

PLINIUS CAECILIUS SECUNDUS, GAIUS

LUCIA A. CIAPPONI

(Chapel Hill, North Carolina)

<i>Fortuna.</i>	74
I. <i>Epistulae</i>	
II. <i>Panegyricus</i>	
Bibliography.	104
Composite Editions.	107
I. The Corpus of the <i>Epistulae</i> .	111
Commentaries.	
1. Johannes Maria Catanaeus.	
2. Henricus Stephanus.	
3. Isaacus Casaubonus.	
4. Janus Gruterus.	
5. Claudius Minos.	
II. Selected <i>Epistulae</i> .	129
Commentary.	
1. Hadrianus Barlandus.	
III. Book 10.	130
Commentary.	
1. Cunradus Rittershusius.	
IV. <i>Epistulae</i> 10.96–97.	132
Commentaries.	
1. Franciscus Balduinus.	
2. Cunradus Rittershusius.	
V. <i>Panegyricus</i> .	136
Commentaries.	
1. Johannes Maria Catanaeus.	
2. Jacobus Locher Philomusus.	
3. Hermannus Rayanus.	
4. Johannes Livineius.	
5. Justus Lipsius.	
6. Cunradus Rittershusius.	
7. Dominicus Badius.	
8. Janus Gruterus.	

FORTUNA

Gaius Plinius Caecilius Secundus (Pliny the Younger) was born before 24 August 61 or 62 A.D. His father's family was that of the Caecilii, his mother that of the Plinii, both prominent families of Novum Comum (Como) in northern Italy. His father died when he was very young, before he was fourteen, for he had as a *tutor legitimus* Verginius Rufus, a prominent figure in Roman politics, who was consul three times. He was adopted by his famous maternal uncle, Gaius Plinius Secundus (Pliny the Elder), probably in his will. As a result, he changed his name from *Gaius* (or *Lucius*) *Caecilius Secundus* to *Gaius Plinius Caecilius Secundus*.¹

Pliny first studied under a grammarian at Como, then moved to Rome where he studied rhetoric under Quintilian and the Greek Nices Sacerdos.² In 79 he witnessed the eruption of Vesuvius, in which his uncle died; afterwards he described this event in two famous letters to his friend Tacitus (*Ep.* 6.16 and 20). Inheriting a conspicuous patrimony from his uncle and, later, properties around Como from his mother, he also increased his wealth by his marriages. It is not clear whether Pliny married two or three times. His first (or perhaps, second) wife was probably connected with the consular family of Pomponius Celer, who owned large properties in Tuscany and Campania; his last wife, Calpurnia, whom he married in 104 when she was very young, was the granddaughter of another rich landowner, Calpurnius Fabatus. There were no children from any of these marriages.³

The precise dates of Pliny's political career are still under discussion. He began with mi-

nor offices, as junior advocate in the Centumviral court, followed by the *Vigintiviratus*. Next he served as military tribune in Syria, perhaps in 81. After entering the senate, he was probably helped by the patronage of powerful friends, such as Sextus Frontinus, Corellius Rufus, and his formal guardian Verginius Rufus, to become *quaestor* in 89 or 90. Then he held the offices of *tribunus plebis* (probably in 91 or 92), *praetor* (in 93), and *praefectus aerari militaris* (ca. 94).

His career seems to have been interrupted during the last couple of years of Domitian's reign. Scholars, however, are suspicious of Pliny's claim that he was in danger during this period, and think that, on the whole, he managed to survive well the imperial tyranny. After Domitian's death in 96, his career flourished under Nerva and Trajan: he was *praefectus aerari Saturni* between 94 and 100 and *consul suffectus* with Cornutus Tertullus in 100. Trajan made him augur in 103 and *curator alvei Tiberis* probably in 104.⁴

A civil lawyer throughout his life, Pliny was involved in some famous trials. For example, in 100, with his friend Tacitus, he successfully prosecuted Marius Priscus, a notoriously corrupt governor of the province of Africa; in 103 he defended Julius Bassus, a governor of Bithynia-Pontus who was accused of corruption, and in 106-107 Varenus Rufus, a former governor of the same province. Finally, Trajan sent Pliny himself to govern Bithynia-Pontus. Again the dates when he held this office are not certain: he may have been governor from 109 to 111, or 110 to 112, or 111 to 113. It is believed that he died there in either 111 or 112 or 113.

Pliny wrote poetry and published two volumes of verses, mostly in hendecasyllables, but also in other meters.⁵ They have not come down to us. But his major works are extant: the *Panegyricus dictus Traiano Imperatori*, an enlarged and polished version of the speech Pliny gave in the senate in 100 to thank the emperor for his election to the consulship; and the *Epistulae*, consist-

1. *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum* (= *CIL*), vol. 5.2 (Berlin, 1877), nos. 5262, 5263, and 5667; H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae*, 2d ed. (Berlin, 1954), 2927. See E. Aubrion, "La 'Correspondance' de Pline le Jeune: problèmes et orientations actuelles de la recherche," in *ANRW* 2.33.1 (1989), 304-6; O. Salmies, *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire* (Helsinki, 1992), 27-28, no. 6; F. Trisoglio, ed., *Opere di Plinio Cecilio Secondo*, vol. 1 (Turin, 1973), 9-12; A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary* (Oxford, 1966), 69-82, to which the present biography is indebted. In Appendix 1, 732-33, Sherwin-White republishes the inscriptions.

2. Pliny, *Ep.* 2.14.9 and 6.6.3.

3. M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, *Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre sénatorial (Ier-IIe s.)* (Louvain, 1987), no. 177 (Calpurnia) and no. 626 (Pompeia Celerina).

4. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny*, 79; Aubrion, "La Correspondance," 310, thinks that Pliny was *curator alvei Tiberis* slightly earlier. For Pliny's *cursus honorum* see *Prosopographia Imperii Romani (PIR)*.6 (Berlin, 1998), 204-9, no. 490.

5. This is known from his own *Epistulae*: 4.13.1; 4.14.2; 4.18; 4.27.2-3; 6.6.6; 9.10; 9.16.2; 9.34. See Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny*, 287, 289, 306, 363, 500-501, 515-16.

ing of nine books of letters written at different times to various relatives and friends, and a tenth book which contains Pliny's correspondence with Trajan before and during his governorship of Bithynia-Pontus.

The letters of the first nine books, which he published between 99 (or 104) and 109 at irregular intervals, recommend friends for various posts, advise them, or comment on social, domestic, and political events. Originally actual letters, they were certainly revised and elegantly polished by Pliny for publication. Pliny declares in the first letter to Septicius Clarus that he has collected his letters *non servato temporis ordine* ("not in chronological order") but *ut quaeque in manus venerat* ("as they came into his hands"). However, scholars have noticed that they follow a somewhat chronological order and appear to have been carefully arranged according to rhetorical and stylistic principles, especially the principle of *varietas*. Each letter is built around a theme. Pliny likes a clear, elegant style deprived of excesses, and is very careful in choosing his words and phrases. The letters of the tenth book, in which Pliny asks Trajan for guidance and advice on the practical matters of administering a province, are more direct and simpler in style and so do not seem to have been revised. In all likelihood they date from 98 to the end of his governorship and were probably published after Pliny's death.

The *De viris illustribus*, a work on the lives of famous Romans from Proca to Antony and Cleopatra, was at one time attributed to him but is now thought to have been composed by an unknown author of the fourth century A.D.⁶ It will not be treated in this article.

Pliny's extant works, the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus*, have quite different manuscript traditions. As they also had very distinctive *fortuna* in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, separate accounts are given below for each.

6. M. M. Sage, "The *De viris illustribus*. Authorship and Date," *Hermes* 108 (1980) 83-100. See also F. Pichlmayer, ed., *Liber de Caesaribus. Praecedunt Origo gentis romanae et Liber de viris illustribus urbis Romae. Subsequitur Epitome de Caesaribus* (Leipzig, 1961; repr. 1966, 1970, 1993); W. K. Sherwin, Jr., ed., *Deeds of Famous Men (De viris illustribus)* (Norman, 1973), with the review by G. V. Sumner in *Phoenix* 27 (1973) 209-10.

I. EPISTULAE

ANTIQUITY TO THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

Although Pliny had many friends and acquaintances, the only contemporary authors who mention him are Martial (*Epig.* 10.20) and Sennius Augurinus, who praises him as a writer of verses in a short laudatory poem preserved in one of Pliny's own letters (*Ep.* 4.27.4). In general, his influence from ancient times up to the fourteenth century was limited, to judge from the few quotations and imitations of his letters, and especially from the limited number of older manuscripts that have survived.

At the end of the second century, Tertullian must have known at least the tenth book, since he comments in his *Apologeticum* 2.6-9 on the letters between Pliny and Trajan with regard to the treatment of the Christians in Bithynia (10.96 and 97). In the fourth century, Eusebius refers to the Tertullian passage (*Historia ecclesiastica* 3.33.1-3).

Both Jerome (ca. 347-420) and Ausonius (fourth century) demonstrate a direct knowledge of Pliny's letters, which may have been known also to Ambrose.⁷ Aurelius Symmachus (ca. 340-ca. 402), although he does not directly imitate or show echoes of Pliny's letters, may have been acquainted in some fashion with the *Epistulae*: his own letters, published posthumously by his son probably between 402 and 408, consist (like Pliny's) of nine books of private letters and one of official correspondence.⁸ In the early fifth century, Paulus Orosius is at least aware of the letter of Pliny to Trajan about the Christians, and of Trajan's response (*Adv. pag.* 7.12.3). Somewhat later Sidonius Apollinaris (ca. 430-post 489) states that he imitates Pliny and shows in his let-

7. For Jerome and Ausonius, see H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers*, Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis 64 (Göteborg, 1958), 186-87; Alan Cameron, "The Fate of Pliny's Letters in the Late Empire," *Classical Quarterly*, N. S., 15 (1965) 289-95; Cameron, "Pliny's Letters in the Later Empire: An Addendum," *ibid.*, N. S., 17 (1967) 421-22; C. P. Jones, "The Younger Pliny and Jerome," *Phoenix* 21 (1967) 301. For Ambrose, see F. Trisoglio, "Sant'Ambrogio conobbe Plinio il Giovane?" *Rivista di studi classici* 20 (1972) 363-410.

8. L. D. Reynolds, "The Younger Pliny," in *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, ed. Reynolds (Oxford, 1983), 317; Cameron, "The Fate of Pliny's Letters," 295-97; and (for a different opinion) E. T. Merrill, "The Tradition of Pliny's Letters," *Classical Philology* 10 (1915) 9-10.

ters clear reminiscences of his model, although he may have not known the tenth book, while Cassiodorus in the sixth century demonstrates knowledge of the tenth book of the *Epistulae*.⁹

Although more than a hundred manuscripts of Pliny's letters survive, early instances are scarce: a few leaves preserved from the oldest known witness date from the end of the fifth century (New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M.462).¹⁰ There are only three extant manuscripts of the ninth century (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 4736 and Ashb. 98; Vatican Library, BAV, Vat. lat. 3864), and one of the late eleventh century (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, San Marco 284, fols. 41r-77r); all the others range from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century.

There seems also to be a gap of approximately three hundred years during which Pliny, apparently, was not read or even quoted. It is not until the ninth century, when Einhard echoes Pliny in some of his works, that knowledge of the *Epistulae* reappears. In the tenth century, Rather, with access to a manuscript in the Verona Chapter library, mentions the letters, and echoes of Pliny's words and phrases appear in his writings.¹¹ In

9. Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep.* 4.22.2: "Et ego Plinio ut discipulus assurgo" ("I rise above the commonplace, as a disciple of Pliny"); see also *Ep.* 1.1.1. In a letter to Firminus Sidonius (9.1.1) he writes: "Addis et causas, quibus hic liber nonus octo superiorum voluminibus accrescat: eo quod Gaius Secundus, cuius nos orbitas sequi hoc opere pronuntias, paribus titulis opus epistolare determinet" ("Add also these reasons for which this ninth book is added to the eight preceding volumes, that Gaius Secundus, whose path you say I follow in this work, establishes the limit of his epistolary work with the same number of volumes"); on this passage, see Cameron, "The Fate of Pliny's Letters," 295-97. For Cassiodorus, see his *Variae* 8.13.4 and Cameron, *ibid.*, 297.

10. E. A. Lowe, ed., *Codices Latini Antiquiores. A Palaeographical Guide to Manuscripts Written before 800 A.D.*, vol. 11 (Oxford, 1966), 24, no. 1660 and plate (details of fols. 1r and 4v), where Lowe dates the fragmentary text to the end of the fifth century. In an earlier study (Lowe and E. K. Rand, *A Sixth-Century Fragment of the Letters of Pliny the Younger: A Study of Six Leaves of an Uncial Manuscript Preserved in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York* [Washington, D.C., 1922]), he had ascribed it to the end of the fifth century or, more likely, to the beginning of the sixth century. Lowe's contribution ("The Palaeography of the Morgan Fragment") to his joint study with Rand is reprinted in E. A. Lowe, *Palaeographical Papers, 1907-1965*, ed. L. Bieler, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1972), 103-26 and plates 8-19 (fols. 1r-6v, reduced).

11. For Einhard, see E. T. Merrill, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri decem* (Leipzig, 1922), iv; D. Ganz, "The Preface to Einhard's 'Vita Caroli,'" in H. Schefers, ed.,

the same century a *liber epistularum Gaii Plinii* is recorded in the catalogue of the monastery of St. Nazarius at Lorsch.¹² In the eleventh century, also in Germany, Pliny's words and phrases are echoed in the letters of Mainard of Bamberg,¹³ and the *Epistulae* are recorded in the catalogue of an unknown library.¹⁴

In twelfth-century England, Walter Map was acquainted with the *Epistulae*, and at the end of the following century Walter Burleigh knew (probably from Vincent of Beauvais) of the hundred-letter family of the *Epistulae*.¹⁵

Einhard. *Studien zu Leben und Werk. Dem Gedenken an Helmut Beumann gewidmet*, Arbeiten der Hessischen Historischen Kommission, N.S., 12 (Darmstadt, 1997), 304, 306, 307. Merrill suggests possible echoes of Pliny's *Ep.* 2.1.10 in a letter of Einhard to Servatus Lupus and Pliny's *Ep.* 1.9.5 in Einhard's poem *Hexameron*. Ganz finds parallels between Pliny's *Epp.* 5.6, 5.8, and 6.21 and the preface to Einhard's *Vita Caroli*. Rather lists Pliny as a writer of letters alongside Cicero and Seneca, and cites from *Ep.* 1.5.16 (M. Manitius, "Beiträge zur Geschichte römischer Prosaiker im Mittelalter," *Philologus* 47 [1889] 567). See also B. L. Ullman, "The Transmission of Latin Texts," *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 27-28 (1956) 582, who thinks that Rather, coming to Verona from Liège, might have brought the manuscript of Pliny from Belgium or northern France; Merrill, "The Tradition of Pliny's Letters," 19; R. Sabbadini, *Storia e critica di testi latini*, 2d ed. (Padua, 1971), 263 and *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, 2d ed., vol. 2 (Florence, 1967), 88 and 242.

12. G. Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (Bonn, 1885; rpt. Hildesheim and New York, 1973), 109, no. 387 and 121, no. 42. For a study of the Lorsch library, scriptorium, and extant codices, see B. Bischoff, "Lorsch im Spiegel seiner Handschriften," in F. Knopp, ed., *Die Reichsabtei Lorsch: Festschrift zum Gedenken an ihre Stiftung, 764*, vol. 2 (Darmstadt, 1977), 7-128.

13. A list of quotations from Pliny in Mainard is available in C. Erdmann and N. Fickermann, eds., *Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV.*, MGH, Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit, vol. 5 (Weimar, 1950), 107, 115, 122, 207, 222, 224, 227, 228; see also the additions of L. Wallach in his review of Erdmann and Fickermann's work (*Speculum* 26 [1951] 500-502).

14. Becker, *Catalogi*, 147, no. 39.

15. In his poem "Metamorphosis Goliae Episcopi" (T. Wright, ed., *The Latin Poems Commonly Attributed to Walter Mapes* [London, 1841], 28, line 182), Map mentions Pliny's love for Calpurnia, to whom Pliny had addressed *Epp.* 6.4, 6.7, and 7.5. Like Vincent of Beauvais, Burleigh affirms that Pliny wrote a hundred letters, mentions *Epp.* 10.96-97, and quotes from *Epp.* 1.22.5, 3.13.5, and 5.5.8 (H. Kunst ed., *Gualteri Burlaei Liber de vita et moribus philosophorum* [Tübingen, 1886; rpt. Frankfurt-am-Main, 1964], 368-70). See Manitius, "Beiträge zur Geschichte," 567 and Sabbadini, *Le scoperte* 1.3 n. 8 and 2.242. It is called the "hundred-letter family" since the two extant ancient manuscripts of this family (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 4736

As for France, a volume of *epistole Plinii iunioris*, together with *Apuleius, de deo Socratis et Hilarius super Matheum et gesta Francorum*, appears in the twelfth-century catalogue of the Abbey of Bec among the books donated by Philip of Harcourt, bishop of Bayeaux.¹⁶ In a late twelfth-century florilegium of various classical authors preserved in Paris, BNF, lat. 18104, there are some excerpts from Pliny's *Letters*.¹⁷ In the thirteenth century, the letters were known to Vincent of Beauvais (*Speculum historiale* and *Speculum doctrinale*) and, indirectly, to Richard de Fournival (*Biblionomia*).¹⁸

During the fourteenth century, knowledge of Pliny seems to have spread more widely both in France and in Italy. As regards the former, Nicholas de Clamanges and Gontier Col knew of Pliny's letters, while Jean de Montreuil owned

and Ashb. 98) are not complete and have only the letters of books 1–5.6, which total 100.

16. Becker, *Catalogi*, 201, no. 78; *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements* (Octavo Series), vol. 2 (Paris, 1888), 397, no. 81.

17. T. Maslowski and R. H. Rouse, "Twelfth-Century Extracts from Cicero's 'Pro Archia' and 'Pro Cluentio' in Paris B. N. Ms Lat. 18104," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 22 (1979) 98, 119–20. The authors believe that the excerpts are from the family of Laurentianus San Marco 284.

18. Vincent of Beauvais, although he thinks Pliny the Elder and Pliny the Younger are one and the same person, refers to "about one hundred letters" of Pliny in his *Speculum historiale* 10.67 ("eiusdem epistolas ad diversos circiter centum reperi") and quotes Pliny's *Epistulae* in the *Speculum historiale* 11.66, 67 (*Epp.* 10.96–97; 1.22.5), and in his *Speculum doctrinale* 5.129 (*Epp.* 1.22.5; 5.25), 5.25 (*Ep.* 5.5.8), and 6.57 (*Ep.* 3.13.5). See E. Boutaric, "Vincent de Beauvais et la connaissance de l'antiquité classique au treizième siècle," *Revue des questions historiques* 17 (1875) 52; Merrill, "The Tradition of Pliny's Letters," 16; Sabbadini, *Le scoperte* 2.59; and Kunst, ed., *Gualteri Burlaei Liber*, 368–70.

Delisle published the *Biblionomia*, where the *Epistulae* of Pliny appear in the catalogue with other classical authors as excerpts from a florilegium ascribed to Censorinus: "Censorini exceptiones (sic) florum ex operibus quorundam sanctorum et philosophorum moralium: primo quidem de libro Macrobiani . . . quinto de epistolis Plinii Secundi" (L. Delisle, *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, vol. 2 [Paris, 1874; repr. New York, 1973], 529). See A. Birkenmajer, "La bibliothèque de Richard de Fournival, poète erudite français du début du XIIIe siècle et son sort ultérieur," in Birkenmajer, *Études d'histoire des sciences et de la philosophie du Moyen Age*, Studia copernicana 1 (Breslau, Warsaw, and Cracow, 1970), 185, no. 84; and P. Glorieux, "Études sur la 'Biblionomia' de Richard de Fournival," *Recherches de théologie médiévale* 30 (1963) 227. Birkenmajer and Glorieux identify as extant some manuscripts catalogued in the *Biblionomia*, but not the "florilegium Censorini."

a copy.¹⁹ In Italy, Simon della Tenca of Arezzo brought a copy of the *Epistulae* from France, the present Laurentianus San Marco 284, which Geri of Arezzo knew and Coluccio Salutati came to possess; there are more than twenty Italian manuscripts that derive from it.²⁰ Geri must have studied the letters very carefully, since Coluccio Salutati calls him "maximus Plinii Secundi oratoris . . . imitator."²¹ Domenico Bandini also owned a copy of Pliny's letters, and Petrarch's friend, Zanobi da Strada, was familiar with the text, as was the compiler of Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale, 552, which was once owned by Petrarch; Petrarch, however, never mentions Pliny's *Letters* and seems not to have known them.²²

It appears very likely that the same manuscript to which Rather had access in the ninth century was also used at Verona in 1329 by the anonymous author of the *Flores moralium auctoritatum*. One of his Veronese contemporaries, Giovanni de Matociis, known also as Johannes Mansionarius, not only owned a copy of the *Epistulae*, probably made from Rather's codex, but wrote also a *Brevis adnotatio de duobus Plinius*.²³ In this brief work he distinguishes Pliny

19. Sabbadini, *ibid.* 2.9, 68, 81, 242; Manitius, "Beiträge zur Geschichte," 567.

20. Reynolds, "The Younger Pliny," 318; Giuseppe Billanovich, "Tra Dante e Petrarca," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 8 (1965) 35; Billanovich, "La prima lettera del Salutati a Giovanni di Montreuil," *ibid.* 7 (1964) 342; Billanovich, "Dal Livio di Raterio (Laur. 63.19) al Livio del Petrarca (B. M. Harl. 2493)," *ibid.* 2 (1959) 158 n. 4; Billanovich, "Petrarch and the Textual Tradition of Livy," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 14 (1951) 196–98; B. L. Ullman, *The Origin and Development of Humanistic Script* (Rome, 1960), 16–18; R. Weiss, *Il primo secolo dell'umanesimo* (Rome, 1949), 60, 109, 121–22; U. Pasqui, "La biblioteca d'un notaio aretino del secolo XIV," *Archivio storico italiano*, 5th Ser., 4 (1889) 250–55; R. A. B. Mynors, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri decem* (Oxford, 1963), viii.

21. Coluccio Salutati, *Epistolario*, ed. F. Novati, vol. 3 (Rome, 1896), 84; R. G. Witt, *In the Footsteps of the Ancients: The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni* (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne, 2000), 224, 226 and n. 149, 227; Reynolds, "The Younger Pliny," 318–19.

22. Billanovich, "Petrarch and the Textual Tradition of Livy," 198 and "Tra Dante e Petrarca," 35; Sabbadini, *Le scoperte* 2.118, 186, 242.

23. R. Avesani, "Il preumanesimo veronese," in *Storia della cultura veneta: il Trecento*, vol. 2 (Vicenza, 1976), 120 and (with B. M. Peebles) "Studies in Pietro Donato Avogaro of Verona," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 5 (1962) 49 (Avesani, "Il 'De viribus illustribus antiquissimis qui ex Verona claruerunt'"); Sabbadini, *Le scoperte* 1.2–3 and 2.186.

the Elder, author of the *Naturalis historia*, from Pliny the Younger, author of the *Epistulae*, and thus is the first to correct the erroneous belief of a thousand years' standing that they were a single person. Mansionarius, however, assumed that the Plinii were from Verona; this gave rise to another mistake of long duration that was the object of heated discussions in the following century.²⁴ Still at Verona, Guglielmo da Pastrengo, another contemporary of the anonymous author of the *Flores*, knew a manuscript of the *Epistulae* that belonged to the same branch of the textual tradition.²⁵

Giovanni d'Andrea (ca. 1271–1348), a teacher of canon law at the University of Bologna, quotes Pliny's letters several times in his *In Decretalium librum commentaria*; the Florentine Francesco Nelli (d. 1363) does so once.²⁶ So, when Guarino Guarini 'discovered' at Verona in 1419 a manuscript of Pliny's letters, which was probably the same codex that had been used by Rather, by the author of the *Flores*, by Giovanni de Matociis, and by Pastrengo,²⁷ the text was not a novelty. However, his discovery brought the *Epistulae* to the attention of the humanists and, as Stout has noticed, added to their knowledge 118 new letters, since Guarino's manuscript belonged to a tradition different from that of the San Marco manuscript family which had been circulating previously and contained only books 1–5.6.²⁸

24. Avesani relates in detail the controversy in the fifteenth century ("Studies in Pietro Donato Avogaro II," 48–56, 63 n. 3, 69, 71–72; "Il preumanesimo veronese," 120); see also F. Gamberini, "Materiali per una ricerca sulla diffusione di Plinio il Giovane nei secoli XV e XVI," *Studi classici e orientali* 34 (1984) 138–46. For several more centuries after the discovery of the inscriptions concerning Pliny the Younger, while Pliny the Younger was believed to be from Como, Pliny the Elder was still considered Veronese.

25. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte* 1.2–3, 14–15 and 2.90 and *Storia e critica*, 263; Billanovich, "Petrarch and the Textual Tradition," 198.

26. Giovanni d'Andrea quotes Pliny's letters from book 1 (letters 3, 8, and 20), book 3 (letters 7 and 20), and book 4 (letter 12). Nelli refers to Pliny's *Ep.* 1.2; see Sabbadini, *Le scoperte* 2.157–58, 174, 186.

27. Mynors, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri decem*, ix; Sabbadini, *Le scoperte* 1.96 and 2.242–43; Merrill, "The Tradition of Pliny's Letters," 19; D. Johnson, "The Manuscripts of Pliny's Letters," *Classical Philology* 7 (1912) 66–75.

28. S. E. Stout, *Scribe and Critic at Work in Pliny's Letters: Notes on the History and Present Status of the Text*, Indiana University Humanities Series 30 (Bloomington, 1954), 17.

Manuscripts

The textual tradition of Pliny's *Letters* is rather complex,²⁹ because of the small number of ancient witnesses and the large number of contaminated humanist codices. Usually the manuscripts are divided into three main groups:³⁰

1. The eight-book family (designated γ in Mynors' edition), whose archetype was the Veronese manuscript discovered by Guarino in 1419 and previously used, it is assumed, by Rather, Giovanni de Matociis, and the author of the *Flores*.

The archetype, which has disappeared, contained books 1–7 and 9, the latter called book 8, while book 8 of the modern editions was missing. The order of the letters in books 5 and 9 was different from modern editions; and letters 8, 12, 23, 24 of book 1 and letter 6 of book 9 were missing.³¹ A large number of Italian manuscripts of the fifteenth century derive from the now missing Veronese codex, as Guarino not only made copies for himself and some friends,³² but also lent his manuscript to many others who copied it; in fact, he often had a hard time getting it back. Af-

29. The manuscript tradition of Pliny's *Epistulae* has been extensively studied in the prefaces to the editions by H. Keil (Leipzig, 1858 and 1870), E. T. Merrill (Leipzig, 1922), M. Schuster (Leipzig, 1933; 2d ed., 1952), and Mynors (Oxford, 1963), who also utilized the previous editions and the work on the manuscripts by Dora Johnson (n. 27 above). Besides these works, Stout's *Scribe and Critic*, which examines in detail not only a large number of manuscripts but also all the printed editions up to 1506, and Merrill's numerous articles have been extremely useful. The description of the manuscript families presented here follows the exposition given in Mynors' edition.

30. However, both Stout (*Scribe and Critic*, 6–10 and "The Eight-book Manuscripts of Pliny's Letters," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 55 [1924] 62–72) and Mynors think that the so-called eight-book and nine-book families have a common archetype.

31. Mynors, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri decem*, ix–x; Stout, *Scribe and Critic*, 16–17.

32. For example, Bartolomeo Capra, archbishop of Milan, asked Guarino in 1425 to prepare a copy for him (R. Sabbadini, *Vita di Guarino Veronese* [Genoa, 1891], no. 178, reprinted in M. Sancipriano, ed., *Guariniana* [Turin, 1964]). Later Guarino sent, through Poggio Bracciolini, the copy (or the manuscript itself?) of the *Epistulae* to Pope Nicholas V. Poggio acknowledged its arrival in a letter dated Rome, 7 December 1449; see H. Harth, ed., *Poggio Bracciolini, Lettere*, vol. 3 (Florence, 1987), 103: "... reddite sunt mihi abs te littere et Epistole Plinii, quas a te petiveram pontificis nomine..." Angelo Decembrio took a copy with him to Spain after 1458 (Sabbadini, *Le scoperte* 1.138 and n. 8).

ter 1449 there is no further notice of this codex.³³

The relationships among the witnesses making up the eight-book family are complicated, since most of the copies derived from Guarino's archetype were corrected and revised by their possessors with the help of manuscripts from the San Marco 284 (= F) family that had long been in circulation.³⁴ Sicco Polenton had seen a beautiful exemplar of such a revised manuscript,³⁵ and in Milan, Archbishop Francesco Pizolpasso owned the present Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, I 75 sup., which Pier Candido Decembrio seems to have corrected and for which he supplied the missing Greek words. While attending the Council of Florence (1439–42), Zenone Amidano asked Decembrio to send him from Milan his (Zenone's) manuscript of Pliny, which he had forgotten, probably with the intention of correcting it, since he had heard that in Florence some people had a "volumen . . . satis emendatum" (probably Laurentianus San Marco 284).³⁶

2. The nine-book family, which is divided into two groups.

The archetype of the first group (α in Mynors' edition) is lost, but two important, though incomplete, manuscripts survive, of which one is now Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 4736 (= M), ninth century, originally coupled with the *Annales* of Tacitus (now Laurentianus 68.1). Copied at Fulda, the codex then passed to the abbey of Corvey in Germany whence it was stolen, and ended up in the hands of Pope Leo X in 1508.³⁷ This codex contains books 1–9.26.8.

The other important member of the α group is Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 3864 (= V), copied s. IX² at Corbie. This composite manuscript con-

tains books 1–4 of the *Epistulae* (fols. 76r–108r), Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* (fols. 1r–75v), and Salust's *Orationes* (fols. 109r–133r), all texts most likely copied at Corbie in the second part of the ninth century. At some point during the fifteenth century (it is not known how or exactly when), the codex came into the possession of the Vatican Library; Pomponio Leto borrowed it from there in 1475.³⁸ Of the few manuscripts that descend from this family, one, now London, BL, Harleianus 2497, fifteenth century, of German origin, belonged to Nicholas of Cusa, who donated it to the hospital of Saint Nicholas.³⁹

The archetype of the other group (called θ in Mynors' edition) is also lost. It is believed to have contained books 1–7 and the present books 8 and 9, with a lacuna in book 8 (*Epp.* 8.8.3–18.11). Editors reconstitute the missing text from extant humanist manuscripts such as Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, D II 24 (= t), a beautiful volume that belonged to Ferdinand of Aragon, king of Naples; Paris, BNF, lat. 8620 (= f), once owned by Antonello Petrucci (d. 1487) of Naples, secretary of King Ferdinand and a member of the Academia Pontaniana; and Vatican City, BAV, Chigi H. V. 154 (= c), formerly belonging to Francesco Piccolomini (Pope Pius III).⁴⁰

3. The ten-book family or the hundred-letter family (β in Mynors' edition). Only six leaves survive of the archetype of this family. It was, apparently, the only manuscript to contain the tenth book of the *Epistulae* (Pliny's correspondence with Trajan). The six leaves from the library of the Marquis Taccone of Naples were sold to Tammaro De Marinis, from whom they were acquired by the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, where they are now ms. M. 462.⁴¹ The

33. Sabbadini, *Storia e critica*, 263–79.

34. Mynors, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri decem*, xi–xiv; for a detailed analysis of the manuscripts of this family, see Stout, *Scribe and Critic*, 16–52; Merrill, "The Tradition of Pliny's Letters," 19–21; Johnson, "The Manuscripts," 71–75.

35. R. Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Guarini veronese* (Catania, 1896), 111, 188–89 (reprinted in Sancipriano, ed., *Guariniana*).

36. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte* 2.23, 138 and *Storia e critica*, 270–73; A. Paredi, *La biblioteca del Pizolpasso* (Milan, 1961), 124–25; Johnson, "The Manuscripts," 74.

37. Mynors, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri decem*, xvi–xvii; P. Lehmann, "Corveyer Studien," in *Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-philol. u. hist. Klasse* 30.5 (Munich, 1919), 22, 38; Merrill, "The Tradition of Pliny's Letters," 23.

38. Reynolds, "The Younger Pliny," 321; B. Bischoff, "Harleianus and the Manuscripts of Classical Authors from Corbie," in *Didascalicae. Studies in Honor of Anselm M. Albareda*, ed. S. Prete (New York, 1961), 48–49, 52–53 (reprinted in Bischoff, *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, vol. 1 [Stuttgart, 1966], 55–56, 60); M. Bertòla, *I due primi registri di prestito della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, Codices e Vaticanis Selecti, Series maior 27 (Vatican City, 1942), 3 n. 6; Sabbadini, *Le scoperte* 1.145; Merrill, "The Tradition of Pliny's Letters," 23.

39. Mynors, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri decem*, xvii; Stout, *Scribe and Critic*, 12–16; Merrill, *ibid.*, 22 and 25; Johnson, "The Manuscripts," 70.

40. Mynors, *ibid.*, xv; Stout, *ibid.*, 41–42.

41. M. Harrsen and G. K. Boyce, *Italian Manuscripts in*

volume to which these leaves belonged (= π) was written in Italy at the very end of the fifth century in uncial.⁴² From there the codex was taken to France, where it was at Meaux in the fourteenth century and in the Abbey of Saint Victor at Paris in the fifteenth century.⁴³

It is generally agreed that this must have been the manuscript, often called *Parisinus*, discovered around 1500 by Fra Giocondo da Verona, architect, epigraphist, and antiquarian, who was working in Paris at the time to rebuild the bridge of Notre Dame destroyed by fire in 1499.⁴⁴ The discovery must have been known in humanist circles in France, for, on Christmas Eve of 1500, Janus Lascaris wrote to Aldus Manutius: "Delo Plynio non vi prometo anchora, perche bisognaria revederlo meglio: non so come haremo ocio."⁴⁵ From Lascaris' words it seems that the news had been communicated to Aldus, that Aldus wanted the manuscript for an edition of his own, and that the manuscript might have been somewhat difficult to read and would require extra time. In any case, Giocondo was able to make at least one copy and to put together various *exemplaria*, partly printed and partly handwritten ("partim manuscripta, partim impressa"), six of which he gave to Aldus before the Venetian ambassador, Aloisio Mocenigo, brought him (Aldus) the manuscript itself, which then disappeared, except for the six leaves now at the Morgan Library.⁴⁶

the Pierpont Morgan Library (New York, 1953), 3, no. 1 and pl. 7 (fol. 1r).

42. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores* 11, no. 1660 (n. 10 above); Lowe and Rand, *A Sixth-Century Fragment*, 13 (= Lowe, "The Palaeography of the Morgan Fragment," in *Palaeographical Papers*, 115).

43. G. Ouy, *Les manuscrits de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor: catalogue établi sur la base du répertoire de Claude de Grandrue (1514)*, 2 vols. (Turnhout, 1999), 1.30–33 and 2.630, no. 13; G. Ouy et al., *Le catalogue de la bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor de Paris de Claude Grandrue 1514* (Paris, 1983), 408; L. C. Barré, "A propos d'un essai de plume du manuscrit en onciale des *Lettres de Pline le Jeune* (Collection Pierpont Morgan)," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 94 (1933) 420–22.

44. L. A. Ciapponi, "Appunti per una biografia di Giovanni Giocondo da Verona," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 4 (1961) 147; Guillaume Budé, *Annotationes in libros Pandectarum*, (Paris, 1508), xxxvii r: "nos integrum ferme Plinium habemus, primum apud Parrhisios repertum opera Iucundi sacerdotis."

45. P. de Nolhac, "Les correspondants d'Alde Manuce: matériaux nouveaux d'histoire littéraire (1483–1514)," *Studi e documenti di storia e diritto* 8 (1887) 272.

46. See the dedicatory letter of Aldus Manutius in his

In 1502, an edition with *Epp.* 41–121 (modern numeration) of the then known but as yet unpublished tenth book appeared in Venice, edited by the Veronese humanist Girolamo Avanzi, and printed by Johannes Tacuinus alias Tridinus. Avanzi, in his dedicatory letter to Bernardo Bembo, declares that he is publishing the letters that Pietro Leandro has brought to him from France, although they are "incomplete and corrupt" ("mancas et depravatas").⁴⁷ In fact he assigns the number "xxvii" to the first letter. The likelihood is that the text was copied from the same *Parisinus* discovered by Giocondo, since it is very improbable that two new manuscripts with the tenth book of the *Epistulae* were discovered at about the same time and in the same place.⁴⁸ Pietro Leandro, an Italian humanist, was in Paris around 1500 and seems to have known Giocondo, perhaps even to have collaborated with him in collecting inscriptions; and he may have known of his discovery, as did Janus Lascaris. Moreover, Leandro may have seen the manuscript himself and made a partial copy, which he then brought to Italy to be published.⁴⁹ Publication "scoops" were not unknown even in those days.

An example of the kind of books "partim manuscripta, partim impressa" that Giocondo had put together and sent to Aldus has survived in

edition of Pliny (*C. Plinii Caecilii Novocomensis Epistolarum libri decem. Eiusdem Panegyricus ad Traianum. Iulii Obsequentis Prodigionum libri . . .*, Venice, 1508): ". . . habenda est plurima gratia . . . Iocundo Veronensi . . . quod et easdem Secundi epistolas ab eo exemplari [Parisino] a se descriptas in Gallia diligenter, ut facit omnia, et sex alia volumina epistolarum partim manu scripta partim impressa quidem, sed cum antiquis collata exemplaribus, ad me ipse sua sponte . . . adportaverit, idque biennio antequam tu [Mocenigo] ipsum exemplar publicandum tradidisses."

47. *L. Plinii Junioris ad Traianum Epistolae 46 nuper reperte cum eiusdem responsis* (Venice, 1502), fol. A2r; by Avanzi's count there are only forty-six letters because he does not number separately Trajan's answers and does not assign a number to *Epp.* 10.57 and 10.87.

48. S. E. Stout maintains that the manuscript from which Leandro copied his letters was different from the *Parisinus* ("The Basis of the Text in Book X of Pliny's Letters," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 86 [1955] 235 and *Scribe and Critic*, 59ff.). He also thinks that the *Parisinus* was written in Carolingian minuscule, not in uncial, as was the manuscript of which the Pierpont Morgan fragment is a membrum disiectum (*Scribe and Critic*, 62).

49. On Pietro Marino Leandro, and a different interpretation of this episode, see C. Vecce, *Jacopo Sannazaro in Francia* (Padua, 1988), 13–23.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. L. 4.3. This volume is made up of three different books, printed separately, plus a manuscript section: (1) the edition of Pliny's letters edited by Filippo Beroaldo the Elder (Bologna 1498), with nine books, but the eighth book is lacking *Epp.* 8.8.3–8.18.11 and, according to the tradition known up to then, the eighth book of Beroaldo is the ninth of modern editions and vice versa; (2) letters 41–121 in the volume published by Avanzi in 1502; (3) two short works by Beroaldo, the *Declamatio philosophi, medici, oratoris de excellentia discrepantium* and the *Libellus de optimi oratore et principe*, published together at Bologna in 1477.

In the first two printed volumes there are notes entered by two different hands: one, a cursive hand called *i* by Pliny's editors and identified as that of Guillaume Budé, observes, for example, that book 8 "in antiquis exemplaribus" is book 9, copies the missing letter 9.6 (fol. 118v), makes additions and corrections throughout, and writes at the end of the 1502 volume: "Hae Plinii Iunioris epistolae ex vetustissimo exemplari Parisiensi et restitutae et emendatae sunt, opera et industria Ioannis Iocundi, praestantissimi architecti, hominis in primis antiquarii." As we have already seen, Giocondo did not keep the discovered text of Pliny for himself; rather, he shared it among the humanists by reading, teaching, correcting, and emending it publicly. The young Budé, who had followed Giocondo's lectures on Pliny, as he had done for those on Vitruvius, continued to work and add notes to his text afterwards.⁵⁰

The other hand in the Bodleian codex, designated as I by editors, perfectly imitates the printed fonts of the editions when it copies the missing letters from book 8 (from 8.8.3 to 8.18.11) and letters 4–40 of book 10. Letters 1–3 of book 10 are missing.

Still extant are two incomplete, but important manuscripts belonging to the ten-book family. Both seem to descend, through a common

50. On the relations between Giocondo and the young Budé, see L. A. Ciapponi, "Agli inizi dell'umanesimo francese: Fra Giocondo e Guglielmo Budé," in *Forme e vicende: per Giovanni Pozzi* (Padua, 1988), 101–18 (but correct 'Venezia' for 'Verona' as the printing place of Avanzi's edition). For more discussion on the Bodleian volume and its relation to the *Parisinus* and Budé, see E. T. Merrill, "On a Bodleian Copy of Pliny's Letters," *Classical Philology* 2 (1907) 129–56 (where Merrill shows that the volume and the notes belong to Budé), and Stout, *Scribe and Critic*, 58–70.

antigraph, from π. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ashb. 98 (= B) was written at Auxerre in the ninth century⁵¹ and later belonged to the Chapter Library of Saint-Pierre, Beauvais; according to Merrill, this was the manuscript used by Vincent of Beauvais. Originally bound with the *Naturalis historia* of the elder Pliny, it contains books 1–4.25 and 4.27–5.6.32, with an index at the head of each book. By some means the codex came to Italy and entered the Riccardiana Library in Florence; Guglielmo Libri later detached the two works from each other and sold the *Epistulae* to Lord Ashburnham. The Italian government bought the manuscript back from his heirs and presented it to the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana.⁵² This codex does not have any known descendants.

The other manuscript derived from the same antigraph as Laurentianus Ashb. 98 is Laurentianus San Marco 284 (F), s. XIex.⁵³ This is the codex that Simon della Tenca brought back from France and Coluccio Salutati owned (see p. 77 above). The numerous humanist copies made of ms. San Marco 284 often show a completed text with help from manuscripts of the eight-book family.⁵⁴

Incunabula

After the invention of printing, a large number of editions of Pliny's works were produced, first of the *Epistulae*, then of the *Panegyricus*, and finally of the *Epistulae* and *Panegyricus* together. In the first fifty years they were published mainly in Italy, afterward chiefly across the Alps. For more than thirty years the text of the *Epistulae* was printed without a commentary. The first Italian editors concentrated mainly on finding manuscripts, establishing as complete and readable a text as possible, and studying the style and variety of content of Pliny's letters.

Nine editions appeared in Italy between 1471 and 1500. The *editio princeps* was printed at Ven-

51. Reynolds, "The Younger Pliny," 318.

52. Mynors, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri decem*, vii–viii; Merrill, "The Tradition of Pliny's Letters," 16.

53. Mynors, *ibid.*, xvi–xvii; Merrill, *ibid.*, 21–22, who thinks that the manuscript may have originated in Germany.

54. For a list of manuscripts directly or indirectly descended from F, see Johnson, "The Manuscripts," 68–70, 73–75.

ice in 1471. Its editor was Ludovico Carbone (1430–85), a humanist who had studied Greek with Theodore Gaza and Latin with Guarino Guarini, of whom he had been a favorite student.⁵⁵ Carbone's edition basically reproduces the text of the eight-book family discovered by Guarino: it contains books 1–7 and 9 (the latter numbered as 8; the present book 8 is missing), and it lacks letter 9.16; the order of the letters in books 5 and 9 is typical of this family.⁵⁶ However, the text was corrected against a manuscript of the ten-book family, since it does not omit letters 8, 12, 23, and 24 of book 1, and has many readings derived from F of the ten-book family.⁵⁷

Carbone dedicated his edition to his patron Borso d'Este.⁵⁸ In the dedicatory letter he recommends to Borso the reading of Pliny's letters: although Pliny's style does not have the overflowing abundance (*redundantia*) of Cicero, his sentences are elegant, witty, and have weight and dignity (*pondus et gravitas*), and his language is concise and grand.

The edition that appeared seven years later at Milan in 1478 follows closely the text of the *editio princeps*, with obvious typographical corrections, and adds the names of the addressees of

55. Venetiis (Venice), 1471: [Christopher Valdarfer] (H*13110; IGI 7896; Goff P-804; BN P-471; Proctor 41334). Carbone was *corrector* (i.e., his position was somewhat similar to that of a modern editor who emends and prepares a text for printing; see S. Rizzo, *Il lessico filologico degli umanisti* [Rome, 1973; repr. 1984], 275–76). For other classical works published by Valdarfer besides Pliny's *Epistulae*, see "Carbone, Ludovico," DBI 19 (1976) 699–703 (L. Paoletti); L. Piacente, "Ludovico Carbone e un'edizione pirata di Servio," *Invigliata lucernis* 9 (1987) 129–42; Piacente, "Dinastie di maestri. Battista Guarino succede a suo padre," *ibid.*, 143–62; and Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi*, 113.

56. Book 5 is ordered as follows: *Epp.* 1–8; 21; 15; 10–20; 9. The order of book 9 is: *Epp.* 1–2; 7; 9; 12; 17; 21; 24–25; 30–32; 3–5; 8; 10–11; 13–15; 18–20; 22–23; 26.

57. Merrill's critical apparatus seems to show that this edition is close to the group of manuscripts designated *oux* (Vatican City, BAV, Ottob. lat. 1965 and Urb. lat. 1153; Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 48). These, in fact, are manuscripts of the eight-book family with readings from the F family; see Merrill, ed., *Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri decem*, xvi. For collating the variants, Merrill's apparatus has been the most useful, since it contains readings of more *recentiores* manuscripts than does Mynors' edition.

58. Paris, BNF, Rés. Z 130, a copy of this edition, has a manuscript dedication; the hand imitates the printed font. The first page of Pliny's text is beautifully illuminated; there are numerous marginal notes by two hands. Dr. Vladimir Jurën kindly called the author's attention to this copy.

Epp. 6.13–16 and 7.1, which are missing in the *editio princeps*. This volume was probably printed by Valdarfer for Philippus de Lavagnia.⁵⁹ It was, in turn, reprinted at Treviso in 1483 by Johannes [Rubeus] Vercellensis.⁶⁰

A new edition, thought to have been printed in Rome in 1474, published fourteen previously unknown letters.⁶¹ The anonymous editor seems to be unaware of the novelty of his publication. There is no dedication or preface.⁶² The exemplar from which this edition was printed appears to be a manuscript of the nine-book family with readings of the Guarinian type of manuscripts corrected against manuscripts of the ten-book family.⁶³

The edition published at Naples in 1476 and edited by Giuniano Maio,⁶⁴ although it contains

59. Mediolani (Milan): per Philippum Lavagniam, 1478 (H 13112; IGI 7899; Goff P-807; BN P-474; Proctor 5860). Valdarfer had left Venice and was in Milan by 1473. He is known to have printed for Philippus de Lavagnia, who often served as his *corrector*. It is also known that Lavagnia attributed to himself some printings that he commissioned to Valdarfer; see *Catalogue of Books Printed in the XVth Century now in the British Museum*, vol. 5 (London, 1924; rpt. 1963), 182, and vol. 6 (London, 1930; rpt. 1963), 699 and 724; V. Scholderer, "Printing at Milan in the Fifteenth Century," *The Library*, 4th Ser., 7 (1927) 360–63; T. Rogledi Manni, *La tipografia a Milano nel XV secolo* (Florence, 1980), 27–35 and 184, no. 818; Piacente, "Ludovico Carbone," 129 n. 2.

