WARBURG LIBRARY COMMONS | SCHOOL OF ADVANCED STUDY UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

[https://commons.warburg.sas.ac.uk/downloads/cc08hf642]

Gaisser, Julia Haig. *Pontano's Catullus.*

2015

Book Section

To cite this version:

Gaisser, J. H. (2015). *Pontano's Catullus* (pp. 53–91). Classical Press of Wales. www.classicalpressofwales.co.uk

Available at: https://commons.warburg.sas.ac.uk/concern/published_works/jq085k00g

Publisher's URL: www.classicalpressofwales.co.uk

Publisher: Classical Press of Wales

Date submitted: 2020-04-24

Copyright is retained by the author. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the User Deposit Agreement.

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 53

3

PONTANO'S CATULLUS[1]

Julia Haig Gaisser

The great Neapolitan humanist Giovanni Gioviano Pontano (1429–1503) studied and imitated many Latin poets, but he had a special predilection for Catullus. He imitated Catullus so creatively and extensively that he made poetry in the style of Catullus a recognizable and popular genre that would be written all over Europe for the next two hundred years.[2] In an early poem he explicitly presents himself as the new Catullus, claiming his model's charm and wantonness in hendecasyllabic verse.[3]

Numquid a Catullo
quemquam uideris esse nequiorem,
aut qui plus habeat procacitatis,
non dico tamen elegantiorem?
Sed certe meus hic libellus unum
doctum post sequitur suum Catullum
et Caluum ueteremque disciplinam.
Non multo minor est nouis poetis.
Saltat uersiculis canens minutis
hoc, quod non sonuere mille ab annis
Musarum citharae et Lyaei puellae.

(*Parthenopeus* 1.28.4–14)[4]

(Surely you won't have seen
Anyone naughtier since Catullus,
Or who has more wantonness –
To say noting of being more elegant?
But surely this tiny book of mine
Follows its learned Catullus alone
And Calvus and the ancient discipline.
It is not much less than the new poets.
It dances, singing in little verses this strain
that the Muses' lyres and the girls of Bacchus
have not sounded for a thousand years.)

But Pontano did not confine his interest in Catullus to imitation. He was not only a poet, but also a philologist, a literary critic, an essayist, a scribe,

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 54

an annotator, and an emender of texts, and he used all his talents in approaching Catullus. In what follows I will look for connections between his several methods, also drawing as necessary on his work on Propertius and Tibullus. In the process I hope to suggest what we can infer – or at least guess – about Pontano and the manuscripts he used for his work on Catullus.

In 1448 Pontano – not yet twenty – came to Naples from his native Umbria.[5] He soon found a friend in the courtier and humanist poet Antonio Beccadelli, called Panormita, who had become notorious over twenty years earlier for his obscene poetry book *Hermaphroditus*.[6] Within a year Pontano had produced a collection of salacious poetry in the style of his mentor: the *Pruritus* or 'Titillation'. The *Pruritus* is not preserved as a distinct collection, but Walther Ludwig has identified fifteen poems in Soldati's edition of Pontano as belonging to it.[7] In this early work, Pontano, like Panormita, imitated Martial and the *Priapea* and treated both homosexual and heterosexual themes. Unlike Panormita, however, he also imitated Catullus – knowledgeably, extensively, and creatively. Panormita mentions Catullus, but barely uses him. The *Hermaphroditus* contains only a handful of possible parallels, and of these only two or three are convincing.[8] Pontano, by contrast, constantly uses Catullus's vocabulary and turns of phrase. Ten of the fifteen poems of the *Pruritus* identified by Ludwig are in hendecasyllables, Catullus's most characteristic metre – which had not been used by Panormita.[9] Pontano would make this metre his own, developing it into the hypnotic and sensual hendecasyllables of his *Parthenopeus siue Amores* and much later *Baiae* – a verse 'more like Catullus than Catullus's, as Ernst August Schmidt has put it.[10] Pontano's diction and metre in the *Pruritus* are recognizably in the style of Catullus, but he does not write a detailed imitation of any given poem. He draws on Martial and the *Priapea* for obscene *color*, but conspicuously echoes Catullus's themes and phrases to announce his allegiance to the famous but as yet largely unstudied poet.[11]

A glance at the program poems Ludwig has identified as opening and closing the collection will demonstrate his method. Here is the opening poem:

Pruritum feret hic nouus libellus
Ad rubri luteum dei sacellum,
Qui semper puerisque furibusque
Minatur gladioque mentulaque.
At tu si sapias, caue, libelle.

(Pontano, *Appendix* 9 Soldati)

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 55

(This new little book will bring titillation
to the clay shrine of the ruddy god
who always menaces boys and thieves
with his sword and penis.
But you, little book, if you're smart, watch out!)

This first poem alludes both to the *Priapea* (note the 'ruddy god' in line 2), and to Martial, whose book so often takes on the character of a promiscuous young boy.[12] But its first line sends us straight to Catullus. The phrase *nouus libellus* evokes *nouum libellum* in Cat. 1 (and appears in the same position in the line).[13] For both poets the phrase is programmatic, proclaiming a new kind of poetry. Catullus claims novelty in his use of Alexandrian poetics, Pontano in his use of Catullus. *Pruritus*, the first word in the verse, announces the theme of the collection, for it evokes the central lines of Cat. 16, picking up *quod pruriat* (Cat. 16.9).[14]

Nam castum esse decet pium poetam
ipsum, uersiculos nihil necesse est;
qui tum denique habent salem ac leporem,
si sunt molliculi ac parum pudici,
et quod pruriat incitare possunt,
non dico pueris, sed his pilosis
qui duros nequeunt mouere lumbos.

(Catullus 16. 5–11)

(For it is right for the true poet to be chaste himself,
but not necessary for his verses to be so;
they only have wit and charm
if they are a little soft and not quite modest,
and can stir up sexual excitement –
I don't mean for boys, but for those hairy old men
unable to move their stiffened loins.)

These same lines of Catullus 16, as I argued many years ago, would become the cornerstone of Pontano's program for poetry written in the manner of Catullus: the idea that it should be titillating not just to boys, but also to sexually exhausted old men.[15] Pontano spells out this idea in the last poem of the *Pruritus*, which is entitled *Leonti Tomacelli sodali suo.* It begins:

Leon, delitium tui poetae,
Nostrum dum legis arrige ad libellum
Cuius nequitiae procaxque lusus
Possunt herniolam senis uoracis
Samarrae patris irrumationum,
Vel siquid mage languidum, incitare.

(Cortona, Bibl. Comunale MS. 84, 37v, verses 1–6)[16]

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 56

(Leonte, darling of your poet,
as you read, be aroused at our book,
whose naughtiness and wanton play
can stir up the ruptured limb of insatiable old
Samarra, the father of irrumation
– or anything even limper than that.)

