact that Sabellicus is addressing Baptista perhaps does not affect the argument.

79. The letter was published and attributed to Baptista by E. Abel in *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien*, XXXIV (1883), 164–66. Sabbadini attributed it to Guarinus in *Rivista di filologia e d’istruzione classica*, XIII (1885), 266–69 and *ibid.*, XIV (1886), 179–81. He later published it in his edition of Guarinus’ correspondence, attributing it to Baptista (*Epistolario*, III, 465–79).

a poem celebrating the accomplishment, and this too appears in Alexander's commentary.<sup>80</sup> Moreover, Alexander's principal motive in writing his commentary, as he says in the preface, was to preserve and explain his father's work.

No manuscript or edition contains the name of Baptista Guarinus, but we can draw some inferences about the nature and extent of his emendations. According to Alexander's preface, Baptista emended a corrupt codex and published his results as a *nitidum et tersum opus* (the phrase recalls a line in Baptista's poem). The commemorative poems as well as the preface speak of *loci* emended by Baptista: "Accipe facundi genitrix Verona Catulli / Iam bene correctos quos tueare locos" (Baptista); "pro viribus explicare tentet / Quos pridem petii mihi resolvi / arguti dubios locos Catulli / Sive aenygmata rectius vocarim" (Pictorius). It seems likely that Baptista concerned himself with textual cruxes rather than editing a whole text and that his *nitidum et tersum opus* was a collection like that of Avantius (see p. 232 below). Avantius provides another parallel in that he, too, had been asked by a friend to elucidate certain particularly knotty passages. The date of Baptista's emendations is unknown. In his commemorative poem, which was published in 1492, Pictorius speaks of the emendations as a work in progress, but Alexander Guarinus says on Pictorius' authority that Baptista had completed the emendations many years earlier. The priority of some of Baptista's emendations was contested, and no doubt Alexander's vagueness about the date arises from his desire to suggest their earliest possible diffusion. In fact, however, Baptista's work was anticipated by the 1485 edition and commentary of Antonius Parthenius (see p. 223 below), as we can see in Parthenius' reference to a slower rival in his *Letter to the Reader*: "Cur igitur huiusmodi homines tanquam fuci operi alieno infesti insidiatores ipsi ante me tales conatus non sunt aggressi? Cur alienam inventionem oscitantes expectarunt? Cur herculea virtute instructi ac freti immanem Catulliani carminis hydram non sunt ausi conficere?" The jibe

"herculea virtute instructi ac freti" identifies Baptista, whose principal patron was Ercole I, duke of Ferrara.

By 1460–70 manuscripts of Catullus were common, and a series of printed editions in the next decade ensured that the text was widely available, if still confused and corrupt. The *editio princeps* was published in Venice in 1472 (HC 4758) from a text similar to that of London, British Library, Add. MS 11915;<sup>81</sup> the volume included Tibullus and Propertius, by now regular companions of Catullus in the manuscripts, as well as the *Silvae* of Statius. It was reprinted in Venice with some changes in 1475 (HC 4759). Another edition of around 1475 was printed in Rome (C 1539); this, too, depended heavily on the 1472 edition. The Parma edition of 1473 (HC 4756) contains many changes from the 1472 edition and includes readings from a different group of manuscripts.<sup>82</sup> Its colophon criticizes the 1472 edition and claims that the editor, Franciscus Puteolanus, has improved the text of Catullus and Statius in a thousand places. Closely descended from it is the 1481 edition published in Reggio Emilia (HC 4757).

The editions of both Venice (either 1472 or 1475) and Parma were used by Calphurnius (Giovanni Planza dei Ruffinoni) in the Vicenza edition of 1481 (HC 4760), although he mentions only the Venetian edition.<sup>83</sup> According to Calphurnius' dedication to Hermolaus Barbarus, his students had wanted him to lecture on Propertius and Statius, but on turning to the Venetian edition (which contained also Catullus and Tibullus), he found it so faulty that it scarcely made sense, and he resolved to produce a text of his own for all four poets. As a result, he boasts not so much of having emended as of having rewritten the whole. Calphurnius is the earliest editor known to have lectured on Catullus. In 1493 Avantius wrote enthusiastically of the well-attended lectures in Padua in which Calphurnius explained *plures Catulli sensus latentes*, but no doubt he lectured on Catullus throughout his long career.

80. *Baptistae Guarini Poema Divo Herculi Ferrariensium Duci dicatum* (Modena, 1496), lii–liii. See also *Alexandri Guarini Ferrariensis in C. V. Catullum Veronensem per Baptistam Patrem emendatum Expositiones* (Venice, 1521), A10r–v.

81. Zicàri, "Calfurnio editore di Catullo," *Scritti catulliani*, 106 (= *Atene e Roma*, n.s., II [1957], 157–58). For collations of these editions and Vicenza 1481 see G. Bombieri, "Collazione di alcune antiche edizioni catulliane," *Acme*, XV (1962), 179–239.

82. Zicàri, "Calfurnio editore di Catullo."

83. *Ibid.*; Bombieri, "Collazione."



In the decade from 1472 to 1481 six editions had been published, but Catullus, unlike his companions in the 1472 edition, still lacked a commentary. This was probably because of the corrupt condition of the text, a complaint first expressed by Antonio da Legnago in 1375 in the subscription to Paris lat. 14137, but reiterated by most subsequent editors and scholars. Many of the poems had been transmitted *en bloc*, and scholars disagreed on where to divide them. Others were beset by corruptions that obscured their meaning. In the 1470s the text was barely readable: only a very inexperienced or a very great scholar would be tempted to comment on it.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Angelus Politianus was the first to make the attempt.<sup>84</sup> His subscription in the first edition tells us that he was working on Catullus in 1473, when the *editio princeps* was only a few months old and he himself was a mere eighteen. Politianus continued to annotate his edition at least into the early 1480s, adding readings from subsequent editions and occasionally changing his mind about earlier solutions. His attention was directed principally to the text, and his notes contain a large number of variant readings and emendations, some gleaned from collating other editions and manuscripts and others not found elsewhere in his lifetime. Many annotations, however, are not primarily textual. Some gloss phrases and collocations that would later figure in his own Neo-Latin poetry;<sup>85</sup> many others are explanations and citations of parallel passages. Politianus probably began to write with the intention of producing a commentary. The notes alone indicate as much, and a letter written to Alessandro and Lattanzio Cortesi in 1486 confirms the impression.<sup>86</sup> But by the time of his letter to the Cortesi, he was inclined to doubt the value of many of his notes, and he knew that much remained to be done: it was *nondum editione dignum*. Worse still, he had

been anticipated by the 1485 commentary of Antonius Parthenius (see p. 223 below). Politianus never completed a Catullan commentary, but his interpretations appeared in another form, in his *Miscellanea* (1489), seven of whose chapters are devoted to Catullus.<sup>87</sup> Since five of the seven have clear antecedents in the marginalia, it is possible to trace the evolution of his ideas and to evaluate his claims for their priority. A sixth chapter has no parallel in the marginalia, and the evidence for the seventh is appropriately ambiguous. This is Politianus' most notorious Catullan interpretation, the obscene reading of the sparrow in Cat. 2–3 (*Misc.* 6), which both repelled and titillated his successors and still has its adherents today.<sup>88</sup>

Predictably, the principal (if unnamed) target of the polemics in Politianus' Catullan chapters was Antonius Parthenius Lacisius, author of the first commentary.<sup>89</sup> Parthenius' preface expresses many fears of *invidia* and plagiarism, probably directed at Baptista Guarinus (see p. 206 above), but it is not clear that he was expecting an attack from Politianus. After so many years of neglect, the time was ripe for a commentary, and Parthenius feared that he would be anticipated. As it was, some of the Catullan lectures he had given in 1481 were being circulated anonymously. Accordingly, he rushed his commentary into print with the hope that he would be able to make revisions and additions later. He was still working on Catullus in 1493, according to Avantius, but the revisions apparently never materialized, and his commentary was reprinted unchanged through several editions.

Parthenius evidently forestalled other potential commentators, for over a decade elapsed before the appearance of the next complete commentary. In the meantime, however, Catullus figured in several works. Philippus Beroaldus the elder explained three passages in his *Annotationes centum* (1488),<sup>90</sup> which was soon

84. The following discussion is based on J. H. Gaisser, "Catullus and His First Interpreters: Antonius Parthenius and Angelo Poliziano," *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, CXII (1982), 83–106.

85. I. Mäier, *Ange Politien: la formation d'un poète humaniste* (Geneva, 1966), 125–29.

86. L. D'Amore, *Epistole inedite di Angelo Poliziano* (*lettere latine estratte dal codice Vaticano-Capponiano 235*) (Naples, 1919), 32–33 (=I. Mäier, ed., *Angelus Politianus, Opera omnia* [Turin, 1971], III, 502–503).

87. *Misc.* 2 (on Cat. 98.4); *Misc.* 6 (on Cat. 2–3); *Misc.* 19 (on Cat. 84); *Misc.* 68 (on Cat. 66.48); *Misc.* 69 (on Cat. 66.94); *Misc.* 73 (on Cat. 17.19); *Misc.* 83 (on Cat. 74).

88. For the *fortuna* of Politianus' interpretation see H. D. Jocelyn, "On Some Unnecessarily Indecent Interpretations of Catullus 2 and 3," *American Journal of Philology*, CI (1980), 420–41.

89. Gaisser, "Catullus and His First Interpreters."

90. Cat. 93.2; 41.7–8; 10.30. *Annotationes centum in varios auctores* (Bologna, 1488), cii–cii(v).



followed by Politianus' *Miscellanea* (1489). Hermolaus Barbarus discussed several Catullan problems in his *Castigationes* of Pliny (1492), and it should be remembered that he was the owner of a manuscript of Catullus and a friend of Calphurnius, who had dedicated the 1481 edition to him. Moreover, Barbarus has the distinction of being one of the few early scholars to sympathize with Politianus' interpretation of the sparrow. Glossing *struthos* in Pliny, he points out that its obscene use in mime provides some support for an obscene *passer* in Catullus.<sup>91</sup>

Sabellicus, writing at some time between 1485 and 1493, treated Catullus in an appendix to his *Annotationes in Plinium*, published in 1497. Unlike other fifteenth-century scholars, Sabellicus claims that he has little to add to Catullan studies because the poet had already received plenty of attention. The remark could not have been made before Parthenius' commentary, which Sabellicus praises in *De latinae linguae reparatione*: "pari paene laude nominandi sunt Cyllenius et Parthenius Veronensis, Catulli hic, ille Tibulli interpres; sed alter civica ut sic dicam corona paene dignus qui civem servavit suum. Servavit enim quem multis nodis vinculum solverat."<sup>92</sup> Although Sabellicus' work on Catullus is almost unknown today, it was studied carefully by his contemporaries. Avantius, for example, writing his own *Emendationes* (1495) in 1493, clearly considered Sabellicus an important Catullan scholar and cited his readings with approval.

Avantius himself, however, made a far more important contribution. His *Emendationes* contain many valuable improvements to the text, as well as a record of contemporary Catullan scholarship. Avantius' work, unlike that of his predecessors, was revised not once but several times. A second edition appeared in 1500, together with a text of Catullus, which is virtually identical with the text of Parthenius, although Avantius is advertised as its editor. But the *Emendationes* did become the basis for Avantius' 1502 and 1515 Aldine editions, and the edition published by Trincavellius in 1535 with

a dedication by Avantius is based in part on the *Emendationes*.

The second complete Catullan commentary appeared in 1496. Its author, Palladius Fuscus, like Calphurnius and Parthenius, had lectured on Catullus; but, unlike his predecessors, he had no special interest in the poet. His commentary suffers as a result, and his work on Catullus is inferior in many respects to that of previous scholars. Palladius' commentary had little influence, but there are a few manuscript abridgements of it, the most notable being in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 7989, which was owned by the family of his friend Aloysius Cippicus.

By the 1490s several scholars had tried their hand at emending and interpreting Catullus. Their results are summarized and incorporated in Vatican Library, Barb. lat. 34, a manuscript of Catullus probably annotated near the end of the century. Parthenius is the annotator's chief source, but he also quotes Politianus, Barbarus, Beroaldus, and Sabellicus, the last of whom he designates rather strangely as *Pol*. Since he mentions neither Avantius (published in 1495) nor Palladius, but has quoted all of the previous printed Catullan sources, we may tentatively assign his work to the period 1493–95.

According to several contemporary sources, Pontanus (d. 1503) wrote on Catullus, but his work is now lost. Pontanus was clearly interested in Catullus because he owned a manuscript and imitated Catullan lyric in his own poetry, but the nature and extent of his philological studies are uncertain.<sup>93</sup> The sources mention both a commentary and an annotated text, but their language is ambiguous, and we should not rule out the possibility that the commentary consisted of notes in a manuscript or printed edition.

Pontanus' work is mentioned three times in letters to Angelus Colotius (see p. 212 below), who had Catullan interests of his own and seems to have been particularly eager to obtain it. Writing to Colotius in 1509 in the preface of his edition of Pontanus' *De immanitate*, Petrus

91. Cat. 64.287; 26.2; 27.3; 1.9; 53.2–5; 2.3. C. Plinii *Naturalis Historiae Castigationes* (Basel, 1534), pp. 74, 186, 255, 511, 513.

92. Sabellicus, *Opera*, 114.

93. Pontanus' manuscript of Catullus and Tibullus is included in the inventory of his books presented in 1505 to S. Domenico Maggiore in Naples (E. Pèrcopo, *Vita di Giovanni Pontano* [Naples, 1938], 120–21). For his imitations of Catullus, see *ibid.*, 137–83; A. Sainati, *La lirica latina del Rinascimento* (Pisa, 1919), 3–68; Ludwig, "Catullus renatus," 172–80.

Summontius says that he intends also to publish Pontanus' youthful *commentarioli* on Catullus:

Est mihi praeterea in animo . . . iuveniles quosdam eius lusus (si Actio [i.e., Sannazaro] nostro ita videbitur) in lucem proferre, quorum quidem supputuisse hominem illud declarat quod eius rei nullam dum vixit mentionem unquam fecerit. Hi sunt exquisiti quidam commentarioli in Valerium Catullum, cuius illum constat iuvenem studiosissimum fuisse. Quod si iniuria mortuo fiat edendis iis quae ille contemnebat quaeque a viri gravitate aliena omnino videri possint, audacia haec nostra legentium utilitate compensetur. Sunt enim talia ut neminem omnino ea legisse poe-  
niteat.<sup>94</sup>

Summontius wrote to Colotius again in 1515, saying that he could not obtain Pontanus' work on Catullus because its present possessor (unspecified) had refused him access to it. Summontius' language is difficult and allusive, and it is not absolutely clear that he is in fact referring to the *commentarioli* mentioned in 1509, for he uses the words *opera*, *scripti*, *texto*, and *archetypi* but not *commentarii*.<sup>95</sup> He hints that the work is no longer in Naples, but a commentary (if not an annotated text) did apparently remain there for at least another decade, for during the siege of Naples (1528) it came into the hands of Summontius' pupil Traiano Calcia, together with some notes of Summontius and several

works by members of the Accademia Pontaniana. Writing to Colotius from Treviso in 1548, Calcia says that he bought the works at great expense (saving them from the burning city) and promises that he will have them published by Paulus Manutius.<sup>96</sup>

In his first letter to Colotius, Summontius said that he would publish Pontanus' commentary if Sannazaro agreed. We are fortunate in having Sannazaro's opinion on the work itself, if not on the plans to publish it, in his epigram *De emendatione Catulli ad Iovianum*:

Doctus ab Elysia redeat si valle Catullus  
ingratosque trahat Lesbia sola choros,  
non tam mendosi moerebit damna libelli  
gestiet officio quam Ioviane tuo.

Ille tibi amplexus, atque oscula grata referret;  
mallet et hos numeros quam meminisse  
suos. (Sannazaro, *El.* I.13)

The last verse finds an echo in a note in the commentary of another Neapolitan, Aulus Janus Parrhasius, which was written between 1512 and 1519 (see p. 249 below). Writing on Cat. I.9, Parrhasius says: "Nec omittam quae acri ingenio gravique iudicio poeta Pontanus emendabat: *qualecunque quod ora per virorum*. Quod ipse Catullus etiam si suum non sit pro suo libenter agnoscat."<sup>97</sup> The comments of Sannazaro and Parrhasius suggest that some, at least, of Pontanus' work on Catullus consisted not so much of emendation and explication as of creative rewriting and "improvement" of troublesome passages. Some confirmation of this idea is provided by an edition of Tibullus in Florence (Biblioteca Nazionale Inc. Magl. C. 5. 28), in which several lacunose and corrupt passages are glossed with replacement verses identified as the work of Pontanus.<sup>98</sup> The clearest statement of Pontanus' practice, however, is provided by Pierius Valerianus, (see p. 255 below) lecturing on Catullus in 1521:

Verum hic operae precium est varias multorum opiniones percurrere qui locum hunc [Cat. I.9] diversimode capiunt, mutant, inversant, ut vero eos missos faciam qui tam

94. Giovanni Gioviano Pontano, *De immanitate* (Naples, 1512), verso of title leaf.

95. "Resta solamente rispondere ad Vostra Signoria in quel testo di Catullo, che è più tempo, mi domandò, e così non rimane altra cosa, ad che io per vostre precedenti lettere sia obligato. Dico dunque non possere risolvere la Signoria Vostra per causa che non hò la opera del Pontano in poter mio. Et in summa, Signor Colotio mio, mai più vera verità uscìo da quessa aurea et veridica bocca vostra, che quando animosamente, *atque utinam non tam vere*, mi significaste voi [significastevo *ed.*] lo errore di tucti noi altri di qua, che *plane iam nobis persuademus*, questo regno nostro solo essere Italia, *et praeter illud, nihil esse ulterius*. Perchè io lo dica, non lo vogliate sapere. In summa uno anno combatto per havere tale opera, e mi è così discortesemente contesa, senza haversi rispetto ad chi li hà tucti questi scripti del Pontano, *id est* li archetypi da manifesta perditione liberati. *Dabo tamen operam, ut rem omnino habeam tibi que ea omnino in parte satisfaciam*; del che non mi dimenticarò finchè havero satisfatto a l'officio debito" (Vatican Library, Reg. lat. 2023, fol. 352v); E. Pèrcopo, ed., *Le rime del Chariteo* (Naples, 1897), ccxcvi.

96. Quoted in Pèrcopo, *Vita di Giovanni Pontano*, 294.

97. Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale XIII B 12, fol. 4r.

98. B. Soldati, "Un emistichio di Manilio e quattro lacune di Tibullo," *Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica*, XXVIII (1900), 287–90.

impudenter castam lectionem ausi sunt pervertere ne dicam vitiare dum legitimis verbis expunctis adulterinum hemistichium imprimum curavere, *Ora per virorum*; quoque impudentiam tueantur suam, falso Iovianum Pontanum hoc pro Catulliano publicasse obiectant. Sed enim scio ego ex fide dignis hominibus Iovianum Pontanum virum in re litteraria aetate nostra summum, non eo consilio in sui codicis margine scripsisse *Qualecumque quidem ora per virorum* vel *Qualecumque quod ora per virorum* ut eam pro Catulliana lectione venditaret, sed quia solebat animi gratia cum auctoribus ita iocari quo ingenium ipse suum experiretur et stilum exerceret. Quare iam eam lectionem quae est *ora per virorum*, eorum confessione qui ex Pontano ipso rem acceperunt nimirum adulterinam praeteribimus. (Vatican Library, Vat. lat. 5215, fol. 42r-v)

A poetic treatment of this kind is consistent with Pontanus' own poetic activity and many imitations of Catullus, as well as with Summontius' choice of the word *lusus* to describe Pontanus' *commentarioli*.

A work that consisted of verses (with or without discussions in prose) could have circulated either as a separate manuscript or as annotations in a printed or manuscript text. Apparently no manuscript has survived, but various printed editions have been credited with notes in Pontanus' own handwriting. The one most frequently mentioned is a Brescia edition of 1486 in the Vatican Library (Inc. II.200), which Fulvius Ursinus identified as containing autograph notes of Pontanus,<sup>99</sup> but the volume is sparsely annotated and modern scholars reject the attribution. Another edition in the Vatican (R.I. V.2238) has manuscript notes identified by Ursinus as those of Pontanus and Colotius. At best, the annotations might be copies of Pontanus' work, since the volume is a 1534 edition, but some variants are accompanied by the designation *v.c.* (presumably "vetus codex"), which suggests that they are a version of Puccius' marginalia (see p. 243 below).

99. The attribution of Inc. II.200 (formerly 502) was accepted by P. de Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* (Paris, 1887), 226. Ullman rejected it: "Achilles Statius' Manuscripts of Tibullus," in *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 2d ed. (Rome, 1973), 447 n. 10.

Pontanus' notes have left few traces in the work of his contemporaries or in that of the next generation. His rewriting of Cat. 1.9 was discussed and attributed to him in his lifetime by Hermolaus Barbarus, Avantius, and Palladius.<sup>100</sup> Around 1502 his friend Franciscus Puccius mentioned that emendation and one or two others, but he does not seem to have had access to Pontanus' notes as a whole. A few years later Parrhasius mentioned the emendation of Cat. 1.9, which he could have found in Puccius or another source. In 1520 Basilius Zanchus copied a manuscript which he said had belonged to Pontanus, but his own manuscript contains no additional material, and there is no indication that he was using Pontanus' notes or an annotated manuscript.<sup>101</sup> Even taken together, the number of references to Pontanus' work is not impressive, but we know from Summontius that Pontanus was embarrassed by his *lusus iuveniles* on Catullus, and perhaps he would not be displeased that they have so nearly disappeared.

#### THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

The appearance of Avantius' Aldine edition in 1502 signaled a new phase in Catullan studies, making the poet far more widely and more conveniently available than before. According to Avantius' dedication, the press run was 3,000 copies, which seems to have been an unprecedented number for any text before the great theological controversies of the 1520s.<sup>102</sup>

Between 1500 and 1520 there were no printed commentaries, but there was still plenty of interest in Catullus, particularly in Naples. Pontanus' work, though suppressed in his lifetime by the author and after his death by bad luck and misadventure, perhaps nevertheless stimulated

100. G. Pozzi, ed., *Hermolai Barbari Castigationes Pliniana et in Pomponium Melam* (Padua, 1973), I, cxix-cxxi and cxxxvii-cxl.

101. "Catullus Petrei Bergomatis [=Basilius Zanchus] ex antiquissimo exemplari Joviani Pontani diligentissime descriptus. MDXX Kal. Mart." (Vatican Library, Vat. lat. 7044, flyleaf). See Thomson, *Catullus*, 58-59.

102. "Aldus Manutius . . . ex codice catulliano per me miro studio et incredibili labore emendato tria exemplorum milia politis typis impressurus, me iterum ad hanc operam socio usus est" (ed. Venice, 1502, fol. Fii<sup>r</sup>). See M. Lowry, *The World of Aldus Manutius* (Ithaca, N. Y., 1979), 174 n. 96, 257.

his successors, Puccius and Parrhasius. A year before Pontanus' death, Puccius finished annotating an edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius. His copy of the notes has yet to be identified, but his subscription was reproduced several times by subsequent scholars who copied his annotations.<sup>103</sup> The notes thus achieved a degree of popularity well beyond their merits, for Puccius contributed little to the improvement of the text, and his marginalia lack the historical interest of a work like Avantius' *Emendationes*, which meticulously presented attributions of readings as well as observations on the activities and personalities of their authors. Puccius' notes were copied by Parrhasius, who also began and soon abandoned a commentary of his own, but they were also copied by many other scholars (especially in Florence) through the first half of the sixteenth century.<sup>104</sup> Naturally, the notes suffered deletions and accretions, and many of the apographs contain no mention of Puccius himself, but they are rather easy to identify, both by their content and by the persistence of the abbreviations "P" (= Puccius) and "v.c." (= *vetus codex*). It would scarcely be an exaggeration to say that almost any text of Catullus annotated in the sixteenth century is likely to contain notes based directly or indirectly on Puccius. In preparing this article I have collected eighteen apographs, several of which had previously been unidentified, but no doubt there are many more.

During the papacy of Leo X (1513–21) the initiative in Catullan studies passed briefly to Rome. Angelus Colotius, who had become a member of the Accademia Pontaniana in the 1490s and had Neapolitan friends and connections throughout his long life, tried for nearly half a century to lay his hands on Pontanus' work on Catullus. His own Catullan annotations are preserved in several editions,<sup>105</sup> but the existing versions contain relatively few notes, and those

few are of little interest. Rather surprisingly, the annotations show no knowledge either of the few well-known readings of Pontanus or of Puccius' notes. Of far greater importance is the work of Colotius' friend Pierius Valerianus, who lectured on Catullus at the University of Rome in 1521–22.<sup>106</sup> Valerianus' words were taken down as he lectured, and the resulting manuscript was the property of his friend and pupil Petrus Melinus. Unfortunately, a large portion of the work was lost in the Sack of Rome (1527), but the remainder is preserved in the Vatican Library (Vat. lat. 5215). Valerianus chose Catullus as a topic largely at the behest of his students, and the lectures no doubt received an enthusiastic response, for they are both informative and entertaining. He reviews textual problems, handles metrical difficulties, and discusses possible interpretations of the poems—all in a far more sophisticated way than his predecessors and contemporaries. Perhaps his greatest interest, however, is in Catullan diction and style, for he is much concerned to present Catullus as a model for the Neo-Latin poetry of his students. Valerianus evidently took his own advice, for there are many Catullan imitations in his poetry and still more examples of Catullan meter and diction. In spite of their great interest, however, Valerianus' Catullan lectures were never published and seem to have been unknown to his contemporaries outside the circle of Colotius and Melinus.

Almost equally devoid of impact was the contemporary commentary of Alexander Guarinus (1521), which has been mentioned on p. 206 above in connection with Guarinus and Baptista Guarinus. Alexander published his commentary to preserve his father's work, but he had done some research himself on Catullus and was able to present many of his own ideas. Like Valerianus, he was interested in interpretation of the poet more than in ancillary lexical, geographical, historical, and mythological questions.

After Alexander Guarinus it was over thirty years before the publication of another complete commentary. Nevertheless, there are signs of interest in Catullus. The *Index Aureliensis* lists seventeen editions between 1521 and 1554,

103. F. Calonghi, "Marginalia," *Miscellanea Pandiani* (Genoa, 1921), 97–114; Richardson, "Pucci, Parrasio and Catullus." J. L. Butrica has shown that Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Ediz. Rare 372, previously thought to be Puccius' copy, is an early apograph. The hand is not that of Puccius ("Pontanus, Puccius, Pocchus, Petreius, and Propertius," *Res Publica litterarum*, III [1980], 5–9).

104. Richardson, "Pucci, Parrasio and Catullus."

105. Vatican Library, Aldine III 20 (a 1502 Aldine annotated by Colotius and Basilius Zanchus ["Petreius"]); R.I. V.2238 (a 1534 Lyons ed.); Inc. III.18 (1472 ed.). See Ullman, "Achilles Statius' Manuscripts," 446–49.

106. See J. H. Gaisser, "The Catullan Lectures of Pierius Valerianus" in *Acta Conventus Neo-latini Guelpherbytani* (Binghamton, N.Y., 1988), 45–53.

of which fourteen were published outside Italy, mostly in Basel and Lyons. In the same period two translations were made of Catullus' longest poem, the *Epithalamium of Peleus and Thetis* (Cat. 64). It seems likely that the earlier of these is the translation of Luigi Alamanni (d. 1556).<sup>107</sup> Although it is a later note on the binding rather than a contemporary title in the manuscript itself that identifies the work as Alamanni's, the attribution is probably correct. Alamanni is known to have translated Cat. 64,<sup>108</sup> and the style of the translation is consistent with that of his early work. It should probably be dated to the 1520s or perhaps even a few years earlier. The second translation is that of Lodovico Dolce (Venice, 1538).

By the 1540s the attention of commentators, like that of the translators a few years earlier, was beginning to be directed to individual long poems rather than to the corpus as a whole. Franciscus Robortellus (1548) and Constantius Landus (1550) published commentaries on Cat. 61, apparently without knowledge of each other's work, and Bernardinus Realinus (1551) produced the first of a series of commentaries on Cat. 64. It is perhaps characteristic of the period that the commentaries of Landus and Realinus were written as school exercises; unlike earlier commentaries from Parthenius through Guarinus and Robortellus, they were not the work of mature specialists but only of diligent students. An exception to the general decline is the work of Petrus Victorius, who devoted two dozen chapters of his *Variae lectiones* (1553) to Catullus and added still more in subsequent editions. Victorius sometimes emends but more often elucidates, frequently with recourse to parallel usage in Greek and Roman comedy. In at least one case the source of his ideas is Puccius, for his emendation of Cat. 17.25 (Book XIII, cap. 9) is from Puccius' notes, which he had

transcribed in 1521 (see p. 245 below). In spite of Victorius, however, in the case of Catullus, as with humanistic studies in general, Italy had become stale and unproductive. From now on in the sixteenth century, the principal initiative in Catullan interpretation was to come from France and the Low Countries.

Beginning with the famous Lyons counterfeit of the first Aldine (ca. 1503), a steady stream of French editions issued from the presses of Paris and Lyons, but although Catullus was read and studied in France in the first decades of the century, a strong atmosphere of moral disapproval prevented interpretation or open enthusiasm.<sup>109</sup> After about 1530, however, a more relaxed attitude prevailed, and over the next twenty years imitations of Catullus began to appear in increasing numbers in both French and Neo-Latin poetry. Poets such as Dolet, Macrin, and Bèze wrote Neo-Latin imitations and appreciations of Catullus in the 1530s and 1540s, but it was Ronsard's transformation of Catullus into French lyric (beginning ca. 1550) that was to have the greatest importance.

It was in this climate that Marcus Antonius Muretus wrote his commentary on Catullus. Muretus, like Valerianus, was both a philologist and a poet. In 1552 he lectured on Catullus in Paris to large and enthusiastic audiences that included some of the Pléiade poets. He became a friend of Ronsard and wrote a commentary on Ronsard's *Amours* (1553) as well as a collection of Neo-Latin poetry (*Juvenilia*, 1552). Muretus both influenced and was influenced by the Pléiade, and his commentary has many "literary" aspects—from comments about the aesthetic and emotive qualities of Catullan diction to an original poem in galliambics (*Galliambus in Bacchum*) that accompanies the discussion of Cat. 63. But Muretus was also influenced by professional scholars and philologists, as is evident from his use of the Catullan chapters of Pier Vettori's *Variae lectiones* (1553). Muretus generally acknowledges Vettori as his source but fails to do so when he attributes three *priapea* to Catullus and inserts them between Cat. 17

107. Rimini, Biblioteca Civica Gambalunga SC-MS. 162 (olim 4.B.I.48). The translation, first discovered in 1884, was published by A. Tambellini, *Epitalamio di Peleo e di Teti* (Nozze Bonini-Gobbi, Rimini, 1888). See H. Hauvette, *Luigi Alamanni (1496–1556): sa vie et son oeuvre* (Paris, 1903), 234–38.

108. The translation is mentioned in a letter by Claudio Tolomei in 1543: "I quali (versi sciolti) furon gia usati da M. Luigi Alamanni nel transferir l'epitalamio di Peleo e di Tetide che fece Catullo" (*Lettere* [Venice, 1549], 9v, quoted by Hauvette, *Luigi Alamanni*, 234).

109. M. Morrison, "Catullus in the Neo-Latin Poetry of France before 1550," *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance*, XVII (1955), 365–94; Morrison, "Ronsard and Catullus: The Influence of Marc-Antoine de Muret," *ibid.*, XVIII (1956), 240–74.

and 21 in his edition.<sup>110</sup> The commentary was printed in Venice in 1554, after Muretus' hasty flight from Paris, but surely most of it was composed in France since he had been in Italy for only a few months before its publication.

More than thirty years had intervened since the last commentary, and Muretus' work soon became the standard text; three new editions appeared within the decade (1558, 1559, 1562). Muretus' text and commentary on Cat. 66 were printed by Henricus Stephanus in his edition of Callimachus (1577) to represent Callimachus' "Lock of Berenice." Copies of Muretus were annotated by other scholars. Jacopo Corbinelli, who had come from Florence to Paris in 1533 with Catherine de' Medici and retained connections with both French and Italian scholars, owned a 1554 edition of Muretus' commentary, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Rés. p. Yc. 372). His annotations refer to Muretus and other scholars almost as frequently as to the text of Catullus himself; many are accompanied by a reference to Actius Sincerus (= Sannazaro). Much less extensive are the approximately contemporary annotations of Fulvius Ursinus in another 1554 edition (Rome, Biblioteca Angelica, Aut. 1.18).<sup>111</sup> Most are merely citations of parallel passages with emphasis on Greek authors. The principal interest in Ursinus' annotations stems from the importance of Ursinus himself as a collector and student of ancient literature and from his friendship with Achilles Statius, whose commentary on Catullus was published in 1566.

Statius, Portuguese by birth and education, had lived in Paris, Louvain, and Padua before settling in Rome in the 1550s, but his commentary seems firmly anchored in the milieu of Roman humanism. He never mentions Muretus, but (among other Romans) he cites Colotius and Ursinus, whom he seems to have consulted on Greek usage. A close comparison of Ursinus' notes and Statius' commentary might be instructive. A brief examination has shown that Statius' reference to Ursinus at Cat. 5.1 has a parallel in Ursinus' notes *ad loc.*, and there may be other

examples. Statius himself annotated a 1502 Aldine, formerly in the Biblioteca Vallicelliana and now in Paris (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Rés. p. Yc. 375),<sup>112</sup> but the notes are few and of little interest. Statius consulted several manuscripts, including one that Ullman identified as Ottob. lat. 1829 (see p. 205 above),<sup>113</sup> but he did not understand their relative importance, and his citations are not always accurate.

These were defects of a sort that Joseph Justus Scaliger was prepared to remedy, although it was Muretus rather than Statius whom he most sought to correct. Grafton has shown that Scaliger, although an early admirer of Muretus, came to suspect his literary approach and to aspire to what he perceived as the greater method and rigor of Vettori.<sup>114</sup> Personal pique against Muretus also played a part. Scaliger's commentary on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius (1577) to some extent was designed to be a demonstration of Vettori's method applied to Muretus' most famous subject, and the intent was to show up the defects in Muretus. Systematic collation of a single authoritative manuscript (rather than the indiscriminate citation of several, à la Statius) was the cornerstone of his approach. For Catullus the manuscript was that of Cujas (London, British Library, Egerton 3027),<sup>115</sup> which he collated in the margins of a 1569 Plantin edition now in Leiden (Leiden University Library, 755 H 23). Scaliger overestimated the manuscript, and his collations are occasionally careless,<sup>116</sup> but his method, his assertion that all the manuscripts of Catullus were descended from a single archetype, and his attempt to reconstruct that archetype from the evidence of inscriptions and errors in the manuscripts were important and innovative. His *Catullus* immediately became

112. B. L. Ullman, *The Identification of the Manuscripts of Catullus Cited in Statius' Edition of 1566* (Chicago, 1908), 18–19.

113. *Ibid.*, 15–17.

114. A. Grafton, "Joseph Scaliger's Edition of Catullus (1577) and the Traditions of Textual Criticism in the Renaissance," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XXXVIII (1975), 155–81; Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford, 1983), 161–79.

115. A. Palmer and R. Ellis, "Scaliger's *Liber Cuiacianus* of Propertius, Catullus, etc.," *Hermathena*, II (1876), 124–58.

116. Grafton, "Joseph Scaliger's Edition" and *Joseph Scaliger*.

110. *Priapea* 86, 85 (Bücheler); Cat. frag. 1; P. Vettori, *Variae lectiones*, Book XII, cap. 3. Muretus' opinion prevailed until the poems were finally excluded by Lachmann in 1829.

111. De Nolhac, *Bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini*, 271.

controversial and soon superseded the commentary of Muretus and eclipsed that of Statius.

Scaliger's was the last important commentary of the sixteenth century, but translations, notes, lectures, and partial commentaries continued to appear. Florens Christianus, who specialized in Greek translations of Latin poetry, added Cat. 62 to his repertoire (K. Οὐαλερίον Κατούλλου Ἐπιθαλάμιον [Paris, 1587]). A less eccentric production is the Italian translation of Cat. 64 by Giulio Cesare Bagnoli, a poet and playwright who flourished near the end of the century (Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, Pal. 720). Generally, however, after Statius the most interesting work on Catullus is associated with Belgium and Holland and, as was the case with Muretus in the 1550s, resulted from the interaction of literary and scholarly interests. In the late 1560s Victor Giselinus prepared an edition of Catullus for Plantin, which he planned to accompany with *notationes* and to dedicate to his friend Janus Dousa (the elder).<sup>117</sup> Plantin printed the edition in 1569 without Giselinus' knowledge and without either the notes or dedication, and a second edition to which he could add the omitted material never materialized. His notes are apparently lost, but a fragment from the dedication, a poem in pure iambics, is preserved in the *Nova poemata* (1575) of Dousa. Dousa, who was later to be a founder of the University of Leiden, was at this period an aspiring young Neo-Latin poet, fresh from studies in Paris and stimulated by his friendships with French Neo-Latin poets.<sup>118</sup> With the help of Giselinus he published his first book, *Epigrammatum libri II* (Antwerp, 1569); a second, *Nova poemata*, followed a few years later (1575). Not surprisingly, Catullus was an important model in both.

In 1579 Dousa's friends Giselinus and Janus Lernutius collaborated on a book of Catullan parodies, which they called *Phaselus Catulli* and produced under the pseudonym Sixtus Octavianus with a dedication to Dousa under the pseudonym N. Ascanius.<sup>119</sup> The *Phaselus* is a farrago

of commentaries and parodies of Cat. 4 (*Phaselus ille quem videtis hospites*), with commentaries on some of the parodies, parodies on a few other poems of Catullus, and on several Horatian odes. The temptation to parody Catullus' pure iambics had begun even in antiquity with "Vergil's" parody in *Catalepton* 10. Georgius Anselmus Nepos (d. 1528) seems to have been the earliest Renaissance imitator of Cat. 4, but his parody was followed by many others, including one by Joseph Scaliger in Greek.<sup>120</sup> Giselinus and Lernutius gathered their parodies from various published sources, Lernutius wrote others under the name Octavianus, and Giselinus produced the commentaries. It is likely that the notes on Cat. 4 are taken from the *notationes* omitted from his 1569 edition. Dousa, the addressee not only of the *Phaselus* but also of Lernutius' epigrams published in the same year, responded with the *Praecidanea pro Q. Valerio Catullo* (1580), which he dedicated to Lernutius.

Dousa's work was followed a few years later (1592) by the Catullan edition and notes of his son Janus Dousa the younger, which are more strictly philological than the *Praecidanea* but bear the stamp of the same circle. Young Dousa's text, for example, is probably based on the Plantin edition of Giselinus. The *Phaselus* of Giselinus and Lernutius had a small *fortuna* of its own. A second, expanded edition was published in 1593, and another anthology closely modeled on it was collected by Nicolaus Henelius in the next century (Leipzig, 1642).<sup>121</sup>

jaarg. 21, nr. 3 (Brussels, 1959), 3–7. See Heesakkers, *Praecidanea Dousana*, 10.

120. G. Anselmus Nepos, *Epigrammaton libri septem* (Parma, 1526), epigr. I.5; J. J. Scaliger, *Poemata omnia*, ed. P. Scriverius (Leiden, 1615), pt. ii, pp. 86–89. The autograph manuscript is preserved in Leiden University Library, Scaligeranus 62, fols. 25v–27v.

121. Lernutius and Giselinus continued to write and collect Catullan parodies, although their next efforts seem to have been less influential. The Bibliothèque Royale in Brussels contains a manuscript entitled "Manes Catulli sive ad omnia eiusdem Catulli epigrammata parodiae" (ms. II.2365), a collection of 115 epigrams by Lernutius, Giselinus, and others. Most of the epigrams are in the hand of Lernutius, but Giselinus has added annotations and comments. See H. Crombruggen, *Janus Lernutius (1545–1619). Een biografische studie* (Brussels, 1955). A similar title, *Manes Catulliani*, had already been used by J. C. Scaliger many years earlier for a collection of hendecasyllabic poems in the Catullan style—that is, for imitations as opposed to parodies. See K. P. Harrington, "The *Manes Catulliani* of

117. C. L. Heesakkers, *Praecidanea Dousana: Materials for a Biography of Janus Dousa Pater (1545–1604)* (Amsterdam, 1976), 52.

118. Unlike Muretus twenty years earlier, however, Dousa took little interest in the Pléiade or in vernacular poetry in general. See *ibid.*, 15.

119. H. Van Crombruggen, *Lernutiana in Mededelingen, Koninklijke vlaamse academie voor wetenschappen,*



The Dutch humanists placed a high value on Scaliger's commentary and on Scaliger himself. It was the elder Dousa, after all, who played a major role in luring Scaliger to Leiden in 1590; the edition and notes of the younger Dousa were dedicated to him. Others were less enthusiastic, but no one took the step of challenging Scaliger by producing a rival text and commentary as Scaliger himself had challenged Muretus. Johannes Passeratius, for example, was known to be studying Catullus in the late 1570s, but his work, which is highly critical of Scaliger, was not published until 1608, six years after his death. Passeratius' commentary was compiled, perhaps by his literary executor, Jean de Rougevalet, from manuscript notes in his copy of the 1559 edition of Muretus (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Rés. p. Yc. 390); the text is not his own and may even be Scaliger's.<sup>122</sup> Since most of Passeratius' works were published posthumously, it is difficult to be sure that he refrained from completing and publishing the Catullus so as to avoid trouble with Scaliger, but it is at least a possibility. We know, for example, that Jacopo Corbinelli attempted to get his views on Catullus and Scaliger in 1578–79 but was rebuffed, and the presumption is that Passeratius did not want to publicize his opinions.<sup>123</sup> The case is more straightforward with Robertus Titius (see CTC III, 123), whose four *Praelectiones* on Cat. 63 were published in Bologna in 1599. Titius had already incurred Scaliger's wrath, and criticism of Scaliger in the *Praelectiones* would open no new controversies. The *Praelectiones*, though ostensibly on Cat. 63, are in fact essays on several topics, including a general justification of poetry, the question of obscenity in Catullus, meter and quantity, the *praenomen* of Catullus, and the manuscripts used by Statius and Scaliger. Catullus' *praenomen* had been discussed by Scaliger, who argued that it was Quintus rather than the Gaius transmitted by most of the manuscripts. Both Passeratius and Titius disagreed. For Passeratius the idea was a *levis coniectura*, and the same phrase

is used by Titius in his stinging attack: "Plus valet apud me summus tot librorum veterum, recentiorum, scriptorum cusorumque consensus, quam levis coniectura hominis vanissimi et arrogantissimi."<sup>124</sup>

Most of the seventeenth century saw only publication and consolidation of work done in the sixteenth—the posthumous appearance of Passeratius and Livineius; publication of compendia such as Janus Gruterus' *Lampas sive fax artium* (Frankfort, 1602), which included the commentaries of Sabellicus, Robortellus, and Realinus; the huge 1604 Paris edition of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and their commentators; and the slightly less ambitious composite editions of 1659 and 1680. The jejune notes of Theodorus Marcilius (*In C. Valerium Catullum Asterismi*) made their first appearance in the 1604 edition but perhaps were composed earlier, like the other commentaries in that compendium. Cat. 64 continued to inspire separate treatment: there are at least seven seventeenth-century manuscript commentaries.<sup>125</sup> The most important work in this century, however, is the text and commentary by Isaac Voss (London, 1684). Voss was one of the most learned men of his age and owned a large collection of manuscripts, including some of Catullus. His extensive commentary, published in London but probably composed of sheets printed in Leiden,<sup>126</sup> enjoyed a wide circulation. In 1685 the first edition *in usum Delphini* was published in Paris, with a commentary by Philippus Silvius. Its practice of removing obscene passages from their contexts and collecting them at the end of the volume was abandoned in the later edition, published in London in 1822.

#### LATER DEVELOPMENTS

The eighteenth century was not an important period for Catullan studies. The edition and

J. C. Scaliger," *Classical Journal*, XXVII (1931–32), 596–610.

122. *Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius cum Galli fragmentis* (Zweibrücken, 1783), xlix.

123. R. Calderini de Marchi, *Jacopo Corbinelli et les érudits français* (Milan, 1914), 159–63.

124. R. Titius, *Ad Catullum Galliam Praelectiones quatuor* (Bologna, 1599), p. 28. Titius' *Praelectiones* were reprinted in *C. Valerii Catulli Opera omnia cum notis et interpretatione in usum Delphini* (London, 1822), II, 702–21.

125. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 8231 (contains three commentaries) and lat. 11304 (a 1626 Paris edition with two commentaries, the second dated 1627); Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 2242 (25) and 2242 (25 bis). On the Florence manuscripts see Thomson, *Catullus*, 49.

126. J. Carter, "Farewell, Catullus," *Texas Quarterly*, III (1960), 281.



commentary of Johannes Antonius Vulpus (Padua, 1710) was learned and detailed in the extreme but characterized by citation of large numbers of parallel passages rather than by interpretation of the poet himself. It was reprinted in 1737 and appeared as part of a variorum edition in 1738. But if Vulpus was a pedant, his successor was a fraud. In 1738 the Venetian poet Johannes Franciscus Corradinus de Allio published an edition and commentary based, as he claimed, on over a dozen manuscripts, including an old and important witness he had discovered in Rome.<sup>127</sup> The Roman manuscript, of course, did not exist, and the fraud was soon discovered, but Corradinus was unrepentant.<sup>128</sup> The edition was as interesting and idiosyncratic as its author, and although he did not make an important contribution, Corradinus is still credited with one generally accepted correction to the text of Catullus—no mean accomplishment if one considers that the total for the whole of the eighteenth century is seven.<sup>129</sup> Near the end of the century appeared both the first Bipontine edition (Zweibrücken, 1783), which included a *notitia literaria* of earlier editions, and the influential edition of F. G. Doering (Leipzig, 1788), which was reprinted in 1792 and supplied the text for several editions in the next century, including the English Delphin edition (1822).

In the nineteenth century, as in the eighteenth, the text was the principal focus of scholarly attention, but we can catch a whiff, at least, of literary interest in the French translation of F. Noël (Paris, 1802), which was accompanied by notes, Latin parodies (see p. 215 above), and as the title avers, “les meilleures imitations des poètes français.” But German philology, not French poetry, was the order of the day, and the century saw significant advances in the study of

the text and little interest in its literary qualities. The most important contribution was that of Karl Lachmann, whose edition (Berlin, 1829) is generally hailed as a landmark in Catullan studies both for its many improvements to the text and for its advances in philological technique: “He provided students with the first rationally constructed *apparatus criticus* they had ever seen.”<sup>130</sup> But Lachmann, like all his predecessors after Statius, was basing his text on fifteenth-century manuscripts.<sup>131</sup>

The discovery of the fourteenth-century manuscript G (Paris lat. 14137) was announced by Sillig a year after Lachmann’s edition,<sup>132</sup> but its importance was not recognized for another thirty years.<sup>133</sup> Discovery and acceptance of the other important fourteenth-century manuscripts was to take even longer. In his edition of 1867 Robinson Ellis first called attention to O (Oxford Canon. Class. Lat. 30), the oldest and most faithful manuscript, but in fact he made little use of it, and it remained for Emil Baehrens to proclaim G and O the only sources for the text and to act on that opinion in his own edition (Leipzig, 1876). In 1896 William Gardner Hale discovered R (Vatican Library, Ottob. lat. 1829), which became mired in controversy almost immediately.<sup>134</sup> K. P. Schulze, who regarded himself as the successor to Baehrens and had indeed reedited Baehrens’ text in 1893 (in such a way, however, as to provoke Housman’s often quoted jibe that his was an Oedipodean piety),<sup>135</sup> was convinced of the importance of the late fourteenth-century manuscript, M (Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. XII 80 [4167]) and unwilling to acknowledge the priority of Hale’s manuscript. An acrimonious exchange ensued, and Hale’s plans to vindicate his manuscript became increasingly elaborate: originally he had planned to publish a collation and facsimile, then a volume collating R, G,

127. Corradinus’ claims are set forth in his title: *C. Val. Catullus in integrum restitutus. Ex Ms. nuper Romae reperto et ex Gallicano, Patavino, Mediol., Rom., Zanchi, Maffei, Scaligeri, Achillis, Vossii et aliorum. Critice Jo. Fran. Corradino de Allio in interpretes veteres recentioresque, grammaticos, chronologos, etymologos, lexicographos, cum vita poetae nondum edita.*

128. On Corradinus see Michaud IX, 254, and T. F. Dibdin, *An Introduction to the Knowledge of Rare and Valuable Editions of the Greek and Latin Classics* (London, 1827), I, 380.

