2. A CASE-BASED VIEW ON GRAMMAR, RHETORIC AND POETICAL THEORY IN RENAISSANCE LATIN COMMENTARIES ON VIRGIL'S *AENEID*

Grammaticorum est munus poetas exponere.
'It is the task of the grammarians to explain the poets.'

1. Introduction: Poetry and the Task of the Grammarian

From antiquity onwards, grammarians have played an important role in the explanation and interpretation of key works from classical literature. The citation above is taken from the commentary on the *Aeneid* by the 16th-century Jesuit scholar Jacobus Pontanus, who is paraphrasing Quintilian.[142] The citation attests to the continuing importance of grammatical disciplines for the study of classical literature, and especially poetry in the early modern era.[143]

In this chapter, I will discuss a selection of lemmata from a variety of early modern *Aeneid*-commentaries, discussing topics from the fields of grammar, rhetoric and poetical theory. While, as I have explained in the introduction to this thesis, early modern commentaries have received relatively little attention in modern scholarship, modern scholars have displayed a considerable degree of interest in this type of lemmata.[144] Since the grammatical tradition is an important, if not essential, part of Virgilian studies, writing on early modern *Aeneid*-

---

[142] Q. 1.6.13-17. The citation is from Pontanus' lemma on V., *A.* 1.1 *Arma virumque.*

[143] Pontanus continues the lemma by citing a poem he attributes to Ausonius (modern editions of Ausonius' works no longer include the poem. See *Epigrammata Bobiensia* 47 (ed. Campana & Munari 1955)) in which the profession of the grammarian is mocked: *Ex his igitur verbis Virgilianis perlepide occasionem sumit Ausonius irridendi cuiusdam Grammatici, cui erat rixosa et querela uxor. Inducit autem ipsum loquentem: 'Arma virumque docens, atque arma virumque peritus / non duxi uxorem, sed magis arma domum. / Namque dies totos, totasque ex ordine noctes / litibus oppugnat meque meumque larem.' (...).* ['From these Virgilian verses then, Ausonius very wittily takes the opportunity to mock a certain grammarian, who had a quarrelsome and complaining wife. For he presents him speaking himself: 'Teaching about arms and the man, and skilled in arms and the man / I have not led a wife, but rather weapons to my home. / For all days, and all nights in a row / she beleaguers me and my house with disputes.' (...).']. This parodying of the famous opening words of the *Aeneid* ('Arma virumque') through the voice of a grammarian makes clear how much the meticulous study of poetry was the field of the grammarian. For the Greek epigram that lies at the basis of Ausonius' poem and for some more examples of grammarians as a target of ridicule in antiquity, see Sluiter (1988), 41-65.

[144] See the discussion of secondary literature on early modern (Virgilian) commentaries in chapter 1 of this thesis.

commentaries without providing a discussion of this field of scholarship would result in a distorted picture of these works. The grammatical tradition is a crucial part of early modern learning, but because of the longstanding tradition of the grammatical disciplines it can be difficult to unravel lemmata dealing with this subject matter. More specifically, the reasons for discussing the relation between the grammatical tradition and the early modern *Aeneid*-commentary in the first chapter of this dissertation are the following:

1. a study of the role of the grammatical tradition provides the necessary point of departure for the research questions that underlie the other chapters of this study, in which material is discussed that has received considerably less attention in modern scholarship;
2. in discussing the discontinuities within seeming continuities in the grammatical tradition, I will be able to show how out of the interaction between tradition and context arose different kinds of commentary, representing different approaches to Virgil's epic. This typology will then serve as a frame of reference for the analysis in the other chapters of this study;
3. in paying attention to three fields (grammar, rhetoric and poetical theory) that have always been considered to be part of the competence of the grammarian, I aim to contribute to the modern scholarship on this topic by providing not only a contextualized discussion of these fields, but also by making available a selection of these often highly complex lemmata to a broader group of scholars working in the field of early modern intellectual history, but not necessarily trained in classical philology.[145]

In accordance with these aims, I will analyze in this chapter commentary lemmata pertaining to the fields of grammar, rhetoric and poetical theory. I will focus on four early modern Latin Virgil commentaries – those of Landino, Pontanus, Farnaby and La Rue – occasionally making references to other ones (especially in section 5 in which a lemma from the commentary by Pomponio Leto is discussed).[146] The four selected commentaries present different approaches to

[145] This third goal also explains why the footnotes in this chapter occasionally tend to become somewhat excessive in length.

[146] I will cite from the editions mentioned in section 9.1 of chapter 1.

Virgil's epic and will play an important role in the other three analytical chapters of this dissertation.

1.1 Set-up of this Chapter

The discussion in this chapter is organized in eight sections. Following this introductory section, in **section 2** I will discuss the educational context that is invariably linked to the (early modern) *Aeneid*-commentary. Also in that section each of the four aforementioned commentators will be briefly introduced. **Sections 3 to 7** each offer a case study in which one of the three fields of the grammatical tradition is discussed with reference to one or more of the commentaries. This discussion will focus on the large amount of rich lemmata on the very first lines of the *Aeneid* (*A.* 1.1-11). In the course of my analysis, I will however occasionally also refer to lemmata on other verses of the *Aeneid* to provide some additional contextualization.

In **section 3** I will study discussions of genre, as a case study in poetics. In **section 4,** I will discuss the field of grammar by analyzing lemmata on etymology. Then, I will focus on rhetoric, especially on the influence of the rediscovery of the works of Quintilian and Tib. Cl. Donatus (**sections 5-6**). Finally, I will return to the field of poetics to discuss poetics in the late-15th-century commentary by the Florentine scholar Landino (**section 7**). A brief conclusion will follow **(section 8)**.

2. The Educational Context of the *Aeneid*-commentary

2.1 Cristoforo Landino: the Allegorical Commentary

The Florentine humanist Cristoforo Landino (1425-1498), poet, teacher at the Florentine studio, and author of the famous *Disputationes Camaldulenses* (c. 1472), published a commentary on the *Aeneid* in 1487/8. In view of his appointment at the studio, Landino had to lecture on many ancient authors, such as Cicero, Vergil, Horace, Juvenal and Persius, but also on later authors like Petrarch and Dante.[147] In his *prolusio* (prefatory oration) of 1462 – called *Praefatio in Virgilio* – Landino announced that he would lecture on Virgil the coming academic year (1462-63).[148] A manuscript of these lectures is still extant, enabling a closer look at the teaching of Landino.[149] The text of the manuscript consists of a word-by-word commentary

[147] Rombach (1991), 22.

[148] Field (1978), 17; Cardini (1973), 16; Kallendorf (1983), 520. An edition of the text can be found in Cardini (1974), I.20-28.

[149] See Kallendorf (1983), 520-521.

on the first seven books of the *Aeneid* that is almost three times as long (280 folios) as the amount of commentary on these books in the 1488 commentary.[150] Probably Landino continued his lecturing on the *Aeneid* (books VIII-XII) in the following academic year (1463-64). Landino's teaching at the studio appears to have been firmly rooted in the demands Florentine society had set for the education of its elite (e.g., the teaching of rhetoric for use in public life) and in the Neoplatonic tradition that is so characteristic of Florentine humanism of the second half of the 15th century. Both of these elements are visible in the lemmata from Landino's commentary.

Grammar, rhetoric and poetical theory are domains of knowledge that traditionally were part of an educational context. Many grammars, rhetorical manuals and commentaries were intended for school use, some directed at pupils, some at teachers.[151] Landino's *Aeneid*-commentary originated in the context of Landino's teaching at the Florentine studio. The commentary is in many ways the fruit of his educational activities, and, as I will further discus in section 7, the work is also greatly influenced by Landino's peculiar interpretative model which he had developed in his *Disputationes Camaldulenses*. The field of grammar in a narrow sense – the explanation of grammatical and syntactic rules – plays a minor role in the commentary: only rarely does one encounter lemmata that deal at length with such grammatical issues.[152] This can probably be explained by the fact that the teaching of grammar belonged to an earlier phase in education, and was not part of the curriculum at the university level.[153] One of the few cases in which Landino discusses an issue of grammar, is at the opening of the work. There he presents a semantic explanation in his lemma on 1.4 *memorem Iunonis ob iram*:

> Landino on V., *A.* 1.4 *memorem Iunonis ob iram*
> Multa nomina active passiveque ponuntur. Active dicimus "sis felix, nostrorumque leves, quaecumque, laborem" [V. A. 1.330] id est 'sis propitia', ac 'da felicitatem'. Passive autem 'Vivite felices', non quod inferant aliis, sed ipsi accipiant. Sic

[150] Field (1978) supposes that the manuscript is a draft of lectures transcribed by a student.

[151] Where grammar is concerned, grammatical text books were generally written for use by teachers, not by pupils. Jensen (1990), 57.

[152] When one considers grammar in a broader sense – pertaining to all the tasks of the grammarian, including for example the explanation of matters of culture and history – the field has a much more prominent role in Landino's commentary: he frequently presents a discussion of elements from the *Aeneid* that refers to historical practices from the classical world or to classical mythology.

[153] This becomes also apparent from Landino's introduction to his commentary on Horace, as discussed by Pieper (2013), 223.

> formidolosus, et qui infert et cui infertur formido. Aliter ergo Terentius "Nimis formidulosa es"[154], aliter Sallustius "Semper illis aliena virtus formidulosa est"[155]. Sic memor active ponitur ut "dum memor ipse mei, dum spiritus hos regit artus" [*A.* 4.336], passive cum ait Horatius "... sive puer furens // impressit memorem dentibus notam"[156], id est de qua illa meminerit. Sic nunc memorem iram, id est, de qua meminisset Iuno.
>
> Many nouns[157] are used in an active and in a passive sense. In an active sense we say 'Be thou gracious [*felix*], whoe'er thou art, and lighten this our burden',[158] this means 'be favorable' and 'give good fortune' [*felicitatem*]. In a passive sense however 'Live happy' [*felices*], not because they should bring this to others, but that they may get this themselves. Similarly, '*formidolosus'* is both he who brings and he who receives fear. Thus in one way Terence, 'You are too fearful [*formidulosa*]', and in another way Sallust 'The merit of others always causes them fear [*formidulosa*]'. In the same way '*memor'* is used actively as in 'While I have memory of myself, and while breath still sways these limbs', and passive when Horace says '... or if a passionate young man leaves you a mark to be remembered with his teeth', <i.e.> about which she will remember. So now '*memorem iram'*, that is, anger about which Juno had remembered.

In this lemma, Landino mentions the possibility in Latin for the same adjectives to be used either in an active or passive sense. This is illustrated by a few examples and references to the classical authors Terence, Sallust and Horace (drama, prose and poetry), and to the *Aeneid* itself. Interestingly, Landino interprets *memorem* in Horace and in *A.* 1.4 as passive (*de qua meminisset Iuno*), while, for example, the Oxford Latin Dictionary gives it an active significance in Virgil ('showing remembrance') and a passive one in Horace. Notwithstanding, the explanation in this lemma facilitates the reading of this particular verse by discussing how *memorem* should be read according to Landino, and at the same time gives more insight into a rather advanced aspect of Latin grammar. Moreover, Landino's

---

[154] Probably Ter., *Eun.* 756: *Num formidolosus obsecro es, mi homo*? ['You're not frightened, for goodness' sake, my dear fellow?'] (translation by Barsby 2001).

[155] Sal., *Cat.* 7.2.2: *semperque iis aliena virtus formidulosa est.* ['and always the virtue of someone else inspires fear in them'].

[156] Hor., *Od*. 1.13, 11-12: *... sive puer furens // impressit memorem dente labris notam*. ['... or a raging boy // leaves on your lips a noticeable mark with his teeth.'].

[157] The *nomina* include both substantives and adjectives.

[158] Translation by Rushton Fairclough (1956).

references to instances of the same phenomenon in other classical texts both offer the interested reader a set of similar examples for further study, teaching, or excerption, while on the other hand they also aid in establishing an image of the commentator as an expert on the subject matter. I will return to the field of grammar in Landino's commentary in section 4 (on etymology) and discuss an example of the more allegorical aspects of his work in section 7.

2.2 Jacobus Pontanus: a Jesuit Commentary

The Virgil commentary by Jacobus Pontanus (Jakob Spanmüller; 1542-1626), was printed in 1599. Pontanus, who taught at Augsburg, was a member of the Jesuit order. Through their involvement in education, the Jesuits had a profound influence on education throughout (Catholic) Europe. Pontanus was a member of one of the commissions that were set up by the Jesuits to evaluate critically the proposals for a revision of the school curriculum in the new 1599 *Ratio studiorum*.[159] In this work the precepts for education by the Jesuit order were laid down.[160] Another instance of his intricate involvement in teaching is his work on poetical theory, the *Poeticae institutiones* (1594). This book presents one of the few Renaissance theoretical works on poetry for use in schools.[161] Pontanus wrote several commentaries on the works of classical authors, which were printed in a series called *Symbolarum libri*. Through this series, Pontanus' commentaries on classical authors were used in the Jesuit teaching program in Latin. This program consisted of first three years of study of Latin grammar, then one year of study of the classical writers, and finally one year of the study of rhetoric.[162] Especially Pontanus' editions of Ovid[163] and Virgil were used in Jesuit schools all over Europe.[164] The command of Latin and the imitation of classical authors took an important place in the program.[165] The teaching practice in the Jesuit classroom is described by Bauer (1998): first, in the *praelectio*, the teacher would give a paraphrase of the content of a passage, then he would offer a translation of it, and finally he would present comments on specific words and examples from other

---

[159] Blum (1998), 51.

[160] An edition of the *Ratio studiorum* from 1599 can be found in Adrien Demoustier et al., *Ratio studiorum: plan raisonné et institution des études dans la Compagnie de Jésus. Édition bilingue latin-français* (Paris: Belin, 1997).

[161] Moss (1996), 220-221.

[162] Demoustier e.a. (1997).

[163] See for example Moss (1996, 178n.66) on Pontanus' Ovid-commentary.

[164] Moss (1996), 221n.6. Jesuit education was very influential; see also Garin (1976, 205).