Pontano's addressee in this poem is a young man, his friend Leonte Tomacelli.[17] Samarra, otherwise unknown, is identified as old. Both are to be aroused by the aptly named *Pruritus*. Forty years later Pontano, now an old man himself, would expand and develop the theme in his *Baiae*, emphasizing the power of poetry to create erotic adventures and arouse and please old men.[18] Appropriately enough, the dedicatee of that work is Marino Tomacelli, Leonte's brother and Pontano's lifelong friend, now cast as the old man to be aroused by poetry, just as over a generation earlier his brother had been cast as the young one.[19]

Catullus is virtually absent from Panormita's *Hermaphroditus*, but a major presence in Pontano's *Pruritus* – surely because Panormita did not have a manuscript of the poet and Pontano did. Catullus manuscripts were still hard to find in 1425 (the date of the *Hermaphroditus*), and Panormita complains of the fact in one of his poems.[20] They had become slightly more numerous by the end of the 1440s, and Pontano undoubtedly either owned or had access to one. This tantalizing fact raises several questions. Did Pontano bring a Catullus manuscript with him from the north, or did he find one in Naples? Was the manuscript he used for the *Pruritus* his only Catullus, or did he later acquire another? Did he even own a Catullus manuscript at this point, or merely use one belonging to someone else?

We might be closer to answering these questions if we understood the connection if any between Pontano and the manuscript of Catullus transcribed by Leonte Tomacelli, whom we have just seen addressed in the *Pruritus*. This manuscript, dubbed the Codex Tomacellianus by D.F.S. Thomson and James Butrica, is now in a private collection, but Butrica provided a description, and Dániel Kiss has recently studied it in detail.[21] The manuscript contains Catullus and his frequent companions, Propertius and Tibullus. Propertius and Catullus were transcribed by Leonte, and Tibullus by a scribe named 'Lutius', to be identified as Lucio da Visso, also called Lucio da Spoleto (d. at the end of 1439 or beginning of 1440), a friend and perhaps once tutor of Marino Tomacelli.[22] Two short notes in the manuscript sketch its early history, one written after the Propertius and Catullus portion, the other after Tibullus. After Catullus:

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 57

> Leo tomacellus scripsit et moriens dono dedit infelicissimo fratri marino tomacello inmonumentum perpetui meroris et luctus. (Codex Tomacellianus, fol. 134r.)[23]
>
> (Leonte Tomacelli wrote [this] and on his death left it as a gift to his unhappy brother Marino Tomacelli as a memorial of perpetual grief and mourning.)

After Tibullus:

> Scripsit Lutius. et dono dedit Adulescenti Illustri Marino Tomacello In monumentum et pignus fidei atque amoris in eum sui. (fol. 178r)[24]
>
> (Lutius wrote [this] and gave it as a gift to the noble youth Marino Tomacelli as a memorial and pledge of his loyalty and affection to him.)

The transcription of Tibullus must be dated before 4 January 1440 (the *terminus ante quem* of Lutius' death).[25] But the dating of Propertius and Catullus is less clear. In his first discussion of the manuscript (1984) Butrica suggested that Leonte might have copied the text of Propertius from a (now lost) manuscript brought to Naples by Pontano in 1448.[26] Much later (2002) he dated the Propertius to around 1445.[27] He did not date the Catullus. Kiss, however, has made a good case on codicological grounds for dating the transcription of Catullus after that of Propertius.[28] Following Butrica's early suggestion that Leonte transcribed Pontano's manuscript of Propertius, he suggests that he also copied a (now lost) manuscript of Catullus that Pontano had brought with him to Naples and places the *terminus post quem* for the transcription of both texts after 1448.[29] The only chronological points that we can be sure of, however, are that the Propertius was copied before the Catullus and that the transcription of both poets is to be dated between around 1440 or so and Leonte's death at an unknown date after 1453 or 1454.[30]

Our information about Leonte and his manuscript is little enough, but still suggestive when we combine it with what is known about Pontano and the Tomacelli. The fact that Leonte transcribed a text of Catullus adds point to his presence in the poem in the *Pruritus*. As we have seen, Pontano urges Leonte to be aroused by 'the naughtiness and wanton play' of racy verse, using him as a counterpart of the susceptible boys in Catullus. This is a generic role that could be assigned to almost any young man – and Pontano would soon give it to someone else, as we shall see presently. But Leonte is not just any young man; he is one with a special interest in Catullus, which is wittily acknowledged and complimented by the allusion to Catullus 16.[31] He is the addressee of Pontano's poem, but he may also be the dedicatee of the collection as a whole, as Ludwig very plausibly assumes.[32] If Ludwig is right, as I believe he is, the literary connection

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 58

between Leonte and Pontano becomes all the more important even if it is not clear what conclusion we should draw from it. There are three possibilities: (1) Pontano studied Leonte's manuscript of Catullus as he composed the *Pruritus*; (2) Pontano had a manuscript of Catullus that Leonte used as his exemplar; (3) the two simply shared an interest in Catullus and neither relied on a manuscript owned by the other. Given the state of our knowledge, the question must remain open. Kiss prefers the second possibility. But I am inclined to prefer the first: that Pontano used Leonte's manuscript. It is both the most economical (it does not require the very young and impoverished Pontano to arrive in Naples with his own manuscript), and it provides the neatest explanation of the compliment to Leonte, which was not noted by Kiss. Leonte Tomacelli died young and left the manuscript to his brother Marino, who remained Pontano's close friend for over fifty years.[33] Marino already owned the manuscript of Tibullus transcribed for him by Lutius; the legacy from Leonte would have given him Propertius and Catullus as well. Whatever its relation to the *Pruritus*, then, Leonte's manuscript, which after his death included all three poets, would have been available to Pontano throughout his lifetime.[34]

In 1450–51, barely two years after his arrival in Naples, Pontano accompanied Panormita on a long diplomatic mission to the north.[35] In 1451 they spent several months in Ferrara, where Pontano became friends with another precocious young poet, Tito Strozzi, to whom he addressed the same epigram in the *Pruritus* that he had already addressed to Leonte Tomacelli just a year or two earlier.[36] If we agree with Ludwig that Pontano had used the epigram to dedicate the *Pruritus* as a whole to Leonte, we can follow him in assuming that he was now using it to rededicate the collection to Strozzi.[37] The rededication was accomplished by changing the names in two lines of the poem. Here are the opening lines again (the alterations are shown in italics).