129. G. P. Goold, “A New Text of Catullus,” *Phoenix*, XII (1958), 100.

130. Carter, “Farewell, Catullus,” 282.

131. Principally D and L; that is, Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Diez. B. Sant. 37 and 36.

132. I. Sillig, review of Doering-Naudet edition, *Jahrbücher für Philologie*, XIII (1830), 262ff.

133. L. Schwabe, *Quaestiones Catullianae* (Giessen, 1862), 6–7.

134. The following account is based on Thomson, “New Look,” 121–26.

135. A. E. Housman, in his review of the edition, *Classical Review*, VIII (1894), 252.

and O, accompanied by a restored text of the lost archetype, and, finally, a grand collation reconstructing the entire manuscript tradition of Catullus. Although Hale and his students labored mightily for the next thirty years, none of these plans came to fruition, and "in 1928 Hale died at his desk, his collations of the *codices deteriores* lying open before him."<sup>136</sup>

The philological excesses of the nineteenth century provoked a backlash in the twentieth, which in general has been concerned more with Catullus' life and poetry than with the minute study of his text. The new spirit is neatly summed up by W. B. Yeats:

Bald heads forgetful of their sins,  
Old, learned, respectable bald heads  
Edit and annotate the lines  
That young men, tossing on their beds,  
Rhymed out in love's despair  
To flatter beauty's ignorant ear.  
  
All shuffle there; all cough in ink;  
All wear the carpet with their shoes;  
All think what other people think;  
All know the man their neighbour knows.  
Lord, what would they say  
Did their Catullus walk that way?  
(*The Scholars*)<sup>137</sup>

This romantic view held the stage of Catullan criticism for the first half of the century. For many Catullus was the poet of strong personal emotion, whose life and feelings were bound up in every line. When spontaneous and powerful emotions were not immediately evident (as in some of the longer poems), Catullus was convicted of frigidity and lack of inspiration.<sup>138</sup>

<sup>136</sup> Thomson, "New Look," 115.

<sup>137</sup> First printed in *Catholic Anthology* (London, 1915).

<sup>138</sup> Thus, for E. A. Havelock, the *Lock of Berenice* (Cat. 66) "is a piece of hack-work written to order" and, in spite of isolated fine passages, each of the verse epistles (Cat. 65, 68a, 68b), "considered as a whole is a complete failure" (*The Lyric Genius of Catullus* [Oxford, 1938], 77). R. G. C. Levens seems to be speaking for himself as well when he says that the twentieth century, which "has come to judge poetry more by the energy it transmits than by the polish of its surface, is naturally drawn to a poet whose sense of form was the servant of his urge to express emotion" (*Fifty Years and Twelve of Classical Scholarship* [New York, 1968], 357, rpt. from *Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship*, ed. M. Platnauer [Oxford, 1954]).

Understanding and appreciation of Catullus' learned Alexandrianism, though not absent before 1950,<sup>139</sup> has been more general since, as scholars have come to learn more about Greek Alexandrian poetry, particularly that of Callimachus.<sup>140</sup> In the late 1920s several important papyri of Callimachus were discovered which together provided the text for the prologue of the *Aitia* and the *Coma Berenices*—the one the essential position paper for Alexandrian poetics, the other the source of Cat. 66.<sup>141</sup> These provided the basis for understanding Catullus' application of Callimachean ideas to his own Latin poetry.

But the century has not lacked editions and commentaries, among which are the editions with commentary of Kroll (1922) and Lenchantin de Gubernatis (1953), the commentaries of Fordyce (1961) and Quinn (1971), and the editions of Schuster (1949), Mynors (1958), Bardon (1973), and Thomson (1978), as well as the edition and translation of Goold (1983).<sup>142</sup>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. BIBLIOGRAPHIES OF CATULLUS

J. Granarolo, "Catulle 1948–1973," *Lustrum*, XVII (1973–74), 27–70; H. Harrauer, *A Bibliography to Catullus* (Gerstenberg, 1979); J. P. Holoka, *Gaius Valerius Catullus: A Systematic Bibliography* (New York, 1985); K. Quinn, "Trends in Catullan Criticism," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, I.3, 369–89; D. F. S. Thomson, "Recent Scholarship on Catullus (1960–69)," *Classical World*, LXV (1971), 116–28. Notices appear annually in *L'année philologique*.

<sup>139</sup> See esp. Wheeler, *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry*.

<sup>140</sup> See the sources cited in nn. 2, 5, and 14, as well as W. V. Clausen, "The New Direction in Poetry," in E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen, eds., *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* (Cambridge, 1982), II, 2, 4–32.

<sup>141</sup> For the most convenient account of the papyri see R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* (Oxford, 1949), II, ix and xiv–xv. Pfeiffer has also printed Cat. 66 facing Callimachus' *Lock of Berenice* (fr. 110); see Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, I, 112–23.

<sup>142</sup> See under Selected Editions and Commentaries in the Bibliography, p. 219 below.

## II. SELECTED EDITIONS AND COMMENTARIES

Isaac Voss (London, 1684); F. G. Doering (Leipzig, 1788–92); K. Lachmann (Berlin, 1829); L. Schwabe (Giessen, 1862–66); R. Ellis, ed. (Oxford, 1866), expanded ed. (Oxford, 1878), commentary (Oxford, 1889); L. Mueller (Leipzig, 1874); E. Baehrens (Leipzig, 1876); E. Baehrens and K. P. Schulze (Leipzig, 1893); M. Haupt (Leipzig, 1912); G. Lafaye (Paris, 1922); W. Kroll, ed. and commentary (Leipzig, 1922); E. Cazzaniga (Turin, [1941]); M. Schuster (Leipzig, 1949); M. Lenchentin de Gubernatis, ed. and commentary (Turin, 1953); M. Schuster and W. Eisenhut (Leipzig, 1958); R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1958); C. J. Fordyce, commentary and text of Mynors for selected poems (Oxford, 1961); J. B. Pighi (Verona, 1961); H. Bardon (Brussels, 1970, and Leipzig, 1973); K. Quinn, commentary and text based on Mynors with a few changes (London, 1971); D. F. S. Thomson (Chapel Hill, 1978); G. P. Goold, ed. and tr. (London, 1983).

## III. TRANSMISSION

A. Albertini, "Calfurnio bresciano. La sua edizione di Catullo. 1481," *Commentari dell'Ateneo di Brescia* (1953), 29–79; Giuseppe Billanovich, "Dal Livio di Raterio al Livio del Petrarca," *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, II (1959), 103–78; Giuseppe Billanovich, "Terenzio, Ildemaro, Petrarca," *ibid.*, XVII (1974), 1–60; Guido Billanovich, "Veterum vestigia vatium nei carmi dei preumanisti padovani," *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, I (1958), 155–243; Billanovich, "Appunti per la diffusione di Seneca tragico e di Catullo," in *Tra latino e volgare. Per Carlo Dionisotti*, Medioevo e Umanesimo, XVII–XVIII (Padua, 1974), 147–66; G. Bombieri, "Collazione di alcune antiche edizioni catulliane," *Acme*, XV (1962), 179–239; U. Bosco, "Il Petrarca e l'umanesimo filologico," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, CXX (1942), 107–16; R. Calderini de Marchi, *Jacopo Corbinelli et les érudits français* (Milan, 1914), 159–63; F. Calonghi, "Marginalia," *Miscellanea Pandiani* (Genoa, 1921), 97–114; W. Clausen, "Catulli Veronensis Liber," *Classical Philology*, LXXI (1976), 37–43; F. Della Corte, *Due studi catulliani* (Genoa, 1951); A. C. de

la Mare, "The Return of Petronius to Italy," in *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to Richard William Hunt*, ed. J. J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibson (Oxford, 1976), 220–54; de la Mare and D. F. S. Thomson, "Poggio's Earliest Manuscript?" *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, XVI (1973), 179–95; R. Ellis, ed., *Catulli Veronensis Liber* (Oxford, 1878), v–lxxvii, 351–56; Ellis, *Catullus in the XIVth Century* (Oxford, 1905); J. H. Gaisser, "Catullus and His First Interpreters: Antonius Parthenius and Angelo Poliziano," *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, CXII (1982), 83–106; Gaisser, "The Catullan Lectures of Pierius Valerianus" in *Actus Conventus Neo-latini Guelpherbytani* (Binghamton, N.Y., 1988), 45–53; G. P. Goold, "A New Text of Catullus," *Phoenix*, XII (1958), 93–116; Goold, "Catullus 3.16," *Phoenix*, XXIII (1969), 186–203; Goold, "Two Notes on Catullus 1," *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, VI (1981), 233–36; A. Grafton, "Joseph Scaliger's Edition of Catullus (1577) and the Traditions of Textual Criticism in the Renaissance," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XXXVIII (1975), 155–81; Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford, 1983), 161–79; J. Granarolo, "Un classique latin au moyen âge avant le xiv<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Annales de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines d'Aix*, XXXVI (1962), 63–75; W. G. Hale, "Benzo of Alexandria and Catullus," *Classical Philology*, V (1910), 56–65; J. Hankins, "The Latin Poetry of Leonardo Bruni," *Humanistica Iovaniensia*, XXXIX (1990), 19–30; H. D. Jocelyn, "On Some Unnecessarily Indecent Interpretations of Catullus 2 and 3," *American Journal of Philology*, CI (1980), 420–41; W. Ludwig, "Kannte Lovato Catull?," *Rheinisches Museum*, CXXIX (1986), 329–57; Ludwig, "Catullus renatus: Anfänge und frühe Entwicklung des catullischen Stils in der neulateinischen Dichtung" in *Litterae Neolatinae* (Munich, 1989), 162–94; I. Maier, *Ange Politien: la formation d'un poète humaniste* (Geneva, 1966), 125–29; A. Manzo, "Testimonianze e tradizione del liber catulliano nella letteratura esegetico-scolastica antica," *Rivista di studi classici*, V (1957), 137–62; M. Morrison, "Catullus in the Neo-Latin Poetry of France before 1550," *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renais-*

sance, XVII (1955), 365–94; Morrison, “Ronsard and Catullus: The Influence of Marc-Antoine de Muret,” *ibid.*, XVIII (1956), 240–74; E. Pèrcopo, *Vita di Giovanni Pontano* (Naples, 1938), 292–95; B. Richardson, “Pucci, Parrasio and Catullus,” *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, XIX (1976), 277–89; R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne’ secoli xiv e xv*, 2d ed. (Florence, 1967), Index, s.v. “Catullus”; Sabbadini, *Epistolario di Guarino Veronese* (Venice, 1915), I, 505–6; A. Sainati, *La lirica latina del Rinascimento* (Pisa, 1919), 3–68; L. Schwabe, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, 2d ed. (Berlin, 1886), vii–xxiii; M. Skinner, *Catullus’ Passer: The Arrangement of the Book of Polymetric Poems* (New York, 1981); O. Skutsch, “Metrical Variations and Some Textual Problems in Catullus,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London*, XVI (1969), 38–43; Skutsch, “The Book under the Bushel,” *ibid.*, XVII (1970), 148; T. Sorbelli, “Della fortuna del Carme terzo di Catullo presso gli umanisti,” *Classici e Neo-Latini*, VIII (1912), 170–81; R. J. Tarrant, “Catullus,” in *Texts and Transmission*, ed. L. D. Reynolds (Oxford, 1983), 43–45; D. F. S. Thomson, “A New Look at the Manuscript Tradition of Catullus,” *Yale Classical Studies*, XXIII (1973), 113–29; Thomson, *Catullus: A Critical Edition* (Chapel Hill, 1978), 3–69; C. Tristano, “Le postille del Petrarca nel Vat. lat. 2193,” *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, XVII (1974), 414–15; B. L. Ullman, *The Identification of the Manuscripts of Catullus Cited in Statius’ Edition of 1566* (Chicago, 1908); Ullman, “Hieremias de Montagnone and His Citations from Catullus,” *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 2d ed. (Rome 1973), 79–112; Ullman, “Achilles Statius’ Manuscripts of Tibullus” *ibid.*, 429–49; Ullman, “Petrarch’s Acquaintance with Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius,” *ibid.*, 177–96; Ullman, *The Humanism of Coluccio Salutati* (Rome, 1958); Ullman, “The Transmission of the Text of Catullus,” in *Studi in onore di Luigi Castiglioni* (Florence, 1960), II, 1027–57; K. P. Walters, “Catullan Echoes in the Second Century A.D.,” *Classical World*, LXIX (1976), 353–60; R. Weiss, “Geremia da Montagnone,” in *Il primo secolo dell’umanesimo* (Rome, 1949), 15–50; Weiss, “Benvenuto Campesani (1250/55?–1323),” *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova*, XLIV (1955), 129–

44; R. E. H. Westendorp Boerma, ed., *P. Vergili Maronis Catalepton* (Assen, 1963), II, 28–48; A. L. Wheeler, *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry* (Berkeley, 1934), 1–32; M. Zicàri, *Scritti catulliani* (Urbino, 1976).

#### IV. MANUSCRIPTS

Works cited above are listed in abbreviated form in this section.

##### A. General

W. G. Hale, “The Manuscripts of Catullus,” *Classical Philology*, III (1908), 233–56; F.–R. Hausmann, “Datierte Quattrocento-Handschriften lateinischer Dichter (Tibull, Catull, Properz, Ovid-Epistula Sapphus ad Phaonem, Martial, ‘Carmina Priapeia’) und ihre Bedeutung für die Erforschung des italienischen Humanismus,” in U. J. Stache et al., eds., *Kontinuität und Wandel. Lateinische Poesie von Naevius bis Baude-laire. Franco Munari zum 65. Geburtstag* (Hildesheim, 1986), 598–632. A. Morgenthaler, *De Catulli codicibus* (Strassburg, 1909); D. F. S. Thomson, “A New Look”; Thomson, “Table of Manuscripts,” in *Catullus: A Critical Edition*, 44–63; M. Zicàri, “Ricerche sulla tradizione manoscritta di Catullo. I,” *Bollettino del Comitato per la preparazione dell’Edizione Nazionale dei classici greci e latini*, n.s., 6 (1958), 79–99 (= *Scritti catulliani*, 79–104).

##### B. Individual Manuscripts

Austin, Texas: Humanities Research Center 32; J. Carter, “Farewell, Catullus,” *Texas Quarterly*, III (1960), 274–84; Kristeller, *Iter*, V, 205.

Bergamo: Biblioteca Civica Sigma 2.33 (3); G. Cremaschi, “Catullo e Propertio in un codice della Biblioteca Civica di Bergamo,” *Aevum*, XXIX (1955), 88–94; Kristeller, *Iter*, V, 484.

Bologna: Biblioteca Universitaria 2621; J. B. Pighi, “Catulli Codex Bononiensis 2621,” *Rheinisches Museum*, XCIII (1950), 24–26; Pighi, *Catulli Codex Bononiensis* (Bologna, 1954); R. Sabbadini, *Storia e critica di testi latini* (Milan, 1913), 173–74; R. Sambin, “Ricerche per la storia della cultura nel secolo xv: la biblioteca di Pietro Donato, 1380–1447,” *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova*, XLVIII (1959), 1–49; M. Zicàri, “Il ‘Cavrianeus’ antaldino e i codici catulliani affini al Bononiensis

2621," *Studia oliveriana*, IV (1956), 145–62 (= *Scritti catulliani*, 61–77).

———, Biblioteca Universitaria 2744: I. C. Codrignani, *Catulli Codex Bononiensis 2744* (Bologna, 1963).

Brescia: Biblioteca Queriniana A VII 7: V. Cremona, *Catulli Codex Brixianus A VII 7* (Bologna, 1954); Kristeller, *Iter*, I, 33.

Brussels: Bibliothèque Royale IV.711: J. H. Gaisser, "Schlägl 143 and Brussels IV.711," *Manuscripta*, XXV (1981), 176–78.

Budapest: Országos Széchényi Könyvtár 137: E. Bartoniek, *Catalogus Bibliothecae Musei Nationalis Hungarici* (Budapest, 1940), XII, 119–20; Kristeller, *Iter*, IV, 291.

Edinburgh: National Library of Scotland, ms. Adv. 18.5.2: I. C. Cunningham, "Latin Classical Manuscripts in the National Library of Scotland," *Scriptorium*, XXVII (1973), 78–79; Cunningham, "An Italian Catullus (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland Adv. Ms. 18.5.2)," *Scriptorium*, XXXVII (1983), 122–25; A. Fairbank, "Ludovicus Regius," *Journal of the Society for Italic Handwriting*, XLVII (1966) 6–10; Kristeller, *Iter*, IV, 15.

El Escorial: Real Biblioteca de S. Lorenzo ç.IV.22: A. Ghiselli, "Due codici catulliani inediti," *Museum criticum*, XV–XVII (1980–82), 175–85. (See also under S. Daniele del Friuli.)

Florence: Biblioteca Laurenziana 33.11: A. C. de la Mare, "The Return of Petronius," pl. XXIII; de la Mare, "The Library of Francesco Sassetti," in *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller*, ed. C. H. Clough (Manchester, 1976), 178.

———, 33.12: B. L. Ullman, *The Origin and Development of Humanistic Script* (Rome, 1960), 114.

———, 36.23: A. C. de la Mare, "Humanistic Script: The First Ten Years," in *Das Verhältnis der Humanisten zum Buch*, ed. F. Krafft and D. Wuttke (Boppard, 1977), 98–100.

———, Ashb. 973: *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de son Exc. M. le Comte D. Boutourlin* (Florence, 1831), 8; Kristeller, *Iter*, I, 92.

———, Biblioteca Riccardiana 606: B. L. Ullman, "The Transmission," 1053.

Leiden: Bibl. der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. lat. oct. 81: A. C. de la Mare, "The Return of Petronius," 223–24.

London: British Library, Egerton 3027: A.

Grafton, "Joseph Scaliger's Edition"; A. Palmer and R. Ellis, "Scaliger's *Liber Cuiacianus* of Propertius, Catullus, etc.," *Hermathena*, II (1876), 124–58; Kristeller, *Iter*, IV, 143.

Naples: Biblioteca Governativa dei Gerolamini (now Oratoriana) C.F.III.15: B. L. Ullman, *The Origin and Development*, 118–23.

Oxford: Bodleian Library, Canon. Class. Lat. 30: R. W. Hunt et al., *The Survival of Ancient Literature: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Greek and Latin Manuscripts* (Oxford, 1975); R. A. B. Mynors, *Catullus: Carmina. Codex Oxoniensis Bibliothecae Bodleianae Canonicianus Class. Lat. 30* (Leiden, 1966) (complete facsimile ed.).

Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 7989: A. C. de la Mare, "The Return of Petronius," 239–47; G. Petzl, "Abrechnung eines humanistischen Schreibers," *Scriptorium*, XXVI (1972), 65–66.

———, lat. 14137: Giuseppe Billanovich, "Dal Livio di Raterio," 160–65; E. Chatelain, *Catulle: manuscrit de St.-Germain-des-Prés (Bibliothèque Nationale, n° 14137)* (Paris, 1890); Kristeller, *Iter*, III, 232; D. McKie, "Lesbia damnose bibens interpretatur," *Latomus*, XXXV (1976), 143.

Pesaro: Biblioteca Oliveriana 1167 (formerly 1217): R. Sciava, "Di un manoscritto pesarese di Catullo," *Athenaeum*, VI (1918), 72–75; M. Zicàri, "Il codice pesarese di Catullo e i suoi affini," *Studia oliveriana*, I (1953), 5–23 (= *Scritti catulliani*, 43–60).

Rome: Biblioteca Casanatense 15: G. Muzzioli, "Due nuovi codici autografi di Pomponio Leto," *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, II (1959), 337–51.

San Daniele del Friuli: Biblioteca Guarneriana, Guarn. 56: M. D'Angelo, ed., *Alcune notizie inedite su Guarnerio d'Artegna da un antico regesto* (S. Daniele del Friuli, 1970), 28; A. Ghiselli, "Due codici catulliani inediti," *Museum criticum*, XV–XVII (1980–82), 175–85 (see also under El Escorial); M. Zicàri, "Il Catullo di Guarnerio d'Artegna," *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, II (1959), 453–65 (= *Scritti catulliani*, 109–22).

Schlägl (Austria): Prämonstratenserstiftsbibliothek 143: see above under Brussels IV.711; G. Vielhaber and G. Indra, *Catalogus codicum Plagensium manuscriptorum* (Linz, 1918), 249–50.

Vatican Library: for Barberini, Ottoboni, and Chigi manuscripts see E. Pellegrin et al., *Les*

*manuscripts classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane* (Paris, 1975), vol. I.

———, Ottob. lat. 1829: W. G. Hale, "A New MS of Catullus," *Classical Review*, X (1896), 314; for detailed bibliography see D. F. S. Thomson, "A New Look at the Manuscript Tradition," esp. 121–25; Thomson, "The Codex Romanus of Catullus: A Collation of the Text," *Rheinisches Museum*, CXIII (1970), 97–110.

———, Ottob. lat. 1982: G. W. Kellogg, "A New MS of Catullus," *Classical Review*, XIV (1900), 127–28; Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 434b–435a.

———, Vat. lat. 1608: G. J. O'Gorman, "Codex Vat. Lat. 1608: A Source for Catullus," *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, C (1969), 321–29.

Venice: Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XII 80 (4167): A. C. de la Mare and D. F. S. Thomson, "Poggio's Earliest Manuscript?" *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, XVI (1973), 179–95.

Vienna: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 224: C. Csapodi and K. Csapodiné Gárdonyi, *Bibliotheca Corviniana: The Library of King Matthias Corvinus of Hungary* (New York, 1969), 71, 302, and pl. CVI.

———, 3198: A. C. de la Mare, "The Return of Petronius," 230.

## COMPOSITE EDITIONS

1500, Venetiis (Venice): per Ioannem de Tridino. With the text of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius edited by Hieronymus Avantius, commentary of Bernardinus Cyllenius on Tibullus, commentary of Philippus Beroaldus on Propertius, commentaries of Antonius Parthenius and Palladius Fuscus on Catullus, *Emendationes Catullianae* of Hieronymus Avantius and *In Priapeias Castigationes* of Avantius. HC 4766; BMC V, 535; Goff T-374. BL; (MH; PU).

1520, Venetiis (Venice): in aedibus Guilielmi de Fontaneto Montisferrati. With the text of Tibullus, Catullus, and Propertius; commentaries of Bernardinus Cyllenius on Tibullus, Antonius Parthenius and Palladius Fuscus on Catullus, Philippus Beroaldus on Propertius; *Emendationes* of Hieronymus Avantius on Lucretius, Catullus, the *Priapea*, Statius, *Silvae*. Panzer,

VIII, 463, 1041; *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlv; NUC. BL; BN; (MH; CtY; DLC).

1579, "Eboraci" (York [= Antwerp?]): "Apud Iohannem Marcantium." With the text of Cat. 4; the *10th Catalepton*; Cat. 3, 54; Horace, *Odes* III. 10, I. 35; Propertius I. 20; parodies of all; discussions of parody by J. C. Scaliger and Henricus Stephanus; commentaries of Muretus, Statius, and Scaliger on Cat. 4; commentaries of "Sixtus Octavianus" on Cat. 4 and several parodies. The printer and place of publication identified on the title page are fictitious: no Iohannes Marcantius is known to have been a printer at York. The true printer and place of publication are unknown. *Index Aureliensis*, I.vii.210; H. R. Palmer, *List of English Editions and Translations of Greek and Latin Classics Printed before 1641* (London, 1911); NUC. BL; BN; (PU; MiU; TxU).

1582, Antwerpiae (Antwerp): apud Aegidium Radaeum. A reprint of Joseph Justus Scaliger's 1577 edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, with his *Castigationes* and the commentaries of Marcus Antonius Muretus on the three poets. *Index Aureliensis*, I.vii.211; Adams C-1156; *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlvii; NUC. BL; BN; (MH; NNC; IU).

1593, Lugduni (Lyons): apud Thomam Soubron. To the contents of the 1579 edition have been added *Lusus, De artificio epigrammatis disquisitio* by Claudius Verderius, and *Epigrammata quaedam partim ex Graeco translata*. *Index Aureliensis*, I.vii.212; NUC. BL; BN (MH).

1602, Francofurti (Frankfort-am-Main): Jonas Rhodius. Janus Gruterus, ed., *Lampas, sive fax artium liberalium*, 7 vols. (Frankfort-am-Main, 1602–34), includes Politianus, *Miscellanea*; Marcus Antonius Coccius Sabellicus, *Ex Catullo* (I, 162–65); Franciscus Robortellus on Cat. 61 (I, 1422–29); and Bernardinus Realinus on Cat. 64 (II, 355–71). J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliographia antiquaria* (Hamburg, 1760), 98–100; NUC. BL; BN; Vatican Library; (ICN; MiU; MoU).

1604, Lutetiae (Paris): ex officina typographica Marci Orry. With the text of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and *Pervigilium Veneris* and commentaries of Antonius Parthenius and Palladius Fuscus on Catullus; Bernardinus Cyllenius on Tibullus; Philippus Beroaldus and Ja-

nus Dousa pater on Propertius; Iustus Lipsius on *Pervigilium Veneris*; Achilles Statius on Catullus and Tibullus; Marcus Antonius Muretus on Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius; Ianus Dousa filius on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, and *Pervigilium Veneris*; Franciscus Robortellus and Constantius Landus on Cat. 61; Joseph Justus Scaliger on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius; Ianus Dousa pater, *Praecidanea* on Catullus and Tibullus and *Schediasmata succidanea* on Tibullus and Propertius; Robertus Titius, *Praelectiones* on Cat. 63; Hieronymus Avantius, *Emendationes in Catullum*; and Theodorus Marcilius, *In C. Valerium Catullum Asterismi*. Ed. Bipont. (1783), xlviii; J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca latina*, I, 55; NUC. BL; BN; (MH; TxU).

1608, Lutetiae (Paris): apud M. Orry. This is a reissue of the preceding edition. NUC. BL; (CtY; IU).

1659, Trajecti ad Rhenum (Utrecht): typis G. a Zijll et T. ab Ackersdijck. Simone Abbes Gabbema, ed. With the texts of Catullus, Propertius, Tibullus, and *Elegies* of "Cornelius Gallus" and commentaries of Scaliger, Statius, Muretus, Meleager, Palladius Fuscus, Parthenius, Dousa filius, Lipsius, Passeratius, Turnebus, and Salmasius. Ed. Bipont. (1783), li; J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca latina*, I, 56; NUC. BL; BN; (NIC; TxU).

1680, Trajecti ad Rhenum (Utrecht): ex officina Rudolphi a Zyll. J. G. Graevius is claimed (perhaps fraudulently) as the editor. With the texts of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius; complete commentaries of Joseph Justus Scaliger, Marcus Antonius Muretus, Achilles Statius, Hieronymus Avantius, Janus Dousa (pater and filius), and Theodorus Marcilius; *Praelectiones* on Cat. 63 by Robertus Titius; and selections from the commentaries of Johannes Passeratius. Ed. Bipont. (1783), li; J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca latina*, I, 57; NUC. BL; BN (MH; TxU; CSt).

(\*)1737–51, Florentiae (Florence): sumptibus Societatis, 4 vols. A reedition, by J. F. Palesius and F. Tamburinus, of Janus Gruterus, ed., *Lampas, sive fax artium liberalium*. See ed. 1602 above. CTC IV, 322; NUC. BN; (CtY; ICN).

1783, Biponti (Zweibrücken): ex typis Societatis Bipontinae. With the texts of Catullus, Ti-

bullus, Propertius, and the *Pervigilium Veneris*. NUC. BL; (PU; MH; ICU).

1822, Londini (London): A. Valpy. The Delphin edition, with the text of Catullus edited by F. G. Doering, text of *Pervigilium Veneris* edited by J. C. Wernsdorf; variorum notes on *Pervigilium Veneris*; variorum notes on Catullus (largely from Scaliger); the commentaries of Marcus Antonius Muretus, Achilles Statius, Janus Dousa pater, Hieronymus Avantius, and Theodorus Marcilius; and the *Praelectiones* of Robertus Titius on Cat. 63. NUC. BL; (MH; PBm; NcU).

## I. COMMENTARIES ON THE CORPUS AND ON GROUPS OF POEMS

### I. Antonius Parthenius Lacisius

Parthenius' commentary appeared in 1485, some dozen years after the first edition of Catullus (1472) and a decade after each of the other poets of that edition had received a printed commentary, for 1475 had seen the commentaries of Bernardinus Cyllenius on Tibullus (HC 15522) and Domitius Calderinus on Statius' *Silvae* (HC 14983), as well as Calderinus' *Elucubratio in quaedam Propertii loca* (HC 14983). The delay, which no doubt stemmed from the corrupt state of the text, as Parthenius observes in his preface, also provided him with the opportunity to chastise the Veronese scholars Calderinus and Cyllenius for having neglected their learned fellow citizen Catullus in favor of *externi poetae*.

Parthenius asserts a long-standing interest in Catullus. In the dedication to Pomponius Laetus he says that he had lectured on the poet four years earlier, and in a note on Cat. 4.2 he discusses two emendations that he claims to have proposed eight years before. The commentary itself, however, seems to have been rushed into print before Parthenius was satisfied with it. His friends urged him to publish without further revision; he was persuaded to do so because comments from his lectures had been collected and were being circulated as a commentary without his name or consent. Parthenius continued to work on Catullus while his commentary was being published and for several years thereafter. In the Letter to the Reader he says that he has already begun writing

*Quaestiones* on Catullus, which will incorporate changes and additions to the commentary, and that he plans to work on them in the little free time he has from teaching. Avantius (see p. 235 below), writing the dedication to his own work on Catullus in 1493, says that he has heard that Parthenius is still working on Catullus. Unfortunately, however, there is no evidence that the *Quaestiones* were ever completed.

Parthenius' work is not only the first but also the most important of the fifteenth-century commentaries on Catullus. He made significant improvements to the text and explained Catullan style and usage with parallels from a wide range of ancient authors, both Latin and Greek, including among others Cicero, Vergil, Martial, Ovid, Lucretius, Donatus, Pliny, Homer, and Sappho. He was also interested in interpreting the poems and successfully emended and explained several that had previously seemed pointless. The commentary was hailed in verse by several of Parthenius' fellow citizens and other contemporaries, including Iacobus Iulianus and Hieronymus Bononius, and it was highly regarded by scholars such as Avantius and Sabellicus (see p. 231 below). It found less favor with Politianus, who criticized its textual mistakes in his *Miscellanea* and claimed credit for its interpretations of Cat. 74 and Cat. 84—all, however, without mentioning Parthenius by name.

The commentary was reprinted several times in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and appears in the variorum editions of the seventeenth. It is also found in three different manuscript versions that abridge Parthenius' comments and add new material. The printed commentary and its manuscript variants will be treated separately below.

#### a. The Printed Commentary

*Letter to Parthenius* (ed. of Brescia, 1485–86). Iacobus Comes Iulianus Veronensis suo Parthenio salutem. [*Inc.*]: Quaeris, Partheni, quid sentiam de tua in Catullianum carmen lucubratione, an existimem in omnibus ad poetae sensum satisfacere? Ego etsi palam afferre iudicium meum inter tot malivola obtreptatorum ingenia quos nostra videt aetas, haudquaquam arbitror tutum, dicam tamen aliquid, sed minus certe quam sentio, ne meo in te amoris nimium credam indulgisse. Adortus es rem in primis arduam et a nullo antehac tentatam tum carminis

ipsius duritiae quam affectasse de industria poetam uterque auctor est Plinius, tum mutilati operis vetustatis incuria, depravatione; in quo quid effeceris, iudicabunt qui commentarios tuos legent. Omnibus placere immensum et supra vires prope humanas est. In hoc te dignum laude ducimus, quod ingenti id tu animo, quod nemo hactenus aut ausus est aut potuit attingere. In magnis etiam non assecutis voluisse abunde pulchrum atque magnificum est. Oblatraturos tantisper scio si quos aut editione praevenisti aut quibus suoapte ingenio calumniandi animus est, donec intelligent nostro testimonio te non ea causa ad Catulliani carminis interpretationem adductum, ut aliis praereptam laudem velles, sed simul et officii in civem tuum gratia et ut aliis excultius fortasse aliquid elucubrandi viam aperires. Nos iure nostro id possumus vel ab omni calumnia tuti affirmare, te vera civica dignum, quod labentem iam et a vetustatis iniuria paene obrutum civem ingenii tui clypeo sublevasti protexistique, quod huiusmodi epigrammate lusimus:

Hactenus abiecit cariosos docta libellos  
Et mutilos lusurba Catulle tuos.  
Lesbiacas norat lachrymas, nec passeris ullus  
Funera; squalebat nobile vatis opus.  
Maxima Parthenius Latiae dispendia linguae  
Non tulit, et patriae publica damna suae.  
Excussit salebras, abstrusaque sensa reclusit,  
Amissumque capit pagina prisca decus.  
Intret in arcanum lepidi penetrabile poetae  
Quisque, gerit faciles iam nova charta  
iocos.  
Vos reducem lauro vates ornat Catullum,  
Parthenio satis est civica sola meo.

*Dedication.* Antonius Parthenius Lacisius Veronensis Iulio Pomponio salutem. [*Inc.*]: Plerique cives mei optimi atque clarissimi viri, disertissime Pomponi, auctoritate sua me coegerunt ut tandem ederem ad communem studiosae iuventutis commoditatem meas in lepidissimum poetam Catullum interpretationes anno iam quarto singulis lectionibus lucubratas. Ego etsi noveram nullo pacto editionem esse praecipitandam quum tamen gravissimis viris negare minime auderem, mecum diu multumque consultavi cui potissimum homini hasce Catullianas enarrationes dicarem. Non enim ignorabam quantis invidiae iniuriis esset obnoxia sors atque conditio scriptorum omnium, quorum nemo a conditis litterarum monumentis usque ad aeta-



tem nostram malivolorum hominum difficilem nasum effugere valuit. Qua ego adversa sorte monitus quum tutum aliquod operi meo profugium inquirerem, Veronensem patriam meam, pervetustum atque sacratissimum divinarum musarum templum, cui libellus meus te authore dedicetur delegi, sperans fore ut hoc voto sit a vulgi temeritate inviolatus. Nec novo quidem exemplo opusculum meum immortalis praesidio tuendum esse censi. Nam prisci quoque rerum authores penes quos omnium fere bonarum artium inventiones claruerunt, quorumque ingenia et mores non solum haec aetas sed etiam vetustas maxime mirata est, quum in plerisque aliis rebus tum in hac praesertim prudentissimi fuisse inveniuntur, quod res quas intemeratas atque memoria sempiterna munitas optabant quo tutiores forent diis immortalibus consecrabant eorumque tutelae omni studio et industria commendabant. Hinc publicas porticus, theatra, circos, amphitheatra multorum deorum numinibus dicata legimus. Hinc urbium muros, arciumque moenia diis cuiusque civitatis patriis consecrata comperimus. Tu igitur, doctissime Pomponi, unicum saeculo nostro bonarum litterarum oraculum, et singularis Camenarum antistes, fies huic dicationi perinde ac pontifex maximus, commentationumque mearum Veronensi patriae meae dicandarum conceptis verbis vota nuncupabis, et tuae nuncupationi omnes celeberrimi academiae tuae sectatores respondentes linguis animisque benigne favebunt. Sic vestris auspiciis lusus mei meorumque studiorum primitiae immortalitatem assequuntur. Vale.

*Introductory Poem.* Antonius Parthenius Lacisius libello suo.

[*Inc.*]: Chare liber superas tecum lature per auras

Nomina nostra vide cautius ut sit iter.

Effuge sordidulos atra rubigine dentes

Et vulgum audacem grammaticasque manus.

Lividius nihil est, nihil est nasutius illis,

Pagellae criticum se tibi quisque geret.

Infestos morsus et acutos fortius ungues

Perfer, dum civis stet tibi tuta salus.

Sic tibi perpetuum decus et per longa superstes

Saecula sit vivax gloria chare liber.

*Preface.* Antonii Parthenii Lacisii Veronensis in Catullum Commentationes. [*Inc.*]: Editurus

meas in Valerium Catullum interpretationes saepe ac multum mecum revolvebam utrum praefatione miserandum poetae mei fatum conquererem an potius singulari laetitia nascentem eius felicitatem prosequi deberem. Nam quid in locupletissima litterarum re publica aequale dolum erat quam doctissimum poetam Catullum usque in hoc saeculum nostrum in tenebris iacuisse atque a litteratis civibus suis Cyllenio Domitioque praestantissimis Latinae linguae interpretibus fuisse desertum, et quod molestius ferendum erat, ab illis externos poetas elegantissimis enarrationibus esse in lucem revocatos? Quid deinde tanto gaudio meo mihi dignum videri debet, quam si aut per meas lucubratiunculas aut per nonnullorum virorum studia mearum vigiliarum aemulatione mota cum doctorum hominum tum scholarum, atque praeceptorum ulla familiaritate Catullus illustrabitur? Quum igitur in omnibus civitatibus omnium fere poetarum quae supersint scripta legerentur, ac solus Catullus tum quia eius scripta corruptissima erant, tum quia carebant interprete, scholarum familiaritate orbatus esset, hunc poetam ab eruditissimis scriptoribus nomine doctissimi elegantissimique poetae honoratum in scholas atque magistrorum manus quoad potui nuper inducere tentavi. Etenim si utriusque linguae periti nostro saeculo cives mei Cyllenus atque Domitius doctis enarrationibus suis interpretati sunt, alter Tibullum, alter Iuvenalem, Martialem, atque Papinium externos scriptores, quanto studiosius debui Catullum civem meum quantalucunque mea declaratione interpretari? Atque utinam Cyllenio Domitioque mecum fuisset pro poeta nostro idem consilium, eadem voluntas, similisque conatus, ut Catullum nostrum miserabiliter disiectum ac exanimem, iandiu in tenebris iacentem in sua membra reducerent atque a tenebrarum sordibus in splendidam lectionum lucem revocatum honori suo restituerent; quod si fecissent poetam profecto nostrum quem vix spirantem ac male pedibus innixum respicimus, vividum, robustum, nitidum, exultantem haberemus. Catullus enim usque ad hanc aetatem in tenebris latebris iacuit, nec adhuc ullas praelectionum illustrationes ullumve interpretationis lumen habuit. Conatus igitur sum atque tentavi si possem his lucubrationibus suscitare poetam de patria nostra benemeritum, ut si litteris aliquid valeo non tantum externis scriptoribus quantum civi nostro prodesse multo studiosius

atque honestius voluisse videar. Nec vero multum reformidabo quid in me inhumana invidia sit machinatura quod opus hoc multis in locis diminutum et in pluribus depravatum atque ob id ab eruditioribus bonarum litterarum professoribus tanquam cadaver quod nullis humanis opibus nullo ingenio excitari possit obscuritati relictum ego mediocri studio nec claro admodum ingenio audaci conatu sim aggressus. Tantum autem a me abfuit et abest huiusmodi vanus invidiae metus ut multo avidius quam statueram susceptum opus maturaverim. Nam quum sit consilium meum luci et honori suo restituere Catullum, quanto plures docti viri mearum interpretationum aemulatione movebuntur, tanto utilius consulent poetae nostro, et in quibus ego inbecillitate ingenii detentus defecero, studiosi homines cura peritius perfectiusque dicendi litteratae iuventuti me duce satisficient. Hoc modo auspiciis meis paulatim adiuvabitur poeta noster atque per multos scriptores pari studio motos decus suum reparabit. Nec mihi multum molesta erit communis omnium scriptorum sors, adversa invidorum maledicentia et obtrectatio quas a conditis litterarum monumentis evitavit nemo. Nec inter omnes scriptores quisque tam felici fuit ingenio qui vel in magnis vel in parvis ex parte non erraverit. Quo fit ut minus moleste sim subiturus hanc communem sortem quam nullo modo cavere potuissem nisi omnino nihil unquam scripsissem. Quod pessimum atque calamitosissimum virtuti consilium si omnibus scriptoribus fuisset, nulla litterarum monumenta unquam extitissent. Qua iactura quid posset esse perniciosius hominum ingeniis? Quamobrem quod incommodum doctissimus quisque ac divinus scriptor non reformidaverit, ego etsi non summo ingenio mediocrique doctrina non tamen minus aequo animo sum laturus, dum labore studio industria prosim civi meo. Etenim si Servius peritissimus grammaticus in Virgilianis expositionibus Caprum Urbanum Hyginium Didimum Probum Asprum Donatum multosque alios Virgilii enarratores secutus in plurimis errasse deprehenditur, et nihilominus doctissimi grammatici nomen et dignitatem non amittit, ego quoque a lectoribus non inhumanis aliquantulum veniae sperare possum et debeo, quum in hoc perquam difficili opere interpretando ducem nactus neminem et studio satisfaciendi litteratis iuvenibus et singulari adiuvandi civis mei amore ac pietate tantum meae professionis onus

tantumque invidiae periculum susceperim. Nam quamquam et in Graecis et in Latinis nullum librum magis corruptum magisque mutilatum quam Catullum inveniri satis constat, ea tamen quae tum in emendanda tum interpretanda lectione Catulliana senserim neque invidiose conticenda neque inhumane occultanda putavi. Id unum postremo lectores monuerim: me Catulli poemata in locis supra centum mendosa deprehendisse, ut verissimum appareat cuiusdam civis nostri Graecis et Latinis eruditissimi dictum. Quum enim is cuius nomini honoris gratia parco super quodam Catulli obscuro et deprava[va]to versu nuper interrogaretur quid sentiret, fertur respondisse prudenter se nullam ex tempore daturum esse responsionem, quoniam tanta esset Catulliani libri confusio, tanta inversio ut si ab inferis revocaretur Catullus, carmina sua non esset agniturus. Ego autem collatis et veteribus et recentioribus Catulliani operis exemplaribus quoad potui etsi non in totum maxima tamen ex parte lepidissimi poetae carmina a tam sordido situ excitare atque tantis ab iniuriis extrahere vindicare tueri sum conatus. Nonnulla tamen confiteor esse loca de quibus adhuc valde quaerendum esse arbitror ut *Salipentium* sive *Solopechyum disertum* [Cat. 53.5] et bona pars epigrammatis in Egnatium intercepta [Cat. 37–39] et illud *idmaeneos ne petam montes* [Cat. 64.178], tum *Peneum prope Cylleneum* [Cat. 68.109] et quaedam alia pauca de quibus ego nihilominus tam probabiles (ut opinor) attuli sententias, ut a lectoribus sperem me si non magnam laudem bonam tamen iudicii mei veniam consecuturum. Vale.

*Catulli Vita.* [Inc.]: Caius Valerius Catullus nobilis inter Latinos lyricos poeta Veronae natus Olympiade centesima septuagesima tertia non humillimis quidem natalibus neque obscuris parentibus fuit. Nam patrem virum Caii Caesaris dictatoris hospitio clarum habuit . . . / . . . [Expl.]: Frequens autem est inter doctos viros opinio cui ego quoque Plinii autoritate ductus assentior, a Catullo alia quaedam poemata fuisse composita quae veterum negligentia iamdiu perierunt. Fuit et quidam alius poeta nomine Quintus Catullus Gellii atque Ciceronis testimonio commendatus.

*History of Lyric Poetry.* [Inc.]: Lyrici carminis origo a quo potissimum autore coeperit non facile dixerim . . . / . . . [Expl.]: Elegos vero quibus tertium ingenii sui conatum effudit in-

certo auctore adinventos atque adhuc de illius metri origine litem sub grammaticis agitari tradidit Horatius, quamquam Iulius Pollux eorum inventionem Eteocli Naxio seu Eretriensi assignavit. Nunc ad institutum meum accedendum est.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: *Quoi dono lepidum novum libellum* (Cat. 1.1). In hoc primo epigrammate poeta Cornelio Nepoti amico suo libellum hunc dicat atque in eius nomine opus edit assignans huius dicationis rationem videlicet quia Cornelius poetae scripta iamdudum plurimi semper fecerit. Quis autem fuerit hic Cornelius quidam docti viri a me dissentiunt . . . / . . . [Expl.]: *Dabis* (Cat. 116.8). *s* finalis de metro abiicitur more antiquorum licentioso ut Ennius: *Egregie cordatus homo catus Aelius Sextus* (Enn., Ann. X.326).

*Final Letter.* Antonius Parthenius lectori. [Inc.]: Haec habui, humanissime lector, quae assiduis litterarii ludi laboribus implicitus atque distractus per singulas lectiones Catullianas annua fere aut non multo longiore commentatione mihi annotata tecum triennio post operis feturam communicanda esse duxi ut si enarrationibus meis studio tuo ulla ex parte consului tu quoque pari mecum officio et industria si quid est a me vel praetermissum vel ignoratum quod ad necessariam (-um *ed.*) Catulli mei pertineat illustrationem istius arcani tui me participem benigne facias atque si quid erratum est quod potuerit a me et deprehendi et corrigi non tantum mihi vitio des quantum amicis meis honori meo nimis cupide studentibus per quos non licuit mihi scripta mea in nonum comprimere annum. Est praeterea quaedam alia editionis festinatae causa non minor in nonnullis hominibus invidis qui enarrationes meas superiore anno quarto discipulis meis dictatas et in commentarium sine nomine meo redactas dum inique intercipiunt meum operis maturandi consilium everterunt. Sed ex his interpretationibus si quae mihi mutanda quae fortasse non pauca erunt videbuntur fato mihi non adversante faciam te certiore in quaestionibus meis quas iam exorsus succisivi temporis textura in lucem maturo partu deducam. Non autem ignoro plerosque litteratores atque difficiles criticos vel reclamatuos gravi supercilio vel scriptis suis huic meo conatui perinde ac temerario refragatuos quoniam loca quaedam mutanda censuerim et innovare sim ausus quale illud *Idaeosne petam montes* (Cat.

64.178) et *Peneum propter amoenum* (Cat. 68.109). Verum hi si qui sunt hoc aequius videant ne ipsi multo audaciorum ne dicam impudentiorum temeritatem incurrant quum ingenuos labores meos pro cive meo pie susceptos ob paucissima loca vetustate corrupta inhumane damnent ac invidia compulsi lacerent impudenter. Cur igitur huiusmodi homines tanquam fuci operi alieno infesti insidiatores ipsi ante me tales conatus non sunt aggressi? Cur alienam inventionem oscitantes expectarunt? Cur hercule virtute instructi ac freti immanem Catulliani carminis hydram non sunt ausi conficere? Cur ante vigilias meas tam desidiosi hallucinatores fuere? Cur denique molesti alieni operis critici benedicendo potius quam obtrectando honestis laboribus nomen ac famam sibi non quaesivere? Vale.

#### *Editions:*

1485, 1486, Brixiae (Brescia): Boninus de Boninis de Ragusia. According to Goff the colophon appears in four variants, with the following dates: April 6, 1485, April 6, 1486, April 21, 1486, May 21, 1485. GW 6391; HC (Add) 4761 (I); BMC VII, 968; Goff C-324. Vatican Library; BL; (CtY; NNC).

1487, Venetiis (Venice): per magistrum Andream de Palthaschichis. With the texts of Catullus and Tibullus and the commentary of Bernardinus Veronensis on Tibullus. In this edition the verses of Parthenius to his book precede the dedication. HC 4762 (I); BMC V, 354; Goff T-371. Vatican Library; BL; (CtY; DLC).

1491, Venetiis (Venice): a Boneto Locatello Bergomensis. With the texts of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius and commentaries of Bernardinus Veronensis on Tibullus and Philippus Beroaldus on Propertius. In this edition the letter of Iulianus, his poem to Parthenius, and the verses of Parthenius to his book appear at the end of the commentary, after the letter of Parthenius to his reader. HC 4763\*; BMC V, 439; Goff T-372. Vatican Library; BL; (MH; CtY).

1493, Venetiis (Venice): per Symonem Bevilaqua Papiensem. Contents as in previous edition. HC 4764; BMC V, 517; Goff T-373. Vatican Library; BL; (MH; CtY).

(\*)1497, Venetiis (Venice): a Boneto Locatello Bergomensis. Contents as in previous edition. HC 4765; *Indice generale degli incunaboli*

delle biblioteche d'Italia 9667; Panzer, III, 409, 2178; *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlii. Bologna, Biblioteca Comunale dell'Archiginnasio; Pistoia, Biblioteca del Seminario.

1500. See above, Composite Editions.

1520. See above, Composite Editions.

1604. See above, Composite Editions.

1608. See above, Composite Editions.

1659. See above, Composite Editions.

1680. See above, Composite Editions.

#### *b. The Manuscript Abridgements*

1. Vatican Library, Barb. lat. 34, s. XV, fols. 102v–141v. This marginal commentary is an abridged version of Parthenius, supplemented by extracts from other sources, especially Politianus, Sabellicus (see p. 231 below), Philippus Beroaldus, and Hermolaus Barbarus. Frequently ancient sources are quoted on the suggestion of Parthenius, who has mentioned only the author or work (e.g., the ancient testimonia on fol. 103v, which were suggested by references in Parthenius' *vita*). The letter from Iulianus, dedication, preface, history of lyric poetry, and letter to the reader have been omitted, but the manuscript includes Parthenius' *vita* (fol. 102v) and the poem of Parthenius to his book (fol. 103). The *vita* on fol. 141r–v is not found elsewhere.

