Transactions of the American Philological Association 112 (1982) 83–106

CATULLUS AND HIS FIRST INTERPRETERS: ANTONIUS PARTHENIUS AND ANGELO POLIZIANO*

JULIA HAIG GAISSER
Bryn Mawr College

Habent sua fata libelli, justly remarks the preface to the Delphin edition of Catullus.[1] The *liber Catulli* survived the vicissitudes of the Middle Ages in a single corrupt manuscript that was lost almost as soon as it was found at the end of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century, lasting only long enough to become the *exemplar*—either immediate or at one remove—of the three important fourteenth-century manuscripts, and the ancestor of a host of fifteenth-century *codices deteriores* and all subsequent editions of Catullus.[2] The *liber Catulli* had survived, but it was by no means unscathed. Corrupt, lacunose, unmetrical, the text was not merely difficult and obscure, but sometimes totally devoid of meaning; it needed explication as well as emendation—and sometimes both at once.[3]

The history of modern Catullan interpretation begins at the end of the fifteenth century, with an ill-matched pair of scholars, Angelo Poliziano and Antonius Parthenius—the one the most famous scholar of the age,

* The study of Poliziano's marginalia was supported in part by a grant from the American Philosophical Society. The present discussion is a revised and expanded version of a paper presented at a seminar on Ancient Poets in the Renaissance at the APA meetings in New Orleans in December, 1980.

I would like to express my thanks to Professors Gregory Dickerson and F. E. Cranz for their helpful observations on this paper, as well as to the Association's anonymous referee.

[1] *C. Valerii Catulli Opera Omnia in Usum Delphini* (London 1822) I.3.

[2] B. L. Ullman, "The Transmission of the Text of Catullus," in *Studi in onore de Luigi Castiglione* (Florence 1960) II.1027–57. D. F. S. Thomson, "A New Look at the Manuscript Tradition of Catullus," *YCS* 23 (1973) 113–29; *Catullus: A Critical Edition* (Chapel Hill 1978) 3–43. (Subsequent references to Thomson in this paper are to *Catullus: A Critical Edition*.)

[3] Complaints about the text begin as early as the scribe of G in 1375. "Tu lector quicumque ad cuius manus hic libellus obvenerit, scriptori da veniam si tibi coruptus videbitur, quoniam a corruptissimo exemplari transcripsit; non enim quodpiam aliud extabat, unde posset libelli huius habere copiam exemplandi. Et ut ex ipso salebroso aliquid tantum sugg[er]et, decrevit potius tamen coruptum habere quam omnino carere, sperans adhuc ab alliquo alio fortuite emergente hunc posse corigere . . ." (Paris 14137, 36r). See R. A. B. Mynors, *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina* (Oxford 1958) vi.

and the other a figure so obscure that even the correct form of his name is in doubt.[4] In a way, however, the contribution of Parthenius to Catullan studies is the more obvious, for his was the first (1485), and perhaps the best, of the Renaissance commentaries on Catullus. Poliziano, on the other hand, never produced a Catullan commentary or a work of any size on the poet. Our estimation of his Catullan scholarship must depend on the seven chapters of the *Miscellanea* (1489) devoted to Catullan problems and on the unpublished marginalia in his copy of the first edition of Catullus (1472), which he was annotating as early as 1473 and continued to annotate into the 1480s.

It is the purpose of the present discussion to examine the contributions to Catullan studies in these three works, to trace the development of Poliziano's ideas about Catullus between the marginalia and the *Miscellanea*, and to show that many of his attacks against unnamed scholars in the Catullan chapters of the *Miscellanea* are directed against Parthenius. As a result we may hope to shed some light on the earliest phase of systematic emendation and interpretation of Catullus and to suggest to what extent not only our present text but also our understanding of the poet is owed to his first interpreters.

The young Poliziano began to annotate his copy of the first edition of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and Statius almost as soon as it appeared.[5] Fortunately for us, he has left some record of his intentions and his own estimation of the marginalia in two dated subscriptions in the volume itself and in a letter to Alessandro and Lattanzio Cortesi. These *testimonia* are worth examining in some detail.

The earliest is the subscription to Catullus, written August 12, 1473, when Poliziano was only eighteen years old.

> Catullum Veronensem librariorum inscitia corruptum, multo labore multisque vigiliis, quantum in me fuit emendavi, cumque eius poetae plurimos textus contulissem, in nullum

[4] The bibliography on Poliziano (1454–1494) is enormous. But see I. Maïer, *Ange Politien: la formation d'un poète humaniste* (Geneva 1966). Almost nothing is known of Parthenius except that he was a native of Verona (hence a fellow citizen of Catullus) and that he produced a Catullan commentary. He is often called Antonius Parthenius Lacisius, but it has been suggested that the cognomen Lacisius is the result of confusion with another Parthenius. The suggestion is unnecessary, for he is called Lacisius repeatedly in his commentary. See M. Cosenza, *A Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of Italian Humanists and the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300–1800* (Boston 1962) III.2613–14; V.1330.

[5] The volume is now in the Biblioteca Corsiniana in Rome (Corsiniana 50.F.37). Neither the Catullan annotations nor a systematic study of them has ever been published. The volume is described by A. Perosa, *Mostra del Poliziano nella Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana: manoscritti, libri rari, autografi e documenti. Firenze, 23 Settembre–30 Novembre 1954* (Firenze 1954) 13–16; and I. Maïer, *Les manuscrits d'Ange Politien* (Geneva 1965) 361–62. The Catullan annotations are discussed by Maïer (above, note 4) 116–20, 124–29.

> profecto incidi qui non itidem ut meus esset corruptissimus. Qua propter non paucis graecis et latinis auctoribus comparatis, tantum in eo recognoscendo opere absumpsi ut mihi videar consecutus quod nemini his temporibus doctorum hominum contigisse intelligerem. Catullus Veronensis, si minus emendatus, at saltem maxima ex parte incorruptus mea opera meoque labore et industria in manibus habeatur! Tu labori boni consule in quantum in te est, quae sunt aut negligentia aut inscitia nostra nunc quoque corrupta, ea tu pro tua humanitate corrige et emenda. Meminerisque Angelum Bassum Politianum, quo tempore huic emendationi extremam imposuit manum annos decem et octo na(tum). . . . (Corsiniana 50.F.37, p. 37)

Whatever else, the youthful Poliziano was certainly not guilty of false modesty, and we would probably be inclined to agree with the more moderate assessment which he made a dozen years later in his subscription to Propertius (1485):

> Catulli Tibulli Propertiique libellos coepi ego Angelus Politianus iam inde a pueritia tractare, et pro aetatis eius iudicio vel corrigere vel interpretari. Quo fit ut multa ex eis ne ipse quidem satis (ut nunc est) probem. Qui leges, ne quaeso, vel ingeni vel doctrinae vel diligentiae nostrae hinc coniecturam aut iudicium facito. Permulta enim infuerint (ut Plautino utar verbo), me quoque qui scripsi iudice digna lini. Anno MCCCCLXXXV. (Cors. 50.F.37, p. 127v)

The change of tone reflects not only the difference between a precocious eighteen-year old and a man of thirty, but also a change in Poliziano's professional perspective and in the state of Catullan studies. In 1473 Poliziano was a gifted and promising young scholar-poet on the eve of his long and fruitful patronage by Lorenzo de' Medici; by 1485 he had left the household of the Medici and had been a professor of oratory and poetry at the Florentine Studio for five years.[6] In August of 1473 Catullus was widely available in a single corrupt edition; by 1485 the student of Catullus had before him five more editions, and perhaps a sixth, the edition and commentary of Parthenius.[7]

[6] Maïer, (above, note 4) 419–38 provides a useful chronology and biographical summary.