> Leon, delitium tui poetae, / *Facunde Tite, corculum Guarini,*
> Nostrum dum legis arrige ad libellum
> Cuius nequitiae procaxque lusus
> Possunt herniolam senis uoracis
> Samarrae patris irrumationum / *Aurispae patris irrumationum*,
> Vel siquid mage languidum, incitare.
>
> (Pontano, *Appendix* 8, Soldati)

'Leonte, darling of your poet' is replaced by 'Eloquent Tito, sweetheart of Guarino', and Samarra gives way to Aurispa. But the revision still makes Pontano's point about the ability of his poems to arouse both youth and

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 59

age. In 1451 Strozzi was twenty-seven, just a few years older than Pontano, while Aurispa would have been seventy-five.[38]

The rededication of the *Pruritus* commemorates a new association that would be fundamental to Pontano's poetic development. Pontano came to Ferrara primarily a poet of epigram, steeped in the *Priapea* and in the works of Panormita, Martial, and Catullus. He had drawn on Catullus's *elegiac poetry* in an early poem to Leonte Tomacelli (*Parth.* 2.11).[39] But his friendship with Strozzi, who had already established a reputation as an elegist in the tradition of Tibullus and Propertius, encouraged him to make elegy a major part of his repertoire. By the end of the decade, he had finished his second poetry collection, *Parthenopeus siue Amores*, and in 1460 he transcribed manuscripts of both Propertius and Tibullus. These two manuscripts are extant. The Propertius is now in Berlin (Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lat. fol. 500); the Tibullus is in Wolfenbüttel (Herzog August Bibliothek 82.6 Aug. 2°).[40] We will come back to them presently.

In the first part of this paper I have raised the possibility – it can be no more than that – that in composing the poems of *Pruritus* Pontano might have used the manuscript of Catullus transcribed by his friend Leonte Tomacelli. Whether he used the Tomacellianus or not, however, at some point Pontano owned and annotated a Catullus manuscript of his own. This manuscript dropped out of sight not long after his death. In what follows I will discuss the contemporary testimonia about the existence of the manuscript, the evidence for its readings in other scholars' notes or texts of Catullus, and how we might put that evidence together with clues drawn from other works of Pontano to see what we might infer – or speculate – about the contents and appearance of his manuscript.

First, the existence of the manuscript. Pontano died in 1503, leaving his books to his daughters, Eugenia and Aurelia. In 1505 Eugenia donated her books to the Convento di San Domenico Maggiore in Naples, and an inventory was made at the time.[41] Item 31 in the inventory is Propertius, clearly the manuscript in Berlin, since it is described as 'Propercium manu Pontani'. Item 15 is a manuscript of Tibullus and Catullus – that is, a single manuscript containing both poets. Although no one else seems to have worried about it, I find this very strange. We do have the Tibullus manuscript in Wolfenbüttel, of course, but did it ever contain a Catullus? The Wolfenbüttel manuscript contains the text of Tibullus, followed by that of the *Epistula Sapphus*. It has four gatherings of five folios followed by a single folio of a fifth gathering, whose second and any subsequent folios have been removed.[42] Could there have been a text of Catullus beginning on that second folio? Or did Pontano simply add – not a gathering – but

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 60

a single folio at the end of the manuscript in order to complete the text of the *Epistula Sapphus*? On the other hand, the Wolfenbüttel manuscript need not be the Tibullus of the inventory at all, for we must remember that the inventory represents only Eugenia's books – that is, only about half of Pontano's library. The Wolfenbüttel Tibullus might well have belonged to the other half. In any case, the Catullus manuscript of the inventory is lost, and so is any other Catullus that Pontano might have owned.

Further testimonia, however, appear from time to time until the middle of the sixteenth century. These are contained in three letters to the Roman humanist and bibliophile Angelo Colocci (1474–1549), who had a great interest in both Pontano and Catullus. The earliest reference is found in the dedication of the 1512 edition of Pontano's *De immanitate*. The author is Pietro Summonte, Pontano's literary executor, who says that – if Pontano's friend Jacopo Sannazaro agrees – he plans to bring to light 'some of Pontano's youthful trifles' (*iuueniles quosdam eius lusus*). He continues:

> quorum quidem suppuduisse hominem: illud declarat: quod eius rei nullam: dum uixit: mentionem unquam fecerit. Hi sunt exquisiti quidam commentarioli in Valerium Catullum: cuius illum constat iuuenem studiosissimum fuisse. Quod si iniuria mortuo fiat: edendis iis: quae ille contemnebat: quaeque a uiri grauitate aliena omnino uideri possint: audacia haec nostra legentium utilitate compensetur. Sunt enim talia: ut neminem omnino ea legisse poeniteat. (*De immanitate* 1512, Iv)[43]
>
> (The fact that he never mentioned it as long as he lived shows that he was a little ashamed of them. They are choice little notes (*commentarioli*) on Valerius Catullus, in whom it is well known that he took a great interest in his youth. But if a wrong should be done to the dead man by publishing what he disdained and what could seem altogether foreign to his dignity, this audacity of ours would be compensated for by the benefit to readers. Indeed, they are of a kind that no one at all would regret having read them.)

Summonte mentions the matter again at the end of a letter to Colocci in 1515. This time he is apologetic.

> Resta solamente rispondere ad Vostra Signoria in quel texto di Catullo, che è più tempo, mi domandò... Dico dunque non possere risolvere la Signoria Vostra per causa che non hò la opera del Pontano in poter mio... In summa uno anno combatto per havere tale opera, e mi è così discortesemente contesa, senza haversi rispecto ad chi li hà tucti questi scripti del Pontano, *idest* li archetypi, da manifesta perditione liberati.[44]
>
> (It remains only to reply to your lordship about that text (*texto*) of Catullus you asked me for a long time ago... I say, finally, that I cannot satisfy your lordship because I do not have the work (*opera*) of Pontano in my control... In short, I have fought for a year to get the work (*opera*), and have been

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 61

> rudely rebuffed without any consideration for the person who has saved all these writings of Pontano – the originals (*li archetypi*), that is, – from clear destruction.)[45]

In this letter Summonte does not refer to *commentarioli*, but uses the words *texto* and *opera*. *Opera* is vaguer than *commentarioli* but perhaps suggests notes or corrections, while *texto* probably refers to a manuscript of an author.[46] The third reference appears near the end of a letter to Colocci written in 1548, over thirty years later. The author is Traiano Calcia (ca. 1500–ca. 1551), who had studied with Summonte in Naples in the 1520s.[47] The reference begins:

> In poter mio si trovano alcune Annot[azioni] Summontiane, de mano sua, et un Commentario di Catullo, de mano propria del Pontano.[48]
>
> (I have in my control a few annotations of Summonte in his own hand, and a commentary on Catullus in the hand of Pontano.)

Calcia goes on to say that he acquired these works at great expense during the siege of Naples in 1528, that he has shown them to Lazzaro Bonamico and 'reverendo padre Meser d. Egnazio',[49] and that he hopes to have them published as soon as possible by Paolo Manuzio. Manuzio did not publish them, and this is the last we hear of Pontano's work.

