

PROPERTIUS, SEXTUS

†DOUGLAS F. S. THOMSON

(University of Toronto)

<i>Fortuna.</i>	154
Bibliography.	180
Composite Editions.	184
 <i>Elegiarum Libri IV.</i>	
I. Commentaries.	185
1. Johannes Jovianus Pontanus.	
2. Anonymus Petriburgensis (Books I–II).	
3. Anonymus Chisianus (Books I.1–II.6).	
4. Pacificus Maximus Irinaeus.	
5. Anonymus Vaticanus (Books I–II).	
6. Domitius Calderinus (selected passages).	
7. Gaspar Manius (Books I.1–IV.4).	
8. Philippus Beroaldus Senior.	
9. Antonius Volscus.	
10. Angelus Politianus.	
11. Johannes Cotta (doubtful).	
12. Franciscus Puccius.	
13. Marcus Antonius Muretus (Books I.1–III.11.64).	
14. Gulielmus Canterus.	
15. Joseph Justus Scaliger.	
16. Janus Dousa Pater.	
17. Janus Dousa Filius.	
18. Johannes Passeratius.	
19. Johannes Livineius.	

FORTUNA*

Sextus Propertius (ca. 49–after 16 B.C., but before 2 A.D.) is the author of four books of elegies. He tells us that he was born in Umbria (*Eleg.* I.22.9 and IV.1.121), and modern scholars believe that Assisi was his native town.¹ Inscriptions of

*The following abbreviations will be frequently used:

Butrica 1978 = James L. Butrica, *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius* (Diss. University of Toronto, 1978)

Butrica 1984 = the revised version of the same doctoral dissertation, published (under the same title) in book form as Supplementary Volume 17 to *Phoenix* (Toronto, 1984)

Atti (e.g.) 1996 (1998) = *A confronto con Properzio (da Petrarca a Pound). Atti del Convegno internazionale, Assisi, 17–19 maggio 1996*, Accademia Properziana del Subasio, ed. G. Catanzaro and F. Santucci (Assisi, 1998). Since 1976 the Accademia Properziana del Subasio has sponsored an annual conference at Assisi that deals with various aspects of Propertian studies, with subsequent publication of the papers in variously titled volumes of *Atti*; our citations of pertinent articles include the year in which the conference was held, the title of the volume, and, in parentheses, the date of publication at Assisi. In 1985, however, there were two *convegni*, one of which bears the title *Bimillenario della morte di Properzio*; this will be referred to by its title as just given, while the former will be cited as *Atti* November 1985.

I wish to record my thanks to the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library of Yale University for the award of a Visiting Fellowship, and in particular for the help afforded to me, and the interest shown in my work, by Dr. Robert G. Babcock, as well as his colleagues in the Library; also to the staff members of several libraries who provided me with information or arranged for the preparation of microfilms. In this connection I should like to mention especially the University of Valencia, Mr. Michael J. Boggan of the Department of Manuscripts in the British Library, and Mr. Greg Colley, Reference Librarian in the Department of Special Collections and Western Manuscripts at the Bodleian Library, Oxford. For much assistance I should also like to thank the following: (†) Prof. James L. Butrica, Prof. Julia Haig Gaisser, Dr. Marina B. Smyth, and Dr. Anna Rose. I should also like to record with gratitude the help given to me by my son James, especially in regard to matters involving the use and operation of computers. Above all, my thanks are here expressed to (†) Prof. Virginia Brown, to whom with her colleagues on the CTC committee I am greatly indebted for most valuable advice and assistance in preparing this article.

The text of Propertius used for line readings is that of P. Fedeli (Stuttgart [Teubner], 1984).

[Volume editor's note: Professor Thomson died while this volume was in preparation.]

1. The reading *Asis* at IV.1.125 is attributed to Karl Lachmann by many editors, and it was accepted by W. A. Camps, ed., *Propertius, Elegies, Book IV* (Cambridge, 1965) and R. Hanslik, ed., *Sexti Propertii Elegiarum libri IV* (Leipzig, 1979). This reading, however, does not appear in Lachmann's editions of Propertius (Leipzig, 1816 and 1829).

Propertii have been found there.² Moreover, at Assisi a certain Passennus Paulus, himself a poet of a later generation, claimed descent from our Propertius.³ Geographical indications in the poems of Propertius (I.22.9, IV.1.65–66 and 121–25) also support Assisi as the poet's birthplace.⁴

He claims to have worn the *bullā* or "locket" in his boyhood (IV.1.131). The *bullā*, worn as a charm by pre-adolescent males, contained the *fascinum* or "amulet." Since wearing it was a privilege confined to the sons of senators and *eques* (Liv., *A. U. C.* 26.36.5; Plin., *N. H.* 33.4.10) and Propertius says that his family was not ranked as *nobilis* (II.24.37–38; II.34.55), he presents himself as having the social rank of an *eques*, i.e., a member of the second social order, ranking just behind the senatorial one in regard to wealth and standing.

The first ascertainable date in his life is given by the statement in his poems (IV.1.128–30) that his father's estate was greatly reduced in the course of confiscations. This would have taken place in 41/40 B.C., when the triumvirs assigned to their own veterans the confiscated lands of those who had taken the wrong side—the side of L. Antonius—in the Perusine War. Perugia (the modern Perugia) was, of course, close to Assisi, Propertius' probable birthplace. *Eleg.* I.21 and 22 record the profound impression made on those who suffered by the events of that war.

Propertius says he was still only a boy when the lands were redistributed (IV.1.131), but already old enough to observe the surveyors at work with the *pertica tristis*, or "dismal measuring-rod" (IV.1.130), to understand what this portended, and to feel deep resentment. This passage at IV.1.129–32 has been used to help estimate the poet's date of birth. He notes that he took off the *bullā* and assumed the *toga virilis* (usually put on

2. H. E. Butler and E. A. Barber, eds., *The Elegies of Propertius* (Oxford, 1933), xix, citing CIL xi 5376, 5389, 5405–6, 5516–22.

3. Pliny the Younger, *Epp.* 6.15.1 and 9.22.1.

4. *Eleg.* I.22.9; IV.1.65–66 and 121–25; in line 66 "scandentes . . . de vallibus arces" should be compared with the line (IV.1.125) "scandentisque Asis consurgit vertice murus". The picture of a city steeply ascending the side of a hill suits Assisi better than any other town of the region. See J. P. Postgate, ed., *Select Elegies of Propertius* (London, 1881), xiv and P. J. Enk, ed., *Sexti Propertii Elegiarum liber I (Monobiblos) cum prolegomenis, conspectu librorum et commentationum ad IV libros Propertii pertinentium, notis criticis, commentario exegetico* (Leiden, 1946), 6–7.

between the ages of fifteen and seventeen) soon after the confiscations (IV.1.131), but *mox* ("soon") is vague enough to imply no more than "after a while" or "before long." The interval between the confiscations of 41/40 B.C. and Propertius' reception of the *toga virilis* would have been at least four or five years and in the ordinary course would have been more. We know, too, that Propertius was older than Ovid (who was born in 43 B.C.), yet probably no more than some five or six years older, since he is described as a *sodalis* by Ovid. Furthermore, when Ovid, in the same passage (Tr. IV.10.45–54), places the four elegiac poets of Rome in the order Gallus, Tibullus, Propertius, and lastly Ovid himself,⁵ and designates each in turn as *successor* to the poet named just before him, it would surely be reasonable to allow a few years to elapse for the "succession" to emerge in each instance. If Tibullus was born about 54 B.C. and Ovid in 43 B.C., a birthdate of about 49 B.C. for Propertius would result in a more or less uniform series, whereas a much earlier date would not. These considerations, taken together, point to 50–48 B.C. (certainly not after 47 B.C.) as the most likely approximate dates between which we ought to look for the birth of Propertius.⁶

On the subject of the year of the poet's death, Ovid (*Rem.* 764 "cuius opus Cynthia sola fuit") implies his decease before the date of the poem (attributed to 2 A.D.). But, of course, Propertius may have died several years before that date. The notion that he died young is speculation, possibly based on an analogy with Catullus or Tibullus.⁷ The last of his four books of elegies refers

to two events which can be securely dated in 16 B.C.,⁸ and it is implied that both of them are of recent occurrence; and no later events are alluded to. Since Passennus Paulus claimed Propertius as a direct ancestor,⁹ it may be that in his later years Propertius withdrew altogether from serious poetic composition and devoted himself to family life. We have no certain evidence that—*lacunae* apart—Propertius wrote anything that has not survived.

The poet's very name was for long a matter of doubt among scholars. He calls himself only "Propertius"; but we can add the *praenomen* Sextus from Donatus, *Vita Virgilii* 12.45. In the manuscript tradition he is given the designation "Propertius Aurelius Nauta," with the notable exception of Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. Gud. lat. 224 (= N, formerly known as the Neapolitanus). This codex, copied in northern France around 1200 and acknowledged to be the earliest extant witness, begins simply *Incipit Propertius*; the two words, however, were not copied with the text but added from the text by the scribe of the second part of the manuscript. The archetype seems to have been blank at this point. Two of the three names just quoted are false; clearly he could not have borne two "gentile" names.¹⁰ "Aurelius" seems to have been erroneously transferred from Prudentius, who was sometimes credited with the works of Propertius, or a part of them.¹¹ (Propertius and Prudentius stand side by side in the *Biblionomia* of Richard of Fournival [fl. 1246–60], and this may have abetted the confusion.) "Nauta" is the result of a bizarre misreading, *navita dives eras*, at II.24.38, where the true reading, divined by Filippo Beroaldo the Elder (1453–1505), is *non ita dives eras*.¹² In the passage just quoted, and at

5. It should be noticed, however, that (as Butler and Barber, eds., *The Elegies of Propertius*, xx n. 1, point out) Ovid does not say that Propertius was *born* after Tibullus, but only that he "succeeded" him in the order of poets; they suggest that Ovid may have arranged the "succession" in a sequence of the poets' dates of death rather than of birth.

6. P. T. Keyser, "Propertius' Horoscope: A Suggested Birthdate," *Classical Philology* 87 (1992) 328–34 suggested a date in 43 B.C.; this, however, was convincingly refuted by J. L. Butrica, "Propertius' Horoscope and a Birthdate Rejected," *Classical Philology* 88 (1993) 330–31.

7. For Propertius, see the version of Sicco Polenton's *Vita* in the 1472 de Spira edition of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and Statius, *Silvae*: "Romae moritur ante maturam aetatem." On this statement, see Butrica 1978, 443: "The assertion that Propertius died at Rome may be based upon the Roman content of Bk. 4; that he died young, perhaps on an analogy with Catullus, unless the author troubled to seek datable historical references in the text."

8. The surrender of the Sygambri (IV.6.77), and the consulship of P. Cornelius Scipio (IV.11.66).

9. See n. 3 above.

10. M. Haupt, "Ueber die namen des dichters Propertius," in *Mauricii Hauptii Opuscula*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1875; rpt. Hildesheim, 1967), 282; see also pp. 281 and 286.

11. E.g., H. Keil, ed., *Grammatici latini*, vol. 5 (Leipzig, 1868; rpt. Hildesheim, 1961), 576.22 (*De dubiis nominibus*, citing Propertius III.11.15). The *apparatus criticus* of this edition records *Prudentius* instead of *Propertius* in three manuscripts (Laon, Bibliothèque Municipale, 463, s. XII; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14252, s. IX; Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 89, s. IX).

12. J. L. Butrica, "Pontanus, Puccius, Pocchus, Petreius,

II.34.55–56, Propertius adds the information that besides lacking wealth he also lacked ancestors of high official standing.

Propertius' father died while he was still quite young (IV.1.127). The date of his mother's death is uncertain, though a *terminus post quem* is suggested by his assumption of the *toga virilis* in the presence of his mother's gods (IV.1.132 "matris ante deos"), and a *terminus ante quem* by II.20.15 "ossa tibi iuro per matris et ossa parentis," in a poem to be dated (see below) about 26 B.C.

Shortly after taking the *toga virilis*, Propertius had a temporary infatuation with a girl, probably a servant, whom he calls "Lycinna" (III.15.5–6, 11). Soon thereafter, perhaps two or three years later at the outside but certainly no later than 30 B.C. (the date of I.6; see below on the chronology), he was abruptly plunged into the tempestuous, and lasting, love of "Cynthia," which made a poet of him. We are informed that her real name was Hostia.¹³ Older than Propertius by some years, she was a striking beauty and (as many scholars believe) is on the whole likely to have been a *meretrix* in fact, whatever her social standing (though this is by no means an unchallenged conclusion). In II.6.1–6 she is compared with Lais, Thais, and Phryne, all celebrated "society" courtesans, while in II.16.12 her singular attention to her lovers' purses is noted ("semper amatorum ponderat una sinus"). In I.4 "she is one of a class designated as *puellae* and her vexation at the loss of a lover is spoken of as a recurrent event."¹⁴

Unlike Catullus' "Lesbia," Cynthia was not a married woman. The affair lasted about five years (III.24.23); at some point, there was a period of estrangement, lasting a year or so and followed by a reconciliation. Eventually Propertius' passion cooled, and we can trace the stages of this development, especially in the later books. In III.24 we seem to have his final farewell to Cynthia, yet IV.7 appears to imply a return of his love for her. Cynthia is represented as dying while Propertius

was still alive: one of the two Cynthia poems in book IV describes a visitation by her ghost (IV.7). The fourth book, however, largely represents a change of direction on the poet's part to writing on public themes, no doubt with the approval of the *princeps* himself.

Propertius' choice of the literary life as opposed to that of the courts of law (IV.1.133–34 "pauca suo de carmine dictat Apollo / et vetat insano verba tonare Foro") was prompted not only by the lack of wealth and familial standing but also by temperament, and possibly—a proximate cause—by the impulse to celebrate his overmastering passion for Cynthia. Despite his youth at the time when the first of his four books was completed and issued, it was soon evident that the choice he had made was correct. Book I captured the attention and speedily won the favor of a public which was ready for love poetry of such high quality as this (IV.1.133–138; see also II.1.1–2 and II.34.94). It brought him to the notice of Maecenas, whose circle of poets he joined. In addition to Ovid, his relation to whom is described as a *so-dalium* (Ovid, *Tr.* 4.10.46 and see p. 155 above), other literary men who are to be found among his friends include the epic poet Ponticus (I.7; I.9) and the iambographer Bassus (I.4); both of these persons are mentioned by Ovid (*Tr.* 4.10.47) immediately after Propertius himself. With Horace—a generation or so older—it is usually agreed that he did not get on well; the reasons for this are debatable,¹⁵ but in Horace's *Ep.* 2.2.87–101 it appears that Propertius is under attack for literary reasons. However, the conventional view of the relations between Propertius and Horace has been challenged. Referring to the lines in Horace, *Ep.* 2.2.91–92, Butrica writes: "Rather than being evidence of a quarrel, this suggests friendly emulation, as Horace describes how each flatters the other by rating him the equal of his chief model; the unexpected joke about becoming Mimnermus, and that being more than becoming Callimachus, is a pleasant jest that looks back from III.1.1 to the monobiblos, where Mimnermus is the only predecessor held up for admiration (I.9.11)."¹⁶

There is no ancient authority for the tradition-

and Propertius," *Res publica litterarum* 3 (1980) 9 n. 3 (where he disproves the frequent editorial claim that Giovanni Pontano [1429–1503] is responsible for the emendation); see also Butrica 1984, 209, no. 6.

13. Apuleius, *Apol.* 10.

14. W. A. Camps, ed., *Propertius, Elegies. Book I* (Cambridge, 1961), 6. See also Butler and Barber, eds., *The Elegies of Propertius*, xxi, and Postgate, ed., *Select Elegies*, xviii, for further indications of Cynthia's probable status as a *meretrix*. Her amateur or professional status is in doubt.

15. See Postgate, ed., *Select Elegies*, xxxii–xxxiv for a lengthy exposition of this account of the relations between Horace and Propertius.

16. J. L. Butrica, "The *Amores* of Propertius: Unity and

CHART 1.

	<i>Book I</i>	<i>Book II</i>	<i>Book III</i>	<i>Book IV</i>
P. J. Enk	29–28 B.C.	26–25 B.C.	22–21 B.C.	16+ B.C.
Butler and Barber	29–28	25	22	16+ (publication later?)
W. A. Camps	30–29	26–25	22 (III.4, preparations against Parthia)	16+ (publication later?)
G. P. Goold	30–29	by 25	23–22	16+

ally accepted numbering of the books containing the poems of Propertius.

What was Propertius' first book called? The designation *Monobiblos*¹⁷ appears only once, i.e., in the heading to Martial, *Epig.* 14.189, but not in the text of the distich itself, which (taken with Propertius II.24.2) seems to suggest that book I may have taken its formal title from the woman who is almost exclusively its subject: "Cynthia, facundi carmen iuvenale Properti, / accepit famam, nec minus ipsa dedit."¹⁸ To the entire corpus of Propertius' writings only Nonius Marcellus (*De comp. doct.*, p. 169M) gives the designation *Elegiarum libri*. This, however, is not a title, but simply a description of the kind of poetry Propertius wrote.¹⁹ The individual books were written, though not necessarily published, separately;²⁰ each of them has a poem designed to serve as prologue, and another as epilogue, with the partial exception of book IV, which has no epilogue-poem;²¹ and we have seen that in Martial's time book I still circulated independently of the others and could be recommended as a gift, complete in

itself. Although the dates of composition of the separate books must be arrived at indirectly, by inference, the suggested dates of completion advanced by twentieth-century editors agree fairly closely: see chart 1.²²

The historical events on which the suggested dates depend are chiefly the following:

Book I: I.6.19: the proconsulship (*secures*)²³ of L. Volcacius Tullus (30–29 B.C.).

I.8: later than the Illyrian War of 34 B.C.

Book II: II.10.15: Octavian is addressed as "Augustus"; therefore 27 B.C. or later. (lines 15–17): the Indian embassy to Augustus reached him in Spain (*Oros., Hist. adv. pag.* 6.21.19); we know he was in Spain 26–25 B.C. (Dio Cassius 53.25); the Arabian expedition, which ended disastrously in 24 B.C., was in preparation, and apparently set out, in 25 B.C. (Strabo 16.780); Britain, to which Augustus was going in 26 B.C. (Dio Cassius 53.25) when he was prevented by trouble in Spain.

II.7: perhaps written in 27 B.C.; it refers to the repeal of a marriage law that may have been passed in 28 B.C.

II.34.91–92: Cornelius Gallus has died "lately" (*modo*), implying a date in 27–26 B.C., or not much later (Camps, Introduction to book I, p. 7).

22. The reasons why these dates are suggested can be found in the editions cited here.

23. Rather than consulship; see the notes in Butler and Barber, eds., *The Elegies of Propertius*.

Structure in Books 2–4," *Illinois Classical Studies* 21 (1996) 133–34 n. 101.

17. See S. J. Heyworth, "Propertius: Division, Transmission, and the Editor's Task," in R. Brock and A. J. Woodman, eds., *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*, vol. 8 (Leeds, 1995), 165–85, especially 175–78.

18. The name was applied more widely in Ovid, *Rem.* 764 "cuius opus Cynthia sola fuit."

19. Butrica, "The *Amores* of Propertius," 96.

20. Ibid., especially 157 and n. 154: "It is possible that Propertius planned the project <of Books II–IV, viewed as a three-book collection to be read in sequence> from the beginning, then created and issued it in instalments, or that he originally wrote Book 2 as another monobiblos <like Book I> and then planned 3 and 4 as 'sequels' to it." This view is challenged by Tarrant, "Propertian Textual Criticism," 56 n. 52.

21. Butler and Barber, eds., *The Elegies of Propertius*, xxv.

Book III: III.18: after the death of Marcellus (23 B.C.).

III.4: the emphasis at the beginning of the poem on preparations for a military expedition against the Parthians suggests the period about 22 B.C. (and before the settlement of 20 B.C.).

Book IV: IV.11.66, consulship of P. Cornelius Scipio, 16 B.C.;

IV.6.77, submission of the Sugambri, hence a reference to the *ludi quinquennales* 16 B.C. (Dio Cassius 54.19.1, 8 and 20.4–6).

IV.6.82, adoption of Gaius and Lucius Caesar, 17 B.C.

The theory, started by Karl Lachmann in his first edition (1816) and continued in another form by Theodor Birt,²⁴ that there are really five books, not four (book II being divided, owing to its exceptional length and for other reasons), was firmly dealt with by Enk;²⁵ accordingly, the traditional number of four books has until very recent years been generally accepted by the poet's editors, though there is now a good deal of support for the five-book theory.²⁶

ANTIQUITY

The literary influence of Propertius' work can be traced, among his contemporaries most strongly in Ovid, to whom he gave two important

ideas: that of writing mythological epistles (from the Arethusa letter, IV.3), and that of writing poems about the "origins" (ἀρχαί) of public institutions and customs (book IV, followed by Ovid in the *Fasti*). But more than this, Ovid's "mind was thoroughly saturated with the poems of Propertius."²⁷ At *Tr.* 4.10.45ff., Ovid informs us that he frequently heard Propertius reciting his own poems. (Even if Ovid was only a youth when he first attended these recitations, this cannot have occurred earlier than 26 B.C., since Ovid was born in 43 B.C.). After Ovid, there was a steady current of Propertian imitation. The post-Ovidian parallel passages that strongly, or less strongly, suggest such imitation are conveniently set out—with full quotations of the lines on both sides—in the *prolegomena* to Enk's commentary on book I and in a supplementary article by D. R. Shackleton Bailey.²⁸ A. La Penna has provided a short, but acute, assessment of Propertius' continuing popularity as a model for imitation in post-Ovidian times;²⁹ to this are owed some of the observations made in the list that follows.

The *Consolatio ad Liviam* (also known as the *Epicedion Drusi* and composed in the first century B.C./A.D., though the date is highly controversial) borrows, as is natural, chiefly from the funerary elegies, such as II.13, IV.7, and IV.11. At III.18.32, on the death of Marcellus, there is at least one phrase (*corpus inane*) which was to be inherited by the author of the *Consolatio* (line 315 "Frigidus ille tibi corpusque refertur inane"). The phrase occurs, however, also in Ovid, *Amores* 3.96, and in Martial, *Epigrammata* 8.75.12. Further, at *Consolatio* 330, the line "inter honoratos excipietur avos" certainly seems to be based on Propertius IV.11.102. At *Consolatio* 359 the opening words *tendimus huc omnes* perhaps echo Propertius III.18.21; but see also Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 10.34. In the latter

24. T. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen* (Berlin, 1882; rpt. Aalen, 1974), 413–26; Birt, "Bemerkungen zum 'ersten Buche' des Properz," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, N.F., 38 (1883) 197–221, and "Zur Monobiblos und zum Codex N des Properz," *ibid.*, N.F., 64 (1909) 393–411.

25. Prolegomena to his commentary on book I (n. 4 above), 19–29. See also Butrica, "The *Amores* of Propertius" (n. 19 above).

26. For further details, see R. O. A. M. Lyne, "Propertius 2.10 and 11 and the Structure of Books '2A' and '2B,'" *Journal of Roman Studies* 88 (1998) 21–36 n. 18. Heyworth, "Propertius" (n. 17 above), 182 n. 4 contains a select bibliography of "work which has contributed to the debate." For a view of books II–IV as a *syntagma* or *tribiblos*, published together, see Butrica, "The *Amores* of Propertius," 87–158, especially 98–158. There is a bibliography of articles for and against the five-book theory in R. M. Colaizzi, "A New Voice in Roman Elegy: The Poeta of Propertius 2.1," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 136 (1993) 127 n. 1. For a concise discussion of the problem, see Tarrant, "Propertian Textual Criticism," 56–57.

27. Postgate, ed., *Select Elegies*, cxlv. See now especially K. Morgan, *Ovid's Art of Imitation: Propertius in the Amores*, Supplement 47 to *Mnemosyne* (Leiden, 1977).

28. Enk, ed., *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum liber I*, 54–77; D. R. Shackleton Bailey, "Echoes of Propertius," *Mnemosyne* 5 (1952) 307–33. In some additional notes by Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge, 1956), 268–316, Appendix and by G. B. A. Fletcher, "Propertiana," *Latomus* 19 (1960) 736–48 and 20 (1961), 85–92, there are further lists of parallel passages—not necessarily imitations—but the text is not quoted.

29. A. La Penna, *L'integrazione difficile: un profilo di Properzio* (Turin, 1977), 250–99, Appendix 2: "Appunti sulla fortuna di Properzio."

passage we may be able to restore Propertius' text from the *Consolatio ad Liviam*.³⁰ The *Elegiae in Maecenatem* (early first century A.D.) are clearly indebted to Propertius; so are Manilius and Germanicus, at about the time of the death of Augustus, and a little later Columella. In the age of Nero, we can point with assurance to Seneca the Younger, above all in his tragedies; to Lucan, who even outdoes Propertius himself in the taut boldness of his *iuncturae* or joinings of words (e.g., *Bell. civ.* 3.533 *lunata classe*, from Propertius IV.6.25 *aciem lunarat in arcus*); also to Calpurnius Siculus (*Ecl.* 1.21 *properanti falce* manifestly echoes Propertius IV.2.59); and, though somewhat less certainly, to the *Ilias latina* (for lines 233–35 see Propertius III.29–30, and for line 881 see Propertius II.34.42). Borrowings by Persius and Petronius are uncertain, or at best slight. In the same period, quotations in Pompeian and other inscriptions testify to the poet's wide popularity; the Pompeian inscriptions include three of Propertius' couplets, and a single line, scribbled informally on the walls of buildings.³¹

When we come to the Flavian age, we find a general rush of new enthusiasm for Augustan poetry, including that of Propertius. Slightly later evidence shows Propertius now well established, at least by implication, as a "classic" (La Penna's word), with much more support from the reading public than might be deduced from Quintilian's somewhat dismissive "sunt qui Propertium malint" (*Inst. or.* 10.1.93). Propertian influence is strong in Martial, and also in Statius (not only in the *Silvae*, as we might expect, but also in the *Thebaid*). It may be remarked that Statius, like Lucan, relished the bold and crisp *iunctura*: *Theb.* 12.170 *tigridis . . . ieiunum murmur* is based on Propertius IV.5.4 *ieiuno . . . sono*, of Cerberus' barking. That influence is much more frequently attested in Silius Italicus than in Valerius Flaccus, though the latter also had a taste for "Propertian" junctures; compare, e.g., *Arg.* 7.525 *torsit sibila* with Propertius IV.8.8 *ex ima sibila torquet humo*. It is present, to some extent, in Juvenal,

who shows a limited number of (quite certain) borrowings; evident once again is the appeal of a phrase like *surdo remige* (Propertius III.12.34), which reappears, inverted, at Juvenal, *Sat.* 9.150.

In later antiquity, especially during and after the "renaissance" of the fourth century A.D., Propertius—though his popularity trails far behind that of Virgil, Horace, or Ovid—is by no means eliminated from the canon of standard authors. Lactantius (*Div. inst.* 2.6.14) cites the text of IV.1.11–14 (ordered 13–14, 11–12 by Fedeli).³² As for poetic imitations, we are not quite certain of Prudentius, and quotations in Ausonius are rare. Claudian, however, was a warm admirer and frequent imitator, especially in his shorter poems; as La Penna notes, *carmina minora* 30.42ff. recalls Propertius IV.11.29ff. This seems to support our impression of the public's familiarity with the work of Propertius as a whole.³³ In Rutilius Namatianus there are rare, but quite certain, traces: e.g., at *De reditu suo* 1.591 (echoing Propertius IV.1.79) and 2.62 (echoing Propertius II.30.14). Other imitations can be traced, particularly in Dracontius, Sidonius Apollinaris, and Venantius Fortunatus; consequently, we may say with confidence that in the fifth century Propertius was quite widely known and read in Gaul and in Africa; in Gaul, even as late as the sixth century. Boethius, however, exhibits only a very few traces of Propertius.

There may be signs of Propertian influence in the works of some late Greek epigrammatists, especially (it has been claimed) Paulus Silentiarius in the sixth century, though it is more likely that both authors borrowed independently from collections of earlier Greek epigrams.³⁴ By this period, however, Propertius had fallen out of the list of classical Roman poets who circulated widely. As a kind of postscript, nevertheless, one scholar adds the name of a Greek writer of iambic verse about the twelfth century, and finds in his works eighteen passages apparently involving Propertian imitation.³⁵

30. At Propertius III.18.21, J.L. Butrica, in his unpublished commentary on Propertius book III, reads *tendimus huc omnes*.

31. Enk, ed., *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum liber I*, p. 27. See also Bailey, "Echoes of Propertius," 329–31 for quotations in the *Carmina epigraphica* not mentioned in the edition of C. Hosius.

32. Butrica 1984, 19.

33. Bailey, "Echoes of Propertius," 307.

34. For Paulus Silentiarius, see W.A.B. Hertzberg, ed., *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Elegiarum libri quattuor*, vol. 1 (Halle, 1843), 230. More recently, J.C. Yardley, "Paulus Silentiarius, Ovid, and Propertius," *Classical Quarterly*, N.S., 30 (1980) 239–43 has mustered strong reasons to doubt the direct influence of Propertius on Paulus Silentiarius.

35. Postgate, ed., *Select Elegies*, cxlvi–cxlvii.

It should be noticed that there are, in general, very few references to Propertius in the grammarians.³⁶ Donatus (*Vita Virgilii* 45) has already been mentioned (he quotes Propertius I.34.65–66). Charisius (Keil, *Grammatici latini* 1.89:23) quotes Propertius II.13.35 for *pulvis* as feminine (though there is also an example at I.22.6). Earlier, in the first century A.D., Caesius Bassus (Keil, *Grammatici latini* 6.264:10) cited Propertius II.1.2, thus proving that the works, and not only book I as we might suppose from Martial, circulated among the public of his time (that is, in the principate of Nero). In four places the grammarians' citations provide valuable information concerning the history of the poet's text.³⁷

THE MIDDLE AGES

Thanks to some recent research, we can no longer say without qualification that Propertius' works were unknown until the age of Petrarch. It is in France rather than Italy, and even there only in limited regions around Orléans and (probably) Paris, that Propertius seems to have been read and studied in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Whether he was known at all in the Carolingian period is a matter for speculation, and the indications on which an inference might be based are slight indeed.³⁸ Several pieces of early

evidence suggest that we should probably posit at the head of the existing tradition a lost manuscript in which the poet's name was either not given at all or given in a garbled form. No name was given in the original form of our two oldest manuscripts: in N (as noted on p. 155 above) *Incipit Propertius* is added by a second hand; in Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. lat. O.38 (= A), copied ca. 1230–50 for the library of Richard of Fournival, the title was almost certainly added by Richard himself.³⁹ The name is given as "Propitius" in the 1338 Sorbonne catalogue, and we have already indicated a citation of one line by a grammarian with an attribution to "Prudentius."⁴⁰ Like Lucretius, whose name was omitted or erased in the two earliest manuscripts of the *De rerum natura*,⁴¹ Propertius (we may speculate) had perhaps fallen under ecclesiastical censure, not for atheism as in Lucretius' case but for *lascivitas*. According to Quintilian, *Inst. or.* 10.1.93, Ovid is *lascivior*, but see Martial, *Epig.* 8.73.5 "Cynthia te vatem fecit, lascive Properti."

Be that as it may, the absence of the author's name from the archetypal manuscript would be the most likely reason why that name might have been dropped from a library catalogue.⁴² Given some indications that the texts of Tibullus and Propertius marched together in the early stages of the developing tradition and the inclusion of a Tibullus manuscript in a catalogue sometimes "believed to represent the court collection of ca. 790," Butrica has cautiously inferred that a Propertius manuscript, though without attribution and hence omitted from the catalogue, may also have belonged to that collection.⁴³

could have come from a collection of *sententiae* or a glossary, rather than from direct access to a manuscript of Propertius.

39. Butrica, "The *Amores* of Propertius" (n. 16 above), 89: "The archetype did not even name the author." See also Butrica 1984, 25: "... the absence of any indication of authorship may well be the most decisive reason for the long neglect of Propertius in the Middle Ages."

40. See n. 11 above.

41. Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. lat. F.30 (= O) and Voss. lat. F.94 (= Q). On the evidence for the erasure of the name of Propertius, see Butrica 1984, 24–25.

42. Butrica 1984, 30 and n. 36.

43. Butrica 1984, 30 and n. 37. On the presence of Tibullus in this catalogue, see M.D. Reeve and R.H. Rouse, "Tibullus," in *Texts and Transmission*, 421. They also appear to accept Bernhard Bischoff's attribution of the catalogue to the court library at Aachen. See, however, C. Villa,

36. See Butler and Barber, eds., *The Elegies of Propertius*, xxxii: "There are sixteen certain citations of Propertius in later Latin literature and the Pompeian wall inscriptions. It is curious that all come from Bks. II, III, or IV, while only a single dubious echo of Bk. I (sc. I.1.5) can be traced. These citations come mostly from the grammarians of the fourth century; the latest is apparently the quotation of IV.1.13 by Isidore (7th cent.)." [Isid., *Etym.* 18.4]. See also the *addenda* to Butrica 1984, 30–32, where a list is given of fourteen citations taken from Keil's *Grammatici latini*, from Nonius Marcellus, and from Servius. For the Pompeian inscriptions (four passages in all), see above and n. 31. It should be added that in the seventh-century treatise *De dubiis nominibus* (Keil, *Grammatici latini* 5.592:5) Propertius is reported to give *torques* in the feminine, presumably at IV.10.44, but the actual words of the citation have disappeared from the text (Enk, ed., *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum liber I*, 27).

37. The passages in question are listed in Butrica 1984, 19–20.

38. Ibid., 20–22. R.J. Tarrant, "Propertius," in *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, ed. L.D. Reynolds (Oxford, 1983), 324–26 is based on Butrica's 1978 thesis (the version in book form had, of course, not yet been published) and speaks (in n. 1) of the "imitations" of Propertius in Alcuin and Ermolaus Nigellus. Tarrant suggests that they

In the twelfth century there is cogent evidence that John of Salisbury (d. 1180) read the whole text of Propertius, not merely extracts from a *florilegium*, and formed some sort of mental picture of the poet and his circumstances.⁴⁴ About the same period, there are three or four lines in the comedy *Pamphilus* (written at or near Orléans) which look very like Propertian imitations.⁴⁵ At a somewhat later date (mid-thirteenth century) Propertian echoes have been detected in the epic poem *Troilus* by Albert of Stade.⁴⁶

Nevertheless, the surviving manuscripts are generally late and poor in quality. After N was

"La tradizione di Orazio e la 'biblioteca di Carlo Magno': per l'elenco di opere nel codice Berlin, Diez B Sant. 66," in *Formative Stages of Classical Traditions: Latin Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance. Proceedings of a conference held at Erice, 16-22 October 1993, as the 6th Course of International School for the Study of Written Records*, ed. O. Pecere and M. D. Reeve (Spoleto, 1995), 299-322 and 3 plates. Rejecting the views of Traube and Bischoff, Villa contends that the list on pp. 218-19 in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Diez B Sant. 66, s. VIII ex. did not emanate from the northern court at Aachen, but came rather from an Italian source. Her interpretation has been received favorably.

44. John of Salisbury, *De septem septenis*, prologue ("Propertius vero scripsit Augusto; quoniam et in ipso studiorum spes erat et ratio") in *Opera omnia*, ed. J. A. Giles, vol. 5 (Oxford, 1848), 209; see Butrica 1984, 23-24. John's authorship of this work was denied, on very unconvincing grounds, in the nineteenth century and, unfortunately, the denial has been accepted, without proper examination, as authoritative.

45. F. G. Becker, ed., *Pamphilus. Prolegomena zum Pamphilus (de amore) und kritische Textausgabe*, Beihefte zum "Mittelateinischen Jahrbuch" 9 (Ratingen, 1972): lines 237 (I.12.5), 414 (II.15.30), 420 (I.32.2), and 641 (I.5.30). See Butrica 1984, 22-23 and Tarrant, "Propertius," 324 and n. 3.

46. C. J. Crowley, "Echoes of Propertius in the *Troilus* of Albert of Stade," *Romanitas* 6-7 (1965) 83-89. T. Gärtner, *Klassische Vorbilder mittelalterlicher Trojaepen* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1999) has the complete text on pp. 417-549 and a list of what are claimed as Propertian imitations on pp. 571-72. Nevertheless, examination of that list evokes the same negative conclusion as Butrica 1984, 27 reached concerning the passages in Albert that C. Hosius had claimed as Propertian imitations, with the reservation that those that deserve serious attention might (as Hosius himself suggested) "come at second hand from a yet unnoticed literary source." As Butrica observes, it is very hard to believe in the accessibility of a Propertius manuscript in the vicinity of Hamburg at this date; and there is no evidence that Albert studied at Paris or Orléans. On the other hand, there is at least one line of an *Ilias*, written by a twelfth-century canon who did live in Paris, that arguably imitates Propertius III.7.42 and may well have been taken from a manuscript of the poet; see Butrica 1984, 28.

produced around 1200, only a thin thread of textual tradition can be traced before the middle of the fifteenth century, at which time, approximately, the poems began to be extensively copied in Italy. N certainly originated in northern France.⁴⁷ Manuscript A now ends at *Eleg.* II.1.63 and is a sister manuscript of N; both of them derive independently from the same source-manuscript, with no intermediary in either instance. Because A is incomplete, we have to arrive at its readings by inspection of the derivatives of Petrarch's lost manuscript; for these, see p. 162 below. A was produced in the region of Orléans for the library of Richard de Fournival of Amiens (d. 1260), who lists both Tibullus and Propertius in his *Biblionomia*.⁴⁸ It was in Orléans, too, that he acquired both his Tibullus and his Propertius; in the latter case, the manuscript must have been the (lost) source of N and also of A.⁴⁹ The text of Tibullus had a very limited circulation; a common interest in him links Fournival to the *Florilegium Gallicum* (apparently written in Orléans) of a century earlier, whose compiler cites Tibullus, though not Propertius.⁵⁰

Among those thirteenth-century florilegia that have a common source with Fournival's text, some extracts from Propertius are found in Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 2120 (a *membrum disiectum* of Paris, BNF, lat. 15155, probably written in Orléans).⁵¹ The contents of Reg. lat. 2120 imply that the writer knew the whole text of Propertius.⁵² If Reg. lat. 2120 derives from the source-manuscript, as seems most probable, then that source-manuscript itself was probably written "in or near Orléans"⁵³ in the thirteenth century. The Vatican florilegium cannot derive from N, since it

47. Butrica 1984, 323-25, no. 137.

48. R. H. Rouse, "Manuscripts Belonging to Richard de Fournival," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 3 (1973) 253-69, especially 267-68.

49. R. H. Rouse, "Florilegia and Latin Classical Authors in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Orléans," *Viator* 10 (1979) 155.

50. R. Burton, *Classical Poets in the "Florilegium Gallicum"*, *Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters* 14 (Frankfurt and Bern, 1983), 83-84.

51. D. M. Robathan, "The Missing Folios of the Paris Florilegium 15155," *Classical Philology* 33 (1938) 188-97; see Rouse, "Florilegia and Latin Classical Authors," 148 and Butrica 1984, 25.

52. Rouse, *ibid.*, 148.

53. Butrica 1984, 26; Fleury is the most likely place for the copying of the source-manuscript.

has *enumerat* at *Eleg.* II.1.44, where N gives *et numerat*. In an annotated codex of Papias (Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 276) that is contemporary with those manuscripts,⁵⁴ the text of four lines cited (and one merely alluded to) from Propertius evidently derives from the source-manuscript; no more than Reg. lat. 2120 can this text have come from N, since it has the correct reading *beryllon* at *Eleg.* IV.7.9, where N gives *beryllos*.⁵⁵ In short, both Reg. lat. 2120 and Bern 276 derive from sources earlier than N (or A, which is later).

THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES

In due course, A found its way to the library of the Sorbonne and there was copied twice in the fourteenth century. One of these copies is the florilegium preserved in Paris, BNF, lat. 16708, which also contains extracts from Tibullus.⁵⁶ The other copy, as Ullman argued persuasively, was the manuscript owned by Petrarch.⁵⁷ Petrarch's manuscript, apparently now lost, came to stand at the head of a large family of manuscripts, beginning with F (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 36.49), made for Coluccio Salutati in 1380, five years after Petrarch's death, and including L (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Holkham Misc. 36), P (Paris, BNF, lat. 7989), and Z (Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Zan. lat. 443 [1912]).⁵⁸ FLP, together with the Paris florilegium, are sometimes useful for supplying the missing parts of A. Until after 1400, however, it is possible that no one apart from Petrarch and Salutati consulted any of the manuscripts belonging to the "A-group," that is, the group of manuscripts

closely related to A, even though some of them had been accessible at least in a few places in Italy since the decades around 1350.⁵⁹ As for N, it did not circulate in Italy until late in the fifteenth century. Modern scholars are in general agreement that N and the incomplete A represent two major branches of the tradition. The possibility of a third major branch, consisting of a lost manuscript and its mostly late descendants, is more controversial; whether it exists, and if so, what its relation is to N or A or both may perhaps be considered as the most hotly debated questions in Propertian textual research at the time of writing. The lost source is designated X by Butrica and A by Heyworth. Butrica has provided grounds to suggest for it a date "perhaps about contemporary with N."⁶⁰ For reasons that will be given presently, Butrica also describes the lost source as Poggio's manuscript, or as the *vetustus codex* of Berardino Valla.⁶¹ A copy of this lost source is found in Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 3273, copied at Florence in 1427 by Antonio Beccadelli (Panormita),⁶² and there are copies in five other manuscripts, all considerably later in date, of which four were written in Florence and one (by Pomponio Leto) in Rome.⁶³ By inspection of these manuscripts we may confidently determine that their source did not make a division between poems II.26 and II.27, whereas both N and A divided them.⁶⁴ Again, Panormita notes that his exemplar did not make divisions between poems II.9 and 10, and between II.10 and 11. N, however, does so.⁶⁵ Here, then, we appear to have something standing on its own, whether or not a twin of N (as Butrica believes, citing a good deal of further evidence) or a more independent branch, as Heyworth maintains.

54. Rouse, "Florilegia and Latin Classical Authors," 144.

55. Butrica 1984, 26.

56. Rouse, "Manuscripts Belonging to Richard de Fournival," 267–68; Butrica 1984, 38 and 58 n. 4. On Paris, BNF, lat. 16708, see P. W. Damon, "A Second Propertius Florilegium," *Classical Philology* 48 (1953) 96–97.

57. B. L. Ullman, "The Manuscripts of Propertius," *Classical Philology* 6 (1911) 285–97.

58. Ullman, *ibid.*, 289; A. C. Ferguson, *The Manuscripts of Propertius* (Diss. Chicago, 1934), 34–61 on the correcting hands down to F4, and see also Butrica 1984, 223 on these same hands. The stemma in Butrica 1984, 54 shows F and Z as having been copied directly from Petrarch's manuscript, but L and P as copied from a copy of this. However, S. J. Heyworth, reviewing Butrica 1984 (*Classical Review*, N.S., 36 [1986] 45–48), presents strong evidence against Butrica's claim that Z is a direct copy of Petrarch's manuscript.

59. See Butrica 1984, 96.

60. *Ibid.*, 81.

61. See the detailed account in *ibid.*, 62–95.

62. *Ibid.*, 312–13, no. 125.

63. They are as follows: Munich, Universitätsbibliothek, 8° Cod. ms. 291 (= Cim. 22) (a. 1460–70); Paris, BNF, lat. 8233 (a. 1465); Cologny-Genève, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, lat. 141 (a. 1466); Vatican City, BAV, Urb. lat. 641 (a. 1465–70); and Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, 15 (a. 1470 or 1471). The last of these was written by Pomponio Leto. Tarrant, "Propertius" (n. 38 above), 325 n. 18 gives a few further particulars of these five manuscripts.

64. In 1502 Francesco Pucci noted that Berardino's manuscript failed to make the division in question (Butrica 1984, 80–81).

65. Butrica 1984, 76.

The history of X, as given by Butrica, is briefly this. The manuscript was acquired by Poggio Bracciolini on his travels, perhaps in France on his way to England (which he visited in 1418).⁶⁶ In 1427, Poggio sent X to Niccolò Niccoli in Florence; Panormita may have seen it there, since he was in Florence until late 1427, the year in which his own manuscript can be dated. Later, X was owned by Berardino Valla, at whose house it was seen in 1484 by Angelo Poliziano.⁶⁷ In 1502, Francesco Pucci added to his commentary (I.12 below) the observation that he had annotated Propertius "secutus fidem antiquissimi codicis qui primum fuit Bernardini [sic] Vallae," remarking further that Valla had presented the codex to the king of Naples. Readings characteristic of N, which are shared in considerable numbers by X, are discussed by Butrica 1984, chapter 3. They form part of the reason why Propertian textual critics of the conservative school are still inclined to adhere to the view that N itself was the manuscript that Poggio brought to Italy, and that there is no good evidence for a third (lost) manuscript source of equal rank to stand beside N and A in the stemma of Propertius.

We have noted that Panormita was in Florence until late 1427. His friend, the enterprising bookseller Giovanni Aurispa, was also in Florence at that time. Aurispa then moved to Ferrara, where descendants of X began to multiply in the period up to 1450.⁶⁸ Panormita's autograph of the text of Propertius (Vat. lat. 3273) has some marginal notes in "a slightly later hand," which Butrica tentatively attributes to Pontano; these notes, however, are too few and too slight to constitute a commentary.⁶⁹

It has been suggested that Pontano himself may have found a text of Propertius in northern Italy, perhaps in or near Ferrara, before he went to Naples in 1448 (he entered the service of the

king of Naples in the previous year, while the king was abroad on campaign).⁷⁰ Pontano's autograph manuscript of Propertius, which he copied at Naples in 1460, is now Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lat. fol. 500. This manuscript has a commentary (I.1.b below), which was added to by its author for forty years or more.⁷¹ Pontano also wrote, in the same year, another and more elementary set of annotations, on a text not copied by himself, and these notes are preserved in Valencia, Biblioteca Universitaria, 725 (I.1.a below). At present, he is the earliest known commentator on Propertius.

In Rome, between 1450 and 1470, there was a flourishing school of Propertian scribes and commentators, with links to the methods and interests of Pomponio Leto and the members of his Academy. To this school we owe several early extant commentaries on the poet, and they were directed to the needs of students. Because Propertius makes so much use of mythological references, these notes are to a considerable extent designed to explicate myth and religion, history and topography, for the benefit of such students as actually lived in Rome and could visit its monuments. The very ample anonymous commentary preserved in St. Petersburg, Rossiiskaia Natsionalnaia Biblioteka, Cl. lat. Q 12 (I.2 below) appears to be the oldest commentary produced in the "Roman school." Covering books I and II only and copied by Marianus de Magistris in 1463 at Rome, both the Latin text of Propertius and accompanying commentary reflect the strong local tradition of Propertian study. This Roman tradition is also exemplified for us in the anonymous commentary found in Vatican City, BAV, Chigi H.IV.137 (I.3 below), which, unfortunately, covers only *Eleg.* I.1–II.6. A third commentary of Roman origin is likewise anonymous and deals with books I and II only; this is to be found in Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 1611 (I.5 below),

66. Ibid., 172.

67. Poliziano, *Miscellanea* (Florence, 1489) says he saw this *vetustus codex* at Valla's house five years earlier (Butrica 1984, 80 and 92 n. 20).

68. Butrica 1984, 100 and especially nn. 4 and 5. Aurispa was, of course, not merely a bookseller. He offered a supplement, apparently his own, for the line (missing in a considerable number of manuscripts) at Tibullus 3.4.65 ("saevus amor docuit validos temptare labores"), as is recorded, e.g., in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud. lat. 77, fol. 21r.

69. Butrica 1984, 66 (where he describes them as "glosses") and 312, no. 125.

70. Butrica 1984, 106–7. Note, however, that this possibility is not discussed in Butrica's more recent study "Propertius and the Myth of the Itali."

71. B. L. Ullman, "Pontano's Handwriting and the Leiden Manuscript of Tacitus and Suetonius," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 2 (1959) 309–35, especially 334–35 and pls. 26–28 (reprinted in Ullman's *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 2d ed., [Rome, 1973], 401–28, especially 427–28 and pls. 23–28); Butrica 1978, 420–33 ("Appendix 4: Conjectures of Pontano"); Butrica 1984, 209–10, no. 6; Butrica, "Propertius and the Myth of the Itali," 377–88.

copied ca. 1470. Another interesting commentary (I.7 below), also of Roman origin and unedited, was composed by Gaspere Manio; it is now Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 1612, with a subscription bearing an original date of 1470.⁷²

An important non-Roman figure who intervenes in this period is Pacificus Maximus Irinaeus (I.4 below). A professor at Perugia, he annotated there, at various times, the manuscript that is now London, British Library, Egerton 3027; this codex was copied in 1467 and later used as a base text by Joseph Justus Scaliger (I.15 below).

We now enter the period of the first printed editions of Propertius. Two of these, both published in Venice, bear the date 1472. Of these, the *editio princeps* is almost certainly that which has been attributed to the printer Federicus de Comitibus (CR 4888; dated in February). It contains only the *Elegies* of Propertius, according to the bibliographies; but a text of Tibullus (C 5830) seems originally to have been attached to it.⁷³ The evident source of its text—and also of that of the Δ family of later manuscripts—is Z (p. 162 above), written at Padua in 1453.⁷⁴ The other Venice edition of 1472, containing Tibullus, Propertius, and Catullus, as well as Statius' *Silvae*, was printed by Vindelinius de Spira (H 4758*); its source, as Butrica has suggested, was either Vatican City, BAV, Barb. lat. 34, or a manuscript closely related thereto.⁷⁵ Its text is contaminated and undistinguished; but thanks to the Milan edition, with corrections, of 1475 (HC 4759, edited perhaps by Bonus Accursius), and later the two 1481 editions, produced respectively in Vicenza (H 4760*, edited by Giovanni Calfurnio) and in Reggio Emilia (H 4757*), and their derivatives, it had a numerous progeny.

72. This date was later altered to 1480; for more detailed information, see I.7 below.

73. D. Coppini, "Il commento a Properzio di Domizio Calderini," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, Classe di lettere e filosofia, 3d Ser., 9.3 (1979) 1162–63.

74. Butrica 1984, 318, no. 131, where the manuscript is described as "a generally reliable direct descendant of Petrarch's copy from about 2.29 to the end." See, however, n. 58 above for another view.

75. Ibid., 145. K. Fischer, *Die Codices recentiores und die Inkunabeln des Properz* (Diss. Vienna, 1964), 48–53 held that Barb. lat. 34 was not the source of the 1472 de Spira edition but was, in fact, derived from that edition. To this the readings cited by A. Rose, *Filippo Beroaldo der Ältere und sein Beitrag zur Properz-Überlieferung* (Munich and Leipzig, 2001), 248–49, are an adequate reply.

The *Elucubratio in quaedam Propertii loca quae difficiliora videbantur* of Domizio Calderini (I.6 below) was first published in 1475 at Rome. Calderini was a Veronese scholar who came to Rome by way of Venice and attained a responsible office at the papal court.⁷⁶ As the title implies, the *Elucubratio* is not a continuous line-by-line exposition of a text, with classroom needs in mind—indeed, he prints no text—but an examination, often at considerable length, of selected passages which seemed to Calderini to need, or to deserve, extensive discussion. It is followed by the *Ex tertio libro Observationum*, an appendix consisting of "sample discussions" of linguistic topics deriving from texts taken from a variety of other authors. The grammatical (linguistic) work of Calderini also set a fashion, to be followed by the elder Beroaldo, Pontano, Poliziano, and others.⁷⁷ Antonio Volsco's 1482 text is based on the Vicenza 1481 edition,⁷⁸ and through this on the *editio princeps*; but for his 1488 second edition, which also included a commentary (I.9 below), Volsco depends on Reggio 1481,⁷⁹ and hence ultimately on de Spira 1472. In 1487 Beroaldo had produced at Bologna an edition with a commentary (I.8 below), using Vicenza 1481 as a base instead of Volsco's 1482 text.⁸⁰ Thereafter the textual future lay with Beroaldo, whose edition of the *Elegies* was reprinted frequently—at Venice in 1491, 1493, and 1500 (his commentary was included in all three editions) and at Paris in 1499 (without his commentary), to take only a few notable dates—and served as the basis of the first Aldine in 1502. Beroaldo's text continued to be reprinted in *variorum* editions, thus influencing the vulgate for many generations. In contrast, Volsco's commentary of 1488, for all its merits (see I.9 below), must be said to have, in a manner of speaking, run into the sand; it had only a solitary reincarnation; this was published outside Italy (Leipzig, 1495).⁸¹

76. He was Apostolic Secretary under Pope Paul II and had a chair at the Studio from 1470/71 onwards. See "Calderini, Domizio," DBI 16.597–605 (A. Perosa).

77. See Perosa, *ibid.*, 602 on the inspiring effect of the *Ex tertio libro Observationum* (as a new kind of scholarship) on Beroaldo and Poliziano.

78. Butrica 1984, 164.

79. Ibid., 161.

80. Ibid., 164.

81. A moderately interesting commentary, as far as I.16.1, exists in a copy of Volsco's 1482 edition that is now London,

There is a body of glosses, written by Poliziano in the margins of a copy of the 1472 de Spira edition of Propertius and other poets; these notes (I.10 below), dated 1485, represent an interest in Propertius maintained by Poliziano from early youth onwards. He found the state of the text deplorable, and in seeking to improve it he took readings from an old manuscript; these he listed in a separate notebook, now evidently lost. He also used the work of Calderini.