[7] Ed. 1473, Parma (Poliziano could not have seen this edition before writing his subscription on August 12, for the colophon is dated August 31). Ed. 1475, Venice. Ed. [1475, Rome]. Ed. 1481, Vicenza (Calphurnius). Ed. 1481, Reggio Emilia. Ed. 1485/1486, Brescia (Parthenius). There are some problems in dating Parthenius, as the colophon appears dated variously: 6 April 1485, 6 April 1486, 21 April 1486, 21 May 1485. The earliest date for its availability seems to be April 1485, but the lack of a month in Poliziano's subscription makes it impossible to know if he could have seen the edition.

But Poliziano's most interesting observations on his Catullan studies are contained in the postscript to a letter to Alessandro and Lattanzio Cortesi, who had asked him for a commentary on Catullus. The date is August 27, 1486:

> His scriptis, rediit in mentem quod, cum in Catullum commentarium aliquod nostrum petieris, quondam non nihil pueri in Catullum scripsimus; idque tamen qualecumque fuerit marginibus libelli nostri affiximus.
>
> Et quamquam nonnulla fortasse non inutiliter eruimus, non tamen plane perfectum a nobis est, ut Catullum aut omnino emendatum, aut non alicubi obscurum legere possimus. Sunt et nonnulla puerilia, neque satis erudita tritisque auribus digna. Quapropter nondum editione dignum putavi. Siquis tamen inciderit nodus quem tu non ita per te facile solvere potueris, scribito ad nos ubique quantum in nobis erit, bonam operam exhibebimus. Siqua autem nos fugerint patiere, quae tua est humanitas, non iniquo animo et te nobiscum ignorare. Atque tamen vereor ne cum nostras ineptias petis, nos illudas, Alexander, utpote qui et per te ipsum quidem tantum ingenio valeas quantum non facile dixerim et domi Jovianum habeas qui unus multorum instar doctorum hominum sit habendus. Iterum vale.[8]

Here is evidence that a commentary on Catullus was under discussion in the 1480s (even though the idea was rejected), that Poliziano took his marginalia seriously enough to have toyed with the idea of using them as the basis for a commentary, and that he maintained an active enough interest in the poet to suggest an exchange of ideas on thorny passages with the Cortesi.

At this point it is time to have a closer look at the marginalia themselves. The annotations in the Corsini volume are all by the hand of Poliziano. They are in inks of various shades and seem to have been done over a period of time, although palaeographers are reluctant to attempt even a relative chronology on the basis of the ink or handwriting of the entries. Unfortunately, the ink is badly faded—almost to the point of illegibility in many places—and in trimming the volume for binding many notes have been severely mutilated. The notes on Catullus are abundant and various. They include the usual matter of the Renaissance commentary: explanations of hard words and grammatical points, metrical comments, and a profusion of parallel passages from other authors. There are also many brief lemmata which, as Ida Maïer has shown, were

[8] L. D'Amore, *Epistole inedite di Angelo Poliziano (Lettere latine estratte dal codice Vaticano-Capponiano 235)* (Naples 1909) 32–33 (=I. Maïer, ed., *Angelus Politianus Opera Omnia* (Torino 1971) III.502–3.

used to provide a kind of poetic lexicon for the young Poliziano to draw upon in composing his own neo-Latin poetry.[9] Diminutives, poetic compounds, intriguing Catullan combinations of noun and epithet, were thus drawn into his poetic stock and used both in his Latin translations and in his original compositions. Maïer has argued that these lemmata belong to the early period of Poliziano's interest in Catullus, and that as he began to think more seriously of producing a commentary at some point in the future, he added notes which would elucidate Catullan usage or explain references in the text. A more precise chronology would be very difficult to establish, but the main point is clear: the longer marginalia were added over a period of ten or fifteen years and stem from successive stages in Poliziano's scholarly development.

The most numerous annotations, however, are also the least conspicuous: dozens of neatly indicated, sometimes faded and barely discernible corrections to the text. It was textual improvement, we remember, that Poliziano prided himself upon in the subscription of 1473 and hinted at again in 1485 and 1486, but his claim of 1473 seems improbable on the face of it, coming from an eighteen-year old—even the eighteen-year old Poliziano. Moreover, it is a claim not borne out by the attributions to Poliziano made in modern editions, for according to Goold's census of corrections in his review of Mynors' text of Catullus, Poliziano is credited with only three emendations, all of which stem, of course, from discussions in the *Miscellanea*.[10] But an examination of Poliziano's corrections reveals some interesting and surprising facts, for many are now accepted readings, although they are variously ascribed to other sources by modern editors. In the following table Poliziano's corrections to Catullus are listed under three headings: A. Corrections made in the *Miscellanea*; B. Corrections in the 1472 edition available in sources before 1494 (the year of Poliziano's death); C. Corrections in the 1472 edition attributed to sources after 1494.[11] With a few exceptions, I have not included Poliziano's "unsuccessful" corrections (those not printed in modern editions), which are very numerous, and I have omitted corrections of the 1472 edition that appear to be merely restorations of the archetype V or its fourteenth-century descendants, O, G, R, and M. The Greek letters are Mynors' designations for manuscript families; unless otherwise indicated, the dates are Goold's.

[9] Maïer (above, note 4) 125–29.

[10] G. P. Goold, "A New Text of Catullus," *Phoenix* 12 (1958) 99. Goold's figures are based on Mynors' text (above, note 3), but Poliziano is credited with the same corrections in the editions of M. Schuster and W. Eisenhut (Leipzig 1958), H. Bardon (Stuttgart 1973), and Thomson (above, note 2).

[11] Except in the cases of *golgos*, Cat. 64.96 (C4) and *campi*, Cat. 64.344 (C5), where I have followed Thomson, attributions have been made on the basis of Mynors' *apparatus*. Differences between Mynors' attributions and those of Thomson are noted.

A. Corrections Made in the *Miscellanea*.
66.48 Chalybon
84.2 hinsidias[12]
84.3–4 *established in their present position*

B. Corrections in the 1472 ed. Available in Sources before 1494.
1. Beroaldus, 1488 [1491, Goold]
93.2 albus an ater homo[13]
2. Ed. 1485 (Parthenius)
4.2 ait
4.3 trabis
4.4 nequisse
10.24 decuit
11.2 penetrabit
12.13 *μνημόσυνον*
22.6 novi
22.14 infacetior
25.12 minuta
27.5 quo lubet
29.13 vestra
34.12 amniumque
36.1,20 annales Volusi
36.14 colis quaeque
41.1 defututa (B. Guarinus)[14]
45.1 Acmen (*ηθ*)
45.21 Acmen (*η*)[15]
48.1 iuventi
53.5 disertum
55.12 hic (ζ)
61.180 bene
61.187 velut
61.194 remoratus
61.198 abscondis
61.226 bene vivite et
63.9 tua
63.23 hederigerae

[12] It is difficult to understand why Poliziano has been credited with this emendation, for the text of the line as it appears in the *Miscellanea* is essentially the same as those of Calphurnius and Parthenius: *Dicere, et hinsidias Arrius insidias*. Modern editions aspirate the second *insidias*, not the first. In the marginalia, however, Poliziano aspirates the second *insidias*. See discussion below.