These three letters to Colocci are both tantalizing and ambiguous, but we can put them together to obtain a coherent picture. In 1512 Summonte mentions 'youthful trifles' (*iuueniles...lusus*) and 'choice little notes' (*exquisiti...commentarioli*). In 1515 he speaks of the 'text of Catullus's (*texto di Catullo*) and 'the work of Pontano' (*la opera del Pontano*). In 1548 Traiano Calcia mentions 'a commentary of Catullus in Pontano's own hand' (*un commentario di Catullo, de mano propria del Pontano*). I believe that the differences in the descriptions arise from the different circumstances and purposes of their authors and that the three testimonia all refer to a single entity: a manuscript of Catullus with Pontano's autograph notes. In the 1512 dedication Summonte is speaking as Pontano's literary executor: he hopes to publish *Pontano's* work; Catullus's is not at issue. In the more personal letter of 1515, by contrast, Summonte is answering Colocci's specific request for Pontano's *text* of Catullus; he calls it 'the work of Pontano' because it contains Pontano's notes and corrections – and perhaps also because Pontano had transcribed the manuscript – a plausible idea, as I will suggest presently, but one for which we have no evidence except plausibility. Calcia in 1548, like Summonte in 1512, is interested in publication. At this date, another *text* of Catullus is unlikely to interest Manuzio or anyone else, so he puts all his emphasis on the notes, magnifying them from Summonte's modest *commentarioli* into a full-fledged *commentario*.

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 62

Evidence for the contents of the manuscript – and particularly its readings – has been sought in three sources: copies of the annotations of Francesco Pucci, a manuscript transcribed by Basilio Zanchi in 1520, and the Catullus commentary of Achilles Statius (1566). Each provides important clues, but none is wholly reliable. A partial collation of these sources is given in the Appendix.

Francesco Pucci (1463–1512), a generation younger than Pontano, became a member of his Academy in the 1480s and was mentioned prominently in several of his later works.[50] In 1502 he annotated the Reggio 1481 edition of Tibullus, Catullus, and Propertius, signing his work in a subscription at the end of Propertius. Pucci's original is apparently lost, but his notes were widely diffused in the sixteenth century, suffering both accretions and deletions as they were passed along.[51] I listed 18 copies in my article on Catullus for the *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum*.[52] Five more have been located in the interim, and there are undoubtedly more.[53] The copies Butrica considered closest to Pucci's original are Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana Edizioni rare 372 and Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale SQ X H 10, both copies of the Reggio 1481 edition.[54] The notes to Catullus in these two apographs are nearly identical, even in their placement on the page. I use these versions, henceforth denoted as f and n, as my principal source.

Pucci's subscription refers only to a manuscript of Propertius once owned by Berardino Valla and later by King Alfonso II of Naples.[55] It makes no mention of either Pontano or Catullus. Nonetheless, his notes are an obvious place to look for clues about Pontano's Catullus manuscript both because of his friendship with Pontano and because it is clear that he had studied Pontano's manuscripts of Tibullus and Propertius, as both B. L. Ullman and Butrica observed.[56] Some of Pucci's notes on these poets are his own; others come from various sources – including Pontano, whom he often copied verbatim. Sometimes he credits Pontano, but often he does not. In the case of Propertius, Butrica has noted that many conjectures now attributed to Pucci in fact originated with Pontano. For Tibullus and Propertius it is easy enough to see when Pontano is the source of an unattributed note since we have his manuscripts for comparison, but an unattributed note on Catullus is just that – an unattributed note – unless we can come at it in another way.

Unfortunately, although Pucci mentions Pontano with some frequency in his notes to Tibullus and Propertius, he names him just twice in the notes on Catullus in our two most authoritative copies, f and n: at 1.9 and 66.48 (see Appendix). At 1.9 he quotes Pontano's conjecture *quod ora per uirorum*. We will come back to this conjecture presently. At 66.48 he credits

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 63

Pontano with the reading *telorum* and Poliziano with the now universally accepted *Chalybon*:

> Juppiter ut telorum omne genus pereat. Ita reposuit Pontanus. Politianus ex Callimachi versiculo legebat Chalybon.[57]
>
> (Florence, Riccardiana Edizioni rare 372, fol. g 8r)

> Juppiter, may the whole class of weapons [*telorum*] perish. Pontano restored it this way. From a verse of Callimachus Poliziano read *Chalybon* [i.e., the whole race of the Chalybes].

The reading *telorum* probably did appear in Pontano's manuscript, but it is not certain that it originated with him, for it also appears in the editions of Giovanni Calfurnio (Vicenza 1481) and Antonio Partenio (Brescia 1485). Pontano could have added it to his manuscript after seeing it in Calfurnio or Partenio.[58]

Other copies of the notes attribute additional readings to Pontano. (See Appendix.) But in almost every case Pontano is credited in only a single copy, while in others the reading is attributed to Pucci, noted without attribution, or omitted altogether.[59] Two lone attributions, however, are worth noting: at 66.1 and after 34.2. (For the attribution of *suspexit* at 66.1, see on Zanchi below.) After 34.2 Antonio Petreio (in b) added 34.3 (*Dianae pueri integri*) to the text of his second Aldine (Venice 1515) with the note, 'Pon. ex u.c.', i.e., 'uetere codice' (Pontano from an ancient *codex*).[60] The added verse, although not printed in the second Aldine, was already well known. Palladio had printed it in his 1496 commentary, claiming (mendaciously?) to have seen it 'in an older exemplar'.[61] A few years later it was printed in the first Aldine (Venice 1502).[62] Recently, however, Dániel Kiss has also found the verse added in a fifteenth-century hand in Budapest, Széchényi National Library C.l.m.ae. 137, a manuscript once owned by Pontano's friend Antonello Petrucci (d. 1487).[63] The reading, then, has a Neapolitan provenance, and it is very likely that some form of it also appeared in Pontano's manuscript – whether or not he originated it. The probability is increased by its presence in the text of Basilio Zanchi's manuscript, where it is written (unfortunately without attribution) in the form in which it appears in modern editions: *Dianam pueri integri*.[64]

The readings noted at 1.9, 34.3, and 66.48 are all that we can attribute to Pontano's manuscript with any confidence from the apographs of Pucci's notes. But Pucci did not always credit Pontano in his notes on Tibullus and Propertius, and he probably did not always credit him in his notes on Catullus. We must also bear in mind that Pucci's own copy is lost, and that the surviving copies – some closer, some farther away from Pucci

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 64

himself, and often drawing on other sources – provide only indirect evidence of what was in Pontano's manuscript.[65]

The manuscript of Basilio Zanchi (ca. 1501–1558), however, seems to offer something much better – an actual transcription.[66] In 1520 Zanchi transcribed a text of Catullus. The manuscript is preserved in the Vatican Library (Vat. lat. 7044). Its flyleaf bears this inscription:

> Catullus Petrei [Sanchi] Bergomatis ex antiquissimo exemplari Jouiani Pontani diligentissime descriptus. M.D.XX Kal. Mart.
>
> (Vat. Lat. 7044, fol. Ir)[67]
>
> (The Catullus of Pietro [Sanchi] of Bergamo most carefully transcribed from the most ancient exemplar of Gioviano Pontano. 1 March 1520.)

