Fortuna

With the exception of one problematic passage in Fronto, to be discussed below, our knowledge of Aulus Gellius’ life comes entirely from his only known work, a learned miscellany in twenty books covering matters of language, literature, history, law, and much else, presented sometimes in straightforward exposition, sometimes in reports of discourses and debates, and full of quotations from earlier authors whose works in many cases have not survived; the entire collection is preceded by a preface and a summary of contents, chapter by chapter. Produced in an age when the authors who wrote before Cicero were preferred to those who wrote after him (Sallust is an exception, and for Gellius, though not for Fronto, Vergil), it is written in a style that, without consistently imitating the pre-classical authors, often exhibits words and phrases taken from them, many of which Gellius himself discusses in other chapters.

The work is called Noctes Atticae, “quoniam longinquus per hiemem noctibus in agro, sicuti dixi, terrae Atticae commentationes hasce ludere ac facere exorsi sumus” (Præfatio 4; “sicuti dixi” refers back to the lost beginning of this preface). That is to say, it was during a stay in Athens that Gellius began the process of converting his miscellaneous notes into literary form, while preserving (so he says) their haphazard order (Præfatio 2: “usi autem sumus ordine rerum fortuito, quem antea in excerpendo feceramus”) and variety of subject matter (Præfatio 3: “Facta igitur est in his quoque commentariis eadem rerum disparilitas quae fuit in illis annotationibus pristinis, quas breviter et indigeste et incondite ex auditionibus lectionibusque variius feceramus”). In fact, however, signs of deliberate ordering and disordering may be observed,¹ a warning that first-person statements are not to be taken at face value; nevertheless, all attempts to deduce the details of Gellius’ life from his work rest on the assumption, which so far has not been disproved, that even when adopting the dialogue form with all the scope for fiction that it entailed, he takes care to respect chronology like Cicero, rather than muddy the waters like Plato.

On this basis Gellius’ birth has been dated to between A.D. 125 and 128;² there are reasons to suppose that his family came from a colony in Africa, but

he was evidently brought up, and may have been born, at Rome. His sojourn in Greece included attendance at the Pythian Games in (probably) summer 147;³ in the early 150s he was placed on the register of judges in private suits, the only official function he is known to have discharged; he published the *Noctes Atticae* at some time between the death of Herodes Atticus in 177 and the burning down of the Temple of Peace in 192. Earlier echoes in Apuleius, notably in the *Apologia* of 158–59, seem due to personal acquaintance followed by literary exchange.

Although Gellius was socially and intellectually acceptable company for such prominent persons as Fronto, Herodes Atticus, the grammarian Sulpicius Apollinaris, and the philosophers Favorinus and Taurus, he is always the guest and never the host; nor is any reference made to him in contemporary authors except that Fronto, apparently in the 160s, begins a low-spirited letter to Ti. Claudius Julianus (consul in 159): “Non agnovi ista mea ab Gellio pessime quaeri; credideris admonuisse se edere” (*Ad amicos* 1.19) before passing on to other woes. While there is no good reason to deny that “Gellio” refers to Aulus Gellius, the precise import of the sentence is unclear; but it appears that Gellius very badly wants (rather than that he is making a nuisance of himself by seeking out) some writings (not necessarily such formal works as speeches or letters) of Fronto’s with a view to publishing them or incorporating them in a work of his own.

After his death, Gellius was forgotten as a man but remembered as a text. Palimpsested fragments, conventionally called A, from a codex of the *Noctes Atticae*, preserved in a seventh-century manuscript Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Palatinus latinus 24 have been redated to the Severan period, within a few decades of the original publication (Cavallo 1996: 68–9; Bibliography I. B). If so, the codex antedated by about a century the first mention of Gellius and his work, in Lactantius’ *Epitome diuinarius institutionum* 24. 5 (a passage not found in the original *Divinae institutiones*): “huius [Chrysippi] sententiam interpretatus est A. Gellius in libris Noctium Atticarum sic dicens”; there follows a long quotation from the first chapter of book 7 that preserves the opening words lost in the manuscript tradition.

Our sole source for Lactantius’ work, a copy made in the seventh century, calls our author not *A. Gellius* but *Agellius*, a false form that became usual in the

the aorist *praestitit* at 19.12.1 result from misunderstanding *Graeca oratione* in that sentence as “in a Greek speech” and not, in accordance with Gellius’ constant usage, “in the Greek language.”

³ Although in principle a subsequent visit or subsequent visits cannot be excluded, the anecdotes related in 2.21, 18.2, and 18.3 all represent Gellius as a student among other students, not a man of mature years. For controversy over the date, see also Holford-Strevens, “Analecta Gelliana,” *Classical Quarterly*, n.s., 43 (1993) 292–97, at 296–97 with literature there cited.
Middle Ages except in his manuscripts and found its defenders in the Renaissance, not being decisively discarded till the seventeenth century. This need not be Lactantius’ own error, since the great fourth-century scholar Aelius Donatus clearly knew the right name, which is preserved with Aulus spelled out both in his pupil Servius’ commentary on Vergil, *Aeneid* 5.738 and in the so-called Deutero-Servius (which largely incorporates matter from Donatus’ original commentary) at *Georgics* 1.260. Furthermore, in the late fourth or early fifth century, the author of the *Historia Augusta* opens his life of the emperor Probus with quotations from Sallust and “Marcus Cato et Gellius historici”; on the face of it he is citing the annalist Cn. Gellius of the second century B.C., but the truth of the matter is that he is citing Cato as quoted in the *Noctes Atticae*, whose author he must therefore know as Gellius.

On the other hand, in the second decade of the fifth century, Augustine, who names Gellius seven times in two passages, *De ciuitate Dei* 9.4 and *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum* 1.30, never omits the initial A, which (contrary to editorial tradition) indicates that he already took the name to be Agellius. Both passages relate to *Noctes Atticae* 19.1, in which a Stoic in a storm at sea shows the external symptoms of fright, but explains that the wise man does not assent to the impressions produced by alarming events; in the first Augustine paraphrases the text, calling Gellius “vir elegantissimi eloquii et multae undecumque scientiae” (the text is a little insecure here), in the second, written some years later, he summarizes it from memory and adds a note to himself or his amanuensis to look it up the text and report it carefully.

Furthermore, in the course of the fourth and fifth centuries Gellius was diligently read and extensively exploited by Nonius Marcellus, Ammianus Marcellinus, and more blatantly than either Macrobius, none of whom names him, though Nonius more than once refers to him as an author of obscure or uncertain authority.\(^4\) One C. Aurelius Romulus wrote an epigram thanking “nobilis Eustochius” for a gift of “Cecropias noctes” (*Anthologia Latina* 904, ed. A. Riese); it is preserved in our manuscripts at the transition from book 9 to book 10, implying that (as in some modern editions) a division between volumes had been made there. But although the work is named, the author is not.

Gellius is cited again by name, always as Agellius, in the sixth century by Priscian; among his citations is one from book 8,\(^5\) which subsequently disappeared without trace except for the recovery of the chapter summaries in the late Middle Ages. Later in the century Gregory of Tours, in the preface to *De vita


patrum, notes that “Agellius quoque” (not “A. quoque Gellius”) had used vita in the plural.⁶ Thereafter, Gellius is lost to view until Carolingian times, unless sightings of him in Virgilius Maro Grammaticus and Aldhelm can be confirmed; these texts come respectively from seventh-century Ireland and England, though in neither country have we any direct evidence for a manuscript of his work.⁷

When he resurfaced in the ninth century, Gellius at once became a subject of interest to the scholars of the age. Servatus Lupus begged Einhard for the loan of the Noctes Atticae among other texts to copy; he evidently received it, for he later reports that before he could return it Hrabanus Maurus, who had in turn borrowed it for the same purpose, snatched it back, claiming that the transcription had not been completed.⁸ Later in the century, between 862 and 875, one “E.” in the region of Laon asked “A.” for Terence, Gellius, or Philo.⁹ The fruit of this interest can be seen in our earliest extant manuscripts (the Palatine palimpsest apart). These are derived from a recension divided into two parts, one comprising the preface and books 1–7, the other books 9–20 down to 20.10.6 (the continuation, itself curtailed at 20.11.5, would also reappear in the Quattrocento); the chapter summaries now appeared before the individual books, but those to book 19 had not been preserved.

Of the two parts, the first is not found in extant copies until the twelfth century, but quotations from it appear in the ninth: book 1, chapter 1 is used

---

⁶ Ed. B. Krusch, in MGH, Scriptores rerum merovingicarum, vol. 1, part 2, Gregorii Episcopi Turonensis Miracula et Opera minora (Hannover, 1885), 662, line 20.


⁹ Ed. E. Perels, in MGH, Epistolarum Tomus 6, Karolini aevi 4 (Berlin, 1925), 186, lines 3–4: “et Terentium mittite aut Agellium noctium Atticarum aut Philonis Iudei historiam.”
by Johannes Scottus Eriugena (Gautier Dalché, 1991, 118–20; Bibliography I.C); book 3, chapter 6, on the wood of the palm-tree, was incorporated along with passages from Ambrose, Gregory, and Isidore into a brief florilegium on that tree known from two ninth-century manuscripts, one of which appears to depend on a copy also used by Martin of Laon to cite book 3, chapter 2 in a gloss on Bede, De temporum ratione 5, since in both places the book is misnumbered III (Contreni, 2002, 128, 131–35; Bibliography I.C);10 the extract from book 3, chapter 10 in the glosses falsely ascribed to the early eleventh-century scholar Byrhtferth of Ramsey on De temporum ratione 8 may come from the same milieu.11 The anonymous commentary on Martianus Capella variously attributed to Martin and to Dunchad of Reims quotes 6.14.10.12 A reference to Pisistratus as a patron of Latin [sic] (“antiquitus veteris floruit scientia linguae latinae sub Piscistrato [sic] auctore”) in the prologue of the Vita Bavonis has been associated with NA 7.17.1 owing to its mention of the liberal arts;13 the Gellian passage is at any rate closer than Cicero De oratore 3.137 or Isidore, Etymologiae 6.3.3.

The earliest manuscripts to contain this part belong as already stated to the twelfth century: they are R (Leiden, Bibl. der Rijksuniversiteit, Gronovianus 21), P (Paris, BNF, lat. 5765), and V (Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 3452), all written in France. Closely related to this, but containing numerous conjectures, many of which are clearly right, is C (Cambridge, Clare Coll., 26) of the thirteenth century, perhaps written at St. Albans;14 in addition, these books are present in D (Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Philol. 162), a manuscript of both parts written in the fifteenth century by a Paris master of arts by the name of Pierre Chappelle (“per me Petrum Chapellam famate parrhisien-sis achademie artium magistrum”), which abbreviates many of the early chapters, but also exhibits intelligent corrections often anticipating later conjectures.

The second part is represented by two ninth-century copies: one (Leeuwarden/Ljouwert, Provincjale en Buma Bibl. fan Fryslân 55), called F, is thought to be the very manuscript commissioned by Hrabanus and written at Fulda in 836;

12 See Dunchad: Glossae in Martianum, ed. C.E. Lutz (Lancaster, Pa., 1944), 15 on Martianus 4.327 (cued to p. 151, line 10 Dick); it is less clear that the note at Lutz p. 18 on 4.331 (153.14) is due to NA 16.11 rather than Pliny, NH 7.2.14–15.
the other (Vatican City, BAV, Reginensis lat. 597), called O, has innumerable annotations and corrections in Lupus’ hand. His correspondence also exhibits words and phrases that may come from Gellius; all belong to the second part.

O is the oldest representative of the manuscript family known as γ; its other members are X (Leiden, Bibl. der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. lat. F.112) from the tenth century, lacking book 9; Π (Vatican City, BAV, Reginensis lat. 1646, written in 1170), copied from a manuscript at Sainte-Colombe-les-Sens (de la Mare, Marshall, and Rouse 1976; Bibliography I.B) from which also came, by way of a lost intermediary, the relevant portion of G (Paris, BNF, lat. 13038, olim Saint-Germain 643), apparently owned by Thomas Becket, and a contemporary text called v, bound together with manuscript V of the first part (see above); and one fifteenth-century manuscript, N (Florence, BNC, Conventi Soppressi J. IV. 26), written by the humanist Niccolò Niccoli. Another family, δ, comprises two manuscripts from the later twelfth century, Z (Leiden, Bibl. der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. lat. F.7) and B (divided between Bern, Burgerbibl., 404 and Leiden, Bibl. der Rijksuniversiteit, B.P.L. 1925), which contains only books 9–12 together with book 13, chapter 5; the heavily interpolated Q (Paris, BNF, lat. 8664) from the thirteenth century; and down to 14.1.22 the fifteenth-century manuscript already noted, D.