*Testimonia* (fol. 103v): Martial X.103.5–6; Pliny, *Naturalis historia* XXXVI.154–55; Ovid, *Tristia* II.427–28; Martial VIII.73–78; Martial XIV.195.

*Epigram of Benvenuto Campesani* (see p. 203 above). Hexastichum (hextichum *ms.*) Guarini Veronensis oratoris clarissimi in Libellum Valerii Catulli eius concivis.

[*Inc.*]: (fol. 103v) Ad patriam venio longis de finibus exul / Causa mei reditus compatriota fuit . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: Quo licet ingenio vestrum celebrate Catullum / Quovis sub modio clausa papirus erat.

*Commentary.* [*Inc.*]: (fol. 104r) *Cui dono* (Cat. 1.1). In hoc primo epigrammate poeta Cornelio Nepoti amico suo libellum hunc dedicat atque in eius nomine opus edit, assignans huius dedicationis rationem videlicet quia Cornelius poetae scripta iamdudum plurimi semper fecerit . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 140v) *Affixus nostris* (Cat. 116.8). Alii codices habent 'nobis', quae lectio probabilior videtur, ut sit 'tu affixus mihi et meo capiti patieris supplicium'. *Dabis* (Cat.

116.8). *s* finalis de metro abiicitur more antiquorum licentioso ut Ennius: *Egregie cordatus homo catus Aelius Sextus* (Enn., *Ann.* X.326).

*Vita.* Vita Valerii Catulli Veronensis. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 141r) Verona Venetiae amplissima est civitas in quam misit Pompeius Strabo Pompei magni pater olim colonos et eam restituit quam Retii incumbentes vastaverant . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 141v) Hoc genus carminis constat primo spondeo secundo dactylo, inde tres habet trocheos ut illud: *Veti Betim Mantua provocare nolit.*

#### *Manuscript:*

Vatican Library, Barb. lat. 34, s. XV, fols. 102v–141v (E. Pellegrin, J. Fohlen, C. Jeudy, Y.-F. Riou, and A. Marucchi, *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane* [Paris, 1975], I, 81–85; Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 457).

2. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 3243, s. XV, fols. 1r–29r.

This manuscript contains only poems 1–54.6, accompanied by a paraphrased and much abbreviated version of Parthenius. There are some additions, particularly in the area of meter, and numerous additional citations of ancient poetry. The prefatory material has been abridged and rearranged so that a section from Parthenius' dedication to Pomponius appears as part of the introduction, and parts of the preface appear under the heading *Parthenius Lacisius Veronensis Iulio Pomponio salutem in prohemio Catulli.*

*Introduction.* [*Inc.*]: (fol. 1r) Non enim ignoravi quantis invidiae iniuriis esset obnoxia sors atque conditio scriptorum omnium, quorum nemo a conditis litt[er]arum monum[en]tis usque ad aetatem nostram malivolorum hominum difficilem nasum effugere valuit. Nemo a vulgi temeritate illesus esse inviolatusque potest. Pluris enim facio unius eruditi iudicium quam sexcentorum male litteratorum.

*Dedication.* Parthenius Lacisius Veronensis Iulio Pomponio salutem in prohemio Catulli. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 1r) Nam prisci quoque rerum auctores penes quos omnium fere bonarum artium inventiones claruerunt, quorumque ingenia et mores non solum haec aetas sed etiam vetustas maxime mirata est, cum in plerisque aliis rebus tum in hac prudentissimi fuisse inveniuntur qui res quas intemeratas atque memoria sempiterna

munitas [optabant,] quo [tutio]res forent diis immortalibus consecrabant. Hinc publicas porticus, theatra, circos, amphitheatra multorum deorum numinibus dicata legimus. Hinc urbium murosque moenia diis cuiusque civitatis patriis consecrata comperimus. Nec mihi multum molesta communis omnium scriptorum sors adversa invidorum maledicentia et obtrectatio, quas a con[ditis] litterarum monumentis evitavit nemo. Nec inter omnes scriptores tam felici fuit ingenio quisquam qui vel in magnis vel in parvis aliqua ex parte non erraverit. Quo fit ut minus moleste sim subiturus hanc communem sortem, quam [nullo] pacto cavere potuissem, nisi omnino nihil umquam scripsissem. Quod pessimum atque calamitosissimum v[irtuti] consil]ium si omnibus scriptoribus fuisset, nulla litterarum monumenta umquam extitissent. Qua quidem iactura quid [possit] esse perniciosius hominum ingeniis? Indignum ungui castigante suppende.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. 2r) On Cat. 1.1. Primum hoc carmen et secundum phaleuti[cum] endecasillabum est. Phaleuticum ab inventore, endecasillabum a numero sillabarum quia undecim sillabas habet. Habet autem q[ui]nque pedes. Primus est spondeus, secundus dactillus, tertius, quartus, quintus trochei . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 29r) On Cat. 53 and 54. Poeta fatetur Rustico risum suum q[ue]m conceperat ex eius insulsi hominis [in]lepta vaniloquentia scilicet Libonis.

*Manuscript:*

Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 3243, s. XV, fols. 1r–29r (S. Endlicher, *Catalogus codicum philologicorum latinorum Bibliothecae Palatinae Vindobonensis* [Vienna, 1836], II, 241; *Tabulae codicum manuscriptorum praeter graecos et orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum* [Vienna, 1868], II, 241).

3. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard College, Houghton Library Inc. 4303.

This copy of the 1475 edition (HC 4759) contains a manuscript commentary on Cat. 1–15, 29, and 93–98. For the most part the notes have been drawn from Parthenius' commentary and that of Palladius Fuscus (see p. 239 below), but there are a few additions. It is possible that the commentary was compiled from the edition of 1500, which includes both Parthenius and Palladius. There is no introduction or preface. (No

page numbers are cited below, because the signatures have been cut off by the binder.)

*Commentary:* [Inc.]: *Omne aevum* (Cat. 1.6). Id est omnia gesta et facinora saeculi praeteriti virorum fortium et summae laudis. Orsus enim est Cornelius ab urbis Romae vel ut alii volunt orbis primordio viros omnes memoria dignos describere . . . / . . . [Expl.]: *In te si quicquam dici pote putide Victi* (Cat. 98.1). Acerbe invehitur in Victium hominem verbosum atque insulsum nugatorem.

*Manuscript:*

Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard College, Houghton Library Inc. 4303. I wish to thank Professor John Van Sickle, who called this manuscript to my attention.

*Biography:*

Antonius Parthenius Lacisius (Antonius Parthenius Veronensis, Antonio da Lazise, Antonio Partenio) was born in Verona in 1456 and died in 1506. The surname Lacisius is derived from the original home of the family, Lazise on Lago di Garda, from which his father, Bartolomeo da Lazise, had emigrated to Verona in 1443. Bartolomeo prospered in Verona: he had five sons, including Antonius, became a notary, and was elected vicario of Sirmione in 1466.

Antonius studied under Bartolomeus Parthenius Benacensis in Treviso and seems to have assumed the name Parthenius in honor of his teacher. He returned to Verona and became a teacher of Latin and Greek, although he must have taught privately since he is not named as a teacher in the records of the Comune of Verona. Unlike his father, Parthenius held no public offices, but he seems to have been wealthy, and contemporary records show that he bought several pieces of land. He married around 1500 but apparently had no children, for in his will (January 4, 1500) he divided his estate between his wife and brothers and nephews, and the codicil seemingly made very soon before his death (February 13, 1506) mentions no children. He possessed a large library, which he divided between his nephews and Santa Maria delle Grazie. His will lists the books left to Santa Maria (see Perpolli, p. 39) but not those left to his nephews. It does not mention Catullus.

*Works:* Parthenius is known almost entirely for his work on Catullus, which apparently con-

sumed the bulk of his scholarly attention for many years, for he seems to have studied Catullus from the late 1470s until at least 1493. He is mentioned frequently by contemporaries (e.g., Sabellicus and the author of the *Actio Panthea*) but always primarily in connection with his Catullan commentary. Parthenius contributed several epigrams to a collection honoring the memory of Domitius Calderinus (Verona, Bibl. Capitolare CCLVII [229]) and is credited by the author of the *Actio Panthea* with pastoral poems and by Maffei with a panegyric *in laudem Veronae* in 300 hexameters.

*Bibliography:* Cosenza, III, 2613–14, V, 1330; G. Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana* (Florence, 1809), VI, 1060; V. Cavazzocca-Mazzanti, “Due illustri lazisiensi,” *Pro Verona*, nos. 8–10 (1911), 13–27; J. H. Gaisser, “Catullus and His First Interpreters: Angelo Poliziano and Antonius Parthenius,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, CXII (1982), 26–46; G. C. Giuliari, *Della letteratura veronese al cadere del secolo XV* (Bologna, 1876), 20, 126–28; S. Maffei, *Verona illustrata* (Milan, 1825), III, 236–39; P. de Nolhac, “Recherche sur un compagnon de Pomponius Laetus,” *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire*, VI (1885), 139–46 (according to which Laetus’ friend, the PARTHENIUS of the catacomb graffiti, is not Antonius Parthenius but a member of the Roman family of Pallini or Paolini); C. Perpolli, “L’*Actio Panthea* e l’umanesimo veronese,” *Accademia di agricoltura, scienze e lettere, Verona, Atti e memorie*, 4th ser., 16 (1915), esp. 35–40; A. M. Quirini, *Specimen variae literaturae quae in urbe Brixia eiusque ditone paulo post typographiae incunabula florebat* (Brescia, 1739), I, 66–77; R. Weiss, “In memoriam Domitii Calderini,” *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, III (1960), 309–21.

## 2. Angelus Politianus

Angelus Politianus began to annotate his copy of the first edition of Catullus almost as soon as it appeared, and by 1473 he believed that he had improved the text well beyond the accomplishments of previous scholars, as he states in his subscription to Catullus. It is clear, however, not only that Politianus later reconsidered this first assessment of his Catullan scholarship but also that he continued to study the poet and to add to

his original annotations. The subscription to Propertius, written in 1485, contains his second thoughts on the merits of his early work on Catullus, and there is internal evidence in the marginalia of addition and revision well into the 1480s.

Politianus glosses hard words, cites parallel passages in both Latin and Greek, and explains historical and mythological allusions. He also glosses striking expressions and phrases, many of which were to appear in his own Neo-Latin poetry. Most numerous, however, are his textual emendations, which show familiarity with several manuscripts and with most of the early editions of Catullus—especially those of Calphurnius (1481) and Parthenius (1485). There are also several emendations that anticipate the work of later scholars—from Avantius in 1495 to Lachmann in 1829. It seems likely that Politianus at one time intended to use his annotations as the basis for a published commentary. The matter is discussed in a letter to Alessandro and Lattanzio Cortesi: in answer to the request for a commentary he mentions his youthful annotations, saying, however, that his work on Catullus is *nondum editione dignum*. Politianus never wrote a Catullan commentary. Instead, his interpretations of the poet were published in seven chapters of the *Miscellanea* (1489): 2, 6, 19, 68, 69, 73, 83. Five of these chapters (2, 19, 68, 69, 83) have their antecedents in the annotations.

There is no introduction or dedication.

*Subscription to Catullus* (Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana 50 F 37, fol. 37r). [*Inc.*]: Catullum Veronensem librariorum inscitia corruptum, multo labore multisque vigiliis, quantum in me fuit, emendavi, cumque eius poetae plurimos textus contulissem, in nullum profecto incidi qui non itidem ut meus esset corruptissimus. Quapropter non paucis graecis et latinis auctoribus comparatis, tantum in eo recognoscendo operae absumpsi ut mihi videar consecutus quod nemini his temporibus doctorum hominum contigisse intelligerem. Catullus Veronensis, si minus emendatus, at saltem maxima ex parte incorruptus mea opera meoque labore et industria in manibus habeatur! Tu labori boni consule in quantum in te est, quae sunt aut negligentia aut inscitia nostra nunc quoque corrupta, ea tu pro tua humanitate corrige et emenda. Meminerisque Angelum Bassum Politianum, quo tempore huic emendationi extremam imposuit manum annos decem et octo na(tum). Vale iucun-

dissime lector! Florentiae, Mccccxxiii, pridie idus sextiles. Tuus Angelus Bassus Politianus.

*Subscription to Propertius.* [Inc.]: (fol. 127v) Catulli Tibulli Propertique libellos coepi ego Angelus Politianus iam inde a pueritia tractare, et pro aetatis eius iudicio vel corrigere vel interpretari. Quo fit ut multa ex eis ne ipse quidem satis (ut nunc est) probem. Qui leges, ne, quaeso, vel ingeni vel doctrinae vel diligentiae nostrae hinc tibi coniecturam aut iudicium facito. Permulta enim infuerint (ut Plautino utar verbo), me quoque qui scripsi iudice digna lini. Anno Mccccxxxv.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. 4r) [Namque tu solebas / meas esse aliquid putare nugas] (Cat. 1.3–4). Plinius libro primo allegat hunc versum in epistula: “Sit enim haec tui praefatio, verissime, dum maximi consenescit in patre. Namque tu solebas putare esse aliquid meas nugas ut obiter emolliam Catullum conterraneum meum—agnoscis et hoc castrense verbum, etc.” [Pliny, *Praef.* 1] . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 37r) [dabis supplicium] (Cat. 116.8). *s* in veterrimo versu nullam habet vim ut apud Priscianum [Inst. 1.40], *inter se coiisse virosque [discernere ferro]* [Aen. XII.709], licet Seneca in epistulis [Ep. LVIII.3] putat Virgilium [dicere] *cernere*.

#### *Manuscript:*

Rome, Bibl. Corsiniana 50 F 37, fols. 1r–37r (Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 117; I. Maïer, *Les manuscrits d'Ange Politien* [Geneva 1965], 361–62; A. Perosa, *Mostra del Poliziano nella Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana. Manoscritti, libri rari, autografi e documenti. Firenze, 23 settembre–30 novembre 1954* [Florence, 1954], 13–16).

#### *Biography:*

See CTC I, 133–34, 225–26; IV, 272. Add to *Bibliography*: J. H. Gaisser, “Catullus and His First Interpreters: Angelo Poliziano and Antonius Parthenius,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, CXII (1982), 83–106; A. Grafton, “On the Scholarship of Politian and Its Context,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XL (1977), 150–88; I. Maïer, *Ange Politien: la formation d'un poète humaniste* (Geneva, 1966), 116–20, 124–29.

### 3. Marcus Antonius Coccius, called Sabellicus

Sabellicus' notes on Catullus appear in his *Annotationes in Plinium et alios auctores* (CTC

IV, 344–48), in a section entitled *Ex Catullo*. The *Annotationes* were printed in 1497, but the sections on Pliny and Catullus, at least, were composed earlier. Nauert (CTC IV, 344) has argued for a date between 1487 and 1493 for the dedication and commentary on Pliny, and the Catullan notes probably belong to about the same period. Sabellicus says that he has little to add to Catullan studies because the poet has already received plenty of attention. The statement, which is unusual in the fifteenth century, could probably not have been made before the appearance of Parthenius' commentary of 1485–86 (see p. 223 above). Moreover, the notes were composed and in circulation well before 1493, for Avantius (see p. 232 below) cites several of them with approval and praises their author, whom he calls Sabellus.

Sabellicus makes no attempt at systematic commentary, limiting himself to discussion of specific questions. Most of his comments are textual, but because he is eager to demonstrate that his emendations arise from context or metrical necessity, the notes are sometimes long. There are comments on Cat. 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 14, 25, 27, 29, 31, 34, 50, and 64. Soon after their circulation the notes were carefully studied not only by Avantius but also by Palladius (see p. 239 below), who incorporated several of them into his own commentary without giving their source. The notes were reprinted several times in the sixteenth century with Sabellicus' work on Pliny.

*Introduction* (ed. of [1497]). [Inc.]: (fol. 10r) Subtexam nunc ex lepidissimi Catulli carmine quam paucissima, nec ipsa, ut aperte dicam magni admodum momenti, quando ad hunc diem non defuerunt qui sedula in vetustissimum poetam opera consecuti sint, ut non adeo multa in eo desiderarentur atque ex illis ipsis quaedam quae consulto praeterita videri possint. Sed sint illa quantumlibet levia, quia ad lectionis emendationem attinent, pro appendice alteri centuriae adiiciam, eritque hoc ipsum admonere lectorem non docere. Etenim quae in coniectura posita sunt, sciebam non temere recipi solere; nemo enim non libentius si opinione certandum sit suo etsi minus sit probabile quam alterius optimo acquiescit iudicio.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. 10r) [Patroa virgo] (Cat. 1.9). Sed qui in haec inciderint boni consulant. Nunc videat lector an praeter celebres alio-



rum opiniones in fronte operis Patroa virgo Diana intelligi possit, cui et Apollini saeculare carmen decantari solitum satis superque constat, ut sit Patroa dicta quasi patris nomen habens. Est enim Diana quasi Ioviana. Sed hoc ipsum ita probo ut eam non omnino eorum repudiem opinionem qui et *patronam* legi posse contendunt, ut ad Minervam videatur allusum quam Cicero in ea oratione quam ad pontificem habuit custodem urbis appellat, ut operis aeternitatem deae Catullus commendet quae etiam urbis et ingeniorum patrona crederetur. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 10v) (Cat. 64.158–59). Neque multum ad haec inepte fecerit siquis locum eodem carmine fronte satis quidem perspicua sed recessu caliganti et obscuro intentius intuebitur. Verba sunt Ariadnes in Naxo a Theseo relictæ. *Si tibi non cordi fuerant connubia nostri, / Saevaeque abhorrebas prisci praecepta parentis.* Quod Aegeus pater praeceperit Theseo ut rei uxoriae studeret nullo quod sciam loco legere est; quid quod ne priscum quidem poeta elegantiarum studiosissimus eum appellasset, qui adhuc in humanis ageret. Superest igitur ut ad Cecropem antiquissimum Athenarum regem aliquis non inepte id referat, qui ut Trogus prodidit biformis fuisse traditur, quia primus maris et foeminae connubium in ea terra conciliarit.

*Conclusion.* (fol. 10v) Sed haec tam levia ut dixi quam multa sunt, a quibus referendis, quia exiguum operae videbam inesse precium, simul quod abunde satis sit alteri centuriae factum, quae extrariae huius evocationis genere explenda fuit, consulto abstineo.

#### *Editions:*

[1497, Venice?]: Marcus Antonius Sabellicus, *Annotationes in Plinium et alios auctores*, including the section *Ex Catullo*. The volume also includes other works by Sabellicus, Philippus Beroaldus, Angelus Politianus, and Domitius Calderinus. H 14059; Goff S-6; IGI IV, 150; CTC IV, 319. Rome, Biblioteca Angelica; (CtY; IU).

(\*)1502, [Venice]: Jacobus Pentius de Leuco. Marcus Antonius Coccius Sabellicus, *Annotationes veteres et recentes*, containing *Ex Catullo* and works by Philippus Beroaldus, Joannes Baptista Pius, Angelus Politianus, and Domitius Calderinus. (I wish to express my thanks to Professor Peter Smith, who verified the contents of this edition). Panzer, VIII, 351, 110; Graesse,

*Trésor*, VI (1922), 202; CTC IV, 319; NUC. BL; Vienna NB (NcU).

(micro.) 1508, Venetiis (Venice): Joannes Tacuinus de Tridino. Marcus Antonius Coccius Sabellicus, *Annotationes veteres et recentes*, including *Ex Catullo* and commentaries on Pliny by Philippus Beroaldus. CTC IV, 319; NUC. BL; BN; (IaU; PBL).

(\*)1511, [Paris]: Joannes Parvus and Jodocus Badius Ascensius. Jodocus Badius Ascensius, ed., *Annotationes doctorum virorum in grammaticos, oratores, poetas, philosophos, theologos et leges*. Contains *Ex Catullo*. (I wish to express my thanks to Professor James J. O'Donnell, who verified the contents of this edition). Panzer, VII, 552, 444; CTC IV, 319; NUC. BL; BN; (MH; MiU; NjP).

1602. See above, Composite Editions.

(\*)1737–51. See above, Composite Editions.

#### *Biography:*

See CTC IV, 347–48. Add to the *Bibliography*: C. Dionisotti, "Marcantonio Sabellico e Giovan Francesco Fortunio," in *Gli umanisti e il volgare fra Quattro e Cinquecento* (Florence, 1968), 15–26.

#### 4. Hieronymus Avantius

Avantius' *Emendationes in Catullum* were published in 1495, but they had been completed in 1493 and sent to Avantius' friend Augustinus Moravus Olomucensis, who circulated them among Veronese and Paduan scholars, including Calphurnius, editor of the 1481 edition of Catullus (HC 4760), and Iacobus Comes Iuliarius, to whom Parthenius' commentary had been dedicated. Avantius himself had been a student of Parthenius and had worked on the text of Catullus in the late 1480s (1487, 1488?), with particular emphasis on metrical problems. At that time he managed to restore about forty places in the text, but he soon abandoned his philological and poetical interests in favor of philosophy, which consumed his full attention for five years. In 1493, however, he set aside philosophical problems and withdrew for some time to the country, taking with him a manuscript of Catullus belonging to Christopher Papallis. Comparing this with his own Catullan manuscript and other texts, he produced the *Emendationes*.

Avantius is principally interested in textual and metrical problems and only occasionally in



interpretation. His emendations are based on the collation of his texts, the work of other scholars, and his own observations of Catullus' stylistic and metrical practice. He depends much less on parallels from other Latin or Greek authors, which he cites sparingly and selectively. In keeping with his metrical interests, he has grouped the poems by meter, abandoning the traditional order: thus hendecasyllabics, iambs, sapphics, and so on are treated separately, but within each category the traditional order is generally preserved. At the end of the *Emendationes* he takes up some additional Catullan problems posed to him by Augustinus, the most interesting of which is whether modern poets should be allowed the same metrical license that Catullus uses in the hendecasyllabics (i.e., substituting a trochee or iambus for a spondee at the beginning of the line). Avantius will not extend this license to modern poets, arguing that its use by those who know better is anachronistic and offensive, and he rejects the metrical practice of the *Carmina priapea* as a precedent, appending a detailed metrical and textual discussion of the *Priapea* (see CTC IV, 437–38) to show that their author did not in fact employ the license.

Avantius' *Emendationes* contain not only interesting observations on the history of Catullan studies in Verona, especially on the work of Calphurnius and Parthenius, but also strongly worded polemics against Angelus Politianus, who was still alive when the work was written. The basis for Avantius' attack is not Politianus' philology but his polemical treatment of Avantius' fellow citizen Domitius Calderinus in the *Miscellanea* (1489).

The *Emendationes* were published without a text of Catullus, but the second edition, published in 1500, appeared in a volume that included not only Catullus but also Tibullus and Propertius—all ostensibly edited by Avantius, although the text of Catullus is virtually identical with that of Parthenius (see above, p. 223). The volume also contained commentaries on the poets by several scholars (see above, Composite Editions), as well as emendations of Lucretius and Statius by Avantius and a letter to Iacobus Cornelius which listed further corrections to the text of Catullus. Avantius used this edition as the basis for his important first Aldine edition of Catullus (1502), and its influence is apparent in his second Aldine (1515), as well as in the edi-

tion published by Trincavellius ca. 1535. Avantius thoroughly revised the second edition of the *Emendationes*, greatly abbreviating both prefatory material and notes and deleting his polemical remarks against Politianus. He is still concerned with metrical license in hendecasyllabics and now acknowledges one instance of the license in the *Priapea*, but still refuses to sanction it in the poetry of his contemporaries. Since there are important differences between the first and second editions of the *Emendationes*, both will be considered in some detail.

#### a. The edition of 1495

*Preface by Augustinus Moravus Olomucensis* (ed. of Venice, 1495). Augustinus Moravus (Moranus ed.) Olomucensis iuris pontificii et liberalium artium professor studiosae iuventuti, s.p. [*Inc.*]: (fol. a1v) Quom nihil praestabilius in rebus humanis inveniatur nihilque divinius quam et prodesse multis et in quo deficere ceteros videas, operas in commune largiri, id quod a summis saepe viris factitatum invenimus, qui tum se demum boni aliquid assecutos arbitrabantur si id in utilitatem plurimorum collocatum iri sensissent, non ut id intra privatos parietes contineant quod miseri semper ac sordidi ingenii existimatum est, non in his modo quae in usum traducendae vitae comparata sunt, sed in eis et ex quibus tanquam penetralibus quibusdam et vitae nostrae institutum optimum et excolendis ingeniis fructum uberrimum eruere possimus. Quod ipsum quanto studio antiquitas curavit ut legendi scilicet optimi cuiusque auctoris commoda cuivis (cuius ed.) facultas daretur, cum liberalitas principum per ea tempora tum bibliothecae sumptuosissimae tanta bonorum diligentia comparatae ostendunt, ut mihi non mirum sane videatur tot viros eruditissimos tot praeclarissima ingenia uno simul tempore effluisse, ubi ea excolendi ingenii quasi armamentaria quaedam publicitus exponerentur. Ut enim Pisistratum Atheniensem transeam et post hunc Seleucum Nicanorem quorum opera incredibilis librorum copia Athenis constructa dicitur, illudque etiam quod incredibile fertur bello scilicet Alexandrino Caesaris ad septingenta voluminum milia conflagrasse, nonne eius rei apud Romanos complura nobis exempla non suppetunt quanta vel a Paulo Aemilio vel Lucullo post praedam ponticam librorum copia fuerit comparata? Dato post et M. Varroni negotio bibliothecas omnis

utriusque linguae ordinandi ac digerendi, nullum scilicet uberiores ingenii fructum rati quam si id in quo detineretur quisque maxime data sibi legendi copia assequeretur. In quo aevo nostro non gratulari et quidem vehementissime non possum, quod extincto iam prope bonarum litterarum splendore in ea rursum tempora redierit ut exuta barbarie in pristinum illud decus denuo aspiret taleque congerendis optimorum auctorum libris studium adhibeat, ut id brevi cum his quae diximus temporibus vitae configere possit. Sed neque fidelissimi interpretes deesse nobis videntur qui sicuti M. olim Varro id annitantur sedulo ac studeant ut quoad eius fieri possit eos qui temporum iniuria quasi interierant veterumque ac paedore iam prope sepulti fuerant in lucem dignitatemque pristinam revocentur. Sic enim Plinius sic Pomponius Mela sic Papinius Statius sic Propertius Iuvenalisque leguntur et qui superiore aevo omnibus membris discerpti fracti exanimesque videbantur, nunc integri solidi vividique perspiciuntur. Solus poetarum Catullus quo nemo suavior nemo iucundior nemo tersior fuerat scabra adhuc rubigine consitus detinebatur, cui ad temporum iniuriam ne id quidem defore potuit, quominus a litteratoribus quibusdam stigmatibus ineluibilibus inureretur. O miserandam lepidissimi poetae fortunam! Quis enim indolere vehementius non debeat eas humani generis delicias tenebrosis quorundam erroribus interpretatiunculisque adeo obductas ut contra eos iure ac merito dicere possimus id quod de se vates ipse lepidissimus vaticinatus est: "At vobis male sit malae tenebrae Orci quae omnia bella devoratis. Tam bellum mihi passerem abstulistis. O factum male, o miselle passer. (Cat. 3. 13–16.)" Verum enimvero rerum natura parens diutius tantam iacturam non sustinens quom aliquandiu poeta iucundissimus situ marcereque squaleret quo modo tandem hunc etiam in lucem reduceret enixa est, idest ut civium ipsius inveniretur aliquis, qui eum et a barbarie vindicaret et ubi aliqua vel mendosa vel abstrusa essent, emendaret explicaret atque digereret. Is est Hieronymus Avantius Veronensis cuius vigiliae eximiaque in civem suum pietas id tandem effecisse perspiciuntur ut ex obscuro nitidum ex lacero solidum et ex barbaro denique Latinum denuo efficeret. Quod si ob servatos cives vel Sicinius Dentatus vel Africanus Minor decreto publico civicas meruere, quis non hunc etiam ea dignum existimet qui civem

suum non servasse modo sed ab inferis quodammodo (quodammodo *ed.*) revocasse videtur? Verum tanta fuit hominis modestia tanta ingenii vivacissimi diffidentia ut eas vigilias suas non nisi paucis et his quidem amicissimis quom ruri rediret exhiberet ut vel arrogantiae omnem a se suspicionem amoveret vel aemulorum obtreptionibus qui praeclara omnia ogganunt occasionem omnem adimeret. Ego vero, cui iam annis duobus eas vigilias suas ut pote qui currentem eum (sicuti aiunt) plerumque impuleram singulari humanitate sua dedicaverat neve menstruos illos labores (sic enim eos appellabat) ederem una etiam iniunxerat, considerans mecum quantum studiosis omnibus gloriaeque Catulli consulerem si in publicum quandoque emitterentur, malui amicitiae nostrae discrimen subire praevaricatorque videri quam ea intra scrinia continens Catullum ita sicuti erat scabrum sentumque intra studiosorum manus relinquere, quum praesertim Hieronymi etiam gloriae non parum consultum iri vidissem, quumque haec scripta Leonicus Patavinus, Iacobus Comes Iulianus Veronensis, Aurelius Ariminensis, Calfurnius Brixianus nulla non laude maiores sedulo perlegerint ac mire commendarent, quom et ingenii ipsius dexteritas talisque in civem suum pietas vulgo studiosorum innotesceret ut qui de se complura alias praeclaraque testimonia concionibus publicis praestiterat quantum etiam hoc genere scripti praestet tum etiam qualem de se spem in reliquum praebeat iis veluti laborum suorum primiciis declarari possit. Has itaque emendationes Catullianas laetis animis iuvenes studiosissimi accipite atque Catullum ipsum ita vobis restitutum tali deinceps cura diligentiaque excutite ut et sales ipsius habitumque generosi huius carminis (id quod facturos vos non ambigo) penitus imbuatis. Patavii tertio Nonas Martii Anno Christi Domini MCCCCXCIII.

*Dedication.* Hieronymus Avantius Veronensis Augustino Moravo Olomucensi, s.p.d. [*Inc.*]: (fol. a2r) Scribis Augustine eruditorum humanissime tibi renunciatum esse quemadmodum hac publica studiorum remissione sepositis altioribus studiis Valerii Catulli lusus retractem rogasque ut tibi Catullianas dictiones mancas aut inversas seu epigrammata incautius congesta transverso calamo illinire velim. Et si onus supra vires meas iniungis turpissimum esse duxi tuae voluntati morem non gerere quem tantopere et

colo et observo. Malui potius audentior videri quam ullam a me repulsam acciperes, immo et libentius quid in mentem succurrit te auspice observabo. Expectaturus tuum de meis omnibus annotationibus simplex iudicium ac nudum examen quum praesertim ea te comitate praeditum sciam ut stilum rudem quo haec condita erunt in bonam partem accepturus sis quumque probe cognoscas iam abhinc annis quinque me humanitatis studiis paene renunciasset et philosophorum dogmata quae nostro tempore horrida sunt et inculta prosecutum fuisse. Cur autem hac tempestate mansuetissimas musarum delicias recolem paucis accipe. Priusquam philosophorum sacris initiarer impensissime (haud vera tacebo) conatus sum Catulliana pleraque loca abstrusissima percipere ac potissimum vatem hunc a syllabarum praevaricatione qua maxime notabatur vindicare. Ceterum tunc tenuitate ingenii vix quadraginta loca aut paulo plura perversa offenderam ac anxius restitueram ut coram te annotavimus eo die quo Patavinam praefecturam inivit Sebastianus Baduarius nostrorum studiorum recidivum decus ac singulare ornamentum. Nunc quum intermissis severioribus studiis in agellum meum (ut apud me essem) secedere vellem, Christoforus Papallis iuvenis non minus poeticae quam legum peritus Catullum satis bonae vetustatis mihi sub certa fide commendavit; inibi dum singula regustarem ac diligentius perscrutarer conferremque exemplaria et meum praesertim iamdiu manu exaratum, nonnulla alia restitui loca. Qua industria id effeci ut me haud laboris poeniteat. Meretur profecto Catullus, quem A. Gellius (ut scis) vatum elegantissimum appellat et omnes prisci uno consensu doctissimum nominant, eruditorum manus quarum (ut sic dicam) lima sordes omnes deponat ut suum pristinum nitorem et cultum resumat. Quare laetor hoc saeculum acutissimis ingeniis florere quorum pia cura (non posthabitis tamen his vigiliis nostris) Catulli legitimus libellus (nisi fallor) qui tot annis barbarorum manibus deturpatus eminentium poetarum consortium erubuit posthac in lucem prodire non dubitabit. Quis enim ante laboriosissimam Calphurnii castigationem Catulli scripta non stomachosus attingebat? Hic porro quantum humani vires ingenii passae sunt uno mense elaboravit, quin vir iste uti morum gravitate integritate sic virtutum amore ac eximia eruditione spectatissimus dum quattuor illa poetarum volumina impressoribus festinantibus

emendaret, non negabat plerasque apud Catullum esse mendas quae tam in circumciso tempore vix corrigi possent. At singulis lectionibus quas in frequentissimo Gymnasio Patavino proficitur plures Catulli sensus latentes atque ad hoc aevi non perceptos in dies (ut dicitur) recognoscit ac edocet, quae omnia ut habeas et hortor et rogo. Nihil enim ex eius officina non excultissimum prodit. Alii praeterea pariter lectioni Catullianae suffragantur. Utinam mecum essent Augustinus Beneus ac Hieronymus Bagolinus, iuvenes mihi urbe studiis moribus aetate pares apud quos poetica sapientia et philosophica scientia de principatu decertant. His nihil amabilius nihil eruditius invenio. Horum qui graecas lectiones intellegit, dubitat nempe Veronae an Athenis nati et eruditi sint. Huius rei locupletissimum est testimonium Nicoletus Theatinus qui dum Arabum praescripta fastiditus sit Augustini ac Hieronymi traductione interpretatione ac enarratione absque graecis litteris graecorum omnium philosophorum dogmata probe tenet ac sapienter in dies edocet. Audio etiam Matheum Ruffum ac Pantheum, non minus sinceræ Latinitatis quam religionis cui praesident acerrimos custodes, simul et virum singularem Benedictum Prunulum ac litteratissimum Baptistam Guarini filium, conterraneos nostros omni praeconio meo praestantiores, mirum in modum ad legitimam Catulliani operis lectionem anhelare. Supersunt quoque urbis nostrae ingenia praestantissima Petrus Bravus praestans, Burana, Donatus Avogarius, Alovixius Zendrata, et insignis eques ille nobilium eruditissimus cui ab Astraea nomen et cognomentum inditum est. Quorum omnium castigationibus ac inventis prorsus candorem suum reparabit vatum doctissimus Catullus. Parthenius quoque (ne longe abeam) plura loca in suis commentariis reformat et multis aliis locis lucem daturus erat nisi amicorum assiduis et precibus et adhortationibus editionem paene praecipitare coactus fuisset. Verum nunc ut accepi festinationis iacturam mora ac diligentia resarcire nititur. Ego interim ut pro viribus nostris tibi mos geratur, quicquid vel ex veterum codicum praesidio vel ex assidua nostra versuum libratione observaverim brevibus explicabo. Non enim omnium rationes subiiciam. Haec enim tibi committimus ut conferas cum aliorum opinione iudicium nostrum quod tantisper a te probari existimabo dum id in aliquibus tibi (ut ait Plinius) displicuisse cogno-

vero. Omne Catulliani carminis genus seorsum percurram atque ut plenius optatis tuis obtemperem non modo syllabarum quantitatem pensitabo verum pravas descriptiones simul exarabo. Prima sede phaleutii hendecasyllabi ac secunda sede saphyci versus Catullus abutitur. Alias si unum tantum corruptum epigramma excipias syllabarum fuit observantissimus.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. a2r) Imprimis codex meus carmen passeris [Cat. 2 and Cat. 3] quod passim uno epigrammate congeritur duobus seiungit quorum alterius principium est: *Lugete o veneres* [Cat. 3.1] ut agnovit Sabellus noster. Insuper mirabar Catullum posuisse iambum loco trochei ibi *usque pipillabat* [Cat. 3.10]. *Pipo* enim primam corripit. Ovidius si tamen id opus est Ovidii dicit *pessimus at passer tristia flendo pipit*. Parthenius ut accepi legit *pipulabat* quod placet. *Pipulo* enim apud M. Varronem, Nonium Marcellum ac Plautum significat convitior. At in hoc loco de passeris intellectu sicut in verbo *expernare* [Cat. 17.19] ingenue ab Angelo Politiano dissentio quod vel ex uno epigrammate Martialis videri potest, scilicet *accidit infandum nostrae scelus Aule puellae* [Mart. VII.14.1] et cetera . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. a5r) Lege in primo versu ultimi carminis [lege *ed.*] *venante requirens* [Cat. 116.1] participium, non autem *requiris*. Ibidem lege *quis te lenirem, quis pro quibus* [Cat. 116.3]. Ibidem legerem *mittere musca caput* [Cat. 116.4], *mittere* id est *committere*.

*Conclusion.* [Inc.]: (fol. a5r) In calce epistolae tuae pleraque inquiris loca non a me qui vix per triennium in haec studia incubuerim ac eadem iam dudum sequestraverim, sed depromenda a viro magnam cui mentem animumque Delius inspiret vates. Sed quo tamen vinculo inhibeor ne saltem aliqua te auspice attingam, malo equidem tecum inscitiae quam improbi stuporis argui. Quare quom quae supra annotavimus ad te mittere maturuissem decrevi rem hanc paululum differre ut aliquibus quaesitis tuis (nam eorum multa superius enarrata invenies) a me uberius satisfactum iret. Tuis igitur optatis inhiens Benacum accessi non studio visendi lacum alioquin amoenissimum sed ut convenirem Paulum Calderinum quem certe avunculus eius non minus Angeli Politiani probris indignus quam eiusdem Angeli laudibus dignissimus et rerum et virtutum heredem constituit, apud

quem ut huius comitatem frugalitatem scias ac desideres, habeas nusquam dulcius nusquam hilarius numquam maiori cum voluptate me dies composuisse. Hic Paulus octo diebus haud secus me detinuit ac si syrenios scopulos immoratus fuisset. Omnia Benaci oppida una lustravimus. Quomque in primis non satis admirarer (admiraret *ed.*) Syrmionis structuram latericiam triplici fornice concuneatam immo non mortaliū manibus elaboratam et eiusdem loci laurus praeter veri fidem odoratissimas, inde Pisceriam et Gardam Benaci oppida pulcherrima ingredi laetabundus festinavi, sperans a duobus civibus nostris horum locorum praesidibus ac vatibus eminentibus plura excultissima ac vere Catulliana me percepturum, qui enim Iacobo comite Iuliario ac Iacobo Mapheo (sic namque nuncupantur) antiquitatis cognitione ac poetarum peritia praestet scio neminem. Sed heu saeva temporis occasio! Vix unus ac cum ipso nova uxor Pischeria cesserat lacum visuri, alter aquarum, sed Athesis potissimum mirabilem vel miserabilem potius inundationem veritus Veronam concesserat. Quo casu tantum ego moerorem concepi ut vix laetari daretur ratio nisi Hieronymi Nugarolae nobilium eruditissimi Vilium montem supra quem describi posset conspicuum atque amoenum Paulo suadente conscendissemus. Huius nempe inspectione post hac cuncta orbis miracula pili faciam sive pulcherrimum situm sive loci amoenitatem sive olei ubertatem inquiras. Sed non est consilium loci huius dotes rarissimas pro materia praedicare quom ibidem morari arbitrer superos. Nescio cur Pheacum cur Hesperidum hortos cur Elisios campos cooptet qui iuga haec incolat. Iure igitur ferunt hoc reconditissimo (recondissimo *ed.*) secessu Leonardum (Leornandum *ed.*) eiusdem Hieronymi avum divina monumenta excudisse cuius volumina vel ex hoc semper magnifeci quod illa lectitet extollat atque admiretur amantissimus convictor meus Augustinus de Suessa magni commentatoris peritissimus enarrator. Quare ut ad phrasim tandem redeam, in eius montis olentissimis herbis fragrantissimo vertice cum Paulo meo ex his quae cunctabar multa una advertimus. Ipse quidem plura probe vidit, plurima optime recognovit. Quod tamen nec multa me admiratione afficit. Hic avunculi fere omnes libros (si septem cadaveris comites excipias) tam Graecis quam nostris litteris nactus est, quos quom intuetur quasi praeceptorem semper inve-

nit. Domitius namque nihil animadvertendum praelegebat quod non in codicum margine signaret atque cum aliis auctoribus conferret ut quaeque promptuaria teneret cuius rei brevi locupletissimos testes reliquisset nisi acerba nimis mors eum praevenisset. Nam quom his diebus a Paulo inquirerem quod opus in manibus Domitii versaretur ante immaturum et nunquam satis conclamatum diem suum, tunc ille nihil ultra sed iure illachrimans et scrinia codicibus referta recludens aperuit mihi librum non absolutum quem observationum ac recognitionum vocabat Domitius, et Pausaniam qui Domitii benigno labore de Graecia in Italiam migrabat. Verum vix tertiam partem gloriosi itineris tenebat cum trigeneria Domitii nece (heu naturae dedecus) vix suos in Pelasgos agnitus remansit. Iisdem diebus Ciceronis ad Atticum epistulas non nobis minus quam Attico fuerant cognobiles reddebat. Itidem commentaria in Silium Italicum, libros Fastorum Nasonis, politica Ciceronis officia, ac pleraque alia partim fere absolverat partim inchoaverat. Sed huius nonnulli labores, proh furta robore atque unco animadvertenda! alium dominum sortiti sunt. Caesarum vitas a Suetonio derelictas conditissimo stilo exorsus fuerat. Iis igitur institutionibus ac praeclaris monumentis Paulus imbutus quid ignorabit quum ille insuper assiduo studio beatissimae memoriae ac miro ingenio suffragetur? Ipse igitur me suadente, immo deprecante, dialecticorum meandris quibus interceptus erat inducias indixit ut una huiusmodi amoeniores artes reviseremus. Nostras has in Catullum meditatuunculas huic ostendimus ac placuisse sic gratulamur ut aliorum iudicium audentius aliquando subiturus sim. Nimis multus sermo esset si velim omnia quae una perscrutati sumus referre. Sed de multis satis sit quid super quaedam Catulliana quaesita tua Paulo annuente censeam. In primis non meam sed variam lectionem accipies illius versus in primo carmine Catulli quem sic legendum esse suadent alii: *Qualecumque quidem patroa virgo* [Cat. 1.9], alii *qualecumque quod est*, alii *qualecumque quod o*, alii *qualecumque quod haec*, alii non *patroa* sed *patrona*. At Pontanus ille apud Ferdinandum regem invictissimum inter archanorum secretarios hodie primarius legit ut audio *qualecumque per ora quod virorum*. Idem Pontanus iam undecim annis agnovit carmen illud *Chommoda dicebat si quando* [Cat. 84.1], licet Politianus hoc inventum sibi arroget quod

quilibet mediocriter eruditus potuit videre apud Quintilianum. Sed ad *patroam virginem* redeamus de qua in praesentiam pauca. Sed de hoc versu latissime coram te fabulabor, ubi rationes referam legentium et *patroa* et *patrona* et dicentium Catullum intellexisse in illo versu vel Palladem vel musam vel Dianam vel Lesbiam. Secundo autem quum quaeras ut exponam hemistichium illud *cavent cui visere parent* ingenue [Cat. 62.9], parcas inscitiae meae. Ignoro quod sibi Catullus voluerit. Similiter me latet sensus illius versus *Minosum linquens Doris celebranda choreis nonacris* [Cat. 64.287] ut praediximus. . . . At quom postremo quaeras an me iudice liceat nobis in faleucio endecasyllabo abuti primo pede ut Catullus solet, pace aliorum dixerim nequaquam decet. Cui enim non iure illudetur quom hic sibi Ennianam licentiam usurpet. Esto veneranda nuncupatione vatum pater cantitetur Ennius. Ennio namque atque id genus viris tunc multa licebant. At eadem temporibus nostris adeo desueta sunt ut qui eorum minimum abusum affectet omnium aures simul et stomachum offendat. Quod autem noster ille citet Priapeiarum auctoritatem cedo interim Nasonem vel si mavis Maronem aliquando trochaeum et iambum locasse in prima sede faleucii. Num tandem sibi tantum arrogabit ut autumet sibi quod et Maroni vatum praecellentissimo licere? Ceterum si perspiciet intimius non modo in prima sede faleucii apud Maronem pedem alium a spondeo non reperiret sed in toto Priapeiarum opusculo alioquin obscenissimo nullam syllabam perperam positam inveniet nisi Maro (ut vulgo fit) ex prava inscriptione legatur. Ego enim ut hanc rem penitus perciperem totam hanc Maronis paginam perlegi ac fere omnium syllabarum quantitatem ponderavi omniumque dictionum inversionem depravationemque accommodavi, quae omnia tibi explicare constitui, quia me tibi minimum hactenus satisfecisse videor. Omnia prius persolverissem si ad te has nugulas nostras ante preces tuas misissem. Quare ut a nobis aliquid accidat precibus tuis, audi quid in Maronem castigatione dignum animadverterim. [A short commentary on the *Priapeia* follows, fols. a6r–v. See CTC IV, 433–39.]

Haec saltuatim percurrimus non ut opus illud alioquin obscenissimum explanarem sed ut ex gratissimo sudore meo luce illustrius videas Maronem (cuius testimonio contra opinionem

tuam et eandem optimam nitebatur Regulus ille) nunquam alium pedem a spondeo in prima sede faleucii recepisse, immo eius pertinaciae omnino Maronem adversari. Nec tamen postliminio habendus est Catullus quod hac licentia abusus fuerit, nam tempori hoc tribuendum est. Nec oblatrent curiosi ac nasutissimi praestigiatores si quaedam poetice dicta inspiciant, quum et Maro poetarum deus in divino illo Aeneidos opere saepissime syllabas licentiosissimis figuris excusaverit, immo consulto huiusmodi lusus usurpat . . . Sed quid te pluribus detineo? Scias insuper me Ausonium lectitasse et super sexaginta non vulgares depravationes in eodem deprehendisse observavisseque ac in veram legitimamque lectionem (nisi decipior) redegissem. Hunc nempe auctorem omnium poetarum corruptissimum habemus. Verum cum huiusmodi diebus haec amoenissima et uberrima loca una cum Francisco fratre meo revisant Dantes Alliger, Augustinus Capellus ac Virgilius Savarisius cives nostri, vates (ut referre solet disertissimus Marcus Antonius Sabellus) doctissimi ac prudentissimi, horum ego consortium inibo eorundemque iudicio ac censura fretus Ausonium spero candidiorem ac paene integrum ad te mittam. Iam igitur ut nugulis nostris finem imponamus, quanta datum est brevitate habes, Augustine doctissime atque amicorum optime, quid his genialibus diebus rure morans in his studiis meditati simus, quae tametsi non praecipiti calamo reponenda fuerant (quadragesimus enim est dies quo istuc secessimus), malui tamen a te castigari quam ignaviae accusari. Cras Veronam accedam litem iam tribus annis exorsam tribus mensibus compositurus. Tantundem enim ex institutorum nostrorum sanctione assignatur arbitris nostris. Me igitur utcunque res eveniat videbis Ianuarii mense transacto. Interim si me amas ut soles clarissimo calamo ad nos perscribas quid de singulis annotationibus sentias. Tua enim interest iis scriptis (qualiacunque sint) patrocinari quae tuis praescriptis obsequentissime cudimus, nec indecens videatur ut mihi virtutum tuarum studiosissimo morem geras astronomicas disciplinas seponere quarum sciam ex publicis praedictionibus ac ex annuis futurorum prognosticis fatidicus vates haberis ac praedicaris, simul et humanarum divinarum quoque legum pelago secedere quod ante omnes aequales tuos gloriosius transfretasti. Revise precor his praesertim quasi halcyonidum diebus mansuetissimas ac

nobis quondam familiares amoenissimasque musas, nostrasque has meditatiunculas (si digna deposcimus) perlegas recognoscas atque pro arbitrio castiges. Vale et Olomucensium gloriam quae per omnes proavos tuos tibi dudum florentissima ac integerrima reservata est geniali studio ac peculiaribus virtutibus observa. Iterum vale, Avantii tui memor. Pridie Idus Octobris. MCCCCXCIII.

*Edition:*

1495, Venetiis (Venice): per Ioannem de Tridino. Avantius, Hieronymus. *Emendationes in Catullum*. GW 3098; Proctor 5435; BMC, V, 530. BL; BN; (MH).

*b. The edition of 1500*

*Preface* (ed. of Venice, 1500). The Preface by Augustinus Moravus Olomucensis is repeated from the 1495 edition.