[165] Garin (1976), 203. See also Bauer (1998), 235.

authors.[166] On difficult words in the text, the teacher would offer synonyms and he would often present a prose paraphrase of the narrative in poetry to enhance insight in the construction of the sentence.[167] Pontanus' commentary on Virgil is very compatible with this type of teaching: its lemmata facilitate classroom explanation in various ways, e.g., by offering synonyms, by presenting references to other authors, or by offering a prose paraphrase. His monumental commentary on the *Aeneid* was a product of the Jesuit educational program, but also in many ways the outcome of the large number of commentaries that had been published over the course of the 16th century.[168] The work is striking in the extent to which it incorporates material from other commentators and classical authors. This leads to a work that is huge both in its magnitude and in the knowledge it contains. In this respect, Pontanus' commentary seems to be of the same type as that of his fellow-Jesuit Juan Luis de la Cerda, whose work I will discuss in chapter 3 of this thesis.

As I have argued above, Pontanus' commentary should be seen in the context of Jesuit education. Conveniently, Pontanus himself explicitly identifies the intended audience of his commentary and his goals in composing the work in a prefatory letter to the text. This letter is directed at the teachers and students of Virgil.[169] One of the issues discussed by Pontanus in the letter, is why he has undertaken the arduous task of writing yet another commentary on the *Aeneid*, when so many commentaries and other scholarly works were readily available. He explains first how, in writing his own work of scholarship, he has taken into account the works of his precursors,[170] who had written valuable comments based on their own ingenuity, or on the study of old (annotated) editions of the text. Pontanus emphasizes the amount and different kinds of works of scholarship he

---

[166] Bauer (1998), 236.

[167] Bauer (1998), 237-8. In fact the Jesuit method of teaching is much in line with early modern teaching in general. See Kallendorf (2013), esp. 318-324.

[168] Moss (1996, 178) points out that the method of teaching in Jesuit schools was in fact very much consistent with the set-up of late fifteenth-century Italian classical commentaries.

[169] *De causis et ratione suscepti operis, ad Virgilii studiosos et professores praefatio* ['On the reasons and the method for the undertaking of this work, preface to the students and teachers of Virgil'].

[170] *Observavi, eos qui operam et tempus impenderunt faciendis Variis lectionibus, Adversariis, Miscellaneis, et quibus aliis appellationibus huiuscemodi notae commentarios suos inscripserunt ... ut Victorii, Turnebi, Politiani, Rhodigini, Mureti, Lipsii, et huius ordini trecenti, antiquiores, recentiores…* ['I have taken into account those who have expended labor and time in compiling *Variae lectiones*, *Adversaria*, *Miscellanea* and whatever other titles of this kind they have given their commentaries … such as the innumerable works, ancient and modern, of Victorius [Germanus], Turnebus, Poliziano, Rhodiginus, Muretus, Lipsius, and any number [litt. 'three hundred'] of their colleagues, ancients and moderns'].

has studied in preparing his own commentary. He has consulted works written by authors form different professions, from very different places, with very different goals in studying the works of Virgil.[171] In all their variety, he notes, all these works are useful for elucidating Virgil, especially the works of the Latin and Greek historians and poets.[172] Pontanus' commentary shows that his remarks in the prefatory letter are not mere boasting. In fact, the method of excerption and compilation which he describes are very visible in the commentary, which consists of lemmata often built from numerous paraphrases or citations from the works of other scholars. In this respect Pontanus seemed to have had a preference for the commentators Corrado and Nascimbeno and scholars such as Turnebus and Scaliger. Finally, in the last part of his prefatory letter, Pontanus identifies the intended readership for this kind of commentary:

> Pontanus, *praefatio*
> Quapropter, si e tam multis ac multifariis literatissimorum virorum vigiliis has explicationes, illustrationes, comparationes, emendationes arbitratu iudicioque meo decerperem, ac per libros Virgilianis libris dispositione ac numero respondentes, secundum seriem carminum, aptis sectionibus, pro recepto more distributam disponerem, ratus sum me a vobis, quique intra domesticos parietes Maronem lectitatis, quique eundem in illis eruditionis mercatibus pro cathedra discipulis interpretamini, gratiam non modicam initurum. Cum praesertim non raro incassum alibi sperata auxilia, hoc vobis non defutura habeam polliceri.
>
> For that reason, if I gathered according to my own opinion and judgment these explanations, illustrations, comparisons, emendations from so many and so

[171] *Notavi item, cum hos ipsos, tum alios, velut aliarum familiarum homines, diversarumque civitatum cives, dissimili scriptionis, sive tractationis genere occupatos, tam sacros, quam civiles, Theologos, Philosophos, Iureconsultos, Medicos, Rhetores, Grammaticos, et quidquid demum appellandi sunt, aliud agentes, Maronianos versus ad probandum, confirmandum, refutandum, ornandum, illustrandum aliquid in medium adducere.* ['I have moreover observed both these ones [aforementioned scholars], and others, like men from different families, and citizens from diverse cities, occupied with dissimilar kinds of writing or treatise, both religious and civil, theologians, philosophers, scholars of law, scholars of medicine, rhetoricians, grammarians, and however they are to be called precisely, who are having different goals, put forward Maro's verses in order to examine, assert, refute, embellish, or illustrate something'].

[172] *Animadverti insuper, ex variis auctoribus, maxime autem ex historicis, et poëtis utriusque linguae, ad lucem Virgilianae poësi maiorem adhibendam idonea permulta derivari posse.* ['Moreover, I have noticed that a great many useful things can be derived from the works of various authors, but especially from historians and poets in either languages [Greek and Latin] in order to shed more light on Virgil's poetry.'].

> manifold nightly efforts of the most learned men, and arranged them in books corresponding in arrangement and number to the books of Virgil, following the chain of the verses, in fitting portions, distributed in the commonly accepted way, I think that I would win no small gratitude from all you who eagerly read Maro within domestic walls, and all you who teach the same to students professionally in those market halls of erudition. Especially since I promise you that you will not be left without the help that is often hoped for in vain elsewhere.

Pontanus thus intended his information-dense commentary for teachers and for students without a teacher, studying Virgil on their own. The same line of reasoning is found in Badius Ascensius'[173] preface to his commentary on the *Aeneid*.[174] Therefore this kind of argumentation could very well be perceived as a traditional argument that could be used by the commentator to defend himself from criticism about the overload of information contained in his commentary. On the other hand, this kind of commentaries may very well have been intended to be bought not only by teachers, but also by students.[175] The most interesting point that emerges from Pontanus' prefatory letter however, is that it makes clear how the massive amount of Virgilian scholarship produced in the past centuries called for a clear restructuring and excerpting of the material. Only in this way could the vast knowledge contained by the Virgilian commentary tradition be made accessible again for those not intimately involved in Virgilian scholarship.

As was pointed out above, one of the traditional classroom activities was for the teacher to provide paraphrases of the poets and to let students practice writing

---

[173] Jodocus Badius Ascensius (Josse Bade van Asse; 1462-1535) was printer in Paris. His press was very productive: between 1503 and 1515 alone he published over 700 editions (Renouard 1909, 6). In the commentaries he published, he included lots of material from various older commentaries and classical texts which he combined into a new, more or less coherent commentary. His *Aeneid*-commentary was first printed in February 1501 and became one of the most printed Virgil commentaries in the early modern period (see for example Kallendorf 1999, 37).

[174] In his dedicatory letter to Petrus Apherdianus in the 1501 edition Badius explicitly states how he has conceived his commentary in such a way that it could also be used by students without a teacher: (…) *Hunc autem poetam familiariter exponere constitui ut quibus praeceptorum deest copia habeant ex nobis facilem ad eam viam.* (…)' ['I have however decided to explain this poet in an accessible way, so that those who lack the ready knowledge of teachers will have easy access to such knowledge from our work'].

[175] Kallendorf (1999, 45-49) argues that printers of the sometimes voluminous commentary also had a younger public of readers in mind and that a *folio* format of an edition does not necessarily point to the contrary (against the often heard argument that large editions were not intended for use in schools, because of their size, weight and cost).

paraphrases themselves. At the end of Pontanus' commentary, a short treatise and paraphrases of the first and last three books of the *Aeneid* are attached. In the treatise, Pontanus discusses the usefulness of writing paraphrases on the work of classical poets. The paraphrase was not only prescribed by the Jesuit order, but had always been a traditional part of the grammatical and rhetorical tradition.[176] The form in which it is found in early modern commentaries varies. In Pontanus' commentary the paraphrase takes the form of long prose summaries of (large part of) entire books of the *Aeneid*. In the works of commentators such as Badius and La Rue they form a running prose summary printed next to the lines of the poem, while with Farnaby the paraphrase has taken the form of short (often one-sentence) prose summaries of sections of the *Aeneid*. In his treatise, Pontanus calls the paraphrase 'one of the rhetorical exercises or one of the minor tasks of the orator' (*oratoriarum exercitationum minorumve operum oratoris*), and refers to Lorenzo Valla's paraphrase of the *Iliad* as a good example of this type of work (*extat item tota Ilias a Laurentio Valla ad hunc modum tractata*).[177] With respect to the goal and use of the prose paraphrase, Pontanus writes that it serves on the one hand as a means to improve the students' understanding of literature, and that on the other hand a prose version enables a better understanding of difficult poetical texts (*Dubitare enim fas non est, quae prosa oratione, et verbis notioribus, et omnino elocutione oratoria efferuntur, expeditius solere intelligi, quam quae libertate illa, more, institutoque poetico*).[178] For this reason, he writes, the practice of writing paraphrases has always been frequent even among the ancient interpreters of the poets (*Quare et vetustiores poetarum explanatores paraphrasibus saepe usos constat*),[179] especially in the case of Virgil because of the difficulty in his work (*Quod si in ullo de Latinis utiliter istud, in Marone profecto utilissime fieri asseverari potest, in quo multa obscura, impedita, difficilia, et ingenia etiam eruditissimorum torquentia*).[180] At the end of his treatise, Pontanus briefly summarizes his argument in the following way:

---

[176] See for example Mack (2014, 58-59) and Grafton & Jardine (1986, 130-135) on the role of Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* (ca. 4th century) in early modern education.

[177] 'In the same way the *Iliad*, which has been discussed in this manner by Lorenzo Valla, stands out'.

[178] 'For there is no reason to doubt that what is uttered in prose, through more common words, and altogether through oratorical diction, is usually more easily understood than what [is uttered] through that poetic license, practice and precepts.'

[179] 'It is well-known that for this reason even the older interpreters of the poets often made use of paraphrases.'

[180] 'But if it can be claimed that this practice can be usefully pursued in any of the Latin writers, it can without question be claimed that it can be most usefully pursued in Maro, in whom there are many obscure, obstructed, difficult things, and things tormenting the genius of even the wisest men.'

Pontanus

Meus ergo (ut revertar, unde paulisper abii) idem scopus, qui superiorum Paraphrastarum: nempe, ut lectori levioris armaturae ad aliquot libros divinae Aeneidos commodius ac planius intelligendos tanquam ansam porrigerem; minime autem ut ad eius versus me exercendo, eloquentiam compararem: quod ipsum si quis facere instituerit, eum ego laudem mereri existimo. Igitur ad rem accedamus.

My goal is thus the same as that of the earlier paraphrasts (to return to the point from which I have briefly digressed): namely, that I offer as it were a handle to the less well equipped reader for easier and better understanding of some of the books of the divine *Aeneid*; not at all that by training myself through its verses I would match its eloquence; but if anyone should have set out to do this, I consider him worthy of praise. But let us now move on to the matter itself.

Pontanus affirmatively states that he has provided the prose paraphrase of the *Aeneid* to serve as a reading aid for the reader 'of lighter equipment' of the epic (and not as examples of his own eloquence). Since Pontanus intended his commentary, as I showed before, to be used by teachers and by readers of the epic studying the work on their own, the printed prose paraphrase in fact serves as a teacher who explains the narration and at the same time provides training in prose composition. As Pontanus notes a reader could through these paraphrases more easily and better understand some of the more difficult parts of the *Aeneid*.

Before I move on to the discussion of two other commentaries in the next section of this chapter, I briefly mention a specific use of the paraphrase, that is not identified by Pontanus, and which will be more fully discussed in chapter 5 of this thesis. In some cases the printed paraphrase in early modern commentaries appears to have been used by readers as an aid facilitating access to the text of the *Aeneid* in a very direct way. By underlining words from the prose paraphrase and the corresponding words from Virgil's verses, a reader could turn his paraphrase into a sort of index to the poetical text, since, as Pontanus remarks, a prose text is easier to read than poetry. This annotating practice shows once more how parts of the commentary could serve as access points to the work of literature, which is also in accordance with Pontanus' remarks on the use of paraphrases.

2.3 Two School Commentaries: Thomas Farnaby and Charles de la Rue

In this section I will discuss another two commentaries that are linked to an educational context. Following a brief introduction to both commentators, I will

discuss the similarities of and differences between these seventeenth-century works of scholarship.

2.3.1 Thomas Farnaby

Thomas Farnaby (1575-1647) was one of England's most influential schoolmasters and writers of schoolbooks of the seventeenth century. His commentary was first published in 1634. Farnaby is the author of many annotated editions of Latin authors, among them Seneca, Martial, Ovid, Terence and Virgil, which enjoyed huge popularity. Apart from his commentaries, he wrote an influential textbook on rhetoric, the *Index rhetoricus* (1625), and a Latin grammar, the *Systema grammaticum* (1641). Farnaby's commentary, as I will show below, was written for education at an intermediate level. This resulted in a rather selective and condensed type of commentary. As I will demonstrate, this is both determined by the developments in the commentary tradition over the preceding 150 years and by the specific educational setting of his work.

2.3.2 Charles de la Rue

Charles de la Rue (1643-1725) was a member of the Jesuit order and a very influential preacher at the French court. Many of his orations – of which his funeral oration for the Dauphin (Louis of France, the son of Louis XIV) is especially noteworthy– were printed during his lifetime. His commentary on the works of Virgil was first published in 1675; a revised edition appeared in 1682. Just as Farnaby's work, La Rue's commentary was aimed at education at an intermediate level.

