PHILOLOGY AND POETRY IN THE *CASTIGATIONES VIRGILIANAE* OF PIERIO VALERIANO

By Julia Haig Gaisser

Pierio Valeriano (1477-1558) was a prominent figure in the intellectual and social world of sixteenth-century Roman humanism. In June 1521 he published a textual study on the whole of Virgil, Castigationes et varietates virgilianae lectionis*, the first work of its kind and a landmark in the history of Virgilian scholarship. Its criteria are both philological and aesthetic, reflecting Valeriano's own interests as a scholar and a poet. This paper looks at the* Castigationes *in the context of Valeriano's intellectual biography and life in humanist Rome and considers connections between his textual studies and other contemporary projects, especially the lectures on Catullus at the Studium Urbis that he began just a few months after the publication of the* Castigationes.

Pierio Valeriano was a prominent figure in sixteenth-century Italian humanism and an active participant in the several convivial sodalities that thrived in Rome during the papacy of Leo X (1513-1521). Although Valeriano is best known today for his great iconographical work, the *Hieroglyphica*, he was also a serious philologist and student of manuscripts, a prolific Latin poet, a writer of dialogues, and a reflective observer of humanist life.[1] In June 1521 he published his study of Virgil, *Castigationes et varietates virgilianae lectionis*.

The *Castigationes* is a textual commentary on the whole of Virgil — the first of its kind, and the first to be based on the complete collation of a major ancient manuscript.[2] Method is at the very heart of the work, as Valeriano explains in the dedication to Cardinal Giulio de'Medici that he uses as a preface.[3] He has carefully corrected his text of Virgil—"my Virgil," he calls

[1] For a brief biography, see Gaisser 1999, 1-23, with earlier references.

[2] For important general discussions, see Savarese 1993; Fera 2001; Campanelli 2008, 484-493. On Valeriano's philology, see Funaioli 1948, 289-290; Zabughin 1921-23, vol. 2. 71-75. For its many editions, see Pellegrini 2002, 61-66.

[3] *Castigationes*, fol. aa2 r. The fact that the volume uses three numbering systems strongly suggests that its parts were printed separately; Campanelli 2008, 487 n.48. Roman numerals are used as page numbers for the notes on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, Arabic page

it—by comparing its readings with those both in his primary manuscript and in several others—the oldest ones he could find—weighing the readings in these manuscripts with those in many others, and with the further evidence of inscriptions, ancient commentators, and the usage of Virgil and other classical poets. This clearly stated philological method, meticulously followed through almost three hundred densely packed pages, distinguishes the *Castigationes* from all previous textual studies, making it a landmark in the history of Virgilian scholarship. But it is not Valeriano's only method of evaluating readings; he has a second standard of judgment, not mentioned in the preface, but constantly invoked in tandem with his philological evidence and fundamental to the work as a whole.[4] This second standard is aesthetic. Italian scholars have sometimes called it *gusto* (taste), but its criteria, although personal, are less subjective than that term suggests. His judgment of the artistic merit of particular readings is that of an expert, based both on his extensive study of poetry and poetic criticism and on his own experience as a poet.

In what follows I will look at the ways in which Valeriano uses both of his methods. I will suggest that his work is both philological and poetic—or rather, that it is an inextricable amalgam of the two approaches—and that it is a very specific product both of its historical context and of Valeriano's own intellectual biography. It reflects his place in the world of the Roman humanists and his lifelong interest in ancient texts and monuments and provides tantalizing glimpses of his work on several projects. I will end by looking at one such project, the lectures on Catullus that he began at the Studium Urbis in the autumn of 1521, just a few months after the publication of the *Castigationes.*

Philological Method and the World of the Roman Humanists

Like a modern philologist, Valeriano begins with an account of his *sigla*, the names by which he will cite his most important manuscripts. He lists four, all of which are extant and have been identified.[5] Here is how he describes them:

numbers for those on the *Aeneid*. The whole volume is numbered by fascicles, but only the numbering by fascicles is used for the prefatory material (title page, dedication, indices, etc.). The fascicles of both the prefatory material and the notes on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* are numbered with double lowercase letters (aa, bb, etc.), those of the notes on the *Aeneid* with single capitals (A, B, C, etc.)

[4] See Savarese 1993, 64-65; Fera 2001, 130-31; Campanelli 2008, 490-91.

[5] The manuscripts named by Valeriano are Romanus (Vatican Library, Vat. lat. 3867, 6th c.), Oblongus (Vat. lat. 1574, 12th c.), Longobardicus (Vat. lat. 1573, 12th c.?), and Mediceus (Florence, Biblioteca laurenziana Plut. 39.23, 12th c.). They were identified by Zabughin 1921-23, vol. 2, 71-75, 97-98. Valeriano's names for them will be used throughout the discussion.

> The Codex Romanus [is] undoubtedly the most ancient. I call it Romanus because its letters are very close to Roman ones, to those, in fact, that we read everywhere written in ancient inscriptions on marble or tablets of bronze and on the more elegant coins of those ages. It is kept with great care in the inner recesses of the Vatican Library. It is written in letters almost as high as a finger's breadth.
>
> The second, which is in smaller letters and itself very old, will be called Oblongus because of its shape.
>
> There is also the Lombardic manuscript, which one would not regret reading. There are also several others not to be despised that are available for general use in the same library.
>
> The Mediceus too is among the corrected ones.[6]

The Codex Romanus is Valeriano's principal source and the subject of his detailed collation. It is luxurious and lavishly illustrated**,** but its text is inferior to that of the other most ancient manuscripts.[7] Valeriano treats it with appropriate caution. After noting that it is corrupt in many places, he continues, "But, as Virgil used to say about Ennius, 'gold is often gathered from that dung.'" [8] The Oblongus he frequently calls Pomponio Leto's "pet manuscript," but I have not found references to it in Pomponio's commentary.[9] The somewhat dismissive designation "Lombardic" for his third manuscript refers to its difficult Beneventan script. These three (Romanus, Oblongus, and Longobardicus) were kept in the reserved section of the Vatican. Valeriano could have consulted his fourth manuscript, the

[6] "Antea quam rem ipsam aggrediamur, nomina, quibus insigniores quosdam codices citamus, praedocere visum est. Ea sunt, Codex Romanus, ille quidem dubioprocul antiquissimus; eum vero ideo Romanum appellamus, quod eius characteres Romanis propiores sunt, iis quippe, quos in antiquis marmorum; aut ex aere tabularum inscriptionibus, et in nummis saeculis illis elegantioribus notatos ubique legimus. Custoditur is in interioribus Vaticanae Bibliothecae penetralibus magna diligentia, digitalibus pene litteris perscriptus. Alter, qui minoribus est litteris et ipse admodum vetus, a paginarum facie Oblongus nuncupabitur. Est et Longobardicus, quem non omnino pigeat evoluisse. Sunt et usui omnium expositi eadem in Bibliotheca codices alii atque alii non contemnendi. Est et Mediceus inter emendatos," *Castigationes* I, on *Eclogue* 1.

[7] For the illustrations see Wright 2001. The text is characterized by Geymonat 1995, 306: "Of our late-antique mss., **R** is perhaps the least accurate, with errors, even trivial ones, that disfigure almost every page, omissions, repetitions, glosses that have slipped into the text, all clear proofs that the showy wealth of the man who ordered **R** was certainly not matched by an adequate cultural level."

[8] "In litteris vero nonnunquam corruptissimus est. Sed ut de Ennio Virgilius profiteri solitus, 'ex eo stercore aurum plerunque colligitur'," *Castigationes* LIII, on *Georgic* 3.190. The anecdote appears in Aelius Donatus' life of Virgil: "Cum Ennium in manu haberet, rogareturque quidnam faceret, respondit se aurum colligere de stercore Ennii" (*Vita quae Donati Aucti dicitur* 71, quoted from Brugnoli and Stok 1997, 113).

[9] I have checked only selectively in Leto 1544, that is, for passages where Valeriano mentions the Oblongus, or in the passages I have discussed.

Mediceus, in either Florence or Rome.(It is not to be confused with the important fifth-century manuscript called Mediceus by modern editors.[10]) His use of it testifies to his status as a client of the Medici, whom he served in several positions, including those of papal notary and secretary to his dedicatee, Giulio de'Medici.[11] Although Valeriano perhaps had access in his own right to the inner reaches of the Vatican for his other three manuscripts, it is possible that his Medici connections played a role there too, and that they were obtained for him by the pope, who borrowed all three of them from the library in 1516.[12]

But Valeriano did not limit his researches to these four manuscripts. He notes that there are others "not to be despised" (*non contemnendi*) in the public area of the Vatican, and in the commentary itself he draws on both his own manuscripts and those of many friends, whose names constitute almost a "W*ho's Who*" of the Roman humanists. He wants to survey as many texts as possible, refusing to rely too much on any one testimony:

> Although if you look closely, every single manuscript is riddled with distortions and errors, nevertheless from the comparison and agreement of a greater number, we arrive at the truer readings, or at least those more like the true ones.[13]

Scholars usually call Valeriano's work the *Castigationes* (Corrections), but its full title matters: *Castigationes et varietates virgilianae lectionis*, "Corrections and Variants of the text of Virgil." Vincenzo Fera has pointed out that the title introduces a concept foreign to earlier philology—the full and systematic comparison of readings in a text across a number of manuscripts.[14] Such a project would have been unthinkable a generation earlier, he notes, simply because so few manuscripts of a given author were available at one time. He is right, of course, but I think that the essential point for Valeriano is that his title is descriptive: it openly allows for the existence of multiple readings and suggests that certainty is not always possible. He usually says which reading he prefers, but he is no A. E. Housman. He often either reserves judgment or leaves the choice up to the reader, whom he assumes to be a cultivated and expert student of Virgil like himself and like the friends and fellow Roman humanists who made up his first audience,

[10] Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana Plut. 39.1.

[11] Giulio's stemma is prominently displayed on *Castigationes* fol. bb7v.

[12] For Vat. lat. 1573 and Vat. lat. 1574 (Longobardicus and Oblongus), see Pellegrin et al., 1991, 137 and 141. For Vat. lat. 3867 (Romanus), see Pellegrin et al. 2010, 339.

[13] "Quamvis vero omnes, si diligentius inspicias, perversionibus, erroribusque ad unum scateant, ex plurium tamen collatione consensuque, aut veriora, aut certe veris similiora deprehendimus," *Castigationes* I.

[14] Fera 2001, 120.