*Dedication* (ed. of Venice, 1500). [The Dedication is an abbreviated version of that in the edition of 1495. Much of the repeated material has been omitted below.] Hieronymus Avantius Veronensis Augustino Moravo Olomocensi, s.p. [*Inc.*]: (fol. o1v) Scribis Augustine eruditorum humanissime. . . . Cur autem hac tempestate mansuetissimas musarum delicias recolem paucis accipe. Priusquam philosophorum sacris initiarer impensissime conatus sum Catulliana pleraque loca abstrusissima percipere ac potissimum vatem hunc a syllabarum praevaricatione qua maxime notabatur vindicare. Nunc autem quum intermissis severioribus studiis in agrum meum ut apud me essem secesserim nonnulla alia restitui loca. . . . Quis enim ante Calphurnii castigationem Catulli scripta non stomachosus attingebat? Hic porro quantum humani vires ingenii passae sunt uno mense elaboravit ut quattuor illi poetae emendatiores haberentur. Parthenius quoque (ne longe abeam) plura loca in suis commentariis reformat et multis aliis locis lucem daturus erat nisi amicorum assiduis et precibus et adhortationibus editionem paene praecipitare coactus fuisset. . . . Omne Catulliani carminis genus seorsum percurram atque ut plenius optatis tuis obtemperem non modo syllabarum quantitatem pensitabo verum pravas dictiones simul exarabo.

*Commentary*. [*Inc.*]: (fol. o2r) Imprimis duo sint passeris carmina [Cat. 2 and Cat. 3]. In primo lege *usque pipulabat* [Cat. 3.10] non *pipillabat* propter metrum. De passeris intellectu

sicut in verbo *expernare* a Politiano dissentio vel ex illo Martialis epigrammate scilicet *accidit infandum nostrae scelus Aule puellae* [Mart. VII.14.1]. Vide reliquos Martialis versus . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 03r) *Legerem venante requirens* [Cat. 116.1] et *mittere musca* [Cat. 116.4].

*Conclusion.* [Inc.]: (fol. 03r) Quod autem noster ille ex Priapeiarum auctoritate credat in faleco hendecasyllabo posse abuti prima sede, cedo interim Nasonem vel si mavis Maronem (meo quidem iudicio fuit multorum poetarum farrago) alium a spondeo pedem usurpasse. Num tandem sibi tantum arrogabit ut autemet pluries sibi licere quod semel Ausonio semelque Priapeiarum auctori placuit? Quod opus tibi obsequens percurri et in eo haec connotavi. [A short commentary on the *Priapeia* follows, fol. 03r–v; see CTC IV, 433–39.]

Habes, Augustine amantissime, quid his genialibus diebus rure morans meditati simus quae tametsi non praecipiti calamo reponenda fuerant a me praesertim qui sub Parthenio vix per triennium in haec studia incubuerim ac eadem per quinquennium fere sequestraverim. Malui tamen a te castigari quam ignaviae accusari. Tu igitur nostras has meditatiunculas perlegas recognoscas ac pro arbitrio castiges. Vale pridie idus Octobris. MCCCCLXXXIII.

*Additional Letter.* Hieronymus Avantius nobilissimo adolescenti Iacobo clarissimi Georgii Cornelii filio felicitatem [Inc.]: (fol. 04v) Dii te ament Iacobe merum Corneliorum exemplar, Ioannes Tacuinus Corneliae familiae addictissimus observantissimusque me tuo nomine rogavit ut emendationum in Catullum (quas denuo observarim) te certiore reddam. Pareo quam libentissime. Nam cum plurima ad te et amandum et venerandum identidem me adhortentur, vel ex hoc te ornatissimumque fratrem Marcum admiror qui doctrinarum studium tanto amore amplexamini ut vix adolescentes cum affluentibus opibus natale id solum deserueritis in quo nil magis suspicimus quam insignes Corneliae gentis imagines avitamque (avitaque *ed.*) gloriam ac meritissimam praeclari parentis auctoritatem. Maluistis nobilissimi adolescentes scientiarum potius quam maiorum splendore decorari dulcissimo quarum haustu in dies humaniores spectatioresque evaditis. O felicem Platonis testimonio aetatem nostram in qua viri principes in probas disciplinas sedulo incumbant sibi

earundem professores amore obsequiis ac contubernio devinciant. Vos enim Nursius civis meus ac Bartolomeus Merula viri eruditissimi ut totidem Maecenates agnoscunt celebrantque. Macte igitur Iacobe insignis et Corneliorum gloriam (quae tibi per maiores tuos dudum florentissima ac integerrima reservata est) peculiaribus virtutibus ac incepto scientiarum itinere observa. Sic enim optimis votis tuis benigna fortuna subscribet subsignabitque. Vale et Avantium qui Corneliam domum colit dilige.

*Additional Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. 04v) Fortasse, ornatissime Iacobe, versus ille *si qui forte mearum ineptiarum* [Cat. 14b.1] cum duobus sequentibus subsequi debet illum versum *legistis male me marem putastis* [Cat. 16.13] . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 04v) *Lege Firmanus saltus* [Cat. 114.1] non *salius*. Loquitur enim de saltu Firmano cuiusdam mali poetae qui dicebatur Mentula. Sic primo emendavimus *Saltum laudemus dum tamen ipse egeas* [Cat. 114.6]. *Lege maximus horum* [Cat. 115.7] non *ultra*. *Lege mentula magna nimis* [Cat. 115.8] non *minax*. Iterum bene vale.

#### *Editions:*

- 1500. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1520. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1604. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1608. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1680. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1822. See above, Composite Editions.

#### *Biography:*

See CTC IV, 439.

### 5. Palladius Fuscus

Palladius' commentary was published in 1496, but he claims in the dedication to have written it much earlier (*pridem*). This assertion may be true, but his vague *pridem* seems unconvincing after the detailed and circumstantial accounts of the chronology of their work given by his predecessors. Though the exact date and circumstances are not known, it seems likely that Palladius wrote his commentary so that he could lecture from it to his students, since he was a teacher of poetry and rhetoric.

Palladius attempts both to elucidate and to emend the text. He has taken into account the work of earlier scholars, whom he usually does not name, content with vague allusions to *quidam* or *alii*. He does mention Pontanus by name



(*ad Cat.* 1.10) but not Avantius, whose emendation *antistans* he cites with approval (*ad Cat.* 9.2). He abides only selectively by the principle that he states in the final letter: "ut nemini unquam detraham et si quid ab aliis didicerim id acceptum referam." He is moved to disagree, however, with Politianus' notorious suggestion about Lesbia's sparrow (*Vita Catulli*, end), although, characteristically, he does not name Politianus. Palladius' habit of not naming other scholars allowed him to plagiarize their ideas. This is particularly true in the case of Sabellicus (see p. 231 above), several of whose emendations and interpretations he prints as his own. He is not reluctant to emend the text, but most of his suggestions have not been accepted by subsequent scholars. He has a tendency to emend what he does not understand and more than once tries to remedy a sound text. For example, at *Cat.* 4.9 ignorance of Greek metrical convention and Catullus' use of it leads him to change *Propontida* to *Propontidem*. Palladius elucidates Catullus with references to a wide range of Latin authors, including Pliny, Vergil, Cicero, Horace, and Quintilian. His familiarity with Greek authors is much less extensive, although he cites Plutarch and Strabo.

Palladius' commentary was less influential than those of Parthenius and Avantius if one may judge by the comparatively small number of editions in which it appears, but there are two manuscript abridgements, and a third manuscript commentary is greatly indebted to him. The printed edition and manuscript abridgements will be treated below; the related manuscript commentary (Vatican Library, Ottob. lat. 1982) will be discussed separately (see p. 251 below).

#### a. The Printed Commentary

*Dedication* (ed. of Venice, 1496). Palladius [*sic*] Fuscus iuveni clarissimo Laurentio Bragadeno Patritio Veneto felicitatem. [*Inc.*]: Nuper ab amicis exoratus, Laurenti iuvenis optime et in nostris studiis eminentissime, ut commentarios quos in Catullum pridem scripsi iam emitterem, diu multumque cogitavi cui eos potissimum dicarem [*decarem ed.*]. Verum cum mihi multi occurrerent qui hoc munere quantulumcunque sit dignissimi viderentur, nemo tamen oblatus est qui te dignior visus sit. Memineram enim te nostras litterulas semper plurimi fecisse, ex quo

praestantiae tuae me meaque omnia libentissime dedicavi, ut ego quoque iis annumerarer qui te ob generis splendorem eximiamque eruditionem admirati amant colunt et venerantur. Occurrebat praeterea alium neminem Catulli poetarum procul dubio elegantissimi lectione adeo delectari, ut qui in hoc scribendi genere eum unum secutus carminis argutia atque lepore ipsum nobis mirifice effingas. Sed laudes tuas tunc pro ingenii mei mediocritate recensere destinavi cum alios quos in Plinii Iunioris epistolas scribere coepi commentarios tibi perfecero. Interea hos perleges ita tamen ut in ipsis priusquam impressoribus tradantur si quid deesse visum fuerit id continuo addas, sin superesse detrahas nec minus audacter deleas si quid perperam vel somniculose a nobis dicatur ut tua diligentia quam etiam rebus minimis adhibere soles in manus hominum quam emendatissimi veniant. Vale, Patriae ornamentum.

*Poem commemorating Palladius' commentary.* Viri clarissimi Donati Civaletti in Palladii Fusci Commentarios Endecasyllabon.

Si quis per tenebras Catullianas  
Securos cupit explicare gressus  
Hic mox Palladium meum sequatur  
Claras lampadas et faces ferentem.  
Non sic semita claruit per orbem  
Quaerenti Cereri abditam rapinam  
Ut docti tenebrae nitent Catulli  
Claras Palladio faces ferente.

*Vita Catulli [Inc.]*: Valerius Catullus quem ob eximiam eruditionem posteriores poetae doctum appellarunt Veronae natus ut Eusebius scribit in Temporibus circiter centesimam septuagesimam olympiadem, mortuus est anno vitae xxx non sine magna rei litterariae iactura. Quippe si longioris aetatis beneficio usus esset et plura et meliora haud parum posteris profutura procul dubio scribere potuisset voluissetque . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: Neque illis repugnamus immo eorum accedimus sententiae qui hunc multo plura quam hic habeantur scripsisse dictitant, sed quae temporum iniuria et nostrorum maiorum negligentia prorsus perierint. Verum cum omnia scripta sua in unum opus contraxisset illudque iam emissurus esset a deploratione mortui passeruli qui in delitiis Clodiae erat passerem appellavit. Neque enim illorum sequimur opinionem qui hanc vocem occultiore quendam intellectum habere contendunt.



*Letter to the Reader.* Palladius ad lectorem. [Inc.]: Epigramma quod genus poematis a nobis dici potest inscriptio latinis magis quam graecis familiare fuisse comperio. Quippe cum apud illos pauci vix singulis epigrammatis claruerint, apud nos vero multi non exiguos epigrammaton libros scripserint ut Marsus, Pedo, Getulicus, Catullus, Lucanus, Ausonius, ac etiam Caesar Augustus. Quorum post Catullum (hic enim verborum tum elegantia suavitateque tum lepore et eruditione ceteros longe excessit) maxime laudatur Valerius Martialis. Epigrammatis autem licet lex ea sit, ut nudis prope verbis iocandi cavilandi deridendique licentia lasciviat, nonnunquam tamen laudat atque ad aliquid agendum quod peractum laudem sit allaturum eum ipsum ad quem scribitur vehementer hortatur. Hoc enim a satyris differunt qui scribunt epigrammata, quod illi vitia tantum acrius carpunt, hi etiam honesta laudant et nos ad virtutem amplexandam plerumque adhortantur. Praeterea satyrarum scriptores aspera oratione et verborum copia, hi leni nonnunquam brevique sermone fere semper utuntur. Sed de hoc satis: iam Catullum interpretari incipiamus.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: *Quoi dono* (Cat. 1.1). Versus est hendecasyllabus. Idem phalecius ab inventore dictus constat ex spondeo dactilo et tribus trocheis. Catullus hoc primo epigrammate alloquitur Cornelium Nepotem cui opus suum dedicat simulque optat ut musa favente opus ipsum plus uno duret saeculo . . . / . . . [Expl.]: *Dabis* (Cat. 116.8). Abiicitur *s* de metro in scansione quod a priscis fieri solitum multorum patet exemplis. Q. Catulus in epigrammate apud Gellium: *Ibimus quaesitum verum ipsi ne teneamur / Formido. Quid ago? da Venus consilium* [Q. Lutatius Catulus, 1.5–6 (Morel)].

*Final Letter.* Palladius Fuscus ad eundem iuvenem clarissimum Laurentium Bragadenum omnium bonarum artium alumnum. [Inc.]: Hi sunt nostri in Catullum commentarii, Laurenti iuvenis clarissime, quos ego hortatu amicorum editurus tibi lubens dedicavi ut ipsi tuo caeterorumque Bragadenorum favore aliqua ex parte muniti in medium audacius prodirent. Quamvis enim in toto opere usus sim eo temperamento ut nemini unquam detraham et si quid ab aliis didicerim id acceptum referam, video tamen mihi quoque paratos esse illos qui obtreptione alienae scientiae famam sibi aucupantur, vel ob id potissimum quod nonnullis in locis partim

vetustioris exemplaris fidem secutus partim ingenio meo fretus epigrammata quae alii interpretes ante me iunctim [*vinctin* ed.] legerunt dividere et alia quae idem diviserunt coniungere non dubitaverim. Sed ego tuo tuique similium iudicio contentus Homeromasticas omnes et quicumque illis favet ut Catulli verbis utar pili facio. Valeat praestantia tua cui me plurimum commendo.

*Editions:*

1496, Venetiis (Venice): Johannes Tacuinus, de Tridino. GW 6390; HC 4768; BMC, V, 530; Goff C-325; NUC. BL; Bodleian Library; BN; (CtY; DLC; TxU).

1500. See above, Composite Editions.

1520. See above, Composite Editions.

1604. See above, Composite Editions. Palladius is part of a variorum commentary.

1608. See above, Composite Editions. Palladius is part of a variorum commentary.

1659. See above, Composite Editions. Palladius is part of a variorum commentary.

*b. The manuscript abridgements*

1. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 7989, fols. 132r–179r.

This is one of the oldest fifteenth-century manuscripts (copied in 1423) and the earliest to join Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius. It also contains Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis* (for which it is most famous) and several other poems, including the *Phoenix* of Claudian, which was added in the sixteenth century (fol. 249r). The scribe of the *Phoenix* annotated all of the texts except for the *Cena*. His commentary on Catullus is based on Palladius and consists almost entirely of abridgements of the summaries Palladius used to introduce each poem. The manuscript belonged to the family of the Cippico family at Traù (Trogir) and perhaps was acquired by Pietro Cippico, ca. 1438. Pietro was the grandfather of Alvisio Cippico, a friend of Palladius.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. 132r) (*On Cat. 1*) Catullus Cornelium alloquitur Nepotem cui suum dedicat libellum, simulque Musam obsecrat ut hoc opusculum plus uno seculo perenne esse velit . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 177r) (*On Cat. 97*) Poeta insectatur Emiliū cui os turpissimum foedissimumque est.

*Manuscript:*

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 7989, a. 1423, fols. 132r–179r. (A. C. de la Mare, "The

Return of Petronius to Italy," in J. J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibson, eds., *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to Richard William Hunt* [Oxford, 1976], 239–51).

2. *Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard College, Houghton Library Inc.* 4303.

This 1475 edition (HC 4759) contains handwritten annotations drawn from the commentaries of Palladius and Parthenius. For discussion, see on Parthenius (p. 229 above).

*Manuscript:*

Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard College, Houghton Library Inc. 4303.

*Biography:*

Palladio Negri (Palladius Niger), more commonly known as Palladio Fosco or Palladius Fuscus, was a native of Padua, although he seems to have practiced his profession as a teacher of poetry and rhetoric chiefly in the cities of Traù (Trogir), Zara (Zadar), and Capodistria. He died in Capodistria on October 17 or 18, 1520, of the effects of a stroke suffered while he was teaching in the cathedral, and was buried in the Basilica of San Francesco.

Little is known about the details of Palladius' life. He seems to have started his career in the 1480s in Padua, where he made the acquaintance of several Dalmatian humanists, including Aloysius Cippicus of Traù, later (1489) bishop of Famagosta. Some evidence for Palladius' aspirations and disappointments at this period in his life is contained in the correspondence of Marcus Antonius Sabellicus. From a letter to Palladius it appears that Sabellicus, who had left his position as teacher of rhetoric in Udine in 1483 to go to Venice, had tried to have Palladius named as his replacement but that the position had gone instead to Bartholomaeus Celottus (called Uranius) and his son. After describing his efforts on Palladius' behalf Sabellicus reminds him of his previously expressed reluctance to continue in the teaching profession: "Quamquam tute ita velle connivebas qui mihi per litteras sub id tempus significasti nolle ineptire amplius, sed Cippici antistitis auctoritatem secutum velle Romam proficisci. Probo ego vehementer id consilium ac tibi foeliciter evenire volo quod in luce hominum destines non inter pueros consenescere" (Sabellicus, *Epistolarum familiarium liber sex-*

*tus*, in *Opera* [Venice, 1502], 32). The sincerity of Sabellicus' friendship, however, is questionable, especially in regard to the position at Udine, for although he claims to have recommended Palladius, it is clear from his letter to the citizens of Udine that he was supporting another unsuccessful candidate, Johannes Franciscus Philomusus (Sabellicus, *Ep. fam. liber primus*, in *Opera*, fol. 5r–v). Because of the plague of 1486 the disappointed Palladius did not go to Rome after all (Sabellicus, *Ep. fam. liber sextus*, in *Opera*, fol. 32v) but continued teaching. He taught at Traù at some time during this period, but in 1493 he was brought to Zara by Donatus Civaellus. From 1493 to 1516 Palladius remained in Zara, first as *rector scholarum* and then as *cancellarius ad criminalia*. In 1516 he left Zara for Capodistria, perhaps because of the enmity of his successor as *rector scholarum*, Nardinus Celinensis, who wrote two invectives against him. Palladius taught in Capodistria until his death. He was survived by his wife.

*Works:* In addition to his commentary on Catullus, Palladius composed a rather influential treatise, *De situ orae Illyrici libri duo*, which was probably written after 1500, according to one of its early editors, G. Luccio (1666). The work was first published in 1540 in Rome, under the direction of one of Palladius' pupils, Bartolomeo Fonte, who was attempting to save his master's works from oblivion, and it subsequently appeared in three more editions: 1666, with notes of G. Luccio (Amsterdam); 1725, with notes of G. Luccio, in J. G. Graevius, *Thesaurus antiquitatum et historiarum Siciliae* (Leiden), vol. XIV; 1746, in J. G. Schwandtnerus, *Scriptores rerum hungaricarum veteres* (Vienna), III, 755–64. Palladius also wrote a history in three books, *De bello . . . inter Venetos et Turcos* (Padua, Biblioteca del Seminario, ms. 647, listed in Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 10). There is one letter of Palladius preserved in the correspondence of Sabellicus, a *consolatio* to Sabellicus on the death of his nephew (Sabellicus, *Ep. fam. liber nonus*). Palladius' biographer, Scardeone, says that he wrote many poems, but most seem to have perished. Some were gathered by Fonte in the 1540 edition of *De situ orae Illyrici*, including *Laus syrmini collis in agro aegidensi*. Another, addressed to his friend Aloysius Cippi-

cus on his accession to the bishopric of Fama-gosta, is contained in Luccio's notes to *De situ orae Illyrici* and has been reprinted by Praga.

The rest of Palladius' works seem to have perished. Laurentius Pignori (Origines patavinae [Padua, 1625], ch. XIV, p. 94) claimed to possess a manuscript of a geographical work on the Veneto, and Scardeone mentions *De insulis libri tres* and *Collectanea rerum non vulgarium* (in the manner of Aulus Gellius). It is not known whether Palladius ever completed the commentary on Pliny's *Letters* that he mentions in the *Dedication* of his Catullan commentary.

*Bibliography:* Cosenza, II, 1508 and V, 757; Eckstein, 399; Jöcher, III, 1196; Michaud, XIV, 440–41; Tiraboschi (1809), VI, 1049; G. Praga, "Un poemetto di Alvise Cippico sulla guerra di Ferrara nel 1482," *Archivio storico per la Dalmazia*, X (October 1930), 318–20; M. A. Sabellico, *Opera* (Venice, 1502), fols. 5r–v, 10r–v, 32r–v, 48r; B. Scardeone, *De antiquitate urbis Patavii et claris civibus patavinis libri tres* (Basel, 1560); G. J. Voss, *De historicis latinis libri tres* (Leiden, 1651), 601; A. Zeno, *Dissertationi vossiane* (Venice, 1752–53), II, 49–56.

#### 6. Franciscus Puccius

According to the subscription at the end of a copy of the 1481 Reggio edition of Tibullus, Catullus, and Propertius now in Florence (Biblioteca Riccardiana, Edizioni rare 372), Franciscus Puccius was annotating the three poets in 1502. Most of his notes on Catullus are textual, but others have to do with explication and interpretation. Puccius explains hard words, cites parallel passages, identifies meters, and discusses the correct division of the poems. Since he also mentions the emendations and interpretations of his predecessors, Hermolaus Barbarus, Philippus Beroaldus, Pontanus, and Politianus, his notes are valuable evidence for the attribution of emendations and for the history of the text in the late fifteenth century. Because Puccius was a pupil of Politianus and kept abreast of his teacher's work, it is not surprising to find some of Politianus' emendations from the *Miscellanea* in the notes. On the other hand, Puccius does not seem to have had access to Politianus' unpublished annotations (see p. 230 above), for there is almost no overlap between the two sets of notes.

Puccius' annotations on Catullus were never published, but they were widely diffused among both his own pupils and the scholars of the next generation. The notes suffered deletions and accretions in their transmission, and many versions contain no mention of Puccius himself. Nevertheless, they are easily identified, both by their content and by the persistence of the abbreviations "P" (= Puccius) and "v.c." (= *vetus codex*). Calonghi (see Bibliography below) attempted to make a stemma for the transmission of the notes but was hindered by lack of information about several versions, including Puccius' own copy, which has yet to be identified. No version of the notes contains a preface or dedication.

*Subscription.* (Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Edizioni rare 372, fol. p5v) Franciscus Puccius haec annotabat anno salutis MDII, Augustino Scarpinella comite studiorum, sequutus fidem antiquissimi codicis qui primum fuit Berardini Vallae patricii romani, viri doctissimi, dein ab eo dono est datus Alfonso secundo regi Neapolitano principi litterarum amantissimo.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. e1) *quod patrona nirgo* (Cat. 1.9) *quod o patroa virgo*. Pontanus: *quod ora per virorum . . . / . . .* [Expl.]: (fol. h7v) *Telis infestum mitteremusque caput* (Cat. 116.4). *infestum telis icere mi usque caput*. *Valuisse* (Cat. 116.6). *evaluisse*. *Amica* (Cat. 116.7). *amictu*. *Nobis* (Cat. 116.8) *nostris*. *Dabe* (Cat. 116.8). *dabis*.

#### *Manuscripts:*

For full references to discussions of the manuscripts cited below only by the last name of the author, see Bibliography, p. 249 below.

1. (micro.) Aberdeen, University Library, Incun. 165.

This copy of the Reggio 1481 edition contains Catullus and Propertius; the Tibullus portion is in Naples (Biblioteca Nazionale, ms. XIII B 12, see p. 249 below). The annotator is Aulus Janus Parrhasius (CTC III, 104–105), a pupil of Puccius. The notes are abundant through Cat. 66.54, with only a handful in the rest of the text. The virtual ending of the notes at Cat. 66 suggests a possible relation to the Göttingen apograph (number 7, below), especially since this, like the Göttingen copy, contains no notes on Propertius. There is no subscription.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. e1r) *Arido* (Cat.

1.2). arida. *Quod patrona virgo* (Cat. 1.9). quod o patroa. Pontan[us]: quod ora per virorum . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. g8r) *Scelerum* (Cat. 66.48). telorum ex Pontano. Chalybon ex Callimacho. *Unigena* (Cat. 66.53). Frater eodem editus utero. Significat autem Zephyrum, qui sunt omnes alii venti, natus ex Astraeo proditur et Aurora. Ordo igitur est: quum se Memnonis Aethiopis unigena, id est frater Zephyrus, obtulit se aquis Arsinoes. *Aquis Arsinoes* (Cat. 66.54). pro ad aquas. Arsinoe civitas in littore Cyrenaico redditur ubi Venus Arsinoe colebatur ad Zephyrium promont[orium].

(Kristeller, *Iter*, IV, 3; Richardson, 277–89).

2. (\*)Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek,  
Bibl. Diez. oct. 2474.

This 1515 Aldine of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius was owned by Antonius Petreius, who apparently annotated it over a period of time, for he has changed the dates as well as the contents of his subscriptions. The only legible date is 1528. The volume was subsequently owned by Nicolaus Heinsius, who bought it from a junk dealer in Florence in 1646, and later by Burmann and Santen. After Santen's death it was bought by Diez, who left it to the Königliche Bibliothek in 1817. I am indebted to the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, which supplied me with the entry for this volume from its catalog before publication, including a transcript of the subscriptions. I am including the subscription for Propertius as well as that for Catullus because it appears at the end of the volume and contains some information about Catullus. The location of this apograph was not known to Calonghi or Richardson.

a. *Subscription for Catullus*. (fol. 42r) Annotabam et recognoscebam Ego Antonius Petreius collatis vetustissimis et emendatissimis codicibus, adhibita tamen auctoritate multorum doctrina insignium, hoc anno 1528.

b. *Subscription for Propertius*. (fol. 148r) Emendabam et annotabam Catullum, Tibullum et Propertium ego Antonius Petreius collatis vetustissimis exemplaribus alio Pontani alio episcopi Cremonensis alio Francisci Puccii nec non aliis Romae et Florentiae habitis anno 15— et 15—.

(Butrica, 6; Calonghi, 106–11; E. Huschke, *Albii Tibulli Carmina* [Leipzig, 1819], I, xi, xvii–xix; Jacob, xvi–xvii; K. Lachmann, *Albii*

*Tibulli Libri quattuor* [Berlin, 1829], vi–viii; Richardson, 279; R. Ridolfi, “Antonio Petrei letterato e bibliofilo del Cinquecento,” *La bibliofilia*, XLIX [1947], 53–70, esp. 63, n.3; Santen, v–vii; C. Saxe, *Onomasticon litterarium* [Utrecht, 1782], IV, 606; G. Targioni-Tozzetti, *Clarorum Belgarum ad Ant. Magliabechium nonnullosque alios epistulae* [Florence, 1745], I, 163–64; U. Winter, *Die europäischen Handschriften der Bibliothek Diez II* (Leipzig, 1986), 36–37.).

3. (\*)Edinburgh, University Library Inc.  
174.

This copy of the 1481 Vicenza edition was owned and annotated by Baccio Valori, a student of Vettori (number 8, below). It contains only a few of Puccius' notes.

(Kristeller, *Iter*, III, 26; Richardson, 280).

4. Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale  
Inc. Magl.A.3.39.

This copy of the Vicenza edition of 1481 was called V<sup>1</sup> by Calonghi. It was owned and annotated by Bernardus Pisanus, who transcribed Puccius' notes in 1522. Pisanus has written a subscription at the end of the text of each of the three poets (Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius), but he has not copied Puccius' subscription.

*Subscription*. (fol. d6v) Valerii Catulli Veronensis epigrammaton libri finis; quem recognovi ego Bernardus Pisanus collato emendatissimo F. Puccii exemplari anno MDXXII.

*Commentary*. [Inc.]: (fol. a2r) *Nanque tu solebas* (Cat. 1.3). Hinc legitur apud Plinium praefatione: nanque tu solebas meas esse aliquid putare nugas. *Quidem patroa virgo* (Cat. 1.9). quod o patroa virgo. Pontanus: quod ora per virorum . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. d6v) *Hinc valuisse* (Cat. 116.6). evaluisse. *Dabis* (Cat. 116.8). dabe legitur in quibusdam sed mihi non probatur.

(Calonghi, 105–106; Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 513; Richardson, 278).

5. Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale,  
Postillati 41.

This copy of the 1503 Giunta edition was annotated by Piero della Stufa in 1554, using Giannotti's version (number 15 below).

*Subscription*. (fol. f10r) P.S. contulit cum codice quem Donatus Iannoctius et Iacobus Diacetus contulerant cum codice quem Franciscus

Puccius Neapoli diligentissime emendarat, cum illic profiteretur humaniores literas. MDLIII.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. a5r) *Cui* (Cat. I.1). Quoi. *Quidem ora per virorum* (Cat. I.9). Hoc Pont[anus]. quod ora patrua virg[o] . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. f9r) *Venante* (Cat. 116.1). cupiente. *Neu* (Cat. 116.3). neque. *Musca* (Cat. 116.4). mi usque. *Valuisse* (Cat. 116.6). evaluisse.

(Kristeller, *Iter*, I, 177; Richardson, 280).

6. (micro.) Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Edizioni rare 372.

This 1481 Reggio edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius contains an early and reasonably faithful version of Puccius' notes, but it is not, as was formerly believed, Puccius' own copy. Butrica has noted that the script is not the same as that in two known examples of Puccius' hand. The volume contains Puccius' subscription to Propertius and a note of ownership by his uncle, Andrea Cambini.

*Subscription:* See p. 243 above.

*Commentary:* See p. 243 above.

(Butrica, 5–6; T. De Marinis, *La biblioteca napoletana dei re d'Aragona* (Milan, 1947–52), I, 192; Kristeller, *Iter*, V, 613; Richardson, 277–89).

7. (micro.) Göttingen, Universitätsbibliothek, ms. Philol. III.

This copy of the 1481 Vicenza edition was called V by Calonghi, who says that the anonymous annotator used sources not mentioned by R (number 9, below) or A (number 18, below) and that the notes have an air of originality. The notes in this volume are incomplete: Tibullus is fully annotated, as is Catullus—but only through c. 66 (*pace* Richardson, who says that only Cat. 66 is annotated); according to Calonghi there are only two notes on Propertius, both on I.1. There is no subscription.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. a2r) *Arido* (Cat. I.2). arida legendum est secundum Servium in xii Aeneidos in illo versu, *Inclusas* (Aen. XII. 587). *Doctis iuppiter et laboriosis* (Cat. I.7). Aliqui legunt *doctis, et pariter laboriosis*, sed lepidior alter ille sensus et familiaris Cat[ulli] vel de coma B[erenices]: *Juppiter ut tristi lumina saepe manu et inibi Juppiter ut Calybon omne genus pereat* (Cat. 66.48). *Quare* (Cat. I.8). Aliqui addunt *quod quare habe haec tibi*, etc. *Qualecumque* (Cat. I.9). P.: quaecumque quod

o patroa virgo. Pont. ita legebat: quaecumque quod ora per virorum . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. e7r) *Oarion* (Cat. 66.94). Vide Politianum in Miscellaneis. Aliqui enim legebant *Erigone* quod noster Marullus approbat in suo distico contra Politianum quo[d] est in Ecnomum: “Oarion pro Erigone citat Ecnomus, unde? / Non facit ad mores virgo, sed Oarion” (Marullus, *Ep.* III.11), innuens delectari eum amore puerorum non virginum.

(Calonghi, 104–105; Lachmann, viii; W. Meyer, *Verzeichniss der Handschriften im preussischen Staate* (Berlin, 1893), I, 25; Richardson, 278).

8. (micro.) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 2° Inc. c. a. 1120.

This copy of the Reggio 1481 edition was owned and annotated by Petrus Victorius (CTC II, 35–36). Victorius transcribed Puccius' notes in 1521, as he records at the end of the subscription.

*Subscription.* The subscription is identical to that of number 6 above, except that it contains the following addition (cited from Calonghi): *Contuli cum codice autographo . . . ad unguem omnia in nostrum hunc excrimer . . . idibus iulii MDXXI. P. Victorius.*

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. e1r) *Arido* (Cat. I.2). arida, Ser[vius]. *Quaecumque quod patroa nirgo* (Cat. I.9). quod o patroa virgo. Pontanus: quod ora per virorum . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. d6v) *Telis infestum mitteremusque caput* (Cat. 116.4). infestum telis icere mi usque caput. *Valuisse* (Cat. 116.6). evaluisse. *Amica* (Cat. 116.7). amictu. *Nobis* (Cat. 116.8). nostris. *Dabe* (Cat. 116.8). dabis. *Dabis supp[licium]*. s liquescit.

(Butrica, 6; Calonghi, 98–99; F. Jacob, *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Carmina* (Leipzig, 1827), xv–xvi; Richardson, 279; L. Santen, *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Elegiarum libri IV* (Utrecht, 1780), vii–ix; B. L. Ullman, “Pontano's Handwriting and the Leiden Manuscript of Tacitus and Suetonius,” *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, II (1959), 333, n. 1; Kristeller, *Iter*, III, 633).

9. (micro.) Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, SQ X H 10.

This copy of the Reggio edition of 1481 was designated R by Calonghi, who called it the most faithful copy of the notes. The volume contains Puccius' subscription, and the annotator is anonymous.

*Subscription.* (fol. p5v) The subscription, though faint, is identical to that of number 6, above.

*Commentary.* [*Inc.*]: (fol. c1r) *Quod patrona nirgo* (Cat. 1.9). quod o patroa virgo. Pontanus: quod ora per virorum . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. h7v) *Telis infestum mitteremusque caput* (Cat. 116.4). infestum telis icere mi usque capud. *Valuisse* (Cat. 116.6). evaluisse. *Amica* (Cat. 116.7). amictu. *Nobis* (Cat. 116.8). nostris. *Dabe* (Cat. 116.8). dabis.

(Butrica, 5–6; F. Calonghi, “Marginalia,” in *Miscellanea Pandiani* (Genoa, 1921), 97–114; Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 549; Richardson, 278).

10. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Rés. p. Yc. 379.

This is a copy of the 1515 Aldine edition of Catullus which does not include Tibullus or Propertius. Since it bears a notation on the frontispiece, *ex bibliotheca menteliana*, it presumably once belonged to the French scholar Jacobus Mentelius (1597–1671). There are two sets of annotations, one in Italian in a seventeenth-century hand, the other in a neat sixteenth-century script; both annotators are anonymous. The later hand identifies the Latin notes as those of Puccius in a note on the flyleaf: “Franc. Puccius vir doctissimus et diligentissimus in evolvendis scriptorum veterum libris Florentiae vivebat ineunte superiore saeculo. Hic passim laudatur per literam P. aut Pucc. Politianus in epistulis saepius mentionem illius facit—.” The book is heavily annotated throughout, but there is no subscription. This copy of the notes was unknown to Calonghi or Richardson.

*Commentary.* [*Inc.*]: (fol. 1v) *Arido* (Cat. 1.2). arida. *Quidem ora per virorum* (Cat. 1.9). Pont[anus]: quod ora per virorum. Quod o Patrona virgo . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 41v) *Battiadae* (Cat. 116.2). Callimachus Batti et Messane filius, patria Cyreneus. *Neu* (Cat. 116.3). P. ne. *Musca* (Cat. 116.4). P. mi usque. *Tu dabis supplicium* (Cat. 116.8). s liquescit.

11. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, Van Pelt Library, Lat. C.C2294.531c.

This is a 1531 edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, printed in Venice by Melchior Sessa. The annotations are anonymous, but a nineteenth-century Italian note in the front of the volume suggests that the hand is very similar to

that of Marcus Antonius Muretus. The annotations, however, have nothing in common with Muretus’ commentary (see p. 260 below), as the Italian scholar acknowledges. Rather, the volume is another apograph of Puccius, who is frequently acknowledged by the abbreviation, “P”. A second note on the flyleaf identifies the annotator as Latino Latini (1513–93). The copy may have some relation to number 17, for their first lemmata are almost identical and have no parallel in other apographs. Like number 17, the volume contains much material that is not from Puccius. There is no subscription. The volume was not known to Calonghi or Richardson.

*Commentary.* [*Inc.*]: (fol. a2r) *Cornelium Nepotem* (in title of Cat. 1). Ad Cornelium Nepotem amicum suum Padi (ut Plin[ius] ait) accolam qui editis aliquot voluminibus Augusti principatu obiit, unde Catull[us] eum vocat historiographum. In alios ad Cor[nelium] Gallum elegiarum scriptorem scribit, quod minus placet, quod Gallus non fuerit historiographus. Cor[nelium] Nepotem historiogr[aphum] citat Gellius . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. e8v) *Musca* (Cat. 116.4). mi usque. *Valuisse* (Cat. 116.6). evaluisse. *Dabis* (Cat. 116.8). id est liquescet.

(M. A. Shaaber, *Sixteenth-Century Imprints in the Libraries of the University of Pennsylvania* [Philadelphia, 1976], 132, item 282).

12. Vatican Library, Aldine III.19 (formerly A.15).

This copy of the 1502 Aldine edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius contains a greatly abbreviated but still recognizable version of Puccius’ notes. The familiar abbreviations P and v.c. are used throughout. There is no subscription. The volume was not known to Calonghi or Richardson.

*Commentary.* [*Inc.*]: (fol. a2r) *Quaecunque quidem ora per virorum* (Cat. 1.9). Aliter quod o patroa virgo . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. f2r) *venante requirens* (Cat. 116.1). et cupiente requiro. *Quis te lenirem* (Cat. 116.3). Quae te lenirent. *Musca* (Cat. 116.4). mi usque. v.c. *Valuisse* (Cat. 116.6). evaluisse.

(Butrica, 6–7; P. de Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* [Paris, 1887], 258, n. 6).

13. Vatican Library, Barb. CCC. II. 7.

This 1502 Aldine edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius contains an abbreviated version of Puccius’ notes very similar to that in

number 12. The abbreviation v.c. is used throughout, but there is no reference to Puccius. A note on the flyleaf reads "ex libris Caroli Moroni." There is no subscription. The volume was not known to Calonghi or Richardson.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. A2r) *Qualecunque quidem ora per virorum* (Cat. 1.1). quod o patroa virgo . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. F2r) *venante requirens* (Cat. 116.1). et cupiente requiro. *Quis te lenirem nobis* (Cat. 116.3). Quae te lenirent nobis. *Musca* (Cat. 116.4). mi usque-v.c. *Valuisse* (Cat. 116.6). evaluisse.

(Butrica, 6–7).

14. Vatican Library, Barb. CCC. II. 26.

This copy of the 1515 Aldine edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius includes Puccius' notes, together with a mass of non-Puccian material. The annotator names several scholars, including Politianus, Hermolaus Barbarus, and Beroaldus, but does not mention Puccius, whose annotations are included with no attribution or (more frequently) with the preface *al.* Occasionally the abbreviation v.c. or v.co. is used. There is no subscription. The volume was not known to Calonghi or Richardson.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. 2r) *Cui* (Cat. 1.1). al. quoi. nam cui pro quoi veteres scriptores. *Dono.* in And. 23. *Arido* (Cat. 1.2). al. arida, Ser[vius] 305 . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 42r) *Venante requiris* (Cat. 116.1). et cupiente requiro. *Icere musca caput* (Cat. 116.4). iecere mi usque. *valuisse* (Cat. 116.6). evaluisse. *Nostris* (Cat. 116.8). nobis.

(Butrica, 6–7).

15. (micro.) Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XII 127 (4020).

This copy of the 1502 Aldine edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius was annotated by Donatus Jannoctius (= Gianotti) using a version of Puccius' notes made by Laurentius Benivenius. In addition to the familiar abbreviation P (= Puccius), Jannoctius frequently denotes readings and comments with A.

*Subscription.* The subscription is identical to that of number 6 above, except that it contains the following addition: "Consulit Laurentius Benivenius ut omnia in suum exscriberet. Ego autem cum ipso Laurentii sic adtuli ut nihil intermissum sit. Absolutum opus Anno MDXXX iiii Cal. Augusti. Obsessa urbe. Donatus Jannoctius."

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. A2r) *Arida* (Cat. 1.2). pumex arida, Ser[vius]. *Qualecunque quidem ora per virorum* (Cat. 1.9). Pont[anus]. quod o patroa virgo, P[uccius]. A: qualecumque quidem o patrona virgo . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. F2r) *Dabis* (Cat. 116.8). s liquescit.

(Butrica, 6; Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 242; Richardson, 279–80; D. F. S. Thomson, *Catullus: A Critical Edition* [Chapel Hill, 1978], 60–61, item 119).

16. (micro.) Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XII 128 (4021).

The annotator of this 1515 Aldine is anonymous, but he is clearly copying a version of Puccius' notes, and he occasionally uses the abbreviations P and v.c. (*Puccius* and *vetus codex*), which are familiar in several apographs. There is no subscription.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. 2r) *Arido* (Cat. 1.2). Arida. *Quidem ora per virorum* (Cat. 1.9). per ora quod virorum. quod o patroa virgo . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 42r) *Queis te lenirem, nobis neu* (Cat. 116.4). quae te lenirent nobis, ne. *Musca* (Cat. 116.4). mi usque. *Valuisse* (Cat. 116.8). evaluisse. *Dabis* (Cat. 116.8). s liquesces.

(Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 242; Thomson, 60–61, item 120).

17. (micro.) Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XII 187 (4029).

The anonymous annotations in this 1515 Aldine rely heavily, although not exclusively, on Puccius' notes but do not mention Puccius himself. The annotator frequently credits Pontanus for corrections identified as Puccian in other apographs. There is no subscription, but a note on the flyleaf has sometimes been taken to suggest that the annotator was Alexander Synclyticus Cyprius: "Vide num annotationes in margine semper sint manu Alexandri Synclytici Cyprii." The volume was not known to Calonghi or Richardson.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. 1r) *Cui* (Cat. 1.1). quoi. *Corneli* (Cat. 1.3). Ad Cornelium Nepotem amicum suum, Padi ut ait Plinius accolam qui editis aliquot voluminibus Augusti principatu obiit [Pliny IX.137], unde Catullus eum vocat historiographum. Certe ad Cornelium Gallum non scribit, qui poeta fuit. Et Gellius citat Cornelium historiographum . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 42r) *venante* (Cat. 116.1). et cupiente. *Neu*

(Cat. 116.3). ne. *Musca caput* (Cat. 116.4). mi usque caput.

(Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 242).

18. (\*)Present location unknown.

This 1515 Aldine of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius was owned by Calonghi, who called it A. It formerly belonged to Calonghi's friend Carlo Nardi. The volume was fully described by Calonghi, who believed that it was annotated after 1558. According to Calonghi, the notes tend to abbreviate and summarize Puccius and contain some material not in Puccius. There are several hands, all anonymous, and the volume contains a version of Puccius' subscription.

*Subscription.* Franciscus Pucci haec annotavit an. sa. MDXVI Antonio Scar[pine]lla studio[rum] comite secutus [fi]d[em] antiquiss. codicis qu[i] primum ful[it] Bernardini Patritii Romani viri [doc]tiss. dein ab eo dono est datus Alfonso II reg. neapolitano principi [litterar]um am[an]tissimo.]

(Calonghi, 97–114; Richardson, 279).

#### *Biography:*

Franciscus Puccius (Francesco Pucci) was born in Florence September 3, 1463. He died in Rome August 24, 1512.

Puccius was one of the first pupils of Angelus Politianus, for he attended the Florentine Studio in 1480, Politianus' first year as professor. The influence of Politianus was to be deep and long-lasting. In later years Puccius circulated his notes from Politianus' lectures, quoted his opinions, and corresponded with him. Puccius remained at the Studio for several years, becoming a professor in 1483–84. He moved to Naples in 1485 or 1486, presumably to take up a position at the Neapolitan Studio, but it is not certain that he was lecturing before the academic year 1487–88. He continued to lecture until the closing of the Studio in the political upheavals after the departure of Charles VIII. Puccius enjoyed the patronage of the Aragonese kings and served as librarian of the Biblioteca Aragonese until the end of the dynasty. Then, for some time before 1504, he served as *arrendatore* of revenues for Naples and the region of Nola. His last position was that of secretary to Cardinal Luigi d'Aragona in Rome, an appointment he held until his death. He was buried in S. Onofrio in Rome.

Throughout his career Puccius enjoyed the friendship and patronage not only of the Ara-

gonese kings but also of other highly placed Neapolitans. Santoro speculates that Puccius may have owed his initial appointment in Naples to the famous but ill-starred Antonello de Petrucciis. However that may be, even after the great man's fall and condemnation Puccius remained loyal to him and his family. He was close to the Carafa family and was honored and favored, especially by his pupil Bernardino Carafa, but also by Alberico Carafa (the duke of Ariano). Pucci had many friends among Neapolitan scholars and humanists—including Antonio d'Alessandro, Silvestro Galeota, Giano Anisio, and Jacopo Sannazaro. He was a member of the Accademia Pontaniana and a friend of Pontanus, who mentioned him in the *De sermone*, wrote a poem in his honor (*Ad Franciscum Puccium*, *Hend.* II.9), and made him one of the speakers in the *Aegidius*. He was the teacher of Antonius Seripandus and Aulus Janus Parrhasius (see p. 249 below).

*Works:* In addition to his notes on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, Puccius wrote numerous commentaries, letters, orations, and poems, but only one letter was published in his lifetime. Although some works have been printed since, many, including his philological studies, are accessible only in manuscripts.

The most important source is Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale V F 2, which was rediscovered and described by Santoro in 1948. The manuscript includes three of Puccius' philological works, preserved in the notes of his pupil Antonius Seripandus in 1501: a commentary on part of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, *Collectanea in epistulis Ciceronis ad Atticum*, and *Enarrationes in Priapeis Virgilii*. It also contains Puccius' *Spicilegium*, a commentary on some books of Pliny's *Historia naturalis*, probably in his own hand. Puccius' annotations on the *Epistulae* of Pliny the Younger are to be found in Florence (Biblioteca Riccardiana, Ediz. rare 351).

Puccius wrote funeral orations for Francesco Minutolo and Silvestro Galeota, which are preserved in Naples V F 2 and have been edited by Santoro. Other funeral orations are contained in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Florence (fondo Palatino 165) and may be the three orations sent to Florence and praised by Marsilio Ficino in a letter to Cambini in 1489. Puccius' funeral orations for King Ferrante I and Antonio d'Alessandro are lost.



Puccius wrote both lyric and elegiac poetry; the same collection of thirty-three poems is to be found in both Naples V F 2 and Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana G 109 inf. An elegy entitled *A Peregrino Lorino* is contained in Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana Corsin. 582 (45 C 17), fol. 108v. Gualtieri published five poems from Naples V F 2 when the manuscript was still in the library of S. Giovanni a Carbonara: *Poetarum saec. XVI carminum ineditorum fasciculus*, in *Poematum libellus*, ed. V. M. Giovenazzi (Naples, 1786). All of the poetry, including *A Peregrino Lorino*, has been edited by Santoro.

In 1487 Puccius composed a letter to Cambini on the death of Antonello de Petrucci (Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale Vindob. lat. 61). This was edited by G. Mazzatinti in *La biblioteca dei re aragonesi di Napoli* (Rocca S. Casciano, 1897), LIV, and again by Santoro. In 1489 Puccius wrote to Politianus to congratulate him on the *Miscellanea*; the letter was included in Politianus' *Epistulae* (Venice, 1498) and has been edited by Santoro. He wrote in 1495 to Caracciolo *De rebellione Neapolis a Carolo Francorum rege ad regem Aragoniae Ferdinandum* (Lucca, Biblioteca Capitolare Feliniana, ms. 555). This was edited by S. Baluzius in *Miscellanea novo ordine digesta* (Lucca, 1761), I, 526–27, and again by Santoro. Puccius corresponded more informally with Bernardo Michelozzi; three of his letters to Michelozzi were owned and published by T. De Marinis. In the last year of his life (1512) Puccius wrote a vernacular letter to Andrea de Passano, which is contained in the Biblioteca Capialbi of Monteleone Calabro and was published in V. Capialbi, *Opuscoli* (Naples, 1849), III, 248.

*Bibliography*: Cosenza, II, 2968–69, V, 1466–67; J. L. Butrica, "Pontanus, Puccius, Pochus, Petreius, and Propertius," *Res Publica litterarum*, III (1980), 5–9; F. Calonghi, "Marginalia," *Miscellanea Pandiani* (Genoa, 1921), 97–114; T. De Marinis, *La biblioteca napoletana dei re d'Aragona* (Milan, 1947–52), I, 186–93, 254–55, IV, pl. 311; F. Pèrcopo, "Francesco Pucci," *Archivio storico per le provincie napoletane*, XIX (1894), 390–409; A. Perosa, *Mostra del Poliziano* (Florence, 1954), 17–18; B. Richardson, "Pucci, Parrasio, and Catullus," *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, XIX (1976), 277–89; M. Santoro, *Uno scolaro del Poliziano a Napoli: Francesco Pucci* (Naples, 1948).