[13] Beroaldus had suggested the correction, claiming it had its source *ex probatissimis codicibus*. Thomson attributes it to *Edin.*, *Urb.* 812, *Diez.* 56(2).

[14] Not mentioned by Mynors. Thomson credits B. Guarinus.

[15] Thomson: *η*. Mynors: r.

°63.46	sine quis[16]
63.66	corollis
63.68	ferar
63.70	nive
63.71	columinibus
63.79	ictu
63.81	verbera
[°64.3	aeetheios][17]
64.11	prima (β)
64.36	ac moenia Larissea
64.77	*deletes* quom
64.138	miserescere
64.298	natisque
°64.307	vestis
64.341	praevertet
64.368	madefient
°64.386a	*perhaps deletes*[18]
66.5	sub Latmia
66.12	vastatum
66.24	sollicitae
66.27	adepta es
66.35	tetulisset[19]
°66.66	Lycaoniae
66.70	autem
66.79	quas
66.80	unanimis
67.7	dum
67.22	ad
68.40	defferrem (ed. 1473)[20]
[68.41	Mallius][21]
68.49a	*deletes*
68.61	levamen
68.64	lenius

[16] Thomson: Parthenius. Not mentioned by Mynors.

[17] Not printed in Mynors or Thomson. Mynors: *Aeeteos*; Thomson: *Aeetaeos*. Poliziano has added the gloss *Aeetheus* in the margin, which suggests that perhaps he meant his correction to read *Aeetheos*. The 1472 ed. read *oetheios*, which Poliziano corrected by striking out the *oe* and writing *aee* above. He has not stricken the *i*.

[18] The 1472 ed. prints a spurious verse (=67.21) after 64.386, which Parthenius deletes. In Poliziano's marginalia there is no line striking out the verse, but there is a *very* faint two-word note in the margin, which may read *delendum puto*. *Puto* is clear.

[19] Not mentioned by Mynors.

[20] Thomson: (η).

[21] Not printed in modern editions. The "corrected" verse reads . . . *qua Mallius in re*.

68.141 componier
69.3 illam rarae
76.12 dis (*Parth. diis*)
77.3 surrepsti
78b.4 fama loquetur anus
84.1 chommoda
°84.4 hinsidias
84.11 arrius
84.12 Hionios
88.2 prurit
90.6 omentum
95.5 cavas
100.6 perspecta

3. B. Guarinus, 1485
°34.17 menstruo
°63.14 *deletes* celeri[22]
°64.308 talos

4. *Ed.* 1481 (Calphurnius)
°4.3 ullius

5. Ed. Rom. (1475)
°44.19 Sexti recepso
[°66.58 Canopieis][23]

6. T
62.7 oeteos

7. α
63.4 animis
63.10 quatiensque

8. β
64.21 tum[24]

9. Cod. Leidensis anni mcccccliii [= (γ)]
61.179 viris

10. ζ
66.63 deum me

11. θ
17.10 putideque
61.196 iuverit

[22] The 1472 ed. reads: *Alienaque petentes velut exules loca celeri.* In the margin Poliziano has *velut exules loca.*

[23] Not printed in Mynors or Thomson. Mynors: *Canopitis*; Thomson: *Canopeis.*

[24] Thomson: β; Mynors: *Aldina.*

C. Corrections in the 1472 ed. Attributed to Sources after 1494.

1. Avantius (1495)
   - 9.2 antistans
   - 17.14 cui cum[25]
   - 38.1 cornifici
   - 46.5 uber

2. Ed. 1496 (Palladius)
   - 36.19 ruris
   - 50.18 cave sis

3. Avantius (1500)
   - 98.1 inquenquam[26]

4. Ed. 1502 (Aldine, ed. Avantius)
   - 64.96 golgos[27]
   - 93.2 scire
   - 95b.1 sodalis

5. F. Puccius (1502)
   - 64.344 *adds* campi[28]

6. A. Guarinus (1521)
   - 107.7–8 hac quid / optandum[29]

7. Ed. 1535 (Trincavellium, ed. Avantius)
   - 42.4 nostra
   - 99.8 abstersisti[30]

8. Statius (1566)
   95b *separated from* 95

[25] Thomson: *Avantius* (recte); Mynors: *Palladius*.

[26] Mynors: *Aldina*; Thomson: (δ), *Avantius*. The correction does not appear in the 1495 edition of Avantius.

[27] Thomson: *Ald.*; Mynors: *Hermolaus Barbarus teste Mureto*. The reading was assigned by Muretus to H. Barbarus and by Statius to P. Bembus, but there is no evidence for it before the Aldine ed.

[28] Thomson: Puccius (et β^2); Mynors: *Statius*. This is one of several cases in which Poliziano has made more than one correction. The last word in the 1472 ed. is *teucri*. Poliziano has written *campi* above it, but in the margin he has written *rivi* (Calphurnius' correction). It is impossible to say which correction he regarded as final. Similarly, at 63.47 (*extuante rursum, extuanter usus*); 63.71 (*columinibus* Calph., *culminibus*); 66.63 (*decumme* V, *deum me*); 66.79 (*que, quas* Calph.); 68.64 (*leviter, lenius*); 69.3 (*labefacta est, labefactas*).

[29] Thomson prints *hac quid / optandum* and credits A. Guarinus. Mynors prints (and obelizes) *hac est / optandus* and does not mention this reading.

[30] Thomson reads *abstersti*, as do Schuster-Eisenhut and Bardon (note 10). On the claims of *abstersisti* vs. *abstersti* see Goold (above, note 10) 97–98, who is convincingly refuted by M. Zicàri, "Some Metrical and Prosodical Features of Catullus' Poetry," *Phoenix* 18 (1964) 199–200.