It is disputed whether F is independent of these two families, or conflates earlier states of their texts; the former position would entail adopting (or at least starting from) its text whenever either of them agreed with it, the latter dispensing with it except when it carries a unique and true reading, but no editor has followed either course, and the former is impossible. In any case, there is some overlap between the families, individual manuscripts of one bearing readings from the other; moreover, the fragment from Egmond preserved as Brussels, Royal Library of Belgium, IV 625/60, exceedingly corrupt as it is, hovers between the two in much the same manner as F.

16 These are not taken from a text resembling F; they are closer to X (see below).
17 The most convincing is “in codice reverendae uetustatis,” Epistulae 103. 4 (p. 101), cf. 9. 14. 26, 18. 5. 11.
19 Or, in principle, when it is necessary to show that a reading in δ is attested as early as its competitor in γ.
20 Holford-Strevens, “Recht as een Palmen-Bohm and Other Facets of Gellius’ Medieval and Humanistic Reception,” in Holford-Strevens and Vardi, eds., *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*, 265–81, at 265–69. For another fragment in the same library dating from the twelfth century (10615–10729, fol. 230vb) see *ibid.*, 269–70.
In addition, there are medieval witnesses derived from copies in which the two parts were not divided. Of these the most important is a florilegium of chapters, copied as faithfully as in any other manuscript, from Gellius (both parts) and Valerius Maximus; this was extant by the end of the eleventh century, when it was entered at Salisbury Cathedral into a manuscript that subsequently passed from the possession of William III by way of Richard Bentley to Trinity College, Cambridge, where it is now manuscript R. 16. 34 (982). 21 The two parts are also combined in a florilegium of Gellius known as φ, perhaps made by William of Malmesbury in the twelfth century; 22 it is preserved in two twelfth-century manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Rawl. G.139, made for William himself; 23 lat. class. d. 39), and was used by William in his Poliistor and by John of Salisbury in his Policraticus. 24 In addition, both were contained in a lost manuscript from the library of the Collegium Trilingue at Leuven and known as the Buslidianus from the college’s founder the Mechelen councillor and humanist Jeroen van Busleyden (Hieronymus Buslidius, ca. 1470–1517). 25 This manuscript was seen by several scholars in the sixteenth century, but never afterwards; by report it dated from the twelfth century, and presented the books in a strange order, beginning with our book 18 and relegating our book 1 to fourteenth place. It preserved the beginning of book 18, chapter 9, which no other extant source does, and that of book 1, chapter 3, which was not known otherwise till remains were found in A; its other readings range from the manifestly correct to the blatantly interpolated.

There is also evidence for a division after book 10: the extracts from Gellius in the Florilegium Gallicum (compiled ca. 1165) are taken from the first ten books only (but there is nothing from book 8); 26 in the eighteenth century the library

21 The other manuscripts are Bremen, Universitätsbibl., C. 41; Paris, BNF, lat. 4952; and Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 3307 (all s. XII, as are the excerpts inserted into Bonn, Universitäts- und Landesbibl., S 218); Paris, BNF, nouv. acq. lat. 1777, s. XIV; and Florence, Bibl. Marucelliana, C 220, s. XV.


23 Copied in Poppi, Bibl. Comunale Rilliana, 39.


25 See H. de Vocht, Jérôme de Busleyden, Founder of the Louvain Collegium Trilingue: His Life and Writings Edited for the First Time in their Entirety from the Original Manuscript, Humanistica Lovaniensia 9 (Turnhout, 1950).

of the Counts Zaluski in Kraków held a copy of books 1–10, and Jacques Cujas (Cujacius) in the sixteenth century collated a manuscript from the library of Jean duc de Berry at Bourges containing books 11–20.

Although we know of several more medieval manuscripts than have come down to us (Holford-Strevens 2004, 274–81), Gellius was far from the most widely circulated classical author in the Middle Ages; nevertheless, he was not without renown, not only in Latin literature but also in vernacular, appearing in orthographic disguise as a standard of excellence in poems by Jehan de Le Mote and Eustache Deschamps. Numerous quotations, allusions, and verbal borrowings have been detected, but many more doubtless remain to be discovered. As is true for other authors, many of these borrowings result not from reading Gellius himself but an intermediate author or a florilegium; for example, most of the references to the *Noctes Atticae* in John of Salisbury’s *Policraticus* that C. C. J. Webb notes in his edition come, as we have seen, from the φ florilegium,


27 J.A.A. Janocki, *Specimen catalogi codicum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Zaluscianiae* (Dresden, 1752), 79, no. CCLXIII. The collection was confiscated by Russian troops in 1794; this manuscript did not reach St. Petersburg (Hertz, *editio maior*, 2:lxxi n. 1) and must be presumed lost.


30 Although outdated, the treatment in Hertz, *editio maior*, 2:xxiii–xlvii has not yet been superseded; see too Manitius (1889); (1892); (1911–31), index s.v. Gellius, 1:739, 2:848, 3:1109.
and many of John’s citations reappear by way of Hélinand de Froidmont in Vincent of Beauvais, who also used the *Florilegium Gallicum*.

Among twelfth-century authors who plainly did read Gellius are Adam Bal-sam (Parvipontanus, “of Petit Pont”; D. before 1159), who knew the second part,31 and Radulphus de Diceto (d. 1202), who knew both parts;32 he bases his impossible dates of 118 and 119 for Gellius’ work on the observation that Hadrian is the latest emperor whom he mentions.33 John of Wales, in his *Communiloquium*, written in the 1260s, cites only the first half, but not from any known florilegium; by the time he wrote his *Compendiloquium* in the next decade, having encountered the second part, he refers to the *Noctes Atticae* over fifteen times.34 His text was probably that in the Sorbonne, previously owned by Richard de Fournival; it seems to be from John, rather than Fournival’s manuscript, that Thomas of Ireland derived the Gellian matter in his *Manipulus Florum*.35 John was also a source for Gellian quotations in the *Liber de vita et moribus philosophorum* whose authorship formerly attributed to Walter Burley, but now to an anonymous Italian.36 About 1300 the anonymous author of the *Gesta Romanorum* freely adapted Gellius’ accounts of Androclus (NA 5.14), who becomes a knight (*miles*); Arion (16.19), introduced by the words “Refert Agillus de Amore”; the boy loved by a dolphin (6.8, though the tale is ascribed to Valerius Maximus); and Regulus’ battle with the serpent (7.3). Moral meanings are found for all four.37 The early

---

32 Martin, “John of Salisbury’s Manuscripts,” 15–16; he owed a few quotations to William of Malmesbury’s *Poliistor*.
35 Ibid., 27–28; for Fournival’s manuscript see Léopold Delisle, *Le Cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1874), 530, no. 89.
37 *Gesta Romanorum*, ed. H. Oesterley (Berlin, 1872), respectively chapters 104 (pp. 434–35); 148 (p. 506); 267 (p. 668); and 268 (pp. 668–69). However, in chapter 126 (pp. 476–77), the story of Papirius Praetextatus comes not from NA 1.23 but (as the author states) from Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1.6.19–25; the words “Senatores uero paventes in verecundo sexu tam impudicam insaniam . . . ut <non> parve rei prodigium” (p. 477.8–10) come from *Saturnalia* 1.6.23. The absence of such a conceit from the poem printed with those of Hildebert de Lavardin at PL 171.1431–32, no. 114 may suggest that it was taken from Gellius, whose work was in general more widely known than the *Saturnalia*. 
fourteenth-century Franciscan compiler of the *Fasciculus Morum* used Crassus’ severity in *NA* 1.13.11–13 to argue that God is even more concerned that his and the church’s laws should be obeyed; but in the same chapter he ascribes to Gellius a description of Justice very different from that in *NA* 14.4.38.

A particularly favored chapter was 1.8, on Demosthenes’ refusal to pay the prostitute Lais’ exorbitant fee, which is cited or used by John of Salisbury, Walter Map, Giraldus Cambrensis, Johannes de Hauvilla, Jacobus de Cessolis, and John Ridevall.39 The chapter on palm-wood (3.6), which we have seen admitted to exalted company in Carolingian times, was incorporated not only into ϕ but into a *catena* extant in the twelfth century, and also appears in a Franciscan sermon sometimes attributed to St. Bonaventure but rather by Guibert of Tournai (ca. 1200–84), which takes the text from John of Salisbury.40

As if in compensation, the sermon attributes to Gellius a passage on the supposed meeting of Alexander the Great with the Brahmans of India, also taken from John of Salisbury, that ultimately derives from the *Collatio Alexandri et Dindimi*.41 This is by no means the only false quotation in which Gellius’ name is attached to matter from other authors: at *Policraticus* 2.23 John of Salisbury writes “Plane sciolus paululum michi cum Peripateticis prae illo videor qui huius difficultatis angustia in Atticis Noctibus confessus est se nescire se non esse cicadam,” a misquotation of Aug. *Contra Academicos* 3.10.22: “Hic evigilavit Carneades—nam nemo istorum minus alte quam ille dormivit—et circumspexit rerum evidentiam. Itaque credo secum ipse, ut fit, loquens ‘ergone, ait, Carneade, dicturus es te nescire te, utrum homo sis an formica?”” Giraldus Cambrensis, who elsewhere cites genuine Gellius either directly or from the *Florilegium Angelicum*,42 has two such false references: *De vita Galfridi archiepiscopi Eboracensis* 2.19 “Quoniam ut ait Agellius cunctorum meretur odium qui omnium in commune se approbat inimicum,” in fact from Jordanes, *Getica* 187, and *Speculum duorum, epistularum pars V*, p. 202, lines 212–14 “ut ait Agellius sine culpa mole sarcine vincitur qui ad portandum onus etsi impar tamen devotus occurrit,” from Ennodius, *In natale Laurenti Mediolanensis episcopi*, dictio 1: “sine culpa vincitur oneris inmensitate qui ad portandum sarcinam etsi impar tamen devotus occurrit.” This passage is included in the twelfth-century *Florilegium Angelicum*,43 which also contains some heavily redacted excerpts from the

41 Ibid., 262–65.
42 Marshall, Martin, and Rouse, “Clare College Ms. 26,” 373 with n. 31.
43 On which see Rouse and Rouse, “The *Florilegium Angelicum*,” 101–52, arguing for compilation at Orléans; Stirnemann and D. Poirel, “Nicolas de Montièramey,” 173–78 hold
From the end of the fourteenth century to the beginning of the sixteenth, the fortunes of the *Noctes Atticae* were transformed by the copying of some hundred manuscripts combining both halves of the text (a few of the later specimens were copied from printed text). In the first part, these *recentiores* differ sharply from the older manuscripts, in the second they belong to the γ family. In general, they present an inferior text, and are notable more for corruptions than corrections; even the recovery of the chapter summaries for book 8 and the continuation of book 20 does not bring any improvement to the rest of the text. The most remarkable features of these manuscripts are that the preface is relegated to the end, and that books 6 and 7 are interchanged. This interchange had already taken place in MS C (Cambridge, Clare Coll., 26) and apparently also in Richard of Bury’s *Philobiblon*, which in chapter 7 cites *Noctes Atticae* 7.17 as coming from book 6; but since the chapter number is given as 16, scribal error is not to be excluded. The inversion is not found in the Valerio-Gellian florilegium, the *Florilegium Gallicum*, or John of Wales; it is also absent from Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 1532, probably written in the third quarter of the century, and from D (Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Philol. 162), which stands apart from the other *recentiores* not only in being French, but in being closer to the older manuscripts in the first part and being of the Δ family

that the manuscript Rome, Biblioteca Angelica, 1895, from which the florilegium takes its name, was dedicated by Nicolas de Montiéràme to Pope Adrian IV.