## 7. Aulus Janus Parrhasius

Parrhasius' autograph commentary is to be found in his copy of the 1481 Reggio edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, which also includes his version of Puccius' notes on the three poets (see p. 243 above). The sections of this volume containing Catullus and Propertius are now in Aberdeen; the Tibullus portion is in Naples, and it is this that contains the Catullan commentary. The commentary appears in two versions: the first on Cat. 1–Cat. 4.20–21 and the second on Cat. 1–Cat. 2.2. The first version appears to be a draft: the script is somewhat untidy, and often words are crossed out and revised. The second version is in a neater and larger hand. It covers a much smaller portion of the Catullan text than the first but does so in far more detail. There are more glosses than in the first version, and some of the old glosses have been modified, either by expansion or rewording. Most of the changes are stylistic, but there are a few additions of substance—the most interesting being a reference to Pontanus' emendation of Cat. 1.9 (not in the first commentary but present in Parrhasius' version of Puccius' notes *ad loc.* in Aberdeen Incun. 165). In both versions of the commentary Parrhasius discusses questions of interpretation almost as freely as textual problems or definitions of hard words. Although—rather surprisingly—he does not mention Puccius, he does name other scholars and discuss their opinions. For example, he rejects Politianus' "base" interpretation of the sparrow in Cat. 2 and gives credit to Antonius Seripandus for a rearrangement of the verses in Cat. 2. It is this last reference that has allowed Richardson to date the commentary between 1512 and 1519, for Parrhasius calls Seripandus "Aragonei Lysiae principis mei magister epistularum" (fols. 2v and 4v), a title that Seripandus could have held only between the death of Puccius, the former secretary, in 1512, and that of Luigi d'Aragona himself in 1519. The commentary is unfinished, and neither version contains a dedication or preface.

a. *Commentary on Cat. 1–Cat. 4.21* (Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale XIII B 12, fol. 2r). [*Inc.*]: *Quoi dono lepidum novum libellum* (1.1). *Carmen est hendecasyllabum quod alio nomine Phalecium nuncupatur a cultore non ut quidam putant inventore suo. Nam versus hic apud Sappho frequens est, in quinto praesertim libro si credi-*

mus Attilio . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 2v) *Utrumque in pedem* (4.20–21). Pedes in navibus agnoscit et Homerus . . . Pedes autem sic a graecis explicantur . . . id est pedes navigii funes qui imum velum continent hodieque vulgus inversa paululum voce pogia nuncupat. Virg. *una omnes fecere pedem* [Aen. V.830].

b. *Commentary on Cat. 1–Cat. 2.2.* [Inc.]: (fol. 3r) *Quoi dono lepidum novum libellum etc.* (1.1). Carmen est hendecasyllabum quod et Phalecium nuncupatur a cultore non (ut quidam putant) inventore suo. Nam versus hic apud Sappho in quinto praesertim libro frequens est ut observavit et docuit Attilius . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 4v) *Quicum ludere etc.* (2.2). Hunc et insequentem statim verum qui in alienum migraverant Antonius Seripandus e nobilitate Neapolitana patricius et Aragonei Lysiae principis (regis *supra*) mei magister epistularum suo loco restituit, id est continuo post illud carmen *et tristes animi levare curas* [Cat. 2.10], ubi bellissime quadrant.

#### *Manuscript:*

(micro.) Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale XIII B 12, fols. 2r–4v (D. Gutiérrez, “La biblioteca di san Giovanni a Carbonara di Napoli,” *Analecta augustiniana*, XXIX [1966], 198, item 2424; Kristeller, *Iter*, I, 407; B. Richardson, “Pucci, Parrasio, and Catullus,” *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, XIX [1976], 277–89).

#### *Biography:*

See CTC III, 104–105. Add to the *Bibliography*: R. M. Cosentino, “Aulo Giano Parrasio e l’Accademia Cosentina,” *Atti della Accademia Pontaniana* (Naples), XXVII (1978), 219–29; C. Tristano, *La biblioteca di un umanista calabrese: Aulo Giano Parrasio* (Manziana, 1988).

#### 8. Anonymus Vaticanus: Ottob. lat. 1982 (*post-1517?*)

Ottob. lat. 1982 contains a miscellany connected with the circle of Pomponius Laetus and seemingly collected with special focus on his friend Paulus Pompilius (d. 1490/91). In addition to a manuscript and commentary on Catullus it contains, *inter alia*, the *Framea* of Pompilius, a collection of letters of the second academy of Pomponius Laetus, and a calendar highlighting the feasts of SS. Victor and Luke, patrons of the second academy. The Catullus manuscript contains *carm.* 1–63.44, but the commentary

covers only Cat. 1–10 and Cat. 12. The title on fol. 171r suggests that Paulus Pompilius is the author or editor of the *vita* and commentary.

It is more likely, however, that the *vita* and commentary are largely the work of a student of Pompilius. Although the paper in this section of the manuscript belongs to the period 1480–84, fol. 171, which contains the title and *vita*, seems to be a later addition. Both commentary and *vita* are indebted to Palladius Fuscus (see p. 239 above), whose work appeared in 1496, half a dozen years after Pompilius’ death.

Moreover, in the extensive quotation from *Catalepton* 10 on fol. 174r there are several readings that modern editors attribute to the 1517 Aldine edition of the *Catalepton* (*Diversorum veterum poetarum in Priapum lusus*). These are *mulio* (2), *ullius* (3), *dicit* (15), *sibi* (21), *facta* (21). Westendorp Boerma attributes all five readings to the 1517 edition, whereas Richmond ascribes three to it (*mulio*, *dicit*, and *facta*), attributing the others to fifteenth-century manuscripts.

Although the commentator draws on Palladius frequently, the majority of his notes are not Palladian, and his fullest discussions (of *carmina* 4 and 10) show almost no influence from Palladius’ commentary. Borrowings from Palladius appear throughout, but they are most prevalent in the notes on *carmina* 6, 7, 8, and 12. The commentator claims to have consulted several different manuscripts, and he is interested in discussing and improving the text. He draws upon a rather small range of authors to elucidate Catullus, including Gellius, Eusebius, Quintilian, Cicero, Terence, and Vergil.

*Vita* (Vatican Library, Ottob. lat. 1982, fol. 171r). Collectae Catulli Veronensis editae a Pompilio. Adsit principio Virgo Maria meo. Poetae vita. [Inc.]: Valerius Catullus quem peculiari epitheto posteriores poetae doctum appellant ut scribit Eusebius in Temporibus Veronae nascitur circiter Olympiadem centesimam septuagesimam tertiam. Moritur anno vitae suae trigesimo. Valerius ipsius pater Caio Iulio Caesari gratissimus fuit. Nam ex teste Tranquillo [Suet., *Iul.* 73] Caesar cum ex Catulli versiculis perpetua stigmata accepisset non dissimulavit quin satisficientem eadem die adhibuit cenae hospitioque patris eius sicut consueverat uti perseveravit. Modo miratus est maxime Catullus Ciceronem quem et pulcherrimo epygrammate

honestavit. Amavit Caium Calvum qui famosa epygrammata in Caesarem scripsit, cuiusque Suetonius meminit. Cornelio vero Nepoti qui de Mamurra Caesariano historiam scripsit ut docet Plinius libro trigesimo sexto passerem opus suum dicavit. Fuere qui Cornelio Gallo maluerunt, quod non placet. Nondum enim is tanti erat. Verum ad Nepotem Cicero etiam de eloquentia Caesaris gravissime scripsit. Fuit ex eodem tempore multi nominis Cornelius Fagita, cui Caesar cum nocturnas insidias aeger atque latens ne produceretur ad Syllam vix praemio dato evaserat numquam nocere sustinuit [Suet., *Iul.* 74], item Cornelius Balbus familiarissimus Caesaris et idem poeta. Amavit poeta noster Clodiam, at ipse veneratione habita in ingenium Lesbiae Saphus Lesbiam appellat. Hanc vero moderationem ut veris amorum nominibus parceretur ceteri secuti sunt. Tidas pro Metella Perillam scripsit, Propertius pro Hostia Cynthia, Tibullus pro Plania Deliam. Et quidem Caius Lucullus quamquam iambicus fuerit improbatur quod Gentium et Macedonem ut Apuleius testatur in *Apologia* [10] rectis nominibus prostituerit. Demum opusculum hoc quod interpretari sumus ad deplorationem [*eploationem*, ms.] mortui passeruli qui in deliciis fuerat Clodiae nomen sibi adinvenit. Nam passerem Catulli scriptores vulgo appellant.

*Commentary.* [*Inc.*]: (fol. 171v) *Cui dono* [Cat. 1.1]. Poeta opus suum dicat Cornelio Nepoti optatque ut musa duraturum sibi (si *ms.*) carmen exhibeat et in principio blanditur operi suo per compellationes et quod lepidus sit et quod novus et quod pumicatus. Nec defuere, tanta ingeniorum pervicacitas est, qui dicerent *cui lepidum*, hoc est venustorum, licet lepor in verbis sit, immutarentque *novum* in *meum* et ita vitabant asynteton . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 179r) *Setabis* (Cat. 12.14). Urbs Hispaniae citerioris ubi pulcherrimae telae texebantur. Meminit Silius *Setabis et telas Arabum* [Sil. 3.374]. Et alibi Catullus.

#### *Manuscript:*

Vatican Library, Ottob. lat. 1982, s. XV, fols. 171r–179r (Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 434–35; G. Mercati, *Codici latini Pico Grimani* [Vatican City, 1938], 258, no. 223; E. Pellegrin et al. *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, I [Paris, 1975], 722–24; W. Bracke, “The Ms. Ottob. lat. 1982. A Contribution to

the Biography of Pomponius Laetus?” *Rinascimento*, 2d ser., XXIX (1989), 293–99; Bracke, “L’Ottob. lat. 1982, un codice di scuola della fine del ’400,” *Res Publica litterarum*, XIII (1990), 19–30; G. D. Kellogg, “A New Manuscript of Catullus,” *Classical Review*, XIV [1900], 127–28; J. A. Richmond, ed., *Catalepton*, in *Vergilii Opera minora* [Oxford, 1966]; R. E. H. Westendorp Boerma, *P. Vergili Maronis Catalepton* [Assen, 1949]). I wish to thank dott.ssa Concetta Bianca for valuable information on this manuscript and for drawing my attention to the articles of W. Bracke.

#### 9. Alexander Guarinus

Alexander Guarinus published his *Expositiones in Catullum* in 1521, basing his text on the manuscript of Catullus corrected many years earlier by his father, Baptista Guarinus (d. 1505). Indeed, a principal purpose of the *Expositiones* is to claim credit for Baptista Guarinus for those of his corrections that had become generally accepted and to rescue the rest from neglect and oblivion. As a result, the work contains many interesting observations about the history of the text in the late fifteenth century. Alexander Guarinus had studied the work of various Catullan scholars, and his knowledge of variant readings and interpretations is reflected in his discussions of textual problems, to which he sometimes contributes his own solutions. The text, however, is not his only concern, for the *Expositiones* include discussions of meter, explanations of hard words and mythological allusions, and interpretations of the poems themselves. In the preface he gives pride of place to interpretation, urging his critics to understand *me nec historiographum, nec mitologum nec geographum, nec vocabulorum explanatorem, sed Catulliani tantum operis interpretem agere* (fol. a2v).

The format of the commentary is intended to emphasize discussion of Catullus himself and to provide the reader with easy access to explanations of specific points and references to parallel passages from other authors, for Guarinus includes a detailed index and cites many parallels by specific references to their author rather than by quotation in full. He is not consistently selective, however, and the commentary contains many digressions, including personal comments about himself and his family (e.g., discussion

of the name Guarinus, fol. 3r, and justification of his epitaph for Philippa Varana, fol. 68r–v).

The commentary seems to have had little influence, for there was no second edition, and the work was not included in the variorum editions of the seventeenth century.

*Preface* (ed. of Venice, 1521). Alexandri Guarini Ferrariensis in expositiones catullianas ad divum Alphonsum Ferrariensem Ducem III prohoemium. [*Inc.*]: (fol. a2r) Cum abhinc multis annis, dux invictissime, Baptista vir (ut nosti) cum doctissimus, tum optimus, et pater et praeceptor meus, cuius cineri duplici hoc iure plurimum debeo, quoniam non esse tantum ut a Philippo Alexander Macedo, sed ut ab Aristotele ille, sic ego ab eodem et bene esse acceperim, corruptissima Catulli docti et elegantis poetae carmina emendasset, et sicuti Aesculapius (uti poetae dicunt) herbis Hippolytum ita ipse dilaceratum poetam summa diligentia multiplicique doctrina in lucem revocasset, mendosumque et mutilatum ipsius codicem divino (ut affirmare non vereor) ingenio in pristinum redegisset, quod ad communem rei publicae litterariae utilitatem spectabat minime occultandum ratus, nitidum et tersum opus edidit. Atque Veronae patriae epigrammate suis inserto carminibus quae iam diu in lucem incluti patris tui favente numine (minime *ed.*) prodire, id testante, gratum munus donavit. Sed ex posterioribus quidam (quod tamen pace illorum dixerim) non ea fortasse praediti quae necessaria est ad eruditissimi huius poetae sensus percipiendos doctrina, in doctissimum poetam, doctissime substitutas emendationes minime percipientes emendatum id opus melius corrigere sibi persuadentes, adeo tamen corrumpere, ut rursus ad pristinas labes, ad pristinas tenebras cuncta reciderint. Quare non modo ruenti poetae, sed etiam paternis emendationibus propediem perituris opem ferre omnino decrevi. His igitur meis qualescumque fuerint elucubraciunculis profiteor me Catulliano codici secundum paternam emendationem impresso lucem attulisse, unde neminem mirari velim, si sensus quosdam poetae aliter quam hactenus interpretati fuerint, enucleaverim, et quoniam id laboravi ut suus splendor et decor Catullo restitueretur, ideo quae ad sensus percipiendos ab aliis etiam docte et recte dicta fuerunt carptim perstrinxi. Quamobrem si qui tanquam suum aliquid agnoscent, composito recipiant, cum enim intuendis agris a patre mihi relictis totque annos

pacifice possessis ut vel hoc uno diuturni temporis iure Virgilianum illud mihi asserere possem: *haec mea sunt, veteres migrate coloni*, multum diuque summo cum dispendio elaboraverim, et adeo ut, nisi sapientissimus sanctissimusque senatus Venetus (hoc est verum iustitiae benignitatisque specimen) iniquorum malignitati obstitisset, de agris procul dubio actum fuisset, didici quod ex Ascraei quoque vatis praecepto antea perceperam: dimidium plus toto quandoque valere. Ea tamen lege id concesserim, ut ego quoque si in illorum scriptis paterna aliqua deprehenderim, mihi iusta vindictarum fuerit actio. Si quae vero non sua, sed nova et a me excogitata fatebuntur, ea in hos utor liberalitate munificentiaeque, ut in posterum si usu venerit etiam pro suis uti libere valeant, eam enim novi optimam scientiarum possessionem esse, cum plures earum proventibus usi fuerint, quod si mihi contingerit maiores dabuntur animi ad cetera quae in Propertium et Plautum iam conscripsimus emitenda. Si quis in explicandis poetae sensibus vocabula, quibus usus fuerim, tanquam trita nimisque nota et orationis facilitatem tanquam dissolutam et nervis carentem damnaverit, noverit is me non cum Evandri matre, non cum Tarquiniis, non cum Oratiis, sed cum nostri saeculi hominibus sermonem habere, meque imprimis hoc agere, ut lucem non ut tenebras Catullo praeferam. Si quaedam alii ut breviter tacta aut de industria a me praetermissa desiderabunt, sciant me nec historiographum nec mitologum nec geographum, nec vocabulorum explanatorem, sed Catulliani tantum operis interpretem agere. Eos tamen admoneo ne indicatos diversorum auctorum locos (nec is sane magnus erit labor, quoniam summa cum fide et libros et capita citavi) recensere pigeat; in illis quippe, quaecumque optaverint, copiosius perlegere poterunt. Si rursus diffuse nimis quaedam commemorata verbosiusque aliis videbuntur, cum meum sit propositum neminem invitum morari, nec tria cum quopiam hac de causa verba commutare, ea omittat, quae placebunt tantum legat, meminerint tamen omnes nihil difficilius esse, ut verissime quoque prius dictum fuit, quam reperire quod sit ex omni parte in genere suo perfectum. Ego autem Plinium secutus id omni studio tentavi, ut alia aliis, quaedam fortasse omnibus placeant. Cogitanti autem mihi cui potissimum donarem meas istas in lepidum poetam utinam non illepidas expositiones modo typis

excussas, tu unus Alphonse dux eminentissime occurristi. Namque tu meas esse aliquid putare nugas iam tum coepisti cum mortuo parente meo quem unice amaveras, unaque linguae utriusque lumine extincto, ausus es me vix undevigesimum agentem annum publicum doctorem studiosissimis huius almae civitatis adolescentibus deligere, tantumque mihi favorem impertivisti, quantum certe non essem ausus optare, unde nunc quoque cum scripta mea, tanquam arenam sine calce male coherentia viderem, et propriis diffidenti viribus *Τιτᾶνας καλέω* ut in Graecorum est proverbio mihi opus esset, cogitans non temere tibi Alphonsi nomen impositum fuisse, quod graeco sermone eum significat qui ad servandum se principem exhibeat, maxime te idoneum putavi, cui et me et expositiones commendarem meas, in quo illud unum me non mediocriter sollicitum reddidisset, quod amplitudini tuae nugarum mearum humilitas minime respondet, nisi tua mihi, benignissime princeps, probe perspecta fuisset humanitas, quam exploratum habui non muneris exiguitatem, sed promptam dantis voluntatem, et animi magnitudinem contemplaturam, ita ut inter obstrepentes undique susurros et detrahentium linguas tuo sub nomine servatum me iri minime dubitem. Nam quemadmodum iustitia, affabilitate, sapientia, celeberrimis denique domi forisque gestis secundus existis nemini, ita studia haec nostra te praecipuum fautorem et protectorem habent. Quid vel uno illo evidentissimo certissimoque argumento intelligere possumus, quod praestantissimos filios usque adeo impense operam his navare volueris, ut praeter morum elegantiam et modestiam, praeter eximiam supra aetatem prudentiam, incredibili praecipue in tenella aetate doctrina ita omnibus admirabiles se reddiderint, ut principum principes futuros facile sperare possimus? Rogo itaque et ego patronam virginem, sed veram illam virginem, quae procum Vulcanum habuit neminem, virginem inviolatam, quae verbum omni verbo inviolabile peperit, ut munusculum hoc quaecumque quidem plus uno maneat perenne saeclo, non alia me hercle de causa, nisi ut meae in te fidei venerationisque inde[le]bile hoc monumentum, et parentis mei de universo terrarum orbe in hac litteraria militia benemeriti laus perduret, illud autem imprimis supplex te oratum velim, et unum illud, Dux magne, tibi proque omnibus unum praedicam et repetens iterumque iterumque monebo,

ut memineris me Carneadem, sed Carneadem Ferrariensem esse, qui ut de Chrisippi, ita et ego de parentis mei libris assidue dicere et audacter confiteri non erubescam: nisi Baptista fuisset ego non essem, sed quid ego plura? Cum longa praefatione ut recte Plinius inquit vel excusare vel commendare ineptias sit ineptissimum. Vale magnanime Dux, et Alexandri tui memor vive optantis et perpetuam tibi felicitatem et fortunam Atestinorum quam florentissimam permanere.

*Vita Catulli.* C. Valerii Catulli Vita. [Inc.]: (fol. a3r) C. Valerius Catullus poetarum elegantissimus nitidissimusque ab A. Gellio libro vii, capite xx et ob eximiam eruditionem a posterioribus poetis doctus appellatus, Olympiade centesima septuagesima tertia ut ex chronicis Eusebii colligitur, Veronae natus est . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. a3r) Scripsit et alia multa sicuti ex eius versiculis qui ab A. Gellio et aliis latinis grammaticis citantur, et minime in hoc opusculo inveniuntur, coniectura assequi possumus, sed haec omnia temporum vetustate amisimus, quemadmodum et reliqua paene omnia, nisi parentis mei doctrina diligentiaque praesto fuisset, iam prorsus periissent. Mortuus est Romae xxx aetatis suae anno, quo tempore Virgilius Cremonae studiis eruditur, ut Eusebius docet.

*Commentary.* Alexandri Guarini Ferrariensis in Catullum per Baptistam patrem emendatum Expositiones. [Inc.]: (fol. 1r) Epigrammatis I Expositio. *Quoi dono lepidum* (Cat. 1.1). hoc epigrammate Cornelio Nepoti historiarum scriptori librum suum poeta dedicat, et licet plures (ut constat) Corneli fuerint, de Cornelio tamen cognomento Nepote hoc loco intelligendum est . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 116v) *Tu dabis supplicium* (Cat. 116.8). *s* in fine dictionis *dabis* in scansione abiicitur, sicut apud Lucretium *cum nihil omnino fieret ex omnibus rebus* (*De rerum nat.* I.159), immo apud Virgilium in primo georgico, cum sua vocali abiicitur cum ait *aut ovium foetus aut urentis culta capellas* (*Georg.* II.196). Sed nonnulli hoc evitare volentes sic legere maluerunt *affixusque dabis tu mihi supplicium*.

#### *Edition:*

1521, Venetiis (Venice): per Georgium de Rusconibus. Panzer, VII, 467, 1075; Adams I-1141; NUC. BL; BN; (CU; InU; NNC; PBL).

#### *Biography:*

Alessandro Guarini (Alexander Guarinus Maior) was born in Ferrara in 1486, the son of

Baptista Guarinus (CTC I, 214) and grandson of the famous Guarinus Veronensis (CTC I, 207). He was educated by his father, who was professor of rhetoric at Ferrara, and proved such an apt pupil that he was appointed to succeed him, even though he was only nineteen at the time of Baptista's death in 1505. (He was thus the third member of his family to occupy the position, for Baptista had succeeded Guarinus Veronensis in 1460). He served as professor for many years and was regarded as the mainstay of the university during the wars and other vicissitudes of the period. Alexander Guarinus had been appointed to the chair at Ferrara by Duke Alfonso I; he continued to enjoy the patronage of Alfonso and later of his son Duke Ercole II, winning the titles of *segretario*, *fattor generale*, and *consigliere* in addition to his professorship. He was employed on several important missions by the dukes of Ferrara, serving Alfonso I as ambassador during the siege of Florence and Ercole II as orator to Pope Paul III. The embassy to Florence was long and difficult, and on the return journey Guarinus was captured by the Prince of Orange and nearly put to death. He survived, however, by keeping his head and employing his oratorical powers and lived to serve the dukes of Ferrara for many years. He died, a bachelor, on July 31, 1556, and was buried in the church of S. Paolo, Ferrara. An inscription in the church commemorated his narrow escape from the Prince of Orange. Guarinus' talents as a scholar and statesman were celebrated in poetry by many of his contemporaries, including Lilio and Cinzio Giraldis and Ludovico Pittorio. The most famous tribute is Ariosto's couplet:

Ecco altri due Alessandri, in un drappello,  
Da gli Orologi l'un, l'altro il Guarino.  
(*Orlando Furioso*, c. 46)

*Works*: Although Guarinus was a prolific writer and scholar, the *Expositiones in Catullum* is his only published work. Many other commentaries are preserved in manuscripts in the Biblioteca Estense in Modena. Guarinus commented on Book I of Horace's *Satires*, Cicero's *pro Milone*, *pro Lege Manilia*, *pro Archia*, *pro Marcello*, *pro Ligario*, *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, *Cato Maior*, *ad Herennium* (Bibl. Est. lat. 87 [Alpha P.9.32], reported by Kristeller in *Iter*, I, 369); on Horace's *Epistles* (Bibl. Est. lat. 88 [Alpha Q.6.14], reported in *Iter*, I, 369); and on

Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations* (Bibl. Est. lat. 100 [Alpha P.9.2], reported in *Iter*, I, 378). The commentaries on Plautus and Propertius that Guarinus mentions in the preface to Catullus seem to have perished. Guarinus wrote many orations, of which one is to be found in a manuscript in the Vatican Library: *Oratio pro incohanda lectione Ciceronis de Officiis*, delivered in 1517 (Ottob. lat. 1153, reported in *Iter*, II, 427). Another is reported by Cittadella (p. 92) as existing as a printed work in the Biblioteca Comunale Ariostea of Ferrara: *Funebris oratio in R.D. Hippolitum Estensem S.R.E. Cardinalem habita in Cathedrali templo IIII Idus Septembris 1520*. He also wrote an *Apologia contro il conte Annibale Manfredi* (Genoa, Biblioteca Civica Berio, m.r.X,2,35, reported in *Iter*, II, 521).

Some of his letters are preserved in manuscript in the Biblioteca Estense of Modena (Est. ital. 834 [Alpha G.1.16], reported in *Iter*, I, 385) and in the Archivio di Stato in Mantua (E XXVIII 3; E XXXI 3, reported in *Iter*, I, 265–68). Two manuscripts in the Archivio di Stato in Mantua (E LXI 1–2, reported in *Iter*, I, 268) contain the correspondence of Isabella d'Este and that of Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga; each includes correspondence with Guarinus.

Guarinus was also noted for his poetry. He exchanged poems with Daniel Finus (Ferrara, Bibl. Com. Ariostea I 437, reported in *Iter*, I, 56; Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, Parm. 1487, pp. 48–50, reported in *Iter*, II, 49). Borsetti (pp. 110–11) quotes two poems to Finus, which he found "in Finiamo ms. apud Haeredes Favalli, pag. 32–33." An autograph epigram is preserved in Ferrara (Bibl. Com. Ariostea, Antonelli 273, reported in *Iter*, I, 60). Ughi (pp. 29–30) mentions a poem *De bello Estensi et Veneto*, which perhaps has perished. Guarinus' most famous literary achievement was his long epitaph for Philippa Varana, written before 1521, which was inscribed in S. Maria in Vado in Ferrara. The epitaph contains a riddle, which defied attempts at solution as late as the end of the seventeenth century (Baruffaldi, p. 27): "Quae sunt, pro his, quae non sunt, quae si essent, pro his, quae cum sint, non sunt quae videntur esse; pro his quae clam sunt, in causa sunt; ut quod estis sitis." In Guarinus' own day the epitaph gave rise to suspicions of heresy, which he tried to allay in a curious digression in his Catullan commentary (fol. 68r–v).

*Bibliography:* Cosenza, II, 1717–18, V, 873; G. Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana* (1812), VII, 1376–77; Lorenzo Barotti, *Memorie storiche di letterati ferraresi* (Ferrara, 1792–93), II, 74–79; Hieronymus Baruffaldi, *Dissertatio de poetis ferrariensibus* (Ferrara, 1698), 27; Ferrante Borsetti, *Historia almi Ferrariae gymnasii in duas partes divisa* (Ferrara, 1735), II, 107–11; Luigi Cittadella, *I Guarini: famiglia nobile ferrarese oriunda di Verona* (Bologna, 1870), 58–60, 100–102; G. C. Giulitari, *Della letteratura veronese al cadere del secolo XV* (Bologna, 1876), 146–50; Marcantonio Guarini, *Compendio storico dell'origine, accrescimento e prerogative delle chiese e luoghi pii della città e diocesi di Ferrara* (Ferrara, 1621), 178–79; Scipione Maffei, *Verona illustrata* (Milan, 1825), III, 162–66; L. Ughi, *Dizionario storico degli uomini illustri ferraresi* (Ferrara, 1804), II, 29–30.

#### 10. Pierius Valerianus

This commentary on Cat. 1–Cat. 22 is in the form of lectures (*praelectiones*) delivered by Pierius Valerianus to his students at the University of Rome. It can be dated with some probability to the year 1521–22, for the third lecture (fol. 26r) seems to have been delivered when the schools were reopened after the mourning for Leo X (d. December 1, 1521) and the election of Pope Adrian VI (January 9, 1522). The lectures were taken down as Valerianus delivered them, by the orders of one of his friends, Petrus Melinus. Melinus, like many others, fled the city before the Sack of Rome in 1527. On his return he discovered that much of his library was lost or destroyed, but he was able to salvage a portion of the Catullan lectures, together with a few notes in Valerianus' own hand. He sent the commentary to Valerianus' former pupil Ippolito de' Medici, with the hope that he would see to its publication.

Valerianus' discussions are full, anecdotal, and detailed. He generally devoted at least one full lecture (about eight to ten folios) to each poem, discussing its meter, style, and interpretation, as well as textual points, hard words, and mythological and historical references. A poet himself, Valerianus was more interested than most commentators in the literary aspects of the poems, and he devoted a certain amount of attention to the relation between style and

content, the artistic effect achieved by use of a particular word order or metrical pattern, and the overall meaning or interpretation of the poetry. He was particularly interested in the possibility of imitating Catullus and of teaching his students to do so. Indeed, he was persuaded to lecture on Catullus, not only by the enthusiasm of the students for the poet but also by his own opinion that the brevity, elegance, and variety of the poems would encourage the students to try different meters and poetic genres.

The commentary breaks off after Cat. 22, and the last folio (fol. 249v) contains a note: *reliquum in direptione Romae desideratum*. A smaller lacuna between Lectures XXII and XXIV is no less tantalizing. Here we may suspect the hand not of the barbarian troops but of censorship. One folio (194r–v) remains of Lecture XXII. The course has arrived at Cat. 15, the first obscene poem in the corpus, and Valerianus is discussing his dilemma as a lecturer. It was his original plan, he claims, to conceal anything licentious in the poems. He could do this either by replacing Catullus with another author or by bowdlerizing Catullus. The students were outraged at the first possibility, rejecting Valerianus' idea of lectures on Horace's *Epistles* in place of their favorite Catullus, and many accused him of barbarism, hypocrisy, or naïveté for even considering the second. It seems from the context that Valerianus is going to forget his scruples and launch into an explication of Cat. 15 and its obscene neighbor, Cat. 16, but the text breaks off in mid-sentence at the bottom of fol. 194v with the note: *desunt multa usque ad O Colonia* [i.e., Cat. 17]. The next leaf is fol. 209r, which begins the lecture on Cat. 17. This lecture is not numbered, but we may infer that it is Lecture XXIV because its immediate sequel is numbered XXV.

*Dedication* (Vatican Library, Vat. lat. 5215, fol. 1r). Petrus Melinus Romanus Hippolyto Medicae s.p.d. [*Inc.*]: Post relictam a publicis hostibus patriam suisque sedibus Clementem restitutum, ubi domum me recepi, nihil mihi prius curae fuit, magnificentissime Hippolyte, quam libros revisere omnesque tum meos tum amicorum qui apud me asservabantur colligere, ut eos ex tam foeda et diuturna tempestate velut certo in portu collocarem, quos dum sedulo et diligenter evolverem, multosque partim in ignem coniectos partim efferatissimis manibus dilaceratos et



in frustra concerptos (conserptos *ms.*), partim etiam deperditos, et non ab inimicis tantum, sed etiam a nostris distractos ex Mauro puerulo quem solum domi reliqueram, comperissem, magno afficiebar dolore, ut qui iacturam sane longe aliis omnibus graviolem et nullo sarcien- dam tempore aestimarem. Accidit tamen bono certe fato ut inter miserabilem huiusce stragis ruinam apparerent nonnulla Pierii nostri monu- menta, quae is dum publice in Ro. gymnasio Catullum interpretaretur brevibus quibusdam scedulis adnotarat. Accedebant hu[c] pleraque alia quae nos ex legentis ore excepta [*excerpta ms.*] describi iusseramus, mox in unum collecta et suis reddita partibus. Licet pleraque interie- rint, ne quo tamen tempore funditus pessum irent, volui ea sic descripta ad te mittere, ut quando nunc ut accepi coactus est ille domesti- cas res suas invisere, haberes in indignissimo hoc exilio iucundam sane quare te oblectares lectionem, tam et si eam nondum absolutam. Longe enim satius putavi luxatum hoc atque mutilum tuas in manus tradi quam suppressere, exemplum in hac re secutus nostrum et praecipue tuum, qui cum miro antiquorum operum deside- rio tenearis, soles vel unum statuæ alicuius pe- dem aut manum aut caput admirari nec minore cum diligentia ista perquiris quam faceres in- tegra, quippe cum vel ex illis artificis ingenium artemque / (fol. Iv) et solertiam perpendas. Tu velim haec praeceptoris tui scripta publicanda cures, neque quicquam vereare id eo inscio et inconsulto facere. Nam aequo animo ferat ne- cesse est quod et meo qui illi amicissimus sum consilio, et auctoritate tua, cuius ille patrocínio tot annos fruitur factum fuerit, neque est ut nos- trum de se iudicium sit unquam aspernatus. Tu vale et nos atque illum, quod facis, ama. Romae. Kal. Martiis MDXXVIII.

*General Introduction.* Pierii Valeriani Bellu- nensis Ro. Gymnasii Professoris Praelectiones in Catullum Auditorum Quorumdam Diligentia ad Verbum dum profiteretur Exceptae. In In- gressu. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 1r) Periclem Atheniensem ferunt, eruditissimi viri, boni et studiosi adoles- centes, quotiescumque domi forisve rei publicae princeps aut exercituum imperator creatus esset assumeretque paludamentum et reliqua magis- tratus insignia, secum multa de re palam loqui solitum, quid ea sibi vellent, quem virum, quam operam ornatus ille deposceret, interrogare . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 14r) Verum agite vos quoque

bonam in primis spem proficiendi concipite. Inde Socratis dictum illud memineritis, neque mulierem absque viro neque bonam spem abs- que labore quicquam proficere. Dixi. [This is apparently intended to replace the original end- ing on fol. 14v, which has been lightly crossed out: Ante omnia vero vel summam animi tran- quillitatem vel ipsam etiam immortalitatem qui praecipuus laborum huiusmodi futurus est fruc- tus vobis ante oculos proponite, ad eam unam inspicite, eam unam admiramini, eam unam af- fectate, id assidue memoria repetentes in una- quaque re conatum in laude, in causa, reque ipsa effectum esse. Dixi.]

*Introduction to Catullus.* Praelectio secunda. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 15r) Auspicaturus Catulliani carmi- nis interpretationem nuper id mecum cogitabam utrum ea quae prolegomena Graeci dicunt, nos vel proloquia vel anteloquia vel praefationes ap- pellare possumus, essent necessaria quae a me proponi deberent, an ea potius velut supervaca- nea praeterirem atque ab ipsius carminis enu- cleatione primae statim praelectionis initium exordirer . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 33r) Quibus ego responsum faciam veteres grammaticos rem tantam in tam insigni poeta non tacituros si le- gem eum transgressum animadvertissent. Adno- tasset hoc dubio procul Fab. Quintilianus qui vel in multo levioribus examinandis tam curiosus fuit. Non dissimulasset Probus Valerius, non Asper, non Carisius, qui in veterum stilo forma et elocutione perpendenda quam diligentissimi fuere, non Scaurus, non Vellius Longus et pleri- que alii rem intactam reliquissent, sed quoniam viri illi doctissimi non ignorabant huius carminis naturam partim heroicam partim trochaicam par- tim iambeam esse, nihil quicquam offensi sunt quod sede prima auctor ex his quem mallet pe- dem arbitrio suo collocaret. (f. 33v) Sed iam tempus est ut de re dicere incipiamus.

*Commentary.* [*Inc.*]: (fol. 33v) *Quoi dono le- pidum novum libellum* (Cat. 1.1). Primi huius epigrammatis argumentum est libelli dedicatio, quem Cornelio Nepoti nuncupat, curque illum ex omnibus unum selegerit, rationes explicat, quod et amicus sit, et huiusmodi studiorum ama- tor, quod doctrina et iudicio praestet, quippe qui magnorum voluminum historias in pulchram et lucubratam redegerit brevitatem. Postremo loco deam orat, in cuius patrocínio vel carmina vel primitiae rerum omnium sunt, velit libello suo perennitatem elargiri. Ait itaque compellatius



hoc orationis genere. *Quoi dono cui muneri mitto libellum lepidum*, libellum non futurum quidem taedio ob prolixitatem, quia parvulus sit, *libellus* scilicet, non *liber* . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 248v) *Quod in tergo est* (Cat. 22.21). Sed ita omnes affecti sumus, ut aliorum labeculas libenter calumniemur, nostris autem vitiis ab-blandiamur. Immo ita nos mala delectant nostra, ut neque mala esse putemus. Huiusmodi genus hominum Horatius ita carpit: *quum tua pervideas oculis mala lippus inunctis, cur in amicum vitiis tam cernis acutum?* [Hor., *Serm.* I.3.25–26] . . . (fol. 249v) Nonnulli malunt *quid manticae* legere, hoc est, cuiusmodi mantica in tergo est quam scilicet plena ea sit vitiis nostris quae si aliquando ad calculum revocare-mus, multa quae in aliis reprehendimus graviora apud nos esse deprehenderemus, quo aequiores aliis essemus qui aliquos in errores laberentur “sed non videmus manticae quid in tergo est”.

*Manuscript:*

Vatican Library, Vat. lat. 5215 (L. Alpago-Novello, “Spigolature vaticane di argomento bellunese. I. Un’opera inedita et ignorata di Pierio Valeriano,” *Archivio veneto tridentino*, IX [1926], 69–96; J. H. Gaisser, “The Catullan Lectures of Pierius Valerianus,” in *Acta Conventus Neo-latini Guelpherbytani* (Binghamton, N.Y.), 45–53. Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 332).

*Biography:*

Johannes Pierius Valerianus Bellunensis (Giovanni Pietro Valeriano dalle Fosse, Giovanni Pierio Valeriano Bolzanio) was born in Belluno February 3, 1477. He died in Padua in June 1558.

Valerianus’ father, Lorenzo dalle Fosse, died ca. 1486 of wounds suffered in a battle near Venice against imperial troops and left his widow and several children in relative poverty. Obscurity and privation blighted Valerianus’ childhood and youth, as he explains in his autobiographical poem, *De calamitate vitae suae* (1509). He began his education in Belluno in the public school of Faustino Giosippo Vicentino but was brought to Venice in 1493 to continue his studies by his father’s brother Urbano Bolzanio, a well-known humanist and an associate of Aldus Manutius. Financial woes still plagued him in Venice, for, as he says in *De calamitate vitae suae*, he had scarcely been there a few months when poverty forced him to go into ser-

vice with a rich family. Nevertheless, he managed to learn Greek under his uncle’s instruction and to study under some of the city’s most prominent scholars, including Marcantonio Sabellico (CTC IV, 347–48, and p. 231 above). It was Sabellico who encouraged him to change his name from Pietro to Pierio, but assuming the surname Bolzanio seems to have been his own idea. According to Alpago-Novello (1926), Valerianus took the name after the extinction of the Bolzani, a well-known family of Belluno, and applied it to his uncle as well as himself.

In 1500 Valerianus moved to Padua, where he completed his education, studying philosophy under the celebrated Leonico Tomeo. In 1509 French and German troops invaded Lombardy and the Veneto in force, and Valerianus fled to Rome for safety. Almost immediately he was befriended by several eminent men, and before the end of the year (1509) Pope Julius II named him *parrocco* of S. Giustina di Limana, an appointment achieved through the influence of Giles of Viterbo and the first of several sinecures that he was to hold over the next forty years. Valerianus also served as tutor to the sons of Bartolomeo della Rovere and later was befriended by Gianfrancesco della Rovere, bishop of Turin and governor of Castel S. Angelo, who provided him with a residence in S. Angelo. His most important patron, however, was his uncle’s former pupil Cardinal Giovanni de’Medici, who became Pope Leo X in 1513. Under Leo, Valerianus became an intimate of the papal court and enjoyed the official designations of papal notary, secretary to Cardinal Giulio de’Medici (later Pope Clement VII), and *arciprete* of Belluno. He was also entrusted with the education of the pope’s nephews Alessandro and Ippolito de’Medici. Moreover, it seems likely that it was under Leo that he first became professor of eloquence at the University of Rome, and not under Clement VII, as was previously assumed. The evidence for this is in the lectures on Catullus, which are to be dated on internal evidence to 1521–22. The lectures also give some indication of Valerianus’ whereabouts and activities in 1522. It is usually stated that he left Rome very soon after Leo’s death in December 1521 and returned only late in 1522 or even at the end of 1523, but the beginning of Lecture III shows him in Rome in January or February 1522, and it is probably safe to assume that he continued

the course into the spring. Another break occurred between Lectures XXI and XXII, for in Lecture XXII (fol. 194r) he mentions having been called away to Belluno on family business "quum aestas omnino iam appeteret." Alpago-Novello (1926), unaware of Valerianus' mention of Leo's death in Lecture III, mistakenly argued from this passage that Lectures I–XXI were composed in 1521 and that Valerianus then absented himself from Rome until the academic year 1522–23, when he finished the lectures. It is more likely that the break between Lectures XXI and XXII took place at or near the end of the academic year 1521–22, as the reference to *aestas* suggests, and that Valerianus returned to Rome in the autumn of 1522 to continue the course on Catullus.

How long the lectures continued is open to speculation because of the incomplete state of the commentary and Pope Adrian's notorious aversion to frivolous classical subjects. At any rate, Valerianus did absent himself from Rome for much of Adrian's brief reign, spending time in both Naples and Belluno. He was recalled immediately, however, on the accession of his old patron Clement VII (Giulio de' Medici), who named him apostolic protonotary, reappointed him to the University of Rome, and again placed him in charge of the literary education of the young Medici, Alessandro and Ippolito. Clement also bestowed upon Valerianus the sinecures of Sospirolo and Castion, and promoted him from *arciprete* to *canonico* of Belluno. Valerianus faced a certain amount of opposition and competition in taking possession of these lucrative ecclesiastical positions. The parish of Castion is a case in point, for as Alpago-Novello (1934) and Lucchetta have shown, obtaining the parish required a papal bull and payment by Valerianus of forty gold ducats to the man originally appointed. Valerianus retained the revenues and privileges from his ecclesiastical positions for most of his life, although he periodically resigned their titles to his nephews and great-nephews.

In 1524 Valerianus went to Florence to supervise the education of his Medici charges, finding time to collect material for his magnum opus, the *Hieroglyphica*. He was in Florence during the Sack of Rome but soon fled to Piacenza with his pupils. He left them at Piacenza and returned

to Belluno but quickly rejoined them in Parma. In 1529 he wrote his dialogue, *De litteratorum infelicitate*. In the next years Valerianus continued his close association with the Medici, in 1529 receiving an offer from Clement of the bishopric of Capodistria (which he declined) and becoming secretary to Ippolito after his election as cardinal. After the murder of Alessandro in 1537, close after the deaths of Clement (1534) and Ippolito (1535), he retired to his studies. In 1537 he was ordained by the bishop of Belluno, and he spent most of the next twenty years in his parish of Castion, which he tried to make a cultural as well as a spiritual center. He occasionally traveled for short periods to Padua or Venice, and he died in Padua in 1558. He was buried in Padua in the basilica of S. Antonio.

*Works:* Valerianus' literary and scholarly production is impressive both in quantity and variety. His best-known works are his short dialogue, *De litteratorum infelicitate* (written in 1529 but first published in 1620), which was inspired by the destruction of books and the suffering of individual scholars in the sack of Rome, and his monumental compendium, the *Hieroglyphica*, conceived as early as 1508 and the subject of his research for many years until its publication in 1556. Other prose works include *De fulminum significationibus declamatio* (1517), *Antiquitatum bellunensium sermones quattuor* (written in 1522 but first published in 1620), *Defensio pro sacerdotum barbis* (1531, which was translated into English in 1533), and *Compendium in sphaeram* (1537). Valerianus' only vernacular work is *Dialogo della volgar lingua* (written around 1516 but first published in 1620).

Throughout his long life Valerianus wrote and published poetry, including the *Praeludia quaedam* (1509); *Joathas rotatus* (1512), the only completed section of a heroic poem on the triumphs of the martyrs; the *Amores* (1549); and *Hexametri, Odae, et Epigrammata* (1550). In 1813 Ticozzi published *De milacis cultura*, a didactic poem in the manner of the *Georgics*, composed ca. 1534–35. Alpago-Novello (1926) was unable to find an earlier edition of this work. Valerianus' poetry contains many imitations of classical authors, including Catullus, Vergil, and Ovid, as well as over fifty epigrams translated

from the *Greek Anthology* (a work done in his youth but first published with the *Hexametri*).

Valerianus' philological interests were equally broad. He edited the 1502 edition of Lactantius, translated Lucian's *De aulicorum aerumnis* (1516), produced a Vergilian commentary (1521), lectured on Catullus (1521–22), wrote a metrical treatise for Ippolito de' Medici (Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Vittorio Emanuele 368 [568.411] reported by Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 126) and produced a book of forty-four letters on the *Pandects* (Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana 801). His autograph corrections to the Vergil commentary are to be found in the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice (Marc. lat. XII 230 [3959], reported by Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 243).

A detailed bibliography of Valerianus has been compiled by Alpago-Novello (1926), who lists many of the minor prose works not mentioned here and discusses details of the numerous editions and translations.

*Bibliography*: Cosenza, IV, 3537–41, V, 1824–26; J. Hutton, *The Greek Anthology in Italy to the Year 1800* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1935), 175–78; Jöcher, IV, 1409; Michaud, XLII, 463–64; Tiraboschi (1805), VII, 861–65; L. Alpago-Novello, "Nuove notizie intorno a Pierio Valeriano con documenti inediti," *Archivio storico di Belluno, Feltre, e Cadore*, VI (1934), 477–84, 497–504 and "Spigolature vaticane di argomento bellunese. I. Un' opera inedita ed ignorata di Pierio Valeriano," *Archivio veneto tridentino*, IX (1926), 69–96; G. Bustico, "Pierio Valeriano, poeta bellunese del sec. XVI," *Atti della R. Accademia Roveretana degli Agiati*, XI (1905), 155–76; G. Fiocco, "Il ritratto di Pierio Valeriano," *Archivio storico di Belluno, Feltre, e Cadore*, XXXIII (1962), 1–6; K. Giehlow, "Hieroglyphenkunde des Humanismus in der Renaissance," *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, XXXII (1915), 113–29; V. Lettere, "Dalle Fosse, Giovanni Pietro," DBI XXXII, 84–88; G. Lucchetta, "Contributi per una biografia di Pierio Valeriano," *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, IX (1966), 461–76; A. Marocchi, "Ludovico Beccadelli e Pierio Valeriano: per la prima fortuna degli 'Hieroglyphici'," *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, XII (1969), 329–34; W. Roscoe, *The Life and Pontificate of Leo the Tenth*

(Philadelphia, 1805–1806), IV, 255–58; S. Ticozzi, *Storia dei letterati e degli artisti del dipartimento del Piave* (Belluno, 1813), I, 85–150.

#### II. Anonymus Florentinus: Biblioteca Nazionale, Rinuccini filza 17

This anonymous work contains a commentary on Cat. 1–Cat. 12 only. The manuscript belongs to the sixteenth century, but there is no further indication of date. The author shows no knowledge of the work of other Catullan scholars, and he seems to be poorly informed about Catullus himself. He believes, for example, that Catullus dedicated his poetry to Cornelius Nepos because Nepos had mentioned him in his work *De viris illustribus* and that the dedication was made on the occasion of the Ludi Saeculares. The commentary on each poem is preceded by a brief summary, and the notes are explanatory in a general way. Often the commentator merely rephrases; sometimes he explains a geographical reference or a hard word. He refers to several Latin authors, including Vergil, Horace, and Silius Italicus, but displays no knowledge of Greek. He seems uninterested in textual matters.

*Vita* (Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Rinuccini filza 17, last fascicle [fol. 1r]). *Vita Catulli*. [*Inc.*]: Sirmio lacus Benaci in agro Veronensi peninsula avitos lares Valerio Catullo dedit. Ipse Veronae natus quo Plotius tempore rhetoricen latinam primus Romae docere coepit, in urbem venit patre non ignobili qui Caesaris hospitio potissimum claruit tanta benevolentia ut quamvis Caesari etiam imperanti Catullus filius perpetua stigmata versiculorum licentia inusserit, tamen ille et satisfacienti dederit veniam et patris hospitio non desiverit uti. In Bithynia fuit praetorem illuc inter amicos secutus. Eusebius novem annis ante bellum civile Caesaris mortuum tradit, cui ne assentiar et Tranquilli adducor auctoritate qui post civile bellum huius meminit et poetae ipsius voce qui eius belli mentionem facit vel eo versiculo: *Socer generque perdidistis omnia* [Cat. 29.24]. An idem sit quem Suetonius in Caligula Valerium Catullum nuncupavit [Suet., *Cal.* 36]? Pro certo non tradiderim vanum. In eo ingenium multiplex poeticae quare non lyricos tantum numeros sed granditatem quoque heroicam [herpicam, ms.] attigit. Callimachi elegiam ad verbum transtulit. Fremit in primis acerbitate iambi. Tanta in eo libertas ut exeat in licentiam.