The work contains many examples of his flexibility and deference to his readers. Here is one in a note in *Aeneid* 6, where Aeneas prays for divine aid in finding the golden bough: *et sic forte precatur* (and so by chance he prayed; *Aeneid* 6.186). The reading in question is *forte*. Valeriano reports that the codex Romanus reads *voce* (with his voice); the Longobardicus *ore* (with his mouth), and that *forte* appears in many ancient manuscripts.[15] Servius knew *forte*, he says, but rejected it as otiose, considering it a metrical place-holder.[16] He concludes:

> After these variants I had carefully collected began circulating, I see that either *ore* or *voce* finds more approval [than *forte*] in the opinion of experts. But we leave the matter open.[17]

And another example: *interea medium Aeneas* (Aeneas now in mid-course; *Aeneid* 5.1). The question is the correct order of *medium* and *Aeneas*. Valeriano notes that some very ancient manuscripts reverse them: not *medium Aeneas*, but *Aeneas medium.*[18] The order *Aeneas medium* seems more artistic or skillful (*artificiosior*), he thinks, because it produces an exact alternation of dactyls and spondees. But *medium Aeneas* might be considered weightier from its clashing or elision of several letters.[19] The conclusion? "Let each one consult his own ears, for we will leave it open."[20] Please note the instructions to consult one's ears; sound is an essential esthetic element in Valeriano's arsenal of textual criticism, and he will invoke it again and again.

But he is not always so tolerant, as we can see from a long note in *Aeneid* 4, where Dido appears dressed for the hunt.

---

[15] Valeriano does not say so, but *forte* appears in both the Oblongus and the Mediceus. But at least one reader of the Oblongus had some doubts; see next note.

[16] "Addit vero Servius versum hunc ex eo genere esse, qui tibicines appellantur, quibus aliquid additur ad solam metri sustentationem. Vacare enim adverbium FORTE putat," *Castigationes* 99. Valeriano's paraphrase closely follows Servius' language, but omits his reason for considering *forte* otiose: "Vacat 'forte' . . . . nec enim possumus intellegere eum fortuitu rogasse," Servius *ad loc*. A second hand in the Oblongus glosses *forte* with a paraphrase of Servius: "Vacatur. nec possumus intelligere forte rogasse" (Vat. lat. 1574, fol. 72r).

[17] "Sed enim intelligo, posteaquam hae variae lectiones, nostra cura collectae per manus hominum circumferri coeptae sunt, aut ORE, aut VOCE peritorum iudicio magis approbari. Nos vero hoc in medio ponimus," *Castigationes* 99.

[18] *Castigationes* 67. Valeriano does not say which manuscripts read *Aeneas medium*. The relevant folio is lacking in the Codex Romanus, but Oblongus, Longobardicus, and Mediceus all read *medium Aeneas*. (A second hand in Longobardicus reverses the order.)

[19] The last two letters of *medium* are elided: *medi(um) Aeneas*.

[20] "Sed enim suas quisque aures consulat, nos enim id in medio relinquimus," *Castigationes* 67.

> Cui pharetra ex auro, crines nodantur in aurum,
> aurea purpuream subnectit fibula vestem. (*Aeneid* 4. 138-9)
>
> (She had a quiver of gold, her hair was knotted into a golden clasp,
> A golden brooch fastened her purple garment.)

This is how both the ancient Romanus and modern editions read the passage, and it is what Valeriano prefers. But the vulgate text, which he was glossing, had a different idea about her quiver—not that it was gold (*ex auro*), but that it hung from her shoulder (*ex humero*).

Valeriano supports *ex auro* with aesthetic, stylistic, and philological arguments. He begins with the literary observation that it is appropriate to Dido's motivation at this point in the poem:

> *Ex auro* is pleasing because Dido was eager at that moment to be attractive to Aeneas; and so she came forth elaborately dressed and furnished with the most splendid possible accoutrements. And this all-golden extravagance [*lascivia*] marvelously suited her feminine elegance.[21]

Still arguing in aesthetic terms, he turns, now polemically, to the subject of poetic style and Virgilian usage:

> And yet some people insist that this extravagance [*lascivia*] does not suit Virgil's grandeur, more because they want to make objections than because they know what constitutes grandeur in poetry or extravagance in style.[22]

He claims that these critics are too ignorant to see that the repetition of the word "gold" (*ex auro*, *in aurum*, *aurea . . . fibula*) is completely Virgilian and that the poet uses it in other lavish descriptions.[23] Finally, he invokes his decisive argument: the philological evidence of the manuscripts.

> But away with those pathetic little critics, with their keen discernment and sophisticated tastes. We support the reading *cui pharetra ex auro* on the testimony of almost all the ancient manuscripts.[24]

---

[21] "[Ex auro] ideo placet, quia Dido tunc pulcherrima esse studuit, ut Aeneae placeret; ideoque ornatissima, et quam maxime divite habitu instructa processit. Congruitque mirifice cultui muliebri lascivia haec prorsus aurea," *Castigationes* 56.

[22] "Et tamen sunt, qui lasciviam hanc Virgilianae maiestati non convenire clamitent, contradicendi potius studio, quam quod sciant, quid sit in carmine maiestas, aut quid in scribendo lascivia," *Castigationes* 56.

[23] E.g. at *Aeneid* 8.659-61, 11.774-76, 7.278-79.

[24] "Sed valeant cum suo tam acri iudicio, tamque emunctis naribus pulchelli isti Critici. Nos lectionem hanc CUI PHARETRA EX AURO antiquorum pene omnium codicum testimonio corroboramus," *Castigationes* 56.

He had begun his note by saying that *ex auro* was the reading "in that undoubtedly very ancient codex Romanus" (*in Romano illo codice dubio procul antiquissimo*). Now he brings in many others: the Longobardic manuscript, as well as that of his friend Camillo Porcari, an old manuscript in his home city of Belluno, and some of his own manuscripts.[25] He also notes that it appeared in another very ancient manuscript in the Vatican Library (unidentified), where it had been changed to *ex humero*.[26] He also points out that the reading appears in quotations of the verse by both Tiberius Donatus and Probus.[27] He concludes with the polemical comment that he has heaped up all this evidence because some people are so wrong-headed that they dislike being instructed about fine literature and try to deter others from from learning what they still don't know themselves.[28]

But he is still not finished. He comes back to the matter with a final piece of evidence in a note on *Aeneid* 5.817.[29] Petrarca had quoted the verse from book 4 with *ex auro* in his letters (*Seniles* 6.8).

> When these notes had already begun to circulate, Camillo Porcari … reminded me that the reading *cui pharetra ex auro,* which I had discussed at length in the previous book, was also known to Francesco Petrarca … It was appropriate to insert the point here, since I had not yet read this when I was writing those things, and there are still people who try to refute all the arguments I brought up there.[30]

Valeriano's whole discussion of *ex auro* is polemical, and its hostility extends even to the index, which describes his note in book 4 as "a defense against some people's slanders"[31] Such polemics are not surprising, for the Roman

[25] For Camillo Porcari, see Gaisser 1999. 319-20; Jones 1990.

[26] "In alio vero perveteri eiusdem Vaticanae bibliothecae, dicta tota AURO improbe, ac imperite admodum abrasa est, non ita tamen, ut singularum litterarum vestigia non extent, et manifeste AURO prius scriptum fuisse discernatur," *Castigationes* 56.

[27] Tiberius Donatus 1969, 372; Pseudo-Probus 1848, 9-10. Both are quoted in *Castigationes* 56-7.

[28] "Haec ut forte plus nimio coacervarem, id in caussa fuit, quod nonnnuli sunt ita pravo ingenio praediti, ut meliores se doceri litteras aegre ferant, proindeque alios ab eorum cognitione, quae ipsi hactenus ignorarunt, avertere conentur," *Castigationes* 57.

[29] Here again the question is the vulgate substitution of another word for "gold," the reading of the manuscripts."Nulla non exemplaria vulgata CURRU legunt. Sed enim vetera omnia manu scripta IUNGIT EQUOS AURO GENITOR uno exemplo legunt," *Castigationes* 94.

[30] "Dum vero haec vulgari iam coepta essent, admonuit me Camillus Porcius ... lectionem eam, *cui pharetra ex auro*, qua de superiore libro multa retuleramus, agnitam etiam Fr. Petrarchae ... Quod loco hoc inserere non fuit importunum, quando, quum illa scriberemus, nondum hoc legeramus, et adhuc sunt, qui tot a me rationes eo loco allatas conentur oppugnare," *Castigationes* 94.

[31] "Defensa lectio. Cui pharetra ex auro. contra nonnullorum Calumnias," *Castigationes* aa 5v. See also his note in the index on *Aeneid* 5.817: "Iungit equos curru. Lectionem in IIII, cui Pharetra ex auro etiam aliis agnitam," *Castigationes* aa 6r.

Academy, like its counterparts elsewhere, was full of dissension and rivalry. But this is the only place where I've seen such animosity in the *Castigationes.*[32] Valeriano's antagonist is unknown. All we can say is that his animus clearly has a contemporary target, someone (or several someones) with whom he has an ongoing and acrimonious dispute.[33] In his polemical enthusiasm he even shades the truth. He gives the definite impression that *ex humero* is not only incorrect but without manuscript authority, but fails to mention that it appears in two of his principal sources: the Oblongus and the Mediceus.[34] He is so interested in making his case for the right reading that he papers over some of the evidence for what is obviously the wrong one.

His discussion also raises two general questions. The first is the composition and publication of his work. He often tells us that his notes circulated among his friends before publication; an early version of them, as he says in his preface, consisted of readings alone, unaccompanied by explanations. Many notes show him taking his readers' comments into account, giving us glimpses of exchanges and discussions with his fellow humanists. But the notes on Dido's quiver show something more.The citation of Petrarca in book 5, fifteen hundred lines and almost forty pages after the original note in book 4, suggests that the *Castigationes* was published piecemeal, perhaps even one book at a time, and that Valeriano was revising even after parts of it had already been printed.[35] The second question concerns his method and the texts he was using. He identifies his principal manuscripts and names the owners of several others, but he never tells us what text he is correcting. Although any modern editor would identify it, Valeriano is less concerned with a particular text than with the vulgate tradition as a whole. Sometimes he does attribute the reading in his lemma to the vulgate, but ordinarily, as in the present case, its source in the vulgate is simply assumed.[36]

---

[32] The note on the spelling Virgilius (not Vergilius) at *Georgic* 3.573 is long but not hostile in tone; *Castigationes* lxix-lxxi. He is disdainful but not angrily so in several brief notes that seem to reflect contemporary disputes about the text, e.g., those on *Aeneid* 1.409; 3.43; 6,447; 7.808-11.