In view of the gigantic commentaries by scholars like La Cerda (see chapter 3) and, to a somewhat lesser extent, Pontanus, the need for more compact and especially more accessible commentaries can be readily understood. Thomas Farnaby's commentary on the *Aeneid* is both much briefer in length and more restricted in content than its sixteenth-century predecessors. In some ways the commentary seems to share traits with the one by Charles de la Rue, which appeared in the Dauphin series. Both works were clearly intended for use in education at an intermediate level – Farnaby being one of England's most famous schoolmasters and the Dauphin series being intended for use by the young Dauphin of France. La Rue's commentary contains a preface, which will be discussed below. When looking at the commentary itself, it appears that Farnaby generally stays closer to the explanation of the narration of the *Aeneid* than some of his precursors had done. He seems to focus more on explaining the language and content of the poem itself, to make it better accessible to a readership of students at the intermediate level,

than on using the poem as a starting point for providing information that appears to be not directly relevant to the narrative of the epic. This kind of approach would suggest that the commentator has had to restrain himself more in what he offers to his readers than commentators such as Landino, Badius, Pontanus and La Cerda, who turned their works into hoarding-places of knowledge. It so happens that Farnaby comments on this problem in his lemma on V., *A.* 6.282. Here, Farnaby remarks that he cannot discuss certain topics in great detail, and therefore refers to other works for more information:

> Farnaby on V., *A.* 6.282
> Dabis mihi veniam, lector, per institutae brevitatis angustias excluso, si strictis tantum sterilis huius ulmi foliis, vanisque poëticorum monstrorum somniis excussis, te ad ipsos poëtas mythologos, eosque qui allegoriis philosophantur, relegem.
>
> You will excuse me, reader, (my hands are bound because of the constraints of the prescribed brevity) if, having barely touched the leaves of this barren elm [*A.* 6.282-284] and having banished the false dreams of poetic monsters [*A.* 6.283-285], I refer you to the mythological poets themselves and to those who philosophize through allegory.

Farnaby refers to the elm and the monsters that are mentioned here by Virgil in his depiction of the Underworld. The discussion of Virgil's depiction of Hades in book 6 of the *Aeneid* had traditionally attracted a lot of attention from commentators, especially those seeking to read the epic in an allegorical way. Farnaby makes it clear that he will not offer a discussion of these topics, but instead refers to other authors and scholars. This remark by Farnaby not only shows that his commentary has another kind of set-up than the large sixteenth-century commentaries by scholars such as Pontanus (who, as I discussed above, really intended to compile and make accessible the most important observations of commentators and scholars before him), but possibly also hints at another conceptualization of the knowledge-value of the *Aeneid*. For the implication of Farnaby's remark is that he is leaving out information which a reader of an *Aeneid* commentary would expect to find in such a work of scholarship. It is conceivable that in selecting the material to include in his commentary, Farnaby chose to leave out those categories of information which he deemed less important. In this case, his remark that he refers his readers to "the mythological poets" and "those who philosophize through allegory" seems to suggest that he deems the information provided by those writers less important for a student of the *Aeneid*. Farnaby's selection is thus not

strictly quantitative – as he presents it in the passage cited above – but also qualitative. Since Farnaby's commentary comes without a preface, one encounters this kind of information in a commentary lemma. La Rue's commentary however has a preface, in which he explicitly discusses a very similar issue:

> La Rue, *praefatio*
> His ego auctoribus ac ducibus, in hac Virgilii explanatione, praeter brevitatis nitorisque studium, id imprimis mihi proposui: publicis commodis, non meae me laudi servire. Igitur versibus interpretationem, notas interpretationi subieci. (...) In notis neglexi nihil cuius in legendo Virgilio usus esse aliquis posset; nihil ad solam literaturae ostentationem usurpavi.
> (...)
> In quo quid praeter alios interpretes praestiterim, facile intelliget, quisquis eos aliquando attigerit; quorum quidem errores notare nolim asperius, qui excusari meos peto. Sane opera non inutilis a me posita est in explicandis ex fide historiae compluribus locis obscuris prius, aut parum feliciter enotatis; advocata etiam interdum subsidia aliarum artium ac disciplinarum, ne grammaticum egisse tantum dicerer; quibus tamen in singulis si cui videbor nimis presse stricteque versatus, cuiusmodi querelae iam ad me delatae sunt: is me, non geographum, aut philosophum, aut rhetorem, sed Virgilii interpretem esse intelligat.
>
> With these authors and guides I have set myself, except the desire for brevity and splendor, first and foremost the following goal in this explanation of Virgil: to serve public convenience, not my own glory. Therefore I have placed the interpretation under the verses and the notes under the interpretation (...) In my notes, I have omitted nothing that could be of any use in reading Virgil; and I have included nothing only for the sake of showing off erudition.
> (...)
> In this respect all who will ever have touched upon other interpreters, will easily understand what I have achieved over and beyond them; I, who ask that my own mistakes be excused, do not want to note <too> harshly their mistakes. Clearly, I have taken useful troubles in explaining on an historical basis many previously dark passages, or passages that had not been annotated felicitously enough; occasionally I also summoned the help of other arts and disciplines, lest people say that I operated only as a grammarian; if anyone however thinks that I am too succinct or too little informed in any of those fields, and such complaints have already reached me: let him know that I am no geographer, philosopher or rhetorician, but an interpreter of Virgil.

This preface tellingly shows that La Rue's readership – or at least part of it – expected from a Virgilian commentary not only an explanation of matters that were traditionally part of the domain of the grammarian, but also of issues pertaining to fields like geography and philosophy. La Rue even states that (hypothetical) complaints had reached him that in his explanations he had paid too little attention to those disciplines. Compared to previous commentaries like those of Landino, Pontanus and La Cerda, it is certainly true that La Rue has limited himself in what to include in his commentary. As he himself states in his preface, this is consistent with his aim to present a commentary that is, unlike some of its precursors, comprehensive, but workable. Admittedly, La Rue's statement is not lacking in rhetorical force and should also be read as the preemptive defense of a scholar anticipating criticism for leaving things out of his commentary. Even then however this passage from La Rue's preface, as Farnaby's remark in his lemma on V., *A.* 6.282, indicate that both these commentaries have a different scope from those by Landino, Pontanus and La Cerda. In part this can probably be explained by the specific educational setting for which each of these commentaries were intended, but I would suggest that it is also indicative of another tendency. As Knauer has remarked, Virgilian scholarship became very much congested by voluminous commentaries such as those of Pontanus and La Cerda.[181] These scholars included centuries of Virgilian scholarship into their commentaries, making more works of the same nature no longer necessary. However, there was still need for editions for use in the classroom, that were less densely packed with information.

Concluding Remark

In this section I have discussed four early modern *Aeneid*-commentaries in relation to their educational context. I have identified some general features of each of these works and made some first assumptions as to the broader implications of these observations for the early modern Virgilian commentary. At this point, it is time to turn to the case studies, in which the fields of grammar, rhetoric and poetical theory in *Aeneid*-commentaries will be analyzed in more detail.

---

[181] Knauer (1964, 86-87) remarks how these kind of commentaries in effect blocked further developments in the writing of Virgilian commentaries for the next 150 years. While this view may be somewhat dated – especially because Knauer dismisses all Virgilian scholarship between La Cerda and Heyne and seems to judge pre-modern commentaries by modern standards – his observation that there occurred some type of (perceived) congestion in the commentary tradition seems to have certain validity.

3. Poetics: A. 1.1a-d, *Ille ego*...: Jacobus Pontanus on *A.* 1.1a-1d *Ille ego* and the Conventions of Genre

The opening of the *Aeneid* had traditionally been a heavily debated topic in Virgilian scholarship.[182] Starting with Servius, many commentators paid attention to the question of whether the work should open with the four lines starting with *Ille ego* (which I will number 1.1a-d) and in which the poetic career of Virgil was summarized, or with *Arma virumque*.[183]

V., *A.* 1.1a-1d; 1.1

Ille ego, qui quondam gracili modulatus avena	I am he who once tuned my song on a slender pipe,
carmen, et egressus silvis vicina coegi	and then, leaving the woods, made the nearby fields
ut quamvis avido parerent arva colono,	obey the husbandmen however greedy, a work to
gratum opus agricolis ; at nunc horrentia Martis	win favour with farmers; but now I sing of the
arma virumque cano (...)	bristling arms of Mars and the man (...)[184]

Most early modern commentators take into account the problematic first four lines, if only as an opportunity to discuss the genre of epic poetry and the relation between the various poetical works of Virgil. Pontanus goes into the issue in detail in his lemma on V., *A.* 1.1a *Ille ego*. First, he pays attention to the fact that lines 1.1a-d would serve as a mechanism to counter plagiarism: by referring to his other works (the *Georgics* and the *Bucolics*) Virgil identifies himself as the author of the epic.[185] According to Pontanus, this mechanism goes back to the mythical poet Orpheus. Tucca, the poet and friend of Virgil, would have removed the lines because he deemed them unnecessary, for the work was immediately published

---

[182] Ziolkowski & Putnam (2008), 22-25.

[183] See Servius, *In V. Aen. praef.*: *Augustus vero, ne tantum opus periret, Tuccam et Varium hac lege iussit emendare, ut superflua demerent, nihil adderent tamen (...) ... et aliquos detractos [versiculos], ut in principio – nam ab armis non coepit, sed sic: (...)* ['Augustus actually, to prevent the loss of such a work, ordered Tucca and Varius to emend it according to the following principle, that they would remove what was superfluous, but that they would add nothing']. The same story is found in the life of Virgil attributed to Aelius Donatus (for an English translation of the relevant part of the life, see Copeland & Sluiter (2009), 102 par.39). I cite Servius from Thilo & Hagen (1881).

[184] Translation by Williams (1972-1973).

[185] The same type of discussion of this passage is found in the commentary of Juan Luis de la Cerda (Toledo 1558 – Madrid 1643). For antiquarianism in La Cerda's commentary, see chapter 3 of this dissertation.

under the name of the author.[186] Pontanus depends for this interpretation on a commentary by Germanus.[187] This is indicated at the end of the first section of the lemma. Pontanus frequently paraphrases from another commentary or scholarly work on Virgil and indicates this by briefly naming the author at the end of his paraphrase. What makes the lemma in question stand out is that Pontanus cites several authorities – he continues the lemma by referring to the *Poetics* of Scaliger, who agrees that Virgil wrote the four lines to prevent anyone from stealing his work. The quotation of Scaliger complements Pontanus' paraphrase of Germanus in that it provides the extra information that the use of devices against plagiarism was common among the ancients.[188] Pontanus continues to give information that

---

[186] *(...) Est autem Orpheum, qui Argonauticῶn principio compendiosa enumeratione opera sua est complexus et professus, brevi enim anacephalaeosi sua quoque distinxit et comprehendit, ne aut plagiarii, a quibus olim vexatus fuerat, sacrilegio versus divinos sublegerent, sibique adscriberent, aut eos falsarii adulterare auderent. Tucca tamen post Virgilii mortem, nullo discrimine principium hoc recidere est agressus, quod ab utrisque nihil metuendum esse videret, iam temporibus Augusti integro poemate et opere Maronis, sub germano auctoris nomine evulgato, et recognito. German*. ['(...) This is however Orphic, who at the beginning of his *Argonautica* through a compendious enumeration has included and claimed his works, for he also distinguished and described them in a short recapitulation, so that neither plagiarizers, by whom he had been plagued in the past, would steal the divine verses through sacrilege, and ascribe them to themselves, nor forgers dare to counterfeit them. Tucca nevertheless, after the death of Virgil, has proceeded to cut away this beginning without risk, because he saw that there was nothing to be feared from either group [plagiarizers or forgers], because already in the times of Augustus the entire poem and the work of Maro had been published and recognized under the author's own name. Germanus.'].

[187] Germain Vaillant de Guélis (1516-1587), abbot of Pimpont and bishop of Orléans. His commentary on the *Aeneid* was published in 1575. See Knauer (1964), 78-82; see also Delacourcelle (1954), 336-361. La Cerda used the commentary in writing his own and shares with Germanus a fondness for Greek literature.

[188] *Veritus, inquit Scaliger Poet. lib. 5 cap. 17 plagiariorum temeritatem, tum in extremo 4. Georg. nomen posuit suum, tum hic prudenter innuit. Quae qui abstulere, suam faciunt Aeneidem, non Maronis. Et erat apud priscos in more positum, ut non titulis solum adscriberent nomen, sed operis statim principis apponerent. Sic omnes Arabes, et Chaldaei, ac prophetae veteres: Visio Azahelis, Iudicium Abidiae, Dixit Avenzabri, Sermo filii Zacuth, Propositiones Barthecuas, sic Herodotus, sic Thucydides. Idem Poet. lib. 1. cap.56*. ['"Out of fear of the temerity of plagiators", says Scaliger in book 5, chapter 17 of his *Poetics*, "he [Virgil] both placed his name at the end of *Georgics* 4, and he here indicated it wisely. Those who took them [verses 1.1a-d] away, made the *Aeneid* their own, not of Maro. And it was an established practice with the ancients, that they not only wrote their name at the title, but that they placed it immediately at the beginning of the work. Thus all the Arab peoples, and the Chaldaeans [Babylonians], and the ancient prophets: the *Visio* of Ezekiel, the *Iudicium* of Obadja, Avenzabri said, the *Sermo* of the son of Zacuth, the *Propositiones* of Barthekuai, thus

pertains to poetical theory, now going into the discussion of the proem for different genres of poetry, for which he again cites Scaliger[189] and also refers to a work by another scholar (Johannes Antonius Viperanus (1540-1610), *De poetica libri tres*). [190] He then turns to an intricate discussion of the connection between genre and style. For this topic, he again refers to the works of other scholars, in this case the Virgilian commentaries by Sebastiano Corrado and Nascimbene de' Nascimbeni.[191]

Herodotus, thus Thucydides." See also Scaliger, *Poetics*, book 1, chapter 56.']. As is remarked by Vogt-Spira (1998) in his edition of Scaliger's *Poetics*, the oriental names are difficult to identify.

[189] Pontanus cites the following passage from the *Poetica* (book 1, ch. 56): *Sunt et in generibus poematum proemia, ut in musicis προαύλια. In quibus plurimus fuit Claudianus, separato carmine a iusto poemate. Divinus autem poeta unum corpus fecit. Illa enim fuerant prooemium, 'Ille ego qui quondam' et cetera, ut pessima temeritate praetulerint arbitrium suum ii, qui exemerunt ea de iudicio tanti viri. (...) Tales sunt operum conclusiones, quos epilogos Graeci nominant, ut apud Horatium, 'Exegi monumentum aere perennius', et Ovidium, 'Iamque opus exegi', quae sunt a iusto opere separata. At non separavit idem Vergilius a Georgicis, 'Illo Virgilium me tempore dulcis alebat // Parthenope'.* Then he refers to Viperanus (*Lege etiam Viperanum, Poetices lib. 2 cap. 5*) for more information. ['And there are proems for categories of poems, just as 'proaulia' for musical works. Claudianus has the most of them, setting apart the [introductory] verse from the true poem. The divine poet [Virgil] however has created one corpus. These [verses] for instance were the proem, 'I am he who once' [V., *A.* 1.1a] etc., so that those people gave preference to their judgment through most nefarious temerity, who have removed them in defiance of the judgment of such a man. (...) Such are the conclusions of works, which the Greeks call epilogues, such as with Horace, 'I have constructed a monument more enduring than bronze', and Ovid, 'Now I have constructed a work', which [verses] are set apart from the work itself. But Virgil again did not separate [the closing verses] from the *Georgics*, 'At that time I Virgil was nursed by sweet Parthenope.' Read however Viperanus, *Poetics*, book 2, chapter 5.'].