44 Ed. M. Boutry, CCCM 196A (Turnhout, 2012), 305.

in the second. However, the interchanged order was reproduced in all editions before 1853.

The abundance of manuscripts not only increased knowledge of Gellius, making references to him less and less remarkable, but also spread the recognition of his true name (though in the early Renaissance it was often misspelled with one l); the praenomen is typically either omitted or spelled out,\footnote{See e.g. Cynthius Cenetensis’ commentary on the Aeneid at respectively 1.636, 11.410. The name is also spelled out by Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini in De liberorum educatione, section 55, Humanist Educational Treatises, ed. and trans. C.W. Kallendorff, The I Tatti Renaissance Library 5 (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 2002), 200 = Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini, ed. R. Wolkan, II. Abteilung: Briefe als Priester und als Bischof von Triest (1447–1450), Fontes rerum Austriacarum, Zweite Abteilung: Diplomataria et Acta 67 (Vienna, 1912), 135; it is omitted by B. Guarini, De ordine docendi et studendi (15 February 1459, first published Ferrara, ca. 1475), section 31, ed. Kallendorff, 294.} and even when abbreviated it is clearly separated.\footnote{So, e.g., Angelus Decembrius, De politia litteraria 1.1.3 (Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 1794, fols. 6v, 8v).} This awareness is not confined to humanists proper: the music theorist Johannes Tinctoris (Jean le Teintenier of Braine-l’Alleud), demonstrating his erudition in De inventione et usu musice (ca. 1487), writes “Verumtamen Antigenidam (tempore quo Pericles rempublicam Atheniensium regebat) canere tibiis docuisse: apud Aulum Gelium mihi compertum est.”\footnote{K. Weinmann, Johannes Tinctoris (1445–1511) und sein unbekannter Traktat “De inventione et usu musicae”: Historisch-kritische Untersuchung, rev. W. Fischer (Tutzing, 1961), 39; as NA 15.17.1. Just above there is an unacknowledged quotation from NA 1.1.1–2. For another allusion see Holford-Strevens, “Tinctoris on the Great Composers,” Plainsong and Medieval Music 5.2 (1996) 193–99.} and the English poet John Skelton, naming far more authors than he can be supposed to have read in his Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell (published in 1523, though mostly written earlier), speaks of “Aulus Gelius, that noble historiar” (verse 351).\footnote{John Skelton, The Complete English Poems, ed. J. Scattergood (Harmondsworth, 1983), 322.} 

As is evident not only from explicit comments, but also from the use made of him, Gellius was valued not merely as a source of rare knowledge and choice words, but as a model of elegant and attractive presentation; his influence is plainly visible in Politian’s Miscellanea and Crinitus’ De honesta disciplina. He survived the triumph of Ciceronianism in the early sixteenth century and the rise of the Silver authors Seneca and Tacitus in the later decades; in seventeenth-century England knowledge of him could be taken for granted even in a court masque.\footnote{[Sir Francis Kynaston, 1587–1642], Corona Minervæ: Or a Masque Presented before Prince Charles his Highness, The Duke of Yorke his Brother, and the Lady Mary his Sister, the 27th of February, at the Colledge of the Museum Minervæ (London, 1635[/6]), sigs. [C]3.}
for groups of students adducing quotations to illuminate a given subject, in particular one set up at Leipzig in 1641 that survived till 1673 and produced *Acta Gelliana*; in the Russia of Peter the Great the powerful preacher and reformer Feofan Prokopovič (1681–1736) held learned soirées described by a participant as “quasi noctes Atticae.”

In time, however, Gellius’ star began to wane, partly because his style did not accord with Enlightenment tastes, partly because of a greater detachment from the ancient world. In 1768 the English philosophical writer Abraham Tucker (1705–74) narrated a vision in which John Locke introduces Gellius as a messenger between the worlds, “for having a very moderate capacity he could produce little of his own . . . however as he was a diligent honest creature we acknowledge him for one of our line. You find him often quoted by the learned, for though his writings contain nothing of much importance, yet such minute matters as he has recorded are sometimes turned to good use by others”; his talents being “industry and exactness,” he will “engrave traces of every particular in [Tucker’s] sensory” so that he shall have knowledge of his vision when he wakes. At the end, however, Gellius the faithful copyist becomes potentially fallible: “if there be anything in them [the engraven records] not consonant to the truth of facts it is his fault for misleading me,” but in return acquires a capacity for comment: “It vexed me that I could not recover his interlineations for by the imperfect notion I have of them I imagine they tend to harmonize Reason with Religion.” Doing so was a concern of Tucker’s and his contemporaries; yet the remark seems to show recognition that Gellius’ interest in the supernatural is largely confined to the state religion.

By the late nineteenth century, when Gellius’ information had been assimilated and his quotations had been collected as fragments of their authors, scholars’ conviction of knowing better than the ancients—most marked in a Germany in any case so tightly gripped by Romantic Hellenism that even the greatest Roman authors could hardly pass muster—brought Gellius into disrepute as an unintelligent compiler who represented a trivial age without serious purpose; in an age when those countries in which the classics were most studied were engaged not only in industrial development, but in political unification or imperial expansion, the Antonine era could hardly not have been found wanting.


53 Ibid., 334.

54 Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*, 286–89.
The late twentieth century, in which such judgments no longer corresponded to current circumstances, saw a rehabilitation of the Antonines, including Gellius.

**Bibliography I: Fortuna**

**A. General**


**B. Manuscript Tradition**

C. Use by Later Authors


**Editions**

The first edition of Gellius, of 11 April 1469, was one of many classical *editiones principes* made by Giovanni Andrea Bussi (1417–75), bishop-designate of Aleria (but excluded from his benefice by the Sforza, who at that time controlled Corsica), and printed by Arnold Pannartz and Konrad Sweynheym. It is dedicated, on account of the praise bestowed on Favorinus the Gaul, to his compatriot Guillaume d’Estouteville, cardinal bishop of Ostia, archbishop of Rouen, who had made Bussi a long loan of one hundred gold ducats when, as he puts it in his preface, “ne ad ponendam quidem barbam: sumptus mihi facultasve suppleret.” The print run, according to the printers in their plea to Sixtus IV of 20 March 1472, was 275 copies; the price recorded in 1470 by Hartmann Schedel was three papal ducats.

Bussi introduced a number of emendations, some of which have stood the test of time, others not; he numbered the chapters but not the books, and made no reference either to the loss of book 8 or the survival of its chapter summaries. To all Greek passages were appended Latin translations by Theodore Gaza; Bussi states in his preface that he would have preferred to put them in the margins, but the printers declared it impossible. The unfortunate consequence was that the translations were sometimes taken for Gellius’ own.

Although in their petition the printers claimed that unsold stock of their editions had brought them into distress, Gellius must have found a market, for on 6 August that year the edition was reprinted; it was also in 1472 that Nicolas Jenson produced the first of the many Venetian editions; the books are numbered, but without regard to book 8. Seven more incunabula followed (see

55 DBI 15.565–72 (M. Miglio).
56 Preface to Nicolaus de Lyra, *Postilla super totam Bibliam*, vol. 5 (Rome, 1472), fol. 2v; their petition for expectatives, with the papal fiat, is printed by J. Schlecht, “Sixtus IV und die deutschen Drucker in Rom,” in S. Ehres, ed., *Festschrift zum elfhundertjährigen Jubiläum des deutschen Campo Santo in Rom* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1897), 207–11, at 211, who does not recognize either the standard nature of such petitions or the “first-base” nature of expectatives.
57 Munich, BSB, Einzelblatt VIII 1t.
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Bibliography II.A);¹⁸ that of 1493 was the first to include the chapter summaries for book 8 and therefore to number the books correctly.

However, the first edition to make any important improvements to the text was that by Philippus Beroaldus the elder (1453–1505), printed at Bologna by Benedetto d’Ettore⁵⁹—who had printed his Apuleius three years earlier—and dated 1 February 1503 with a dedication to his pupil, and godfather to his son, Sigmund Graf zu Hohenlohe (1485–1534), best known as the author of the Lutheran tract of 1525 called the Kreuzbüchlein.⁶⁰ This had some effect on the editions by Aegidius Maserius (Gilles de Maizières, fl. 1500–25), dated 22 March 1508 French style (1509 modern),⁶¹ printed at Beauregard (“in Bellovisu”) behind the Collège de Boncourt by Jean Marchand for the Parisian bookseller Jean Petit,⁶² which contains a few corrections (and is the first to include an imaginary author portrait as some manuscripts had done), and by Nicolaus Ferettus, dated 20 April 1509, printed by Tridino at Venice, which reproduces the letter to Hohenlohe; it was the basis for that by Joannes Connellus (Jean Conneau) of Chartres, dated 13 November 1511, printed by the scholar-printer Iodocus Badius Ascensius (Joost van Assche or Josse Bade, 1462–1535) and sold by Jean Petit, which also contains corrections, not all preserved in the various reprints.

Further improvements to the text were made in the Juntine of January 1513 Florentine style (1514 modern)⁶³ by Carolus Aldobrandus (Carlo Aldobrandi), dedicated to Lorenzo II de’ Medici, the grandson of Lorenzo il Magnifico, nephew of Leo X, father of Catherine de Médicis, and future duke of Urbino,

---


⁵⁹ Benedetto Faelli (d. 1523): see DBI 44.140–42 (A. Cioni). Vaunting his carefulness in the colophon, he made two mistakes, with another in the date.

⁶⁰ See ADB 12.694–95 (G. Bossert); NDB 9.492–93 (R. Stupperich).

⁶¹ Until 1563, French usage counted the year from Easter.


⁶³ Before 1750, Florence, like England and the American colonies before 1752, counted the year from 25 March.
and the Aldine of September 1515 by J.B. Egnatius (the Venetian Zuan Batista Cipelli), dedicated to the notary Antonio Marsilio, who was to draw up his will, in which the translations from the Greek were relegated to the end and the list of chapter summaries suppressed; this formed the basis for editions published at Strassburg in March 1517 by Matthias Schürer (d. 1519), printed by the learned printer Johann Knoblauch or Knobloch (d. 1528) with a prefatory commendation by the eminent lawyer Nikolaus Gerbelius (d. 1560); at Venice on 1 December 1517 by Matthaeus Bonfinis Asculanus (Matteo Bonfini of Ascoli) with some corrections, printed by Tridinus; at Basel on 1 September 1519 by Andreas Cartander (Hartmann; D. 1540), printed by Ludwig Hornken; and again at Strassburg in March 1521 by the music theorist Ottmar Luscinius (Nachtgall; 1478/80–1537), also printed by Knobloch.

More important, however, was a series of Parisian editions by Ascensius, each improving its predecessor and expanding the notes (many of which were by Maserius). The first of these, published by Petit and Ascensius, though bearing the date August 1517, was dedicated in a letter of 4 September to the translator of Erasmus and future Protestant martyr Louis de Berquin (ca. 1485–1529); after reprints by various printers dated 31 December 1518 there followed editions of October 1519, October 1524, March 1530, and September 1532, besides a posthumous edition of September 1536, in which a few notes are eliminated.

Meanwhile two Cologne editions had appeared in 1526: one by the erudite publisher and future mayor Godefridus Hittorpius (Goddert Hittorp, ca.1485–1573) with help (especially on Greek) from Arnoldus Vesaliensis (Arnold Haldrein from Wesel in the duchy of Cleves, 1484–1534), printed by another learned printer, Eucharius Cervicornus (Hirtzhorn) with date 7 March; the other by Johannes Soter (Johann Heyl) in June, who produced a second edition in Sep-

65 See A. Cataldi Palau, Gian Francesco d’Asola e la tipografia aldina: La vita, le edizioni, la biblioteca dell’Asolano (Genoa, 1998), 63.
66 See respectively ADB 33.84–86 (G. Knod); ADB 8.716–18 (L. Geiger); ADB 16.314–18 (J. Franck).
67 ADB 47.540–41 (K. Steiff).
69 Specified as “iuxta Romanæ curiae calculus” and “supputatione Romana,” hence reckoned from Christmas 1529.
71 ADB 12.371–72 (J. Franck).
tember 1533. By then Sebastianus Gryphius (1492–1556), born in Germany as
Sebastian Greif but settled in France as Sébastien Gryphe, had issued the first of
his many Gellian editions at Lyons in 1532. These, continued by his son Antoine
and in Venice by his brother or other kinsman Jean (Giovanni Griffio, ca. 1518–
ca. 1576),72 were the most significant editions to appear in the mid-sixteenth cen-
tury, both for the gradual process of emendation they display and as the model
for the rest.