60. H 13113; IGI 7900; Goff P-808; BN P-475; Proctor 6497.

61. Stout, *Scribe and Critic*, 31–34. This edition (H 13108; IGI 7897; Goff P-805; BN P-472) has neither the place nor the date of printing, nor the name of the printer nor that of the editor, but bibliographers believe that it was printed by the German printer Johannes Schurer, active at Rome in this period. A copy in the BNF (Rés. Z 688) has many marginal notes, most of which call attention to names, places, etc., as well as a subscription at the end of the colophon: "1474 sedente Xysto pon. max. eius anno tertio; kal. Iuniis in hospitio Sanctis de Pireto." Dr. Vladimir Jurën kindly supplied this information.

62. This edition begins with the title of the first book and contains books 1–9; book 8 corresponds to modern book 9, and vice versa; but *Epp.* 8.8.3–8.18.11 are missing (letter 8.8 is made up of the first lines of 8.1–3 [*Vidistine aliquando Clitumnus . . . navium patiens*] and the last lines of 8.18.11–12 [*eodem quo emerat . . . exemplis erudimur*] combined with *Ep.* 9.16). The order of the letters of book 5 and 9 is the same as that of Carbone's edition.

63. Stout, *Scribe and Critic*, 31–34.

64. Neapoli (Naples), 1476: Mathias Moravus (H13111; IGI 7897; Goff P-806; BN P-473; Proctor 6695A). On Maio, see P. Pellegrini, "XEIP XEIPA NIIITEI. Per gli incunaboli di Giovanni Calfurnio, umanista editore," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 42 (2001) 243, 268 and R. Ricciardi, "Angelo Poliziano, Giuniano Maio, Antonio Calcillo," *Rinascimento*, N. S., 8 (1968) 277–309.

the same books 1–9 (with the usual exchange of book 8 and 9) and is missing *Epp.* 8.8.3–8.18.11 and 9.16, seems to be independent of the 1474 edition for books 1–7 and 9. Maio not only made good corrections and conjectures of his own, but may also have had a quite different manuscript as exemplar. His text seems to be close to Parisinus lat. 8620 (f). This manuscript belongs to Mynors' θ group, but is missing book 8. However, for the fourteen letters of book 8, Maio used the 1474 text.⁶⁵

In his dedicatory letter to Gerolamo Caraffa, Maio praises the *Epistulae* for their variety of content and style and for their moral values. Pliny's style is not only varied, but is more like the conciseness of Demosthenes than Cicero's grandeur, so Maio writes; Caraffa will appreciate, enjoy, and learn from him more as he will return to read him again and again. A copy of this edition, formerly in the Aragonese library and now Paris, BNF, Rés. Z 131, belonged to Giovanni Antonio Petrucci, son of Antonello and secretary of Ferrante of Aragon, with his notes and a subscription dated 7 November 1481.⁶⁶ Another copy (Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Edizioni rare 351) has, among others, notes and corrections made by Francesco Pucci. In the subscription, dated Naples, 15 October 1481, Pucci claims to have collated the edition with five manuscripts, one of which was *perantiquus* and annotated by Francesco Aretino.⁶⁷ While Pucci's notes correct

and emend the text, they do not comment on it. In the late 1470s and early 1480s there was clearly a lively philological interest in the text of Pliny's letters in Naples.

It has already been observed above that, in 1475, Pomponio Leto borrowed from the Vatican Library an early, incomplete witness of the ninth century, namely, ms. Vat. lat. 3864 (V).⁶⁸ He took notes from it then, or he may well have borrowed it again at a later time, since several readings proper to Vat. lat. 3864 are found in the edition which he published in 1490 at Rome for the printer Eucharius Silber.⁶⁹ Merrill reported that he himself owned a copy of the 1483 Treviso edition with autograph notes of Leto inserted in the margins; these notes consist of readings from a manuscript of Mynors' θ group and from Vat. lat. 3864, and were probably made by Leto in preparation for his own edition. Indeed, most of these marginal annotations did pass into Leto's 1490 text.⁷⁰

lingua eruditissimi. quem in plerisque ac prope omnibus locis probavit et sequutus est. Interdum vero sua usus Minerva quaedam ipse corripuit. immutavitque quae probaturum se doctis (*corr.*) ac sani iudicii lectoribus confidit. paratus tamen melioribus acquiescere. et ultro manus dare. veniam si quid errati fuerit (*the preceding five words have been corrected*) ingenue petit. Vale posteritas. Neapoli Idib. octobr. Anno a natali domini deique nostri M° CCCC° LXXXIX°." Francesco Aretino's manuscript apparently contained nine books given Pucci's note at the beginning of *Ep.* 8.1.1: "Hic liber non est in omnibus codicibus sed in eo pervetusto et bono tantum extat."

For new instances of other classical texts with Pucci's notes, see C. Vecce, "Postillati di Antonio Seripando," in *Parrhasiana II. Atti del II Seminario di Studi su Manoscritti Medievali e Umanistici della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli. Napoli, 20–21 ottobre 2000*, ed. G. Abbamonte, L. Gualdo Rosa, and L. Munzi, A.I.O.N. Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli, Dipartimento di Studi del Mondo Classico e del Mediterraneo Antico, Sezione filologico-letteraria 24 - 2002 (Naples, 2002), 53–60 and 4 plates on 61–64. 68. See n. 38 above.

69. Romae (Rome), 1490: per Eucharium Silber (H 13114; IGI 7901; Goff P-809; BN P-476; Proctor 3841).

70. Merrill, "The Tradition of Pliny's Letters," 23: "This particular book [*sc.* Treviso 1483] from the collection of Laetus, with its numerous marginalia from V [Vat. Lat. 3864] and from a MS of the c [Chigi H. V. 154] t [Turin 297] r [1474 Rome ed.]-class, I hold in possession, having bought it in 1899 from a bookseller in Rome. Laetus had apparently equipped the volume provisionally as a copy for the printer of his own edition, which appeared in 1490. It may be not without interest to remark that I also own a copy of the edition of Laetus which bears the indubitable autograph of Lorenzo de' Medici at the top of its first page of the text, and

65. Mynors, "Praefatio," xv; Stout, *Scribe and Critic*, 34, 44–46.

66. Giovanni Antonio Petrucci owned and annotated also a 1472 Rome edition of Livy; see A. Altamura, *L'umanesimo nel mezzogiorno d'Italia. Storia, bibliografie e testi inediti* (Florence, 1941), 88–89.

67. B. Richardson, "Pucci, Parrasio e Catullo," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 19 (1976) 278–81; CTC 7.212 n. 103 (Catullus). According to Butrica, these notes and subscription are not in the hand of Pucci but represent an apograph, as in the case of Pucci's subscription to Catullus; see J. L. Butrica, "Pontanus, Puccius, Pocchus, Petreius, and Propertius," *Res publica litterarum* 3 (1980) 5–9. It is possible that this volume belonged to the library of either Pierfilippo or Francesco Pandolfini, who owned a copy of this edition with notes by Francesco Pucci (A. Cataldi Palau, "La biblioteca Pandolfini. Storia della sua formazione e successiva dispersione: identificazione di alcuni manoscritti," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 31 [1988] 351–52). The subscription reads: (fol. 106r) "Franciscus Puccius magna diligentia ac fide recognovit et emendavit ___ (erasure) collatis inter (*corr.*) se (*corr.*) quinque codicibus. et uno presertim perantiquo et annotato manu francisci Arretini viri utraque

Not surprisingly, Poliziano also consulted early manuscripts. At present, we do not know of any codex or incunable of Pliny which belonged to Poliziano and was corrected and annotated by him, but he must have owned at least one. In fact, in his early commentary on Statius (1480–81), he frequently quotes from Pliny's *Epistulae*.⁷¹ Around 1493–94, when he was putting together his notes on Suetonius and writing his second collection of *Miscellanea*, Poliziano had already collated a printed edition or editions and corrected at least the passages that interested him with the help of two early manuscripts (Laurentianus San Marco 284 and Ashb. 98) then in the library of the Dominican monastery of San Marco at Florence.⁷²

The first composite edition containing the

was (I imagine) carried off when the Medici palace at Florence was plundered in 1494." Merrill restates some of this information in the preface (p. vii) to his 1922 edition of Pliny's *Epistulae*. Prof. Brendan Boyle has kindly supplied the information that Pomponio Leto's notes in Merrill's copy of the Treviso 1483 edition were the subject of a seminar paper by one of Merrill's students; see A. Lincoln, "Pomponius Laetus' Marginal Notes in His copy of the Treviso 1483 Edition of Pliny's Letters" (Chicago, The University of Chicago, Regenstein Library, Department of Special Collections and Archives, ARCH, folder 1). The disposition of Merrill's library after his death in 1936 is presently unknown.

71. Angelo Poliziano, *Commento inedito alle Selve di Stazio*, ed. L. Cesarini Martinelli, Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento, Studi e Testi 5 (Florence, 1978), 781 ("Index auctorum", s.v. "Plinius iunior").

72. G. Gardenal, *Il Poliziano e Svetonio. Contributo alla storia della filologia umanistica* (Florence, 1975), 56 (where Poliziano, in quoting and correcting a reading of Pliny's, refers to "vetusti . . . codices"), 58, 68, 72. For corrections to Gardenal and the transfer of the date of the notes on Suetonius to 1493–94, see L. Cesarini Martinelli, "Il Poliziano e Svetonio: osservazioni su un recente contributo alla storia della filologia umanistica," *Rinascimento*, N. S., 16 (1976) 119–22 and V. Fera, *Una ignota Expositio Suetoni del Poliziano* (Messina, 1983), 14–15, 196 n. 2. In the *Miscellanea secunda*, Poliziano mentions again the two ancient manuscripts: "Illud etiam quod ait aliquis [sc. Filippo Beroaldo the Elder] abiicio, 'paedagogium' legi apud Plinium in epistolis oportere pro loco ubi ministri commorantur. Nam si vetustos adeas codices 'paedagogium' invenies: sicuti et est in duobus qui Florentiae patent cuius in publica Medicae familiae bibliotheca" ("I also reject what someone says, that we should read 'paedagogium' in the letters of Pliny [7.27.13] for the place where the servants stay. In fact, if you look up the ancient manuscripts, you will find *paedagogium*, as it is in the two manuscripts in the public library of the Medici family, which are accessible to anyone"). See Angelo Poliziano, *Miscellaneorum centuria secunda*, ed. V. Branca and M. Pastore Stocchi, vol. 4 (Florence, 1972), 33.

Epistulae, the *Panegyricus*, and the spurious *De viris illustribus*, here attributed to Pliny, does not have any indication of printer, place, or date of printing. Bibliographers, however, agree that the volume was published in Venice and assign it to the printer Johannes Roscius; but they disagree on the date of publication.⁷³ For the *Epistulae*, this edition follows the text of the 1483 Treviso edition, with an abundance of typographical mistakes, but also with some good editorial changes.⁷⁴ It was reproduced, with corrections of the numerous typographical mistakes, by Johannes Rubeus Vercellensis around 1500.⁷⁵ From an epigram at the end of the text of the *De viris illustribus* it appears that Antonio Moreto, well known in Venetian editorial circles not only as a financial sponsor and book trader, but also as *corrector*, was the editor.⁷⁶

Filippo Beroaldo the Elder had interpreted five passages from Pliny's letters in his *Annotationes centum* published in 1488.⁷⁷ In 1498, at the end of his *Heptalogus*, he advertised his forthcoming course on Pliny and Horace, wittily promising the students that he will make the authors sweeter and easier to digest.⁷⁸ In that same year he published (19 October) his own edition of the *Epistu-*

73. H 13116; IGI 7904; Goff P-811; BN P-477; Proctor 5492; BN and Goff suggest ca. 1492, IGI ca. 1500. According to the BMC 5.536, only one book bears Roscius' name. This anonymous edition of Pliny has been assigned to him on typographical evidence.

74. Stout, *Scribe and Critic*, 28–29 believes that it was emended with the help of Parisinus lat. 8620 (f).

75. H 13117; IGI 7905; Goff P-812; BN P-479; Proctor 5129. Again, the date is uncertain, with Goff giving it as ca. 1492, IGI and BN ca. 1500. See also Stout, *Scribe and Critic*, 28 n. 19.

76. On Moreto, see G. Borsa, "L'attività dei tipografi di origine bresciana, al fuori del territorio bresciano, fino al 1512," in E. Sandal, ed., *I primordi della stampa a Brescia 1472–1511: Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Brescia, 6–8 giugno 1984*, Medioevo e umanesimo 63 (Padua, 1986), 36; J. Monfasani, "The First Call for Press Censorship: Niccolò Perotti, Giovanni Andrea Bussi, Antonio Moreto, and the Editing of Pliny's 'Natural History,'" *Renaissance Quarterly* 41 (1988) 14–22, 28–31 (list of publications in which Moreto took part); Pellegrini, "XEIP XEIPA NIITTEI," 191 n. 27, with bibliography; and, more recently, P. Osmond, "Il testamento di Antonio Moreto, editore e mercante di libri a Venezia (22 maggio 1501)," *Atti dell'Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere e arti* 163 (2004–2005) 1–27.

77. Filippo Beroaldo the Elder, *Annotationes centum*, ed. L. A. Ciapponi, *Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies* 131 (Binghamton, N.Y., 1995): ann. 45.1 (*Ep.* 1.2.4); 46.1 (*Ep.* 2.20.3); 47.1 (*Ep.* 5.2.2); 89.7 (*Ep.* 5.11.4); and 92.4–5 (*Ep.* 9.6.2–3).

78. Bononiae (Bologna), 1498, unpaginated.

lae.⁷⁹ His text is close to that of Leto, though with corrections and conjectures of his own. Beroaldo, according to Merrill, might have had access also to a contaminated manuscript derived from Laurentianus San Marco 284 (F).⁸⁰ Beroaldo shows his enthusiasm for Pliny's letters in his dedication to one of his Bohemian students, Johannes of Wartenberg, where he compares Cicero and Pliny as writers of letters. He considers them equal, though different, and he praises the qualities of both: the exuberant, natural style of Cicero, his eloquence and richness of vocabulary, and the laconic, thoughtful, careful style of Pliny, his elegance and the density of his sentences. They are "the two pillars of letter-writing" ("in epistolis scriptandis duo columina"); but, he adds, owing to his conciseness, Pliny is at this time preferred as a model for letter writing. He therefore urges Johannes, as a teacher to a student, not only to study Pliny's letters, but to keep them constantly in his hands, to make them his manual ("enchiridion tuum"), and even to devour them gluttonously.

THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

The humanists of the fifteenth century worked hard putting together, correcting, and emending the text of Pliny's *Epistulae*. They appreciated the style of the letters and the variety of their content, which provided a wealth of new idiomatic expressions and vocabulary, since the letters dealt not only with state affairs, as did Cicero's, but also with the situations of everyday life. In the roughly thirty years after the *editio princeps* a respectable number of editions (thirteen) were published, but none with a commentary. In the sixteenth century, with the discovery of the tenth book, the corpus of the text of Pliny's *Epistulae* was completed, and the first commentary would soon appear.

79. Bononiae (Bologna), 1498: per Benedictum Hectoris (H 13115; IGI 7902; Goff P-810). A copy at Como, Biblioteca Civica (shelf mark: A-3-2) has numerous marginal notes by a notary, Gulielmus Pratensis, that are dated Prato, May 1513. The 1498 edition was reprinted at Venice, with the addition of the *Panegyricus* and the *De viris illustribus*, by Albertinus Vercellensis in 1501 (some copies bear the date 1500: C 4776; IGI 7903); and (*Epistulae* only) at Paris in 1510 by Franciscus Regnault and Egidius Gourmont (see below).

80. Merrill, ed., *Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri decem*, xviii.

Girolamo Avanzi began the publication of the tenth book with his edition of forty-six letters from the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan; it appeared on 11 May 1502 at Venice and the printer was Johannes Tacuinus. The text of these letters was very likely copied from the same manuscript discovered in France by Fra Giocondo.⁸¹ Avanzi's edition contains only *Epp.* 41–121 (modern numeration) of book 10, and numerous misprints and mistakes indicate that it was produced in haste.⁸² In his dedicatory letter to Bernardo Bembo, a Venetian patrician and father of Pietro Bembo, Avanzi does not seem to be much interested in Pliny. He claims to be publishing the *Letters*, though incomplete and corrupt, to satisfy Bembo's wish ("imprimis tuo desiderio"), and because he thinks that they will be useful to scholars; Pliny's style befits Bembo, and Avanzi hopes that he will find time to read them.

A few months later, on 24 January 1503,⁸³ the elder Beroaldo, taking advantage of Avanzi's work, published an edition of the tenth book only of the *Epistulae*, together with the text of the *Panegyricus* taken from the *editio princeps* of his teacher Francesco Puteolano. Beroaldo does not claim to have a manuscript, new or old, of the tenth book, nor does he acknowledge Avanzi as his source. In a brief note to the reader, he presents these letters as "some letters that have very recently come to light" ("hae sunt epistolae aliquot quae nuperrime in lucem prodierunt") exchanged between Pliny and Trajan. He has corrected and given them to the printer. His edition, corrected by conjecture, is in fact much better than Avanzi's. Not satisfied with this limited edition, on 1 April of the following year (1504) Beroaldo published another edition, this time with all ten books (but only letters 41–121 of the tenth book) of the *Epistulae*, together with the *Libellus de viris illustribus* attributed to Pliny.⁸⁴

81. See p. 80 above.

82. On Avanzi's and the immediate successive editions of the tenth book of the *Epistulae*, see E. T. Merrill, "On the Early Printed Editions of Pliny's Correspondence with Trajan," *Classical Philology* 5 (1910) 451–66.

83. *Epistolae Plinii ad Traianum cum Panegyrico. Ex castigatione Philippi Beroaldi*, Bononiae (Bologna), 1502: per Benedictum Hectoris. The date of the colophon is "anno MDII xxiii Ianuarii," but since the new year started at Bologna in March, the actual date is 1503. Beroaldo's edition came out eight months after Avanzi's.

84. *C. Plinii Secundi Iunioris Epistolae per Philippum*

This edition, interestingly enough, has the complete book 8, i.e., it includes all the letters (8.8.3–8.18.11) that, according to the modern order, were missing in all the preceding editions.

Uncharacteristically, Beroaldo does not boast or even inform the reader of this novelty. The fact that he managed to get hold of these letters is all the more surprising since Aldus Manutius (see below) claims in the prefatory letter of his 1508 edition to be the first both to publish all the letters of book 8 and to have recognized, thanks to his new manuscript (the *Parisinus*) that the eighth book is actually the ninth, and vice versa. Beroaldo still calls the ninth book the “eighth”, but he does have book 8 in its entirety, a fact that seems to have escaped all the editors of Pliny. A comparison between readings in book 8 that are typical of Aldus and *I* (the added handwritten letters of the incunabulum signalled above with the shelf mark Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. L. 4.3) with those of Beroaldo’s 1504 edition reveals that Beroaldo has the exact readings of the other two texts.

Giovanni Maria Cattaneo (ca. 1450–1529/30) was the first to publish, at Milan in 1506, commentaries on the *Epistulae* (I.1 below) and the *Panegyricus* (V.1 below). Extensive in scope and length, they appeared in the same volume and were placed beneath and around the text of both works;⁸⁵ the volume was dedicated to Milanese dignitaries. For the text of the *Epistulae* Cattaneo follows Leto and Beroaldo (1498) in books 1–9, and Avanzi and Beroaldo (1503) in book 10, but he corrects, emends, and makes conjectures of his own. Numerous reprintings (wholly or in part) and consultation by all successive commentators attest to the usefulness and popularity of Cattaneo’s efforts. He also provided the reader for the first time with a *Vita Plinii*, a short, but fairly accurate biography of the Roman writer, whose

Beroaldum correctae, Bononiae (Bologna), 1504: per Benedictum Hectoris. The text of the *Epistulae* consists of books 1–9 (with the usual inversion of books 8 and 9), and *Epp.* 41–121 of book 10.

85. His edition of the *Epistulae* contains books 1–9, with the usual inversion of books 8 and 9, and *Epp.* 41–121 of book 10; still missing are *Epp.* 8.8.3–8.18.11, 9.16, and 10.1–40. Cattaneo was obviously unaware of Beroaldo’s 1504 edition. A pirated version of this edition was reprinted at Venice, in 1510, with slight differences in the sequence of the works and minor omissions, by the brothers Johannes (Rubeus) and Bernardinus de Lisona Vercellensis.

main source is Pliny’s works, and at least one inscription on Pliny (*CIL* 5.5263).

In 1508 Aldus Manutius (and his father-in-law, Andreas Asulanus) published at Venice the first complete text of Pliny’s *Epistulae*, using the newly discovered *Parisinus* and the other volumes collated with it.⁸⁶ This Aldine edition contained books 1–9 in the modern sequence, including *Epp.* 8.8.3–8.8.11 and 9.16, and *Epp.* 1–121 of book 10. The letters of book 5 remained and would remain for a few more centuries in the traditional sequence.⁸⁷

Aldus’ title boasts of the novelty of his edition, but besides the *Parisinus* he also took advantage of preceding editions. The Aldine text seems to have been in flux: different copies have several different readings, a phenomenon that provoked various studies in the 1920s and 1930s, amidst lively discussion, by F. E. Robbins, E. T. Merrill, B. B. Boyer and A. P. Dorjahn, G. P. Winship, A. E. Case, and B. L. Ullman.⁸⁸

Although modern editors are wary of Aldus’ edition because of his many emendations and conjectures, it became very popular and was reprinted for many years in Italy and abroad. The problem of how to reconstitute Pliny’s text is especially acute for a modern editor of book 10, for which there are no early manuscripts: for letters 41–121 the only witnesses are the editions

86. As noted on p. 80 above, the *Parisinus* had been brought to Aldus from France by the Venetian ambassador Aloisio Mocenigo, the others by Fra Giocondo.

87. See n. 56 above.

88. *C. Plinii Secundi Novocomensis Epistolarum libri decem in quibus multae habentur epistolae non ante impressae. Tum Graeca correctae et suis locis restituta atque, reiectis adulterinis, vera reposita. Item fragmentatae epistolae integrae factae. In medio etiam epistola libri octavi de Clitumno fonte non solum vertici calx additus, et calci vertex, sed decem quoque epistolae interpositae, ac ex nono libro octavus factus, et ex octavo nonus. Itaque beneficio exemplaris correctissimi et mirae ac potius venerandae vetustatis. . . .* Aldus’ edition, in octavo as are many of his texts, contains (beside the *Epistulae*) the *Panegyricus*, the *De viris illustribus* attributed by him to Pliny, the *De claris grammaticis et rhetoribus* of Suetonius, and the *De prodigiis* of Julius Obsequens, a short work that had recently been discovered by Fra Giocondo. For a detailed analysis of Aldus’ use of his sources, see Stout, *Scribe and Critic*, 68–80; B. B. Boyer and A. P. Dorjahn, “On the 1508 Aldine Pliny,” *Classical Philology* 20 (1925) 50–61; G. P. Winship, “The Aldine Pliny of 1508,” *The Library*, 4th Ser., 6 (1925–26) 358–69; A. E. Case, “More About the Aldine Pliny of 1508,” *The Library*, 4th Ser., 16 (1935–36) 173–77. See also Bibliography II. B below.

of Avanzi, Beroaldo, and Aldus, and the Oxford incunabulum of Budé (Auct. L. 4.3); for letters 4–40 there are only the texts of Aldus and Budé, and for letters 1–3, Aldus' text only.

Aldus dedicates his edition of Pliny to Mocenigo. In his dedicatory letter he expresses his enthusiasm for the newly found manuscript of Pliny's *Epistulae*, which, he says, is not only very correct, but also of such great antiquity that it could be thought to have been written during Pliny's lifetime.⁸⁹ After expressing his gratitude both to Mocenigo and to Fra Giocondo, Aldus, like Cattaneo two years previously, responds to the objections of those who did not believe that the *Epistulae* comprising the tenth book had been written by Pliny. Aldus does not think that the style of the letters in book 10 is inelegant, though, as Pliny himself says, the others were written *accuratius* ("more carefully"). He repeats with Cattaneo that the appellative *dominus* was used during Pliny's lifetime, and quotes two examples from the *Epigrams* of Martial (8.1; 5.8.1) to support this claim. As a strong reason in favor of Pliny's authorship, Aldus points out that the very ancient manuscript from which he is publishing the letters attributes them to Pliny. He also repeats that Tertullian (*Apol.* 2.6.9), Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3.33.1–3), and Paulus Orosius (*Adv. pag.* 7.12.3) refer to *Ep.* 10.96, in which Pliny asks Trajan how to handle the Christians, as written by Pliny. Finally, Aldus adds parallel passages from the tenth and other books to show mutual connections with respect to persons and subjects.

He continues his dedicatory letter by arguing that the *De viris illustribus* is also a work of Pliny, although he is aware that many, on Jerome's authority, think that it was written by Suetonius.⁹⁰ But Suetonius, Aldus notes, is the author of the *De claris grammaticis et rhetoribus*, which he here adds to the other works in this edition.

In this letter Aldus' interests are more philological than rhetorical. He talks about the *Parisinus* and how it came into his hands, showing with external and internal arguments and numerous quotations why book 10 of the *Epistulae*

is composed by Pliny and arguing for Pliny as the author of the *De viris illustribus*. But he says very little about Pliny as writer of the *Epistulae* and instead praises the style of the *Panegyricus*.

Aldus' edition sparked a number of unauthorized printings. It influenced Erasmus, who was then in Venice working on a new edition of his *Adagia* that would be published by Aldus in September of the same year. Erasmus mentions the future publication of Pliny's *Epistulae* in this work as a specimen of a less corrupt text, and he quotes examples from them.⁹¹ He uses Pliny's letters extensively as examples in his own *De conscribendis epistolis*, published in final form in 1522 but in preparation for many years. In addition he cites Pliny frequently in several other works.⁹²

In June of 1518 Aldus Manutius and his father-in-law Andreas Asulanus reprinted their 1508 edition. Mention of the novelty of this edition is, obviously, omitted. There are, however, some additions: an index of the names of persons mentioned by Pliny, an index of interesting topics in the whole work (*Index rerum memorabilium et propriorum nominum quae toto opere continentur*), and a Latin translation of Greek words and phrases used by Pliny both in the *Epistulae* and in the *De viris illustribus* (*Latina interpretatio dictionum et sententiarum graecarum quae hoc in volumine habentur*).

The period intervening between the first and second Aldines witnessed the publication of an edition in October 1515 by the Florentine firm Giunti. Edited by Giovanni Francesco Zeffi, it con-

89. Modern scholars, with the exception of Stout, believe that the six leaves in fifth-century uncial, now ms. M. 462 in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, are what is left of the *Parisinus* (see pp. 79–80 above).

90. In his 1504 edition Beroaldo had also attributed the *De viris illustribus* to Pliny, but without discussion.

91. *Desideri Erasmi Roterodami Adagia, Opera omnia*, ed. M. Szymánski (Amsterdam et al., 2005), 2.3, 18 (Chil. II cent. 1.1): "Tum denique cognitum erit quam prodigiosis mendis scateant auctores, etiam hi qui nunc satis emendati putantur. Cuius rei si cui libebit velut ex degustatione coniecturam facere, Plinianas epistolas, quae propediem ex Aldina officina prodibunt in lucem, cum vulgatis exemplaribus conferat, quodque ibi deprehenderit, idem in aliis expectet auctoribus" ("Then it will be recognized in how many mistakes ancient authors abound, even those who are thought to be sufficiently correct. If someone wants to have a sample of this, let him collate with the current exemplars the epistles of Pliny which soon will come out of the Aldine printing house, and what he finds there, he should expect also in other authors"). See also pp. 106, 198, 238, and 248.

92. *De conscribendis epistolis*, ed. J. C. Margolin, *Opera omnia* 1.2, 205–579 (see the numerous examples in the index, s.v. "Pliny"); see also *De pueris . . . instituendis*, ed. Margolin, *Opera omnia* 1.2, 44, 63, 66; *Dialogus Ciceronianus*, ed. P. Mesnard, *Opera omnia* 1.2, 658, 663.

tained the *Epistulae* “*purgatissimae*”, the *Panegyricus*, and all the other works that had been published in 1508 by Aldus.⁹³ A novel aspect of the Giuntine edition, at least for Italy and with respect to the Aldine, was a *Traductio graecarum dictionum quae passim volumini sunt inserta*; this may have inspired Aldus to make a similar addition to his 1518 edition.⁹⁴ Although Zeffi claims to have collated exemplars and to have worked hard to produce a better text, even if not perfect, he follows Aldus’ edition in publishing all the new letters of books 8, 9, and 10 in the same order, and he appears to have mainly collated Beroaldo’s (1502), Cattaneo’s (1506), and Aldus’ editions for the other letters, but no manuscripts, and to have made a few conjectures and corrections himself.

In his dedication to Pier Francesco de’ Medici, Zeffi praises Cicero, who is and will always be liked, but affirms that Pliny is more imitated. He also extols the qualities of Pliny and his style; Pliny is modest in his praises, ardent in his invectives, and rational in defense of himself or others. He is witty, concise, and lucid in his narration; he expresses his feelings in such a way that one sympathizes with him; he gives benevolent advice, and exhorts gently. Zeffi continues by praising Pliny’s purity and richness of vocabulary as well as the beauty of his sentences, full of light and wit. He concludes with the observation that Pliny instructs his readers with his language and morality, while pleasing their ears and souls.

Cattaneo’s interest in Pliny continued after 1506, and in 1518 he published a new, more complete, and elegant edition of Pliny’s *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus* for the Milanese printing house of Johannes Jacobus de Legnano and his brothers. Since this edition bears no date (bibliographers assign it to 1518),⁹⁵ there is difficulty in de-

93. *C. Plinii Caecili Secundi Novocomensis epistolae omnium quae hactenus prodire purgatissimae*. . . Florentiae (Florence), 1515: opera et sumptu Philippi Iuntae. For Zeffi, a member of the “Platonic Academy” in Florence, see P. O. Kristeller, “Francesco da Diacceto and Florentine Platonism in the Sixteenth Century,” in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, vol. 4, *Studi e Testi* 124 (Vatican City, 1946), 268 (reprinted in Kristeller, *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*, vol. 1, *Storia e letteratura* 54 [Rome, 1956, 1969, 1984], 294).

94. A 1511 Parisian reprint of the 1508 Aldine edition had already added a translation of the Greek words in the *Epistulae*; see p. 89 below.

95. The de Legnano Brothers, an old and well-established publishing house in Milan, used numerous presses in the

termining whether it preceded or followed the second Aldine edition. A new dedication by Cattaneo to Jacopo Sadoletto, bishop of Carpentras, is dated 15 March 1518, Rome.⁹⁶ This volume contains the complete ten books of the *Epistulae* and adds a commentary (I.1.b below) to the letters previously missing in books 8, 9 and 10. Cattaneo also publishes here for the first time the three inscriptions with information on Pliny’s career (*CIL* 5,262, 5263, and 5667).⁹⁷ A further embellishment is a series of five different woodcuts, which are apparently copies of earlier Venetian woodcuts.⁹⁸

In the dedicatory letter to Sadoletto, Cattaneo claims to have had access to a new manuscript, according to which he had corrected the order of books 8 and 9 and completed book 10. His claim, ten years after Aldus had published his edition with all the *Epistulae* and cleared up the confusion about the order of books 8 and 9, is rather preposterous. He did collate, however, a new manuscript for book 8.⁹⁹ In addition, without overtly naming either the edition or its editor, Cattaneo castigates Aldus’ edition as full of mistakes and criticizes Aldus as a poor editor.

With the triumph of Ciceronianism, no new Latin edition of Pliny’s *Epistulae* was published in Italy after 1518 for more than a century and a half. There are two exceptions: a 1525 reprint of Avanzi’s edition;¹⁰⁰ and a pirated edition (Venice,

city. The printer of this book, however, is unknown: see G. Sutermeister, *Gli editori ‘Da Legnano’, 1470–1525* (Varese, 1946), no. 185; F. J. Norton, *Italian Printers 1501–1520*, Cambridge Bibliographical Society, Monograph No. 3 (London, 1958), xvii–xix, 46; Rogledi Manni, *La tipografia a Milano*, 63–64; and C. Gallazzi, *L’editoria milanese del primo cinquantennio della stampa: I da Legnano (1480–1525)*. *Annali tipografici* (Busto Arsizio, 1980).

96. Cattaneo had probably resided in Rome since 1511 (“Cattaneo, Giovanni Maria,” *DBI* 22 [1979] 469 [G. Ballistreri]).

97. These inscriptions were the object of study and discussion among his Milanese friends, Andrea Alciati and the brothers Paolo and Benedetto Giovio; see I. Calabi Limentani, “La lettera di Benedetto Giovio ad Erasmo,” *Acme* 25 (1972) 31–37.

98. M. Sander, *Le livre à figures italien depuis 1467 jusqu’à 1530*, vol. 2 (Milan, 1942; rpt. Nendeln, 1969), no. 5765. See p. 107 below.

99. See I.1.b below and Merrill, “On the Early Printed Editions,” 451–66, who compares the readings of Cattaneo’s 1518 edition, Aldus’ 1508 edition, and the incunabulum of Budé (Oxford Auct. L. 4.3).

100. *C. Plinii Iunioris ad Traianum Epistole 46 nuper*

1519) of Cattaneo's 1518 effort.¹⁰¹ In 1548 Ludovico Dolce translated into Italian fifty-two letters from different books of the *Epistulae*; they formed part of a collection that also included letters of Petrarch, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, and other humanists.¹⁰²

Instead, outside of Italy, in the first half of the sixteenth century and beyond, both Aldus' and Cattaneo's editions were reproduced several times. The first French edition of Pliny's *Epistulae*, which appeared at Paris in 1510, was a reprint of Beroaldo's 1498 edition; but in the following year (1511) an edition was reprinted "per fidelissimum exemplar Aldinum" (of 1508) by Aegydius Gourmont and Hemon Le Febure. This 1511 edition includes the first translation of all the Greek words in Pliny's letters; the translator is Ricardus Crocus (Richard Crooks), who dedicated his work to his teacher Girolamo Aleandro. As noted above, this example was followed by Zeffi (1515), Aldus (1518), and Cattaneo (1518).

In Germany, the first publications of Pliny's writings consisted of selections from the *Epistulae*. Forty-eight letters from the first five books, together with the dedication of Beroaldo the Elder to his student Johannes of Wartenberg (1498), had been printed before 1500, perhaps at Leipzig; selections from Cicero's letters and thirty-four of Pliny's letters appeared at Deventer in 1499 (reprinted in 1500,¹⁰³ 1506, and 1514). Other selections from the eight traditional books were published at Leipzig in 1502 (sixty-two letters) and in 1521 (sixty-one letters). However, the first complete edition of Pliny's letters consisted of a faith-

ful reprint of the 1508 Aldine edition, and it was published in 1514 at Strassburg by Matthias Schurer. The editor, Bilbius (Beatus) Rhenanus, in his dedication to Johannes Ruser, says that Schurer "summopere conatus <est> ne ab archetypo Aldino, transversum, quod aiunt, digitum uspiam aberraret" ("tried hard not to deviate even by a finger's breadth, as they say, from the Aldine exemplar"). This edition contains only the *Epistulae*.

Rhenanus praises Ruser for following not only his own (Rhenanus') advice, but also that of Rudolph Agricola, in his devotion to Pliny's *Epistulae*. Agricola, he says, when he was teaching at Heidelberg and lecturing on Pliny, thought that Pliny's style was rich, concise, dense, clear, carefully wrought and thought out, and a model of eloquence; in fact, he had begun his lecturing at Heidelberg with this author. He was so taken by Pliny that he called him "his," and even wrote hendecasyllabics in his honor, which Rhenanus has just found among Agricola's papers and is publishing immediately after his dedicatory letter.¹⁰⁴ However, according to the editors of the correspondence of Agricola, Pliny's influence on Agricola's language is rather limited, although it is agreed that his epistolary style leans generally more towards Pliny than Cicero.¹⁰⁵

Shurer's edition and Agricola's admiration for Pliny's style seem to have inspired Hadrianus Barlandus (Adriaan van Baarland), a professor of philosophy and then of eloquence at Leuven, to publish in 1516 a selection of Pliny's letters with a brief commentary.¹⁰⁶ His intention in publishing his work was to improve the rhetorical skills of students and scholars.

Between 1521 and 1551 numerous reprints of the 1518 Aldine edition appeared, i.e., at Strassburg (1521), Antwerp (1523),¹⁰⁷ Lyons (1527, 1529

reperite cum eiusdem responsis, Arimini (Rimini), 1525: in aedibus Hieronymi Soncini.

101. The printer is the Joannes Rubeus Vercellensis, who had already published at Treviso in 1483 an edition of Pliny's *Epistulae* (virtually a copy of the 1478 Milanese edition), and had printed around 1500 a copy of Roscius' edition; his brother Albertinus had printed in 1501 a copy of the 1498 Beroaldo edition, while the same Johannes, with his other brother Bernardinus de Lisona, had already printed in 1510 a copy of Cattaneo's 1506 edition.

102. L. Dolce, trans., *Epistole di G. Plinio, di M. Franc. Petrarca, del G. Pico della Mirandola et altri eccellentiss. huomini* (H. Barbaro, H. Donato, M. Ficino, A. Politiano) (Venice, 1548), 1-30. There are no Italian translations of the entire corpus of Pliny's *Epistulae* until G. A. Tedeschi's *Lettere di Plinio il Giovane tradotte in lingua italiana* (Rome, 1717).

103. Before 1500: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 4a lat. B 428 m (this seems to be a very rare copy). [Deventer,] 1499: H 5226; C 1620; GW 6876. 1500: H 5227; GW 6877.

104. Agricola's poem, first published at the end of the dedicatory letter of this edition, was reprinted in a collection of his *Opuscula* (Basel, 1518); see *Rudolph Agricola, Letters*, ed. and trans. A. van der Laan and F. Akkerman (Tempe, Arizona, 2002), 3-7, 19-20, 48-49.

105. Agricola, *Letters*, 19-20, 27.

106. *C. Plinii Secundi Epistole familiares cum Barlandi scholiis*, Lovanii (Leuven), 1516: vendit Theodoricus Alustensis qui et impressit.

107. In this instance, the Aldine edition was reprinted by Guilielmus Vostermannus without the *Epistulae*, but with Pliny's *Panegyricus*, the *De viris illustribus*, and the texts of Suetonius and Julius Obsequens.

for Vincentius de Portonaris, 1531, 1537, 1539, 1542, 1547, 1551), Paris (1529),¹⁰⁸ and Basel (1530). Andreas Cratander and Sebastianus Gryphius were the two publishers more frequently involved.

Cratander seems to have had a long-lasting interest in Pliny. He published a reprint of the 1508 Aldine edition at Basel in 1521 and again in 1526. In a prefatory letter to the reader he declared that he was printing Aldus' text, though with some corrections, and was including Aldus' dedicatory letter to Mocenigo because the Italian humanist had given elegant proof of Pliny's authorship both of the tenth book of the *Epistulae* and of the *De viris illustribus*. Cratander then wrote a new letter to the reader for the 1527 and 1529 Lyons reprints, in which he praises the content and the elegant and "juicy" style of the *Epistulae*, their *brevitas* and *gravitas*, urging those who wish to write letters not only to read Pliny's letters, but also to learn from them.

In 1530 Cratander himself printed again at Basel a new edition, this time adding the *Vita Plinii* by Cattaneo and announcing on the title page that the text of the *Epistulae* has been collated and corrected according to the autograph manuscript of Rudolf Agricola. A letter to the reader is provided not by Cratander but by the editor, Johannes Sichardus, professor of rhetoric at Basel, in which Sichardus reports that he has recently discovered a new manuscript of the *Epistulae*, that is, the codex copied by Rudolf Agricola (now Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. lat. Q. 80). He also complains about the carelessness of printers in editing texts and especially criticizes Aldus for the many mistakes in his edition, although he recognizes both that Aldus might have some merits as an editor and that the work of an editor is difficult, particularly if one has to deal with old exemplars which are corrupt and mutilated. Sichardus concludes his letter by exhorting Georgius Islungus, the addressee and one of his pupils, to continue his studies and to imitate Pliny's virtue.

In reality, Sichardus' text of the *Epistulae* is that of the 1518 Aldine. Cratander prints in the margins the variant readings from Agricola's manuscript, faithfully supplied by Sichardus, for

108. Published by Paul Estienne; this is the first Estienne edition of Pliny according to A. A. Renouard, *Annales de l'imprimerie des Estienne*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1837-38; 2d ed. 1843; repr. New York, [1960, 1972]), 31, no. 23.

books 1-7 and 9, and in the text a few corrections and conjectures by the latter. Agricola had copied his manuscript in 1478 when he was a student in Ferrara, where he had also corrected for his friend Theodoricus Plinius (Dietrich von Pleininger) a similar manuscript copied by someone else.¹⁰⁹ The text of both manuscripts resembles closely that of the *editio princeps* (Venice, 1471) and belongs to the same eight-book family. Since Agricola was at Ferrara in 1478, his exemplar was, in all likelihood, a manuscript from Guarino's circle or his own copy of the *editio princeps* itself.¹¹⁰ Despite Sichardus' ambition, most of the readings from Agricola's manuscript do not improve the text, and they are not useful for its restoration.¹¹¹

Sebastianus Gryphius' numerous editions (1537, 1539, 1542, 1547, 1551) reprint the 1518 Aldine with a few marginal notes, mostly textual variants taken from Cattaneo. All add the *Vita Plinii* by Cattaneo and (despite the announcement in the table of contents) leave out the *Latina interpretatio* of Greek words and phrases. The 1542, 1547, and 1551 editions are preceded by a letter to

109. Agricola's autograph manuscript, as we now have it, begins incomplete at *Ep.* 1.3.3. On fol. 132v there is the subscription: "rodolphus agricola phrisius Ferrariae absolvit anno christi mcccc^olxxviii^o kl. decembr. Lector perpetuum vale." Although this codex is usually considered to be autograph, H. E. J. M. van der Velden's suggestion that it may have been written by the hired copyist Johannes Pfeutzer is recorded by G. I. Lieftinck, *Manuscripts datés conservés dans les Pays-Bas*, vol. 1: *Les manuscrits d'origine étrangère* (Amsterdam, 1964), 97-98, no. 227, who identifies the scribe accordingly as "Rodolphus Agricola?—Pfeutzer?"

The manuscript corrected by Agricola is now Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Cod. poet. et philol. 4^o 30, with this subscription on fol. 126v: "c. plinij secundi novocomensis viri consularis et oratoris clarissimi epistolarum liber diligenter per rhodolphum agricolam frisum recognitus, exscriptus pro theodorico plinio germano scholastico tunc Ferrariae anno 1478, 26 february hercule duce estense imperante foeliciter Jesus christus etc."

Both codices were inspected from a microfilm at the Walter Davis Library of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (shelf mark: Film 876.P7.1530).

110. Agricola's copy of the *editio princeps* is now Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Inc. fol. 13110 (Kristeller, *Iter* 3.712b).

111. This is the conclusion of R. M. Frazer, *Agricola's Manuscripts of Pliny's 'Letters'* (Diss. Univ. of North Carolina, 1959), who collated both manuscripts with Sichardus' edition. A check of the marginal readings in the first book of the *Letters* in Sichardus' edition confirms Frazer's findings. The 1530 Basel edition was reprinted at Antwerp in 1542 "apud Dumaeum."

the reader by Gryphius himself, who claims to have corrected the text with the help of “multis codicibus” and his and others’ conjectures. The text, however, actually changes very little.

The *fortuna* of Cattaneo’s 1518 edition spread later and more slowly than that of Aldus’ edition, but lasted longer—in fact, into the seventeenth century (see below). Josse Badius Ascensius and Johannes de Rogny republished it, without woodcuts, at Paris in 1533. Starting with *Ep.* 1.4, Badius separated from the rest of the commentary Cattaneo’s summaries preceding the letters and called them *argumenta*; this practice became very popular with later editors from Henri Estienne onwards. Cattaneo’s 1518 edition was also republished by Froben (Basel, 1552), without the dedication to Jacopo Sadoletto, but with the addition of a *Vita Plinii* by Conradus Lycosthenes (Konrad Wolffhart) and the text of the *De viris illustribus* accompanied by Lycosthenes’ commentary. Paul Estienne, after collating both Badius’ and Froben’s editions, reproduced in his own edition (Paris, 1600)¹¹² Cattaneo’s original text, again without the dedication to Sadoletto, and he added the *Panegyrici veteres*, the notes by Isaac Casaubon already published by his father (see I.3 below), and the *Vita Plinii* by Lycosthenes. In his dedication to Justus Ruberus, Estienne regrets that commentaries by many learned men are neglected in his own day and is especially saddened that this fate has befallen the commentary on Pliny by Cattaneo, a man of such varied knowledge. He is therefore including it, thinking that Pliny himself, if alive, would be very happy. Estienne’s edition was reprinted several times.¹¹³

Cattaneo’s *Vita Plinii* had a life of its own as it figured in all of Gryphius’ editions and in Cratander’s editions of 1530 and 1542, even though their texts of the *Epistulae* reproduced the Aldine edition. With few exceptions, the *Vita Plinii*, together with Cattaneo’s introductions or summaries to each letter, now (thanks to Badius) styled

argumenta, continued to be published throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹¹⁴

After Froben’s 1552 edition of Cattaneo’s works, there is a hiatus of about thirty years during which, even outside of Italy, no edition of Pliny’s *Epistulae* was published. But around 1581 Henri Estienne published his first edition of Pliny’s *Epistulae* and *Panegyricus*, with the *Vita Plinii* by Cattaneo, the *Panegyrici veteres*, and the *Actio gratiarum* addressed to Gratian by Ausonius.¹¹⁵ Estienne is the first important editor after Aldus and Cattaneo. Although he does not provide a commentary on the text, his lengthy prefatory letter to the reader is a mini-commentary on Pliny’s letters, and his *Graecarum . . . interpretationes* is a commentary on all Greek words and expressions in the letters (see I.2 below).