[33] A similar line is taken by Savarese 1993, 60.

[34] Oblongus (Vat. Lat. 1574, fol. 56r): Mediceus (Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana Plut. 39.23, fol. 77v). The reading *ex humero* thus goes back at least to the twelfth century.

[35] For a similar suggestion, see Savarese 1993, 61. See also Campanelli 2008, 487 n.48, who makes a slightly different argument. On the basis of the different numbering of the several parts of the work, he suggests that the printing took place in two phases, beginning with the *Aeneid*. Some of Valeriano's notes support the idea that the Aeneid was done first, e.g. those on *Georgic* 3.189 and 4.479; *Castigationes* liii and lxviii.

[36] He often refers to the vulgate text. For example: he attributes a reading to *vulgata fere omnia exemplaria* (*Aeneid* 12.464), adds one very close to his lemma that he calls characteristic of the *divulgatorum exemplarium* (*Aeneid* 10.186), quotes a whole verse as it

He probably did have one text that he used as a reference and perhaps annotated with various readings, but he was aware of a wide range of editions and manuscripts. He often refers in general terms to incunables, and he clearly knew at least three sixteenth-century editions.[37] The fact that he is correcting the vulgate, however, makes it difficult to identify a given representative of it as his text. Our present reading, *ex humero*, appears in three sixteenth-century editions that he could have seen.[38]

Valeriano's fellow humanists are a constant presence in the *Castigationes,* lending manuscripts, agreeing (or disagreeing) with his ideas, and even influencing his choice of readings, as we have seen. But the interests of the Roman humanists, and of Valeriano himself, were not limited to texts, even those of Virgil. The sixteenth-century Roman Academy, like that of Pomponio Leto a generation earlier, had an insatiable interest in ancient Roman material culture—coins, monuments, sculptures, inscriptions—and Valeriano invokes such evidence on nearly every page.

He almost always cites inscriptions to illustrate ancient orthography, rarely discussing the inscriptions themselves.[39] They were everywhere in Rome, and Valeriano likes to name friends who pointed them out. He was shown one in the gardens of the Colonna by Mariangelo Accursio, a noted collector and student of inscriptions.[40] The prominent humanist Antonio Lelio braved his gout to take him to the bank of the Tiber to see another, soon after its discovery.[41] Valeriano also refers to inscriptions in the houses—and especially the gardens—of hosts of humanist sodalities. These include Iacopo Sadoleto, Angelo Colocci, and Johann Goritz, whose sodality was the largest

appears in the *vulgata exemplaria* (*Eclogue* 2.73), and identifies a reading *as passim . . . in impressis codicibus* (*Eclogue* 5.30) and another as found *in impressis omnibus codicibus* (*Aeneid*. 10.377).

[37] He refers specifically to the third Aldine (Aldine 1514) on *Aeneid* 3.43, *Castigationes* 38; and indirectly more than once to Venice 1507 (edited by his friend Giovanni Battista Egnazio), and either Florence 1510 or 1517 (edited by Benedetto Riccardini). For references to Egnazio and Riccardini, see Venier 2001, 74-75, 122-25.

[38] Aldine 1501, Aldine 1514, Riccardini 1517. I have not been able to see Egnazio 1507. The other readings discussed in this paper also appear in all three editions, except *forte* (*Aeneid* 6.186) and *divom* (*Aeneid* 6.792), both only in Aldine 1501.

[39] He emends and interprets two inscriptions in *Castigationes* 200-201.

[40] "Vir bene litteratus Mariangelus Accursius Aquilanus, opportune mihi in Hortis Columnensium ad DD Apostolos hanc inscriptionem in vetusto lapide notatum ostendit," *Castigationes* 200. For Accursio see Campana 1960.

[41] "Antonius Laelius civis meus antiquam indicavit inscriptionem in ipsa Tyberis Ripa pulchris characteribus ita notatam ... Quo vero maiorem Laelio gratiam debeo, non gravatus est vir ingenii et eruditionis elegantissimae podagra etiam eum miserabiliter affligente ad recenter erutum lapidum visendum me deducere," *Castigationes* 200. For Lelio see Jossa 2005.

and most famous of all.[42] Valeriano's introduction to Goritz's inscription invokes the sodality itself and its festive gatherings: "and on a very ancient stone in the garden of Johann Goritz in the Forum of Trajan that he has dedicated to the genius of the Roman Academy, one can read …". [43]

He also cites ancient coins to confirm readings or spellings.[44] There is a nice example in his note on Anchises' description of Augustus in the "parade of heroes" at *Aeneid* 6.792. Modern texts read: *Augustus Caesar, divi genus* (Augustus Caesar, son of a god). But the vulgate Valeriano was using had *divom genus* (descendant of gods). Here is what he says:

> In the Romanus and Mediceus and several others we read *divi genus*, which you may find also inscribed on coins, as on a very fine coin on which one side has the head of Caius Caesar with the legend *divos Iulius*, the other the head of Augustus Octavianus, with the legend *Augustus divi f<ilius>*; I think Virgil is alluding to that title here. I pass over the inscriptions on stone, on the Capitoline and elsewhere, in which I have noticed *divi f<ilius>*.[45]

The coin Valeriano describes is unusual: my numismatist friends tell me that few coins have a portrait head on both sides. But I have found one that almost fits his description: a denarius struck in 17 BC.[46] Augustus appears on the obverse with the legend "DIVI F<ilius> AUGUSTUS." Julius Caesar is on the reverse, with the comet above his head that marks his divinity. The legend,

[42] Sadoleto, at *Aeneid* 1.247; Colocci, on *Georgic* 1.2, 4.563, *Aeneid* 12.348; Goritz, at *Aeneid* 7.648. Valeriano would list all three among the hosts of sodalities in the lectures on Catullus. See Gaisser 1993, 136. For Sadoleto see Douglas 1959; for Colocci, Anonymous 1982; for Gortitz, Ceresa 2002. Valeriano also mentions inscriptions in the houses or gardens of the humanists Mario Mellini (*Aeneid* 8.105) and Mario Maffei (*Aeneid* 6.1, 7.648). For Mellini, see Modigliani 2009; for Maffei, Benedetti 2006.

[43] "Et in hortis Ioannis Coritii, quos in Fo[ro]. Traiani Academiae Ro[manae] Genio consecravit, antiquissimo lapide legere est …," *Castigationes* 124.

[44] E.g. at *Aeneid* 4.263, 6.792, 8.201, 8.664.

[45] "AUGUSTUS Caesar DIVOM Genus. In Ro. codice, in Mediceo, et plerisque aliis legere est DIVI GENUS, id quod in nomismatum etiam inscriptionibus invenias ut in nummo pulcherrimo, a cuius altera parte C. Caesaris caput habetur, titulus est DIVOS IULIUS. ab altero vero parte Augusti Octaviani caput, cum inscriptione AUGUSTUS DIVI F. ad quem titulum crediderim hoc loco Virgilium adlusisse. Praetereo vero lapidum inscriptiones, quae sunt et in Capitolio, et alibi, in quibus DIVI F. scriptum observavi," *Castigationes* 108. Valeriano goes on to note that *Divi genus* was the original reading in the manuscript of Camillo Porcari, and that it is undoubtedly the reading in the manuscript of Janus Vitalis. The Oblongus reads *divi genus*, the Lombardic *divum genus*.

[46] RIC 1.338 (= Carson and Sutherland, eds. 1984, 66). The coin is illustrated on plate 3.1 in Mattingly 1923, 13 (item 71).

however, does not read "Divos Iulius," but rather the name of the moneyer, M. Sanquinius.[47]

Sculptures, like inscriptions and coins, were everywhere, but they were less relevant to Valeriano's textual project and he seldom mentions them. His note on a passage in the ecphrasis of Aeneas' shield is a notable exception.

> Fecerat et viridi fetam Mavortis in antro
> procubuisse lupam, geminos huic ubera circum
> ludere pendentis pueros et lambere matrem
> impavidos, illam tereti cervice reflexa
> mulcere alternos et corpora fingere lingua. (*Aeneid* 8.630-34)
>
> (And Vulcan had made the mother-wolf lying
> in Mars' green grotto, the twin boys playing,
> tugging around her dugs and sucking the mother unafraid;
> she, bending her slender neck, caressed them in turn
> and licked them into shape with her tongue.)

Valeriano comments: "It is worth looking at a figure like this in several places in Rome, in both marble and bronze. You would be in doubt whether Virgil took the model of the image from the sculptors, or the sculptors from Virgil."[48] The she-wolf was often depicted in antiquity, and Valeriano suggests that images were easy to find although he does not name a particular example.[49] His appreciative comment on Virgil's description, however, seems not only vague. but inaccurate, since Virgil's nursing wolf is lying down (*procubuisse*), while most visual images have her standing. Virgil was not following the sculptors or the sculptors Virgil. It seems, rather, that Valeriano was reading the passage through his knowledge of the visual images—that he knew the canonical pose of the wolf and read it into Virgil's description.[50]

---

[47] Valerianus perhaps was remembering the legend "Divus Iulius" from coins showing not a portrait, but a star or comet on the reverse (e.g. Mattingly 1923, plates 6.7, 6.8, 6.9, 51.5). These show the head of Augustus on the obverse with the legend "Caesar Augustus."

[48] "Operaepretium vero est huiusmodi figuram plerisque in locis, tum ex marmore tum et ex aere, Romae spectare. Ambigas enim utrum Virgilius a sculptoribus, an sculptores a Virgilio huius imaginis desumpserint exemplar," *Castigationes* 145.

[49] He probably was not thinking of what might seem the most obvious candidate, the famous bronze wolf placed on the Capitoline in 1471 and still to be seen in the Capitoline Museum, for it must have been common knowledge that the nursing twins were added to the sculpture only around the time it entered the museum. For a survey of the images see Weigel 1992.