[190] Joannes Antonius Viperanus (died 1610), author of *De poetica libri tres* (Antwerp 1579), was court historian of king Philip II of Spain and bishop of Giovinazzo in Apulia.

[191] Sebastiano Corrado (professor at Bologna, died 1556), wrote an allegorical commentary on the first book of the *Aeneid*, published in Florence in 1555. See Knauer (1964), 103n.1. Nascimbene de' Nascimbeni (Nascimbaenus Nascimbaeni; died 1578) wrote a commentary on the first six books of the *Aeneid* (Basel 1577). He was a professor at Bologna, Ferrara and rector at Dubrovnik (1561-1569) and spent the last eight years of his life in prison after being convicted of heresy. See also Zabughin (2000 [1921-23]), II.79 on Nascimbeno's commentary.

Pontanus on *A.*1.1a *Ille ego*

Prudenter animadversum a Sebastiano Corrado, quemadmodum res ipsae ita sibi successerunt, ut se contingere videantur, pastoritia, rustica, civilis. Ita Virgilium opera sua, quibus hanc triplicem varietatem explicaret, quasi colligare voluisse.

This has been cleverly observed by Sebastiano Corrado, in what way the very subjects succeeded one another, so that they seem to be connected to each other: pastoral, rural and civic. And that in this way Virgil wanted to bind together, as it were, his works – through which he revealed this threefold variety – to one another.

Pontanus' discussion of the first four lines serves not so much to establish whether the lines should be included as the opening of the work or not (he does go into this question, but only briefly at the end of his lemma), but as an opportunity to discuss concepts from poetical theory, namely generic differences and the accompanying stylistic levels.

Pontanus on *A.*1.1a *Ille ego*

Certissimum est Virgilium singulis poematis suis singulos dicendi characteres seu figuras aptasse – humilem Bucolicis, mediam Georgicis, gravem Aeneidi – id quod rerum personarumque qualitas exigebat.

Definitely Virgil accommodated each individual stylistic level or form to each of his poems – the low level for the *Bucolics*, the middle for the *Georgics,* the grave one for the *Aeneid* – because the sort of subject matter and characters required this.

Pontanus then gives a detailed analysis of how each of the four prefatory lines corresponds to a different stylistic level of poetry (namely 1a-b1 to the *Bucolics*, 1b2-1d2 to the *Georgics*, and 1d2-1 to the *Aeneid*). First on the *Bucolics*:

Pontanus on *A.* 1.1.a *Ille ego*

Quod non solum ex ipsorum poematum lectione sed etiam ex hisce quatuor versibus primis satis superque perspici posse. Quorum quidem versuum naturam, formam, stylum, rationem, si quis aequa lance perpendat, poetam in illis prope clamare animadvertet, opus Georgicorum Bucolico et Aeneidis tantum praestare Georgico, quantum secundus versus distat a primo, et quartus differt a secundo. Nam quid hoc versu gracilius, humiliusque dici aut excogitari potest? 'Ille ego, qui quondam gracili modulatus avena Carmen.' Hoc nos admonet stylo tenui opus Bucolicorum esse compositum.

This cannot only be understood from the reading of the poems themselves, but also more than sufficiently from these first four verses. Indeed if someone weighed the character, the form, the style, the property of these verses impartially, he will notice the poet almost calling out in these, that the *Georgics* surpass the *Bucolics,* and the *Aeneid* the *Georgics* so much, as the second verse differs from the first, and as the fourth stands apart from the second. For what can be said or contrived that is more slender and more humble than this verse? 'I am he, who once tuned my song on a slender reed'. In this way he reminds us that the *Bucolics* were written in the subtle style.

Then on the *Georgics*:

Pontanus on *A.* 1.1.a *Ille ego*

Sed observa, uti sensim et gradatim verbis insurgat,

'----- et egressus sylvis vicina coegi,
ut quamvis avido parerent arva colono:
gratum opus agricolis.'

Haec omnino altiora sunt primis, ut intelligas opus Georgicorum altiori quam carmen Bucolicum stylo fuisse perscriptum.

But notice, how gradually and little by little he raises [the level of style] with these words,

'--- and then, leaving the woods, made the nearby fields obey
the husbandmen, however greedy,
a work to win favour with farmers.'[192]

These verses are in every respect more elevated than the first, so that you may realize that the *Georgics* have been written in a more elevated style than the *Bucolics.*

And finally on the *Aeneid*:

Pontanus on *A.* 1.1a *Ille ego*

At hoc extremum Aeneidos opus, quantum rerum pondere et gravitate reliquis excellere debere cognovit, tantum hos novissimos versus prioribus sublimiores esse curavit. Subdit enim, 'at nunc horrentia Martis // Arma, virumque cano.' An haec cum superioribus, aut illa cum istis sunt conferenda? Quae cum verborum sonitu rei magnitudinem indicant, tum rerum quasi tumultu apta quadam cum orationis

[192] Translation of 1b-d by Williams (1972-1973).

acrimonia usque adeo resonant, ut cuiusque avidas aures, atque immensum aliquid, infinitumque desiderantes implere possint. Ab his igitur versibus vario stylo compositis inchoatam fuisse a Virgilio Aeneidem nemo vel mediocriter eruditus ignorat. Nascimbaenus Commentar.

*Hausit hoc a Corrado Nascimbaenus qui asseverat, ita esse composita haec carmina quatuor prima, ut verbis ipsis ac dicendi figuris res tripartito opere explicatas referant, pastoritiam simplicitatem, rusticam sedulitatem, civilem dignitatem, et tres characteres, attenuatum, mediocrem, grandem, paucissimis verbis esse repetitos. Plura ibidem de horum versuum artificio.

But this last work, the *Aeneid*, to the degree in which he acknowledged that it ought to surpass the others through its weight of subject matter and dignity, to that degree did he take care that these last verses would be more exalted than the previous ones. For he wrote, 'But now of the fearful Martian arms and of the man I sing'. Can these verses be compared to the previous ones, or this subject matter with those topics? They both indicate the greatness of the subject matter by the sound of the words and resonate by the tumultuousness, so to speak, of the action, combined with a suitably vehement tone, to such an extent that they can fill anyone's ears, eager and desiring something immense and infinite. Thus no one, even of moderate learning, fails to see that the *Aeneid* was begun by Virgil with these verses, joined together in varying style. So Nascimbaenus in his commentary.

*Nascimbaenus has taken this from Corradus, who asserts strongly that these first four verses were composed in such a way that they reflect by their very words and figures of speech the contents that are set out in the three parts of his oeuvre, the pastoral simplicity, the rustic earnestness, the civic dignity, and that the three stylistic levels, slender, middle and grand, are called to mind with the smallest number of words. More on the skill of these verses in the place already mentioned.

This type of discussion is a traditional element in the commentary tradition that is already found in Servius and taken up by other early modern commentators like La Cerda and Farnaby.[193] In fact, Pontanus' lemma consists of a rhetorical analysis

[193] See for example *Rhet. Her.* 4.11f. La Cerda comments *ad loc.*: *(…) Deinde, hoc initio triplicem stilum, tenuem, medium, copiosum (Graeci appellant ἰσχνόν, μέσον, ἁδρὸν) magno quodam artificio expressit. (…'*. ['(...) Finally, through this beginning he expressed a threefold style, the subtle one, the middle one, and the copious one (which <style> the Greeks call 'ischnos' [weak], 'mesos' [middle], 'hadros' [strong]), with great skill. (...)']. Farnaby: *(…) voluntque hanc ἀνακεφαλαίωσιν appositam quasi sigillum, uti et illam sub fine quarti Georgici, contra plagiariorum furta et falsariorum adulteria, constareque triplicis stili artificio, ut a tenui carminis Bucolici avena, a mediocri Georgici calamo ad sonorum Martiae tubae clangorem assurgeret.* ['(...) and they want this recapitulation to have been placed as a sort of mark, such as the one at the end of

of an element from the field of poetical theory (the discussion of genre). This is a clear example of how grammar, rhetoric and poetical theory were often intertwined. Making clear distinctions between these three fields of study is therefore not always possible and perhaps even unproductive. In a commentary such as that of Pontanus the analysis of the four verses not only reflects the commentator's involvement with the commentary tradition (which also is apparent from the references to other commentators, of which he has indirectly cited Corrado by reading Nascimbaenus), but also shows the interest in elements pertaining to rhetoric (the three levels of style)[194] and poetical theory (the opening of an epic poem). Pontanus is especially interested in the mechanism against plagiarism and does not primarily focus on the question of authorship with regard to the verses 1a-d.[195] I will return to poetics in section 7.

The discussion in the section demonstrates how early modern commentary lemmata in a Virgilian commentary can be situated in a broader web of knowledge, to which they themselves in turn also offer a contribution. On the one hand, the commentator could use the tradition of Virgilian scholarship as a point of reference for his discussion of the poem, if only for the identification of important topics. On the other hand, an early modern commentator such as Pontanus is also actively reworking the Virgilian tradition by compiling information from various sources and by new references for further information. Moreover, in referring to his peers – other commentators, such as Corrado and Nascimbaenus – and to classical authors and scholars Pontanus places himself and his work in this network of (contemporary) Virgilian scholarship, thus also claiming a place for himself. The picture that arises from all this, is that of the commentator as the nucleus in a vast network of knowledge, with his commentary serving as a focal point through which this knowledge is filtered, focused, sharpened and made (more) accessible for an audience of readers that is not as highly trained and as profoundly invested in these knowledge systems as the commentator. As I have mentioned already at the beginning of this chapter, this would certainly be the case for the grammatical disciplines which could pride themselves on a centuries-old tradition of

---

Georgics 4, against the thefts of plagiarizers and the counterfeits of forgers, and that it consisted of the skillful application of the threefold style, so that he rose from the tender reed-pipe of the *Bucolics*, from the medium reed of the *Georgics*, to the resounding noise of the trumpet of Mars.']

[194] See *Rhet. Her.* 4.8.11 and Cic., *Or.* 20-2; 69; 128 for the theory of the three levels of style.

[195] At the end of the lemma he briefly states that clearly these four verses were composed by Virgil as the opening of the *Aeneid*.

scholarship, reaching back into classical antiquity itself. After this the learned discussion of poetical theory in Pontanus, the next section will concern itself with a fascinating field within the early modern study of grammar: etymology.

4. Grammar: *A.* 1.2 *Italiam* and Etymology[196]

The first word of the second verse of the *Aeneid* causes Landino to write the following lemma:

> Landino on *A.* 1.2 *Italiam*
>
> *Italiam*] Sunt qui dicant a bobus denominatam, quod Graecorum prisca lingua boves 'italiae' dicebantur. Quod autem bobus abundaret, ex eo patet quod multa quae suprema dicebatur instituta erat duarum ovium, boum vero triginta pro copia boum et ovium penuria, ait Gellius.[197] Servius autem ab Italo rege Siciliae dictam putat. Qui in eam regionem veniens in qua postea regnavit Turnus, 'Italiam' de suo nomine illam appellavit. Festus autem scripsit Italiam dici quod magnos italos, id est boves, habeat; quia vituli ab Italis sunt dicti 'itali'.
>
> Some say that Italy was called after oxen, because in the ancient language of the Greeks oxen were called *italiae*. That there were plenty of oxen is clear from the fact that the penalty which was said to be the highest was set at two sheep, but at thirty oxen, in accordance with the abundance of cattle and the lack of sheep, says Gellius. Servius however states that Italy was named after Italus, the king of Sicily. He came to the region where Turnus would later rule and called it 'Italia' after his own name. Festus, however, wrote that it is called *Italia* because it had big *itali*, that is to say oxen; because the calves [*vituli*] were called *itali* by the Itali [the inhabitants of *Italia*].

In this lemma, Landino explains why Italy was called *Italia*.[198] He provides three competing etymologies and a classical source for each of them (Gellius, Servius

---

[196] Since many of the early modern etymologies that are discussed in this section go back to classical examples, I will provide, when applicable, the reference to Maltby (1991), *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*.

[197] Gel 11.1.2: *Coniectare autem possumus ob eandem causam, quod Italia tunc esset armentiosissima, multam, quae appellatur 'suprema', institutam in dies singulos duarum ovium, boum triginta, pro copia scilicet boum proque ovium penuria*. ['Indeed we can infer for the same reason (viz. that Italy then was most abundant in cattle), that the financial penalty, which is called 'the highest', was set at two sheep and thirty oxen per day, clearly in relation to the abundance of cattle and the shortage of sheep.'].

[198] Maltby (1991), 314 s.v. *Italia*.

and Festus). To a modern reader, this kind of lemma might seem somewhat odd: the modern *Aeneid*-commentaries of Conway (1935), Austin (1971) and Williams (1972-1973; 1975) do not mention the etymology of *Italia* at all in their lemmata on this verse. Lemmata providing this kind of etymological explanations of Latin and Greek words are however frequently encountered in early modern *Aeneid*-commentaries. In this section I will discuss a selection of lemmata pertaining to this particular field within the discipline of grammar.

'*Etymologia*' in the early modern period had a different meaning than its modern counterpart 'etymology'.[199] It did not focus on establishing historical origin, but on establishing an interpretation of the name. In early modern etymology, just as with its classical precursor,[200] this interpretation consists of presenting an explanation of the name that supports an already established (deeper) meaning of the word. Etymology was thus used as an epistemological tool for gaining access to hidden knowledge by constructing semantic relations.[201] Because of this connection between naming and meaning, etymologies were often used as an argument in favour of a specific interpretation of a word, which in turn could often support an overall reading of a passage. Moreover, etymology provided the commentator with an opportunity to affirm his authority as a scholar, in providing explanations for obscure or difficult words in Latin (or, occasionally, Greek).[202] Since the *Aeneid* and the Latin language still played an important role in early modern learning and scholarship, a commentator who was explaining etymologies was not only contributing to a better understanding of the past, but also to the understanding of the present.[203] In early modern Virgilian commentaries the use of etymology is frequently found, for example in the commentaries by Landino, Farnaby, Badius and La Rue (while Pontanus seems to be less interested in this field of scholarship). A survey of these commentaries shows that the etymologies can be classified in more or less consistent categories on the basis of their argumentative function. I

---

[199] See also Sluiter (2015), 897.