All previous editions, however, were rendered obsolete by that of Ludovicus
Carrio (Luis Carrión in his father’s language, Lodewijk Carrio in his mother’s,
ca. 1547–95),73 published at Paris in 1585 by Henricus Stephanus (Henri Estienne,
ca. 1531–98). Carrio had not only consulted manuscripts, in particular the
Buslidianus, but produced very many conjectural emendations, some of which
(even though too bold for Stephanus)74 are still accepted by modern scholars.
His reward was the suppression of his name in subsequent editions.

The original intention had been for Carrio to append a commentary, but in
the event, eight months after printing, only octavo sheets, with notes of a tex-
tual nature (often reports of manuscript readings, which Stephanus regarded
as dispensable), had been supplied by the deadline for the Frankfurt book fair;
accordingly Stephanus compiled in their stead his own Noctes Parisinae,75 among
them a defense of Gellius against the aspersions of Luis Vives on his style and
learning, an attack on the genuineness of the chapter headings, and textual dis-
cussions.76 The book nevertheless appeared with a promise on the title page of
further annotations by Stephanus to appear with Carrio’s own, said already to be
in press; but none were forthcoming, though Carrio’s “Castigationes et notae,”

72 DBI 59.375–77 (p. Tinti).
73 See Caspar Barthius (Kaspar von Barth), Adversariorum commentariorum libri LX
(Frankfurt a.M., 1624), 35.6, col. 1595: “Ludovicus Carrio patre Hispano, matre Belgâ
natus.”
74 See Stephanus’ prefatory letter to his son Paul: Auli Gellii Noctes Atticae, seu Vigiliae Atti-
cae, quas nunc primum a magno mendorum numero magnus veterum examplarium numeros
repurgavit. Henrici Stephani Noctes Aliquot Parisinae, Attieis A. Gellii Noctibus seu Vigilis
iniugilatae. Eiusdem H. Stephani Annotationes in alios Gellii locos prodibunt cum notis Lud.
75 See ibid., 20–21; Stephanus and Carrio quarrelled with each other and the printer
(Jacques-August de Thou, Commentariorum de vita sua libri sex, book 3, near the end of
1584). Carrio also edited and Stephanus published the companion edition of Macrobius;
see S. Lecompte, La Chaîne d’or des poètes: presence de Macrobe dans l’Europe humaniste
(Geneva, 2009), 70–72.
76 Respectively “Nox II, et III,” answering Vives’ De ratione dicendi 2.2 and De tradendis
disciplinis 3.8 = Opera omnia, ed. Gregorius Majansius (Gregorio Mayans y Siscar), vol. 2
337, 340; “Nox IIII, et V,” assigning the chapter headings to a “Pseudogellius,” and “Nox
VI, VII, et VIII.”
which took 120 pages to reach 1.25.10, were attached to a minority of copies. They were reprinted by Hertz in the Breslau *Indices scholarum* for 1885–86 (see Bibliography IV).

In 1592 Joannes Tornæsius (Jean II de Tournes) published (at Geneva, though this is not stated) an edition blending Carrio’s text (ascribed to “H. St.”) with variants from Seb. Grypius’ edition of 1550, edited (he says on fol. †3r) by his father, the great Lyonnais printer Jean I de Tournes (1504–64), whose office of royal printer he had inherited;77 more usefully, he adduced readings from F (Leeuwarden/Ljouwert, Provinsjale en Buma Biblioteek, fan Fryslân 55) and conjectures by Scaliger, Casaubon, and other scholars. Carrio’s text was reprinted, without mention of his name and omitting some of his emendations, at Geneva and Frankfurt;78 it was also reprinted in 1644, without the falsifications of intervening editions but with careless misprints, by Hieronymus (Jeroen) de Vogel (fl. 1639–48).

Seven years later, Gellius was published at Amsterdam by Lodewijk Elsevier (1604–70)79 in an “[e]ditio nova et prioribus omnibus docti hominis cura multa castigatior”; the learned man, as everyone knew, was the Hamburg-born professor of rhetoric and history at Deventer, known in both Latin and the language of his adopted country as Johannes Fredericus Gronovius (1611–71).80 The description was amply justified from the very first text page, on which the preface appeared restored, with the list of chapter summaries, to its proper place; the correction had already been indicated, on the basis of manuscript P (“codex Regius” = Paris, BNF, lat. 5765), by Claudius Salmasius in his *Plinianae exercitationes* (Paris, 1629), and with a false implication of independence by Petrus Lambecius (see IV below). Gronovius’ edition was pirated by Janssonius (Jan Janszoon); it was reprinted by Lodewijk’s cousin Daniël Elsevier (1626–80)81 in

77 He continued to use the title even after fleeing for Geneva in 1585 as a Huguenot; it may have been this that misled Hertz, in his *editio maior* (vol. 2, cxxi), and some catalogers, into locating his edition at Lyons.

78 Except that in Samuel Crespin’s reprints (1602, 1609), which take over Tornæsius’ list of emendations, he appears there as “Car.” for emendations from *Antiquarum lectionum libri tres* (Antwerp, 1576). These editions omit the letter to Paul Estienne; the Frankfurt reprints (1603, 1624) include it down to “magna spes esset” p. 10 in Paris, 1585 (ed.), but replace the rest with “Quae spes ut hactenus nec matrem, nec me fefellit: ita indies de te maior est exspectatio uberiorum ingeni tui fructuum, quos, ut mox videamus, cura unice. Vale.”

79 See BW 5.112; NNBW 9.239–40 (F.J. Hoogeveen).

80 BW 7.437–40; NNBW 1.989–92 (J.W. Bierma). The Latinized surname corresponds to Low German *van Gronouwe* and standard German *Gronau*, still a frequent name in Hamburg.

1665 and by Janssonius’ son-in-law Jan Janszoon van Waesbergen (fl. 1642–81) 
together with Elizaeus Weyerstraet in 1666.

In the same year, 1666, there appeared an edition begun by Antonius Thy-
sius (ca. 1603–65), professor of eloquence and university librarian at Leiden,
carried on by him down to book 12, and completed after his death by Jacobus 
Oiselius (1631–86), professor of law at Groningen and a notorious plagiarist. 
Based on Gronovius’ text, the edition was accompanied by copious but not 
always intelligent annotations that sometimes dissented from it. Far more ele-
mentary but certainly not more intelligent notes, avoiding difficult passages but 
identifying persons and places besides converting ancient money into contem-
porary equivalents, were appended by Jacques Proust SJ to his Delphin edition 
(Paris, 1681), which often reverts in its text to Carrio, together with paraphrases 
into simpler Latin of anything in the text that the less learned reader (such as the 
Dauphin, had he ever cared to look at it) might not immediately understand. The 
printer was remarkably inaccurate in his pagination, even repeating the sequence 
279–88 whole; the word index (complete in intent but not in execution) some-
times cites the true number instead of the false.

Gronovius, who in 1658 had been appointed professor of Greek and his-
tory at Leiden and in 1665 succeeded Thyssius as university librarian, contin-
ued to work on Gellius; in 1652 he had acquired manuscript R (Leiden, Bibl. 
der Rijksuniversiteit, Gronovianus 21) from Bernhard Rottendorff (1594–1671), 
city physician of Münster and Neo-Latin poet. His annotations down to 9.4.14 
were published in 1687 in a new edition by his son Jacobus (1645–1716), who 
in 1706 incorporated these and others down to 9.15.5 “Hoc extremum Patris”) in 
a quarto volume, along with abundant notes of his own, reports of manuscript 
readings and conjectures by Gaspar Scioppius (Kaspar Schoppe, 1576–1649), and most of Thyssius’ and Oiselius’ annotations, which he professes to have 
included only at the unscholarly insistence of his publishers, and on which, 
as on Proust’s, Gronovius frequently comments with the disdain for which he

82 BW 18.116–19; NNBW 5.924–25 (P.J. Blok).
83 BW 14.58–60, giving his vernacular name as Jacob Oesel with variant spellings.
85 NDB 22.141–42 (H. Lahrkamp).
87 ADB 33.479–84 (R. Hoche); NDB 23.475–77 (K. Jaitner).
88 “Cui sententiae quum resisterem perinde, ac illam male-factam maleque utilem edicionem et celerrima imprudentia collectarum notarum acervum spernerem, non quivi tamen consilio vincere, et acerriram pertinentiam expungnare, quam tuebantur argumentis non ex studiorum commodo petitis, sed talibus, quae quilibet haud rudis adse-
quitur facillum” (preface, sig. ****1v).
was as notorious as for his bad Latin.89 This edition, which long remained the
standard, was reissued in 1762 by the jurist Johann Ludwig Conradi (1730–85),90
who added legal excursûs of his own and a few good notes by Enoch Christian
August Otho (ca. 1724–ca. 1775); again at Zweibrücken in the Palatinate by the
Societas Bipontina in 1784 with, as usual in its publications, a “Notitia Litteraria”
of the author and an “Index Editionum.”

The only other edition in the eighteenth century was that by Paul Daniel
Longolius (1704–79), published in 1741 at Hof in Bavaria, where he was rector of the
*Gymnasium*.91 The edition is notable for three things: the constant addition
of asterisks to all words in the copious index; the absurdly literal Latin trans-
lations printed side by side with Greek passages and totally incomprehensible
without them; and the marginal section numbers, which despite their somewhat
irregular distribution have become the standard form of reference, being used by (Heinrich) Albert Lion (1796–1867) in his two-volume Göttingen edition of
1824—on the whole a poor piece of work all the more vitiated by the editor’s
use of a bad fifteenth-century manuscript from Wolfenbüttel—and from him
adopted by Hertz. These section numbers are certainly more convenient than
the larger units used by Abraham John Valpy (1787–1854)92 in his three-volume
edition (London, 1824), and substituted for Proust’s page numbers in the word
index; Jacobus Gronovius’ text is reprinted with Proust’s and Thyssius–Oiselius’
notes whole, but only extracts from the Gronovii.

The next edition was the Tauchnitz “editio stereotypa” by Otto Holtze
(Leipzig, 1835), which belied its proudly boasted new technology by relegating
the preface to its old place at the end of book 20; not for nothing did the pub-
lications of the Carl Tauchnitz Verlag, long the mainstay of German education,
acquire the sobriquet of “Taugenichts,” or worthless, editions.93 Eight years later,
in 1843, Iwan von Glöden published an annotated edition of the legal chapters,
*Auli Gellii quae ad ius pertinent*, at Rostock, covering the first three books; no
more appeared, since the author, who in the same year published a study of

89 See, on his Cicero, Clericus (Jean Le Clerc, 1657–1736) to Locke on 21 October 1692
Gellius*, vol. 1 (London, 1795), p. *xxiv* on his “peevish and fastidious temper,” and for a
similar comment BW 7.441. That is not to deny that his disdain was justified.
90 ADB 4.444–45 (E. Steffenhagen).
91 ADB 19.156–57 (G. Laubmann).
93 See ADB 37.441–43, at 442 (G. Wustmann).
Roman law under the Ostrogoths, turned his attention to legal and constitutional questions in the Grand Duchy of Mecklenburg-Schwerin.\footnote{Governed since 1755 by the \textit{Landesgrundgesetzlicher Erbvergleich}, which guaranteed the rights of the Estates against the Grand Duke; a liberal constitution was promulgated in 1849 but withdrawn the next year.}

The nineteenth century’s advances in textual method were applied to Gellius by his lifelong student Martin Julius Hertz (1818–95).\footnote{NDB 8.710–11 (G. Baader).} Having made or procured collations of the most important manuscripts, he first, while a \textit{Privatdozent} at Berlin, produced a Teubner text (Leipzig, 1853) with a list of divergences from the 1706 edition but no \textit{apparatus criticus}; it was the first edition to restore the original order (as it seems) of books 6 and 7. In breaking away from previous editions, Hertz reproduced the \textit{paradosis}, or text transmitted by the manuscripts, with deliberately over-conservative fidelity, “ut librorum manusciptorum imaginem, ubicumque aliquatenus saltem liceret, exprimerem” (1:iv), a policy that brought sharp criticism on his head from Johan Nicolai Madvig (1804–86)\footnote{Adversaria critica ad scriptores graecos et latinos, vol. 2, \textit{Emendationes latinae} (Copenhagen, 1873), 583–619. On Madvig, see DBL 9.344–48 (H. Larsen and H. Ræder).} and Theodor Bergk (1812–81).\footnote{“Beiträge zur kritik des Gellius,” \textit{Jahrbücher für classische Philologie} 111 (1876) 279–88. On Bergk, see ADB 46.381–83 (R. Peppmüller).} There is far less conservatism in Hertz’s two-volume \textit{editio maior} published by his brother Wilhelm at Berlin in 1883–85, which provides in its apparatus a full account of manuscript readings and scholarly conjectures; the second volume opens with a long preface setting forth Gellius’ textual tradition, his medieval reception, and his editorial history. Despite numerous errors and misprints, some of which were corrected in a subsequent article,\footnote{“Supplementum apparatus Gelliani,” \textit{Jahrbücher für classische Philologie}, Suppl. 21 (Leipzig, 1894) 1–48.} this edition remains indispensable for all students of Gellius.