Pietro of Bergamo is Basilio Zanchi, as a later note on the flyleaf attests.[68] In spite of its claims, however, Zanchi's manuscript raises more questions than it answers. The first question is simply how he gained access to Pontano's work. In 1520 Zanchi was a very young man. He had been brought to Rome by his father sometime in 1519, and had been there only a few months by 1 March 1520 when he wrote the subscription to Vat. lat. 7044.[69] Where did he see Pontano's manuscript? Did he study it in Naples, where Traiano Calcia would claim to have found it in 1528? Or was it for a time in Rome? Zanchi was rich and well connected, and he quickly made a name for himself as a poet.[70] We are even told that he was a member of both the Roman Academy and the Accademia Pontaniana.[71] If the manuscript was available, he probably could have had access to it. But if it was available to Zanchi, why not also to Colocci, who enjoyed a much more senior and exalted position in the same circles and was well known to be eager to see it? Rome in the early 1520s was full of closely connected poets and humanists, many of whom – including Colocci – seem to have been friends of the young Zanchi; but not one of them, so far as I know, mentions his use of Pontano's manuscript.

The picture is complicated by the fact that Zanchi also had access at some point to a version of Pucci's notes, for he is the annotator of va, Biblioteca Vaticana Barb. CCC.II.7. His signature, 'Petre(ius) Zanchus', appears on the recto of the last folio, as Giovanni Mercati observed.[72] The hand is the same as that in Vat. lat. 7044.[73] The relationship between va and the manuscript is unclear; their readings often but not invariably overlap (see Appendix). I have been unable to conclude that Zanchi was correcting one from the other, and I suspect that he did not study them together in any systematic way. The readings in Vat. lat. 7044 also do not map neatly on those attributed to Pontano in other versions of Pucci's notes or in the commentary of Achilles Statius, discussed below. Some readings credited

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 65

in Pucci or Statius are not in Zanchi's manuscript at all.[74] Some appear in the text.[75] Sometimes a reading from Pucci or Statius is written as a correction.[76] Sometimes it appears either in the text or as a correction but is crossed out and replaced with something else.[77] Zanchi's manuscript also includes six readings present in Pontano's *De aspiratione*, including two not found in Pucci or Statius.[78]

Perhaps Zanchi did transcribe Pontano's manuscript, as he claims in his subscription, in spite of the spotty match of his readings with those in other sources, and in spite of the worrying question of how he got access to Pontano's work. But even if he did, we are entitled to question his claim to have transcribed it 'diligentissime'. We cannot be confident that his manuscript fully reflects Pontano's text, and we may be sure that it tells us essentially nothing about Pontano's marginal observations, for it it is almost completely devoid of notes and glosses. Nonetheless, a few of Zanchi's readings deserve a closer look, for they may supply some clues about the relation of his manuscript to other texts, including Pontano's.

Zanchi mentions Pontano twice in his manuscript. At 1.9 his text reads *qualecunque per ora quod uirorum*. The note *Pon(tanus)* appears in the left margin; an alternate reading, *qualecumque quod o patrona uirgo*, appears in the right. The attribution to Pontano and the alternate reading are typical of the Pucci apographs.[79] But Zanchi's reading of the line is not.[80] It is the version Ermolao Barbaro (1492) reports hearing in the Roman Academy (*Castigationes Plinianae* ed. Pozzi 14.24).[81] Pucci's version is *qualecunque quod ora per uirorum*; and the same reading is reported by Aulo Giano Parrasio in his commentary (Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale MS. XIII. B12, fol. 4r).[82] Zanchi, transcribing his manuscript in Rome, followed the reading known in the Roman Academy rather than the Neapolitan version of Pucci and Parrasio, but we cannot be sure which was the reading of Pontano himself.

Zanchi also mentions Pontano at 84.11, where he corrects *Arrius isset* in his text to *appulit ipse*, crediting *Pont(anus)*. The reading, mentioned in only one copy of Pucci's notes and not at all in Statius, might very well have appeared in Pontano's manuscript, for he presented it in his discussion of Catullus 84 in *De aspiratione*.[83] Zanchi could have seen it in either place. At 34.3, as we saw above, Zanchi's text includes *Dianam pueri integri*, perhaps from Pontano's manuscript.

At 36.12 Zanchi's manuscript reads *Uriosque* – unremarkably, since this was the reading of *O* and *R* and of the fifteenth-century editions. It no doubt also appeared in Pontano's manuscript, but its presence there is virtually guaranteed by Zanchi's note in va correcting the first Aldine's *Eriosque* to *Uriosque*: 'Uriosque. legit Pontanus ab uriis montibus Apulie ubi fuit ueneris templum' (Pontano reads *Uriosque* from the Urian

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 66

mountains of Apulia where there was a temple of Venus). Zanchi's note may also have appeared in Pontano's manuscript, for it differs from the explanation of *Uriosque* in other copies of Pucci, which all speak of a place called Uria 'in the foothills of Garganus' (*in radicibus Gargani*) and mention no temple of Venus.[84]

At 66.1 Zanchi's text reads *suspexit*, which has been corrected to *dispexit*, the reading of the first Aldine (Venice 1502) that he annotated in va. There he added in the margin: '*suspexit*. pont. de asp.'. *Suspexit* is indeed in Pontano's text of *De aspiratione*, and it no doubt appeared in his manuscript as well.[85]

At 66.7 Zanchi writes *numine*, unremarkably, since it is the reading of the fourteenth-century manuscripts *O*, *G*, and *R*, and appears in many editions.[86] It is also the reading Pontano mentions in *De aspiratione*, and probably appeared in his manuscript.[87]

At 67.32 Zanchi originally wrote *Brixia Cycnea supposita in specula*, but *Cycnea* has been corrected to *Chinaea* or *Chinnea*.[88] The reading *supposita in specula* was printed in the first Aldine (Venice 1502), which Zanchi annotated in va.[89] But *Cycnea* seems to have its earliest attestation in Zanchi himself.[90] It appeared again in 1531, in a work entitled *De origine Orobiorum sive Cenomanorum Tres Libri* by Zanchi's brother, Giovanni Crisostomo Zanchi, who presents 67.32 in exactly the same form as in Zanchi's original text: *Brixia Cycnea supposita in specula*. Giovanni Crisostomo comments:

> Quo dicto declarare nobis uoluit poeta lepidissimus principem illius arcis summo in collis cacumine positae, fundatorem, ac conditorem fuisse Cydnum illum Liguris filium quem Graeci Cycnum uocant...quippe quae...proprio nomine ab autore Cycnea specula cognominaretur, ut habent nonnulla haud contemnendae uetustatis exemplaria, non autem Cichonia, aut Chinnea, quod in libris minus accurate scriptis reperiri solet.[91]
>
> (Saying this, the charming poet wants to tell us that the first founder and builder of that citadel placed on the highest peak of the hill was that well known Cydnus son of Ligur, whom the Greeks call Cycnus...since the Cycnean hilltop [*Cycnea specula*] was called by the proper name from its founder.[92] This is the reading of several texts of respectable antiquity, not *Cichonia* or *Chinnea*, which is generally found in carelessly written books.)