[200] See Sluiter (2015) and the 'Etymology Dossier' in Copeland & Sluiter (2010), 339-367.

[201] Borchardt, (1968), 429. Rothstein (1990, 333) goes as far as to make an analogy between the epistemic function of etymologies and the focus on origin and source in the Renaissance in general: 'Treating many things as we treat only words, in the Renaissance the identifiable (or identified) source of a thing is frequently taken as a principle defining the way it is to be understood and classified. ... The parameters of what a thing (actually or potentially) is can be defined by knowing its origin; in this sense origins can be taxonomic functions.' See also Copeland & Sluiter (2009), 339-367; Sluiter (2015), 900-901.

[202] Sluiter (f.c.), at n. 3.

[203] This is pointed out by Sluiter (2015, 898) for ancient etymology, but is also characteristic for the early modern practice.

will briefly identify each of these categories and include examples of their use in the footnotes.

The first category consists of etymologies that are given when information is provided about a god, a hero from mythology or a city.[204] This specific use of

[204] E.g., Landino on V., *A.* 2.610, *Neptunus: A 'nando' dicitur Latine, quia vis aqua est et quondam ab aqua nobis potus pervenit. Apud Graecos ποσιδαων quia 'potum dei' appellatur. (...)* ['Neptune: in Latin it is derived from 'nare ['to swim'], because water is power, and once our drink came from water. With the Greeks he is called 'Posidaôn', because he is 'potum dei' ['drink of the god'] (...)'] (see Maltby (1991), s.v. *Neptunus*; see also Sluiter (2015, 917), who points out that Cicero is mocking this etymology in Cic., *Nat. D.* 3.24.62f); Landino on V., *A.* 7.2, *Caieta: ... Alii dicunt propter combustas ibi naves Caietam fuisse appellatam, nam καίειν 'urere' est.* ['... Others say that Caieta was so called because of their burning the ships, because 'kaiein' [Greek] means 'to burn'] (see Maltby (1991), s.v. *Caieta*); Farnaby on V. *A.* 3.74, *Aegaeo: Aegea urbs erat Euboae, ubi templum Neptuni Aegaei. Strabo lib. 9. [9.2.13] unde et nomen mari Aegaeo; quod tamen alii a scopulo, αἴγε referentes, dictum autumant [i.e., Var., L., 7.22]: alii a fluctibus protervis et αἰγῶν more insultantibus.* ['Aegea: Aegea was a city in Euboa, where there was the temple of Neptune Aegaeus. Strabo in book 9 [derives] from this also the name of the Aegean sea; of which others however say that it was called after a rock, that brought to mind two goats [Greek: 'goats' (dualis); two rocks resembling goat-heads, see Var., *L.* 7.22]: others [say that it was called] after rivers that were violent and that leapt likes 'aiges' [Greek: 'goats'].'] (Maltby (1991), s.v. *Aegeum mare* (a)); Farnaby on V. *A.* 3.274, *Leucatae: Promontorii Epiri, a petris λευκαῖς dicti.* ['Of Leucata: of the promontory of Epirus, called after the 'leukai' [Greek: 'white'] rocks'] (Maltby (1991), s.v. *Leucate*); Farnaby on V., *A.* 4.207, *Lenaeum: Vinum, Lenaeus Bacchi nomen a ληνός 'torcular' et 'lacus'.* ['Lenaeum: a wine, Lenaeus [is a] name of Bacchus [derived from] 'lênos' [Greek: cask] meaning 'grapepress' and 'tank'] (Maltby (1991), s.v. *Lenaeus*); Farnaby on V. *A.* 6.13, *Delius: Apollo, a natali insula: vel a vaticinatione, a δῆλος* ['Delian: this is Apollo, after his island of birth; or from his prophecy, from 'dêlos' [Greek: 'clear'].'] (Maltby (1991), s.v. *Delius*); La Rue on V., *A.* 1.1, *Troiae: Troia, regio Phrygiae minoris, in Asia minore, cuius urbs praecipua Ilium, ab Ilo rege dicta: non procul ab Ida monte. Haec et 'Troia', a Troë rege et 'Dardania', a Dardano Trois avo; et 'Teucria', a Teucro Dardani socero, vocata est. Eius arx 'Pergamus', plur. 'Pergama.'* ['Troia : Troia, a region of Phrygia minor, in Asia minor, of which the most important city is Ilium [Troy], named after king Ilus: not far from mount Ida. It [the city] is also called 'Troy', after king Tros, and 'Dardania', after Dardanus the grandfather of Tros; and 'Teucria', after Teucer the father-in-law of Dardanus. Its citadel [is called] 'Pergamus', plural 'Pergama'.'] (Maltby (1991), s.v. *Troia, Ilium, Dardania* and *Teucri*); La Rue on V., *A.* 2.31, *Innuptae Minervae: Pallas' item dicta est. Vulcani nuptias respuit et virginitatem servavit. Nomen, vel a 'minari', quod armata pingatur; vel a 'memini', quod memoriae Dea dicatur; vel potius ab antiquo 'minervo', id est, 'moneo', quod homines bene moneat, utpote Dea sapientiae atque artium.* ['Unmarried Minerva: 'she is also called 'Pallas'. She rejected a marriage with Vulcan and kept her virginity intact. Her name is either [derived] from 'minari' [Latin: 'to threaten'], because she is depicted armed, or from 'memini' [Latin: 'I remember'], because she is called the goddess of memory; or better even from the old word 'minervo', which means 'moneo' [Latin: 'I admonish'], because she admonishes men in a good way, being the Goddess of wisdom and the arts.'] (Maltby (1991), s.v. *Minerva*).

etymology seems to be very consistent with the Virgilian commentary tradition. Servius, Donatus and in fact already the classical commentators on the works of Homer tend to provide this type of etymology in the same cases. Another aspect that comes to the fore in this first category is the role of Greek: only in rare cases does an etymology go back to a non-Greek word.[205]

This brings me to the second category of etymologies, namely those of non-proper names that explain the meaning of a Latin word by deriving it from the Greek. This can also pertain to defining the exact meaning of a Latin word, such as when La Rue at V., *A.* 3.257 explains that *ambesas* ('to eat around') in fact means the same as *circumesas*, because *ambi* is derived from the Greek ἀμφί ('around').[206] Although this kind of etymology might resemble the interest in the historical origin of a word that is the object of study of modern etymology, La Rue's etymology is still different in that it is focused on establishing a semantic relation between the name and meaning of the word.

This relation between naming and meaning brings me to the third and largest category of etymologies, namely that in which an etymology serves as an entry point to the classical world. In these cases an etymology is provided either to facilitate the explanation of an aspect of classical culture or to validate such an explanation given earlier in the same lemma.[207] It is thus employed as an argumentative tool. As an example, I turn to La Rue's comment on *A.* 1.490 *Amazonidum*:

---

[205] The focus on Greek etymologies in a commentary on the *Aeneid* is not very surprising in view of the attention commentators generally pay to the links between the *Aeneid* and the works of Homer.

[206] Maltby (1991), s.v. *ambo*.

[207] See for example Landino on *templum* at V., *A.* 1.446 (*quasi te*ctum *amplum...* ['as it were, 'larger roof' ('tecto amplum')]) (Maltby (1991), s.v. *templum*); Landino on *remos* at V., *A.* 1.552 *(...a graeco verbo ῥέω quod facile per aquam fluat: inde 'remigare' est remis navigium agere. Inde 'remiges' qui remos agunt*. [*remus* ['oar'] from the Greek verb 'rheô' ['to flow'] because it glides easily through the water: therefore *remigare* ['to row'] is moving a ship ['navigium *agere*'] with the '*remi*' ['oars']. Therefore *remiges* ['rowers'] is the word for those who move [*agunt*] the *remi* ['oars']...') (Matlby (1991), s.v. *remus* and *remex*); La Rue at V., *A.* 2.225 on *delubra* (*Templa sic dicta, a deluo, quia plerumque ante templa fontes erant, aut lacus, ubi templa ingressuri deluebantur*. ['Temples were called from *delubra* ['to wash off'], because there were usually springs in front of temples, or ponds, where those who were to enter the temples washed themselves.'] (Maltby (1991), s.v. , *delubrum*)); La Rue at V., *A.* 2.761 on *asylo* (*Asylum ἄσυλον ab α privativo et σύρειν 'trahere', σύλα 'spolium', quia qui ad illud confugisset, inde trahi aut spoliari non poterat. ...* ['In the asylum: '*Asylum*, [Greek] 'asulon', from the privative alpha and 'surein' [Greek], 'to pull', 'sula' [Greek], 'spoils', because whoever had fled into it, could not be pulled from it nor be stripped.'] (Matlby (1991), s.v. *asylum*).

La Rue on V., *A.* 1.490 *Amazonidum*

'Id est, 'Amazonum': quae sibi mammam alteram inurebant, ne iaciendis sagittis esset impedimento. Alteram baltheo substringebant. Nomen inde ab α privativo et μαζός 'mamma'. De iis fuse *Ae.* 11.659 et c. Harum regina *Penthesilea*, Troianis post mortem Hectoris opem tulit. Et iuxta aliquos, ab Achille; iuxta alios, a Neoptolemo Achillis filio interfecta est.

This means 'of the Amazons'; the Amazons burned off one of their breasts, so that it would not be a hindrance for the shooting of arrows. The other one they tied up in a girdle. The word is derived from the privative alpha and the Greek 'mazos', 'breast'.[208] More on them in *A.* 11.658 and further. Their queen Penthesilea offered help to the Trojans after the death of Hector. And according to some she was killed by Achilles, according to others by Neoptolemus, the son of Achilles.

The explanation of the etymology of *Amazonidum*[209] is meant to support the *realia* behind the term (and vice versa the *realia* affirm the etymology). It shows who the Amazons were and why they were called by this name. In fact, the etymology builds on the mythological story of the amazons, describing their supposed distinctive feature – namely their lack of one breast. Modern scholars deem this etymology to be not very feasible from a modern linguistic point of view, as is often the case with classical and early modern etymologies.[210] The issue of whether the etymologies found in the early modern commentaries are sound from a linguistic perspective is however not so much of interest for this current study, since – as I have pointed out above – early modern etymology was aimed at establishing semantic relations, not historical-linguistic ones. The importance attached to the semantic function of etymology becomes apparent from the

[208] Isidore of Seville (*Etym.* IX.ii.62) presents two other etymologies: ἅμα ζῶν ('living together', referring to the Amazons living together without men) and ἄνευ μαζῶν or ἄνευ μαζοῦ ('without breast'; which is consistent with La Rue's point); see also Servius on *A.* 1.490.

[209] See Maltby (1991), s.v. *Amazon*.

[210] LSJ gives the same etymology as La Rue *s.v.* Ἀμαζών. Chantraine (1968, *s.v.*) however characterizes this etymology as "L'étymologie populaire admise dans l'antiquité (...)" and poses that the "étymologie veritable" has to be completely different. He refers to the hypothesis by Lagercrantz (1912) that it is derived from the Iranian tribe **ha-mazan*, probably meaning "warriors". Frisk (1960, *s.v.*) notes that the etymology of the word remains unclear and also primarily refers to Lagercrantz. See Blok (1995) for more on the myth of the Amazons.

following lemma from Badius (on *A.* 1.196, *heros*[211]). At the end of this lemma the commentator refers explicitly to the traditional task of the grammarian in giving etymologies:

> Badius Ascensius on *A.* 1.196 *heros*
> ... Item nimis concisus est Servius in explanatione heroum. Nec absolutam expressit rem in non parva significatione: audiatur itaque Augustinus copiosissime docens qui sunt heroes libro X *De civitate dei*[212] his verbis: 'nomen heroum a Iunone dicitur tractum, quod Graece 'Iuno' Hera appellatur, et ideo nescio quis filius eius secundum graecorum fabulas heros fuit nuncupatus, hoc videlicet mysticum significante fabula, quod aer Iunoni deputetur, ubi volunt cum daemonibus heroas habitare, quo nomine appellant alicuius meriti animas defunctorum.' Idem in VII [cap. 6]: 'inter lunae gyrum et nimborum ac ventorum cacumina aerias esse animas, sed eas animo, non oculis videri et vocari heroas et lares et genoios.' Ex iis liquido patet qui sint heroes et unde nomen sortiantur. Trimegistus quoque auctor est heroas habitare inter aeris purissimam partem supra nos et terram ubi nullus est nebulis locus. Minime praetereundum est id quod Martianus Capella tradit in *De Nuptiis philologiae* [2.160] heroas videlicet ab Hera, quae terra dicitur, esse nuncupatos. Ista curioso interpraeti fuerant vestiganda et enarranda. Nisi forte Servius existimavit satis superque esse id quod tractabat mutilatum tradere atque concisum. Cum boni tamen grammatici officium sit etymologias verborum significataque ubertum explicare.' Haec ille.
>
> ... Similarly, Servius is too succinct in his comment on the heroes. And he did not explain the whole matter in its not so small significance. Let us therefore listen to St. Augustine, who in book X of *De civitate Dei* [cap. 21] teaches most eloquently what heroes are with these words: 'It is said that the name 'heroes' was derived from Juno, because in Greek Juno is called 'Hera', and therefore some son of her, according to the Greek myths, was named 'Heros'; the tale clearly signified this secret information that the air was the domain of Juno, where they think the heroes live together with the demons, and by the name hero they call the souls of the deserving dead.' The same in his 7th book [cap. 6]: 'Between the orbit of the moon and the outer limit of the clouds and winds there are the aerial souls, but these are seen with the mind and not with the eyes, and they are called *Heroes*, *Lares*, and *Genii*.' From these things it is clearly evident who the heroes are and from what

[211] Maltby (1991), s.v. *heros*.

[212] Cap. 21; this is incorporated by Isidorus in *Etym.* VII.xi.96.

> they got their name. [Hermes] Trismegistus also testifies that the heroes live between the purest part of the air above us and the earth, where there is no place for clouds. Least of all should we ignore that which Martianus Capella writes in his *De nuptiis philologiae* [2.160], 'that 'heroes' is derived from Hera, who was said to be the earth.[213] These things had to be tracked down and explained by the thoughtful interpreter. Unless perhaps Servius thought that it was more than enough to hand down in mutilated and concise form what he was discussing. But it is the task of the good grammarian to explain in full the etymologies of words and to explain their meaning.' This is what he said.