9. Lachmann (1829)
66.70 restituit

The corrections in Group A will be considered in the discussion of the *Miscellanea*. Group B includes a wide range of sources, from the ninth-century manuscript T to Beroaldus in 1488, but the table does not invariably show Poliziano's corrections under their ultimate sources. This would not demonstrate where he found them, or what texts of Catullus he was consulting, since many of the corrections made in manuscripts appeared in other manuscripts or in printed editions, and corrections made in early editions were frequently taken up by later ones. Instead, it has seemed best to list the printed sources of Group B in reverse chronological order, attributing to each only the corrections not found in its successors and ascribing to manuscripts only corrections not found in the editions. (Corrections found for the first time in a given source are marked with an °.) This will avoid attributing to an earlier source what Poliziano might have noted more easily in a later one, but it cannot show that he necessarily derived a correction from its latest possible source, or indeed that he had a source in any particular case, for no doubt he arrived at at least a few of the corrections in this group independently, by the method he claims in the subscription of 1473:

> Qua propter non paucis graecis et latinis auctoribus comparatis, tantum in eo recognoscendo opere absumpsi ut mihi videar consecutus quod nemini his temporibus doctorum hominum contigisse intelligerem. (Cors. 50.F.37, p. 37)

Most of Poliziano's corrections are paralleled in the latest edition of Group B, the 1485 edition of Parthenius. Of these 71 corrections[31], five appear for the first time in Parthenius; the great majority (60) of the rest appear also in the 1481 edition of Calphurnius. The few not in Calphurnius stem from various early editions and manuscripts; the source of each is noted. Only one of Poliziano's corrections is found in Calphurnius and *not* in Parthenius, but that, together with the great overlap between Calphurnius and Parthenius and the importance of Calphurnius' edition, strongly suggests that Poliziano made considerable use of both, and that Calphurnius in fact provided him with some of the corrections listed under Parthenius. It also seems clear that Poliziano used the Roman edition of 1475, for he has one "successful" correction from that edition not printed in its successors in Group B and one "unsuccessful" correction. The presence of corrections usually attributed to Beroaldus and B. Guarinus helps to round out the picture of Poliziano's continuing interest in the text in the years between 1475 and 1491: it is clear that he made a

[31] I have not counted 64.3 *aeetheios* or 68.41 *Mallius*.

practice of consulting new editions and textual studies as they appeared and incorporated the readings he approved into his own text.

The presence of several manuscripts in Group B points to the earlier phase of Poliziano's scholarly activity, which he describes in the 1473 subscription: ". . . cumque eius poetae plurimos textus contulissem . . ." Since the number of corrections for each manuscript is so small, however, one cannot be sure in a particular case whether Poliziano derived the correction from the manuscript or arrived at it independently. The most interesting is probably item 6, the ninth-century manuscript T, with which Poliziano shares the reading *oeteos* at 62.7. Yet Poliziano does not include many other corrections to Cat. 62, as he surely would have done had he been consulting T, a manuscript differing in nearly every line from the manuscripts and editions with which he was familiar.[32] Moreover, although we are not well informed about the history of T, it seems unlikely that it was available to Poliziano. Perhaps he arrived at the correction independently, or perhaps he found it in the R^3 additions to R (made in Florence around 1475).[33]

Group C contains the most interesting corrections, those attributed in modern editions to works appearing after Poliziano's death—from Avantius in 1495 to Lachmann in 1829. In the case of Avantius the situation is not entirely clear: the *Emendationes* were published in 1495, but they were in circulation well before Poliziano's death in September of 1494. Avantius completed the work in 1493 and sent it to his friend Augustinus Moravus Olomucensis in Padua in the form of a letter which bears the date October 14, 1493. Augustinus in turn showed it to various Paduan and Veronese scholars (including Calphurnius), as he states in his dedication to the published work (dated March, 1494). It is certainly possible that Poliziano saw the work or learned of some of Avantius' corrections and added the ones he approved to his text. The possibility is consistent with his long-standing interest in Catullus and his habit of keeping abreast of new corrections. On the other hand, Poliziano was very busy in the last year or so of his life,[34] and, given the ill-will aroused by his attacks on Calderinus in the *Miscellanea*, he might not have been in close

[32] This ninth-century French MS "was copied from a manuscript now in Vienna (Vienna 277) which was brought to Naples from France, possibly from Tours, by Sannazaro about the year 1502." Ullman (above, note 2) 1028.

[33] On the availability of T in Italy in the fifteenth century see B. Richardson, "Pucci, Parrhasio and Catullus," *IMU* 19 (1976) 285–86. On R and the R^3 additions see Thomson (above, note 2) 35.

[34] His activities included lecturing on Aristotle and Ovid at the University of Florence in the academic year 1493–94, a running feud with Bartolomeo Scala and another with Giorgio Merula, collating the text of Columella, plans to publish his correspondence and a book of epigrams, and work on the Second Century of *Miscellanea*. See Maïer, (above, note 4) 436–38.

correspondence with the offended scholars of Verona and Padua, of whom Avantius was a distinguished example.[35]

Fortunately, no such ambiguity exists about Poliziano's relation to the other sources in Group C, and we can say in these cases, at least, that he anticipated the corrections of later scholars and made his own not inconsiderable, albeit unrecognized, contribution to the text of Catullus.[36]

It seems likely, as Maïer suggested, that Poliziano considered using his notes and textual corrections as the basis for an edition and commentary on Catullus, although there is no evidence of his intentions except for his letter to the Cortesi and the marginalia themselves. However that may be, he never wrote a Catullan commentary. At the outset he may have been hindered by lack of time: other scholarly projects were never lacking and may have seemed more pressing or important than the difficult and time-consuming business of line-by-line correction and elucidation. He may also have been deterred by the appearance of Parthenius' commentary. To produce the first Catullan commentary was a great achievement: to produce the second a much less appealing prospect, especially for a man of Poliziano's reputation and self-esteem. But even without Parthenius, it is possible that Poliziano would have lost interest in a Catullan commentary. After the first great spate of printed commentaries in the 1470s and early 1480s, the drudgery of commentary writing and the mundane nature of much of the necessary material of the commentary made the genre increasingly unattractive for scholars seeking to solve new problems rather than to explain old ones, and eager to demonstrate flair and brilliance rather than thoroughness and competence.[37] A different genre was called for, which would allow its author to exhibit his philological acumen on selected problems and spare him from plodding line by line through a text. Several scholars tried their hand at such a work,[38] but it was Poliziano himself who perfected the form, in the *Miscellanea* (1489).

It was in the *Miscellanea*, then, rather than in a commentary, that Poliziano chose to publish his interpretations of Catullus, and he devoted seven of its one hundred chapters to the poet:

[35] C. Dionisotti, "Calderini, Poliziano e altri," *IMU* 11 (1968) 173–79. The *Emendationes* themselves contain many polemical remarks leveled at Poliziano, and it seems likely that Avantius would not have indulged in such invective if he had not considered Augustinus and his friends a sympathetic audience.

[36] Poliziano seems also to have anticipated some "unsuccessful" corrections of later scholars: 35.13 *inchoatam* (Palladius); 64.120 *praeoptaret* (Laetus); 68.131 *paulum* (Colotius).

[37] Dionisotti (above, note 35). A. Grafton, "On the Scholarship of Politian and its Context," *JWI* 40 (1977) 152–56.

[38] Namely Calderinus, Sabellicus, Beroaldus. See Dionisotti (above, note 35) and Grafton (above, note 37) 156.

Misc. 2: on Cat. 98.4
Misc. 6: on Cat. 2[39]
Misc. 19: on Cat. 84
Misc. 68: on Cat. 66.48
Misc. 69: on Cat. 66.94
Misc. 73: on Cat. 17.19
Misc. 83: on Cat. 74.

We will examine these chapters with two points in mind: their relation to Poliziano's annotations in the Corsini volume, and their relation to the commentary of Parthenius. The matters are separate but intersect at several points.