[50] In this he perhaps followed Servius. He does not gloss the all-important word *procubuisse*, "lying," but Servius did—also reading Virgil's words through the familiar images. "PROCUBVISSE: id est prima parte se inclinasse, quod Graeci προκύπτειν dicunt, ut inclinatione corporis ubera praeberet infantibus: nam si 'procubuisse' iacuisse accipias, contrarium est quod dicit 'ludere pendentes pueros'. quod si 'procubuisse' ut 'cum fetu

A Poet's Perspective

Valeriano wrote the *Castigationes* in Rome and could have done so nowhere else; for only Rome provided the necessary opportunities and materials: plentiful manuscripts, inscriptions, and artifacts, to be sure, but also the essential support of many fellow humanists and highly-placed patrons. The intellectual foundation of his work, however, had been laid in his early studies in Venice and Padua, long before his arrival in Rome. In Venice he began to develop an interest in inscriptions and to study coins and images, embarking on the study of signs and symbols that would culminate in the publication of the *Hieroglyphica* fifty years later.[51] He edited texts for the Venetian printer Tacuino and probably did some correcting for Aldo Manuzio.[52] Above all, however, he devoted himself in these early years to Latin poetry—so fervently that one of his teachers, the famous humanist Marcantonio Sabellico, changed his name from Pietro to Pierio after the Pierian Muses.[53] The young Valeriano studied both ancient and contemporary poets, but he also wrote poetry himself. His first collection, *Praeludia*, printed in 1509, included epigrams, Horatian odes and satires, Catullan hendecasyllables, an epyllion, and even two epigrams in Greek.[54] Contemporary Latin poetry is a frequent theme. Valeriano writes about the status of modern poetry and about himself as a poet, treats the history and modern use of different meters, and both praises and criticizes other contemporary poets.[55] He especially admires Giovanni Pontano, whose poetry had recently been printed in Venice.[56] He

concolor albo procubuit' [*Aeneid* 8.82-83] accipiamus, intellegere debemus 'pendentes' desiderio alimoniae suspensos vel intentos ... sciendum tamen, voluisse eum gestum proprie exprimere, quem in ipsius lupae cernimus statuis," Servius on *Aeneid* 8.631.

[51] He discusses these early studies in Valeriano 1602, chapter 46, preface.

[52] For his editions of Lactantius and of Lorenzo Valla's translation of Homer for Tacuino, see Pellegrini 2002, 39-44.

[53] Gaisser 1999, 4, 281-282.

[54] Valeriano, 1509. The Greek epigrams appear on fol. F4v. The work contains several books that probably circulated separately in manuscript. For the volume, see Pellegrini 2002, 44-45, 115; the frontispiece is shown in *tavola* VIII.

[55] Here are some examples. Status of modern poetry: "De studiorum conditio sermo" (Valeriano 1509, A2r-B4v). Valeriano as a poet: "Ad Bernardum Camusium" (D1v); "Ad Io. Ant. Marosticanum" (D3r); "In Priscum" (E4r-v); "Ad Virg. Zavarisium" (F2r). Uses of meter: "Prolixitatem non incongruam hendecasyll. (E1r-v); "Ad Hieronymum Bononium Tarvisinum iambum unicuique materiae iam aptum esse" (I4r-v); "De decoro iambici carminis ad Paulum Dandulum P. V." (K2v-3r); "De scazonte ad Annib. Phaethonta disc." (K3v); "In Plinianum 'duriusculum se fecit' ad Petr. Aleandrum ex Corneliano" (K4r). Praise or criticism of contemporary poets: "De ix lyricis in laudem Ioan. Aur. Augurelli (C4r-v); "Pontani tumulus" (C4v); "Ad Egnatium Bapt." (D2r-v); "De Andr. Maronis extemporalitate ad Dantem III Alig." (D4r-v); "Ad Marcum" (E4v).

[56] Pontano's poetry was printed twice in 1505, in Venice by Aldo Manuzio and in Naples by Sigismondo Mayr. But perhaps Valeriano saw Pontano's work in manuscript (in

defends Pontano's use of hendecasyllables for long poems and laments his death in a poem called "Tumulus," which recalls the title of Pontano's own verse epitaphs.[57] In these years he probably also studied Pontano's philological study of language in *De aspiratione* (1481); soon afterwards he would have worked through Pontano's treatment of the hexameter in *Actius* (printed in 1507). He was to draw deeply on both works in the *Castigationes.*

Valeriano came to Rome in 1509, and within a few years had begun his intensive study of Virgil's text. He approached his task using the hard evidence of manuscripts, inscriptions, and ancient critics, weighing that evidence on the scale of literary quality. This literary scale is omnipresent in the *Castigationes*, but its use in each case depends on the quality of the philological evidence. If the hard evidence is unclear or ambiguous, Valeriano either leaves a reading open or exercises his own aesthetic judgment. If a reading seems irrefutable or highly probable on philological grounds, he generally defends it on aesthetic grounds. But the aesthetic never trumps the philological; he will never put a near certain reading aside in favor of one he finds aesthetically appealing.

Valeriano's aesthetic judgments are personal and subjective and sometimes overly vague, but they are nonetheless worth our attention—not because modern scholars agree with them (often they do not), but for their value to the history of reception. His verdicts are those of a sixteenth-century reader steeped in Latin poetry and in both ancient and contemporary poetic theory. But the essential point is that they are also the verdicts of a practicing poet. In evaluating the readings of his manuscripts Valeriano looked not only for the qualities he saw in the best ancient poetry, but also for those he sought to achieve in his own.

His aesthetic observations are usually brief, simply noting the stylistic or emotive quality of a particular reading, but occasionally he engages in a fuller discussion. In a note on a passage in the *Fourth Georgic*, he expatiates on the motivation and force conveyed in a single phrase in the description of Orpheus' laments for his lost Eurydice.

> Septem illum totos perhibent ex ordine mensis
> rupe sub aeria deserti ad Strymonis undam
> flesse sibi. (*Georgic* 4.507-509)

Manuzio's printing shop?), since there was so little time between Pontano's appearance in print and the composition of Valeriano's poems on him. The colophon in the Aldine edition of Pontano is dated August 1505; Valeriano's dedication to Girolamo Donà of the book of the *Praeludia* with the poems on Pontano is dated 13 August 1505. (The date appears only in the 1550 edition reprinted in Valeriano's *Hexametri,* fol. 122v; see Pellegrini 2002, 45.)

[57] Valeriano 1509, E1r-v and C4v.

(They say that for seven whole months, month after month,
under a lofty cliff by the wave of the lonely Strymon,
he wept to himself.)

The reading in question is *flesse sibi* (he wept to himself). But the vulgate Valeriano was glossing read *flevisse* (he wept). Valeriano says:

> In the codex Romanus the reading is *flesse sibi*. That is, he wept all alone ... no longer to the Shades, or to persuade the gods of the underworld, not to assemble the wild beasts and the birds flying overhead, not to soften the fierce hearts and calm and improve the behavior of savages—but to himself—to lament his terrible loss, to blame the harshness of the underworld gods. He wept to himself to find some ease for his grief by the kindness of the Muses, with whom, as Hesiod says, arose "forgetfulness of evils and rest from cares."[58]

Valeriano's note is a miniature literary essay. He begins with the manuscript evidence, moves to interpret the phrase "wept to himself" as suggesting the whole range of emotions and motivations of Virgil's Orpheus, and neatly concludes with a quotation from Hesiod. The reading *flesse sibi*, which he so admires, is unique to the Romanus among the ancient manuscripts and was often passed over by editors before the twentieth century.[59] It is now generally found in the major modern editions, however, so that we can say that Valeriano's judgment has been vindicated.[60]

In another note he discusses the internal structure of the *Aeneid*. Book 7 opens with Aeneas' landing in Latium at the place later called Caieta:

Tu quoque litoribus nostris, Aeneia nutrix,
aeternam moriens famam, Caieta dedisti. (*Aeneid* 7.1-2)

(You too with your death, Caieta, nurse of Aeneas,
gave eternal fame to our shores.)

---

[58] "In Ro. Codice legere est FLESSE SIBI, quippe solitarium deserti ad Strimonis undam, non amplius ad Manis, Deosve inferos exorandos, non ad contrahendas feras, & supervolantes aves, non ad agrestium hominum fera corda mitiganda, moresque componendos, expoliendosque, sed sibi, sed ad calamitatis suae lamentationem, sed ad inferorum duriciem incusandam. Flesse sibi, ut tanti doloris lenimentum aliquot inveniret Musarum beneficio, cum quibus ortas ait Hesiodus, λυσμοσύνην τε κακῶν ἄμπαυμά τε μερμηράων [*Theogony* 55]". *Castigationes* lxviii.

[59] But the anonymous referee has pointed out that *flesse sibi* was accepted by Ribbeck 1859. It was also printed by Hirtzel 1900.

[60] Mynors 1972 and 1990; Thomas 1988; Geymonat 2008; Ottaviano and Conte 2011. Mynors 1990 *ad loc.* comments: "*flesse sibi*: so the Romanus, which is not usually right against our other authorities; but *flesse* is perhaps a more puzzling form to scribes than *flevisse*, and *sibi* helps to emphasize the loneliness which dominates these lines ..." Both Valeriano's preference for *flesse sibi* and his note are criticized by Fera 2001, 132, who dismisses the reading as "un errore del Virgilio Romano".

Valeriano starts with the word "shores" (*litoribus*). It is spelled with two t's in his vulgate, but Valeriano, along with modern editors, prefers one, and he notes that he has found it with a single *t* in older manuscripts as well as in inscriptions, which, as he says, "are not erased or written over, like manuscripts."[61] He is more interested, however, in something else: the fact that the word appears in three consecutive verses.

> Tum se ad Caietae recto fert *litore* portum.
> Ancora de prora iacitur; stant *litore* puppes.
> Tu quoque *litoribus* nostris, Aeneia nutrix. (*Aeneid* 6.900-901; 7.1) [62]
>
> (He sailed to the port of Caieta straight along the shore.
> The anchor was thrown from the prow; the ships stood on the shore.
> You too ... Caieta ... gave fame to our shores.)

Some people might object that the third verse has nothing to do with the others, he says. The first two appear at the end of one book, the third at the beginning of the next. But that is just his point.

> Let them see that the whole *Aeneid* is a single body, fashioned with twelve limbs, so to speak. The body is not heterogeneous as in the *Georgics*, which the proems there show, separating distinct themes and different contents ... But the *Aeneid* is held together by just a single subject, the actions of Aeneas, and the books themselves are linked together in such a way that even the verbal structure connects the end of each one with the beginning of the next.[63]

He goes on to explain, showing how his interpretation is borne out in the first seven books. At the end of book 1, Dido asks Aeneas to tell of the Trojans' misfortunes; book 2 begins: "They all fell silent, and held their tongues in

---

[61] "Non enim abraduntur, aut transcribuntur marmora veluti codices," *Castigationes* 111. (On *Aeneid* 1.3 Valeriano also notes that *litus* is spelled with a single *t* in ancient manuscripts and inscriptions.) The spelling at *Aeneid* 7.1 varies in his principal manuscripts: *litoribus* in Romanus and Longobardicus, *littoribus* in the Mediceus. In the Oblongus *litoribus* is written in very dark ink, perhaps over an erasure. (The word is clearly *litore* at *Aeneid* 6.900 and 901); at *Aeneid* 1.3 it is clearly *littora*.)