The Venice edition of 1500 containing the poems of Tibullus, Catullus, and Propertius lists among its contents *Annotationes in Propertium* by Giovanni Cotta (I.11 below), but the work was not actually included in the volume and is otherwise unknown.

THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

The first Aldine edition in 1502 was based on Beroaldo's 1487 Latin text of the *Elegies* and initiated the period of wide distribution of Propertius' poems, together with those of Catullus and Tibullus. In the same year, Francesco Pucci (Franciscus Puccius)—a pupil of Poliziano with a strong interest in grammar—wrote a series of notes barely amounting to a commentary, which took account of the work of Pontano; these notes (I.12 below) were copied and recopied for several decades.⁸² As for the text, the primacy of the first Aldine was reinforced particularly in France by counterfeit "Aldine" editions produced in Lyons,

beginning in 1503. There were also Giuntine editions, published in Florence, which similarly reprinted the first Aldine text. The second (and better) Aldine edition, of 1515, was again repeatedly counterfeited in Lyons (1518, 1534, 1537, 1539, 1542, 1544, 1549, 1551). A number of Paris editions appeared as well: 1529 and 1533 (copied again from the first Aldine, with further reprints in 1542, 1543, and 1554). In Venice, the editions of 1520, of Melchior Sessa (an entrepreneur who made a great business out of the production of school texts in heavy demand) in 1531, and of 1549 (taken from Gryphius' fourth Lyons edition and corrected from the second Aldine) all followed the Aldine example. Finally, the second Aldine edition itself was the starting point from which a new French luminary of scholarship, who worked in Venice—Marcus Antonius Muretus (Marc-Antoine Muret, I.13 below)—initiated a new text, accompanied by a commentary or "Scholia in Propertium." The volume was published at Venice in 1558, and in both text and commentary he showed a healthy disrespect for his predecessors. His edition ousted all others until the advent of Joseph Justus Scaliger, who, by relying for his text on a single manuscript, laid the (uncertain) foundation for the next stage.

The edition of Muretus contained a larger element of purely literary interpretation than any before it. This coincided with an eager interest, especially in France (among the poets of the Pléiade, above all), in the *tresviri amoris*—Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius—and Ovid as models for imitation. In fact, Muretus himself was personally close to the circles of the Pléiade. (We shall see this mutual influence of scholarship and literary creation repeated in The Netherlands at the century's end, in the person, for example, of Janus Dousa the Elder).⁸³ Yet just as Muretus' commentary strove to place something more strictly controlled by the principles of literary criticism, as they were understood in his day, in place of the textual speculations and the extravagant displays of mythical learning and knowledge of antiqui-

BL, IA 18812 (Hain 13402). It consists of interlinear glosses with a few marginal notes: *Inc.* [fol. 1r] *Cynthia prima* (I.1.1). *Mea domina ante omnes mulieres. . . / . . . Expl.* [fol. 13v] *Deforor* (I.16.48; -fe- leg.). *Agitor. Invidia. Perpetuo odio.* Sometimes these notes outline the theme of the poem, or the situation described by the poet. The margins (and sometimes the bottoms of pages) are badly cropped, so that often only part of a note can be read. Parts of the text receive no annotation at all (the whole of *Elegy* I.2, for example). Nevertheless, the anonymous annotator has read further in Propertius, if we may judge from his quotation of II.4.7 at the top of fol. 1v. He is fairly well informed: on fols. 1r–5r, he mentions Apollonius Rhodius, Diodorus Siculus, Plautus, Ovid (*Amores*), Strabo (twice), and Justin. He does not venture to discuss, much less to correct, textual problems. The marginal glosses are of an elementary kind; sometimes they are wrong, e.g., on fol. 1r at I.1.16, where *tantum* is rendered by *solum*. This volume also contains on its flyleaf a *Vita* of Propertius, on which see Butrica 1978, 445–47.

82. See CTC 7.243–49.

83. See J. A. van Dorsten, *Poets, Patrons and Professors: Sir Philip Sidney, Daniel Rogers, and the Leiden Humanists* (Leiden and London, 1962), 1, 4, 8, 33–47 (especially 36), 82–84, 122. For a short list of Dousa's works see C. L. Heesakkers, *Praecidanea Dousana: Materials for a Biography of Janus Dousa Pater (1545–1604)*. *His Youth* (Amsterdam, 1976), 181–85 and also 113.

ties that had filled the pages of his predecessors, so Joseph Justus Scaliger, whose Paris edition of 1577 (with commentary) was explicitly designed as a challenge to that of Muretus, attempted to draw the attention of scholars from a poem's purely literary qualities back to its text, or, from another point of view, forward, to certain considerations related to the reconstruction of the text itself; and these have at times a distinctly modern air. Scaliger was, for example, the first Propertian commentator (see I.15 below) to argue for the possibility that a considerable amount of displacement of the poet's couplets had occurred in the course of transmission.

The Antwerp house of Plantin began to print Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius in 1560. In 1569 it published an important edition of the three poets. The Propertius section of this new edition was edited by Willem Canter, who provided notes consisting of new readings, references, and brief explanations (below, I.14 Gulielmus Canterus). Canter's notes also included the variant readings of Victor Giselinus, who had edited the Catullus section of the 1569 edition. Certainly one of the most notable sixteenth-century editions after that of Muretus, it was reprinted more than once, at Lyons (first in 1573) and Antwerp (1582). In Leiden, however, Scaliger's commentary retained its influence even before he migrated there in 1590 at the instance of Janus Dousa the Elder. An equal enthusiasm for Scaliger's Propertian scholarship was shown by Dousa's son, Janus Dousa the Younger, who in 1592 included his father's *In Propertium Notae reliquae sive Paralipomena* in his own *Coniectanea et notae* on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius (I.16, 17 below), published at Plantin's Leiden press.⁸⁴

A Paris edition of 1604, under the name of Claude Morel, contains the first *variorum* commentary, embracing the contributions of Beroaldo, Muretus, Scaliger, the Dousas (father and son), and others. The opposition that soon developed to Scaliger's habit of bold correction and to some other features of his work was represented, in France at least, by Johannes Passeratius (Jean Passerat, I.18 below), whose notes on Propertius were published posthumously at Paris in 1608 and acquired in turn a considerable influence on

the course of Propertian studies.⁸⁵ Another commentary, that of Johannes Livineius (Jan Lievens, 1546?–99; I.19 below), also appeared posthumously. Edited by Jan Gebhard, who added some notes of his own, it was published at Frankfurt in 1621 and quoted, as authoritative in later *variorum* editions.⁸⁶

After this, the move to a new age, at least in the improvement of textual studies, was signalled by Isaac Voss' edition and commentary on Catullus (London, 1684); here, for the first time, a text was based on the systematic examination of a wide range of manuscripts.⁸⁷ In 1702 came Jan van Broekhuizen's Amsterdam edition of Propertius (second edition, 1727), which carried on the philological search for good readings in the light of the manuscripts.

LATER DEVELOPMENTS

The earlier part of the eighteenth century is marked, and may perhaps in some sense be said to be dominated, by Broekhuizen's editions of 1702 and 1727. The editions of Johannes Antonius Vulpus (Giovanni Antonio Volpi), published at Padua in 1710 and 1754–55, added little in the way of either text criticism or interpretation and merely imported a considerable number of further illustrative parallels from other authors, including (in the 1754–55 edition) a shortened and adapted form of Passeratius' commentary. Later in the century Pieter Burman (1713–78) followed the editorial example of Broekhuizen but died before he could finish his work; the edition was completed by Laurens van Santen and published at Utrecht in 1780. It should be noted that both Broekhuizen and Burman–van Santen approached the task of an editor by way of a somewhat uncritical accumulation of readings from manuscripts, incunabula, and collations, with no serious attempt to evaluate the relative authority of each kind of witness to the readings.⁸⁸ The text of the *editio Bipontina* (1783) ultimately rests on

85. This edition also included the texts of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius as well as Passeratius' commentaries on Catullus (discussed in CTC 7.275–76) and Tibullus.

86. See for example the anonymous Cambridge edition of 1702 (published by Jacob Tonson), under the name of Jan Gebhard.

87. See CTC 7.216.

88. Butrica 1984, 3.

84. Heesakkers, *Praecidanea Dousana*, 136.

that of Beroaldo and is supplemented by a useful list of previously published commentaries.⁸⁹

Next we come to the "philological age," largely under German auspices, of the nineteenth century, which for Propertian studies must be deemed to begin with Karl Lachmann's first edition, published at Leipzig in 1816. The merit of this edition resides (as with Lachmann's work on Catullus and especially Lucretius) in the method he directed towards establishing a "scientific" text and apparatus; it does not—in this instance, any more than in the others we have mentioned—rest on his choice of manuscripts. In 1843–45, W.A.B. Hertzberg's edition in three volumes (with commentary) appeared at Halle. It is sober, comprehensive, and even today still useful in places. Only in 1880 did Emil Baehrens produce an edition that at last grappled with the real problem of classifying the extant manuscripts.⁹⁰ J. P. Postgate, in his London 1881 edition entitled *Select Elegies of Propertius*, provided a great deal of helpful interpretation of the poems; his complete text (London, 1894) had no commentary attached. Max Rothstein's 1898 Berlin edition (second edition, 1920 and 1924) enriched and expanded the commentary in successive stages.

The twentieth century witnessed considerable work on Propertius. J. S. Phillimore (in 1901) and Carl Hosius (in 1911) published conservative text-editions. O. L. Richmond produced in 1928 a thoughtful and elaborate textually oriented edition, marred by some eccentricities which could have been easily avoided. The joint edition of H. E. Butler and E. A. Barber with commentary (Oxford, 1933) is still frequently consulted. P. J. Enk's Leiden edition, with a useful Latin introduction and commentary, is limited to the first two books (book I, 1946; book II, 1962). E. A. Barber's Oxford Classical Text of 1953 had a second (revised) edition in 1960. W. A. Camps provided an interpretative commentary in four volumes (book I, 1961; book II, 1967; book III, 1966; book IV, 1965). In 1979, Rudolf Hanslik pro-

duced at Leipzig a modern Teubner text; another Teubner edition, that of Paolo Fedeli, appeared at Stuttgart in 1984. (Fedeli had previously published editions of book IV in 1965, at Bari, and book I in 1980, at Florence; in 1985 he added an edition of book III, which was published at Bari). In 1984, J. L. Butrica's monumental *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius*, based on his University of Toronto dissertation (under the same title) of 1978, arrived to put research on the text of Propertius, together with the history of the manuscripts, on an entirely new footing. Finally, recent work has revealed a greater amount of Propertian content in some medieval florilegia than had hitherto been suspected.

A new Oxford Classical Text edited by S. J. Heyworth and a companion volume with a translation and selective textual commentary appeared in 2007.

READERSHIP AND LITERARY INFLUENCE

The influence of the Roman love-elegy, as a part of the literary Renaissance, generally advances from country to country. Broadly speaking, the Propertian interest, where Italy is concerned, largely centers in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries; where France is concerned, in the late sixteenth. In England, the focus shifts to the seventeenth century, and in Germany to the last two decades of the eighteenth.

Italy

Clearly it is among the Italians that we must look for the greatest wave of Propertian influence. He was one of their own poets; his successors in the Renaissance period celebrated both in Latin and in the vernacular their links to his native region. Yet he was unknown in Italy before the middle of the fourteenth century (whereas France, alone among nations, had long possessed his work in manuscripts and florilegia). Petrarch, visiting Paris in 1333, seems to have been the first Italian to discover Propertius.⁹¹ His manuscript

89. On p. lvi the claim is made, after a reference to the Burman-van Santen 1780 edition, "Textum huius editionis et nos recepimus." It should, however, be noted that, of the numerous readings attributed to Burman-van Santen in the apparatus of P. Fedeli's Teubner text (Stuttgart, 1984), just one is present in the *Bipontina*.

90. See his "Prolegomena," in *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum libri IV* (Leipzig, 1880), xxxvi–xl.

91. It was argued by Guido Billanovich, "'Veterum vestigia vatū' nei carmi dei preumanisti padovani," *Italia medievale e umanistica* 1 (1958) 155–243, that the Paduan pre-humanists Lovato Lovati and Albertino Mussato knew

of the elegies is now lost, but the copy of it made in Florence for Coluccio Salutati generated a surge of interest in Propertius at Siena ca. 1430, and shortly afterwards in a few other places, notably Rimini and Naples.

Critics have pointed out, however, that whatever pains Petrarch took to familiarize himself with Propertius (and the evidence that he took such pains is clearly visible in his work),⁹² it cannot be denied that he shows a certain degree of hesitation in acknowledging the Roman poet as a source of inspiration for his love-poems. This is a kind of hesitation that we are to meet again in later generations. Petrarch was, after all, a Christian, and his outlook on life and love, with its tendency to widen the expression of emotion from erotic to spiritual, a legacy from the poetry of the Middle Ages, must inevitably differ in many respects from that of the most outspoken and sensual among the Augustan poets. In the following century, and particularly at Florence, we shall have also to allow for the effect of the neo-Platonic movement, which followed the *Phaedrus*

Propertius around or before the end of the thirteenth centuries. This idea gained some acceptance until it was challenged by B.L. Ullman ("The Transmission of the Text of Catullus," in *Studi in onore di Luigi Castiglioni*, vol. 2 [Florence, 1960], 1055–56) and W. Ludwig ("Kannte Lovato Catull?" *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 129 [1986] 329–57) and finally demolished by Butrica 1984, 28–29. Indeed, during the thirteenth century, among those writers who might have been expected at least to know Propertius' name, neither Guglielmo da Pastrengo nor Benzo of Alessandria nor Giovanni del Virgilio nor the compiler of the *Flores moralium auctorum* (even though Catullus and Tibullus are cited) so much as mentions this poet.

92. For the evidence see (*inter alia*) R. Caputo, "Petrarca e Properzio che d'amor cantaro fervidamente," in *Atti* 1996 (1998), 113–23; and also La Penna, *L'integrazione difficile*, 255–61 for a striking recall in the *canzone* "Quando il soave mio conforto" on the poet's dream of the appearance of Laura's ghost (*Canzoniere* 359, lines 37–38)—a recall not only of Propertius IV.7, but also of Propertius II.13.45–46, with its unusual content of ideas (La Penna, *ibid.*, 260–61). The theme of solitude in lonely places may also exemplify the close link between the two poets: compare, for example, *Canzoniere* 35 "Solo e pensoso i piu deserti campi" with Propertius I.18, and 182 "Amor che 'ncende il cor d'ardente zelo" with Propertius II.6.13ff.

See also B.L. Ullman, "Petrarch's Acquaintance with Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius," in Ullman, *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 177–96; C. Dionisotti, "Fortuna del Petrarca nel Quattrocento," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 17 (1974) 61–113; and N. Tonelli, "I *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta* e il codice elegiaco," in *L'elegia nella tradizione poetica italiana*, ed. A. Comboni and A. Di Ricco (Trent, 2003), 17–35.

in conceiving of love as a kind of divine madness leading the lover's soul, by exchange with that of the beloved, to perfection or (in Christian terms) to God.⁹³

Some humanists who in their youth eagerly imitated Propertius as a model for theme and style were reluctant to acknowledge his influence in their years of maturity. An outstanding example is Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (1405–64), who gave the title *Cinthia* to his collection of Latin love-poems, thus openly proclaiming his debt to Propertius. Later, however, as Pope Pius II, he strove to suppress his youthful effusions and to give the impression that he had composed them at a much earlier age than was in fact the case. Baca gives clear proofs of a later date (after 1431), and continues: "Aeneas' biographers date the publication of the *Cinthia* between 1426 and 1428, when he was a student in Siena. These dates appear to me far too early. . . . It can be stated . . . with a fair amount of certainty, that the *Cinthia* was in circulation ca. 1432–58, the latter year being that in which Aeneas ascended the throne of St. Peter's as Pope Pius II. At this time, the *Cinthia* began to disappear for two reasons. First, Aeneas was himself embarrassed by the *Cinthia* (as well as by other works of an amatory nature which he had written prior to becoming pope) and withdrew his poems from circulation; marginal notations made by Aeneas clearly cite those poems and passages from his works he wished excised. Then, after his death, his amatory works were further censored and their circulation limited, especially by Pius III, himself a member of the Piccolomini family."⁹⁴ It is noteworthy that Aeneas, as pope, omitted Propertius from the list of books prescribed for children's reading in his *De liberorum educatione*. Indeed, Propertius' influence was limited by the fact that he was often deemed unsuitable for schools. This was partly (as we have seen) based on ethical considerations, since so many of his poems dealt with sexual obsessions and sexual jealousy. At the same time, it

93. See especially S. Ebbersmeyer, *Sinnlichkeit und Vernunft: Studien zur Rezeption und Transformation der Liebestheorie Platons in der Renaissance*, Humanistische Bibliothek, Reihe 1, Abhandlungen 51 (Munich, 2002), for a full discussion of this subject.

94. See A. R. Baca, "Propertian Elements in the *Cinthia* of Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini," *Classical Journal* 67 (1971–72) 221–26.

also partly came about because the text, once it became more widely available, was found to be extremely corrupt, and his thought often seemed hard to follow. Thus educators found in Propertius an author whom on all these grounds they were loth to recommend for a place in the curriculum by the side of (say) Cicero, Livy, or Sallust, and among the poets Horace, Virgil, and Ovid.

Other humanists followed the lead of Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini. One of the earliest love-elegists in Siena was the Sicilian Giovanni Marrasio (1405–ca. 1457), who began to write before 1430. His collection of elegies entitled *Angelinum*, recording the course of his love for Angela Piccolomini, has occasional echoes of Tibullus and Propertius.⁹⁵ We have already noted on p. 163 above that Panormita (1394–1471), the author of *Hermaphroditus*, and his younger friend Pontano, the earliest commentator, transcribed the poems. These two were major poets in their own right, and both were deeply interested in Propertius, showing his influence in their works. As might be expected, Panormita is not an *anima naturaliter Propertiana*; he tends to distort the elegiac into the epigrammatic vein, always with more than a touch of irony, and his principal model is Martial. Yet apart from language and metaphor, some of which he borrows from Propertius, the thematic influence of Propertius can be seen, for example, in the motifs from Propertius II.28 cited by La Penna,⁹⁶ who also points out how Panormita parodies Propertius II.20–21 and deprives the lines of pathos. After arriving at Naples in 1448, Pontano becomes friends with Panormita. Pontano's early poems, a collection entitled *Pruritus* (ca. 1449), were epigrams very much in the vein of Panormita's *Hermaphroditus*. But he moved in a different direction in his *Parthenopeus, sive Amores* (1457–58), a collection which bears the signs of his decisive transformation from salacious epigrammatist to elegist.⁹⁷ As an illustration of the new Pontano, *Amores* I.10, a long elegy, is a meditation on the theme of *fides*

and constancy in a single love, containing within it observations on the lack of *fides* among beauties (Propertius II.32).

A coeval of Pontano, though less long-lived, was Giovannantonio Campano (1429–77). Both Pontano and Campano were linked to Propertius' native Umbria: Pontano by birth, Campano by adoption. Campano, though a gifted humanist, was the slighter figure. He owed his interest in Propertius to his patron Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini and drew into a single elegy motifs from several Propertian poems.⁹⁸ Nevertheless, Campano's handling of Propertian themes seldom if ever rises to the anguished intensity of the poet he makes his model; when he imitates, he does so with a certain degree of ambiguity, sometimes introducing a note of irony. To some extent Campano seems actually to write from a desire to emulate Propertius, taking motifs from him but manipulating and even reversing them with literary cleverness. An example of this, as Tateo has pointed out, is Campano's dream-poem (*Eleg.* 1.9) based on Propertius IV.7, in which Silvia utters her complaint against the poet for dedicating his love-poems to Diana. Campano is ready, he says, to burn all such poems; but Silvia prevents it, allowing him to go on writing so long as love is excluded. For the sake of reconciliation, he accepts her terms, but admits to the reader that he was untruthful in claiming that no love was involved.

At Florence, the enthusiastic following of Propertian themes was largely initiated by Cristoforo Landino (1424–98), who virtually founded a school of poets under the patronage of the Medici. Landino interweaves with his ancient Propertian inheritance a considerable degree of influence from Petrarch's modern version of erotic lyricism.⁹⁹ In two major respects he paid homage

95. La Penna, *L'integrazione difficile*, 266–67. Marrasio was in close correspondence with Leonardo Bruni (ca. 1370–1444), chancellor of Florence, friend of Cosimo de' Medici, and translator of Plato's *Phaedrus*.

96. La Penna, *L'integrazione difficile*, 264.

97. F. Tateo, "Properzio nella poesia latina del Quattrocento," in *Atti* November 1985 (*Properzio nella letteratura italiana*) (1987), 56.

98. F. Tateo, "Le elegie 'properziane' di Giovannantonio Campano," in *Atti* 1996 (1998), 125–40. Elegies 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, and 3.1 of Campano are strongly influenced by Propertius; for the details, see Tateo, "Properzio nella poesia latina del Quattrocento," 64 and n. 48.

99. For Landino and his followers, as well as Pontano, Jacopo Sannazaro, and Tito Vespasiano Strozzi, see Tateo, "Properzio nella poesia latina del Quattrocento," 41–64 and also D. Coppini, "Properzio nella poesia d'amore degli umanisti," in *Atti* 1979 (*Colloquium Propertianum [Secundum]*) (1981), 169–201. On Landino in relation to Florence and the Medici, see P. Murgatroyd, "Landino's *Xandra* 3.3 and its ancient Latin models [including Propertius IV.1]," *Renaissance Studies* 11.2 (1997) 57–60.

to his favorite Roman elegist: he first emerged as a poet of love and later turned to patriotic verse, and he produced his collection (addressed to Leon Battista Alberti) under the name of a woman, *Xandra*, standing for an actual Sandra. Landino and the later poets of his school (Ugolino Verino, Naldo Naldi, and Alessandro Braccesi) were to a certain extent followed by Poliziano, whose poems are deeply influenced by Propertian language and imagery.¹⁰⁰

The members of Landino's circle, though united in making recurrent use of motifs that were originally Propertian, show a certain variety in their forms of discipleship. Ugolino Verino (1438–1516) was perhaps the closest in spirit: his *Flametta* reproduces the pattern of a single love and its history, celebrated in a *canzoniere*. Verino's frequent imitation of Propertian devices is mediated through Landino, and even the occasional liberties he takes with these are of a kind that may be found in Landino himself. In his *Epigrammaton liber* Naldo Naldi (1439–ca. 1520) shows, by the comparative scarcity of detailed Propertian allusions, a smaller sense of obligation than Verino to follow in Landino's wake and a looser, less intense, relationship to the ancient poet. On a broader front, however, Naldi reproduces something close to the structure of Landino's *Xandra*: love-poems in the first book, which is the most Propertian; then elegies to friends in the second book; and finally a third book entirely made up of celebratory poems addressed to the Medici family. Alessandro Braccesi (1445–1503) displays well-integrated Propertian influence throughout his book of *Amores*, modified by a staunch refusal to apologize for love-poetry as a humbler species of composition. Love is seen by Braccesi as *furor*, as *servitium*, but also as that which can confer glory and fame on its object. Again we have a work commemorating a single love, characterized by *fides*, and chronicling the stages in the development of the love-relation, though this dominant theme is expended and relieved by elements of a non-erotic kind.¹⁰¹

In Florence, one more eminent figure may

100. F. Tateo, "Le Elegie del Poliziano e la fortuna di Properzio nella cerchia medicea," in *Atti 1994 (Commentari e traduttori di Properzio dall' Umanesimo al Lachmann)* (1996), 153–67.

101. For Braccesi, see "Braccesi, Alessandro," DBI 13.602–608 (A. Perosa).

properly be said to have undergone strong Propertian influence, namely, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463–94). Pico, who had an elegant Latin style and a great love of the language, composed in his earlier years a body of amatory verse, nearly all of which, to our great loss, he destroyed. Paul Oskar Kristeller chronicled the recovery, by himself and Wolfgang Speyer (and a few others), of what survives.¹⁰² In that study, a newly discovered poem is published for the first time; its final couplet ("Quare pone metus; nostri, mea nympha, fuisti/principium, nostri finis amoris eris") inevitably recalls the concluding line of Propertius I.12 ("Cynthia prima fuit, Cynthia finis erit"); similarly, Pico's line 8 ("Tu nostram credis iam cecidisse fidem?") echoes Propertius II.20.4 ("quid queris nostram sic cecidisse fidem?"), and *inter alia* the urgent series of questions with which the poem opens reminds us of the same phenomenon in Propertius; for example, at the beginning of I.8 and II.20.¹⁰³

At Naples, Cariteo (Benedetto Gareth, ca. 1450–1514, a Spaniard of Neapolitan domicile), and Jacopo Sannazaro (1458–1530), who had studied Pontano's commentary, were among interested poets.¹⁰⁴ Cariteo, perhaps, deserves to be

102. P.O. Kristeller, "The Latin Poems of Giovanni Pico della Mirandola: A Supplementary Note," in *Poetry and Poetics from Ancient Greece to the Renaissance. Studies in Honor of James Hutton*, ed. G.M. Kirkwood (Ithaca, N.Y., 1975), 185–206 (reprinted in Kristeller, *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*, vol. 3, *Storia e letteratura* 178 [Rome, 1993], 305–21).

103. Kristeller goes so far as to say "I am inclined to think that Propertius was Pico's favorite model," and he quotes statistics to show that Pico has more lines reminiscent of Propertius than of any other Roman poet except Virgil (*ibid.*, 191 [Kristeller, *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*, 310]).

104. Cariteo, a friend of Pontano, was strongly influenced by Petrarch as well as by Propertius; see La Penna, *L'integrazione difficile*, 273–74 and G. Rati, "Properzio e i lirici del Cinquecento," in *Atti November 1985 (Properzio nella letteratura italiana)* (1987), 117–30, especially 126–27. Sannazaro had been Pontano's pupil. He wrote three books of elegies: the first elegy of his second book has been carefully studied by G. Lieberg, "Properzio in alcuni passi dell'elegia II, 1 di Jacopo Sannazaro," in *Atti 1985 (Bimillenario della morte di Properzio)* (1986), 313–18, for its deep dependence on Propertius in theme, structure, and language. Lieberg concludes that Sannazaro tends to use Greek mythology for ornamental purposes, whereas Propertius handles it in a more functional way; but Sannazaro could do as he did only because his readers, like himself, were steeped in Propertius and could therefore immediately grasp his Propertian

especially mentioned as one who, being passionate by nature (and his life was full of tension and drama), saw Propertius as a congenial spirit and found in the Roman poet's language and imagery a means of expressing himself. If he infused a certain element of Petrarchism into the mixture, as for example in speaking of the undying presence of love, it was with a Propertian accent and tone.¹⁰⁵ Sannazaro, as a poet, is less important than some of the other humanists mentioned here; his temperament is that of a literary critic, and he was interested in the evaluation of different poetic genres. He devoted much effort to his studies on the text of Propertius. We are told that while dining at home with friends, during the intervals between courses of the meal, he caused a servant to declaim passages of Propertius to which he would offer his own emendations for the assembled company to discuss (all this to the sound of flutes).¹⁰⁶ Sannazaro's poems borrow from Propertius some of the themes that were favorites among his contemporaries, including solitude, refusal to write in a loftier strain (*recusatio*), the underworld (usually referred to as the Tartarus theme), and the poet's soul inflamed by love (invoking the metaphor of the burning of Troy). Michele Marullo (1453–1500) was a pupil and also a friend of Pontano, and a friend of Sannazaro as well. Though his book is entitled *Epigrammaton liber*, its introduction and exploitation of a great many elegiac (essentially, Prop-

ertian) themes, such as *servitium amoris*, love as *nequitia*, and the beloved's *superbia*, clearly demonstrate that Propertius' poetic legacy of Propertius is not confined to elegy.¹⁰⁷

Another circle of poets who were affected by Propertius developed at Ferrara, which could boast of Tito Vespasiano Strozzi (1425?–1505).¹⁰⁸ Strozzi was a pupil of Guarino (who had moved to Ferrara in 1429 and there encouraged an interest in Propertius and other Roman love-poets). His *Eroticon libri sex* consists of elegies, first addressed to "Anthia" (up to book 4, after which this series abruptly ceases); books 5 and 6 contain familial or encomiastic or merely occasional pieces. The nucleus of this major work lies in a very small collection published when Strozzi was less than twenty years old; five of its seven poems are deeply indebted to Propertius. It is relevant that Strozzi possessed at this time (1443) a manuscript of Propertius (Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Magl. VII 1053). His tendency in composition is towards independence from his model in the details even when he accepts its themes, many of which (like other humanists) he merged with the Petrarchan tradition of love-poetry. Strozzi's *Erot.* 4.1 shows a general influence from Propertius I.11, though with few formal references; the same is true of *Erot.* 4.5 in relation to Propertius II.10, and of the opening lines of *Erot.* 5.2 compared with those of Propertius II.20.

In addition to commenting on Propertius (I.8 below), Filippo Beroaldo the Elder wrote love-poetry influenced by the Roman poet.¹⁰⁹ Several of Beroaldo's Latin *poemata*, and above all the first four of his elegies, should be regarded as amplifications of, or variations on, familiar Propertian

allusions. See also Tateo, "Properzio nella poesia latina del Quattrocento," 58–60, and M. Santoro, "Properzio e la poesia volgare nel Quattrocento," in *Atti November 1985 (Properzio nella letteratura italiana)* (1987), 88–90. For Sannazaro's acquaintance with Pontano's commentary, see Lieberg, *ibid.*, 313 ("È nota la familiarità che il Sannazaro ebbe con Properzio. Sappiamo, per esempio, ch'egli si serviva di un codice properziano trascritto dallo stesso Pontano, il *Berolinensis Latinus folio 500*"); and Tateo, *ibid.*, 58 ("Sappiamo dal D'Alessandro che in una delle discussioni filologiche Jacopo Sannazaro s'impuntò sull'emendamento di una lezione di Prop. I.xi e credette di poter aggiungere alla famosa *divinatio* di Pontano [*non ita per nauta*] quella che sostituiva *Thesproti con te Prochytae*"). On Agostino Staccoli, who may have anticipated Cariteo in recovering motifs from Propertius, see E. Cecchini, "Properzio nella poesia di Agostino Staccoli," in *Atti 1985 (Bimillenario della morte di Properzio)* (1986), 269–76.

105. See P. Morossi, "Presenze elegiache nel primo canzoniere di Cariteo," in *L'epigramma nella tradizione poetica italiana* (n. 92 above), 103–14.

106. Alessandro D'Alessandro, *Genialium dierum libri* (Cologne, 1539), 49–51.

107. Coppini, "Properzio nella poesia d'amore degli umanisti," 196–97; A. Perosa, "Studi sulla formazione della raccolta di poesie del Marullo," *Rinascimento* 12 (1959) 128–34; C. Kidwell, *Marullus: Soldier Poet of the Renaissance* (London, 1989); D. Coppini, "*Nimium castus liber*: gli *Epigrammata* di Michele Marullo e l'epigramma latino del Quattrocento," in *Atti 1998 (Poesia umanistica latina in distici elegiaci)* (1999), 67–96.

108. Tateo, "Properzio nella poesia latina del Quattrocento," especially 41–49; A. Tissoni Benvenuti, "Boiardo elegiaco e Tito Vespasiano Strozzi," in *L'epigramma nella tradizione poetica italiana*, 81–102.

109. Coppini, "Properzio nella poesia d'amore degli umanisti," 198–201. For Beroaldo's poems on other subjects, see also some remarks in Rose, *Filippo Beroaldo der Ältere* (n. 75 above), 145–50. The following statements are especially indebted to Coppini's article.

themes. In the first elegy, entitled *Osculum Panthiae*, these include *servitium amoris*, condemnation of women's use of cosmetics (as in Propertius I.2), preference for love over riches, and a list of celebrated beauties who are compared unfavorably with the poet's lady-love; in this instance, the list includes Propertius' Cynthia herself. The second elegy, *Philippi Beroaldi Fortuna*, which is addressed to Minus Roscius and treats of the poet's happiness with Panthia and its abrupt end, shows many correspondences with Propertius I.12. Similarly, the third elegy (*Dirae in maledicum*) is a reworking, with amplification, of Propertius IV.5. The fourth elegy (*Philippi Beroaldi Cupido*) resembles, with variation, several poems of Propertius. Its opening is derived from Propertius, but the model is trivialized: Beroaldo does no more than ask a friend whether his lady still loves him or not, whereas Propertius' questions to Lygdamus, though generally similar, are subtly detailed in such a way as to catch sight of Cynthia's emotional attitude, not from mere statements of fact but from incidental allusions which can convey a message only to the experienced eye.

The influence of Propertius on vernacular as well as neo-Latin poetry grew steadily stronger in the sixteenth century especially. At this period, Ferrara could boast the names of Ariosto (1474–1533), Pietro Bembo (1470–1547), and Celio Calcagnini (1479–1541), among others. Coppini has found that one of the poems of Giovanni Cotta (1480 or 1482–1510; I.11 below), although inspired by Catullus, also imitates Propertian "comic" structure and technique through a series of questions concerning the lady's faithfulness and anticipation of certain descriptions of her conduct, which we should expect to deduce from the answers.¹¹⁰

The anxiety initially felt by Italian humanists about a possible loss of moral reputation due to juvenile enthusiasm for Propertian love-elegy later became universal. Erasmus, for example, in an early letter (1489?) addressed to the cleric Cornelis Gerard, includes Propertius among poets who may appropriately be taught to the young;¹¹¹ but in his more publicly oriented treatise *De ratione studii* (Paris, 1511), which largely

follows the same list, he drops Propertius, even though he retains Catullus and Martial. Still later, we find that even the universities hesitated to include Propertius among prescribed authors. Only when—after many revisions of the text—expurgated editions began to be published, especially in The Netherlands and (more hesitantly) by some Counter-Reformation educators, did Propertius gain acceptance as a school author. There were also collections of "moral maxims," in which Propertius, duly excerpted, figures sparingly.¹¹²

Significantly, no early attempt was made to translate Propertius into Italian. The Italian humanists were, above all others, qualified to read him in the original language; however, no Italian version of the complete poems was published until the year 1743. In more modern times, Italy has continued to be the repository of much of the purely literary interest in Propertius, even though from about 1600 onwards much of the philological leadership in Propertian studies (except, notably, for Antonio Volpi's edition of 1710) passed to The Netherlands and later to Germany. La Penna claims that in the period between 1770 and 1800, at the time when the neoclassical movement was breaking its conventional bonds and turning to romanticism, Propertius attracted attention in Italy and France on account of his status as the "most Hellenizing" among the Augustan poets, since the fascination of Greece—especially the Alexandrian poets—was strong in those decades.¹¹³

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the same romantic search for an "Alexandrian" kind of beauty, as represented in sculpture by Praxiteles, attracted to Propertius the attention of Ugo Foscolo (1778–1827).¹¹⁴ All his life, Foscolo felt a strong attraction to Propertius, whom he felt to have shared his own somewhat rebellious temperament. Indeed, when Foscolo attacked the Augustan poets for their conformity, he failed to mention Propertius' name. The "lu-

110. Coppini, *ibid.*, 197–98.

111. P.S. Allen, ed., *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterdami*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1906), Ep. 20, line 99.

112. E.g., Johannes Murmellius, *Loci communes sententiosorum versuum ex elegiis Tibulli Propertii et Ovidii. . . diligenter collecti* (Halle, 1613). Murmellius' compilations went through seventy-seven editions in three centuries of use.

113. La Penna, *L'integrazione difficile*, 282–83.

114. *Ibid.*, 286–89; also M. Scotti, "Foscolo e Propertio," in *Atti November 1985 (Propertio nella letteratura italiana)* (1987), 177–96.

minous" Greek spirit, as embodied in Propertius, also appealed to Foscolo, as did the more flexible literary traditions of Greece (compared with those of Rome) exhibited in Propertius' favorite Callimachus. Foscolo approved of yielding oneself to passion and to melancholy, of the recognition of love's tyranny, and of the search for a kind of purification in the world of myth. He compared Propertius to Pindar for the boldness of his style: Propertius, he maintained, treated love with a Pindaric brush and gave it a character unknown before or since, as well as writing political elegies more sublime than many an ode, ancient or modern.

In the second hymn of Foscolo's *Grazie*, 398–401, we read: "ei sul meriggio / fa sua casa un frascato, / e a suon d'avena / le pecorelle sue chiama alle fonte." The words of Propertius that Foscolo had in mind are in Propertius IV.4.5–6: "Lucus erat felix hederoso conditus antro / multaque nativis obstreperat arbor aquis, / Silvani ramosa domus, quo dulcis ab aestu / fistula poturas ire iubebat ovis."¹¹⁵ The last two lines are praised by Foscolo in a letter for their succinctness and direct expressive power (analogous to that of painting), qualities that Foscolo himself eagerly sought.¹¹⁶ Scotti has summarized the reasons that attracted Foscolo to Propertius: sympathy for the learned elegance of Callimachus, associated with Foscolo's devotion to the Greek spirit; a love of expressive density and of a "Pindaric" boldness in images and transitions; also, on the side of psychological affinity, submission to the onset of passion and an inclination to melancholy; a strong desire to return to "Arcadian" simplicity; and finally a preoccupation with death, which we shall find also in the poetry of Giacomo Leopardi.

When we consider the Italian poets of the middle and later years of the nineteenth century, we find only slight influence, as, for example, in the early works of Giosuè Carducci (1835–1907), a cultivated poet with an astonishing memory. Carducci himself attested that Propertius was by no means his favorite elegist: he preferred Ovid and Tibullus. Nevertheless, in 1856 he apparently began a serious academic study of Propertius (later abandoned); and he felt the presence, as it

were, of Propertius throughout his subsequent literary career. It surfaced in his works at three distinct periods which critics have duly chronicled. Briefly, these are the *Rime di San Miniato* (1857), followed closely by the *Iuvenilia*, especially *Iuv.* 31 "A Neera"; then the period of his maturity, roughly the 1870s, with the *Primavere elleniche*; and lastly the *Odi barbare*, especially 2.48 "Presso l'urna di Percy Bysshe Shelley" (1884). Later, he found support in Propertius for his attacks on contemporary "realism."¹¹⁷

There are few substantial traces of Propertian influence in Giovanni Pascoli (1855–1912), and no more than a few in Alessandro Manzoni (1785–1873), whose favorites were Virgil and Horace. Manzoni, however, certainly knew Propertius, and it is reported that Propertius was the last author read by Manzoni before his death; and also that he expressed reservations about the "erudition" as well as the harshness of Propertius' style.¹¹⁸

The poetry of Giacomo Leopardi (1798–1837) shows more direct influence from Propertius, whom he certainly knew, and he is reported to have owned a copy of the Amsterdam edition of 1619.¹¹⁹ The themes of love as the one reason of a tormented life, and the close connection between love and death, are worked out by Leopardi in a manner that reminds us of Propertius.¹²⁰ For example, in "A Silvia," lines 44–45, "Non ti molceva il core / la dolce lode or delle negre chiome" suggests a memory of Propertius II.1.8 "<Cynthia> gaudet laudatis ire superba comis"; and for

117. See E. Bigi, "Echi properziani in Manzoni, Leopardi e Carducci," in *Atti* November 1985 (*Properzio nella letteratura italiana*) (1987), 197–213, especially (for Carducci) 205–13; also R. Scrivano, "Suggerimenti properziani in Giosuè Carducci," in *Atti* 1996 (1998), 141–57 (with a bibliographical note on 157). La Penna has some useful pages on Carducci (*ibid.*, 294–97).

118. For these facts, and for a list of Propertian allusions in Manzoni, see the works cited in Bigi, *ibid.*, 197–99 n. 9.

119. Bigi, *ibid.*, 201 n. 17. Of the three editions of Propertius now in the Biblioteca Leopardi, Recanati, none bears the poet's *ex libris* or exhibits annotations in his hand. The 1619 Amsterdam edition (shelf mark: II XII G 14) has the *nota possessoris* "Luigi Leopardi," the poet's uncle; the other two editions, published at Venice in 1762 (shelf mark: I XV L 28) and 1764 (shelf mark: I XIX H 31) respectively, contain no indications of ownership. (This information on the Propertian holdings in the Biblioteca Leopardi was kindly communicated by dott.ssa Carmela Magri.)

120. Bigi, *ibid.*, 200–205.

115. Both passages are quoted by La Penna, *ibid.*, 288.

116. *Ibid.*, 288.

"Amore e morte," lines 98–99, "pietosa/tu sola al mondo dei terreni affanni," we may compare Propertius I.16.25 "tu sola humanos numquam miserata dolores," where the verbal echo remains despite the change from negative to positive and the altered setting. Also, in the "Bruto minore," lines 116–20, we find "A me dintorno/le penne il bruno augello avido roti;/prema la fera, e il nembo/tratti l'ignota spoglia;/e l'aura il nome e la memoria accoglia," a virtually certain reminiscence of two passages from Propertius (II.8.18–20 and II.28b.38). In general, however, such formal echoes are not enough to demonstrate an organic and systematic relationship of Leopardi to Propertius; the evidences of Leopardi's interest in Propertius are somewhat marginal, for he, like Manzoni, has closer links with Virgil and Horace. Themes, however, are often inherited, for example, the Propertian motif of love as the supreme good, surpassing riches and power. In "Il pensiero dominante," 69–81, Leopardi asks "Anzi qual altro affetto/se non quell'uno intra i mortali ha sede?/Avarizia, superbia, . . . che sono altro che voglie/al paragon di lui? Solo un affetto/vive tra noi: quest'uno,/prepotente signore,/dieder l'eterne leggi all'uman core." Furthermore, the connection established by Leopardi between love and death is in general terms Propertian. In Propertius, love's justification as the single reason for living arrives at its conclusion in the poet's meditation on death; a similar, if not identical, idea is present in the work of Leopardi, who stresses the function of death in freeing one from the illusions, induced by love, of a perfect and hence unattainable happiness. Death, then, rescues love from its precarious condition and opens the doors of dreaming in order to fulfil the dreamer's desire. Moreover, Leopardi is deeply aware of the very Propertian motif of love as "the door to an unknown paradise, where one is allowed to continue the divine dream, interrupted on earth."¹²¹ In the poem entitled "Amor e Morte," Leopardi presents death as a beautiful young woman (line 10), on whose maiden bosom the poet hopes one day to rest his sleeping head (lines 122–24).

121. E. Donadoni, "Il sentimento dell'infinito nella poesia leopardiana," in *Da Dante al Manzoni. In onore di G. A. Venturi* (Paris, 1923), 197 (quoted by Bigi, *ibid.*, 204 n. 29).

In the late nineteenth century the most striking Italian figure showing Propertian influence is, by common consent, Vincenzo Padula (1819–93).¹²² Padula's essay on Propertius, modestly entitled *Pauca quae in Sexto Propertio Vincentius Padula ab Acario animadvertibat*, was composed in 1871. It might have disappeared into total obscurity except for two things: Benedetto Croce viewed its ideas with approval, and Paula Valeri Tomaszuk gave it its first publication, in the form of an English translation under the title *A Romantic Interpretation of Propertius: Vincenzo Padula* (L'Aquila, 1971). In the introduction she comments on the unusual nature of Propertius' imagery, based on mythology, as expressing an urban—in his case, Roman—vision uniting visual and literary elements. She also compares Padula to Ezra Pound (for whom see below); both saw the past as the mirror of the present, and they both approached ancient texts under the rubric "make it new"; also, both thought Propertius had something to say to political radicals and revolutionaries (Padula's hero being Garibaldi). Benediktson quotes one interesting and (for its date) very perceptive remark by Padula concerning the "difficulty" of Propertius' text: "much of <Propertius> obscurity is due to the fact that Propertius, swept away by the tide of his passions, jumps very quickly from one idea to another."¹²³

In the twentieth century, Gabriele D'Annunzio (1863–1938) has been examined for what we might expect to be signs of Propertian influence, but without substantial results.¹²⁴ A modern poet who owes a great deal to Propertius, as well as to Virgil and Dante, is Eugenio Montale (1896–1981), whose imagery, use of metaphor, and general outlook in the poem "I morti" have been firmly traced to certain elegies by Propertius.¹²⁵

122. See D. T. Benediktson, *Propertius, Modernist Poet of Antiquity* (Carbondale, Ill., 1989), 130–32; also P. Tuscano, "Vincenzo Padula lettore di Properzio," in *Atti November 1985 (Properzio nella letteratura italiana)* (1986), 215–29 and N. Scivoletto, "Cinzia e la signora delle camelie," in *Atti 1996* (1998), 159–69.

123. Benediktson, *Propertius*, 131.

124. E. Paratore, "Properzio e il D'Annunzio," in *Atti November 1985 (Properzio nella letteratura italiana)* (1987), 231–33.

125. See M. F. Williams, "Poetic Seacoasts: Montale's *I morti* and Propertius 3.18, 1.11, 3.5," *Classical and Modern Literature* 17.2 (1997), 149–69.

France

In the Renaissance, France took its literary motivation to a great extent from Italy and especially, either directly or indirectly, from Petrarch. Pontano also had a considerable influence on French writers. Pierre Laurens has demonstrated the development and enrichment of themes and techniques of Propertius II.12 by members of the Pléiade (Joachim du Bellay, Lazare de Baïf, Jean-Antoine de Baïf, Pierre de Ronsard).¹²⁶ He makes the interesting suggestion that all four versions were inspired by an expository lecture, probably given by Jean Dorat (1508–88), perhaps at the house of the elder Baïf—thus illustrating the close nexus between scholarship and creative poetry in mid-century France,¹²⁷ and thereby recalling the same thing as having occurred earlier in Italy, in (as well as before) the time of Poliziano.

After the efflorescence of the sixteenth century, however, French poets seem to have taken little interest in Propertius for the next 150 years or so until the romantic school of love-poetry that culminated in André Chénier's *Les amours*, *Élégies*, and *Bucoliques*.¹²⁸ Chénier (1762–94) read and loved Propertius from a very early age. In a long note written at the age of twenty, he acknowledges that Propertius first gave him the idea of love's triumph in youth. In *Les amours* III.1, he borrows (with some variation) the scene depicted in Propertius II.29a of the poet's fantasy of being taken prisoner by a crowd of *amoretti* when on a nocturnal visit to Cynthia. In the *Élégies* there are several obviously Propertian motifs: e.g., at *Élég.* 10, echoing Propertius III.24 and 25, on the renouncing of Cynthia. Chénier, like Propertius, bitterly reproaches the woman to whom his verses have given fame for her beauty, and (like Propertius) he ends by predicting that in old age, abandoned by all, she will weep for her faithlessness. And again in the *Élégies* (no. 18), Chénier speaks of freeing himself from an unhappy love by a journey (see Propertius III.21); Chénier's journey is to Constantinople, his mother's city, and a Greek one (he believed his mother to have been Greek): "Partons, la voile est prête, et Byz-

ance m'appelle./Je suis vaincu, je fuis. Au joug d'une cruelle/le temps, les longues mers peuvent seuls m'arracher." In the following poem (*Élég.* 19) Chénier gives a list of Greek cities, just as Propertius does in his next elegy (III.22). In *Élég.* 25, Chénier dreams of love and death, echoing Propertius II.13. In *Bucoliques* 22, he uses the myth of Hylas to portray a youth distracted from his work by falling in love with a flowery meadow, a motif originating in Propertius I.20.37–42; and the ending of Chénier's poem (Hercules' calling desperately and in vain for Hylas) simply elaborates the end of Propertius I.20. Lastly, in *Bucoliques* 23 there is a prayer to the sea-gods of the Aegean that originates in Propertius III.757–64.

The poets of the French romantic school were less interested in Propertius than in the Greek Alexandrian poets (or even other Roman poets), although his influence has been detected in Chateaubriand (1768–1848) and in the poets of the "Parnassian" school, whose collections were published in *Le Parnasse contemporain* (1867–77).¹²⁹ Such interest as was entertained for Propertius was often related to his lavish use of Hellenistic themes and imagery—seen as chronicling a decadent stage of ancient civilization but also as exhibiting a rich beauty comparable to that of the works of Praxiteles in the artistic sphere—as well as to his supreme ability in expressing the turbulent passions of youth.

At a later stage in the nineteenth century, Frédéric Plessis (1851–1942) not only devoted himself to the academic study of Propertius but also, out of a purely literary interest in the Roman poet, made adaptations in French of some of the *Élégies*.¹³⁰

In the twentieth century, the French literary figure who attracted the greatest attention to Propertius was Julien Benda (1867–1956), a radical, who is best known for *La trahison des clercs* (Paris, 1927). He is also the author of *Properce ou Les amants de Tibur* (Paris, 1928), in which he stressed Propertius' "Alexandrian" artistry as his

126. P. Laurens, "Imitations de Properce en France au XVI^e siècle," *Orpheus* 9 (1962) 95–104.

127. See below for a similar manifestation in nineteenth-century France, in the person of Frédéric Plessis.

128. On Chénier, see La Penna, *L'integrazione difficile*, 283–86.

129. On the Parnassians, see R. Pichon, "L'antiquité romaine et la poésie française à l'époque parnassienne," *Revue des deux mondes*, 6th Ser., 5 (1911) 132–66. They are said to have been the originators of the expression "L'art pour l'art."

130. La Penna, *L'integrazione difficile*, 294. See also F. Plessis, *Études critiques sur Properce et ses élégies* (Paris, 1884) (his Latin editions of I.2, III.12, and IV.11 are found on pp. 307–20).

French forerunners had done, and defended him against the charge of obscurity.¹³¹

England and other English-speaking countries

Petrarch's *canzoniere*, which appealed to English poets, afforded the model of a body of love-poems having a single beloved person in view; and since Petrarch, as we have seen, was permeated with Propertian influence, a channel was thus provided by which something of the Roman elegist came to England.

The earliest edition of Propertius to circulate in England was that of 1534 published at Lyons.¹³² This was the edition apparently used (in 1601 and later) by Thomas Campion (1567–1620), the first great English poet to imitate and allude to Propertius,¹³³ as well as to Catullus. Campion has been rightly said to have known Propertius' elegies so well that "idioms from them came spontaneously to his mind."¹³⁴

A contemporary of Campion, Barnabe Barnes (*bap.* 1571–1609)¹³⁵ was a love-poet with a highly

original style, a Petrarchist, and also a follower of Sir Philip Sidney. Unlike Petrarch, however, and also unlike Sidney, he does not place women on a pedestal; his approach, like that of Propertius, was more overtly erotic.¹³⁶ Echoes of Propertius have been detected in his verse although he nowhere names this poet, referring instead to Ovid, Musaeus, and Petrarch.¹³⁷ In his sonnet-sequence *Parthenophil and Parthenophe*, Barnes makes liberal use, in the Propertian manner, of mythology to illustrate a tale of passion. This work had many imitators, who sought to emulate its "verve."¹³⁸ In *Elegy 4*, a dream-vision of the beloved as dead recalls Propertius IV.7.

Turning to the circle of Ben Jonson (1572–1637), we find many Propertian allusions in the works of Thomas Carew (1594/5–1640), and also deep Propertian influence on Robert Herrick (*bap.* 1591–1674).¹³⁹ Jonson himself knew Propertius, though he refers to him hardly at all. All of these poets drew on striking Propertian images and expressions to embellish their works, but none (as many critics have noted) seems to embrace identification with the persona depicted by Propertius himself, with all its doubts and stresses, contradictions, and alternations between joy

131. La Penna, *ibid.*, 314–24.

132. See H. Harrauer, *A Bibliography to Propertius* (Hildesheim, 1973), 18, no. 294.

133. Unless we accept the Propertian parentage of Spenser's *Prothalamion*; see M. West, "Prothalamia in Propertius and Spenser," *Comparative Literature* 26 (1974) 346–53.

134. The judgment is that of L. P. Wilkinson, "Propertius and Thomas Campion," *The London Magazine* 7 (April 1967) 56–65, who gives a thorough account of the many passages in Campion's poetry inspired by Propertius. See also J. V. Cunningham, "Campion and Propertius," *Philological Quarterly* 31 (1952) 96, who precedes Wilkinson in noting the development of Campion's poem "My sweetest Lesbia, let us live and love" from Propertius II.15, except for the first stanza, which echoes Catullus 5. Other Propertian models cited by Wilkinson include the list of beauties at Propertius II.28.51–56, including Iope (*Antiope* is a modern emendation), echoed by Campion in the poem, "When thou must home to shades of underground"; also, another catalogue of mythical beauties, rivalled by the poet's beloved, in "Give beauty all her right," where the two sources are Propertius I.4.5–8 and I.19.13–16; and again, the second line ("Ne'er let her false tears henceforth thy constant grief assuage!") of "Harden thou thy tired heart," apparently recalling Propertius III.24.25–26. Finally, in "Thrice toss these oaken ashes," among other spells found at a grave are "screech-owl feathers," certainly echoing Propertius III.6.29 "et strygis inventae per busta iacentia plumae."

135. For his biography, see M. Eccles, "Barnabe Barnes," in C. J. Sisson, ed., *Thomas Lodge and Other Elizabethans* (Cambridge, Mass., 1933; rpt. New York, 1966), 165–241, and

also the brief notice in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 2004), 981–82 (J. D. Cox). Son of Richard Barnes (1532?–87), bishop of Durham, and educated at Oxford, he avoided all quieter courses to serve in the wars, and was brought before the court of Star Chamber in 1598 for an unsuccessful attempt to murder John Browne, the Recorder of Berwick, with a glass of poisoned wine. Escaping condemnation, he ended his life at Durham; the theme of poison achieves prominence in his play *The Devil's Charter*, set in Renaissance Italy. Whether Barnes was (as has been suggested) the rival poet of Shakespeare's sonnets, is an open question.