This lemma sums up the importance attached to etymology by an early modern commentator of Virgil such as Badius. The citation from Martianus Capella shows that explaining etymologies and the meaning of words in full was part of the tasks of the grammarian. For this reason Badius, following Martianus Capella, criticizes Servius, who only provided a short comment at the word *Heros*, without any information on the etymology of the word, which could account for its meaning.[214] Therefore Badius cites St. Augustine and Martianus Capella and refers to Hermes Trismegistus. The lemma exemplifies how etymology was seen as a tool that could be used as an entry point to knowledge about classical culture.

The fourth and last category of etymologies consists of etymologies adduced in support of a certain argument or interpretation. Clearly the boundaries between this category and the previous ones is not sharp: my categorization is for practical purposes only. For a discussion of an example of this type I refer to section 7 of this chapter, where I will discuss Landino's lemma on the word *Musa*.

The aforementioned categories of etymologies demonstrate the early modern conceptualization of etymology as a tool for interpretation through an analysis of names. Especially in the case of the Virgilian commentary, where a commentator had to deal with an imposing amount of information handed down through the tradition of Virgilian scholarship, this kind of argumentative tool could aid in underpinning the commentator's interpretation and his authority as a scholar explaining Virgil. In the next two sections I will discuss commentary lemmata pertaining to the field of rhetoric – a field in which longstanding scholarly tradition

---

[213] Cf. Var., *L.* 5,65: 'Idem hi dei caelum et terra Iupiter et Iuno...' ['These gods 'heaven' and 'earth' are the same as 'Jupiter' and 'Juno'.'].

[214] Servius wrote *ad loc.*: *Heros] vir fortis, semideus, plus ab homine habens, ut ait Hesiodus'* ['*Heros*: a brave man, half god, deriving more from man, as tells Hesiod'].

was invigorated by the rediscovery of important classical texts in the early modern period.

5. Rhetoric: *A.* 1.1 *Arma virumque* and the Influence of Quintilian

The increased interest in rhetoric – especially visible in the attention paid to style and figures of speech (clearly visible from the commentaries of Farnaby and La Rue in which many lemmata only consist of a brief identification of these phenomena)[215] – is often seen as one of the hallmarks of the Renaissance.[216] Many humanist scholars wrote rhetorical manuals or other works related to rhetoric.[217] This attention is reflected in the commentaries on the *Aeneid*, which frequently identify rhetorical concepts or the use of rhetoric in Virgil.[218] The combination of the increased attention to rhetoric by humanist scholars and the rediscovery of classical works determined to a great extent the use of this discipline in early modern commentaries on the *Aeneid*. More in general, the rediscoveries of classical texts in the second half of the fifteenth century had an important influence on the development of the Renaissance grammatical and rhetorical tradition:[219] the humanists came into contact with Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* (hitherto only known from fragments) and Varro's *De lingua Latina* (of which the first edition was

---

[215] The domains of grammar and rhetoric overlap where figures and tropes are concerned. This was already the case in antiquity (see for example Q. 1.8.16: *Enimvero iam maiore cura doceat [sc. grammaticus] tropos omnes, quibus praecipue non poema modo sed etiam oratio ornatur, schemata utraque, id est figuras, quaeque lexeos quaeque dianoeas vocantur: quorum ego sicut troporum tractatum in eum locum differo quo mihi de ornatu orationis dicendum erit.* ['The *grammatici*, however, should take greater care in teaching all the Tropes, which are the main ornaments not only of poetry but also of oratory, and both kinds of Schemata – that is to say, Figures of speech (*lexis*) and of Thought (*dianoia*) as they are called; these, like the Tropes, I postpone till I come to deal with the ornaments of style.' (transl. Russell 2001)].

[216] Grendler (1989), 205.

[217] This is also visible in the other types of scholarship of Virgilian commentators, like Badius (editor and printer of manuals on rhetoric), Pontanus (*Poetica*), Melanchthon (*De rhetorica libri tres*) and Thomas Farnaby, who wrote the *Index Rhetoricus* (1625).

[218] The specific interest in figures and tropes is clearly reflected in the commentaries. In commenting on *A.* 3.56-57, (...) *quid non mortalia pectora cogis / auri sacra fames!* (...) Nascimbaenus discusses an example of the distinction between both categories (referring to Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.1.3 and 9.3.24-25): *Exclamatione avaritiam detestatur. Quintilianus id vocat ὑπέρβατον, non illud quidem, quod inter τρόπους annumeratur, sed aliud quod est eius figurae sententiarum, quae ἀποστροφή dicitur, simile (…)* ['Through the exclamation he renounces greed. Quintilian calls this 'hyperbaton', not the one however, which is counted among the 'tropes', but the other one which is similar to that figure of the sentence, which is called 'apostrophe'.' (i.e. turning away from the normal audience, addressing another, which is an expression of pathos)].

[219] Tavoni (2000), 659.

published in 1471 by Pomponio Leto).[220] These works showed how the Romans themselves had disagreed on important issues of grammar and rhetoric, stimulating a re-evaluation of the established practices in these fields. With the rise of the vernacular, Renaissance scholars also started to write the first vernacular grammars, borrowing the descriptive framework from the traditional Latin ones.[221]

The importance of the rediscovery of classical works pertaining to the language sciences is clearly visible in the instant influence of the rediscovery of a complete edition of Quintilian's *Institutio oratiora* (in 1416 by Poggio Bracciolini at St. Gall).[222] It quickly became the humanist's standard reference for classical rhetoric.[223] The humanist scholar Giulio Pomponio Leto (1428-1498) – involved in the first printed edition of the *Aeneid* (1469), the writer of a commentary on Quintilian and Virgil, and the first editor of Varro's *De lingua Latina* – refers to it frequently in his commentary on the *Aeneid*.[224] In the first lemma of his commentary, Leto cites from the *Institutio*:

> Leto, on *A.* 1.1. *Arma virumque*
> *Arma virumque*] Quintilianus ait: "breviter et dilucide summam rei, de qua cognoscere volumus, indicare in principiis debent poetae, ut fecerunt Vergilius et Homerus, in operum suorum principiis."[225] Et idem libro primo, tres in elocutione virtutes inesse debere monstrat, dicens: "Sit autem imprimis lectio virilis et cum

[220] Another important stimulus was the rediscovery of works of Cicero. See Sabbadini (1905, 100); only three of Leto's commentaries were published, namely those on Columella, Quintilian and Virgil – of which the last one was published without his consent in 1490 in Brescia. See Kallendorf (1999, 44n.47) who concludes that Leto's work on Virgil should be re-examined.

[221] Percival (1995), 148-150.

[222] Plett (2004), 14-16.

[223] Lorenzo Valla took Quintilian as a starting point in writing his very influential *Elegantiae Linguae Latinae*. Classen (2003), 175.

[224] The situation regarding the text of Leto's commentary is very complex. For this chapter, I have used the edition *In omnia quae quidem extant, P. Vergilij Maronis opera, commentarij, varia multarum rerum cognitione referti, nuncque primum in lucem editi / Iulius Pomponius Sabini ; cum rerum et verborum in hisce memorabilium locupletissimo indice* (Basel: Joannes Oporinus 1544). For a discussion and a recent bibliography of Leto's commentary, see Abbamonte (2011, 115n.1). Contrary to what Zabughin (2000 [1921-23]), I.191) states ('... Pomponio era dispregiatore della retorica...'), Leto's use of the *Institutio oratoria* in his commentary indicates a certain fondness of rhetoric.

[225] Q. 4.1,34: *si breviter et dilucide summam rei, de qua cognoscere debeat, indicarimus (quod Homerus atque Vergilius operum suorum principiis faciunt*). ['If we shall have briefly and clearly indicated the core of the matter, of which one must learn (which Homer and Virgil do in the beginnings of their works)'].

> suavitate quadam gravis, et non †pressae†[226] similis: quia carmen est et se poetae canere testantur. Non tamen in canticum dissoluta, nec plasmate, ut nunc a plerisque fit, effoeminata, de quo genere C. Caesarem adhuc praetextatum accipimus dixisse: 'Si cantas, male cantas; si legis, cantas'."[227]
>
> Quintilian says: 'The poets should briefly and clearly state the principal matter, about which we want to know in the opening of their works, as Virgil and Homer did.' And the same author shows in the first book that there should be three virtues in the style [of an oration], for he says: 'But foremost the reading should be manly and dignified with a certain smoothness, and not like prose, because it is a song and the poets claim that they sing. But the reading should not dissolve into actual singing, nor in effeminate modulations, as is done nowadays by most, on which practice we hear that Gaius Caesar, still a boy, has said: 'If you sing, you sing badly; if you read, you sing.'

Leto cites from the *Institutio* to show how Quintilian refers to the opening words of the *Aeneid* as a good example of how a poet should give a brief and clear indication of the topic of his work at the beginning of it.[228] By citing this particular phrase, Leto's lemma fits into the traditional discussion in Virgilian commentaries on the appropriateness of *Arma virumque*: already Servius noted how some scholars questioned the order of these words, as *arma* refers to the second part of the *Aeneid*, and *virum(que)* to the first part.[229] Citing the text of Quintilian, who, being a scholar

---

[226] The edition prints *pressae*, which though grammatically correct does not make sense and should probably be emended to *prosae* in view of the reference to Quintilian.

[227] Q. 1.8,2: *sit autem in primis lectio virilis et cum suavitate quadam gravis, et non quidem prosae similis, quia et carmen est et se poetae canere testantur, non tamen in canticum dissoluta nec plasmate, ut nunc a plerisque fit, effeminata, de quo genere optime C. Caesarem praetextatum adhuc accepimus dixisse: 'si cantas, male cantas, si legis, cantas*. [However this reading must foremost be manly and with a certain dignity with sweetness, and certainly not like that of prose, because it is a song and the poets claim to sing, but not [should this result in] licentious singing nor in the effeminate modulations, as is now done by many, on which practice we have heard that Gaius [Julius] Caesar, still wearing the toga *praetexta* [i.e., the toga of boys] has said most excellently: "If you sing, you sing badly, if you read, you sing."'].

[228] This judgment is also found in Tib. Cl. Donatus, *ad loc.*: *in hac brevitate et angusta propositione multa complexus est; nam et proposuit et divisit et in eo ipso sese commendat (…).* ['in this short and limited proposition he has comprised much; for he has set out [the topic], and has divided [it], and in doing so he commends himself.'].

[229] The discussion of this topic – which was in itself already traditional, as seen from the fact that the opening words of the *Iliad* had also been issue of debate in the Homeric scholia - became a traditional

living in the 1st century AD and thus very close to the time of Virgil, was of great authority, he settles the argument in favor of Virgil (see also the next section). Quintilian adduces Virgil as an authoritative example for how a poet should state the subject matter of his poem at the beginning of his work. Citing this passage

---

element in the Virgilian commentary tradition. Servius on *A.* 1.1 *Arma* (referring to the Life of Virgil in his preface): *Multi varie disserunt cur ab armis Vergilius coeperit, omnes tamen inania sentire manifestum est, cum eum constet aliunde sumpsisse principium, sicut in praemissa eius vita monstratum est. (...)* ['Many have discussed in divergent opinions why Virgil began with 'arma', it is however evident that all debate in vain, because it is undisputed that he had seleced another opening, as has been demonstrated in his foregoing Life'], and on *A.* 1.1. *Arma virumque*: *figura usitata est ut non eo ordine respondeamus quo proposuimus; nam prius de erroribus Aeneae dicit, post de bello. Hac autem figura etiam in prosa utimur*. ['It is a common figure of speech not to give the corresponding items in the same order in which we announced topics; for he speaks first about the wanderings of Aeneas, and later about the war. This figure of speech we alsu use in prose.' (transl. Copeland & Sluiter 2009)]. Fulgentius notes the controversy, but gives a rather idiosyncratic analogical reading which forms the key to his allegorical interpretation of the *Aeneid*: [Virgil speaking to F.] *Nam ut ab armis inciperem, - scivi enim quod viri vocabulum significatio sexus sit, non honoris; si viri primum nomen ponerem: multi viri sunt, non tamen omnes laudandi; ergo virtutem primum posui (…) ... trifarius in vita humana gradus est, primum habere, deinde regere quod habeas, tertium vero ornare quod regis. Ergo tres gradus istos in uno versu nostro considera positos, id est: 'arma', 'virum' et 'primus': 'arma', id est virtus, pertinet ad substantiam corporalem, 'virum', id est sapientia, pertinet ad substantiam sensualem, 'primus' vero, id est princeps, pertinet ad substantiam censualem, quo sit ordo huiusmodi: habere, regere, ornare.* ['For that I started with 'Arms', - in fact I knew that the word 'man' has a signification of gender, not of honor; if I used 'man' as first word: there are many men, not all however are to be praised; therefore I placed excellence in the first place (...) ... there are three degrees in human life, first 'having', then 'to rule what you have', but the third 'to adorn what you rule'. Take it therefore that these three steps are placed in one verse of mine, that is: 'weapons', 'man', and 'first': 'weapons', that is: 'excellence', pertains to the corporal component, 'man', that is: 'wisdom', pertains to the component of the senses, but 'first': 'leader', pertains to the component of appraisal, so that the order is as follows: having, ruling, adorning.'] (Fulg., *Expositio,* 146-147). A nice early modern discussion of the topic (and solution of the problem) is found in La Cerda who comments *ad loc.*: [in the margin: *Virgilius defenditur*] *Sunt qui poetam reprehendant, quod virum postposuerit, ad quem pertinent sex priores libri; arma praeposuerit, ad quae sex posteriores. Sed sciant hi, non constringi oratores aut historicos hac lege, adeo nec poetas. (...) Sed quid si adhuc alia defensio poetae? Sunt enim non pauci, qui dicunt, nihil curandam distinctionem de aequa illa portione librorum, cum respectu ad duas voces arma, virum.* ['Some people reprimand the poet, because he has postponed 'man', to whom pertain the first six books; and because he placed 'arms' up front, to which pertain the six last books. But let them understand that orators and historians are not constrained by this rule, and neither are the poets. (...) But what if there is yet another defense of the poet? For there are not a few, who say, that one should not care about this equal division of the books, with respect to those two words 'arms', 'man'.].

from Quintilian in a lemma on the opening words of the *Aeneid*, serves as a defense of Virgil. In the next section I will discuss another work of which the rediscovery provided to be influential for the commentary tradition on the *Aeneid*.