In his edition, Estienne changes, without explanation, the order of the letters of book 10: the letters that do not have Trajan’s reply are grouped together and placed before the others, a practice continued in most editions until the nineteenth century. He precedes each letter with an *argumentum* or summary, taken verbatim from the first part of the commentary to each letter by Cattaneo. Ascensius and many succeeding editors adopted the same practice. For his text Estienne mostly follows Aldus and Cattaneo, placing the reading of one in the text and the other in the margin, occasionally adding a conjecture of his own.

Ten years later, in 1591, Estienne reprinted his 1581 edition with some corrections and additions.¹¹⁶ A dedicatory letter to Joachimus Carolus (Joachim Karl), duke of Brunswick and Lüneburg, and some annotations by Isaac Casaubon, his son-in-law, are the interesting additions to this edition. Casaubon’s notes (I.3 below) are few, brief, and philological in character.

Estienne’s 1591 edition proved very popular and was frequently reprinted.¹¹⁷ While the edition published at Frankfurt by Nicolaus Hoffmann in 1611 reproduces Estienne’s text, the ad-

112. Some editions are dated 1601. Renouard records only copies that are dated 1601 with the imprint “Coloniae Allobrogum,” the dedication to Justus Ruberus, and the letter to the reader; however, the copy at the Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense, Milan dated 1600 (shelf mark: ZZ.10.33) also has as the imprint “Coloniae Allobrogum” (printed in small letters, perhaps added later) and both the dedication and the letter to the reader.

113. See below, Composite Editions.

114. The *Vita Plinii* was included in all the following editions: 1581, 1591, 1599, 1600/1601, 1604, 1605, 1606, 1607, 1610, 1611, 1620, 1625, 1638, 1650, 1665, 1675 (Leipzig).

115. This edition is without date and place, but it is believed to have been published at Geneva in 1581 (Renouard, *Annales . . . des Estienne* 1.148 no. 4).

116. Renouard, *Annales . . . des Estienne* 1.154, no. 2.

117. 1591, 1599, 1604, 1605, 1607, 1610, 1611, 1620, 1632, 1638, 1650, and 1665; see below, Composite Editions.

dition of notes by Janus Gruterus (I.4 below) constitutes a novelty.

Meanwhile, an edition of the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus* with *Notae et observationes*, including an explanation of Greek words and phrases found in the *Epistulae*, by Claudius Minos (Claude Mignault, I.5 below) was published at Paris in 1588.¹¹⁸ More interested in the moral and historical content of the *Epistulae* than in philology, he is one of the first editors to stress the moral value of Pliny's work. Minos' *Notae et observationes* are collected and placed at the conclusion of the text of the *Epistulae* and *Panegyricus*. The format of a thorough commentary surrounding the text and often overwhelming it, popular with fifteenth-century commentators and adopted by Cattaneo, had already been abandoned by Estienne in favor of a letter/essay in which he discussed selected words and phrases. Minos writes in a similar vein, although his *Notae et observationes* are presented as endnotes rather than as an essay.

Ten years later Minos republished his edition and accompanying commentary, in Paris, apparently with two different printers (Robertus Micard and Franciscus Gueffier); he added a new dedication and Casaubon's notes.¹¹⁹

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

During the first half of the seventeenth century all editions of Pliny's *Letters* were published outside of Italy and were, for the most part, reprints of Estienne's, Cattaneo's, and Minos' editions. The second half of the century is marked by the appearance of new editions, mostly with multiple commentaries.

118. The *Panegyricus*, however, is not mentioned on the title page, and the *Epistulae* and *Panegyricus* have a numeration separate from that of the *Notae et observationes*. In some copies (e.g., New York, Columbia University, Butler Library, Department of Special Collections, Gonzales Lodge 1588 [shelf mark P719; BN Z 39372]), the dedication to Bishop Ludovicus Clericus precedes the texts of the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus*; the letter to the reader precedes the *Notae et observationes*. In the copy (Radcl. f.28) at the Bodleian Library, Oxford, the dedication precedes the *Notae*, and the letter to the reader precedes the text of the *Epistulae*.

119. The contents of the two editions are identical. They were reprinted again by two different printers in 1608 (see below, Composite Editions). The *Notae et observationes* were also printed separately at Paris in 1608 without a printer's name.

This was also a century of bitter religious controversies, particularly in northern Europe, and the attention of some jurists and theologians was drawn to *Epp.* 10.96–97. Already in the preceding century Franciscus Balduinus (François Baudouin), a French jurist, theologian, and historian, had included the text of the same two letters and a commentary on them (IV.1 below) in his *Edicta veterum principum Romanorum de Christianis* (Basel, 1557). These letters were important for his purpose, since their contents are helpful in understanding the juridical process followed by the Romans, and especially by Trajan and Pliny, in handling the Christians.

In 1608 Cunradus Rittershusius (Konrad Rittershausen), a German jurist and scholar, edited the text and in 1609 published a commentary (IV.2 below) on the whole tenth book of the *Epistulae*.¹²⁰ In his long *Prolegomena*, an essay that precedes his commentary, he stresses the juridical value of the whole tenth book and the useful information contained therein on Roman law and politics. Rittershusius analyzes these letters with the purpose of trying to understand the way of thinking of Pliny and Trajan about the Christians, and of clarifying the legal proceedings that the emperor and his proconsul were trying to follow in handling the Christians. For him this is not just an academic question, but one that is relevant to him and to the contemporary religious controversies of his times.

More than forty years later (1654) two essays by the humanist and theologian Gerardus Johannes Vossius commenting on the two letters were published posthumously at Amsterdam. In the first, *In epistolam Plinii de Christianis et edicta Caesarum Romanorum adversus Christianos commentarius*, Vossius gives the history of all the persecutions endured by Christians in Roman times; then he explains and interprets the content of *Ep.* 10.96 by dividing it into parts, which he summarizes and comments upon, relying on

120. The *Epistulae* were printed, together with other minor historical writings on Pliny and Trajan, at Amberg in 1608 by Joannes Schonfeldus. According to the table of contents the *Epistulae* should have been followed by the commentary of Rittershusius himself, and, for *Epp.* 10.96 and 97, by that of Balduinus; however, both Rittershusius' commentary on the whole tenth book and Balduinus' commentary on *Epp.* 10.96–97 were published separately the following year (Amberg, 1609) by the same printer.

both historical and juridical sources. In the second, the *Analysis ac commentarius epistolae Trajanicae S. ad Plinium Secundum* he follows the same method of dividing the letter (10.97) into sections according to their content and commenting upon them, but more succinctly.

Later in the century, Christianus Kortholtus (Christian Kortholt), a theology professor at Kiel, also commented on the two letters in a work published there in 1674 and entitled *In Plinii et Trajani de Christianis primaevae epistolas commentarius*. His tone is rather polemical. A strong defender of the Christians, he underlines their innocence; condemning the Romans, he complains of their inability to grasp the message of the true religion. He criticizes Pliny for what Kortholtus thinks is his self-assurance that the Christians need to be condemned and his false hope that they will renounce their religion (although Kortholtus admits that there were apostates). Kortholtus exults in the final success of the Christians and in the emptiness of pagan temples.

While jurists and theologians focused on Pliny's *Epp.* 10.96–97, historians, philologists, and teachers of rhetoric continued to study, comment, and recommend to their patrons and students the entire corpus of Pliny's works.

In 1611 Nicolaus Hoffmann published at Frankfurt a reprint of Estienne's 1591 edition.¹²¹ The novelty of Hoffmann's edition lies in the inclusion of notes by Janus Gruterus, the director of the Palatine Library, who had discovered in the library a new manuscript, the *Codex Palatinus* (as yet unidentified), which he collated. His notes, which embrace the whole corpus of the letters, are mostly the result of this collation, with some corrections, emendations, and brief comments of his own.

An edition of the *Epistulae*, with some *Variantes lectiones* at the end of the text, was published in 1640 at Leiden by the brothers Bonaventura and Abraham Elzevier. The *variantes lectiones* are variant readings of the text from other editions, occasionally providing a brief explanation of a word. This edition was reprinted at Leiden in 1653 (Johannes and Daniel Elzevier) and edited by Marcus Zuerius Boxhornius (Boxhorn). There are only minor changes with respect to the 1640

edition, to which a brief dedicatory letter by Boxhornius and a short essay by the same are added. In his essay (*Judicium quo christianum eum non fuisse, ut volunt alii, ostenditur*), Boxhornius takes issue with an apocryphal Christian writer who pretended that Pliny had become a Christian. Boxhornius' editorial work is otherwise limited to a few conjectures; as he confesses, he did not have a manuscript with which to collate the text.¹²²

A few years later (1644), Augustus Buchnerus (August Buchner), a poet and professor of poetry and rhetoric at Wittenberg, published an edition of the *Epistulae*, reprinting Gruterus' text (1611) to which he added the *argumenta* by Cattaneo. At the end of the text he provided notes in which he offers variant readings and emendations of his own and interprets the text or explains a word or a custom; he quotes ancient as well as modern authors and often supplements, confirms, or refutes the opinions of previous scholars.

In the second half of the seventeenth century the work of an editor of Pliny changes inasmuch as it becomes more and more a task of consulting and collating earlier editions (not manuscripts), and collecting notes, commentaries, and essays of previous or contemporary scholars. Only occasionally does the editor add something original of his own.

Such is the character of the efforts of Andreas Rivinus, a professor at Leipzig, who took charge, at the request of the bookseller Melchior Klossmannus, of an edition of the *Epistulae* and of the *Panegyrici veteres* (Frankfurt, 1650, 1665). Rivinus reproduces Estienne's edition corrected against Gruterus, to which he adds the notes by Buchnerus and a few others by Caspar Barthius (Kaspar von Barth, 1587–1658), a poet, historian, and editor of several ancient authors. Most of Barthius' notes are textual: he reports the readings of his manuscript (now Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek—Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Dc 166)¹²³ which differ from the printed editions, and compares the readings of his manuscript with those of the *Codex Palatinus* of Gruterus. Barthius also makes conjectures of his

122. Boxhornius' edition was reprinted in 1659 and in 1660.

123. This is an Italian manuscript, but more correct than most: Keil, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri novem* . . . (1870), "Praefatio", xiv; Mynors, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri decem*, xiii.

121. Some copies do not have the *Panegyrici*: see below, Composite Editions.

own and comments, occasionally and briefly, on the text. Since Dresden Dc 166 is a manuscript of the nine-book family and does not have book 10, Barthius' commentary covers only books 1–9.26.8.

Johannes Veenhusius (Johannes van Veenhusien), editor of the 1669 (Leiden/Rotterdam) edition of the *Epistulae* alone, follows and expands on the practice of Rivinus. He publishes the *Epistulae* with multiple commentaries in the footnotes, that is, with the "complete commentaries" (*notis integris*) of Casaubon, Gruterus, Henri Estienne, Buchnerus, Barthius, Johannes Fredericus Gronovius, and with "select notes" (*selectissimis notis*) of Cattaneo, Rittershusius, and himself. The emendations of Gronovius, which Keil appreciated,¹²⁴ are here published for the first time. Veenhusius also adds Henri Estienne's *Praefatio* and Lycosthenes' *Vita Plinii* (the latter with footnotes of his own), Boxhornius' essay on Pliny's alleged Christianity, and the commentaries by Balduinus, Rittershusius, and Vossius on *Epp.* 10.96–97.

Veenhusius' contribution, besides the footnotes to Lycosthenes' *Vita Plinii* and some notes to the text, is a brief note, at the end of the latter, on the tradition of Pliny's *Epistulae*, which, although far from being complete and accurate, is a novelty. For his text of the *Epistulae*, Veenhusius generally follows Estienne/Cattaneo, even when he reports in the footnotes the notes and comments of other scholars who disagree with or correct the text he is printing. To confirm Pliny's authorship of book 10, he reprints at the beginning of that book the dedicatory letter of Cattaneo to Maino.

In his dedication to the officers of the city of Bremen, Veenhusius speaks of the difficulty of an editor's work. But he affirms that Pliny is an author worthy of their sponsorship: many of his letters deal with Roman law, which would be useful to compare with common law, and many contain learned observations about antiquity and politics, which are not only useful but also necessary to know (points already made by Balduinus and Rittershusius).

Another edition with multiple commentaries, essays, a "new" preface, and enriched *Prole-*

gomena (a series of various texts that deal in one way or another with Pliny) appeared at Leipzig in 1675.¹²⁵ Jacobus Thomasius, the editor, lists the previous editions that he has used; they include most of the important ones, from Aldus (1508) to Veenhusius (1669). He also gives the abbreviations for the names of the commentators that appear in the footnotes: Cattaneo, Henri Estienne, Rittershusius, Gruterus, Buchnerus, Barthius, Gronovius, and Veehenusius. Thomasius' contribution is found in scattered notes on the text, in the dedication to Christian Daumius and, especially, in the preface to the reader. In the dedication, Thomasius thanks Daumius for having allowed him to use three editions from his library (those by Aldus [1508] and Estienne [1591] as well as the 1611 Frankfurt edition with the notes by Gruterus), which were particularly helpful because they had in the margins the handwritten notes of Daumius' friend, Caspar Barthius. Thomasius includes these notes in his edition.

Thomasius' long preface is significant, for it contains a discussion of the order in which Pliny's letters have been transmitted. After a brief and schematic history of the manuscript tradition that ends with the publication by Aldus of all ten books of the *Epistulae*, Thomasius comments on several of the previous editions, asserting that no new text has been printed since the Aldine. Reviewing the editions which also contain commentaries, he summarizes the state of the studies on Pliny's *Epistulae* at his (Thomasius') own time.

The anonymous editor of both the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus* printed at Oxford in 1677 took an approach different from that adopted by Veenhusius and Thomasius. In his short *Praefatio*, he complains of the commentaries which overwhelm Pliny's text, and declares his intention of freeing it from this farragineous erudition that began with Cattaneo. His own text, he promises, will be brief, without variant readings (he has chosen the ones that seemed more true to him after collating various exemplars and a manuscript from Westminster Abbey Library),¹²⁶

124. Keil, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri novem*. . . (1858), "Praefatio," xi.

125. The title page affirms that this is a revised edition, but a search for an earlier edition has not been successful. The 1675 edition was reprinted at Halle in 1686 by Simon Johannes Huebnerus.

126. Pliny's name does not appear in the list of books

and he has given a minimum of explanations for both the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus*. This edition, with its elementary explanations and clean text, caters to an audience composed of students, as the editor declares, rather than of scholars. It was printed again at Oxford in 1686 and at Lyons in 1693.

The last interesting edition of the seventeenth century is the work of Christophorus Cellarius. It contained both the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus* and appeared at Leipzig in 1693. Cellarius became professor of Eloquence and History at the University of Halle when it was founded in 1694, but he was very much interested in geography and had produced several important geographical works. This scholarly concern is reflected in the edition of Pliny, whose novelty consists in four geographical maps illustrating the various sites named by Pliny, namely, the Tiberine region, Vesuvius and its surroundings, the provinces of Phrygia and Bithynia, and the province of Pontus. These maps, he hoped, would help his readers not familiar with such places.

For the text of the *Epistulae*, Cellarius has collated (as he explains in his preface) the older editions and taken advantage of the collations of Gruterus from the *Codex Palatinus*. Moreover, he has surveyed the conjectures by Casaubon, Gronovius, and Barthius, choosing those that appeared to him to be the best. In the footnotes he indicates clearly which interpretations are taken from scholars other than himself. Cellarius also composed a new *Vita Plinii* with precise cross-references to the *Epistulae* (his main source) and to the *Panegyricus*.

We may now consider other kinds of work that involved Pliny's letters. In the sixteenth century, as mentioned above, Ludovico Dolce translated fifty-two letters of Pliny into Italian (Rome, 1548). In 1588 Marco Antonio Abagaro used the Italian translation of the younger Aldo Manuzio to publish at Rome descriptions of Pliny's villas extracted from his letters. Worthy of note is the seeming influence that these letters in which Pliny's villas are mentioned (*Epp.* 2.17, 6.6, and

9.7) had on the concept of the Italian garden.¹²⁷ Abraham Fleming, in his *A panoplie of epistles* (London, 1576), translated into English a few letters of Pliny together with those of other classical authors.¹²⁸ There are no translations during the sixteenth century into other languages.

In the seventeenth century, despite the interest in Pliny in the German-speaking countries, only the French translated the *Epistulae* into the vernacular. The first French translation is that of Jacques Bouchard (1632). His purpose, clearly declared on the title page, was to teach good epistolary style.¹²⁹ It was followed by a partial translation (books 1–3) by Hyppolite Jules Pilet de la Mesnardière (Paris, 1643), and by the complete version of Louis de Sacy (Paris, 1677, 1699, and reprinted many times in the eighteenth century). There is also a French translation of *Epp.* 2.17 and 5.6 (the descriptions of the Laurentine and Tuscan villas), with facing Latin text, by Jean François Félibien des Aveaux (Paris, 1699).

THE EIGHTEENTH TO TWENTIETH CENTURIES

Numerous editions were published in the eighteenth century. Of these the most remarkable was initiated by Gottlieb Cortius and (after his death in 1731) continued by his student Paulus Daniel Longolius (Amsterdam, 1734). For the first time since the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, new and good manuscripts were collated for the sake of establishing a better text. Cortius and Longolius were able to use two of the older manuscripts referred to above, namely, B (Laurentianus Ashb. 98, saec. IX), which has the eighth book, and F (Laurentianus San Marco 284, saec. XI), collated in Florence for Cortius by Francesco Gorio. The edition is important for its text and, in fact, modern editors of Pliny regard the Cortius-Longolius edition as the best before that of Keil. Otherwise, editors of the period once again read,

127. L. Bek, "Ut ars natura—ut natura ars. Le ville di Plinio e il concetto del giardino nel Rinascimento," *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 7 (1974) 109–56.

128. H. R. Palmer, *List of English Editions and Translations of Greek and Latin Classics Printed before 1641* (London, 1911), 87.

129. *Lettres de Pline Second ou l'on voit la parfait methode d'écrire à toute sorte de personne et le vray style que douvant suivre qui s'en meslent . . .* (Paris: T. Quinet, 1632).

in the library of Westminster Abbey before its dissolution (1540). In the catalogue of books in the new library, which was destroyed in the fire of 1694, one entry reads "Plinii Epistolae charta;" see *The Manuscripts of Westminster Abbey*, ed. J. A. Robinson and M. R. James (Cambridge, 1909), 30 (List A, no. 42).

studied, and collected the works of most of the preceding scholars which they republished, often adding erudite notes and comments of their own.

The first modern edition, based on a study of the manuscript tradition, is that of Heinrich Keil (Leipzig, 1858), followed by a second edition with a revised text and expanded preface by the same scholar (Leipzig, 1870), and by that of the tenth book by E. G. Hardy (London and New York, 1889). Hardy discovered Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. L.4.3 with the annotations in the hand later identified by Elmer Truesdell Merrill (see his 1907 article cited in Bibliography II.B below) as that of Guillaume Budé.

Several editions of the *Epistulae* were published in the twentieth century without commentary. There are also numerous studies on the manuscript tradition and the transmission of the *Epistulae*; the most complete are those of Dora Johnson (1912) and Selatie Edgar Stout (1954). A. N. Sherwin-White (1966) published the most complete commentary (without text) since Cattaneo's, while Francesco Trisoglio edited and commented on the text, providing also an introduction and a rich bibliography (1973, 1978). Helmut Kasten published a Latin text with a German translation (1982), and Wynne Williams the Latin text of book 10 with English translation and commentary (1990).

II. PANEGYRICUS

On 1 September 100 A.D. Pliny, beginning his consulship, delivered in the senate his *gratiarum actio*, a speech of thanks to the emperor Trajan for appointing him. He then revised and enlarged his speech for publication. It is unknown, however, how and why the speech was enlarged, and when it was published.¹³⁰

There is no mention of the *Panegyricus* by Pliny's contemporaries, despite the fact that correspondences have been found between passages from the *Panegyricus* and Juvenal's *Satire* 4.¹³¹

In the following centuries, however, Pliny's *gratiarum actio* became a model in the schools. The transmission history of the *Panegyricus* is

130. On these problems, see P. Fedeli, "Il 'Panegirico' di Plinio nella critica moderna," in ANRW 2.33.1 (1989), 400-411.

131. N. Scivoletto, "Plinio il Giovane e Giovenale," *Gior-nale italiano di filologia* 10 (1957) 133-46.

both independent of and quite different from that of the *Epistulae*: the text of the former has come down to us together with a group of eleven other panegyrics dated from the end of the third to the end of the fourth century. This assemblage, known as the *Panegyrici veteres*, must have been read and known during the period of its formation, although no written record of such use survives.

In the fifth century Pliny's *actio* was known to Salvianus and to Sidonius Apollinaris.¹³² The latter is the first to refer to the work as *Panegyricus*.¹³³ Between the sixth and the seventh century Isidore of Seville copied some passages from it.¹³⁴ The *Panegyricus* then seems to have been forgotten for more than 400 years.

It seems to reemerge in the twelfth century with John of Salisbury, who may have known it.¹³⁵ Then there is no other mention of this work until 1433, when Giovanni Aurispa discovered in the cathedral of St. Martin at Mainz a manuscript with the twelve *Panegyrici veteres*. Since Aurispa's participation in the Council of Basel was responsible for his presence in Germany, he hastily copied the Mainz codex. This copy, which he later brought back to Florence, probably around the end of 1434,¹³⁶ is now lost.

One of the first owners of a text of the *Panegyricus* was Francesco Pizolpasso, archbishop of Milan and a well-known bibliophile whose manuscript collection also included Pliny's *Epistulae* (see p. 79 above). Scholars hypothesize that, as the archbishop was attending the Council of Basel at this time, his manuscript may not have been copied from Aurispa's apograph but rather derived from the same archetype. In a letter of 1436 to Pizolpasso, Pier Candido Decembrio says that he (Decembrio) had read the *Panegyricus*; later, he also described Pizolpasso's codex and copied

132. See A. Reifferscheid, "Zwei litterarhistorische Phantasmata," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 16 (1861) 16-17, who compares *Policraticus* 3.14 with *Paneg.* 2.3; and Manitius, "Beiträge zur Geschichte," 567 (n. 11 above).

133. *Ep.* 8.10.3; Fedeli, "Il 'Panegirico,'" 400 n. 38.

134. C. H. Beeson, "Isidore's *Institutionum Disciplinae* and Pliny the Younger," *Classical Philology* 8 (1913) 93-98; P. Pascal, "The 'Institutionum Disciplinae' of Isidore of Seville," *Traditio* 13 (1957) 425-31.

135. Manitius, "Beiträge zur Geschichte," 567.

136. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte* 1.116 and 2.243 and (ed.) *Carteggio di Giovanni Aurispa*, in *Fonti per la storia d'Italia* 70 (Rome, 1931), 81-82.

some passages from it.¹³⁷ Pizolpasso's manuscript of the *Panegyricus* has since disappeared. The extracts made by Decembrio are preserved in Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, R 88 sup. Sabbadini collated these passages with Baehrens' edition of 1874, and thought that Pizolpasso's manuscript may have contained a better text than the other extant Italian witnesses.¹³⁸

By 1436 Poggio Bracciolini also owned a copy of the *Panegyricus*, now missing. Guarino Guarini was able to make a copy in his own hand (the present London, BL, Add. ms. 12008). Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, obtained in 1442, probably through Decembrio, a manuscript which he donated to the University of Oxford (now Paris, BNF, lat. 7805).¹³⁹ In 1443 Biondo Flavio knew of and perhaps owned a manuscript of the *Panegyricus* himself (Vatican City, BAV, Ottob. lat. 1215).¹⁴⁰ Between 1443 and 1444 Lorenzo Valla asked Guarino for news about "quadam oratione Plinii . . . admirabili eloquentia."¹⁴¹

A manuscript of the *Panegyric* appearing in the 1455 inventory of the Vatican Library is to be identified, in all likelihood, with the present Vat. lat. 1775.¹⁴² The present Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 141 was corrected at Buda in 1464, while other manuscripts were copied at Florence in 1468 (now Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 48) and at Pavia in 1473 (now London, BL, Royal 15.B.v, which belonged to An-

tonello Petrucci, secretary to the king of Naples, who also owned the present Paris, BNF, lat. 7840 and a manuscript of the *Epistulae* [Paris, BNF, lat. 8620; see pp. 79, 83 above]).¹⁴³ In 1475 a certain Antonius Clodius Angellarius, "artium et medicinae professor," borrowed a manuscript with the *Panegyrici*, including Pliny's, from the papal library.¹⁴⁴ The humanist Girolamo Squarzafico owned a copy, which afterwards entered the library of Santa Giustina in Padua and is now ms. A D XIV 40 in the Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense, Milan.¹⁴⁵

All these and most of the other extant Italian humanist manuscripts (ca. twenty-seven in all) derive directly or indirectly from Aurispa's and/or Pizolpasso's apographs; they testify, together with the writings of the humanists, to the diffusion in Italy of the *Panegyricus* after Aurispa's discovery and before the publication, around 1482, of the *editio princeps* prepared by Francesco Puteolano.¹⁴⁶

The Manuscript Tradition

There are no ancient manuscripts of the *Panegyricus*, with the exception of a few sixth-century fragments in half-uncial discovered by Angelo Mai in a Bobbio palimpsest (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, E 147 sup., pp. 21–22, 27–28, 361–362, 367–368).¹⁴⁷ The manuscript discovered by Aurispa at Mainz and called *Maguntinus* by editors of the *Panegyricus* remained in Mainz

137. G. Suster, "Notizia e classificazione dei codici contenenti il Panegirico di Plinio a Traiano," *Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica* 16 (1888) 511–12 (who publishes this letter); Sabbadini, *Le scoperte* 2.243.

138. R. Sabbadini, "Panegyrici veteres," in Sabbadini, *Opere minori*, vol. 1: *Classici e umanisti da codici latini in esplorati*, ed. T. Foffano, Medioevo e umanesimo 87 (Padua, 1995), 100–101.

139. Sabbadini, "Poggio e Guarino e il Panegirico di Plinio," *Bollettino di filologia classica* 5 (1899) 252–53; R. A. B. Mynors, ed., *XII Panegyrici latini* (Oxford, 1964), vi; B. L. Ullman, "Manuscripts of Duke Humphrey of Gloucester," in *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 2d ed. (Rome, 1973), 355; D. Lassandro, ed., *XII Panegyrici latini* (Turin, 1992), xx–xxii; Lassandro, "Inventario dei manoscritti dei *Panegyrici*," *Invigilata lucernis* 10 (1988) 122–25.

140. Suster, "Notizia e classificazione," 514–15, 518. According to Lassandro, ed., *XII Panegyrici*, xviii–xix, the manuscript was owned by Biondo's sons and then by Cardinals Guglielmo Sirleto and Pietro Ottoboni (later Pope Alexander VIII).

141. Suster, *ibid.*, 513–14; Gamberini, "Materiali per una ricerca," 133 n. 1 (see n. 24 above); Lassandro, *ibid.*, xxii n. 48.

142. Lassandro, *ibid.*, xi–xii and n. 24.

143. Mynors, ed., *XII Panegyrici*, xi and n. 1; Lassandro, ed., *XII Panegyrici*, x, xv, xvii, xix–xx and "Inventario," 130–31.

144. Bertòla, *I due primi registri* (n. 38 above), 3.

145. Sabbadini, "Il Plinio di Girolamo Squarzafico," in Sabbadini, *Opere minori* 1.246–47; Kristeller, *Iter* 1.357a.

146. A full description of all Italian manuscripts containing Pliny's *Panegyricus* is found in Suster, "Notizia e classificazione," 516–26. Lassandro, "Inventario," 107–200 provides a full description of all manuscripts containing the *Panegyrici* (not necessarily Pliny's *Panegyricus*); he enriches his article with a reproduction of a page of each manuscript he describes. Detailed information on the manuscripts also containing Pliny's *Panegyricus* is found in the preface to his edition of the *XII Panegyrici*, v–xx.

147. Suster, *ibid.*, 506–9; Mynors, ed., *XII Panegyrici*, ix; Fedeli, "Il 'Panegirico' di Plinio," 396; V. Paladini and P. Fedeli, eds., *Panegyrici latini* (Rome, 1976), xii–xxiii; Lassandro, ed., *XII Panegyrici*, xvi and "Inventario," 107 n. 1. See also Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1938), p. 20, no. **29 and plate (detail of p. 437).

but subsequently disappeared. Scholarly disagreement about its relation to some of the extant manuscripts may be summarized as follows.

Earlier editors thought that, before its disappearance, the *Maguntinus* had been copied not only by Aurispa, but also by Johannes Hergot, between 1458 and 1460, and by an anonymous German scribe. The copy made by Hergot is the present Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket, C 917 (= A); and that of the German scribe, the present London, BL, Harley 2480 (= H). Mynors, however, followed by Fedeli, argued that A was not copied directly from the *Maguntinus*, but from another German manuscript, the Napocensis Lat. 7 (olim 168), now in the Biblioteca Centrală Universitaria, Cluj; he also thought that even the *Napocensis* was copied from H rather than from the *Maguntinus*. (H is considered by all editors to be the more accurate representative of the *Panegyrici* tradition). Further, Mynors believed, as did Lassandro, that both Aurispa's apograph and the Harleianus derive directly from the *Maguntinus*.¹⁴⁸ Fedeli disagreed, holding that only Aurispa's manuscript can be proved to have been copied directly from the *Maguntinus* and thus H would come directly from the same archetype as the *Maguntinus*. Although Aurispa probably copied his manuscript in a hurry, according to Fedeli, this does not suffice to explain the sometimes substantial differences of the Italian manuscripts, often beautifully produced but textually corrupt with respect to H.¹⁴⁹

Mynors, followed by Lassandro, thought that Pizolpasso's manuscript was independent of Aurispa's copy and divided the Italian witnesses into two families: X¹, whose members would descend from the manuscript copied by Aurispa; and X², whose manuscripts would derive from Pizolpasso's codex.¹⁵⁰

Another manuscript of the panegyrics, which is thought not to have derived from the *Maguntinus*, was once at Saint-Omer in the monastery of Saint-Bertin. Known as the *Bertinensis*, it was seen in 1596 by the Belgian humanist Franciscus

Modius (Maulde) who was preparing an edition of the *Panegyricus*. Modius died before he could publish his work, but he had given his readings from this manuscript to his friend Marcus Valserus (Welser); the latter passed them on to Johannes Livineius (Jan Lievens), who used Modius' readings for his 1599 edition (see below). However, as Fedeli has noted,¹⁵¹ in all likelihood Modius' manuscript did not contain the *Panegyric* of Pliny.

Printed Editions

THE FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES

The *editio princeps* of Pliny's *Panegyricus*, published at Milan around 1482 by Antonius Zarotus and edited by Francesco Puteolano, included the other eleven *Panegyrici veteres*, the *Vita Agricolae* of Tacitus, and fragments from Petronius.¹⁵² There is no commentary. Puteolano used a manuscript of the Italian family, and his text is rather corrupt. The volume has a moral as well as a didactic purpose. In his dedicatory letter to Jacopo Antiquario, secretary to the duke of Milan, Puteolano says that he has published Pliny's *Panegyricus* at the exhortation of Antiquario so that the princes of his time, reading this work, might learn from it as from a teacher; it would be especially helpful to the young Gian Galeazzo (Visconti), whom Antiquario wishes and hopes will become a good prince like Trajan. Puteolano then makes a comparison between the virtues of Antiquario and of Pliny; so similar are their virtues that, reading Pliny, Antiquario will recognize himself.

No new editorial work was done in the fifteenth century on the *Panegyricus*. Puteolano's edition was reprinted verbatim in Venice ca. 1500 by Otinus de Luna,¹⁵³ and reprinted again at Venice, together with the *Epistulae*, ca. 1492 and 1500, in 1501, and in 1503.¹⁵⁴

In the sixteenth century, Cattaneo published jointly the first commentaries on the *Panegyricus* and the *Epistulae* (Milan, 1506). He dedicates the *Panegyricus* to Gian Giacomo Trivulzio, and his commentary is as thorough and varied as that

148. Mynors, ed., *XII Panegyrici*, vi–vii; Lassandro, ed., *XII Panegyrici*, xxv–xxvii; see also S. Jakó, "Codex Napocensis lat. 7 (olim 168)," *Revista Arhivelor* 10 (1967) 58–62.

149. Fedeli, "Il 'Panegirico,'" 393; Paladini and Fedeli, eds., *Panegyrici latini*, xxviii.

150. Mynors, ed., *XII Panegyrici*, v–vi; Lassandro, *XII Panegyrici*, xxv–xxvii.

151. Fedeli, "Il 'Panegirico' di Plinio," 393 n. 19. See below.

152. H 13119; IGI 7179; Goff P-813; Proctor 5837.

153. H 13120; IGI 7180; Goff P-814.

154. See pp. 84 and 85 above.

on the *Epistulae*. The text of the *Panegyricus*, accompanied by the commentary, was republished with the *Epistulae* in 1518 by Cattaneo himself, the *Panegyricus* virtually without changes. It was reprinted, either with or without the *Epistulae*, by others in 1510, 1519, 1533, 1552, 1581, and 1599 (see below, and Composite Editions); the summary and selected lemmas of the commentary were reprinted in many other editions (see below and also Composite Editions).

The themes that will justify for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the publication of the *Panegyricus* and its dedication to army captains, princes, government officers, and illustrious students are all already present in Cattaneo's dedicatory letter. These reappear very frequently in dedicatory letters of succeeding editions, as do the practical, rhetorical, and moral reasons Cattaneo provided for reading and studying the *Panegyricus*. Aldus, for example, included the text of the *Panegyricus* (unaccompanied by any commentary) in his 1508 edition of Pliny's *Epistulae*. In his dedication to Aloisio Mocenigo, he briefly praises the style of the *Panegyricus*, which he defines as elegant, erudite, acute, and useful. Aldus recommends that it be read especially by leaders, not only for rhetorical reasons such as its authoritative views ("sententiarum gravitate") and varied content ("copia rerum"), but also for moral purposes, since its content is full of precepts on how to live well and happily ("ad bene beateque vivendum sanctissimis optimisque praeceptis").

As with the *Epistulae*, no new editions appeared in Italy after 1519, with the exception of the edition of the twelve panegyrics by Paolo Navio (Venice, 1576) and an anonymous scholar (Bologna, 1665).¹⁵⁵ Navio confesses in his address to the reader that he has merely corrected and emended Puteolano's edition (i.e., the *editio princeps*). In fact, there is no commentary in Navio's edition; a simple summary precedes the text of Pliny's *Panegyricus* as well as that of each of the other eleven texts.

155. *Panegyrici diversorum nunc demum recogniti et in lucem editi per Paulum Navium. Quibus addita sunt argumenta ut cuique facile sit quae voluerit ea et in historijs et in cronicis posse reperire* (Venice, 1576); *Panegyricae orationes imperatoribus olim dictae a C. Plinio Caec. Secundo, Latino Pacato, Mamertino, Nazario, Eumenio, Ausonio et alijs. In gratiam eloquentiae studiorum nunc denuo impressae* (Bologna, 1665).

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, however, the panegyrics were the object of ongoing philological study and of new commentaries beyond the Alps. The *Panegyricus* of Pliny continued to be published during this period in transalpine regions whenever the *Epistulae* were printed (see below, Composite Editions). Beroaldo, Cattaneo, Aldus, and Navio had followed the texts of Puteolano and the Italian tradition with corrections and emendations of their own. A new edition that is thought to have used a manuscript of a family different from the Italian tradition appeared at Vienna in 1513. Johannes Cuspinianus (Cuspinien) had corrected and emended the text of the *Panegyricus*, even collating an ancient manuscript, according to his nephew Georgius Cuspinianus, who published the work of his uncle, since the latter was busy serving the emperor Maximilian.¹⁵⁶ This text has been regularly collated and used, together with the texts of the Italian humanists, by succeeding editors down to the present, despite considerable scholarly disagreement on the value of Cuspinianus' manuscript (which does not appear to be extant) and of his edition.¹⁵⁷

In 1520 Johann Froben published at Basel the twelve *Panegyrici veteres* from a text corrected and emended by Beatus Rhenanus originally for private use.¹⁵⁸ Rhenanus followed "his own judg-

156. *Panegyrici variorum auctorum et declamationes nonnullae perquam eruditae hactenus non impressae* (Vienna, 1513).

157. Keil, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri novem*. . . (1870), "Praefatio," xl-xliii; Fedeli, "Il 'Panegyrico' di Plinio," 393 and n. 19; Mynors, ed., *XII Panegyrici*, viii; and Lassandro, ed., *XII Panegyrici*, xv-xvi. A summary of the different positions of scholars is found in Paladini and Fedeli, eds., *Panegyrici Latini*, xxxii-xxxvi. See also K. Thomas, "Cuspinians Panegyrikausgabe," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 122 (1979) 338-43, who believes that Cuspinianus' edition does not represent a branch of the tradition directly dependent on the *Maguntinus*, but is indebted to the Italian tradition.

158. *In hoc volumine continentur Panegyricus C. Plinij Secundi Novocomensis dum novum consulatum iniret Traiano Augusto dictus. Panegyricus Maximiano et Constantino dictus* (Basel, 1520). The text begins directly with Froben's note to scholars. It is followed by the table of contents and by the dedication of Rhenanus to Lucas Bathonius. Besides the twelve panegyrics (for four of which Rhenanus wrote a short introduction), this edition contains also, on the suggestion of Rhenanus, three humanist panegyrics variously addressed: Ermolao Barbaro to Friedrich III and Maximilian I, Pandolfo Collenuccio to Maximilian I, Erasmus to Philip of

ment" ("iudicium suum"), as Froben says in his dedication, since he had no manuscript to collate. This edition does not include a commentary. In the same year, Jacobus Philomusus (Jacob Locher), a poet and professor of poetry at Ingolstadt, published at Nuremberg the text of Pliny's *Panegyricus* with brief marginal notes, which sometimes consist of variant readings, but more often are simple explanations or interpretations of the text that constitute a commentary (V.2 below).

The next commentary on the *Panegyricus* is the work of Hermannus Rayanus (V.3 below). It was published in 1554 at Lyons in a volume that included Rayanus' edition of the text. While appreciating the historical value of the *Panegyricus*, he insists (in his dedicatory letter to the Gaudanei brothers) on the purity and elegance of its language, a strong enough reason to overcome the uneasiness of reading an author who was anti-Christian.

An edition of the twelve panegyrics (without commentary), Ausonius' oration, a funeral oration by Julius Caesar Scaliger, and the *argumentum* of Pliny's *Panegyricus* by Cattaneo appeared at Douai in 1595.¹⁵⁹

Four years later (1599), a text of the twelve panegyrics accompanied by a commentary appeared at Antwerp. For this edition, probably published after his death, the editor Johannes Livineius (Jan Liviens), besides correcting and emending the text himself, collated several editions as well as a manuscript, which he refers to as "V", now identified as Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Albert Ier, 10026-32.¹⁶⁰ His commentary is marked by the philological interests for which he was well known.

Burgundy, son of Maximilian I, and Georgius Sauromanus (Georg Saueremann) to Charles and Ferdinand, grandsons of Maximilian I.

159. *Latini oratores sive Panegyrici diversorum cum veterum recentiorum scriptorium*. . . (Duaci, 1595: ex officina Baltazaris Belleri).

160. Livineius died on 13 January 1599; the date of the *approbatio* of his edition is 14 May 1598, but that of printing is 1599, with no indication of the month. On Brussels ms. 10062-32, see L. Battezzato, "Livineius' unpublished Euripidean marginalia," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 30 (2000) 328 and n. 24, 329 and nn. 26 and 28; Lassandro, "Inventario dei manoscritti," 131-32 and *XII Panegyrici*, v-vi.

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The *Panegyricus* continued to enjoy great popularity in the seventeenth century outside of Italy. Included in nearly all the editions with the *Epistulae* (see below, Composite Editions), it was also printed independently, often accompanied by multiple commentaries or *notae* of various scholars.

In 1599 Justus Lipsius, as the senior and most illustrious professor at Leuven, gave the official address to the Archduke Albert Maximilian II and Duchess Isabella of the Spanish Netherlands, who were visiting the university. The following year (1600) he published his address, entitled *Dissertatiuncula*, together with the text of the *Panegyricus* and a commentary (V.5 below), which he dedicated to the archduke and duchess. His hope was that his dedicatees might learn from the *Panegyricus* (and his clarifications of the text) to be good rulers.

Lipsius is the first commentator after Cattaneo interested in writing a running commentary, though his work is more concise. Before starting his commentary, Lipsius introduces the text by putting the *Panegyricus* in its historical perspective, explaining the subject, the occasion, and the time of the oration. This historical perspective is present throughout his commentary, which became very successful, and was reprinted several times in the seventeenth century with his text, or as part of collections of other commentaries.

Cunradus Rittershusius, the jurist and scholar who a few years later would edit and comment on the tenth book of the *Epistulae* (V.6 below) did not edit the *Panegyricus*, but he briefly commented on a few lemmata and made conjectures and emendations to the text of the Plinian and the other panegyrics edited by Livineius. First published in 1604, his notes (see V.6 below) were reprinted several times with other commentaries.

Janus Gruterus, in his edition of the twelve panegyrics (Frankfurt, 1607), republished the commentary of Livineius and the notes of Rittershusius, to which he added his own commentary (V.8 below). In 1643 Claudius Le Beau reprinted at Paris Gruterus' edition in two volumes. Vol. 1 contains Pliny's *Panegyricus* with the commentaries by Cattaneo, Rayanus, Livineius, Lipsius, Rittershusius, and Gruterus. In a note to the reader Le Beau informs the public

that he has added to Gruterus' edition the "notae criticae et historicae" by Claudius Puteanus (Claude Depuy), and further variant notes by Petrus Faber Saniorianus, Franciscus Iuretus, and Antonius Schonovius. These additional notes by Saniorianus, Iuretus, and Schonovius are merely collations of an unidentified source with the Froben edition (1520); they are printed separately by Le Beau at the end of the first volume. This edition was later known as the Puteana. The nature and extent of Puteanus' contribution to Pliny is not clear; his variant readings and some explanatory notes on the other panegyrics are found at the end of the second volume.

The editor of the 1635 Strassburg edition is Johannes Frischmannus, who was a teacher there.¹⁶¹ Frischmannus acknowledges in a brief prefatory note that his text (now divided into chapters) is that of Livineius, whose abbrevia-

161. Since the sixteenth century there has been confusion as to who was actually the editor of this edition. The title page and the dedication to Friedrich, margrave of Baden and Hochberg, dated 1 January ("Calendis Januari") 1635, present in some copies, name Johannes Frischmannus as the editor ("curante Joanne Frischmanno"). However, some copies have a different title page and different content for the first three folia: Frischmannus is not mentioned on the title page; appearing instead are the names of Matthias Berneggerus, professor of history at Strassburg, and Johannes Stocker ("[Panegyricus] Denuo editus. . . Nunc vero duce Deo praeside viro doctissimo clarissimoque Dn. Matthia Berneggero Historiarum professore ordinario, patrono meritissimo ad publicam dissertationem propositus a. d. [blank space] Februario a Iohanne Iacobo Stocker Scaphusia, Helvetia. Plato: ὁ βασιλεὺς ὡς νεὸς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων"). In addition, instead of Frischmannus' dedication, there is a very brief dedicatory epigraph by Stocker to his patrons (including his father), a dedication of Berneggerus to Stocker's father, dated 5 January ("nonis Ianuariis") 1635, and two laudatory poems to Stocker, one by Johannes Henricus Boeclerus and one by Frischmannus. From the dedication of Berneggerus to Stocker's father, it appears that Berneggerus, after he accepted Stocker as a student at the Academy in Strassburg, found as other teachers for him Frischmannus and Boeclerus, whom Berneggerus praises. It also appears that Frischmannus is the editor of the *Panegyricus* and added notes of his own to the commentary by Lipsius and the notes of other scholars; that Stocker did a public disputation in February 1635 which seems to have had as its title a sentence by Plato (ὁ βασιλεὺς ὡς νεὸς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων) probably expounding on themes in the *Panegyricus*. This is confirmed by Frischmannus' and Boeclerus' poems. In all likelihood, Stocker was the candidate/respondent of the disputation, whose text, however, does not accompany the edition of the *Panegyricus*. On the problem of public disputations for a degree, see W. Clark, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* (Chicago and London, 2006), 204–8.

tions of manuscripts and editions he reprints in the margins. The emendations and the commentary, in the form of notes at the end of each chapter, consist mostly of notes by Lipsius, Gruterus, Livineius, and Rittershusius. Frischmannus occasionally adds some notes of his own but does not sign them.

Both the dedication of Johannes Frischmannus, present in some copies, and the laudatory poems, present in others, underline the interest of a group of German scholars and teachers in the moral and political teachings of the *Panegyricus*. In their view, both a good prince and young men aspiring to a life of honor and glory should imitate Trajan's virtues.

Other editions, without commentaries and independent of the *Epistulae*, appeared at Vendôme (1637), Paris (1648), and Utrecht (1652). The edition published at Le Mans in 1653 "ad usum collegiorum congregationis oratorii Domini Jesu" ("for the use of the academies of the Oratorians") was clearly meant, as the subtitle suggests, not for scholars but for students. The preface explains what a panegyric is and gives a summary of the work. The text is broken up into sections and each section is preceded by a brief summary; the explanatory notes, which surround the text, cite mostly passages from Greek and Latin classical authors, with an occasional quotation from Lipsius.

In 1674 Georgius Kirchmajerus published at Wittenberg his edition of the *Panegyricus*. To his dedicatees, political figures, Kirchmajerus, again, suggests that they imitate Trajan, the prince under whom the Roman Empire expanded and flourished, and Pliny, whose rhetorical elegance he praises, echoing and quoting Cattaneo's words.

In the preface to the reader, signed L.H., the writer, perhaps a collaborator, examines in detail the rhetorical qualities of the *Panegyricus*, praising its subject matter (*inventio*), organization (*dispositio*), vocabulary (*elocutio*), structure of periods, sound and rhythm (*compositio*), and figures of speech (*figurae*). He agrees with Erasmus that the purpose of panegyrics, and of Pliny's *Panegyricus* in particular, is to correct bad leaders, to be profitable for the good, to educate the ignorant, and to warn and stimulate the idle.

For his text Kirchmajerus perused the editions of many previous scholars. He praises especially Livineius' edition, a copy of which, with

notes by Piccartus and Barthius, was given to him by his friend Christianus Daunius; he found it particularly useful. Besides collating all these editions, his work as editor consists in dividing the text into chapters (as Frischmannus, he acknowledges, had already done) and paragraphs, and in improving and enriching Frischmannus' index.

Kirchmajerus did not compose a commentary for this edition, but in his *Diatribae*, appended to the text of the *Panegyricus* and consisting of an introduction (*prolegomenon*) and six chapters, he discusses the origin of the name *panegyricus*, its parts, its requirements, and the topics proper for such a genre. It is clear that for Kirchmaierus the value of the *Panegyricus* lies in its rhetoric.