Personarum dignitati non parcat quam lepore quodam figurato eludit. Irae indulgens, quod irati proprium est, non abstinet verborum obscenitate, quam in moribus suis non indicat sed inter alienos ingerit, tanta doctrinae auctoritate ut eius laudem tam apud poetas quam alios scriptores sit consecutus. Epigrammata variis argumentis conscripta redacta tandem in libellum dicat Cornelio, ea praefatione quacum immortalitatem optet sibi auguratur.

*Commentary.* [*Inc.*]: (fol. 1r) *Cui dono lep[i-dum]* (Cat. 1). Redactam lucubrationem in libellum dicat Cornelio ut ego sentio Nepoti qui historia scribenda claruit Augusti temporibus et dicat his diebus quibus ludi saeculares celebrabantur, ea adductus ratione quoniam Cornelius Nepos tres libros scripserat de viris qui in Italia claruerunt quibus inseruerat Catulli nomen. Versus phaletius est a Phaleco primo inventore ita cognominatus qui in (fol. 1v) undecim distribuitur syllabas et quinque pedes. Primus pes constanter esse solet spondeus, sed Catullus et iambum et trocheum aliquando usurpavit. *Coi* [Cat. 1.1]. antiquum est, *cui* nostrum. *Corneli* [Cat. 1.3]. Nonnulli ad Cornelium Gallum referunt poetam foroiuliensem cuius meminimus in Propertium. Fuit item Cornelius secundus Nepos de quo scribit Fabius . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 10r) *Sethaba* [Cat. 12.14]. Sethabis oppidum Hispaniae a quo Sethabitani appellantur. Cives iidem appellantur Augustani et cum aliis conveniunt Carthaginem novam. Telas subtilissimas conficiebant; inde Silius: *Sethabis et telas arabum sprevisse superba* [Sil. 3.374]. Nam Fabullus et Veranius miserunt mihi ex Hispania Sethaba linthea ex telis et lanificio sethabetano. *hoc amem necesse* [Cat. 12.16] id est hoc lintheum quoniam est in eo et Veranii et Fabulli sodalium meorum pignus et monumentum.

*Manuscript:*

Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Rinuccini filza 17, last fascicle, s. XVI (Kristeller, *Iter*, I, 167).

12. Braccius Ricasulanus

This marginal commentary and the manuscript in which it appears are by the hand of Braccius Ricasulanus, whose signature and note of ownership are found on fol. 1r. Thomson dates the manuscript to the beginning of the sixteenth century, but the notes, at least, are to

be dated after 1548 by a quotation from the *Annotationes* of Franciscus Robortellus (see p. 283 below), who is named on fol. 47r. Ricasulanus is interested in meter and textual problems as well as questions of interpretation and cites both ancient sources and parallels and contemporary scholarly opinion. Several of Politianus' Catullan chapters from the *Miscellanea* (see p. 230 above) are cited, and Ricasulanus is clearly aware of the readings of more than one edition. There are references to the first Aldine edition throughout. It seems very likely that Ricasulanus' exemplar was a manuscript or edition containing the notes of Franciscus Puccius (see p. 243 above). Frequently Puccius' readings are given in Ricasulanus' text, but (almost as frequently) he has a correction to Puccius in the corresponding note. Puccius himself is not named, and the notes bear little relation to Puccius'—the chief exceptions being at the very beginning and end of the commentary.

*Commentary* (Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana Ashb. 973 [904], fol. 1r). [*Inc.*]: *Quoi* (Cat. 1.1). de hoc dativo Quintilianus agit. *arida* (Cat. 1.2.). aliter arido. *Expolitum pumice* (Cat. 1.2). cui modo supremam manum imposui: nam expolitus pumice libellus accipitur perfectus et undique absolutus . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 64r) *venante* (Cat. 116.1). et cupiente. *telis icere musca caput* (Cat. 116.4). mittere in usque caput. *mi usque caput. hinc valuisse* (Cat. 116.6). huc valuisse. aliter evaluisse. *amictu* (Cat. 116.7). amicta. *affixus nostris* (Cat. 116.8). affixus nobis.

*Manuscript:*

Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana Ashb. 973 (904), s. XVI, fols. 1r–64r. (Kristeller, *Iter*, I, 92; D. F. S. Thomson, *Catullus: A Critical Edition* [Chapel Hill, 1978], 46–47).

*Biography:*

Braccius Ricasulanus (Braccio Ricasoli) is otherwise unknown. He probably belonged to the well-known family of the Ricasoli in Florence.

13. Marcus Antonius Muretus

In 1552 Marcus Antonius Muretus lectured on Catullus and other Latin poets in Paris, perhaps at the Collège du Cardinal Lemoine or the Collège de Boncourt. Included in his large and enthusiastic audiences were several poets of the

Pléiade—most notably Ronsard, his friend and near contemporary. Muretus' lectures created a fashion for "Catullan" poetry. His own Neo-Latin collection, the *Juvenilia* (December 1552), contains several Catullan imitations, but Catullus is still more important in the French poetry of the Pléiade, much of which appeared close on the heels of his lectures. Late in 1553 Muretus was forced to leave Paris because of allegations of heresy and sexual misconduct. He fled to Toulouse and by May 1554 had arrived in Venice. He was soon befriended by Paulus Manutius, who, learning of his enthusiasm for Catullus, persuaded him to produce a commentary. Muretus set to work and completed the task in a little less than three months, as he says in the dedication, dated October 15, 1554.

Since Muretus had been in Venice only a few months, his commentary on Catullus was no doubt largely drawn from the Paris lectures. His notes display a combination of learning and poetic sophistication that would have appealed to the Pléiade. More than any of his predecessors except Valerianus (see p. 255 above), he discusses the artistic qualities of Catullus' work and the details of vocabulary and meter that work together to secure an effect. Except for Valerianus, he is the first commentator to understand that Cat. 4 is written in pure iambs, "ut admirari liceat tantum leporem in tanta numerorum necessitate." He appends a poem of his own in galliambs to his discussion of the meter in Cat. 63, discusses the appropriateness of the similes in Cat. 68 (which he regards as perhaps the most beautiful elegy in Latin), and discourses on the delight of studying Catullus' translations in close conjunction with their Greek models. He is the first commentator to print Sappho's poem with Cat. 51, and he laments the loss of Callimachus' *Lock of Berenice* in the discussion of Cat. 66 and prints all the fragments known to him. Muretus is interested in the text, but he is cautious about emendations and adamant in refusing to admit modern conjectures and supplements, no matter how apposite.

Muretus' commentary was the first to be published since that of Alexander Guarinus in 1521 (see p. 251 above) and the most important since the commentary of Antonius Parthenius in 1485 (see p. 223 above). His work on Catullus influenced the French poets even before its publication as a commentary; the commentary itself

appeared in several editions. The commentary on Cat. 65 and Cat. 66 was printed separately in Stephanus' edition of Callimachus (1577); it will be discussed below.

*a. Muretus' Commentary*

*Dedication* (ed. of Venice, 1554). M. Antonius Muretus Bernardino Lauredano, Andreae F. Patricio Veneto, s.p.d. [*Inc.*]: (fol. ii<sup>r</sup>) Praestantium poetarum, Bernardine Lauredane, adolescens clarissime, neque magna unquam copia, et semper magna laus fuit. Copia ne fuerit, id in causa est, quod in ceteris facultatibus nemo est, duntaxat eorum qui hebeti penitus ingenio non sunt, qui non, adhibito labore, si minus excellere, at certe ad mediocritatem aliquam pervenire se posse confidat; in hac, nisi ab iis, quos ipsa quodam modo natura ad eam finxerit, labore, diligentia, vigiliis effici nihil potest. Ea ipsa res in hominum animis admirationem peperit poetarum: obstupefactis videlicet hominibus, cum viderent alios sponte quadam et propensione naturae, sine ullo labore, ea fundere, quae cum omnibus eloquentiae luminibus interlita, tum sparsa multifariam eruditionis variae notis, non tantum dulci sono tenerent aures, sed etiam omni genere affectuum intimos audientium sensus cogitationesque tentarent; alios contra ingenuarum artium scientia perpolitos, nulla tamen diligentia aut diuturnitate studii consequi posse, ut aliquo inter poetas numero ac loco haberentur. Ut autem omni elegantis doctrinae tractatione, ita huius quoque virtutis praestantia, longe supra ceteros graecorum hominum ingenia floruerunt. Romani et serius attigerunt poeticam, et coluerunt negligentius, et minime longo tempore in recte scribendorum poematum via perstiterunt. Siquidem cum a rudibus apud eos poetica profecta principiis, tandem per multos gradus ad Virgilium pervenisset, quo ego homine nihil statuo fieri potuisse divinius, ita postea coepere ingenia in deterius labi, ut mirum sit, quanta, quam brevi tempore, sit consecuta mutatio. Hispani poetae praecipue et Romani sermonis puritatem contaminarunt, et, cum inflatum quoddam, et tumidum, et gentis suae moribus congruens invexissent orationis genus, averterunt exemplo suo ceteros a recta illa et simplici, in qua praecipua poetarum sita laus est, et in quam superiores omni studio incubuerant, imitatione naturae. Itaque fere post Augusti tempora, ut quisque versum maxime inflaverat, senten-

tiam maxime contorserat, eo denique modo locutus fuerat, quo nemo serio soleret loqui, ita in precio haberi coepit. Quin etiam fucatus ille splendor, et adulterina eloquentiae species ita nonnullorum, qui verae eloquentiae gustum non habent, occaecavit animos, ut his quoque temporibus extiterint Hispani duo, homines ceteroqui et in primis eruditi, et scriptis editis nobiles, quorum alter Lucanum Virgilio, alter Martialem Catullo anteponere veritus non est. Quorum ab utroque ita dissentio, ut si quis deus potestatem mihi optionemque faciat, non dicam Virgilii, cui videor iniuriam facere, si eum ullo modo cum ceteris comparem, sed Ennii alicuius, aut Furii, quam Lucani, multo similem in scribendo esse me malim. Inter Martialis autem et Catulli scripta tantum interesse arbitrer, quantum inter dicta scurrae alicuius de trivio, et inter liberales ingenui hominis iocos, multo urbanitatis aspersos sale. Neque vero negaverim, multa in Martiale quoque non inscienter dicta reperiri, sed profecto deteriorum longe numerus maior est. Latinae quidem orationis nativa illa minimeque quasi pigmentis infuscata germanitas in Martiale nulla est, in Catullo praecipua. Iis de causis cum ab illo altero, nescio quo modo, semper abhorruissem, Catullum contra nunquam non mirabiliter amavi, itaque legebam eum adolescentulus studiose, magnamque operam ad lepores illius intelligendos conferebam, nihil tamen minus cogitans, quam fore unquam ut in eum commentarios scriberem. Sed cum haud ita pridem venissem in Italiam, et ut eam regionem aspicerem, qua qui aequo animo carent, mihi quidem antiquitatis memoriam satis colere non videntur, et mehercule, verum ut dicam, cum alios eruditos homines, tum Paulum in primis Manutium ut cognoscerem, quod in eius scriptis mihi videbar animadvertisse expressas quasdam excellentis doctrinae eximiaeque probitatis notas, mihiq[ue] divina quadam virgula contigisset, ut non pedem paene prius in hac civitate ponerem, quam in amicitiam ipsius familiaritatemque intimam admitterer, ipseque aliquot diebus post de meis sermonibus collegisset, quantopere me eius poetae scripta caperent; Quin tu, inquit, M. Antoni, quae in hoc genere notasti, ea in publicum profers, fructumque laboris tui cum ceteris antiqua illa naturae atque humanitatis lege comunicas? Ibi tum ego cum et longe aliarum virium opus illud esse dixissem, et protulissem alia multa, quae mihi ad eam cogitatio-

nem suscipiendam sane quam incommoda essent, eaque ipse amice admodum refutare pergeret (nosti autem divinam hominis illius in dicendo suavitatem), non prius destitit quam me impulit denique, sibi ut reciperem, me id primo quoque tempore esse facturum. Neque vero diu fidem meam liberare distuli, ut qui inter varias occupationes, homo alioqui laboris non nimium tolerans, hoc tamen, quicquid est, trium mensium, aliquanto etiam minore, spatio absolverim. Nunc hasce vigilias meas, Bernardine Luredane, multae sunt causae, quamobrem tibi dicatas velim. Natus es ex ampla cum primis et nobili familia, et ex qua ea Venetae civitatis lumina extiterunt, quorum claritatem nulla unquam inobscurabit oblivio. Praeterea est hoc generi vestro prope fataliter datum, ut ametis literas, hominesque earum scientia excultos benignitate vestra comprehendatis . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. iv<sup>v</sup>) Accessere his prope quotidiani mecum Pauli Manutii de tua laude sermones, in cuius tu viri ore plane habitas, ita enim frequenter, ita cupide de te loquitur, ut mihi numquam omnino, quam cum de te dicere ingressus est, facundior esse videatur. Attigi breviter ea, quae me, ut hunc librum tuo nomini potissimum inscriberem, impulerunt. Nunc a te, adolescens ornatisime, etiam atque etiam peto, primum, ut munusculum hoc non ex sua magnitudine, sed ex meo tibi gratificandi animo ponderes; deinde, ut, si quando eorum rationem inibis, quos eximiae tuae virtutis admiratio adiunxit tibi, me quoque, si videtur, eorum adscribendum numero existimes. Venetiis. id. Octob. MDLIII.

*Commentary.* C. Valerii Catulli Veronensis ad Cornelium Nepotem Libellus, et in eundem Commentarius M. Antonii Mureti. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 1r) *Quoi dono* (Cat. 1.1). Quis hic Cornelius fuerit, diu multumque dubitatum est. Dubitandi autem nulla fuisset occasio, si in veteribus libris haec, quae nunc in omnibus legitur, inscriptio fuisset, *C. Valerii Catulli ad Cornelium Nepotem Libellus*. Sed profecto et haec, ut ceterae, quae sunt singulorum epigrammatum, factae sunt non ab ipsis auctoribus, sed vel a grammaticis, vel a librariis. Cui rei si nihil aliud, certe illud indicio est quod multae in eis absurdissimae et ab auctorum sententia alienissimae reperiuntur. Neque de hoc tantum libro loquor. Idem in Tibullo, Propertio, odis Horatii, a quolibet non imperitissimo homine animadverti potest. Utinam quidem quae deberet, ea in tractandis vete-

rum monimentis et servata esset a superioribus et hodie servaretur religio. Simpliciora haud dubie omnia et integriora legerentur. Nunc, dum quisque, pro suo arbitratu, addit, delet, immutat, fiunt ex non integerrimis voluminibus manu scriptis impressa vitiosissima. Neque vero improbo, magnopere etiam laudo, qui modeste coniecturas suas proponunt; certorum audaciam non approbo. At de his satis. Quod hic Cornelium Nepotem intelligi aiunt, mihi quoque probatur. Cornelium quidem ipsum magnifice de Catullo sensisse, ex eo liquet, quod in vita Attici cum L. Iulium Calidum a poematum suavitate ita laudaret, ut eum ceteris aetatis suae omnibus anteponeret, Lucretium modo et Catullum excipiendos putavit . . . / . . . (fol. 99r) *Etsi me assiduo* (Cat. 65.1). Receperat Ortalo, se Callimachi Elegiam de Coma Berenices expressurum latinis versibus, eique missurum. Id igitur se quamvis multis ex fraterna morte doloribus praepeditum, praestitisse dicit, ne rei sibi ab amico mandatae immemor videretur . . . / . . . (fol. 104v) *Utinam coma regia fiam* (Cat. 66.93). Utinam, inquit, rursum redeam in caput reginae, fulgeatque Bootes sive Arcturos proximus Erigone, ut priusquam ego in sidus converterer, interiicererque inter ipsum et Erigonen. Postremus autem versus, ut a nobis scriptus est, ita legitur in veteribus libris, etiamque ratio ipsa ut ita legatur necessario postulat. Quo magis mirandum est, quid cogitarit Politianus, cum hunc locum adhibita industria corrumpere, collectis, si Diis placet, multis locis quibus planum faceret, a Graecis interdum Oarionem pro Orione dici, quasi id ageretur. Itaque merito incidit in aculeos reprehensorum, praecipue Marulli, qui quodlibet vadimonium, ut dicitur, potius deseruisset, quam ullam exagitandi illius occasionem. Eius igitur illa sunt, "Oarionem pro Erigone citat Ecnomus. unde? / Non facit ad mores virgo, sed Oarion." Et hoc item alterum, "Quaeris, qua niteat docto coma parte Catullo? / Proximus Arcturo fulgor et Erigone est. / Virginis et saevi contingens namque Leonis / Lumina, Calisto iuncta Lycaoniae, / Flectit in occasum, tardum dux ante Booten, / Qui vix sero alto mergitur Oceano. / Quae tu si relegens, ubi sit coma regia, quaeris, / Ecnome, aquam medio quaeris in Oceano. / Quamvis, quid relegas, vitiis miser, invidiaque / Obrutus? Ingeniis candor inesse solet. / Ergo dum omnia conturbas, dum credere doctis / Negligis, et per te nil sapis

ipse tamen, / Fecisti Oarionem ex Erigone, ex Arcturo / Hydrochoum, iam quod monstrum erit ipsa coma?" Hinc autem videri potest, illustres homines, quique magnum nomen habent in literis, quanto periculo peccent. Efficit enim Politiani auctoritas, ut nullus iam, quod sciam, extet liber impressus, in quo non, reiecta vera lectione, nothus ille et suppositicius versus legatur, *Proximus Hydrochoum fulgeat Oarion . . . / . . .* [Expl.]: (fol. 134v) *Tela infesta* (Cat. 116.4). In aliis, *Infestum telis icere musca caput*, qui versus neque inconcinnus, neque a sententia alienus est; sed, quod in his rebus unum considerari oportet, Catulli non est. Hunc autem, quem nos reposuimus, in libris veteribus legi, ipsi quoque, qui eum reiecerunt, confitentur. Porro si, ubi veteres libri aut deficiunt, aut scripturam parum probabilem habent, tamen, eorum auctoritate neglecta, aliquid de suo attexere temeritatis est, ubi perspicue in eis probabile aliquid et idoneum legitur, consulto alia quaerere, et nova veteribus, adulterina germanis, falsa veris antepondere, cuius insaniae esse dicemus? Haec habui, quae in Catullum scriberem; quae si studiosis huius poetae placebunt, erit quod mihi gratuler; sin minus, nunquam me tamen praestitisse ea, quae potui, et morem gessisse voluntati amicorum, qui hortati me sunt ut hoc munus susciperem, poenitebit.

#### Editions:

1554, Venetiis (Venice): apud Paulum Manutium, Aldi filium. With the *Priapea*. Adams C-1145; *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlv; NUC. Cambridge University Library; BL; BN; (CtY; MH; PP; ICU).

1558, Venetiis (Venice): apud Paulum Manutium. With the *Priapea* and the texts of Tibullus and Propertius and notes on Tibullus and Propertius. Adams C-1146; *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlvi; NUC. BL; BN; (DLC; MH; CtY; CSt).

1559, Lugduni (Lyons): apud Gulielmum Rovillium. Contents as in preceding edition. Adams C-1147; Baudrier, IX, 254; *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlvi; NUC. Cambridge University Library; BL; BN; (CtY; NNC; CSt).

1562, Venetiis (Venice): [Aldine Press]. For contents see edition of 1558. Adams C-1150; *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlvi; NUC. BL; BN; (MH; OCU; DFo).

1579. See above, Composite Editions. Muretus is part of a variorum commentary on Catullus 4.



1582. See above, Composite Editions.

1593. See above, Composite Editions. Muretus is part of a variorum commentary on Catullus 4.

1604. See above, Composite Editions. Muretus is part of a variorum commentary.

1608. See above, Composite Editions. Muretus is part of a variorum commentary.

1659. See above, Composite Editions. Muretus is part of a variorum commentary.

1680. See above, Composite Editions. Muretus is part of a variorum commentary.

1822. See above, Composite Editions.

*b. Muretus' Commentary on Cat. 65 and Cat. 66 as edited by Henricus Stephanus*

It had been recognized as early as Antonius Parthenius (see p. 223 above) that Cat. 66 was a translation of a lost poem of Callimachus. Politianus (see p. 230 above) used a fragment from Callimachus to emend Cat. 66.48. In 1577 Henricus Stephanus (CTC III, 48) approached the problem from the other direction in his edition of the *Hymns* and *Epigrams* of Callimachus, representing the *Coma Berenices* of Callimachus by Catullus' translation, together with Muretus' commentary, which he shortened by omitting much of the attack on Politianus' reading of Cat. 66.93. (Compare the notes on Cat. 66.93 quoted below and above on p. 263).

*Letter to the Reader* (ed. of Geneva, 1577). Henricus Stephanus Lectori. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 53r) Quum, excusis Callimachi hymnis, adeo pauca ex tam multis tam docti tamque elegantis poetae poematiis superesse non dolerem tantum, sed etiam (qui meus est erga illius Musam amor) ingemiscerem, coepi de tabulis saltem tanquam ex naufragio colligendis cogitare. Dum vero non tabulas sed tabularum duntaxat fragmenta colligerem, commodum in mentem venit integri poematii de coma Berenices, quod Catullus interpretatus esset. Hoc mihi tanquam *hermaion* quoddam, quum gaudium, aut saltem aliquid solatii attulisset, eiusdem te sive gaudii sive solatii ut participem facerem, poematum illud, cum Antonii Mureti commentariis (sicut Graeca quae praecedunt, suos habent) apponendum hic, eique eiusdem Catulli epistolium ad Ortalum [Cat. 65] (in cuius gratiam et cuius rogatu illa Callimachi carmina ex Graecis Latina se fecisse testatur) praeponendum curavi. Quod autem epistolium appellavi, id vel ipsi Catullo probari posse alibi ea voce utenti existimavi. Vale.

*Commentary.* [*Inc.*]: (fol. 53r) *Etsi me assiduo* (Cat. 65.1). Receperat Ortalo, se Callimachi Elegiam de coma Berenices expressurum latinis versibus, eique missurum. Id igitur se quamvis multis ex fraterna morte doloribus praepeditum, praestitisse dicit, ne rei sibi ab amico mandatae immemor videretur . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 59r) *Utinam coma regia flam* (Cat. 66.93). Utinam, inquit, rursum redeam in caput reginae, fulgeatque Bootes sive Arcturos proximus Erigoneae, ut priusquam ego in sidus converterer interiiceretque inter ipsum et Erigonen. Postremus autem versus, ut a nobis scriptus est, ita legitur in veteribus libris, etiamque ratio ipsa, ut ita legatur, necessario postulat. Quo magis mirandum est quid cogitarit Politianus quum hunc locum adhibita industria corrumperet, collectis, si diis placet, multis locis, quibus planum faceret, a Graecis interdum Oarionem pro Orione dici, quasi id ageretur. Itaque merito incidit in aculeos reprehensorum, praecipue Marulli, qui quodlibet vadimonium (ut dicitur) potius deseruisset, quam ullam exagitandi illius occasionem.

*Edition:*

1577, [Geneva]: excud. Henricus Stephanus. This edition of the *Hymns* and *Epigrams* of Callimachus contains Cat. 65 and Cat. 66 with the commentary of Muretus, pp. 53–59. Adams C–232; NUC. Cambridge University Library; BN; (DLC; CtY; CU; MH).

*Biography:*

See CTC I, 105. Add to the *Bibliography*: D. G. Coleman, "Catullus in Montaigne's 1580 Version of *De la tristesse* (I.2)," *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance*, XLII (1980), 139–44; M. W. Croll, "Muret and the History of Attic Prose," in *Style, Rhetoric, and Rhythm* (Princeton, 1966), 107–62; A. Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford, 1983), I, 71–100; M. Morrison, "Ronsard and Catullus: The Influence of the Teaching of Marc-Antoine de Muret," *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance*, XVIII (1956), 240–74; Morrison, "Henri Estienne and Sappho," *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance*, XXIV (1962), 388–91; M. Patison, "Muretus," in *Essays*, I (Oxford, 1889), 124–31; R. Trinquet, "Recherches chronologiques sur la jeunesse de Marc-Antoine Muret," *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance*, XXVII (1965), 272–85.



## 14. Achilles Statius

Statius began the study of the Latin poets as a preparation for translating the Psalms and other scriptural passages into Latin verse, for he wanted to be able to represent the variety of biblical poetry with an appropriate rhythmic and metrical diversity. In the course of his reading he made detailed notes on Tibullus, Vergil, Lucretius, and Horace, as well as Catullus; urged by his friends to publish his work, he decided to begin with Catullus (1566). A commentary of Tibullus appeared in 1567. Statius' commentaries on the other poets were never published: the Vergil is preserved in manuscript (Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana E 60<sup>2</sup>), but the works on Lucretius and Horace's *Odes* seem to have perished (an apparently unrelated work, a commentary on the *Ars poetica*, was printed in 1553).

Statius carried out his intention of writing sacred poetry in classical meters, for his paraphrases of the Psalms are to be found in a manuscript at the Biblioteca Vallicelliana (B 106), together with his *Carmina sacra* and *Carmina profana*. The poems contain little that is obviously Catullan, but they live up to the promise of metrical variety implied in the preface to the commentary on Catullus: most are written in elegiacs, but sapphics, hendecasyllabics, iambs, and hexameters are also used, as well as more complex lyric meters. The Vallicelliana formerly also contained Statius' own copy of the 1502 Aldine edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius with his annotations. This volume disappeared from the library in the nineteenth century (it is wrongly included in Kristeller's *Iter*, II, 128), but Ullman identified it with an edition in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Rés. p. Yc. 375). The edition is interesting more for its history than for its content, however, for the annotations on Catullus are infrequent and very brief.

In his commentary Statius is principally interested in textual problems, but he also makes a number of literary observations, usually on the effectiveness of individual words or phrases in their context. He not only explicates Catullan usage with the usual range of Latin and Greek authors but also frequently refers to inscriptions. His commentary contains numerous references to specific manuscripts and often cites the interpretations and emendations of other humanists,

many of whom were his friends and contemporaries. Among others, he mentions Angelus Colotius, Fulvius Ursinus, Jacobus Corbinellus, Petrus Victorius (see p. 213), and Antonius Augustinus. That he never mentions the work of Muretus (see p. 260) suggests an antagonism or rivalry between the two scholars, at least on Statius' part. Statius' commentary, however, was much less influential than that of his famous predecessor. It never appeared in a second edition and was reprinted first in the variorum editions of the seventeenth century.

*Dedication* (ed. of Venice, 1566). Achilles Statius Hieronymo Rusticuccio Pii V. Pont. Max. Secretario Sal. [*Inc.*]: (fol. A2r) Ego vero de Catulli commentario edendo non magis profecto cogitabam, quam de Tibulli, Vergilii, Horatii, Lucretiique commentariis, quos partim institutos, partim vero confectos iam atque absolutos habeo. Casus vero mirificus intervenit, quasi testis industriae diligentiaeque in lectitando meae. Namque aliud agenti et spectanti mihi longe aliud evenit. Equidem invitus, quia nondum maturum iudicabam, sed tamen necessario consilii mei rationes exponam. Versatur in animo meo cogitatio iampridem suscepta de Sacrorum librorum poesi latinis versibus exprimenda. Quae cum varia multiplexque sit, nec enim generis unius sunt, quae David Rex, quae Job, quae alii denique sanctissimi viri modulatissimis versibus cecinerunt, non unum quoque latini carminis esse adhibendum genus intelligebam, quo vel numerorum similitudinem vel illorum varietatem, si nihil aliud, ipsa demum varietate repraesentarem. Itaque ad id opus antequam adgrederer, quo paratior hoc ipsum politis ornatique versibus praestarem, summos in suo quemque genere latinos poetas diligenter evolvi. Inter legendum autem, quod adsolet, ita multa notaram, ut iustum prope volumen effectura viderentur. Ea mei studiosis hominibus cum placita essent, contenderunt a me scilicet etiam atque etiam, ne ceteros celarem neve publico invidere. Ergo victus a Catullo initium duxi, quem superior aetas omnis tanti fecit, ut elegantia illum poetis omnibus facile praestare censuerit. Certe Divus Hieronymus dignum putavit, cuius nomen Eusebii, quae convertebat in Latinum, Chronicis intexeret. Nam, quod idem lascivius ac mollius scripsit, id vero temporum illorum sive mos, sive licentia potius ac vitium fuit. Quamquam de se ipse tamquam suppudens dicit,

*Nam castum esse decet pium Poetam/Ipsam, versiculos nihil necesse est* [Cat. 16.5–6]. Ut et ille alter, *Musa iocosa mihi est, vita pudica tamen* [cf. Ovid, *Tr.* II.354]. Cum autem operis huius editio in idem tempus incidisset, quod me Pius V Pont. Max. in suis esse voluisset, atque ego tum, Hieronyme Rusticucci, in amicitiam atque adeo in familiaritatem tuam venissem, quasi quodam fato, quidquid hoc est libelli, debere tibi sum arbitratus . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. A3v) Sed de te satis apud te, verissimas tuas laudes modeste nimis aversantem. De Catullo ipso, laudatissimo poeta, nihil amplius dicam, illius commendandi causa. De lucubratione hac mea vere videor posse dicere, eo consilio et conatu institutam, quod me tamen adsecutum non profiteor, quem multa fugerint, plura fortasse fefellerint hominem vix mediocri praeditum ingenio, ut optimum poetam negligentia temporum valde corruptum, si non omnino restituerem, at paullo quidem certe meliorem redderem. Vale. Romae. Kal. Mart.

*Introduction.* Achillis Statii Lusitani Commentarius Catulli. [Inc.]: (fol. A4r) De Catullo plura dixissem, nisi hoc Crinitum munere praeclare functum viderem, sed tamen, quod ille mihi reliqui fecit, id in principio mearum in optimum poetam commentationum esse ponendum duxi ac mihi quidem Criniti ipsius scripta legenti valde probatur, quod praenomen Cai Catullo praeposuerit, auctorem opinor Apuleium [Appuleium *ed.*] atque Hieronymum Eusebii interpretem, quod tamen non exprimit, secutus illum in Apologia I. Antonius Augustinus, Ilerdae episcopus, praestante vir ingenio parique probitate, nummum mihi Romae ostendit aereum, cuius in altera parte videre erat expressam incudem, tum haec in orbem ducta atque exstantia verba, III.VIR. A.A.A.F.F., in altera item in orbem, L. VALERIUS CATULLUS. Intra quae litterae singulares erant, S.C., quae nisi omnia patere iam ac nota omnibus esse putarem, interpretarer scilicet. Octaviae Catullae nomine in hortis Rodulfi Pii Card. amplissimi, hodieque exstat inscriptum monumentum: DIS MANIB / OCTAVIAE. P.F. CATULLAE / GELADI. DIVAE. AUGUST. L / UXORI. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 9) Lesbiam vero idest Clodiam sororem Clodii fuisse dicit Sidonius Apollinaris. Ille vero versus apud Nonium Marcellum de indiscretis adverbis, *Animula miserula properiter abit* [Septimius Serenus fr. 16, in Nonius 517, 4],

vereor ut Catuli sive Catulli sit antiquioris illius. Ad quem autem Catullum referamus etiam illud, quod adducit Servius interpretans Vergilii versum, *Purpureae, pretiaeque* [Verg., *Georg.* II.950]. Hanc unam, inquit, praecipue Cato laudat in libris, quos scripsit ad filium. Contra Catullus eam vituperat et dicit nulli rei esse aptam, miraturque cur eam laudaverit Cato. Versus ipsi, quibus utitur primoribus, hendecasyllabi, ab Sentio Augurino in epigrammate apud Plinium iuniorem minuti dicuntur: *Canto carmina versibus minutis, his olim quibus et meus Catullus, et Calvus, veteresque* [Sentius Augurinus I.3 in Pliny, *Epist.* IV.27.3].

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (p. 10) *Cui dono lepidum novum libellum* (Cat. I.1). In duobus manuscriptis CUI, ut est etiam impressum; in uno QUOI; in Patavino altero QUIN, quae scriptura ad eam, quam veteres in scribenda voce hac tenebant, consuetudinem propius accedit, si tantum modo N litteram a fine sustuleris, cuius rei auctor Donatus, illud in Andria Terentii interpretans, *Exorandus* legitur, inquit, et *Expurgandus*. Si *Expurgandus*, lege CUI, non QUI, quia Cui per Q veteres scripsere . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 415) *Adfixus nostris tu dabis supplicium* (Cat. II.6.8). Nostrum, inquit, enim mage erit, ut ait poeta, penetrabile telum. Et posterior etiam Manilius s ipsum sic elisit: *Formosos Phoebus geminos, Cyllenius cancrum* (Manilius II.440). Ut Cicero ante, *Delphinus iacet haud nimio lustratus* (Cic., *Ph.* 92). Vetustiores autem fere semper elidebant.

#### *Editions:*

1566, Venetiis (Venice): in aed. Manutianis. Adams C–1151; *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlv; NUC. BL; BN; (CtY; NPV; MA).

1579. See above, Composite Editions. Statius is part of a variorum commentary on Catullus 4.

1593. See above, Composite Editions. Statius is part of a variorum commentary on Catullus 4.

1604. See above, Composite Editions. Statius is part of a variorum commentary.

1659. See above, Composite Editions. Statius is part of a variorum commentary.

1680. See above, Composite Editions. Statius is part of a variorum commentary.

#### *Biography:*

See CTC V, 188. Correction: Statius' first published work was printed in Louvain in 1547. It was a book of poems (*duae sylvulae*) and a

preface to Cicero's *Topica* (see Gomes Branco, "A propósito . . ."). Add to the *Bibliography*: J. Gomes Branco, "A propósito da primeira obra de Achilles Statius Lusitanus," *Humanitas* (Coimbra), II (1948–49), 81–92; Gomes Branco, "Uma comemoração de Achilles Statius Lusitanus," *Humanitas* (Coimbra), II (1948–49), 403–12; Gomes Branco, "Un umanista portoghese in Italia: Achilles Estaço," *Relazioni storiche fra l'Italia e il Portogallo*, Reale Accademia d'Italia (Rome, 1940), 135–48; M. La Tella Bartoli, "A proposito di Aquiles Estaço e dei 'carmina' del codice vallicelliano B 106," *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale*, sez. Romanza, XVII (1975), 293–362; A. Moreira de Sá, "Manuscritos e obras impressas de Aquiles Estaço," *Arquivo de bibliografia portuguesa* (Coimbra), III (1957), 167–78; P. de Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* (Paris, 1887; rpt. Geneva, 1976), 263–65 and passim; G. B. Pighi, "Achillis Statii Lusitani (xvi s.) lectiones atque emendationes Catullianae," *Humanitas* (Coimbra), III (1950), 37–160; B. L. Ullman, *The Identification of the Manuscripts of Catullus Cited in Statius' Edition of 1566* (Chicago, 1908); Ullman, "Achilles Statius' Manuscripts of Tibullus," *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 2d ed. (Rome, 1973), 429–49.

#### 15. Joseph Justus Scaliger

Scaliger began to work on Catullus, along with Propertius and Tibullus, near the end of 1575 when he was recuperating from a debilitating illness and, according to his own account, still too weak to undertake the study of serious texts. In December 1575 he wrote to his friend Claude Dupuy (= Cl. Puteanus), to whom he eventually dedicated his work on the three poets, asking for the loan of Achilles Statius' commentary on Catullus (see p. 265 above); in subsequent correspondence with Dupuy we can follow the progress of Scaliger's own *Castigationes*. Scaliger despised Statius' work and professed to find almost nothing useful in it (February 1576). After brief bulletins in May and June 1576 he sent the finished work to Dupuy for his approval (August 1576). By September he was complaining of the printer's slowness: had he known how long the printer would take, he would not have been in such a hurry himself, for his work on all three poets, he claimed, took less than a month. By mid-December, however, he had received

the first gatherings from the printer and was fretting about punctuation. The published work was soon controversial: by July 1577 Scaliger was complaining to Dupuy that people were grumbling about his Catullus.

Like Muretus (see p. 260 above) and Statius, Scaliger made abundant use of Greek authors, although his sources tended to be more recondite. In other respects, however, his Catullus was a novelty, for it was based on the systematic collation of a manuscript and it attempted to reconstruct characteristics of the lost archetype from extant manuscripts. The manuscript Scaliger collated belonged to the celebrated legal scholar Jacques Cujas; Palmer and Ellis identified it with Egerton 3027 in the British Library. The manuscript is not important, but Scaliger considered it so because, having been relatively untouched by correctors, it seemed free of interpolations that departed from the original tradition. Scaliger claimed to have completed his collation of Cujas' manuscript in three days, writing it in the margins of his 1569 Plantin edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius (now in the Leiden University Library, with the shelf mark 755 H 23). The collation so hastily made contained some errors but was generally accurate. Scaliger's use of the collation in his edition and commentary, however, was both less accurate and less interested in palaeographical detail. Scaliger used Cujas' manuscript to infer details about the archetype—not merely its readings but also the script, spelling, and abbreviations that could have given rise to the errors he identified in its descendant.

But Scaliger's work is not concerned only with the text or based only on the evidence of his manuscript. In spite of his professed contempt for Statius, he used his commentary extensively. The commentary of Muretus seems to have influenced him greatly, although his own differs from it at many points. It may be taken as a sign of Scaliger's early respect for Muretus' work that in 1562 he dedicated to him a Greek translation of Cat. 66 based on Muretus' text, and as indicative of a change of opinion that he printed a different text of the poem in his own edition of 1577 (the translation was changed to accord with Scaliger's text in the printed edition, *Poemata omnia*, ed. P. Scriverius [Leiden, 1615]). Other predecessors were treated more harshly, and, at least in the cases of Marullus

and Avantius (see p. 232 above), Scaliger departs from his promise in the dedication: "mortuos autem, etiam quum ab eis dissentio, nunquam nisi honorificentissime appellarim." The commentary is intentionally spare and brief: many poems are not discussed at all; most have only a note or two. Scaliger is more embarrassed by obscenity than his predecessors: it should be skirted, he says, just as shoals and reefs are avoided by the experienced sailor. True to his word, he avoids discussing individual obscenities and usually has no notes at all on the poems in which they appear.

Scaliger's Catullus was both controversial and influential. Though attacked by important Italian scholars such as Vettori and Lolgi, it appeared in several editions and was reprinted frequently in the variorum editions of the seventeenth century. The text and commentary (*Castigationes*) are printed as two separate works and paginated separately; their colophons are identical, and they are bound in a single volume. The dedication to Puteanus is prefaced to the text but serves as an introduction to the whole. The first gloss, a discourse on the *praenomen* of Catullus, is an introduction to the *Castigationes*.

Scaliger's text of Cat. 66 was printed with his commentary in Vulcanius' edition of Callimachus (1584); it will be discussed below.

#### *a. Scaliger's edition*

*Dedication* (ed. of Paris, 1577). Cl. Puteano Consiliario Regio in Suprema Curia Parisiensi Josephus Scaliger Iul. Caesaris F. S. P. D. [*Inc.*]: (fol. a2r) Accidit mihi anno, Cl. Puteane, quod ne tu quidem nescis, ut ex gravi valetudine is status me exceperit, ut nondum mecum statuerem, e re mea fuerit magis cum illo morbo conflictari, quam ea taedia pati, quae postea magno studiorum meorum impedimento expertus sum. Quod etsi grave erat, quia ea re studiorum meorum impetum, sine quibus vita mihi acerba est, retardari videbam; tamen in eo malo hoc bonum sensi, eoque multum molestiae levatum est, quod tametsi omnem graviorum literarum et usum et fructum mihi ademptum viderem, tamen non ita nobis fuit male et moleste, ut eorum studiorum lectioni operam dare non licuerit, quae neque morositate sua aegri animi fastidia augerent potius, quam detergerent, neque non sine aliquo fructu legi possent. Primum igitur, ita me Deus amet, Catullum, qui tum

forte se obtulerat, in manus sumpsi; quumque, ut fit, inter legendum multa occurrerent partim vetustate obsoleta, partim temeritate correctorum, quae una fatalis librorum pestis est, interpolata, coepi ea cum libri scripti lectione conferre atque ita eum politissimum scriptorem versavimus ut eius laboris, si sapiam, poenitere me non debeat. Multa enim quae ignoratione priscae lectionis grammatae contaminaverant, restituimus; non pauca, quae aliquot abhinc saeculis vitio potius aetatis suae, quam suo imperiti homines illi praetermiserant, e penetralibus vetustatis in lucem protulimus. Quid multa? Nolui simplicem insaniam insanire. Idem enim et in Tibullo et Propertio tentavimus, quia eos, ut scis, vulgatae editiones coniungere solent et nisi fallor, feliciter successit nobis; quamvis, Deum testem laudo, ne integrum quidem mensem illis tribus poetis recensendis impendimus. Tamen, ne quid dissimulem, meliorem partem harum criticarum commentationum vindicat sibi stilus et scriptio. Quum enim quae in animo habebam, ea chartae commendarem, cui rei viginti tantum dies dedimus, sub acumen calami, ut solet, longe plura cadebant, quam inter legendum auctores ipsos commentati fuimus. Id quod testatum volumus, ne forte quispiam putet nihil aliud nos, quam haec Aristarchea nec velle nec posse tractare, quae tamen critices pars per se ita gravis est, ut nesciam, an quosdam melius fuerit eam non attigisse, quam aliis eam feliciter tractasse gloriae et ornamento fuit. Nos profecto in his non nimium, quod isti sciant, aestuavimus et, ut libere et vere loquamur, haec nobis paene dixerim aliud agentibus excidere solent. Quum igitur Cato etiam otii rationem reddi velit, nos egregium otii nostri testimonium edimus, quotiens aliquid tale publicamus. Non enim haec frequentius nobis succurrunt, quam quum maxime otiosi sumus. Nam graviorum studiorum, ut in seriis occupationibus locum tantum habent, ita gravius testimonium esse debet. Interea ista non ulli venient ingrata legenti, ut ait ille; atque adeo si quis est, qui humanioris musae aliquem sensum habet, etiam non in postremis habebit. Hoc dico quia *δοκησίσοφοι* quidam adeo sua admirantur, ut ista negligant, ob unam illam causam, quod quum harum literarum omnino ignari sint, tanti illas non esse aiunt, ut iterum sibi repuerascere necesse sit, et quae pueri didicere, senes perdenda fateantur. Nos contra, qui non solum illa habemus omnia, quae illos commendant, sed

et ea praeterea, quae illi in nobis negligunt, quia in se non esse sentiunt, nunquam parcemus operae, quin quodcumque nobis a gravioribus studiis vacabit, totum id bonis auctoribus iuvandis impendamus, id quod in istis tribus luminibus poetices Romanae praestitimus in quibus vix est, ut ullum animadversione dignum locum praetermiserimus, praeterquam si quae sunt, quae castae aures ferre non possunt. Ea enim attingere neque partes meae sunt, neque alius cuiuspiam, qui aliquem saltem pudorem habet. In istis commentatiunculis nostris ne verbulum quidem extat, quod me praeteriisse melius fuerit, quam scripsisse. Vellem equidem ipsi veteres pudoris aliquam rationem habuissent, neque tot infamibus scriptis hominibus sese traduxissent. Sed quia aliter contigisse videmus, interea nos isto Catone contenti erimus; nam ex quibus Latinitatem, quam ex istis fontibus hauriemus? Et tamen isti tres poetae flagitiosius non loquuntur, quam vel una Aristophanis comoedia cuiusmodi tamen multas semper lectitasse Chrysostomum proditur. At quantum virum? Cui profecto eloquentia, probitate, pietate parem alium nulla post aetas tulit. Lectionem poetarum ego mari comparo: in eo sunt scopuli, ad quos tamen peritus nauta nunquam navem offendit. In poesi sunt quaedam non bona dicta, in quae nunquam plus animus offendit, sed ea strenuus secure praetervehitur. Quare ut quosdam rogatos volo, quos delectant poetica, ut ab illis praetextatis verbis aures, oculos, linguam, animam denique abstineant; ita alios castigandos censeo, qui propter unam, aut alteram, vel denique paucas aspersas labeculas totum opus maculosum putant. Sed his nunc locus non est. Ego vero, qui scirem istos tres poetas ab omnibus magnifieri, ut qui unum ex illis intelligere possit, non parum se in literis profecisse gloriatur, quare pauculas horas male me collocasse putabo si effeci ut illos tres simul vel quivis mediocriter doctus nunc intelligat? Ut taceam, quod haec malui facere, quam nihil omnino facere. Scio magnae eruditionis viros non parum his auctoribus illustrandis contulisse. Equidem illis suam gloriam non invidio. Sed neque ipsi meam mihi praeripere si bene operam collocavi, neque si male conatum saltem vituperare possunt. Eum vero modum in istis brevibus ac paene nudis notis servavi, ut neminem vivum ne minima quidem animadversione perstrinxerim; mortuos autem, etiam quum ab eis dissentio, nunquam nisi honorificentissime appella-

rim. Illiberale enim facinus, propter nescio quas verborum quisquillas, aut propter errorem aliquem, qui humanitus contigerit, tantorum hominum eruditionem, atque adeo totum nomen et famam in periculum vocare. Hoc solent facere stolide arguti homunciones, qui in huiusmodi ἀκανθολογίαις totam aetatem contriverunt, divina autem sapientiae mysteria ignorant. Sed nae stultus sum, mi Puteane, qui haec notis praedicem, hoc est tibi, quem nihil latet, quod hominem liberaliter educatum scire oportet, aut qui me haec eruditis auribus probare diffidam, si modo tibi probare possim, quem ego non tantum ex omni amicorum meorum numero, in quibus tu familiam ducis, sed ex omnium doctissimorum nostri temporis delegi, cui haec dedicarem, tum ut hoc mei in te amoris fidissimum pignus extaret, tum etiam ut non nisi a te probata in lucem exirent. Non enim, aut ego fallor, tam leviter amicitia nostra perfungi velles, ut non animadvertas in ea, quaecunque forte hic occurrent, quae illo acutissimo ingenio tuo corrigi aut meliora fieri possunt; quod genus multa esse puto, sed quae et qualia sint, nisi tute indicaveris, profecto cur aliorum de iis iudicium expectem, non est. Te enim harum rerum acerrimum aestimatorem re ipsa expertus sum, ut instar omnium unus mihi esse possis. Accedit his, quod amicitiae nostrae instituendae nullus casus fortuitus auctor fuit, nulla occasio intervenit, nullus proxeneta aut pararius intercessit praeter admirabilem virtutem ac doctrinam tuam, cuius nomen multo ante mirifico tui videndi desiderio animum meum accenderat; neque frustra fui, nam ut te cognovi, et virtutes illas, quas animo praeceperam, agnovi et ut vidi, illico mihi species illa virtutis tuae percussit animum. Quare duo a te pro iure amicitiae nostrae peto: unum, ut non nisi te auctore liber iste prodeat; alterum, ut hoc munusculum aequi boni consulas. Quod si feceris, abunde ac plene mihi satisfactum putabo. Vale. Abenni in Pictonibus, IIII Nonas Aug. MDLXXVI.

*Introduction.* [Inc.]: (p. 3) C. Valeri. In manuscripto eruditissimi viri Iacobi Cuiacii non Caius sed Quintus praenomen exaratum est, idque videtur confirmari carmine in ianuam, illo versiculo: *Verum isti populi naenia, Quinte, facit* (Cat. 67.12). Quare, qui illi Caio praenomen faciunt, possunt hac auctoritate permoti sententiam suam mutare. Porro liber ille, quo usi sumus cuiusque iam mentionem fecimus, longe

alios huius poetae manuscriptos bonitate superare mihi videtur, quum tamen omnes ex uno exemplari descripti fuerint. Id exemplar ab homine Veronensi, quisquis ille fuit, in Galliis repertum, omnes illos codices eius poetae, qui in Italia extant propagavit. Et quum multi extiterint, quorum pars vitam poetae collegerint, pars in eum commentarios ediderint, miror a nemine illorum memoriae proditum, quando et a quo et ubi hic liber repertus in manus nostras pervenerit. Solus Volaterranus, quod sciam, memoria avorum suorum et situ erutum scribit. Sed in Galliis se eum reperiisse ille ipse qui publicavit epigrammate testatus est. Quod quamvis dignum est elegantia saeculi illius, quo literas scire barbaries erat, tamen nequid sine teste dicerem, id aequo animo hic adposui. Inducit vero Catullum loquentem. . . . [Scaliger quotes the epigram of Benvenuto Campesani (see p. 203 above, where the text is slightly different)] Et si, candide lector, hoc epigrammate patienter carere poteris, habet tamen, quod te scire melius fuit quam ignorare. Non repetam de Catullo, quae vulgatissima alii atque alii tanquam nova nobis obtrudunt. Id tantum dicam, urbicarium et mimographum poetam huic nostro cognominem fuisse, cuius meminit Iuvenalis, et fortasse is fuit auctor carminis de Vere, ex quo hoc citat Erasmus: *Sic Amyclas, dum tacebant, perdidit silentium*. Suspicio autem illud gallicanum exemplar langobardicis literis scriptum fuisse, quia errores, qui in postremis codicibus ab imperitis librariis disseminati sunt, non aliter videntur quam a morosis illis characteribus nati, id quod suo loco diligenter admonebimus. Praeterea non character solum menda propagavit, sed et antiquaria lectio. Nam librarius semper scripserat: QVOR, QVOM, LVDEI, LVCEI, ADEPTA'S M'ALIVS, OCEANO'S, POPVL' ARBITRIO, DEVOLVITILL' ACVTO, ILI' ET. Item multa alia praeterea quorum ignoratione quantum in hoc auctore edendo peccatum sit, postea docebo. Miraberis enim, studiose lector, tantam mendorum segetem hunc politissimum auctorem occupasse. Quam si non omnem extirpavero, tamen non magnum post me spicilegium relinquam.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (p. 4) *Arida modo* (Cat. 1.2). Cur dubites de hac lectione causae non est, si Servium locupletissimum auctorem habes. Quare enim illi minus quam libris abhinc centum annis scriptis tribuendum sit, non video . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 109) *Affixus nostris* (Cat.