When Parthenius published his commentary in 1485 he wrote—perhaps at even greater length than was usual in the Renaissance—of the possibility of hostile criticism and the plagiarism of his ideas by unnamed scholars. He strikes an apprehensive note in the introductory epigram:

Antonius Parthenius Lacisius Libello Suo

Chare liber superas tecum lature per auras
Nomina nostra, vide, cautius ut sit iter.
Effuge sordidulos atra rubigine dentes,
Et vulgum audacem, grammaticasque manus.
Lividius nihil est, nihil est nasutius illis,
Pagellae criticum se tibi quisque geret.
Infestos morsus, et acutos fortius ungues
Perfer, dum civis stet tibi tuta salus.
Sic tibi perpetuum decus, et per longa superstes
Saecula sit vivax gloria, chare liber[40]

In the preface the spectre of *invidia* is evoked repeatedly, and repeatedly dismissed:

> Nec vero multum reformidabo, quid in me inhumana invidia sit machinatura. . . Tantum autem a me abfuit, et abest huiusmodi vanus invidiae metus, ut multo avidius, quam statueram, susceptum opus maturaverim.

His last words in the letter to the reader at the end of the commentary are all indignation:

> Verum hi, [difficiles critici] si qui sunt, hoc aequius videant, ne ipsi multo audaciorem, ne dicam impudentiorem temeritatem

[39] Cat. 2 and Cat. 3 were transmitted as a single poem. They were first separated in the 1502 Aldine. See H. D. Jocelyn, "On Some Unnecessarily Indecent Interpretations of Catullus 2 and 3," *AJP* 101 (1980) 422.

[40] Quotations from Parthenius have been taken from the 1491 ed., which is essentially the same as the 1485 ed.

> incurrant, quum ingenuos labores meos pro Cive meo pie susceptos, ob paucissima loca vetustate corrupta, inhumane damnent, ac invidia compulsi lacerent impudenter. Cur igitur huiusmodi homines tanquam fuci operi alieno infesti insidiatores, ipsi ante me tales conatus non sunt aggressi? . . . Cur herculea virtute instructi ac freti immanem Catulliani carminis hydram non sunt ausi conficere? Cur ante vigilias meas tam desidiosi hallucinatores fuere? . . .

We are also told in the letter to the reader that Parthenius' ideas are being plagiarized:

> Est praeterea quaedam alia Editionis festinatae causa non minor in nonnullis hominibus invidis, qui ennarrationes meas superiore anno quarto discipulis meis dictatas, et in Commentarium, sine nomine meo, redactas, dum inique intercipiunt, meum operis maturandi concilium everterunt.

It is perhaps unlikely that Parthenius was directing his remarks specifically at Poliziano, but his fears of controversy were by no means groundless, for in the *Miscellanea* he was to encounter both severe criticism and disputes over the correct attribution of ideas expressed in his commentary. When Poliziano disagrees, he is scathing; in cases of agreement he suggests plagiarism—all without once mentioning the name Parthenius.

In *Miscellanea* 2, for example, Poliziano explains a hard word in Cat. 98—an epigram directed against the foul-mouthed Victius, whose tongue is fit for use on buttocks or the soles of peasants' shoes.

> In te, si in quemquam, dici pote, putide Victi,
> id quod verbosis dicitur et fatuis.
> ista cum lingua, si usus veniat tibi, possis
> culos et crepidas lingere carpatinas.
> si nos omnino vis omnes perdere, Victi,
> hiscas: omnino quod cupis efficies. (Cat. 98)

The combination *crepidas . . . carpatinas* (sometimes spelled *carbatinas*) in line 4 provided the difficulty. A *crepida* is a slipper consisting only of a sole; *carpatinas* is a transliterated Greek word meaning "made of undressed hide," i.e., "cheap, rustic." Parthenius, not understanding *carpatinas*, had emended to *coprotinas*—a word unknown to the Latin language. He glossed the resulting combination *crepidas . . . coprotinas* as *calciamenta stercorata*, deriving *coprotinas* from Greek κόπρος, and pointing out with some pride that "dung-covered" would be rather nice after *culos* at the beginning of the verse. Now Poliziano:

> Quidam autem plani, et tenebriones in literis, vetere expuncto vocabulo, nescio quas supponunt aut Cercopythas aut Coprotinas

> ex hara productas, non schola, vocabula nuda, nomina cassa, et nihili voces.[41] (*Misc.* 2)

To the pig-sty of his unfortunate predecessors Poliziano contrasts his own source, the store-house of Greek literature:

> Nos de graeco instrumento, quasi de cella proma, non despicabilis, nec abrogandae fidei proferemus autoritates, quibus et lectio praestruatur incolumis, et interpretamenti nubilum discutiatur. (*Misc.* 2)

Finally, he goes on to vindicate the traditional reading *carpatinas* on the authority of several Greek authors, including Lucian, Aristotle, and Xenophon. So much is clear: the attack on *coprotinas* points to Parthenius. Unfortunately, the pedigree of the other emendation (*cercopythas*) is obscure and the identity of Poliziano's target unknown. The matter is not clarified by Marullus' scurrilous epigram attacking Poliziano's discussion. (Ecnomus is Poliziano.)

> Lingere carbatinas vult Vection Ecnomus, ipse
> ut possit trepidas lingere cercolipas.[42]

The second line of the epigram plays on Cat. 98.4 and suggests another outrageous reading (*cercolipas*), which is tantilizingly close to *cercopythas*. The obscenity of *cercolipas* is perhaps clearer than that of *cercopythas*, but its paternity is equally unattested, in spite of Muretus' assertion that it has the authority of ancient manuscripts.[43]

Parthenius is refuted also in *Misc.* 68 and 69, although less elaborately. At Cat. 66.94 he had argued for *Aorion* in the verse *proximus Hydrochoi fulgeret Oarion.*

> *Aorion.* Haec est vera huius loci lectio. Alii autem legunt oyrion divisa diphthongo imperite. Penultima enim fieret brevior quum apud omnes poetas producatur, sed legendum est Aorion nulla dipththongo divisa. Non enim ab orione deducit quamquam idem est signum sed aorion ensiger dicitur. ἄορ enim significat ensem, inde aorion quasi ensifer.

[41] *Miscellanearum centuria una.* The ed. used is that of 1553 (Basel), reproduced in Maïer (above, note 8) I.

[42] Michael Marullus, *Ep.* III.27 in A. Perosa, ed., *Michaelis Marulli Carmina* (Turici 1951) 66.

[43] Muretus (1554) prints *trepidas . . . cercolipas*, noting "Cercolipas vocat [Catullus] obscoenas partes viriles, ficto ex cauda et pinguitudine vocabulo . . . Quod autem Politianus legit, *crepidas carbatinas*, multis de causis non placet: primum quia est contra fidem veterum exemplarium . . ." M. A. Muretus, *Commentarius in Catulli Carmina* in *C. Valerii Catulli Opera Omnia*, ed. F. G. Doering (London 1822) II.