His interest in the *Panegyricus* continued. A few years later, in 1688 and again in 1689, he republished the text at Wittenberg, this time with a commentary of his own, following, as he says, in the path of Lipsius ("ad ductum Lipsii").

In 1675, Petrus Elzevier published at Leiden the text of the *Panegyricus* with the now standard commentaries by Lipsius, Livineius, Gruterus, and Rittershusius as well as the hitherto unpublished notes of Dominicus Baudius. Baudius, a distinguished professor of oratory at Leiden, had delivered an oration on the *Panegyricus* in 1603 as a *praelectio* to his course. This was first published in 1619 in a collection of his orations, then in 1635 by Frischmannus, and now by Elzevier. Apparently Baudius had also left some notes, albeit in a confused state, on the *Panegyricus*, which Elzevier was able to find, edit, and publish. They consist of an introduction on some points of rhetoric, and of explanatory observations, mostly on rhetoric and style (see V.7 below).

An edition *ad usum Delphini*, with the twelve panegyrics and a commentary, was published at Paris in 1676 by Jacobus de la Baune, a Jesuit. His text is that of the 1643 Parisian edition, the so-called *Puteana* (p. 101 above), which de la Baune considers the best. De la Baune provides his own biographies of Trajan, Pliny, and each emperor to whom a panegyric is addressed, as well as a synopsis of each panegyric. He also divides the commentary into *notae* (explanations of words, rhetorical devices, historical events, and juridical questions) and *interpretationes* (discussions of the text).

The only Latin edition of Pliny's *Panegyricus*

to have been printed in Italy in the seventeenth century was published at Venice in 1687, without any commentary, but with the *argumentum* taken from Cattaneo and with footnotes containing variant readings.¹⁶²

Christophorus Cellarius' text of the *Panegyricus*, published together with the *Epistulae* in 1693 (p. 95 above), follows Baudius and de la Baune. In his footnotes he makes some observations of his own and often quotes other scholars whose opinions he confirms, refutes, or approves.

Although each of the seventeenth-century editions mentioned above claimed to be *correctissima* and better than any predecessor, no new manuscript was ever used for any of them. Instead, the text is always a combination of corrections and conjectures emanating from the present and earlier editors.

What translations we have of the *Panegyricus* into the vernacular date mostly from the seventeenth century. In the Quattrocento the Florentine humanist Lippo Brandolini (ca. 1454–97) made an Italian translation for Ferdinand of Aragon, king of Naples; still unedited, it is now Paris, BNF, ital. 616.¹⁶³ No Italian translations seem to survive from the sixteenth century. A few passages from the *Panegyricus* were translated and published at Naples in 1616. C.G.V.M. Sanese "detto lo Sbattuto" made the first complete Italian translation; published at Rome in 1628, it includes the Latin text (in smaller characters and placed in the margins). More than forty years passed before another complete Italian translation of the *Panegyricus* appeared. The work of Giovanni Lengueglia, it was published at Venice in 1670 and reprinted there in 1686. Shortly afterwards, in 1688, what would be the third Italian translation of the *Panegyricus* in its entirety also appeared at Venice; the dedication is signed by Genesio Soderini and the Latin text and vernacular rendering of an anonymous translator are on facing pages.

Despite the interest in the Latin *Panegyric* in northern Europe, translations were not popu-

162. A curious note before the text warns the reader not to pay attention to pagan notions of fate, fortune or similar things that are found in the *Panegyricus*.

163. T. De Marinis, *La biblioteca napoletana dei re d'Aragona*, vol. 2 (Milan, 1947), 178. For Brandolini, see "Brandolini, Aurelio Lippo," DBI 14 (1972) 26–28 (A. Rottò).

lar there. Gotha, Forschungsbibliothek, A 585 preserves an early German translation by Dietrich von Pleieninger.¹⁶⁴ It is signed by the translator and has two dedications, one to Frederick the Wise of Saxony, dated 1 March 1512, and one to William, count of the Palatinate, dated 23 April 1511.¹⁶⁵ This translation was printed at Landeshut in 1515, and then at Strassburg in 1520. No German translations in the seventeenth century have yet been located.

Although there seem to be no Latin editions of the *Panegyricus* printed either in Spain or in Portugal, a translation by Francisco Barreda was published at Madrid as early as 1622. Kristeller signals a Portuguese translation in Lisbon, Biblioteca Nacional, Fundo Geral 3182.¹⁶⁶

In 1632 Jacques Bouchard published the first French translation of both the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus*.¹⁶⁷ Hyppolite Jules Pilet de la Mesnadière's translation of the *Panegyricus* was published in 1638 at Paris and reprinted in 1642 at Strassburg; he later translated the first three books of the *Epistulae* (Paris, 1643). Finally, Monsieur l'Abbé de l'Esprit produced the last French translation of the *Panegyricus* in the seventeenth century (Paris, 1677, 1694, 1697).

Sir Robert Stapylton was the first to make an English translation of the *Panegyricus*; it was published at Oxford in 1644. A little more than forty years later, the *Panegyricus* was translated again into English, this time by Kennett White, bishop of Peterborough. White's version, first published at London in 1685, was printed again in 1686 for Thomas Fickus and William Hart, booksellers in Oxford.

THE EIGHTEENTH TO TWENTIETH CENTURIES

In the eighteenth century, besides reprints of de la Baune's and Cellarius' editions, new texts and commentaries were edited by Henric Jo-

164. His manuscript of Pliny's *Epistulae* (Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Cod. poet. et philol. 4° 30) had been corrected by Agricola at Ferrara; see p. 90 and n. 109 above.

165. Kristeller, *Iter* 3.393b.

166. *Ibid.* 4.464a.

167. Both the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus* were printed by Toussaint Quinet in Paris. They have separate title pages so they could be sold separately, but some copies are bound together (e.g., Paris, BNF, Z-13745).

hann Aertzen (1738), Johann Mathias Gesner (1739), Christian Gottlieb Schwarz (1746), and E. G. Gierig (1796). Nineteenth-century interest in the *Panegyricus* was mostly philological, with a focus on reconstituting the text through careful study of the manuscript tradition. Heinrich Keil published the *Panegyricus* with his editions of the *Epistulae* of 1858 and 1870. He based his text on seven Italian manuscripts of the fifteenth century¹⁶⁸ and on the fragments of Ambrosianus E 147 sup. His 1870 edition is enriched by an historical index compiled by Theodor Mommsen. Emil Baehrens was the first scholar to examine thoroughly the manuscript tradition and to try to clarify it (1874, 1884). His son Wilhelm corrected and modified his work (1911).

In the twentieth century, while the study of the manuscript tradition continued to evolve, scholarly interest returned to the content of the text itself. Marcel Durry published a rich commentary (1938) and subsequently edited the text with a French translation in the "Les Belles Lettres" series (1947). A few years later Enrica Malcovati edited the text with a commentary (1952), while Alvaro d'Ors edited, commented on, and translated it into Spanish (1955), and Werner Kühn translated it into German with an introduction (1985). R. A. B. Mynors edited the text with a brief introduction in 1964. Francesco Trisoglio published his text and commentary on the *Panegyricus* together with text and commentary on the *Epistulae* (1972, 1978). In 1989 Paolo Fedeli made a comprehensive study of the *Panegyricus*, reconsidering the manuscript tradition and exploring the linguistic, literary, and historical issues raised by the text. Domenico Lassandro's careful catalogue of all the manuscripts containing the twelve panegyrics appeared in 1988. In 1992 he published an edition of the twelve panegyrics with a very useful introduction that includes also an examination of the manuscripts containing only Pliny's *Panegyric* (these had been omitted in his 1988 article).

168. BAV, Vat. lat. 3461; Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. Gudianus lat. II 45; Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 48; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 309; Augsburg, Universitätsbibliothek, II.118; Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Carlsruhensis 457 (olim Durlacensis 36), and Milan, Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense, A D XIV 40. He collated only the Milan and Wolfenbüttel witnesses (Keil, ed., *Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri novem*. . . [1858], "Praefatio," xiii).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHIES

M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, *Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre senatorial (Ier-IIe s.)* (Louvain, 1987), no. 177 (Calpurnia) and no. 626 (Pompeia Celerina); E. Aubrion, "La 'Correspondance' de Pline le Jeune: problèmes et orientations actuelles de la recherche," in ANRW 2.33.1 (1989), has a rich bibliography on all the topics he discusses regarding Pliny's life and *Epistulae*: general bibliography, 305-6; career, 310-11; poetry and orations, 314; composition and publication of the letters, 321-23; historical interest of the letters, 330-40; Pliny's social environment, 344-45; personality, 349-52; literature, 355-58; language, 361-63; textual criticism, 365-68; editions 368-72; pedagogical influence, 373-74; O. Salomies, *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire* (Helsinki, 1992), 27-28, no. 6; *Prosopographia Imperii Romani (PIR).6* (Berlin, 1998), 204-9, no. 490.

J. Bennett, *Trajan, Optimus Princeps: A Life and Times* (London and New York, 1997), 277-97 and also "Index of Personal Names," 301, s.v. "Pliny the Younger"; F. Beutel, *Vergangenheit als Politik: neue Aspekte im Werk des jüngeren Plinius*, Studien zur klassischen Philologie 121 (Frankfurt am Main, 2000), 271-82; P. Fedeli, "Il 'Panegyrico di Plinio' nella critica moderna," in ANRW 2.33.1 (1989), 513-14 (bibliography regarding Pliny and the *Panegyric*); S. B. Platner, "Bibliography of the Younger Pliny," *Western Reserve Bulletin* (1901) 10-34; F. Trisoglio, ed. and trans., *Opere di Plinio Cecilio Secondo*, vol. 1 (Turin, 1973), 49-101; L. Vidman, *Étude sur la correspondance de Pline le Jeune avec Trajan*, Rozprawy Československé Akademie Véd. Rada společenských věd. Ro. 70, seš. 14 (Prague, 1960).

II. EPISTULAE

A. Selected Editions, Commentaries, and Translations

H. Keil, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri novem. Epistularum ad Traianum liber. Panegyricus* (Leipzig, 1858; 2d ed. with expanded preface, 1870); E. G. Hardy, ed., *C. Plinii Caecili Secundi Epistulae ad Traianum imperatorem cum eiusdem responsis*, with notes and introductory essays (London and New York, 1889);

E. T. Merrill, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri decem* (Leipzig, 1922); A.-M. Guillemin, ed. and trans., *Pline le Jeune. Lettres*, 3 vols., with comprehensive introduction and brief commentary (Paris, 1927); M. Schuster, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri novem; Epistularum ad Traianum liber; Panegyricus* (Leipzig, 1933; 2d augmented and rev. ed. 1952, 1958); M. Durry, ed. and trans., *Lettres: livre 10. Panégyrique de Trajan*, with comprehensive introduction and brief commentary (Paris, 1947); S. E. Stout, ed., *Plinius, Epistulae. A Critical Edition* (Bloomington, 1962); R. A. B. Mynors, ed., *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri decem* (Oxford, 1963); A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary* (Oxford, 1966); F. Trisoglio, ed. and trans., *Opere di Plinio Cecilio Secondo*, with introduction and commentary, 2 vols. (Turin, 1973; repr. 1978); H. Kasten, ed. and trans., *Plinius, der Jüngere: Briefe, Schriften und Quellen der Alten Welt 35* (Berlin, 1982); W. Williams, ed. and trans., *Pliny: Correspondence with Trajan from Bithynia (Epistles X)*, with introduction and commentary (Warminster, 1990).

B. Transmission

E. Aubrion, "La 'Correspondance' de Pline le Jeune: problèmes et orientations actuelles de la recherche," in ANRW 2.33.1 (1989), 304-74; (anonymous author), "Aldo Manuzio e le sue edizioni dei classici," *La bibliofilia* 27 (1925-26) 321-22; R. Avesani and B. M. Peebles, "Studies in Pietro Donato Avogaro of Verona," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 5 (1962) 48-84 (Avesani, "Il 'De viris illustribus' antiquissimis qui ex Verona claruerunt"; Avesani, "Il preumanesimo veronese," in *Storia della cultura veneta*, vol. 2: *Il Trecento* (Vicenza, 1976), 111-41, figs. 53-57, and color plate 3; L. C. Barré, "À propos d'un essai de plume du manuscrit en onciale des *Lettres* de Pline le Jeune (Collection Pierpont Morgan)," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 94 (1933) 420-22; *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France, Départements* (Quarto Series), vol. 2 (Paris, 1888), 394-98 ("Mss de la Bibliothèque d'Évreux. Tituli librorum quos dedit Philippus, Episcopus Baiocensis, Ecclesie Becci"); G. Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (Bonn, 1885; rpt. Hildesheim and New York, 1973); L. Bek, "Ut ars natura—ut natura ars: le ville di Plinio e il concetto del giardino nel Rinas-

- cimento," *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 7 (1974) 109–56; M. Bertòla, *I due primi registri di prestito della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Codices e Vaticanis Selecti, Series Maior 27* (Vatican City, 1942); G. Billanovich and G. Ouy, "La première correspondance échangée entre Jean de Montreuil et Coluccio Salutati," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 7 (1964) 337–72; Billanovich, "Tra Dante e Petrarca," *ibid.* 8 (1965) 1–44; Billanovich, "Il Catullo della cattedrale di Verona," in *Scire litteras. Forschungen zum mittelalterlichen Geistesleben*, ed. S. Krämer and M. Bernhard, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Abhandlungen, Philos.-hist. Klasse, N.S., 99 (1988), 35–57; Billanovich, "Petraarch and the Textual Tradition of Livy," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 14 (1951) 196ff.; B. Bischoff, "Hadoardus and the Manuscripts of Classical Authors from Corbie," in *Didascaliae: Studies in Honor of Anselm M. Albareda*, ed. S. Prete (New York, 1961), 41–57 (also in German: "Hadoard und die Klassikerhandschriften aus Corbie," in *Mittelalterliche Studien. Augewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, vol. 1 [Stuttgart, 1966], 55–60); B. B. Boyer and A. P. Dorjahn, "On the 1508 Aldine Pliny," *Classical Philology* 20 (1925) 50–61; A. Cameron, "The Fate of Pliny's Letters in the Late Empire," *Classical Quarterly*, N.S., 15 (1965) 289–98; Cameron, "Pliny's Letters in the Later Empire: An Addendum," *ibid.* 17 (1967) 421–22; A. E. Case, "More about the Aldine Pliny of 1508," *The Library*, 4th Ser., 16 (1935–36) 173–87; L. Cesarini Martinelli, "Il Poliziano e Svetonio: osservazioni su un recente contributo alla storia della filologia umanistica" *Rinascimento*, N.S., 16 (1976) 111–31; L. A. Ciapponi, "Appunti per una biografia di Giovanni Giocondo da Verona," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 4 (1961) 131–58; Ciapponi, "Agli inizi dell'umanesimo francese: Fra Giocondo e Guglielmo Budé," in *Forme e vicende: per Giovanni Pozzi*, ed. O. Besomi et al. (Padua, 1988), 101–18; A. P. Dorjahn, "On Aldus' Use of P," *Classical Philology* 20 (1925) 279–82; D. Ganz, "The Preface to Einhard's 'Vita Caroli,'" in *Einhard: Studien zu Leben und Werke. Dem Gedenken an Helmut Beumann gewidmet*, ed. H. Schefers, Arbeiten der hessischen historischen Kommission, N.S., 12 (1997), 299–310; Erasmus, *Adagia* in *Opera omnia* 2.3, ed. M. Szymanski (Amsterdam et al., 2005); Erasmus, *De pueris . . . instituendis*, in *Opera omnia* 1.2, ed. J.-C. Margolin (Amsterdam, 1971), 1–78; Erasmus, *De conscribendis epistolis*, ed. Margolin, *ibid.*, 153–579; Erasmus, *Dialogus Ciceronianus*, ed. P. Mesnard, *ibid.*, 581–710; C. Erdmann and N. Fickermann, "Weitere Briefe Meinhards von Bamberg," in *Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV.*, MGH, Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 5 (Weimar, 1950), 189–248; V. Fera, *Una ignota Expositio Suetoni del Poliziano* (Messina, 1983); F. Gamberini, "Materiali per una ricerca sulla diffusione di Plinio il Giovane nei secoli XV e XVI," *Studi classici e orientali* 34 (1984) 133–70; G. Gardenal, *Il Poliziano e Svetonio: Contributo alla storia della filologia umanistica* (Florence, 1975); E. G. Hardy, "A Bodleian MS of Pliny's Letters: VII 8.23–18.11 and ad Traj. 1–40," *Journal of Philology* 17 (1888) 95–108; M. J. Heurgon, "Fra Giocondo et l'édition du X^e livre de la Correspondance de Pline le Jeune," *Bulletin de la Société Nationale des antiquaires de France* 1956 (1958), 57–63; D. Johnson, "The Manuscripts of Pliny's Letters," *Classical Philology* 7 (1912) 66–75; C. P. Jones, "The Younger Pliny and Jerome," *Phoenix* 21 (1967) 301; H. Kunst., ed., *Gualteri Burlei Liber de vita et moribus philosophorum* (Tübingen, 1886), 368–70; E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, vol. 11 (Oxford, 1966), 24, no. 1660 and plate; E. A. Lowe and E. K. Rand, *A Sixth-Century Fragment of the Letters of Pliny the Younger: A Study of Six Leaves of an Uncial Manuscript Preserved in the Pierpont Morgan Library*, New York (Washington, D.C., 1922) (reprinted in E. A. Lowe, *Paleographical Papers, 1907–1965*, ed. L. Bieler, vol. 1 [Oxford, 1972], 103–26); M. Manitius, "Beiträge zur Geschichte römischer Prosaiiker im Mittelalter," *Philologus* 47 (1889) 566–67; E. T. Merrill, "On a Bodleian Copy of Pliny's Letters," *Classical Philology* 2 (1907) 129–56; Merrill, "On the Early Printed Editions of Pliny's Correspondence with Trajan," *ibid.* 5 (1910) 451–66; Merrill, "The Tradition of Pliny's Letters," *ibid.* 10 (1915) 8–25; Merrill, "On the Use by Aldus of His Manuscripts of Pliny's Letters," *ibid.* 14 (1919) 29–34; Merrill, "Two Impressions of an Aldine Pliny," *ibid.* 18 (1923) 68–69; G. Ouy, V. Gerz-von Büren et al., *Le catalogue de la bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor de Paris de Claude de Grandrue, 1514* (Paris, 1983); Ouy, *Les manuscrits de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor: catalogue établi sur la base du répertoire de Claude de Grandrue (1514)*, vol. 1 (Turnhout, 1999); A. Paredi, *La biblioteca del Pizolpasso* (Milan, 1961); U. Pasqui, "La biblio-

teca d'un notaro aretino del secolo XIV," *Archivio storico italiano*, 5th Ser., 4 (1889) 250-55; E.K.Rand, "A New Approach to the Text of Pliny's Letters," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 34 (1923) 83-191; L.D.Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1983); F.E.Robbins, "The Relation between Codices B and F of Pliny's Letters," *Classical Philology* 5 (1910) 467-75; Robbins, "Impressions' of the 1508 Aldine Pliny," *ibid.* 23 (1928) 185-87; R.Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Guarini veronese* (Catania, 1896), reprinted in *Guariniana*, ed. M.Sancipriano (Turin, 1964); Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, 2 vols., 2d ed. (Florence, 1967); Sabbadini, "Le 'Epistulae' di Plinio," in *Storia e critica di testi latini*, 2d ed., ed. E. and M.Billanovich, *Medioevo e umanesimo* 11 (Padua, 1971), 263-79; N.Scivoletto, "Plinio il Giovane e Giovenale," *Giornale italiano di filologia* 10 (1957) 133-46; A.N.Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary* (Oxford, 1966); S.E.Stout, "The Eight-Book Manuscripts of Pliny's Letters," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 55 (1924) 62-72; Stout, "A Defense of the Nine-Book Tradition of Pliny's Letters," *ibid.* 57 (1926) 5-31; Stout, *Scribe and Critic at Work in Pliny's Letters. Notes on the History and Present Status of the Text*, Indiana University Humanities Series 30 (Bloomington, 1954); Stout, "The Basis of the Text in Book X of Pliny's Letters," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 86 (1955) 233-49; Stout, "The Coalescence of the Two Plinys," *ibid.*, 250-55; Stout, "Trials in Manuscripts," *The Classical Bulletin* 34 (1957) 3-4; Stout, "The Origin of the Ten-Book Family of Pliny Manuscripts," *Classical Philology* 53 (1958) 171-73; F.Trisoglio, "Sant'Ambrogio conobbe Plinio il Giovane?" *Rivista di studi classici* 20 (1972) 363-410; B.L.Ullman, "Another 1508 Aldine Pliny," *Classical Philology* 23 (1928) 363-70; Ullman, "The Transmission of Latin Texts," *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 27-28 (1956) 582-83; Ullman, "Manuscripts of Duke Humphrey of Gloucester," in *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 2d ed., *Storia e letteratura* 51 (Rome, 1973), 345-56; C.Vecce, *Iacopo Sannazaro in Francia. Scoperte di codici all'inizio del XVI secolo*, *Medioevo e umanesimo* 69 (Padua, 1988); L.Wallach, review of Erdmann and Fickermann's *Briefsammlungen*

der Zeit Heinrichs IV. (see above), in *Speculum* 26 (1951) 500-503; G.P.Winship, "The Aldine Pliny of 1508," *The Library*, 4th Ser., 6 (1925-26) 358-69.

III. PANEGYRICUS

A. Selected Editions and Commentaries

H.J.Aerntzen, ed., *Panegyricus, cum notis integris Francisci Jureti, Joannis Livineii, Justi Lipsii . . . et selectis aliorum*, 3d rev. ed. (Amsterdam, 1738); J.M.Gesner, ed., *C. Plinii Caecilii secundi Epistolarum libri decem. Eiusdem gratiarum actio sive Panegyricus* (Leipzig, 1739, 1770, 1805; Venice, 1786); C.G.Schwarz, ed., *Panegyricus Caesari Imp. Nervae Traiano Aug. dictus* (Nuremberg, 1746; Göttingen, 1749); H.Keil, ed., with the *Epistulae* (Leipzig, 1858, 1870; see Bibliography II.A above); E.Baehrens, ed., *XII Panegyrici latini* (Leipzig, 1874, 1884); W.Baehrens, ed., *XII Panegyrici latini* (Leipzig, 1911); M.Durry, *Panegyrique de Trajan* (Paris, 1938 [commentary]); Durry, ed. and trans., *Panegyrique de Trajan* (Paris, 1947); E.Malcovati, ed. and trans., *Il panegyrico di Traiano*, with commentary (Florence, 1952); A.d'Ors, ed. and trans., *Plinio el Joven. Panegirico de Trajano. Edición bilingüe*, with commentary (Madrid, 1955); R.A.B.Mynors, ed., *XII Panegyrici latini* (Oxford, 1964); F.Trisoglio, ed. and trans., *Opere di Plinio Cecilio Secondo*, vol. 2, with introduction and commentary (Turin, 1973; repr. 1978); W.Kühn, ed., *Panegyrikus: Lobrede auf den Kaiser Trajan*, with commentary (Darmstadt, 1985); D.Lassandro, ed., *XII Panegyrici latini* (Turin, 1992).

B. Transmission

J.Beaujeu, review of Mynors' *XII Panegyrici latini*, in *Revue des études latines* 43 (1965) 565-67; C.H.Beeson, "Isidore's *Institutionum Disciplinae* and Pliny the Younger," *Classical Philology* 8 (1913) 93-98; M.Bertòla, *I due primi registri di prestito della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, *Codices e Vaticanis Selecti*, Series Maior 27 (Vatican City, 1942); P.Fedeli, "Il 'Panegirico di Plinio' nella critica moderna," in ANRW 2.33.1 (1989), 387-514; D.Lassandro, "Inventario dei manoscritti dei Panegirici," *Invigilata lucernis* 10 (1988) 107-200 (with reproduction of one folio from all the manuscripts which are described); M.Manitius, "Beiträge zur Geschichte römischer Prosaiker im

Mittelalter," *Philologus* 47 (1889) 566–67; P. Pascal, "The 'Institutionum Disciplinae' of Isidore of Seville," *Traditio* 13 (1957) 425–31; R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, 2 vols., 2d ed. (Florence, 1967); Sabbadini, "Il Plinio di Girolamo Squarciafico," in Sabbadini, *Opere minori*, vol. 1: *Classici e umanisti da codici latini inesplorati*, ed. T. Foffano, Medioevo e umanesimo 87 (Padua, 1995), 246–47; Sabbadini, "Panegyrici veteres," *ibid.*, 100–103; Sabbadini, "Poggio e Guarino e il Panegirico di Plinio," *Bollettino di filologia classica* 5 (1899) 252–53; Sabbadini, *Carteggio di Giovanni Aurispa*, Fonti per la storia d'Italia 70 (Rome, 1931), 81–82; G. Suster, "Notizia e classificazione dei codici contenenti il panegirico di Plinio a Traiano," *Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica* 16 (1888) 504–51.

COMPOSITE EDITIONS

1506, Mediolani (Milan): apud Alexandrum Minutianum. With the texts of the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus*, both edited and commented on by Giovanni Maria Cattaneo (Johannes Maria Catanaeus); four short poems in hendecasyllabics, and two in elegiac couplets in praise of Cattaneo and his work on Pliny; a *Vita* of Pliny, composed by Cattaneo himself, and a description of a bombard also by Cattaneo. The first nine books are dedicated to Giaffredo Carli, the tenth book (*Ep.* 10.41.121) to Ambrogio del Maino, the *Panegyricus* to Gian Giacomo Trivulzio. After the text and the commentary on the *Panegyricus* there are two poems in honor of Trivulzio, an *Index verborum et rerum electarum*, a long *errata corrigere*, the description of a bombard by Cattaneo, a colophon listing the works in this edition. Schweiger 3.803; G. Bologna, *Le cinquecentine della Biblioteca Trivulziana*, vol.1 (Milan, 1965), no.388; Adams P-1535; NUC. BL; BNF; Oxford, New College; (CtY; NNC; ICU).

1510, Venetiis (Venice): per Ioannem et Bernardinum fratres de Lisona Vercellenses. Texts and commentaries as in the 1506 edition, with the omission of the six poems in praise of Giovanni Maria Cattaneo and the description of the bombard; the corrections in the *errata* of 1506 have been incorporated into the text. Schweiger 3.803; Adams P-1537; NUC. BL; Oxford, St. John's; (NNC; FU; InU).

[1518, Milan]: Ioannes Jacobus et fratres de Legnano. Giovanni Maria Cattaneo's edition of the *Epistulae* and *Panegyricus*, together with his accompanying commentaries. Giovanni Maria Cattaneo has revised the 1506 text of the *Epistulae* and added the following: *Epp.* 8.8.3–8.18.11; 9.16; 10.1–40, with their commentary, which were missing in the 1506 edition; a new dedication of books 1–9 to Jacopo Sadoletto, bishop of Carpentras; and the three inscriptions describing Pliny's career (*CIL* 5262; 5263; 5667). The dedication of book 10 to Ambrogio del Maino appears here before book 9, an obvious printer's mistake. The *Index verborum et rerum electarum* is updated. This folio edition is embellished by a series of five different woodcuts, printed respectively at the beginning of books 1 (reprinted at the beginning of book 6), 2, 3 (reprinted at the beginning of book 8), 4 (reprinted at the beginning of book 10), and 5. Books 7 and 9 have no woodcuts. Bologna, *Le cinquecentine* 1.389; M. Sander, *Le livre à figures italiens depuis 1467 jusqu'à 1530*, vol. 2 (Milan, 1942; rpt. Nendeln, 1969), no. 5765; NUC. Milan, Biblioteca Trivulziana; Como, Biblioteca Civica; (InU).

1519, Venetiis (Venice): per Ioannem Rubeum Vercellensem. Texts and commentaries as in the 1518 edition, with the omission of the six poems in honor of Giovanni Maria Cattaneo, his description of the bombard, and his new dedicatory letter to Jacopo Sadoletto. The woodcut of the first book of the 1518 edition appears at the beginning of all ten books. Schweiger 3.804; Adams P-1539; NUC. BL; BNF; (MH; CtY; InU; IU).

1533, [Paris]: veneunt Jadoco Badio et Joanni Rogny. Contents as in the 1518 edition, with texts in a slightly different order. There are no woodcuts. The misplacement of the dedication to Ambrogio del Maino is corrected. This folio edition was very popular and is often quoted by later editors as *Badiana editio*. Schweiger 3.804; Adams P-1543; NUC. BL; BNF; (MH; CU; DFo; ICU; DLC).

1552, Basileae (Basel): per Hieronymum Froben et Nic. Episcopium. Texts and commentaries as in the 1518 edition, with the omission of the six poems in praise of Cattaneo, the description of the bombard, and the dedicatory letter to Jacopo Sadoletto. Added are: some hendecasyllabics by Tussanus Valerius Campanus in honor of Pliny; the text of the *De viris illustribus*, attributed to Pliny, with

the commentary by Conradus Lycosthenes (Konrad Wolffart); and a *Vita Plinii* by the same. Schweiger 3. 805; Adams P-1545; NUC.BNF; Oxford, Magdalen College; (CtY; NNC; MnU; CSt).

1591, [Geneva]: excud. Henr. Steph. Contents as in a previous edition [Geneva, 1581] of Estienne (Renouard, *Annales . . . des Estienne* 1.148, nos. 3 and 4), with a slightly revised *Praefatio* and texts of the *Epistulae* and *Panegyricus*; also with material already in the 1581 edition, namely, the *Vita Plinii* by Giovanni Maria Cattaneo, the *Graecarum partim vocum, partim sententiarum, quas Plinius suis epistolis inseruit, interpretationes et in easdem annotationes* by Estienne, the *Panegyrici veteres* (with introductions by Beatus Rhenanus to some panegyrics), the *Actio gratiarum* by Ausonius, and the *Panegyricus* by Claudian. Added are: Estienne's dedication to Joachimus Carolus; excerpts relating to Pliny's life from Onofrio Panvinio's *Commentarii in Fastos*; and the *Notae* by Isaac Casaubon on the *Epistulae*. Renouard, *Annales . . . des Estienne* 1.154, no. 2; Schweiger 3.805; Adams P-1546; NUC.BL; BNF; (MH; CtY; CU; NNC).

1598, Parisiis (Paris): apud Robertum Micard. BNF; (PPiU). See immediately below.

1598, Parisiis (Paris): apud Franciscum Gueffier. Micard's and Gueffier's editions are identical. They reprint the 1588 Paris edition of the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus* (not mentioned on the title page) by Claudius Minos (Claude Mignault), with Minos' *Notae et observationes* on the *Epistulae*, explanation of Greek words and phrases, and detailed index of important facts and words in the *Epistulae*. Added are Minos' new dedication to Nicolaus Clericus and the *Notae* by Isaac Casaubon. NUC.BL; BNF; Oxford, All Souls College and St. John's College; (CabVau).

1599, [Geneva: Paulus Stephanus]. 2 vols., with contents as in the 1591 edition, except for some changes in the marginal notes. Renouard, *Annales . . . des Estienne* 1.195, no. 4; Schweiger 3.805; Adams P-1547; NUC. (MH; CtY; NNC; IU; NcU).

1600, Coloniae Allobrogum (Geneva): excudebat Paulus Stephanus. Some editions are dated 1601. Texts and commentaries as in the 1518 edition, with the omission of the dedication to Jacopo Sadoletto, the poems in honor of Giovanni Maria Cattaneo and Gian Giacomo Trivulzio, and the description of the bombard. Also included are: the *Vita Plinii* by Cattaneo and by

Lycosthenes; the three inscriptions describing Pliny's career; an index of things *notatu digna* both in the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus*; the *Panegyrici veteres*; and the *Actio gratiarum* by Ausonius, as in Henri Estienne's editions of 1581 and 1591. Adams P-1548 (1600); Schweiger 3.805; NUC.BL (1600); BNF (1601); Como, Biblioteca Civica (1601); Milan, Biblioteca Braidense (1600); (MH [1600]; CtY [1600]; CU [1600]; MH [1601]; IEN [1601]; Iau [1601]; CaOTU [1601]).

(*) 1604, [Paris]. Contents as in the 1591 edition. Schweiger 3.805; NUC. (CLSU).

(*) 1605: ex typographia Stephaniana. Contents as in the 1591 edition. Renouard, *Annales . . . des Estienne* 1.197, no. 18; Schweiger 3.805.

1606, n. p., but with the trademark of the Estiennes. Contents as in the 1591 edition. Schweiger 3.805; NUC. (NcU).

1607, [Geneva: Geremie des Planches]. Contents as in the 1591 edition. NUC. Como, Biblioteca Civica; (MH).

1607, Francoforti (Frankfurt). The twelve *Panegyrici* with the commentaries by Johannes Livineius, Janus Gruterus, and Cunradus Rittershusius, and, for the other panegyrics only, by Valens Acidalius. Further notes by Rittershusius are added at the end of his commentary on Pliny's *Panegyricus*. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.

1608, Parisiis (Paris): apud Claudium Chappellet. Contents as in the 1598 edition. BNF.

1608, Parisiis (Paris): apud Nicolaum Buon. Contents as in the 1598 edition. BNF.

(*) 1608, Parisiis (Paris): apud Marcum Orry. Contents as in the 1598 edition. NUC. Oxford, All Souls College; (IU; OCU).

1609, Ambergae (Amberg): apud Johannem Schönfeldium. With the commentaries of Cunradus Rittershusius on book 10 of the *Epistulae* and Franciscus Balduinus on *Epp.* 10.96–97. BL.

1610, Coloniae Allobrogum (Geneva): excudebat Iacobus Stoer. Contents as in the 1591 edition. NUC. Como, Biblioteca Civica; Oxford, Bodleian Library; (DCL; MNS; MWiW; NPV).

1611, [Geneva]: Oliua Pauli Stephani. Contents as in the 1591 edition. Renouard, *Annales . . . des Estienne* 1.197, no. 19; Schweiger 3.805; NUC. Oxford, Bodleian Library; (MH; NNC; NIC; IU).

1611, Francofurti (Frankfurt): apud Nicholaum Hoffmannum, sumptibus Iacobi Fischeri. Texts of the *Epistulae* and *Panegyricus* as in the 1591 Estienne edition. Some copies (BNF, Z 13721; Göt-

tingen, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Auct. lat. V 2367; Oxford, Bodleian Library, 80.Z.183 Jur.) contain only the *Epistulae* with the *Vita Plinii* by Giovanni Maria Cattaneo and the notes by Janus Gruterus and Isaac Casaubon; others (BL, 1095.aa.15) contain also the *Panegyricus* and the *Panegyrici veteres* with the commentaries by Johannes Livineius, Cunradus Rittershusius, Gruterus and, for the other panegyrics only, by Valens Acidalius. Schweiger 3.805.

1620, [Geneva]: ex typographia Jacobi Stoer. Contents as in the 1591 edition. Schweiger 3.805. BL; BNF; Como, Biblioteca Civica; Oxford, All Souls College; (DGU).

1625, Genevae (Geneva): apud Petrum et Iacobum Chouët. Contents as in the 1600 edition. Schweiger 3.805; NUC.BL; Como, Biblioteca Civica; Oxford, Bodleian Library; (MHi; CtY; MdBj; ICU).

1632, Genevae (Geneva): apud Iohannem de Tournes et Iacobum de la Pierre. Contents as in the 1591 edition. NUC.BL; Oxford, Bodleian Library; Como, Biblioteca Civica; (MH; CSt; IU; MeB).

1635, Argentorati (Strassburg): sumptibus Caspari Dietzeli. Johannes Livineius' text of Pliny's *Panegyricus*, with the commentaries of Justus Lipsius, Janus Gruterus, Livineius, Cunradus Rittershusius, and the editor, Johannes Frischmannus (Johann Frischmann). Also included are: a table of contents; the *Oratio de vita moribusque Traiani* by Marcus Zuërius Boxhornius; the *Oratio auspicalis in C. Plinij Panegyricum* by Dominicus Baudius; the introductory note by Lipsius; and *Elogia* of the *Panegyricus*.

Copies vary with respect to title pages and first folios:

(i) In some copies (such as Como, Biblioteca Civica, 88.7.6 and Oxford, All Souls College, Gallery C.11.3) the title page gives as editor Johannes Frischmannus (*curante Iohanne Frischmanno*), and is followed by Frischmannus' dedication to Fridericus, margrave of Baden-Hochberg. NUC. (MH; IU).

(ii) In other copies (such as Paris, BNF, Rés. X 3226 and Göttingen, Universitätsbibliothek, 8 AUCT Lat V 2695), the title page bears the name of Matthias Berneggerus, the presiding professor for a dissertation, presumably on Pliny, by a student named Johannes Jacobus Stockher. ("Nunc vero duce Deo praeside viro doctissimo claris-

simoque Dn. Matthia Berneggero Historiarum professore ordinario, patrono meritissimo, ad publicam dissertationem propositus A.D. februario a Iohanne Iacobo Stochter. Scaphusia Helvetio. Plato: ὁ βασιλεὺς ὡς θεὸς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων." Instead of the dedicatory letter to Fridericus, there is a dedicatory inscription by Stocker to various gentlemen, a letter by Berneggerus to Stocker's father, and two poems in praise of the younger Stocker by his teachers Johannes Henricus Boeclerus and Frischmannus.

1638, Genevae (Geneva): apud Petrum Chouët. Contents as in the 1591 edition. NUC.BNF; (MH; MeB; NPV).

1643, [Geneva]: apud Petrum & Iacobum Chouët. Contents as in the 1600 edition. Schweiger 3.806; NUC.Como, Biblioteca Civica; (MH; NNC; ICN).

1643, Parisiis (Paris): apud Claudium le Beau. 2 vols. Vol. 1: Janus Gruterus' text of Pliny's *Panegyricus*, with the commentaries of Gruterus, Giovanni Maria Cattaneo, Hermannus Rayanus, Johannes Livineius, and Justus Lipsius; the commentary of Franciscus Balduinus on Pliny's *Epp.* 10.96–97; and, at the end of the volume, collations by Petrus Faber Saniorianus, Franciscus Iuretus, and Antonius Schonovius of an unidentified source with the text of Pliny's *Panegyricus* in the Froben edition (Basel, 1520). Vol. 2: the other panegyrics, with a *variorum* commentary. NUC. (CtY; IU; NN [vol. 1 only]).

1650, Francofurti ad Viadrum (Frankfurt-am-der-Oder): sumptibus Melchioris Klossmanni. *Epistulae* and *Panegyricus*, edited by Andreas Rivinus and dedicated to Mattheus Braunensis. Henri Estienne's edition of the *Epistulae* and the *XII Panegyrici veteres*, without marginal variant readings, but with his preface and *Graecarum partim vocum, partim sententiarum, quas Plinius suis epistolis inseruit, interpretationes et in eadem annotationes* and the notes on the *Epistulae* by Isaac Casaubon, Kaspar von Barth, and August Buchner. The summaries that precede each letter are shorter and by Rivinus, the summary of the *Panegyricus* is Giovanni Maria Cattaneo's. Schweiger 3.806; NUC.BL; BNF; Oxford, All Souls College; (ICU).

1655, Parisiis (Paris): apud Simeonem Piget, via Iacobaea, sub signo Prudentiae. 2 vols., with contents as in the 1643 (Paris) edition. BL. (MH [vol. 1 only]; CaOTU).

1665, Francofurti ad Viadrum (Frankfurt-an-der-Oder): sumptibus Melchioris Closemanni bibliopolae. Contents the same as in the 1650 edition, with the addition of a brief note to the reader by Closemannus and the omission of the dedication and name of the editor (Andreas Rivinus). NUC. (ViLxW).

1669, Lugduni Batavorum et Roterodami (Leiden and Rotterdam): ex officina Hackiana. *Epistulae* only, edited by Johannes Veenhusius. Included are: Henri Estienne's *Praefatio*; the *Vita Plinii* by Lycosthenes annotated by Veenhusius; the *Judicium quo christianum eum non fuisse, ut volunt alii, ostenditur* by Marcus Zuerius Boxhornius; a series of passages in which various authors (Martial, Sidonius Apollinaris, Giovanni Maria Cattaneo, Erasmus, Vives, Gerardus Johannes Vossius) praise Pliny; the three inscriptions describing Pliny's career; footnotes containing the complete commentaries by Isaac Casaubon, Janus Gruterus, Henri Estienne, Augustus Buchnerus, Caspar Barthius, Johannes Fredericus Gronovius and "select notes" from the commentaries by Cattaneo, Cunradus Rittershusius, and Veenhusius himself; and the commentaries by Franciscus Balduinus, Rittershusius, and Vossius on *Epistulae* 10.96–97. NUC. BL; BN; Como, Biblioteca Civica; Milan, Biblioteca Trivulziana; Oxford, Bodleian Library; (MH; IU; NNC; NN).

1671, Genevae (Geneva): apud Samuelem Chouët. Contents as in the 1600 edition. Schweiger 3.806. BNF; Como, Biblioteca Civica.

1675, Lipsiae (Leipzig): typis et sumptibus Christiani Michaelis. *Epistulae* only, edited by Jacob Thomasius. Giovanni Maria Cattaneo, Henri Estienne, Isaac Casaubon, Janus Gruterus, Cunradus Rittershusius, Augustus Buchnerus, and Johannes Fredericus Gronovius are part of a *variorum* commentary. The *argumenta* of the letters are by Cattaneo. Also included are: a long letter to the reader by Thomasius; unpublished notes by Barthius; *Prolegomena (Vita Plinii)* by Lycosthenes with footnotes, the *Oratio de vita moribusque Traiani* by Marcus Zuerius Boxhornius, and the three inscriptions describing Pliny's career); *elogia, judicia, testimonia* of writers from Martial to the seventeenth century who have mentioned Pliny (23 authors); and laudatory passages from Pliny's editors (36), from Cattaneo to Veenhusius. NUC. BNF; (MH; IaU; MiU).

1675, Lugduni Batavorum (Leiden): ex officina Hackiana. (According to A. C. J. Willems, *Les Elzevier: histoire et annales typographiques* [Brussels, 1880; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1962], cclv and 414, no. 1608), there are a few copies dated "Trajecti ad Rhenum, ex officina Petri Elzeviri 1675." *Panegyricus* only, with the commentaries of Dominicus Baudius, Justus Lipsius, Johannes Livineius, Janus Gruterus, and Cunradus Rittershusius. Also included are the oration on the *Panegyricus* by Baudius and the *Oratio de vita moribusque Traiani* by Marcus Zuerius Boxhornius. NUC. BL; BNF; Como; Biblioteca Civica; Milan, Biblioteca Braidense; (MH; CtY; DLC; InU; CaBVaU).

1686, Hall(ae) Saxon(iae) (Halle): sumptibus Simon Johannis Huebneri. A second edition of the *Epistulae* edited by Jacobus Thomasius ("Editio secunda revisa et emendata"). Contents as in the 1675 (Leipzig) edition. BL; Milan, Biblioteca Braidense.

(*) 1695, Halae Sax(oniae) (Halle): sumptibus Simon Joh. Hubneri bibliop. A third edition of the *Epistulae* edited by Jacobus Thomasius ("Editio tertia revisa et emendata"). Contents as in the 1675 (Leipzig) edition, with the addition of the text of the *Panegyricus*. Schweiger 3.806.

1716, Londini (London): typis Gul. Bowyer, impensis Hen. Clementis. *Panegyricus* only, edited by Jacques de la Baune, who also commented on the text. Giovanni Maria Cattaneo, Hermanus Rayanus, Johannes Livineius, Justus Lipsius, Cunradus Rittershusius, and Dominicus Baudius are part of a *variorum* commentary placed at the end of the volume and entitled *Quaedam notae selectiores Lipsii, Livinaei, Catanaei, Rayani, Baudii, Rittershusii et aliorum*. The *notae*, however, are not attributed to individual commentators. NUC. BL; (CLU-C; DLC; IEG).

1723, Halle im Magdeburgischen: zu finden der Rengerischen Buchhandl. *Panegyricus* only. The volume was edited by Caspar Gottschling, who used the Latin text of Christophorus Cellarius and added notes of his own in German. Johannes Livineius, Justus Lipsius, Cunradus Rittershusius, Dominicus Baudius, and Janus Gruterus are part of a *variorum* commentary. Schweiger 1.812; NUC. (NcD).

1734, Amstelae'dami (Amsterdam): apud Janssonio-Waesbergios. *Epistulae* only, edited by Gottlieb Cortius and Paulus Daniel Longolius.

Included are: the dedicatory letters of Hieronymus Avantius (1502), Aldus Manutius (1508), and Giovanni Francesco Zeffi (1515); the *Praefatio* of Henri Estienne (1591); excerpts from the *Bibliotheca latina* by Fabricius; a complete collation of Maio's 1476 edition; a new *Vita Plinii*; the three inscriptions describing Pliny's career, with a long *Praefatio*; copious indexes; and selected notes from the commentaries by Giovanni Maria Cattaneo, Jacobus Schegkiius, Jacobus Sirmundus, Isaac Casaubon, Henri Estienne, Cunradus Rittershusius, Claudius Minos, Caspar Barthius, Augustus Buchnerus, Johannes Schefferus, Johannes Fredericus Gronovius, and Christophorus Cellarius. Each letter is preceded by a brief *argumentum*. NUC.BL; BNF; (MH; CtY; ICU; InU).

1738, Amstelaedami (Amsterdam): apud Janssonio Waesbergios. *Panegyricus* only, edited by Henric Johann Aerntzen (Johannes Arntzenius), with notes by Aerntzen. Included are: the *C. Plinii Secundi Junioris vita ordine chronologico digesta* by Jean Masson, with dedicatory letter and preface on the inscriptions describing Pliny's career; the dedicatory letters of Francesco Puteolano (1476), Aldus Manutius (1508), Giovanni Maria Cattaneo (1506), and Johannes Livineius (1599, along with his note to the reader); the note to the reader and introductory note of Justus Lipsius; the *Oratio auspicalis in C. Plinii Panegyricum* by Dominicus Badius (1603); the *Oratio de vita moribusque Traiani* by Marcus Zuerius Boxhornius; the dedicatory letter of Matthias Berneggerus to Franciscus Stockher (1635); commentaries by Johannes Livineius, Justus Lipsius, Cunradus Rittershusius, Janus Gruterus, and Christianus Gotlibus Schwarzius; and collations of Pliny's *Panegyricus* with the Froben edition (1520) by Petrus Faber Saniorianus and Franciscus Iuretus. NUC.BL; BNF; Oxford, Bodleian Library; (MH; CtY; InU; IU).