[62] The text of *Aeneid* 6.900-901 is disputed. Mynors 1972 and several other modern editors print not *litore* but *limite* in *Aeneid* 6.900; Norden 1957 and Conte 2009 keep *litore.* Norden and others, including Conte 2009, have omitted *Aeneid* 6.901 (identical with *Aeneid* 3.277); for discussion see Norden ad loc.). See also Wills 1997, who defends *Aeneid* 6.901, and Conte 2016, 45-48, who rejects it.

[63] "Videant unum esse corpus totam Aeneida, duodecim veluti membris compactum; neque ita ut in Georgicis eterogeneum, quod ibi ostendunt prooemia distinctas materias, argumentaque dissimilia dividentia. . . .At Aeneis uno tantum comprenditur argumento, de rebus ab Aenea gestis, librique ipsi ita invicem colligati sunt, ut verborum etiam structura uniuscuiusque finem cum alterius principio connectat," *Castigationes* 111. For an interesting modern study of the formal connections between the books of the *Aeneid*, see Torzi 2015.

close attention."[64] Aeneas' narration in book 2 ends with his taking Anchises on his back and heading for the mountains; it resumes at the beginning of book 3 with Troy in ashes and the survivors preparing to sail into the unknown.[65] He finishes his tale at the end of book 3; book 4 begins with Dido entranced and burning with love.[66] Book 4 ends with Dido's death; book 5 opens with Aeneas on his ship looking back at her city's walls glowing red with her funeral pyre.[67] Book 5 ends with Aeneas' epitaph for the lost Palinurus: "Alas, too trusting in calm sea and sky, Palinurus, you will lie naked on an unknown sand." Book 6 begins, "So he spoke, weeping, and gave the fleet its head."[68] Books 6 and 7 are similarly linked, as we've seen. He ends his discussion with the claim: "The remaining books are also joined to each other like this."[69]

Valeriano's note, interesting in itself, also suggests two matters for further consideration, both of which are fundamentally literary rather than textual. First, his assertion notwithstanding, books 7-12 are not connected to each other in the same way as books 1-7. They are connected, of course, but not with the same close articulation. We can blame Valeriano for trying to obscure the point, but it might be more interesting from a literary point of view to consider the reasons for the change and to identify the formal connections between books in the second half of the poem.

Second, the formal link between books 6 and 7 is more important structurally than those connecting books 1-6 since it also serves as a hinge between the two halves of the epic. The three occurrences of the word "shore" take Aeneas from Cumae and his visit to the underworld to Caieta and Latium—his destination and the end of his long voyage from Troy. That ending is marked by the last line in book 6 ("the anchor was thrown from the prow; the ships stood on the shore"). At the beginning of book 7 Aeneas pauses at this first stop in Latium for the funeral of his ancient nurse (and a final burial of the Trojan past) before embarking for the short trip up the coast to the mouth of the Tiber and the war that awaits him in Italy.

The notes on Orpheus' weeping and Virgil's structuring technique could be those of any close reader with literary instincts. Many others, however, show Valeriano looking at the text like someone appraising the technique and workmanship of a fellow craftsman—that is, with the eye and sensibility of a practicing poet. Once or twice he explicitly refers to what we might call his

[64] *Aeneid* 1.733-736; *Aeneid* 2.1.
[65] *Aeneid* 2.801-4; *Aeneid* 3.1-8.
[66] *Aeneid* 3.716-718; *Aeneid* 4.1-2.
[67] *Aeneid* 4.704-705.; *Aeneid* 5.1-4.
[68] *Aeneid* 5.870-71; *Aeneid* 6.1.
[69] "Atque ita libri reliqui invicem connectuntur," *Castigationes* 113.

professional interest. At *Aeneid* 7.758, for example, the phrase "sought in the mountains" appears in the vulgate and the Mediceus as *quesitae in montibus,* but "in most other ancient manuscripts" as *quaesitae montibus*.[70] Valeriano comments: "Perhaps this will seem a small point to many, but to those who enjoy training themselves in style it is not displeasing to think about."[71] At *Aeneid* 5.284 he thinks about word order and metrics. The verse describes a slave woman given as a prize in the funeral games for Anchises: "He was given a slave skilled in the work of Minerva." Both Valeriano's vulgate and modern editors print *Olli serva datur operum haud ignara Minervae*. But he notes that "in certain ancient manuscripts" (he does not say which ones) the line has a different rhythm, in which the words *datur* and *operum* are reversed.[72] He thinks that the words were later transposed to avoid the artificial lengthening of the last syllable in *datur* before the caesura and has no objection to the original text and the vulgate.[73]

> But in case anyone is annoyed at observations like this as trivial and essentially worthless, let him know that those who make verses generally pay more attention to rhythms of this kind the more knowledgeable they are and the more precise and discerning they want to be considered.[74]

Although comments like these are rare (Valeriano explicitly identifies himself as a poet only a very few times), the *Castigationes* are full of the sort of technical observations that one would expect from someone with long practical experience in composing poetry.[75] His notes on various readings treat not just their history and pedigree, but their poetic merit: metrics and scansion, the rhythmic effects of different word orders, the sounds of particular words and combinations, appropriateness of readings to particular genres, and the literary and emotional qualities associated with small

[70] The reading is *quesitae in montibus* in Valeriano's vulgate and the Mediceus, but *quesite* or *quaesitae montibus* in the Romanus, Oblongus, and Longobardicus.

[71] "Leve hoc fortasse videbitur multis, sed iis, qui sese stilo exercere gaudent pensitatione non iniucundum," *Castigationes* 130.

[72] Valeriano's four prinicpal manuscripts all have the order *datur operum*: Oblongus, fol. 64 v; Longobardicus, fol. 74r; Romanus, fol. 119v; Mediceus, fol. 89v.

[73] "Puto vero ita transpositas fuisse dictiones, quod aliqui pentimemerim ut brevem Poetae nostro noluerint indulgere. Nam in priori eademque vulgata lectione nihil est quod me offendat," *Castigationes* 84. For the occasional lengthening of short syllables before the caesura, see Williams 1960, *ad. loc.* with further bibliography.

[74] "Ne vero quis observationes huiusmodi ut inanes, et nullius pene momenti stomachetur, sciat [*ed.* sciant], eos qui versus faciunt, eo curiosius huiusmodi numeros observare solere, quo peritiores sunt, et elegantiores haberi volunt," *Castigationes* 84.

[75] Several notes suggest Valeriano's professional interest less explicitly: e.g., on *Eclogue* 4.63 (see below), *G* 3.260, *A*.1.270, *A* 2.662, *A*. 8.557, *A*. 11.728.

differences in diction or inflection.[76] The observations in particular cases are for the most part the product of his own experience and sensibility, but his general approach is traditional, ultimately derived from the ideas of ancient critics like Quintilian and Aulus Gellius, but more immediately based on his reading of Pontano, especially *De aspiratione* and *De numeris poeticis*, Pontano's technical study of the aesthetic qualities of the Virgilian hexameter in the *Actius.*

Pontano is unquestionably Valeriano's most important modern source.[77] He is mentioned by name at least fifteen times, usually in notes invoking specific passages in either *De aspiratione* or *De numeris poeticis*.[78] Valeriano calls him "the most learned man of the previous generation," and "easily the most eminent in every kind of learning in that generation."[79] Even on the one occasion when he has to reject one of Pontano's ideas (it is contradicted by the evidence of all the manuscripts and ancient commentators), he calls him "a man of the highest ability and incomparable erudition, as is clear to all."[80] But Pontano's influence is more pervasive than even this large number of citations suggests; both his philological methods and his aesthetic principles are reflected in much of Valeriano's analysis.

In every page and nearly every note of the *Castigationes* Valeriano demonstrates his focus on the aesthetic qualities of Virgil's hexameter, Pontano's principal subject in *De numeris poeticis.* Valeriano is no slavish imitator, and his work has a different purpose—not to explain the rhythmical

[76] For example (the list is by no means exhaustive): word order and rhythm *G.*3.260, *A.*1.271, *A.*2.662; importance of variety of vowel sounds *E.*1.37, *A.*8.164, *A.*8.545; quality of vowel sounds *E.*4.1; beginning with a spondee more *gravis* than with a dactyl *A.*8.502; force of a hypermetric verse *A.*5,422; appropriateness to generic register *E.*4.63, *E.*5.37*, E.*10.76; emotional effects and pathos A.1.99, A. 6.869, A.9.491; emotional force of mood and tense *A.*4.479, *A.*5.628.

[77] Valeriano names no other humanist more than four or five times, except for Camillo Porcari and Pomponio Leto, almost always in connection with readings in their manuscripts. For Pontano's importance to Valeriano, see also Savarese 1993, 53; Fera 2001, 135-136.

[78] Some examples. On *A.*3.606 (*Castigationes* 51) he cites *Actius* 50 (Pontano 2020, 170) on the sound effect of juxtaposed identical unelided vowels. On *A.*1.444 (*Castigationes* 15) he quotes *Actius* 38 (Pontano 2020, 116) on the rhythmic quality of two monosyllables placed after a dactyl. On *E.*6.46 (*Castigationes* xxiii) he invokes Pontano's *De aspiratione* indirectly (Pontano 1481, fols. 31v-32r) on the scansion of the name Pasiphae.

[79] "Iovianum Pontanum litteratissimum priori aetate virum" (*Castigationes* lviiii, on *G.*4.15); "Pontanum in omni doctrinarum genere ea aetate facile principem" (*Castigationes* 162, on *A.*10.6). See also "Iovianus Pontanus vir litteratissimus" (*Castigationes* 162, on *A.*10.1); "clarissimi aetate superiore viri Iovianus Pontanus et Hermolaus Barbarus" (*Castigationes* 125, on *A.*7.648).