136. An epigram (no. 40) in book 6 of Thomas Bastard's *Chrestoleros* (London, 1598), quoted by Eccles, *ibid.*, 219, remarked of Barnes that his verse was "like a cup of sacke, heady and strong." Though Campion attacked Barnes ("Barnzy") in various epigrams, chiefly on the grounds of his personal life, or for moral failings such as untruthfulness, he came to respect Barnes's literary quality.

137. See, e.g., the *Oxford Companion to English Literature*, 5th ed., ed. M. Drabble (Oxford, 1985), s.v. "Propertius."

138. This is the word used repeatedly by Janet G. Scott, *Les sonnets élisabéthains: les sources et l'apport personnel* (Paris, 1929), chapter 5, to describe its unique qualities.

139. See K. A. McEuen, *Classical Influence upon the Tribe of Ben* (New York, 1968) and P. Aiken, *The Influence of the Latin Elegists on English Lyric Poetry, 1600–1650, with particular reference to the work of Robert Herrick*, University of Maine Studies, 2d Ser., 22 (Orono, 1932).

and despair until we come to John Donne (1572–1631), whose psychological makeup, in youth at least, so closely resembled that of Propertius.¹⁴⁰ In Donne's early love-poems the influence of Propertius, as the poet of turbulent passion, is unmistakable. To read Propertius, and thereafter read Donne, is to become aware that their similarity of temperament is reflected in a similarity of structure and style. Both are distinguished by a tendency to use abrupt openings and almost equally abrupt changes of direction; both employ bold and striking language of an innovative kind. In this sense, although Donne is by no means the earliest English poet to borrow themes and expressions from Propertius, he is the first to be on terms of understanding and sympathy with his Roman predecessor. John Milton (1608–74), on the other hand, although he had read Propertius, is totally out of sympathy with him, and takes little if any notice of this poet.¹⁴¹

In the eighteenth century little attention was paid to Propertius except in the academic sphere—and we must be aware of that side of Propertius too. An important exception is the translation of book I published in 1782 by John Nott (1751–1825). Nott, a physician, also translated Catullus, the *Odes*, *Epodes*, and *Carmen saeculare* of Horace, and the first book of Lucretius. One or two English poets also noticed Propertius' elegies, and either translated some small part of them or took from them materials for imitation. Thomas Gray (1716–71), for example, translated Propertius III.5 (in 1758) and II.1 (in 1742).¹⁴² Moreover, it has been claimed (though the evidence is slender) that his

Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College reveals in lines 28–30, at least, that Gray had in mind Propertius III.14.¹⁴³ But the Augustan spirit of eighteenth-century English literary life was generally hostile to the irregular sequences of thought and feeling in Propertius. Nor did tendencies of a pre-Romantic and Romantic sort, like those in French poetry of the latter part of the century, produce in England an enhanced amount of attention to Propertius. While it is true that the concept of the "Man of Feeling" emerged at this period as a subject of literature in England (and Scotland), nevertheless it cannot be claimed that enthusiasm for the poems of Propertius had any part in this development. It may be worth noting that the first complete translation of Propertius into English recorded in Harrauer's bibliography is that of P. J. F. Gantillon published at London in 1848.¹⁴⁴

Only with the "aesthetic" movement of a century later, concentrated in the 1890s, and particularly with the poet Ernest Dowson (1867–1900), did the lyricized elegy of Propertius find a congenial response in the English-speaking world. Of Dowson's *Cynara*, his most famous poem, it was said that "Horace suggested, but Propertius inspired."¹⁴⁵ There are links between this movement and (in his early development) Ezra Pound; one such link is constituted by Dowson's contemporary and fellow-poet Lionel Johnson (1867–1902), whose work the youthful Pound warmly admired. A gifted though short-lived poet and dramatist, James Elroy Flecker (1884–1915), author of *Hassan*, *The Old Ships*, and *The Golden Journey to Samarkand*, composed, at the age of twenty, a verse translation of Propertius I.20, of which eight lines are quoted on p. xxix of the Introduction to Flecker's *Collected Poems* (London and New York, 1916; often reprinted) by its editor, J. C. Squire. Both the complete translation of Propertius I.20, composed at the end of 1904, and also the translation of Propertius II.12

140. There appears to be no comprehensive study of Propertius and Donne. See, however, S. P. Revard, "Donne and Propertius: Love and Death in London and Rome," in *The Eagle and the Dove: Reassessing John Donne*, ed. C. J. Summers and T. L. Peabworth, *Essays in Seventeenth-Century Literature* 1 (Columbia, Missouri, 1986), 69–79. See also Benediktson, *Propertius*, 126–29 for a poem included among Ben Jonson's works, which may be attributable to Donne; it shows Propertian influence.

141. See, however, the Propertian allusions in Milton's works, cited by La Penna, *L'integrazione difficile*, 281 n. 11, from two studies: W. MacKellar, *The Latin Poems of John Milton* (New Haven, 1930); and A. Variorum *Commentary on the Poems of John Milton*, vol. 1 (New York, 1970), 3–361 (*The Latin and Greek Poems*, ed. D. Bush).

142. For the text, see H. W. Starr and J. R. Hendrickson, eds., *The Complete Poems of Thomas Gray: English, Latin and Greek* (Oxford, 1966), 64–69 and explanatory notes on 232–33.

143. R. S. Edgecombe, "Gray, Propertius, and the Games Stanza in the *Eton College Ode*," *Notes and Queries* 242 (1997) 319–20.

144. Harrauer, *Bibliography to Propertius*, 36, no. 479.

145. V. G. Plarr, *Ernest Dowson, 1888–1897: Reminiscences, Unpublished Letters and Marginalia* (London, 1914), 57 n. 1. On Dowson, see M. Longaker, *Ernest Dowson*, 3d ed. (Philadelphia, 1968), and W. W. Briggs, Jr., "Dowson, Propertius and *Cynara*," *Classical and Modern Literature* 8.2 (1988) 115–23.

done by Flecker in January 1905, survive in manuscript under the pseudonym of Kara James.¹⁴⁶ Throughout his life, Flecker read Latin poetry for pleasure; his early translations of Catullus, and the incomplete verse translation of *Aeneid* 6 on which he was engaged shortly before his death, are both superb.¹⁴⁷ Flecker enthusiastically adopted the principles of the French Parnassians, in the full knowledge of their classical roots, and did much to keep them alive within the progressive development of poetry in England.

To Ezra Pound (1885–1972) a great deal of critical attention has been devoted, especially in regard to Pound's *Homage to Sextus Propertius* (London, 1934), a book that in its turn exerted a considerable influence on a number of modernist poets, including W.B. Yeats (1865–1939) and T.S. Eliot (1888–1965). The *Homage* is reproduced, together with the Latin text of Propertius which Pound used (an 1892 reprint of Lucian Müller's 1870 Teubner text), in J.P. Sullivan's *Ezra Pound and Sextus Propertius: A Study in Creative Translation* (Austin, 1964), 109–71. It has to be said that some of the highly favorable discussions of Pound's *Homage* have a social or political component; Pound is seen in both a political and a literary light as a rebel against all kinds of accepted tradition, this being the character that Pound himself claimed for Propertius in relation to Augustan Rome. Critics, however, and Niall Rudd in particular, have pointed out that very little of the *Homage* can be considered as political, and that Pound only claimed this several years after the *Homage* was published.¹⁴⁸

146. London, British Library, Add. ms. 59610 (a notebook), fols. 11r, 12r (Propertius I.20) and fol. 13r (Propertius II.12). Both versions are in iambic pentameter; like the originals, they are 52 and 24 lines long respectively. Goold's statement on p. 107 of his Loeb Classical Library edition and translation of Propertius (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1990) that only a few lines from Flecker's translations of Propertius have survived is incorrect.

147. The autograph translation of Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.264–547 is preserved in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Gilbert Murray 435, fols. 201–16; for a letter written by Flecker to Murray in 1914, see MS. Gilbert Murray 24, fols. 24–25. According to Flecker's biographers, Murray considered the translation from the *Aeneid* to be the best ever made.

148. G. Townend, "Propertius among the Poets," *Greece and Rome*, 2d Ser., 8 (1961) 36–49 and N. Rudd, *The Classical Tradition in Operation* (Toronto, 1994), 117–50 (chapter 5, "Pound and Propertius: Two Former Moderns"). For another well-balanced article, see D.M. Hooley, "Pound's Proper-

In 1946 Robert Lowell (1917–77) published in *Lord Weary's Castle* a translation or adaptation, entitled "The Ghost," of Propertius IV.7; a little more than three decades later (1977) he translated (or adapted very closely) Propertius IV.3 and published it under the title "Arethusa to Lycotas" as the final poem in *Day by Day*, his last book. John Talbot has recently detected Propertian influence in some of Lowell's other poems and also pointed to significant mentions of Propertius in three of his letters.¹⁴⁹

Finally, an extremely prolific modern poet and critical essayist, Christopher Middleton (born 1926), has designated Propertius for special praise.¹⁵⁰ Although he has not so far published translations from Propertius, his "From Catullus: Ten Travesties" (*Tankard Cat* [Riverdale-on-Hudson, N.Y., 2004], 143–52) reveals a mastery of the art of rendering the substance of Roman love-poetry into a modern idiom and in doing so, as Pound would say, "making it new."

Germany

Humanist Latin poetry in Germany (in the widest sense of this geographical term) can show two sixteenth-century names of major international renown, those of Johannes Secundus (1511–36) and Petrus Lotichius Secundus (1528–60). Together they were described by Janus Dousa Pater as *principes utriusque Germaniae poetarum*.¹⁵¹ In

tius, again," *Modern Language Notes* 100.5 (December 1984) 1025–44. Somewhat more antipathetic to its subject, but valuable and informative, is G.M. Messing, "Pound's Propertius: The Homage and the Damage," in *Poetry and Poetics from Ancient Greece to the Renaissance* (n. 102 above), 105–33.

149. J. Talbot, "Robert Lowell's Propertius," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 14 (2007) 130–47. See also Benediktson, *Propertius*, 136–42 (where Lowell's "Arethusa to Lycotas" is reproduced, together with the original Latin, and critically discussed) and S. Hamilton, ed., *The Letters of Robert Lowell* (New York, 2005), 82, 215, 222.

150. See C. Middleton, "Reflections on a Viking Prow," in Middleton, *Jackdaw Jiving: Selected Essays on Poetry & Translation* (Manchester, 1998), 28–29. A special section (pp. 7–137) of the *Chicago Review* 51.1–2 (Spring 2005), was devoted to Christopher Middleton, including a bibliography (pp. 132–37) ranging from 1962 to 2002.

151. See W. Ludwig, "Petrus Lotichius Secundus and the Roman Elegists: Prolegomena to a Study of Neo-Latin Elegy," in *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 1500–1700. Proceedings of an International Conference Held at King's College, Cambridge April 1974*, ed. R.R. Bolgar

Johannes Secundus' first book of elegies, entitled *Julia*, the contrasts between love and death, joy and grief, fulfilled and unfulfilled sexual longing, are themes derived from Propertius.¹⁵² Petrus Lotichius Secundus published three books of elegies (to which two were added posthumously), borrowing or adapting themes and structures as well as language from Propertius. His quietist nature, however, inclined him to prefer Tibullus and he was described even in his own age as the German equivalent of Ronsard (the comparison is not undeserved).¹⁵³

After this period, there is a vast lacuna in the history of Propertian influence on German poets, until we come to Goethe (1749–1832). Inevitably, a great deal has been written on Goethe's debt to Propertius.¹⁵⁴ Goethe certainly could and

did read Propertius in the original; a Latin edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius was presented to him in October 1788, after his return from the prolonged visit to Italy in June of that year, by his friend Karl Ludwig von Knebel.¹⁵⁵ In May 1794 Goethe said that this gift had caused a "strong commotion" (*Erschütterung*) in his soul. This remark was repeated, and elaborated on, in 1798, when Goethe received and read Knebel's just-completed translation of Propertius.¹⁵⁶ In the meantime, Goethe planned (in 1788) and worked at his *Römische Elegien* (which he was later to describe as "dans le goût de Properce"); they appeared first in 1798, in Schiller's magazine *Horen*. Three factors may be said to have influenced the *Römische Elegien*: Goethe's experiences in Italy, his absorption of Propertius, and the onset of his passion for Christiane Vulpius, whom he later married. At a later period, while writing *Hermann und Dorothea*, and so at a time when he had largely turned from the expression of private emotion to the consideration of more public themes, Goethe was apt to dismiss the *Römische Elegien* as a folly of his youth, but one still firmly linked with the name of Propertius. In fact, though the *Römische Elegien* had been finished in 1791, Goethe continued to keep Propertius in mind; in the elegy *Euphrosyne*, a work of the year 1797, he still shows strong Propertian influence.

Translations apart, the question of the extent to which German literature of the nineteenth and

(Cambridge, 1976), 171–90 (178 n. 4 for the quotation from Janus Dousa Pater).

In a note on Propertius II.28.49–50, the elder Dousa (see I.16 below for his *Notae reliquae sive Paralipomena*) cites a striking reflection of Propertius' metre as well as language from Johannes Secundus' second book of elegies; in a further note, on III.20.30, Dousa observes that elsewhere Secundus inverts Propertius' conceit ("semper amet, fructu semper amoris egens") when he remodels the line thus: "semper amet, dulci semper amore fruens."

152. Ludwig, *ibid.*, 179. See also C. Endres and B. K. Gold, "Joannes Secundus and His Roman Models: Shapes of Imitation in Renaissance Poetry," *Renaissance Quarterly* 35 (1982) 577–89. The authors point to Propertius and Ovid as the models, in theme and structure and often in language, of Johannes Secundus' three books of *Elegiae* (just as Catullus was the model for his *Basia*). They find that in these love-elegies Secundus rejects the fundamentally frivolous attitude of Ovid towards love itself, and they attribute this new seriousness to a Christian view of morality, to "the changed attitude toward love which arose between antiquity and the Renaissance" (pp. 585–86). (It might however be claimed that some of this added seriousness about the effects of love can be found in Propertius). They also stress Secundus' habit of imitation by inversion, as in his denial of the persuasive power of poetry as compared with riches in capturing a woman's favor, instead of which, as they note, he concentrates rather on the power of love itself on the poet. Their last paragraph, devoted to the dialogue—part agreement, part rejection—between Secundus and his models as engendering creativity in the Renaissance Latin poet, is particularly helpful.

153. Ludwig, *ibid.*, 178.

154. A sound critical study of the various theories advanced concerning this, together with an exhaustive bibliography, can be found in H. J. Meissler, *Goethe und Properz* (Bochum, 1987). See also G. Lieberg, "Properzio e le 'Elegie Romane' di Goethe," in *Atti 1979 (Colloquium Propertianum Secundum)* (1981), 131–45. Add the articles by G. Cusatelli, "Temi properziani nella tradizione tedesca," in *Atti 1996 (A confronto con Properzio: Da Petrarca a Pound)*

(1998), 105–11, which (despite the comprehensive title) concerns Goethe only; and B. Zimmermann, "The Reception of Propertius in the Modern Age: Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's *Römische Elegien* and Ezra Pound's *Homage to Sextus Propertius*," in *Brill's Companion to Propertius*, ed. H.-C. Günther (Leiden and Boston, 2006), 417–28 (the section devoted to Pound occupies pp. 425–28 only).

155. The edition was that of 1762, published by Vandenhoeck at Göttingen. Goethe's thanks are expressed in a letter to Knebel dated 25 October 1788 (*Goethes Werke, Weimarer Ausgabe* 4.9 [Weimar, 1891], 43–44). See Meissler, *ibid.*, 21 and n. 3; Lieberg, *ibid.*, 131 n. 1. Goethe's copy of the edition still exists, according to a kind communication from Dr. Petra Graupe, Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek, Weimar, who reports the shelf mark to be that used by H. Ruppert, *Goethes Bibliothek. Katalog* (Weimar, 1958), 191, no. 1366.

156. Goethe's letter to Knebel, 28 November 1798 (Meissler, *ibid.*, 78 and n. 2); *Goethes Werke, Weimarer Ausgabe* 4.13 (Weimar, 1893), 322–24. Goethe had taken an interest in the gradual progress of Knebel's translations over the preceding decade.

twentieth centuries reflects the influence of Propertius would appear still to merit investigation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. BIBLIOGRAPHIES OF PROPERTIUS

H. Harrauer, *A Bibliography to Propertius* (Hildesheim, 1973); W. R. Nethercut, "Twelve Years of Propertian Scholarship, 1960–1972," *Classical World* 69 (1975–76) 1–33, 225–57, 289–309; Nethercut, "Recent Scholarship on Propertius," in ANRW 2.30.3 (Berlin, 1983), 1813–57; P. Fedeli and P. Pinotti, *Bibliografia Properziana (1946–1983)*, Atti dell'Accademia Properziana del Subasio, 6th Ser., 9 (Assisi, 1985); J. P. Sullivan, "Recent Structural and Post-structural Studies on Propertius," *The Augustan Age* 9 (1989) 37–41; N. Holzberg, *Die römische Liebeslegie: eine Bibliographie* (Munich, 2004).

For the period up to 1946, the exhaustive *conspectus librorum* in the Prolegomena to P. J. Enk's edition of Propertius I is very useful; the Prolegomena to his edition of Propertius II contains a supplement to his *conspectus librorum*, bringing the bibliography to 1960.

Notices appear annually in *L'année philologique*.

II. SELECTED EDITIONS AND COMMENTARIES

J. Broekhuysen (Amsterdam, 1702; 2d ed., 1727); P. Burman and L. van Santen (Utrecht, 1780); C. T. Kuinoel (Leipzig, 1805); K. Lachmann (Leipzig, 1816; his second edition, 1829, is without value); W. A. B. Hertzberg (3 vols., Halle, 1843–45); M. Haupt (Leipzig, 1853; revised by J. Vahlen, 1879); L. Müller (Leipzig, 1870); A. Palmer (London and Dublin, 1880); E. Baehrens (Leipzig, 1880); J. P. Postgate (selected elegies, with commentary, London, 1881; text only, *Corpus poetarum latinorum*, fasc. 2, London, 1894); M. Rothstein (Berlin, 1898; 2d ed., 1920 [books I–II] and 1924 [books III–IV], reprinted with addenda, Dublin, 1966); J. S. Phillimore (Oxford, 1901); C. Hosius (Leipzig, 1911; 2d ed., 1922; 3d ed., 1932); O. L. Richmond (Cambridge, 1928); H. E. Butler and E. A. Barber (Oxford, 1933); P. J. Enk (books I and II) (Leiden, 1946 and 1962 respectively); E. A. Barber (Oxford, 1953; 2d ed., 1960); W. A. Camps (4 volumes, Cam-

bridge 1961–67); G. Luck (Zürich, 1964); L. Richardson, Jr. (Norman, Oklahoma, 1977); R. Hanslik (Leipzig, 1979); P. Fedeli (Stuttgart, 1984; book IV, Bari, 1965; book I, Florence, 1980; book III, Bari, 1985; book II, Cambridge, 2005); G. P. Goold (Loeb Classical Library 18; Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1990); R. J. Baker (book I) (Armidale, NSW, Australia, 1990); G. Lee (translation and notes; Oxford, 1994); G. Giardina (Rome, 2005); S. Virarre (Paris, 2005); G. Hutchinson (book IV, Cambridge, 2006); S. J. Heyworth, *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius* (Oxford and New York, 2007).

See also P. Fedeli, "The History of Propertian Scholarship," in *Brill's Companion to Propertius*, ed. H.-C. Günther (Leiden and Boston, 2006), 3–21.

III. TRANSMISSION

R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci nei secoli XIV e XV*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1905 and 1914; rpt. 1967); A. La Penna, "Studi sulla tradizione di Propertio. I," *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 25 (1951) 199–237; La Penna, "Studi sulla tradizione di Propertio (continuazione e fine)," *ibid.* 26 (1952) 5–36; G. Billanovich, *I primi umanisti e le tradizioni dei classici latini*, Discorsi universitari N. S. 14 (Fribourg, 1951); P. W. Damon, "A Second Propertius Florilegium," *Classical Philology* 48 (1953) 96–97; D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge, 1956); B. L. Ullman, "Pontano's Handwriting and the Leiden Manuscript of Tacitus and Suetonius," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 2 (1959) 309–35, especially 334–35, and pls. 26–28, reprinted in Ullman, *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 2d ed. (Rome, 1973), 401–28, especially 427–28 and pls. 23–28; J. L. Butrica, "Pontanus, Puccius, Pocchus, Petreius, and Propertius," *Res publica litterarum* 3 (1980) 5–9; Butrica, "Propertius and the Myth of the Itali," in *Atti 2000 (Propertio alle soglie del 2000: un bilancio di fine secolo)*, ed. G. Catanzaro and F. Santucci (Assisi, 2002), 349–88; Butrica, "The Transmission of the Text of Propertius," in *Brill's Companion to Propertius*, 25–43; W. R. Smyth, *Thesaurus criticus ad Sexti Propertii textum*, Supplement 12 to *Mnemosyne* (Leiden, 1970); R. H. Rouse, "Manuscripts Belonging to Richard de Fournival," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 3 (1973) 253–69; A. T. Grafton, "Joseph Scaliger's Edition of Catullus (1577) and

the Traditions of Textual Criticism in the Renaissance," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 38 (1975) 155–81; A. C. de la Mare, "The Return of Propertius to Italy," in *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays presented to Richard William Hunt*, ed. J. J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibson (Oxford, 1976), 220–54; C. L. Heesakkers, *Prae-cidanea Dousana: Materials for a Biography of Janus Dousa Pater (1545–1604). His Youth* (Amsterdam, 1976); A. La Penna, *L'integrazione difficile: un profilo di Properzio* (Turin, 1977), Appendix 1, 241–49; R. H. Rouse, "Florilegia and Classical Authors in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Orléans," *Viator* 10 (1979) 131–60; A. Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford, 1983); A. Rose, *Filippo Beroaldo der Ältere und sein Beitrag zur Properz-Überlieferung* (Munich and Leipzig, 2001) (with much bibliographical information related to Propertian studies).

IV. MANUSCRIPTS

A. General

C. Hosius, "Die Handschriften des Properz," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 46 (1891) 577–88; A. E. Housman, "The Manuscripts of Propertius," *Journal of Philology* 21 (1893) 101–97 and 22 (1894), 84–128 (reprinted in *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*, ed. J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear, 3 vols. [Cambridge, 1972], 1.232–304 and 314–47); Housman, "The Manuscripts of Propertius," *Classical Review* 9 (1895) 19–29 (reprinted in *Classical Papers*, ed. Diggle and Goodyear, 1.351–68); J. P. Postgate, "On Certain Manuscripts of Propertius, with a Facsimile," *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society* 4.1 (1894) 1–83; T. Simar, "Les manuscrits de Propertius du Vatican," *Le Musée Belge* 13 (1909) 79–98; B. L. Ullman, "The Manuscripts of Propertius," *Classical Philology* 6 (1911) 282–301; A. C. Ferguson, *The Manuscripts of Propertius* (Diss. Chicago, 1934); G. P. Goold, "Noctes Propertianae," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 71 (1966) 59–106; J. L. Butrica, *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius* (Diss. University of Toronto, 1978); Butrica, *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius*, Supplement 17 to *Phoenix* (Toronto, 1984) (revised version of his 1978 doctoral dissertation with the same title); R. J. Tarrant, "Propertius," in *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Clas-*

sics, ed. L. D. Reynolds (Oxford, 1983), 324–26; Tarrant, "Propertian Textual Criticism and Editing," in *Brill's Companion to Propertius*, 45–65; S. J. Heyworth, "The Elegies of Sextus Propertius: Towards a Critical Edition" (Diss. Cambridge, 1986); G. P. Goold, "On Editing Propertius," in *Vir bonus discendi peritus: Studies in Celebration of Otto Skutsch's Eightieth Birthday*, ed. N. Horsfall, Supplement 51 to *Bulletin of the University of London Institute of Classical Studies* (London, 1988), 27–38; Goold, "Paralipomena Propertiana," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 94 (1992) 287–320.

B. Individual Manuscripts

See J. L. Butrica, *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius* (Toronto, 1984), Part Two (pp. 205–334), for full descriptions and bibliographies of the 148 extant manuscripts now known.

V. READERSHIP AND LITERARY INFLUENCE

A. La Penna, *L'integrazione difficile: un profilo di Properzio* (Turin, 1977), 250–99, Appendix 2 ("Appunti sulla fortuna di Properzio"); *Propertius, Elegias*, ed. A. Tovar and M. T. Belfiore Martire (Barcelona, 1963; reprinted with corrections, Madrid, 1984), xxxv–xxxvii (for a list of allusions to Propertius in the works of Lope de Vega, Quevedo, and others); D. T. Benediktson, *Propertius: Modernist Poet of Antiquity* (Carbondale, Ill., 1989), with extensive bibliography on pp. 153–66; A. Iurilli, "Episodi della fortuna editoriale delle opere di Properzio," in *Atti 1994 (Commentatori e traduttori di Properzio dall'Umanesimo al Lachmann)*, ed. G. Catanzaro and F. Santucci (Assisi, 1996), 263–301 (almost all the communications in this volume are of great value for our purpose); D. Estefanía, "Influsso di Properzio nella letteratura spagnola," in *Atti 1996 (A confronto con Properzio: da Petrarca a Pound)*, ed. G. Catanzaro and F. Santucci (Assisi, 1998), 51–79; A. Álvarez Hernández, "Properzio e Quevedo," *ibid.*, 81–106 (Francisco Gómez de Quevedo y Villegas, 1580–1645); S. Gavinelli, "The Reception of Propertius in Late Antiquity and Neolatin and Renaissance Literature," in *Brill's Companion to Propertius*, 399–415.

J. H. Gaisser's *Catullus and His Renaissance Readers* (Oxford, 1993) may also be consulted

with considerable profit by students of Propertius.

VI. TRANSLATIONS

An asterisk before an entry expresses indebtedness for that particular item to C. Santini's well-informed article "Un secolo di commenti e traduzioni properziane," in *Atti 2000 (Properzio alle soglie del 2000: un bilancio di fine secolo)*, ed. G. Catanzaro and F. Santucci (Assisi, 2002), 71–107. This article should also be consulted for translations into English, French, German, and Italian, as they are not covered below.

A. Chinese

Wang Huansheng (Beijing, 2000) (book I, with selections from books II–IV).

See also Wang Huansheng, "La traduzione in cinese di Properzio," in *Atti 2000 (Properzio alle soglie del 2000: un bilancio di fine secolo)* (2002), 465–68 (an introductory article, in Italian and Chinese, describing the genesis of the foregoing translation).

B. Czech

F. Doucha (Progr. Königsgrätz, 1915); V. Šrámek (Prague, 1962); O. C. Smrčka, *Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius* (Prague, 1962); Smrčka, *Pěvci lásky: Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius* (Prague, 1973).

C. Danish

A. Juel, *Tibullus og Propertius. Kaerligheden og freden Elegies i udvalg og overs* (Copenhagen, 1942).

D. Dutch

J. Van Gelder, *Latijnse lyriek. Een keuze van vertalingen uit Catullus, Horatius, Tibullus en Propertius* (Haarlem, 1949); A. W. J. Holleman, "Propertius' Cynthia-Erlebnis in nuce (Prop. II.26)," *Hermeneus* 42.3 (1971) 144–47, with a related translation on p. 148 by M. d'Hane-Scheltema; W. A. M. Peters (Baarn, 1991).

E. Finnish

*V. A. Koskeniemi, *Roomalaisia runoilijoita* (Porvoo, 1919); P. Oksala, *I kirja Cynthia ja IV kirja Regina elegiarum* (Helsinki, 1964).

F. Greek

G. A. Tourlides, Σέξτου Προπέρτιου ἐλεγείαι. Βιβλίον τέταρτον, ἐλεγεία ἐνδεκάτη (Athens, 1973); Tourlides, Ἑλεγείαι, 2, 3 (1–20) (Athens, 1979); *V. I. Lazanas (Athens, 1987).

G. Hebrew

H. B. Rosén, *Carmina selecta Catulli, Properti, Horati, aliquot carminibus sepulcralibus adiectis* [with commentary in Hebrew] (Tel Aviv, 1958).

H. Hungarian

J. Csengeri, "Cynthia dicsérete (II.3), Hylas (I.20)," *Egyetemes philologiai Közlöny* 7 (1883) 393–94, 803–4; J. Csengeri, "Tithonos (II.18 Baehrens). Cynthia gyógyulásakor (I.28b Baehrens). Az ünnep (II.33)," *Egyetemes philologiai Közlöny* 10 (1886) 531, 567, 575–76; *J. Csengeri [complete translation] (Budapest, 1897); V. Lessi and K. Szábo (Budapest, 1970) (selected elegies of Tibullus and Propertius).

I. Polish

M. Ostowski, "Propertius, Elegje," *Kwartalnik klasyczny* 73 (1933) 247 (*Eleg.* III.20.1–9 and 22); *T. Sinko (Warsaw, 1938) (selections); J. Wójcicki, and M. Brożek (Warsaw, 1986).

J. Portuguese

A. A. Nascimento et al. (Assisi and Lisbon, 2002) (with a facing Latin text).

See A. A. Nascimento, "Propércio em tradução portuguesa: notícia e alguns pormenores de rectificação," *Euphrosyne* N.S. 31 (2003) 551–59. This article contains supplementary information on the life and work of António Aires de Gouveia (1828–1916), who added eleven poems by Propertius to his Portuguese translation of Tibullus; it also discusses the preparations for Nascimento's translation of Propertius, together with the problems confronting the translator of this poet.

K. Romanian

I. Micu, "Cynthiei, după Propertius II, 11," *Revista Clasică* 4–5 (1932–33) 271.

L. Russian

J. Cholodnjak (Moscow, 1886) (*Eleg.* I.14); A. A. Fet (St. Petersburg, 1888) (verse translation); S. Apt, F. Petrovskij, and E. Berkova, *Valerij Katull, Albij Tibull, Sekst Propercij* (Moscow,

1963); Ja. M. Borovskij, "Chetyre elegii Propertija," in *Antichnost i sovremennost: k 80-letiju Fedora Aleksandrovicha Petrovskogo*, ed. M. E. Grabar-Passek et al. (Moscow, 1972), 330–33 (translations of Propertius I.3, III.10, III.17, and III.21).

See A. Liubzhin, "La terza edizione completa di Propertio in lingua russa," in *Atti 2004 (Propertio nel genere elegiaco: modelli, motivi, riflessi storici)* (2005), ed. C. Santini and F. Santucci, 477–80 for a brief survey of Russian interest in Propertius and an announcement of Liubzhin's own complete translation in prose.

M. Serbo-Croatian

*M. Atanasijević, *Elegije, izhor* (Belgrade, 1966); *S. Teklić, *Cintija—Monobiblos* (Zagreb, 1931); *D. Grečl, *Odabrane elegije* (Zagreb, 1979); [Propertius], *Elegiae selectae* [text and translation by D. Grečl (*Latina et Graeca* 14 [1979] 57–72); N. Šop, ed. and trans. (into Croatian), *Katul, Propertije, Tibul: Iz lirike starog Rima* (Zagreb, 1950); Pyratić, *Propertijeva elegija IV. Il u prepjevu Jakova Betondića* (*Latina et Graeca* 7 [1976], 15–18).

See D. Novaković, "Il raguseo Ilija Crijević (*Aelius Lampridius Cervinus*, 1463–1520) e la tradizione dell'elegia amorosa in Croazia," in *Atti 1998 (Poesia umanistica latina in distici elegiaci)*, ed. G. Catanzaro and F. Santucci (Assisi, 1999), 165–81.

N. Slovenian

J. Mlinarič, *Pesmi* (Maribor, 1973).

See K. Gantar, "Echi properziani in due poeti sloveni," in *Atti 1985 (Bimillenario della morte di Propertio)*, ed. G. Catanzaro and F. Santucci (Assisi, 1986), 305–12.

O. Spanish

G. Salinas (Madrid, 1914); M. A. Caro, *Flos poetarum*, in *Obras completas*, vol. 1 (Bogotá, 1918), 109–49, containing versions of twenty-nine poems; see M. Briceño Jáuregui, "Propertio y Miguel Antonio Caro: un humanista colombiano traductor de Propertio," in *Atti 1985 (Bimillenario della morte di Propertio)* (1986), 343–53; J. Mínguez (Barcelona, 1925; 2d ed., 1946); A. Tovar and M. T. Belfiore Mártire, ed. and trans. (Barcelona, 1963; reprinted with corrections, Madrid, 1984); R. Bonifaz Nuño (Mexico City, 1974, 1983) (with a facing Latin text); A. Núñez (Valladolid, 1980)

(selected poems, with notes); J. D. Casasús (Mexico City, 1981); P.-L. Cano Alonso (Barcelona, 1984); H. F. Bauzá (Madrid, 1987); A. Ramírez de Verger (Madrid, 1989; reprinted 2001); *A. Cuatrecasas (Barcelona, 1990); J. L. Pérez Vega (Ubeda, 1993); M. Dolç and Antonio Ramírez de Verger (Barcelona, 1998) (with the elegies of Catullus); A. Álvarez Hernández (Buenos Aires, 1999) (book I only); F. Moya and A. Ruiz de Elvira, ed. and trans. (Madrid, 2001); M. Berdusán Cabellos *Todo amor es grande = Omnis amor magnus/Propertio: traducción, introducción y notas* (selections) (Saragossa, 2004); J. Parramón i Blasco. *Libre primer d'elegies (Cintia) Sext Propertio: presentació i versió homomètrica* (Barcelona, 2004) (in Catalan).

See D. Estefanía, "Traducciones al español de Propertio I 9, 23–24 realizadas en el siglo XX: una revisión," in *Atti 2000 (Propertio alle soglie del 2000: un bilancio di fine secolo)* (2002), 443–50 for a critical and comparative study of eight published versions in Spanish of Propertius I.9.23–34; it is interesting that she awards the palm to a pair of translations, A. Álvarez Hernández and R. Bonifaz Nuño above, composed in Argentina and Mexico respectively.

P. Swedish

C. A. Renwall (Helsingfors, 1847) (eight elegies). Note that Helsingfors is the Swedish name of Finland's capital, Helsinki; M. Iohansson (Uppsala, 1862) (selected elegies); M. I. F. Flemming (Uppsala, 1863) (selected elegies); C. H. G. Lundquist (Uppsala, 1867) (five elegies); L. Sjöblom (Göteborg, 1869) (selected elegies); A. Frigell (Uppsala, 1883) (twelve elegies); T. F. Kylander (Linköping, 1884) (selected elegies from book I); E. Janzon (Göteborg, 1911).

See C. Santini, "Kellgren traduttore di Propertio," in *Atti 1994 (Commentatori e traduttori di Propertio dall' Umanesimo al Lachmann)* (1996), 303–22, who chronicles the sudden spate of Propertian interest and influence in Sweden, largely if not entirely due in the first instance to the popularity in that country of the French translation by Pierre de Longchamps (Paris and Amsterdam, 1772; revised edition, Paris, 1795). This article has a helpful final note (321–22), which traces the further *fortuna* of Propertius in Sweden during the nineteenth century.

COMPOSITE EDITIONS

1582, Antverpiae (Antwerp): apud Aegidium Radaeum. Contents the same as in Joseph Justus Scaliger's 1577 edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, with his *Castigationes* and the commentaries of Marcus Antonius Muretus on the three poets. *Index Aureliensis* I.vii.211; Adams C-1156; *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlvii; NUC.BL; BNF; (CtY; NNC; IU; CaOTU; CaOTV). See CTC 7.222.

1592, Lugdunum Batavorum (Leiden): ex off. Plantiniana, apud Franciscum Raphelengium. Janus Dousa Filius, ed. With the text of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and *Pervigilium Veneris*, and the commentaries of Janus Dousa Filius on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius; Janus Dousa Pater (*Notae reliquae sive Paralipomena*) on Propertius; Justus Lipsius on *Pervigilium Veneris*; Greek translations by Scaliger (*Priapea* attributed to Catullus and Tibullus [respectively, nos. 85 and 83 in the edition of F. Vollmer]), Quintus Septimius Florens Christianus (Catullus 62), Bonaventura Vulcanius (Catullus 65), and Henricus Stephanus (Propertius II.12). Adams C-1160; NUC.BL; BNF; (ICU; NcU).

1604, Lutetiae (Paris): ex officina typographica Marci Orry, via Iacobaea ad insigne Leonis salientis. With the text of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and *Pervigilium Veneris*, and the commentaries of Marcus Antonius Muretus, Joseph Justus Scaliger, and Janus Dousa Filius on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius; Achilles Statius on Catullus and Tibullus; Janus Dousa Pater, *Praecidaneae* on Catullus and Tibullus and *Schediasma succidaneum* on Tibullus and Propertius; Philippus Beroaldus Senior and Janus Dousa Pater (*Notae reliquae sive Paralipomena*) on Propertius; Antonius Parthenius and Palladius Fuscus on Catullus; Franciscus Robortellus and Constantius Landus on Catullus 61; Robertus Titius, *Praelectiones* on Catullus 63; Hieronymus Avantius, *Emendationes in Catullum*; Theodorus Marcilius, *In C. Valerium Catullum Asterismi*; Bernardinus Cyllenius on Tibullus; Janus Dousa Filius and Justus Lipsius on *Pervigilium Veneris*; Greek translations by Quintus Septimius Florens Christianus (Catullus 62), Bonaventura Vulcanius (Catullus 65), Federicus Morellus (Catullus 101 and Tibullus I.10), and Henricus Stephanus (Propertius II.12). *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlviii; J.A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca latina* 1.55;

NUC.BL; BNF; (MH; TxU). See CTC 7.222–23. 1608, Lutetiae (Paris): apud M. Orry. This is a reissue of the preceding edition. NUC.BL; (CtY; IU). See CTC 7.223.

1659, Trajecti ad Rhenum (Utrecht): typis Gisberti a Zyll et Theod. ab Ackersdyk. Simone Abbes Gabbema, ed. With the texts of Catullus, Propertius, Tibullus, and *Elegies* of "Cornelius Gallus," and a variorum commentary consisting of extracts from the commentaries of Marcus Antonius Muretus, Joseph Justus Scaliger, Janus Dousa Filius, Johannes Passeratius, and Johannes Livineius on Catullus, Propertius, and Tibullus; Achilles Statius on Catullus and Tibullus; Antonius Parthenius, Janus Meleager, Palladius Fuscus, Justus Lipsius, Adrianus Turnebus, and Claudius Salmasius on Catullus; Franciscus Robortellus on Catullus 61; Bernardinus Cyllenius on Tibullus; Philippus Beroaldus Senior and Janus Dousa Pater (*Schediasma succidaneum* and *Notae reliquae sive Paralipomena*) on Propertius. Reproduced in full are the commentaries of Janus Dousa Filius and Justus Lipsius on *Pervigilium Veneris*. *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), li; J.A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca latina* 1.56; NUC.BL; BNF; (NIC; TxU). See CTC 7.223.

1680, Traiecti ad Rhenum (Utrecht): ex officina Rudolphi a Zyll. J.G. Graevius is claimed (perhaps fraudulently) as the editor. With the texts of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, and the complete commentaries of Marcus Antonius Muretus, Joseph Justus Scaliger, and Janus Dousa Filius on these three poets; Janus Dousa Pater, *Praecidaneae* on Catullus and Tibullus, *Schediasma succidaneum* on Tibullus and Propertius, and *Notae reliquae sive Paralipomena* on Propertius; Achilles Statius on Catullus and Tibullus; Robertus Titius, *Praelectiones* on Catullus 63; Hieronymus Avantius, *Emendationes in Catullum*; and Theodorus Marcilius, *In C. Valerium Catullum Asterismi*. Included as well is a variorum commentary consisting of extracts from the commentaries of Muretus, Scaliger, Dousa Pater, Dousa Filius, Johannes Passeratius, and Johannes Livineius on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius; Statius on Catullus and Tibullus; Janus Gebhardus on Tibullus and Propertius; Antonius Parthenius and Palladius Fuscus on Catullus; and Bernardinus Cyllenius on Tibullus. *Ed. Bipont.* I, li; J.A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca latina* I, 57; NUC.BL; BNF; (MH; TxU; Cst). See CTC 7.223.

ELEGIARUM LIBRI IV

I. COMMENTARIES

1. Johannes Jovianus Pontanus

Pontanus has left us two autograph commentaries on Propertius. The first, preserved in Valencia, Biblioteca Universitaria, 725 and dated 1460, is of a quite elementary kind. The accompanying Latin text of Propertius was not copied by Pontanus. As for the second instance (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lat. fol. 500), both text and commentary were copied by Pontanus; he retained possession of this manuscript and continued to annotate it throughout his life. Both commentaries reflect the keen interest in Propertius felt and expressed by Pontanus from his very early youth onwards. In fact, Propertius was one of his favorite poets: there are many Propertian motifs in Pontanus' early *Parthenopeus* and in his later *De amore coniugali*.

a. Valencia, Biblioteca Universitaria, 725

An abundant marginal and interlinear commentary in Pontanus' own hand appears in Valencia, Biblioteca Universitaria, 725. Dated 1460 at I.16.2 *Tarpeiae* on fol. 10v, this is the earliest dated commentary on Propertius and must be presumed to be Pontanus' own creation (there are only a few additions by a later hand). It is distributed over all four books and consists of brief annotations covering mythology, history, antiquities, and literary allusions, with some slight attempts at textual criticism. But this commentary does not go far beyond the basic instruction of a student. On the intended recipient(s) of the commentary, see Butrica 1978, 434–35: "The interlinear glosses function exactly as did their medieval forebears and show the reader how to construe the text; the marginal glosses expatiate upon more difficult points and provide occasional illustrative parallels. No Greek authors seem to be cited; among the Latin writers, the most interesting reference is to the recently discovered *De grammaticis* of Suetonius, of which Pontano made a celebrated copy, also in 1460, now Leiden, XVIII Periz. Q.12. The Valencia commentary may have been composed specifically for some didactic purpose, such as the instruction of students, or upon commission from some patron (the coat of arms found in the ms. has not been identified;

it belonged later to the royal library in Naples)."

The text of the *Elegies* is a direct copy, by an unidentified scribe, of Berlin Lat. fol. 500 (Butrica 1984, 298, no. 107).

Commentary. (Valencia, Biblioteca Universitaria, 725). [*Inc.*]: (fol. 2r) *Cynthia* (I.1.1). *Cynthia* pro Hostilia dixit quae nobilis fuit romana. *Fastus* (I.1.3). *Superbie*. *Castas puellas* (I.1.5) vel puellarum castitatem. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 71v) *Quoius honoratis signa vehantur equis* (IV.11.102). *Funere honorato equorum pompabilium more*.

Manuscripts:

(micro.) Valencia, Biblioteca Universitaria, 725, s. XV (a. 1460), fols. 2r–71v. (M. Gutiérrez del Caño, *Catálogo de los manuscritos existentes en la Biblioteca Universitaria de Valencia*, vol. 3 [Valencia, 1913], 65, no. 1879; Butrica 1984, 298, no. 107, with further bibliography).

(micro.) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 16693, s. XV (a. 1468–69), fols. 1r–126v. (A. La Penna, "Studi sulla tradizione di Properzio (continuazione e fine)," *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 26 [1952] 28–30; C. Samaran and R. Marichal, *Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copie*, vol. 3 [Paris, 1974], 561 and pl. 186 [detail of fol. 12v]; Kristeller, *Iter* 3.265b).

The beginning of the commentary in Paris, BNF, lat. 16693 has been lost, and the first complete note is on fol. 1r at I.3.29. Though not provided, the Latin text from which the lemmata are derived is clearly that of Valencia, Biblioteca Universitaria, 725. On the derivative character of the commentary itself, see Butrica 1978, 435–36: "The Valencia commentary has a direct descendant in Paris, B.N. 16693. . . . Composed by one Nicolaus Gaucius (or Gancius?) while he served as 'capitaneus' at a small town near Naples in 1468 and 1469, it depends heavily upon Pontano's work, as may be seen from the following glosses on 4. 1: 1 hospes) 'urbem querens cupiditate scientie rerum externarum' Pontano: 'nam hospites semper sunt cupidi et curiosi scire res externas et novas dum queritant orbem' (*sic*) Gaucius; 2 collis et herba) 'herbosus collis' Pontano: 'collis herbosus' Gaucius; and both agree in the one or two word glosses in the following lines: 3 sacra) 'dedicata'; 4 euandri) 'regis'; 4 profugae) 'ex arc(h)adia'; 4 concubuerunt) '(et) stabulavere'; 5 haec) 'demonstrantis'. Gaucius was clearly no scholar, but his

individual contributions are sometimes interesting, as in this introduction to Bk.4: 'hunc librum ostendit propercius edidisse post illos tres amatorios et non hunc cum (eum *ac*) aliis libris inse-ruisse, ut ipse dicit in una eledia, Sat michi si tres sint pompa libelli. ex natura intencio (*sic*) poete credo quod non fuit inserere hunc cum aliis set postea simul esse adiunctos. inuenimus intencio propercii in hoc libro est scribere situm et edificium rome ciuitatis ab inicio enee'. The grammar is hair-raising, but one may admire the economy of a theory that accommodates the 'three books' of 2.13.25 which so bedevilled Lachmann and Birt ('tam temerarium et inconsultum de librorum suorum numero testimonium' Lipsius called it in the *Variae Lectiones* 1.16) and the very obvious difference of Bk.4 from 'illos tres amatorios'. It is possible that at those points in which Gaucius differs from or adds to Pontano's commentary he is drawing upon some other commentary now lost (or at least not yet discovered) rather than relying upon his own *ingenium*; both Gaucius' Latin and such errors as his befuddling of Pontano's gloss on 'collis et herba' ('herbosus collis', i.e. an instance of hendiadys, altered by Gaucius to a lemma 'collis' with the gloss 'herbosus') suggest a man of limited intellectual abilities. His insistence upon defining the 'intencio' of the work, which was apparently not felt by Pontano to be a necessity, is ultimately derived from Servius, but was probably suggested to Gaucius by the medieval commentaries that he knew."

The degree of dependence may be further illustrated from the fact that, in the first 100 lines of book IV, every annotation in Valencia 725 is taken up and made the basis of a note in Paris, BNF, lat. 16693 (with the solitary exception of line 87, where the note in the Paris codex is more concise and somewhat independent). Indeed, many of the notes in Paris, BNF, lat. 16693 are entirely copied from those of Valencia 725; this applies to the quotations from Ovid at lines 23 and 25. It should also be noted that an aberrant reading in the text of Valencia 725 at line 26 is faithfully reproduced in Paris, BNF, lat. 16693.

Commentary. (Paris, BNF, lat. 16693). [*Inc.*] (fol. 1r) <*Insolitos timores*> (I.3.29). (*inc. mutilus*) vanum et malum sompnum. *Visa* id est fantasmata. *Invitam* (I.3.30). *Te* supple. . . / . . . [*Expl.*] (fol. 126v) *Merendo* (IV.11.101) hoc scilicet ob mea merita sum digna ut celum michi patheat. *Equis*

(IV.11.102) cum funere honorato more mobilium (*sic*) etc. Ihesus christus vincit et semper sit et est et erit mecum. Amen.

Subscription. (fol. 126v) Finito libro sit laus deo omnipotenti. Amen. Hoc opus scriptum et confectum est per me Nicolaum Gaucium de Alifia tempore quo steti in officio et Capitaneus in civitatibus Vici et Masse Lubrensis in anno domini millesimo cccc° lxxviii°. et mo cccclxxviii°. et exercui dictum officium Capitanei in ipsis ambabus civitatibus. et per annos duos et mensem unum et plus. videlicet incipiendo a die xv° Iulii anni xv° indictionis et finiendo sub ultimo die augusti in anno secunde indictionis. tum in fine dicti anni ultimi completum fuit per me Nicolaum ut supra. Deo gratias.

b. Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—
Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lat. fol. 500

This annotated manuscript of Propertius, identified by B.L. Ullman as Pontanus' autograph, was clearly meant for his own use. It has been described as "almost an edition . . . perhaps the most significant contribution of a single scholar of the Renaissance to the emendation of Propertius" (Butrica 1984, 108). Pontanus copied the text in 1460 and began at once to add notes and variant readings. He continued to do this over a period of forty years and more; the richest vein of his additions belongs to the time when he was able to consult the texts and commentaries of Philippus Beroaldus Senior (I.8 below) and Antonius Volscus (I.9 below). Many of their suggestions for improving the text were adopted by him; for an example, see J.L. Butrica, "Pontanus, Puccius, Pocchus, Petreius, and Propertius," *Res publica litterarum* 3 (1980) 9 n. 3. It is noteworthy that Pontanus at first wrote *Nautae* in the subscription (see p. 187 below) but later erased it, no doubt after he had seen Beroaldus' edition of 1487.

Pontanus' notes, however, were not made available to the world of scholarship until Franciscus Puccius (I.12 below) made a selection of them when he inserted his 1502 collation in a copy of the Reggio Emilia edition of 1481. There is also a further set of collations in other printed editions, including that of Marcantonio Pocchi (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. 2. R. VI.26 [Venice, 1502]) and Antonius Petreius (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Diez oct. 2474

[Venice, 1515]); the latter, owned by Marcus Antonius Muretus, in whose possession Justus Lipsius saw it, and later by Nicholas Heinsius, was first cited in the 1780 Utrecht edition of Pieter Burman and Laurens van Santen. The common source of these evidently had access to Puccius' notes but also to those of Pontanus through another channel. But the survival of the Berlin codex gives us, fortunately, direct access to Pontanus' notes and conjectures, without the need to reconstruct them from later copies.

There is another series of notes, by a second hand, the anonymous author of which inserted only a general preface and the *argumenta* of the individual poems. This series begins (on the inside front cover) "Elegantissimum (*corr.*) hoc opus elegiaco carmine scriptum est" and ends (fol. 65r) "huic elegiae commentum in calce huius pagellae ascriptum est."

Commentary. [Inc.]: (fol. 1r) *Minalion* (I.1.9). Milanion. *Syli* (I.1.13). *Hylei*. A Graecis dictus est "Hyleus" et "Syleus," "dasea" in *s* versa. Si dixit *Hylei*, bene habet, ut dixit Ovidius: Sensit et *Hylei* contentum saucius arcum [*Ars amat.* 2.191]. Sin dixit *Sylei*, legendum est *Ille et Sylei*. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 66v) *Causa perorata est* (IV.11.99). Perorata causa in consessu iudicum, testes surgebant ad dicendum . . . *Ossa vehantur equis* (*corr. s.s. ex aquis*) (IV.11.102). *Merces extrema triumpho*.

Subscription. (fol. 66v) Aurelii Propertii (Nautae *del.*) lib. IIII finit. M.CCCC.LX Martio mense Neapoli.

Manuscript:

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lat. fol. 500, s. XV (a. 1460), fols. 1r–66v. (B.L. Ullman, "Pontano's Handwriting and the Leiden Manuscript of Tacitus and Suetonius," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 2 [1959] 309–35, especially 334–35, and pls. 26–28 [details of fols. 66v, 43v, 20v, 60v, 32r, 59r], reprinted in Ullman, *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 2d ed. [Rome, 1973], 401–28, especially 427–28, and pls. 23–28 [details of fols. 66v, 43v, 20v, 60v, 32r, 59r]; Butrica 1984, 209–10, no. 6; Kristeller, *Iter* 3.475a).

Biography:

Johannes Jovianus Pontanus (Giovanni Gioviano Pontano) was born at Cerreto in Umbria. The date of his birth is uncertain: in the introduction to his *De sermone*, which can be dated

to 1501 by external references, he claims to be in his seventy-third year, whereas in the dialogue *Asinus* he says that he was sixty at the time of an event in 1486. The date 1426 is supported by Paolo Giovio in his *Elogia doctorum virorum* (Antwerp, 1557), 102, but on unknown grounds; C. Kidwell (see below, *Bibliography*) is inclined to vote for 1429. He died at Naples in the autumn of 1503.

In early childhood Pontanus lost his father, who was killed in battle. He was educated in Perugia (of which city his uncle was chancellor) on the Latin grammar of Priscian and the philosophy of Aristotle; later, he was to learn Greek and astronomy. In 1447, after trying unsuccessfully to recover some of his father's alienated property, Pontanus sought employment with King Alfonso I of Naples, who happened to be on campaign in Tuscany. Moving to Naples with the king in 1448, he found a post in the treasury and had the good fortune to live in the house of Giulio Forte, master of the treasury, a man of very great personal culture, who became a father to him. He also made a friend of Panormita (Antonio Beccadelli), who likewise had been in Alfonso's military train, and of Marino Tomacelli, who subsequently became the Neapolitan ambassador to Florence.