In 1886 the house of Teubner published Hertz’s \textit{editio minor}, without apparatus but with a few changes from the Berlin edition; it replaced this in 1903 with an edition by Carl Hosius (1866–1937),\footnote{See NDB 9.649–50 (C. Becker).} which introduced the sigla γ and δ for the manuscript families of the second part, but is chiefly notable for its abundant if uncritical list of parallel passages, which to some extent serves in lieu of a commentary but jumbles together texts drawn on by Gellius, texts drawing on Gellius, and texts merely treating of the same subject or using the same unusual word; it is stronger on Latin than Greek, and weakest of all in philosophy.

Hosius’ text, lightly adapted, was combined with an English translation by John C. Rolfe for the Loeb Classical Library (1927, rev. ed., 1946), and with a Catalan translation by Cebrià Montserrat for the Escriptors llatins series of the Fundació Bernat Metge in Barcelona, of which the first volume, covering the
preface and books 1–2, appeared in 1930, the second covering books 3–5, in 1934. A third volume, covering books 6–9, did not appear till 1988; it was edited by Vicent Ferrís and Miquel Dolç, who took account of the supervening editions by Marache and Marshall.

In 1934 a new Garnier edition appeared in Paris by Maurice Mignon, in three volumes, with his own text, a paraphrastic translation, and notes not without value, especially on philosophical questions. This has been superseded by the Collection Budé edition in four volumes, the first three (Paris, 1967, 1978, 1989) by René Marache (1914–93), who had written a very important work on the stylistic tastes of Gellius and his age, but proved to be one of the many scholars who write about their authors far better than they edit them. The edition was completed by Yvette Julien (Paris, 1998).

More significant was the Oxford Classical Text published in 1968 by Peter K. Marshall (1934–2001) of Amherst College, Massachusetts, based on renewed studies of the manuscripts; in particular, despite occasional references in Tornaesius and Hertz, it was Marshall who first made full use of F (Leeuwarden/Ljouwert, Provensjale en Buma Biblioteek, fan Fryslân 55), which he controversially regarded as independent of both γ and δ. He also challenged the excessive esteem in which Hertz and Hosius had held the latter family, especially Q (Paris, BNF, lat. 8664), which he showed to be much interpolated. Having established the reading of the archetype, however, like other students of manuscripts he was at times too reluctant to depart from it; his apparatus criticus, as often in the older specimens of the series, is excessively selective. Moreover, it was only afterwards that he published important articles on the manuscripts, which rendered his edition, especially of the first part, obsolete; however, the 1990 reprint takes no account of these findings, merely correcting a few slips and misprints.

Since Marshall, two bilingual Italian editions have been published: by Franco Cavazza, in eight volumes down to book 13 (Prosatori di Roma; Bologna: Zanichelli, 1985–99), after which the editor’s attention turned to other matters, and by Giorgio Bernardi Perini of the whole text in two volumes (Turin: Unione Tipografica Editorial Torinese, 1992, rev. ed., 1996); both show fresh thinking about the text, on which Bernardi Perini had published several articles beforehand.

The present author feels obliged to disclose, in case it should affect the reception of his judgments, that he is currently working on a new Oxford Classical Text of Gellius.

100 La Critique littéraire de langue latine et le développement du goût archaïsant au IIe siècle de notre ère (Rennes, 1952); useful too is his Mots nouveaux et mots archaïques chez Fronton et Aulo-Gelle ([Paris], 1957).

Bibliography II: Complete Editions

A. Incunabula


1472, Romae (Rome): Giovanni Andrea Bussi. “Aspicis illustris lector quicumque libellos / Si cupis artificum nomina nosse: lege. / Aspera ridebis cognomina Teutona: forsan / Mitiget ars musis inscia uerba uirum. / Conradus suueynheym Arnoldus pannartzque magistri / Rome impresserunt talia multa simul. / In domo Petri de Maximis. / M.CCCC.LXXII. die / Sexta Augusti.” GW 10595; HCR 7518; ISTC ig00119000; Goff G-120.


1477, Venetiis (Venice): Andrija Paltašić of Kotor. “Auli Gelii Noctium Atticarum Commentarii / Finis: Impressi Venetiis per Andream Iacobi Catharensem M.CCCC.LXXVII. Andrea Vendrameno [Vendramin] duce Venetiarum inclyto.” GW 10596; HCR 7520; ISTC ig00121000; Goff G-121. May be read online through Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.

1485, Brixiae (Brescia): edited by Marco Scaramucino of Palazzuolo, printed by Dobrić Dobričević of Dubrovnik. “Impresa Brixiae per Boninum de Boninis de Ragusia anno domini M.CCCC.LXXXV. Die tercio Marcii. Correctore Marco Scaramucino de Palatiolo.” GW 10597; HCR 7521; ISTC ig00122000; Goff G-122. May be read online through Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.

1489, Venetijs (Venice): Bernardino de’ Cori of Cremona and Simone de Lovere. Bernardino de’ Cori of Cremona and Simone de Lovere. “Venetijs per Bernardinum de choris de Cremona & Simonem de Luero. M.CCCCLXXXIX. Die xiii Augusti.” GW 10598; HCR 7522; ISTC ig00123000; Goff G-123. May be read online through Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.

102 On this edition, which exists in two states, see L. Donati, “Saggio di un’esplorazione del Gellio di Bonino de Boninis (Brescia, 1485),” Archivio storico per la Dalmazia, ann. 2 (1927/8), vol. 4, fasc. 22, 181–98; U. Baroncelli, Gli incunabuli della Biblioteca Queriniana di Brescia (catalogo) (Brescia, 1971), p. 191, no. 430. Of the two copies, Inc. D.II.12 and Lechi 152, the former clearly represents an earlier, barely corrected state, in which no Greek has been inserted in sig. 1, and on 16 recto a line of text (“Nostro deuincti beneficio,” 6.17.12) is missing, though occasionally it is the latter that presents an error (autopsy April 2012).
1493, Venetiis (Venice): Cristoforo Caetti of Antegnano and Martino Lazzaroni of Rovato. “Venetiis Impressum per Christophorum de Quaietis de Antegnano & Martinum de Lazaronibus de Rouado socios. M.CCCCLXXXXIII. Die XVII. Iulii.” This is the first to include the chapter summaries for book 8, and number the books correctly. GW 10599; HCR 7524; ISTC ig00124000; Goff G-124. May be downloaded from Gallica.

1494, Venetiis (Venice): for Ottaviano Scoto of Monza by his regular printer Boneto Locatello. “Auli Gelii noctium atticarum finis. Impressum Venetiis sumptibus Nobilis viri domini Octauiani Scoti Ciusi Modoietensis .M.CCCCLXXXXIIII. Idibus Nouembribus. Per Bonetum Locatellum.” Book 8 is ignored in the numeration, but the summaries of book 8 are grudgingly appended on the last leaf. GW 10600; HCR 7525; ISTC ig00125000; Goff G-125. May be read online through Münchner Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.

1496, Venetiis (Venice): Zuane de Trino (Giovanni da Tridino) alias Tacuino. “Impressum Venetiis per Ioannem De Tridino alias Tacuinum Anno domini .M.cccc.lxxxxvi. die .vi. Aprilis”; a careless reprint of the 1493 edition. GW 10601; HCR 7526; ISTC ig00126000; Goff G-126. May be read online through Münchner Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.

1500, Venetiis (Venice): Filippo Pincio of Mantua. “Impressum Venetiis a Philippo Pincio Mantuano. Anno domini .M.ccccc. die .xv. mensis Iulij Augustino Barbadico [Agostino Barbarigo] serenissimo Venetiarum duce.” GW 10602; HCR 7527; ISTC ig00127000; Goff G-127. May be downloaded from Gallica, and read online through Münchner Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.

B. Sixteenth Century


1508 (French style; modern 1509), Parisiis (Paris): Gilles de Maizières. “Auli Gelii lingue et graecae et latine fulgentissimi syderis Noctium Atticarum Commentarii. Venduntur in vico diui Iacobi Sub Leone Argenteo . . . Auli Gelii viri quidem non minus in latina quam graeca lingua diserti Noctium Atticarum commentarii ad unguem levigati In Bellouisii pro Iohanne Petit fidelissimo


ca. 1511–ca. 1517, Parisiis (Paris): reprints of foregoing by Jean I Frellon, Pierre Gaudoul, Pasquier Lambert, Hémon Le Fèvre, the Frères de Marnef, Jean Petit, François Regnault, and Denis Roce.103 The copies by Frellon, the Frères de Marnef are not mentioned; the copies by Le Fèvre and the Frères de Marnef are dated to ca. 1512, the rest to ca. 1517, on the basis of printers’ marks for all except Gaudoul (whose edition

103 At Moreau, *Inventaire* (n. 51) vol. 2, 129, no. 320, and vol. 1, 430, no. 1617, Frellon and Roce are not mentioned; the copies by Le Fèvre and the Frères de Marnef are dated to ca. 1512, the rest to ca. 1517, on the basis of printers’ marks for all except Gaudoul (whose edition
nef, and Roce have “summa accusatione” on the title page. NUC.NG 0107167; BL; BSB; Berlin, Staatsbibl.; Cambridge, Univ. Lib.; Mainz, Gutenberg-Museum; Rome, BNC; Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibl. Regnaut reprint may be read online through Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.

1512, Lugduni (Lyons): Reprint of Connellus 1511 by Barthélemy Trot. NUC. NG 0107168; BL; BNF; BSB; Berlin, Staatsbibl.; Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibl.; Florence, BNC; Oxford, Bod. Lib. Incomplete download available from Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.


is known only from a sale-catalog) listed by Renouard, Les marques typographiques parisiennes des XVe et XVIe siècles (Paris, 1926), which do not obviously bear out these dates (respectively nos. 542 of 1516; 599 of 1511; 600 of 1512; 719 of 1513; 887 of 1511; and 941 of 1514).

104 The catalogue of Yale University Library and NUC give the date of Frellon’s edition as ca. 1508 because of the volumes the book is bound with, and the place (conjecturally) as Lyons, where Jean II worked; but see Baudrier and Baudrier (n. 51) vol. 5, 153–54, Renouard, Répertoire (n. 51), 158.
Argentinae in Aedibus Ioannis Knoblouchi. Mense Martio. Anno M.D.XVII.