6. Rhetoric: *A.* 1.4 *vi* and Tiberius Claudius Donatus

The *Interpretationes Vergilianae* of Tiberius Claudius Donatus resurfaced again in Italy in the mid-15th century. Two Carolingian manuscripts were brought to Italy, the first in 1438, the second in the 1460s. Copies of the work circulated widely.[230] Like Quintilian, the rediscovery of Tib. Cl. Donatus' work influenced the commentary tradition, but to a lesser extent.[231] A manuscript of the text was owned by Landino, who as I will show made use of it in his commentary.[232]

In the *Interpretationes*, Tib. Cl. Donatus gives an overall interpretation of the *Aeneid* by reading it as a work of panegyric rhetoric.[233] This reading starts from the central hypothesis that Virgil has written the epic as a poem of praise for Augustus, shaping Aeneas as his mythical counterpart.[234] This type of reading makes it necessary to uphold the moral integrity of Aeneas' behavior and often results in the need to explain inconsistencies or less fortuitous actions on Aeneas's part. This defense of Aeneas (or Virgil) had been a traditional part of the commentary tradition[235], but received an important stimulus from the reappearance of Tib. Cl.

---

[230] Reynolds & Marshall (1983), 158.

[231] The dating of the work by Tib. Cl. Donatus is uncertain and not much about his life is known. Starr (1992), 159-174.

[232] The first edition of the full text of the *Interpretationes* appeared only in 1535. Before that, scholars used an epitome that was published by Landino. See Georges (1969), xix; Kallendorf (1989), 14 & 14n.37; and Wilson-Okamura (2010), 16-17.

[233] Copeland & Sluiter (2010) point out that Tib. Cl. Donatus' rhetorical interpretation of the *Aeneid* is part of the traditional competition between the language disciplines, in this case whether the explanation of poets belonged to the domain of the grammarian or the rhetorician. Copeland & Sluiter (2010), 141.

[234] Tib. Cl. Donatus in his preface: *Primum igitur et ante omnia sciendum est quod materiae genus Maro noster adgressus sit; hoc enim nisi inter initia fuerit cognitum, vehementer errabitur. Et certe laudativum est (…) Talem enim monstrare Aenean debuit, ut dignus Caesari, in cuius honorem haec scribebantur, parens et auctor generis praeberetur (…).* ['First then and before all else it is to be known what sort of subject matter our Maro has taken up; for if this is not known at the start, bad mistakes will be the result. And it is certainly of the laudatory [type] (...) For he had to show Aeneas to be such, that he could be presented as an ancestor and progenitor of the *gens* worthy of Caesar, in whose honor these things were written (...)'.].

[235] Especially Macrobius made it his aim to solve the inconsistencies and other problematic passages in the *Aeneid*. Comparetti (1908), 65.

Donatus' work.[236] For a commentator such as Landino, whose theoretical frame for reading the *Aeneid* depended on the exemplarity of Aeneas' behavior, this results in lemmata such as the following on V., *A.* 1.4 *vi*:

> Landino on *A.* 1.4 *vi*
>
> *Vi*] Vis, vim et vi 'i' in singulari habent. Est autem a Graeco βία, nam apud illos dicitur, et significat 'robur', ut "fit via vi" [*A.* 2.494], item virtutem, ut "multa vi muniet Albam" [*A.* 1.271]. Item 'violentiam', unde dicimus 'illatam vim virgini', significat copiam, "vis magna auri homini illi fuit." Vi ergo superum id est non iustitia et aequitate, sed violentia a qua non abest crudelitas. Conciliat ergo benevolentiam Aeneae a persona adversariorum qui tam inique Aeneam insectarentur, et a persona Aeneae commiserationem excitat, quod non sua culpa, sed aliorum crudelitate in tantas tamque graves aerumnas inciderit. Et tamen omnia animi magnitudine et sapientia toleraverit et superaverit, et cum non verisimile videretur quod superi dii ita inique fueri<n>t hominem pium insectari, ostendit illos studia Iunonis esse secutos, quam Homerus etiam scribit deos in Troianos concitasse.
>
> The nominative, accusative and ablative of *vis* have an 'i' in the singular. The word is derived from the Greek, for they say '*bia*', and it means '*robur*' ['force'], as in "he makes a road through force ['*vi*']"; likewise it means *virtus* ['virtue, courage'], as in 'and he will build the walls of Alba with great virtue ['*vi*']'. Likewise it means *violentia* ('violence'), so that we can say 'violence ['*vim*'] done to a virgin'; and it means 'abundance' ['*copia*'], "that man had a great abundance of gold." 'Vi superum' thus means not through justice and fairness, but through violence, not lacking in cruelty. He [Virgil] thus procures favor for Aeneas from the character of his adversaries since they pursued Aeneas so unjustly, and he procures compassion from the character of Aeneas, because he fell into such great and such serious hardships not through a fault of his own, but because of the cruelty of others. And yet he endured and conquered all these things with greatness of spirit and with wisdom; and because it would not seem likely that the gods would be so unjust as to hunt down a pious man, he shows that they acted in accordance with the zeal of Juno, of whom Homer already writes that she stirred up the gods against the Trojans.

[236] For reading the *Aeneid* in terms of epideictic rhetoric in the Renaissance, see Kallendorf (1989).

The lemma starts with an etymology, followed by a semantic analysis, but then turns towards a rhetorical analysis of the way in which Aeneas is portrayed in the passage: Aeneas' virtue is stressed by Virgil by contrasting it with the unjust anger of Juno. For the reader this brings about *benevolentia* and *commiseratio* towards Aeneas, because the protagonist did not suffer all his misfortunes by his own fault, but because of the anger of one of the gods.[237] And not only was he an innocent victim of this divine wrath, he also endured it in a magnificent and wise manner. A look at Tib. Cl. Donatus' comment on this passage shows that Landino's interpretation is in fact much in accordance with that of his early 5th-century precursor:

> Tib. Cl. Donatus on *A.* 1.4
> Vis enim non est nisi cum fit aliquid extra leges, hoc est contra fatum. Ut autem ex hoc quoque excusaret Aenean, qui nihil tale de superis meruerat, addidit *saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram*, hoc est non propter Aeneae aliquam culpam haec superos fecisse, sed ut obsequerentur studio et voluntati Iunonis, cui utpote reginae universi in quam vellet partem consentire debuerant et idem velle quod illa praesumpserat. Purgatur ergo etiam ex ista parte Aeneas. Restat ut ipsam quoque Iunonem frustra adversus ipsum odium suscepisse monstremus, in quo ipso non tantum purgatio est susceptae personae, verum etiam deformatio Iunonis, quam e diverso poeta constituit; ait enim *saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram*.[238]
>
> For it is only *vis* if something is done in violation of the laws, that is to say against fate. And to excuse Aeneas on this ground too, who had deserved nothing of the

[237] Servius on *A.* 1.4 *vi superum* also notes the defence of Aeneas by Virgil; Fulgentius also comments on the function of *vi superum* (through the *persona* of Virgil), but gives it a Platonic twist by connecting the virtue of Aeneas to the wisdom of his soul (Fulg., *Expositio*, 144-145).

[238] The endurance of Aeneas throughout all his hardships is one of the key themes for Tib. Cl. Donatus, as appears from his comment on *A.* 1.8-11 *Musa mihi causas memora … labores inpulerit?*: (…) *Quod autem in themate posuit 'saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram', hic quoque confirmat. Interea hoc dicendo instruit homines ad bonam vivendi rationem. Bonum enim virum iustus dolor debet commovere et sic nec in ultione sit inmoderatus nec ipsas quamvis iustas inimicitias diutius in animo retentet. (…) Quantum ergo reprehendenda est Iuno, quae nec accepit Aeneae iniuriam et sic persecuta est innocentem!* ['(...) Here, too, he confirms that he has indeed made 'through cruel Juno's unforgiving wrath' a topic. Meanwhile by saying this he instructs people in the method of living well. For legitimate grief should move the good man and thus he should neither be unrestrained in revenge nor should he keep in his mind too long his enmities, however justified. (...) How much then is Juno to be blamed, who did not receive an injustice from Aeneas and thus persecuted an innocent man!'].

> sort from the gods, he added 'through cruel Juno's unforgiving wrath', that is to say that not because of any fault of Aeneas did the gods do those things, but in order to submit to the zeal and will of Juno, with whom, as is natural, since she is the queen, all had to agree in in what she wanted and go along with what she had initiated. Aeneas is thus cleansed in this respect as well. It remains that we show that even Juno herself had taken up her hate against him in vain. This is not so much a cleansing of the character of Aeneas, but even the depreciation of Juno, whom the poet has depicted in opposition to him; for he says 'through cruel Juno's unforgiving wrath'.

Landino's interpretation of the passage is in many ways the same as that of Tib. Cl. Donatus: Aeneas is excused for having been struck by misfortune, because this was the result of unjust anger from *one* of the gods. While Landino's explanation closely follows that of Tib. Cl. Donatus he also adds some rhetorical terminology of his own: *conciliat benevolentiam*; *commiserationem excitat*; *non verisimile videretur*.[239] All of these elements pertain to key notions from rhetorical theory: the tasks of the orator in giving a good opening to a speech (*captatio benevolentiae*), the use of affects to influence the audience (*pathos*), the importance of the credibility of elements from an oration (probability, *verisimilitudo*). Each of these elements also pertains to one of the three means of persuasion (ethos, pathos and logos).[240] The use of this terminology creates a reciprocal relation: on the one hand, Landino analyses the opening of the *Aeneid* as if it were an oratorical work (a frame presented by Tib. Cl. Donatus, which fits Landino's very specific interpretative frame with which he approaches the work, more on this in **section 7**); on the other hand, he explains or illustrates these very rhetorical concepts with the help of the *Aeneid*. Both aspects demonstrate the importance of rhetoric in the humanist mindset. One of the main reasons why Landino's teaching, part of the Florentine *studio*, focused on rhetorical theory was that many of his pupils would eventually pursue a worldly career – at the court, in diplomacy or in politics. The rhetorical analysis of a poetical work such as the *Aeneid* is therefore not only of use to the formation of scholars, but also to the education of men of the world. Thus the role of the field of rhetoric in his commentary is in accordance with this educational context and the role of rhetoric

[239] Tib. Cl. Donatus' use of *purgare*, *monstrare* and *e diverso constituere* could also be reminiscent of a (forensic) rhetorical setting.

[240] See Cic., *Or.*, 2.115 and 310; the three means of persuasion were often confused with the three tasks of the orator; see Copeland & Sluiter (2010), 163n.85.

in Florentine society.[241] All early modern commentaries on the *Aeneid* that are discussed in this study were conceived against the background of a centuries-old tradition of Virgilian scholarship, while at the same time being conceived in an era in which much was changing, both in scholarship and in society at large. In the last section of this chapter, I will discuss a lemma from Landino's commentary on the *Aeneid*, which presents one of the more striking early modern frameworks of Virgilian interpretation.

7. Poetics: *A.* 1.8 *Musa* and the *furor poeticus*

The rhetorical reading of the *Aeneid* which we have encountered above in Tib. Cl. Donatus and Landino sometimes led to the reading of the *entire* work from a rhetorical point-of-view. As we have just seen, this often meant a reading in terms of morality. This type of reading originates from the connection between rhetoric and poetics on the one hand, and rhetoric and ethics on the other, which dates from antiquity itself and for which Virgil was an essential author. In an extreme form, this type of reading developed into the allegorizing of the entire work, for example in terms of a moral allegory of the virtuous life (starting with Fulgentius). This line of interpretation became one of the two important branches in the commentary tradition on the *Aeneid* – the other one being the grammatical and rhetorical one starting with Tib. Cl. Donatus and Servius.[242]

Landino presented this kind of allegorical reading, from a Neoplatonic point of view, in the third and fourth book of his *Disputationes Camaldulenses*. And though he states differently in the dedicatory letter to his commentary,[243] this

---

[241] In an analysis of Landino's commentary on Horace's *Ars Poetica*, Christoph Pieper also points to the embeddedness of the commentary in the social and political context of Florentine public life. Pieper (2013).

[242] In his preface, Tib. Claudius Donatus explains his desire to write a (rhetorical) commentary on the *Aeneid* by referring to the existing grammatical tradition: *Si Maronis carmina competenter attenderis et eorum mentem commode comprehenderis, invenies in poeta rhetorem summum; atque inde intelliges Vergilium non grammaticos sed oratores praecipuos tradere debuisse*. ['If you will pay attention to Maro's poems properly and you will get hold of their design neatly, you will find in this poet the highest rhetor; and from this you will understand that Virgil should be entrusted not to the grammarians, but especially to the orators.']. See also Comparetti (1908, 61).

[243] *Nam quemadmodum in Camaldulensibus philosophi interpretis munus obivimus, sic in his commentariis grammatici rhetorisque vices praestabimus*. ['For just as we have attended to the duty of the philosophical interpreter in our *Camaldulenses*, so will we fulfill in these commentaries the office of the grammarian and the rhetor.']. See Kallendorf (1989), 132-136 for a discussion of these two approaches to literature in Landino.

specific approach is clearly visible in this work too.[244] Central to Landino's theory of poetics, which determines his reading of the *Aeneid*, is the notion of the *furor poeticus* – the poetic fury which brings the poet in contact with the divine and allows poetical works to comprise divine knowledge. Central to this concept is the idea that the human soul is imprisoned in the human body and only able to return to the world of Ideas by contemplating the ideas.[245] From this conceptualization, Landino develops a distinct conception of poetry: it is not merely important for moral and political education, but in fact encompasses all domains of learning. This idea is clearly visible in Landino's *Praefatio in Virgilio* (1462).[246] In fact, the *furor poeticus* functions as a direct connection between the human and the divine, by which the *poeta theologus* is able to serve as an intermediary between both worlds. Thus poetry functions as an instrument for bringing the individual soul closer to the divine by revealing divine knowledge. Virgil is considered by Landino to be one of the most eminent poets in the respect.[247]

---

[244] See Kallendorf (1989, 132-142; 136): '... for Landino, both the allegorical-philosophical and the grammatical-rhetorical approaches to poetry lead naturally to the praise of virtue and condemnation of vice. For this reason, it was difficult for Landino to maintain in practice the methodological distinction he professed between the two approaches, for no matter where he began, he tended to shift toward a common critical ground.'

[245] See for this concept Galand-Hallyn & Hallyn (2001), ch. 2.2; Oehlig (1992); Nebes (2001); Zinten (1990), 189-203; Pieper (2008).