In 1450–51 Pontanus joined Panormita on an embassy to Rome, Florence, and Venice. He stayed for a while in Florence, and greatly impressed Cosimo de' Medici with some poems written in Venice. From that time, he steadily climbed in the administration and diplomacy of Naples, gaining a peerless reputation for ability and integrity. Some evidence of his teaching activity in this city has also been published recently. At the same time he pursued a very full social and especially literary life, centered on the Neapolitan Academy and his friends there, who were the élite of Naples in civil and ecclesiastical affairs, including many of the hereditary aristocracy. Among them were Theodore Gaza, Lorenzo Bonincontri (from whom Pontanus learned astronomy), and Pietro Golino, "il Compatre," whom Pontano seems to have regarded as—with Marino Tomacelli—his closest friend; the circle also included Franceschello Marchese, Elisio Calenzio, and other men of letters and learned (usually witty) companions. It was at this period that Pontanus adopted the name "Giovianus."

As Pontanus never neglected literature for

public duty (or vice versa), he wrote a great quantity of Latin poetry in the 1450s, as well as *Charon*, the first of his dialogues. In the early 1460s he married, had three children, and became tutor to the heir to the throne. He seems to have interrupted his public career in Naples during the period 1466–68, possibly taking up a professorship of “oratory” at Perugia. In 1471, when Panormita died, Pontanus succeeded him as the moving spirit in the Neapolitan Academy. Politically, he consolidated his position by a friendship with the wife of his royal pupil Alfonso; in 1475 he became her secretary, and shortly afterwards that of the heir himself. Devoting himself to astronomy, he translated into Latin a work by Ptolemy and accompanied it with a commentary in which each translation of a single statement was followed by roughly a page of explanation with examples.

In the wars of the 1480s, Pontanus was actively employed as a diplomat; he was also appointed head of the *Sommaria* in Naples. Still, he continued to write poetry, especially on astronomical themes (*Urania* and a revision of his poem on meteors). He was present with the king’s son (Alfonso) at the siege and relief of Otranto (1480–81), and he composed a long victory poem, as well as a prose work on courage. On his return to Naples, he wrote the dialogue *Antonius* (named after Panormita), which satirized the Academy as well as other aspects of life in Naples; and he began the huge treatise *De rebus coelestibus*, in prose.

Presently Naples was at war again, this time against Venice; as usual, Pontanus marched with the army in the role of a diplomatic negotiator. On campaign in Ferrara, he met and fell in love with “Stella,” to whom many of his later lyrics are addressed, including a cycle of poems, entitled *Eridanus* (the Po River). In July 1484, he negotiated the Peace of Bagnolo. Further disturbances included the Colonna-Orsini war, which brought Pontanus to Rome; here he was welcomed as a poet, and crowned with laurel by the pope. At this time he wrote the *Asinus*, which has been described as the most perfect dialogue of the fifteenth century. Naples was at war once more in 1489, when the pope declared its throne vacant; Pontanus was deeply involved in the subsequent negotiations. Meanwhile his wife died, and he began to think of retiring. He built a chapel (the *tempio*, as he called it) as a burial place for his family and himself; the Academy some-

times met there. His prose works began to be published, though many of the poems had to wait until 1501/1502.

Unable to retire from diplomacy because of continuing crises, he left the political scene only when the French occupied Naples in 1495, and even then persevered in the royal service, keeping a place in the *Sommaria*. Meanwhile he revised his already numerous writings in verse and in prose, among them *Lepidina*, a sort of masque in praise of the city and countryside of Naples, which he had composed in the 1480s. At his death he was still working on two astronomical treatises.

Works:

For all his mastery of Latin verse and prose-style, Pontanus was a public official and diplomat rather than a professional scholar. His very numerous literary, historical, ethical and scientific works were composed in the intervals of leisure allowed to him by a busy life, and thus the creation of many of them extended over a number of years. They may be conveniently divided into three large categories: poetry, dialogues, and other works in prose. Often, publication was delayed, in many cases until after Pontanus’ death. Pontanus himself revised his formal poems, on which (like many other humanists) he considered that his reputation would rest; the less formal poetry was for the most part revised only by his literary executors, Jacopo Sannazaro (who subsidized most of the publications between the years 1504 and 1512) and Pietro Summonte, Pontanus’ successor as head of the Neapolitan Academy. Sannazaro and Summonte were able to persuade Pontanus’ surviving daughter Eugenia to donate his library and his papers to the church of San Domenico, Naples. Some poems, sent by Pontanus himself to Aldus Manutius in Venice for publication in 1502, were by mischance, or a series of mischances, held back from publication until 1505. J. Oeschger, in his edition of the *Carmina* (Bari, 1948), gives an account of the publication of the poetry; see especially pp. 489–90. An earlier, notable modern edition of the poems is that by B. Soldati (Florence, 1902).

The principal collections of poems are the following: *De laudibus divinis* (written in the 1450s), to a pupil, consisting of hymns; *Parthenopeus* (subtitled *Amores*), begun in the 1450s and ded-

icated to Lorenzo Bonincontri, who introduced Pontanus to astronomy; *Lyra*, contemporary with the preceding collection; *Liber meteororum*, in hexameters (1450s; rewritten in the 1480s); *Hendecasyllabi sive Baiae* (begun in the 1470s; published in 1505); *De amore coniugali*, begun on his marriage in 1461; *Tumuli* (begun in 1479); *Eclogues*, written at various dates (the fifth and perhaps most important, *Coryle*, written in praise of his wife who died in 1490, remained unpublished until 1507); *Urania*, a long astronomical-astrological poem (written for the most part in 1476–80); *Lepidina*, a masque consisting of a series of *Pom-pae*, written largely (it appears) in the 1480s; a pastoral, *Iambi* (six, on the death of his son Lucio in 1498); *Eridanus*, a work of his old age; and *De hortis Hesperidum*, modelled on Virgil's *Georgics*, which was finished in 1500 and sent to Aldus in 1501 (it was published in 1505). There are various modern editions of his poetry: B. Soldati, *Ioannis Ioviani Pontani Carmina*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1902); L. Monti Sabia, *Hendecasyllaborum libri* (Naples, 1978); R. G. Dennis, *Giovanni Gioviano Pontano, Baiae*, The I Tatti Renaissance Library 22 (Cambridge, Mass, 2006) (with an English translation).

The prose dialogues are five in number: *Charon*, begun in or after 1458 and published in 1491; *Antonius*, a satirical dialogue, begun probably a little after 1471, brought to its final form about 1482, and published in 1491; *Asinus*, a work of 1486–87; *Actius* (from the “Academy” name of Sannazaro), written in 1499; and *Aegidius*, a work of Pontanus’ last years, written in 1501. After their initial appearances in print, the *Dialogues* were published together, as part of an edition of the whole corpus of Pontanus’ prose works, in Florence in 1520. For a modern edition of the *Dialogues*, see C. Previtera, *Giovanni Pontano, I Dialoghi* (Florence, 1943). Another important prose work is the *De bello neapolitano* (published in 1530), which Francesco Guicciardini used extensively in the preface to his *Storia d’Italia*. In addition to this, an important historical source resides in Pontanus’ letters on public affairs, written on behalf of the successive kings of Naples whom he served; there is an edition by F. Gabotto (Bologna, 1893), which describes the letters as being still unpublished at that date.

The ethical treatises, on such topics as courage, obedience, generosity, and practical wisdom, are carefully discussed, as well as summarized,

by C. Kidwell (see below, *Bibliography*). Pontanus composed them at various periods, more or less in a Senecan vein, as the vicissitudes of his life prompted him to take up one or another theme.

Commentaries on Virgil and Valerius Maximus that exhibit a link with Pontano are partially preserved as *recollectae* copied by unknown scribes in Rome, Biblioteca Angelica, 1368, s. XV: (fols. 1r–7v) “Recollecte sub Pontano super sextum Virgilii” (*Aen.* 6.1–326); (fols. 8r–17v) “Recollecte per Pontanum super Georgicis Virgilii” (*Georg.* 4.117–545); (fols. 22v–34r) “Recollecte sub Pontano super Valerium Maximum” (*Facta et dicta memorabilia* 1, praef.; 1.1–2.9). They have been edited by A. Iacono (see below, *Bibliography*) who also regards the “Recollecte super Ovidium sine titulis” on fols. 17v–18v (notes on *Am.* 1.2–4, 6–8) as the work of Pontano.

For the “commentary” on Catullus, which is supposed to have survived until the middle of the sixteenth century, see the preface to Soldati, *Ioannis Ioviani Pontani Carmina* 1.xiii–xiv; and especially the long discussion in CTC 7.209–11.

Bibliography:

E. Pèrcopo, *Vita di Giovanni Pontano*, ed. M. Manfredi (Naples, 1938); “Pontano, Giovanni (Gioviano),” in *Enciclopedia italiana* 27 (Rome, 1949), 851–53 (E. Carrara); “Pontano, Giovanni,” in *Enciclopedia Cattolica* 9 (Vatican City, 1952), 1740–42 (G. Toffanin); A. La Penna, “Studi sulla tradizione di Properzio (continuazione e fine),” *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 26 (1952) 28–30; L. Monti Sabia, “Giovanni Gioviano Pontano,” in *Poeti latini del Quattrocento*, ed. F. Araldi et al. (Milan and Naples, 1964), 307–14; Monti Sabia, “Un canzoniere per una moglie: realtà e poesia nel *De amore coniugali* di Giovanni Pontano,” in *Atti 1998 (Poesia umanistica latina in distichi elegiaci)* (1999), 23–65; J. L. Butrica, “Pontanus, Puccius, Pocchus, Petreius, and Propertius,” *Res publica litterarum* 3 (1980) 5–9; Butrica, “Propertius and the Myth of the Itali,” in *Atti 2000 (Properzio alle soglie del 2000: un bilancio di fine secolo)* (2002), 349–88; C. Kidwell, *Pontano: Poet & Prime Minister* (London, 1991), with a lengthy bibliography on pp. 408–18; A. Iacono, ed. and comm., *Uno studente alla scuola del Pontano a Napoli: le Recollecte del ms. 1368 (T. 5. 5) della Biblioteca Angelica di Roma*, Nova itinera humanitatis latinae 4 (Naples, 2005).

2. Anonymus Petriburgensis

An unpublished anonymous commentary on books I and II is preserved in St. Petersburg, Rossiiskaia Natsionalnaia Biblioteka, Cl. lat. Q 12. This codex was copied in 1463 at Rome by Marianus de Magistris, and the commentary is in a contemporary hand. An abridgment of the commentary is found in Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria, 245, which was written a year later (1464).

a. St. Petersburg, Rossiiskaia Natsionalnaia Biblioteka, Cl. lat. Q 12

The commentary, added in the margins as an accompaniment to the Latin text, is very full and covers books I and II only. It begins acephalous on fol. 2r at I.2.11 since the original first leaf is now missing. In addition to brief interlinear glosses explaining the meanings of words, there are marginal notes performing the same function. Other notes, some of them quite long, treat a variety of topics: these include mythology, geography, literature (with references to Homer, Strabo, Ovid, and the elder Pliny, for example), identifications of historical persons, religion, customs and other antiquities, and variant readings, with occasional attempts at emendation. The commentator takes pains to ensure that the reader grasps in advance the general drift of the poem he is about to annotate.

Commentary. (St. Petersburg, Rossiiskaia Natsionalnaia Biblioteka, Cl. lat. Q.12). [*Inc.*]: (fol. 2r) *Discordia* (I.2.17) *Mercurius Iovis imperio* . . . [The rest of the note is not legible on the microfilm] . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 37v) *Falerno* (II.33.39) *monte Campaniae ubi est vinum optimum et nigrum*.

Subscription. (fol. 76v, at the end of Propertius) *Deo laus et honor. Scripsi ego Marianus de Magistris Romae anno MCCCC^oLXIII^o. IX kalendis martiis;* (fol. 113v, at the end of Tibullus) *Scripsi ego Marianus de Magistris de Urbe anno Domini MCCCCLXIII idibus martiis Romae. Lege feliciter.*

Manuscript:

(micro.) St. Petersburg, Rossiiskaia Natsionalnaia Biblioteka (formerly Leningrad, Saltykov-Shchedrin Public Library), Cl. lat. Q 12, s. XV (a. 1463, 21 February for Propertius, 15 March for Tibullus), fols. 2r–76v. (Butrica 1984, 242, no. 49).

Marianus de Magistris, the scribe, was born on 25 March 1441. Baptized as Mariano dello Mastro, he came to prefer, in humanist fashion, the Latin form of his name. He is described as a *vir nobilis*: that is, he came from a family of substance. The date of his death is uncertain, but he was *scriptor apostolicus* as late as 1499. On 12 February 1476, he is listed as *notarius de regione Pontis*. Copying manuscripts seems to have been a continuing activity on his part; as a youth he probably did this professionally, but since it is recorded that he married a wealthy wife, in later life this probably became a hobby. He had a taste for Cicero, some of whose works he copied for his own use. He was also fond of Latin poetry, both classical and contemporary; on the other hand, he clearly did not know Greek. In addition to the manuscript at St. Petersburg, other manuscripts written by him aged 20 to 24 (1461–65) survive: BAV, Vat. lat. 1690 includes notes on Cicero, *Epistulae ad Familiares*; and Oxford, All Souls College, 93, finished 23 May 1465, is dedicated to Giovanni Tortelli and contains *inter alia* the *Elegantiae* of Lorenzo Valla. (C. Bianca, “Marianus de Magistris de Urbe,” in *Scrittura biblioteche e stampa a Roma nel Quattrocento* (Atti del 2^o Seminario, 6–8 maggio 1982, ed. M. Miglio et al., Littera antiqua 3 [Vatican City, 1983], 555–99 and pls. 39–42; Butrica 1984, 112–14 and 242, no. 49; E. Caldelli, *Copisti a Roma nel Quattrocento*, Scritture e libri del medioevo 4 [Rome, 2006], 129, 220; Kristeller, *Iter* 5.192b).

b. Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria, 245

The Latin text of Propertius in Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria, 245, written by Paulus Maueziin and dated 1464, is “probably a direct copy” of St. Petersburg, Rossiiskaia Natsionalnaia Biblioteka, Cl. lat. Q 12 (Butrica 1984, 113; see also p. 114 where Butrica provides detailed evidence of the close relationship). Variant readings and glosses in books I and II amount to an abridgment of the commentary in the St. Petersburg codex. Books III and IV in Salamanca 245 contain no glosses and only a very few variants.

A substantial number of the Salamanca glosses either reproduce word for word those in the Anonymus Petriburgensis or seem to depend on that manuscript for their content. Many of the glosses in Salamanca 245 are clearly related to the annotator’s interest in Latin words for their own

sake; sometimes they pick up a word occurring in the text and discuss it at length without any intention to explain Propertius' use of the word, or else (surprisingly often) they are totally irrelevant to the context. Of such "lexical" notes, as we may call them, there are approximately seventy-four. With only a few exceptions, the notes are in a less formal version of the original scribe's hand. The use of Italian in about a score of notes may point to the annotator's domicile, if not his origin; see the *explicit* below for an example.

Commentary. (Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria, 245). [*Inc.*]: (fol. 1r) *Cinthia* (I.1.1) a Cinthia monte in quo Lathona peperit Phoebum et Dianam. . . . *Fastus* (I.1.3). Fasti dies in quibus certa verba licebat fari praetoribus. Nefasti contrarium. Faustus felix a faveo et quia felices superbi Fastus fasta fastum superbus significat. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*] (fol. 39v) *Pagina calvi* (II.34.89). Pagina una faciata de versi.

Subscription. (fol. 77v) Finis per me Paulum Maueziin MCCCCLXIII principio Sextilis.

Manuscript:

(micro.) Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria, 245. (Butrica 1984, 296, no. 103). The scribe's surname, which suggested a Spanish origin (as a corruption of the Arabic *muezzin*) to La Penna, *L'integrazione difficile*, 246, is probably French. The most interesting village of Mauvezin (though not the only one under that name) is located in the Pyrenees, between Auch and Montauban. It lies at the foot of the Castle of Mauvezin and close to the Abbey of Escaladieu, a Cistercian foundation, closed about 1830, which possessed a good library and scriptorium, and is notable for the fact that it served as a place of lodging for pilgrims on the way to Santiago de Compostela.

The surname is recorded in various forms: Mavesyn, Mauvesyn, Mauvezin, Mauvesin, Mauveysin, Malvezin, Malvesin, Malvesyn, Malvezyn, Malveysin, Maleveisin, Mauvoisin, Mauvoizin, Malvoisin. Malvoizin, Malvoisine, Malevoisine, Malvoisinne. This name, in whatever form, has a widespread and distinguished history. Samson de Mauvoisin was archbishop of Reims, 1140–61. For a Gérard Mavoisin (also spelled Mavesyn), a Knight Templar, mentioned at Louvain in 1289 and again about 1312, see *Académie Royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques*, 5th Ser., 9 (1923), 256 and

n. 2. The estate of Mavesyn Ridware in Staffordshire, England, takes its name from Malvoisin, a French knight who seems to have acquired it for services at the Norman Conquest. (After eight centuries in the same family, it was lost in 1883 to pay gambling debts that bankrupted its then owner, John de Heley Mavesyn Chadwick.) The name Mauesyn or Mavesyn is also recorded in the mid-fifteenth century in the vicinity of Battle Abbey in East Sussex.

3. Anonymus Chisianus

An anonymous commentary on books I.1–II.6 is preserved in Vatican City, BAV, Chigi H. IV. 137. Butrica 1978 suggests that this commentary originated at Rome in the 1460s and, in the Chigi version, is "a student's copy of lecture notes" (p. 436). The watermark of the paper on which the commentary is written provides some support for this dating, since only two comparable watermarks are known: one (Briquet 14089) of 1454 (which is much too early) and one (Briquet 11709) of 1466. It would, therefore, be reasonable to venture a date ca. 1466.

The commentator (or annotator) consulted at least one manuscript belonging to a family different from that of the exemplar; at I.6.32 (fol. 71v), for example, both *cingit* and *tingit* are given as the reading of the text. Sometimes there is agreement with the corrections (based on a collation of a manuscript of the η-group, which seems to have its roots in the Veneto) made to Vatican City, BAV, Ottob. lat. 1514 by Ludovico Regio, a *corrector* for the Rome press of Eucharis Silber. The commentator is interested in metre and grammar, and well versed in Roman history and antiquities; there are also comments of a literary-critical sort. He cites at least eighteen Latin authors, including Tibullus, Ovid, Virgil, Horace, Plautus, Terence, Pliny the Elder, Pliny the Younger, Cicero, Juvenal, Statius, Lucan, and Suetonius (whose statement, in *Vita Divi Augusti* 18, that Augustus made a Roman province out of Egypt, is quoted *verbatim* in a note on II.1.30 [fol. 73v]), and at least eight Greek authors (Homer, Sappho, Mimnermus, Herodotus, Thucydides, Menander, Callimachus, and Philitas; possibly more, since some of the commentary is damaged or illegible). Reference is made to Boccaccio's *De genealogia deorum*. Parallels from Italian vernacular literature are included; see, e.g., the com-

ments on I.7.24 (fol. 71v) “*Ardoris*. Propertius cum maximo ardore scripsit. Petrarcha: ‘l’uno era Propertio, l’altro era Tibullo che cantar d’amor si fervidamente’” (cf. *Trionfo d’amore* 4.23–24) and II.3.26 (fol. 74r) “*Matrem*. Mater non dedit tantam pulchritudinem; sicut dicit Petrarcha: ‘ma sono volti fatti in paradiso’.” The commentator also gives colloquial Italian terms for popular literary genres, e.g., at I.16.10 *carmina* (fol. 72v): “le frotole, li strambotti.”

Although “*finis*” is written (by a different hand?) on fol. 74v at the end of the commentary on II.6.41, the writer is acquainted with later parts of book II, and also with book IV. When he quotes, he does so from memory, as is shown by the kind of errors he makes. The sprawling, unsteady and irregular handwriting may also suggest a student writing in haste. Included in the note on I.1.1 (fol. 69v) is a “biography” of the poet (discussed by Butrica 1978, 450–53 and the same, “Life and Career,” for which see below under *Manuscript*); as a *vita*, it is unique in its century as owing nothing to Siculo Polenton’s *Scriptorum illustrium latinae linguae libri XVIII*. There is an abbreviated version of the derivation of the word *monobiblos* (for which see Butrica 1984, 335–39). Probably the author of the commentary either used a now lost copy of the derivation, or else used considerable freedom in altering the version we now have. See now Butrica 1999, 199–203 (cited in *Bibliography*, below) for further arguments which, though they recognize the remarkable qualities of the commentary, point to the origin of our version in a student’s transcription of lectures.

Commentary. (Vatican City, BAV, Chigi H.IV.137). [*Inc.*]: (fol. 69v) <Cynthia> p<ri>ma suis (I.1.1). Propertius <fuit> ex ordine equestri et in domo Propertii, teste <Plinio> [cf. *Ep.* 6.15.1, 9.22.1], poesis hereditaria fuit usque ad divum Nervam. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 74v) *Tuta* (II.6.40) in carcere ut Daphne. <De>ducet (II.6.41) removebit. *Finis*.

Manuscript:

(micro.) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Chigi H.IV.137, s. XV (ca. 1460–70?), fols. 69v–74v. (E. Pellegrin et al., *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, vol. 1 [Paris, 1975], 298–99; M. Buonocore, *Properzio nei codici della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana* (Assisi, 1995), 50–51 and pl. 7 (fol. 69v [the folio has

since suffered further damage and this plate confirms our reading of some words now missing]); J. L. Butrica, “The Life and Career of Propertius in the Scholarship of the Early Renaissance,” *Giornale italiano di filologia* 51 [1999] 179–212, especially 199–203).

4. Pacificus Maximus Irinaeus

Pacificus Maximus Irinaeus Asculanus (Pacifico Massimi of Ascoli Piceno) was distinguished not only for his exceptionally long life but also for the richness and variety of his literary output in verse and prose. His unpublished commentary on Propertius, accompanied by the text of the *Elegies*, survives in an autograph manuscript (London, BL, Egerton 3027) written at Perugia in 1467. The corrections, variant readings, glosses, and notes which Maximus inserted in the manuscript were made in different inks and at various—in all probability widely divergent—dates. Nearly all of them bear a strong impress of original creation. That he was a man of forceful character is evident from his very handwriting. Clearly, he worked rapidly; his approach is that of a busy teacher rather than that of a scholarly investigator into his given author as a whole.

The commentary is notable for the number of textual variants it records; some of the variant readings first encountered here are attributed by modern editors to much later sources. A considerable amount of originality is evident in the explanatory notes dealing with matters of geography and mythology as well as the meanings of words, grammar and style. Also notable is the number of citations from other authors, both Greek and Latin: among them, Strabo, Plutarch, Pausanias, Catullus, Horace, Virgil, Ovid (*Fasti*, *Tristia*), Lucan, Statius (*Silvae*), and the younger Pliny. Some notes are taken from Domitius Calderinus either verbatim (as at I.19.7 *Phylacides* and I.20.33 *Arganthei Pege* on fols. 9r and 10r respectively), or slightly altered, as at I.20.12 *Non minor Ausoniis* and I.20.17 *Pagasae* (both on fol. 9v), I.20.48 *Sonitum* (on fol. 10r), and II.2.11 *Sais* (sic) (on fol. 11v), or occasionally mixed with another source (as at I.20.6 *Theiodamanteo* on fol. 9v). Calderinus published his commentary on Propertius in 1475 (see I.6 below), and so such instances of his influence on Maximus indicate that the latter’s interest in Propertius continued after he copied the *Elegies* in 1467.

There is no introduction or dedication. For books I, II, and III.1–20 (fols. 1r–40r), the commentary usually consists of a series of mainly brief marginal notes, with many variant readings, though for some poems of books I and II the annotations are much more extensive, e.g. at I.19–22 (fols. 9r–10v). From III.21.19 to the end of book IV (fols. 40v–55r) the commentary is abundant.

Commentary. (London, BL, Egerton 3027). [*Inc.*]: (fol. 1r) *Cupidinibus* (I.1.2). Al. libidini-bus. *Deficit* (I.1.7). Al. desit. . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 55r) *Ossa vehentur aquis* (corr. s.s. ex *equis*) (IV.11.102). Quasi triumphent ossa mea propter bonos meos mores.

Subscription. (fol. 55r) Sexti aurelii propertii nautae monobilos ad Cinthiam foeliciter explicit per me Pacificum Maximum de Asculo in sapientia veteri Perusiae. Anno 1467 6 die februarii. Deo gratias et matri. K non gaudeo K.

Manuscript:

London, British Library, Egerton 3027, s. XV (a. 1467, Perugia), fols. 1r–55r. Autograph. See Butrica 1984, 246–47, no. 56: “His Propertius [sc. Latin text of the *Elegies*] is a copy of the already interpolated Ravenna 277 (copied in Spello[?] in 1459), to which a number of original conjectures have been added. . . . Scaliger used it to prepare his edition . . .” (A. G. Watson, *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 700–1600 in the Department of Manuscripts, The British Library*, 2 vols. [London, 1979], 1.116, no. 619, with further bibliography, and 2, pl. 698 [detail of fol. 39r]; Butrica 1984, 87–88, 149–50, and 246–47, no. 56; Kristeller, *Iter* 4.143a).

Biography:

Pacificus Maximus (Pacifico Massimi) was born in 1406 at Ascoli Piceno and died in 1506 at Fano. He informs us that he lost his parents at the age of four; at ten, he married; his wife left him after having three children, all of whom died young. (Maximus dedicated his *Regulae grammaticales* to his son Ippolito; see *Hecatelegium* II.6 n.) Perhaps in 1445, or 1448, he served in the army of Alfonso of Aragon, where he acquired a dislike of bloodshed. In 1459 he studied law at Perugia. In 1467, when he copied the Propertius manuscript (London, BL, Egerton 3027), he was professor at Perugia. Maximus found a friend in Braccio II Baglioni, the powerful *condottiere* who

ruled Perugia at that time, and commemorated him in the *Triumph* and *Draconis*.

About 1476 Maximus was in Rome and had formed friendships with members of the Roman Academy of Pomponius Laetus, including Antonius Volscus (see I.9 below), Pomponius Laetus himself, Johannes Jovianus Pontanus (I.1 above), Michael Marullus and others; all of these attended his birthday dinner (see Desjardins, note on *Hecatelegium* IX.7, for a more complete list of his friends). Besides being a poet, Maximus was a professor, and the author of many original emendations in the texts on which he lectured, including those of Propertius, Tibullus, and Catullus in ms. Egerton 3027. Other manuscripts copied by him are listed in Butrica 1984, 149; they include Cicero (*Ad familiares*), Ovid (*Fasti*), Lucan, Persius, Juvenal, Orosius, and Julius Consultus. R. A. B. Mynors (*C. Valerii Catulli Carmina* [Oxford, 1958], xi) attributes to him anonymously (as *vir quidam doctus*) about fifty emendations that appear in the θ class of Catullus manuscripts.

In 1485 Maximus was at Florence in the house of Jacopo Salviati. He was professor at Lucca in 1488 and again in 1493. Depressed by his reception there, he thought of taking service with the Turks. During his last years, Maximus was, so to speak, adopted by Angelo Colocci (Angelus Colotius), who persuaded him to change the erotic tone of his earlier writings; for example, the *Hecatelegium*, first published in 1489, “is composed of 100 poems written in highly competent elegiac couplets, in the course of which the author gives an account of his own sexual activities which rivals the dialogues of Pietro Aretino in vigour and explicitness” (A. T. Grafton, “Joseph Scaliger’s Edition of Catullus [1577] and the Traditions of Textual Criticism in the Renaissance,” *Journal of the Warburg Institutes* 38 [1975] 161 n. 21). Hence Maximus’ composition of the *Lucretia* and *Virginia*, both in praise of chastity. When he died at the age of 100, he was still vigorously employed (at Colocci’s suggestion) on an expurgated edition of his own works.

Works:

The so-called *Opera* of Maximus (Fano, 1506), edited by Angelo Colocci, contains a list of contents that is largely spurious. A note in the BL catalogue gives the details of this “list” and rightly adds that the Fano *Opera* “contains only the

first two works <Lucretia, Virginia> and an epitaph on the author; no more appears to have been published of this edition." The earliest dated publication is the prose work *Ad magnificum Iacobum Salviati de componendo hexametro et pentametro* (Florence, 1485). The first edition of the *Hecatelegium* appeared in Florence in 1489; it is reprinted, with a facsimile on facing pages, in Desjardins, 31–423 (notes, 424–59). The *Lucretiae libri duo et Virginiae totidem* (in elegiac verse, with a preceding elegiac *prologus*) are reported as having been independently published at Fano in 1500. A list of minor works is given by Desjardins in her bibliography, p. 500. See also Desjardins, 467–74 for details of some of these, with a selection of texts, including that of the elegy *Ad Kallimachum*, addressed to Filippo Buonaccorsi, who was also known as Callimaco Esperiente; for this elegy Desjardins gives a reference to a previous modern publication in a Polish article dated 1958.

Bibliography:

Butrica 1984, 246–47, no. 56, with further bibliography; J. Desjardins, ed. and trans., *Pacifico Massimi: les Cent élégies (Hecatelegium, Florence, 1489). Pacifico Massimi, avec quatre élégies inédits* (Grenoble, 1986), with a good introduction, edition of hitherto unpublished or inaccessible minor works, and extensive bibliography.

5. Anonymus Vaticanus

At least three hands annotated, in varying degrees, the text of the *Elegies* in Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 1611 (s. XV [Rome, ca. 1470, *teste* †A. C. de la Mare]). We are concerned here with the hand responsible for the numerous comments on books I and II that were inserted chiefly in the margins but also between the lines. These notes are not derived either from the commentary of Philippus Beroaldus Senior (I.8 below) or from that of Antonius Volscus (I.9 below); nor do the mythological explanations owe anything to Giovanni Tortelli's *De orthographia*. The annotations concern mythology, geography (including place-names), metre (in books I and II), and literary history; their general character is epexegetic (explaining the *meaning* of the text for students).

Another hand occasionally entered brief comments that may be associated with the commentary of Franciscus Puccius (I.12 below), e.g., on fol. 1r at I.1.9 *Menalion* ("Mimalion" and I.1.13

Psilli ("Ilei"); on fol. 1v at I.1.22 *faciat* ("Facite"); and on fol. 2r at I.2.11 *formosus*. ("Formosius") and I.2.16 *soror* ("Suo").

Such few annotations as there are on book III are written in a third hand, and annotation ceases almost entirely after fol. 54r except for marginal keywords, braces, and pointing hands. At III.5.35 (fol. 53r), there is a slightly longer, astronomical note on *Bootes* and on the same folio a note on III.5.44 *Tityo*: "*Titius Gigas novem iugera corpore occupabat.*" At III.7.72 (fol. 56r) *condar* is omitted.

In book IV there are no annotations of any substance. On fol. 73r *abiegni* at IV.1.42 has been erased, as was *vina* at IV.2.30 (fol. 76r).

There is no introduction or dedication.

Commentary. (Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 1611). [*Inc.*]: (fol. 1v) *Cytheinis* (I.1.24) *id est Medae*. (fol. 5r) *Ad Tullum* (I.6, heading). Tullus in *Asiam consul iturus erat et volebat Propertium secum iturum. Iste vero hoc denegabat. . . / . . .* [*Expl.*]: (fol. 48v) *Et modo formosa quam multa Lycoride Gallus/mortuus inferna vulnera lavit aqua* (II.34.91–92). Gallus interfectus fuit; ideo dicit (*corr.*) *vulnera*. Al. dicas "*vulnera amoris.*" Nam ad inferna usque verus amor penetrat.

Manuscript:

(micro.) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1611, s. XV, fols. 1r–94r. See Butrica 1984, 309, no. 121: "The text combines strong influences both from Salutati's copy (Laur. pl. 36, 49) and from a group of Roman manuscripts (St. Petersburg, Cl. lat. Q 12 [I.2.a above], and Salamanca, BU 245 [I.2.b above])." (*Codices Vaticani latini*: B. Nogara, *Codd. 1461–2059* [Rome, 1912], 108–9; Butrica 1984, 55–58, 113–14 and 309, no. 121; E. Pellegrin et al., *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, vol. 3.1 [Paris, 1991], 211–15; M. Buonocore, *Properzio nei codici della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana* (Assisi, 1995), 74–75 and pl. 20 [fol. 1r]).

6. Domitius Calderinus

Domitius Calderinus' *Elucubratio in quaedam Propertii loca quae difficiliora videbantur* is preserved in both printed editions and manuscript abridgments. Dedicated to Francesco d'Aragona, it was published at Rome in 1475, together with a commentary on the pseudo-Ovidian *Epistle of Sappho to Phaon* ([Ov.], *Her.* 15), as an appendix

to his commentary on Statius' *Silvae*. The same volume includes an additional appendix, *Ex tertio libro Observationum Domitii* (a selection of linguistic notes on a variety of Roman authors, not including Propertius, for which see the *Final letter* below). Both of these appendices may be described as stimulating, rather than comprehensive in scope. The commentary on Propertius is, as the title indicates, selective; and it is not accompanied by a text. The notes and discussions in the *Elucubratio* are largely confined to books I and II. Many passages, and many topics, are not discussed at all; this was later to be made evident in the 1486 Brescia edition of the *Elucubratio* in parallel columns with a text of the *Elegies* (HC 4761), where many pages are half empty.

In his short life, and particularly in the fertile years from 1473 to 1475, Calderinus generated a remarkable number of commentaries. He lists nine of them below in his *Final letter* (*epilogus*) to Francesco d'Aragona and mentions as well two works in progress, namely, three books entitled *Observationes* (of which the first two were apparently never published) and an as yet unidentified Latin translation of a Greek work requested of him by a "certain prince." Most of Calderinus' commentaries are marked by a certain degree of haste and impatience and by his indulgence in the desire to show off his very extensive knowledge of classical literature and ancient mythology. Indeed, a review of the questions to which the phrase *quae difficiliora videbantur* in the title of his work on Propertius is applied seems to reveal, not so much a concern for what might puzzle a student, as a desire to focus on places where Calderinus himself might display his brilliance. For better or worse, his novelty lay in writing for fully adult, and scholarly, readers. But in the course of time he came to be suspected also of a more serious kind of willfulness; he claimed—perhaps as a joke—to have discovered in France the work of a hitherto unknown Roman historian named Rusticus, a claim that (after due consideration) was dismissed by Politianus among others. Levity of this kind was not appreciated, especially when it was taken in conjunction with his somewhat impetuous approach to annotation.

Though his contemporaries might accuse him of irresponsibility in abandoning the classroom-bound medieval tradition of exposition, he nev-

ertheless opened the door to a new consciousness of antiquity and concern for ancient life and civilization as a whole as the proper material of a commentary on a text. Here, in an age before encyclopedias, his learning served him and the future of scholarship well indeed. In the succession of Propertian studies, his position may be compared to that of Angelus Politianus in relation to Catullus. Calderinus was the first to break away from the traditional kind of commentary, initiating a new style of "books written by and for scholars, books that dealt selectively with difficult and interesting problems" (A. Grafton, "On the Scholarship of Politian and its Context," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 40 [1977] 156).

The *Elucubratio* contains a number of sound emendations, with which Calderinus attempted (often successfully) *ope codicum* to rectify the vulgate of both editions of 1472. His emendations sometimes diverge considerably from their readings (D. Coppini, "Il commento a Properzio di Domizio Calderini," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di lettere e filosofia*, 3d Ser., 9.3 [1979] 1163). The base text from which he started seems to be that of de Spira (Venice, 1472); certainly he largely relied on it for his commentary on Statius' *Silvae* (C. Dionisotti, "Calderini, Poliziano e altri," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 11 [1968] 180–83; Coppini, *ibid.*, 1164). Some of Calderinus' ideas on the text of Propertius are reflected in the sparse annotations in a copy of the 1475 reprint of de Spira (now Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Inc. Nenc. 27); but these are insufficient to constitute a commentary, as Coppini (*ibid.*, 1166 and n. 9) is inclined to suggest.

Calderinus' work on Propertius was widely diffused. Johannes Calphurnius drew on it heavily for his 1481 Vicenza edition, adopting many of Calderinus' readings (Coppini, *ibid.*, 1171). Both of the major commentaries that presently followed—those of Philippus Beroaldus Senior (I.8 below) and Antonius Volscus (I.9 below)—are considerably in its debt. At first the *Elucubratio* earned the cordial respect of Politianus, though he eventually turned against Calderinus on the grounds of a certain haste and willfulness in his approach to scholarship. A "profile" of Calderinus can be read in Politianus' *Miscellanea* I.9.

a. The printed commentary

Commentary. (ed. of Rome, 1475). Domitii Elucubratio in quaedam Properti loca quae difficiliora videbantur. Ad Franciscum Aragonium Ferdinandi Regis Neap. f. (fol. 154r). Ex primo libro Propertii. In primam elegiam cuius argumentum: Uritur, et nulla fias quom mitior arte/ ut se dissolvat Cynthia quaerit opem. [*Inc.*]: *Minalion* (I.1.9). Atalantae duae fuerunt: altera filia Promethei et Celenusae, cuius fuerunt filii Lycus et Chimereus; altera filia Schinei, amor Meleagri, de qua extat fabula apud Ovidium [*Met.* 10.560-704]. In hac multos habuit rivalet. . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 164v) *Dum vernat sanguis, dum rugis integer annis, / utere, nec quid eras liber ab ore dies* (IV.5.59-60). Puto ita esse emendandum: "Dum rugis integer, annis utere, nec quis eat liber amore dies."

Final letter. (fol. 164v) Domitii ad Franciscum Aragonum (*sic*) epilogus et προσφώνησις de observationibus. <S>cio me multa praeterisse quae fortasse explicationem desyderabunt. Id cum occupationibus tum certo consilio aegi, ne viderer minima quaeque consecrari, omnemque aliis praeripere facultatem doctrinae, cuius nomine gloriantur plurimum, illustrandae et ostentandae, si voluerint nonnulla quae apud hunc poetam sunt, diligentius aperire. Sed illud, Francisce, praeterire non possum, quod nuper, cum iam commentarios in Sappho Ovidii composuissem, mihi accidit. Nam opusculo absoluto, quod in multorum auditorum manibus erat, ecce tibi nescio quis libellum affert grandibus characteribus formatum eiusdem argumenti et industriae, in qua nos eramus versati: fateor me antequam legerem consilii poenituisse quod nostrum edidissem. (fol. 165r) Cupiebam enim integrum esse, vel suppressere, si hic melius aliquid attulisset, vel emendare, si quid a nobis erratum huius lectione admonitus depraehenderem. Sed ita hic aegit ut malim nostrum una ab hominibus legi et conferri quam omnino nihil scripsisse vel non edidisse quod tibi iam misimus. Multa sunt dissimilia: ille de historia Sapphus latinum hominem sequitur, nos ex graecis autoribus accepimus. At inquires, nonne et tu latine eadem scripsisti? Scripsi quidem; quid enim Graecis oportuit? Sed veram illic nactus historiam, affirmavi Sappho filiam peperisse Cercyle nomine Cleida. Is vero non filiam, sed filium ait, secutus mendosam latinorum librariorum scripturam. Inde ambigit an, ubi "certe filia vivit" ait [*Her.*

15.120], de filia Sapphus intelligat an de Eharaxi. De quo dubium ei nunquam fuisset, si graecum, ut dixi, scriptorem secutus esset. Quae praeterea obscura videbantur loca, per haec nullo illato lumine ipse evadit mira celeritate suspensis gradibus ne usquam offendant. Nam ubi ait "Nec mihi Pierides subeunt Dryadesve puellae, / nec me Thespiadum caetera turba iuvat" [*Her.* 15.15-16], ipse tantum negat legi posse *Naiades*, syllaba repugnante, quasi vero non illud potius in quaestione esset, cur Dryades inter Musas nominet et quid sit quod dicat "caetera turba Thespiadum." Idem illic ait "Niseides matres Sicelidesque nurus" [*Her.* 15.54] et illic: "nec vos errorem tellure remittite nostrum" [*Her.* 15.53]. Alibi praeterea saepe idem; quod equidem non tam existimo eum ignorasse quam persuasum habuisse neminem haec requisitum. Diversa praeterea sentit atque nos multis in locis. Nam ubi "Et variis albae iunguntur saepe columbae" [*Her.* 15.37] de pavonibus qui variae aves sunt et columbis intelligi docuimus, ipse totum de columbis tradit. Ubi interrogantes legimus "Non agitur (fol. 165v) vento nostra carina suo" [*Her.* 15.72], ipse affirmat, parum convenienti (ut mihi quidem videtur) sensu. Et ubi "Si, nisi quae facie poterit te digna videri, / nulla futura tua est" [*Her.* 15.39-40], nos ita docuimus "si nullam es amaturus nisi quae dignitate formae tuae conveniet, nullam amabis" (quasi dicat "nulla tam formosa est quam tu"), ipse ita accipit "si nullam amabis nisi quae formosa est, nullam amabis; nulla enim formosa est." Sed nolo singula enumerare. Haec certe cum legissem, non poenituit commentariolos nostros iam in manibus hominum esse. Nihil enim fuit quod in nostrum opus transferre vellem, aut totum aut ulla omnino ex parte. Itaque facile patiar utrumque legi, cum praesertim non aemulatione ulla scripserim. (Quid enim ille asinus ad lyram nostram?) Sed iam emissum opus nec potuerim domi continere, nec vellem etiam si integrum esset. De commentariis nulla mihi posthac erit cura magnopere. Iam enim edidimus in Martialem, in Iuvenalem, in Ibyn Ovidii, in Sylvas Papinii, in Sappho Ovidii, et in haec Propertii loca. Quibus si addidero commentationes in epistolas ad Atticum, in Suetonium Tranquillum et in Syllium Italicum, quae omnia iam collegimus et composuimus ultimamque tantum expectant manum, consilio meo satisfacere et voluntati amicorum. Interea acriore studio et maiore ocio

duo perficimus et expolimus opera: quorum alterum est e Graeco in Latinum conversum principis cuiusdam nomine qui id a me postulavit, opus varietate doctrinae iucundissimum futurum et tam utile quam magnum; alterum est latinis litteris elucubratum, quod Observationes inscripsimus, tribus voluminibus, quorum primum continet tercentum locorum ex Plinio explicationem, secundum quicquid (fol. 166r) observavimus (obseruuiamus *ed.*) parum ab aliis traditum apud poetas omnes, tertium quae collegimus et observavimus apud Ciceronem, Fabium, Livium et scriptores omnes reliquos. Haec cuius generis sint facile intelliges si pauca quaedam tibi subiecero ex iis quae nuper in tertio volumine elaborabamus. Si tibi probabuntur idque intellexero, statim edemus, pluris facientes communem litterarum dignitatem quam nonnullorum benivolentiam qui ea potissimum de causa nos odisse et insectari videntur quod litterarum studia amamus et amplectimur. Vale.

Editions:

1475, Romae (Rome): Arnoldus Pannartz. With the texts of Statius, *Silvae* and [ps.-Ovid], *Epistula Sapphus* and commentaries of Domitius Calderinus on the *Silvae* (with *Papinii Vita*), *Epistula Sapphus*, and Propertius; and Calderinus, *Ex tertio libro Observationum*. HC 14983; BMC 12.5 (IB.17913); Goff S-697; NUC.BL; BNF; (CsmH).

(*) 1476, Brixiae (Brescia): Henricus de Colonia. With the commentaries of Domitius Calderinus on [ps.-Ovid], *Epistula Sapphus* and Propertius; and Calderinus, *Ex libro tertio Observationum*. Usually combined with Calderinus' commentaries on Statius, *Silvae*, but these are "undated, with a separate set of signatures a-o, GW 5893" (ISTC). HC 4244 (II); BMC 7.964 (IB.31043); Goff C-42; NUC.BAV C-29; BL; (Pbm).

[ca. 1481-82, Venice: printer of Cicero, *De officiis* (H 5268)]. Contents the same as in the 1475 edition.—5607; BMC 7.1145 (IB.22018); Goff S-698; NUC.BL; BNF; (CtY; ICN).

1483, Venetiis (Venice): Octavianus Scotus. With the texts of Statius, *Thebaid*, *Achilleid*, and *Silvae* (with *Vita Papinii*) and [ps.-Ovid], *Epistula Sapphus*, and commentaries of Placidius Lactantius on the *Thebaid*, Franciscus Maturantius on the *Achilleid*, and Domitius Calderinus on the *Silvae* and on Propertius; and Calderinus, *Ex tertio libro Observationum*. HC 14976*; BMC 5.278

(IB.21203); Goff S-691; NUC.BL; BNF; (LC; MH; CtY; ICN; CsmH).

1486, Brixiae (Brescia): Boninus de Boninis, de Ragusia. With the text of Propertius, *Elegiae*, commentary of Domitius Calderinus on Propertius, and Hieronymus Squarzafricanus, *Vita Propertii*. This is the first edition to join Calderinus' commentary to the text of Propertius. HC 4761; BMC 7.970 (IB.31093); Goff P-1016; NUC.BAV; BL; (LC; CtY; ICN).

1490, Venetiis (Venice): Iacobus de Paganinis. With the texts of Statius, *Thebaid*, *Achilleid*, and *Silvae* (with *Vita Papinii*) and [ps.-Ovid], *Epistula Sapphus*, and commentaries of Placidius Lactantius on the *Thebaid*, Franciscus Maturantius on the *Achilleid*, and Domitius Calderinus on the *Silvae* and on Propertius; and Calderinus, *Ex libro tertio Observationum*. HC 14978, including HC 14975; BMC 5.456 (IB.23305), 12.32; Goff S-692; NUC.BAV; BL; BNF; (LC; MH; ICN; CsmH).

1494, Venetiis (Venice): Bartholomaeus de Zanis. With the texts of Statius, *Silvae*, *Thebaid*, and *Achilleid* and commentaries of Domitius Calderinus on the *Silvae*, Placidius Lactantius on the *Thebaid*, and Franciscus Maturantius on the *Achilleis*; the commentary of Calderinus on Propertius; and Calderinus, *Ex tertio libro Observationum*. HC 14979*; BMC 5.432 (IB.23711); Goff S-693; NUC.BAV; BL; BNF; (MH; CtY; ICN; CU; CsmH).

1498-99, Venetiis (Venice): Petrus de Quarengiis, Bergomensis. With the texts of Statius, *Silvae*, *Thebaid*, and *Achilleid* and commentaries of Domitius Calderinus (ed. Hieronymus Avantius) on the *Silvae*, Placidius Lactantius on the *Thebaid*, and Franciscus Maturantius on the *Achilleid*; the commentary of Calderinus on Propertius; and Calderinus, *Ex tertio libro Observationum*. HC14980*; BMC 5.514 (IB.24172); Goff S-694; NUC.BAV; BL; BNF; (MH; CtY; MiU; CsmH).

1582. See above, Composite Editions.

1604. See above, Composite Editions.

1608. See above, Composite Editions.

1659. See above, Composite Editions.

1680. See above, Composite Editions.

1996, Assisi. D.Coppini, "Il Properzio di Domizio Calderini," in *Atti 1994 (Commentatori e traduttori di Properzio dall' Umanesimo al Lachmann)*, ed. G.Catanzaro and F.Santucci (Assisi, 1996), 46-79.

Doubtful edition:

1500, Venetiis (Venice): per Ioannem de Tridino de Cereto alias Tacuinum. With the texts of Tibullus, Catullus, and Propertius, and the commentaries of Bernardinus Cyllenius on Tibullus, Philippus Beroaldus Senior on Propertius, Antonius Parthenius and Palladius Fuscus on Catullus, *Emendationes Catullianae* of Hieronymus Avantius and *In Priapeias castigationes* of Avantius. According to the list of contents, the volume also contains *Annotationes in Propertium, tum per Domitium Calderinum, tum per Ioannem Cottam Veronensem*, but these works were not included. For Johannes Cotta, see I.11 below. HC 4766; BAV T-182; BMC 5.535; Goff T-374. BL; (MH; PU).

b. The manuscript abridgments:

The first two manuscripts cited below give a more or less complete version of Calderinus' notes. Nos. 3 and 4 show a slightly greater amount of divergence from Calderinus; no. 5, though it is based on Calderinus and contains his *argumenta* (headings), preserves a fair quantity of material not derived from Calderinus.

1. Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, CCLXIII (235), s. XV, fols. 1r–20r.

Commentary. [Inc.]: Domitii Elucubratio in quaedam Properti loca quae difficiliora videbantur. Ad Franciscum Aragonium Ferdinandi Regis Neap. f. (fol. 1r) Uritur, et nulla fias quom mitior arte/ut se dissolvat Cynthia quaerit opem. Laus Deo optimo maximo. *Minalion* (I.1.9). Atalante duae fuerunt: altera filia Promethei et Celenusae, cuius fuerunt filii Lycus et Chimereus; altera filia Schinei, amor Meleagri, de qua extat fabula apud Ovidium [Met. 10.560–704]. In hac multos habuit rivales. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 20r) *Dum vernat sanguis, dum rugis integer annis, / utere, nec quid eras liber ab ore dies* (IV.5.59–60). Puto ita esse emendandum: "Dum rugis interger (*sic*) annis utere, nec quis eat liber amore dies." *Studia amemus et (vel te?) ampleximur.* Vale.

Final letter. [Inc.]: (fol. 20r) <S>cio me multa pra<e>terisse quae fortasse explicationem desiderabunt. Id cum occupationibus tum certo consilio egi ne viderer. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 22r) Si tibi probabuntur idque intellexero, statim edemus, pluris facientes communem litterarum dignitatem quam nonnullorum benivolentiam qui ea

potissimum de causa nos odisse et insectari videntur quod litterarum studia amamus et amplectimur. Vale.

Manuscript:

(micro.) Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, CCLXIII (235), s. XV, fols. 1r–20r. (Kristeller, *Iter* 2.297b).

2. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Acq. e doni 233, fols. 260r–273r.

Commentary. Domitii Calderini interpretatio in Sappho Ovidii finit et in Propertii loca incipit. Ad Franciscum Aragonium Ferdinandi regis neapolitani filium. [Inc.]: (fol. 260r) Ex primo libro Propertii. In primam elegiam cuius argumentum: Uritur, et nulla fias cum mitior arte/ut se dissolvat Cynthia quaerit opem. *Minalion* (I.1.9). Atalantae duae fuerunt: altera filia Promethei et Celenusae, cuius fuerunt filii Lycus et Chimereus; altera filia Schinei, amor Meleagri, de qua extat fabula apud Ovidium [Met. 10.560–704]. In hac multos habuit rivales. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 273r) *Dum vernat sanguis, dum rugis integer annis, / utere, nec quid eras liber ab ore dies* (IV.5.59–60). Puto ita esse emendandum: "Dum rugis integer, annis utere, nec quis eat liber amore dies." Domitii elucubratio in Propertii loca finit.

Final letter. Eiusdem ad Franciscum Aragoneum epilogus et προσφώνησις de observationibus. [Inc.]: (fol. 273r) Scio me multa praeterisse quae fortasse explicationem desiderabunt. Id cum occupationibus tum certo consilio egi ne viderer. . . [Expl.]: (fol. 274v) Si tibi probabuntur idque intellexero, statim edemus, pluris facientes communem litterarum dignitatem quam nonnullorum benivolentiam qui ea potissimum de causa nos odisse et insectari videntur quod litterarum studia amamus et amplectimur. Vale.

Manuscript:

Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Acq. e doni 233, s. XV, fols. 260r–273r. Copied by Bartolomeo Fonzio (unsigned) and decorated by Attavante degli Attavanti; made for King Matthias Corvinus of Hungary. (S. Caroti and S. Zamponi, *Lo scrittoio di Bartolomeo Fonzio*, Documenti sulle arti del libro 10 [Milan, 1974], 74, no. 20 [with further bibliography] and plate 30 [fol. 1r]); A. Garzelli, *Miniatura fiorentina del Rinascimento 1440–1525. Un primo censimento*, vol. 1 [Florence, 1985]: A. de la Mare, "New Research on

Humanistic Scribes in Florence," 414 n. 142 and 488; Kristeller, *Iter* 1.101b).

3. *Siena, Biblioteca Comunale, I. IX. 6, fols. 69r–120v.*

The commentary, entitled "Collecta supra Elegias Propertii per Titum Sutrinum" and dated 1480–81, contains Calderinus' comments on Propertius for books I and II only and introduces some instances of other material. Titus Sutrinus (Francesco Tito da Sutri) appears in archival records as a grammar teacher at Siena during the years 1475–81, 1487, and 1491 to 1493 or 1494 and at Spoleto from 1493 to 1495 (P. Denley, *Teachers and Schools in Siena, 1357–1500* [Siena, 2007], 115–16); Coppini (see below) has suggested that he received Calderinus' notes from a pupil of the latter. The final comment in the Siena manuscript ends incomplete.