The title of *Misc.* 69 sets the tone of Poliziano's rebuttal: *Oarion synceriter esse apud Catullum, quod Aorion isti legunt, qui bonos violant libros. Oarion*, like *carpatinas* in Cat. 98, is defended by recourse to Greek sources:

> In elegia eadem Catulli ex Callimacho, Oarion legitur, pro eo quod sit Orion. Quam quoniam integram adhuc, inviolatamque dictionem nonnulli temere attentare iam incipiunt, contra hanc sinistram imperitorum audaciam standum mihi est omni (quod aiunt) pede, vel Callimachi eiusdem autoritate, qui sic in hymno in Dianam, etiam nunc extante ait: οὐδὲ μὲν Ὤτος / οὐδὲ μὲν Ὠαρίων ἀγαθὸν γάμον ἐμνήστευσαν [Callimachus, *Hymn to Artemis* 264–65]. (*Misc.* 69)

The paragraph continues with citations from Nicander, Pindar, and Eustathius.

The tone is similar in *Misc.* 68, although it is not clear that Poliziano is thinking specifically of Parthenius. The verse in question is Cat. 66.48: *Iuppiter, ut Chalybon omne genus pereat*. For *Chalybon* the manuscripts read *celitum* or *celerum* or *celorum*. Parthenius had printed Calphurnius' *telorum* without comment.[44] Poliziano produced the correct reading, the Greek genitive *Chalybon*, from a fragment of Callimachus' *Lock of Berenice* preserved in the scholia to Apollonius Rhodius. This is one of the three readings with which he is credited in Mynors' text.[45] After proposing his own solution he disposed of other possibilities:

> Atque hoc inscite legunt quidam Telorum. Vulgatissimi codices coelitum retinent contra etiam metri rationem. (*Misc.* 68)

Twice in the seven Catullan chapters of the *Miscellanea* Poliziano finds himself in the position of discussing interpretations which Parthenius had got into print first—in *Misc.* 83 on Cat. 74 and in *Misc.* 19 on Cat. 84.

The wit and obscenity in Cat. 74 depend on the identification of Harpocrates in line 4:

> Gellius audierat patruum obiurgare solere,
> si quis delicias diceret aut faceret.
> hoc ne ipsi accideret, patrui perdepsuit ipsam
> uxorem et patruum reddidit Harpocratem.
> quod voluit fecit: nam, quamvis irrumet ipsum
> nunc patruum, verbum non faciet patruus. (Cat. 74)

[44] According to Pucci, *telorum* should be attributed to Pontano. Richardson (above, note 33) 282.

[45] Poliziano's reading was in circulation before the publication of the *Miscellanea*: *Sed hanc scio nostram observationem iampridem esse pervulgatam, quum tamen a nobis ortam, vel ille ipse scit, qui vulgavit, libenterque etiam fatetur vir doctissimus undecunque Picus* (*Misc.* 68).

Parthenius' identification and glosses make the point explicit, demonstrating precisely how Gellius managed to secure his uncle's silence while he seduced his wife.

> *Reddidit Harpocratem* [74.4]. mutum fecit, silere coegit . . . Nam ut Plutarchus in oratione de Serapidis numine scribit Harpocrates ab Aegyptiis colitur deus silentii cuius numinis simulacrum digito labiis admoto figuratum indicat silentium . . .
> *Fecit quod voluit* [74.5]. Patruum silere coegit duplici modo scilicet et eius libidini satisfaciendo et mentula os obturando. Nam qui irrumatur et fellat tacere cogitur.

Little was left for Poliziano, but he made the best of the situation by devoting the bulk of his chapter to Harpocrates himself and citing sources as diverse as Plutarch, Ovid, Augustine, and the *Psalms*, including a citation in Hebrew. At the end he returns to Cat. 74:

> Ut ergo ad Catullianum Laelium[46] redeamus, scite ille quidem ne obiurgaretur a patruo, posthabita illius, quam comprimebat uxore, ipsum iam coepit irrumare patruum, eoque pacto tacere coegit, quoniam loqui fellator non potest. (*Misc.* 83)

Cat. 84 presented interesting problems in emendation and interpretation:

> *Chommoda* dicebat, si quando commoda vellet
> dicere, et insidias Arrius *hinsidias*.
> et tum mirifice sperabat se esse locutum,
> cum quantum poterat dixerat *hinsidias*.
> credo, sic mater, sic liber avunculus eius,
> sic maternus avus dixerat atque avia.
> hoc misso in Syriam requierant omnibus aures:
> audibant eadem haec leniter et leviter,
> nec sibi postilla metuebant talia verba,
> cum subito affertur nuntius horribilis,
> Ionios fluctus, postquam illuc Arrius isset,
> iam non Ionios esse sed *Hionios*. (Cat. 84)

The point of the epigram turns on the excesses of the aspirating Arrius, who betrays his origins by conscientiously and complacently misplacing his aitches. But the jest had been lost or obscured in the transmission of the text, for each of the words essential to the point (italicized above) appeared in the archetype V in its "correct," unaspirated form.[47]

[46] I.e., *Gellium*.

[47] See the *apparatus* of Mynors (above, note 3) or Thomson (above, note 2).

Calphurius corrected to *chommoda* in line 1, and changed the first *insidias* in line 2 to *hinsidias*. Parthenius emended to *hinsidias* in line 4 and printed *Hionios* in line 12.[48] His introduction to the poem and first gloss make the principal points.

> Arium verba latina barbare aspirando pronunciantem ac consonantes et vocales litteras pleno ac crasso spiritu magnoque aspirationis afflatu praeter grammatices rationem praeterque latinitatis usus cum intolerabili audientium fastidio proferentem ioco risuque Catullus insectatur. *Chommoda* [84.1]. Sic proferebat Arius prima consonante barbare aspirata. Veteres aspiratione litterarum parcissime usos scribit Quintilianus etiam in vocalibus quum aedos ircosque dicebant; diu deinde reservatum esse ne consonantibus spirent, ut in graccis et triumpis [ed. 1491, *triumphis*] . . . Qua de re ut idem Fabius Quintilianus scribit Catulli nobile hoc epigramma est. Plura in hunc sensum Cicero in oratore perite ut caetera conscribit.

In his chapter on Cat. 74 Poliziano had widened the discussion from the interpretation of the epigram (which Parthenius had printed first) to a general consideration of Harpocrates. He uses the same approach here, taking the occasion to combine his discussion of the epigram with an account of Latin aspirates. The title of *Misc.* 19 suggests equal emphasis on the two topics: *Super aspiratione citata quaepiam, simul enarratum Catulli nobile epigramma.* Nevertheless, Cat. 84 remains at the heart of the discussion, which he begins by quoting the same passage from Quintilian on aspirates cited by Parthenius, spelling out the identification of Quintilian's *nobile epigramma: Putamus autem epigramma citari hoc potissimum.* The text of Cat. 84 that accompanies his discussion is essentially the same as that of Parthenius, except that he has rearranged the verses, placing vv. 3–4 in their present position (in the course of transmission they had been dislocated and placed after line 10). He is credited with this emendation by modern editions. There is also an interesting minor change, which was not approved by subsequent editors: *requierant* to *requierunt* in line 7. The discussion on aspirates follows, which includes quotations from Cicero (mentioned but not quoted by Parthenius), Aulus Gellius, and Priscian. In *Misc.* 83 Poliziano had embellished his discussion with a quotation in Hebrew; here he fills out his literary citations with numismatic evidence:

> Sed et aureolum vidi equidem nuper apud Laurentium Medicen nomisma, cum titulo, Triumpus et item argenteum alterum, cum vulgatiore hoc, Triumphus. (*Misc.* 19)

[48] The change originated in θ. See Thomson (above, note 2).