[246] '*Est igitur poetica disciplina non dicam una ex iis artibus quas nostri maiores liberales appellarunt, sed quae illas universas complectens (…). Quam quidem rem, ut et divinus ille Plato in Phaedro et Platonicus Cicero in Tusculanis disputationibus ostendit, nemo umquam mortalium sine divino quodam furore attingere potuit.*' ['The poetic discipline is however not, I would say, one of these arts which our ancestors have called 'liberal', but one which embraces them all, (…). Indeed, as both the divine Plato also shows in his *Phaedrus* and the Platonist Cicero in his *Tusculan Disputations,* never was any mortal able to achieve this without a certain divine fury.']. *Praefatio in Virgilio* (ed. Cardini, 1974, 313).

[247] 'Quam ob rem si divina potius quam humana haec, de qua diu loquor, disciplina habenda est, si antiquissimi sunt omnium poetae, si utilitas simul atque iocunditas ab illis expectatur, si et bene dicendi et bene vivendi infinita praecepta atque exempla in illis deprehendimus, si soli ex omni scriptorum genere sunt apud quos omnes disciplinae reperiantur, si et hominibus admirandissimi et diis immortalibus acceptissimi semper fuerunt, nihil iam vobis obstare, optimi adolescentes, video, quominus divinissimam hanc disciplinam omnibus ingenii viribus et tota, ut aiunt, mente amplectamini; praesertim cum ex eo vate illa nobis haurienda proponantur, qui rerum copia et verborum elegantia ita reliquos antecellit, ut nemo, nisi longo intervallo, sibi secundus esse apud Latinos possit.' ['For this reason, if this discipline concerning which I have been speaking for a long time is to be considered divine rather than human, if poets are the most ancient of all, if benefit as well as pleasure is to be expected from them, if we learn through them the innumerable rules and examples of speaking well

The effect of this frame on the reading of the *Aeneid* is clearly visible in Landino's lemma on the word *Musa* in *A.* 1.8. The lemma starts with an element of grammar: Landino gives two possible etymologies of the word *Musa* (of which the second goes back to Plato's *Cratylus*):

> Landino on *A.* 1.8 *Musa*
> Musa ab eo quo est μυεῖν, id est 'docere', dicitur, vel παρὰ τὸ μῶ,[248] id est 'inquiro', nam omnium bonarum artium illas inventrices esse volunt.
>
> The word Muse comes from the word *muein* [Greek], which means 'to teach', or from *mô* [Greek], which means 'to search', for they consider them [the Muses] the inventors of all the liberal arts.

The lemma shows how the etymologies given by Landino support his subsequent interpretation of the Muses as sources for divine inspiration for the poet. The names of the nine Muses are given with reference to Hesiod,[249] and then a transition is made towards an allegorical reading (with reference to Fulgentius) of the nine Muses in which they refer to the human speech organs:

> Landino on *A.* 1.8 *Musa*
> Anaximander Lampsacenus et Xenophanes Heracleopolites dicunt poetas esse in tutela Apollinis qui lyra canit et novem Musarum in quarum medio ipse residet. Et per Apollinem humanam vocem intelligunt quae novem instrumentis proficitur. Haec autem Fulgentio teste[250] intelligunt quattuor anteriores dentes - quorum

---

and living well, if they are the only ones of all types of authors in whom all the disciplines are to be found, if they always were the most admirable for men and the most welcome to the immortal gods, then nothing, I think, stands in the way, excellent young men, of your embracing this most divine discipline with all the powers of your talent as they say, with your whole mind; especially since these things are laid out for us to be harvested from this poet, who surpasses all the others in richness of subject matter and elegance of words to such an extent, that no-one, unless at a long distance, can call himself second to him among the Latin [writers].']. Landino, *Praefatio in Virgilio* (ed. Cardini (1974), 324-5).

[248] Pl., *Crat.*, 406a1-5.

[249] Hes. *WD*, 1; *Th.*, 77-79.

[250] Although Landino only mentions him in this section, the second part of the first section of the lemma is also much dependent on Fulgentius, who writes in the fifteenth tale from his *Mitologiarum libri* (called *Fabula de novem Musis*): *Huic etiam Apollini novem deputant Musas ipsumque decimum Musis adiciunt illa*

siquis desit sibilus et non vox ex ore provenit - item duo labia; septima est lingua; octavum palatum quod Graeci 'uranion' dicunt, quoniam sit ad formam caeli quid 'uranos' appellatur. Qua ex re octava Musa dicitur Urania. Nona est gutturis profunditas, per quam spiritus egreditur.

Anaximander of Lampsacus and Xenophanes of Heracleapolis say that the poets are under the protection of Apollo, who plays on his lyre, and of the nine Muses in whose midst he himself resides. And by 'Apollo' they mean the human voice which originates from nine instruments.

These [nine instruments], on account of Fulgentius, they understand as the four frontal teeth – if any of these is missing, a hissing comes from the mouth, not an articulated sound – further two lips; the seventh [instrument] is the tongue; the eighth, the palate which the Greeks call 'ouranion', because it has the form of the sky, which is called 'ouranos'. For this reason they call the eighth Muse Urania. The ninth is the depth of the throat, through which the breath comes out.

Landino, however, discards the interpretation by Fulgentius and prefers the one offered by Plato in his *Republic*. At this point the concept of *furor poeticus* is

---

videlicet causa, quod humanae vocis decem sint modulamina; unde et cum decacorda Apollo pingitur cithara. Sed et lex divina decacordum dicit psalterium. Fit ergo vox quattuor dentibus, id est e contra positis, ad quos lingua percutit et quibus si unus minus fuerit sibilum potius quam vocem reddat necesse est. Duo labia velut cimbala verborum commoda modulantia, lingua ut plectrum quae curvamine quodam vocalem format spiritum, palatum cuius concavitas profert sonum, gutturis fistula quae tereti meatum spiritalem praebet excursu et pulmo qui velut aerius follis concepta reddit ac revocat. Habes ergo novem Musarum vel Apollinis ipsius redditam rationem, sicut in libris suis Anaximander Lamsacenus et Zenopanes Eracleopolites exponunt (...) Nos vero novem Musas doctrinae atque scientiae dicimus modos, hoc est (..). ['They also assign to Apollo the nine Muses and add him to the Muses as a tenth one, for the reason that there are ten organs of articulation for the human voice, whence Apollo is also depicted with a lyre of ten strings. Also Holy Scripture speaks of a psaltery of ten strings. Speech is produced with the four teeth, that is, the ones placed in the front, against which the tongue strikes; and if one of them were missing it would necessarily give forth a whistle rather than speech; two lips like cymbals, suitably modulating the words; the tongue, like a plectrum as with some pliancy it shapes the breathing of the voice; the palate, the dome of which projects the sound; the throat tube, which provides a track for the breath as it is expelled; and the lungs, like a sack of air, exhaling and reinhaling what is articulated. There you have the explanation of the nine Muses and Apollo himself as given by Anaximander of Lampsacenum and Zenophanes of Heraclea. (...) But I also say that the nine Muses are the stages of learning and knowledge, as follows. (...).' (translation by Whitbread (1971)].

introduced and the Muses are connected to the heavenly spheres. Hesiod is brought forward as an additional authority for this interpretation:

> Landino on *A.* 1.8 *Musa*
> Ego autem Platoni libenter adhaereo. Ponit enim tantus philosophus divini furoris genera quattuor, de quibus alio fortasse in loco dicemus. Inter eos ponit poeticum eumque a Musis provenire demonstrat. Musas autem appellat caelestium sphaerarum cantus, nam in libro De republica, singulis sphaeris singulas Sirenas appositas dicit motum ipsum sphaerarum ac sonum qui inde fit significans. Quapropter per octo sphaeras octo Musas, ac per illarum concentum nonam ponit, quam, quoniam harmonia una est ex omnibus suavissime composita, excellentissimam reliquarum dixit Hesiodus. Ergo poesis a divino furore, furor a Musis, Musae a Iove, eodem Platonis teste, proveniunt. Sed de his alio in loco latius.
>
> But I gladly adhere to Plato. For he, the great philosopher, states that there are four sorts of divine fury, of which we will perhaps speak at another place. Among those he places the poetic fury and he shows that it originates from the Muses. For he calls the Muses the song of the heavenly spheres, for in his *Republic*, he says that every sphere has its own Siren, referring to the very movement of the spheres and the sound that originates from it. Therefore there are eight Muses for eight spheres, and for their harmony he posits a ninth, which Hesiod has called the most excellent of all, for harmony is one, composed in the most pleasant way from all of the others. Thus poetry comes from divine fury, the fury from the Muses, the Muses from Jupiter , as Plato testifies. But on this topic more at another place.

Landino then turns back to a more down-to-earth discussion of his topic (having stated that he will come back to the Muses and divine inspiration more extensively in one of his other lemmata), namely to the names of the nine Muses, in which etymology again plays a prominent role:

> Landino on *A.* 1.8 *Musa*
> Alcmeon ac nonnulli alii eas caeli et terrae filias dicunt. Sed et de numero non omnes idem sentiunt, cum sint qui tres tamen ponant Musas, sed nobiliores novem dicunt. Ait nam Homerus Μοῦσαι δ'εννέα πᾶσαι ἀμειβόμεναι ὀπὶ καλῇ [Hom., Od. 24,60]. Addit etiam Diodorus, quod Clio dicitur quia κλέος 'gloria' est et poetae ex laudibus quos aliis tribunt et sibi et illis maximam gloriam vendicant.

> Euterpe quoniam ex bonis quae ex illa doctrina perveniunt non mediocrem voluptatem capiant. (...)[251]
>
> Alcmeon and a number of others call them the daughters of heaven and earth. But they do not all agree on the number of Muses, for some say that there are three Muses, but the more renowned authors say there are nine. For Homer says 'The nine Muses all replying with sweet voice'. And Diodorus adds that Clio is called that way because 'kleos' is 'glory' and that the poets from the praise which they offer to others gain the highest glory both for themselves and for those others. Euterpe is called that way because from the good things that come forth from her teachings, they gain much pleasure. (...)

What happens in this lemma, especially in the passage about the Muses in Plato and Hesiod, is that the Muses are discussed within the frame of Landino's concept of the *furor poeticus*. The commentator thus presents a discussion of old material in a new context. Apart from the mix between etymology, *realia* and poetical theory, the lemma is characterized by the mix of sources that are referred to: Hesiod's *Theogony*, Anaximander, Xenophanes, Fulgentius, Plato, Alcmaeon of Croton, Homer, Diodorus Siculus. It is clear that Landino has not consulted all these sources himself, especially in view of his probably limited knowledge of classical Greek.[252]

A look at the remarks of other Virgilian commentators on this passage shows that Badius gives the same kind of interpretation – which is not surprising in view of Badius' frequent use of Landino's commentary – but most others focus on other points of interest from poetical theory: Pontanus focuses on the *invocatio* and refers to Corrado for more information on the (invocation of) the Muses; Juan Luis de la Cerda discusses both the invocation and the Muses himself; Farnaby in a much shorter lemma only identifies the Muse; and La Rue leaves the issue of divine inspiration aside altogether. This quick comparison shows all the more how

[251] The etymologies of Clio and Euterpe are found in Fulgentius, *Myth.* 1,15 (see Maltby (1991), s.v. *Clio* and *Euterpe*).

[252] In the 1507 edition of Landino's commentary, only the first part of the lemma is printed, while everything starting from *Haec autem Fulgentio teste* is removed. The explanation of elements from classical cultural history in the course of grammatical explanation was a traditional part of education. That is probably why the first part of the lemma is printed in the 1507 edition and why the more idiosyncratic discussion by Landino in the remainder of the lemma was omitted. More scholarly work on the reception of Landino's commentary and on the use of his work by other commentators needs to be done to come to a satisfying answer to these kind of questions.

characteristic the frame of interpretation in Landino's lemma is for his commentary and for the Florentine context in which he operated, with its interest in Neoplatonism and the teaching at the Florentine *studio*.

8. Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed a selection of lemmata from four commentaries that will also figure prominently in the other chapters of this dissertation. I have focused my discussion on lemmata discussing topics from three areas of the language disciplines: grammar, rhetoric and poetical theory. I have limited my analysis to lemmata on the first few lines of the epic (*A.* 1.1a-10) and started my discussion by discussing the educational context in which early modern *Aeneid*-commentaries often functioned. In my discussion of the subsequent case studies I discussed some particulars of each of the three aforementioned fields and at the same time showed that often the fields of grammar, rhetoric and poetics are intertwined. I have shown how the explanation of matters pertaining to those fields had been part of the competence of the grammarian since antiquity itself, and a longstanding tradition of grammarians writing commentaries on works of poetry such as the *Aeneid* was available to early modern commentators. However, it has also become clear that, while the influence of tradition is clearly discernible in early modern *Aeneid*-commentaries, there was also room for innovation, for the commentators' own preferences and interpretations. This becomes manifest in the different character of the commentaries discussed in this chapter. Landino, using his very specific interpretative framework (in part based on Tib. Cl. Donatus), combined his poetical theory with rhetorical analysis in the context of the Florentine studio. Pontanus made extensive use of available commentaries and other works of scholarship – especially the commentaries by Corrado and Nascimbeno – to produce a work full of references to and citations from classical and later sources. His preface and treatise on the use of the paraphrase make clear that his work is firmly rooted in the Jesuit tradition of education. The commentaries by Thomas Farnaby and Charles de la Rue, also rooted in an educational context, represent very different types of commentary. Although these works differ among each other, they have in common that they take a step back in terms of the collection of information. In selecting the material they present to their readers, these commentaries make the *Aeneid* better accessible again after the deluge of information from the commentaries that had gone before.

Though, as I have discussed, characteristic features of a commentary are to a certain extent determined by the social and intellectual context in which the author operated, we can conclude that the commentaries by the aforementioned four authors seem to represent three different types within the genre: the (early)

Humanistic commentary (Landino; Leto and Badius are also of this type), the Jesuit tradition of writing huge commentaries for use in education (Pontanus and La Cerda), and the 17th century commentary intended for use in school education (Farnaby, La Rue). Other categories are possible, and I have certainly not discussed all types of early modern Virgilian commentary. Still what we have seen is how the four commentaries that have been discussed in this chapter attest to the flexibility of the genre and the variety which results from it. In the next chapter I will focus on one commentary to study the relation between early modern antiquarianism and the early modern *Aeneid*-commentary.