116.8). Lege *at fixus*, et ita vetus scriptura. [*at fixus* was introduced by the zeta class manuscripts.]

*Editions:*

1577, Lutetiae (Paris): apud Mamertum Patissonium, in off. Rob. Stephani. With the texts of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius and commentaries on the three poets. *Index Aureliensis*, 134, 495; Adams C-1154; *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlvii; NUC. BL; BN; (MH; NcU; PBm; CSt).

1579. See above, Composite Editions. Scaliger is part of a variorum commentary on Catullus 4.

1582. See above, Composite Editions.

1593. See above, Composite Editions. Scaliger is part of a variorum commentary on Catullus 4.

1600, Heidelbergae (Heidelberg): in bibliopolio Commeliniano. With the texts of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius and commentaries on the three poets. Adams C-1162; *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlviii; NUC. BL; BN; (MH; CtY; CU).

1604. See above, Composite Editions. Scaliger is part of a variorum commentary.

(\*)1607, Lugduni (Lyons): Apud Anton de Harsy. Contents the same as in 1600 edition. *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlix; NUC. (NNR; MiU).

(\*)1608. See above, Composite Editions. Scaliger is part of a variorum commentary.

1659. See above, Composite Editions. Scaliger is part of a variorum commentary.

1680. See above, Composite Editions. Scaliger is part of a variorum commentary.

*b. Scaliger's commentary on Cat. 66 in the edition of B. Vulcanius*

*Preface* (ed. of Antwerp, 1584). [Inc.]: (p. 244) Adiciam Coronidis loco Callimachi poemation De Coma Berenices, latinis versibus a Catullo redditum, cum longe doctissimis V. Cl. Iosephi Scaligeri Castigationibus, quibus non tantum Catulli vulnera, quae illi Sciolorum quorundam temeritas inflixerat, curavit, sed magnam etiam Callimacho lucem adfert. Utinam vero magnus ille vir, etiam Callimachi fragmentis, quae misere lacera collegi, medicam aliquando manum adhibeat.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (p. 249) *Dulcis amor gyro* (Cat. 66.6). Ita docti viri ex *Govero* aut *givodero*. Nam et illud correptum ex *goero*. Goerus est Gyrus. Ausonius: "Octo et octoginta goeris, et super trigorio" [Aus., *Ecl.* 17.5]. Idem: "Additis ad hos priores goeros geminis

orbibus" [Aus., *Ecl.* 17.8]. Idem doctissimus poeta dixit *Coebum* pro *cubo*, ut olim in nostris Ausonianis lectionibus notavimus. Gyrus autem est flexus metae ut *Interiore diem gyro rapit*, hoc est, sinisteriore flexu. Spatium Lunae et Solis non mirabitur, qui scit eis bigas et quadrigas adtribui . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 262) *Fulgeat Oarion* (Cat. 66.94). Eiusdem, cuius et illa superiora, officinae est verbum *fulgeat*. Bonum quidem ipsum, sed quod Catullus tamen nunc non usurpat. *Fulgeret* enim posuit ut praeferunt scripti libri et antiquae editiones. *Fulgerare* archaicum ut *pignerare*, *temperare*. Glossae: fulgero ἀστράπτω.

#### Edition:

1584, Antverpiae (Antwerp): apud Christophorum Plantinum. With the texts of Callimachus, Moschus, and Bion and commentaries on the three poets by Bonaventura Vulcanius. *Index Aureliensis*, 129.592; Adams C-233; NUC. BL; BN (CtY; PBm; MoU).

#### Biography:

See CTC II, 13–14. Add to *Bibliography*: A. Grafton and H. J. de Jonge, *Joseph Scaliger: A Bibliography, 1852–1982* (The Hague, 1982); A. Grafton, "Joseph Scaliger's Edition of Catullus (1577) and the Traditions of Textual Criticism in the Renaissance," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XXXVIII (1975), 155–81; Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. I (Oxford, 1983), 161–79; A. Palmer and R. Ellis, "Scaliger's Liber Cujacianus of Propertius, Catullus, etc.," *Hermathena*, II (1876), 124–58; R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship, 1300–1800* (Oxford, 1976), 113–19 (the German translation, *Die klassische Philologie von Petrarca bis Mommsen* [Munich, 1982], 143–51, contains additional footnotes and references); J. J. Scaliger, *Lettres françaises inédites*, ed. P. Tamizey de Larroque (Paris and Agen, 1879; rpt. Geneva, 1970).

#### 16. Janus Dousa Pater

Janus Dousa began his literary career in 1569 with a book of Latin poetry based on various models, including Catullus. Over the next decade he continued to imitate Catullus' poetry in his own, but it was not until 1581 that he produced a scholarly treatment, the *Praecidanea pro Q. Valerio Catullo*. To a large extent the

work is the product of Dousa's friendships with Victor Giselinus and Janus Lernutius, with whom he shared a long-standing interest in both Catullus and Neo-Latin poetry.

In the late 1560s Giselinus was working on an edition and commentary on Catullus, which he planned to dedicate to Dousa (see gloss on Cat. 16.5, quoted below p. 273): Giselinus' publisher, Plantin, however, rushed the work into print in 1569 without the notes or dedication. There was some hope in the 1570s of a second edition that would include Giselinus' commentary, but the edition never materialized, and Giselinus' notes seem to have been lost, although the dedication, a poem in pure iambics, was later printed in Dousa's *Nova poemata* 1576 (fols. 2G1r–2r). While a second edition of Giselinus' text was still under consideration Dousa and Giselinus had frequent discussions about Catullus, as Dousa states in Chapter I of the *Praecidanea*. It may be, as Heesakkers has speculated, that Dousa waited to publish his ideas on Catullus out of deference to Giselinus, but it is also worth noting that the first of Dousa's scholarly works appeared only in 1580 (notes on Sallust).

The timing of the *Praecidanea* seems also to have been influenced by a purely literary event, the publication in 1579 of a volume of parodies entitled *Phaselus Catulli* by Giselinus and Janus Lernutius, who edited their work under the pseudonym Sixtus Octavianus (see p. 280 below) and dedicated it to Dousa under the pseudonym N. Ascanius. In the same year Lernutius produced a volume of his own Neo-Latin verse, a portion of which (the epigrams) he dedicated to Dousa. In gratitude for both dedications, Dousa (who seems to have associated the *Phaselus* primarily with Lernutius) dedicated his *Praecidanea* to Lernutius.

The *Praecidanea* are not a line-by-line commentary but rather a miscellaneous discussion of various Catullan problems. The work is divided into nine chapters, each preceded by a brief heading summarizing its contents. Dousa is primarily interested in Catullan usage and diction, which he elucidates by referring to other Latin poets. He frequently mentions contemporary poets as well as the scholarly works of Muretus, Statius, and Scaliger. The work is followed by sixteen poems, of which the first is a parody of Catullus 4 and the last a poem to Janus Lernutius.



*Dedication* (ed. of Antwerp, 1581). Janus Dousa Nordovix Jano Lernutio Brugensi S.D. [*Inc.*]: (p. 3) Estne, ut dixi? Et te (quod, tua utique ex parte, neque futurum unquam, neque adeo fieri posse, verbis conceptissimis, hoc est, PER OCELLOS TUOS, adiuraveras mihi) epistolarum frequentia vinco? Est: si quidem rationes utrinque convenire inter nos postulas, accepti atque expensi dico. Hic tu etiam criminatorem tuum insimulas, quasi communi in noxia manifesto haerentem, ac te taciturnitatis nostrae exemplo purgare cogitas mihi. Nequicquam. Tantum ad calculos sedeamus.

Scin' cuiusmodi? Specta igitur, ut scias. Bien-nium transisse iam vides, atque haec tertia a nobis Epistola aures etiamnum consopitas verberat tibi, utique post domuitionem e Batavis vestram. Ipse interea quid? literarum inquo. Equidem unas nobis expensas ferēs, scio, quas recens etiam tum a praelis madenti libello Carminum tuorum adiunxeras, veluti transmarini itineris comites. Salutem praeterea frequentem; non quidem per literas, sed vero per amicos interpretes, istinc porro ad nos commeare solitos, Dousae identidem renunciata verbis tuis. Atque haec anno. Restat horni ratio. Cuius me hercule conficiundae tabulis nobis Quaestoriis opus non erit. Ita minus, quam antea, etiam acceptum mihi, neque lucelli quidpiam relatum in Adversariis patet. Nisi tu forte, exemplo Catulli tui, inanissimum illum Praetorem suum *magno cum pretio et malo secuti* (cf. Cat. 28.7–8; 77.2), datum lucello referre nos postules; aut Phaselum etiam tuum imputandum censeas nobis, quem non minus musteum quam superiora illa, quae dixi, primitus Lipsius noster Lugduni tradidit mihi, de manu (quod aiunt) in manum, et quidem (portenti simile) sine schedula, sine epistolio aliquo. Sed cito conieci, operae haud fuisse tibi, teque (publicis, an domesticis?) occupationibus prohibitum, quo minus de munusculo isto tuo sermonem (ut soles) familiarem mecum serere per literas interpretes posses. Ut ut est, gratias tibi, mi Lernuti, pro munerum tuorum facetiis habeo, habeoque porro, dum vivam, semper. Nam qui aliter quaeso facere possim, quamdiu comitas haec nobis tua in oculos atque in animi mentem incurret? Quod eo etiam fit frequentius, quod ea sit scriptorum tuorum festivitas, is lepos ut me *ad se volentem ducant nolentem trahant*. Itaque vix est, ut haec unquam possim de manibus deponere. Ac ne in

opera te gratuita esse pigeat diutius, nosque ex eorum hominum ingeniis aestimare pergas porro, qui (ne non apud te quoque solenne illud meum, ut Plautissem, obtineam solens) *lingua tantummodo largiuntur, opera vero ac factis fallunt*; en tibi pro geminis germanis illis, lepidissimis libellis inquam tuis, *Praecidanea* haec nostra *plena ruris, et inficetiarum* [Cat. 36.19] . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 9) Illud tamen indictum nobis abire non debet, cur Catullum hunc potius, quam alium quempiam ex electissimo illo Principum Poetarum Triumviratu, sub nominis tui integumento apparere voluerim. Causae huiusce delectus multae, illa vero potissima, quod praeter ceteras in illustri positas virtutes tuas Musicas, priscae illius ac Catullianae festivitatis imaginem maxime in scriptis tuis recognoscere videor mihi; praesertim quoties OCELLOS istos contemplor, non quidem adumbratam ac fucosam illam, sed vero eapse numerorum mollitie, verborum elegantia, pondere sententiarum denique ac dictorum argutia planissime oppido, et quidem examussim, expressam. Itaque iam neque Quintiliam Calvi nobis, nec Smyrnam Cinniae, aut Lydiam etiam Catonis, veterum Catulli aequalium amores, magnopere desideramus, in quarum amissarum vicem Hyella Lernutiana (*gratior una tribus*) succidanea facta est nobis, ac contenti sumus hac Helena. Ad hos lepores cum Phaselus tuus accesserit insuper, miraris hoc iudicio nostro nos usos, ut Triumviratus huius Principem potius tibi, quam vel Tibullum, vel etiam Propertium inscriberemus? Sed quoniam Phaseli incidit mentio, haud alienum a more et instituto meo videor facturum, si explendae Parodiarum tuarum Decuriae, Iambos etiam nostros, huic libello per causam subtexuero, in quibus si a Catulli tibi ac *Ocellorum* tuorum archetypo longius fortasse quam velles, visus fuero recessisse, cogitare debes in tete omnem culpa istius invidiam residere potissimum, qui totum poetae nostri *μυροθήκιον*, et quantum adeo Valerianis arculis inerat pigmentorum, ita avariter excussum in narthecia, ususque absumpseris tuos, ut ne tenuissimam quidem Lesbiana istius, unguenti dico: *Illi quod Veneri Catullianae / Donarant Veneres, Cupidinesque*, gutticellam modo Catullientibus Phaseli tui vectoribus, nobis puta, aemulis ac rivalibus tuis reliquam porro ullam fecisse videaris . . . Conclusi (ut vides) epistolam versu, Di boni, quam praeter exemplum, *Et non ad Genium tui*

*Catulli*. Sed vero tute (ut dixi) in culpa; ego extra noxiam. Iterum vale. Filiolo auctum me scito, salva puerpera. Et viden', Carmen te Genethliacum debere? Vale etiam tertium, mi oculissime Lernuti. Ultratraiecto.

*Commentary*. [Inc.]: (p. 13) '*Pius Poeta*' (cf. Cat. 16.5), pro erudito; 'impious,' contra . . . Memini me ante septennium, hoc est, turbulentissimas istas, vereque decumanas civilis discordiae tempestates, cum Victore meo Giselino de nova Catulli editione (quam id temporis, doctis omnibus cupientissimis adornare se mihique adeo sollenni insuper nuncupatione appensa, propriam dicare dixerat) verbis pluribus accuratissime agere; notulasque in eum poetam aliquot meas in re praesenti coram recitando praeire, quarum Lectori, meum profecto non est, ut specimen invideam diutius, ne et integerrimi et subtilissimi viri iudicio, quo eae ipsae tum temporis serio hercule dilaudatae, uniceque comprobatae fuerunt, quicquam videar diffidere, in quibus et haec (uti spero) nomen suum profiteri non verebuntur: 'pium,' scilicet, 'poetam,' pro arguto et docto a doctissimo poeta positum esse eo versu, *Nam castum esse decet pium poetam/ ipsum, versiculos nihil necesse est* (Cat. 16.5–6) . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 58) *Et ille nunc superbus, et superfluens perambulabit omnium cubilia* (Cat. 29.7). *Superbus, et superfluens*, hoc loco, non tam ad immoderatum animi fastum, atque insolentiam, quam ad ea quae sequuntur porro referenda autumo: ad elationem fascini scilicet, in bellissimam quamque femellarum impetu facto, 'Vim illam Lucillianam evomentis promiscue;' atque in omnia omnium cubilia, nulla aut matronalis stolae, aut dignitatis suae habita ratione, temere ac passim ingrentis et penetrantis sese, atque eo in hanc sententiam sum proclivior, quod cum superbia ista penita superfluentiam coniunxerit poeta, quae tametsi prima fronte pro vitio, quod dixi, vel etiam pro infami foedeque prodiga pessime partarum opum effusione, posita videri possunt; tamen rem ipsam penitius inspicienti, facile, opinor, fuerit considerare, Valerium hunc nostrum non alio, quam ad plena et quasi praegnantia Mamurrae vasa, ad locorum eius multo semine turgentium proluviem in primis respicere voluisse.

*Editions:*

1581, Antwerpiae (Antwerp): ex officina Christophori Plantini. J. Machiels, *Catalogus*

*van de boeken gedrukt voor 1600 aanwezig op de Centrale Bibliotheek van de Rijksuniversiteit Ghent* (Ghent, 1979), I, 332; NUC. BN; Leiden University Library; (ICU).

(\*)1582, Antwerpiae (Antwerp): ex officina Christophori Plantini. Adams D-877; *Belgica typographica, 1541–1600*, I, 976; J. Machiels, *Catalogus van de boeken gedrukt voor 1600 aanwezig op de Centrale Bibliotheek van de Rijksuniversiteit Gent* (Ghent, 1979), I, 323. BL; Royal Library at the Hague.

1604. See above, Composite Editions. Dousa is part of a variorum commentary.

(\*)1608. See above, Composite Editions. Dousa is part of a variorum commentary.

1659. See above, Composite Editions. Dousa is part of a variorum commentary.

1680. See above, Composite Editions. Dousa is part of a variorum commentary.

*Biography:*

See CTC III, 329–30. Add to the *Bibliography*: H. Van Crombruggen, *Janus Lernutius (1545–1619): Een biografische studie* (Brussels, 1955), 9–20, 33; Van Crombruggen, *Lernutiana* (Brussels, 1959), in *Koninklijke vlaamse academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België. Letteren, Klasse der Mededelingen*, jaarg. 21, nr. 3; J. A. Van Dorsten, *Poets, Patrons and Professors* (Leiden, 1962); Ch. L. Heesakkers, *Praecidanea Dousana: Materials for a Biography of Janus Dousa Pater* (Amsterdam, 1976) (chapter 1 = *Lias II* [1975], 5–54 and 191–248).

17. Janus Dousa Filius

Less than a decade after Janus Dousa the elder published the *Praecidanea pro Q. Valerio Catullo* (see p. 271 above), his son Janus produced an edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, accompanied by *Coniectanea et notae* on all three poets, in a volume that also included the elder Dousa's *In Propertium Paralipomena*. Considering Dousa's extreme youth (he was only twenty-one when his work appeared), it is not surprising that he followed an earlier edition, as he states in the letter to the reader (p. 3) that prefaces his text. He does not identify the edition, saying only that it was very small (*minima illa ac manuarum forma*, p. 3) and had been corrected by a learned man for the present edition. According to *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlviii,

Dousa's text was based on that of the 1569 edition. There are two 1569 editions, but presumably Dousa used the Plantin edition of Giselinus rather than the Basel edition, as Dibdin suggests. The Basel edition is generally considered faulty and inaccurate, and there are good reasons for associating Dousa with Giselinus' text. Giselinus was a friend of Dousa's father, and his edition no doubt was well known also to young Dousa. It was published by the same printer as Dousa's edition, and its size (*duodecimo*) accords with Dousa's description.

Dousa's interests in the *Coniectanea et notae* are wide-ranging and various. He is interested in the text, although not in a systematic way, and he discusses readings suggested by his father and Scaliger, Lipsius, and Muretus. He adduces parallels for Catullan usage from many ancient authors but especially Callimachus and other Hellenistic poets. Translation, either of single Greek words and phrases or of whole poems, interests him, and he has long discussions of both Cat. 51 and Cat. 66.

Dousa's text and commentary are printed as two separate works and paginated separately; their colophons are essentially identical, and they are bound in a single volume. In the *Coniectanea et notae* the letter to the reader is followed by poems by Lipsius, Vulcanius, and Raphelengius celebrating Dousa's Catullus; a letter dedicating the work to Joseph Scaliger; a poem to Joseph Scaliger; and a poem to Julius Caesar Scaliger. The *Coniectanea et notae* consist of eleven chapters, in the first ten of which are grouped Catullus' poems, in order, with a discussion of one or two passages of interest in each. The heading of each chapter contains a summary of its contents. It is clear that the work was intended to consist of ten chapters, for Chapter 11 is announced as an afterthought and contains a miscellany of points that Dousa had neglected to insert in their correct chapters. The letter to the reader in the *Coniectanea et notae* is a preface to the commentaries on all three poets. The introduction to Chapter 1 serves as preface to Catullus.

*General Preface* (ed. of Leiden, 1592). Janus Dousa fil. Lectori. [*Inc.*]: (p. 3) Nihil solidioris eruditionis a Musarum sacrariis alienum esse testes esse possunt prisci Philosophi, qui in illis ipsis abstrusis et reconditis scientiis Poetarum fontibus hortulos suos irrigarunt; extra illas non

tamen commiserunt quin severiorum cogitationum nubila Poeticis interdum delinimentis abstergerent. Testes etiam vates ipsi qui sapientiam suam decentissimis numeris explicarunt . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 9) Vale, Lector, atque his frui, quae quidem promisso meo ampliora et opinione nostra longius excrevisse ne mireris. Siquidem in hoc stadio currentibus saepe accidit, ut prosiliens a carceribus currus spatia corripiat, neque audiat habenas priusquam pervenerit ad candidum calcem, in quo flexu sicubi fervidis rotis metam quam proxime strinxerim, agnoscas; sicubi improvide adhaeserim, ignoscas.

*Dedication.* Viro illustri atque incomparabili Josepho Scaligero Juli Caes. Filio Janus Dousa Fil. s.d. [*Inc.*]: (p. 13) Quae ad Veronensem poetam et in maiorum tuorum ditone natum et industria tua velut renatum, Josepho Scaliger, novo quidem opere, sed nondum arida pumice satis expolito, notavi, ea ad te non tam Veronae quam ingenii doctrinaeque principem suffragiis eruditorum, praefidentius fortasse quam par est, perpendenda recensendaque mitto . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 13) eximio certe et maximo laboris mei fructu, si id consequar, nonnullo etiam, si minus consequar, imbutis scilicet hac opinione lectorum animis non nisi optima esse posse quae inscripta tali viro; cuius admirationem nobis assidua cognoscendi consuetudo, quia nunquam satis cognoscimus, excutere non potest, quemque praesenti contemplatione propius venerari magis magisque quotidie exoptamus.

*Preface to Catullus.* [*Inc.*]: (p. 17) Quantumvis in perpurgando Catullo laboratum iam pridem sit a doctissimis ea cura ac diligentia, quam merebatur auctor tantus; tamen ex tam uberi messe spicas etiamnum aliquas esse reliqui erroris, quae a nobis legi mereantur, atque aliquid etiam ab illis relictum desiderari, quod novis operis expleri atque sarciri possit, facile mihi aequi omnes et boni dabunt. Neque enim in ullius hominis esse arbitror potestate, ut exhaustat sequentium ingeniorum foecunditatem, praesertim in hoc studio, quod velut Africa est, et in quo, ut in humanae vitae curriculo, nunquam ita quisquam bene rationes subduxit, 'Quin res, aetas, usus semper aliquid apportet novi.' Quod cum viderem, neque summos illos viros viam posteriorum industriae obstruere voluisse existimarem, collocatos in ea laudis arce quam ad omnem posteritatis memoriam sibi exaedificassent, facile me in eam sententiam

pertrahi passus sum, ut nihil eruditissimorum interpretum maiestate deterritus, in hac silva si quod materiae superesset nondum ab aliis edolatum, efformare atque exasciare tentarem, et opis aliquid afferre politissimo scriptori, praesertim iis in locis, qui aut mendosi aut obscuri aut a nemine hactenus satis explicati essent. Ad principium huius libri.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (p. 18) *Quoi dono lepidum novum libellum / Arida modo pumice expolitum?* (Cat. 1.1–2) Respexisse Plinium Naturalis Historiae lib. xxxv, cap. xxi his verbis, ‘Sed et ii pumices qui sunt in usu corporum levigandorum faeminis, iam quidem et viris, atque, ut ait Catullus, libris,’ alii monuerunt . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 56) *Jupiter ut, etc.* (Cat. 66.48). Ad Euripidis exemplum illic a me citatum adde hoc Aeschylī in Agamemnone [quotes Ag. 1080–82].

#### *Editions:*

1592, Lugdunum Batavorum (Leiden): ex off. Plantiniana, apud Franciscum Raphelengium. Adams C–1160; NUC. BL; BN; (ICU; NcU).

1604. See above, Composite Editions. Dousa is part of a variorum commentary.

(\*)1608. See above, Composite Editions. Dousa is part of a variorum commentary.

1659. See above, Composite Editions. Dousa is part of a variorum commentary.

1680. See above, Composite Editions. Dousa is part of a variorum commentary.

#### *Biography:*

See CTC III, 333–34.

#### 18. Johannes Passeratius

Passeratius’ notes on Catullus were collected and published in 1608, six years after his death, by his nephew Jean de Rougevalet, who also supervised the publication of his other posthumous works.

The commentary consists of brief remarks, often concerning the text but sometimes citing parallels or discussing mythological allusions or nuances of Catullus’ diction. Some poems are not discussed at all; most receive one or two comments. There are fuller commentaries on Cat. 61, 62, 64, and 65, and all but the last of these receive a short introduction. Passeratius elucidates Catullus with a wide range of Latin and Greek authors, including Vergil, Horace, Plautus, Tertullian, Theocritus, Antimachus,

and Callimachus. He refers to many of his scholarly predecessors, especially Scaliger, Muretus, Guarinus, and Statius.

For the most part the notes are little more than glosses, and one may perhaps doubt whether Passeratius intended to produce a commentary. We are fortunate, however, in having Passeratius’ notes on which the published commentary was based and in being able to reconstruct the editorial process, whether the compiler was Passeratius or his industrious nephew. The notes are contained in Passeratius’ copy of the 1559 edition of Muretus, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Rés. p.Yc. 390). The notes and printed commentary are not identical, but there is a considerable overlap. The 1608 edition includes and expands a large number (but not all) of the manuscript comments and tends to be fuller only in its elucidation of Cat. 61, 62, 64, and 65, mentioned above. In the manuscript many of the notes with parallels in the printed commentary are marked with an asterisk, as if indicating a selection among the marginalia to be included in print. The manuscript notes seem to be the only extant source for the commentary. The few remarks on the longer poems found in the commentary and not in the marginalia may have been supplied by Passeratius’ nephew or from other notes of Passeratius himself. They are not derived from Passeratius’ *Praefatio in Epithalamium Catulli* (also published posthumously, in 1606).

There is no date in Passeratius’ manuscript notes, but he probably wrote the bulk of his marginalia between 1577 and 1597 (when he suffered a crippling stroke). It was well known in the late 1570s that Passeratius had notes on Catullus, for the Italian humanist Jacopo Corbinielli made more than one attempt in 1578–79 either to see the notes or to get Passeratius’ opinion on some passages and on Scaliger’s edition and commentary (see p. 267 above). Corbinielli was not successful, for Passeratius claimed to have corrected only one of the passages in question and not to have examined Scaliger’s Catullus closely. He was surely disingenuous in at least the second claim, for even without the evidence of the manuscript notes, which frequently mention Scaliger, it is almost inconceivable that any humanist of the period, especially one interested in Latin poetry, would not have made a thorough study of Scaliger’s work, which was both famous and controversial almost

as soon as it appeared. Passeratius may have felt that his notes were not ready for public circulation (and he seems to have made no attempt to publish them himself), but it is also likely that he feared plagiarism by Corbinelli and controversy with Scaliger. Certainly, he frequently takes issue in the printed commentary with both Scaliger's judgment and his reporting of the text preserved in Cujas' manuscript.

The 1608 edition includes the texts of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, followed by a commentary on each author. The text of Catullus is not Passeratius'; the *Ed. Bipont.* (1783) says it is Scaliger's, though Dibdin attributes it to the younger Dousa (see p. 273). The dedication to the Duc de Sully precedes the three texts and serves as an introduction to the whole. As in Scaliger's edition, the first note is a discussion of Catullus' *praenomen* and serves as an introduction to the commentary.

*Dedication* (ed. of Paris, 1608). Illustrissimo et Clarissimo D.D. Maximiliano de Bethuna, Suyllio Duci, Marchioni Rosnio, Pari Franciae, omni Armamentario Gallico aerarioque praefecto et apud Pictones Proregi. [*Inc.*]: (fol. a2r) Admonitu veteris poetae, Dux Illustrissime, hunc avunculi mei τοῦ μακαρίτου Propertium, duobus eiusdem operae sodalibus comitatum, tuo nomini dicandum putavi: *Carmen amat, quisquis Carmina digna gerit* . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. a2v) Hanc meriti gratiam Heroici tui manes sibi referri quondam sentient a Passeratii genio, cuius tu reliquiis vitam pervigiliis alteram das lucem. Vale Dux Illustrissime.

*Introduction.* Ioannis Passeratii Professoris et Interpretis Regii in C. Valerii Catulli Epigrammata Notae. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 1r) Scaliger Catullum praenomine Quintum vocat levi coniectura ex versiculo ad ianuam: *Verum isti populo Janua Quite facit* (Cat. 67.12) pro Quinte, additque praenomen ita scriptum in libro ms. Jacobi Cuiacii V.C. Alii, ut. D. Hieronymus in Chronicis Eusebii, et Apuleius in Apologia, Caium praenominant, quod librorum, qui hactenus excusi, fide nititur. Caius autem, sive Gaius, qui primus praenominatus est, ita dictus fuit a gaudio parentum. Auctor libri, cuius lemma De praenomine, fuit Catullus e gente Valeria, quae summa antiquitate censetur. Valerii, qui et Valesii, Festus in *Aurelia*, boni ominis nomen; ideoque in dilectu censuque primi nominabantur, Valerius, Salvius, Stratorius, Festus in *Lacus lucrinus*. Tres

autem eius gentis poetae extant, Valerius Catullus, Valerius Flaccus, Valerius Martialis. Extat et nomen Valerii Aeditui. Praeter hunc Catullum fuit et alter poeta Urbicarius mimographus, de quo Iuvenalis.

*Commentary.* [*Inc.*]: (fol. 1r) *Credo ut tum gravis acquiescat ardor* (Cat. 2.8). Vetus liber Cuiacii, error, non ardor, quod silentio praeteriit Scaliger. Non improbari tamen debet. Nam et Amor insanus et error mentis insania dicitur. Unde Amor etiam error vocatur. Virgilius ecloga 8 *Ut vidi ut perii, ut me malus abstulit error* (Verg., *Ecl.* VIII.41) expressit videlicet illud ex Theocriti Pharm. (Passeratius quotes Theocr., *Id.* II.82). Ita igitur dictus est error gravis Catullo, ut Virgilio error malus. Propertius quoque novum errorem pro novo amore dixit Elegia 3, lib. I. *Quae tibi sit felix, quoniam novus incidit error* (Prop. I.13.35). Idem errata vocaverat elegia 9 eiusdem libri: *Quare si pudor est, quamprimum errata fatere. / Dicere quo pereas saepe in amore levat* (Prop. I.9.32–33) . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 76r) *Caetera sunt maria* (Cat. 115.2). Proverbialiter hoc dictum putat Scaliger. Ego Euripum aliquem aut Nilum significari puto in villa Formiana. Nam superiore epigrammate dixit illic esse omne genus pisces. Plinius de Lucullo, *Exciso monte Euripem et maria invexit* (Pliny, *H.N.* 9.170). Videndus Cicero initio libri 2 de legibus. *Non bono, sed vere mentula magna nimis* (Cat. 115.8). vet. lib. *mentula magna minax*. Videtur depravasse versum Ennii: *Machina multa minax minitatur maxima muris* (Enn., *Ann.* 621). An adludit ad custodem hortorum, qui *Inguinibus puero, praedoni falce minatur* (Col., *De re rust.* X.34), ut iocetur in Mamurrani terculamentum.

#### *Editions:*

1608, Parisiis (Paris): apud Cl. Morellum. With the texts of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and the *Priapea*, and commentaries on Tibullus and Propertius. *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlix; NUC. BL; BN; (PV; CtY; TxU).

1659. See above, Composite Editions. Passeratius is part of a variorum commentary.

1680. See above, Composite Editions. Passeratius is part of a variorum commentary.

#### *Biography:*

Johannes Passeratius (Jean Passerat) was born in Troyes October 18, 1534, and died in Paris, September 14, 1602.

As a child Passeratius was in the care of his maternal uncle Canon Thienot, who took charge of his education. He proved an unwilling pupil and ran away to Bourges (where he supported himself by working in a smithy and fishing) and then on to Sancerre, spending several months in the care of a monk of Saint-Satur before returning to Troyes. There he was received by his uncle, who again enrolled him in the local school, where he continued his studies with great success. At the age of sixteen he was sent to Paris to study at the Collège de Reims but soon returned to Troyes and studied under the Latinist Jean Lescot, who took him back to Paris when he became professor of rhetoric at the Collège du Plessis. Lescot taught the advanced classes and young Passeratius (now about twenty) the elementary.

In the late 1550s Passeratius moved first to the Collège du Cardinal Lemoine and then to the Collège de Boncourt, where he numbered among his students the poets Ronsard and Baïf. He began to write poetry of his own, publishing his first work, *L'adieu à Phoebus et aux Muses* and *Ode à Bacchus*, in 1559. Sometime before 1559 Passeratius lost an eye as the result of an injury—an affliction commemorated in *L'adieu à Phoebus*.

Despite the loss, he continued his scholarship. From 1565 to 1567 he studied Roman law under the great jurist Cujas in Bourges and soon was lecturing on the subject to enthusiastic audiences in Paris. Among his hearers was the wealthy Henri de Mesmes, already a patron of letters. De Mesmes encouraged and cultivated Passeratius and engaged him to be the tutor of his son. In 1570 Passeratius took up residence in the de Mesmes household, where he remained until 1597, the year after de Mesmes' death. Each New Year's Day from 1570 until 1596 he presented his patron with a Latin poem; in 1597 he collected and published these tributes under the title *Kalendae Januariae*.

It was through the influence of de Mesmes that Passeratius was named professor of eloquence in the Collège de France in 1572, to replace Ramus, who had been killed in the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. He held the position until 1597. Passeratius celebrated his appointment in the New Year's poem of 1573, thanking de Mesmes and rejoicing that at last he would be free of poverty. His optimism was only partly

justified, however, for his salary often went unpaid, and he was forced to petition the king on more than one occasion for back wages.

During his twenty-five years at the Collège de France, Passerat worked on several philological projects, most of which were published only after his death. He was a famous lecturer and opened each course with an oration. Twenty-nine of these are preserved in a posthumous work, *Orationes et praefationes*, published in 1602. Scholarship, however, was never Passeratius' only concern. He continued to write poetry and was increasingly drawn into the political and religious controversies of the day. When the Catholic League controlled Paris in 1593 and the schools were closed, Passeratius and his friends, under the leadership of Pierre Leroy, composed and published *Satyre Menipée de la vertu de Catholicon d'Espagne*. The work took Paris by storm and was later said to have helped Henri IV as much as the Battle of Ivry.

Passeratius returned to his duties at the Collège de France after the decisive victory of Henri IV in 1594 and continued to lecture until 1597, when he suffered the stroke that paralyzed and blinded him. For a time he was able to work with the aid of a secretary, and in 1598 he published *De caecitate oratio*. Soon, however, he became completely helpless. He died in 1602. His nephew Jean de Rougevalet was his literary executor and published much of his work with the financial backing of the Duc de Sully.

*Works:* Passeratius wrote both French and Latin poetry on various topics ranging from the satiric to the serious, and his work includes erotic elegies as well as occasional poetry. His philological studies were equally varied. In addition to the commentaries on the Latin elegists, he translated Apollodorus (published in 1605) and wrote the satirical *Praefatiuncula in disputationem de Ridiculis* (1594). The letter was based on a course of lectures given in 1594, after the triumph of Henri IV and the reopening of the university. Passeratius' ostensible subject was Book II of Cicero's *De oratore*, but in fact the work is an attack on the Catholic League and the Jesuits. His unpublished works include translations from Ovid and Homer (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale mss. fr. 2310 and 2311). Perhaps his most characteristic work, however, is to be found in his annual lectures, *Orationes et*

*praefationes* (published in 1606). Here Passeratius discourses on a number of Latin authors but especially on his favorites, Plautus, Cicero, and Propertius. All of Passeratius' biographers speak of his great personal charm and his talent as a lecturer, and these qualities are manifest in the *Orationes et praefationes*. The *Praefatio in Epithalamium Catulli*, which is a catalog of the Roman deities associated with marriage followed by an account of the marriage ceremony, ends on a characteristic note: "Non progrediar hodie longius. Satis enim negotii uno die confecit qui mulierem ornavit, compserit, et deduxerit" (ed. of 1606, p. 249).

A detailed list of Passeratius' works is to be found in Cioranescu.

*Bibliography:* Michaud, XXXII, 226–27; Nicéron, II, 320–32; P. Blanchemain, *Les poésies françaises de Jean Passerat* (Paris, 1880), I, i–xxiii; R. Calderini de Marchi, *Jacopo Corbinelli et les érudits français* (Milan, 1914), 159–63; A. Cioranescu, *Bibliographie de la littérature française du seizième siècle* (Paris, 1959), 548–49; M. de Gaillon, "Passerat dans sa chaire du Collège de France," *Bulletin du bibliophile et du bibliothécaire*, 5th ser. (1861), 13–32; A. Goujet, "Jean Passerat," *Bibliothèque française*, XIV (Paris, 1752), 1–19; C. Des Guerrois, *Jean Passerat, poète et savant* (1856; rpt. Geneva, 1969); K. C. K. Merken, "Jean Passerat, Poet and Humanist" (diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1966); E. von Mojsisovich, *J. Passerat, sein Leben und seine Persönlichkeit* (Halle, 1907).

#### 19. Theodorus Marcilius

The *Asterismi* of Theodorus Marcilius first appeared in the Paris compendium of 1604 (see p. 222 above)—the only work in the volume not previously published. Although the dedication to Andreas Laurentius (André du Laurens) is dated 1604, it bears little relation to the work itself, and it is possible that the *Asterismi* were composed much earlier. In 1599 Isaac Casaubon, recently arrived in Paris, was summoned to visit Marcilius, then almost at the acme of his fame and importance (he would be appointed Johannes Passeratius' successor as professor of eloquence in the Collège de France in 1602). Casaubon obeyed the summons, and in July

1599 he wrote a scathing account to J. J. Scaliger of his encounter with the man he dubbed *paedagogorum Apollo*. In Marcilius' room were stored the fruits of his prodigious labors in every field, including commentaries on Greek and Latin authors. All awaited the ideal moment for publication: it was Marcilius' plan to wait until other scholars had published and then to show up their feeble efforts with his own brilliance. Casaubon is not a disinterested reporter, but it is certainly tempting to suppose that one of Marcilius' pigeonholes contained the *Asterismi*.

Though impressively learned, Marcilius' notes are thin and contribute little to the understanding of Catullus or his text. One is reminded of Scaliger's famous barb: "saepe mirari soleo illum tantum scriptorum legisse, ideo ut nihil sciret" (*Scaligeri Epistolae* [1627], 198). The *Asterismi* are primarily concerned with textual points and often refute the ideas of unnamed previous scholars. Sometimes it is clear that Marcilius is thinking of Scaliger, as for example, on Cat. 10.13, where he says "nihil facit correctio 'nec facerent'" (*nec facerent* was the reading approved by Scaliger). Throughout the notes Marcilius refers to Catullus as Valerius or Valerius Catullus, no doubt in response to the controversy stirred up by Scaliger's assertion that the *praenomen* of Catullus was Quintus, not Gaius. The *Asterismi* exerted little influence. The work was sent as a peace offering to Casaubon, with whom Marcilius had feuded almost from the moment of Casaubon's arrival in Paris; we are told that Casaubon received it graciously but not that he read it. The *Asterismi* were reprinted twice in the seventeenth century and included in the English Delphin edition (1822).

*Dedication* (ed. of Paris, 1604). Medendi laude C TR Q. Orn. Cl. V. Andreae Laurentio, Henrici IV Galliae et Navarrae Regis, Consiliario, Medicoque ordinario. S. Theodorus Marcilius. [*Inc.*]: (p. 3) Poeta venit in clientelam tuam Valerius Catullus neque plebei spiritus et de trivio aliquis poeta, sed Valerius Catullus poeticae nationis flos ipse, qui quanto *συντέχνους* suis sive ut locuti olim *conforaneis* in pretio fuerit, *utque viro Phoebi chorus adsurrexerit omnis* [Verg., *Ecl.* VI.66], ut omnium suffragiis unus docti poetae nomen tulerit, longissimus sermo esset, ut quidem metus non sit quin huiusce sortis clientelam, quivis patronus sibi ho-



nestissimam arbitretur . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 4) Brevis ad hanc mihi rem oratio est. Etenim si praeclarius aliquis ingenii mei fetus lucem videre posset, tuus illa verna esset. Hic quidem qualis qualis est, optimo iure tuus est. Hanc quasi glebam tibi offero, in qua fundum ipsum uti optimus maxumus est vindicare possis. Lutetiae Parisiorum e. a. d. III Id. Mart. MDCIV.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (p. 5) *Arida modo* (Cat. 1.2). Sic melius quam *arido* etsi *arido* legit Terentian. lib. de metris, Victorinus lib. iv, Atilius Fortunatianus, Isidorus, c. xi. lib. vi. Item alii . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 19) *Tela infesta meum mittere in usque caput* (Cat. 116.7–8). Legere aliqui *telis infestans mi icere musca caput*. Alii *telis infesto mi icere musca caput* et acceperunt: *telis infesto mihi armato mihi*. Veteres: *telis infestum mittere musque caput*. Fuit opinor: *telis infestum icere mi usque caput*. Cur *infestum* illud mutavere omnes? Quia non adtendere *infestum*, usurpari pro *infestato*. L. A. Gellius c. xii. lib. ix. M. vero literam sic manere in versu nota res.

*Letter to the Reader.* Lectori meo s. [Inc.]: (p. 20) Paucula in Valerium Catullum haec notata mihi, lector amicissime, dieculae operam ut δόσιν ὀλίγου τε φίλιου τε accipias velim. Potui plura. Nam quae uberius messis quam Catullum aut recensere aut interpretari, cuius et libri mendis oppleti et carmina ingenii acumine doctrinaeque copia singulari sunt? . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 20) Invitissimus equidem finem facio, lector amicissime, quia perlibenter de laudibus Valerii dico sed iam negotii mei forte et tui tempus admonet ut votum tibi meum adponam optantis te bellissime valere. Lutetiae e. a. d. iii. Id. Martii MDCIV.

#### *Editions:*

1604. See above, Composite Editions. Catullus is part of a variorum commentary.

1608. See above, Composite Editions. Catullus is part of a variorum commentary.

1680. See above, Composite Editions. Catullus is part of a variorum commentary.

1822. See above, Composite Editions. Catullus is part of a variorum commentary.

#### *Biography:*

See CTC III, 302. Add to the *Bibliography*: Michaud, XXVI, 501; C. P. Goujet, *Mémoire historique et littéraire sur le Collège Royal de France* (Paris, 1758; rpt. Geneva, 1971), II,

377–89; M. Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, 2d ed. (Oxford, 1892), 168–71.

#### 20. Johannes Livineius

Johannes Livineius died in 1599, and his notes on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius came into the hands of his friend Andreas Schottus, who lent them to Janus Gebhardus some years later. Gebhardus transcribed the notes and incorporated them into the second printing (1621) of his edition of the three poets. He probably acquired the notes in 1619 because they do not appear in the first printing (1618), and Livineius is not mentioned in its preface.

It is not known when Livineius worked on Catullus, but from his frequent references to Scaliger, we can assume that it was after 1577. The notes themselves are brief. Livineius is concerned primarily with explaining usage, although he also cites parallel passages, discusses textual problems, and frequently takes issue with the interpretations of Muretus (see p. 260 above) and Scaliger.

*Dedication* (ed. of Frankfurt, 1621). Clarissimo Praestantissimoque Viro Dn. Henrico Albertio Hamiltono s.p. Janus Gebhardus. [Inc.]: (fol. A2r) Benigniore fato accidit, Praestantissime Hamiltone, ut mihi tecum apud Cl. Gruterum nostrum notitia nata sit; dein maior familiaritas in convictu D. Nicolai Backendorffii Medici p.m. adoleverit . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. A2v) Quam non sim vanus, iudices nunc velim, cum tibi in longinquis regionibus posito Doctissimi Livinei notas in Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium inscriptas adfero. Desperaverant eae proculdubio lucem tanto post auctoris obitum intervallo dispretae ac derelictui habitae; sed scripti Genius, me vindice, tenebras atque oblivionem eluctabitur, praeceunte V. Cl. et ad literas iuvandas ornandasque producto Andrea Schotto, qui mihi librum totum Livinei manu conscriptum ante biennium utendum transmiserat, ut inde quae vellem in privatos usus exciperem. Virgula divina contigerunt mihi, ut eriperentur interitu. Nam aliquos fuisset reperire, qui alieno labore in se transmoto, in furtivo schemate basilice ne suam operam ignaris venditatum in Famae theatrum irrupissent praestolati optimi Schotti fatum, cum quo omnis notitia scripti huius foret sepulta. Degeneris et abiecti animi sunt talibus inhiantes. Ego contra ingenuitatis

meae esse duxi sudore maximo acerrimaque oculorum fatigatione fugientes literas indagare. Inde saepius felici coniectura vestigia veritatis ipsorumque Livinei verborum ordinem erui paucis exceptis, quae neque mea neque arcessita acie vel ipsius Lyncei erat deprehendenda. Tanto beneficio obligati Doctissimi Livinei Manes non indignabuntur mihi, si sub nomine viri literatissimi et poeticis palaestris subactissimi postumas eius observationes emisero. Neque tibi, Hamilton humanissime, rubori erit copulari cum tantis viris, in quorum ipse flagrantissima gratia es; ideoque et illi minus adsessu tuo frontem contrahent. Vive quam optime ac diutissime Daniaeque tuae illustre sidus exorere. Vale. MDCXXI, Mense Sextili.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (p. 1) *Ad Cornelium Nepotem* (title of Cat. 1). Corneli Nepotis, cui librum Catullus dedicat, Chronicorum meminit Ausonius. Turneb. 13. cap. 14 . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 21) *Data*. (Cat. 110.6). Munera, ut Propert. *hei nullis capta Lycinna datis* Eleg. 13. lib. III.

#### *Editions:*

1621, Frankofurti (Frankfort): in Officina Wecheliana apud Danielelem et Davidem Aubrios et Clementem Schleichium. With the text of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius; notes of Janus Meleager on Catullus; notes of Gebhardus and Livineius on Tibullus and Propertius. *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), 1; NUC. Vatican Library; BL; (MH; NcU; PU).

#### *Biography:*

See CTC V, 179–80.

## II. CATULLUS 4

### COMMENTARIES

#### I. "Sixtus Octavianus" (= Janus Lernutius and Victor Giselinus)

Cat. 4 is an Alexandrian tour de force. It lavishly employs Greek prosody, morphology, and syntax and is written in pure iambics, a nearly intractable meter. It purports to be the self-description of a yacht (*phaselus*) now retired and musing on its past. The conceit has some parallels in the *Greek Anthology*, which contains several epigrams on "speaking objects" (including A.P. 1x.34 and 36, where ships speak in their own person), but in Catullus the device is

different, for the boat's words are only reported by the poet, and repeated reminders of this fact create the impression that it is chatty and self-important. The distinctive qualities of Cat. 4 were not lost on the poet of the *10th Catalepton* (whom many identify with the youthful Vergil), and he produced a close parody exploiting them for a satiric attack on a certain Sabinus. To judge from the surviving examples, full-scale literary parody was not much practiced in antiquity, but it became something of an art form in the Renaissance, and Cat. 4 was an irresistible subject. Renaissance parodists were no doubt attracted by the same qualities that had caught the eye of the poet of the *10th Catalepton*, but their temptation was increased by the nearly universal identification of that poet with Vergil. The challenge was to imitate Vergil imitating Catullus, and dozens of Renaissance poets tried their hand. Among the first was Georgius Anselmus (d. 1528), whose "speaking object" is the *libellus* of Vergil. Julius Caesar Scaliger wrote several parodies, and Joseph Scaliger translated Catullus' poem into Greek.

In 1579 Janus Lernutius and Victor Giselinus published a collection of Catullan parodies under the pseudonym Sixtus Octavianus, which they called *Phaselus Catulli* and dedicated to their friend Janus Dousa the elder (see p. 271) under the pseudonym N. Ascanius (Van Crombruggen, "Lernutiana," 3). The *Phaselus* contains commentaries and parodies on Cat. 4, with parodies on a few other poems of Catullus and several Horatian odes. The commentaries of Muretus, Statius, and Scaliger on Cat. 4 are included. Giselinus and Lernutius gathered their parodies from various published sources but added three of their own, together with a commentary on Cat. 4 and the other parodies. The division of labor is not entirely clear, but the probability is that Lernutius wrote the parodies and Giselinus the commentary. A decade earlier Giselinus had edited Catullus for Plantin with the intention of including notes and a dedication to Janus Dousa. The edition was mistakenly printed without either, and it is likely that Giselinus took the opportunity in the *Phaselus* to recoup his losses with the pseudonymous dedication to Dousa and a portion of his earlier notes.

A second, expanded edition of the *Phaselus* was published in 1593, and in 1642 another anthology closely modeled on it was compiled

by Nicolaus Henelius with a commentary by Andreas Senftleben.