The text of books I–II on fols. 8r–68r seems to be taken from the [Milan] edition of 1475 (Butrica 1984, 166); it is accompanied by many brief glosses in the hand of the original scribe that do not amount to a commentary.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (fol. 69r) *Cinthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis, / contactum nullis ante cupidinibus* (I.1.1–2). Amores cecinit primus Orpheus, amissa Erudice, quem lirici sequi Anacreon Sapho Corimnam eodem argumento quamvis disparibus metris carmen composuerint. Mox Alexander Etolus, Athimacus Calinus, Titheus Lacedomonius, Philetes Cohus et Quintiliani iudicio [*Inst. or.* 10.1.58] Callimachus omnium princeps elegiam quam olim in mortuis ex desiderio deflendis usurpaverat ad amores canendos apud Grecos traduxerunt. Apud nostros vero Gallus (-los *ms.*) durioribus (*sic; fort. durior* <omn>ibus *leg.?*), merus (*ut vid.*) Tibullus Persio (tersior *leg.?*), Propertius ardentior, Ovidius lascivior elegiam composuerunt [cf. Quint., *Inst. or.* 10.1.93]. Aurelius autem Propertius Nauta de quo nunc agimus obscuris parentibus a quibus Naute cognomen accepit. Mevanie (*corr.*) idest Umbrie opidum nascitur; eruditur Rome; in(?) pretesta Licinam amavit; carmen eligiacum in eius amorem cecinit, quod mox clamavit cum triennio post in Hostie amorem lapsus. Genus carminis maiori industria excoluisset. in volumen redegit dicavitque Tullo patritie gentis viro. Amicam Cintiam mutato nomine appellat imitatus (fol. 69v) Tibullum qui Clodiam amicam

Lesbiam nuncupavit. Studiosus inprimis Octavii fuit quippe qui perpetua elegia aliquando ei assentatur Filetem et Calimacum et grecis imitandos preponit quos ita expressit ut se Romanum Calimacum aliquando iactitet prima elegia amoris inpatiens dissidium querit presertim cum nullis artibus puellam sibi conciliari(e?—*macron over r*) valeat opus est. . . . / . . . (fol. 69v) . . . Argumentum elegie: Uritur; nulla fiat (*corr. ex fias*) cum mitior arte / ut se dissolvat Cintia querit opem. *Ocellis* (I.1.1) Diminutivum est gratia blandimenti amantibus conveniens. *Cupidinibus* (I.1.2). Cupidines tres fuisse scribunt antiqui: primum Mercurii et Diane prime filium; secundum Mercurii et Veneris secunde filium; tertium vero et Veneris tertie genitum. Ovidius duos fuisse Cupidines canit. Silius Cupidinum turbam memorat [cf. *Pun.* 7.442–47]: unde cupidines affectus amatoris dicimus. *Minalion* (I.1.9). Athlante due fuerunt: altera filia Promethei et Celemose (*sic*) cuius filii fuerunt Licus et Chimereus; altera filia Schinei, Meleangni amoris (*corr. ex amor*) cuius memorat Ovidius in *Meta.* longo carmine eandem [*Met.* 10.560–704]. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 120v) *Non tutior ibis Homero* (II.34.45) idest emulando Antilocum aut Homerum in scribendo non eris in amore foelicior quam si versus elegos componis. Nam puellae non capiuntur sublimi (*sull- ms.*) versu. *Galesi* (II.34.67). Apud Galesum fluvium Tarentinum hunc locum repressit Maro. Tantum enim

Subscriptions. (fol. 86r) Expliciunt collecta super primum librum Propertii per Titum Sutrinum M^o.CCCC^o.LXXX; (fol. 120v) Expliciunt commentaria supra secundum librum Propertii data et aperta per doctissimum virum Titum Sutrinum die xxviii Iunii eo tempore quo ____ (*erasure*), M^o.CCCC^o.LXXXI.

Manuscript:

Siena, Biblioteca Comunale, I. IX. 6, s. XV (a. 1480/81), fols. 69r–120v. (N. Terzaghi, "Index codicum latinorum classicorum qui in Senis in bibliotheca publica adservantur," *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 11 (1903) 421, no. 60; D. Coppini, "Il commento a Properzio di Domizio Calderini," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di lettere e filosofia*, 3d Ser., 9.3 [1979] 1173; Butrica 1984, 166 and 296–97, no. 105; Kristeller, *Iter* 2.155b–156a).

4. Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Inc.
Magl. B.3.1, fols. 57r–67r.

This copy of the 1481 Reggio Emilia edition contains in the margins a fifteenth-century handwritten selection of Calderinus' notes (with a few small variations) on book I and a single entry for book II. As Coppini (see below) remarks, the principle of selection or omission is obscure and the notes chosen do not exhibit a strictly philological character. At I.3.5 *Edonis fessa choreis* (fol. 57v; I1v) the scribe reproduces (more or less mechanically) Calderinus' remark "ut in comen-tarii (sic) Iuvenalis docuimus," without ever men-tioning Calderinus himself.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (fol. 57r; I1r) *Milanion* (I.1.9). Atalantae duae fuerunt: altera filia Pro-methei et Celenusae, cuius fuerunt filii Liycus et Chimereus; altera filia Schinei, amor Meleagris, de qua extat fabula apud Ovidium [*Met.* 10.560–704]. In \h/ac multos habuit rivales. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 67r; K3r) *Phaero* (II.3.53). *Phaero* Ap-pollonius [*Arg.* 1.119]. Homerus in evocatione ma-nium Clorim, Amphionis filiam, Neleo nupsisse (*corr. ex nupssi-*) scribit. Unde nati (*corr. ex nasi*) sunt Nestor, Chromius, Periclimenes et Pero. Ne-leus autem, ut ait, pronuntiavit nemini filiam uxorem se daturum nisi ei qui boves Iphicli ex Phi-laca urbe Tessaliae (*corr.*) ad se duceret. Solus Melampus, Amithaonis filius, id promisit isque ab Iphiclo deprehensus (*corr.*) in vincula coniec-tus est, sed post annum solutus egit ut Pero \sibi/ (*corr. s.s. ex si*) data Bianti fratri nuberet [*Hom., Odys.* 11.281–97]. Na<m> illius fuisse uxorem scribit Teocritus [3.44–45]; Diodorus Siculus [*Bibl. hist.* 4.68] aliter sentit

Manuscript:

Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Inc. Magl. B.3. 1, s. XV, fols. 57r–67r (I1r–K3r). (Coppini, "Il commento a Properzio di Domizio Calderini," 1172–73).

5. (*) Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale,
Magl. VII 1053, fols. 1r–74v.

This manuscript, written in the fifteenth century, contains the poems of Propertius (fols. 1r–74v) and Tibullus (fols. 75r–110v). In the margins there is a series of notes on books I, II, and the first five poems of book III, some but not all copied (often in an abbreviated form) from Calderinus' notes. At the beginning of *Eleg.* I.2–7, 9, 11,

13–20 and II.2, 3, 6–8, 13, 16, 25, 27, the same hand has placed the verse *argumenta* which stand at the head of Calderinus' commentaries on these poems; the *argumentum* by Calderinus that pre-cedes *Eleg.* I.1 was added by a different hand.

The codex was once owned by Tito Vespasia-no Strozzi and (*teste* †A. C. de la Mare) quite pos-sibly copied by him.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (fol. 1r) Argumentum. Uritur, et nulla fias cum mitior arte / ut se dis\ s / olvat Cynthia quaerit opem. (fol. 1v) *Non sic Leucippis succendit Castora Phoebe* (I.2.15). Leucip-pi et Philo\do\ces filiae. Has rapuerunt Castor et P<o>llux Lyn<c>eo et Ida adversantibus. (fol. 2r) *Ilaira* (I.2.16). Filia Leucippi et Philidoces. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 41r) *Braccati* (III.4.17). Braccas vestes esse intonsas et varii coloris Diodorus docet [cf. *Bibl. hist.* 5.30.1]. (fol. 42r) *Perhebi* (III.5.33) id est Tessali. Nam Perhebia Tessalia quoque est dicta, ut scribit Strabo [cf. *Geog.* 9.5.23].

Manuscript:

Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Magl. VII 1053, s. XV, fols. 1r–74v. (A. Galante, "Index codicum classicorum latinorum qui Flo-rentiae in bybliothea Magliabechiana adservan-tur. Pars I [cl. I–VII]," *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 10 [1902] 351–52; Coppini, "Il commento a Properzio di Domizio Calderini," 1173; Kristeller, *Iter* 2.124a).

Biography:

See CTC 1.221 (Juvenal) and 3.385–87 (Silius Italicus). The following account provides supple-mentary information.

Domitius Calderinus (Domizio Calderini) was born at Torri del Benaco, on Lake Garda, in 1445 or 1446 and died at Rome in 1478. The Chris-tian name given to him on his baptism was Do-menico (*Lat.* Dominicus).

His father Antonio, a notary by profession, owned a house in Verona, and for this reason and because of Verona's prestige it was natural that Calderinus should be sent there for his education. He studied Greek and Latin under Antonio Brog-nanigo, whose school had a considerable influ-ence on Veronese humanism. After this he went to Venice, attracted by the still greater reputa-tion of the school of which the master was Bene-detto Brugnoli da Legnano; here he stayed for more than two years, until at the age of twenty (that is, in 1466 or 1467) he decided to make a fu-

ture for himself in Rome. Here, he soon came to know several members of the Roman Academy; the group, to which he subsequently became attached, was that around Cardinal Bessarion, who thought highly of him, took him into his "family," and made him his private secretary. The great resources of the cardinal's library especially in Greek, and in philosophy as well as literature, together with the company of many distinguished men of letters, brought about an immense widening of Calderinus' horizons. He took part, along with Niccolò Perotti, on Bessarion's side in the dispute with George of Trebizond over the relative merits of Plato and Aristotle. A long and well-documented treatise on this subject by Calderinus, in the form of a letter to the bishop of Treviso, raised the esteem in which he was held; in 1470 he was appointed to a chair in the *Studio*, and in 1471 to the position of *secretarius apostolicus* in the secretariate of the Vatican. According to Perosa, his teaching began with Latin rhetoric (i.e., literature), to which a little later he added courses in Greek; but Lee has shown, on the basis of archival material, that he was appointed to teach Greek in 1470.

In April 1472 he set out for France with Bessarion, when the latter was sent there by Sixtus IV to encourage Louis XI to take part in a new crusade; they reached Lyons on 18 June. His correspondence shows that at this time he composed an epigram on the palace newly built at Urbino by Federigo da Montefeltro, and a love-elegy to a French girl named Claudia. Shortly after returning from France, on 17/18 November 1474, Bessarion died. The pope and his nephews, however (especially Cardinal Pietro Riario), continued to support Calderinus with their patronage and actively encouraged his poetic efforts.

Works of scholarship also began to appear: the commentary on Martial, based on a collation of a manuscript in the Medicean Library (now Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 53.33), was dedicated to Lorenzo de' Medici and presented to him at Florence on 1 September 1473; the same manuscript also contains an *Apologia* against criticisms made by Niccolò Perotti, who himself had recently (30 April 1473) edited Martial. (Perotti also severely criticized Calderinus' Juvenal). Calderinus met Politianus, and impressed him with his scholarship. From this time onwards he remained in touch with Politia-

nus and with the Medici: his next commentary, on Juvenal, was dedicated to Giuliano de' Medici. A few days after it was presented, in September 1474, Calderinus published at Rome his commentary on Ovid's *Ibis*. The following year saw, also at Rome, a volume containing various texts: the *Silvae* of Statius, with a commentary by Calderinus; his notes on the *Epistle to Phaon* of the pseudo-Sappho; and the *Elucubratio in quaedam Propertii loca quae difficiliora videbantur*. Added to these, as a kind of appendix, was a linguistic essay on the usages of Roman writers, purportedly extracted from the third book of his *Observationes*, a work of miscellaneous comment then in preparation.

Other works, to which he refers, but which survive only in manuscript, sometimes in a fragmentary state, or not at all, include commentaries on Suetonius (his lectures on the first three Lives in Suetonius' *De vita Caesarum* survive in the form of student notes) and Silius Italicus, and notes on parts of Cicero (*Letters to Atticus*, *Verine Orations*; only the introductory lectures survive, in manuscript, of his courses on *De oratore* and *De officiis*). Some fragments of commentaries on Virgil's *Aeneid* and on parts of the *Appendix Vergiliana* (the latter were first published after Calderinus' death) have come down to us; Perosa considers that these may have been early works which Calderinus thought not worth revising for publication (601). By the middle of the sixteenth century at least one scholar had noticed that Calderinus chose "difficult" poets for comment: poets, that is, whose mythological or historical subject-matter and literary context required deep learning for proper interpretation. He edited, for the printers, the text of three of the declamations of pseudo-Quintilian (Rome, 1475), and revised Iacopo di Angelo's translation of Ptolemy's *Cosmographia* (it was published posthumously on 10 October 1478); his contributions to the Latin version of Pausanias are dealt with by Perosa. Although he does not appear as the primary commentator on any major Greek text, his Latin commentaries are plentifully sprinkled with references both to Greek authors and to the scholia on those authors; with all of these he shows a wide and deep acquaintance.

Despite the death of his patron Cardinal Pietro Riario in January 1474 Calderinus was made an apostolic secretary in June, by which date he

had joined the *familia* of Cardinal Giuliano Della Rovere (later to be Pope Julius II); in December 1475 he recited a panegyric in honor of the Cardinal's brother Giovanni, the prefect of Rome. After the marvelously productive years of 1473–75, no more commentaries appeared; Calderinus concentrated his effort on the three books of *Observationes* and the translations from Ptolemy and Pausanias, already mentioned. He died prematurely, of the plague.

Works:

See CTC 1.221 (Juvenal) and 3.386 (Silius Italicus); also A. Perosa (see below), 603–4 and A. Rose (see below), 375–77.

Bibliography:

See CTC 1.221 (Juvenal) and 3.386–87 (Silius Italicus). Add: "Calderini, Domizio," DBI 16.597–605 (A. Perosa); E. Lee, *Sixtus IV and Men of Letters*, Temi e testi 26 (Rome, 1978), 170, 181; D. Coppini, "Il commento a Properzio di Domizio Calderini," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, Classe di lettere e filosofia, 3d Ser., 9.3 (1979) 1119–73; Coppini, "Il Properzio di Domizio Calderini," in *Atti 1994 (Commentatori e traduttori di Properzio dall'Umanesimo al Lachmann)*, ed. G. Catanzaro and F. Santucci (Assisi, 1996), 27–79; A. Rose, *Filippo Beroaldo der Ältere und sein Beitrag zur Properz-Überlieferung* (Munich and Leipzig, 2001), 362–81; M. Campanelli, *Polemiche e filologia ai primordi della stampa. Le Observationes di Domizio Calderini*, Sussidi eruditi 54 (Rome, 2001).

7. Gaspar Manius

Described as "undoubtedly the most interesting of the unpublished commentaries" on Propertius (Butrica 1978, 438), this commentary was written in the margins of Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 1612. The codex contains the four books of Propertius' *Elegies* and was copied by Johannes ____ (illegible) Hyspalensis. On fol. 78r the original copyist added a subscription, dated 1470 (see below), in which he acknowledges his obligation to others, including a certain "B. M." Gaspar Manius, who inserted numerous marginal comments, doctored this subscription, changing the date to 1480 and substituting over erasures his own name for that of the scribe as well as the names of "Petreius" and Pomponius Laetus for whatever other names had been entered

by the scribe. He did not, however, remove or change the initials "B. M.," which (so far as Manius is concerned) may possibly stand for "Benedicto Maphaeo" (Benedetto Maffei, 1428–94), an influential official in the papal chancery as well as the editor of *Epistolae selectae* of Cicero (Rome, [1483]). Manius and Maffei were friends, as demonstrated by a letter addressed to Manius in which Maffei recounts his sorrow occasioned by the death of his two sons and expresses his appreciation of Manius' consolatory epistle on the loss of his younger son Mario (Maffei's letter, dated Rome, 2 August 1486, is found in Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Inc. Magl. VI 191, fols. 73r–80r). But even if Benedetto Maffei is Manius' "B. M.," the scribe may well have had some other "B. M." in mind.

Interestingly enough, Manius also did not erase or alter the concluding part of the subscription in which the original scribe mentions his use of a correct exemplar written by his patron ("cuius etiam habui emendatissimum exemplar eius propria manu confectum"). It made sense for him not to do this since, in fact, Pomponio Leto had himself copied a manuscript containing the texts of Tibullus, Propertius, and Catullus (Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, 15).

Manius' commentary is distributed over the first three books and the first four poems of book IV. Manius' own notes end on fol. 66v at IV.4.90 *nube ait*. To his comments were added some others in a second hand, which Butrica has conjectured to be that of the "Petreius" mentioned in the subscription. How the credit for the commentary should be distributed among Manius, "Petreius," and Laetus (under whose supervision the commentary was composed, according to Butrica 1978, 449) is impossible to say.

The *Vita Propertii* prefixed to Antonius Volscus' edition of 1488 refers to a derivation of the word *monobyblos* (from *byblos* = papyrus) which is present in Vat. lat. 1612 (fol. 77v) and in some other manuscripts; this lends support to the suggestion that Volscus consulted Manius in preparing his own commentary (see Butrica 1978, 449). But we may go farther than this and speak with confidence of wholesale borrowings, even *verbatim*, by Volscus from Manius (see I.9 below). The following observations are largely based on Butrica 1978, 438–39.

Variant readings are frequently discussed in

the commentary, some of which are attested in few or no manuscripts at all: at II.20.12 (fol. 28v) the correct emendation *transilium* is rightly favored over its exotic rivals *stasilium* (the paradox), *strofilium*, and *stafilium*, all of which are discussed in full. We have the first recorded instance of the joining through conjecture of two poems transmitted separately in the entire manuscript tradition: “Non ausim hanc separare elegiam quoniam cum superiori eodem argumento convenit,” he says on fol. 43v at III.5.1 *Pacis amor*, an opinion shared later by Marcus Antonius Muretus (I.13 below), to whom editors have attributed the correction), Joseph Justus Scaliger (I.15 below), Johannes Livineius (I.19 below), E. Baehrens, and O. L. Richmond. At II.7.13 *Unde mihi patriis gnatos prebere triumphis*, Manius refuses to accept the beginning of a “new” poem and he cancels the rubric (“Ad Cynthiam”), noting “Non est elegia dividenda: ducitur enim ex eodem argumento et loquitur cum indignatione” (fol. 20r). Editors assign this correction also to Volscus. Another instance of a reading attributed by editors to Volscus but more properly assigned to Manius is *Autharicis* at I.8.25 (fol. 6v). Finally, a notable feature of Manius’ commentary is his abundant citation of Greek authors. The notes on the first poem of book IV (fols. 59v–62v) contain, for example, quotations from Plutarch, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus Siculus, and a fragment of Sophocles, in addition to the expected Latin authors.

Commentary. (Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 1612). [*Inc.*]: (fol. 1v) A tempore atque exemplo quam perdit amet indicat et Cynthie difficultatem ostendit; quae cum nulla arte vinci possit, vix magico carmine credit posse fallescere adque quod destituta Lycinna (Cynthia s.s.) quam prius amarat (Cynthia erat s.s.), amore novo male plectatur. Amicos monet, si felices esse velint, ut a consueto amore non discedant vel, si felices sint, in primo amore permaneant. *Cynthia* (I.1.1) dicit cum prius Licinnam lascivisset et nominasset et ab ea explicari (*sic*) non possit tanto teneatur ardore. *Primo* (I.1.1). Nullo utitur principio ut estuanti convenit et nimio amore sevient. *Miserum* (I.1.1). Miser is est cuius calamitati non est remedium. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 66v) *Patriamque iacentem* (IV.4.87) quia omnia dormiebant. *Nubendique petit quem velit ipsa diem* (IV.4.88). Nuptiarum fidem exigit quibus flagitat diem dici. *Nube ait* (IV.4.90). Iro-

nica permissio est; “non” inquit “mihi nupseris nec meum talamum prodicionis”.

Final note. (fol. 77v) Propertii Aurelii Nautae monobyblos ad Cymthiam (*sic*) aliosve Liber quartus et postremus finit. Qui quidem dicitur *monobyblos* a monos, unus vel solus, et byblos, iuncus marinus. Sed hic ponitur pro libro quia in iuncis scribebant prisci. Inde autem Monobyblos id est liber de una persona compositus quia de Cimthia (*sic*) fere ubi (*sic*; *lege ubique*) loquitur. De quo Ovidius in libro de Remediis [*Rem.* 763–64]: “Carmina quis tuto possis legisse (fol. 78r) Tibulli/vel tua cuius opus Cynthia sola fuit.” Idem in Tristicia [5.1.17]: “Aptior huic Gallus blandique Propertius oris.” Item Martialis [*Epig.* 14.189.1]: “Cynthia, facundi carmen iuvenile Properti.” Item [Mart., *Epig.* 8.73.5]: “Cynthia te vatem fertur lasciva puella” (*sic*). Nonius autem Marcellus aliter hunc appellat librum [Nonius Marcellus 169M, 249 Lindsay]: dicit enim “Propertius in quarto libro Elegiarum.” Fuerit autem familiaris Ovidio Nasoni nostro uti patet apud eundem in Tristibus [4.10.45–46] in hunc modum: “Saepe suos solitus recitare Propertius ignes, / iure sodalitii qui mihi iunctus erat.” Deo laus et honor.

Subscription. (The substitutions made by Gaspar Manius are italicized.) (fol. 78r) Scripsi Ego Gaspar Manius Romanus et ultro et iocunde Anno Mccccclxxx. Kalendis Decembris. favente mihi clarissimo atque sanctissimo vate. *Petreio ac Pomponio omnium hominum sapientissimo principe meo.* B. M. cuius etiam habui emendatissimum exemplar eius propria manu confectum. Reagent has been applied to the line containing the words “Petreio . . . principe.”

Manuscript:

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1612, s. XV (a. 1470, 1480), fols. 1v–78r. (*Codices Vaticani latini*: B. Nogara, *Codd.* 1461–2059 [Rome, 1912], 109; Butrica 1984, 139–40, 152, 337–39, and 309–10, no. 122; E. Pellegrin et al., *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, vol. 3.1 [Paris, 1991], 215–17; M. Buonocore, *Properzio nei codici della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana* [Assisi, 1995], 75–77 and pl. 21 [fol. 1v]; E. Caldelli, *I codici datati nei Vaticani Latini 1–2100*, I codici latini datati della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana 2 [Vatican City, 2007], 94–95 and pl. 180 [fol. 22r]).

Biography:

Very little is known about Gaspar Manius. He has been plausibly identified with the person in Marcantonio Altieri's *Li nuptiali* named "Casparo" and described as a poet domiciled in Rome (E. Narducci, ed., *Li Nuptiali di Marco Antonio Altieri* [Rome, 1873; reprinted 1995, with new introduction by M. Miglio and index by A. Modigliani], 25–26). There he was a friend of Benedetto Maffei.

Works:

Manius' unpublished commentary on Propertius was composed in 1480 under the guidance of "Petreius" and Pomponio Leto (see above for the subscription in Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 1612). With Bernardinus Capella he coauthored a Latin eclogue, with a prose preface, addressed to Cardinal Raffaele Sansoni Riario (London, BL, Harley 4088, s. XV, fols. 13r–v, 14r–18r and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. misc. c. 62, s. XV, fols. 14v–17v). Manius wrote an "after dinner" poem addressed to the same cardinal (Harley 4088, fols. 18r–19v, "Carmina ad lyram post mensas") as well as a poem on the death of Ursinus, son of Johannes Lanfredinus, who died in Rome at age eighteen while his father was ambassador at the court of Innocent VIII (London, BL, Add. 22805, s. XV [a. 1489], fol. 2v).

Bibliography:

R. Weiss, "In obitu Ursini Lanfredini. A Footnote to the Literary History of Rome under Pope Innocent VIII," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 2 (1959) 353–66, especially 360–61, where Gaspar Manius is identified with the "Casparo" mentioned by Marcantonio Altieri in connection with Tamira, Bernardino Cappella, and Giuliano Ceci; Butrica 1978, 438–39; Kristeller, *Iter* 4.111a, 178b, 254a.

8. Philippus Beroaldus Senior

The existence of Johannes Calphurnius' 1481 Vicenza edition and the partial commentary of Domitius Calderinus (I.6 above) printed opposite the text in 1486, as well as Antonius Volscus' 1482 text-edition and no doubt the knowledge that Volscus was preparing a full commentary (I.9 below), spurred Beroaldus to publish a full commentary at Bologna in 1487. His annotations are printed in the margins opposite his text and combine emendation and interpretation. They reveal

a command of a wide range of classical literature and antiquities on a par with that of Volscus and a Latin style that is, by comparison with that of Volscus, a good deal less flowing and agreeable, though perfectly competent. Beroaldus' textual acumen (especially in the field of *emendatio ingenii ope*) is considerably greater.

Instead of relying on ecclesiastical patronage, as Volscus had done (and was to do, in the following year), Beroaldus—who was a professor, rather than a cleric—appealed to the local patriotism of his native Bologna and gained the backing of the powerful Bentivoglio family as well as the friendship of several Bolognese dignitaries. Minus Roscius (Mino Rossi, 1451–1503), the dedicatee and a lifelong friend of Beroaldus, was an aristocratic Bolognese senator who enjoyed the favor of Giovanni II Bentivoglio, the ruler of Bologna. Several literary works were devoted to Roscius by Beroaldus, including a number of poems. Roscius accompanied Beroaldus on the latter's visit to Florence in 1485–86; his sudden and early death affected Beroaldus deeply.

In his dedicatory letter to Minus Roscius, Beroaldus provides considerable information about the commentary and about Roscius. He begins by explaining that poets are inspired by the Muse, but those who interpret the poets are also, in their way, inspired; they derive their inspiration from the poets themselves, by a kind of magnetic force. And modern times can show interpreters equal to those of antiquity; Domitius Calderinus, for example, wrote in a clear, attractive style, but in such a concise fashion that "he seems to have sung only to himself and the Muses, as the saying goes." For his own part, Beroaldus reports that he has been working for three months on a commentary, directed to the needs of beginners and "veterans" alike, which should achieve a reasonable compromise between excessive brevity, leading to obscurity (as with Calderinus), and on the other hand a tiresome degree of prolixity. He decided to dedicate his efforts to Roscius, since they were both from the same region and lovers of good letters; and both had studied with Franciscus Puteolanus, who did more than anyone else to revive enthusiasm for literature in Bologna. From this studious association there arose a close friendship reinforced by almost daily meetings and by similarity of tastes and age. Beroaldus states that he

pursued letters, first as a student at Bologna, then as a young teacher at Parma, and later at Paris, whence he was recalled by his country to serve as a professor. Meanwhile, Roscius pursued these same interests privately (as suited his rank as a public man) in the belief that no life was worth living without the study of literature. Beroaldus has no doubt that this was instrumental in helping Roscius to gain entry to the Council and also to acquire the high regard of Giovanni Bentivoglio and his son. Roscius' wealth has never made him arrogant, but rather a generous supporter and protector of his friends and dependents. And again, to whom might commentaries on a love-poet be more aptly dedicated than to one who himself has served in the lists of love, i.e., that purest kind of love that makes us friends of the gods and is celebrated in Plato's *Symposium*? Only the wise are devotees of such true love. As Afranius says, "The wise will love; the rest will but desire." So Roscius should incur no blame for loving, in the way that a wise and learned young man of our times does. Beroaldus concludes with the statement that he would rather have the approval of just a single learned man than that of a very large number of ill-educated persons.

Beroaldus' edition takes the unusual step of advertising its critical respectability at the outset by opening (even before the preface) with a list of twenty-seven of what Beroaldus considered to be his cleverest emendations. The appeal to the scholarly world was thus direct, and by no means deficient in self-confidence. This list is reproduced below, since a number of Beroaldus' proposed emendations have been adopted by editors of Propertius and as a body of textual criticism they are still held to deserve the close attention of scholars.

Frequently reprinted, his text and commentary held the field until the emergence of those of Marcus Antonius Muretus (I.13 below). This deserved dominance was reinforced after his text was adopted in 1502 as the basis of the first Aldine edition (which, of course, implied a wide distribution) and circulated in France by means of the counterfeit Aldine editions repeatedly issued in Lyons and Paris for most of the sixteenth century.

Dedicatory letter (ed. of Bologna, 1487). Ad magnificum Minum Roscium Senatorem Bononiensem Philippi Beroaldi Bononiensis epistola.

[*Inc.*]: (fol. aiir) Maxima est vel potius divina virtus poetarum, Mine mi, eruditorum nobilissime, nobilium eruditissime; magna etiam vis est ipsorum explanatorum, qui a Cicerone [*Div.* 1.34] grammatici, a Platone [*Ion* 530C] rhapsodi appellantur. Illi afflatu divino concitati poemata preclara conficiunt; hi poetico furore correpti preclare interpretantur. Illi deo pleni deo dignissima eloquuntur; hi poetica inflammatione calentes divinas interpretationes excudunt. Et ut apud Platonem [*Ion* 533D] disserit Socrates, prope divinitus poetae a musa divino instinctu agitantur, interpretes a poetis furore extimulantur, et quemadmodum lapis nomine Magnes non solum anulos ferreos trahit, sed vim etiam anulis ipsis infundit qua hoc idem efficere possint anulorum catena pendente, ita deus poetas, poetae interpretes furore corripiunt. Magnes deo primus, qui rapitur anulus poetae, secundus interpreti perquam eleganti similitudine comparantur. Non est sine deo bonus poeta; non est sine poetico afflatu bonus interpres: ille tanquam oraculum, hic tanquam oraculi explicator. Et cum poetae officium sit obliquis figurationibus poema velare, et sententias concinniter implicare, interpres involucri explicat, obscura illustrat, arcana revelat; et quod ille strictim et quasi transeunter attingit, hic copiose et diligenter enodat. Quocirca poetae primo in loco venerandi sunt. Secundum poetas ipsi interpretes honorandi, quorum lucubrationes etiam posteris prosunt; nec minus habent emolumentum quam ipsi poetae oblectamenti. Nec solos lectione dignos esse censeo antiquos commentatores, verum etiam nostrorum temporum ingenia non despicio. Non enim credibile est rerum naturam longa seculorum intercapedine effatam veluti mulierem consenuisse, et nefas est existimare deteriora fieri in dies ingenia mortalium. Nam cum sint eadem quae semper fuere elementa, cum eisdem numeris animae sint sociatae corporibus, cum sint ex eadem materia membra compacta, eadem quoque ingenia eundemque animorum vigorem durare atque pollere necessum est. Et ut eleganter inquit Manilius [*Astr.* 1.521], "Idem semper erit, quoniam semper fuit idem." Vigent hodie clarique sunt in studiis litterarum complusculi, qui interpretando, commentando, explanando veterum poemata non mediocrem laudem consequuti sunt; quorum ego provocatus exemplo commentarios cudi in Propertium elegiacum poetam, ut opinor non peni-

tendos. Extant Domitii [sc. Calderini] enarrationes luculenter quidem scriptae, sed adeo concise ut sibi soli et Musis, sicuti dici solet [cf. Cic., *Brut.* 187; Hieron., *Ep.* 50.2], cecinisse videatur. Nos talia intra duos sesquimenses elucubravimus ut tironibus placere possint, nec veteranis displicere, eo adhibito temperamento ut neque nimia brevitate obscurus fierem neque nimia prolixitate repudiandus. Haec autem qualiacunque sunt tibi uni ex omnibus potissimum dicare constitui, primum quod eadem utrique patria, idem genitale solum est; deinde quia tu litteratus litteras amas, litteratos foves et studiorum studiosorumque commercio delectaris; preterea quod condiscipuli fuimus, quod simul in scholis tyrocinia posuimus, quod simul didicimus eadem humanitatis studia (fol. aiiiv) sub Francisco Puteolano, praefatore haudquaquam penitendo; qui eloquentia precellens et multiiuga eruditione tersissimus Bononiae litteras litteratas prope extinctas excitavit et mansuetiores Musas situ squalentes in lucem nitoremque revocavit, non trivialia nec de discenda docens sed recondita et scitu digna, frequentissimo auditorio quotidiana lectione depromens; qui de ingeniis nostrorum municipum optime meritus est; cui, quicquid in me est eruditionis, id ingenue acceptum <re>fero, eique illam mercedem ubique gentium dependam atque persolvam, quam Thales Milesius ex septem sapientibus unus a Mandrayto [*codd. Apul. Flor.* 18] Prienense rependi sibi depoposcit. Ex hoc condiscipulatu, ex hoc dulcissimo litterarum commertio, amicitia inter nos vera et sancta ac religiosa quadam necessitudine imbuta coaleuit; neque enim sanctius est sacris iisdem quam studiis initiari. Auxit benivolentiam frequens ac pene quotidiana consuetudo, fuitque ad amorem mutuum stabiliendum instar glutini tenacissimi similitudo studiorum, aetas pene par, nec dispare mores. Ego te cum summa reverentia, sicut par erat, diligere volui; tu amari familiariter maluisti. Ego amicitia tua gloriari soleo, nec tu meam aspersionem unquam existimasti. Ego studia litterarum ingenuarum adolescentulus adhuc et pene puer, primo Bononiae, mox Parmae, deinde in gymnasio Parrhisiorum celeberrimo profiteri cepi; unde in patriam honorifice revocatus multos iam annos publice lectitans elaboravi pro virili parte ne inter postremissimos professores essem annumerandus. Tu vero domi intra privatos parietes, sicuti dignitati tuae con-

veniebat, eadem studia excoluisti, easdem disciplinas adamasti, eandem sectam sequutus es adeo ut sine studiis litterarum vitam nullam esse ducas, ut nullum pene diem tam occupatum agas quin aliquid aut legas aut audias, cumque plurimum scias, quotidie tamen aliquid addiscas; et ita mehercules oportet senatorii ordinis virum, qualis es tu, vitam degere: ut scilicet post occupationes multiiugas, post sequestratam rei publicae administrationem, in diversorio Musarum quasi respiret ac requiescat. . . . [Continues in praise of Minus Roscius] (fol. aiiir) . . . Quibus haud dubie rebus effectum est ut tu ante legitimam aetatem allectus fueris in senatum concordi cunctorum suffragio; ut apud illustrem principem nostrum Ioannem Bentivolum in magna sis, sicut esse debes, estimatione; ut apud clarissimum eius filium Hannibalem, quo potissimum discipulo gloriamur, sis omnium longe honoratissimus, qui te tanti facit ut pluris faciat neminem, ut sine te nihil altum auspicetur. Divitiae vero, quae tibi sunt luculentissimae, non te insolentem efficiunt, ut multos, sed magnificum, ut paucos; et censu plane senatorio senatoriam tueris dignitatem, amicorum clientiumque qui frequentes domum tuam colunt propugnator acerrimus, subsidiumque promptissimum. Postremo cui convenientius dicari debuerant commentarii de rebus amatoriis disputantes quam illi qui amare novit, qui amatoria callet? "Quomodo enim Graecorum historias illi magis intelligunt qui Athenas Spartamque viderunt, quomodo tertium Eneidos virgilianae librum lucidius illi intuentur qui" (ut ait divus Hieronymus [*Praef. in lib. Paralipomenon*]) "a Troade per Leucatem et Acroceraunia ad Siciliam et inde ad hostia tyberina enavigaverunt;" ita poesim enarrationemque amatoriam melius ille percipiet, iucundius ille lectitabit, qui stipendia fecit in Veneris contubernio, qui fuit assecla cupidinis; illius, inquam, cupidinis qui beatissimus, pulcherrimus, optimus est; qui nos diis amicos facit; quem Plato in Symposio celestem pretiosumque esse autumat. Et profecto turpe non est amare; immo optimi quique et generosi non clanculum sed palam amaverunt, nec ullus adeo ignavus est, ut philosophi dixerunt, quem amor non inflammet ad virtutem, cuius non vegetetur ingenium marcore hallucinationibusque discussis. Solique sapientes veri sunt amoris sectatores. Unde eleganter inquit Afranius [O. Ribbeck, *Comicorum romanorum frag-*

menta, no. 221]: “Amabit sapiens, cupient caeteri.” Tibi itaque nemo probro, nemo dedecori det quod amaveris, quod ames, qui sapiens es, qui iuvenis, qui eruditus, cum et sapienti et erudito et iuveni amare conveniat. Sed haec hactenus; et enim epistolicus character non minus peccat, si supra modum evagetur, quam si infra modum coerceatur. Accipito igitur, clarissime senator, commentarios a Philippo tuo concinnatos in Propertium, eosque illa frontis serenitate perlegito qua tu id genus scripta legere consuevisti, cui semper fuit studiorum summa reverentia, summus amor studiosorum. Equidem pro viribus curavi ne inutiles penitus forent; ne emptoris impensa periret; ne operam lector amitteret. Verum operae pretium me fecisse existimabo si tibi tuique similibus enarrationes nostrae probabuntur. Pluris enim facio unius eruditi iudicium quam sexcentorum male litteratorum. Tu autem cum in ocio litterario sine interpellatore versaberis, cum ab omni serio eris feriat, cum denique nihil agere voles, tunc in manum sumito libellos Philippi tui, qui te fraterne diligit et reverenter observat. Quod reliquum est, dii faxint ut hi commentarii, qui in exemplaria mille transcripti sunt, sempiterni testes sint mei erga te amoris et observantiae. Vale, decus meum, et me sicuti soles ama.

List of Emendations. [Inc.]: (fol. aiiiv) Huic epistolae subiunxi aliquot locos partim a nobis nostro Marte emendatos partim accuratius explicatos quam ab aliis explicari soleant, ut ex his candidus lector preiudicium facere possit quid sit de totis commentariis iudicaturus.

Pallidus ora timor: <i>nos eme<n>davimus</i>	
Palladis ora tumor	[II.30.18]
Cur vatem Herculeum: <i>pro curva ten</i>	
Herculeum	[II.32.5]
Parrhasius parva: <i>pro pireicus</i>	[III.9.12]
Mens bona si qua deo est: <i>pro si qua</i>	
dea es	[III.24.19]
Armantur etrusca sagittis: <i>pro susa</i>	[II.13.1]
Persuasae fallere prima sat est:	
<i>pro rima</i>	[IV.1.146]
Navita dives eras: <i>pro non ita</i>	[II.24.38]
Dure poeta: <i>pro choe</i>	[III.9.44]
Munitus henricus hostis equo: <i>pro</i>	
munito sericus	[IV.3.8]
Offensam illa mihi: <i>pro infensa</i>	[III.8.40]

Cera Philippeis: <i>pro Philitheis</i>	[IV.6.3]
Syriganam tracto: <i>pro serica nam</i>	
taceo	[IV.8.23]
Magnus et ipse suos: <i>pro nanus</i>	[IV.8.41]
Detonsis ab annis: <i>pro mannis</i>	[IV.8.15]
Critei carmine (<i>sic</i>) vatis	[II.34.29]
Fluminaque Hemonio cominus	
isse viro	[III.1.26]
Migdoniis cadis: <i>pro modis</i>	[IV.6.8]
Perrhebi tremuere cacumina Pindi	[III.5.33]
Puros sideris esse dies: <i>pro Isidis</i>	[IV.5.34]
Pretoria classica	[III.3.41]
Sic Sanctum Tatiae composuere Cures	[IV.9.74]
Qui dabit immundae venalia fata	
saginae	[IV.8.25]
Clausus ab umbroso qua ludit pontus	
Averno	[III.18.1]
Et nobis aquilo Cynthia ventus erit	[II.5.4]
Libera sumpta toga	[IV.1.132]
Sirpiculis medio pulvere ferre rosam	[IV.2.40]
Cornicum immeritas eruit ungue	
genas	[IV.5.16]

History of elegy. Ad magnificum Minum Roscium Philippi Beroaldi Bononiensis Commentarii in Propertium. (fol. aiiir) Elegiacum carmen quod a luctu sive a miseratione nomen accepit querimoniis lamentationibusque est accomdatum (*sic*), eoque usi veteres sunt ad defunctorum (*sic*) laudes in funeribus celebrandas. Romani id genus carminis quod cum lamentatione mortuis adcanitur Nenia nuncupaverunt. Posteriores vero elegiaco metro amores resque alias scriptitare ceperunt et, ut inquit <H>oratius [Ars 76], “Inclusa est voti sententia compos.” Elegiam apud Graecos multi scripsere praeclare, quorum princeps habetur Callimachus, secundas confessione plurimorum Philetas occupavit. Apud Latinos elegiae scriptores complusculi floruerunt, ex quibus tersus atque elegans maxime videtur Quintiliano [10.1.93] Tibullus, Ovidium lascivire existimanti. Consensus plurimorum palmam dat Sexto Propertio, qui gravitate sententiarum, pondere verborum, eruditione minime triviali haud dubie est eminentissimus. Idem ardens, concitatus, et interdum supra elegiacum stilum grandiloquus. In affectibus vero amatoriis explicandis facile praecipuus: amat ut qui verissime; dolet

ut qui impatientissime. Graecorum et imprimis Callimachi exprimit emulationes, quo uno precipue est usus archetypo; unde non minus vere quam eleganter se Romanum Callimachum appellat. Patriam habet Mevaniam, quae civitas est Umbriae in sexta Italiae regione. Parentibus obscuris natus; fortuna modica; sed ingenio nobili, cuius beneficio pervenit ad Augusti Caesaris commendationem, qui ingenia seculi sui modis omnibus fovit. Promeruit et Mecenatem, eruditorum id temporis singulare presidium. Acceptissimus fuit Tullo, haud dubie nobilissimo, cuius nomen perire non sinit ipsius poetae carmen. Sodalicii iure Ovidio copulatus; Virgilii utpote synchroni admiratur et laudat ingenium. Nauta passim cognominatur, nullo satis idoneo argumento: videntur plerique omnes id opinari ex illo ipsius poetae versiculo [II.24.38] "Et quamvis navita dives eras"; sed nos in commentariis nostris aliter legendum et intelligendum locum illum esse docuimus. Hostiam puellam quam efflictim deperiit sub nomine Cynthiae versibus illustravit, sicut Catullus Lesbiam pro Clodia et Tibullus Deliam pro Plania nominaverunt. Monobiblon Propertii opus inscribere non pauci, tanquam de sola Cynthia concinnatum; sed ex nulla veterum scriptorum allegatione id confirmari potest, qui poetae testimonium citantes elegiarum libros appellant. Hic unus omnium affectiones cupidineas apte, miseranter, lachrymose, inflam<m>anter exequutus est. Idque sentiet esse verissimum quisquis miles est cupidinis, et in castris veneriis iam fecit prima stipendia. A Propertio genus duxit Passienus Paulus, poeta absolutissimus, qui scripsit elegos, opus tersum, molle, atque iucundum, imprimis Propertium emulatus. Sed iam enarrationem auspicemur, in qua non solum quid nobis placeat sed quid aliis etiam videatur explicabimus. Nam, ut inquit divus Hieronymus [*Apol. contra Rufinum* 1.16], commentatoris officium est multorum sententias exponere ut prudens lector, cum diversas explanationes legerit, iudicet quid verius sit, et quasi verus trapezita adulterinae monetae pecuniam reprobet et probam sinceramque recipiat.

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: (fol. aiiir) Propertius suos et Cynthiae scripturus amores in principio operis ostendit quam sit imperiosus in ipsum cupido; quam ardentem Cynthiam depereat in amore superbientem, a qua mutuis affectibus amari desiderat; et carminis magici implorat auxilium.

Miserum (I.1.1). Quoniam, ut inquit Plautus in *Asinaria* [616], "miser est homo qui amat." *Ocellis*. Oculi sunt pars corporis preciosissima et qui teste Plinio [*Nat. hist.* 11.139] lucis usu vitam distinguant a morte. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. siiir) *Sim digna merendo* (IV.11.101). Utinam, inquit, beneficio morum et vitae bene actae merito digna existimer femineo post obitum triumpho. Elocutio est metaphorica. Nam ut victoribus dabatur triumphus ob rem bene gestam et curru quadriiugo pompa triumphali in urbem invehebantur, ita optat Cornelia sibi defunctae ob merita decerni ornamenta feminei triumphus et *ossa sua vehi equis honoratis* (IV.11.102), hoc est, triumphalibus: tanquam primaria sit et feminea virtute precellens in grege mulierum, sicut excellentissimus est imperator, cui ob virtutem triumphalia insignia decernuntur.

Final letter. (fol. siiir) Habes, magnifice senator litterarumque patrone, lucubrationes nostras in Propertium; quas quantulaecumque sunt boni consulas rogamus. Vos autem lectores omnis quaeso ne prius nos vellicare vellitis (*sic*) quam vellicatione dignos reperieritis, nec prius nostra obelisco confodere quam vos asterisco illuminanda deprompseritis. Videor mihi meo more facturum si commentarios hendecasyllabis clusero.

Verses. (fol. siiiv) Eiusdem Philippi Beroaldi hendecasyllabon:

Quisquis carptor es et calumniator,
 Quisquis lividus, osor, obloquutor,
 Et lolliginis oblitus cruore,
 Quisquis rictibus improbus caninis
 Adlatras decus eruditiorum,
 Sis queso procul a meis libellis.
 Non scribo criticisque Zoilisque;
 Non scripsi tibi; iure non vocatus
 Conviva eiicitur. Quid impudenter
 Te in cena aspicio mea accubantem?
 Quae non est tibi cocta delicate.
 Illi fercula nostra condiuntur
 Qui luxum altitium probat, nec idem
 Fastidit tenuem tamen paratum,
 Cui vel relliquiae placere possunt.
 Tu vero, stomachose nauseator,
 Tangis singula dente qui superbo,
 Aut mensas mihi pone lautiores
 Nostra aut vescere cenula libenter.
 Nos hec quantulacunque sunt benigno

Lectori ingenuoque candidoque
 Passim scribimus, et damus legenda.
 Uni sed tibi, Mine, dedicantur,
 Quem non sors mihi iudicem paravit
 Sed quem pagina nostra nominatim
 Delegit sine provocatione.
 At tu iudice gaudibunda tali
 Esto, pagina, qui tibi advocatus
 Iam iam ex iudice fiet et patronus
 Multa predictus eruditione,
 Pollens consilio, disertus ore,
 Unus qui merito potest vocari
 Orator bonus et bonus senator.
 Iam livor vacet, improbique mussent;
 Imperterritus exeat, libelle:
 Mino vindice nil tibi est timendum.

Followed on fol. sivr by complimentary verses
 (ten elegiac distichs) of Hieronymus Salius.

Editions:

1487, Bononiae (Bologna): Franciscus de
 Benedictis (for Benedictus Hectoris). HCR 13406;
 BAV P-498; BMC 6.822 (IB.28863); Goff P-1017;
 NUC.BL; BNF; (UNCa; ColUL; UpaL).

1491, Venetiis (Venice): a Boneto Locatello
 (for Octavianus Scotus). With the texts of Tibul-
 lus, Catullus, and Propertius, and the commen-
 taries of Bernardinus Cyllenius Veronensis on
 Tibullus, Antonius Parthenius on Catullus, and
 Philippus Beroaldus Senior on Propertius. Vers-
 es by Beroaldus and by Hieronymus Salius (pre-
 ceded by quatrain "Sit Christe Rex piissime/Tibi
 patrique gloria/Cum spiritu paraclito/In sem-
 piterna saecula") at end. HC 4763*; BAV T-180;
 BMC 5.439 (IB.22858); Goff T-372; NUC.BL; BNF;
 (HEHL; NewL; MH; CtY).

1493, Venetiis (Venice): per Simonem Bevi-
 laquam Papiensem. Contents as in the previ-
 ous edition. HC 4764; BAV T-181; BMC 5.517
 (IB.23928). Goff T-373; NUC.BL; BNF; (UCal-
 LAL; UIILL; NYPL; MH; CtY).

(*) 1497, Venetiis (Venice): a Boneto Locatel-
 lo (for Octavianus Scotus). A reprint of the 1491
 edition (not the 1493 edition, which differs on the
 last page). HC 4765; IGI 9667. BL; Pistoia, Biblio-
 theca del Seminario (two copies).

1500, Venetiis (Venice): per Ioannem de Tri-
 dino. With the texts of Tibullus, Catullus, and
 Propertius, and the commentaries of Bernardi-
 nus Cyllenius Veronensis on Tibullus, Philip-
 pus Beroaldus Senior on Propertius, Antonius

Parthenius and Palladius Fuscus on Catullus,
Emendationes Catullianae of Hieronymus Avanti-
 tius and *In Priapeias castigationes* of Avantius.
 HC 4766; BAV T-182; BMC 5.535; Goff T-374;
 NUC.BL; (MH; PU). See CTC 7.222.

1520, Venetiis (Venice): in aedibus Guiliel-
 mi de Fontaneto Montisferrati. With the texts of
 Tibullus, Catullus, and Propertius, and the com-
 mentaries of Bernardinus Cyllenius Veronensis
 on Tibullus, Antonius Parthenius and Palladi-
 us Fuscus on Catullus, Philippus Beroaldus Se-
 nior on Propertius, *Emendationes* of Hieronymus
 Avantius on Lucretius, Catullus, the *Priapea*, and
 Statius' *Silvae*. Panzer 8.463, 1041; NUC.BL; BNF;
 (MH; CtY; DLC). See CTC 7.222.

1604. See above, Composite Editions.

1608. See above, Composite Editions.

1659. See above, Composite Editions.

1680. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:

See CTC 3.188 and 6.20. Add:

His mother's name was Castora (not "Casto-
 rea") di Francesco di Mo. da Argile (the name
 "Giovanna Casto" given by M. Gilmore in DBI
 9.382 is wrong). Evidently she lived until October
 1495. Beroaldus' elder brother entered the world
 of business; according to some sources, he sub-
 sequently became a professor of medicine. The
 youngest of the three brothers, Giovanni (born
 after the father's death) achieved a considerable
 reputation as an architect.

In his boyhood, Beroaldus was educated both
 by his mother and also by two teachers whose
 names are given (by Bianchini, one of the two
 earliest biographers) as Mariano and Matteo. His
 remarkable photographic memory was noticed in
 his earliest youth and developed as he matured.
 This, and perhaps his somewhat delicate health,
 which tended to keep him from business and the
 law, predisposed him to seek a career in classical
 study, despite growing pressure from his family
 to look for more remunerative employment. He
 learned Latin well, but at this stage apparent-
 ly made no more than a beginning in Greek. At
 the age of fourteen he enrolled as a student at the
 University of Bologna, and at once had the good
 fortune to attend the classes of Franciscus Puteo-
 lanus (Francesco dal Pozzo), a leading human-
 ist who had just arrived there from his native
 Parma at the instance of Giovanni II Bentivo-

glio, the enlightened ruler of Bologna. Beroaldus took Puteolanus as his own standard of achievement. Besides attending his lectures, he seems to have taken private lessons from Puteolanus both in Latin literature and (most probably) also in Greek (even though Puteolanus was not in fact appointed to teach Greek), so that for the first time he made serious progress in that language. In 1475, Beroaldus, on the advice of Puteolanus, moved to Parma; but at the end of the summer of 1476 he was obliged to leave that city on account of violent political disturbances occasioned by acts of insurrection against the ruling Rossi family and its partisans, who included Puteolanus.

Beroaldus' Paris period lasted for more than two and a half (possibly almost three) years; we have ample evidence for his presence there in 1478. In Paris he published his *Oratio de laudibus gymnasii Parisiorum*, in which he speaks of lecturing on Lucan.

Although in 1477 an "edict" was sent to Paris by Giovanni II Bentivoglio, desiring Beroaldus to accept the non-academic post (recently vacated by death) of chancellor of the Bolognese Senate, Beroaldus preferred not to conform to this request and did not leave Paris until a year later, and—as it appears—quite voluntarily. What he really wanted at this time was a better-paid university teaching position, preferably at Bologna but alternatively, as a second choice, at the University of Paris. Securing a post at Bologna, he looked in again at Milan on the way home and gave at least one lecture this time; but again it was only a short pause on the journey. His name begins to appear in the list of teachers at the University of Bologna under the academic year 1479–80.

An application by Beroaldus for a post in Milan, as successor in the chair previously occupied by Gaudentius Merula and Puteolanus, was unsuccessful, perhaps because the ruler of Bologna was reluctant to lose him. Though he did not spend any long period in Milan, he made a later visit there (in 1486) that lasted two months. Otherwise he was content to remain in his native city; and he continued to be in favor with court and university alike. His deep commitment to teaching was reflected in the devotion to him of many students from far and wide, including a large number of non-Italians who carried the message of humanism back to their homelands. As

a professor partly engaged in public service, he had a strong interest in juristic literature and to some extent in medical books also (Bologna was, of course, a place of renown in both fields). His father-in-law, Vincenzo Paleotti, had earned recognition as a leading authority on jurisprudence.

Beroaldo died of the plague in 1505. His funerary monument bears the false date 1504; it was set up much later, after his remains were transferred to a second burial place because of a war that was being waged in the vicinity.

Works:

See CTC 3.188–89, where there is a reference to Krautter's comprehensive list.

Bibliography:

See CTC 3.189 and 6.20. A full account of Beroaldo's life and works, together with a very extensive bibliography of books and articles on Beroaldo, and also on Bologna, is found in A. Rose, *Filippo Beroaldo der Ältere und sein Beitrag zur Properz-Überlieferung* (Munich and Leipzig, 2001). M. Gilmore's article in DBI 9.382–84, cited there, should be read with caution; for criticisms and corrections, see Rose.

9. Antonius Volscus

The contribution of Volscus to Propertian studies is twofold. In 1482 his edition of the text, accompanied only by a *Vita* (on which see Butrica 1978, 447–49), was published at Rome. It was dedicated to Cardinal Pietro Giuliano Riario, bishop of Ostia, who was an extremely wealthy prelate and a favorite "nephew" of Pope Sixtus IV. Six years later, in 1488, his second edition appeared at Venice. This time the text was based on Johannes Calphurnius' Vicenza edition of 1481 (unlike the text Volscus published in 1482, which is largely based on the Reggio Emilia edition of 1481 but also shows use of Calphurnius). Volscus' 1488 edition included a commentary printed in the margins of the text. Two instances of a manuscript abridgment of this commentary have been located.

Like the 1482 edition, the 1488 edition was dedicated to Cardinal Pietro Giuliano Riario. As will be apparent from the opening lines of his dedicatory letter preceding book I, Volscus was extremely vague in the language he uses to refer both to his enemies (*inimicorum fraudes vel invidentium calumnia*) and to his friends (*quidam*).