[80] "Iovianus Pontanus summo vir ingenio, eruditioneque, ut omnibus palam est, incomparabili" (*Castigationes* 67, on *A.*5.13); cf. Pontano, *Actius* 30 (Pontano, 2020, 82-85). For discussion, see Savarese 1993, 65-66.

basis of Virgil's artistry like Pontano, but to decide which reading in a given line is both supported by the manuscripts and lives up to the Virgilian standard. The standard, of course, is really Valeriano's, perceived through his own sensibility and identified through long study of Virgil, but in Pontano he found several points to look for, including the importance of variety in rhythm and vowel quality and the effects achieved by different word orders and by long syllables at particular points in the line. The essential point in all these criteria was sound. Was the rhythm of a reading pleasing? Did it produce an emotional effect? Was the succession of vowels or consonants rough or dissonant?

Valeriano's emphasis on sound, like that of Pontano before him, reminds us—and we need reminding, since as moderns we read our poetry silently—that Latin poetry was oral by nature. In antiquity both poetry and prose were written to be heard; correct and expressive oral reading was an essential part of elite education.[81] Both were read aloud at home, sometimes by slaves trained for the purpose, sometimes by their masters. Poetry especially was read aloud both at private parties and in large gatherings either by the poets or by professional readers. Virgil's *Eclogues* were frequently performed on stage, and the poet himself is said to have read portions of his works to Augustus, his recitation "sweet and strangely seductive."[82] The oral component was almost equally important in the Renaissance. The humanists not only worked to recover classical Latin; they tried (and largely succeeded) to use it as a spoken language. Like their classical forbears, they gave Latin orations and Latin lectures, and poets read their works aloud to groups of friends. To note just one example, Pontano himself read his long didactic poem *Urania* over a period of several days to members of his academy.[83]

The sound of poetry is best evaluated by hearing it. For Valeriano, as for Pontano, the ears, whether of poet or listener, are its ultimate judge, and Valeriano frequently appeals to them to assess the merits of a particular

[81] For a very brief account of oral reading with earlier bibliography, see Gaisser 2009, 41-44.

[82] See Donatus 1996, 27-32. For performances of Virgil's works on stage, see also Tacitus, *Dialogus* 13.

[83] The story is told by Girolamo Borgia in his annotated manuscript of *Urania* (Vat. lat. 5175, fol. 4r): "Cal. februarii 1501 Pontanus legere coepit suam Uraniam in sua achademia, cui lectioni fere semper quindecim generosi et eruditissimi viri affuere; nec vero ipse ego Hieronymus ullum unquam praeterii diem, quin adessem, et quae potui in margine anotanda curaverim, quae quidem sunt ab eiusdem auctoris oraculo exprompta." Quoted from Soldati 1902, I.xxxv.

reading.[84] "Let each one consult his own ears," he says.[85] And: "[this] better fills the ears and seems far sweeter," and "[this] better fills the ears and is more affecting, since it seems to put everything before our eyes."[86] Occasionally the ears or their possessors are qualified as "cultivated" or "trained" (*eruditus*).[87] Sometimes the ears belong to those with philological knowledge, as in the discussion at *Georgic* 2.341. There Valeriano's vulgate (and the manuscripts) read *ferrea progenies* ("race of iron"), while Lactantius preserves the reading *terrea progenies* ("progeny of earth").[88] Valeriano, usually deferential to his early sources, rejects the evidence of Lactantius, whose text he knew well. He had edited it in 1503 for the Venetian printer Tacuino; its third edition was printed in April 1521, just two months before the *Castigationes*.[89] He concludes: "That reading *terrea* does not satisfy the cultivated ears of those who think the manuscript of Lactantius is corrupt, since *ferrea* does not change the meaning."[90] More often, however, the ears belong to those with expertise in poetic technique, as in his note on the last verse of Virgil's famous *Fourth Eclogue*. There Virgil says that the newborn child who does not smile at his mother cannot share the pleasures of the gods.

> Nec deus hunc mensa, dea non dignata cubili est. (Eclogue 4.63)
>
> (No god deems him worthy of his table, no goddess of her bed.)

The reading in question is *cubili est.* The codex Romanus reads *cubilest*, all one word, "Plautus style" (*Plautino more*), as Valeriano says. Another old manuscript (unnamed) omits *est* altogether. He comments:

> But the synalepha (elision) that occurs in *cubili est* appears the most suitable to the humble bucolic genre and seems to leave a certain

[84] For Gellius as the ultimate source for the imporance of the judging ear of poet and critic, see Campanelli 2008, 491-493.

[85] He uses this formula in two cases where he leaves the choice of word order open: "Sed enim suas quisque aures consulat" (on *Aeneid* 5.1); "unusquisque autem aures consulat suas" (on *Aeneid* 5.281); *Castigationes* 67 and 84.

[86] On word order: "Sed enim vulgata lectio magis aures implet et longe suavior videtur" (on *Georgic* 1.54; *Castigationes* xxxi); on his choice of *laetantur* over *laetentur* in *Eclogue* 4.52 (*Castigationes* xviii): "In Ro. codice LAETANTUR est, indicandi specie, quod magis implet aures, et longe magis movet, dum cuncta oculis subiicere videtur" (modern editions print *laetentur*).

[87] *Eruditis auribus*: at *Georgic* 2.341; *Aeneid* 1.270; 2.129; 8.531 (*Castigationes* xlv; 9; 24). *Eruditorum auribus*: *at Georgic* 3.348; *Aeneid* 1.156 (*Castigationes* lvi; 6).

[88] Lactantius, *Institutiones divinae* II.10.16. For a defence of *ferrea* see Conington 1881, vol. I, *ad loc.* Mynors 1972 and 1990 and Thomas print *terrea*, but Thomas in his commentary *ad loc*. says, "the choice of reading here must remain uncertain."

[89] See Pellegrini 2002, 39-41, 110-12.

[90] "Illud autem TERREA eruditis <eorum> auribus non satis facit qui putant Lactantii codicem depravatum, quum *ferrea* sententiam nihil immutet"; *Castigationes* xlv.

> sweetness in the ears of those accustomed to the musical rhythms of poets.[91]

Valeriano's *Castigationes* is a remarkable philological achievement—a full textual commentary on almost every contested reading in the whole of Virgil. It is based on the full collation of one manuscript, the nearly full comparison of three others, the irregular consultation of a dozen more, and an expert knowledge of the vulgate tradition and its printed representatives. It draws on evidence from inscriptions, ancient scholars, and the usage of other ancient poets. But it is not only philological, and therein lies its interest. It is a work deeply imbedded in its time and place, the lively social and intellectual world of Roman humanism in the short papacy of Leo X; and on every page it reflects the interests and sensibility—above all, the literary sensibility—of its author. The purely textual research involved in the project might well require the entire effort of a modern scholar, but in the years of its composition Valeriano was first trying to support himself with tutoring jobs and looking for patronage (1509-1513) and later heavily burdened with duties to his Medici masters (1513-1521).[92] He was also constantly engaged in various other intellectual projects. He was writing long poems, treatises, and encomia for patrons, composing masses of occasional poetry, and collecting material for the *Hieroglyphica,*.[93] He was also surely working on Catullus in preparation for the literary and textual commentary that he would present in his lectures at the Studium Urbis, for Catullus is mentioned almost twenty times in the *Castigationes*.[94]

---

[91] "Sed ea synalepha quae fit in CUBILI EST huic humili genere maxime convenire videtur, et nescio quid suavitatis in eorum auribus relinquere, qui musicis poetarum numeris insuerint," *Castigationes* xvii. Modern editions print *cubili est*.

[92] For Valeriano's life in these years and his lack of leisure as a Medici courtier see Gaisser 1999, 8-15. He expresses some of his frustration in a letter to Giano Parrasio at the end of his commentary; *Castigationes* 213 (for partial translation see Gaisser, 14-15).

[93] For Valeriano's works printed between 1509 and 1521, see Pellegrini 2002, 40-58. Much of his occasional poetry was collected many years later in the volumes *Amorum libri V* (1549) and *Hexametri, odae et epigrammata* (1550), both printed in Venice: Pellegrini 2002,156-157. The *Castigationes* contain a handful of references to the *Hieroglyphica,* most prominently at *A*.1.636 on *vitem* (vine) and *A*.8.698 on the dog-headed Egyptian god Anubis. In the first case he promises to say more "in the sacred writings of the Egyptians" ("de hoc latius in sacris Aegyptiorum litteris"; *Castigationes* 19). In the second, he postpones discussion for another work ("Quae vero multa de huiusmodi pictura dici possent, alterius esse negocii existimamus"; *Castigationes* 148). See also on *A*.5.775 and *A*.7.171 (*Castigationes* 93 and 114).

[94] Catullus 3.9, 6.5, 50.5 (*A*.5.441); 4.10 (*A*.1.198); 7.7 (*A*. 6.265) ; 39.2, 4. 6. 7 (*G*. 2.282); 53.3 (*A*.2.65); 61.16, 215 (*A*.8.652); 61.228 (*A*.5.398); 64.18 (*G*.3.53); 64.62 (*A*.4.564); 64.91 (*A*.4.185); 64.156 (*A*.7.302); 64.224 (*A*.10.844); 64.255 (*A*.7.389); 64.291 (*A*.4.54); 64.336 (*G*.4.545); 66.48 (*A* 1.30); 69.3 (*A*. 8.390); 69.5-8 (*E*. 3.8); 100.2 (*A*.3.578). For a mistaken reference to Catullus (*A*.11.178), see note 114 below. Di Stefano 2001 147

How to Write Poetry

Valeriano's lectures began in the autumn of 1521, in the last halcyon days of Leo's papacy.[95] In addition to the usual students, his audience contained a number of the friends and associates who had been the first readers of his notes on Virgil. Indeed, as I have suggested elsewhere, the lectures seem to have been perceived not only as a course at the Studium, but as a kind of humanist event.[96] Given the subject and the lecturer, students and humanists alike would have had a good idea of what to expect: a virtuoso performance on the poetry and text of Catullus by an accomplished contemporary poet who had just published a textual commentary on the most famous poet of all.

Valeriano did not disappoint them. His commentary conforms to the conventions of its genre, summarizing poems, explaining meters, treating textual problems, and glossing geographical, mythological, and historical references. Its overriding theme is the old formulation *prodesse et delectare* (to be useful and to please), a purpose that Valeriano attributes both to Catullus and to himself as the poet's interpreter. He states this purpose in the inaugural lectures and plays with it throughout the commentary, his argument sometimes credible, often clearly tongue-in-cheek. The poet is pleasing, he says, for his delightful subjects: love, praises of the gods, and epithalamia; he is useful as a teacher of style, but also (much less plausibly) for celebrating virtue, condemning vice, and generally promoting good conduct. Valeriano as the poet's interpreter has a complementary purpose: to benefit his students with instruction in literature and character (*litteris et moribus*) and to entertain them in the process. Here is one example of his method, the end of his discussion of the death of Lesbia's sparrow (Catullus 3).