1746, Norimbergae (Nuremberg): sumtu Ioh. Georgii Lochneri. *Panegyricus* only, edited by Christian Gottlieb Schwarz, with *notae* and *observationes* by Schwarzius, his *Expositio numerorum veterum* and related information, elogia, the *Vita M. Ulpii Traiani* and *Vita C. Plinii Caecilii Secundi* by Jacques de la Baune, and the commentary by Lorenzo Patarolo. Also included are: (pp. lxxxxi–lxxxxii) the introductory note by Justus Lipsius; (pp. 611–717) the commentar-

ies by Johannes Livineius, Justus Lipsius, Cunradus Rittershusius, Janus Gruterus, and Matthias Berneggerus; (pp. 718–21) a collation of Pliny's *Panegyricus* with the Froben edition (1520) by Antonius Schonovius; (pp. 721–22) textual emendations by Johannes Fredericus Gronovius; the dedicatory letters of Giovanni Francesco Puteolano (1476), Giovanni Maria Cattaneo (excerpt) (1506), Aldus Manutius (excerpt) (1508), Georgius Cuspinianus (1513), Beatus Rhenanus (1520), Johannes Sichardus (1542), Paulus Navius (1576), Johannes Livineius (1599), Justus Lipsius (1622), Matthias Berneggerus (excerpt) (1635), and Marcus Zuerius Boxhornius (1659). NUC.BL; BNF; Oxford, Queen's College; (MH; CtY; ICU; InU).

I. THE CORPUS OF THE *EPISTULAE*

COMMENTARIES

1. Johannes Maria Catanaeus

Cattaneo produced the first commentary on both works of Pliny. Published at Milan in 1506, the commentary covers the *Epistulae* then known (books 1–9 in the traditional order, with the omission of letters 8.8.3–8.18.11; 9.16; and 10.1–40) and the *Panegyricus* (V.1 below). He composed also a *Vita Plinii*.

His work on the *Epistulae* is dedicated to prominent Milanese officials: the first nine books to Giaffredo Carli, then governor of Grenoble and Milan, and the tenth book to Ambrogio del Maino, the brother of Jason, a well-known Milanese jurist.

In the dedicatory letter, Cattaneo complains about the corrupt state of the manuscripts and the lack of literary and historical sources; these circumstances make editing and commenting on a text like the *Epistulae*—which requires numerous explanations of content, style, and language—difficult. He regrets that major historical works covering Nerva's and Trajan's times are lost, making it more difficult to find information about events, laws, and institutions of the period.

Echoing Filippo Beroaldo the Elder, Cattaneo praises Pliny's style in the first nine books for its balance: it is not too diffuse and redundant, but still full and eloquent, a mixture of Greek wit and Roman seriousness (*gravitas*), not quite as expan-

sive as the Asiatic style, but not as concise as the Laconic. Again, like Beroaldo, he makes a comparison between Cicero's and Pliny's letter writing. While he finds Cicero's style more florid and natural in its splendor and dignity of words, he considers Pliny's more thought out and accurate in its brevity. Cattaneo praises both, but he finds Pliny's variety and his ability to express different emotions especially appealing.

However, the conciseness of Pliny's style often requires explanations for the reader. Stressing his hard work, Cattaneo reminds scholars and readers that, whatever the weaknesses of his commentary, he was the first to dare to attempt such a daunting task. Pliny's *Epistulae* are also presented to Carli as full of examples to imitate both in private and public life in order to acquire immortality through virtue. Cattaneo praises Carli (a praise which he will recant in his edition of 1518), comparing his career and virtues to Pliny's: they both were senators, jurisconsults, and eloquent speakers; they were kind, generous patrons, honest, etc.

In the dedicatory letter preceding the tenth book Cattaneo intends to show, against those who did not believe it, that Pliny was indeed the author also of this book. The major objections to his authorship were the use of the unusual appellative *domine* to address Trajan and the adoption of a literary style so different from that of the other books. Cattaneo first responds through internal evidence: he points out that Trajan, in answering the letters, calls Pliny "Secundus"; and he shows, through parallel passages from some letters, but especially from the *Panegyricus*, that not only are the same people mentioned in the first nine books (like Julius Bassus, Justus, Calphurnius, and especially Suetonius, for whom Pliny had obtained the *ius trium liberorum* from Trajan) as well as in the tenth, but also that the same words and expressions are found throughout the ten books. He further recalls that the famous *Ep.* 10.96, in which Pliny asks Trajan how to deal with the Christians, is regarded by Paulus Orosius (*Adv. paganos* 7.12.3), Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3.33.1-3), and Tertullian (*Apol.* 2.6-8) as having been written by Pliny. Sidonius Apollinaris (*Ep.* 9. 9.1) does indeed refer to only nine books of Pliny's letters, but Cattaneo thinks that Sidonius might not have been interested in imitating the letters of the tenth book (since these were less

elegant and erudite), or he might not have known them.

With regard to the appellative *domine*, Cattaneo affirms that, while it was unusual in earlier times, after Trajan's victory over the Dacians it became common. To the objection that the style of the letters is different, Cattaneo proposes explanations that will be repeated by other scholars afterward: either Pliny was just a good rhetorician who wrote to Trajan in a simpler style because the emperor was not as well educated as his friends; or, more likely, the letters had not been published by Pliny himself (and therefore they had not been polished), but posthumously by one of his friends, as was the case with Cicero's *Epistulae ad familiares*. He then concludes, as usual, with praise of his dedicatee and members of his family.

Cattaneo's commentary is thorough and impressive. His statement in his dedication to Carli that he is not picking and choosing what to comment on, but rather explaining thoroughly, or at least attempting to explain, everything in the text, is accurate. Extant ancient authors, Greek, Roman, and Christian, and contemporary humanists are sources that he uses widely and carefully. He prefaces most letters with a short summary, and he gives information about their addressees and persons mentioned in them. Whenever the occasion presents itself, Cattaneo gives the history of a town or a geographical name (e.g., 1.3.1 *Comum*; 6.16.11 *Stabiae*; 6.16.5 and 11 *Vesuvius*) or of institutional terminology (e.g., 1.8.2 *municipes*; 1.8.16 *decuriones*; 1.8.17 *acclamatio*; 1.16.2 *sententiae*); he explains legal (e.g., 10.97.1 *actum*; 10.104.1 *ius liberorum*, *ius Quiritum*), architectural (e.g., 1.3.1 *triclinium*; 1.3.11 *balineum*; 1.8 *bibliothecae*), nautical (e.g., 6.16.4 *classis*; 6.16.7 *liburnica*; 6.16.8 *classarii*), and geological (e.g., 96.16.11 *pumices*; 6.16.15 *terrae motus*) terminology as well as figures of speech and rhetorical terms (e.g., 1.1.1 difference between writing letters and writing history; 1.1.3 difference between *imitatio* and *aemulatio*; 1.2.2 *figuris orationis*; 1.8.2 difference between *sermo* and *oratio*; 1.13.2 *praefatio*; 5.8.4 difference between *historia* and *oratio*).

He reorders for the reader words in complex and somewhat obscure sentences and clarifies their meanings (e.g., 1.13.4; 5.16.2; 6.16.13); he explains words that may be unfamiliar (e.g., 1.7.2 *cariotas*; 1.13.1 *stationes*; 6.16.6 *cervicalia*; 6.16.11

vadum), Greek words (e.g., 1.2.4 *lekuthous*), and idiomatic expressions (e.g., 1.1.2 *in manum venerat*; 2.11.8 *in metallum damnare*). He also acknowledges his confusion when his sources are conflicting, whether the problem is the identification of a person (e.g., 1.2.1 *Adriano, Arrio* or *Arriano?* 1.16.1 *Erutius* or *Eurutius?*) or the choice of a variant reading (e.g., 1.2.2 *stylo-ζήλω*); and he gives his reason for accepting one source or one reading over the others (*ibid.*).

Another of Cattaneo's accomplishments concerns the Greek in the *Epistles*: he corrects or supplies it. As Stout noted (*Scribe and Critic*, 49–52), Pliny often names the Greek authors he quotes; the manuscripts and the previous editions did not have the longer Greek quotations of Pliny, or had mostly corrupt and incomprehensible sentences. Cattaneo identified these quotations and restored them from the original Greek texts. Such a method has its problems, as modern editors know, but Cattaneo often appears to be right.

His commentary was and still is very useful. Reprinted many times, wholly or in part, in later collections, it was consulted by all successive commentators and, indeed, remained the most thorough commentary on Pliny until the publication of A. N. Sherwin-White's commentary in 1966.

a. The edition of 1506

Dedication of books 1–9. Clarissimo praesidi Gratianopolis ac Mediolani Iafredo Carolo iuris civilis et pontificii prudentissimo Ioannes Maria Catanaeus felicitatem. [*Inc.*]: Interpretandi munus apud veteres utile probatumque, nunc difficillimum et necessarium eruditorum nemo dubitat, cum multa ex historiis et priscorum moribus interciderint dicendarumque causarum ritus et habendi senatus, denique fere omnia nunc immutata quae difficulter ab authoribus colligi possunt. Ad haec tot inter depravationes quas bonae litterae passae sunt scriptorum nullum magis quam solutae orationis huiusmodi calamitas invasit, quae difficiliter animadvertitur et tollitur. Nam carminis menda metri ratione facilius deprehenditur et restituitur; a prosa vero et dictiones et totae clausulae saepius deciderunt quas in integrum reficere nisi alicuius fidi exemplaris testimonium subveniat, nec ipsi qui peperere, si ad nos redirent, consequerentur.

Nos autem peculiare quaedam in hoc opere difficultates circumsteterunt. Nam primum elaborandum fuit ut multa cum impressis vetusta exemplaria conferremus, quibus Plinium Caecilium supra caeteros scriptores depravatum ex Hippolyto, si fieri posset, Virbium faceremus [*Ov., Met.* 15.544ff.; *Fast.* 6.756]. Tot errores in Latinis et Graecis curandi fuerunt. Plura insuper de legibus discutienda veniebant, iam abrogata et desueta, quae vix a prudentibus discerni poterant. Nec ille mediocris scrupulus nos offendebat, Nervae Traianique Caesarum res quae saepius explicandae occurrebant iam fere conclamatae; nam compendia quae supersunt non singula sed summam illustrium rerum vix denotant.

Praeterea stilus pressior et emunctior qui lectori multa per se excogitanda relinquit, ita frequenter acuti sensus enodandi sunt. Quare factum crediderim ut superiorum nemo hoc opus quamvis maxime desideratum attigerit, praesertim cum nondum ab alio preoccupatis authorum marginibus unicuique liberum esset deligere quencumque interpretari placuisset; sed posteris difficillimos expoliendos reliquerit, Scyllas scilicet et Gorgonas nobis domandas. Navigarunt illi per aperta pelagi, nos scopulis et fretis commiserunt; itaque nonnulli parvo labore illustrati sunt. Fit enim plaerumque ut multorum nomina ipsa temporum felicitas et occasio a tenebris educat, at quosdam maximam meritis laudem fortunae malignitas opprimat, ingentesque vigilias minima comitetur gloria.

Neque tamen iccirco magnum aliquid fecisse credimus; sed, cum Plinianas epistolas adolescentibus admodum legeremus mirumque in modum earum venustate ac lepore caperemur, postmodum utilitate publica ducti existimavimus operam nostram non perdituros si ab omnibus provinciam desperatam uberrimos tamen fructus subactam reddituram primi aggredieremur, et emendando et interpretando, non ut plaerique qui a praeceptoribus suis quae exceperunt vel doctioribus elaborata surripuerunt ea sibi vindicantes pro suis publicant, sed haec qualiacumque sunt studio nostro lucubravimus, sublatis innumeris erroribus praeter unum aut alterum quos sine fide veteris exemplaris velle reponere fuisset temerare non emendare; et restitutos si ubique enumeravisse legentibus, fastidium nobisque iactantiae notam contraxissemus. In quibusdam vero visus sum mihi non sine suspitione mendae

quasi per sentes et inculta aratrum trahere quae ita excoluimus ut suspensa manu stilum ducere-mus.

Neque annotationes quasdam hinc inde tantum decerpsimus reliqua dissimulantes, sed uberrime singula videmur attigisse aut saltem tentavimus. Multis enim non paucis consulebamus, ut credatur si alius tantundem laboris vel inertiae in Plinium contulerit, nihil postea lectorem desideraturum, quamquam impossibile sit omnibus satisfacere. Nam qui sibi doctiores videbuntur, nos interdum tanquam nimios arguent; alii fortasse in quibusdam parcos fuisse dicent, etsi non desperamus alia alios detentura. Sunt enim quaedam in nostris non vulgaria, multa mediocria, plura notissima, quae singula stilo humili ac sermoni proximo referre consulto studuimus; nam qui eloqui in commentariis quaerunt, hi mihi videntur in alieno foro litigare, cum saepius utendum verbis de medio petitis, et ea data lex interpreti sit: ne indigeat interprete.

Quod si in hac prius inaccessa provincia aliquod minus domitum quam ut eruditi iudicaverint occurret, ipsi opem ferant. Quicquid enim ad utilitatem omnium insuper publicabitur modo non fiat detrahendi studio; id nos plurimum iuvabit, neque enim ii sumus qui omnia sciamus neque aliis bonum quo nos caremus invideamus, etiam si alius insurgat quia viderit a nobis primum aspera complanata, manca restituta, uberiores in Plinium commentarios transcrip-turus. Agat quomodo lubet et qualibet appendice legentium utilitati consulat. Admoneantur tamen studiosi in quo huius operis lectione profecerint, id nobis imprimis debendum.

Praeterea, addidimus rerum ac verborum electorum indicem, ut (quod plerumque fit) eadem annotatio pluribus locis satisfaceret et quasi digito monstraretur. Ad haec fortasse quidam in laboribus nostris requirent sibi et librorum numerum et caput authorum quos pro commo nostro citamus representari; alii talem modum improbabit, tanquam neque ad ornatum facientem neque nobis usquequaque concessum. Quare nescio quod temperamentum studuimus observare ut interdum proprium locum monstraremus, saepius vero contenti authorem tamen nominasse. Quod si curiosius aliquis ulteriora requiret, inquirendo experiatur an cum fide testes produxerim . . . [Tirade against envious contemporary scholars precedes the praise of Carli.]

Ostende modo te velle; non deerunt qui quod velis cupiant; diligeris, coleris, frequentaris nec immerito. Nam aliquid in studiis praestantes tueris, foves, ornas ut sub te spiritum et sanguinem patriamque recipiant bonae litterae. Ad haec cum pari fere itinere tu et Plinius ad summas virtutes et dignitates perveneritis, iure dicandae tibi fuerunt elucubrationes nostrae. Nam uterque senator optimus, tu iurisconsultus subtilis et orator eloquens, ille summus dicendi artifex nec iuris civilis inscius; humanus, liberalis, iucundus uterque, nemini nisi malis invisus; uterque gravissimarum rerum iudex et moderator uterque. Ille amicis gratuitum patrocinium, tu plerumque vel inimicis operam tuam praestitisti et quos fortunae turbo procul ferat relevasti; publica enim privatis anteponis. Ille rebus honestae partis honestissime usus est, tu virtute tua comparatas pari prudentia dispensas et quae meruistis benemeritis erogas.

Uterque sub felicissimis regibus per bonas artes ad summa proventus: illum Traiani felicitas clariorem reddidit, te Gallorum regum benignitas ad amplissimos magistratus extulit et sub felicissimo rege Carolo sublatam dignitatem tuam sub Ludovico feliciore in maius auxit. Ille a pessimo Domitiano inchoatos honores sub Traiano optimo perfecit post consulatum Bithyniae et Ponti praeses; tu provinciae Narbonensis et Insubriae summa cum integritate summam cuiusque ordinis hominum rationem servans; hoc illo maior, quod diversissimas terras velocissimi syderis more tu regis, ille proximas et coniunctas administravit . . . [Cattaneo continues with praises of Carli.]

Sed et scriptorum veteres non minori studio reparas et a mortalitate tueris, cum tibi maximam librorum suppellectilem comparas. Erravi, scio; non enim tibi tantum, sed studiosis quibus exemplarium tuorum spectatae in multis fidei copiam facis. Imprimis tamen veluti genium Plinianas epistolas veneraris, ita morum similitudine ferente quae generis eius sunt, ut nisi ab acutissimo ingenio, ut a tuo, probari et intelligi possint, quia huius authoris dictio sit elaborata, perpensa, recisa, non effluens, non redundans, verum tamen plena, eloquens, in suo genere copiosa; et si multum ei temporum iniuria nocuerit, magis Atticorum salem et Romanam gravitatem quam Asiaticam latitudinem effingens, neque ad Laconicam breviter concidens. Nam, sicut

M. Tullio in epistolis copia parataque dicendi facultas elucet, ita Plinio exulta, pensitata, amputata; utque illius reliqua divini eius ingenii opera maximam familiaribus epistolis commendationem adferunt, sic Plinio tum rerum tum verborum et splendor et dignitas faciunt ut quae non extant eius scripta summo cum desyderio requiramus, quem cum deponere constitueris, iterum resumes. Tot illecebris lectorem tenet et afficit ut cupidum ulteriora legendi rerum novitate faciat nolentemque aculeis trahat et ducat, neque brevitate officiat, sed magis lectorem capit. M. Tullium subinde societas comitatur ut iam legere paratum plaerunque nimia copia deterreat. Ille quem sensum intendit explicat optime et novitate sententiarum ac rerum acumine, non opprimit lassum sed reparat, pungit.

Enim tanquam chia ficus neque aliquid absque sale condit [Mart., *Epig.* 13.23.1–2], quodque in eo non spernendum in hoc opere, talia complexus quae nostris temporibus ad imitationem apprime faciant. Maior in illo granditas, in hoc cura et diligentia; par nitor; summum utrisque acumen et facetiae non inurbanae. Commendandi ordo dispar: nam Cicero multa et fere eadem repetit, Plinius per diversa, nihil tamen dicendum praeterit; acrius enim contendit, colligit astrictius. In hoc plus lacertorum et curae, in illo plus carnis et naturae; huic nihil demi, illi nihil adici potest. Quamquam propositum nostrum sit alterum laudandi non accusandi alterum, Caecilianus stilus floridus, iucundus, venustus, gravis, castigatus, temporibus suis proprius, verbis parcior, rebus plenior.

Omnes sane numeros in familiaribus epistolis absolvit, quas Septicii hortatu recognitas in novem libros distinxisse Sidonius Apollinaris in Plinii vita tradidit disciplinam maturitatemque in ipsis commendans [*Ep.* 1.1.1], opus sane compositum et abstersum, in quo mirifice affectus exprimuntur. Amat (ipsius enim verbis utar) ut qui verissime, dolet ut qui impatientissime, laudat ut qui begnissime, ludit ut qui facetissime, omnia denique tanquam singula absolvit.

Habes hic, clarissime praeses, de publicis et privatis rebus multa de principatu nec minora de republica, frequentiora de munificentia et ad bene vivendum conducentia. Quaeris quomodo studeas? immortalitatem virtutibus consequaris? hic unus satis tibi faciet. Exornat virtutes, insectatur vitia non verbis turpibus, sed turpia honeste

reprehendens. Quam mira in describendis locis felicitas? in commendando humanitas? in explicando facilitas? Denique nihil in illis est non ad exemplum pertinens. Sed dices, quid mihi cum tam longa praefatione? Verum ita difficultas operis et invidorum malignitas tuaeque virtutes ac Plinii stilus castigatissimus postulabat, ut quamvis multa dixerimus, longe tamen plura dicenda supersint. Mediolani cal(endis) decembris M.D.V.

Dedication of book 10. Magnifico D. Ambrosio Mayno Ioannes Maria Catanaeus s. Forsitan modestius fuerat supersedissee a qualibet Caecilianas ad Traianum epistolas praefatiuncula ne illam videremur ambitioni dedisse, nisi sciremus inter ingeniosos adhuc authorem requiri. Ego ut illius credam primum eo adducor, quod saepius in rescriptis suis Traianum Secundum vocat, quod in his epistolis Plinius multorum meminit ut Iulii Bassi, Iusti, Calphurnii, quos alibi retulerat, imprimis Suetonii, quem pariter contubernalem suum fatetur et ei ab optimo imperatore ius trium liberorum impetrare contendit.

Nec offendat aliquem quod Traianum blandiendo dominum dictitat, cuius appellationem, principatus initio omissam, procedente tempore non est aspernatus, post res adversus Dacos prospere gestas. Nam, ut Secundus ad Severum scribit, recentia maximi principis opera praebuerunt consulibus designatis facultatem nova et magna censendi, vera enim ratio decernendi aliquid non decernendive, quum ipsorum hominum rerum ac temporum conditione mutatur [*Ep.* 6.27.4–5], et dominus iure potuerit appellari, quod esset rerum dominus, ut poeta Romanos rerum dominos iam dixerat [Mart., *Epig.* 14.124.1].

Quaeret (scio) aliquis cur hic quam alibi remissione vel clariore stilo sit usus: quia scilicet ad imperatorem Traianum non doctissimum, si Dioni credimus [Dio Cassius, *Hist. rom.* 68.7.4], scribebas, illas fere ad eruditissimos. Principis ergo sui dicendi genus effingere conabatur et oratoris virtus praecipua sit dicere quae videat lectoribus placere. Nunquam enim arbitraret quod Martialis de Gallicis et Hispanis suis versiculis ideo minus politos quia in provincia non in urbe nati essent, idem accidisset in Bithynia Caecilianis epistolis. Sive eas fecerit non consilio publicandi, sed post eius obitum ab amicorum aliquo, quod Familiaribus Ciceronis litteris contigit, editae sint et ideo minus pressae, quia ab authore

suo non castigatae; an magis, quod et ipse fateatur, ut libellorum suorum vario stilo diversa lectorum ingenia detineret.

Neque tamen interdum dissimulare potuit quin plaeraque multa in praecedentibus usurpata inserat, quale illud "qua publice qua privatim" [Ep. 10.86b]. Nam ad Romanum scripserat "qua foeminae qua viri" [Ep. 6.33.4] et ad Marcum "qua officii maximis qua principum amicitia" [Ep. 3.5.7]. Item verba "qualia sunt", "alioqui", "durum", "dispice", "in melius", "ad exemplum pertinens". Et ne minima quaeque colligamus pares etiam sensus et res hinc inde occurrent, ut ad Traianum: "Diem, domine, quod servasti imperium, dum suscipis" [Ep. 10.52.1]; et in Panegyrico: "Exspectatum est tempus in quo liqueret non tam accoepisse te beneficium quam dedisse. Confugit in sinum tuum concussa resp(ublica) ruensque imperium super imperatorem imperatoris voce tibi delatum est" [Pan. 63]. Item hic: "Ego—inquit—quia sciebam acta Bassi procos rescissa: dictumque a senatu ius omnibus, de quibus ille aliquid constituisset, ex integro agendi, dumtaxat per biennium" [Ep. 10.56.4]. Illic vero eandem rem brevius et ideo minus aperte, ut locus conveniebat, tractans: "O vere,—dixerat—principis: intercedere iniquitatibus magistratuum, infectumque reddere quicquid non oportuerit" [Pan. 80.3]. Ad haec ad Priscum: "Nuper ab optimo principe trium liberorum ius impetravi; quod quamquam parce et cum delectu daret, mihi tamen tanquam liceret indulgit" [Ep. 2.13.8]. Quare Traianus Secundo rescribens idem ius pro Tranquillo roganti: "Quam parce,—inquit—haec beneficia tribuam, utique, mi Secunde carissime" [Ep. 10.95.1]. Tibi satis est exploratum. In fine harum epistolarum, quamvis suppresso nomine, Fabati Prosoceri obitum memorat [Ep. 10.121]. Denique illa Caecilii ad Traianum epistola [10.96] quam Paulus Orosius [Adv. pag. 7.12.3], Eusebius in Chronicis [10–12; PL 27 C2k6], Tertullianus in Apologetico [2.6–8] Secundo tribuunt, satis superque nostram sententiam comprobant. Ea enim in hoc libello offendes, cui subest Traiani rescriptum in eundem sensum a praedictis auctoribus recitatum.

At dicet aliquis: Sidonius tamen Apollinaris refert Plinium novem dumtaxat epistolarum libros posteris reliquisse [Ep. 9.9.1]; sed quos ipse sibi imitandos proposuerat, sed quod eruditiores arbitrabatur, quosque ad amicos scripserat. Nam ad Traianum epistolas, ut pote, res gravissimas

complexas nulla sibi oblata simili facultate scribendi consulto, subicit. Proinde potuit Sidonius eas ignorasse, scriptor sane sui saeculi contentus eruditione, et qui non omnes bibliothecas in illa librorum caritate discusserat. Fatear tamen necesse est primum nobis in animo fuisse has intactas relinquere, et quia uno tantum exemplari praeter impressa nec illo admodum vetusto adiuti fuimus, et ne iccirco ansam maledicis obiurgandi daremus. Sed, cum altius consyderavisset nullam non quamlibet oblatrandi occasionem quamvis iniquam detractores aucupaturos, et puritatem Latini sermonis in hoc opusculo intueremur, ex eiusque lectione multarum rerum commodum multos consecuturos quibusque priorum stilus pressior et emunctior non placuisset posse hoc solutiore vel faciliore detineri, adhibimus eam quam potuimus diligentiam et emendando et interpretando, sprete invidorum malevolentia, imprimis illud Secundi laudatissimum reputantes, oportere privatis utilitatibus publicas anteferre [Ep. 7.18.5], tum etiam patrocinio tuo fretus qui soles nostra lata praedicatione circumferre. Nec favoris minus in nos collaturus sit Iason vir consultissimus, legum moderator et illustris interpres quodam providentiae dono mortalibus datus. Subsequaturque patrum vestigia passu robustissimo, quamvis adolescens, Thomas filius tuus, quem speramus, si virtutes eius et ingenium maturaverit, pariter ab illo adoptatum iri eiusque doctrinae ac bonorum aliquando successorem futurum; et propemodum in domo vestra tale quoddam conspecturi simus quod olim in curia perpetua serie. Nam tu etsi non effecte praeceptis oratorum fueris institutus, ita tamen a natura quodam dicendi flumine exuberans vel rebus maximis exercitus, ut dicendi artes edoctos longe praevenias. Ad hoc proceritas et habitudo corporis et bona fortunae quae large tibi supercurrunt animi bonis plurimum ornamento sunt. Vestro igitur praesidio tutus sinam per ora virorum volitare ad Traianum epistolas iam meliores, iam faciliores, ex quibus, si aliquid ad vos gloriae perveniet, certum habeo tantundem honeris vos suscepturos contra maledicos pro Secundo, pro interprete clarissimo.

Life of Pliny. C. Plinii Secundi Vita per Ioannem Mariam Catanaeum composita. [Inc.]: Scriptorum illustrium duo in urbe saecula imprimis felicissime fuere Augusti (cilicet) et Vespasianorum fratrum, cum inter alios duo Plinii florere; e quibus Iunior, quo die et anno natus sit

adhuc quaeritur, sub Nerone non ambigitur. Patria Novocomensis, L. Caecilio patre et historici Plinii ex sorore genitus . . . [Expl.]: Nullum emendandi genus omittebat, ac primum quae scripserat secum ipse pertractabat, deinde duobus aut tribus legebat, mox aliis tradebat annotanda, notasque eorum, si dubitabat, cum uno rursus aut altero pensitabat, novissime pluribus recitabat.

Commentary on books 1–9. Ioannis Mariae Catanæi commentarii in epistolis libri primi C. Plinii Caecilii Secundi Novocomensis. Frequenter primum praefari libet inscribendum ex veteribus marmorum titulis C. Plinius Caecilius Secundus; ad hoc Tranquillo et Dione in Augusto tradente lege cautum fuisse ut adoptatus adoptantis appellationem sumeret, id est, nomine familiae sua etiam retenta, unde Octavianus a Iulio adoptatus C. Iulius Caesar Octavius est appellatus, et P. Cornelius Africanus Scipio Aemilianus, L. Pauli filius et Africani per adoptionem nepos; neque refert ultra familia praecedat. *Septicius Clarus* (1.1.1), cui hoc opus epistolare dedicat et hortatus eius susceptum emittit, vir fuit iudicio Secundi ab omni fraude remotus; Euritii Clari avunculus, praefecto praetorii Turboni Adriano volente successit; deinde tamen illi successorem dedit imperator, quod apud Sabinam uxorem iniussu eius familiariter ageret quam reverentia domus Caesariae postulabat moxque loco hostis habuit. . . / . . . [Expl.]: *Ne sit nimis* (8.24.10). Admonerim maximo amoris calore ductus. *Maximum* summum, perfectum; nam libera admonitio signum est maximum amicitiae.

Commentary on book 10. Ioannis Mariae Catanæi commentarii in epistolas ad Traianum C. Plinii Caecilii Secundi. [Inc.]: *Intuenti* (10.41.4). Missus ad statum Bithyniae ordinandum Secundus monet imperatorem Traianum ut lacum non procul a Nicomedia permittat fossa manu facta in mare deducere; futurum hoc magno decori et emolumento toti regioni. . . / . . . [Expl.]: *Merito* (10.121). Rescribit Traianus bene fecisse Secundum pro diplomate concessio Calphurniae uxori.

Poems.

Francisci Scauri hendecasyllabum

[Inc.]: Quasi inscitia temporum priorum
Et cladum fera grando bellicarum . . .

[Expl.]: Et nostrae decus urbis, invidendus
Ut multis ita nemini aemulandus.

Iacobi Eustatii Catanæi

[Inc.]: Non cassi, Catanæe, sunt labores
Quos non percipit auribus supinis . . .

[Expl.]: Ut claros maris indici lapillos.
Iam iam sunt aliquid tui labores.

Bernardi Aemilii Merulae

[Inc.]: Dignum gymnasiis esse Latinis
Doctorumque manu semper habendum . . .

[Expl.]: Quem si non capiunt Arcados aures
Nil nimirum citharam nescit asellus.

Ioannis Iacobi Scaptii

[Inc.]: Quid non improba tempora experitur
Vis quaeque optima perditura? Rursus . . .

[Expl.]: Sic ex Hyppolito prius soluto
Spectandum mihi Virbium fecit.

Iovitae Rapicii

[Inc.]: Sunt igitur nobis divinae faemina mentis
Et tegit humani pectoris umbra deum . . .

[Expl.]: Felices ambo: ventura in saecula famam
Mittite et ex aequo nomen uterque trahat.

Andreae Sarrachi Presbyteri

[Inc.]: Intensis hominum studiis aevoque
recenti
Aptius en Plinii perlege, lector, opus . . .

[Expl.]: Quaeris: quo studio studeas? post fata
revivas?

Hunc eme: votorum (nam scio) compos eris.

Editions:

1506. See above, Composite Editions.

1510. See above, Composite Editions.

b. The edition of 1518

In 1518 Cattaneo published a revised version of his 1506 edition. New emendations and corrections were made to the text, and a few minor changes to the existing commentary; books 8 and 9 are restored to their proper order; added are letters 8.8.3–8.18.11; 9.16; 10.1–40, with their commentary, and the three inscriptions describing Pliny's career (*CIL* 5 nos. 5262, 5263, and 5667). Although Cattaneo did not publish these in-

scriptions in the 1506 edition, he must have been aware of them, since they were known in the circle of his friends in Milan, the brothers Benedetto and Paolo Giovio, and Andrea Alciati. Around 1500 Benedetto Giovio had the inscription found at Como (*CIL* 5, no. 5263) fixed into the outside wall of the cathedral of that city, where it still remains. These inscriptions allowed Cattaneo to give correctly Pliny's full name and are, together with the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus*, sources for his *Vita Plinii*, where he outlines Pliny's political and civil career and private life.

This edition is dedicated to Jacopo Sadoletto, bishop of Carpentras. In the dedication, Cattaneo claims to have used a new witness for book 10. He says that when he arrived in Rome and became friends with Domenico Mamiliano, the latter showed him the missing letters of the eighth and tenth books in a German manuscript. Therefore, he has now added the missing letters of books 8 and 9, and has corrected the order of these same books according to the manuscript: "[Mamilianus] gave me to read the letters copied from a very old German manuscript, many letters to Trajan and, besides, some letters of the same Pliny to his friends which had fallen out of the eighth book. This book was in fact printed, in the wrong order, as the ninth. We had then already conjectured that those letters had been removed."

It is true that, in his 1506 edition, Cattaneo had indeed suspected a lacuna in book 8. There, commenting at 8.8.3 on *navium patiens*, he had written: "After this, the manuscript is incomplete, as we conjecture that in this book several letters are missing; although we looked for exemplars, we did not find any that could help in this case. Perhaps someone else sometime will be luckier." By 1518, Aldus, who proved to be the person with better luck, had already published ten years earlier the complete text with the correct order of books.

Nonetheless, Cattaneo did collate a German manuscript at Rome. In this dedication, after acknowledging the help of fellow humanists Tommaso Fedro, Battista Pio, and Andrea Alciati (Alciati had probably acquainted him with the inscriptions on Pliny's career) in completing the commentary for the new letters, Cattaneo praises Filippo Beroaldo the Younger, the Vatican librarian, for having called to his attention a man-

uscript, bound with five books of Tacitus, in the pope's library. This codex is without doubt Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 4736 (M), which is of German origin but contains only books 1–9.26.8, and not the tenth book. A comparison of Cattaneo's text of book 8 with that of the Aldine edition shows that Cattaneo has in fact some readings that differ from all previous editions (including his own) and are found in ms. 4736. This is the only new witness that he used and collated. In all the other books, and especially in the tenth, he accepts the Aldine text when he thinks that it is better, even using it to correct some readings in his 1506 edition—not always for the better, as noticed earlier by Merrill.

Finally, Cattaneo attacks Aldus Manutius and his edition. If one compares, he says, the text of the letters in his present edition with that of Aldus (he does not mention Aldus' edition directly, but says, "[Pliny's letters] which were printed in rather small characters in Venice"), one will find that more than 200 mistakes have been corrected. He offers as an example of Aldus' poor editorial skill *Ep.* 10.3 A–B, which he divides into two letters, while Aldus considered it a single epistle. He then mocks Aldus' ignorance for having said (in his dedicatory letter to Aloisio Mocenigo) that his manuscript (the *Parisinus*) was so ancient he thought it might have been written in the time of Pliny. Does Aldus not know that script has changed many times through the centuries as a result both of people's inclinations and the numerous invasions of Europe? Besides, Cattaneo continues, it is not enough to recover manuscripts of venerable antiquity, if at the same time one does not use sharp judgment in emending the text, since ancient copyists also made mistakes in the course of their work.

There follows a long recantation of his previous dedication of the *Epistulae* to Giaffredo Carli. However, the dedicatory letter to Carli is reprinted immediately afterwards.

Dedication of books 1–9. Reverendo D. Iacobo Sadoletto episcopo Carpentoratensi Io. Maria Catanaeus. [*Inc.*]: Miseram iam pridem commentarios in eas Plinii Caecilii epistolas quae forte tunc impressae circumferebantur. Caeterum, cum postea Romam venissem ac cum Dominico Mamiliano viro in libris antiquae lectionis perquirendis diligentissimo benevolentiam contraxissem, descriptas mihi de vetustissimo codice

Germanico plures ad Traianum et insuper quasdam eiusdem Plinii ad amicos epistolas legendas obtulit quae de libro octavo exciderant; is autem perverso tunc ordine nonus imprimebatur, ubi nos etiam tum coniectura fuimus assecuti ipsas interceptas fuisse; quapropter lectorem eo loco istud clare admonueramus. Itaque ne illae amplius tanquam corpus mancum oberrarent, et inventas pariter interpretandas et loco suo omnes imprimendas studuimus, additis praeterea et immutatis quibusdam in superioribus commentariis quae necessaria aut meliora videbantur. In quo perficiendo adiutoribus usi sumus viris doctissimis Thoma Phaedro, Baptista Pio et Andrea Alciato, quibus eo magis debemus quod in huiusmodi officio nobis alacriter et praesto affuere, quodque plerique alii praestantes doctrina viri, quos suppliciter rogaveramus, operam suam aperte vel non praestiterunt vel differendo subterfugerunt.

Accessit ad curam nostram earundem epistolarum antiquissimi codicis pontificii qui cum libris quinque Corneli Taciti nuper inventus coniunctus fuerat per Philippum Beroaldum elegantis doctrinae virum inspiciendi facultas. Quibus omnibus effectum est ut in praesentia clariores et emendatiores quam unquam antea in lucem veniant. Ab ipsis enim, si doctus aliquis eas conferat cum iis quae Venetiis impressae minutioribus litteris fuerunt, supra ducentas maculas (ut arbitror) absternas deprendet, ut unam ex omnibus manifestissimam referamus ex epistola tertia libri decimi duas effectas [10.3 A–B], cum eas supina correctoris ignorantia in unam congestisset. Verum enim vero non satis est recuperare venerandae vetustatis exemplaria nisi etiam simul adsit acre emendatoris iudicium, quoniam et veteres librarii in voluminibus describendis saepissime falsi sunt, et Plinius ipse scripta sua se vivo depravari in quadam epistola demonstraverit.

Illud vero omnino risu prosequendum quendam testari ausum suum epistolarum Plinii volumen esse adeo diversorum a nostro saeculo characterum, ut ob hanc causam autemet eas Secundo adhuc vivente scriptas fuisse; non dissimile fere mendacium ac si dicerem ego Germanicum earundem epistolarum codicem per vetustum ante natalem Caecilii in lucem exiisse. Quis enim adeo est antiquorum characterum ignarus qui nesciat ante centum abhinc annos to-

tiens immutatam scribendi formam? et eodem saeculo aliam ab alia plerumque diversissimam propter varia hominum ingenia et tot tam pridem per Europam Vandalos, Gothos, Ostrogotos, Longobardos, Saracenos et id genus plurimos qui syncaeram litterarum formam vastare antequam ego puto illam florentis Italiae quae etiam nunc in vetustis marmoribus et caeris tabulis reperitur. Quod si haec lectu facilis, illa vero difficilis, necesse fit ut una cum barbaris Italiam invadentibus ipsa quoque impetum in bonos characteres fecerit, ut igitur hae lucubrationes quantum pro virili nostra fieri licebit undecunque exeant emendatissimae.

Quoniam ipsas prius Iafredo Caroli tunc Mediolani praesidem agenti dedicaveramus quodque postea ipsum longe alium quam tunc putabamus et de eo scripseramus experti sumus, visum est pariter huic parti operae ferre ne quod nunc multis constat id imprudenter vel scienter praeteriisse argueremur, male sanumque caput bene curato corpori superimpositum vagari sine nota pateremur. . . . [recantation of his dedication to Carli of his 1506 edition]

[*Expl.*]: Quod cum per gentem latinam undique circumspicio, tu solus, quem multis experimentis iam pridem optimum virum introspexi, dignus in hac nostra retractatione occurristi cui et priores et recentes in Plinium vigilias illo penitus expuncto dedicaremus, quod noverim te excellenti doctrina et bonarum litterarum studio morumque probitate et elegantia et rara nostro saeculo liberalitate grataque in rebus gerendis dexteritate facilitateque, sed in primis recto animi iudicio polere, ut quod in te virtus et fortuna contulerit, id totum ad iuvandum genus humanum dispenses, speremque hac nova dedicatione maiore cum laude studia nostra in manibus doctorum versari verissimeque ab omnibus dici meas lucubrationes emendatas statueque nostrae laude congruunt caput impositum fuisse. Romae, Idibus Martiis M.D.XVIII.

Commentary on book 10. [*Inc.*]: *Tua* (10.1). Gratulatur Traiano quod brevi post adoptionem accepit imperium Roma eique felicitatem optat. *Sanctissime.* Integerrimae vitae sanctissime religiosissime. . . . [*Expl.*]: *Adiuvandum esset* (10.121): usum eorum intentioni non praefuisse, non profuturum esse intentioni uxoris tuae, quam habebat ut illuc excurreret. Legitur etiam adiuvandum putarem, servum futurum.

Editions:

- [1518]. See above, Composite Editions.
 1519. See above, Composite Editions.
 1533. See above, Composite Editions.
 1552. See above, Composite Editions.
 1600. See above, Composite Editions.
 1625. See above, Composite Editions.
 1643. See above, Composite Editions.
 1669. See above, Composite Editions. Cattaneo is part of a *variorum* commentary.
 1671. See above, Composite Editions.
 1675 (Leipzig). See above, Composite Editions.
 1686. See above, Composite Editions.
 1746. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:

Cattaneo was born at Novara around the middle of the fifteenth century. Very little is known of his early life. He probably studied Latin and Greek in Milan under Giorgio Merula and Demetrius Calchondyles when the two humanists were teaching there during the period 1491–94. Cattaneo's commentaries on Pliny the Younger's *Epistulae* and *Panegyricus* were published at Milan in 1506; these were his major works.

He then left Milan, perhaps because he was disillusioned with Giaffredo Carli, the governor of Milan, to whom he had dedicated the first nine books of the *Epistulae*. In 1509 Cattaneo was temporarily in Rome, and he took up permanent residence there probably in 1511, when he became secretary to Cardinal Bandinello Sauli, who procured for him a benefice. Cattaneo is represented in a portrait of Cardinal Sauli, painted by Sebastiano del Piombo in 1516, together with the historian Paolo Giovio and a fourth figure, perhaps the younger brother of the cardinal, the notary Stefano Sauli. This painting is now in the Samuel H. Kress Collection of the National Gallery in Washington, D. C.; a portrait of Cattaneo in Paolo Giovio's *Elogia virorum literis illustrium* (Basel, 1577) allowed Charles Davis (see Bibliography below) to identify Cattaneo as one of the figures in the painting.

Besides translating works from Greek into Latin, Cattaneo became interested in poetry while he was in Rome: at the suggestion of Cardinal Sauli, he wrote a short poem entitled *Genua* and began *Solymidos*, an epic poem on the first crusade. This latter project may explain why he borrowed from the Vatican Library a manuscript

containing a *Historia regum Britanniae* and the *Historia Hierosolymitana* by Robert of Reims (Vat. lat. 2005), and later a Koran.

He was a member of the group of *litterati* who each year met to celebrate the feast of St. Anne sponsored by Johannes Goritz (Corycius), and who, among other things, wrote poems in honor of the saint and of Goritz. They attached the poems around the altar with the statue of the Madonna, St. Anne, and Christ Child commissioned from Sansovino by Goritz for the church of St. Augustine. The poems were later collected in a volume called *Coryciana*; Cattaneo contributed three poems to the collection and may also have been its first editor.

Cattaneo was on good terms with humanists residing in Rome such as Alciati, with whom he corresponded, as well as Paolo Giovio and Pietro Bembo; he appears as a character in the second book of Pierio Valeriano's *De litteratorum infelicitate*. He seems also to have taught in Rome, since a pupil of his is mentioned in the *De litteratorum infelicitate*.

After the death of Cardinal Sauli, Cattaneo apparently intensified his friendship with men of the curia; he dedicated his revised edition of the *Epistulae* and *Panegyricus* to Jacopo Sadoleto, gained some influence, and, perhaps, obtained more benefices. He died at Rome, in 1529/30, when Pope Clement VII was at Bologna. Paolo Giovio reports that Cattaneo's death was kept secret and that he was buried without a funeral so as to avoid problems with other humanists who were eagerly seeking his numerous benefices.

Works:

From Cattaneo's Milanese period there are, besides the edition of the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus* (1506), a letter to Alberto Pio at the beginning of the *editio princeps* of the *Suda* edited by Demetrius Calchondyles (1499); and two epigrams at the beginning of the Milanese edition of Claudian's *De raptu Proserpinae* (1501) edited by Aulo Giano Parrasio.

At Rome he translated into Latin the *Panegyricus* by Isocrates (printed by Jacobus Mazochius in 1509); three dialogues by Lucian: *Amores*, of which we know nothing; *De conscribenda historia*, which was dedicated to Paolo Giovio [Venice, 1522?]; and *Lapithae* [Rome, n.d.] dedicated to Johannes Goritz. His translation of the *Progymnas-*

mata of Aphthonius had great success: it was first printed by Mazochius in 1517, and reprinted several times afterwards. The revision of his edition of Pliny's *Epistulae* and *Panegyricus* was completed in 1518 (his dedication to Sadoletto is dated 15 March 1518) and published at Milan without a date.

Meanwhile Cattaneo dedicated himself to poetry. His short poem *Genua*, in which he described the city of his then patron Cardinal Bandinello Sauli, was printed by Mazochius, without a date, but the dedication to Stefano Sauli is dated 1 February 1514. His epic poem, *Solymidos*, was not finished, according to Giovio, because of the ironic comments of Bembo; it may have been continued by Cattaneo's pupil Giovanni Bonifacio Vittorio but does not seem to have ever been published. Cattaneo contributed three epigrams to the *Coryciana* collection, published by Blosio Palladio in 1524, and also to the collection *Epulium populi Romani eucharistichon* of Giulio de Simone. A letter to his brother Giacomo in two earlier versions of the *Coryciana* (Vat. lat. 2754, fols. 6v–7r and Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana, Rossi 207, fol. 12 r–v) suggests that Cattaneo intended to edit the collection himself.

According to Giovio, Cattaneo wrote a treatise, *De potestate et cursu solis*, about which nothing is known, and a *De ludis romanis*, left unfinished at his death.

Bibliography:

M. Bertola, *I due primi registri*, 64* (autograph), 70*, 78, 84; G. Bertolotto, "Genua", poemetto di Giovanni Maria Cattaneo," *Atti della Società ligure di storia patria* 24 (1892) 727–818; G. Bologna, *Le cinquecentine della Biblioteca Trivulziana*, vol. 1 (Milan, 1965), no. 388; *Coryciana*, ed. J. Ijsewijn (Rome, 1997), 49–50, 52, 119, 134; L. A. Cotta, *Museo novarese* (Milan, 1701), 174ff.; C. Davis, "Un appunto per Sebastiano del Piombo ritrattista," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 26 (1982) 383–88 and figs. 1–8; DBI 22.468–71 (Ballistreri); C. Dionisotti, "Introduzione," in *Aldo Manuzio editore: dediche, prefazioni, note ai testi*, ed. G. Orlandi (Milan, [1975]), xxix; J. H. Gaisser, "The Rise and Fall of Goritz's Feasts," *Renaissance Quarterly* 48 (1995) 41–57; Gaisser, trans., *Pierio Valeriano on the Ill Fortune of Learned Men: A Renaissance Humanist and His World* (Ann Arbor, 1999), 52–53 and

passim; P. Giovio, *Elogia virorum literis illustrium* (Basel, 1577), 147–48; J. Jungié, "Prophecies of the Angelic Pastor in Sebastiano del Piombo's Portrait of Cardinal Bandinello Sauli and Three Companions," in *Prophetic Rome in the High Renaissance Period: Essays*, ed. M. Reeves (Oxford, 1992), 345–47; I. Calabi Limentani, "La lettera di Benedetto Giovio ad Erasmo," *Acme* 25 (1972) 5–37, especially 31–37; E. T. Merrill, "On the Early Printed Editions of Pliny's Correspondence with Trajan," *Classical Philology* 5 (1910) 451–66, especially 455ff.; M. Sander, *Le livre à figures italien depuis 1467 jusqu'à 1530. Essai de sa bibliographie et de son histoire*, vol. 2 (Milan, 1942; repr. Nendeln, 1969), no. 5765; G. Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana*, vol. 7 (Venice, 1782), 201–2 (chap. 4); F. Ubaldini, *Vita di mons. Angelo Colocci*, ed. V. Fanelli, *Studi e testi* 256 (Vatican City, 1969), 114 (Appendix 4).