But a discourse on aspirates, however embellished, was not Poliziano's main concern, for he returns to Cat. 84 as the climax of his argument:

> Quare si constare tibi Catulliani epigrammatis leporem voles aspirationem ipsam suo loco, quantum poteris, pronunciabis. (*Misc.* 19)

Poliziano's discussions of Cat. 74 and Cat. 84 were fuller and showed a wider and deeper learning than those of Parthenius. The fact remained, however, that Parthenius had published first. This annoying detail was not lost on Poliziano, and in both chapters he claims priority (without, of course, mentioning Parthenius). The claim is made rather briefly near the beginning of the discussion of Cat. 74 in *Misc.* 83:

> Quaesitum diu qui nam is foret Harpocrates, de quo mentionem et hoc loco [Cat. 74] faciat Catullus, et item in altero epigrammate [Cat. 102] . . . Nos tamen et Venetiis, et etiam Veronae (quod diximus) abhinc annos octo ferme de eo studiosis aliquot publice responsitavimus, quorum nunc testor fidem, conscientiamque sicui forte aliena adscribere, ac non mea potius mihi videro vindicare. (*Misc.* 83)

The sojourn in Venice and Verona belongs to the period from December 1479 to May or June 1480, some five years before the commentary of the Veronese scholar Parthenius.[49]

In the case of Cat. 84 (*Misc.* 19) the claim is more vehement; the witnesses whose *fides* he invokes are now named and the circumstances are fully described:

> Sed ista video iam sic innotuisse, ut aliena fortasse cuipiam videri possint: atqui tamen pene adhuc equidem adulescens, coram literatis aliquot, quos et meminisse arbitror, de hoc ipso loco ad Domitium Florentiae retuli, qui sic ei statim applausit, ut ingenue fateretur, se plus eo die ab uno scholastico didicisse, quam multis ante annis a quopiam professorum. Scit Aurelius Ariminensis (ut alios omittam) qui nunc Patavii degit, praestanti iuvenis et ingenio et literatura, quam multos abhinc annos, istam de nobis enarrationem Florentiae tum quidem agitans acceperit, quamque sit (ut idem postea Patavii narrabat) nova prorsus, ignotaque iam tum visa omnibus ad quos de ea. Catullum autem plane universum Veronae (scit hoc vir liberrimi ingenii Baccius Ugolinus) intra officinam quampiam, quo nos pluvia coegerat, viris aliquot literatis pene cogentibus, enarravimus: cum quidem illic adesse etiam Guarini propinquus, Ioannes Baptista (ni fallor) nomine, simulque Dantes quidam Alighierius, quintus ut aiebat, a Dante Florentino

[49] Maïer (above, note 4) 423.

> poeta, neque non duo, qui tum Veronae non indocti homines profitebantur, magnaque itidem scholasticorum manus, ita pronis auribus nostra illa qualiacunque accipientes, ut identidem clamarent, demissum coelitus Angelum sibi (sic enim aiebant) qui poetam conterraneum interpretaretur. Neque ob id istorum tamen commemini, quo inventa mea mihi denique uni, nullo in participatum recepto, tribui postulem (non enim sic mihi arrogo) sed ne quis forsan alienis laboribus me quasi corvum, aut vulturem relictis ab aquila cadaveribus putet vesci. (*Misc.* 19)

Poliziano interpreted Cat. 84, so he says, as a very young man when the famous Domitius Calderinus visited Florence; the year was 1473.[50] The performance in Verona was presumably in 1479–80, when he also explained Harpocrates.[51] Given the time and the place, it is at least possible that Parthenius was one of the audience; Poliziano is surely suggesting as much by including anonymously and somewhat contemptuously in his list of those present: *neque non duo, qui tum Veronae non indocti homines profitebantur.*

But we have not said enough about Poliziano's claim to have interpreted the poem in 1473. The date is suggestive, for it takes us back to the very young Poliziano and his marginalia to Catullus with their subscription of 1473. Can we verify any of Poliziano's assertions by recourse to the marginalia, or can we find a germ of any of the ideas that were to be fully developed in the *Miscellanea*? We must remember, of course, that Poliziano continued to add to his marginalia well into the 1480s and that dating and chronology are thus difficult to establish. Even so, the results are interesting. Five of the seven chapters devoted to Catullus in the *Miscellanea* have some clear precedent in the marginalia, and one more may possibly be anticipated.

First, the negative. There is no note on Cat. 17.19, which is discussed in *Misc.* 73, and the reading *separata* has not been changed to *expernata*, the suggestion in the *Miscellanea*. In the next case the evidence is appropriately ambiguous. This is *Misc.* 6, in which Poliziano expounded his notorious theory about Lesbia's sparrow, basing his obscene interpretation on an epigram of Martial:

> Da mihi basia,[52] sed Catulliana:
> Quae si tot fuerint, quot ille dixit,
> Donabo tibi passerem Catulli. (Mart. 11.6.14–16)

[50] Maïer (above, note 4) 122.

[51] This is borne out by the apparent reference to this discussion in the passage on Cat. 74 in *Misc.* 83: . . . *et item Veronae* (*quod diximus*).

[52] Poliziano is quoting Martial incorrectly, presumably to increase the parallel with Catullus: the second word in 11.6.14 is *nunc*, not *mihi*.

> Nimis enim foret insubidus poeta (quod nefas credere) si Catulli passerem denique ac non aliud quidpiam, quod suspicor, magis donaturum se puero post oscula diceret.

There is no corresponding gloss on Cat. 2–3. On Cat. 2.1 Poliziano says only: *de passere Catulli saepius meminerit Martialis*. And again, on Cat. 2.9–10: *Martialis Issa est passere nequior Catulli* [Mart. 1.109.1]. But on Cat. 5.7 under the heading *Martialis de basiis* he quotes two extracts from Martial, the second (and possibly a later addition)[53] the same verses from Martial cited in the *Miscellanea*. From the context it seems likely that at this point Poliziano was thinking only of kisses and not of an obscene sparrow, but the association of ideas (Martial, sparrow, kisses, Catullus) may have proved suggestive.

There is no such ambiguity about the other five chapters. The marginalia include a gloss on Cat. 98.4, the subject of *Misc.* 2. In the 1472 edition the line was printed: *culos et trepidas lingere carpatinas*. Poliziano has changed *trepidas* to *crepidas* and *carpatinas* to *carbatinas*, which he glosses with quotations from Aristotle, Greek bucolic poetry, and Lucian, all included in the *Miscellanea*.

Moreover, Poliziano's notes on Cat. 66.48 and 66.94 anticipate his textual remarks in *Misc.* 68 and 69. The note on Cat. 66.48 is largely illegible, but it begins clearly enough: *Chalybum legendum*. The next words are *puto id ex Callimachi*; the object of *ex* is too faint to read, as are the next two lines, which contain perhaps eight to ten words in all. Then it is possible to make out rather clearly: *Nam Apollonius Rhodius* (or *Apollonii Rhodii*), which is followed by half a dozen lines that have nearly vanished from the page. It seems a reasonable inference that the illegible portions contained both the quotation from Callimachus cited in the *Miscellanea* and a reference to the scholia on Apollonius Rhodius. On Cat. 66.94 there is a very faint note of several lines, glossing *Oarion*. Again, it is not possible to vouch for the entire contents of the gloss, but the word *Nicander* is legible, followed by:

> Βοιωτῷ τεύχουσα κακὸν μόρον Ὠαρίονι [Nic. *Ther.* 15]. Uarion puto scribendum quod ἀπὸ τῶν οὔρων, id est ab urina Iovis, Apollinis, et Neptuni sit natus.