The comment is instructive. Giovanni Crisostomo almost certainly took 67.32 from his brother's manuscript. Since this work, transcribed just eleven years earlier, could scarcely be described as 'of respectable antiquity' even by the generous standards of the Renaissance, *Cycnea* must derive from a much earlier manuscript, and the obvious candidate is Pontano's.[93] At some point, however, either Zanchi or a later annotator must have lost confidence in *Cycnea*, replacing it with *Chinaea* as in the first Aldine

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 67

(Venice 1502) or even *Chinnea*, one of the readings explicitly disdained by Giovanni Crisostomo.

At 69.6 and 71.1 Zanchi writes *halarum* for *alarum*: *valle sub halarum* (69.6) and *sacer halarum* (71.1). *Halarum* does not appear in Pucci or Statius. Zanchi's source must be Pontano, who uses the aspirated form when he quotes 69.6 in *De aspiratione*: 'Aspiramus etiam *halitus* et *exhalo*: necnon et *hala* pro eo quod ait Oratius: *Hirsutis cubat hircus in halis* [*Epode* 12.5] et Catullus: *Valle sub halarum trux habitare caper*'. (We also aspirate *halitus* and *exhalo*, also *hala*, to judge from what Horace says: 'a goat couches in his hairy armpits'; and Catullus: 'a savage goat dwells in the valley of your armpits'.) Pontano's manuscript no doubt read *halarum* at both 69.6 and 71.1.

At 84.1 Zanchi's text reads *chommoda* as in Pontano's *De aspiratione*. In 84.2, his text, along with many editions, originally read *dicere et hinsidias Arrius insidias*. The line has been corrected to *dicere et insidias Arrius hinsidias*, as in *De aspiratione*. *Chommoda,* along with the correction *hinsidias*, absent from Pucci's notes, undoubtedly appeared in Pontano's manuscript (see Appendix and discussion of *De aspiratione* below).

Zanchi's manuscript makes only a very small contribution to our search for the probable contents of Pontano's. It confirms the readings we have already noted at 1.9 and 34.3 (although at 1.9 he follows the Roman rather than the Neapolitan version of the line) and adds those at 36.12, 66.1, 66.7, 69.6, 71.1, 84.1, 84.2, and 84.11. (The reading at 67.32, *Cycnea*, is more problematic, as we shall see in the discussion of Statius below.) Putting Zanchi's (obvious) reading of *Uriosque* at 36.12 together with his note in va, we can be fairly confident of one of Pontano's annotations.

For the bulk of Pontano's readings we must turn to Achilles Statius (Aquiles Estaço, 1524–1581), who provides the most detailed (and seemingly authoritative) testimony. But Statius is also a problematic witness, for he published his commentary on Catullus only in 1566 – nearly twenty years after the last reported sighting of Pontano's manuscript.[94] What was his source? I do not believe that he had Pontano's manuscript, or he would have said so, for he was meticulous in citing his Catullus manuscripts.[95] He must have relied on an intermediate witness – perhaps the original of Pucci's notes or even a manuscript or edition with attributions to Pontano. We cannot assume that his source (or sources) were correct in every case, and we must try to look for probabilities as we did in the cases of Pucci and Zanchi. The fact that Statius always discusses his readings may help in evaluating their attribution.

Statius attributes thirteen readings to Pontano.[96] All but one (67.32,

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 68

Chinaeae) appear in at least one of the surveyed copies of Pucci's notes. Only five (marked with asterisks) are found in Zanchi's manuscript.

22.13 tritius
30.6 dic
61.151 sine seruiat
* 64.21 sanxit
64.37 Pharsalum
* 64.212 castae
64.387 a fulgente
* 66.25 atqui
* 66.91 votis
66.93 cur retinent
67.32 Chinaeae
67.32 supposita speculae
* 67.44 speraret

At 22.13 Statius supports the conjecture *tritius* for *tristius* in 'all the manuscripts', attributing it to Pontano and others. He considers it appropriate for an urbane wit (*scurra*) and finds a parallel usage in Demosthenes.[97] The reading may well have been in Pontano's manuscript, for it has Neapolitan associations; it also appears in London, British Library Harley 2574 (ca. 1460), which contains – in addition to Catullus, Propertius, and Tibullus – Pontano's *Parthenopeus* and other Neapolitan poems.[98] Since the reading had some currency in the sixteenth century, Statius could not associate it with Pontano alone; hence he attributes it to 'Pontano and others'.[99]

At 30.6 Statius explicitly credits *dic* to Pontano ('Pontano wrote *dic* for *dico*').[100] The reading is found in many copies of Pucci (see Appendix) and was printed in Avanzi 1535. It might or might not have appeared in Pontano's manuscript.

At 61.151 Statius gives some support to the conjecture *sine seruiat*, which he attributes to Pontano.[101] The reading was printed in Parthenius, Palladius, and Guarinus and appears in many copies of Pucci (see Appendix). It might or might not have appeared in Pontano's manuscript.

At 64.21 Statius attributes *sanxit* to Pontano: 'Pontano, however, changed *sensit* to *sanxit*, which is not in the manuscripts'.[102] The reading is found in many copies of Pucci (see Appendix). It might or might not have appeared in Pontano's manuscript.

At 64.37 Statius attributes the emendation *Pharsalum* to Pontano: 'Pontanus took metrical quantity into account and plausibly read *Pharsalum*.'[103] The reading is absent from Zanchus' manuscript and appears in only one of the copies of Pucci surveyed, ve2, which may depend on

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 69

Statius. Statius' explanation ('he took quantity into account') suggests possible direct knowledge of Pontano's motive for the emendation and may even reflect a note in his manuscript.

At 64.212 Statius strongly disapproves of the conjecture *castae* for *classi*, blaming Pontano for the change: 'Pontano gave himself the license of deleting what he did not approve of in someone else's work and replacing it with his own idea, and so he made it *castae* instead of *classi*'.[104] He goes on to cite examples of the form *classi* for *classe* in several authors, including Catullus himself.[105] *Castae* appears in all the surveyed copies of Pucci, as well as in Zanchi, where *classi* in the text has been corrected to *castae*, and then back to *classi* (see Appendix). *Castae* might or might not have appeared in Pontano's manuscript, but Statius' citation of parallels for *classi* as an ablative suggests that he is countering an argument for *castae* made by its author, and gives a little support to the idea of its having appeared in Pontano's manuscript, perhaps with a note of explanation. The gloss, 'i.e. *Mineruae*', which accompanies *castae* in several copies of Pucci, might also have appeared in Pontano.[106]

At 64.387 Statius disapproves of *templo a fulgente*, which he attributes to Pontano: '*Templo in fulgente*. So also in all the manuscripts. Pontano made it *a fulgente*. But the former should certainly be retained so that he (i.e., Jupiter) might see the annual sacrifices being made to him in his shining temple'.[107] *A fulgente* appears in most of the surveyed copies of Pucci (see Appendix), often with a note glossing *templo a fulgente*: 'that is, "from the sky," for so Ennius called it, too'.[108] The change and explanation are ingenious but erroneous, for, as Statius clearly understands, the point of the passage is the former association of the gods with mortals on earth. Jupiter witnessed the sacrifices in his temple, not from the sky. It is possible that *a fulgente* appeared in Pontano's manuscript, but the odds may be slightly against it. The learned reference to Ennius is in his style, but he was both a poet himself and a fine reader of poetry; it would be a little surprising if he had so completely missed the point of the passage.