2. Henricus Stephanus

a. The edition of 1581

When Henri Estienne published in 1581 his edition of the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyrici veteres*, he did not write the usual lemmatic commentary on the text of the *Epistulae*. Instead, in a lengthy preface to the reader, he underlines the usefulness of their content, makes observations on Pliny's style and word usage, and comments on some Latin and Greek phrases and words; moreover, in his *Graecarum partim vocum partim sententiarum quas Plinius suis epistolis inseruit interpretationes et in easdem annotationes*, he translates, explains and interprets all the Greek words and expressions. He also changes, without explanation, the order of the letters of book 10, separating from the others the letters without a reply from Trajan.

The sentiments expressed in the preface to the reader show that Estienne is reacting to the contemporary Ciceronianism. He begins by complaining that few contemporary scholars now read Pliny's letters, either because they are afraid of contaminating their Ciceronian style or because they do not deem later Latin authors worth reading. Then he proceeds to give reasons why one should, since he believes Pliny's letters ought to be read and imitated because they are useful and pleasurable, certainly no less useful than Cicero's *Epistulae ad familiares*.

The *Epistulae* of Pliny, Estienne says, can be

helpful and interesting to practically everybody, since they deal with politics, law, ethics, economics, physics, philology, and public and private affairs. They offer different letter models, such as letters of petition and very persuasive letters of recommendation; besides, the wit of their author makes them pleasant to read. Estienne insists that they are by no means inferior to Cicero's except in eloquence, regarding which (he adds) Pliny himself had said that he wanted to imitate Cicero. He praises also their *brevitas*, that is, their conciseness, which he considers typical of Pliny.

Examining Pliny's style in some detail, Estienne warns the reader about some of its peculiarities: the use of ellipsis, of common words with uncommon meaning, and of unusual position for certain words; the occasional use of the indicative instead of the subjunctive, and so on. To support his points he quotes many passages from the *Epistulae* as well as a few from the *Panegyricus* and from other authors.

For his text of the *Epistulae*, Estienne explains in the preface that he used both the original Aldine edition of 1508 and the 1542 edition of Cratander's heirs (which reproduced the Aldine text), along with Josse Badius Ascensius' 1533 edition of Cattaneo's text. In his edition Badius, beginning with *Ep.* 1.4, had separated Cattaneo's summaries of each letter from the commentary, calling them *argumenta*. Estienne prints the *argumenta* at the head of each letter, but without acknowledging his source.

Estienne's text is accompanied by variant readings placed in the margin, but his position in his printed text is ambivalent. When the readings of Aldo and Cattaneo differ, he accepts in his text the reading of either one and puts the rejected reading in the margin; however, in the preface, he warns the reader to use his own judgment, since often it is not clear which is the better reading.

The major contribution of Estienne to Plinian studies is his *Graecarum partim vocum, partim sententiarum . . . interpretationes . . . et annotationes* in which he emended, translated, and interpreted the Greek of the *Epistulae*. His ambivalence toward the text is also apparent here, where he sometimes offers and comments upon readings different from those accepted by him in his text or even in the marginal notes. He often agrees with Cattaneo, and his interpretations are very often similar to Cattaneo's; but sometimes

he corrects or criticizes him overtly or anonymously. Estienne's discussions, however, tend to be more linguistically oriented and briefer than Cattaneo's. His text of the *Panegyricus* is likewise a mix of Aldus' and Cattaneo's texts, with rejected variant readings in the margins of one or the other. It is preceded by an *argumentum*, which reproduces verbatim the beginning of the commentary by Cattaneo, but Estienne did not comment on the *Panegyricus*.

Preface to the reader. In Plinii Secundi Epistolas Praefatio H. Stephani in qua utiliorne an iucundior earum sit lectio disserit et de quibusdam quae in ea observanda sunt admonet. [*Inc.*]: Plinii Secundi epistolas quo saepius lego, eo magis illas a plerisque tam raro legi miror, multo etiam magis a nonnullis ne legi quidem omnino. Neque vero de iis tantum loquor qui multos scriptores non aspernantur solum sed etiam aversantur, atque adeo lectione illorum sibi interdicut, non alia de causa quam quod verentur ne suum Ciceronianum stylum aliqua sermonis non satis Ciceroniani contagione inficiant; sed de aliis etiam nonnullis qui, quanvis illo supersticiosae latinitatis morbo non laborent, quosdam tamen e scriptoribus seculo Ciceronis posterioribus lectione sua non dignantur. "Quid ergo habent istae Plinii epistolae propter quod tam dignae sint quae legantur?"—excipiet fortasse vel horum vel illorum aliquis. Ego vero illas aliquid habere propter quod legi mereantur, non respondebo, sed habere omnia quae nos ad epistolarum aut Latinarum aut Graecarum lectionem imitare possint et debeant. Non sive utilitatem sive delectationem sive etiam utrunque in istarum lectione sibi quis proponat, eum quod abunde suo desiderio satisfaciat inventurum esse dico . . . [exposition on the usefulness of Pliny's letters for politics, law, ethics, and economics].

Neque tamen omnia quae suum lectorem hae docere epistolae possunt ad illa posse reduci capita dixerim. Eas enim sumant in manus aulici, aliquid quod ad scientiam aulicam pertineat (neque enim aulicos esse duntaxat empiricos debere existimo) ex earum lectione reportabunt . . . [examples useful to people in power].

Ad delectationem ab utilitate transiens (nam et eos qui hanc etiam in hisce epistolis quaerent, quod desiderio suo satisfaciat inventuros esse dixi) hoc fateor, non tam multa esse quae delectare, quam quae prodesse possint, sed esse tamen

multa dico; variis enim in locis iocatur, et quidem festive . . . [examples of pleasurable and witty letters].

Quod si de artificio quod his subest epistolis (sive hoc ad utilitatem, sive ad delectationem, sive potius ad utrumque pertinet) dicendum mihi aliquid est, ne in hac quidem parte cum Cicerone inferiorem comperiemus. Nam quae petit (ut primum de hoc epistolarum genere loquar) ita petit ut denegari nullo modo possint . . . [examples of skillful letters of petition and recommendation].

Longum esse, sicut exempla illius generis epistolarum attuli, sic etiam reliquorum afferre, et lectorem a me praemonitum diligentius artificium in illis observaturum spero. Quamobrem de narratoriis tantum aliquid addam, nimirum, in illis quoque scriptorem hunc excellere, ob breviter, quam nihil Ciceronianae debere potiusque hanc illi ausim affirmare. Loquor autem de tali brevitate qualis est haec epistolae quintae libri primi, "Evigilaveram; nuntius a Spurinna, 'Venio ad te.' Immo ego ad te.' Coimus in porticum Livia, quum alter ad alterum tenderemus, &c." [1.5.9]. Sed eadem opera lectorem monebo, crebrum esse apud eum figurae quae ellipsis appellatur, usum quod nisi animadverterat quosdam locos immerito mendi suspectos habeat. Exemplum suppeditabit hic . . . [examples follow].

Quavis autem in iis quae proposui Cicero minime cedere illum existimem, nequaquam tamen eius eloquentiam, ne in ipso quidem Pannegyrice, cum Ciceroniana comparandam dixerim, praesertim si non inventionem tantum ac dispositionem, sed ipsam quoque elocutionem spectemus. Eius tamen aemulatorem se fatetur, in epist(ola) libri primi quinta. Totum autem locum afferam quoniam ibi quaedam sunt de quibus eadem opera sententiam meam proferre volo, quum alioqui exemplarium omnino contrariae sint lectiones. Ita igitur in nostra editione (cum alias quasdam tum vero Badianam sequente) . . . [Estienne proposes emendations to some passages in Pliny. Pliny is an imitator of Cicero, as it appears also from some of his letters, from which he quotes].

Sed enim admonendus es a me, lector, quavis tam multa de Pliniana Ciceronis aemulatione audieris, non esse hanc in Pliniano sermone quaerendam. Eum enim non solum habere quam plurima quae quavis Latina, Ciceroniana tamen non sint, sed etiam nonnulla quae illi peculiariter

esse sis existimaturus, et ex quibus aliqua suspecta etiam fortasse habiturus. Atque id intelligi volo dictum tam de loquendi generibus, quam de quibusdam vocibus, eas seorsum etiam et per se considerando . . . [examples of the peculiarities of Pliny's Latin follow].

Unum superest, lector, de quo admonitum esse te, antequam hasce Plinii epistolas in manus sumas, non parum tibi est profuturum. Quidnam illud est? Non eam semper lectionem quae in ipso sit textu (ut vulgo appellamus) ea quam habet margo esse potiore; ideoque delectum esse adhibendum quod ut fiat iudicium adhibeas necesse est . . . [examples of different variant readings in the text which are not necessarily better than those in the margins are given].

[*Expl.*]: Neque enim illud, "Ut tales esse sani perseveremus," aliud sonare puto quam quod Graeci dicerent ἴνα ὑγιαίνοντες (vel ἐν τῷ ὑγιαίνειν) τοιοῦτοι διατελώμεθ' ὄντες. Sed hic tibi valedicam, lector, et te, illo ipso Graeco genere loquendi utens, rogabo ut velis pro hisce meis laboribus ἐμοὶ φίλος ὦ διατελεῖν.

Commentary on the Greek words in the Epistulae. Graecarum partim vocum, partim sententiarum quas Plinius suis epistolis inseruit. Interpretationes Henrici Stephani et in easdem annotationes. [*Inc.*]: (p. 2) Pro his *Eo magis quod nihil ante peraeque eodem stylo scripsisse videor* (1.2.1), in quibusdam edit(ionibus) legitur "Eo magis quod nihil ante peraeque eodem ζήλω scripsisse videor," ubi ζήλω significat aemulationem, vel vehementi imitandi studio. Nam statim subjungit "Tentavi enim imitari Demosthenem" (1.2.2); verum et huic aemulationi paulo post dicit . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 411) εἰσήλασαν (10.118.1). *Invecti* sunt. Itidem in principio epistolae proximae sequentis εἰσήλασεν (10.119): *invectus* est. . . . Haec sunt quae ille [Adrianus Turnebus] ad huius etiam loci expositionem affert. Fit porro mentio nuncupationis et persolutionis votorum pro eodem Traiano pagina etiam 402 (10.100), sicut celebrationis diei quo suscepit Traianus imperium mentionem faciunt duae epistolae, quarum una est pag. 374 (10.53), altera pag. 403 (10.101).

Editions:

[1581, Geneva]. NUC. BL; (IU).

2003, Turnhout. *La Frances des Humanistes: Henri II Estienne, éditeur et écrivain*, 494–500,

no. 124 (*Praefatio*, with Latin text and translation of some passages, French summary of others).

b. The edition of 1591

In 1591 Estienne reprinted his Pliny edition, making a few changes in the text and occasionally eliminating variant readings or adding new ones in the margins. He also added a dedicatory letter to Joachimus Carolus and some annotations of his son-in-law Isaac Casaubon.

In the dedication to Joachimus Carolus (Joachim Karl), duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg, Estienne exhorts his addressee to drop everything and read only Pliny's *Epistulae*. He again praises the style, and the variety of subjects of the *Epistulae*, which may admonish, exhort, make requests, recommend, excuse, congratulate, and console. Estienne especially admires Pliny's ability to express well his various feelings. He would recommend the *Epistulae* even to someone who wanted to write history, since Pliny writes also about historical matters. He then quotes as an example *Ep.* 3.16, one of the letters dealing with the more or less important deeds and sayings of famous people.

Ep. 3.16 provides Estienne with an opportunity to discuss philological matters, and especially emendations, both Latin and Greek. However, his claim (p. 10) that he has introduced in this second edition a clever emendation in *Ep.* 3.16.5 by simply changing a couple of letters and thus transforming *ridebat* ("she was laughing"), which is completely out of context, into *redibat* ("she returned") is rather puzzling. *Redibat* instead of *ridebat* is already the accepted reading in all the editions that preceded his, from the *editio princeps* on, with the exception of the 1588 Minos edition (see I.5 below), seemingly the only one to preserve *ridebat*.

In closing, Estienne again affirms that, although Cicero's letters should be read and imitated, they are fewer and more limited in subject than Pliny's.

Dedication. Illustriss. Principi ac Domino D. Ioachimo Carolo duci Brunsvicensi ac Luneburgensi. Epistola quaedam Caij Plinij Secundi istud habet initium, "Tollite cuncta (inquit) coeptosque auferte labores. Seu scribis aliquid seu legis, tolli, auferri iube et accipe orationem meam ut illi arma divina," vel (alteram sequendo lectionem, quam sequi ipse malo) "ut illa arma, divi-

nam". Hoc, inquam, est Plinianae epistolae, libro sexto [6.33.1], initium sumptum ex hoc Aeneidos virgilianae loco: "Tollite cuncta (inquit) coeptosque auferte labores, / Aetnaei Cyclopes" [*Aen.* 8.439-440] . . . [Estienne exhorts the duke to dedicate himself to the reading of Pliny's letters, and suggests to him how to organize them on his bookshelf].

Ac quandoquidem hunc in sermonem incidi, addam et istud, aliquot eum in locis, eius qui historiae monumentis alicuius facta vel dicta mandaturus est, iudicium formare. Quos inter locos praecipui sunt (quantum quidem possum meminisse) unus quem indicabo. Illum habet epistola XVI libri III ubi se adnotasse ait (immo ab eo dicitur "adnotasse videor") facta dictaque virorum foeminarumque illustrium, alia clariora, alia maiora (3.16.1). Perinde ac si diceret, alia maiora, sed minus tamen clara esse. Nec vero in huius loci mentione omittam quandam quae maximi momenti est emendationem: cuius accessione sicut et aliarum multarum, gloriari ista posterior editio potest. . . . [Estienne gives the example of Arria (*Ep.* 3.16.3-5), and discusses several Latin and Greek emendations to the text].

[*Expl.*]: Quae tamen a me non dicuntur, illustrissime princeps, ut te ab illo imitandi conatu deterream, sed potius ut quo res difficilior est, eo tibi magis gloriosam fore ostendens, eo etiam animatum magis ad eam reddam, praesertim quum iam valde familiarem tibi latinam linguam (quod expertus loquor) reddideris et hoc principium sit velut privilegium, ut quod ab illorum proficiscitur ingenio (in ijs praesertim quae ad literas pertinent), licet tantummodo inchoatum, iam ad summum esse progressum iudicetur atque hunc in sensum sit in illis verissimum non modo vetus proverbium, "Dimidium facti qui coepit habet" [Hor., *Ep.* 1.2.40], sed plus etiam quam quod illo dicitur. Atque adeo si quid esset quod principibus invidere liceret, id ego illis inviderem. Hoc tu nonnisi ridens (sat scio) leges; gaudeo autem quod cum risu a me discedes. Vale.

T.C. observantissimus Henr. Stephanus.

Editions:

1591. See above, Composite Editions.

1599. See above, Composite Editions.

(*) 1604. See above, Composite Editions.

- (*) 1605. See above, Composite Editions.
 1606. See above, Composite Editions.
 1607 [Geneva]. See above, Composite Editions.
 1610. See above, Composite Editions.
 1611 [Geneva]. See above, Composite Editions.
 1620. See above, Composite Editions.
 1632. See above, Composite Editions.
 1638. See above, Composite Editions.
 1650. See above, Composite Editions.
 1665. See above, Composite Editions.
 1675 (Leipzig). See above, Composite Editions.
 Estienne is part of a *variorum* commentary.
 1686. See above, Composite Editions. Estienne is part of a *variorum* commentary.
 (*) 1695. See above, Composite Editions. Estienne is part of a *variorum* commentary.
 1734. See above, Composite Editions. Estienne is part of a *variorum* commentary.
 2003, Turnhout. *La Frances des Humanistes: Henri II Estienne, éditeur et écrivain*, 613–16, no. 155 (pp. 613–15: dedicatory letter to Joachim Karl, with Latin, text and translation of some passages, French summary of others; pp. 615–16: *incipit* and *explicit* of the *Praefatio*).

Biography:

See CTC 3.48.

Add to *Bibliography*:

J. Kecskeméti, B. Boudou, and H. Cazes, *La France des Humanistes: Henri II Estienne, éditeur et écrivain* (Turnhout, 2003) (prefaces and dedicatory letters of all the books published by Estienne).

3. Isaacus Casaubonus

Casaubon's notes first appear at the end of the 1591 edition of his father-in-law, Henri Estienne; they were republished whenever Estienne's edition was reprinted and subsequently in many *variorum* commentaries on the *Epistulae*. Casaubon annotates only a few letters in each book, from a minimum of four in book 10 to a maximum of eleven in books 6 and 9. His notes correct various textual readings by means of conjecture (some of his proposed emendations have been accepted by modern editors) or consist of brief explanations.

Notes (ed. of [Geneva,] 1591). In aliquot locos Epistolarum Plinij notae Isaaci Casauboni. In librum I, Epist. V. pag. 6. [*Inc.*]: *Parce inquiens* (1.5.9). Probo alteram lectionem quae non agnos-

cit vocem inquiens. Legendum enim "addit preces suas, ut decebat optimum virum pro dissimillimo, parce. Cui ego." *Parce* est πεφεισμένως et moderate cauteque, non φείδου aut σύγγνωθι; quod qui non animadvertabant, locum corruperunt. . . . / . . . (*Expl.*): *Et in speciem dianomes incidere* (10.116.2). Quis non videt scribendum esse et hic et sequenti epistola *dianomes*, hoc est, διανομής? Haec habui, lector, quae annotarem in elegantissimum hunc scriptorem, quum eius recentem hanc editionem furtim percurrerem. In Panegyricis maioris fortasse momenti quaedam observaveramus; verum illa publicare priusquam meliores libros saltem editos nacti essemus, haut satis consultum putavimus. Have, mi lector, et vale. Finis.

Editions:

1591. See above, Composite Editions.
 1599. See above, Composite Editions.
 (*) 1604. See above, Composite Editions.
 (*) 1605. See above, Composite Editions.
 1607 [Geneva]. See above, Composite Editions.
 1608 (Chappelet and Buon). See above, Composite Editions.
 1610. See above, Composite Editions.
 1611. See above, Composite Editions.
 1620. See above, Composite Editions.
 1632. See above, Composite Editions.
 1638. See above, Composite Editions.
 1650. See above, Composite Editions.
 1665. See above, Composite Editions.
 1675 (Leipzig). See above, Composite Editions.
 Casaubon is part of a *variorum* commentary.
 1686. See above, Composite Editions. Casaubon is part of a *variorum* commentary.
 (*) 1695. See above, Composite Editions. Casaubon is part of a *variorum* commentary.
 1734. See above, Composite Editions. Casaubon is part of a *variorum* commentary.

Biography:

See CTC 2.262–63.

Add to *Bibliography*:

H. Parenty, *Isaac Casaubon helléniste: des studia humanitatis à la philologie*, *Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 454 (Geneva, 2009).

4. Janus Gruterus

Gruterus' notes on the *Epistulae* were first published in the 1611 Frankfurt edition. After dis-

covering a new manuscript, the *Codex Palatinus* (which had not yet been identified), in the Heidelberg Library of which he was director, he collated this witness with previous editions and made notes. Unfortunately, as Keil noted ("Praefatio", xv n. ** [1851 ed.]), the *Palatinus* (perhaps one of the late Italian manuscripts?) did not offer particularly good readings and did not improve the text. Gruterus' own emendations, his brief observations, and comments, published with the collations, are a better contribution to Plinian studies.

Notes. Notulae seu variantes aliquot lectiones in Plinij Epistolas. [Inc.]: *Septitio suo* (1.1.1). Legitur alias Secundo suo, et sic quoque Palatinus codex, sed alterum constanter occupat omnes editiones antiquas. *Arriano suo* (1.2.1). Alias legitur Adriano, alias Arrio. Nihil horum in Palatino, sed Arrino quod et conspicitur in editione Mediolanensi anni 1478 eiusque traduce Tarvisina publicata anno 1483. . . . / . . . [Expl.] *Epist. 122 quae officio tuo dedi adiuvandum esse, usum eorum intentioni non profuisse* (10.121; *usum eorum intentioni non profuisse* is added after *esset* in the Aldine edition). Catanaeus prodit etiam legi "adiuvandum putarem, servum futurum cum apud," quod mihi minus inquinatum a glossematis quam alterum, sed nondum tamen purum puto.

Editions:

1611 (Frankfurt). See above, Composite Editions.

1669. See above, Composite Editions.

1675 (Leipzig). See above, Composite Editions. Gruterus' *Notulae* are part of a *variorum* commentary.

1686. See above, Composite Editions. Gruterus' *Notulae* are part of a *variorum* commentary.

(*) 1695. See above, Composite Editions. Gruterus' *Notulae* are part of a *variorum* commentary.

Biography:

See CTC 4.288–89.

5. Claudius Minos

In the dedication of his 1588 edition of the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus* to Ludovicus Clericus (Louis Le Clerc), prior of the Cluniac priory of Saint-Christophe-en-Halatte near Senlis, Claudius Minos (Claude Mignault) decries the sad political situation of his time and confesses to having found solace and a way to emerge

from what we would call depression by returning to literary studies, and particularly to the study of Pliny.

His editorial practice and purpose are explained in a letter to the reader. Although he claims to have paid attention to variant readings and also to have collated a manuscript from the library of François Olivier, chancellor of France, Minos takes issue with some of his contemporaries, for whom manuscripts constitute the only authority for a text. For him conjectures, made with good sense, are often necessary, since the manuscripts do not always offer an intelligible text. In any case, he is more interested in philosophy than philology. His declared purpose in editing Pliny is to educate the young, since for him Pliny's work is important for its moral values, which are expressed with elegance and wit. In fact, he prefers *mores sine doctrina* ("morality without learning") to *sine moribus doctrinam ostendere* ("showing learning without morality"). In his view, Pliny, thanks to his elegance, pleasantness, and modesty (*pudicissimus*), has much to offer younger readers with regard to morality and ancient traditions, while at the same time he can give much enjoyment to a more mature audience.

Minos' text, while not much different from previous editions, has some corrections and emendations of his own. As regards book 10, he is the first of many editors to follow Estienne in separating from the rest Pliny's letters without Trajan's answers. He also provides a brief summary at the beginning of each letter.

Minos' annotations cover only the *Epistulae*; they are collected at the end of their text and they are not a running commentary. He briefly comments on or explains a selected word or passage, discusses a variant reading, interprets the meaning of a word or phrase, and gives brief historical background information about a person or an event. Minos' accompanying translation of Greek words in the *Epistulae* seems to depend heavily on Estienne.

This edition was reprinted at Paris in 1598 by two different printers (Micard and Gueffier), with a new dedication by Minos to Nicolaus Clericus, brother of Ludovicus, who had died, and with the notes by Casaubonus, and again in 1608 in two separate editions, by Chappelet and Buon, with the texts of the *Epistulae* and the *Panegyricus*.

Dedication (ed. of Paris, 1588). Ornatiss(imo) viro, Lodoico Clerico, D(ivi) Christophori ad Silvanectum Antistiti Claud(ius) Minos s. p. d. [*Inc.*]: Iam tandem mitto ad te, vir ornatissime, Plinium meum, vel tuum potius, quem dudum tibi uni ex omnibus qui mihi sunt aliquo iuncti necessitudinis vinculo desponderam. Cur autem istum potius quam alium ex veteribus maxime quos valde tibi placere scio, curve tibi quam alii maluerim, non una ratio est. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: Non plura, ne te diutius a lautitiis plinianis mea oratione revocem. Interea tamen in auctore tam gravi et florido, quique pari felicitate Musis Gratias adiunxerit, aliqua opella mea locupletando illustrandoque, si tibi acuto et sapienti homini videbor non omnino male bonas horas collocasse, nihil verebor aliorum aculeos, nec alio quam Tullius animo iudicioque obfirmatus, qui se aliorum omnium facile passurum reprehensiones dicebat, dum a Catone suo laudaretur. Vive felix et beatus, vir ornatissime, tuumque Minoem, qui te plurimum amat (nihil possum ardentius dicere) tuorum in numero esse perpetuum patere.

Dedication (ed. of Paris, 1598). Spectatissimo viro D. Nicolao Clerico in prima senatus summi decuria libellorum supplicum praesidi. [*Inc.*]: Redit ad te, praeses amplissime, Plinius noster quem ante annos decem meditata opera desponderam, fratri tuo, spectatae fidei viro ac emendato, D. Christophori archimandritae, cuius obitum ita gravate fero, ut nullum mihi tristiores casum obtigisse confitear, nullamque iacturam molestiorem senserim, vel proximis superioribus annis, quibus inter barbaricos perduelles vita misera tumultu fere continuo ac trepidatione nobis trahenda fuit . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: qui te Plinio meo quasi patronum quaesiverim, qui in tuam pridem familiam cooptatus et adscriptus, in eadem te auctore ita perseveret, ut nullo casu sit ad alios transiturus. Vive felix, meritissime praeses. Lutetia, Idibus Aprilis 1598.

Letter to the reader (ed. of Paris, 1588). Claud. Minos I.C. Lectori s. Numquam putassem, benigne lector, in hiis Plinij Secundi Epistolis mihi tantum laboris ac taedij fuisse perferendum, quas decies et eo plus cum lego ac relego et singula mihi videor animo atque oculis collustrasse, quaedam tamen haud dubie supersunt in quibus castigandis eruditi homines curam vel iudicium desiderent.

Equidem satis habui primo summatim quae

ad doctrinam morum conferrent et ad antiquitatis rationem facerent, ut levi brachio, quod nostri aiunt, et πόδας attingere, nec tamen lectionum varietatem praetermittere habui quam ita video quibusdam magni fieri ut qui eam negligat habeatur indoctor. In eo si quid vigiliarum impenderim, quod neque ostentare pudor meus patitur neque pluris facere quam deceat, si quid, inquam, sit a me collatum studij vel ingenij, quod sentio quam sit exiguum, velim primas haberi gratias ornatissimo viro D. Clerico Divi Christophori ad Silvanectum Antistiti, cuius unius auspiciis et librum evolvi diligenter et ad finem aliquot manusccriptorum codicum emendationes sum conatus; quin et ad calcem notas qualescumque et observationes meas adiunxi.

Quod instituti operis cum pene ad umbilicum perduxissem, ultro mihi oblatus est liber manuscriptus ab Hadriano Danesio optimo adolescente, quem propter studiorum iuris communionem valde diligo; eum librum non quidem rogatus a me, sed ut in me est egregie affectus, utendum accepit a Nicolao Faviero, supremi senatus advocato, gravissimi senatori Favierii filio, rarae spei iuvene; qui codex eo mihi gratior obtigit, quod, uti ex indice statim observavi, petitus esse e bibliotheca Francisci Olivarii, non ita pridem Galliarum cancellarij. Ex cuius libri lectione et collatione cum meis, quam fateor mihi operosam extitisse, quaedam puto saneque multa observasse quae non sunt in vulgatis, non pauca etiam adnotasse quae ad auctoris adeo lepidi certeque laudati aliquem non poenitendum nitorem pertineant. Ut enim eorum quae ab aliis acceperim me gratum esse ac memorem percipio, ita velim suam haberi meritam gratiam iis qui quasi languescenti mihi defessoque frigidam suffuderunt ut opus incohatum vel, quod fateor ingenue, operis aliquod rude et impoliturum specimen ad finem aliquem perduceretur . . . [a tirade against envious scholars and humble defense of his work].

Nec vero hic gravitate ferent instituti huius mei rationem qui nihil habuerim prius quam ut, paucis admodum exceptis, quae multa provide et graviter acuteve, multa mature et opportune, multa diserte passimque sapienter ab eloquentissimo homine Plinio dicta essent, ego, cui auctor is impensissime placeat, ad morum maxime cultum et vetustastis memoriam aliquam succinerem. Id quia certo scio gratum fore iis apud quos

rerum meliorum cognitio morumque doctrina prior est, non erit, quod vereor aliorum quorundam sinisteritatem (placet enim Plinianum verbum [6.17.3; 9.5.2] ut nullum aliud mihi occurrat opportunius) qui nihil aliud quam membranas somniant, iidemque asseverare audent nullam satis exactam politamque doctrinam peti posse quam a manuscriptis. Ego cum iis eo nomine non sum manus consorturus. Veteres et manu exaratos libros amplexor canamque, ut ita loquar, doctrinam suspicio et veneror; sed studium λογοδαιδάλιας immodicum et grammaticam istam sapientiam quae tota in verbis posita est valere iubeo, quamquam id videam huius seculi cacoethes, ut, quod de suo queritur gravissime Seneca, pro philosophia iam in precio philologia sit [*Ep.* 108.24], ut nonnisi grammaticae spirent qui se totos studio rerum deberent adiungere.

Nec me profecto latet non aspernandam codicum membranis descriptorum auctoritatem, sed non ita superstitione iis haerendum, ut ab iis semper tanquam a veridico aliquo oraculo pendeamus. Quoties enim vel truncatas voces, et contortes sententias offendimus? Quoties in loca mutila, in quasdam ineptas metatheses quibus sententia quaevis pulcherrima invertitur aut conturbatur incidimus? Quam denique secum membranae istae ab aliis dissident? Iudicio ergo opus est eoque bene sano et subacto ingenio, ut, si in re de qua nondum liquet dandus sit aliquis coniecturae locus, id nonnisi mature consultoque fiat, adeo ut post ancipitem divinandi aleam is qui melius coniecerit vates optimus habeatur.

Verum ut istas litteratorum hominum lites missas faciamus, ex eo quod aliquo meo studio sum moliturus, nihil amplius opto quam ut ex aureis istis cordatissimi et, quod vident omnes, elegantissimi, adde etiam ex quo in deliciis haberi debet, pudicissimi scriptoris epistolis adolescentibus fiant meliores, et qui sunt iudicio vel aetate maturiore, voluptatem hinc non minimam frugemque percipiant. Et quid tandem? Parum admodum aut nihil prorsus doctrina mihi vel cum Plinio meo aestimanda quae sine moribus instillatur; ideoque malim sine exquisita ista doctrina mores, quam sine moribus doctrinam ostentari; quae duo qui inseparabili vinculo consociant soli ex omnibus recte sapiunt.

Sed de his iam satis. Tu, lector humanissime, Plinianis primum, dein nostris, si vacat, utere ac frui; aut si quid habes exquisitius utiliusve,

quod non diffido, velim pari candore animique propensione mecum ita decertes, ut etiam multis partibus antevertas meque tibi daturum sponte manus ad exornationem tui mecum etiam preconium adiungi patiari. Vale.

Commentary (ed. of Paris, 1588). In Cai Plinii Secundi Novocomensis Epistolarum libros decem Notae et Observationes auctore Claudio Minnoe Iurisc. [*Inc.*]: *Ad Epistolam I.* Epistola haec πρόδρομος ad sequentes Epistolarum libros quos hortatu maxime Septicij collegit; apud quem eo nomine pudoris veniam precatur quamquam haud obscure opus id suum commendat, non oblitus tamen modestiae, cuius hic et passim sunt impressa non obscura vestigio. *Septitio* (1.1.1). Libri veteres habent "Septimio", alij "Secundo", et sane lubricum in multis mendum litterae pro littera. Is autem ipse Septimius est ad quem epist. 28 lib. 8 & 1 lib. 8. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: *Ad epistolam 122* (10.121). Probat adcommodatum diploma uxori Calpurniae. *Adiuvandum esset*. Sic alij, adiuvandum putarem serum futurum.

Explanation of Greek words (ed. of Paris, 1588). Graecarum vocum et sententiarum quae passim occurrunt in Plinianis epistolis Explicatio. [*Inc.*]: Pagina 1. b. Τὰς ληκύθους (1.2.4). Oratoria lumina seu ornamenta quae et pigmenta dici solent. Pag. 4. b. Δυσκαθαίρετον (5.5.15). Quod non facile evertatur aut expugnari possit. Alij legunt ἀκαταπάλαιστον, quod ineluctabile significant. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: Pag. 232. a. εἰσήλασαν (10.118.1). Investiti sunt, et in proxime sequenti epistola, εἰσήλασεν, investus est, sed non simpliciter at investus equo.

Editions:

1588, Parisiis (Paris): apud Ioannem Richerium, via D. Ioannis Lateranensis, sub Arbore Virrescente. 2 vols. NUC. BL; BNF; (MH [vol. 1 only]; CtY; NN; NPV; RPB).

1598 (Micard). See above, Composite Editions.

1598 (Gueffier). See above, Composite Editions.

1608 (Chappelet). See above, Composite Editions.

1608, Parisiis (Paris): (no printer). Despite the title, the volume contains only Minos' letter to the reader and his *notae* and *observationes*. Como, Biblioteca Civica (shelf mark: GH 394).

1608 (Buon). See above, Composite Editions.

1608 (Orry). See above, Composite Editions.

1734. See above, Composite Editions. Minos is part of a variorum commentary.

Biography:

See CTC 4.213.

II. SELECTED *EPISTULAE*

COMMENTARY

1. Hadrianus Barlandus

Hadrianus Barlandus, first professor of philosophy, then of eloquence at the University of Leuven, published his scholia on a selection of Pliny's letters at Leuven in 1516. He addresses his prefatory letter of the *Epistulae* to all the "ludi magistri" of Brabant, Flanders, and Holland. He is dismayed that, due to their negligence, the ancient authors are ignored in their schools; to correct this, he has prepared notes on a selection of Pliny's *Epistulae* and had his work printed in a portable format at a price accessible to scholars and students alike. So he exhorts the *magistri* to take better care of their students, and to encourage the teachers under them to explain to the students Pliny's letters, whose clear style was greatly admired by Agricola. Those who find Pliny's style too hard and obscure have not progressed enough in the study of letters.

In the dedicatory letter to his friend Gerardus Noviomagus (Gerrit Geldenhauer), Barlandus declares that he has prepared these annotations not out of vanity, but in order to be helpful, since he knows how useful Pliny's letters are for the eloquence of the young. Despite his declared purpose of improving the eloquence of students, Barlandus in his notes paraphrases, explains, and interprets the text, but does not call attention to its stylistic or grammatical features.

Prefatory letter. [a1r] Hadrianus Barlandus apud Lovanienses cultoris literature Professorum infimus S.D. omnibus in Brabantia Flandra et Hollanda ludi magistris.¹⁶⁹

[*Inc.*] Quum adverterem, viri optimi, novos quosdam scriptores in scholis vestris enarrari ac, ut vere dicam, ignavia vestra negligi veteres a quibus ceu fontibus manavit quicquid usque est eruditionis, tanto malo succurrendum existi-

mans, curavi festivissimas quasque C. Plinii Epistolas cum scholiis meis forma portabili excudendas, ut ab omnibus et interpretibus et scholasticis emi quam minimo possent. Nunc reliquum est ut vos hoc meum studium atque in vestros iuvenes syncerum amorem boni consulatis et operam detis pro vestra sapientia veterique consuetudine ut vestri ὑποδιδάσκαλοι vestris discipulis, quos in peculiarem quandam gloriam vestram in literis educatis, deinceps Plinianas narrent. Quarum nitorem unice miratus est olim Rodolphus Agricola vir qui pulcherrimis locubrationibus Germaniam Germanis illustravit. Ab hoc si quis dissentiens Plinii stilum tanquam nimis durum obscurumque respuerit, is evidens habeat argumentum se nondum in studiis literarum proficisse colligatque ingenii vitium cum in rebus clarissimis perinde ut difficillimis cecutit. Valet et nos si meruimus, amate.

Dedication. [a1v] Barlandi epistola dedicatoria ad Gerardum Noviomagum. Gerardo Noviomago suo Barlandus S.D. Cum iis diebus Plinii Secundi Epistolarum volumen quod hactenus maculis et scabie plenum extitit apud Germanos emaculatum in manus meas incidisset [Strasbourg, Schurer, 1514], seu elegantia sermonis latini seu varietate et festivitate operis delectatus, complureis epistolas meo more, hoc est brevius constrictiusque, adnotavi, non certe κενοδοξίας aucupandae gratia, sed solo iuvandi studio, haud ignarus quantum utilitatis ex Plinianiarum editione manare posset ad iuvenes eloquentiae studiosos. Haec igitur scholia, hanc meam feturam, hunc Plinium meum vel nostrum potius (quid enim debeo non commune utrique nostrum putare praeter ignorantiam et delicta iuventutis meae?) tibi, mi Gerarde, amicus amico presbitero presbiter dedico, ut si qua concordia homines propemodum coetanei vixerimus, simul ocii mei apud te ratio et ut studium tibi constet amici. Quid autem in posterum destinaverim, nunc paucis estatem hanc proximam legendis partim secularibus partim sacris authoribus (si modo valetudo mihi prospera contingat a superis) transfigere constitui, nihil novi operis aggressurus toto tempore; etenim comprimendam mihi est hec cupiditas ne quis malignior paulo in me quoque torquendum existimet illud. Numquam tacet quem morbus tenet scribendi. Vale, mi Gerarde, Vale. Vale et salve. Lovanii.

Commentary. Barlandi Adnotationes in Fa-

169. Dr. Jeroen De Keyser kindly supplied the photocopies of Barlandus' prefatory and dedicatory letters, and the beginning and end pages of the commentary.

miliares Epistolas Plinii Caecilii Secundi Novocomensis. C. Plinius Secundus Septitio suo Salutem. [Inc.] *Frequenter hortatus es ut epistolas* (1.1.1). *Quantum tanto amore flagrabas. Paulo accuratius* (ibid.). *Nam minus accurate scriptas sciebas me non editurum; eas autem quas non plane neglectim neque omnino citra curam scripseram putabas dignas que in manus hominum exirent . . .* [Expl.] *Tormentis*.(8.23.8) *Merore, tristitia, luctu. Solare* (ibid.). *Me per literas; medere mihi cum ipse me nequeat curare.*

Editions:

1516. Lovanii (Leuven): vendit Theodoricus Alustensis qui et impressit; Leuven, Universiteitsbibliotheek.

Biography:

Barlandus was born in Baarland in the province of Zeeland in 1486. He was sent to study Latin at Gand with Petrus Scotus. He then went to Leuven at the age of fifteen, where he studied philosophy. He was appointed professor of philosophy there in 1509 at the age of twenty-three. He was ordained priest in 1515 and accepted a prebend in the Church of St. Peter. In 1518 he obtained the chair of Latin in the new Collegium Trilingue, but resigned after a little more than a year. He was then professor of eloquence at Leuven University from 1526 until his death. He was dean of the Faculty of the Arts in 1518 and in 1531. Barlandus was a supporter of Erasmus, and advocated the cause of Humanism in his country, promoting the study of classical authors. He devoted his life to teaching and the education of the young. Barlandus died at Leuven in 1538.

Works:

Barlandus was a prolific and, judging from the number of editions of his works, a popular writer. Besides his commentary on Pliny, he wrote a commentary on the first four books of the *Aeneid* (1529), edited the plays of Terence, collected proverbial expressions from Vergil's *Bucolics* (1514), *Georgics* (1515), and *Aeneid* (1535). He published a selection of Erasmus' letters (1520) and compiled an epitome of Erasmus' *Adagia* (1521, 1534). Among his other works, his *Dialogi XLII . . . ad profligandam e scholis barbariem*, on the model of the *Colloquia*, were published several times in different cities, even after his death (Leuven, 1524, twice; Antwerp, 1526, 1527, 1528, 1530, 1534; Co-

logne 1527, 1530; Paris 1529). He also wrote several historical works, among which the *De Hollandiae principibus* (1519) and the *Rerum gestarum a Brabantiae ducibus historia . . . conscripta* (1526) had several reprints.

Bibliography:

Bibliographie Nationale de Belgique, vol. 1 (Brussels, 1866), 718–22; E. Daxhelet, *Adrien Barlandus et le débuts de l'humanisme belge* (Institut historique belge, 1935); Daxhelet, *Adrien Barlandus, Humaniste Belge, 1486-1538*, *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 6 (Louvain, 1938); F. van der Haeghen and M. T. Lenger, *Bibliographia Belgica. Bibliographie générale des Pays-Bas*, vol. 1 (Brussels, 1964), 133–76 (with complete list of Barlandus' works); P. G. Bientenholtz and T. B. Deutscher, *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, vol. 1 (Toronto, 1985–87), 95–96; A. Wesseling, "In Praise of Brabant, Holland, and the Habsburg Expansion: Barlandus' Survey of the Low Countries (1524)," in *Myrica. Essays in memory of Jozef Ijsewijn*, D. Sacré and G. Tournay, eds. (*Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia XVI*), (Leuven 2000), 229–47.

III. BOOK 10

COMMENTARY

1. Cunradus Rittershusius

A professor of law, Rittershusius was especially interested in the tenth book of the *Epistulae* and in the *Panegyricus* for their juridical value. His edition of book 10 was published in 1608; this was followed in 1609 by his commentary on the text. Rittershusius is the first editor to inform the reader on his textual sources, namely, Aldus' 1508 edition and its 1514 Schurer reprint, Cattaneo's 1518 edition and its Frobenian 1552 reprint, and Estienne's 1591 edition. Moreover, he is the only seventeenth-century editor to follow the ancient sequence of the letters according to Aldus and Cattaneo instead of that devised by Estienne.

Rittershusius' commentary is preceded by an introduction, *Prolegomena*, in which Rittershusius first explains why he, a jurist, is commenting on the tenth book of the *Epistulae*: these letters are important and useful, he says, not only for their juridical content, but also for the juridical *formulae* that they provide; the information on Roman law and politics gleaned from Pliny's

letters supplements what is known from the *Pandectae*, the *Institutiones*, and the *Codex*, and offers the possibility of a better understanding of Roman law by comparing its implementation with the statements in those juridical works.

He then narrates Pliny's and, much more briefly, Trajan's life and career, underlining their personal virtues, political abilities, and the honors bestowed upon each of them. Rittershusius concludes his essay with an attempt to categorize the letters of the tenth book. He thinks that it can be done either by dividing the letters between those without or with Trajan's response, as Estienne had done; or according to their subject; or chronologically.

In his commentary, Rittershusius provides an introduction sometimes to one, sometimes to a small cluster of letters, giving the historical background that he deems necessary to the reader. Then he comments on selected words or sentences in each letter with an interest in their historical-juridical meaning and implication rather than in their rhetoric.

The volume concludes with an *Index rerum et verborum memorabilium* of both Rittershusius' text of the *Epistulae* (1608) and of his commentary followed by the commentary of Franciscus Balduinus on *Epp.* 10.96 and 97 with its own separate index.

Prolegomena (ed. of Amberg, 1609). C. Rittershusii J. C. ad Epistolas Plinii et Trajani commentariolum. Prolegomena quaedam de Plinio et Trajano deque huius interpretationis causis et fructibus. [*Inc.*]: Non vereor ne cui videar negotium a juris civilis professione aut nimis remotum aut alienum suscepisse, dum ad librum decimum Epistolarum Plinii brevi explicatione percurrendum me converti, seposita paulisper severiore legum interpretatione. Usque adeo enim hae epistolae juri civili conjunctae sunt atque cognatae ut ad exercitium et usum ejus aliquem (in illis maxime rebus quae juris sunt publici) sibi comparandum conferre plurimum possint, imo ut a nemine fere nisi a studioso juris quibusdam in locis intelligantur . . . [explanation of the usefulness of the *Epistulae* for understanding Roman law].

Sed priusquam ad ipsas epistolas accedamus, recepto more quaedam de libri huius auctoribus dicenda sunt, de Plinio, inquam, et Traiano . . . [biographies of Pliny and Trajan with frequent references to the *Epistulae*].

Sed ad epistolas ipsas propius accedamus, posteaquam de ipsarum auctoribus quaedam non inutiliter (ut puto) praefati sumus . . . [discussion of ways to group the letters of book 10].

[*Expl.*]: Sed iam ad rem ipsam proficiscamur ab hisce prolegomenis in quibus primo de utilitate istarum Plinii epistolarum et Trajani imperatoris et hujus interpretationis quam ostendi nequitiam alienam esse a professione nostra; secundo de Plinio et ejus vita quae plurima complectitur excellentium virtutum exempla, tertio de Trajano, quarto denique epistolas istas quasi in classes quasdam distribuimus.

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: Ad epistolam primam. Haec epistola ejusque scribendi occasio non potest intelligi sine cognitione historiae, quae talis est . . . [Rittershusius explains the adoption of Trajan by Nerva, and the occasion of Pliny's letter, which he summarizes]. *Pietas* (10.1.1). Debetur maxime Deo et parentibus quique horum sunt loco, ut docet Cicero in Partitionibus oratoris [78] et alibi; et notandum est hic ingenium piorum liberorum qui non exspectantes, id est, optantes, parentum mortem exspectant aequis animis, dum suo fato et valde senes decedant. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: *Intentioni* (10.121; *usum eorum intentioni non profuisse* is added after *esset* in the Aldine edition). Scilicet uxoris tuae, quae erat, quam celerrime posset, ad amitam suam pervenire, ut eam in luctu, quo affligebatur morte sui parentis, consolaretur. Finis commentar. C. R. in Epistolarum Plinii librum X. Commentariolum in Rescripta Trajani ex Pandect. Cod. et Inst. collecta, separatim dabo.

Editions:

1609. See above, Composite Editions.

1669. See above, Composite Editions.

1675 (Leipzig). See above, Composite Editions.

Rittershusius is part of a *variorum* commentary.

1686. See above, Composite Editions. Rittershusius is part of a *variorum* commentary.

(*) 1695. See above, Composite Editions. Rittershusius is part of a *variorum* commentary.

Biography:

Cunradus Rittershusius (Konrad Rittershausen) was born at Brunswick (Braunschweig) in 1560. He studied classical languages at the university of his native city and law at Helmstedt and with Gifanius at Altorf. After traveling in Germany, he obtained his degree in law at Basel

(1591). In the same year he was called to be professor of law at Altorf, where he taught the *Institutiones* and the *Pandectae*. Rittershusius knew both Greek and Latin literature very well and commented on various Latin authors, using the same historical-philological method in these commentaries as in his commentaries on juridical works. He died at Altorf in 1613.

Works:

Rittershusius edited, besides the tenth book of Pliny's *Epistulae*, Oppian (1597, with accompanying Latin translation and commentary); Phaedrus (1598); the *De consolatione philosophiae* of Boethius (1601); the *De interpretatione divinae scripturae* of Isidore of Pelusium; and the *De vita Pythagorae* of Porphyry (1610). He commented also on Petronius and Appian, among others, and published approximately thirty juridical works.