> Now I will add one thing as a corollary, which we can apply to these rites of a dead sparrow. For they can both amuse you in the listening and benefit you greatly by their example. The life of a sparrow is very short. For, as those who write of these matters tell us, the males can live no more than a year, and they say that the reason is unrestrained lust—which also wears out so many men before their time and hands them over to old age. The crow, on the other hand, is very long-lived, since

does not list the references, but also notes that Valeriano was working on Virgil and Catullus at the same time.

[95] The lectures are preserved in Vatican Library, Vat. lat 5215, whose contents were identified by Alpago-Novello 1926, and apparently first studied by Gaisser 1988. For a detailed discussion, see Gaisser 1993, 109-145. See also Di Stefano 2001.

[96] See Gaisser 2011. In addition to their annual events like the festival of Pasquino, the Palilia, and St. Anne's day, the humanists staged or took advantage of irregular occurrences to interest and amuse each other. Some examples: the discovery of the Laocoon (1506), the awarding of Roman citizenship to Leo's brother and nephew (1513), the trial of Longolius for having written a speech arguing for the inferiority of Italy to France (1519).

> it copulates most seldom. Wherefore, young men, if the sweetness of life delights you, nothing will be more useful to you than to reject Venus and the goads of blind passion.[97]

Digressions like this were designed to please, and evidently did. Valeriano's audience for this lecture was twice as large as that for its predecessor on Catullus 2, which he had enlivened with an extravagant attack on Poliziano's obscene interpretation of the sparrow and witty references to his own work on the *Hieroglyphica*.[98]

Valeriano's theme is well suited to his principal subject: poetry and how to write it. As he says in his first inaugural lecture, he intends not only to help the students understand what authors have written, but to encourage them to try to produce similar results.[99] Catullus is the perfect model: most of his poems are short, their meters and subjects various. In the next lecture Valeriano makes the same point in grandiose terms by playing with a theme that would have been recognized and enjoyed by many in his audience. He invokes the familiar discussion of Plato's magnet and poetic inspiration (by now almost a commentary cliché) and brings it together with an entertaining revision of Marsilio Ficino's discussion of the Muses and the harmony of the spheres.[100] Calliope, the greatest of the Muses since she reechoes the music of all the spheres, inspires those who delight in every subject and poetic rhythm. Catullus is her obvious protegé.[101] Inspired by her, Catullus too shares in the music of the spheres and provides the same varied inspiration to his devotees. The lecture concludes with a flourish.

> Come, let it be Catullus first who is set before students about to make their way into poetry, so that when each has fallen upon that rhythm which is well suited to his spirit, by which he feels himself moved and attracted as iron by a magnet or chaff by amber, he will gird himself up

---

[97] "Nunc unum addam pro corollario, quod ad has extincti passeris inferias conferamus. Nam et vos delectare possunt audiendo et exemplo plurimum iuvare. Passeribus vitae brevitas angustissima. Eorum enim mares anno diutius durare non posse tradunt, qui rerum huiusmodi historias conscripsere; cuius rei causam esse aiunt, incontinentissimam salacitatem; quae tot hominum etiam ante diem effoetos tradit senectuti. Contra vero corvinum genus, quia rarissime coit vivacissimum. Quare si vos vitae dulcedo capit adolescentes nihil vobis magis praestiterit quam venerem et caeci stimulos avertere amoris …". Vat. lat. 5215, fol. 63r. Compare the similar treatment of the sparrow in the *Hieroglyphica* (Valeriano 1602, 150).

[98] Gaisser 1993, 134-136.

[99] "Meum non in eo tantum se studium continebit, ut quae auctores scripserint intelligatis, sed id etiam pro viribus adnitemur, ut vos quoque similia facere, et cum auctoribus ipsis gressum conferre parem contendatis," Vat. lat. 5215, fol. 14r.

[100] For Plato's magnet as a commonplace in commentaries, see Gaisser 2016, especially 284-94. For the inaugural lectures, see Gaisser 1993, 114-20.

[101] Orpheus is Calliope's protegé in Ficino. See references in previous note.

> to imitate it and begin to practise with that type of poetry which he sees is proper to his ideal.[102]

Valeriano begins his instruction in the next lecture with a detailed technical lesson on meter.[103] Following the treatment of the ancient grammarian Terentianus Maurus, he shows that the hendecasyllabic verses of Catullus 1 can be divided into dactylic and iambic segments, which may be rearranged to produce meters ranging from hexameters to galliambics. The lesson is well suited to the prospective poets in his audience, teaching them not just how to scan, but how to create the different meters. Valeriano emphasizes, however, that meters are not just successions of long and short syllables; they are suited to different genres and convey different emotions.[104] Sound matters as much as rhythm—indeed it is essential. As in the *Castigationes*, the ear is what matters. Here too he invokes the ears as judges, but now more to train the aesthetic faculties of his budding poets than to defend the merits of a contested reading.[105]

One example must suffice, his treatment of the famous rewriting by Pliny the Elder of one of Catullus' hendecasyllables: *meas esse aliquid putare nugas* (to consider my trifles something; Cat. 1.4).[106] Since Pliny considered Catullus too harsh (*duriusculum*) in this verse because he placed an iamb (*meas,* u -) in the first position instead of the traditional spondee (- -) , he reordered the words to achieve an initial spondee and "to soften" (*ut molliam*) the poet, producing: *nugas* (- -) *esse aliquid meas putare* (Pliny, *Naturalis historia, praef.* 1). But Valeriano objects, arguing that Catullus' iambic substitution is not harsh but smooth and pleasant, since short syllables are lighter and softer than long ones. "I would not have believed," he says, "that anyone was so foreign to the Muses, so tone-deaf, that he could not tell the

[102] "Age esto Catullus primus, qui profecturis in poetice discipulis proponatur, ut quum unusquisque in eum ex numeris inciderit, qui genio suo sit accomodatior, quo scilicet se non aliter moveri atque attrahi sentiat quam ferrum a magnete, paleam a succino, se ad eius imitationem accingat, eoque carminis genere sese exercere incipiat, quod magis ideae suae proprium esse animadverterit". Vat. lat. 5215, fol. 25r.

[103] See Gaisser 1993, 121-130.

[104] Some examples. The pure iambics in Catullus 4 convey the speed of the swift yacht (*phasellus*) they describe. The scazons or limping iambics of Catullus 8 have a halting effect matched to its melancholy subject. For discussion, see Gaisser 1993, 123-125. For a literary analysis and transcription of the lecture on Catullus 8, see Di Stefano 2001, 155-160, 165-76.

[105] E.g., *consulite aures* (consult your ears), on the dragging effect of the scazon in Catullus 8.9.1; *offendat aures* (offends the ears) on Guarino's emendation at Catullus 3.16; see Gaisser 1993, 124 and 127. Also, see below on Pliny's rewriting of Catullus 1.4.

[106] Valeriano had criticized Pliny's rewriting as early as the *Praeludia;* Valeriano 1509, fol. K4r, and see note 55 above.

difference."[107] He then offers an ugly but "correct" rewriting of his own (*nostras esse aliquid putare nugas*), inviting everyone in his audience to "consult his ears" to see why Catullus' line is lighter and more pleasing.[108] Reverting to Pliny's verse, he makes his final point: "Here you see that the same verse, and constructed with the same words, still sounds rougher somehow."[109] The lesson? Meaning and metrical accuracy by themselves do not constitute poetry.

Instructive and entertaining as they are, however, Valeriano's lectures were ill fated almost from the start. They would be rudely interrupted at least twice, first in December by the pope's death, then in the spring of 1522 by the summer holidays. They resumed the following autumn in the shadow of the arrival of the instantly unpopular new pope, Adrian VI; but it is not clear how long they continued, for the manuscript is incomplete. It breaks off after the discussion of Catullus 22, with the note, "The rest was lost in the Sack of Rome".[110]

The many references to Catullus in the *Castigationes* offer only a few hints as to the contents of any subsequent lectures, for most treat Virgil's use of Catullus rather than points of interest in Catullus himself.[111] I find one clear overlap with the existing lectures.[112] One citation could well have had a counterpart in a lecture on Catullus 64.[113] There are three other possibilities.[114]

---

[107] "Profecto neminem ego tam a Musis alienum, tam obturatis auribus esse crediderim qui rationem hanc non internoscat," Vat. lat. 5215, fol. 32r.

[108] "Age exemplum proponamus, ex quo aures unusquisque suas consulere poterit," Vat. lat. 5215, fol. 32r.

[109] "Videtis hic idem carmen, iisdem quoque verbis concinnatum, sonare tamen nescio quid vastius," Vat. lat. 5215, fol. 32v.

[110] "Reliquum in direptione Romae desideratum"; Vat. lat. 5215, fol. 249v. This account of the history of the lectures is reconstructed both from their contents and the physical evidence of the manuscript. See Gaisser 1993, especially 109-114, 136-145.

[111] Di Stefano 2001, 147 discusses Valeriano's references of this kind to Catullus 7.7, 64.62, 64. 91, and 69.3.

[112] At *A.*1.198 (*ante malorum*), where Valeriano says some want to read the phrase as one word, "ut apud Catullum postphasellus. et in Pandectis"; *Castigationes* 7. There is a corresponding note in the lectures on Catullus 4.10: "POSTFASELLUS unica dictio est, veluti in Pandectis emendatioribus, quae Florentiae magna asservantur religione, Postdomus et antedomus invenias si de area loquantur in qua post, vel ante domus fuerit excitata, ita postfasellus materies quae postea in fasellum fabricata est, fuit antea comata silva in ea ora pontica"; Vat. lat. 5215, fol. 75r.

[113] At *G.*3.53 (*crurum tenus*: down to the shins). Valeriano cites as a parallel Catullus 64.18, where Catullus says that the Nereids were standing out of the water down to their breasts (*nutricum tenus extantes*), adding that instead of *nutricum*, "certain people read both foolishly and shamelessly *iam crurum tenus extantes*", *Castigationes* l.