1517, Venetiis (Venice): Matteo Bonfini. “Auli Gellii noctium Atticarum commentaria per Bonfinum Ascularum summa nuper diligentia et studio recognita ac pristinae serenitati candorique restituta locis supra centum emendatis praeter ea: quae alii ante nostram hanc editionem castigaverant: ut ex codicibus nostris si cum aliis conferantur: inspici potest: et adiecta noua etiam indice tabula sententiarum vocabulorum et aliorum denique locorum magis illustrium in margines per eundem exceptorum: ut ipsemet latius sua ipsius declarat epistola. . . . Impressum Venetiis per Ioannem de Tridino alias Tacuinum Anno domini M.D.XVII. Die primo decemb.” However, the letters printed are not from Bonfini but those by Beroaldus to Hohenlohe and from Ferretti to Corner, the latter redated to 15 October 1517. NUC.NG 0107173; BAV; BL; BNF; ÖNB; Cambridge, Univ. Lib.; Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibl.; Florence, BNC; Naples, Bibl. Naz.; Oxford, Bod. Lib.; Paris, Bibl. Sainte-Geneviève; Rome, BNC; Venice, Bibl. Naz. Marciana. May be downloaded from Google Books.

1518, Parisiiis (Paris): Reprint of Ascensius 1517 (dated 31 December, “pridie calendas Ianuarias”) variously for Bernard Aubry, Jean Granjon, Guillaume Le Bret, and Regnault Chaudière, with “una cum haud aspernandis Iodoci Badij Ascensij annotationibus” added before “Cum indicio.” BL; BNF.

1519, Basileae (Basel): Andreas Cartander (Cratander). “Auli Gellii Noctium Atticarum libri XIX Ex inclyta Basilea. . . . Basileae: Apud Andream Cartandrum, sumptu Lodouici Hornken bibliopolae. Anno M. D. XIX.” NUC.NG 0107175, 75-552578; VD16 G 1036; BL; BNF; BSB; ÖNB; Basel,

105 This copy, at Mount Holyoke College, appears in NUC as a ghostly edition printed at “Viena [sic]” in 1514.


Universitätsbibl.; Berlin, Staatsbibl.; Cambridge, Univ. Lib.; Florence, BNC; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibl.; Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibl. May be downloaded from Google Books and Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.


Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibl. May be downloaded from Münchener Digitalisierungs­zentrum (MDZ), BSB.


1537, Lugduni (Lyons): Reprint of Seb. Gryphius 1534. BAV; BL; BNF; Lyons, Bibl. Mun.; Rome, BNC. May be downloaded from Google Books.


1541, Coloniae (Cologne): Reprint of Johann Gymnich 1537. NUC.NG 0107106, 0107140; 108 VD16 G 1041; BL; BSB; Basel, Universitätsbibl.; Berlin, Staatsbibl.; Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibl.; Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August

107 NDB 7.362 (S. Corsten).
108 This copy (in Villanova Univ. Lib.) is misdated 1641 in NUC.
Bibl. May be downloaded from Google Books and Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.


1546, Lugduni (Lyons): Reprint of Seb. Gryphius 1542. NUC.NG 0107109; BL; BNB; Berlin, Staatsbibl.; Cambridge, Univ. Lib.; Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibl.; Lyons, Bibl. Mun.; Rome, BNC; Toronto, Thomas Fisher Lib. May be downloaded from Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.


1560, Lugduni (Lyons): Reprint of foregoing. NUC.NG 0107116; BAV; ÖNB; Basel, Universitätsbibl.; Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibl.; Lyons, Bibl. Mun.; Florence, BNC; Rome, BNC.


1563, Coloniae (Cologne): Reprint of Fabricius 1557. NUC.NG 0107118; VD16 ZV 6484; BSB; Cambridge, Univ. Lib.; Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibl. – Staats- und Universitätsbibl.; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibl. May be downloaded from Google Books and Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.


1565, Lugduni (Lyons): Reprint of Ant. Gryphius 1560. NUC.NG 0107121; BAV; BNF; Cambridge, Univ. Lib.; Lyons, Bibl. Mun.; Moscow, Rossijskaja Gosudarstvennaja Bibl.


1565, Venetiis (Venice): Zorzi (Giorgio) de’ Cavalli.110 “Auli Gellii Noctes Atticae, qua fieri potuit recognitio, ad optima exemplaria novissime bona fide redditae. Cum gemino indice, et Graecarum dictionum versione. . . . Venetiis

109 NDB 8.552–53 (H. Grimm).
110 Besides his classical work, de’ Cavalli was a major Hebrew printer, many of whose productions were burnt in the persecution of 1568: see P.F. Grendler, “The Destruction of Hebrew Books in Venice, 1568,” Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research 45 (1978) 103–30.

1566, Coloniae (Cologne): Reprint of Fabricius 1563. VD16 G 1045; BSB; ÖNB; Berlin, Staatsbibl.; Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibl. – Staats- und Universitätsbibl.; Moscow, Rossijskaja Gosudarstvennaja Bibl.; Paris, Bibl. Sainte Geneviève. May be read online at Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.

1566, Lugduni (Lyons): Reprint of Ant. Gryphius 1565. NUC.NG 0107123; BAV; BL; BSB; ÖNB; Basel, Universitätsbibl.; Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibl.; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibl.; Lyons, Bibl. Mun.; Toronto, Victoria Univ., CRRS Lib. May be downloaded from Google Books and Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.


1584, Parisiis (Paris): Reprint of foregoing. NUC.NG 0107129; BL; BNF.

Bibliography II: Complete Editions


C. Seventeenth Century


1609, Aureliae Allobrogum (Geneva): “Auli Gellii Noctes Atticae, seu Vigiliae Atticae ad exemplar potissimum Henrici Stephani lucidiores redditae. Quas nunc primum a magno mendorum numero magnus veterum exemplarium numeros repurgavit. Hac postrema editione accesserunt in calce uniuscuiusque capitis notas variorum. Cum quinque indicibus perutilibus, nec non interpretatione dictionum Graecarum. Aureliae Allobrogum, Apud Samuelem Crispinum, M. DC. IX.” NUC.NG 0107137; BAV; BL; BNF; BSB; Cambridge, Univ. Lib.; Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibl.; Rome, BNC; Toronto, Thomas Fisher Lib. May be downloaded from Google Books and Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.


111 For Bénard, murdered in 1684 two days after denouncing contraband copies of Pierre Richelet’s Dictionnaire françois, which was published at Geneva and prohibited in France, see Renouard, Répertoire des imprimeurs parisiens, libraires et fondeurs de caractères en exercice à Paris au XVIIe siècle (Nogent le Roi, 1995), 29.

D. EIGHTEENTH CENTURY


1741, Curiae Regnitianae (Hof): “Auli Gellii Noctium Atticarum libri XX. Accuratissime recensent Distincto quoque capite articulis minoribus Veterum quae excitantur locis ex hodierno more nominatis Graecis quam potuit fieri ad verbum Latine redditis Ad marginem adscriptis aliis veterum idem tractantium Praemissa dissertatione de auctore et operae Cum regulis potioribus in genere ad auctorem hunc recte evoluendum et indice locupletissimo quo simul notata in opere sufficierenter illustrantur a Paullo Daniele Longolio Curiae Regnitianae Sumtibus Io. Gottlieb Vierlingii cI Icc LXXII,” 2 vols. BAV; BL; BNF; BSB; Basel, Universitätsbibl.; Berlin, Staatsbibl.; Cambridge, Univ. Lib.; Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibl.; Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibl. – Staats- und Universitätsbibl.; Moscow, Rossiskaja Gosudarstvennaia Bibl.; Rome, BNC. May be downloaded from Google Books and Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.

Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibl. May be downloaded from Google Books and Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.


E. Nineteenth Century


(*) 1825, Gottingae (Göttingen): School edition of foregoing (“Recensuit, in usum scholarum edidit, et indicibus copiosissimis instruxit Albertus Lion”).


F. Twentieth Century


(1930–34, Barcelona; 1934, Paris. See Bibliography III.C.)


Translations

The first known vernacular translations from Gellius were made by Bartolomeo da San Concordio, OP (1262–1347),112 who turned his own collection De documentis antiquorum, including four Gellian extracts (2.1.2, 2.1.4, 11.7.1, 19.2.3), into Italian as Ammaestramenti degli antichi (1302–8); they include two Gellian extracts (2.1.2, 2.1.4) from the Florilegium Gallicum and two (11.7.1, 19.2.3) from the Florilegium Angelicum. The Latin work was published at Treviso in 1601 and again at Florence in 1840, this time faced by the Italian text, which was first pub-

112 DBI 6.768–70 (C. Segre).
lished at Florence in 1661 and most recently at Siena in 1963. Italian translations of chapters 4.19 and 1.17 were also made by an anonymous fifteenth-century author in Oxford, Bodleian Library, add. A. 12 fo. 62br.

In 1534 the Czech humanist Jan Petřík (1499?–1559?) made a mildly abridged translation of chapter 12.1, Favorinus' plea that mothers should breastfeed their babies, appending his own appeal for “you mothers” (vý mátky) to take note (Prague, Strahovská knihovna, Strahov 1735 = DG V. 21, fols. 113r–116v). This chapter proved particularly popular with (male) translators. It was included in the same year by the Lyons printer Guillaume Bouillé in a reissue of Geoffroy Tory’s Politiques ou Citoyens institutions pour bien régir la Chose publique. It was Englished by William Painter (1540?–1595) as “The xxiii. Nouell” (i.e. novella) in The Palace of Pleasure (London: Henry Denham for Richard Tottell and William Jones, 1566), fols. 45v–48r, and was again translated into French, more freely, by Laurent Joubert (1529–82) in Erreurs populaires au fait de la medecine et regime de santé (Bordeaux: Simon Millanges, 1578), 401–10; it also inspired the poem La balia (“The Wetnurse”) by Luigi Tansillo (1510–68) first published at Vercelli in 1767 by Giovanni Antonio Ranza (1741–1801), professor at the Regie Scuole, who appended a prose translation of Gellius’ text. After sections 1–6 had been translated into French by Philippe-Louis Gérard (1737–1813), Le Comte de Valmont, ou les égarements de la raison, 3rd ed., vol. 1 (Paris: Moutard, 1776), 188–90 (letter X, n. b), the whole chapter was translated anew by Jacques-Louis Moreau de la Sarte (1771–1826) in vol. 1 of the Mémoires de la Société médicale d’émulation séante à l’École de médecine de Paris (an V [= 1796/97]), 398–95 (rev. ed. [1802], 474–80), who compared it favourably with Rousseau’s plea in Émile, and by P.J. Pissis, Manuel d’hygiène (Le Puy: J.A. Crespy et Guillaume, an XI [= 1802–3]),

113 From 1549 Jan Petřík z Benešova: Ottův slovník naučný 19 (Prague, 1902), 621.
114 First published Paris, 1532, and made from Nicolaus Secundinus’ Latin version of Plutarch’s Praecepta gerendae rei publicae; for the reprint see Baudrier and Baudrier (n. 51) vol. 4, 27, von Gültlingen (n. 51) vol. 6, 7, no. 23.
116 Other “novels” from Gellius were included. A second volume appeared in 1567; reprints and new editions followed.
119 Better known for Il vendemmiatore (1534) and Le lagrime di san Pietro (1585), but the author of much else besides.
120 The English translation of the poem by William Roscoe, The Nurse (London, 1798), includes extensive quotations from Gellius’ chapter, but only in Latin.
121 NBG 20.158–60; DBF 15.1232–33.
122 NBG 36.500–1.
333–43. In the nineteenth century, classicizing Italian translations of this text were given as a wedding present for bride or groom. One such translation, printed “dal Bolis stampatore camerale” at Fermo in 1828, was made by Felice Avetrani, M.D. (1799–1852) of Monte San Pietrangeli, for his sister Giovanna’s marriage to Luigi Palmieri; another, printed by Annesio Nobili at Pesaro in 1833, was commissioned from the noted man of letters Giuseppe Ignazio Montanari (1801–71) by Terzo Govi of Correggio for his parents Terzo and Teresa Govi to give his sister Maria Luigia on her marriage to Dr Luigi Nicoli of the same city. A third translation by Gianfrancesco Rambelli (1805–65) of Lugo, printed by Pietro Conti at Faenza in 1836, was given ca. 1840 by the cavaliere Dr Antonio Magliatrici, Captain of the Volontari Pontifici, to his cousin Casimiro Flandoli of San Giovanni in Persiceto for his marriage to Irene Marchesi of Bologna; no place, date, or printer is named. Carl Reinhold published a somewhat over-literal translation into ancient Greek in Galēnós 1.2 (1879) 77–80.