It is clear, however, that he proposed as a refuge from his troubles to devote himself to the emendation and explication of difficult passages in a variety of Latin poets; this phraseology, together with his use of the somewhat unusual word *lucubrāmus* (recalling the title of Domitius Calderinus' commentary, I.6 above), suggests that his plan was to follow in Calderinus' footsteps. But it appears not altogether improbable that the "certain people" (*quidam*) who urged him to undertake the major enterprise of a commentary on a single poet, Propertius, had in mind the creation of a sort of response to Beroaldus' commentary, which had appeared the previous year (1487). Dedicatory letters addressed to the same prelate also precede books II, III, and IV; they may help to shed some light on Volscus' outlook and so are cited below, with English summaries.

Although Volscus' commentary had no great following, its place having been already taken by that of Beroaldus (I.8 above), it is a richly learned work, written in a very engaging style and showing a deep understanding of students' needs. Partly independent as it is, the commentary can still acknowledge with perfect generosity the merits of Beroaldus' edition of the previous year, the readings of which—especially variant readings, textual corrections and explanatory notes—are frequently reproduced, either in its text or in its marginal annotation. Volscus borrows heavily from Gaspar Manius' unpublished commentary (I.7 above), often repeating it word for word or with slight changes (though Volscus often adds illustrative references from the classics, e.g., Ovid, to Manius' explanations). He also makes considerable use also of the *Elucubratio* by Domitius Calderinus (I.6 above). Moreover, Volscus' commentary reveals evidence that its author consulted at least one manuscript of Propertius: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Diez B. Sant. 57, written at Ferrara in 1481, anticipates Volscus in at least one passage by printing *versamus* at II.1.45; this manuscript, which contained some other good emendations, was almost certainly used by Beroaldus too (Butrica 1984, 155–56).

Unfortunately, the authorities (ecclesiastical, for the most part) to whom Volscus appealed for patronage soon began to frown on him, partly, it seems, on theological grounds quite unconnected with his Propertian scholarship; and he had

the misfortune to encounter a printer who rendered even parts of his dedicatory epistle quite unintelligible.

a. The printed commentary

Dedicatory letter (ed. of Venice, 1488). Ad amplissimum P(etrum) Iulianum honoratissimum Ostiensem antistitem, sancti Petri ad vincula cardinalem, Antonii Volsci in Propertianarum interpretationum librum primum. Praefatio. [*Inc.*]: (fol. Aiiir) <C>um poetarum et graecorum et latinorum quocunque genere scripserint perdifficiles questiones et locos exolvere pauci admodum potuerint (-erunt *ed.*), seu quod res et verba vetustate obsoleverint (absol- *ed.*) seu quod ad archana illorum sensa (-su *ed.*), ingenii dissimilitudine minime penetratur, ego vero, Iuliane honoratissime Ostiensis antistes, ad id animum intenderam, quod gravissimis molestiarum molibus qui (*sic*) turbulentissimis tempestatibus agitatum oportuit animo differre: expectabamus ocium, sed dum quietis locus et tranquillitatis sperabatur, cepimus maxime fluctuare. Mutato rursus consilio in illis rerum asperitatibus temporumque angustiis, quantum vel inimicorum fraudes vel invidentium calumnia aut mea aut amicorum negocia tribuerent ocii, id ad scribendum potissimum contulimus, ne si caeteris calamitatibus obrueremur ingenii quoque cultus elangeret (-neret *ed.*). Hortata me est etiam animi aegritudo fortunae magna et gravi commota iniuria, cuius maiorem aliquam levationi (*sic*) reperire non potui, quam si me aut ad philosophorum studia aut ad poetarum interpretationes contulissem, ut tantisper incommoda non sentirentur dum illis operam navaremus. Emendationes itaque in latinos poetas lucubrāmus diligenti investigatione, obscuros obsoletosque (absole- *ed.*) locos pertractantes. Nos quidam revocarunt Propertiique amoribus praepositis coegerunt ut quid nostra de illis esset sententia aperiremus, existimantes iisdem de rebus aliquid a nobis politius perfectiusque proferri posse. Quibus neque hortantibus neque rogantibus deesse visum est. Sed quicquid sint nostrae nugae, ut ille ait [cf. Cicero, *Ad fam.* 11.21.1], ut opinioni quoad possit respondeatur, sub tuae dignationis tutela manu mittere non dubitavi. . . . Cantant poetae amorem, non eum tamen qui cum beluis est homini communis sed quo quisque sibi quod est optimum et petit et sequi-

tur. Is est amor qui deos inter et homines locum medium tenet. Is a Diis ad homines quandam divinitatis facit participationem. Is est quem Diotima illa fatidica, quae decennio prius Atheniensibus calamitatem praedixit, in re tantum generosa et pulchra propagari posse contendit, turpia vero atque monstrosa quoniam conservando animantium generi sint inutilia omnino reicere. Quicquid enim in vita est aut animi aut corporis aut utriusque studio et cupiditate movetur. Ille namque corporeus furor cum beluis homines iungit. Nam libidine animantes universae concitate pariter feruntur in venerem. Excitant praelia, caedes patrant. Cum ediderint partus per summas etiam difficultates alunt: quorum causa algent, exuriunt, et si opus sit fortissime occumbunt, quod natura factum est ut successionis amore genus omne servetur. Qui vero magis anima quam corpore fecundi sunt, quae ad animam attinent omni studio secuntur, generosa et magnifica contemplantur, nihil nisi optime elaboratum et perfectum exigunt, deorum hominumque iura non modo pervident (*sic*) sed ea diligentissime intellecta ad mortalium usum convertunt, idque cum ipsi faciant alios quoque idem efficere cupientes iter aperire non desinunt quo quisque ad vere virtutis gloriam perveniat. Quo factum est ut Lycurgus ea Lacedemonas disciplina instituerit ut totius reliquerit Graeciae consultores. Solon quoque traditis legum institutis Athenienses ad iusticiae cultum universos animavit. Dum per aliena et (*ec ed.*) vetera feror exempla, tu, Iuliane, eo animi munere institutus occurris ut omnes ad animi aequitatem atque optimum vite cursum invitare videaris, quippe qui neque aut amplissimis dignitatibus, quas per suos gradus conscenderis, aut rerum copia, quibus affluis, intumescas, neque etiam adverso quovis impetu aut gravissimis fortune iniuriis frangaris. Annis enim superioribus cum saeva illa tempestas detonuisset, undique ingruentibus nimbis de naufragio dubitabatur; tu vero non absque dei optimi numine vastissimas inter procellas gubernacula suscipiens, navigium in portu constituisti, superatisque turbinibus conati sunt quicunque obsistere eo adeo in altum propulisti ut iam fluctibus obruantur. Incredibile ferme est quanta sit tua in omni vita prudentia, quanta equitas, quanta publicis privatisque actionibus virtus atque modestia. Nam Romana res et pontificalis dignitas impiis quibusdam cum iniquissime pulsare-

tur, tua opera factum est ut sacrilegos oppugnatores inceptae iamdiu incipiat temeritatis paenitere, quandoquidem aut herbam dederunt aut subituri iugum supplices adorant. Haec hactenus; ne dum per tuas laudes nogari (*sic*) cupio, quod in aliud tempus differo, propositi videar oblitus. Hoc animi munere inflamatus, inania et caduca despiciens, ex una quam sibi amor proposuit excellentiorem formam, caetera omnia contemplatus praeclaras illius magnificasque actiones aggreditur. Cunque rei cuiusque obiciatur notitia, eximia tantum atque honesta et videbit et faciet; neque interea consistit donec in eum evehatur locum ultra quem progredi non possit. In quo mihi Platonis illa maxime adstipulatur sententia: Amoris, inquit, quaedam est excellentia quae cum per suos gradus conscenderit, neque fit neque interit, neque crescit unquam, neque patitur decrementum; cui quemadmodum quavis iniuria nihil potes deterere, ita nulla unquam fiet accessio. Ex hoc igitur vere pulchritudinis et honesti vim intuentes, ad summa virtutis officia convertuntur, acceptisque optimis vitae institutis ad id demum venire necesse est unde rerum omnium optimarum contemplatio atque scientia generetur. Id modo talium siquis adipiscatur parta foelicitate deo non est absimilis. Poetae vero et elegiarum scriptores cum (fol. Aiiv) id maxime caluissent animi corporisque pulchritudinem iungentes, utriusque vim atque amorem festivissime formant: nunc varios labores molestiasque queruntur; nunc vix possident; nunc potiri videntur; oboriuntur iniuriae, rixae, inimicitiae; rursus reditur in gratiam. Non enim verisimile est feralis libidinosique furoris causa clarissimorum poetarum tot volumina fuisse conscripta, sed ex ipso corpore animae pulchritudinem investigantes vix unquam id contingit reperire quod et hi qui diutissime sunt rerum inquisitione versati nunquam omnino assequi potuerunt. Surgunt igitur in tanto ambitu diuturnae quaerimoniae, quoniam longa investigationis molestia fatigati quod tanto studio conquisierint aut non vident aut si videant delectati ad quae tantopere cupiunt non patet et adcessus sed omnis eorum opera exiguo momento consumitur. Sunt profecto irriti et inanes omnes hominum in tanto pelago labores, nisi in eum conscendant locum unde generosa amoris semina contemplemur. Si ornata pulcherrime corpora quae insigni forma praecellant inspicere delectamur; quanto erit festivius si

divinus (*sic: fort. divinum leg. est*) ipsum amorem intueamur sincerum, integrum, purum, simplicem, non humana compage, non colore, non aliis naturae affectibus maculatum, sed ipsum per se divinum, aequae ut est inter deos et homines medius. Non virtutis simulacra sed virtutes ipsas aspiciet, atque illius aspectu deo par immortalitatem, ut Plato contendit, assequetur. Ideo iucunde atque apposite dictum est una nocte quivis vel deus esse potest. Nam divini amoris poeta particeps deo efficitur similis. Quare desinat moneo poetas lacessere, eosque incontinentia et libidine expostulare; nam rerum omnium consecuti notionem, gravissimis ex rebus voluptatis simulachra deducentes, deorum immortalium et mystica naturae sensa quibusdam festivitatis adminiculis involverunt, ut inde delectatis animis ea quae cum voluptate percepta sunt ad omnis vitae actiones facilius adducantur. Nulli quidem rerum poetas magis studuisse videmus, quam quod hominum vitae simulacra depingant, omnisque eorum vis eo clivo laborat ut erutis e media philosophorum scola sententiis in suum usum traducant, unde animantium generi prosint et sibi ipsi pariant aeternitatem; de quo mihi in emendationibus est amplissime disputatum. Nunc ad Propertii interpretationes festino. Spero equidem susceptum hoc onus non ingratum fore, tantoque apud quemque fieri praeclarius quanto tua mihi aura est futura clementior; quae disiectis procul nubibus omnem mearum aerumnarum molem in tranquillum ducet, si carenti in tanto pelago cymbae pleno velo dexterius aspi-raverit.

Dedicatory letter. Ad amplissimum P(etrum) Iulianum honoratissimum Ostiensem antistitem, sancti Petri ad vincula cardinalem, Antonii Vols-ci in Propertianarum interpretationum librum secundum. [*Inc.*]: (fol. Bviiiir) <N>on eram nescius, Iuliane dignissime Ostiensis antistes, cum summis ingeniis exquisitaque doctrina viri qui summa hominum opinione nostris temporibus florueret: fore ut hic noster labor in varias reprehensiones incurreret, vel quod mearum interpretationum editi<o>nibus fuerim audacior vel quod aliud scribendi genus erat attendandum. . . [*Expl.*]: Unde iudicare est facile monstrare Apollinem voluisse poetarum praeclarissima carmina, non humana cogitatione sed divinitate quadam esse perfecta, poetasque atque eorum interpretes esse nature ministros atque divinos. Quod qui negant

tantum a veritate desciscunt quantum ab aetheris sunt caloribus alieni. Sed iam ad instituta pergamus. [I am to be blamed, it seems, for “audacity,” both in my interpretations and also for experimenting with a new way of writing. But if my long and long-delayed labors are destined to benefit mankind as well as to give me pleasure, what right have people to take offense? Such persons even attack the poets themselves as futile and vain. Great philosophers, however, have spent time in interpreting fables. Crowns were offered at the sacred contests in Greece for competing to interpret Homer and other poets. Socrates not only praised the “rhapsodes” but called them (like the poets) divine: that is, divinely inspired to sing superhuman songs.]

Dedicatory letter. Ad amplissimum P(etrum) Iulianum honoratissimum Ostiensem antistitem, sancti Petri ad vincula cardinalem, Antonii Vols-ci in Propertianarum interpretationum librum tertium. Praefatio. [*Inc.*]: (fol. Fiv) Generi animantium praesul amplissime, Iuliane dignissime ostiensis antistes, videtur natura tributum ut in quocumque genere aut studio diuturna contentione praecellere nitantur. . . [*Expl.*]: Expressis enim amoris ardoribus aliquot nova in elegiis ratione veterum inserit monumenta unde latinitati multum attulit adiumenti et in elegiis primas sibi atque nominis coscivit (*sic*) aeternitatem, quod tertium auspicaturus volumen prima hac elegia veluti praefatione demonstrat. [Nature ordains competitiveness for all its creatures, including man. To try to achieve mastery over others in one’s own kind of activity is a human characteristic (consider Pyrrhus of Epirus, Alexander, Hannibal). This is true of artists also, including men of letters. As for the poets, they win most admiration when they transcend what is merely human, and so appear divine. A Latin example is Virgil. Propertius too has claimed the first place as an elegist, emulating Philetas and Callimachus among the Greeks. For, in expressing the passion of love, he greatly extended the range of the Latin language and—following his Greek predecessors—the range of literary allusions also. This is shown by the opening elegy of the third book.]

Dedicatory letter. Ad amplissimum P(etrum) Iul(ianum) honoratissimum Ostiensem antistitem, sancti Petri ad vincula cardinalem, Antonii Vols-ci in Propertianarum interpretationum librum quartum. Praefatio. (fol. Hvir)

<C>onsideranti mihi quam sit difficile alienam posse mentem percipere atque abdita veterum scriptorum sensa occultissimasque sententias explicare, iniuste quidem, Iuliane honoratissime Ostiensis antistes, facere illi videntur qui me in alieno ingenio laborantem negligentia et tarditate accusare non desinunt. Nam si tardius quam volebant naturam hanc foeturam emisimus, non publica aut privata erat tantum inspicienda utilitas quantum ut partum non abortum eniteremur. Editionem aliquandiu pressimus fateor; sed non in annum nonum ut faciundum erat et (*sic*) iubet Horatius. Quod si rei magnitudinem atque difficultatem cum temporis iactura componant, non dubito admiraturos id tanta confici celeritate potuisse. Est Propertius per se alias elegans et perpolitus subtilissimis figuris iucundissimisque affectibus cuiusque generis aspersus. Historias tamen et fabulas ex origine inculcatas nominibus interdum adeo recondit ut quam voluerit forte reddatur obscurior. Cui ut verus splendor redderetur, vix potuimus diuturnis lucubrationibus assequi. Etenim ut caeteri latini libri, cum praeteritorum saeculorum ignavia concisus fractusque locis pluribus desideraretur, ut vix in ullam formam reducere speraremus. Consilium fuit aliquando ut ante me alii fecerant aliqua tantum delibare ut non deterriti rerum obscuritate aut locorum depravatione sed tanquam cognitu levia reliquisse videremur. In poetis vero aliis cum emendationes tractaremus, solum hunc in elegia elegantissimum atque perfectum non equum putavimus distulisse. Gravissimum igitur laborem liceat ut Brutus dixit in hac parte magnifice loqui; laborem, inquam, herculeis tantum humeris subeundum fortissime aggrediens ut in caeteris aliis factum est. Tandem multo studio in integrum constituimus. Evagati enim per poetas, omnis operae precium est videre quot mendas et latos aut obscuros aut labefactatos exolverimus mutaverimus deleverimus emendaverimus. Superioribus annis Syllii Italici bellum punicum profitentes cum passim mendas offenderemus, mirati sumus quo pacto qui ante nos legerant eruditissimos professores vel non notasse vel ut inconspertas reliquisse. Inciderunt tunc in manus novi quidam commentarii. Qui presbiteri cuiusdam Marsi ferebantur, incertum Vescinus ne an Marucinus sit. Paulus Marsus, vir nostri temporis litteratissimus mihi que summa benivolentia convinctissimus, Marsum esse negabat. Cum il-

los diligentius accuratiusque legissem, non modo maculas non tollebant sed cicatricosum multis aliis vulneribus invenimus sauciare. Id vero suo ne an eorum quos iactitat praeceptorum iudicio fecerit nescio; illud tamen certissimum est locos centum quinquaginta ferme annotasse qui antea aut nullam habebant mendam aut paululum intricati intelligi facillime potuissent. Interpres ille acutissimus ingeniose adeo castigavit ut interdum carminum lex non constet, interdum poetae etiam sensa percipi non possint. Quale est "et tepido figit arma rogo" [Sil. Ital., *Pun.* 8.55] et alibi "seculo cedis inertī" [Sil. Ital., *Pun.* 10.299]; quod emendare cupientes legant: "et tepido fugit Anna rogo" e<t> "seculo cedis Ilerdae". Haec breviter percutisse voluimus, non ut in alios diceremus qui forte, ut in proverbio est, Achemenia excipient spicula, sed ut ex his quae in hoc et aliis emendata sunt facilius intelligantur. Ex Propertio vero cum pene infinitas elueremus mendas, interdum altius desederant adeo quod non ingenii opus sed aruspicum petendam (*sic*) consilia putaremus, ut cera philippeis certet romana corimbis et siriganam tracto volsci carpenta nepotis et mater lubrigia sumpsi. Haec et reliqua ut emendaverimus si suis locis diligentissime examinauerint, non dubitamus non multum temporis iudicatuos omnis sed nos studii et laboris plurimum impendisse haeremus; tamen nequi sint. Qui quod lentitudinem illi, dixerunt celeritatem existiment. Qui si plura desideraverint, nostras consulant emendationes ubi de acantho et pluteis aliisque locis luculentissime disputamus verum quicquid sit. Sive hanc nostram tarditatem vocent sive celeritatem, si tua mihi Iuliane clementia adspiraverit, conculcata omnium malorum dicacitate. Certum est apud optimum quenque has nostras lucubrationunculas absolutae fore maturitatis. [I am accused of tardiness and negligence; but I did not wish my labors in explaining Propertius to produce a premature work. I admit that I delayed publication for a time—but not for ever, *pace* Horace, who recommended "nine years." In fact, if they properly considered the extent and difficulty of my task, they would be surprised that I did it so quickly. Propertius is an elegant and accomplished poet; but sometimes he conceals under new names the fables he borrows, which creates obscurity. Moreover, his text as we have it is corrupt, broken and lacunose, so that it is sometimes hard to make any sense of it.

I decided to remove a few things (as others have done before me), but to make no major changes. In the end, after much devoted work, I restored him to completeness. I have cleared up—altered, destroyed, or emended—many obscure passages. I have also cleared up many errors in other poets. When I was lecturing on Silius Italicus, I found a huge crop of errors in a new commentary on that poet by a certain Marsus. Paolo Marsi, my dear friend and one of the most learned men of our era, denied that they were his. In Propertius, some of the errors I found were so deeply rooted that they required the help of a soothsayer. My response to the text in such cases ought to be described as speedy, not as dilatory. In any case, whether they speak of tardiness or speed on my part, so long as I enjoy your support it is certain that all the sharp cleverness of malicious persons will be trampled under foot and these little efforts of mine will come to full maturity in the eyes of all the best people.] (Note: the editor of Silius Italicus was Pietro Marsi, for whom Volscus felt a longstanding antipathy. The history of their quarrel is related, and fully documented, by Rose, 395–98 [see *Bibliography* below]. The *praeceptores* under whom Pietro Marsi claimed to have studied are Pomponius Laetus and Domitius Calderinus.)

Prooemium. [Inc.]: (fol. aiiv) <E>legiae auctorem licet diu investigarit Antiquitas, nihil tamen certi posteris relictum est. Sed primum in funere ad deae Neniae venerationem a praeficis cantatam manifeste constat. Ideo a cantu miserabili traxisse nomen Ovidius in *Amoribus* [3.9.3–4] his verbis edocet: Flebilis heu moestos Elegia solve capillos/Heu nimis ex vero nunc tibi nomen adest. Nam quod Graeci ἔλεω dicunt, nos cum fletu *misereor* interpretamur. Mox cum ad res laetas amoresque usurparetur, ea “inclusa est voti sententia compos” ut Flaccus Horatius scribit [Ars 76]. In quo genere apud Graecos traduntur maxime claruisse Callimachus Capenaicus (*sic*), Phileta<s> Chous, Alexander Aetholus, Antimachus Calimis (*sic*), Mymnermus, et Tyrtheus Lacedemoniis (*sic*). Sed horum principem fuisse Callimachum Fabius scribit [Quint. 10.1.58]. Ad Latinos primum elegos traduxisse Ennium Rudianum legimus, quem longe postea secuti sunt Valerius Cato cuius ignem Lyden et Dianam fuisse Tycida et Cinna tradiderunt, Varro Attacinius, qui Leucadiam cantavit, Cornelius Gallus;

huius insaniam fuisse Lycoridem Virgilius refert [Ecl.10.22]. Epigrammaton auctorem potius dixerim quam elegiae Catullum. Sed inter principes stetero Tibullus Albius, Pelignus Ovidius et UMBER Propertius, de quo haec legimus monumenta.

Vita Propertii. Antonius Volscus in Propertii vitam. (fol. aiiv) <S>extus Aurelius Propertius Nauta Mevaniae, quod est Umbrie oppidum, M. Antonio et P. Dolabella consulibus [44 B.C.] nascitur. Nautae cognomen in familiam transit quoniam eius maiores mercaturam fecisse traduntur. In praetexta patrem amisit; nec gente clarus, nec multis auctus opibus superstes, ex quo duos illos versus dixit [II.34.55–56]: Aspice me cui parva domus fortuna relictata est;/ nullus ex antiquo Marte triumphus avi. Bello Perusino qui sub L. Antonio militarant duos consortes arme (*sic*) filios Gallum et Lupercum amisit, qui eo bello ceciderunt [IV.1.89–98]. Ipse post paulo pacatis rebus in urbem profectus sub Verrio Flacco et Crassitio qui tunc proficiscebantur (*sic: fortasse* profitebantur; cf. Suet., *Gramm.* 17–18) Rome eruditus est. Tulli, viri patritii, et Corneli Gallii amicitiam sibi comparavit. Ex poetis Ovidium maxime frequentavit, cui suos ignes recitare saepius consuevit. Cum Moecenatem ante omnes observaret et coleret, illius opera in gratiam Augusti Caesaris, qui tunc rem tenebat, adscitus est. In Lyciniam puellam primum lascivire coepit, editis elegiis quas non probavit; mox primos furores vertit Hostia, quam mutato nomine Cynthia nuncupat, imitatus poetas alios qui idem ante se fecerant. Nam Catullus, ut in magica defensione scribit Apuleius [*Apol.* 10], pro Clodia Lesbiam, Tycida pro Metella Perillam, Tibullus pro Plania Deliam; Ovidius pro Caesarea puella, ut ait Sidonius [*Carm.* 23.159–61], quam Iuliam Augustam volunt, Corynnam appellavit. Elegiarum volumina quattuor summa cura edidit, imitatus inter praecipuos Callimachum et Philetam (–tant *ed.*) et Mymnermum. Quodcumque sola Cynthia opus fuerit ut Ovidius dixit [*Rem.* 764], *Monobyblos* inscribitur; est et *byblos* iuncus seu papyrus Aegyptia unde conficiebantur libri. Mortuus est an<n>um agens alterum et .XL. In elegia Gallus quia duriusculus non placuit; Ovidius lascivire nimium visus est; tersum in ea et elegantem maxime auctorem Tibullum putavit Fabius; alii Propertium maluerunt [Quint. 10.1.93].

Introduction. (fol. aiiv) Argumentum in primam Propertii elegiam. <Q>ui dissidium optare

Propertium prima hac elegia putaverunt, magna (*sic*) argumento falluntur. Nam a tempore atque exemplo quam perditae amet indicat, et Cynthiae difficultatem expostulat. Quae cum nulla arte vinci potuerit, vix credit magico etiam carmine flecti posse; cuius amore cum Licinam quam amarat ipse deseruerit atque male plectatur, amicos monet ut a consueto amore, si secundo fruuntur, minime discedant ne, dum nova consecantur, veluti deerrantes destituti cursus dispendio, miseriam atque ardore vitare nequeant.

Commentary. Ad amplis(simum) P(etrum) Iulianum Honoratis(simum) Ostiensem antistitem Sancti Petri ad vincula Card(inalem) Antonii Volsci Propertianarum interpretationum liber primus. [*Inc.*]: (fol. aiiir) *Cynthia prima* (I.1.1). Nullo utitur principio, quod aestuanti convenit et amore nimio saevienti. Nam cum primum in Licinam lascivisset ut diximus. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. kviiir) *Cuius honoratis ossa vehentur equis* (IV.11.102). Id respicit quod paulo super [*scil.* IV.11.101 *moribus et caelum*] exposuit (est posuit *ed.*): haec est foeminei merces extrema triumphi. Eum, inquit, laudis triumphum post fata consequar, quem merentur foeminae, quae pudice summa cum continentia in omnium ordine vixerunt. Sumpta ab imperatoribus translatione, qui cum in castris aut in acie interierint, ut de Thebano Epaminunda aut Druso legimus, in patriam aut hominum humeris aut equis honoratis, hoc est triumphalibus, referuntur. *Equis honoratis* (IV.11.102) hoc est triumphalibus referuntur. Propertii Aurelii nautae poetae finis.

Final dedication. Peracti operis dedicatio. (fol. kviiir) Propertii calores, Iuliane honoratissime Ostiensis antistes, interpretati quicquid est tuae dignationi dedicamus. Quae diximus maxime necessaria visa sunt; multa adiici potuisse non dubitamus. Sed velut cum actis aut saltem pluribus nota distulimus, si qua tamen desiderabuntur, aequo quisquis est patiat animum, quod suae curae investigandum aliquid relictum fuerit. Vetus adagium est, mortalium sapientissimos multa scisse, non omnia.

Laudatory verses. (fol. kviiir)

Thamyra ad Lectorem

Quisquis ab insano nimium cruciatur amore
Aut perdit stabili tempora longa fide,
Hos legat ardentis animo trepidante calores,
Fundere quos captis dura puella solet.

Discat et hinc noctem felici ludere cantu,
Quidve ferat misero facta repulsa gravis;
Sceptraque perfugiat caeci imperiosa tyranni;
Nam lachrymans teneo quod sit amare
malum.

Praeterea haud dubium cuiquam sit, posse
Properti

Noscere quod falso pectore cartha tulit,
Ire per obstruosos sensus, atque invia dicta,
Hactenus a nullo quae potuere legi.
Nam studiosa mei Volsci preciosaque cura
Posse dedit tuto per freta lintre vehi;
Et quamvis foveant scripta haec vincula Petri,
(*sic*)

Ista alias nectunt vincula docta manus.

For Thamyra (Tamira), see R. Weiss, "In obitu Ursini Lanfredini. A Footnote to the Literary History of Rome under Pope Innocent VIII," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 2 (1959) 353–66, especially 361–62, and "Bollettino bibliografico," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 118 (1941) 56–63 (C. Dionisotti's review of A. Altamira, "Per una biografia di Pietro Tamira academico pomponiano," *Archivio della R. Deputazione romana di storia patria* 63 [1940] 173–80).

Editions:

1488, Venetiis (Venice): per magistrum Andream de Patascichis. Propertius only, with the commentary of Antonius Volscus. Often, however, bound with Tibullus and Catullus [Goff T-371, Dec. 1487]; the BNF copy has a combined register for both). HC 4762*; BMC 5.354 (IB.21919); Goff P-1018; NUC. BL; BNF; (HEHL; LC; CtY).

1495, Lipsiae (Leipzig): ex officina Martini Lantzpergss Herbipolensis. Contents the same as in the preceding edition (Butrica 1984, 163: "an unacknowledged reprint"). HC 13403; BMC 3.638. BL; Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek.

b. The manuscript abridgments

1. (micro.) Vatican City, BAV, Barb. lat. 34.

The commentary is clearly based on Volscus' printed commentary of 1488. See, however, M. Buonocore, *Properzio nei codici della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana* (Assisi, 1995), 39: "I commenti a Properzio sono di Antonio Volscus e di Antonio Costanzi, pubblicati, insieme al Tibullo del Cillenio e al Catullo di Antonio Partenio da Lazise, a Venezia nel 1487–1488." As to the date given by Buonocore, there is an inaccuracy.

cy here: see above for the separate dating of the Propertius and Tibullus-Catullus. Moreover, the contribution of the other Antonio (who is often confused with Volscus; see *Biography* below) is minimal, if it exists at all. The excerptor's work is dated "tentatively" to 1493–95 by J.H. Gaisser (CTC 7.209) on the grounds, related to the Catullus part of the manuscript, that "he mentions neither Avantius (published in 1495) nor Palladius [1496], but has quoted all of the previous printed Catullan sources [including Sabellicus, who wrote between 1485 and 1493]."

With occasional exceptions, the notes in ms. Barb. lat. 34 reproduce *verbatim* those of Volscus (1488), just as the Catullus commentary uses the printed edition of Parthenius (1485). The excerptor would probably have liked to incorporate more of Volscus' notes, but simply had no room for them in the margins of the manuscript. There are six indications in the earlier part of the Propertius section (none, however, after *Eleg.* I.14.11–12) that a note is copied from Beroaldus' commentary of 1487; this source is signalled either by "ex beroaldo" or by "ex ber." Found on fols. 40v (I.6.7 *argutat noctibus ignes*), 44r (I.12.18 *translato gaudia servitio*), 44v (I.13.29 *proxima Ladae* and I.14.2 *Mentoreo*), and 45r (I.14.1 *tu licet abiectus* and I.14.3 *lintres*), such notes are usually added in the vacant space either at the top or at the bottom of the page. For Beroaldo's comment on I.14.2 *Mentoreo*, space could be found only on the previous page (fol. 44v), below the final lines of *Eleg.* I.13; the Propertian text to which the comment relates is found on fol. 45r, where two further notes from Beroaldo have been entered in the inner margin. The six notes in question, which seem to have been added later, exhibit a contemporary style of writing that is similar to, but not identical with, that of the main body of the commentary, from which they also differ in their technique of punctuation. Most likely the excerptor had changed his style to some extent; just possibly, these notes are the work of a contemporary who used a slightly different hand.

On rare occasions the original excerptor adds what appear to be his own observations (sometimes consisting in illustrative references to parallel passages), which are not to be found either in Volscus or in Beroaldo. At the lower margin of fol. 38r a later hand (early seventeenth century) has added the alternative title *Incipit Mono-*

biblos Propertii Aurelii Nautae, which he says "In antiquo ms. [now lost, according to Butrica 1984, 300] sic inscribitur." Seven of the variant readings of this "ancient manuscript" are given at the same place (fol. 38r); other variants, in the same early seventeenth-century hand, are on fols. 39v, 48r, 48v, 49v, 50v, 51v, 52r, 52v, 55v (together with a note on poem-division), 56r, 65v, and 66r (the last variant concerns II.28.53). Then there seems to be nothing further in this hand until fols. 85v, 86r, 99r, 100v, and 102r, where some explanatory notes have been added. The reference to Passeratius at III.22.15 (fol. 85v) suggests that this later hand should be dated after 1608. Mention should also be made of a note at the bottom of the page on fol. 43v, in a large sixteenth-century hand, on the etymology and meaning of the form *ecquis* at I.11.6.

History of Elegy. Ex Antonii Volsci Commentariis super Propertium: De Elegiis. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 3v) Elegiae auctorem licet diu investigarit antiquitas, nihil tanen certi posteris relictum est. . . . [*Expl.*]: Sed inter principes stetero Tibullus Albius, Pellignus Ovidius et Umber Propertius. [This is the "History of Elegy" forming part of the prooemium to Volscus' 1488 commentary (see above), but omitting the last five words of the version given there.] Included with an abridgment of Antonius Parthenius' commentary on Catullus; see CTC 7.228.

History of Elegy [taken from Beroaldus' 1487 commentary; see I.8 above]. Ad magnificum Minum Roscium Philippi Beroaldi Commentarii im (sic) Propertium. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 37r) Elegiacum carmen quod a luctu sive a miseratione nomen accepit. . . . [*Expl.*]: cuius nomen perire non sinit ipsius poetae carmen sodalicium iure.

Vita Propertii. Antonius Volscus in Propertii vitam. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 37v) Sextus Aurelius Propertius Nauta Mevaniae, quod est Umbriae oppidum. . . . [*Expl.*]: et elegantem maxime auctorem Tibulum putavit Fabius; alii Propertium maluerunt [Quint., *Inst. or.* 10.1.93].

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 38r) *Cynthia* etc. (I.1.1). A tempore atque exemplo quam perdite amet indicat et Cynthiae difficultatem expostulat. Quae cum nulla arte vinci potuerit, vix credit magico etiam carmine flecti posse; cuius amore cum Licinniam (sic) quam amat ipse deseruerit atque male plectatur, amicos monet ut a consuetu amore, si secundo fruantur, minime discedant

ne, dum nova consecantur, veluti deerrantes destituti cursus dispendio, miseriam atque ardore vitare nequeant. *Cynthia prima* (I.1.1). Nullo utitur principio, quod aestuanti convenit et amor nimio sevient. Nam cum primum in Licinnam lascivisset, ut dictum est, non eo adeo processit amor ut ab ea separari non potuerit. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 102r) *Cuius honoratis ossa vehantur equis* (IV.11.102). Id respicit quod paulo super exposuit [scil. IV.11.101 *moribus et caelum*]: haec est foeminei merces extrema triumphi. Eum, inquit, laudis triumphum post fata consequar, quem merentur foeminae quae pudice summa cum continentia in omnium ordine vixerunt. Sumpta ab imperatoribus translatione, qui cum in castris aut in acie interierint, ut de Thebano Epaminunda et Druso legimus, in patriam aut hominum humeris aut equis honoratis, hoc est triumphalibus, referuntur.

Vita Propertii. Vita Propertii. [Inc.]: (fol. 102v) Aurelius Propertius elegiae scriptor egregius patria Mevania fuit Umbriae, quae Spoletum inter Perusiamque iacet. Is triumphali potestate parentem in primis clarum amisit inter eos CCC qui L. Antonium secuti, capta demum Perusia, in deditionem accepti ductique ad aram, Octaviani iussu foede trucidati sunt et, quod immanius est, sepultura privati. Bona vero militibus Augusti divisa quo tempore Propertius adolescentulus erat. Ea tamen animi indole floruit ut eius fratris cadaver exoraverit et rogulo structo cremaverit; ossa vero multo lachrymarum imbre condita pi-entissime terrae deposuit. Inde se Romam contulit ubi C. Maecenatis et Cornelii Galli benivolentiam ingenii suavitate consecutus, Musis operam omnem studiumque manavit. Hostiliae captus amore, quam Cynthia appellat, quatuor libris amoris sui faces exposuit. Romae moritur ante maturam aetatem.

Manuscript:

Vatican City, BAV, Barb. lat. 34, s. XV, fols. 3v, 37r, 37v–102r. (E. Pellegrin et al., *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, vol. 1 [Paris, 1975], 81–85, and especially 84, where the commentary on Propertius has been assigned to Antonius Constantius Fanensis; M. Buonocore, *Properzio nei codici della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana* [Assisi, 1995], 38–40, with further bibliography, and pl. 2 [fol. 38r]; Kristeller, *Iter* 2.457b and 6.391b).

2. (*micro.*) Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, H 34 sup.

There are notes by several hands up to *Eleg.* IV.6.84, after which annotation ceases. The annotation appears to be an adaptation of Volscus, with some degree of independence. Since at least one of the notes mentions Volscus by name, the date of this note (at any rate) is after 1488. How close the annotation is to Volscus' commentary may be gauged from the first two notes. The former of these is taken from Volscus' *Vita* of Propertius, and reads: (fol. 1r) "Propertius Mevaniae natus est; quod oppidum est Umbriae. Prius amavit Lycinnam quam captus amore Hostiae vehementissimo quam appellat Cinthiam dimisit" (the wording in Volscus is: "Sex. Aur. Propertius Nauta Mevaniae, quod est Umbriae oppidum, M. Antonio et P. Dolabella cos. nascitur. . . . In Lycinnam puellam primum lascivire coepit, editis elegiis quas non probavit. Mox primos furores vertit Hostia, quam mutato nomine Cynthia nuncupavit . . ."). The second note is on I.1.2 *Cupidinibus* and reads: (fol. 1r) "Cupidines tres fuere secundum Ciceronem de natura deorum libro tertio . . ." (in close agreement with Volscus, whose corresponding note reads: "Cupidines tres fuisse Cice[ro] scribit libro tertio de deorum natura").

In general, a selection is made from Volscus' notes, which are either paraphrased or reproduced more or less unchanged.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (fol. 1r) Propertius Mevaniae natus est. . . . *Cupidinibus* (I.1.2). Cupidines tres fuere secundum Ciceronem de natura deorum libro tertio: primus ex Diana et Mercurio natus, alter ex Mercurio et Venere secunda Coeli filia, tertius ex Marte et Venere tertia Iovis filia et Dione [Cic., *N.D.* 3.59–60]. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 77v) *In pueros* (IV.6.82). In Tiberium et alios Caesares. *Ire per Euphraten ad tua busta licet* (IV.6.84). Ubi Crassi pater et filius trucidati fuerunt amissi insepulti.

Manuscript:

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, H 34 sup. (Butrica 1984, 260, no. 63).

Biography:

See CTC 3.273. The following account provides supplementary information.

On Volscus' early life there is very little information. We are told that the name given to him

at birth was Antonio Costanzi; unfortunately, several of the most respected authorities, from Tiraboschi onwards, have confused him with his fellow humanist Antonio Costanzo of Fano, who (as Volscus also did) composed a commentary on Ovid's *Fasti*, though Volscus' was never published. The name "Volscus" was added for a geographical reason (cf. Paulus "Marsus" and Petrus "Marsus" in the same period), since his birthplace, Priverno, was situated on the fringes of the Volscian country, near Frosinone, in the hills to the east of the former Pontine marshes. Consequently he is styled in the annals of humanism as Antonius Volscus Privernas (the name customarily given to the inhabitants of Piperno), or sometimes Pipernas.

The date of his birth is unknown, but must have been about 1440, or a few years later. As A. Rose points out in her study of Beroaldo the Elder (cited below, under *Bibliography*), pp. 393–99, he is described as *iuvenis* in a letter written by Pomponius Laetus on 1 September 1468; and about 1480 he was still *iuvenis*, as appears from the reference to him in the preface to Paolo Marsi's commentary on Ovid's *Fasti*. Benedetto Pecci, in his essay published in 1912 (see *Bibliography* below), attempts (p. 19) to establish a date of birth ca. 1424/25 on the basis of a note by Domizio Calderini's at the end of his commentary on Ovid's *Ibis*, published on 7 September 1474. There it is stated that when Calderini wrote this he himself was not quite twenty years old, while a pair of commentators on the *Heroides*—one of whom Pecci identifies with Volscus, though Calderinus names neither of them—were already fifty ("ea certe fore confido, quae duo quinquagenarii homines . . . ab eo qui vicesimum nonum nondum complevit annum discere malint quam ignorare"). But, apart from the fact, already noted, that no names are given here, Volscus' commentary on the *Heroides* (the first commentary he published) did not appear until 1481, seven years or so after Calderini wrote the words just quoted. Calderini must therefore have been thinking of someone else, as Rose has observed (p. 395).

At some point, it is uncertain precisely when, Volscus left Piperno for Rome. It has been suggested, and is possible, that he received part of his early education there. We first find him in Rome as a pupil of Pomponio Leto, by whom he was held in warm friendship as well as in high re-

gard for his talents. About 1460 he was working on Ovid's *Fasti* (see Paolo Marsi, preface to his commentary on the *Fasti*). A. della Torre (*Paolo Marsi da Pescina* [Rocca di San Casciano, 1903]) has suggested that at some uncertain date, possibly between 1468 and 1471, Volscus taught, or at least was invited to teach, at Perugia. In support of his contention, della Torre (*ibid.*, 35–37) quotes a poem (*Francisci Varani Episcopi Camera-tis in Georgium spretum carmen*) where Volscus appears to be listed together with Paulus Marsus, Johannes Baptista Cantalicius, and Johannes Sulpitius Verulanus as one of those invited to hold a chair at Perugia; and we know that Sulpitius, before he went to Rome, did in fact lecture at Perugia from at least 1472 until 1474 or 1475, and Cantalicius apparently from 1475 onwards. But the person whose name is given as "Volscus" has now been identified by Vermiglioli as *Delius* Volscus Privernas (Rose, p. 396 n. 270).

In 1481–83, and again in 1494–96, Antonius Volscus lectured on rhetoric at the *Studium Urbis* in Rome (E. Lee, *Sixtus IV and Men of Letters*, *Temi e testi* 26 [Rome, 1978], Appendix of Documents, p. 254, no. 28; G. Lumbroso, "Gli accademici nelle catacombi," *Archivio della Società Romana di Storia Patria* 12 [1889] 239; M. C. Dorati da Empoli, "I lettori dello Studio e i maestri di grammatica a Roma da Sisto IV ad Alessandro VI," *Rassegna degli Archivi di Stato* 40 [1980] 98–147); he seems to have continued to teach there from 1473 onwards, and we may suppose that he did, although apart from the few dates given above we have really no information to fill in the blank years.

The date of Volscus' death is uncertain: we know only that his name continued to be registered in the *Depositario dello Studio di Roma* until the year 1496.

Add to Works:

Antonius Volscus collaborated ca. 1472 with Pomponio Leto in the preparation of the *editio princeps* of Nonius Marcellus. His name occurs, along with those of about a score of very distinguished scholars—most of them members, as he was, of the Roman Academy of Leto, but a few from Pontano's Neapolitan Academy—assembled to celebrate the birthday of Pacificus Maximus Irinaeus (see I.4 above), probably in 1476. In 1481 (most probably on 8 September) Volscus

published a commentary, without the text, on Ovid's *Heroides*. Since, in a note on *Her.* 5.3 *Pegasis Oenone*, Volscus says "... et nos in Propertio id latius exposuimus," he must have had in circulation, though not of course as yet in published form, some part at least of a commentary on Propertius even before his first (1482) edition of the poet's text, as A. Lupattelli (see *Bibliography* below) has pointed out. The preface to his edition of the *Heroides* (Parma, 1481) contains a notice of his work on Virgil: "Nam siqua supererant semina eo libello quem emendationem virgilianam inscripsimus, adeo repressi sunt universi ut non modo incoepti poeniteat" (this work was never finished; see A. Rose [cited below], 399 n. 290).

In 1482 Volscus published in Rome a text of Propertius, without a commentary; in 1488 he replaced this with a fresh text of Propertius, published in Venice and based on the text of Johannes Calphurnius (Vicenza, 1481), adding a full commentary. He wrote, but did not publish, a commentary on Ovid's *Fasti* (Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana, R 59; Kristeller, *Iter* 2.134a-b); it may be conjectured that he left this particular Ovidian field to his friend Paolo Marsi, and decided to concentrate on Propertius instead. The commentary he wrote on Persius appears to have been first published at Basel in 1578 together with those of other annotators on the same author (see CTC 3.272-73).

Add to Bibliography:

A. Ricchi, *Teatro degli uomini illustri . . . nel regno de' Volsci esistente nel Lazio, parte dell'Italia* (Rome, 1721); B. Pecci, *L'umanesimo e la "cioceria"* (Trani, 1912), 17-26 ("Antonio Costanzo Volsco Privernate"); G. Castaldi, "Antonio Costanzi da Fano e Antonio Volsco da Piperno," *Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana* 19 (1914) 255-61; G. Tibiletti, "Un ragionamento di Antonius Volscus," in *ANTIΔΩPON Hugoni Henrico Paoli oblatum. Miscellanea philologica*, Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di filologia latina dell'Università di Genova 8 ([Genoa,] 1956), 280-82; R. Avesani and B. M. Peebles, "Studies in Pietro Donato Avogaro of Verona," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 5 (1962) 70-71 (Avesani, "Il 'De viris illustribus antiquissimis qui ex Verona claruerunt'"); F. Lo Monaco, "Alcune osservazioni sui commenti umanistici ai classici nel secondo Quattrocento," in *Il commento ai testi: atti del semi-*

nario di Ascona, 2-9 ottobre 1989, ed. O. Besomi and C. Caruso (Basel, Boston, and Berlin, 1992), 103-54; B. M. Mariano, "Antonii Volsci expositiones in Heroidas Ovidii: alcuni appunti," *Aevum* 67 (1993) 105-12 (with a useful bibliography in n. 1); A. Lupattelli, "Il commento properziano di Antonio Volsco," in *Commentatori e traduttori di Properzio dall'Umanesimo al Lachmann. Atti del convegno internazionale, Assisi, 28-30 ottobre 1994*, ed. G. Catanzaro and F. Santucci (Assisi, 1996), 381-93; A. Rose, *Filippo Beroaldo der Ältere und sein Beitrag zur Properz-Überlieferung* (Munich and Leipzig, 2001), 393-99.

10. Angelus Politianus

A copy of the 1472 Venice de Spira edition (Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana, Inc. 50 F 37) contains autograph marginal annotations by Politianus, who made use of Calderinus' *Elucubratio*. The text is very heavily glossed in the first three books, particularly in book I, but scarcely at all in book IV. Most of the notes are concerned with the citation of parallel passages. The range of authors is encyclopedic; besides the "standard" poets and prose writers from the early tragedians to the Silver Age and the time of Macrobius and Claudian, there is a sprinkling of Greek authors. Strabo is of course well represented, as he often is among the humanists. A typical note, in which Politianus explains the text from his very wide reading, is that on fol. 127r at *Eleg.* IV.11.54 *exhibuit vivos carbasus alba focos*: "De hac lege apud Valerium Maximum libro primo etc. de Relligione."

As he remarks in the subscription to Catullus, dated 1473 (fol. 37r), Politianus had from an early age observed the corrupt state of the poems in all the texts he collated; in the subscription to Propertius, dated 1485 (see below), he again notes the amount of corruption and the fact that he had to resort to conjecture. The *libellus* to which he refers was a notebook, now lost (I. Maïer, *Ange Politien: la formation d'un poète humaniste (1469-1480)* [Geneva, 1966], 119) in which he recorded the readings he had taken from an old codex, probably that of Valla (Butrica 1984, 92 n. 21).

There is no introduction or dedication.

Commentary. (Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana, Inc. 50 F 37). [*Inc.*]: (fol. 70r) Cynthia facundi carmen iuvenile Properti/ accepit phamam, nec minus ipsa dedit [Martial, *Epig.* 14.189]. *Argumentum.* Uritur, et nulla fias cum mitior <arte>/ut

se dissolvat Cynthia quaerit <opem> [Domitius Calderinus, argumentum; see I.6 above]. *Cynthia* (I.1.1). Cynthia fictum nomen est a poeta, nam vero nomine Ostia dicebatur ut ait Apuleius libro primo de Magia [*Apol.* 10]. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 126v) *Tantaleo* (IV.11.24). Hic Tantaleus. (fol. 127r) *Exhibuit vivos carbasus alba focos* (IV.11.54). De hac lege apud Valerium Maximum libro primo — (cropped) de Relligione [1.1.ext.7].

Subscription to Propertius. (fol. 127v) Catulli, Tibulli, Propertique libellos coepi ego Angelus Politianus: iam inde a pueritia tractare: et pro aetatis eius iudicio, vel corrigere, vel interpretari. Quo fit, ut multa ex eis ne ipse quidem satis \ut nunc est/ probem. Qui leges, ne quaeso, vel ingeni, vel doctrinae, vel diligentiae nostrae, hinc tibi coniecturam, aut iudicium facito. Permulta enim infuerint (ut Plautino utar verbo), “me quoque qui scripsi iudice digna lini” [*Ov., Pont.* 1.5.16]. Anno Mccccclxxxv. [Additional note]: <Prope>rtium \quidem/ cum vetusto codice contulimus: sed quae de illo nobis sumpsimus, haut ascripsimus, <h>uic codici, sed in libello (-o *corr.*) rettulimus, qui est inscriptus: Antiquarum emendationum.

Manuscript:

Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana, Inc. 50 F 37, s. XV (a. 1485), fols. 70r–127v (I. Maier, *Les manuscrits d'Ange Politien* [Geneva, 1965], 361–62; A. Perosa, *Mostra del Poliziano nella Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana. Manoscritti, libri rari, autografi e documenti*, Firenze, 23 settembre–30 novembre 1954. *Catalogo* [Florence, 1955], 13–16, no. 1; Kristeller, *Iter* 2.117b).

Biography:

See CTC 1.133–34 (Alexander Aphrodisiensis), 225–26 (Juvenalis); 4.272 (Martialis); 7.231 (Catullus).

Add to Bibliography:

L. Santoro, “Il Poliziano in una lettera inedita di Lorenzo Mehus,” in *Il Poliziano latino. Atti del Seminario di Lecce—28 aprile 1994*, ed. P. Viti, Pubblicazioni del Dipartimento di Filologia Linguistica 10 (Galatina, 1996), 151–61.

11. Johannes Cotta

In the 1500 Venice edition of Tibullus, Catullus, and Propertius from the press of Giovanni Tacuino di Tridino, the list of contents contains

the following announcement: *Annotationes in Propertium tum per Domitium Calderinum, tum per Joannem Cottam*. The *Annotationes in Propertium* by Cotta (1480 or 1482–1510) are not to be found in this edition; at present there is no evidence that they were submitted to the printer, or indeed that they ever existed.

12. Franciscus Puccius

Puccius, a favorite pupil of Angelus Politianus (I.10 above), adopted some of his teacher's emendations (but only those actually published, i.e., in the *Miscellanea*), together with a good many by his friend Johannes Jovianus Pontanus (I.1 above). Puccius also referred to suggestions by Hermolaus Barbarus and Philippus Beroaldus. The manuscript designated X by Butrica 1984, 65 was collated, with the addition of notes, by Puccius in 1502 (see the subscription in our nos. 1, 4, 5, and 10 below). Many versions of Puccius' annotations circulated in the following decades; it has now come to be recognized by scholars that none of these can be identified with his original draft.

Puccius' notes usually appear as marginal insertions placed beside the appropriate lines of the Latin text of Propertius. Essentially explanatory in character, they are directed to the needs of students: there are lexicographical and metrical comments, and literary parallels are cited. Admittedly, these notes do not add a great amount of original information or contribute substantially to the general development of the humanist commentary; but since Puccius' annotations on Catullus have been fully discussed by Julia Haig Gaisser in CTC 7.243–49, they can be treated quite briefly with respect to the Propertian parts of those commentaries which (at least at the period with which we are now concerned) are commonly devoted to both poets.

Of the manuscripts listed by Gaisser, some (e.g., her nos. 3, 10, and 16) contain either no notes by Puccius, or virtually none, on Propertius, while others have only a very few. Some versions (e.g., Gaisser's nos. 12–14) are greatly abbreviated overall so far as Propertius is concerned; in others (e.g., Gaisser's nos. 15–18) the notes on Propertius are too late in date to be of interest for our purpose. Accordingly, the information given for Puccius in the Catullus article in CTC 7 is repeated or condensed in our own list below of the same manuscripts with any substantial amount

of Puccius' Propertian commentary. These witnesses are listed, for convenience, under the serial numbers allotted to them by Gaisser, besides being allotted a serial number of their own. The bibliographical references cited by Gaisser at the end of each entry are not repeated here.

Our nos. 14–17 are new witnesses.

The incipits and explicits cited below in our nos. 4 and 6 were kindly supplied by Prof. Julia Haig Gaisser; those for nos. 1–3 and 13 by Dr. Anna Rose; and those for nos. 5, 7–9, 14–17 by †Prof. Virginia Brown.

Manuscripts:

1. (Gaisser no. 6). Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Edizioni rare 372. [Edition: Reggio Emilia, 1481]. Many glosses. (Butrica 1984, 80–81 and 92 n. 21; L. Santoro, "Il Poliziano in una lettera inedita di Lorenzo Mehus," 157–58 [see *Bibliography* below]).

Commentary. [Inc.]: (fol. 11r) *Propertii Aurelii nautae poetae clarissimi Elegiarum liber primus. Ad Tullum* (book I, title). Incipit Monobyblos Propertii Aurelii nautae. *Mimalion* (I.1.9). *Minalion* (corr. s.s.). *Hyasidos* (I.1.10). Iasis dicitur Atalanta, Iasii neptis, filia Scenes; Priapeia [16.1, ed. F. Vollmer] proinde Sceneida vocant. *Psili* (I.1.13). *Psillei* v(etus) c(odex) sed lego "hyllaei" . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. p5v) *Causa perorata est* (IV.11.99). Dicta enim causa interrogabantur testes. *Merendo* (IV.11.101). Merito morum. *Vehuntur* (IV.11.102). Vehantur.

Subscription. (fol. p5v) Franciscus Puccius hec annotabat Anno salutis M.DII. Augustino Scarpinella comite studiorum. Sequutus fidem antiquissimi codicis. qui primum fuit Berardini vallae (corr. ex vi-) patricii romani, viri doctissimi. dein (corr. s.s. ex et) ab eo dono est datus Alfonso secundo. regi Neapolitano. principi litterarum amantissimo.