[114] Two mention readings of Catullus proposed in earlier editions and commentaries. Catullus 64.336, *Pelei*, on *G.*4.545 (*Orphei*; *Castigationes* lxix) and Catullus 66.48,

Conclusion

Valeriano's works on Virgil and Catullus were literary and scholarly highpoints of the last halcyon days of Leo's papacy, the printing of the one and the public performance of the other separated by only a few months. Both were products of many years of study and interest on the part of their author, and there was considerable cross fertilization between them since he was occupied with them at the same time. They belonged to different genres and were presented in different forms, the textual commentary designed for private study, the lectures for a group of listeners. But in a sense their subjects and audiences were the same. The subject in both cases was Latin poetry, the audience its devotees. There are also important differences between them. In the *Castigationes* Valeriano is correcting an existing text, a critic arguing the philological and aesthetic merits of almost every contested reading. In the lectures he is interpreting whole poems as well as scrutinizing particular words; he is a teacher showing both what poetry is and how to write it. Both works were of great originality and importance. The *Castigationes* was the first work of its kind and was cited by scholars for nearly four hundred years.[115] The lectures were not only entertaining, but also the best textual and literary treatment of Catullus until the commentary of Marc Antoine de Muret (1554), over a generation later. Their importance, however, was not realized until late in the twentieth century, for like Catullus himself, they remained too long undiscovered, hidden away in a neglected manuscript.[116]

Chalybum, on *A.*1.30 (*Danaum*; *Castigationes* 3). The third, on *A.*11.178 (*Castigationes* 181), discusses the verb *tetuli* in an anonymous fragment that Valeriano wrongly attributes to Catullus (*concitum tetuli gradum*; Warmington 1967, fr. 116) as an example of *prothesis* (the addition of a letter or syllable at the beginning of a word). He notes that the word *tetulit* is found "so often (*toties*) in Catullus." Forms of it appear four times in Catullus 63, as well as at 64.172 and 66.35. Valeriano perhaps would have discussed it, especially in his notes on Catullus 63.

[115] To give just one example: Valeriano (referred to as "Pierius") was still being cited as late as the edition and commentary of Conington 1881.

[116] See note 95.

Bibliography

Editions of Virgil 1501-1517

Aldine, 1501, *Vergilius* [First Aldine], Aldus Manutius. Venice.

Aldine 1514, *Virgilius,* [Third Aldine], Aldus Manutius. Venice.

Egnazio, Giovanni Battista 1507, *Publii Vergilii Bucolica, Georgica, Aeneis* B. Stagninus. Venice.

Riccardini, Benedetto, 1510 and 1517 *Virgilius*, Philippus Junta. Florence.

Modern Editions of Vergil

Conington, John 1881, *Vergili Maronis Opera with a Commentary*, 3 vols., London.

Conte, Gian Biagio 2009, *P. Vergilius Maro*, *Aeneis*, Berlin and Boston.

Geymonat, Mario 2008, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Rome.

Mynors, R.A.B. 1972, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Oxford.

Mynors, R.A.B. 1990, *Virgil Georgics, edited with a commentary by R.A.B. Mynors with a preface by R. G. M. Nisbet*, Oxford.

Norden, Eduard 1957, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*, Stuttgart.

Ottaviano, Silvia, and Conte, Gian Biagio 2011, *P. Vergilius Maro, Bucolica et Georgica*, Berlin & Boston.

Ribbeck, Otto 1859, *P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica et Georgica*, Leipzig.

Ribbeck, Otto 1860-1862 *P. Vergilii Maronis Aeneis*, 2 vols., Leipzig.

Thomas, Richard F. 1988, *Virgil Georgics*, 2 vols., Cambridge.

Williams, R. D. 1960, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quintus*, Oxford.

Other Works

Alpago-Novello, Luigi 1926, "Spigolature vaticane di argumento bellunese. I. Un'opera inedita ed ignorata di Pierio Valeriano", *Archivio Veneto Tridentino* 9, 69-96.

Anonymous 1982, "Colocci, Angelo", *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 27, 105-111.

Benedetti, S. 2006, "Maffei, Mario", *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 67, 245-249.

Brugnoli, G. and F. Stok 1997, *Vitae Vergilianae Antiquae*, Rome.

Campana, A. 1960, "Accursio, Mariangelo", *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, 1,126-132.

Campanelli, Maurizio 2008, "*Si in antiquis exemplaribus incideris*. . . I manoscritti tra letteratura filologica e gusto antiquario", *Segno e Testo* 6, 459-99.

Carson, R. A, G. and Sutherland, C. H. V. (eds.) 1984, *The Roman Imperial Coinage,* vol. 1, London.

Castigationes. See Valeriano 1521.

Ceresa, Massimo 2002, "Goritz, Johann, detto Coricio", *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 58, 69-72.

Di Stefano, Anita 2001, "Pierio Valeriano e la nascita della critica catulliana nel secolo XVI", Pellegrini 2001, 137-176.

Donatus, Aelius 1996, *Life of Virgil*. Trans. David Scott Wilson-Okamura. Rev. 2005, 2008. HTTP: www.virgil.org/vitae/a-donatus.htm. Accessed 19 April 2022.

Donatus, Tiberius 1969**,** *Ad Tiberium Claudium Maximum Donatianum filium suum Interpretationes Vergilianae*, ed.: Henricus Georgii, Stuttgart.

Douglas, Richard M. 1959, *Jacopo Sadoleto, 1477-1547: Humanist and Reformer*, Cambridge.

Fera, Vincenzo 2001, "Dai *Miscellanea* alle *Castigationes virgilianae*", Pellegrini 2001, 119-136.

Funaioli, Gino 1948, *Studi di letteratura antica*, vol. 1, Bologna.

Gaisser, Julia Haig 1988, "The Catullan Lectures of Pierius Valerianus", *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Guelpherbytani*, eds.: Stella Revard et al., Binghamton, New York, 45-53.

Gaisser, Julia Haig 1993, *Catullus and His Renaissance Readers,* Oxford.

Gaisser, Julia Haig 1999, *Pierio Valeriano on the Ill Fortune of Learned Men*, Ann Arbor, MI.

Gaisser, Julia Haig 2009, *Catullus*, Malden, Oxford, Chichester.

Gaisser, Julia Haig 2011, "The Mirror of Humanism: Self Reflection in the Roman Academy", *On Renaissance Academies*. Proceedings of the International Conference, "From the Roman Academy to the Danish Academy in Rome" The Danish Academy in Rome, 11-13 October 2006, ed.: Marianne Pade, Rome, 123-132.

Gaisser, Julia Haig 2016, "From Giovanni Pontano to Pierio Valeriano: Five Renaissance Commentators on Latin Erotic Poetry", *Commentaries*, eds.: Christina Kraus, Christopher Stray, and Sander Goldberg, Oxford, 275-298.

Geymonat, Mario 1995, "The Transmission of Virgil's Works in Antiquity and the Middle Ages", *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*, ed.: Nicholas Horsfall, Leiden, New York & Köln, 293-312.

Jones, Iris 1990, "Camillo Porcari e la famiglia", *Blosio Palladio di Collevecchio in Sabina nella Roma tra Giulio II e Giulio III*, ed.: E. Bentivoglio, Collevecchio di Sabina, 105-140.

Jossa, S. 2005, "Lelio, Antonio", *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 64, 327-330.

Landino, Cristoforo 1487-88, *Christophori Landini Florentini in P. Vergilii interpretationes*, Florence.

Leto, Pomponio 1544, *Iulii Pomponii Sabini Grammatici eruditissimi, in Omnia quae quidem extant, P. Vergilii Maronis Opera, Commentarii*, Basle.

Mattingly, Harold 1923, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, vol. 1, London.

Modigliani, Anna 2009, "Mellini, Mario", *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 73, 342-344.

Pellegrin, Élisabeth et al. 1991, *Les Manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane* 3.1, Paris.

Pellegrin, Élisabeth et al. 2010, *Les Manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane* 3.2*,* Paris.

Pellegrini, Paolo, ed. 2001, *Umanisti Bellunesi fra Quattro e Cinquecento. Atti del Convegno di Belluno, 5 novembre 1999*, Florence.

Pellegrini, Paolo 2002, *Pierio Valeriano e la tipografia del Cinquecento*, Udine.

Pontano, Giovanni Gioviano 1481, *De aspiratione*, Napoli.

Pontano, Giovanni Gioviano 2020, *Dialogues*, vol. 2, *Actius*, ed. and trans. J. H. Gaisser, Cambridge, Mass.

Pseudo-Probus. 1848, *In Vergilii Bucolica et Georgica commentarius*, ed. Heinrich Keil. Halle.

Savarese, Gennaro 1993, "Le *Castigationes* virgiliane di P. Valeriano", *La cultura a Roma tra Umanesimo ed Ermetismo (1480-1540)*, ed.: G. Savarese, Rome, 47-67.

Servius 1844-1898, *Commentarii in Vergilii Aeneidos Libros,* eds.: G. Thilo and H. Hagen, reprinted Packard Humanities Institute, Los Altos, Calif. c. 1991.

Soldati, Benedetto (ed.) 1902, *Ioannis Ioviani Pontani, Carmina*, 2 vols., Florence.

Torzi, Ilaria 2015, *Superioribus iunctus. Connettivi e connessioni fra i libri dell'Eneide*, Bergamo.

Valeriano, Pierio 1521, *Castigationes et Varietates Virgilianae Lectionis* Rome.

Valeriano, Pierio 1602, *Hieroglyphica*, Lyons, reprint, New York 1976.

Valeriano, Pierio 1509, *Praeludia quaedam*, [Venice].

Venier, Matteo 2001, *Per una storia del testo di Virgilio nella prima età del libro a stampa (1469-1519)*, Udine.

Vita quae Donati Aucti dicitur. 1997, in *Vitae Vergilianae Antiquae*, eds.: Giorgio Brugnoli and Fabio Stok, Rome, 71-135.

Warmington, E. H. 1967, "Fragments of Tragedies by Authors Unknown", *Remains of Old Latin II*, Cambridge MA and London.

Weigel, Richard 1992, "*Lupa romana.*" *Lexicon iconigraphicum mythologiae classicae (LIMC)*, Zürich & München, vols. VI.1, 292-296 and VI.2, 147-152.

Wills, Jeffrey 1997, "Homeric and Virgilian Doublets: The Case of *Aeneid* 6.901", *Materiali e discussioni* 38, 185-202.

Wright, David H. 2001, *The Roman Vergil and the Origins of Medieval Book Design*, Toronto.

Zabughin, Vladimiro 1921-23, *Vergilio nel Rinascimento italiano da Dante a Torquato Tasso*. 2 vols., Bologna.