In 1584 Lernutius and Giselinus completed a second collection of Catullan parodies, which they called *Manes Catulli sive Ad omnia eiusdem Catulli epigrammata parodiae*. The *Manes Catulli* was never published but is preserved in a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Royale in Brussels (II.2365). Its 115 epigrams are largely in the hand of Lernutius, but Giselinus has added some annotations.

*Preface* (ed. of "York," 1579). [*Inc.*]: (p. 34) Fecit admiratio Catulli, poetae non tam communi nomine quam re vera doctissimi, quicquid sentiant alii qui contra sentiunt, ut propter voluptatem, quam ex hoc etiam poematio singularem capiebamus, in mentem nobis venerit, alios omnes, qui et olim et hodie idipsum imitari summa ingenii contentione sunt conati, in unum quasi fascem colligere, eosdemque inter se mutuo componere. Quae voluptas cum liberalibus ingeniis maxime sit digna, neque inutilis iis qui ad veram ac rectam imitandi rationem adspirant; libuit nonnulla, quae praeter aliorum inventa eodem annotavimus, in commune conferre. Ea opella qualis qualis est, non ingrata fortassis iis erit, qui nos, citra acerbitem, facile videbunt mero animi candore usos esse, et rem ex re ubique exputasse. Si fallimur, homines enim sumus, sola certa rei novitas spem nobis facit futurum, ut eundem animi candorem ab aliis vicissim impetremus.

*Commentary* [*Inc.*]: (p. 34) *Phaselus ille*. (Cat. 4.1). Scripsisse videtur hoc carmen occasione redditus sui e Bithynia provincia, cuius profectionis frequens in toto opere fit mentio . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 35) *Senet quiete*. (Cat. 4.26). Quod de illo qui versus in Sabinum fecit, hoc loco notat Achill. Staius, parum illo dignum est. Aliud enim est senium huius phaseli, aliud sella curulis, aliud denique sedes navium in sua statione. Quae vero ex Prisciano idem adducit, ea in duobus optimis manuscriptis sic lego: Catullus: *Sed haec fuere: nunc recondita senet quiete*. *Senesco* enim inchoativum. Sallustius in III. Historiarum: *Omnes quibus*, etc., quae verba sic accipio ut Priscianus exemplo Catullino ostendat verbum *seneo* itidem in usu esse, ut *senesco*, ab eoque deduci participium *senectus*, quod alius quis non a *seneo*, sed a *senesco* deformasset.

*Dedication*. Ad Clarissimum et Eruditissimum Virum N. Ascanium. [*Inc.*]: (p. 67)

Catulle optime, et optimi Catulli  
Vos vestigia proxime insecuti  
Vates, quos parili Thalia cursu  
In certamine dispari phaselum  
Illam maximi et optimi poetae  
Vidit non parili arte consecutos:  
Vos o vos lepidissimi poetae  
Ite, et Ascanium tenete vestrum  
Vestris deliciis leporibusque;  
Quem nunc Curia seriis severis  
In rebus tenet occupatque totum.  
Illi post strepitus negotiorum  
Quae circum saliunt caput latusque,  
Cum fessam nimio labore mentem  
Musisque et solitae dabit quieti,  
Credo ut e tenebris vetusta multa  
Sepulta eruat, et novo nitore  
Tincta, postgenitorum in ora prodat:  
Frontem exporgite et expedite auras.  
Tam grati ipsi eritis, fuisse gratum  
Quam ferunt bene passerem venustum  
Olim maximi et optimi Catulli  
Missum maximo et optimo Maroni.  
Sixtus Octavianus

#### *Editions:*

1579. See above, Composite Editions. "Sixtus" is part of a variorum commentary.

1593. See above, Composite Editions. "Sixtus" is part of a variorum commentary.

#### *Biography:*

a. Victor Giselinus (Victor Giselin, Victor Ghyselinck) was born in Zandvoorde near Ostend March 22, 1539, and died at Berg-Saint-Winoc (now Bergues) near Dunkirk in 1591.

Giselinus matriculated at the University of Louvain in 1554, received his Arts degree two years later, and continued the study of classical literature in Bruges. Inspired by Arnold Laurens Berchemus, his teacher in Bruges, he began to work on Prudentius, whom he studied and edited over a period of several years. Philology was his principal interest, and although as a practical necessity he began to study medicine in Paris in 1560 or 1561, he always continued his philological studies as much as financial exigency allowed. While he was still a medical student in Paris he published his first edition of Prudentius; two years later he completed the preface of his commentary on Prudentius, which was printed with the edition by Pulmannus. Plantin, the printer of this work, hired him near the end of

1564 as a proofreader, and he remained with Plantin for about two years, becoming a member of Plantin's circle and publishing several philological studies. After leaving Plantin, he traveled extensively through Flanders and Holland, and it was probably in this period that he first met Janus Dousa the elder, with whom he was to maintain a close friendship for several years. Giselinus managed the publication of Dousa's first book in 1569, introduced him to his friends Justus Lipsius and Janus Lernutius, and planned to dedicate his edition of Catullus to him (1569). Plantin printed the edition without either the notes Giselinus had written for it or the dedication to Dousa, but the dedication is probably preserved in Dousa's *Nova poemata* (1576), fols. 2G1r-2r.

In 1571 Giselinus resumed his medical studies, this time at the University of Dôle, in France, and received his degree in 1572 at a ceremony in which his friend Lipsius delivered the oration: "Utrum iurisprudentia an medicina plus boni hominibus attulerit." He began the practice of medicine in Bruges and married in 1576. He published his first and only medical book in 1579 and dedicated it to Janus Dousa, who reciprocated with the dedication to Giselinus of his commentary on Horace. It was also in 1579 that Giselinus and Lernutius published their *Phaselus Catulli*; the companion volume, *Manes Catulli*, was finished in 1584. In 1583 Giselinus, never contented with his enforced choice of medicine over philology, tried to obtain a professorship at the newly established University of Leiden but failed in spite of the efforts of Dousa and Lipsius on his behalf. He left Bruges, spent some time in Rouen, and finally became town physician in Berg-Saint-Winoc, where he spent his last years. He left his papers to Janus Lernutius, who proved an unreliable literary executor, for he published none of them and may have tried to appropriate some of Giselinus' poems by striking out his name in the manuscript of *Manes Catulli*.

*Works:* In addition to the *Phaselus* and *Manes Catulli*, Giselinus wrote several other works, mostly of a philological character. His edition of Prudentius with notes was published in Paris in 1562 and went through several reprintings, while his commentary on Pulmannus' text of Prudentius was printed in Antwerp in 1564. In

1566 he edited Ovid's *Metamorphoses* for Plantin, adding marginal notes that were frequently reprinted, and revised the *Sententiae antiquorum poetarum* of Georgius Maior. He edited Catullus (1569), but was disappointed by Plantin's omission of his notes. Plantin published his edition with notes of Sulpicius Severus in 1574, and his sole medical contribution, an edition of Joannes Fernelius' *De luis venereae curatione perfectissima liber*, in 1579. Lernutius' son oversaw the posthumous publication of a collection of hymns and religious poems (Antwerp, 1620), and some of his other poems are preserved in Gruter's *Deliciae poetarum Belgicorum* II.465-71. The *Manes Catulli* were published by van Crombruggen (Brussels, 1955), 143-92, but the notes on Ausonius that Giselinus had left to his old friend Lernutius were never published.

*Bibliography:* *Biographie nationale de Belgique*, VII, 787-92; C. L. Heesakkers, *Praecidanea Dousana* (Amsterdam, 1976), 15-111; H. Van Crombruggen, "Janus Lernutius (1545-1619). Een biografische studie," *Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren*, XXIII (1955), 33-197; Van Crombruggen, "Lernutiana," *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie* . . . XXI, no. 3 (1959), 3-21.

b. Janus Lernutius (Jean Lernout) was born in 1545 in Bruges, where he died September 29, 1619.

He possessed a substantial fortune, which allowed him to pursue his poetic and philological interests under the best teachers and to travel at will throughout Europe for many years. Lernutius seems to have lacked personal ambition, but he could not escape the political troubles of the time. He was captured by the English in 1587 and held for five years, gaining his freedom in the end only by paying a huge ransom.

Lernutius' interests were more poetical than philological, but he numbered among his friends both scholars and poets, and he was closely associated with Justus Lipsius as well as with Janus Dousa the elder and Victor Giselinus.

*Works:* In addition to the *Phaselus* and *Manes Catulli* Lernutius published *Carmina* (Antwerp, 1579), which included *Ocelli* (many of which took Catullus as their model), *Elegiae*, and *Epigrammata*, as well as *Oda ad bonam Valetudinem*. A second edition appeared without

his knowledge (Lignitz, 1603), and still later he published a third (Leiden, 1614), to which he added religious poems, poetry on contemporary political events, some translations from Book VII of the *Greek Anthology* (*Basia Graecorum*), and a group of his own *Basia*. His poetry was reprinted by Gruter in *Deliciae poetarum Belgicorum*, III, 114–295. Lernutius' son Jacques published his youthful *Commentarius de natura et cultu Caroli Flandriae comitis* (Bruges, 1621), and an anthology, *Preces metricae*, which included poetry by Salmonius Macrinus, Petrus Auratus, Petrus Bucherius, and Victor Giselinus (Bruges, 1616). Some of his correspondence with Justus Lipsius was published by P. Burmann in *Sylloge epistolarum*.

*Bibliography*: Michaud, XXIV, 250–51; Van Crombruggen, "Janus Lernutius" and "Lernutiana" (see *Bibliography* for Giselinus).

### III. CATULLUS 61

#### COMMENTARIES

##### I. Franciscus Robortellus

Before producing his commentary on Cat. 61 Robortellus studied at least one other Catullan passage, for his *Annotationes* (Venice, 1543) contain a discussion of Cat. 17.23–25. Three other passages are discussed in Book II of the *Annotationes*, which appeared in 1548 in the same volume with the commentary on Cat. 61. The commentary contains no hint of the date or circumstances of its composition, but it was probably written between 1543 and 1548, when Robortellus was teaching in Pisa. Robortellus is interested in Roman marriage customs and their Greek parallels, which he cites extensively, drawing from such sources as Macrobius, Festus, and Plutarch. He quotes parallels for usage and diction from Hellenistic and Roman authors and mentions variant readings.

Robortellus' commentary seems to have had little influence. It is not mentioned by either of its immediate successors, Marcus Antonius Muretus (see p. 260 above) or Achilles Statius (see p. 265 above), and it appears again only in a seventeenth-century compendium.

*Introduction* (ed. of Florence, 1548). Francisci Robortelli Utinensis explicationes in Catulli Epithalamium. [*Inc.*]: (p. 94) Carmen hoc

inscribitur EPITHALAMIUM. Sic etiam Theocritus Idyllio XVII Helenae EPITHALAMIUM, Stesichorum imitatus vocavit, ut interpres ait, his verbis: (Robortellus quotes the *Scholia* on Theocr. 18) . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 95) Hymenaeus a Graecis, Thalassius a Romanis. Plutar. in Problem. rerum Rom. et Livius libro primo ab Urbe condita.

*Commentary*. [*Inc.*]: (p. 95) *Hymen o Hymenae* (Cat. 61.5). Sic etiam Theocritus ὕμῶν ὦ ὕμῆναϊε (Theoc. XVIII.58) et Plautus in *Casina* *Io hymen, o hymenae* (Plaut., *Cas.* 800, 808) . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 112) *Valentem exercete iuventam* (Cat. 61.227–28). Dum iuvenes estis florenti aetate, date operam liberis, et in coniugio exercete iuventam. Translate. Horat. Epist. Ode ii, *Rura paterna bobus exercet suis* (Hor., *Epod.* II.3).

#### *Editions*:

1548, Florentiae (Florence): apud Laurentium Torrentinum. With *De historica facultate disputationis*; *Annotationum . . . libri II*; *Explanationes in primum Aeneidos Virgilii librum*; etc. Adams R–621; NUC. BL; BN; (DLC; CtY; MH; MsG).

1602. See above, Composite Editions. (Robortellus is found in vol. I, 1422–29).

#### *Biography*:\*

Franciscus Robortellus Utinensis (Francesco Robortello da Udine) was born in Udine September 9, 1516. He died in Padua March 18, 1567.

Robortellus studied at the University of Bologna under Romulus Amaseus. In 1538 he began to lecture at the Studio of Lucca but left in 1543 for a similar position in Pisa, where he remained until 1549, when he was invited by the Venetian Senate to replace the celebrated Giambattista Egnazio on his retirement. In the same year he returned briefly to Udine, marrying Camilla Bellone, the daughter of a notary. In 1552, after only three years in Venice, Robortellus secured an appointment in Padua through the influence of his father-in-law, Bellone, and was replaced in Venice by Carolus Sigonius (CTC II, 345–46). He moved to Bologna in 1557 but in 1560 returned to Padua, where he remained until his death. It is said that Robortellus died in such poverty that there was no money to pay his funeral expenses, which were met by the University of Padua. The German students at the university erected a monument in his honor in the Basilica of S. Antonio.

From the beginning of his career in Lucca and Pisa Robortellus was known as an energetic and productive scholar but also as a vain and quarrelsome one. In his first published work, *Variorum locorum adnotationes* (Venice, 1543), he attacked Erasmus; in the same volume with his Catullan commentary (1548) is included a self-aggrandizing poem in Greek. In Venice he became further embroiled in scholarly disputes. By disparaging his scholarship he so antagonized his predecessor, Egnazio, that the old man lay in wait for him one day and tried to attack him with a knife. His dispute with Sigonius, his successor in Venice, was one of the famous scholarly quarrels of the century. In 1553 Sigonius in his *De nominibus Romanorum* pointed out some errors in Robortellus' 1548 work of the same name. Sigonius did not mention the name of Robortellus, but Robortellus was still very angry and replied with a stinging attack. The dispute escalated through the 1550s, was temporarily settled by Cardinal Girolamo Seripando in 1561, but resumed when Robortellus and Sigonius both found themselves in Padua in 1562. It reached the level of personal abuse in 1562 with Robortellus' *Ephemerides Patavinae*, which was answered by Sigonius in the second edition of his *Disputationes Patavinae*. Both works were suppressed by the Venetian Senate, which ordered the rivals not to resume the dispute.

**Works:** In addition to his commentary on Catullus, Robortellus produced a large number of philological and scholarly works. A selected bibliography is given by Pompella. He edited Aeschylus' tragedies (1552) and the *Scholia* to Aeschylus (1552); edited and translated Aelian's *Tactica* (1552); and edited and annotated Aristotle's *Poetics* (1548) and Longinus, *On the Sublime* (1554). He wrote commentaries or annotations for Vergil, *Aeneid* I (1543); Callimachus' *Hymns* (1548); and Cicero's *Letters* (1557). He wrote on Aristotle's *Politics* (1552) and Horace's *Ars poetica* (as an appendix to his edition of Aristotle's *Poetics*, 1548). Among the most important of his other works are his *Annotationes* on various Greek and Latin authors (1543 and 1548), *De arte sive ratione corrigendi antiquorum libros* (1557), and several essays on Roman antiquities.

Among Robortellus' unpublished works are

*Animadversiones in Tacitum* (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana D 480 inf.) and *Praefatio in Tacitum* (Padua, Biblioteca del Seminario 416). Annotations on Thucydides (Milan, Ambros. R 118 sup.) have been tentatively attributed to him.

**Bibliography:** Cosenza, IV, 3069–72, V, 1550–51; Eckstein, 447; Jöcher, III, 2147–49, VII, 161–62; Michaud, XXXVI, 194–95; Sandys, II, 140–43; G. Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana* (1805), VII, 829–37; A. Carlini, "L'attività filologica di F. Robortello," *Atti dell' Accademia di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti di Udine*, 7th ser., VII (1966), 53–84; E. J. Kenney, *The Classical Text: Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book* (Berkeley, 1974), 29–37; G. G. Liruti, *Notizie delle vite ed opere scritte da' letterati del Friuli* (Udine, 1760–80), II, 413–83; M. McCall, "The Sources of Robortello's Edition of Aeschylus' *Supplices*," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London*, XXVIII (1981), 79–102 (this article contains references to numerous discussions of Robortellus' work on the tragedies and *Scholia*); W. McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio: The Changing World of the Late Renaissance* (Princeton, 1989), p. 379 s. v. "Robortello, Francesco." G. Pompella, ed., *Francisci Robortelli Utinensis De arte sive ratione corrigendi antiquorum libros disputatio* (Naples, 1975), 9–12.

\*This biography is based in part on information supplied by Professor G. N. Knauer (University of Pennsylvania).

## 2. Constantius Landus

Constantius Landus wrote his commentary on Cat. 61 as an exercise in his youth ("cum puer essem") and published it in 1550, some years later, as a memorial to his teacher Andreas Alciatus, who had just died. The commentary is dedicated to Alciatus' kinsman and heir, Franciscus Alciatus, whom Landus urges to publish his uncle's works. It is difficult to fix the time of composition on the basis of internal evidence because Landus made some revisions for publication, as he says in his note on Cat. 61.19.

It is easy to see that the commentary was a school exercise. Landus cites a wide range of sources extensively if indiscriminately, preferring specialized contemporary works (e.g., Carolus Stephanus, *De re hortensi*) and philological

studies (Politianus, Alexander Guarinus on Catullus) to ancient authors. His frequent citations of Vergil, moreover, are consistent with the fact that he had also written a Vergil commentary in his youth (no doubt as another exercise) and planned to publish it as a companion to his Catullus (*ad Cat.* 61.19). In addition to the usual glosses, he frequently cites Roman family law and numismatic evidence and occasionally embarks on long digressions such as the diatribe in the gloss on *nomen* at Cat. 61.207 in which he attacks those who have arrogated to themselves the name of Landus. Landus' notes are fuller than those of Robortellus (see p. 283) and show no familiarity with them. His commentary exercised even less influence than Robortellus' and was reprinted only once, in a variorum edition of the seventeenth century. The original edition is very rare.

*Dedication* (ed. of Pavia, 1550). Francisco Alciato Iurisconsulto Clarissimo Constantius Landus Complani Comes s.p.d. [*Inc.*]: (fol. a2r) Quam magnum detrimentum ex obitu praeclarissimi viri Andreae Alciati passa sit non modo Italia et Gallia sed universa propemodum Christianorum Respublica, non tantum praesentia sed futura saecula cognoscent . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. a4v) Sed de his hactenus. Nunc quia nomini tuo quasdam annotationes in Catulli poetae epithalamium, quas (cum puer essem) exercitii gratia composueram a me hisque diebus praeteritis elimatas, dicare constitui, supererit ut hanc qualemcunque lucubrationem nostram amoris nostri monumentum accipias, et cum graviora studia intermiseris, et a lectionibus feriatu fueris, eam legere non dedigneris. Vale meque mutuo ama. Placentiae, pridie Idus Maii. M.D.L.

*Commentary.* Constantii Landi Complani Comititis in Epithalamium Catulli Annotationes. [*Inc.*]: (fol. c1v) *Collis o Heliconii* (Cat. 61.1). Carmen istud est nuptiale; celebrat enim Catullus hoc epithalamio Iuliae et Manlii nuptias, quod derivatio ipsa indicat: nam ab ἐπὶ καὶ θάλαμος id est *ad et thalamus* dicitur. Huius carminis repertorem fuisse ferunt Apollinem, quum nuptias Thetidis et Pelei decantasset . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. i1r) *Valentem iuventam* (Cat. 61.227–28). Validam et robustam. Iuventa dicitur et iuventus, et accipitur pro dea saepe. . . . Libet hoc loco postquam ad finem huius Epithalamii pervenimus Alciati nostri carmen in Emblematis de iuventute apponere, etsi ab eodem

Giraldo in syntagmate nominato citatum fuerit. Nam praeceptoris mei mirus amor, divinaque eius doctrina me mirum in modum impellit, ut id efficiam libenti animo cum praecipue ab eo rogetur, ut sibi diuturna esse velit iuventa, quem utinam exaudisset dea: nunc enim non tot undantibus lachrymis Italiae et Galliae flumina fluerent, non tot gemitus, non tot cum coelo querelae haberentur, non pulla veste induti incederemus, non virum e coelo divinitus missum desideraremus, non quinquagesimo octavo anno fato (heu nimis cito) sublatum doleremus, non denique Alciatum nostrum deum in coelo quaereremus, cuius ab ore dulciores melle et manna hi suavissimi cantus olim effluerunt in iuventam. *Natus uterque Iovis tener, atque imberbis uterque / Quem Latona tulit, quem tulit et Semele, / Salvete aeterna simul et florente Iuventa. / Numine sit vestro quae diuturna mihi. / Tu vino curas, tu victu dilue morbos, / Ut lento accedat sera senecta pede.*

#### *Editions:*

(micro.) 1550, Papias (Pavia): apud Franciscum Moschenum Bergomensem. Piacenza, Biblioteca Comunale Passerini-Landi.

1604. See above, Composite Editions.

#### *Biography:*

Constantius Landus (Costanzo Landi), count of Compiano, was born at Piacenza March 19, 1521 and died in Rome July 25, 1564.

Landus was identified as a prodigy on the basis of a Latin elegy he composed at the age of twelve, and he devoted his life to studying various disciplines under a series of distinguished teachers. He began his literary studies in Bologna under Romulus Amaseus and moved to Ferrara to study law under Andreas Alciatus, who was to have the greatest influence of all his teachers. Landus returned to Alciatus many times over the years and studied under him in Bologna and Pavia as well as Ferrara. He interrupted his studies in 1545 to accompany his uncle Count Paolo Scotti to Rome, where he avidly studied the antiquities while his uncle carried out his duties as ambassador to Pope Paul III. Soon resuming his work, however, he became a doctor of laws in Piacenza in 1548 but rejected a legal career in favor of studying medicine and philosophy in Pavia. His plans were frustrated by another uncle, Count Federico Scotti, who claimed that he was too old to



frequent the schools and recalled him to Piacenza, but not long afterward the uncle died, and Landus was free to follow his inclinations—which always led him to new disciplines and further study. Eventually he concentrated his attention on numismatics and moved to Rome because of its abundance of numismatic materials. He died there at the age of forty-three. It is not known whether he was buried in accordance with the instructions given in his will, which stipulated that the New Testament should be placed under his head, the works of Plato and Aristotle on his right, the Pandects and Cicero on his left, Vergil, Tibullus, and Caesar on his chest, and his own works at his feet.

*Works:* In addition to his commentary on Catullus, Landus wrote a commentary on Vergil, which is now lost. He also wrote on Roman law (*Ad titulum Pandectarum* [Piacenza, 1549]), but is best known for *In veterum numismatum Romanorum miscellanea explicationes* (Pavia, 1559), which was reprinted under another title in the seventeenth century (Leiden, 1695). Landus achieved his first distinction for writing poetry and continued to versify. He left a complete volume of poetry in manuscript (*Neopegnios libri duo*, 1545, Piacenza, Biblioteca Comunale Passerini-Landi, Pallastrelli 154 [Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 70]), and another is attributed to him (Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, Parm. 55, fols. 1r–67r [Kristeller, *Iter*, II, 44]). He published two others: *Lusuum puerilium libellus* (Ferrara, 1545) and *Carmina* (Piacenza, 1549). A detailed bibliography of his works is given by Poggiali.

*Bibliography:* Cosenza, III, 1918–19, V, 975; Michaud, XXIII, 148; G. Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana* (1805), VII, 850–53; J. Hutton, *The Greek Anthology in Italy to the Year 1800* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1935), 242–43; V. Osimo, *Costanzo Landi, gentiluomo e letterato piacentino del sec. XV* (Venice, 1900); C. Poggiali, *Memorie per la storia letteraria di Piacenza* (Piacenza, 1789), II, 130–60.

## IV. CATULLUS 64

### COMMENTARIES

#### I. Bernardinus Realinus

Realinus began to annotate Cat. 64 at the age of eighteen, while he was studying in Modena

under Antonius Bendinellius, and continued to work on the commentary after he moved to Bologna, in time stolen, as he says, from the stricter study of Aristotle. Bendinellius urged him to publish the work, and it appeared in 1551, together with a small collection of *Annotationes in varia scriptorum loca*. The commentary consists mostly of citations of parallel passages from various Greek and Latin authors, but Realinus is interested also in metrical and textual points and often discusses such figures as metaphor and anaphora. He is well acquainted with the work of scholarly predecessors such as Antonius Parthenius (see p. 223 above) and Palladius Fuscus (p. 239 above) and freely cites other scholars as well (e.g., Beroaldus and Parrhasius). Chapter VIII of the *Annotationes* contains a refutation of the interpretation of Cat. 2–3 given by Politianus in the *Miscellanea*. Realinus' commentary enjoyed little influence: it was excerpted by Theodorus Pulmannus (see below) and reprinted in a seventeenth-century compendium. In later life Realinus is said to have so regretted the time wasted on Catullus that he destroyed as many copies of the work as he could lay his hands on.

The work is dedicated to his father's patron, Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo, who later assisted Realinus himself in the early stages of his administrative career. The first gloss serves as introduction to the commentary.

#### a. The Printed Commentary

*Dedication* (ed. of Bologna, 1551). Christophoro Madrutio Amplissimo Cardinali Tridentino Bernardinus Realinus s.p.d. [*Inc.*]: (fol. Aii<sup>r</sup>) En tibi Cardinalis Amplissime Realini tui munusculum, non illud quidem quod amplitudine tua dignum existimem nec dare vellem, sed quod observantiae erga te meae pignus habere possis certissimum, et quo nec tu maius a me nunc expectas, nec ego dare possum. Nam cum multa sint, quibus se dedat animus noster, et alii alia sectentur, ego semper humanas, quas vocant, literas ita colui, ut quoties ex severiori Aristotelis lectione otii aliquid suffurari licuit, ad eas toties me retulerim, sic ut multos legens scriptores, animum tamen ad Catullianos sales saepius appulerim, uti quos omnibus et doctissimos scirem et lepidissimos iudicari. Quorum tandem allectus lenocinio ita feci, ut remisso aliquantisper philosophiae studio commentarium scripserim in elegantes et satis difficiles

Pelei et Thetidis Nuptias. Quem in publicum dare iussus ab egregie cordato homine Antonio Bendinellio Lucensi, praeceptore meo, cui quicquid in literis profeci, si modo profeci, acceptum refero, nolui prius exire quam clarissimi nominis tui splendore clarior factus ita facilius eo duce hominum gratiam iniisset, quamquam te solum mihi constituo et iudicem et patronum qui unus instar sis futurus omnium, cuique dum modo hic placeat *sublimi feriam* (quod ille ait) *sidera vertice* (Hor., C. I.1.36). Itaque laeto animo et serena fronte qualescunque sint clientuli tui primitias, ita celsitudini tuae debitas, ut aurum Soli, argentum Lunae, Veneri oricalchum, Marti ferrum, et Musarum Apollini quicumque in earum viridariis fructus innascuntur, accipias; imitatus regem regum, Artoxersen dico, cui obequitanti, cum quidam ex vicino rivulo haustam manibus aquam porrexisset, eam libens bibit, propensum animi potius considerans affectum, quam vilem aut donantis aut doni conditionem. Quod si tibi non displicuisse cognovero, alacriori studio alios labores meos conabor ad finem perducere. Vale.

*Introduction.* Bernardini Realini Carpensensis in Nuptias Pelei et Thetidis Catullianas Commentarius. [Inc.]: (fol. 1r) *Peliaco quondam prognatae vertice pinus dicuntur*. Antequam verborum interpretationem aggrediamur, pauca quaedam ad faciliorem cognitionem breviter strictimque sunt attingenda. Sciendum hoc in opusculo, quod parum caute nonnulli Argonautica inscripserunt, velle Catullum Pelei et Thetidis nuptias celebrare, ad quas antequam accedat tempus prudenter quo Thetidis amore captus est Peleus describens illud fuisse dicit, quo Argonautae ad vellus aureum Colchos sunt profecti, cuius profectionis causas non absurdum fuerit ex historia repetere . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 1v) Aliam assert profectionis causam Parthenius, quam ibi, si placet, lege.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (fol. 1v) *Peliaco vertice* (Cat. 64.1). Pelion montem Thessaliae dicunt esse Plinius in IIII cap.viii, Pomponius Mela libro II cap. i, Solinus cap. xiii, cum Vibio Sequestri in libro de montibus et aliis . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 45v) *Rhamnusia virgo* (Cat. 64.395). In Rhamno nobili terrae Atticae vico fuisse Nemeseos statuam traditum est Straboni in IX . . . / . . . (fol. 46r) Romani enim semper iusta movere arma; ceterae autem nationes odio et malevolentia livoreque, quod imperium tantae

urbis iustitia augetur, tela in populum Romanum capiebant.

*Conclusion.* [Inc.]: (fol. 63v) Hos habui Cardinalis amplissime quos tibi dicarem primos hortuli mei fructus, illos quidem insipidos, sed si piam dicantis spectes voluntatem non aspernandos, unde aequi bonique facias precor et amplectaris meliores, favente Deo, accepturus. Vale.

*Editions:*

1551, Bononiae (Bologna): apud Anselmum Giaccarellum. With *Annotationes in varia scriptorum loca*. Adams R-237; NUC. BL; BN; (ICU; InU; PU; TxU).

1602. See above, Composite Editions.

*b. Manuscript Abridgement*

Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus, M 229, vol. VI, pp. 329–36.

These notes appear at the end of a volume of notes and excerpts made by Theodorus Pulmannus (CTC I, 234–35). Pulmannus has entitled them *Ex Bernardini Realini Carpensensis in nuptias Pelei et Thetidis Catullianas commentariis haec excerpta*, but the excerpts end at verse 300, and he continues with some extracts from Realinus' *Annotationes*, including his refutation of Politianus' interpretation of Cat. 2–3.

*Introduction* (p. 329): Parum caute hoc opusculum nonnulli Argonautica inscripserunt. Pelei enim et Thetidis nuptias hinc Catullus celebrat.

*Commentary.* [Inc.]: (p. 329) *Et fines Aee-taeos* (Cat. 64.3). Sic quidem legendum est, ex nomine regis Aeetes, non *Atheios*, ut Beroaldus in Eleg. Propertii cuius initium. Hoc librarii errorem crediderim . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p. 333) *cultricem montis Itoni* (Cat. 64.300). al. *Ithomi*. Ego Realini hanc laudo lectionem, *montibus Idae*.

*Manuscript:*

Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus, M 229, vol. VI, pp. 329–36. (Kristeller, *Iter*, III, 80).

*Biography:*

Bernardinus Realinus was born in Carpi December 1, 1530, and died in Lecce July 2, 1616.

After beginning his education in Carpi, he moved to Modena in 1546 to study under Ludovicus Castelvetus and Antonius Bendinellius and then to Bologna in 1548 to enter a three-year course in philosophy in preparation for the study of medicine. He finished the philosophy course but, on the urging of a friend named

Chiara, decided to abandon medicine for law, and in 1551 he began a five-year course in jurisprudence at Bologna. Throughout his philosophical and legal studies in Bologna Realinus continued his interest in philology and remained in close association with prominent Bolognese humanists, and the bulk of his philological work belongs to this period. In 1554, however, he moved to Ferrara to continue his legal studies near his home in Carpi, where he was engaged in a dispute concerning his mother's estate. The dispute was decided against him and, convinced that he had been treated unjustly, in a chance encounter some weeks later, he attacked the judge with a knife. The judge was not badly hurt, but Realinus had to flee immediately to escape severe punishment (a large fine and amputation of the offending hand). Returning to Bologna, he completed his legal studies and was awarded the *laurea* in 1556.

He was soon appointed mayor of Felizzano by his father's patron, Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo, governor of Milan, and over the next few years distinguished himself in this and other offices, including those of *avvocato fiscale* of Alessandria (1558), mayor of Cassine (1560) and Castelleone (1562), and overseer of the holdings of the d'Avalos family in the Kingdom of Naples (1564). His friend Chiara died in 1560, and he fell into a deep depression, which he managed to overcome by writing poetry and turning his attention to spiritual matters. In October 1564, having been in Naples only a few months, he gave up his position with the Marchese of Pescara and joined the Society of Jesus.

Over the next decade Realinus held positions of increasing responsibility among his fellow Jesuits in Naples, and in 1574 he was chosen to found a Jesuit establishment in Lecce. The foundation flourished in spite of initial difficulties, and a college was added (1580), which Realinus directed until his death.

Realinus was distinguished by religious devotion and piety that were regarded as extraordinary even in his lifetime, and hopes for his canonization were apparently being entertained as early as 1613, when his first biographer, Antonio Beatillo, began to collect his correspondence and other materials. In 1947 Bernardinus Realinus was canonized; his feast day is July 3.

*Works:* In addition to many spiritual works

(listed in Backer and Sommervogel) Realinus produced several philological studies, of which the only ones to be published were the commentary on Catullus and a brief work printed with it called *Annotationes in varia scriptorum loca* (1551). A study of Aristotle's *Logic* and *Physics* is preserved at the Biblioteca Comunale in Carpi, but his other philological works seem to have perished, perhaps destroyed on the instructions of Realinus himself. These include a prose translation of the *Odyssey* (1555); translations of Aristophanes' *Ploutos* (with notes, 1555) and of various Greek poems; an unfinished commentary on Sallust's *Catiline*; a commentary on the elegies of Gallus (1547); an essay on Aristotle's *De somno et vigilia* (1556); notes on Plato and the whole of the Bible (made between 1556 and 1563); and readings on the sonnets of Petrarch and Bembo.

He also wrote Latin and Italian poetry, many hundreds of letters (of which five hundred or so are preserved in the Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu), and two brief Latin autobiographies covering his life to the ages of eighteen and twenty-one respectively. These have been edited and published by Gioia, who also gives a detailed account of his correspondence.

*Bibliography:* Backer and Sommervogel, VI, 1554–56; Cosenza, IV, 3010–11, V, 1515; DBI IX, 210–13; Michaud, XXXV, 285–86; G. Tiraboschi, *Biblioteca modenese* (Modena, 1781–86), IV, 315–25; G. Boero, *Lettere spirituali inedite del Venerabile Padre Bernardino Realino della Compagnia di Gesù* (Naples, 1854); Boero, *Vita del Venerabile Padre Bernardino Realino della Compagnia di Gesù* (Rome, 1852); C. Dionisotti, "La letteratura italiana nell'età del Concilio" in *Il Concilio di Trento e la Riforma Tridentina* (Rome, 1965), I, 339–40; G. Fuligatti, *Vita del padre Bernardino Realino . . .* (Viterbo, 1664); M. Gioia, "Per una biografia di San Bernardino Realino S.I., 1530–1616," *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu*, XXXIX (1970), 3–101; A. Sammarini, *Alcune lettere inedite del P. Bernardino Realino della Compagnia di Gesù* (Modena, 1894).

## 2. Marcellus Virgilius Adrianus Minor

This commentary, apparently an autograph, on Cat. 64 is found in a manuscript that also includes Adrianus' commentary on the *Ars poe-*

*tica* of Horace. The notes on Catullus are written in the margins of a sixteenth-century edition and on extra sheets inserted between its pages. The marginal notes are for the most part variant readings, glosses of hard words, or citations of parallel passages from other authors; the inserted sheets are reserved for longer discussions of a more literary or rhetorical nature. Adrianus is interested in other versions of the myths, in the characterization of Theseus and Ariadne, and in Catullus' use of various rhetorical devices to secure an effect. He has consulted the commentaries of Muretus (see p. 260 above), Statius (see p. 265 above), and Scaliger (see p. 267 above) and refers to Statius and Scaliger by name (e.g., fol. 12r). The use of Scaliger (1577) provides a *terminus post quem* for the work. There is no indication of Adrianus' purpose in writing the commentary, but it may have been intended as the basis for lectures on Catullus because twice in the preface he urges his listeners (*auditores*) to listen carefully to what he is going to say. The commentary was never printed and seems to have exercised no influence on other scholars.

*Preface.* (Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Magl. VII 1106, fol. 1r). [*Inc.*]: Carmen elegantissimum gravissimumque poetae omnium politissimi Catulli explicare in animo est quod in nuptias Pelei et Thetidis cecinit, putans in latinis auctoribus nichil reperiri posse quod maiori arte ac venustate conditum sit. Nam solum hoc opusculo omnia poeta conclusit quae ab optimo poeta flagitari possent. Est enim fabula qua nichil celebratius est apud poetas, est carmen gravissimum, est mire observatum decorum, praeterea tot venustates tot flores tam varia ac excellens locutio ut nichil amplius desiderari possit. Primum autem fabula est omnium gravissima quam ex Homero intelligere possumus qui autem unum Achillem Thetidis filium sibi omnibus laudibus celebrandum suscepisset. Alii poetae illum imitati alii aliis modis eum celebraverunt. Quin etiam Plato ipse gravissimus philosophus Peleo ex mortalibus uni deos immortales hymenaeum cecinisse auctor est. Puto autem hoc aliquem e lyricis poetis antiquis illis temporibus tradidisse. Catullus igitur hoc idem carmine heroico sibi faciendum existimavit, putans dignam esse rem in quam omnibus ingenii viribus incumberet. Hoc igitur poetae propositum est nuptias Pelei et Thetidos quibus Achilles est editus suis carminibus celebrare atque hoc ut dicebam

heroico carmine; quamvis enim leviora haec alii leviori carminum genere tractarint ut hic idem epithalamium cecinit Manlii, hoc in his personis minime faciendum fuit . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 1v) Hinc enim carminis exordium sumitur quo factum est ut quidam libellum hunc argonautica appellarint, quod ineptum admodum est. Pauca enim sunt quae de illa navigatione dicantur. Propositum enim est ut diximus nuptias has quibus nichil apud poetas celebratius est decantare ut paulo post intellegemus. Plura autem quae in principiis dici possint omittemus, ea reposituri singulis locis ubi erit opus. Hoc autem vos monitos volo ut haec diligenter attendatis. Nichil enim in lingua latina habetur quod elegantius ac floridius sit scriptum. Omnes enim venustates, lepores exornandaeque orationis rationes quae multae ac variae sunt ab elegantissimo poeta decore admodum usurpantur ut melius exponentes significaverimus. Singula igitur diligenter attendite.

*Commentary.* [*Inc.*]: (fol. 2) *Peliaco* (Cat. 64.1). Pelius mons in Thessalia ad mare pertinet e cuius materia ferunt constructam esse navim Argo quam appellant . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 14v) *Nec se contingi patiuntur lumine claro* (Cat. 64.408). Aperta in luce videri. Metaphora a sensu tactus ad visum. (Text following on fol. 15r–v is illegible.)

*Manuscript:*

Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Magl. VII 1106, s. XVI, fols. 1–15. (Kristeller, *Iter*, I, 124.)

*Biography:*

Marcellus Virgilius Adrianus Minor (Marcello Adriani, Marcello Virgilio Adriani il Giovane) was born in Florence in 1553 and died there in 1604. He was the son of the historian Johannes Baptista Adrianus and grandson of the famous Marcellus Virgilius Adrianus (CTC IV, 39) and was often called il Giovane to distinguish him from the latter. Confusion persists, however, especially in library and manuscript catalogs, and care must be taken to distinguish him from both his grandfather and father (whose works are sometimes ascribed to "Marcellus Adrianus").

Adrianus so distinguished himself in the study of Greek and Latin at an early age that he succeeded his father at his death in 1579 as professor of humanity at the University of Florence. Not

content with public lectures, he also taught Latin and Greek privately. He was a member of the Accademia Fiorentina of which he was named *censore* in 1583 and later *consigliere* (four times). He also belonged to the Accademia degli Alterati, where he was known by the name "Torbido".

*Works:* Apart from his work on Catullus and Horace, Adrianus seems to have concentrated his philological efforts on Greek authors. His notes on Aristotle's *Politics* are preserved in a manuscript in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Florence (Nuovi acquisti 850), and the Biblioteca of the Galleria degli Uffizi in Florence contains a commentary on Aristotle's *Categories* either composed or owned by him. He translated Plutarch's *Moralia* and *Parallel Lives* (Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana Corsin. 43.F.9–10) into Italian. Both translations were published for the first time in the nineteenth century—*Opuscoli morali* in Florence in 1819–20, with another edition in Milan in 1825–29, and *Le vite parallele* in Florence in 1859–65, with another edition in 1889. Later in the nineteenth century two volumes of selections from the *Lives* were issued: *Racconti di storia romana* and *Racconti di storia greca*. The latter appeared in three editions, the last in 1924. Adrianus also translated into Italian and commented on Demetrius, *On Style* (CTC II, 27–41), and read the translation to his fellow members of the Accademia degli Alterati in July 1589, as Weinberg discovered from the minutes of the society. The manuscript (A XXXV) is preserved in the Biblioteca Marucelliana in Florence (Kristeller, *Iter*, I, 106), but the translation was first published in 1738 (second edition 1836).

The only works of Adrianus to be published in his lifetime were his editions of two of his father's works: a translation into Italian of Giovanni Battista's funeral oration for Cosimo I (Florence, 1574) and an edition of his father's *Istoria de' suoi tempi* (Florence, 1583). Adrianus himself composed orations for various occasions, including an oration in 1580 for the death of Anne of Austria (now apparently lost) and another in 1598 for the death of Philip II, king of Spain (Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale II.IV.635). He composed two *Lezioni dell' educazione della nobiltà fiorentina* (Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 767, fols. 175r–195r), pub-

lished in *Prose fiorentine*, IV, 2, and in *Scritti vari editi ed inediti di G. B. Adriani e di Marcello suo figliolo* (Bologna, 1871). His lectures *Historiae laus* (1584) and *Humanarum litterarum laus secunda* (1587) are preserved in the Biblioteca Marucelliana in Florence (A XXXV).

*Bibliography:* Cosenza, I, 59–60, V, 18; DBII, (1960), 310; G. Mazzuchelli, *Gli scrittori d'Italia* (Brescia, 1753), I, 154–56; Michaud, I, 192–93; G. Negri, *Istoria degli scrittori fiorentini* (Ferrara, 1722), 393–94; G. Prezziner, *Storia del pubblico studio e delle società scientifiche e letterarie di Firenze* (Florence, 1810), II, 35–36, 42; B. Weinberg, "Argomenti di discussione letteraria nell'Accademia degli Alterati (1570–1600)," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, CXXXI (1954), 175–94; Weinberg, "Translations and Commentaries of Demetrius, 'On Style,'" *Philological Quarterly*, XXX (1951), 356–57; Weinberg, "Demetrius Phalereus," CTC II, 30.

### 3. Franciscus Bencius

This autograph commentary on Cat. 64 appears in a manuscript that also includes Bencius' notes on the speeches in Vergil. In the preface Bencius defends Catullus from some criticisms of previous scholars—that he differs from other poets in his dating of the meeting of Peleus and Thetis; that he devotes more attention to ornament (i.e., the ecphrasis of the coverlet on the marriage bed) than to the work itself (the marriage of Peleus and Thetis); that his work is not an epithalamium because it lacks the responsive songs of other epithalamia; that he claims (wrongly) that the *Argo* was the first ship. The commentary consists largely of citations from other ancient authors, which are adduced either as parallels for Catullan usage or as evidence for mythological details. It is likely that Bencius used his commentary as the basis for lectures at the Collegio Romano, for among his published works is an introductory oration on Cat. 64 (*Oratio viii*, "De laudibus poeticae cum explicare coepisset Catullum de Nuptiis Pelei et Thetidos"). The oration contains a general account of the merits of poetry, followed by a short section in praise of Catullus (which does not duplicate material in the commentary). Bencius' commentary was never printed and seems not to have influenced other scholars.

*Preface* (Rome, Archivio della Pontificia Università Gregoriana 1166, fol. 33r). [*Inc.*]: Occurruntur mihi primum hoc loco in ipso ingesta a viris doctis quaerentibus quae Catullum impulerit causa, ut eo tempore fingat Thetis amore captam Pelei, in expeditione scilicet colchica, quo poetae alii dixerunt iam patrem eum fuisse Achillis ex eadem Thetide . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 36v) Quam ob rem falsum penes Lactantium interpretem Statii apud istum in librum secundum Thebaidos haec legimus: 'Danaus Argos profectus est et primum dicitur navem fecisse a cuius nomine Argo dicta est navis' (= R. Jahnke, ed., Lactantius Placidus, *Scholia to Statius*, p. 96, in *Theb.* II.222). Nisi malis (*verbum obscurum, fortasse omine*) esse in libro, mendum librarii non mendacium auctoris, ut sit legendum 'Danais', et citata est cum a nomine eius dictam navem (*ut vid.*). Et si interpret Arati Danai navem ab materna ostendit ratem primam omnium et Argo nominatam trahi. (fol. 36v / fol. 37) De Argo etiam Aratus libro primo: 'tum nobilis Argo / in caelum subducta mari, quod prima cucurrit' (= Manilius I.412–13).

*Commentary.* [*Inc.*]: (fol. 37r) *Peliaco* (Cat. 64.1). Pelius mons in Thessalia. Plin. 1. IV. cap. viii; Mela lib. ii. c. 1; Solin. c. xiii. Vibius Sequester. Iuxta Pelium montem aedificatam ab Iasone navem Diodorus affirmat. Et Ennius: "Utinam ne in nemore Pelio securibus caesae accedissent abiegnae ad terram trabes" [Ennius, *Medea* 253–54] . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 112v) *lumine claro* (Cat. 64.408). Non patiuntur se videri sed nube teguntur ut Venus virgiliana apparuit filio [quotes *Aen.* II.588–92]. Hesiodos Diebus deos habitare dicit cum hominibus et eorum opera observare sed nube tectos minus videri [quotes *Works and Days*, 252–55]. Vide omnino Pausaniam 'Areaditis' sub nomen.

#### *Manuscript:*

Rome, Archivio della Pontificia Università Gregoriana 1166, s. XVI, fols. 33r–112v (Kriszteller, *Iter*, II, 136).

#### *Biography:*

Franciscus Bencius (Francesco Benci) was born Plauto Benci in Acquapendente in 1542 and died in Rome May 6, 1594.

He studied classical literature for several years in Rome under Muretus (see p. 260 above), who had a high regard for his abilities and treated him as a favorite pupil. Three affectionate and

friendly letters to him are preserved in Muretus' correspondence, one of which is the dedication of Muretus' translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. When Muretus died in 1585, Bencius delivered a funeral oration, which is still preserved. After studying with Muretus, Bencius continued his education with four years of philosophy and another two of civil law. In May 1570 he joined the Company of Jesus and took his father's name, Francesco.

Bencius devoted the rest of his life to teaching and scholarship, first in Siena and Perugia, and finally at the Collegio Romano, where he is listed as a professor of rhetoric in 1583–84. He corresponded with scholars and humanists outside the Order (including Muretus, Vettori, and Lipsius) but for the most part his life was bound up with that of the Collegio Romano, and his plays and verses, as well as several of his orations, were written for college events.

*Works:* Bencius' numerous published works are listed in Backer and Sommervogel. They include funeral orations for Muretus (Rome, 1585), Cardinal Alessandro Farnese (Rome, 1589), and Cardinal Antonio Carafa (Rome, 1591); *Ergastus* (Rome, 1587) and *Philotimus* (Rome, 1591), comedies performed before the awarding of prizes at the Collegio Romano; and many editions of orations and poems on various pedagogical, religious, and classical subjects. Bencius also compiled and edited five volumes of *Litterae annuae Societatis Iesu* (Rome, 1589–94) and wrote the preface to a poem on Columbus by his student Iulius Caesar Stella (*Columbeidos libri priores duo* [Rome, 1590]).

Many other works are preserved in manuscript, especially at the Archivio della Pontificia Università Gregoriana in Rome. In addition to his commentary on Cat. 64, Bencius wrote on the speeches in Vergil (Arch. Greg. 1166 [*Iter*, II, 136]), on Cicero's *Catilinarians* and *In Pisonem*, the *Aeneid* and Seneca's *Hercules Furens* (Vatican Library, Vat. lat. 7756 [*Iter*, II, 343]), on Cicero's *Philippics* and *Pro Sestio* (Arch. Greg. 1169 [*Iter*, II, 136]), and on Aristotle's *Ethics* (Arch. Greg. 1170 [*Iter*, II, 136]) and *Rhetoric* (Arch. Greg. 1171 [*Iter*, II, 136]). Many of these works are in Bencius' own hand; they were no doubt used as the basis for his lectures at the Collegio Romano.

*Bibliography:* Backer and Sommervogel, I, 1285–92; Cosenza, I, 503–504, V, 239–40; DBI VIII, 192–93; G. Mazzuchelli, *Gli scrittori d'Italia* (Brescia, 1760), II, 2, 783–87; Michaud, III, 621; M. A. Muretus, *Opera* (Padua, 1740), II, 97, 184, 407, III, 40–42; G. Tiraboschi,

*Storia della letteratura italiana* (1812), VII, 1456–58; R. G. Villoslada, *Storia del Collegio Romano dal suo inizio (1551) alla soppressione della Compagnia di Gesù (1773)* (Rome, 1954), passim, but esp. 116, 158–60, 335.