At 66.25 Statius approves *atqui*: '*Atqui* should certainly be read, as Pontano proposed it should be read. In the manuscript it was *atque*'.[109] *Atqui* appears in most of the surveyed copies of Pucci and in Zanchi (see Appendix). It might or might not have been in Pontano's manuscript.

At 66.91 Statius attributes *uotis* to Pontano: 'In the manuscripts it is both *nostris* and *uestris* instead of *uotis*. Pontano made it *uotis*, ingeniously, to be sure, but perhaps *uerbis* should be read instead'.[110] *Votis* is not Pucci's reading (see Appendix).[111] It appears in Parthenius (1485) and in the first and second Aldines. It is entirely possible that it appeared in Pontano's manuscript, whether or not he originated it.

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 70

At 66.93 Statius discusses *cur retinent*, pointing out that *cur* (or in one case, *cum*) *iterent* appeared 'thus in the manuscripts'.[112] He continues: 'Whether it was Pontano or someone else, learned men read *cur retinent*. Later others followed it'.[113] *Retinent* is almost certainly not Pucci's reading; it is lacking in f and n and in most of the copies surveyed (see Appendix).[114] Given its absence from Pucci, it may well have appeared in Pontano's manuscript, whether or not he originated it.

At 67.32 Statius approves *Brixia Chinaeae supposita speculae*, which he attributes to Pontano. 'In all the manuscripts, *suppositum specula*. It seems that one should read, as Pontano also proposed, *Brixia Chinaeae supposita speculae*'.[115] We will consider the readings *Chinaeae* and *supposita speculae* separately.

Chinaeae is not Pucci's reading, and according to Dániel Kiss's census, it appears first in Muret (1554).[116] It certainly could have appeared in Pontano's manuscript. On the other hand, Zanchi's manuscript and the testimony of his brother Giovanni Crisostomo have raised the possibility that Pontano read *Cycnea*.[117] *Chinaeae* has the authority of Statius, *Cycnea* the more interesting pedigree. But even if Statius is mistaken about *Chinaeae* – a possibility since his real interest seems to be *supposita speculae* – *Cycnea* is incompatible with *speculae*. Pontano cannot have read both unless all his considerable metrical faculties were asleep; either he would have read *Cycneae* (as in modern editions) or he would have given the line as in Zanchi: *Brixia Cycnea supposita in specula*.

Supposita speculae appears in almost all the surveyed copies of Pucci (see Appendix). It might or might not have been Pontano's correction or have stood in his manuscript, but Statius is very definite in his attribution, and modern editors have agreed with him.[118] If we agree, too, then *Chinaeae* seems to have a slight edge over *Cycnea* as Pontano's.

At 67.44 Statius attributes *speraret* to Pontano. 'In all the manuscripts, *Speret nec linguam esse, nec auriculam*. But so that the verse would scan, Pontano first, I believe, made it *speraret*'.[119] *Speraret* was read by Calfurnio in the Vicenza 1481 edition, and it also appears in copies of Pucci, including f and n (see Appendix). But Statius is inclined to believe that Pontano was the *first* to make the emendation, and that he did so for metrical reasons. The reading almost certainly appeared in his manuscript, whether he originated it or took it from Calfurnio's edition.

It is entirely possible that Statius is correct in every case and that we could expect to see all his readings in either the text or the notes of Pontano's manuscript, but his attributions seem to merit different degrees of confidence. Pontano's manuscript almost certainly contained the readings at 22.13, 64.37, 66.91, 67.32 (*supposita speculae*), and 67.44. There is

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 71

an excellent chance that 64.212 and 67.32 (*Chinaeae*), appeared in the manuscript, an even chance for 30.6, 61.151, 64.21, 66.25, 66.93, and perhaps a little less probability for 64.387. We might also expect to see metrical notes accompanying 64.37 and 67.44, perhaps a grammatical and explanatory gloss on 64.212, and a citation from Ennius on 64.387 (if indeed the reading is Pontano's).

The works of Pucci, Zanchi, and Statius have provided important clues about fifteen or so readings and a few notes that we might expect to find in Pontano's manuscript, but Pontano himself is also a valuable source. In *De aspiratione* he quotes and discusses several passages in Catullus. At least one of his poems contains an important clue to a marginal note. Two or three other poems, as Kiss has recently argued, suggest that he was the author of the conjecture *papillae* at 55.17; the word surely would have appeared in his manuscript.[120] The annotations in his manuscripts of Tibullus and Propertius suggest the *kind* of notes he might have added to his Catullus.

There is every reason to think that the passages Pontano discussed in *De aspiratione* appeared in his manuscript. Six of the readings in *De aspiratione* were picked up by Zanchi, as we have seen: *suspexit* at 66.1, *numine* at 66.7, *halarum* at 69.7, *chommoda* at 84.1, *hinsidias* at 84.2, and *appulit* at 84.11. At 37.10 Pontano read *scipionibus*, perhaps from a manuscript.[121] The reading is printed in many editions, including the *princeps* (Venice 1472). In another discussion Pontano observes that sometimes a short syllable is lengthened before a caesura, giving as one of his examples Cat. 62.4, where *-ur* is long before the fifth-foot caesura: *iam ueniet uirgo iam dicetur hymenaeus*.[122] We might expect to see a corresponding note in his manuscript, especially since another of his examples of the phenomenon, Tib. 1.7.61, is marked in his Tibullus manuscript.[123] Much more important, however, is his discussion of Cat. 84, the epigram in which Catullus pokes fun at Arrius for his misplaced aitches. All the excessive aitches had fallen out of the text in the course of transmission, but Pontano remembered Quintilian's discussion of over-aspiration and his reference to Catullus's epigram on the subject (*Inst. Or.* 1.5.20). He recovered the point of the epigram, restoring the four lost aitches: in *chommoda* (first word in 84.1), *hinsidias* (last word in 84.2), *hinsidias* (84.4), and *Hionios* (last word in 84.12).[124] He surely added the relevant aitches to his manuscript along with a reference to the passage from Quintilian and separated the epigram from Cat. 83 (the two had been transmitted as a single poem). Scholars have often believed Angelo Poliziano's claim to have been the first to make the corrections, but the honor clearly belongs to Pontano. Poliziano asserted his claim in 1489 in *Miscellanea* 1.19, and the corrections appear in his annotations in the first