Bibliography:

Hoefler 42.324–25; Jöcher 3.2117–18; Michaud 36.64–65; NDB 21.670–71 (T. Duve); Pökel 227–28.

IV. *EPISTULAE* 10.96–97

COMMENTARIES

1. Franciscus Balduinus

Balduinus was a French jurist, historian, and theologian, not a classicist or a humanist. He wrote on theological controversies and composed commentaries and notes on the *Corpus iuris civilis* and on the works of ancient jurists. In fact, he published his commentary on *Epp.* 10.96–97, together with their text, as part of a larger work that discusses the edicts of various emperors and is entitled *Commentarius ad edicta veterum principum Romanorum de Christianis*. The commentary on these two letters was published separately as an independent unit first by Rittershusius (1609) and then by Veenhusius (1669).

In his commentary Balduinus mingled his legal, historical, and religious interests. His introduction to both letters underlines their importance for the history of early Christianity; he thinks that they were written not later than forty years, at most, after St. Paul's death and wants to free them from the confusion generated by the misunderstandings of earlier and later Christian writers. He begins by describing the historical

situation of Bithynia and surrounding provinces at the time, and by clarifying the juridical position of Pliny and the state of the Roman law with regard to the Christians. According to Balduinus, Pliny's mission as a proconsul was to restore order in the province. He discovered the Christians (who were numerous there as in neighboring Galatia) and their rituals. Since there was no law to guide him in dealing with them, he wrote to Trajan, whose reply was, on the whole, moderately compassionate in view of the times. Balduinus then provides dense annotation for selected lemmas, more in the letter of Pliny (twenty-six) than in Trajan (four), illustrating, through use of parallel passages from Roman historians and jurists, the historical events, political situation, and juridical institutions of the time.

Introduction to Epp. 10.96–97 (ed. of Leiden and Rotterdam, 1669). Francisci Balduini Atrebatii JC. Commentarius in Relationem seu consultationem Plinii, et ad hanc Rescriptum Trajani Imp. De Christianis. [*Inc.*]: Quid igitur? Quale tandem Romanis legibus iudicium de Christianis constitutum? Hactenus enim nihil nisi vim quandam et saevitiam barbaram atque confusam sine ulla juris iudiciorumve specie, sine ullo ordine iudicariae quaestionis legimus. Quid Trajanus? qui rempubl. abs Domitiano perturbatam in integrum restituere voluit. Orosius ait praecepisse ut Christiani qui sacrificare nollent interficerentur, sed edictum temperasse cum Plinii, qui inter caeteros iudices persecutor datus fuerat, relationem audisset [*Adv. pag.* 7.12]. Haec Orosii descriptio veris falsa involvit. . . . [*Expl.*]: Hunc Tertulliani locum, qui etiam veluti argumentum continet eorum de quibus nunc agendum est, Eusebius libro tertio Historiae ecclesiasticae, eandem historiam commemorans, laudat.

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: *Cognitionibus de Christianis interfui nunquam* (10.96.1). Legerat Plinius Annales Cor. Taciti, familiaris sui. In iis [*Ann.* 15.44] legerat quid tempore Neronis iudicatum de Christianis fuisset, et quam inhumaniter in eos saevitum. Sed et tempore Domitiani, quo etiam praetor ipse fuit, tales potuit multos Romae reos videre. Verum ut Seneca secessisse dicitur cum Nero in Christianos saeviret, sic Plinius Domitiani saevitiam oderat. . . . Ejus generis videtur Romae fuisse crimen religionis christianae. Nam neque de eo certa quaedam et publica lex lata erat. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: *Prope jam desolata templa coepisse cele-*

brari (10.96.10). Oportet terribilem Christianis terrorem incussisse Plinium, si, quod hic affirmat, verum sit. Sed errat profecto, qui tamen facile sibi persuasit reprimi atque adeo opprimi Ecclesiam Christi posse. . . . In alia causa aut crimine prohibentur proconsules calamitosorum precibus il-lachrymari, neque aut deprecationi aut misericordiae locum relinquit severitas juris romani. Sed alio hic jure utendum esse putat Plinius.

Introduction to Ep. 10.97. Ad Rescriptum Trajani de Christianis. [*Inc.*]: Hactenus Plinii et relationem et consultationem, simul et consilium audivimus. Nunc Trajani responsum judiciumque audiamus. Natura placidus erat et clemens: dictusque etiam est optimus princeps. Plinius in Panegyric(o) valde eum laudat, quod pro templis excubaret. Sed si non fuit profanus, certe fanaticus potius fuit quam religiosus. Plutarchus ad eum scripsit praecepta politica. In iis graviter monet omnia in republ. ad cultum dei esse referenda. Sed Romani potius volebant ad remp. referri atque accommodari religionem. Trajanus diu vixit Antiochiae, ubi nobilissima erat ecclesia Christianorum. An de ea aliquid interea audierit, nescio. Sed profecto contempsit: ac ne quidem terribili illo, qui tunc Antiochiam totam concussit, terraemotu excitatus est ut de vera religione quicquam cogitaret. Totus erat in bellis suis parthicis. Interea quid de Christianis rogatus responderit, audiamus.

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: Actum quem debuisti (10.97.1). Actum vocat extraordinariam Plinii quaestionem. Extraordinarium hoc crimen de quo agebatur erat. Nulla enim de eo lex certa erat. Trajanus esse etiam debere hoc iudicium extraordinarium, hoc est, magistratum cognitioni et imperio relinquendum esse putat. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: Sine auctore propositi libelli nullo carmine (sic) locum habere debent (10.97.2). Quae conceptio et formula libelli accusatorii, quae inscriptio atque conscriptio esse debeat, Paulus in Pandectis ostendit c. 3 de accusat Hactenus Trajani de Christianis iudicium audivimus. Sulpitius Severus scribit eum, cum tormentis et quaestionibus nihil in Christianis morte aut poena dignum invenisset, saeviri in eos ultra vetuisse [*Chron.* 2.31]. Sed quid is iusserit veteritve, ex eo ipso cum audiam quid Sulpitius hic narret nihil moror.

Editions:

[1557], Basileae (Basel): per Ioannem Oporinum. Balduinus' commentary (pp. 26–69) on *Epp.* 10.96–97 is part of his *Commentarius ad edicta veterum principum romanorum de Christianis*. NUC. BL; (MH-L; CU-L).

1609. See above, Composite Editions.

1669. See above, Composite Editions.

1727, Lipsiae et Halae (Leipzig and Halle): ex officina Crugiana. Balduinus' commentary (pp. 28–73) on *Epp.* 10.96–97 is part of his *Commentarius ad edicta veterum principum romanorum de Christianis*. NUC. BL; (MH; MoSU; PPULC).

Biography:

Franciscus Balduinus (François Badouin, or Bauduin, Balduin) was born at Arras in 1520. He studied at Louvain, then moved to Paris in 1540, where he followed the lectures of the famous jurisconsult Charles Du Moulin.

Balduinus' involvement in the religious controversies of the times between Catholics and Protestants, and Protestants and Protestants, forced him to move from place to place most of his life. He was professor of law at Bourges from 1548 to 1555, and of history and law at Heidelberg from 1556 to 1561. He went to the Council of Trent as the representative of the king of Navarre; accompanying him was the king's natural son, Charles of Bourbon, whom Balduinus was then tutoring. Balduinus taught a course on the *Pandectae* in Paris in 1566. He became professor of law at Angers in 1569, obtaining also the title "maître des requêtes" of the duke of Anjou. When the latter became king of Poland, he wanted to take Balduinus with him so that the latter could reorganize the University of Cracow. Balduinus, however, died at Paris in 1573.

Works:

Balduinus' numerous juridical works were collected by Johann Gottlieb Heineccius and published in the first volume of the latter's *Jurisprudentia romana et attica* (1738). Among his most important religious-historical works are the *Constantinus Magnus seu De Constantini imperatoris legibus ecclesiasticis atque civilibus libri duo* (1556), where Balduinus attempts to find a common ground among the various Christian denominations; the *Commentaire sur le fact de la réformation de l'Eglise* [1564], which was very controversial; and his *Commentarius ad edic-*

ta principum romanorum de Christianis [1557]. Other historical works include the *De institutione historiae universae libri duo et ejus cum jurisprudentia conjunctione* (1561), a Panegyric on the wedding of Charles X, a French translation of the *Chronica sive Historicae polonicae compendiosa . . . descriptio* by Jan Herburt z Fulsztyna (1573), and *Notes sur les coutumes générales d'Artois* (1704).

Bibliography:

BNB 1.842–47 (C. Rahlenbeek); *Biographisch-bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, 14 vols. and 13 supplementary vols. (Herzberg, 2003), 22.61–64 (R. Baier); DBF 5.908–909; M. Erbe, *François Bauduin (1520–1573). Biographie eines Humanisten. Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte* 46 (Heidelberg, 1978), with a complete list of Balduinus' works on pp. 209–39; J. Havelin, *De F. Balduini jurisconsulti ejusque studiis*, 1871; Hoefler 4.273 (“Balduin”), 4.786–87 (“Baudoin”); Jöcher 1.735–36; Michaud 3.286–88; V. Piano Mortari, *Aequitas et ius nell'umanesimo giuridico francese*, *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Memorie*, 9th Ser., 9.2 (Rome, 1997), 195–201 (“3. François Baudouin”).

2. Cunradus Rittershusius

Rittershusius' commentary on *Epp.* 10.96–97, originally part of his commentary on the whole of book 10, was published by later editors separately with the title *Commentarius in relationem seu consultationem Plinii et ad hanc rescriptum Trajani Imp. de Christianis*. Consequently it is treated here as testimony to the special interest of some seventeenth-century jurists and theologians in these letters.

In his introduction to the two letters Rittershusius explains that, after he had written his commentary, he discovered that Balduinus had also commented upon them; it was a satisfaction to see that they agreed on many points. Nonetheless, he decided to proceed with publication of his own commentary because in some instances it was different.

At the beginning of the lengthy commentary on letters 96 and 97, Rittershusius declares the two letters to be *duae pretiosissimae gemmae*, since they provide information not only about the religion of the early Christians, their simple

life, their sufferings, endurance, and patience, but also about the way the Romans dealt juridically with the Christians. Reflecting on these topics, Rittershusius raises urgent questions relevant for his time: what one should think of the inquisition of heretics; what is gained by religious wars; whether religion can be forced on people; what magistrates can do about enforcement, and so on. After summarizing the letters of Pliny and Trajan, he concludes his introduction by observing that both letters reveal what a magistrate should or should not do.

Then Rittershusius' detailed commentary on the two letters follows. It is an interpretative commentary and shows his juridical as well as religious interests. At the conclusion of the long comment on the last words of 10.97.2 (“Et pessimi exempli nec nostri seculi est”), a question already present in a slightly different form in the introduction to *Ep.* 10.96 is posed again: is it permissible and advantageous to extend and impose religion by force and to persecute the unwilling? Rittershusius does not give a direct answer, but cites the negative opinions of *summi viri*: Tertullian, Arnobius, Lactantius, Hilary, Sulpicius Severus, John Chrysostom, Erasmus, Joachim Hoppers, Jacques-Auguste de Thou, Jean Bodin, and Antonius Benbellona de Godentiis. He also quotes the positive answers of St. Augustine and Charlemagne; and he mentions the example of doctors, who—Rittershusius claims—cure for their own good even the unwilling sick. The reader is left to answer the question for himself. At the end of his commentary on *Ep.* 10.97 and before his commentary on *Ep.* 10.98, Rittershusius inserts the commentary on the two letters by Balduinus (with whom, he declares, he often agrees).

Introduction (ed. of Amberg, 1609). Cunradi Rittershusii J.C. *Commentarius in relationem seu consultationem Plinii et ad hanc rescriptum Trajani Imp. de Christianis*. [*Inc.*]: Haec [10.96] et sequens epistola [10.97], tanquam duae pretiosissimae gemmae in hoc libro decimo eminent atque emicant, ut vel ob illas solas dignus sit totus liber non tantum lectione sed etiam cura interpretis. Non solum enim ad ius civile magno opere pertinent, sed ad religionem quoque nostram sanctissimam ejusque attestantur tum persecutiones et impedimenta, tum progressiones et incrementa quibus implevit Deus illas promissiones

suas regno Christi: dominare in medio inimicorum tuorum.

Discemus hinc plurima cognitione dignissima ut quam simplex olim fuerit religio Christiana, quanta illam profitentium innocentia vitae ipsis quoque hostibus et paganis contestata et admiranda, quanta quamque stupenda in tormentis, suppliciiis et cruciatibus perferendis plerorumque patientia et constantia, quae etiam quorundorum mollities atque defectio et Christianae fidei abnegatio. Quae item de Christiana religione fuerint iudicia, quam iniquae sententiae sapientissimorum alioquin et summorum in seculo virorum, quales absque controversia fuerunt Trajanus et Plinius, quibus et coetaneis eorundem Corn. Tacitus [*Ann.* 15.44] et Suetonius Tranquillus [*Nero* 16.2] (ut alios nunc taceam) consimilia prorsus senserunt atque scripserunt. Denique hinc discemus quo pacto illi, qui moderatiores erant aliis, agendum cum Christianis vel contra eos procedendum censuerint; quid item de inquisitionibus hereticorum sit sentiendum et quid proficiatur bellis ob religionem vel propagandam vel exstirpandam susceptis; an religio imperari vel cogi possit, nec non quid faciendum sit magistratui quando nimia est multitudo peccantium ut, si severitas poenarum ac suppliciorum adhibeatur, stragem quandam editura et vastitatem inductura esse videatur. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: Ad hunc itaque modum priora sua mandata (quae procul dubio asperiora gravioraque fuerunt) hoc rescripto suo mitigat ac lenit imperator. In utraque epistola est quod sequatur magistratus et quod fugiat, ut ex interpretatione et commentariolo subsequente apparebit.

Commentary on Ep. 10.96. [*Inc.*]: *Solemne est mihi* (10.96.1) id est hunc morem perpetuo observare consuevi, sicut alter Plinius libro 28 cap. 9: "Novae nuptae intrantes etiamnum solemne habent postes eo attingere" [*N.H.* 28.135]. Loquitur de adipe suillo. Sic. Cic. lib. 7 ad Atticum epistola 126: "Tantum ergo nostrum illud solemne observemus, ut ne quem sine literis dimittamus" [*Ad Att.* 7.6.1] . . . Sic apud optimos quosque auctores passim legimus, solemnia vota, verba, sacra, sacrificia, festa, auspicia, cerimonias, aras, preces, pompas, ludos, dapes, epulas, dies, habitum, ignem, item imperium, morem, et similia huiusmodi, in quibus certi adhibentur ritus. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: *Si sit poenitentiae locus* (10.96.10). Ad hoc respondet Trajanus, veniam et poenitentiam im-

petrare debere eos, qui negassent se Christianos esse, quantumvis alioquin fuerint. Hic praeter ea quae supra dixi de poenitentia, an excuset criminosos a poena, vel ad eam mitigandam aliquid prosit, notandum est ex l. 3 *C. de Apost.* Apostatis remedium poenitentiae diserte negari. Sic enim Imp. Theodos. Valentin. & Arcadius: "sed nec unquam in statum pristinum revertantur, nec flagitium eorum (*C. Th.* l.4 h. t. habet 'morum') obliterabitur poenitentia." Et mox: "Lapsis et errantibus subvenitur; perditis vero, h. e. sanctum baptismum profanantibus, nullo rimedio poenitentiae quae solet aliis criminibus adesse (*C. Th.* habet 'prodesse') succurritur."

Introduction. Ad Epistolam XCVIII [97]. Etsi nihil fere habet hoc rescriptum Trajani quod non satis superque ex iis intelligi possit quae ad superiorem relationem sive consultationem Plinii diximus (ubi et argumentum huius epistolae quattuor constans capitibus simul concepimus ac praemisimus). tamen ad eam quoque pauca adnotare libet. Ubi hoc praemonuero: praeclare hoc rescriptum Trajani refutari a Tertulliano in Apologetico, ejusque demonstrari ἀσυλλογοισίαν . . . [*Expl.*]: Si enim res digna erat supplicio, esse Christianum, etiam inquisitio et delatio ejus prohibenda non fuit etc.

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: *Actum quem debuisti, secutus es* (10.97.1), hoc est, Recte atque ordine fecisti, ut formula utar Jureconsulti nostri solemniter, de qua vid. l.2 §1 in fin. *D. ad SC Vell.* et l.4 §4 recte *D. de offic. procons.* l. 27 §1 *D. de lib. cau.* et saepe alibi. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: *Et pessimi exempli nec nostri seculi est* (10.97.2). De eleganti combinatione particularum istarum, et "nec" non cuius animadversa, ex Cicerone aliisque optimis auctoribus prolatis pluribus exemplis, qualia etiam apud Plinium occurrunt, alibi dixi. . . . Quare hoc consilio Balduinica cum meis coniungere visum est: non quod mea cum illis paria facere posse considerem (non sic desipio aut mihi ipsi blandior) sed quod ipsa collatio non nihili, vel delectare posset, vel etiam docere juventutem, cui maxime haec nostra inservire iussa est opella. Et in eam partem a benevolo et aequo lectore hanc combinationem accipi velim.

Editions:

1609. See above, Composite Editions.

1669. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:

See III.1 above.

V. PANEGYRICUS

COMMENTARIES

1. Johannes Maria Catanaeus

Cattaneo dedicated his commentary on the *Panegyricus* (1506, 1518) to Gian Giacomo Trivulzio, a Milanese *condottiere* in the service of the kings of France, who had been briefly governor of the duchy of Milan. The dedicatory letter is in itself a mini-panegyric of Trivulzio.

Already present in Cattaneo's letter and in his commentary are all the themes that throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries will justify the publication of the *Panegyricus* and its dedication to army captains, princes, government officers, and illustrious students: comparison between Trajan and dedicatee, Trajan as an example of good prince to be imitated; excellence of style, which makes the *Panegyricus* a primary example of how to compose a deliberative *oratio*; and the historical and juridical value of the work.

Cattaneo, however, is rather specific. He compares Trajan's and Trivulzio's military careers, noting, for example, the fact that both spent their youth training in the army, that Trajan had been *tribunus [militum]* and Trivulzio *praefectus equitum*, that both reformed their armies. He praises the same virtues in Trivulzio (courage, compassion, love of peace, moderation, clemency, generosity, modesty, and so on) that Pliny praises in Trajan, as well as the order and discipline of his household and the virtues of his wife Beatrice, as Pliny had done for Trajan's household. He then adds a personal note expressing his gratitude to Trivulzio for having reconciled the warring factions of his own family (the Cattaneo).

For Cattaneo, Trivulzio truly deserves the dedication of the *Panegyricus*, a work intended by Pliny as an example and inspiration for future emperors. Presumably Trivulzio, in Cattaneo's view, would also be an example of leadership for his contemporaries and future leaders.

Cattaneo also appreciates the qualities of the *Panegyricus* itself; he praises in detail its structure, figures of speech, wording, diction, composition, sound, and rhythm. He is keenly aware of the juridical and historical importance of the work, and he bemoans the difficulties that he had encountered in commenting on it, due especially to the loss of the historical works covering the reigns of Nerva and Trajan.

The commentary on the *Panegyricus* is as thorough as that on the *Epistulae* (I.1 above). The first two lemmas, *Bene* and *Traianus*, function as an introduction, in which Cattaneo summarizes the various themes of the *Panegyricus*, lauds Pliny's style, explains the origin of the word "panegyric," defines what kind of oration a panegyric is, and makes a brief observation on the name Traianus. A large part of this introduction (from the beginning, "C. Plinius consul designatus," as far as "transitus, figuras, elocutionem commendat") was reprinted anonymously by Henri Estienne and subsequently by many other editors at the beginning of their text.

In the commentary proper, Cattaneo, following the method that he had used for the *Epistulae*, emends the text by conjecture and interprets it with the help of parallel passages; he explains stylistic and rhetorical points, usage of words and expressions, historical events, civic and military customs, constitutional and judicial issues, and so on.

His commentary on the *Panegyricus*, like that on the *Epistulae*, was a point of reference for commentators up to the nineteenth century.

Dedicatory letter (ed. of Milan, 1506). Eminentissimo principi Ioanni Iacobo Trivultio Militiae Gallicae Moderatori aetatisque nostrae imperatori clarissimo Ioannes Maria Catanaeus s. [Inc.]: Improvidum arbitrarer divini panegyrici commentarios sine praefatione publicare etiam si nemo satis dignus occurreret cui nostras qualescumque vigilias dedicarem. Verum cum primum eas aggressi sumus, ill(ustrissime) princeps, tu statim hoc munusculo, quamvis maiori dignus, dignissimus iudicatus es. Maxime autem nos ad hoc consilium impulit, quod videbamus multa quae in te eminent et excellunt convenire cum illustribus Traiani gestis . . . [he compares the virtues and qualities of Trajan and Trivulzio, praises the disciplines of their households, and thanks Trivulzio for reconciling his family].

Num igitur tibi meritissimo dicare debuimus Traiano invictissimo dictam orationem omnium eius generis praestantissimam a Secundo publicatam eo consilio, ut imperatori optimo virtutes suae veris laudibus commendarentur, deinde ut futuri principes non quasi a magistro, sed tamen sub exemplo praemonerentur qua potissimum via possent ad eandem gloriam niti? In ea tanta vis eloquentiae fuit ut illum ipsum Traianum eodem virtutis tenore ad extremum vitae finem

perdiderit, humanum, liberalem, iustum conservaverit, felicissimum eius imperium praestiterit. Quam Sidonius incomparabili principi comparabilem id est admirandam acutissime iudicavit [*Ep.* 8.10.3], certe unicum futuris principibus regendi exemplar ut credibile sit qui insecuti sunt imperatorum optimos praestitisse.

Nam si censent Isocratis ad Philippum orationem plurimum Alexandro profuisse ad suscipiendam adversus barbaros expeditionem, quantum putamus hanc posteris contulisse non Traiano missam, sed dictam in illo senatorum ordine clarissimo frequenti malorum Caesarum recordatione vel in virum quae poterat ad bonum trahere? Consistit autem in genere demonstrativo, divini Caesaris laudes complexa, cuius ordo mirabilis et transitus rerum ita convexus ut idem corpus una superficie contentum videatur, variis figuris tanquam luminibus decenter illustratum.

Sine controversia inter panagyricas orationes princeps, quae verbis idoneis et sententiis ad inventionem accomodatis exornata Traiani raram felicitatem puro dicendi flumine comprahendit. Versatur in gravi figura, quam interdum mediocris suscipit, neque enim semper affectanda sunt elata et excelsa. In ea splendorem, magnitudinem, gravitatem, venustatem, celeritatem invenies neque desiderari potest artificium, dictio, figura, membrum, compositio, clausula, sonus. Vitat enim vocalium concursus et quae reddunt orationem hiantem, inde ad rhythmum fluit succulenta. Facilitatem vero ita temperavit ne in humilem sermonem decideret, sed dignitatem suam retineret, at dicendi libertatem ut non monere sed probare videatur. Nec mirandum sit, elocutio et ars saepe detegitur. Nam iis actionibus quae in aliqua sine dubio veritate versantur et sunt ad popularem aptae delectationem, quales legimus panagyricos totumque hoc demonstrativum genus, permittitur adhibere plus cultus omnemque artem quae latere plaerunque in iudiciis debet non confiteri modo, sed ostentare hominibus in hoc advocatis.

Una autem et maxima in hoc opere difficultas nos circumstetit: Nervae Traianique gesta quae frequenter in hoc libro occurrunt publica litterarum iactura ferme deperdita. Nam veterum nemo circumfertur qui illorum vitas luculenter a se scriptas nobis transmiserit. Dionis enim et reliquorum compendiosa quaedam admodum et intermiscia supersunt, cum tamen legerimus mul-

tos ut Marium Maximum, Fabium Marcellinum, Aurelium Verum, Statum Valentem Traiani res posteris tradidisse. Elaborandum igitur fuit non mediocriter circa historiae conquisitionem et ut in integram veramque lectionem Secundum restitueremus. Quod si aliqua necessaria desiderabuntur, scias, Ill(ustrissime) princeps, nobis bonam mentem non defuisse enixumque pro virili nostra diligentis interpretis officio fungi, licet arduum fuerit in tanta rerum caligine ac profunda disciplina ingenii nostri viribus ubique paria fecisse. Homines enim sumus et primi hoc opus ab aliis quamvis doctissimis huc usque intactum aggredimur nullius auxilio nixi.

Veniam itaque petimus si quid minus conveniens offenderis, quamquam si ea facilitate quae caeterorum scripta nostra respexeris, non solum venia sed et laus speranda est. Nobis tamen venia sufficit.

Introduction. [*Inc.*]: *Bene* (1.1). C. Plinius consul designatus cum Cornuto Tertullo imperatori Traiano gratias in senatu agit, principem optimum a parentibus et adoptione laudans, res gestas liberalitatemque commendans, quod delatores expulerit, quod vectigalia represserit, leges moderatus sit, pantomimos sustulerit, doctos fovit. Admiratur in eo humanitatem, statuarum honorumque modestiam, sed plura de consulatibus eius quos gesserat et gerendos recusabat tractat: iustitiam, tolerantiam, adeundi facilitatem diligenter exponens, illi votorum nuncupationes, illi inusitatas acclamationes a senatu habitas; corporis bona sed animi magis admiranda ubi potest, malorum Caesarum comparatione, Domitiani praesertim cuius vitam ubique exagitat, illius virtutes reddit illustriores; totam denique domum, Plotinam imprimis uxorem et Martianam sororem Traiano similes extollens, quantoque studio coluerit amicitias suspiciens. Illa ex tertio De oratore verba commode huc transferri possunt, "Ornatur oratio genere primum et quasi colore quodam et succo suo, nam ut gravis, ut suavis, ut erudita sit ut liberalis, ut admirabilis, ut polita, ut sensus, ut dolores habeat" [*Cic., De or.* 3.25.96]; in toto spectantur haec corpore ut porro conspersa sit, quasi verborum sententiarumque floribus. Id non debet esse fuscum aequabiliter per omnem orationem, sed ita distinctum ut sint quasi in ornatu disposita quaedam insignia et lumina. Ipse praeterea Secundus apud Voconium huius oratione, transi-

tum, figuras, elocutionem commendat [*Ep.* 3.13]. Panegyricae orationes demonstrativae sunt, inde Graecorum aliqui tradidere causarum alias deliberativas, alias iudiciales, alias panegyricas esse. Nam πανηγύρις festivitas, laus, contentus dici potest ἀπὸ τοῦ πᾶν καὶ ἀγυρῶ, quod est totum congreco. Philostratus lib. viii.i “Panagyri templa sunt et deorum cellae et stadia ad currendum, proinde scenae et gentes plurimae partim ex finitimis, partim ex transmarinis regionibus venientes. Ex multis insuper artibus et sophismatibus constat panagyris, ex vera quoque sapientia et poetica, ex consultativis etiam et disputativis orationibus et musicis cantibus.” (*Vita Apoll.* 8.18). Panagyri quidem dico esse virorum conventum et locum ipsum quo ipsos convenire necesse est. Unde merito inscribitur panagyrica oratio, quod in conventu et celebritate senatorum dicta fuit in laude Traiani. Dicitur Secundi Panagyricus sicut Isocratis Panagyricus ad τὸν λόγον respiciendo. Apud Graecos enim inscribi solet ὁ λόγος πανηγυρικὸς, sicut apud nos oratio panagyrica; nam ὁ λόγος masculino genere comprahenditur, at oratio foeminino. *Traianus*. Praeter Traianum imperatorem lego alterum Traianum patricium sub Iustiniano Caesare qui chronica scripsit compendia admodum probata et fidem orthodoxam secutus.

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: *Bene ac sapienter* (1.1). Proemium apparatus quod in deliberativo et demonstrativo laudabile, verum in iudiciali genere praecipitur inutile. Trapezunzius Hermogenem secutus hanc proemii expositionem vocat quod cum fine convenit, nam sicut a precationibus incipit, ita per easdem concludit. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: *consularem* (95.5). Iam peracto consulatu; hi enim consulares dicebantur qui consules fuerant. *Candidatum consulates*. Vobis supplicem. Nam candidati in omne genus se submittebant suffragatoribus. Finis.

Editions:

- 1506. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1510. See above, Composite Editions.
- [1518]. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1519. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1533. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1552. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1600. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1625. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1643 [Geneva]. See above, Composite Editions.

- 1643 (Paris). See above, Composite Editions.
- 1655. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1675, Parisiis (Paris): apud viduam Claudii Thibout et Petrum Eclassan. BL.
- 1685, Cadomi (Caen): apud Joannem Poisson in vico N. Dominae. BL.
- 1716. See above, Composite Editions. Cattaneo is part of a *variorum* commentary.

Biography:

See I.1 above.

2. Jacobus Locher Philomusus

Philomusus, a poet and professor of poetry and oratory at the *gymnasium* of Ingolstadt, was educated in Germany and Italy. He edited the works of several classical authors, among which, in 1520, was the *Panegyricus*. His commentary consists of marginal notes, in which he either briefly comments on or explains the text, or corrects and emends it by conjecture.

In his dedicatory letter to Johannes Rudolphus, abbot of Kempten, Philomusus shows his concern for moral and rhetorical issues. He contrasts the ignorance and arrogance of his contemporaries with Pliny's generosity in sharing his talents, and praises Pliny's elegance both in writing and in speaking. He especially extols not only the polished style of the *Panegyricus*, admired by many humanists from Jacobus Antiquarius to Agricola, but also the sincere way in which Pliny praises the virtues of Trajan, virtues which should also be imitated by present and future Christians leaders. It is fitting, he says, to dedicate the *Panegyricus* to Rudolphus, since he is also a leader, well known for his love of the *studia* and for his liberality. (In a letter to Philomusus that precedes the dedicatory letter, his pupil Conradus Gaillinus praises his teacher Philomusus and exhorts him to seek the patronage of the abbot of Kempten for the publication of whatever ancient author he decides to publish).

Philomusus' joint interest in rhetoric and morality is reflected in his introduction to the *Panegyricus*. This comprises a life of Trajan (*Vita Traiani compendiosa*), a short essay on Pliny's moral purpose in publishing the *Panegyricus* (*Intentio oratoris*), and a discussion of the stylistic classification of the work (*Genus orationis* and *Tituli declaratio*).

Preceding the text are some verses of Ausoni-

us in praise of Trajan and Hadrian, together with a few encomiastic contemporary poems.

Ad lectorem

Pelle saporiferi, lector, glaucoma veterni
 ut cernas oculis verba diserta tuis.
 Quae dixit quondam doctus plaudente senatu
 Plinius: eloquii commeruitque decus.
 Melleus ingenii dulcor, meditatio prompta,
 et tibi magniloquum rite placebit opus.

Letter of Conradus Gaillinus. Praestantissimo poetae et oratori Iacobo Locher Philomuso Conradus Gaillinus felicitatem. [*Inc.*]: Quum nuper, praeceptor dulcissime, nobis Plinianas epistolas intra privatos parietes interpretareris, coepisti, nescio qua occasione motus, de scriptoribus nonnullis situ pulvireo obrutis et hactenus vix uni aut alteri visis mentionem facere, dictitans quoque inter pleraque alia te propediem effecturum ut hi tineis ac blattis cum quibus luctantur ac certant adimerentur ac stanneis formis excusi in studiosorum manus paucis nummis pervenerent. . . . [*Expl.*]: Oblata est tibi praeterea opportuna dedicandi libelli occasio atque hoc tempore praecipue quo nos ingenii culturae percipiendae gratia ad famosissimum Ingoldstadiense Gymnasium misit. Habes quid velim. Vale per annos Argantoniacos. Ex contubernio Parrhisiano decimo sexto kalendas decembres.

Dedicatory letter. Reverendo in Christo patri et domino D. Ioanni Rudolpho Abbati Campidonensi, humanissimo principi et domino observantissimo Iacobus Locher Philomusus s. d. [*Inc.*]: Laudatus profecto et vetus mos est, reverende pater, dum scriptores ingenio praestantes, eruditione nobiles et eloquentia famigerati publicantur, ut eorum consecrati proloquium aliquod honorificum veris laudibus cumulatum nec affectatum in operis liminari pagina rite collocent, quo lectores ipsi rerum novarum cupidi ad universam materiae cognitionem percipiendam facilius alliciantur . . . [complaints about the ignorance of his time and the arrogance of his contemporaries].

Longe alia mens fuit [from Philomusus' contemporaries] nostro Plinio, humanissime princeps, qui laetas ingenii dotes ac facundiae largam suppellectilem non convitiis mancipavit, verum rei publicae patriae cognatis affinibus et propinquis communicavit, immo potius omnem dicendi vim scribendique promptam elegantiam

Traiano principi optimo imperatori iustissimo parenti publico dedicavit.

Panegyricam orationem quam nostra cura recognitam et quibusdam annotamentis vestitam tuae paternitati destinamus, nomini tuo dedicamus et ad honorem tuum emittimus. Tanto artificio, tanta lima, tanto iudicio absolutissimus orator scripsit et consul in frequentissimo senatu dixit ut nihil limatius nihil verius nihil elegantius eruditiusque et legi et videri possit. Quam nempe laudatoriam Novocomensis Plinii dictionem Iacobus Antiquarius Mediolanensis ducis quondam Secretarius, Franciscus Puteolanus, Pomponius Laetus, Ioannes Baptista Guarinus, Philippus Beroaldus, Rudolphus Agricola Frisius ita foverunt ut suas delicias, suos passerculos, suas columbellas, sapam musteam, stacten et cynamomum vocarent. Laudavit eloquentissimus consul Caesarem Traianum ab altissimis virtutibus sine fuce, sine adulatione, quod vitium penitus abhorruit quod tamen hoc temporis multorum pectora obsedit; laudavit, inquam, ab illis quidem virtutibus quae in uno quoque principe Christiano cumulatissime splendere debent, non in generis, ut est communis mortalium opinio qui praesenti fortuna ducuntur, non in pecuniae, amicorum, opum, valetudinis, formae, virium caeterarumque rerum quae sunt corporis aut fortunae commemoratione.

Acres eloquii fraenos relaxavit; certe uberior ac amplius evagatus est in virtutibus animi quarum globus micantissimus in ipso Traiano optimo principe radiis phoebaeis splendidior emicuit. Quis in sacratissimo Caesare sapientiam non admiretur, quis liberalitatem non suspicit, quis iusticiam, fortitudinem, pietatem, magnificentiam, gratitudinem in omnes ordines, humanitatem et, si fas est dicere, humilitatem Traiani non ad sydera tollit? Hic est verum ac aeternum simulachrum, in quo principes etiam christianissimi modo scepra tenentes et futuri quicumque rectores se contemplantur quales sint et quanti aperte discant, et qualem heroa intueantur penitus agnoscant . . . [Philomusus gives reasons why the abbot should read the *Panegyricus* and praises his interest in the humanities and in education, despite his busy life].

[*Expl.*]: Sed ne, pater humanissime, prologus fabula longior esse videtur, epistolae huic dedicatae finem impono, tuam mansuetudinem pariter obsecrans ut Plinii librum nullo mortali

pretio aestimandum, nulla mercede etiam Arabica permutandum, grato animo, placida fronte, benigno sinu, humili nuncupatione dicatum excipiat clientisque Philomusi labores, studium, operam forte non penitendam legat amplectetur videat. Deinde quicquid gratum fore sensero lubens faciam. Vale et fave. Ex Ingoldstadio xiiii Novembris MDIX (1509).

Life of Trajan. Vita Traiani compendiosa. [Inc.]: Traianus ortus Romae, cognomento Ulpius Crinitus, cuius pater nomine Traianus Hispanus fuit, in urbe Italica natus, vir quidem patricius consularis et triumphalis sub Vespasiano et Tito exercitum duxit. . . / . . . [Expl.]: Gregorius papa venerabilis Traiani mirabiles virtutes suspiciens et scriptis vitam optimi principis cognoscens, precibus a deo illi vitam coelestem impetrasse traditur. Vixit annis lxviii mensibus viii et iiii diebus. Imperavit annis xviii et mensibus vi; ex fluxu ventris mortuus est.

Introduction to the Panegyricus. Intentio oratoris Plinii. [Inc.]: Eruditissimi viri hanc orationem omnium generis excellentissimam a Plinio Secundo publicatam eo quidem consilio putant ut imperatoris optimi ac iustissimi principis veris laudibus et dignissimis praeconiis commendaret. . . [Expl.]: Hunc perinde optimum ac iustissimum Traianum veluti perfectissimam imaginem Christiani nostri principes intueantur, hunc cogitent, hunc aemulari studeant ut eodem virtutis tenore ad vitae finem laudabiliter perveniant.

Genus orationis. [Inc.]: Consistit haec oratio in genere demonstrativo, laudes maximi principis complexa, ordinem et transitum rerum mirabili artificio observat, variis figuris et exornationibus tanquam quibusdam luminibus decenter illustrator. . . [Expl.]: Syntaxis non salesbrosus litterarum ductus, omnia nempe membra quasi ad rhythmum modulata cum quadam succulentia et dulcedine fluunt.

Tituli declaratio. [Inc.]: Panegyricae orationes demonstrativae sunt. Inde Graecorum rhetorum aliqui, quod et Fabius Quintilianus scribit, tradidere alias causas deliberativas, alias iudiciales, alias panegyricas esse. . . [Expl.]: Didicit Plinius ex praeceptore suo Quintiliano hominis laudem ex animo et corpore et extra positam esse petendam [Inst. or. 3.7.12]. Proinde laudem Traiani Caesaris optimi ex triplici bonorum constitutione formavit, animi tamen bona sublimiori figura extollens.

Poems. Tetrasticha Ausonii Burgdigalensis de Nerva Traiano et Adriano, etc. [Inc.]: Nerva. Proximus extincto moderatur sceptrum tyranno / Nerva senex: Princeps nomine: mente parens . . . [Expl.]: [Commodus.] Eliso tandem persolvens gutturo poenas, / criminibus fassus Matris adulterium.

Astruximus haec carmina ut inde studiosus lector adoptionem quorundam Caesarum cognosceret. Pauci etenim sunt qui Ausonii poemata viderunt.

Dithyrambus Philomusi extemporalis in laudem Caroli Romanorum ac Hispaniarum regis inclytissimi. [Inc.]: Io Io Io Io / Gaudeamus Io Io / Gentes Alemanicae . . . [Expl.]: Io Io Io Io / Gaudeamus Io Io / Vivit noster Carolus / Io Io.

Osvaldus Helonensiotus Philomuso poetae clariss(imo). [Inc.]: Quam frugi Latinae sive loquelae, / His Clarus satis explicat Libellus . . . [Expl.]: O vates Pylios precetur atque / iucundos. Bene nunc vale poeta.

Ad reverendum in Christo patrem ac dominum D. Ioannem Rodolphum Abbatem Campidonensem principem dignissimum et mecenate suum liberalissimum Conradi Gaillini Leukirchensis Epigramma. [Inc.]: Si mea Pegasis replessem fontibus ora / ut celer Ascreo more poeta forem . . . [Expl.]: Cum moecenatem tam doctum, tamque peritum / reppererit cuius nomine tutus erit. Τέλος.

Commentary. [Note: The margins in the copy of the edition consulted (BL 834.e.21) were trimmed, with the resulting loss of a few letters, when the volume was rebound; angle brackets enclose the reconstituted text]. [Inc.]: Exordium appa<ret> quod cum fine con<venit>; nam sicut a precati<one> incipit, ita per ea<m> concludit. Capere (1.1). Caperetur. Consuli (1.2). Consul post im<perato>rem summum ius hab<ebat>. . . / . . . [Expl.] Ego reverentia (95.5). Honestissima con<clu>sio ex arte dicendi <sum>mata quae se totum se<na>tui subiicit.

Editions:

1520, Nurnbergae (Nürnberg): per Foedericum Peypus. VD 16 P-3498; NUC. BL; (NNC).

Biography:

See CTC 3.168–70.

3. Hermannus Rayanus

Hermannus Rayanus published his edition of the *Panegyricus* at Lyons in 1554. He is interested

in and appreciates the historical knowledge that can be gleaned from the *Panegyricus*, and particularly its language. Rayanus thinks that Pliny, with his friends Tacitus and Suetonius, restored to its purity the Latin language, which had become corrupt.

He praises the linguistic and historical value of the *Panegyricus*, which will lead his dedicatees, the noble Guadanei brothers, one of whom was prefect of Lyon, to both eloquence and great deeds. In fact, one should not be deterred by studying the ancient authors because they were enemies of the Christians, since one does not admire them for moral guidance, but for the purity of their language and their historical examples.

The dedication is followed by an epigram in Greek and three poems in Latin, two in honor of the dedicatees and one in honor of Rayanus by one of his pupils, Julianus Vacceus.

Rayanus prefaces his text and commentary of the *Panegyricus* with a summary of the work and discussions on the *genus* to which this oration belongs and its requirements (*De genere causae; De statu et quaestione; De partibus orationis et genere dicendi; Totius orationis summaria sententia*). His commentary is rather extensive and reflects his interests: Rayanus is particularly attentive to diction and stylistic practice as well as to historical and political events.

Dedication. Amplissimis magnificentissimisque fratribus Gulielmo Guadaneo, Lunelli Baroni, sancti Victoris Domino, Regio senatori, eiusdem Regis Christianissimi a Cubiculis, Lugdunensis provinciae Praefecto clarissimo, et Thomae Guadaneo Beauregardii Domino, necnon illustrissimi Delphini Franciae a Cubiculis, Hermannus Rayanus Vuelsdalius s. p. d. [*Inc.*]: Tantus est studiorum humanitatis et omnium literarum politiorum splendor tamque incredibilis voluptas, viri ornatissimi, ut qui in eis a primis aetatis temporibus recte probeque informati fuerunt non possint non eas unice et amare et amplecti. . . . [praise of the dedicatees and their dead father, as well as of their education in the *studia humanitatis*, and of eloquence; emphasis on the importance of style for other disciplines, even morality].

Haec enim studia morum disciplinam complectuntur, quam ego in omnibus antecedere debere semper existimavi. Quemadmodum enim Pli(nius) monet eloquentiam male sine moribus disci [*Ep.* 3.3.7], sic meum semper fuit iu-

dicium, nihil sine moribus plane nos discere posse. Iam vero quam uberem fructum ex historiatarum lectione colligamus, nemo nescit. In his nempe spirans illa et vivida est philosophia, magnorum virorum magnis exemplis illustrata. Haec autem oculos docent; tenuia, ieiuna, nuda philoso(phiae) praecepta aures tantum imbuunt et ad magnas res gerendas non magis conducunt quam illa sinuosa et perplexa de ideis Plato(nis) in scholis philosophorum disputatio. . . . [lengthy praise of history].

Et hic Panegyricus nullo antiquorum scriptorum inferior est. In quo quisquis multum operae posuerit praeter innumeras historias, absolutam eloquentiam, principum mores tanquam in speculo intuebitur; et quod alij scriptores numerosis voluminibus complexi sunt, id compendio apud Plinium discere licebit. Etsi enim divitijs opibusque (quae certum morum dant experimentum) divinitus circumfluitis, multo tamen praestantius, nobiliter, praeclarius ducitis, sapientia et maximarum rerum cognitione alios quam fortunae commodis anteire. Ea enim res animum generosum et principibus dignum, longe lateque ostentat. . . . [he urges his addressees to continue in their studies].

Haec quoque oratio animos vestros ad praecleara facinora tam publice quam privatim excitare poterit, et maiorem capietis ex pliniana identidem repetita lectione voluptatem. Est enim Plinij Secundi dictio pura et elegans, nimirum qui eloquentissimo praeceptore et gravissimo studiorum censore Quintiliano usus est. Accedit etiam doctissimorum hominum consuetudo Cornelij Taciti, Suetonij Tranquilli, qui, ut omnes aequales fuerunt et sub Traiano floruerunt, ita eo seculo quo lingua latina corrupta, instauranda et emaculanda erat, eruditionis miracula et eloquentiae lumina extiterunt.

Nulla flagrabant invidia, quae nunc latissime serpit, sed concordia, simplicitate, fide, de gloria et honore certabant. Nec quenquam ab horum lectione rejicere debet, quod acerrimi christiani nominis hostes fuerint. Ab his enim non vitae nostrae institutionem, sed sermonis puritatem et copiam exemplorum, quae, Aristotele teste, plebeijs hominibus norma et regula sunt petimus. Caeterum non eo animo haec conscripseram ut invulgarem, sed ut indicis vice rerum quarundam memorabilium, quas in hac oratione multa lectione observaveram, apud me essent. Nihil

enim hoc docto seculo tam politum, limatum et numeris omnibus est absolutum, lydioque examinatum lapide, quod non in multas incurrat reprehensiones. . . . [praise of Rayanus' patrons].

[*Expl.*]: Nihil enim habet splendida amplaque vestra fortuna maius quam ut possitis, nec natura melius quam ut velitis complures eximios literarum alumnos in vestram tutelam patrocini-umque suscipere. Valet optimi integerrimique fratres, et hoc quicquid est muneris, eo quo offertur a me animo, hoc est, candido, syncero, germano suscipite. Valet et me constanter ut facitis, amate. Lugduni ad confluentes.

Poems.

Eiusdem Hermannii Rayani Vuelsdalij ad eosdem fratres epigramma. [*Inc.*]: Docta legunt omnes facundi dogmata Tulli, / Et teritur totis Livius in pluteis. . . . [*Expl.*]: Hoc opus excipite et totis incumbite remis, / Prosperet ut cursus gratior aura meos.

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς αὐτοὺς. [*Inc.*]: Πάντες ἐπαίνουσιν φανερώς παιδεύματα πολλά, / Παιδείαν τ' κ' ἀρετὴν, ἀλλὰ τε καλὰ σφόδρα. . . . [*Expl.*]: Ὑμετέρας ἀρετῆς λαμπρὸν λαμβάνετε ταῦτα / Ἄνδρες γενναῖοι γράμματα, μνημόσυνον.

Ad generosos nobilissimosque Guadaneos fratres Nicolaus Edoardus. [*Inc.*]: Gens Romana suos ornat celebratque gemellos / Unde solum et nomen Fata dedere sibi. . . . [*Expl.*]: Orator vester γνώμας ἀξιώματα fundet, / O fratres ἄβιος docta Minerva iacet.

Iuliani Vaccaeii ad Hermannum Rayanum Vuelsdalium praeceptorem suum epigramma. [*Inc.*]: Te tua mortalem mater genuisse putabat: / Nunc immortalem te genuisse sciat. . . . [*Expl.*]: Te Christo precibus commendet turba bonorum, / Qui te fortunet, prosperet atque regat.