2. (Gaisser no. 2). Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Diez oct. 2474. [Edition: Venice, 1515]

Commentary. [Inc.]: (fol. 79r) *Monobiblos Propertii Nau(tae)*. Sic item vetus codex. *Mimalion* (I.1.9). *Milanion*. *Iasidos* (I.1.10). Iasis dicitur Atalanta, Iasii neptis, filia Scaenei; Priapeia [16.1, ed. F. Vollmer] proinde Sceneid<a> vocant. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 148r) *Vehuntur* (IV.11.102). Vehantur.

Subscription. (fol. 148r) Emendabam et (annotabam) Catullum et Tibullum et Propertium ego Antonius Petreius collatis vetustissimis exemplaribus alio Pontani alio Epi(scopi Cremonensis) alio Francisci Puccii nec non aliis Romae et florentiae habitis anno 15(. .) et 15(. .).

3. (Gaisser no. 4). Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Inc. Magl. A.3.39. [Edition: Vicenza, 1481]

Commentary. [Inc.]: (fol. hir) *Propertii poetae elegiographi clarissimi liber primus* (book I, title). Incipit Monobyblos Propertii (Liber primus *canc.*) Aurelii Nautae. Sic ibi. *Iasidos* (I.1.10). Iasis dicitur Atalanta, Iasii neptis, filia Scaenei; Priapeia [16.1, ed. F. Vollmer] proinde Sceneida vocant. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. o6v) *Causa perorata est* (IV.11.99). Dicta causa interrogabantur testes. *Merendo* (IV.11.101) id est merito morum.

Subscription. (fol. o6v) Bernardus Pisanus haec annotabat brumalibus vigiliis collatis aliis exemplaribus secutus fidem probatissimi qui fuit Francisci Puccii viri litteraturae laude insignis anno .M.D.XXII.

4. (Gaisser no. 8). Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 2 Inc. c. a. 1120. [Edition: Reggio Emilia, 1481]. Many glosses by various hands.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (fol. 11r) *Propertii Aurelii nautae poetae clarissimi Elegiarum liber primus. Ad Tullum* (book I, title). Incipit Monobyblos Propertii Aurelii nautae. *Mimalion* (I.1.9). *Minalion*. *Hyasidos* (I.1.10). Iasis dicitur Atalanta, Iasii neptis, filia Schaenei (corr. s. s. ex Sce-); Priapeia [16.1, ed. F. Vollmer] proinde Sceneida vocant. *Psili* (I.1.13). *Psillei* v(etus) c(odex) sed lego "Hyllaei". . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. p5v) *Causa perorata est* (IV.11.99). Dicta enim causa interrogabantur testes. *Merendo* (IV.11.101). Merito morum. *Vehuntur* (IV.11.102). Vehantur.

Subscription. (fol. p5v; the erased words that could be deciphered or deduced with some certainty are enclosed in angle brackets) <Franciscus Puccius> hec annotabat Anno salutis .M.D. II. Augustino Scarpinella comite studiorum sequutus fidem antiquissimi codicis qui primum fuit Bernardini Vallae patritii Romani, viri doctissimi dein ab eo dono est datus Alfonso secundo regi Neapolitano principi litterarum amantissimo. [In a different hand] Contuli cum codice autographo <Puccii> ut (corr. ex et) ad unguem om-

nia (-i- *corr. ex -e-*) in nostrum hunc exscriberem (-b- *corr. ex -p-*, *ut vid.*) Idibus Iuliis .M..D.XXI. <? > P. Victorius.

On fol. ivr-v (unnumbered initial flyleaf) there are some additional notes reported by Donatus Jannoctius (Donato Giannotti; see also no. 10 below), on selected lemmata from books I and II. (fol. ivr) Propertii. [*Inc.*]: *Ille etiam Hylaei* (I.1.13). Vetus codex: *Psillei*. Hylaeus centaurus quidam legitur fuisse quem tentata ab eo A<ta>lanta percussit. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. ivv) *Cur vatem Herculeum deportant esseda Tybur* (II.32.5). Puccius tradit Beroaldum reposuisse "curva ten Herculeum." Ipse tamen nihil mutat vulgatamque lectionem satis tuetur. *Icare Cecropiis merito iugulate colonis/pampineus nosti quam sit amarus odor* (II.33b.29-30). Puccius fabulam narrare Higinum in signo Boote tradit, qui quidem auctor apud nos hic non est; alias igitur videbimus. . . . De Icaro Tibullus in encomio Messalae: Et cunctis Baccho iocundior hospes/Icarus ut puro testantur sidera caelo [*Carm. Tib.* 3.7.9-10]. Fabulam (*corr.*) quoque refert interpret quidam Germanici Caesaris in Syrio stella. (Followed by a note apparently in another hand).

5. (Gaisser no. 9). Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, S.Q. X.H.10. [Edition: Reggio Emilia, 1481]

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 56r) *Hyasidos* (I.1.10). Iasis dicitur Atalante, Iasii neptis, filia Sceneae; Priapeia [16.1, ed. F. Vollmer] proinde Sceneida vocatur. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 104v) *Lubrica sump-tum* (IV.11.97). Lugubria sumpsi. *Causa perorata est* (IV.11.99). Dicta enim causa interrogabantur testus (*sic*). *Vehuntur* (IV.11.102). Vehantur.

Subscription. (fol. 104v) Franciscus Puccius hec annotabat anno salutis MDII Augustino Scarpinella comite studiorum sequutus fidem antiquissimi codicis qui p(rimu)m fuit Berardini Vallae patricii romani viri doctissimi dein ab eo (Bera)rdino est datus Alfonso Secundo (N)ea(p)olitan)o principi litterarum amantissimo.

6. (Gaisser no. 11). Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, Van Pelt Library, Lat. C.C 2994. 531c. [Edition: Venice, 1531]

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 74v; k2v) *Mimalion* (I.1.9). Minalion P(uccius). *Iasidos* (I.1.10). Iasis dicitur Atalante, Iasi neptis, filia Scenei; Priapeia [16.1, ed. F. Vollmer] proinde Sceneida vocant. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 142v; s7v) *Causa pero-*

rata est (IV.11.99). Dicta enim causa rogabantur testes. *Merendo* (IV.11.101). Merito morum. *Vehuntur aquis* (IV.11.102). Equis vehantur.

7. (Gaisser no. 12). Vatican City, BAV, Aldine III.19. [Edition: Venice, 1502]

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 81r; air) *Sex. Aurelii Umbri Elegiarum liber primus* (book I, title). Incipit Monobyblos Propertii Aurelii. Mimalion (I.1.9). Minalion (*corr. s.s.*). *Psillei* (I.1.13). *Psilleus* habet v(etus) c(odex) sed lego "Hylei". . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (ivir) *Et* (IV.11.97) En (*corr. s.s.*). *Cuius honoratis ossa vehuntur* (*corr.s.s. to -han-*) *aquis* (IV.11.102). *Equis* v(etus) c(odex).

8. (Gaisser no. 13). Vatican City, BAV, Stamp. Barb. CCC.II.7. [Edition: Venice, 1502]

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: (fol. air) *Ad Tullum* (I.1, heading). Monobyblos Propertii Aurelii Nautae. Mimalion (I.1.9). Melanion. *Psillei* (I.1.13). *Psillus* habet v(etus) c(odex) sed lego "Hylei" (*corr. ex hyll-*). . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. ivir) *Et* (IV.11.97). En. *Vehuntur* (*corr. s.s. to -hen-*) *aquis* (IV.11.102). Equis.

9. (Gaisser no. 14). Vatican City, BAV, Stamp. Barb. CCC.II.26. [Edition: Venice, 1515] (Butrica 1978, 467: "Barb. CCC.II.26, a 1515 Aldine, contains some original emendations in addition to collations and notes from Puccius and Pontano").

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 79r; air) *Mimalion* (I.1.9). Melanion. Muretus 8. Po<n>t. Am. 19. Ov(idius) [*Ars amat.* 2.188 *Milanion*], Am. 129.99 [*Ars amat.* 3.775]. *Videre* (I.1.12). Ferire. *Psillei* (I.1.13). Hyllaei; al. *Psillus* Hylaei. Vir(gilius) 64 [cf. *Virg., Ecl.* 6.46]. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 147v; i5v) *Aucturis tot* (IV.11.70). Haud ullis stant. (fol. 148r; i6r) *Vehuntur* (*corr. s.s. to -han-*) *aquis* (IV.11.102). Equis.

10. (micro.) (Gaisser no. 15). Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XII.127 (4020). [Edition: Venice, 1502]

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 81r; air) *Sex. Aurelii Umbri Elegiarum liber primus* (book I, title). P(ontanus): Incipit Monobyblos Propertii Aurelii Nautae. Mimalion (I.1.9). Milanion P(ontanus), M(uretus). *Iasidos* (I.1.10) idest Atalantae quae Iasii neptis fuit, Shenei vero filia, ideoque Priapeii carminis auctor Schaeneida vocat [*Priapea* 16.1, ed. F. Vollmer]. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol.

150r; ivir) *Iuvat* (IV.11.96). *Iuuet* P(ontanus). *Causa perorata est* (IV.11.99). Dicta enim causa interrogabantur testes. *Vehuntur* (IV.11.102). *Vehantur* P(ontanus).

Subscription. (fol. 150r; ivir) Franciscus Puccius haec annotabat anno Salutis .M.D.II. Augustino Scarpinella comite studiorum, secutus fidem antiquissimi codicis qui primum fuit Bernardini Vallae patritii Romani viri doctissimi, dein ab eo dono datus est Alfonso secundo Regi Neapolitano principi litterarum amantissimo. Contulit Laurentius Benivenius cum codice Autographo ipsius Puccii, ut omnia in suum exscriberet. Ego autem cum ipso Laurentii (*sic*) contuli ut nihil praetermissum sit. Absolutum opus Anno M.D.XXX. iiii. Cal. Augusti. Obsessa urbe. Donatus Jannoctius.

There follow in the hand of Donatus Jannoctius some additional notes on selected lemmata from books I and II: (fol. 151r; iviir) Quaedam in Propertium annotationes e codice Laurentii Benivenii exscriptae. [*Inc.*]: *Ille et Hylei* (I.1.13). Vetus codex: *Psillei*. Hyleus centaurus quidam dicitur fuisse quem tentata ab eo Halante (*sic*) percussit. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 152r; iviir) *Cur vatem Herculeum deportant esseda Tybur* (II.32.5). Puccius tradit Beroaldum reposuisse "curva ten Herculeum." Ipse nihil mutat vulgatamque lectionem satis tuetur.

11. (micro.) (Gaisser no. 17). Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XII.187 (4029). [Edition: Venice, 1515]

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 79r) *Durae Iasidos* (I.1.10). *Atalanta*. (fol. 80r) *Phoebe . . . Thelayra* (I.2.15–16). Filie Leucippi et Philodoces raptae a Castore et Polluce. *Filia* (I.2.18). Marpessa Eveni regis Aetholorum filia. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 147v) *Aucturis tot* (IV.11.70). *Haud ullis stant*. (fol. 148r) *Aquis* (IV.11.102). *Equis*.

12. (*) (Gaisser no. 18). Present location unknown.

Subscription. Franciscus Puccius haec annotabat (-vit? see CTC 7.248) an(no) sa(lutis) MDXVI (*sic*) Antonio Scarpinella studio(rum) comite secutus (fi)d(em) antiquiss(imi) codicis qu(i) primum fu(it) Bernardini (*sic*) Patritii Romani viri (doc)tiss(imi) dein ab eo dono est datus Alfonso II reg(i) neapolitano principi (litterarum) am(antissimo).

13. (Gaisser no. 5). Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Postillati 41. [Edition: Florence, 1503]

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: (fol. Air) *Hylei* (I.1.13). *Psillei* vetus codex licet lego "Illaei". (fol. Aiv) *Aure* (I.1.31). *Aura* (*corr. s.s.*). *Pellucet* (I.2.13). *Collucet . . . / . . .* [*Expl.*]: (fol. Ivv) *Numina* (IV.11.64). *Lumina*. *Speciem* (IV.11.67). *Specimen*. (fol. Ivir) *Sunt* (IV.11.81). *Sint*.

Subscription. (fol. eeivr, end of Tibullus) P(etrus) S(tupha) contulit cum codice quem Donatus Jannoctius et Jacobus Diacetus contulerant cum codice quem Franciscus Puccius Neapoli diligentissime emendarat, cum illic profiteretur humaniores literas. M D Liiii. Above this is written: "Petrus stupha can(onicus) flor(entinu)s".

14. Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, S.Q.X.H.25. [Edition: Reggio Emilia, 1481]

Antonio Seripando (1486–1531), who owned the volume, was a fellow disciple of Iacopo Perillo from at least 1501 to 1504 in Puccius' school at Naples. Perillo transcribed the copious notes on Tibullus, Catullus, and Propertius, adding many corrections of his own; in the case of Propertius, he inserted previously unknown glosses attributed to Pontanus which refer to the "Pontani codex" and Pontanus' other works (Vecce, "Postillati di Antonio Seripando," 56–58 [see *Bibliography* below]). Ex libris in the hand of Antonio Seripando: (fol. 105v; p5v) "Antonii Seripandi ex Iacobi perilli amici opt. munere."

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 57r; iir) *Propertii Aurelii nautae poetae clarissimi Elegiarum liber primus. Ad Tullum* (book I, title). Incipit Monobyblos Propertii Aurelii (Nautae *expunct.*). *Constantis* (I.1.3). *Constanti* (*expunct.*) v(etus) c(odex). *Mimalion* (-nal- *corr. s.s.*) (I.1.9). *Milanon*. *Hyasidos* (Ias- *corr. s.s.*) (I.1.10). Iasis dicitur Atalanta, Iasii neptis, filia Scenei; Priapeia [16.1, ed. F. Vollmer] proinde Sceneida vocant. *Psilli* (I.1.13). *Psillei* v(etus) c(odex) sed lego "Hylaei" (*corr. ex -llaei*). . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. 105v; p5v) *Causa perorata est* (IV.11.99). Dicta enim causa interrogabantur testes. *Merendo* (IV.11.101). Merito morum. *Vehuntur aquis* (IV.11.102). *Vehantur equis* v(etus) c(odex).

15. Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, S.Q.XIX.B.4 [Edition: Venice, 1502]

The notes are short and scattered through books I–III. There is no *ex libris*.

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: (unnumbered fol. 81r; a1r) *Mimalion* (I.1.9). *Milanion*. *Psillei* (I.1.13). *Yllaiei*. (unnumbered fol. 81v; a1v) *Et* (I.2.10). *Ut*. *Et* (I.2.11). *Ut*. . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (unnumbered fol. 105v; m7v) *Corniger Idaei vacuum pastoris in aulam* (III.13.39). *Alludit ad Adonem*. *Et leporem quicumque venis venaberis hospes* (III.13.43). *Verba Dianae*. (unnumbered fol. 106r; m8r) *Et* (III.13.55). *Se*. *Verus* (III.13.59). *Pastus*.

16. Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, Vol. Inc. 694. [Edition: Venice, 1491]

This volume contains numerous marginal and interlinear notes inserted, apparently, by at least two humanist hands. One of the principal annotators entered salient keywords from the commentary of Beroaldus that surrounds the text of Propertius; these amount to running titles. The focus of the other main annotator, who copied the subscription reported below, was the Propertian text itself, and we record the incipit and explicit of the contributions made by this scribe.

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: (fol. lir) *Mimalion* (I.1.9). *Minalion* (*inner margin*). *Domit(ii) Pap(inius) 198* (*outer margin*). *Iasidos* (I.1.10). *Priapeia* [16.1, ed. F. Vollmer] *proinde Sceneida vocant*. *Psilei* (*corr. s.s. to -lle*) (I.1.13). *Hyllei*. . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. xivv) *Moribus et caelum patuit: sim digna merendo* (*idest merito morum s.s.*) / *cuius honoratis ossa vehantur aquis* (IV.11.101–102). *Haec duo carmina impressa sunt in alio codice in fine huius ultimae elegiae*. (fol. xvr) *Vehantur* (IV.11.102) pro “*uehentur*” (*an attempt may have been made to erase this final note*).

Subscription. (fol. xvr) M.D.XXIII. die XV februarii. Contuli haec tria volumina cum emendatissimo codice francisci Puccii, quem et ipse contulerat cum codice antiquissimo qui primum fuit Bernardini Vallae patritii Romani viri doctissimi, dein ab eo dono est datus Alfonso Regi Secundo Neapolitano principi litterarum amantissimo.

17. Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana, 31.A.31. [Edition: Lyons, 1542]

Although the marginal annotations in this volume are not numerous and, in fact, are brief when they do occur, their source is clearly the commentary of Puccius and so we report them here.

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: (p. 160) *Psilles* (I.1.13). *Psillus*. (p. 161, wrongly numbered ‘151’) *Coa* (I.2.2). *Cata*. (p. 162, wrongly numbered ‘152’) *Thelayra* (I.2.16). *Layra*. (p. 164, wrongly numbered ‘154’) *Deferet* (I.4.22). *Differet*. . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 292) *Vinxit et acceptas* (IV.11.34). *Iunxit et aspersas*. (p. 293) *Solvitur aucturis* (IV.11.70). *Solvitur haut ullis stant mea fata malis*. *Solvit venturit*.

Subscription. (title page) *Correcti ex (damaged) veteri codice palatinae et altero Jo.Pont. venerandae vetustatis per B(ernar)dum Petrum Artemium Spoletinum . An. M.D.XXIII; (then, in another hand) et per Egnatium pius ex fratre nepotem M.D.LXXIII*.

Biography:

See CTC 7.248.

Works:

See CTC 7.248–49.

Bibliography:

See CTC 7.249. Add: V.Fera, “Un laboratorio filologico di fine Quattrocento: la *Naturalis Historia*,” in *Formative Stages of Classical Traditions: Latin Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance. Proceedings of a conference held at Erice, 16–22 October 2003, as the 6th Course of International School for the Study of Written Records*, ed. O.Pecere and M.D.Reeve (Spoleto, 1995), 435–66, especially 452–66; L.Santoro, “Il Poliziano in una lettera inedita di Lorenzo Mehus,” in *Il Poliziano latino. Atti del Seminario di Lecce—28 aprile 1994*, ed. P.Viti, Pubblicazioni del Dipartimento di Filologia Linguistica e Letteraria dell’Università di Lecce 10 (Galatina, 1996), 151–61; 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.

13. Marcus Antonius Muretus

When Muretus had edited and annotated Catullus in 1554, he conceived the idea of doing the same for Propertius. This he did, though hastily, as he himself admits, in the work he published in 1558. The resulting volume, which also

contained his edition of Tibullus accompanied by notes, was in two parts: a text of Propertius, based on the second Aldine edition of 1515, but having certain readings in common with the first Aldine of 1502; and a set of "scholia," rather than a running commentary on the whole. The final words of the *Scholia in Propertium*, which break off at III.11.64, consist, in fact, of a promise to compose "proper commentaries" (*iusti commentarii*) on Propertius and on Tibullus at some later date, when he has sufficient leisure. In Muretus' Catullus, the notes are entered after the individual poems; but, in his edition of Propertius and Tibullus, they are arranged in a body, following the complete text of each poet.

Muretus' interest in Propertius continued after the publication of the *Scholia*. It is clear that he owned a manuscript of Propertius, acquired between 1554 and 1558 but now lost, which was dated 16 February 1460 at the end of the Propertius part (a few months later, 5 August 1460, for Catullus). The printed text he owned may, in fact, have been that of the second Aldine which previously belonged to, and was annotated by, Antonius Petreius in 1528, and which contained the valuable annotations of Franciscus Puccius. But Muretus notably refrained from emendation, or any serious attempt to refashion the text; the novelty of his attitude to interpretation lay in treating the poems above all as literature and writing a "literary" commentary. His close links to the humanist poetry of his time, and especially to that of the Pléiade, should be remembered in this connection. (See also CTC 7.40–61 for further observations on the genesis and character of Muretus' work.)

The dedicatory letter is addressed to the youthful Francesco Gonzaga (1538–66), son of Ferrante Gonzaga and Isabella Di Capua. At this time the Gonzagas, rulers of Mantua and of several adjoining territories, were at the height of their powers and fame. Eventually, the Gonzaga family took Muretus up; in 1571, he dedicated to Cardinal Scipione Gonzaga (1542–93), who was a great patron of the arts, an edition of his speeches. Muretus' principal friend and patron, however, was Cardinal Ippolito d'Este (see *Biography* below).

In the dedication Muretus compares Propertius with Catullus and Tibullus, and in comparing them recognizes two great strengths of Propertius: a vigorous style, and a taste for learning

(see Dejob 127). Muretus assures the dedicatee that he himself has in youth carefully studied and imitated both Tibullus and Propertius; and in later life, though called to more responsible tasks, he has not been able to resist relaxing with the two poets as a form of light relief. But (he writes) "I should like even those mental diversions to be of service to others, and so I have recently been devoting considerable attention to the emendation and interpretation of Propertius. This, I thought, might be a way of gaining your friendship. It was neither your wealth nor your illustrious birth that led me to wish to be known by you, but only your great and already celebrated virtues. I have no taste for the society of rich people who despise good letters; they are the most tiresome and vulgar of all men, in my experience. The only truly noble souls are those who do their best, as you do, to bequeath to their descendants a name at least as glorious as that which they inherited. Clearly, your reputation already bids fair to rival that of your father. I ask only that you should deem it not unworthy of yourself to take some time from your study of philosophy and devote it to reading the poems of Propertius. For this purpose, I recommend Ippolito Capilupi, the bishop designate of Fano, as an excellent fellow-student; he will make good for you anything I have omitted or wrongly understood."

Dedicatory letter (ed. of Venice, 1558). M. Antonius Muretus Francisco Gonzagae, Ferdinandi f., s. d. [*Inc.*]: (fol. A2r) Non iniuria dubitatum est a veteribus, Francisce Gonzaga, adolescens praestantissime, Tibullone an Propertio deferendus esset inter latinos poetas elegiae scribendae principatus. Nam ut insunt in utroque permulta, quae eos vulgarium numero exemptos in edito atque eminenti statu locum, sic propriae quaedam extant et elucet in utroque virtutes, quibus uterque alterius palmam ambigam facere videatur. Summa in Tibullo elocutionis elegantia et proprietates, summa in Propertio eruditionis poeticae copia et varietas; in illo romana prope omnia, in hoc pleraque transmarina. Illum nativa quaedam et incorrupta romani sermonis integritas in media urbe natum et altum esse perspicue ostendit: hunc praeter cetera forma et character ipse dicendi in graecorum poetarum scriptis assiduissime versatum esse demonstrat. Cumque a sapientissimis viris traditum (fol.

A2v) sit duo esse praecipua poeticae dictionis ornamenta, τὸ σαφὲς καὶ τὸ ξενικόν, illo Tibullus, hoc Propertius excellere videtur. Mollior ille et delicatior: nervosior hic et accuratior; illo magis oblectere, hunc magis, ut opinor, admirare; illum iudices simplicius scripsisse quae cogitaret, hunc diligentius cogitasse quid scriberet; in illo plus naturae, in hoc plus curae atque industriae fuisse perspicias. Quae cum ita se habeant, perdifficile est decernere ac constituere uter alteri praestet. Nam si praecipua laus poetarum in imitatione consistit, mihi quidem videtur Tibullus varios illos fluctuantis animi motus, quibus amantes agitari solent, melius imitatus esse. Sin, ut quicque ad optimum proxime accedit, ita ipsum quoque optimum iudicandum est, crediderim sane veterum illorum Gaecorum, ac praecipue Callimachi, Propertium haud paulo similiorem fuisse: qua etiam fiducia ipse se Romanum Callimachum vocare ausus est. Sed haec utut sunt, neque nostrum est neque cuiusquam hominis pudentis et considerati, qua de re veteres illi, quorum fuit et doctrina maior et iudicium acrius, non liquere pronun(fol. A3r)ciarunt, de ea certi quicquam constituere et litem secundum alterutrum dare. Satiuserit utrumque studiose ac diligenter evolvere, utriusque virtutes accurate perpendere, utrumque sibi ad imitandum proponere, si quando forte nos ad tentandum idem poematis genus aut voluntas adducet aut naturae impetus feret. Quae ego omnia, Francisce Gonzaga, quantum quidem in me fuit, summo studio adolescens fecitavi. Non enim facile concesserim multis qui hos poetas aut saepius aut accuratius legerint, aut vero plus operae posuerint in eorum virtutibus imitando exprimendis. Ex quo autem in me iuvenilis illa, qua studia poetica foventur, alacritas deferbuit animumque sibi meum graviorum et hac aetate digniorum artium tractatio vendicavit, temperare mihi tamen non possum, quin saepe eos in manibus habeam, horisque subsequis graviorum studiorum asperitatem hoc quasi condimento amoenitatis mitigem ac molliam. Quin etiam, ut non occupationes tantum meae, verum remissiones quoque animi afferant aliquid utilitatis hominibus, confero studium non mediocre ad libros eorum perpur(fol. A3v)gandos et ad locos, si quos mihi forte intelligere videor, qui non ita sint omnibus pervii, explicandos. Tale igitur quiddam his diebus in Propertio praestiti: et cum admirabili desiderio tenerer insinu-

andi me aliqua in amicitiam tuam, iter mihi ad eam praemunire hoc munusculo volui. Ut autem a te cognosci cuperem, ne vivam si me aut divitiae quibus abundas aut generis tui claritas aut quicquam denique praeter maximas tuas, et iam nunc omnium sermone celebratissimas, virtutes incitavit. Nam opulentorum, qui honesta studia spernant, non modo <non> ambire ac persequi, sed aspernari etiam ac refugere amicitias soleo, non semel expertus nihil esse eius modi hominibus φορτικώτερον: generis autem nobilitas in iis demum habet aliquid gloriandum, qui faciunt id quod tu, hoc est, in iis qui omni ope moliuntur efficere ut ne minus ipsi splendoris posteris suis tradidisse quam a maioribus accepisse videantur. Itaque colunt te quidem homines et observant, ut magni illius Ferdinandi Gonzagae, sapientissimi, fortissimi, fortunatissimi imperatoris, filium: sed multo te, mihi crede, impensius colunt (fol. A4r) quod eam te viam ingressum aut potius in ea iam longe progressum vident, in quasi, ut spes minime dubia est, perstiteris, non ille apud posteros tot victoriis, tot opimis spoliis, tot trophaeis quam te filio clarior sit futurus. Sed illius quidem res gestae cum aliorum monumentis celebrabuntur, tum praecipue scriptis Antonii Possevini, familiaris tui, eruditissimi hominis et ad conscribendam historiam facti, tradentur memoriae hominum sempiternae; tuas autem hoc loco pluribus persequi nolo tum ne modum epistolae excedam, tum quod mihi veniunt in mentem Euripidis versus:

Αἰνούμενοι γὰρ οἱ ἀγαθοὶ τρόπον τινὰ
Μισοῦσι τοὺς αἰνοῦντας, ἔὰν αἰνῶσ' ἄγαν.
[Iph. Aul. 979–80]

Id tantum te orabo ut, cum a philosophiae studiis, in quibus te quotidie Bernardinus Tomitanus, singulare Patavini gymnasii decus, exercet, relaxare animum voles, Propertianae lectioni temporis aliquid tribuere ne graveris: in qua si comitem tibi, ut facturum auguror, Hippolytum Capilupum, episcopum fanensem des(ignatum), incredibili et virtute et doctrina hominem, assumpseris, habebis, qui tibi possit ea quae a me (fol. A4v) vel omissa vel non satis intellecta sunt unus optime omnium interpretari. Vale. Patavii. Kal. Sext. MDLVIII. *Commentary*. In Propertium scholia. [Inc.]: (fol. 76r) *Milanion* (I.I.9). Admirabilis est hominum in fovendis erroribus pertinacia. Sed praeclare ageretur cum rebus humanis,

si ad haec modo nostra leviora studia id pertinet, neque in rebus maximi momenti magno omnium malo quotidie cerneretur. Hoc mihi nunc ex eo venit in mentem, quod saepe animadverti evenire, ut optimos quosque scriptores maculae quaedam errorum occupent in eis que insideant, quae cum postea inveterarunt, quasi dedita opera retinentur a librariis: vix ut ulla sit cuiusquam eruditi hominis auctoritas tanta, quae illos ad eas purgandas et eluendas possit adducere. . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 92v) *Et cui cognomen Corvus habere dedit* (III.11.64). Hunc M. Valerium, qui a corvo adiutore cognomen invenit, cum in omnibus antiquis libris Corvinus vocetur, eruditi quidam nostrae tempestatis homines, et in romanae historiae cognitione cum primis exercitati Corvum, non Corvinum, vocari iubent, quod in vetustis lapidibus ita nomen scri(fol. 93r)ptum reperitur. Ego autem nunquam de istis rebus magnopere contendam. . . . Atque haec in praesentia sint sa(fol. 93v)tis. Nam ut neque ultimum librum attingerem et in ceteris essem restrictior, id mihi caussae fuit, quod et in hunc poetam et in Tibullum, si quando aliquis mihi deus ocium fecerit, iustos commentarios paro.

Editions:

1558. Venetiis (Venice): apud Paulum Manutium. With the *Priapea* and the texts of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius and notes of Marcus Antonius Muretus on these three poets. Adams C-1146; *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlv; NUC.BL; BNF; (DLC; MH; CtY; Cst). See CTC 7.263.

1559. Lugduni (Lyons): apud Gulielmum Rovillum. Contents as in preceding edition. Adams C-1147; Baudrier 9.254; *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlv; NUC.BL; BNF; (CtY; NNC; Cst.). See CTC 7.263.

(*) 1562. Venetiis (Venice): [Aldine Press]. Contents as in the edition of 1558. Adams C-1150; *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlv; NUC.BL; BNF; (MH; OCU; DFo). See CTC 7.263.

1582. See above, Composite Editions.

1604. See above, Composite Editions.

1608. See above, Composite Editions.

1659. See above, Composite Editions.

1680. See above, Composite Editions.

1871-73, Lipsiae (Leipzig): in aedibus B.G. Teubneri. *Scripta selecta* of Muretus, ed. J. Frey, 2 vols.; vol. 1 contains the Dedicatory letter (pp. 217-20, "Praefatio VI"). NUC.BL; BNF; (DLC; MH).

1887-88, Lipsiae (Leipzig): in aedibus B.G. Teubneri. This is a reissue of the preceding edition. NUC.BL; BNF; (DLC; MH).

Biography:

See CTC 1.105 (Alexander Aphrodisiensis) and 7.264 (Catullus). The following account contains further information.

Marcus Antonius Muretus (Marc-Antoine Muret) was born to a family of landed proprietors at the village of Muret in Limousin on 26 April 1526. He died at Rome in June 1585 and was buried in the church of SS. Trinità de' Monti.

His father, who was not a rich man, followed the legal profession as a jurisconsult, and both by precept and by example incited his son to study, especially in the field of law. Muret possessed verbal fluency and had a natural bent for oratory, as well as for philosophy, and would have done well as an advocate, had he been capable of diligent application; but in his youth he was wayward and hard to discipline, and though his father enrolled him in legal courses at Poitiers he went there only to please his parents and attended scarcely at all. He found legal science to be both dry and intimidating. Indeed, he said that he could not attach himself to any professor for more than three days.

Muretus' rebellious temperament, however, did not prevent him from reading widely and in effect educating himself. In addition to this, he allowed himself to be guided by the advice of a scholar whom he greatly respected, Julius Caesar Scaliger. About 1545, he was at Auch, lecturing on Cicero and Terence; he also published his tragedy *Julius Caesar* and some (now lost) Eclogues. After a short spell of teaching at Villeneuve-d'Agen he moved to Poitiers, where he combined his work in the classroom with renewed attention to his legal studies. He began to lecture on Plautus, and composed some amorous poems, principally addressed to a certain "Margaris" (Marguerite). He also formed friendships with members of the future Pléiade, by whom he was welcomed as a stylist and fellow-poet, as well as for the warmth of his personality. In 1547 he began to teach at the Collège de Guyenne in Bordeaux. Four years later he moved to Paris, where his reputation for eloquence spread rapidly. There he lectured on Cicero's *De divinatione* and also on the *Nicomachean Ethics*, his first Greek text.

It was at Paris that in 1552 he published his *Juvenilia*, consisting entirely of Latin poems, among which the erotic epigrams were the most powerful and original. (The collection also contained ten elegies, two satires, three epistles, five odes, and the tragedy *Julius Caesar*.) At the same time he produced (in French) his *Commentaire sur les amours de Ronsard*. He stood as a poet very close to Pierre de Ronsard himself, as well as to Jean-Antoine de Baïf, Etienne Jodelle, and Jean Dorat, both in Latin and in French; but his French poems were not collected, and have perished, apart from a few laudatory verses in the works of his friends. His only later collection in Latin, the *Poemata varia* (1575), came out in order to testify to his respectability after he had paid the price for his youthful errors. In 1553 he left Paris for Toulouse in order to pursue further his study of law, partly by teaching the *Institutes* of Justinian. There, in the following year, he was condemned on a charge of sodomy, to which that of Protestantism (of which there is no trace in his life) was gratuitously added. He was, however, warned by one of the city officials, and (aided by a friend) he escaped to Italy, where he was destined to spend the rest of his life.

Muretus became, in effect, an Italian, particularly in his highly classical style of composition in prose, though he still thought of himself as a Frenchman and used what both he and others considered as a French approach and method in his teaching. As a brilliant orator, and one who was widely learned but nevertheless always legitimately to be charged with superficiality, he never achieved what in that period—and perhaps to some extent in later ages too—might be considered as the scholar's supreme distinction, to have at least one particular author's name linked with his as the definitive editor; as we speak, for example, of Lambinus' Horace. In the Venetian republic he found a home for his kind of multifarious erudition, and protection for his customary liberty of speech (at least in his public utterances, since in his personal dealings with those in authority he was cautious, almost to a fault). Freedom of conscience, both for teacher and for student, was indeed a feature of universities under Venetian rule, such as the one at Padua.

Muretus had to submit to an examination when he applied for a chair; on its results the Venetian Senate voted, having regard *inter alia* to

the opinion of the students who had attended the exercise. Since the latter took the form of an oration—which survives, together with Muretus' speech of thanks on being appointed—Muretus' command of rhetoric, and eloquent style, stood him in good stead. Immediately, he became a considerable figure in the literary life of his new Venetian friends. He was at once sought out by the famous printer Aldus Manutius, who suggested to him the project of creating a commentary on several Roman poets. The result (in less than three months, as he says in his dedication, dated 15 October 1554) was Muretus' commentary on Catullus, followed four years later, in 1558, by the even more rapid execution of an edition with commentary that combined Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius—the *tresviri amoris*—together. Haste in production, imposed by Manutius' desire, was not unwelcome to the temperament of Muretus. The dedication to the Propertius, where the qualities of that author are compared to those of Tibullus, is particularly valuable as revealing the acuteness of Muretus' powers in literary criticism, and takes the reader into a far wider domain than had been customary among interpreters of the classics, with their concentration on textual matters, together with factual annotations, often of the narrowest scope.

Essentially, the aim of Muretus' pedagogical method was to keep a fair balance between the claims of oratory and those of philosophy. The former, without the latter, of these arts tended to frivolity and mere display; it needed the solidity that philosophical or (in general) scientific and learned content could bring to it, in order to avoid these vices. Mere science, on the other hand, could be arid and repellent. For this reason, we often find Muretus choosing in alternation philosophical and oratorical works, those of Cicero for example, as the subject matter of the courses he taught; more than this, he used each kind of text to illuminate the other. This was unusual. To take an example: in that period, as formerly, to teach philosophy was to teach Aristotle only, and to do so by the traditional method based on Aristotelian logic. As to literature, Muretus claimed for it a degree of usefulness based on the moral insights it offered, on the social function of oratory in the widest sense, and on the need for its exponents to acquire and to call in aid virtually universal knowledge. The sci-

ences, on the other hand, were limited in themselves, and required both of their practitioners and of their students no more than a narrow and specialized competence. Effectively to lecture on (e.g.) Cicero demanded either a grasp of law (and occasionally of Roman history as well), or familiarity with the techniques of philosophy, or both. Consequently, unlike other professors in that age who felt their teaching to be an unwelcome interruption of their personal research, Muretus was able to treat his lectures themselves as the material of his books.

At Venice, in the four years between his first edition of Catullus (1554) and his second combined text of the three Roman love-poets Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius (1558), Muretus produced a Latin translation of the seventh book of Aristotle's *Topica*, with the commentary by Alexander of Aphrodisias attached; then (in 1555) editions of Horace and Terence, both with his commentaries; also his three important orations *De studio litterarum*. In 1556 there appeared his edition, with notes, of Cicero's *In Catilinam*; in 1557, a commentary on the first book of Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*. In the dedicatory epistles or prefaces to these works, we may find, well summed up, the views of Muretus on literature and scholarship. These expressions of his views had a considerable effect: Muretus, who had arrived in Venice alone, virtually penniless, and carrying no letters of recommendation, now rapidly built up a circle of distinguished friends, among them the French philologist Dionysius Lambinus and the Portuguese scholar Achilles Statius, together with many Italians, among them in particular Bernardo Loredano and Girolamo Ferri. From Ippolito d'Este, Cardinal of Ferrara, he received the most comprehensive and enduring patronage of his entire life.

For a year, Muretus taught at Padua as a "private" professor; that is to say, he did not hold a chair but took pupils into his household and gave them instruction in his own residence. At the same time, Manutius was pressing him to work rapidly on his new Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, and to add to this an edition of Terence. In the same year (1558) he had written a preface to Lambinus' Latin translation of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*. But a much more important work marked the following year, namely, the *Variae lectiones*, dedicated to Cardinal Ippolito d'Este.

Muretus accompanied the cardinal to Rome for the conclave to elect a new pope in succession to Paul IV. To some extent he acted as the cardinal's secretary; for example, he composed a speech complimenting the new Pope Pius IV on his election. From this time onwards, Muretus was recognized as the orator of France at the papal curia.

In 1562 and 1563 he was at Paris, in the company of Ippolito, who was there engaged on an embassy. Muretus had time in Paris to buy books and a manuscript or two, and also for literary activities; he published there his already-prepared edition of Cicero's Philippic orations, and dedicated this work to Adrianus Turnebus as the leading figure in French scholarship. Besides Turnebus, Muretus was welcomed by Jean Dorat (Auratus), at whose house he met Gulielmus Canterus (I.14 below) and other scholars, including Jacques Amyot. In 1563 the cardinal, with Muretus, returned to Rome. Muretus now found cause for anger at the betrayal of trust by his former friend Lambinus, who had published their mutual correspondence, including letters that *inter alia* touched on accusations of immorality on the part of Muretus; to quarrel violently and openly was a course of action that Muretus avoided, but he could never forgive Lambinus.

Later in 1563, at the invitation of Pius IV, Muretus took up residence in Rome and in November began teaching there, with a chair in moral philosophy; it was understood and agreed that he would lecture on the *Nicomachean Ethics*. In thus combining philosophy with rhetoric, Muretus found one more opportunity to advance the scheme of education he had come to endorse. During the next four years, he developed a commentary on the *Ethics*. As part of his course of teaching, he expounded his underlying principles in a series of orations, in praise of philosophy, on the need for philosophy, on self-knowledge, on the soul and its faculties, and on justice. At the same time, he worked steadily on Victorinus and on Plato, but the results of these studies were never published, and perhaps they remained unfinished. He also continued to compose diplomatic speeches.

In 1567 Muretus turned away from moral philosophy and began to lecture on law, a task for which he had been preparing himself for the preceding three years. In the realm of jurisprudence, his methods of instruction had an enor-

mous effect in Italy: under his guidance and that of his fellow-countryman Jacques Cujas (Jacobus Cuiacius), teaching was revitalized by a widening of its human and scientific-historical content, so that the expression "the French method" came to be applied to those methods. (As his biographer Dejob [cited below] remarks on p. 177, Muret's editions were often the product of too-hasty preparation, but never his lectures). In his 1567 inaugural lecture, Muretus showed with eloquence and charm how important literary culture was for the studies of specialists in law and (by implication) in other professional fields.

Muretus, whose reputation for judgment and for tact grew steadily, was now sent on diplomatic and administrative assignments outside Rome, on behalf of both his patron Cardinal Ippolito d'Este and also Pope Pius V. For a short time, partly because his public commitments were beginning to encroach severely on his literary leisure (he had published very little between 1559 and 1568), and because he was dissatisfied at not receiving an increase in salary which he had deserved by a record of devoted and regular teaching unusual (at least in Rome) in that age, at his own request he withdrew from lecturing for a period of several months, at the end of which time (in February 1569) he returned to his law students. He was destined to continue to teach in Rome for another fifteen years. Outside the classroom, he received the status of an honorary citizen of Rome for a laudatory oration on Admiral Marcantonio Colonna's return with his squadron from Lepanto; he also delivered other public speeches. These literary exercises brought him, in 1570, the offer of a chair in the humanities at Padua, which he declined, having stated three years previously that his lifelong ambition had been to teach jurisprudence (the chair was awarded to his pupil Antonio Riccoboni).

On 29 March 1572, Muretus acquired the only academic degree recorded under his name, when the University of Macerata bestowed on him a doctorate of law *in utroque iure* (Canon and Civil Law) as attested in Macerata, Archivio di Stato, Archivio priorale, filza 796, fol. 119v (see Grendler, p. 53 n. 37). Also in 1572, Muretus was offered, and accepted, a chair of eloquence at Rome. He maintained afterwards that his colleagues in jurisprudence had forced him to make the change, out of jealousy, by threatening to re-

sign. In this new role, Muretus was to interpret either Aristotle's *Politics* or some purely literary work. He now declared that he embraced the change because it would take him back to the companions of his youth, namely, Cicero, Horace, and the ancient writers in general. Moreover, it was easier to reform literary than legal education, and he had projects for doing so.

His opening lecture produced a new target for his attacks: no longer the Bartolists, but the "Ciceronians," with their purist attitude to Latin style, and their conviction that style was all that mattered. To show that rhetoric needed the support of something more solid than verbal dexterity, he proposed to comment on a philosophical text from Cicero himself: namely, the second book of the *Tusculan Disputations*. *Copia rerum*, then, was as important as *copia verborum*; and in relation to the latter, he urged eclecticism in vocabulary, as Erasmus had done. This does not mean that Muretus' own style was not a truly classical one, or that he recommended to his students the indiscriminate borrowing of expressions from second-rate authors—except where these were felicitous inventions, in line with classical usage, or where they represented post-classical ideas and institutions.

Towards the end of 1572, Muretus' great patron and intimate friend Ippolito d'Este died. Muretus was not admitted to the same close friendship by the cardinal's nephew and successor, though he continued to receive support (now on equal terms with others, however) from that source. He had an assured income, partly from his patron and partly from his chair, and continued to teach (and to practice) eloquence. But he indulged his own strong inclination towards philosophy; at the end of 1573 he announced lectures on Cicero's *De finibus*, in combination with Plato's *Republic*, partly in order to sustain his belief in the value of courses on Greek authors. In his view, both of these texts set out to examine the nature of goodness, of moral virtue; and, after examining them together, he gave the palm to Plato. This kind of exposition represented a great change from the traditional method of minutely examining a text, and either construing it *ad litteram* or adding a brief, so to say marginal, note on the content. It belonged to the realm of "history of ideas," and contained (as Dejob, p. 265 suggests) the germs of something like comparative literature.

Yet within a year Muretus was sharply reprimanded and restricted, by the ecclesiastical governing body of the university, to lecturing on Cicero alone. He had pointed out, too boldly, that Plato was not in agreement with Aristotle on several important questions; and Plato was suspect in the eyes of the Church, as Aristotle was not. It must, however, be emphasized that the reason why the authorities placed a ban on Muretus in this fashion is to be attributed to their addiction to routine and to a traditional method and syllabus, even more than to the rumor of heresy. Fettered in this way, he turned to the philosophical defense, not of Plato but of Seneca, against one kind of opponent, and simultaneously that of Juvenal (as a representative of Roman literature of the "Silver Age") against another—in the latter instance, the purists who saw no good in authors later than Cicero and Virgil. He did not relinquish the notion of a comparative study: he chose to compare Seneca's *De providentia* with the theology of John Chrysostom. In doing so, he made two points: that he stood by his method, and that he was as widely read in the Christian Fathers as in classical literature.

It was also clear that for Muretus the richness of the Christian concept of Providence (for example) showed by contrast the inadequacy of its pagan forerunner. When we take this exercise in conjunction with the publication, in the same year (1575), of the *Poemata varia*, containing as it did an overwhelming preponderance of religious poems, we are hardly surprised to find Muretus, after a grave illness, deciding to take orders. At the same time, he continued to fulfil the functions of his chair, as well as those of a more occasional sort that fell to him in his role as a public orator. He devoted the year 1576–77 to lecturing on Aristotle's *Rhetoric*; the next year, he began a course on the *Politics*.

At the same time, however, he began to feel, more acutely than before, that public opinion in Italy was becoming indifferent to the humanities, and that it respected only the obvious utility of a legal or a medical training. Consequently, he was greatly tempted when he received a generous offer from the king of Poland, inviting him to teach in that country; and after accepting this, he was on the point of leaving Rome when the authorities (with the personal support of the pope) intervened to keep him. Simultaneously, the stu-

dents in the faculty of law at Padua petitioned the governing body of their university for a professor to interpret the *Pandects* "by the French method," naming Muretus; they also made a direct appeal to him, in the same sense. (That Muretus had kept up his research, if not teaching, in this field is proved by the publication in 1580 of his *De origine et progressu iuris romani*). When this offer was brought to the attention of Gregory XIII, the pope merely suggested that the students should come to Rome and enrol in Muretus' classes, adding that they could expect a welcome, and financial assistance.

These various invitations were turned down by Muretus, who continued to teach in Rome. He was nevertheless urged to give up his unfinished commentary on the *Politics*, on the grounds that it was too hard a text for students, and that he should turn instead to interpreting Sallust. For the moment he accepted this; however, in the year 1580–81 he insisted, successfully but after a long struggle, in obtaining permission to lecture on Tacitus instead. In gaining his object, he had to defend at great length the literary merit of the historian, whose unpopularity rested partly on the corruptions of his period and partly on his "un-Ciceronian" style.

In the year 1582, Muretus began to focus his attention on Cicero's letters as matter for comment. They were, as he claimed, historical and also human documents, couched in a kind of language which, if imitated, would prove serviceable to young literate persons in their daily business—in particular, opening to them the confidence of those at the head of affairs. In the following year he resumed (no one can say why) the interpretation of Aristotle's *Ethics*.

Shortly after this, however, he began to think of retiring from teaching, which had occupied him for thirty-five years (twenty years were usually considered sufficient length of service). His health was failing; he was overweight, had lost all his upper teeth, and suffered from gout. Growing disorderliness and idleness on the part of the student body vexed him greatly. As the most eminent defender and practitioner of the humanities in Italy at that time, he found very irksome the steadily increasing disrepute into which those humanities were falling through no fault of his own. For these reasons, he petitioned for retirement; this was granted in 1584, under a financial

settlement that included the retention of his ecclesiastical benefices.

Offered a chair at Bologna, he declined. He may have secretly hoped to become a cardinal; but this was not to be. As a foreigner, perhaps, in an age characterized by growing clerical as well as civic patriotism, he was not even admitted to membership in the *accademie* of the learned at Rome. He consoled himself by writing. The Latin translation of book 2 of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* appeared in 1585, the year in which he died; the translation of book 1, first issued eight years before this, was also revised. Four more books of the *Variae lectiones* (destined to be published after his death) were written at this time; also a commentary on all of Seneca's philosophical works, though this was never completed. Muretus in this same year (1585) composed and delivered several public orations, one of which incorporated some very frank advice to the cardinals who were about to elect a successor to Gregory XIII.

Works:

Muretus wrote for the benefit of those who attended his classes; sometimes even his published notes, as we have them, are punctuated with remarks to the effect that the discussion has gone far enough for today and will be continued tomorrow. It has been well said of him that he served his contemporaries better than he served posterity. Numerous reprintings of his editions, with commentaries, of Horace (Venice, 1555), for example, and Terence (Venice, 1555), occurred during his lifetime and testify to his popularity as a teacher as well as to their great utility. Yet, apart from a second edition of his Terence (1588), the only philological work of his to be reprinted after his death, until collected editions of his works began to be produced in relatively modern times, was his master opus, the *Variae lectiones*. This work, first published in Venice in 1559 when its author was twenty-five years old, originally consisted of eight books, later (in 1580) expanded to fifteen, and later again (posthumously, in 1600) to nineteen. It is immensely readable: conservative in textual matters, it shows at every turn the width of his erudition, both in Greek and Latin literature and in the history and institutions of the ancient world. Much of the commentary here, on a variety of texts, is devoted to comparisons with other authors, of a literary kind.

For a number of years after completing the first version of the *Variae lectiones*, Muretus devoted himself to his classes, and to writing speeches, many of which had considerable diplomatic importance (as noted above, he was the official orator of France at the Vatican); between 1559 and 1568, he published only a classroom edition of Cicero's *Philippics* (Paris, 1562), in which the commentary on the last twelve of the fourteen books occupies barely twenty pages, and the Latin translation of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (Paris, 1567), which he characteristically dedicated to the auditors of a course he taught in 1565. (A commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics* was published posthumously.) The unease he created in the ecclesiastical authorities by introducing philosophical considerations into his lectures on Plato and Seneca, instead of sticking to the text and its literal interpretation, may have occasioned the second lengthy lacuna in his publishing record. During twenty-three years he actually published nothing more (again, in the way of philology) than notes on two books of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (1577); a full commentary did not appear until after his death, together with some supplementary notes for the reissue of Cicero's *In Catilinam* (1581; first edition Venice, 1557) and an edition of the second book of Tacitus' *Annals* (Venice, 1581).

His Latin poems came out in two collections: the *Juvenilia* (Paris, 1552), consisting of amorous verse, and the *Poemata varia*, mostly on saints, or festivals of the Church, but with a few love-poems, probably composed much earlier (Paris, 1576). The orations and letters, for which Muretus had foreseen publication in due course, were edited and issued posthumously, together with the hymns, in 1592; his work on education, the *Institutio puerilis*, had appeared during his lifetime, in 1578. In the field of jurisprudence, the *De origine et progressu iuris romani* was published in 1580.

After Muretus' death in 1585, several further works were published at Ingolstadt in 1602-4 by the efforts of his former pupil Francesco Benci and others; these included his notes on Seneca, his commentary on Aristotle's *Ethics*, a second volume of his collected speeches, the *Observationes iuris*, and commentaries on the first two books of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and various works of Cicero (*De officiis*, *Pro rege Deiotaro*, and the first book of the *Tusculan Disputations*).

Biography:

See CTC 1.105 (Alexander Aphrodisiensis) and 7.264 (Catullus).

Bibliography:

Add: H. Chamard, "Muret, (Marc-Antoine)," in *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises: le seizième siècle*, ed. A. Pauphilet, L. Pichard, and R. Barroux (Paris, 1951), 531–33; R. Trinquet, "Recherches chronologiques sur la jeunesse de Marc-Antoine Muret," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 27 (1965) 272–85; P. Renzi, "Magna populi calamitas est uxorius princeps: educazione marziale e insegnamento della storia nel Cinquecento," in *Profili di donne: mito immagine realtà fra medioevo ed età contemporanea*, ed. B. Vetere and P. Renzi (Galatina, 1986), 262–64; J. H. Gaisser, *Catullus and His Renaissance Readers* (Oxford, 1993), chapter 4 ("Commentarius: Marc-Antoine de Muret, Achilles Statius and Joseph Scaliger"), 146–92, especially 146–55 and 167–68; V. Leroux, ed. and trans., *Marc-Antoine Muret. Iuuenilia*, Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance 450 (Geneva, 2008).

For the relations of Muretus with contemporary French poets, see the short bibliographical notes in Gaisser, *ibid.*, 355 n. 1 and 357 n. 16. For Muret's degree, see P. F. Grendler, "How to Get a Degree in Fifteen Days: Erasmus' Doctorate of Theology from the University of Turin," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 18 (1998) 40–69, especially 53 n. 37.

14. Gulielmus Canterus

In 1569 the Plantin press at Antwerp published an edition of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and the reputed fragments of Gallus with commentaries on all these authors (the Plantin edition of 1560 had given the text only). It had been anticipated that the commentary on Catullus would be written by Victor Giselinus, on Tibullus by Theodorus Pulmannus, on Propertius by Gulielmus Canterus, and on Gallus by Pulmannus. But the edition was mistakenly printed without the commentaries (CTC 7.280), and only very scanty marginal notes were added to the text. A single pagination covers the portions of the book relating to Catullus, Tibullus, and Gallus, but the Propertius section has a separate title page and separate pagination. This suggests that the inclusion, or perhaps the authorship, of the Propertian commentary was not settled at the outset of publication.