The reference to the curious story of Orion's birth is a close translation of the scholia on the same verse of Nicander:

> Οὐαρίων δέ, ἐπειδὴ ἀπὸ τῶν οὔρων τοῦ Διὸς καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Ποσειδῶνος ἐγένετο.[54]

[53] The first extract (Mart. 6.34.7–8) is immediately below the heading. The lines from Mart. 11.6 are written on the right in a second column, in much darker ink. Here Mart. 11.6.14 is quoted correctly: *da nunc basia . . .*

[54] H. Keil, *Scholia in Nicandri Theriaca* [in O. Schneider, *Nicandrea Theriaca et Alexipharmaca* (Leipzig 1856)].

In both cases Poliziano's observations were to appear in a more developed form in the *Miscellanea*. In *Misc.* 68 the suggested reading is the Greek genitive plural, *Chalybon*, rather than the Latin *Chalybum*. In *Misc.* 69 *Oarion* is vindicated by recourse to Callimachus himself; the testimony of Nicander is secondary, and the comment of the scholiast is omitted. Here, too, Poliziano has changed his mind about the text, but in this case the change is apparently the result of new information. *Uarion* had commended itself to him on the evidence of the scholia, which actually included the word Οὐαρίων, but at some point after composing the gloss he found Ὡαρίων in Pindar, Eustathius, and (most important) Callimachus. We cannot be sure just when Poliziano changed his mind about Cat. 66.48 and 66.94, but it is perhaps important to note that he did not attempt to revise his glosses on the lines to make them consistent with the *Miscellanea*.

There is no note on Cat. 74.4, the subject of *Misc.* 83—only the lemma *Harpocrates*. But Harpocrates also appears in Cat. 102.4, and here there is both a lemma and a rather long note, which consists of a reference to the *Isis and Osiris* of Plutarch and Greek quotations from the sections referring to Harpocrates (358e, 377b–c, 378c). The sections are the same (and in the same order) as the passages from Plutarch cited in translation in *Misc.* 83 (where Plutarch was only one of several sources). It seems probable that the quotations from Plutarch were added after the lemma *Harpocrates*. The lemma appears in the margin approximately in the middle of the page next to the word *Harpocratem* in the text, but the quotation is placed above it, extending from the top of the page down to and past the lemma. Corresponding reference marks are placed next to the quotations and *Harpocratem* in the text, but none is near the lemma *Harpocrates*. It also seems a fair guess that the passage in the *Miscellanea* was taken from the marginalia, rather than vice versa. In both the quotation from *Isis and Orisis* 377b–c ends in mid-sentence: διὸ καὶ φακῶν αὐτῷ φυομένων ἀπαρχὰς ἐ[πιφέρουσι . . . (1472 ed., p. 34); *quo circa etiam lentis primitias illi offerri . . .* (*Misc.* 83). There are only nine more words in the rest of the sentence, but space was at a premium in the note, and they were easily omitted. But there was no such reason for omission in the *Miscellanea*, and it seems probable that Poliziano was translating from the Greek text of his note and simply forgot that it was incomplete.

In the case of Cat. 84, the subject of *Misc.* 19, Poliziano has added the aitches which give the poem its point and cited the corroborative passage on aspirates from Quintilian, but he has not indicated two of the textual changes shown in the *Miscellanea*: rearrangement of the verses, and emendation of *requierant* in 84.7 to *requierunt*. Moreover, his disposition of aspirates in 84.2 (*insidias arrius hinsidias*) differs from that printed in *Misc.* 19 (*hinsidias Arrius insidias*) and agrees with the choice of modern

editors. It seems clear that the notes to Cat. 84 antedate the *Miscellanea*; if not, surely Poliziano would have included these changes with the rest. In fact, all the evidence from the other parallel passages in the marginalia and the *Miscellanea* points in the same direction. In *Misc.* 73 Poliziano emended *separata* to *expernata*; the change is not registered in the notes, although nothing would have been easier. No reference to Martial's hair-raising epigram accompanies Cat. 2–3. In the cases of Cat. 66.48 and 66.94 the comments in the *Miscellanea* show increased knowledge and changes in the text that are not reflected in the notes. The gloss on Harpocrates in Cat. 102.4, itself probably later than the original lemma, seems to have been used as the source for part of Poliziano's much longer and fuller comments in *Misc.* 83.

The question of priority vis-à-vis Parthenius is more problematic. Poliziano's marginalia do contain the basic points at issue: the identification of Harpocrates, the citation of Quintilian, and the correct disposition of aspirates. It could still be argued, however, that Poliziano introduced these items into his notes after seeing Parthenius' text and commentary. Certainly, familiarity with Parthenius is demonstrated throughout Poliziano's textual notes, and there is no reason to insist that Parthenius's influence was limited to the text. Two small points may argue for Poliziano's independence, although they cannot prove it. First, the revised text of Cat. 84 in the marginalia is not identical to the text of Parthenius—witness 84.2, where Parthenius (following Calphurnius) aspirates the first *insidias* in the verse, Poliziano the second. Second, although Parthenius mentions Plutarch on Harpocrates, and Poliziano quotes Plutarch in some detail, the difference is that Parthenius' notes are on Cat. 74, whereas Poliziano's gloss is on Cat. 102—a bit surprising if he were merely copying from Parthenius.

The case for priority perhaps must remain unproven, but that is less important than the dispute itself and the evidence it provides for the history of Catullan exegesis in the late fifteenth century. Parthenius and Poliziano were the first modern interpreters of Catullus; it was natural that they should arrive at some similar conclusions, independently or otherwise; and it was inevitable (given the temperament of Poliziano and the climate of the age) that Poliziano should attack his predecessor whenever possible—both when he agreed with his ideas and when he did not. Poliziano's marginalia provide only ambiguous support for his claims of priority, but they are an important witness to his own development as a humanist: they allow us to see, although in unrefined and imperfect form, the germ of some of the interpretations that were to be fully expounded in the *Miscellanea*, and they reveal to what extent his textual studies profited from contemporary Catullan scholarship and anticipated that of the future. But perhaps it is best to let Poliziano himself have the last word. The following passage from the end of the *Miscellanea* (though

written in another context) seems a fitting comment on the *fortuna* of his Catullan studies.

> Et pereant, Donatus aiebat, qui ante nos nostra dixerunt. Nos ei prospera, faustaque precamur et cupimus, qui nostra post nos aut invenit, aut certe dixit. Tantum rogamus, ne pigeat in eorum consortium, quae tanto ante tam multi sub nobis excep-erunt et in quibus pro virili parte laboravimus, etiam nos sicuti partiario admittere, ne non amicorum sint (quod ait Euripides) cuncta communia.