Summary. Argumentum in Panegyricum Plinii Secundi, per Hermannum Rayanum Vuelsdalium. [*Inc.*]: Cum Traianus imperator C. Plinium Secundum Novocomensem una cum Cornuto Tertullo consulem renuntiasset, ei Plinius in senatu hac luculenta oratione gratias egit. . . . [*Expl.*]: Nunquam Romani tam late imperij sui fines extenderunt, atque sub hoc principe. Huius hoc fuit memorabile ἀπόφθεγμα, sanctitas domi, in armis fortitudo, utrobique prudentia. Talem denique Reipub. se prae-buit qualem vix aegreque exprimere valuerunt summorum virorum admiranda ingenia.

Introduction to the Panegyricus. De genere causae. [*Inc.*]: Genus huius orationis demonstrativum est. Etsi enim laudibus Traiani oratio destinata non est, sed gratiarum actioni, tamen quia summum beneficium quod Plinius a principe accepit magnis laudibus celebrat, idcirco encomiastica oratio dicitur. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: Quid autem ipse Plinius Secundus de artificio huius orationis censeat, ipse docet epistola decimatertia libri tertij epistolarum.

De statu et quaestione. [*Inc.*]: Genus demonstrativum statum ex conflictione causarum non habet, sicut in genere iudiciali, sed thema aliquod habet ad quod omnia tanquam ad κεφάλαιον γενικώτατον referuntur. . . . [*Expl.*]: Quem autorem si studiosa iuventus sedulo evolveret, uberes profecto et diuturnos ex eo caperet fructus.

De partibus orationis et genere dicendi. [*Inc.*]: Orationis partes propter ingentem rerum variarum cumulum, tam anxie distinctae non sunt. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: Tota denique oratio ut magno heroi dicata, ita heroicam quandam (ut ita dicam) eloquentiam et maiestatem prae se fert.

De inscriptione paucula. [*Inc.*]: Caii Plinii Secundi Novocomensis. Hic Plinius dictus est Novocomensis a Novum (*sic*) Como Italiae oppido quod Caesar sibi tributarium cum in Gallia bellum gereret fecerat eoque coloniam deduxerat. Quod oppidum M. Marcellus consul Caesari adimendum esse tanquam ultra praescriptum datum senatui romano suasit. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: *Traiano Augusto dictus.* Caesar Octavius, primum Augustus ob egregias victorias dictus est; inde reliqui ab eo Caesares Augusti cognominati sunt, cum ob singularem eorum virtutem, tum ob praeclara vel in suos, vel in universam rempub(licam) merita. Autor Suetonius Tranquillus in Augusto [7.2?]. Sic Iustinianus imperator a senatus (*sic*) Augustus appellatus est.

Totius orationis summaria sententia. [*Inc.*]: Tota oratio duo capita in universum complectitur. Unum, quo Plinius Traiani imperatoris virtutes eximias veris commendat laudibus. Alterum, quo futuros principes non quasi a magistro, sed sub exemplo praemonet, qua ad eandem gloriam via niti possint. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: Haec propterea subieci ut diligens lector aliquid in tanta rerum varietate in quo mens eius acquiesceret haberet.

Commentary. C. Pl. Secundi Novocomensis, in-turi novum consulatum, Panegyricus Traiano Augusto dictus. Recens per Hermannum

Rayanum Vuelsdaliū Commentariis illustratus. [Inc.]: *Bene ac sapienter* (1.1). Exordium hoc sumptum est a more quem in initijs rerum veteres observare solebant. Est etiam similitudo, quae sic explicanda est: quemadmodum veteres prudenter instituerunt ut hi qui res tractandas aggrediuntur vota facerent, ita etiam sapienter factum est ut hi qui dicunt a precatione exordiantur. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: *Ut candidatum consulatus* [95.5]. Hoc est, quemadmodum candidati omnem industriam et diligentiam impendunt ut honores consequantur, ita ego obnixē reipub. prodesse studebo. Haec habui, studiose lector, quae in hoc laboriosissimo et maximo profitendi munere, ad huius Panegyrici explicationem conferre potui. Scio curiosis hominibus per omnes numeros non esse factum satis, sed labor noster aequi bonique consulendus est. Finis commentariorum.

Editions:

[1554], Lugduni (Lyon): apud Sebastianum Barptolomaei (*sic*) Honorati, excudebat Iacobus Faure. NUC. BL; Bergamo, Biblioteca Civica; (ICU; MH).

1643. See above, Composite Editions.

1655. See above, Composite Editions.

1665. See above, Composite Editions.

1716. See above, Composite Editions. Rayanus is part of a *variorum* commentary.

Biography:

It is not known where or when Rayanus was born. He graduated as *magister artium* from the University of Paris, where he also obtained a baccalaureate and a license in medicine. He may have lived for a while at Lyon, as his first two works (see below) were published there in the 1550s. He became professor of medicine at the University of Cologne in 1566, where he was professor *ordinarius* from 1598 until his death; however, he does not seem ever to have been a practicing physician. According to a remark made by his German students in 1570, he was very knowledgeable in Greek and Latin (“graece latineque perquam doctus”). He had no wife, children, or practice to interfere with his studies (“adhuc nec liberis nec uxore nec praxi est impeditus quae studiorum avocamenta esse solent” [Meuthen 1.125]).

Rayanus died at Cologne in 1573.

Works:

The commentary on Pliny’s *Panegyricus* (1554) seems to be Rayanus’ first published work. In 1556 he edited the *Dialectica* of Johannes Caesarius; it was first printed (as was the commentary on the *Panegyricus*) at Lyon, then reprinted many times in various places. In 1568 he edited and commented on the *Naturalis philosophia* of Aristotle; the two volumes were published at Cologne. In the same year Rayanus published, with a commentary, a translation into Latin of the *Axiochus* by Ps. Plato, which sometimes was issued together with the *Naturalis philosophia*.

Bibliography:

L’Europe des humanistes, 360; J. Hankins, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*, vol. 1 (Leiden and New York et al., 1990), 773–74, 806; C. H. Lohr, “Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors Pi–Sm,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 33 (1980) 675–76; J.-F. Maillard et al., *La France des humanistes. Hellenistes I*, vol. 1 (Turnhout, 1999), 453; E. Meuthen, *Kölner Universitätsgeschichte*, vol. 1 (Cologne and Vienna, 1988), 125, 392, 396.

4. Johannes Livineius

In the dedication of his 1599 edition of the *Panegyricus*, Livineius (Jan Lievens) thanks his dedicatee Marcus Velserus, a German noble and politician, for having given him the collation of the *Panegyrici veteres* made by Franciscus Modius from the Codex Bertinensis (now missing). He adds, however, that he himself has collated other texts and made his own corrections and emendations. In fact, in a note to the reader, Livineius provides a list of the works consulted by him with the abbreviations used in his marginal notes, which consist of the variant readings of the text. Besides various editions, the collations of Modius, and the notes to Froben’s edition by Carolus Langius, Livineius states that he had used a manuscript he designates as V. This is probably the present Brussels, Bibliothèque Royal Albert 1^{er}, 10026–32, which had formerly been owned by his uncle Laevinius Torrentius (Lieven Vander Bek), bishop of Liège and a scholar himself (Battezzato, 328–29).

Livineius’ efforts represent the first attempt to make a critical edition. Although his text of the *Panegyricus* was considered the best by many later scholars, it is doubtful that the Codex Berti-

nensis actually contained this work (see above, *Fortuna*).

His commentary takes the form of endnotes after the texts of all the panegyrics; it is preceded by a short note that mostly quotes the opinions of Pliny himself and of Sidonius Apollinaris about the *Panegyricus*. In his commentary, Livineius calls attention to features of language and style, and explains and interprets historical events and customs, using parallel passages. His first note, a brief introduction to the *Panegyricus*, was often reprinted by other editors. Livineius considers Pliny's *Panegyricus* decidedly superior to the other *Panegyrici veteres*, despite its somewhat affected language; but he appreciates all the panegyrics for their historical value.

Dedicatory letter (ed. of Antwerp, 1599). Generoso et Clariss. Viro Marco Velsero, Septemviro, Consulari ac Patricio Augustano Iohannes Livineius s. p.

Redeunt, ecce, ad te tandem Panegyrici tui, generose et clarissime Velsere; quid ni enim tuos appellem? in quos e bibliotheca privata ingens adiumentum contulisti, Francisci Modii (iuvenis accurati et ingenio elegante, quem immatura mors nuper extinxit) notis, quas e Bertinensis monasterij Audomatopole scripto codice exceperat tibi que donaverat, ultro et liberaliter ad nos transmissis. Redeunt autem non αὐτῷ τῷ μέτρῳ sed (quod religiosus poeta iubet) λῳιον (Hesiod, *Op.* 350) ausim dicere. Nam, etsi Modiana illa praeclara et eximia, tamen pleraque omnia aut iam occupata erant aut melius in codicibus qui penes nos legebantur paucaque quaedam de novo accesserunt. Omnino autem quid praestiterimus rem ipsam loqui quam ex oratione mea intelligi malo.

Voluimus quidem certe scriptores minime poenitendos pro virili iuvare. (De Plinio hic non dico, qui in suo genere meo iudicio regnat, abesset tantum affectatio quaedam molesta, et illa perpetua ποιητικώτερα dictio. In his autem nostris magni magistri συνθιασώταις, ut incidant subinde quae merito desideres, quam multa passim acuta, bella, gravia, et quae, ut ille dicebat, posses tollere? Multa veterum, multa Ciceronis imitatio). Sed, quod aiebam, iuvandi mihi in primis videbantur, tum quod infinitis mendis scatebant ac foede laceri non a verbis aliquot et sententiis sed integris etiam pagellis habebantur, tum vel maxime historiae causa, quam (si laudatores

dissimules) non aliunde plenius certiusque cognoscas. Nam quae Sex. Victor, Eutropius et qui diligentior utroque Zosimus scripserunt, valde sunt concisa. Et est tamen in quo vicissim lucem ex his nostri mutantur, ut suis quaeque locis accurate monemus.

Quam opellam nostram si iudicio tuo (quod spero) approbamus, abunde mihi studiorum fructum assequutus videbor, teque ut cuiusmodi haec erunt eorum patrocinium ne defugias etiam etiamque rogo et obtestor. Vale singulare Germaniae tuae ornamentum.

Ad lectorem. In auctoribus his purgandis, amice lector, pluribus usi qua scriptis, qua vulgatis codicibus, brevitatis causa singulis quosque litteris designamus. Est igitur V exemplaris signum quod penes nos est in membrana exaratum, notae admodum bonae [sc. Bruxellensis 10026-32; see above]; B apographi Bertinensis, Francisci Modii fide; L veterum schidarum quas doctissimus Car. Langius ad Frobenianam lectionem contulerat; C editionis Cuspiniani quae Viennae prodit M D XIII quam humanissimus Iustus Lipsius suppeditavit; R Beati Rhenani quam Frobenius excudit; G Lugdunensis, non unius anni et typographi. Prodierunt et alibi, sed quos operae pretium non sit excutere. Hoc te scire volui, amice, lector, tu interea salve et fave.

Introductory note. Notae ad Plinii et aliorum panegyricos eodem auctore. [*Inc.*]: Laudatio elegans in primis et quam accuratum exemplum quoddam Atticismi proponam. Quo in genere et laborasse se autor sparsim significat in Epistolis, et vero (nisi me amor et iudicium fallunt) regnat. . . . [*Expl.*]: Sed ea cum aliis fuit, nobis superest desiderium. De hoc opera vero quod iudicium parentis tu aestima, mi lector, ex epistola XIII et XVIII libri III. meminit et XXVII libri VI.

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: *Adhuc dubium fuisset* (1.4). Frequens hoc significato adhuc tum Plinio ac quos nunc damus panegyristis tum Ciceroni ipsi. Loca ex eo aliquot apponam. Verrina VII. "Ita mihi voluntatem spemque reliquae vitae vestra populique Romani existimatio comprobet, ut ego quos adhuc mihi magistratus pop(ulus) R(omanus) mandavit sic eos accepi, ut me omnium officiorum obstringi religione arbitrarer" [Cic., *In Verrem*, act. 2, lib. 5.35]. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: *E studiis nostris* (95.1) id est pro studiorum nostrorum fama et celebritate. Lege huc epistolam XI lib. II [2.11.10]. *Cursu quodam provectus etc.* (5.3).

Intelligit praeturam sub Domitiano gestam Epist. XI lib. III [3.11.1–2].

Editions:

1599, Antwerpiae (Antwerp): ex officina Plantiniana, apud Ioannem Moretum. NUC. BL; Bergamo, Biblioteca Civica; Oxford, Bodleian Library; (MH; CU; NNC; ViU).

1607 (Frankfurt). See above, Composite Editions.

1611. See above, Composite Editions.

1635. See above, Composite Editions.

1643 (Paris). See above, Composite Editions.

1655. See above, Composite Editions.

1675 (Leiden). See above, Composite Editions.

1716. See above, Composite Editions. Livineius is part of a *variorum* commentary.

1723. See above, Composite Editions. Livineius is part of a *variorum* commentary.

1738. See above, Composite Editions.

1746. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:

See CTC 5.179–80 and 7.279.

Bibliography:

See CTC 5.180. Add: *Nationaal Biografisch Woordenboek*, 17 vols. (Brussels, 1964–2005), 16.539–48 (“Livineius, Johannes [Jan Lievens], filoloog en kanunnik” [S. Gysens]); L. Battezzato, “Livineius’ unpublished Euripidean marginalia,” *Revue d’histoire des textes* 30 (2000) 323–48; Battezzato, “Renaissance Philology: Johannes Livineius (1546–99) and the Birth of the *Apparatus Criticus*,” in *History of Scholarship: A Selection of Papers from the Seminar on the History of Scholarship Held Annually at the Warburg Institute*, ed. C. R. Ligota and J.-L. Quantin (Oxford, 2006), 75–111.

5. Justus Lipsius

Lipsius published his commentary on the *Panegyricus* in 1600 together with the *Dissertatiuncula apud principes*, which precedes it. The dedicatory letter of the *Dissertatiuncula* is addressed to the Archduke and Duchess Albert Maximilian II, son of the emperor Charles V, and Isabella Clara Eugenia, daughter of Philip II of Spain, governors of the Spanish Netherlands, for whom Lipsius had delivered the speech in 1599. The text and the commentary of the *Panegyricus* are preceded by a letter to the reader in which Lipsius

makes clear that this work is intended not only for scholars but also for the archduke and duchess. He hopes that they will read the *Panegyricus* carefully, understand and heed its precepts, and put them into practice. At the end of his commentary he expresses again, with two of the same verbs used at the beginning of the letter to the reader, his hope that the rulers may learn from Pliny’s *Panegyricus* to be good governors: “Finem meum dabo. Utinam illum alterum ut *legant*, *capiant*, *audiantque* haec principes cum aeterno suo et publico bono, da tu, o Aeternae” (“I finish here my writing. May you, o Eternal God, grant this also, that the rulers read, understand, and listen to these [precepts] for their and the public’s everlasting benefit”).

In the same letter Lipsius affirms that his commentary will be brief. His declared purpose is to unveil the text and explain the meanings of its words (“Plinianum textum diducere et revelare, et verbis sensibusque eius lucem dare, nec ultra”). Consequently he will not discuss the style of Pliny or illustrate rhetorical figures; the latter would be an elementary and pedantic work and his readers should have studied them already. Nor will he deal with the political theory or philosophical principles of the oration, as he has already done this in his *Libri Politicorum*.

The letter to the reader is followed by an explanation of the subject (*argumentum*), occasion (*caussa*), and time (*tempus*) in which the *Panegyricus* was written, and passages in praise of this work drawn from Pliny himself (*Ep.* 3.13.1–3; 3.17.1–3) and Sidonius Apollinaris (*Ep.* 8.10.3).

His commentary is mostly socio-historical, giving brief information on Roman customs, rituals, and historical events. But Lipsius also explains Latin words and sentences with the help of ample citation of parallel passages from Greek and Roman authors. Occasionally he makes corrections and emendations to the text, and these have often been accepted by modern editors. This edition was reprinted with some changes in 1604, and again in 1622, well after Lipsius’ death, by the same Plantin press.

Ad lectorem meum, cui salus (ed. of Antwerp, 1600). Habes hic perpetuum sed brevem commentarium in Plinij scitam et super Graecas Latinasque laudatam laudationem. Perpetuum ita ut nec minora saepe pigeat attingere et discingere, quia meminisse quibus et cui generi praecipue

haec scripserim, nempe Palatinis nostris, quos votum meum sit, praeclara haec legere, intelligere, atque utinam, bis utinam, obsequi et audire. Itaque nec tenuia interdum transeo, quia plerosque illos transisse per haec studia scio vel festinantes vel occupatos, ideoque iuvandos a nobis, praesertim in argutiis aut ritibus: et utrumque copia est in hoc scripto. Sed breviter tamen haec omnia. Quod pro illorum gustu arbitrator fortasse et usu, nec nimis nunc probo, qui in singulis insistunt et uni alicui ritui explicando paginas donant. Modice satis est et quod in rem praesentem sufficiat; plura pompam magis habeant quam fructum.

Quid, quod nec schemata et ornatos illos floridae orationis tango? Nam visum mihi pertenuia haec et scholastica esse, quae didicisse oporteat magis quam discere, aut alio certe doctore discere; neque *Aquila*, ut in proverbio est, *captat muscas*. Ergo politica et graviora illa dogmata explicares, dicit alius, et conveniebat aulae cui scribis. Haud negaverim istud; illud non suscipio quia et si talium monitorum uberrima et pulcherrima hic seges, tamen falcem meam nunc non sentiet, et satis atque abunde messuisse arbitrator in Politicorum libris qui extant. Singula in loco et tempore agere mihi sententia et votum est, atque igitur hic studuit tantum Plinianum textum diducere et revelare, et verbis sensibusque eius lucem dare, nec ultra. Siquis plura atque alia volet, ibit ad alios qui composite et industrie struere moles operum solent. Casula haec mea est, subitaria et levi manu ad usum, non decus aut speciem fructa, cui Aristophaneum illud inscribo ὅστις οὖν τούτοισι γελᾷ τοῖς ἔμοῖς μὴ χαιρέτω (*Clouds* 560). Quisquis capitur illis talibus, his meis ne gaudeat.

Vale, Lector, et Senecam nostrum (si Deus pauxillum etiam vitae dat) exspecta. Lovanij, XVI Kal. Martias M D C.

Argumentum, caussa, tempus huius scripti. [Inc.]: Argumentum et materies est laudatio Traiani, quam duplicem exequitur, publicae vitae et privatae. Illam ordine quodam temporum peragit, orsus ab adoptione ad tertium eius consulatum, in quo haec dixit et ibi sistit. Quidquid igitur moderate interea, liberaliter, benigne, utiliter publice fecisset recenset, deducit, ornat, saepe floride et poene poetarum in morem, quem stilum hoc orationum genus usquequaque non spernit. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: Neque sane moris illo

principum aevo statim et quasi ex lege finito consulatu in provinciam ire. Imo contraria lex erat, iam inde a Iulio, non ire, nec imperia aut honores continuare, etsi tamen tota res in arbitrio principum, et illi aut forte aut imperio, quando et quo visum esset, mittebant. Quae in Dione variis locis, sed hoc postremum libro LII in actis anni DCCXXVI habes [53.13–14].

Commentary. [Inc.]: *Ut rerum* (1.1). Xenophontis praeceptum πειραῖσθαι σὺν τοῖς θεοῖς ἀρχεσθαι παντὸς ἔργου, ὡς τῶν θεῶν κυρίων ὄντων οὐδὲν ἤττον τῶν εἰρηλικῶν ἢ τῶν πολεμικῶν ἔργων [*Oecon.* 6.1]: Conari omne opus cum diis aggredi, quia dii non sequius rebus civilibus quam et bellicis praesunt ac dominantur. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: *Candidatum* (95.5). Qui obnoxij semper, reverentes, supplices. Finem meum scribendi habeo. Utinam illum alterum, ut legant, capiant, audiantque haec principes, cum aeterno suo et publico bono, da tu, o Aeterna.

Editions:

1600, Antuerpiae (Antwerp): ex officina Plantiniana, apud Ioannem Moretum, With Lipsius' *Dissertantiuncula apud principes*. NUC.BNF; (IU; NcD; NIC).

1604, Antuerpiae (Antwerp): ex officina Plantiniana, Apud Ioannem Moretum ("editio secunda aucta et emendata"). With Lipsius' *Dissertantiuncula apud principes*. NUC.BNF; Oxford, All Souls College; (MH; CtY; MiU; CaOTU). [Lipsius' commentary on Pliny [Also in Lipsius' *Opera omnia*, ex officina Plantiniana, Apud viduam et filios Ioanni Moreti, Antwerp, 1614 (a collection in several volumes of texts published at various times). NUC. (DCU; NIC; ICN; CAOTU).]

[1610?], without date and place, in a volume with other works by Lipsius, which are dated: *Manuductio ad stoicam philosophiam libri tres* (Antwerp, 1610) and *De constantia* (Antwerp, 1627). Oxford, All Souls College.

1622, Antuerpiae (Antwerp): ex officina Plantiniana Balthasar Moreti ("editio tertia aucta et emendata" in a volume with other works by Lipsius). NUC.BL; BNF; Oxford, Balliol College; (DFo).

1635. See above, Composite Editions.

1637, Antuerpiae (Antwerp): ex officina Plantiniana Balthasar Moreti. 4 vols. containing Lipsius' *Opera omnia postremum ab ipso aucta et recensita*. His note to the reader, argumentum,

and commentary on Pliny's *Panegyricus* appear in vol. 4, pp. 295–364. NUC.BL; BNF; (CtY; CU; DfO; InU; CaOTU).

1643 (Paris). See above, Composite Editions.

1652, Trajecti ad Rhenum (Utrecht): typis Gisberti à Zijll et Theodori ab Ackersdijck. NUC.BL; (IU; NIC).

1655. See above, Composite Editions.

1662, Oxonii (Oxford): impensis Samuel Pockkii, typis Guil[elmi] Hall. NUC.BL; (MH; CtY; CLU-C; CaOTU).

1671, Salmurii (Saumur): apud Ioannem Lesnerium typographum et bibliopolam. NUC.BNF; (NNC; PCarlD; CaBVaU).

1675 (Leiden). See above, Composite Editions.

1675, Vesaliae (Wesel): (vol. 1) apud Andream ab Hoogenhuysen et Societatem; (vols. 2–4) typis Andrae ab Hoogenhuysen, Typogr. Ord. 4 vols. containing Lipsius' *Opera omnia postremum ab ipso aucta et recensita*. His note to the reader, argumentum, and commentary on Pliny's *Panegyricus* appear in vol. 4, pp. 349–510. NUC.BL; BNF; (MH; CtY; CU; ICU; CaOTV).

1716. See above, Composite Editions. Lipsius is part of a *variorum* commentary.

1723. See above, Composite Editions. Lipsius is part of a *variorum* commentary.

1738. See above, Composite Editions.

1746. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:

See CTC 2.40 and 6.121.

6. Cunradus Rittershusius

Rittershusius published his commentary on the *Panegyricus* in 1604, but, as he says in his dedication to Marcus Velserus, he had been working for almost twelve years on the *Panegyrici veteres*, Ausonius, and Symmachus at the encouragement of his Russian fellow student and friend Salomon Pantherus. In fact, his dedicatory letter is dated 1 February 1600.

He explains that, in the absence of manuscripts, he has made conjectures. Though dismayed by Estienne's edition, he was delighted with the careful edition of Livineius, donated to him by Marcus Velserus, especially when he discovered that many of his emendations were corroborated by manuscripts used by Livineius and by conjectures of Livineius himself. However, he found that he had more conjectures to add, and

so decided to publish them and dedicate his efforts to the same Marcus Velserus to whom Livineius had dedicated his own edition.

Rittershusius' commentary is based on the text of the *Panegyrici veteres* of Livineius' 1599 edition, and he cites the page numbers of this edition in textual references. The commentary consists of a scattered series of emendations and a few brief interpretations of the text.

In 1607 Janus Gruterus republished this commentary by Rittershusius and added some other notes which Rittershusius had apparently written in the margin of his own copy.

Dedication (ed. of Lindau, 1604). Illustri viro Marco Velsero Reip. Augustanae senatori septemviro, consulari ac patricio s. d.

Anni sunt iam quasi XII cum in Plinio iuniore, Ausonio, Symmacho et veteribus Panegyricorum scriptoribus ceteris non indiligenter essem, revocante me subinde a studiis Iuris ad amoeniora illa Salomone Panthero, amoenissimi et florentissimi ingenii adolescente aequaevo et amico meo quem in ipsa terra Russia natum adiunxerat mihique atque conciliaverat voluntatum consensio et studiorum ex parte communio.

Quamquam autem omnibus destituerer scriptorum codicum adminiculis, tantumque ingenio et coniecturis meris innitendum haberem, tamen (praefiscini hoc dixerim) in omnibus illis scriptoribus quaedam minime poenitenda etiam post optimorum aliorum editiones observata erant a nobis unde melior aliqua et emendatior adornari posse videretur. Sed ceteris quidem auctoribus alia et sua cuique fata obstitere, vel nostra potius, quo minus, quod cupiebamus, a nobis perpoliti in manus hominum venirent.

Plinii autem epistolas cum subiunctis Panegyricis, quibus plurima passim adscripseram, quidam mihi, et sane is qui minime omnium debebat, sublegit, malaeque fidei emptori perexiguuo pretio multarum horarum non malas operas curasque nostras addixit, magno meo sed casso atque irritato cum dolore, qui quidem recrudescere quoties novam H. Stephani editionem eius libri, quam mihi postea comparaveram aspexi. Hanc tamen, quantacunque fuit, molestiam expui omnemque penitus deteresi animo meo, postquam prodiit optima et accuratissima Panegyricorum illorum editio a Ioanne Livineio Gandensi, eruditissimo homine, non sine tuis auspiciis procurata. Quam superiore aestate abs te cum aliis muneri-

bus auro contra mihi caris dono datam ut vidi, ut auide percurri, et multas mearum emendationum coniecturalium inibi recognovi partim manusciporum librorum, quibus ille usus est, auctoritate corroboratas, partim cum ipsius coniecturis plane congruentes, nonnullas etiam (quod mireris) post tantam accuratorem mihi relictas quas plures procul dubio recognovissem, absque illo, quod dixi, furto fuisset. Quales tamen hae sint, nemini eas potius quam tibi, vir illustris, allegandas existimavi, ut vel hinc intelligeres quam bene tuum donum collocaris. Arbitrare, quaeso, num sese viris doctis, quorum tu in nostra gente princeps, approbare possint. Vale, nostri amorem prennans. Altorfij Kal. febr. MDC.

Commentary. Cunradi Rittershusii coniecturae in panegyricos veteres. Numerus paginarum refertur ad editionem Antwerp. Iohannis Livineij anno 1599. [*Inc.*]: Pag.17 *Tela tentares, ac si quod gravius accipienti videretur, ipse vibrares* (13.2). Ita legerim pro *si quid durius*. Pag. 20 *Neque enim unquam nisi ex contemptu imperij nostri factum est, ut vinceremus* (16.4). Manifeste falsa lectio; scribe *vinceremur*. Contemptus enim non est causa victoriae, sed potius τῆς ἥττης. . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: P.83 *Ut amores recti* (91.3). Sic s. *magistri recti*. Sic Ovidius: Ipse decor recti, facti si praemia desint/Non movet etc. [*Ex Pont.* 2.3.13]. Sic alibi *specie recti* τοῦ καλοῦ τοῦ κατορθώματος.

Notes added by Rittershusius in the margin of his own copy (ed. of Frankfurt, 1607). (p. 440) Sequentia ad oram libri sui notarat Rittershusius quae breviter excerpserat. [*Inc.*]: *Cap. I. Ita dicendi initium a precationibus caperetur* (1.1). Capere V.B. recte. . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: *Cap. XCII. Tanquam parum esset excipere, praevenit* (92.1). Livin. in scr. *altera* recte.

Editions:

1604, Insulae ad Lacum Acronium (Lindau): ex officina typographica Ioannis Ludovici Bremensis. The commentary on Pliny's *Panegyricus* is contained in a volume edited by Melchior Goldast and entitled *Paraneticorum veterum pars prima*, pp. 461–73. BL. Also included in the volume are the commentary by Rittershusius on the other panegyrics, a doubtful work by St. Basil, and the *Epistulae* of St. Columban. BL.

1607 (Frankfurt). See above, Composite Editions.

1611. See above, Composite Editions.
 1635. See above, Composite Editions.
 1643 (Paris). See above, Composite Editions.
 1655. See above, Composite Editions.
 1675 (Leiden). See above, Composite Editions.
 1716. See above, Composite Editions. Rittershusius is part of a *variorum* commentary.
 1723. See above, Composite Editions. Rittershusius is part of a *variorum* commentary.
 1738. See above, Composite Editions.
 1746. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:

See III.1 above.

7. Dominicus Baudius

Baudius was for some time a professor of oratory at Leiden, where in 1603 he delivered an oration as a *praelectio* to the *Panegyricus*. It was published posthumously in 1619 in a collection of his orations, republished by Johannes Frischmannus in 1635 and again by Petrus Elzevir in 1675 when he republished the edition of Frischmannus. Elzevir was able to add to Frischmannus' edition unpublished notes by Baudius, which he printed in the footnotes separately from those of the other commentators.

In an address to the reader, Elzevier underlines the importance of his publication of these notes, long awaited by scholars, and reminds the reader that in Frischmannus' edition of 1635 the latter had regretted the unavailability of Baudius' comments. He also acknowledges the difficulties encountered in their publication, due to the political situation and to the confused condition in which Baudius had left the material. Such problems account for the delay in publication. Although Elzevier's designation of these notes as *praelectiones* suggests that they may have been written at the time (1603) Baudius delivered his oration on the *Panegyricus*, evidence to support such a date remains to be found.

Elzevier further reports that he had received these notes some years previously from an unknown scholar ("vir eruditus") who in turn had acquired them at the auction of the library of Petrus Scriverius (d. 1660). Scriverius, who published Baudius' *Amores*, may have bought the notes on Pliny at the auction of Baudius' library (*Catalogus librorum Dominici Baudii . . . quorum auctio habebitur apud Lud. Elzevirum ad diem XXIV*

mensis Maij [Leiden, 1614]; H. J. de Jonge [see *Bibliography* below]).

The intended audience for Baudius' oration is his students. He wants to explain to them Pliny's *Panegyricus*, the best of its genre, from which one can learn much, especially by imitating the excellent prince Trajan. For Baudius, the *Panegyricus* is useful not only to princes and officials, but to everyone, since Pliny illustrates both the public and the private virtues of Trajan.

Baudius begins his notes with a prooemium illustrating general principles of rhetoric and praising the elegance of Pliny's style; his notes on the text contain observations on style, history, and law using parallel passages.

Printer's address to the reader (ed. of Leiden, 1675). Typographus Benevolo Lectori. [*Inc.*]: Habes hic, amicissime lector, Dominici Baudii, de quo, ut ipse nosti, praestat silere quam pauca dicere, praelectiones in Plinii Panegyricum tam diu et tam ardentem desideratas, quas ante nonnullos annos tecum communicavit vir eruditus, qui eas ex autione Petri Scriverii sibi vindicaverat. Illis edendis statim quidem admovimus manus, sed intercessit non solum haec fatalium temporum perturbatio ut diu inchoatae jacuerint, sed et moram ipsae sibi saepissime attulerunt.

Paucissimis enim locis auctorum, quibus in illis concinnandis usus erat plurimis, adscripserat οὐ πάνυ nomina, quae labore fuerunt aerumnabili indaganda. Interdum prima tantum verba sententiarum dictorumque quae meditati occurrerant annotaverat; interdum complurium scriptorum sententias perpetua contextas serie, ac si ipsius Baudii essent, conglutinaverat, omnia ex divina, qua valebat, effundens memoria. Quamvis vero pleraque mutila suppleverimus pleraque etiam suis reddiderimus parentibus, et varias variorum περικοπὰς, quae coaluerant, discreverimus, non pauca tamen harum rerum vestigia in istis annotationibus etiam nunc deprehendes. Maluimus enim, sicubi haerebat nobis aqua, aut illos fallebat memoria quos adhibebamus ut in autographo jacent emittere, quam quicquam de tam excellentis viri curis delibare ac praetermittere.

Nulli dubitamus quin tam avide sit eruditus orbis eas excepturus quam antehac expetiit. Quanta illarum fuerit expectatio vel hinc colligas, quod clarissimus Berneccerus aut ejus auspiciis Ioan(nes) Frischmannus in conspectu editio-

nis suae, quam Argentinae MDCXXXV publicavit, haec posuerit verba: "Oratio Dominici Baudii in hunc librum, Principibus nunquam satis praelegenda, cujus viri eruditissimi ad eundem notae, si ad nos pervenissent, facile primas teneant."

Hunc thesaurum nunc accipis. Accedunt Baudianis integrae notae Justi Lipsii, Joannis Livinaei, Jani Gruteri, Conradi Rittershusii, et quas ex aliis Frischmannus collegit et nos ipsi ex penu insignium virorum studio docti hominis promissimus. Habes etiam indicem rerum et verborum locupletissimum, qui tamen et ipse Frischmanno debetur. His fruire, lector, et aliorum panegyricos ad hanc formam adornatos a nobis expecta.

Oration on the Panegyricus (ed. of Strassburg, 1635). Dom(inici) Baudii Oratio auspicalis in C. Plinii Panegyricum, publicis lectionibus praemissa Anno MDCIII. [*Inc.*]: Qui ex hoc loco prima verbum faciunt, solent in auspicio orationis quaedam praefari unde sibi benevolentiam et audientiam concilient idque dum se directo limite assequi posse diffidunt, interdum fraena laxant ingenio et liberius exspatiantur a scopo susceptae professionis, ita tamen ut tum maxime rectum iter insistant cum a via digredi videntur. Dicunt enim ea quae consentanea sunt cum officio probitatis ac modestiae, cum ratione loci ac temporis, cum fructu et delectatione auditorum. Quod quidem institutum etsi vehementer approbo, tamen dignius hoc amplissimo consensu conspectuque vestro fore arbitror si secutus fuero disciplinam et auctoritatem Areopagitarum. . . .

Suscepimus enim ex clarissimorum Curatorum et Senatus Academici sententia exponendam studiosae juventuti Panegyricam Orationem a disertissimo felicissimi seculi oratore dictam laudatissimo Caesarum Trajano, in qua sub specie gratiarum agendarum commemorantur omnes laudes atque virtutes quae cadere possunt in summum principem. ὃ λαοί τ' ἐπιτετραφάται καὶ τόσσα μέμελε (Hom., *Il.* 2.25), cui populi sunt commisi, cui tantaque curae. Hoc genus argumenti cum a compluribus tentatum tum magno cum successu a Xenophonte pertractatum esse non diffitemur in Institutione Cyri Persarum Regis, quos libros (ut auctor est Cicero in epistola vere principe ad Quintum fratrem [1.1.23]) magnus ille Scipio Africanus nunquam de manibus ponere solebat.

Sed quanto praestabilior est veritas fictione,

vivens et spirans imago rebus fucatis atque adumbratis, tanto Plinii nostri monumentum antistat graeco scriptori, qui vitam et actiones Cyri sui non ad historicam fidem exegit, sed ad effigiem justis, et omnibus numeris absoluti imperatoris, qui cum ad ejus votum et subtile iudicium nusquam in coetibus humanis exstaret, mente et cogitatione imaginatus est, quem posteris oratione delineavit. Noster autem etsi gratiae non nihil largitur ac styli ubertate licentius interdum luxuriat in tam patenti campo, tam plausibili argumento, tamen a fide et veritate non discedit, ut vere dicturus esse videar, neminem hodie exstare historicum, qui tanti principis res gestas fidelius et curatius posteritati consecraverit, saltem ad tertium usque Traiani consulatum, quo tempore, ut ex probabilibus conjecturis colligitur, haec oratio recitata fuit. Atque utinam eadem curiosa felicitate pertexisset universam illius herois historiam, haberet sane posteritas unde solari posset jacturam tot auctorum qui in eam curam incubuerunt. . . . [Baudius bemoans the loss of historical documents].

Nec de caeteris loquar, in hoc unico Plinii Panegyrico plura deprehendemus, quam quae vel excellentissimi principes imitatione consequi potuerunt. At licet hoc scriptionis genus potissimum inservire videatur usibus eorum qui sedent ad gubernacula regnorum aut rerum publicarum; tamen non deest hic mediae sortis hominibus quod usu suum fecisse magna cum laude laetari possint. Non enim contentus est noster Plinius ire per summa fastigia publicorum operum quae plerumque ad famam et ostentationem diriguntur, verum etiam descendit ad domesticos mores, ad interiorem disciplinam et quotidianae vitae consuetudinem, quae quale cuiusque ingenium sit maxime declarant. Neque enim clarorum virorum gloria fructu tantum amplitudinis et honorum splendore metienda est, sed multo magis aequabili et uniformi morum tenore, qui clarius elucet in recessu familiari, intra privatos Lares et Vestae penetralia, quam in luce gentium, in oculis hominum, in celebritate provinciarum. . . . [A good prince must be honest in private and public life; other qualities of a good prince are discussed; princes should be aware of flattery. King Alfonso of Aragon used to say, "nullos principi consiliarios utiliores esse quam mortuos"].

In qua [panegyrica oratione], sicut ante diximus, titulo tenus "gratias aguntur a consule

Plinio ex decreto Senatus," sed scopus et mens recitationis fuit "ut imperatori virtutes suae veris laudibus commendarentur" [Plin., *Ep.* 3.18.2]. Hoc idem propositum fuit Senecae in eximiis libris *De clementia*, quos Neroni sese dicasse profitetur, "ut (inquit) vice speculi fungerer et te tibi ostenderem perventurum ad voluptatem maximam omnium" [*De clem.* 1.1.1].

Uterque igitur, et Plinius noster et Seneca, laudabili instituto consimili etiam artificio usi sunt ad conciliandum sibi favorem apud suos, dum quisque pro sua parte conatus est exhibere ob oculos vivam virtutis effigiem, in qua velut in speculo sese possent agnoscere et bona sua contemplari. Quae quidem voluptas summa est apud animum recte sibi conscium. Quanquam enim "gloria sequi, non ambiri debet et ipsa virtus satis amplum sibi theatrum est, nec ullam extra se mercedem quaerit," tamen laus grato et libenti animo complectenda est cum ultro se fruendum praebet nec a benigno censore culpam potest dictum Hectoris apud veterem poetam "Laetus sum laudari abs te, pater, laudato viro" [Naevius apud Cic., *Ad fam.* 15.6.1] . . . [comparison of Trajan and Nero, Tiberius, and other emperors, and praise of local officers].

[*Expl.*]: Vobis, autem, lectissimi juvenes, qui frequentes huc convenistis, eum me publice privatimque probabo ut nullo tempore vestris honestissimis studiis et praeclaris conatibus labor et industria nostra defuisse comperiat.

Prooemium to the commentary (ed. of Leiden, 1675). Dominici Baudii Prooemium. [*Inc.*]: Est hoc in more positum et instituto docentium qui aliquem auctorem exponendum suscipiunt quaedam in antecessum praelibare. Sex commemorantur a Boethio [*In Isagogen Porphyrii commentum*, ed. prima, 1.1]: 1. σκόπος; 2. χρήσιμον; 3. τάξις; 4. an sit γνήσιος liber; 5. quae sit ἐπιγραφή. 6. εἰς ποῖον μέρος φιλοσοφίας ἀνάγετο. Scopus et mens huius scriptionis: gratias agere optimo principi. Hac occasione laudes ejus et virtutes extollit. Officium consulatus et senatus auctoritas hanc ei legem indixerat. 2. Χρήσιμον: proponitur exemplum imitandum futuris imperatoribus. De utilitate quidquid dixero, minus erit. 3. Τάξις: ordinem temporum observat eaque exequitur per capita rerum, pro more Suetonii. Nec distat ab Historico, nisi quod oratorie extollit facta et res gestas Trajani, supra forsitan quam veritas ferre videbatur. 4. Dubitationem non habet quin sit Pli-

nii et quin palmarium obtineat inter ejus scripta quae ad nostram aetatem pervenerunt Sidonius lib.VIII ep. 10. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: Non ausim sigillatim de tali viro iudicium ferre, cuius inter minimas laudes elegantiam dictionis connumero, quae tandem interdum est huiusmodi ut omni commendatione, omni exemplo maior sit: utinam modum tenuisset, sed hoc γενναῖον ἀμάρτημα. De Panegyricorum origine vid. Casaub. ad Sueton.

Commentary. Notae Baudii. [Inc.]: Bene etc. (1.1) Orditur a generali sententia, qua nihil religiosius ab homine profano dici potuit: "praefatus divos" [Virg., *Aen.* 11.301] et "dii nostra incepta secudent" [Virg., *Aen.* 7.259]. "Ab Iove principium": Aratus [*Phaen.* 1]. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: *Candidatum* (95.5). Apud Sallust. Oratio Marii: "Talis esse perseverabo post adeptum consulatum, qualem me fore candidatus polliceor" (cf. *Iug.* 85). "Ambitio multos mortales falsos facit" [Sall., *Cat.* 10.5]. "Qui dum aliquid cupiens animus praegestit apisci" etc. [Cat., *Carm.* 64.145]. Cic. pro Muraena: "Dixi 'magis te fortem senatorem mihi videri quam sapientem candidatum'" [43]; "in petendo studium est acerrimum" [46]. Livius I.VII: "Valerius Corvinus, quo nihil popularius est, quibus artibus petierat magistratus, iisdem gerebat" [7.33.3]. Vide et supra cap. 24.

Editions:

1675. See above, Composite Editions.

1716. See above, Composite Editions. Baudius is part of a *variorum* commentary.

1723. See above, Composite Editions. Baudius is part of a *variorum* commentary.

Biography:

Baudius (Dominique Baudier or de Bauldier) was born at Lille, then part of Flanders, in 1561. He studied first at Aix-la-Chapelle, where his Protestant parents had fled, then at Leiden, Ghent, and Geneva. At Geneva he studied theology. He returned to Leiden, where he received a doctorate in law. After being part of an embassy of the General States of the Low Countries to Queen Elizabeth I of England, Baudius spent some time in 1587 as a lawyer at The Hague. He then moved to Paris, where he made the acquaintance of important political figures and became lawyer of the Parliament.

Returning to Leiden in 1601, Baudius obtained the chair of eloquence at that university. In 1607 he succeeded Paulus Merula as professor of histo-

ry, and gave lectures on Tacitus. He also became professor of law. However, because of his scandalous private life, he was forbidden to teach. In 1611 he was able to obtain the title and job of historiographer of the Republic of the United Provinces; shortly thereafter, in 1613, he died at Leiden.

Baudius was a very good poet, a learned man, versed both in the Latin and Greek languages, and, apparently, a wonderful orator. Under a portrait of him done in 1608 (now in the Academisch Historisch Museum of Leiden) twelve lines by Johannes de Wouwer praise his voice and eloquence ("Vultus et ora finxit artifex manus/ Sculptoris: at mens indolensque pectoris/ Et illa vox sermone melleo fluens/ Miranda cunctis, aemulanda nemini . . .," quoted by Oestreich, 186 [see below]). He knew and was in contact with many of the scholars of his time: Erasmus, Casaubon, Puteanus, Scaliger, Douza, Lipsius, and others. But, as one biographer said, he had weaknesses that ruined his career, namely, wine, women, and great ambition.

Works:

Baudius was a prolific writer. He composed numerous poems: see *Dominici Baudii Poematum nova editio* (Leiden, 1607, 1616, 1640); and *Amores*, in a collection of several authors edited by Petrus Scriverius (1638). The collection of his *Epistulae* appeared posthumously (Leiden, 1615, 1642, 1650), as did that of his *Orationes* (Leiden, 1619), which includes the oration on Pliny's *Panegyricus*. He also wrote about law (*De foenere commentariolus* [1615] and politics (*Libri tres de induciis belgicis* [1613])).

Bibliography:

BNB 1.792-96; *Biographisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden*, 7 vols. (Haarlem, 1852-78; repr. Amsterdam, 1969), 156-57 (B. de Saint-Genois); H. J. de Jonge, "The Study of the New Testament," in Th. L. Lunsingh Scheurleer, G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes et al., eds., *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century. An Exchange of Learning* (Leiden, 1975), 65-109 at 81 and n. 165; P. L. M. Grootens, *Dominicus Baudius* (Diss. Nijmegen), (Utrecht and Nijmegen, 1942); Jöcher 1.860; J. N. Paquot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire littéraire de Pays-Bas*, 2d ed. (Westmead, Farnborough, 1970), 210-13; Pökel 14; G. Oestreich, "Justus Lipsius als Universalgelehrter zwischen Renaissance und Barock,"

in *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century*, 177–201 at 186; Sandys 2.306–7.

8. Janus Gruterus

In 1607 Gruterus published at Frankfurt his commentary on the twelve panegyrics. His edition follows the text of Johannes Livineius; he also reprints Livineius' commentary and Cunradus Ritterhusius' notes.

In his commentary Gruterus collates previous editions, and emends and interprets the text; he often responds to explanations or corrects emendations by Johannes Cuspinianus, Livineius, Rittershusius and Justus Lipsius, agreeing or disagreeing with them. The commentary was republished in 1611 and several times afterwards together with the commentaries of various scholars (see above, Composite Editions).

Commentary. Iani Gruteri notae in Plinij Panegyricum. [*Inc.*]: *Cap. I. Ut rerum agendarum ita dicendi initium a precatone capere* (1.1). Verissime; nam apud Livium Cn. Manilius lib. XXXVIII cap. 48, "Sed ego in ea civitate quae ideo omnibus rebus incipiendis gerendisque deos adhibet, quia nullius etc." [38.48.13]; unde et eidem Livio mos ille precandi carmen solenne libro sequenti cap. 15:

"Et concione advocata, cum solenne carmen precatonis quod praefari priusquam populum adloquantur magistratus peregisset consul; ita coepit etc." [39.15.1]. Quae duo loca opportune ad Plinii sui marginem adnotarat illa antiquae virtutis expressa effigies Iacobus Bongarsius. . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: *Aut optimo cuique principum, dilectum statimque hos ipsos quotidie deinde ita formas* (88.3). Hariolabor olim *dilectum aestimatumque. Hoc ipsos quotidie deinde etc.*

Editions:

1607 (Frankfurt). See above, Composite Editions.

1611 (Frankfurt). See above, Composite Editions.

1635. See above, Composite Editions.

1643. See above, Composite Editions.

1655. See above, Composite Editions.

1675 (Leiden). See above, Composite Editions.

1723. See above, Composite Editions. Gruterus is part of a *variorum* commentary.

1738. See above, Composite Editions.

1746. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:

See CTC 4.288–89.