Christian Falster’s Vigilia prima Noctium Ripensium (Copenhagen, 1721; see below, section IV) includes a translation into Danish alexandrine couplets of the verses in which Laberius, forced by Caesar to appear on stage, bewailed his lot, originally cited in the lost chapter 8.15 but preserved by Macrobius; Christoph Martin Wieland, in his translation of Horazens Satyren (Leipzig, 1786; rev. ed. Horazens Satiren, Leipzig, 1804) rendered the same verses into unrhymed German iambics of variably six and five feet, mostly with feminine endings, in his ‘Erläuterungen’ on Sermones 1.10.

In addition, some expanded translations of Aesop included chapters 2.29 (the fable of the Crested Lark) and 16.19 (Arion and the Dolphin, itself a free translation from Herodotus).

The first translation of the whole work was made in English by the Quaker schoolmaster William Massey (1691–1764?), who in a treatise on the alphabet and calligraphy, The Origin and Progress of Letters (London, 1763), discussing chronology, quoted from 17.9 in his translation, which “lies by me ready for the press, if a favourable opportunity should offer for its reception” (chapter 8, section 16). However, the work remained in manuscript (Edinburgh, Univ. Lib., Dc 4. 81); it is often lively, if at times prudish particularly on homoerotic matters.126

---

123 See the obituary by Luigi Cervini, Bullettino delle scienze mediche pubblicata per cura della Società medico-chirurgica di Bologna e compilato dai Soci 3.24 (1853) 471–74.
124 DBI 75.829–31 (V. Corvisieri).
In 1776 ‘M. l’abbé de V****’, i.e. François-Joseph-Ignace Donzé-Verteuil (1736–1818), former Jesuit and future Jacobin, published at Paris and Brussels a selective French translation in which, in accordance with the rationalizing spirit of the Lumières, the carefully randomized order of the original was replaced by a classification into five books respectively covering history, philosophy, ethics, law, and literature; the next year he published four additional books, this time dedicated to history, philosophy, literature, and grammar. The rendering is stylish but wildly inaccurate; the notes are elegant rather than explanatory.

An even more selective German translation was published at Lemgo in 1785 by Anton Heinrich Freiherr von Walterstern. The order of the original is almost entirely preserved, a classified index being appended; the text, despite some remarkable amplifications and simplifications, is rendered with a little less inaccuracy than by Verteuil, though several of his mistakes and paraphrases are transferred, along with some of his notes; Walterstern’s own annotations are not without interest, ranging from reports of chapters not translated to a Native American parallel for Scythian belt-tightening. An unnamed reviewer commented dismissively that people who could read Gellius in Latin would hardly care to read him in German and few of those who could not would bother however good the translation; this one was free of gross errors (an over-charitable judgment), but was entirely wanting in delicacy, refinement, and the appearance of originality, though discretion had been shown in leaving out those chapters that dealt only with Latin. The work was republished at Vienna and Prague in 1803 under a slightly different title and with lightly modernized language.

The first full version to be published was the two-volume Russian translation, by Afanasij (baptized Andrej) Ivanov (1746–1805), rector of the Moscow Slavono-Graeco-Latin Academy and archimandrite of the Zaikonospasskij monastery, subsequently archbishop of Ekaterinoslav (now Dnipropetrovs’k, Ukraine). This translation was undertaken on behalf of the Society Labouring on the Translation of Foreign Books, which on 25 May 1781 Old Style [5 June New Style] paid him 230 rubles. Apart from a few bursts of idiom, it reads...
somewhat heavily, but is generally faithful; some poetic extracts are rendered in quite elegant alexandrines.\textsuperscript{131}

In 1795 the Rev. William Beloe (1758–1817)\textsuperscript{132} published in London an English translation in three volumes, elegant but not always accurate, with notes abounding in quotations from Shakespeare, the Bible, Milton, Pope, and Gibbon; it was dedicated to Horace Walpole, who declined a formal address on the ground of unworthiness.\textsuperscript{133}

The first half of the nineteenth century saw three French translations, all of the kind known as \textit{les belles infidèles}: the first, and most unfaithful, by Victor Verger in three volumes (Paris, 1820), who makes heavy use of Verteuil; by Paul Jacquinet (books 1–10) and A.V.P.D. Fabre (books 11–20) for Désiré Nisard, in a single volume with Petronius and Apuleius (Paris, 1842); and by E. de Chau-mont (books 1–6, book 6 being our book 7), Félix Flambard (books 7–13, book 7 being our 6), and E. Buisson (books 14–20) in three volumes for Charles-Louis-Fleury Panckoucke (Paris, 1845–46). All three were accompanied by Latin texts, respectively those of Proust, Lion, and Holtze. The Panckoucke translation was revised by J.P. Charpentier and J.-A. Blanchet in two volumes for Garnier (Paris, 1863); the preface was restored to its rightful place, but books 6 and 7 remained in their pre-Hertzian order. In addition, the antiquarian A. Bréan made unpublished translations of several Latin authors, including Gellius; his version is preserved at the Bibliothèque municipale, Gien, 26 (*).

The same Felice Avetrani who had translated 12.1 for his sister’s benefit included a slightly revised version in his \textit{Scelta di alcuni capitoli delle Notti Attiche d’Aulo Gellio} (Bologna, 1839); some of these translations had already been published in various places. Francesco Cusani incorporated translations of four chapters in \textit{La letteratura latina dalla sua origine alla caduta dell’impero d’Occidente per squarci dei singoli autori in versioni italiane, con biografie e introduzione storica} (Milan, 1854), 227–29.

\textsuperscript{131} Two other Russian translations to which references will be found are ghosts: one, alleged by F.L.A. Schweiger, \textit{Handbuch der classischen Bibliographie}, vol. 2, part 1, \textit{Lateinishe Schriftsteller} (Leipzig, 1832), 380, to have been published at St. Petersburg in 1818, is unknown to Russian bibliographies; the other, dated 1820, results from misunderstanding of a note by J.D.G. Seebode, \textit{Kritische Bibliothek für das Schul- und Unterrichtswesen} 2 (1820) 255, “Auch Cor. Nepos u. Gellii. N. Att. sind Russisch übersetzt worden,” with no indication of date. (Schweiger, \textit{Lateinishe Schriftsteller}, vol. 1, 312 cites a translation of Nepos supposedly also published at St. Petersburg in 1818 but bearing the same title as Vasilij Lebedev’s version of 1748.)


No new German translation appeared for ninety years after Walterstern’s selection, though the Lutheran theologian Wilhelm Ludwig Steinbrenner (1759–1831), in his Erzählungen nach Aulus Gellius. Wißbegierigen Kindern für die langen Winterabende gewidmet (Zerbst, 1829), retold and moralized various tales from Gellius and others. However, in 1875–76 Fritz Weiss (1822–93), bass singer and part-time actor with the Königlich Sächsisches Hoftheater in Dresden, a devotee of classical authors, published at Leipzig a two-volume translation, based on Martin Hertz’s preliminary edition (Leipzig, 1853), and accompanied by quite learned notes. The translation, usually but not always correct, is insufferably verbose. A supercilious comment on Walterstern, “a third of the work done into German, in places not entirely without skill,” masks frequent use of his version, errors and all.

The Spanish version (Madrid, 1893) by Francisco Navarro y Calvo, a canon of Granada, described as a “traducción directa del latín,” is nothing of the sort: it is a translation of the Nisard version occasionally modified in light of the Latin text printed underneath the French translation and accompanied by Publilius Syrus, from the version appended to the Nisard Horace. It is remarkably faithful to its real, as opposed to its pretended model, but not without an absurd error at 5.7.1, where Nisard’s translator Jacquinet had rendered the supposed etymology of persona, “mask,” a personando (“from personare, ‘to sound through, penetrate with sound’”) by “du verbe personare, retentir”, where retentir is the normal French for “ring out, resound”; Navarro misread retentir as retenir, “retain,” and rendered “retener.” Nevertheless, his work had a profound effect on twentieth-century Argentine literature. The legal chapters were reissued at Buenos Aires in 1959 by Ediciones Jurídicas Europa-América (printed by the Impreso López y Cía.) with a preface on the law in the Attic Nights by the house’s director, the great jurist Santiago Sentís Melendo, Professor of Procedural Law at the Universidad (now Universidad Nacional) del Litoral at Santa Fe; forty years later an unacknowledged light revision (with “resonar” substituted for “retener” at 5.7.1) was published in Mexico City by Editorial Porrúa.

At Kisújszállás in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, József Barcza (1871–1921), Greek and Latin master at the local Calvinist grammar school and father of the mathematician and chess grandmaster Gedeon Barcza (1911–86), published in the annual report for 1897–98, A kisujszállási államilag segélyezett ev-ref.

134 “Zwar auch bei uns erschien ein Drittheil des Werkes 1785 von A.H.W. von W(alterstern) stellenweise nicht ganz ohne Geschick verdeutscht” (vol. 1, iii).


főgymnasium értesítője az 1897–98. tanévről, pp. 19–33, a ten-chapter sample in Hungarian translation, which together with his colleague József Soós (1868–1938) he expanded in 1905 into a complete translation published at Budapest for the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and accompanied by Hertz’s text of 1886. It abounds in errors, some but not all taken from Weiss or due to misunderstanding of his German; moreover, instead of composing their own introduction they translated his, which included a comment on the indignant response to foreigners’ attacks on “our Schiller” or “our Goethe.” Some of the poetic extracts are translated in the original quantitative metres by a far better scholar, Emil Thewrewk of Ponor (1838–1917), the editor of Festus.

Of twentieth-century versions, that in Romanian by David Popescu (Nopţile atice, Bucharest, 1965) is as good as any; it also contains notes and an excellent introduction by Iancu Fischer (1923–2002). An indifferent Italian version, heavily reliant on Rolfe and French translations, by Luigi Rusca (Milan, 1968) with an appendix by Dr Italo Della Rocca, the chief obstetrician at the hospital in Merate, commenting on the medical chapters from the modern point of view, was reissued in 1992, accompanied by Marshall’s Oxford Classical Text as reprinted in 1990, without the medical appendix but prefaced with an essay by Cesare Marco Calcante on archaism and levels of literary communication in Gellius. An Italian version of book 1, with text, was published by Vito A. Sirago (Rome, 1975).

Of the translations in bilingual editions discussed in section II, Rolfe’s, though generally sound, shows undue influence from Weiss; Mignon remains in the older French tradition, but Marache, though not faultless, strives even at the cost of elegance for an accuracy to which its predecessors did not aspire. Of the two Italian bilinguals, Cavazza’s is the more literal.

Selective translations were published in Hungarian, by Gyula Muraközy with selection by Róbert Simon (*); Swedish, by Bertil Cavallin, who renders most of the Greek quotations into English; German, by Heinz Berthold; and Slovak, by Eleonóra Vallová with an afterword by Alexandra Mallá. The preface was translated into Polish by Dorota Czuchaj.

137 For a devastating review, see J. Bán, Egyetemes philologiai közlöny 29 (1905) 866–75.
A Spanish translation for the Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum mexicana (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City) by Amparo Gaos Schmidt, accompanied by Bernardi Perini’s text, began in 2000; it has now reached book 16. Another, by Manuel-Antonio Marcos Casquero and Avelino Domínguez García, in two volumes without text, was issued in 2006 by the Universidad de León in Spain; in 2007 Francisco García Jurado brought out a selective translation (Noches áticas: antología) in the Clásicos de Grecia y Roma of the Alianza Editorial, Madrid. A complete translation in one volume, again without text, was published at Madrid in 2009 by Ediciones Akal.


Bibliography III:
Complete and Serial Translations

A. Eighteenth Century


B. Nineteenth Century


C. Twentieth Century


(1967–98, Paris: see Bibliography II.F.)


2009, Madrid: “Aulo Gelio: Noches Áticas. Edición de Santiago López Moreda. Akal.” Books 1, 4, and 5 were translated by Jesús M. Nieto Ibáñez, books 2 and 3 by M. Carmen Barrigón Fuentes, who also wrote the introduction, the rest by Santiago López Moreda.