Giselinus had hoped to contribute a commentary on Propertius, but his plans in this respect were thwarted by the publisher, perhaps through haste but perhaps also to some extent through animosity; he quarrelled with Janus Dousa the Elder (I.16 below) and also with Dionysius Lambinus because of Giselinus' close connection with Obertus Gifanius. Even so, he shared some friendships with Dousa, including that of Johannes Auratus (Jean Dorat), whose poetry he brought to Dousa's attention, thus earning the latter's gratitude. Giselinus' marginal notes in the 1569 edition comprehend variant readings, with Canterus' judgments on the merits of these, together with suggested new readings, and explanatory notes, most of which are brief but very much to the point. The notes include comparative references to other poems by Propertius, or to other classical authors, both Greek and Latin, as well as to such well-known editions as those of Marcus Antonius Muretus (I.13 above) published at Venice in 1558 and Joseph Justus Scaliger (I.15 below) published at Paris in 1577. They also touch on grammatical points, sometimes adding the appropriate Greek technical terms. Finally, these annotations occasionally refer, for a fuller discussion, to Canterus' own *Novarum lectionum liber*.

According to the compilers of the *variorum* editions that followed, Canterus' notes were of high enough quality and sufficient general usefulness to justify their inclusion among the famous commentaries of previous generations, such as those by Muretus and Scaliger. Indeed, a scholar so late as Frédéric Plessis (*Études critiques sur Properce et ses élégies* [Paris, 1884], 53) considered Canterus' commentary to be one of the best among those that followed Muretus.

In his preface, Canterus claims for Propertius a position of eminence among Roman elegiac poets comparable to that of Virgil in epic, and further asserts that the traditional view of him (initiated by the poet himself) as "the Roman Callimachus" is fully justified. But he concedes that Propertius is a "difficult" poet, because of his elaborate style and close-packed learning; this is the reason why Canterus' friends have urged him to explain some lines in the elegies. Canterus is also aware that some people may think Propertius "not fit for Christian ears." However, he defends Propertius from this charge, saying that

apart from just a few poems the works should pass all but the most severe censors, since the liberties he takes do not exceed what is usual among poets. Indeed, some recent poets by their obscenity make Propertius appear quite innocent. As an example of this, he refers to "a certain Casalis," an ecclesiastical dignitary who was guilty of writing shameless verses some time earlier (*superioribus annis*). The identity of "Casalis" is uncertain, but it may be claimed with a reasonable degree of probability that Canterus has in mind Johannes Casa (Giovanni della Casa, 1503–56), whose Latin poems were published posthumously at Florence in 1564 (see J. B. Van Sickle, ed. and trans., *Giovanni della Casa's Poem Book. Ioannis Casae Carminum Liber* Florence 1564, Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies 194 [Tempe, 1999]). This ambitious prelate—though he never succeeded in reaching the cardinalate he hoped for—had a taste for, and also wrote, profoundly obscene verses (he desired his writings to be destroyed). In a prose treatise on manners entitled *Galateo*, characterized by a great deal of irony, he tapped the vein, and imitated the style, of Boccaccio.

Canterus concludes his preface by accounting for the relative brevity of his commentary, saying that he did not wish either to repeat himself or to expound on what everybody already knew.

Publisher's address to the reader (ed. of Antwerp, 1569). Ch(ristophorus) Plantinus lectori. (fol. A2v) En tibi, candide lector, Catullum et Tibullum doctissimorum virorum lectionibus a Victore Giselino et Theodoro Pulmanno Craneburgio studiose et diligenter collectis emendatos. Quibus suo iure accessit Propertius Gulielmi Canteri Scholiis ita illustratus, nihil ut amplius ad optimum poetam recte intelligendum desiderari posse videatur. Vale, et frue.

Preface to Propertius. In Propertium praefatio Guliel(mi) Canteri. (p. 2, separately paginated). Quem inter poetas locum Sex. Propertius et veterum et nostri temporis hominum iudicio obtineat, non est cur pluribus doceam. Atque de hoc ut constat, ita iudicii huius causa aeque est aperta. Ut enim Virgilio carminis heroici, sic huic elegiae principatum nemo non aut tribuit, aut tribuere saltem debet. Etenim sive insignem et perfectam a poeta doctrinam, sive versus omnis venustatis plenissimos, sive dictionem purissimam ac tersissimam requiras, unus tibi de omni-

bus abunde satisfaciet Propertius. Itaque non levi de causa quo numero apud Graecos esset Callimachus, eo hic apud nostros et habitus fuit et haberi ipse voluit. Quocirca qui Tibullum cum hoc, aut Ovidium contendere voluerit, non leviter, arbitror, operam luserit. Nam Catullus quidem in aliis excellere videtur. Veruntamen quod in Virgilio fere evenit, ut quemadmodum praestantissimus in suo genere poeta censetur, ita difficillimus pariter habeatur: idem in Propertio locum habuit, quem singularis eruditio et accurata scriptio Graecorumque imitandorum studium diligens valde obscurum reddunt. Quo factum est ut nuper amici aliquot mei, quibus et poetae (p. 3) huius lectio perplacebat, et in eo versando non parum temporis nos posuisse videbamur, versus aliquot non ita facilius breves quasdam explicationes a nobis petierint atque, ut sumus harum rerum studiosi, non difficulter impetrarint. Etenim sic existimabam, quicquid in hoc scriptore poneretur operae, id linguae ipsi Latinae totique arti poeticae imputatum iri: cum praesertim hic ut esset optimus poeta, ita minimum fere lucis esset ab interpretibus consecutus. Unum tamen quiddam non raro cursum in hoc opusculo nostrum non leviter est remoratum, quod videbam hunc hominem familiari poetis more nihil in carminibus suis, trium quidem librorum, serii vel gravis, sed omnia ludicra, quaedam etiam turpia prorsus atque impia proponere. Itaque fore metuebam, ne permultis hic labor non tam gratus quam ingens fuit, videretur, qui praesertim totum hoc scriptorum genus procul a Christianis auribus et oculis removendum putant. Veruntamen si duas vel tres elegias excipias, reliqua crediderim a non nimis rigidis censoribus admitti in hoc poeta posse, tanquam quae communem poetarum omnium stylum non excedant: et quod in aliis non gravatim feratur, id in poeta principe multo sit ferendum levius. Alioqui si quis veteres illos Italiae poetas cum nostris Clonibus conferat, impios cum sanctis, execrandos cum adorandis, illos profecto castos et pudicos, hos tur(p. 4)pes et impudicos facile iudicabit. Ut enim de vulgo taceam, quis ferat quod superioribus annis accidit, Casalem quendam, summum prope dignitatis in hierarchia gradum obtinentem, carminibus turpissimis infanda flagitia sua publice praedicare? En egregium familiae divinae columnen: cui turpitudine satis per se magna non ducitur, nisi ad eam impudentissima accedat glo-

riatio. Quod cum a praefectis fiat, quis miretur a proletariis Philaenidis libellos [cf. *Priap.* 63.17] manibus versari, quaeque Lucianus ipse, cum ad eam rem deventum est, prae pudore subticet, ab istis omni fronte perfricta modis omnibus cognosci? Quo circa non immerito Propertius noster cum his collatus, satis probus et innocens videri poterit. Non speramus igitur fore quibus labor hic noster valde ingratus habeatur. Nam quod breves fuimus, id ex instituti nostri ratione fecimus, cum nec idem saepius inculcare nec quae nota cuivis essent temere proponere vellemus. Quantum quidem hac brevitate ad intelligendum optimum poetam contulerimus, aliorum facio iudicium. Denique si non omnia quae requiri poterant a nobis praestita sunt, plura saltem quam a quoquam hactenus, quaeque aliis ad praestantiora calcar addant, allata fuerint.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (p. 5) *Cupidinibus* (I.1.2). *Amoribus. Nullo vivere consilio* (I.1.6). Sic libro 2 ait: Is primum vidit sine sensu vivere amantes [II.12.3]. *Iasidos* (I.1.10). *Atalantae*. . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p.138) *Mutarit ianua lectum* (IV.11.85). *Ominis causa*; vide *Novarum lectionum librum 3* [*Novarum lectionum libri septem* (Basel, 1506)]. . . *Honoratis ossa vehantur aquis* (IV.11.102). Sic supra: Nam gemina est sedes turpem sortita per amnem [IV.7.55].

Editions:

(micro.) 1569, Antverpiae (Antwerp): ex officina Christophori Plantini. With the texts of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and the fragments of "Gallus," and commentaries on Catullus of Victor Giselinus, on Tibullus of Theodorus Pulmannus, on "Gallus" of Pulmannus, and on Propertius of Gulielmus Canterus. NUC.BNF; Oxford, Bodleian Library; (IU; Dfo).

(*) 1573, Lugduni (Lyons): Gryphius. Contents as in the preceding entry. NUC.BL; BNF; Adams C-1153; *Ed. Bipont.*, xlvii; (MiU; NNC; Cst).

Biography:

Gulielmus Canterus (Willem Canter) (1542–75) was born at Utrecht in 1542 and died at Louvain in 1575.

His nickname "Callistratus" (see Martial, *Epig.* 12.80 "Ne laudet dignos, laudat Callistratus omnes" ["Callistratus lavished praise indiscriminately on everyone"]) was given to him by Janus Dousa the Elder and Victor Giselinus. His teachers included Cornelius Valerius (at Louvain) and

Joannes Auratus (in Paris). He met Dousa apparently at Louvain, where he composed a long poem for Dousa's *album amicorum*. A highly successful philologist and literary critic, as well as a productive translator, and author of original Latin poetry, he was in touch with many distinguished contemporary scholars in France and The Netherlands, among them Joseph Justus Scaliger, Lucas Fruterius, Obertus Gifanius, and the publisher Christophe Plantin (Canterus had a share in Plantin's Polyglot Bible).

Works:

Novarum lectionum libri quatuor (Basel, 1564); *Novarum lectionum libri septem, editio secunda, tribus libris aucta* (Basel, 1566); *Novarum lectionum libri octo, editio tertia, recens aucta* . . . <et> *eiusdem Canteri De ratione emendandi graecos auctores syntagma, recens item auctum* (Antwerp, 1571). (F.W.Hall, *A Companion to Classical Texts* [Oxford, 1913; rpt. Hildesheim 1968], 157 attributes a previous edition of the last-named work to the year 1566, but does not give its place of publication; it has not been possible to trace a surviving copy of this earlier edition).

Canterus also published numerous editions of other Latin and Greek authors. These include: Cicero (*Epistulae ad familiares*, *De senectute*, *De amicitia*, *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, *Somnium Scipionis*); Ovid (selections from the *Metamorphoses*); certain Greek orators (notably Gorgias, Dinarchus, and Aelius Aristides); Euripides; Sophocles; Aeschylus; Aristophanes; Diogenes Laertius (with a Latin translation); Stobaeus; and Synesius. He composed a number of translations, including a Latin version, with notes, of the *Alexandra* of Lycophron. The fragments of Pythagoras were added to his edition of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (Basel, 1566). In the same year, also at Basel, he published an edition of Ausonius' *Epitaphia heroum qui bello Troiano interfuerunt*, to which was attached his text of the ps.-Aristotelian *Peplus*. For a comprehensive list of these editions, see A. Gerlo and H. D. L. Vervliet, *Bibliographie de l'Humanisme des anciens Pays-Bas* (Brussels, 1972), 267, no. 3374 and the references given there.

His *Specimen adagiorum* was added to Erasmus' *Adagia* (Paris, 1571). Canterus' Latin poems are included in the *Delitiae centum poetarum belgicorum* (Frankfurt, 1614).

15. Joseph Justus Scaliger

As Marcus Antonius Muretus (I.13 above) had moved in a new direction, neglecting study of his poet's text for interpretation in a wider, more "literary," sense, so Scaliger in turn reacted against this kind of approach by refocussing attention on the text itself and on emendation *ope codicum*. To this end, he searched for manuscripts of Propertius and made a close study of those he considered to offer the "best" text. At least one of his collations survives, in the margins of a copy of the 1569 Antwerp edition (Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, 755 H 23), where the text is collated from London, BL, Egerton 3027 (see I.4 above). In addition, he made history by being the first scholar who systematically transposed the elegiac couplets of the poet's text in order to render it more intelligible to the reader. The text he took for his starting point was derived from the 1529 Paris edition of Simon Colinaeus (Simon de Colines), resting on a mixture of the readings to be found in the first and second Aldine and having, therefore, ultimately the authority of Beroaldus.

Published in 1577, Scaliger's commentary does not proceed line by line, but consists rather of a series of *Castigationes* (selective annotations, where much learning of all kinds is deployed with the end of textual improvement in view). (For further information on the genesis and character of Scaliger's work see CTC 7.267–68; observations concerning his Catullus, made in that article, can be taken as applicable in large measure to his Propertius also.)

The dedication is addressed to Claudius Puteanus (Claude Dupuy), a member of the *Conseil du Roi* and a long-term friend of Scaliger.

Dedication (ed. of Paris, 1577). See CTC 7.268–69.

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: Iosephi Scaligeri Iul. Caes. fili Castigationes in Sex. Aureli Propertii librum primum. (p. 167) *Cynthia prima* (I.1.1). In plerisque Valerii Martialis manuscriptis exemplaribus in Apophoretis inscribitur liber iste Propertii Monobiblos, ut appareat antiquissimam esse inscriptionem illam. . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 252) *Cuius honoratis ossa vehantur aquis* (IV.11.102). Legendum *equis*, ut habet noster codex. Haec confirmant quae superius dixi, nempe matronas honorariis vestibibus, curru et sella curuli efferri, quae filios consulares aut aliis curulibus magis-

tratibus functos relinquerent. Nam equi honorati sunt curules, vel currus praetorius in quo sella curulis. Quare et Praetorium ius dicitur honoratum, et honorarium, et ludi Praetorii, honorarii ludi, et Praetor ipse honorarius magistratus. Ovidius [*Fast.* 1.52]: Verbaque honoratus libera Praetor habet. Ita autem haec ultima distinguenda:

Caussa perorata est. flentes me surgite testes,
dum precium vitae grata rependit humus,
moribus et caelum patuit, sim digna merendo
cuius honoratis ossa vehantur equis.

(IV.11.99–102)

Editions:

1577, Lutetiae (Paris): apud Mamertum Patissonium, in officina Rob. Stephani. With the texts of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius and commentaries of Joseph Justus Scaliger on the three poets. *Index Aurelianus*, 134, 495; Adams C-1154; *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlvii; NUC.BL; BNF; (MH; NcU; PBm; Cst; CaOTU).

1582. See above, Composite Editions.

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

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

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

1608. See above, Composite Editions.

1659. See above, Composite Editions.

1680. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:

See CTC 2.13–14 (Aeschylus).

Bibliography:

See CTC 2.14 (Aeschylus) and 7.271 (Catullus).

16. Janus Dousa Pater

A substantial landowner—he was the "squire" of Noordwijk, a coastal town situated in a north-westerly direction from Leiden—Janus Dousa (Jan van der Does) was constrained by historical circumstances to enact the roles of military commander and statesman as well as that of a man of scholarship and letters. In all of them he was not merely successful but distinguished.

From an early age he exhibited a keen interest in Propertius, as well as several other Roman poets, and held various conversations on that subject at his estate in Noordwijk and elsewhere with scholars of international standing (see J. A. van Dorsten, *Poets, Patrons, and Professors: Sir Philip Sidney, Daniel Rogers, and the Leiden Humanists* [Leiden and London, 1962], 24).

Dousa's notes on Propertius are extant in two collections: first, a set of *Observationes*, as Dousa himself styled them, on Tibullus and Propertius, attached to a letter addressed to Gerard Falkenburg (Gerartus Falkenburgius, 1538?–78) and dated 13 April 1569; secondly, another set recovered and published by Dousa's eldest son, Janus Dousa Filius, who gave them the title *Notae reliquae sive Paralipomena*. It should be remarked that in each case it was a fortunate accident that preserved Dousa's notes for posterity.

The *Observationes*, which arose out of a meeting of scholars and printers in Antwerp, had been intended for inclusion in Canterus' Propertius; but Canterus (I.14 above) repudiated the understanding, and—to Dousa's chagrin—did not even mention Dousa. (It is perhaps not irrelevant that twice in his brief collection of *Observationes* Dousa firmly expresses his dissent from Canterus over a reading). At this point, Dousa seems to have abandoned the idea of publishing these notes in spite of the interest taken in them by at least one correspondent (Victor Giselinus, who lived in Antwerp and had been present at the meeting). Both the 1569 letter and the accompanying notes were evidently lost for twelve or thirteen years, resurfacing only by a happy chance after various adventures, just in time to be added to the *Schediasma succidaneum nuperis ad Tibulum Praecidaneis addendum* (Antwerp, 1582), an essay on the dates of the Roman elegists that constituted, as its title suggests, a kind of supplement to the *Praecidanea pro Albio Tibullo*, Dousa's commentary on Tibullus which had appeared earlier that same year. The *Observationes* were included in various reprintings of the *Schediasma succidaneum* and are cited by Johannes Livineius in his own commentary (I.19 below).

As for the *Notae reliquae*, we owe the survival of these to the filial piety and reverence entertained towards Dousa by his son. The younger Dousa, whose expression of his duty and obligation to his father was very strong, attached to his

own *Coniectanea et notae* (Leiden, 1592: see I.17 below) an introductory letter to Paulus Melissus Franco Germanus Schedius (Paul Schede, 1539–1602), an accomplished Latin poet whose poems appear in the *Delitiae poetarum Germanorum* (Frankfurt, 1612). (Melissus, who spent a considerable portion of his life in Paris, was German by origin). This letter serves as a dedication to Melissus, on behalf of both Dousas, father and son, of the elder Dousa's *Notae reliquae*, which had never seen the light of day until the younger Dousa in 1592 attached them to his own work. Dousa Filius writes as follows: "I thought I should add to my own *Coniectanea* the few notes on Propertius that follow, composed long since by my father; they will give added value to my own work, and attract attention to it. They will also serve to supplement the *Observationes* that ten years ago my father published in the context of a letter to Gerard Falkenburg, together with [i.e., appearing in the same volume as] the *Schediasma* where he makes a fresh and thorough examination of the chronology of the Roman elegiac poets."

Neither the *Observationes* nor the *Notae reliquae* aspire to be regarded as the equivalent of a line-by-line commentary on Propertius as a whole. Both collections deal with detached passages: text, and problems of interpretation, are discussed according to the interest taken in them from time to time by the elder Dousa. Thirty lemmata are treated in the *Observationes* (11, 6, 4, 9 in books I–IV respectively) and ninety-two in the *Notae reliquae* (21, 39, 19, 13 in books I–IV respectively). The approach is commonsensical, and the style inclines to the laconic, as one might expect from a highly practical intelligence such as that of Dousa in his military and civilian roles. In both series of notes, language (including an abundant supply of citations from other poets to illustrate similarities or differences in usage) constitutes a recurrent theme. There is no discernible difference, either of content or of style, between the two collections. A few notes, virtually identical in wording, are common to both (with some increase in the number of illustrative citations in the *Notae reliquae*; see, e.g., the notes on *Eleg.* I.1.26, II.7.11, and IV.3.9).

The date, or dates, of composition of the *Notae reliquae* cannot be determined as exactly as that of the *Observationes*. They cannot be later than 1577, since in that event Scaliger's Proper-

tius, which attracted a great deal of attention, would certainly have been mentioned; and Heesakkers (60 n. 41) has shown that they are unlikely to be later than 1575. It should be borne in mind that Dousa shouldered heavy public responsibilities in the years 1573–74 (see *Biography* below). For these reasons, and because a reading by Justus Lipsius is quoted at one place, on Propertius III.12.39 (Lipsius was in 1571 believed to be contemplating an edition of Propertius, but it came to nothing), an approximate date of 1571 for the *Notae reliquae* seems at least plausible.

a. Observationes (1569)

The complete title of the volume in which the *observationes* first appeared is: *Iani Dousae Nordovicis Schediasma Succidaneum nuperis ad Tibullum PRAECIDANEIS addendum. Eiusdem ad familiarem quandam GERARDI FALKENBURGII Epistolam responsio, ab adolescentulo iam olim commentata et scripta: ac nunc recens primulum Tibulli et Propertii caussa maxime, quorum enarrationes partim, partim correctiunculas continet, typis aliquando divulgata. GERARDI FALKENBURGII Epigrammata quaedam Graeca.*

Letter of Janus Dousa to Paulus Melissus (ed. of Antwerp, 1582). Ianus Dousa Nordovix Paulo Melisso Franco Comiti Palat. et Eq. Caes. C. Ro. s. p. d. [*Inc.*]: (p. 3) Insignitae ac rarae in Falkenburgio nostro animi dotes fuere, magnum honestissimarum artium studium, industriae indoles haud vulgaris cum pari integritate coniuncta. Iam sermo, convictus, mores, omnia ad venustatem facta oppido. “Sed haec modo (heu) fuere: nunc recondita/silent quiete” [Cat. 4.25–26]. Verum ut vel hinc esse Nasonianum illud convincamur scilicet: “Optima prima fere manibus rapiuntur avaris;/implentur numeris deteriora suis” [Ov., *Am.* 2.639–40]. Et quisquam leges audet mihi dicere flendi, qui quidem Falkenburgium visum (p. 4) unquam cognitumque habuerit sibi? Non tu scio, mi Melisse. Etsi iure id quidem. Non enim amoris pertinacia te vinco; erga Falkenburgium utique, cui et tu interiore adeo familiaritatis nexu obstrictus, et diuturnioribus quotidianae vitae delinimentis tantum non agglutinator fuisse videri potes. Itaque nihil etiam addubito, quin contubernali tuo, ne dicam fratri, lessum prope feceris lamentando, atque istam animi tui aegritudinem naturali potius, quam poetico pipulo exoneraveris iam olim. . . . Quo (p. 7) qui-

dem tempore (annis puta abhinc duodecim) nescio quae subsecivae operae in Tibullum ac Propertium hariolationes, sic quasi sub manu natae, quodamque iuvenili impetu potius, quam morosa cogitatione expressae desubito nobis paene abortientibus exciderant. Dederam hoc Becani auctoritati, dederam ipsi in primis Falkenburgio; cui diutius id ipsum debere non poteram, exactione praesertim aequissima et quidem per scriptas literas efflagitatus. . . . / . . . (p. 8) . . . Ipsam farraginem illam, quam dico, Falkenburgius noster iam olim cum amicis communibus, Becano puta, Giselino, aliis communicatam etiam Pulmanno insuper suoapte eam arbitratu pertractandi fecerat copiam. (p. 9) Qui iterata lectione non contentus racemationes hasce nostras per fidem (ut dixi) aliquantisper mutuatus primulum, mox manu ipse sua accuratissime transcriptas sibi porro ac familiaribus excepit. Quod melius caderet, nihil vidi. Etenim idem Pulmannus hic noster anno superiore (quoniam quidem operam nos haud infestivam Tibullo dare de Plantino didicerat, imo inibi iam esse, ut in eum poetam opus aliquod Praecidaneum appareret) opera quoque hic sua parvus esse, vel tam bellae occasione deesse noluit quo minus apographum istud “Per varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum” [Virg., *Aen.* 1.204] in haec tempora servatum Lipsio nostro ad nos rediverenti (ut Andverpiae [*sic*] forte in eumpse inciderat) promptus utique ac lubens ultro oblatum traderet, de manu (quod aiunt) in manum, ad Dousam perferendum Lugdunum usque, hoc est, auctori suo restituendum in tempore. Ita quod et suoapte merito, et (p. 10) ipsius adeo scriptoris incuria (certo, haud arbitrario dico) in perpetuum perierat, exscriptoris industria et benignitate postliminio receptum denique ac recuperatum. . . . / . . . (p. 13) . . . De quo (ne epistolae modum excedam) impraesentiarum aliud praefaturus non sum, quam (p. 14) proletarium illud nostrum, cuius abs te sententiam mutuati scilicet:

Da veniam subitis: et, dum legis ista, memento
me dare non librum, sed Schediasma tibi.

Vale, et fac rogo mutuum Melisse,
mel et mellinae meae Melisse.

Vale, quicquid amas (ocelle) Dousam.

Letter of Gerard Falkenburg to Janus Dousa (ed. of Antwerp, 1582). Gerartus Falkenburg-

gius Noviomagus Iano Dousae Nordovici s. d. [*Inc.*]: (p. 43) Serius, eruditissime Dousa, Nonni Dionysiaca, quae tibi hinc discedenti promisi, ad te mitto . . . / . . . (p. 45) . . . habere rursum quod agant, vel, si mavis, rodant. Iterum vale. Raptim Antverpiae. IV Kal. April. M.D.LXIX.

Letter of Janus Dousa to Gerard Falkenburg (ed. of Antwerp, 1582). Iani Dousae ad superiorem Falkenburgii epistolam responsio, in qua suspecta aliquot Tibulli, plura Propertii loca partim tentata; partim, quae septuosiora videbantur, aut illustrata aut explicita; nonnulla etiam vitii manifesta in melius (uti spero) nunc primum correctae ac restituta. [*Inc.*]: (p. 47) Nae tu homo es quantum vivit hominum impetrabilissimus. . . . / . . . (p. 51) Reliquum est, ut ad meas in Tibullum et Propertium observationes me conferam, quae tametsi nauci non sunt, et, ut paucis dicam, vino tantum inscribi dignae, tamen quum tibi morem non gerere maxima sane religio sit mihi, committere nolui, ut coniecturas meas potius, quam coniectorem ipsum desiderares. Ut ergo Tibullum primo si quasi saltuatim expediamus, scias velim in poeta eo pauca admodum eaque non nimium laboriose a nobis animadversa esse. . . . / . . . (p. 61) Et haec in Tibullum pro tempore inquisisse sufficiat nobis, quorum nonnulla etiam Victori nostro [*sc.* Gisellino], quum hic apud nos esset, praelegisse commemini.

Nunc reliquum quod restat, volo persolvere, de Propertio loquor, in quo gaudeo mihi a Gul(ielmo) Cantero relictum esse, quod eius quondam poetae studiosis atque in primis tibi, qui id ipsum sedulo a me iure prius tuo exigere visus, lubenter hercule ac merito imputare gratificarique possim. Nam omnibus amicis (ut ille ait) quod (p. 62) mihi est, cupio esse idem (Plaut., *Trin.* 54). Proinde in rem praesentem aliquando ut veniamus, sciendum est in eo poeta plaeraque fere eiusmodi esse, ut aliud in recessu habeant, aliud vero primore fronte ostendant.

(*Commentary*) [*Inc.*]: Quale est illud elegiae I *Et labor in magicis sacra piare focis* [Propertius I.1.20]. Etenim τὸ *sacra*, umbras et Manes defunctorum interpretor, quos, ut religiose Flaccus praedicat, "Libitina sacravit" (Hor., *Ep.* 2.1.49). Pro quo tamen meum non esset, ut temere sponderem, nisi Propertius in principio libri III, Genium Philetiae invocans sibi, huius verba sui sensum ipse nobis aperuisset his verbis: "Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philetiae" [Propertius

III.1.1]. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 72) Unum adhuc locum, "ne me Crispini scrinia lippi/compilasse putes" (Hor., *Sat.* 1.1.120–21), appingam modo. Is est elegiae XI, ubi Propertio inter alias leges quas teneat, etiam hanc dicit Cynthia: *Colla cave inflectas ad summum obliqua theatrum* [Propertius IV.8.77]. Unde paret romanas olim mulieres e summa cavea ludos spectare solitas. Ad quas si quis virilis notae in inferiore theatri parte, atque interior collocatus oculos adiectaret, necessario illi caput obliquandum ac cervice retroflexa respectandum erat. Hoc ergo est, quod Cynthia Propertium facere vetat, ob zelotypiam, qua illa laborabat, vel certe laborare, perbelle nimium apud credulas (p. 73) aures assimilabat sese. Quo magis etiam amatorem delinitum in casses porro pertraheret suos. Quod vitium in Corinna item sua ab Ovidio curiose notatum, ubi ait: "Sive ego marmorei respexi summa theatri,/elegis e multis, unde dolere velis" (*Am.* 2.7.3–4). Unam nempe e multis aliquam, quae in summa cavea (ut dixi) spectabant, quum ipse interior, utpote eques, pro dignitate in quatuordecim, hoc est, non nisi in equestribus sederet. Qui locus mirifice cum hocce Propertiano conspirat, adeoque uniter consentit.

Habes tumultuariae opellae symbolam, Falkenburgii doctissime, eorum quae de Tibullo et Propertio mihi hoc tempore in mentem venire potuerunt: cuius te lubenter hercule, ac merito participem esse volui. Quam si tu gratam habueris tibi, accendes, quare magis in posterum plura eiusdem generis tecum liberaliter capiar communicare. Sin autem, nihilo minus ego hoc faciam tamen, ut sit, quod, ubi usus venerit, iterum vino possis inscribere. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 74) Plantino, Pulmanno, Barlaeo, amicis communibus, et si quem alium istic benevolentem noveris, salutem. Iterum vale. Nordovico. Ipsidibus April. MDLIX.

Editions:

1582, Antverpiae (Antwerp): ex officina Christophori Plantini. NUC. BAV; BL; BNF; (KU; MH).

1604. See above, Composite Editions.

1608. See above, Composite Editions.

1659. See above, Composite Editions. The elder Dousa's *Observationes* are part of a *variorum* commentary.

1680. See above, Composite Editions.

b. Notae reliquae sive Paralipomena (ca. 1571)

Introductory letter of Janus Dousa Filius (ed. of Leiden, 1592). (p. 125) Iani Dousae Nordovicis Patris in Propertium Notae reliquae sive Paralipomena. (p. 126) Viro Clarissimo Paulo Melisso Schedio Franco Ianus Dousa f. s. d. Cum Coniectanea ad Propertium mea absolvissem, lubuit haec pauca notata olim a patre ad eundem poetam adtexere velut corollam, tum ad mercium nostrarum commendationem et illicium praetereuntis spectatoris, tum etiam quasi supplementum earum observationum, quas a se in familiari ad Gerardum Falkenburgium epistola scriptas publicavit ante decennium una cum Schediasmate, in quo de elegiographorum poetarum aetatibus noviter et accurate disseruit. Quam omnem operam cum tibi tum temporis inscripserit, mi Melisse, iure tuo, tanquam aes alienum, exigere ab illo poteris hoc auctarium et velut interusurium tot annorum. Itaque qui nos saepe mellitissima Musarum tuarum mulcedine delectasti, libens accipe in suavissimum poetam has notas, a patre quidem tanquam debitum munus, a me vero velut in solutum, et agnoscendis potius quam explicandis infinitis nominibus quibus tibi obstringor.

Commentary. [Inc.]: (p. 127) *In me tardus amor non ullas cogitat artes* (I.1.17). Forte illas. *Et quamvis duplici correptum ardore iuberent/hac Amor hac Liber* (I.3.13–14). Ovidius [Ars 1.244]: *Et Venus in vinis ignis in igne fuit. . . / . . .* [Expl.]: (p. 141) *Ipsa loquor pro me: si fallo, paena sororum/infelix humeros urgeat urna meos* (IV.11.27–28). Sic Ovidius IX. *Metamorphos.* [Met. 9.373–74]: *Viximus innocuae. si mentior, arida perdam/quas habeo frondes, et caesa securibus urar.*

Editions:

- 1592. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1604. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1608. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1659. See above, Composite Editions.
- 1680. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:

See CTC 3.329–30 (Petronius). Add:

After periods of study at Louvain, at Douai, and in Paris—where he met some of the leading French humanists, including Pierre de Ronsard, Jean-Antoine de Baïf, Florent Chrestien, and Jean Dorat—and a visit to England in 1572, the elder Dousa played a very prominent part in the defense of the fortified city of Leiden (where by this

time he had come to reside) against a besieging force of Spaniards in the years 1573 and 1574. Indeed, in the latter year, he commanded the defending troops.

Afterwards he was instrumental in forming and inaugurating the University of Leiden, which formally opened its doors in February 1575. It was intended that the new university should rival both Louvain and Douai. For the opening ceremony, Dousa wrote Latin mottoes, and created the devices that were inscribed in the triumphal arches erected in honor of the occasion. He had already published a book of Latin poetry, in various classical genres, entitled *Iani Dousae a Noortwyck Epigrammaton libri II, Satyrae II, Elegorum liber I, Silvarum libri II* (Antwerp, 1569). In 1575 came his *Nova poemata*, including a series of Odes in commemoration of the recent liberation of Leiden, with an enlarged second edition in the following year. Scholarly editions and notes began to appear in 1580; they included in 1584 a collection of the surviving literary remains of his brilliant friend Lucas Fruterius, who had died prematurely in March 1566. Other close friends were Victor Giselinus (Victor Gislain, Ghyselincq, 1539–91; see I.14 above), Janus Lernutius (Jan Leernout, 1545–1619), Daniel Rogers (1538?–91), Janus Gruterus (1560–1627), and Justus Lipsius (Joest Lips, 1547–1606).

In 1586, the elder Dousa published *Odae britannicae* to record his visits to Queen Elizabeth I of England as a member of embassies in 1584–85. These Odes are among several indications of his importance in the political sphere.

Works:

See C.L. Heesakkers, *Praecidanea Dousana: Materials for a Biography of Janus Dousa Pater (1545–1604). His Youth* (Amsterdam, 1976), 181–85 for a comprehensive short-title checklist of Dousa's published works. The scholarly editions and commentaries, all of which are dated 1580 or later, include work on Sallust, Horace, Petronius, Plautus (a favorite author), and Lucilius.

Bibliography:

See CTC 3.330 (Petronius) and 7.273 (Catullus).

17. Janus Dousa Filius

In 1592, at the age of twenty, the younger Dousa published at Leiden an edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, the text of which was

based upon Plantin's Antwerp edition of 1569. He included in the edition his own critical and philological commentary (*Coniectaneae et notae*) on each poet and also his father's *Paralipomena* on Propertius (I.16 above). Preceding his commentary on Propertius is a dedicatory letter addressed to Quintus Septimius Florens Christianus (Florent Chrestien, 1542–96). Chrestien was a superb Hellenist, having acquired Greek from Henri Estienne, and he was no less distinguished in Latin. The dedicatory letter mentions (in connection with Tibullus) his close friendship with Jacques-Auguste de Thou. (For further information on Chrestien, see B. Jacobsen, *Florent Chrestien: ein Protestant und Humanist in Frankreich zur Zeit der Religionskriege*, Münchener romanistische Arbeiten 32 [Munich, 1973].)

The younger Dousa's commentary is wide ranging but selective, with an intermittent interest in the text. He divides his *Coniectanea et notae* into chapters; at the head of each chapter is a brief summary of its contents. On the choice of a text, and on the character of the work, see CTC 7.273–74 (Catullus), and also A. Iurilli, "Episodi della fortuna editoriale delle opere di Properzio," in *Atti 1994 (Commentatori e traduttori di Properzio dall'Umanesimo al Lachmann)* (1996), 282.

General Preface (ed. of Leiden, 1592). See CTC 7.274.

Dedicatory letter (ed. of Leiden, 1592). (p. 86) V.C.Q. Septimio Florenti Christiano Ianus Dousa f. s. d. Notas ad Propertium nostras praepropera festinatione nuper et velut sub manu mihi natas mitto ad te, Florens Christiane vir clarissime, velut ἀντίδωρον politissimarum tuarum lucubrationum, quibus et Aristophanis lucernam illustriorem redditam [probably a reference to Q. Septimii Florentis Christiani in Aristophanis *Irenam vel Pacem Commentaria glossemata* (Paris, 1589)], et Sophocleos cothurnos altius elatos [probably *Sophoclis tragoedia Philoctetes in Lemno, stylo ad veteres Tragicos accedente quam proxime fieri potuit a Q. Septimio Florente Christiano* (Paris, 1586)] suspicere et mirari licuit. Caeterum ut in illis dispar conatus ab hoc nostro, ita et felicior successus. Nam ut ipse immensam tui ingenii vim nullis terminis claudi posse satis declarasti, dum in recentandis Graecorum scriptis iis te includis interpretationis angustiis, quae aliorum excluderent audaciam, ita nobis satis est, si non penitus exclusissimi simus ab hoc literario

choro, et vel procul doctiorum vestigia adorantes in tenebrosis scriptorum locis lucem aliquam excudere possimus post tot Lynceos. quod an aliqua ex parte assecutus sim, te inprimis arbitro decidi poterit Christiane. Nam tametsi ad illam scriptorum tuorum elegantiam imitabilem pene nulli, quamvis omnibus imi(p. 87)tandam, aspirare nobis minime detur: tamen humanitas tua, qua hoc pignus tibi consecratum tueri voles, velum aliquod poterit obtendere nostris naevis. Quae secundum eam benivolentiam, quam nobis, qua privatim qua publice exhibuisti, maximum hortamentum et quasi protelum fuit ad haec tibi dedicanda. Accedit huc, quod, cum Tibullo nostro Thuanum velut Tutanum Herculem ac Tutelarem Deum praefecerim, rite mihi adiungi visus es tanto viro, cui tu et amore, et studiorum similitudine, et ea gloriae communione coniunctus es, quae ex poetices cultu efflorescit. Quare ut sacerdotes olim Irim precibus elicere solebant ad odoris commendationem arboribus quaerendam, ita ego ad conciliandam aliquam gratiam huic scripto tui nominis celebritatem; quae et munimentum nobis afferet a benevolentiae tuae scuto, et ab acris censurae tuae lima ornamentum. nam vel unicum suffragii tui punctum, si opellae huic nostrae album calculum adieceris, tutam illam praestiterit ab omnibus malevolorum punctunculis. quod tamen ita demum ambio, si assensionem tuam videbor meruisse, et si ea sint merita aliquorum locorum, ut gratia sua obruere possint caeteras culpas.

Dedicatory poem. (p. 88) Ad eundem:

Quae modo nata mihi proles, se vivere tandem
Et putat auspiciis crescere posse tuis:
Tu modo, quum ex sese lux illi et vita negetur,
Lumine fac Florens floreat usque tuo.

Commentary. Iani Dousae Filii in librum I. Sex. Propertii *Coniectanea et notae*. [*Inc.*]: (p. 89) Caput I. Propertii cuidam loco labecula detorsa, compluribus interpretamenti fax adhibita. Secunda elegia tota pensiculatorum excussa et cum Philostrati locis sparsim collectis aliorumque nonnullis collata. *Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis* (I.1.1). Quod Propertius de semetipso, id de Amore Meleager scribit his verbis. . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 123) *Et si quid doliturus eris, sine testibus illis/cum venient, siccis oscula falle genis* (IV.11.79–80). Nam, ut Martialis ait: Ille dolet vere, qui sine teste dolet [*Epig.* 1.33.4].

Editions:

1592. See above, Composite Editions.

1604. See above, Composite Editions.

1608. See above, Composite Editions.

1659. See above, Composite Editions.

1680. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:

See CTC 3.333–34 (Petronius).

18. Johannes Passeratius

Passeratius' edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, accompanied by his commentaries on all three poets, appeared at Paris in 1608 (i.e., six years after his death). It also contained his edition of the *Pervigilium Veneris* (sometimes attributed to Catullus).

This volume has many merits and must be said to have contributed substantially to the progress of Propertian scholarship. Its text is not particularly distinguished in its origins, being based on the repeated versions published by Simon Colinaeus (Simon de Colines) at Paris (1529, 1533, etc.) of the mixed Aldine tradition, which had now achieved, for all practical purposes, the status of a vulgate text. Passeratius, a conservative editor, showed his conservatism not by defending wrong readings, or faulty interpretations to be found in the work of previous editors, but by upholding the readings of the accepted manuscript tradition whenever these readings were not clearly corrupt (F. Plessis, *Études critiques sur Properce et ses élégies* [Paris, 1884], 60–61). As he himself informs us, he had studied several manuscripts, though he positively identifies only one of them, which he calls the *codex Memmianus* (Plessis, *ibid.*, 61). That this is not the manuscript usually designated the *codex Memmianus*, namely, Paris, BNF, lat. 8233, was pointed out by J. P. Postgate, "On Certain Manuscripts of Propertius, with a Facsimile," *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society* 4.1 (1894) 42–43.

In contrast to the relative mediocrity of his text, the quality of Passeratius' commentary is high. As Scaliger had reacted against Muretus, so Passeratius in his turn reacted against Scaliger; he is too conscientious in annotation to pass over difficulties in silence, as Scaliger in his cavalier manner had often done, nor does he adopt an oracular stance. To this personal modesty was united an impressive amount of both learning

and taste, both of which he usually deployed in the service of explaining the received text. Here, to a degree, he reverted to the attitudes of Muretus. Passeratius commanded a wide acquaintance with classical Latin writings, and he used this knowledge effectively for purposes of illustration. In his annual lectures (*Orationes et praefationes*, published in 1606) Passeratius discoursed on a number of Latin authors but especially on his favorites: Plautus, Cicero, and Propertius.

The work is dedicated to Maximilian of Bethune, Duc de Sully and peer of France, who financed the publication of Passeratius' writings after Passeratius had suffered a disabling stroke in 1597. The Duc de Sully's support was obtained on the initiative of Jean de Rougevalet, Passeratius' nephew and literary executor.

Passeratius' services to Propertian studies are acknowledged in the *prolegomena* to the edition of Johannes Antonius Vulpius (Padua, 1710, 1755), whose unadventurous commentary set the tone more than a century later, and thus Passeratius continued to have influence until the very end of that century.

See CTC 7.275–76 (Catullus) for further information concerning the history and character of Passeratius' work.

Dedication (ed. of Paris, 1608). See CTC 7.276.

Commentary. Praelectiones sollennes Passeratii in Propertium. [*Inc.*]: (p. 135) *Cynthia* (I.1.1)]. Eadem fictione a Cyntho Cynthia Propertij dicta, qua a Delo Delia Tibulli, eodem scilicet nomine cum sorore Phoebe, moribus tamen dissimillimis. . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (p. 712) *Cuius honoratis ossa vehantur equis* (IV.11.102). Scaliger per *honoratos equos* currum praetorium cum sella curruli intelligit. Imo censorium funus. Altera lectio, *Honoratis aquis*, verior; id est, per quas Charon honoratas et honestas matronas defunctas vehit in Elysium. . . . *Honoratos*. Albinovanus ad Liviam: Inter honoratos excipietur avos [*Cons. ad Liviam* 330]. Plaut. Captivis: Quod genus est illic polens et honoratissimum [*Capt.* 278]. Livius lib. 36: Honesta honorataque imago [*A.U.C.* 36.40.9]. Ovidius I. Fast. [1.52]: Verbaque honoratus libera praetor habet. Unde *Ius honorarium*. Vet. gloss.: "τετιμημενός honoratus, honorem adeptus."

Editions:

1608, Parisiis (Paris): apud Cl. Morellum. With the text of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius,

and the *Priapea*, and commentaries by Johannes Passeratius on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius. *Ed. Bipont.* (1783), xlix; NUC. BL; BNF; (MH; PV; CtV; TxU).

1659. See above, Composite Editions.

1680. See above, Composite Editions.

1754–55, Patavii (Padua): excudebat Josephus Cominus. With the text of Propertius edited by Johannes Antonius Vulpius, and commentaries of Johannes Passeratius, Janus Broukhusius, and Vulpius; prolegomena of Vulpius comprising, inter alia, Vulpius' poem to Propertius, his *Vita Propertii*, a list of variant readings from Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, 2740 and San Daniele del Friuli, Biblioteca Civica Guarneriana, Guarner. 56, and various indices of Vulpius. Passeratius' commentary has been shortened and adapted by Vulpius.

Biography:

See CTC 7.276–77.

Works:

See CTC 7.277–78.

Bibliography:

See CTC 7.278.

19. Johannes Livineius

Livineius (Jan Lievens, 1546?–99), a canon at Antwerp cathedral, worked on Propertius after 1577. His notes on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius were published posthumously at Frankfurt in 1621 by Janus Gebhardus (Jan Gebhard, 1592–1632), the year in which Gebhardus' edition of the same three poets also appeared. This edition had been preceded by Gebhardus' own commentary on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius (Frankfurt, 1618).

According to the information provided by Gebhardus in the dedicatory letter below, he had received the Livineius material in 1619 (“ante biennium”) from Andreas Schottus (1552–1629) to use as he pleased, and he claims to have deciphered, at the cost of great labor, nearly all of Livineius' notes. Livineius' ghost, he adds, will surely not blame him for publishing his commentary under the name of an experienced critic of poetry; while as for the dedicatee, he too will not be ashamed to be linked with such eminent persons, among whom his reputation already stands high; while they, for their part, will be pleased at

being associated with him. The dedicatee, Henrik Albertsen Hamilton (ca. 1590–ca. 1630), was a Dane of Scottish descent on his father's side; he had studied at Heidelberg and Giessen and was himself noted for his Latin poems. Some of these are available in the *Deliciae quorundam poetarum Danorum* (six poets in all, ed. F. Rostgaard [Leiden, 1693], vol. 1), including poems to Nicolaus Backendorff, Hamilton's *praeceptor* at home and later a physician at Heidelberg, and to Janus Gruterus, both of whom are mentioned in the dedicatory letter.

As presented in this edition, Livineius' annotations are very brief and written in inelegant Latin. They especially relate to usage, illustrative parallels, and textual problems. When he was in Rome, Livineius collated the witness that is now Groningen, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, 159 (Butrica 1984, 234–35, no. 40), which Karl Lachmann took to be the best extant manuscript of Propertius.

The Frankfurt 1621 edition of Livineius contains a eulogy by Aubertus Miraeus (Aubert le Mire, 1573–1640), the author of numerous historical treatises which, in general, are marred by inaccuracy and carelessness. Miraeus absurdly claims that when Livineius wrote his notes on Propertius he was too young to have read Joseph Justus Scaliger's commentary (Paris, 1577; I.15 above) The fact that Livineius expresses his disapproval of Scaliger's commentary (see below) is enough to prove that Miraeus is wrong here. It should be added that Livineius quotes not only Scaliger's notes but also those of Janus Doussa Pater (from the *Schediasma succidaneum* published at Antwerp in 1582, for which see I.16 above)

Dedicatory letter (ed. of Frankfurt, 1621). Clarissimo praestantissimoque viro Dn. Henrico Albertio Hamiltono s. p. Janus Gebhardus. [*Inc.*]: (fol. A2r) Benigniore fato accidit, praestantissime Hamiltone, ut mihi tecum apud Cl. Gruterum nostrum notitia nata sit, dein maior familiaritas in convictu D. Nicolai Backendorffii medici p.m. adoleverit. [Continues in praise of Hamilton] . . . / . . . [*Expl.*]: (fol. A2v) Quam non sim vanus, iudices nunc velim, cum tibi in longinquis regionibus posito doctissimi Livinei notas in Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium inscriptas adfero. Desperaverant eae proculdubio lucem tanto post auctoris obitum intervallo dispretae ac

derelictui habitae; sed scripti genius, me vindice, tenebras atque oblivionem eluctabitur, praeunte v. cl. et ad litteras iuvandas ornandasque producto Andrea Schotto, qui mihi librum totum Livinei manu conscriptum ante biennium utendum transmiserat, ut inde quae vellem in privatos usus exciperem. Virgula divina contigerunt mihi, ut eriperentur interitu. Nam aliquos fuisset reperire, qui alieno labore in se transmoto, in furtivo schemate basilice ne suam operam ignaris venditatum in famae theatrum irrupissent praestolati optimi Schotti fatum, cum quo omnis notitia scripti huius foret sepulta. Degeneris et abiecti animi sunt talibus inhiantes. Ego contra ingenuitatis meae esse duxi sudore maximo acerrimaque oculorum fatigatione fugientes literas indagare. Inde saepius felici coniectura vestigia veritatis ipsorumque Livinei verborum ordinem erui, paucis exceptis quae neque mea neque accessita acie vel ipsius Lyncei erant deprehendenda. Tanto beneficio obligati doctissimi Livinei manes non indignabuntur mihi, si sub nomine viri literatissimi et poeticis palaestris subactissimi postumas eius observationes emisero. Neque tibi, Hamiltone humanissime, rubori erit copulari cum tantis viris, in quorum ipse flagrantissima gratia es; ideoque et illi minus adessu tuo frontem contrahent. Vive quam optime ac diutissime, Daniaeque tuae illustre sidus exorere. Vale. MDCXXI. Mense Sextili.

Elogium Johannis Livinei. Joannes Livineius. Ex Elogiis Belgicis Auberti Miraei Bruxellensis, Canonici Antwerp. [Miraeus' *Elogia belgica* were published at Antwerp in 1609; in 1624 he became dean of the cathedral of Antwerp and vicar general of the diocese]. [Inc.]: (fol. A3r). Absit ut extremum pietatis munus Joanni Livineio collegae meo non persolvam, cui propter communis vitae societatem arcte sum devinctus. Is Clara Laevini Torrentii sorore natus, ab avunculo Coloniam Agrippinam adolescens missus est ut graecis literis perinde ac latinis imbueretur. Qua in urbe ea rei litterariae iecit fundamenta ut in utriusque linguae, ac praesertim graecae, cognitione paucos seculum nostrum pares tulerit. Aetate maturior Lovanii Michaeli Baio caeterisque theologis operam assidue dedit. Quo tempore honesto Leodici ab avunculo tum Brabantiae archidiano ornatur sacerdotio vertitque de graeco Nysseum Gregorium De virginitate, atque eadem ipsa de re Joannem Chrysostomum, tametsi hunc Ju-

lius Pogianus elegantius tamen quam fidelius, illum vero Petrus Galesinius convertissent. Sed et graecam LXXII interpretum Bibliorum versionem cum libris calamo exaratis, una cum Guil(ielmo) Cantero comparavit, cum Philippi II regis Catholici auspiciis ad Complutensem editionem typis Plantinianis excuderetur. Hinc Romam Vaticanam excutiendae bibliothecae gratia profectus, Guil(ielmo) Sirleto et Ant(onio) Carafae doctissimis cardinalibus eiusdemque bibliothecae ex ordine praefectis ob singularem graecarum literarum peritiam carus inprimis fuit. Multa inde describendo eruit, et veterum monumenta variarum membranarum conferendo bonas horas in urbe collocavit. Theodori quoque Studiae Catecheses CXXXV e Stirleti (*sic*) bibliotheca, quae nunc Ascanii Columnae Cardinalis, primus in lucem attulit latinasque a se factas scholiis illustravit. Creato post Torrentio Antuerpiensium antistite, canonica et cantoria in ea ecclesia dignitate cohonestatur, cuius et oculos ibidem clausit. Apoplectico demum correptus morbo, cum avunculo suo (fol. A3v) annos tres et menses octo supervixisset, iam quinquagenarius vita decessit, dum Panegyristas veteres XII eruditus a se notis illustratos (criticus enim acri in paucis iudicio fuit) Plantiniana officina in lucem proferret. Scripsit et adolescens in treviros (*sic*) poetarum elegorum notas sibi et Musis, cum nondum Joseph Scaliger, audax plus satis in emendando, nec Joannis Passeratii vasti in Propertium ac laboriosi commentarii lucem aspexissent; quas notas postumas accipiet posteritas bonique consulet. Nam emendaturus si licuisset erat, atque si longior vitae venia Dei benignitate (a quo illi ingenium et acre ac paene morosum perfluxit iudicium) obtigisset. Conditus est Antuerpiae in amplissima Deiparae basilica ad avunculi tumulum hoc titulo: D. O. M./JOANNES LIVINEIUS GANDENSIS/LAEVINI TORRENTII ANTVERP. EPISCOPI/EX SORORE N./CANONICUS ET CANTOR HVIVS ECCLES./QUI VT GENERE ET ERVDITIONE/SIC ET TVMVLO PROXIMVS AVVNCVLO/HIC QVIESCIT/A GRAECIS PATRIBVS ILLVSTRANDIS/IN QVA LINGVA VALDE EXCELLVIT/E MEDIO CVRSV ABREPTVS/CHRISTI A. M.D.XCIX. IDIB. JAN.

Commentary. Joannis Livinei Notae in S. Aurelium Propertium. [Inc.]: (p. 45) *Sext. Propertii*. Contuli cum scripto, qui in Vaticano servatur, nec antiquus nec probus; eius nota V.P: Joh.

Postii M.S. quem a Sambuco accepit dono. In P inscriptio legitur talis: PROPERTII NAVTAE MEVAN. VMBRI. *Miserum* (I.1.1). Miser est homo qui amat (Plaut. *Asinar.* [616]). . . . / . . . [Expl.]: (p.178) *Cuius honoratis ossa vehantur aquis* (IV.11.102) Turneb. 23. cap. 7. *Equis* P inepte. Supra Eleg. 7 [VII.7.56]: "turbaque diversa remigat omnis aqua" et quae sequuntur. Similiter apud Martialem I Epigr. 50 [49.4] *aquis* non *equis* legendum. Hoc vult, postquam coelum probitate et bonis moribus quaeratur, aequum esse ad inferos sibi iisdem moribus honoratioris aquas patere. Josephi Scaligeris commentarius non placet. In P ad calcem adscriptum erat: "Cynthia, facundi carmen iuvenile Properti / accepit famam nec minus ipsa dedit" [Mart., *Epig.* 14.189.1–2]. Finis.

Editions:

1621, Francofurti (Frankfurt): in officina Wecheliana, apud Danielem & Davidem Aubrios

& Clementem Schleichium. Janus Gebhardus, ed. Often bound together with Gebhardus' edition of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius (Frankfurt, 1621); and the commentaries of Gebhardus on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius and *Spicilegium* of Janus Meleager on Catullus (Frankfurt, 1618). *Ed. Bipont* (1783), l; NUC. BAV; BL; (MH; NcU; PU).

1659. See above, Composite Editions.

1680. See above, Composite Editions.

Biography:

See CTC 5.179–80 (Gregorius Nyssenensis).

Works:

See CTC 5.180.

Bibliography:

See CTC 5.180. Add: L. Battezzato, "Livineius' unpublished Euripidean marginalia," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 30 (2000) 323–48.