**Commentaries**

Two commentaries on Gellius, both lost, were produced at the turn of the sixteenth century. One was by Bernard André of Toulouse (ca. 1450–ca. 1522), Austin friar, court poet, panegyrist of Henry VII and tutor to his eldest son Prince Arthur; his list of his works includes “in Aulum Gellium annotamenta.”143 The other was by John Claymond (1467/68–1536),144 successively President of Magdalen and Corpus Christi colleges, Oxford, who besides a vast but still

---


unpublished commentary on Pliny’s *Natural History*[^145], reportedly worked, “etiamnum adolescens,” on a Gellian commentary[^146], which was said by Anthony Wood to be “[i]n MS, and not, as I conceive, printed,”[^147] but of which no physical trace has been found.

Although from Ascensius onwards several editors (and translators) of Gellius have appended annotations, the first independent commentary was the posthumous *Annotationes Petri Mosellani Protogensis in clarissimas Auli Gelli Noctes Atticas* of Peter Schade (1493–1524),[^148] whose Latin name of Mosellanus derives from his birthplace of Bruttig on the Moselle. The work was first published, without preamble, as an appendix to Soter’s Cologne edition of June 1526; in August of the same year it was reissued in its own right by Johann Bebel at Basel, with a preface to the reader by the humanist and jurist Johannes Sichard (ca. 1499–1552), professor of rhetoric at the local university, who claimed to have stumbled upon Mosellanus’ notes on both Gellius and Quintilian. He states that his original intention had been to publish the latter, evidently together with an edition of the author, for he went on to say that, while awaiting a manuscript written by the humanist Roelof Huisman or Rudolf Agricola of Groningen (1444–85), in the meantime he was publishing the notes on Gellius[^149]. There is not a word of Soter’s edition; of the two misprints noted at the end of the latter only one is corrected in its successor; but correction is haphazard in later editions too (both errors remain in Soter’s reprint of July 1533). The notes are sometimes hair-raisingly misguided, as when Vergil is said to have lived some 300 years before Gellius; otherwise, though they sometimes reveal their author’s interest in Quintilian, they rarely rise far above the elementary and in the later books consist largely of brief glosses.

Kaspar von Barth (1587–1658)[^150] presents a specimen of an old “Glossarium Gellianum,”[^151] which has not been found. John Price (Pricaeus, ca. 1602–76)[^152] consists largely of brief glosses.


[^148]: See ADB 22.358–59 (L. Geiger); NDB 18.170–71 (H. Grimm).

[^149]: In the event, the notes on Quintilian, which extended only to book 7 of the *Institutio oratoria*, were printed and published separately by Adam Petri (Basel, August 1527); Sichard’s edition of that work and the Major Declamations was printed by Bebel in August 1529 without them.

[^150]: ADB 2.101–2 (F.A. Eckstein); NDB 1.605 (F.-W. Wentzlaff-Eggebert).

[^151]: Barthius (n. 62), 8.16, cols. 396–97. It may, however, be his own composition.

speaks of “quae(que) in Gellium ultra mensuram Commentarii istius collecta in scriniis adservantur nostris”; ¹⁵³ these too are lost, along with the “Annotatio-nes in Gellium” by Macrobius’ editor Johannes Isaaci Pontanus (1571–1639),¹⁵⁴ cited by Thysius (Leiden, 1666; Bibliography II.C) on 10.16 but perhaps not to be distinguished from the annotated copy of Antonius Gryphius’ 1566 edition mentioned by Jacobus Gronovius (Amsterdam, 1651; Bibliography II.C) in his preface, sig. ****2v. In 1609 Samuel Crespin appended to his reprint notes from various works of various recent authors to individual chapters.

A full commentary was intended by Philippus Caroli (d. 1639) and begun in January 1628, but had reached no further than book 14 when in July 1629 he aban-doned his post as professor of history and philology at the Gymnasium of Altdorf bei Nürnberg, departed to Austria, and turned Roman Catholic;¹⁵⁵ it survives in manuscript (Staats- und Universitätsbibl. Hamburg “Carl von Ossietzky,” Cod. hans. III. 21, pp. 241–480) and with occasional discrepancies in print,¹⁵⁶ edited by Christoph Arnold (1627–85) together with notes on Quintus Curtius (Nurem-berg, 1663). By then the future Imperial librarian Petrus Lambecius (Peter Lambeck, 1628–80)¹⁵⁷ had published his selective Prodomus lucubrationum criti-carum in Gellii Noctes Atticas (Paris, 1647), accompanied by his Dissertatio de vita et nomine A. Gellii, which disposed of the then widespread belief (still reflected in Caroli’s title) that the author’s name was Agellius.

The Danish schoolmaster Christian Falster (1690–1752),¹⁵⁸ co-rector and then rector of the cathedral school at Ribe, a devoted student of Gellius, in his Vigilia prima Noctium Ripensium (Copenhagen, 1721) essayed a commentary on the lost eighth book based on the chapter headings, complete with prolegom-ena successfully defending the chapter headings against Stephanus and a “Speci-men Lexici Gelliani” relating to their vocabulary. The unpublished “Noctes Ripenses in Noctes Atticas A. Gellii” (Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibl., E don.

---

¹⁵³ In his “annotationes ubiores” on Apuleius’ Metamorphoses (Gouda, 1650), 706. Grammatically it is not quite clear whether “Commentarij istius” refers to these or to the commentary he has just mentioned, that on the Apologia (Paris, 1635), but it would be a thin commentary indeed on Gellius that did not exceed the length of one on the Apologia, even the 220 quarto pages that Pricaeus devotes to the latter work.

¹⁵⁴ So identified in the index. See BW 15.403–8; NNBW 1.1417–20 (S.P. Haak); DBL 11.431 (E. Jørgensen).


¹⁵⁶ At page 326 in the manuscript commentary, commenting on a problematic passage about the younger Scipio’s age when prosecuted for his conduct as censor, Caroli writes “Scipionem quadragenarium barbam rasitasse”; in the printed edition (p. 195) this becomes “Scipionem jam sexagenarium,” making him twenty years older.

¹⁵⁷ ADB 17.533–36 (C. Halm); NDB 13.426–27 (G. König).

var. 4, (fol.), of which that work was to be the first installment, mutated from a commentary into a full-scale lexicon with often lengthy notes on the individual words; it was intended for publication in the Netherlands, but even Sigebert Havercamp (1684–1742), professor of Greek at Leiden, could prevail on the printers to accept it as a whole, though Falster’s more important observations appeared in his Amoenitates philologicae sive discursus varii (vol. 2 [Amsterdam, 1731], 241–72, “Libellus Commentarius de vita et rebus Auli Gellii,” and vol. 3 [Amsterdam, 1732], 211–344, “Admonitones ad interpretes A. Gellii”). One comment that did not survive (Noctes Ripenses, p. 912) is that those who purport to give equivalences for ancient money “docte nugantur,” talk learned nonsense.

Hertz had intended to publish an edition whose apparatus criticus should be combined with a commentary; he produced two specimens in the academic prospectus of the Universität Breslau, ‘A. Gellii quae ad ius pertinent capita quattuor (lib. IV cap. 1–4) emendata et adnotata,’ Index lectionum in Universitate Litteraria Vrlatislaviensi per hiemem a. MDCCCLXVIII a die XV mensis Octobris habendarum, pp. 1* (= 3)–20, ‘A. Gellii Noctium Atticarum praeatio recensa et adnotata,’ Index scholarum in Universitate Litteraria Vrlatislaviensi per aestatem a. MDCCCLXXVII a die IX mensis Aprilis habendarum, 1* (= 3)–13; however, when his projected edition finally appeared, the additional task of commentary had proved beyond him.

In the twentieth century, full commentaries were published on the preface, by Paul Faider, “Auli Gellii Noctium Atticarum Praefatio: Texte revu, publié avec une traduction et un commentaire exégétique,” Le Musée belge 31 (1927) 189–216, and on book 1, by Hazel M. Hornsby, A. Gellii Noctium Atticarum Liber I (Dublin, 1936); in addition, doctoral dissertations were devoted to book 13, by William Charles Kurth, “A Commentary on Book XIII of the Noctes Atticae of Aulus Gellius” (‘The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1965), and to book 2, by L.A. Holford-Strevens, “Select Commentary on Aulus Gellius Book 2” (Oxford, 1971); Dorota Czuchaj’s text and translation of the preface were accompanied by a commentary on content and language. The present century has seen commentaries on book 9, by Jens-Olaf Lindemann, Aulus Gellius Noctes Atticae, Buch 9: Kommentar (Berlin, 2006); on the first three chapters of book 17 by Stefano Rocchi, “Saggio di commento ad Aulo Gellio, Notti Attiche, 17.1–3” (Università Ca’ Foscari Venezia, 2009); on book 3 by Katarzyna Ochman, “A Commentary on Book III of the Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius” (Uniwersytet Wroclawski, 2011); the preface accompanying an ultra-conservative text) by Javier Velaza, “Hacia

159 For this reason, although Falster’s normal Latin hand is itself both clear and elegant, the occasional Danish word is written not in the Gothic script of, e.g., his gloss “meget” (very) on nimi at 13.3.6 in his copy of Jacobus Gronovius’ edition (Copenhagen, Universitetsbibl., Kl. 78212 4°, p. 578), but in very large roman letters.

Translations and bilingual editions include notes, but mostly of an elementary nature; the only annotations that merit the title of commentary are those in Cavazza’s edition (Bibliography II.F). Those in the first volume, indeed, containing books 1–3, were of the kind usual in translations; but from the second volume onwards the notes became far more extensive, especially in linguistic matters.

**Bibliography IV: Commentaries**

1526, Coloniae (Cologne): Petrus Mosellanus, “Annotationes Petri Mosellani Protogensis in clarissimas Auli Gellii Noctes Atticas” attached to Soter’s first edition (Bibliography II.B), published in June, then issued separately in August by Johann Bebel at Basel (NUC.NM 0813613;60 VD16 S 2126; BNF; BSB; Basel, Universitätsbibl.; Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibl.; Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibl.). May be downloaded from Google Books and BSB. Reissued by Ascensius on 24 October 1528 (NUC.NM 0813615; BNF; Lyons, Bibl. Mun.; Oxford, Bod. Lib.), by Soter (Cologne, July 1533) (NUC.NM 0813616; BSB; Basel, Universitätsbibl.; Berlin, Staatsbibl.; Lyons, Bibl. Mun.; Florence, BNC; Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibl.), by Ascensius again (“Rursus”) in January 1534 (NUC.NM 0813617; Rome, BNC), and by Sebastian Gryphius at Lyons in 1542 (NUC.NM 0813627; ÖNB; Lyons, Bibl. Mun.); copies were often sold together with Gellius himself. The individual comments were also incorporated by the two Gymnichs, Fabricius, and Petri in their editions, the shorter notes in the margin, the rest following the relevant chapters.


---

60 The 1527 copy in the University of Pennsylvania Library recorded as NUC.NM 0813614 seems in fact to be a copy of Mosellanus’ notes on Quintilian.
Lib.; Venice, Bibl. Naz. Marciana; Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibl. May be read online through Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.


1885–86, Vratislaviae (Breslau), reprint by Martin Hertz of Carrio’s Castigationes et notae from a copy in the library of the Universität Breslau: 161 Index Scholarum in Universitate Litterarum Vratislawiensis per aestatem anni MDCCCLXXXV a die XV mensis Aprilis habendarum, 1* (= 3)–27, on chs. 1–3; Index Scholarum in Universitate Litterarum Vratislawiensis per aestatem anni MDCCCLXXXVI a die XVIII mensis Aprilis habendarum, 1* (= 3)–27 (chs. 4–15); Index Scholarum in Universitate Litterarum Vratislawiensis per aestatem [sic for hiemem] anni MDCCCLXXXVI a die XV mensis Octobris habendarum, 1* (= 3)–27 (ch. 16–ch. 25. 9).

Addendum


161 As Professor Jakub Pigoń kindly confirms, this is no longer present in the library of the Uniwersytet Wrocławski.