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 72

edition (Venice 1472).[125] Nonetheless, Pontano was first, and Poliziano undoubtedly knew it. Although *De aspiratione* was printed only in 1481, Pontano wrote it in the 1460s, and a copy was circulating in Florence in 1467 – that is, at least five years before Poliziano began to annotate his copy of the first edition and over twenty years before he published the idea in the *Miscellanea*.[126]

In an early poem Pontano anticipated another idea generally attributed to Poliziano, the obscene interpretation of Catullus's sparrow. Poliziano published the interpretation in *Miscellanea* 1.6, but as Ludwig observed, Pontano had the idea forty years earlier and spelled it out in a poem in the *Pruritus* (later brought into *Parthenopeus* as poem 1.5).[127] Given Pontano's fondness for quoting parallels in his marginalia, we could expect to see a reference in his Catullus manuscript to the obscene sparrow of Martial 11.6, which surely provided the inspiration for his poem.

Pontano transcribed his manuscripts of Tibullus and Propertius in 1460 and added annotations to them for many years. These manuscripts give us an opportunity to imagine the appearance of his Catullus manuscript and the kind of annotations it might have contained. They also demonstrate how selective Pucci was in attributing ideas to Pontano and strongly suggest that Pontano deserves the credit for many of the unattributed notes in Pucci's Catullus, although we cannot know exactly which ones.

Pontano's notes in the manuscripts of Tibullus and Propertius are worth more scrutiny than they have yet received. Text critics have studied the textual corrections in both manuscripts. Butrica, in particular, made a detailed study of Pontano's contributions to the text of Propertius.[128] But there is also much to be done with his other notes – not to emend the text of Tibullus or Propertius, but to gain some understanding of what Pontano thought about them. I am interested in the historical and linguistic points he needed to explicate in order to read the poets, as well as how he used one poet to understand another and how his reading contributed to his own poetry. How does his reading of Propertius intersect with that of Tibullus? How does his reading of both poets intersect with that of Catullus – and of all the other poets he loved so well? Can we connect any annotations with Pontano's own poetry? A full exploration of these questions must wait for another occasion. For now we must keep our attention firmly on Catullus, and I can just scratch the surface of these matters, looking briefly at a few notes in each manuscript.

The notes in the two manuscripts present a similar appearance. They are often written in the shape of an inverted triangle, frequently with a small squiggle at the apex.[129] Verses are often marked with a wavy line

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 73

surmounted by three dots; frequently the passages so marked express truisms or generic sentiments.[130]

In the Tibullus manuscript, as Ullman points out, Pontano signed four of his notes – no doubt because he regarded them as a unique contribution and wanted to lay claim to them.[131] They are varied in nature: legal, historical, geographical, and metrical. On 3.11.4, for example, there is a signed note on the second *e* in *dederunt*. 'The ancients often shortened this syllable', Pontano observes, and he goes on to give citations from Vergil and Lucretius.[132] This case is doubly interesting. *Dederunt* is Pontano's correction (the traditional text read *dederant*); and he has used his considerable metrical skill to make it. Pucci picks up the correction, but without the metrical note or any mention of Pontano.[133] Pontano's note on this passage is typical of his close observation of metrical quantity throughout both manuscripts and reminds us that he was no mere 'scanner', but a practicing poet. He also displayed his poetic skills by writing supplements to five lacunae in the text.[134] He apparently composed his supplements at various times (or with various degrees of confidence), for while three are written in the text, two appear only in the margin.[135] Pucci gives all five supplements in his notes and attributes them to Pontano.[136] In another note Pontano seems to question the authorship of Tibullus, book three, commenting:

> Hic liber est de amoribus ligdami et neerę. et enim Tibullus amauit solum deliam et nemesin. quod ouidius ostendit. et hic ipse facit ligdami mentionem. (Herzog August Bibliothek, 82.6 Aug. 2°, fol. 24r.)
>
> (This book is on the loves of Lygdamus and Neaera. For in fact, Tibullus loved only Delia and Nemesis. Ovid demonstrates this; and this [book] itself mentions Lygdamus.)

Pucci paraphrases the note but without mentioning Pontano:[137]

> Hic liber inscriptus uidetur Lygdami nomine, qui amabat Neęram. Alioqui Ouidius amicas Tibulli solas duas Deliam agnoscit et Nemesim.
>
> (This book seems to be signed with the name of Lygdamus, who loved Neaera. Besides, Ovid recognizes only Delia and Nemesis as Tibullus' girlfriends.)

Pontano annotated his Propertius manuscript far more copiously than he did the Tibullus. The notes are extensive enough to earn him the title of Propertius' earliest commentator in Thomson's recent article in *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum*.[138] None of the notes in the Propertius manuscript is signed – an interesting difference from Pontano's treatment of Tibullus. But in other respects the two sets of notes have much

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 74

in common, including an interest in metrics and frequent citations of other poets.

One of the most interesting notes from a literary point of view appears on Propertius 3.8.9–10. The elegist happily reminds Cynthia of her angry attack on him the night before, gloating:

> nimirum ueri dantur mihi signa caloris:
> nam sine amore graui foemina nulla dolet.
>
> (quoted from Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Lat. fol. 500, fol. 40r)

> (Certainly I am given signs of real passion,
> for no woman is aggrieved without great love.)

Pontano marks the generic statement of the pentameter with three dots and a wavy line and glosses the couplet with a quotation from Cat. 92 with the heading: '.Cat.'.

> Lesbia mi dicit semper male nec tacet unquam
> de me. Lesbia me dispeream nisi amat.
>
> (Cat. 92.1–2, quoted from Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Lat. fol. 500, fol. 40r)

> (Lesbia always criticizes me and never keeps quiet
> about me. May I perish if Lesbia doesn't love me.)

The sentiments of the two poets are similar, and Pontano the scribe and annotator has seen that both Propertius and Catullus treat the woman's anger as a sign of her love. But Pontano the *poet* uses the other half of Catullus's epigram.

> quo signo? quia sunt totidem mea: deprecor illam
> assidue, uerum dispeream nisi amo.
>
> (Cat. 92.3–4)

> (On what evidence? Because my actions are just the same.
> I constantly disparage her, but may I perish if I don't love her!)

Catullus's poem is about the emotions of both lovers – not just the woman. The actions and feelings of Lesbia and Catullus mirror each other, and repeated language emphasizes the similarity. The end of the second couplet echoes that of the first; compare *dispeream nisi amat* (92.2) and *dispeream nisi amo* (92.4).

In *Parthenopeus* 1.21 Pontano builds on the second couplet of Cat. 92: the idea that the *poet's* verbal abuse is a sign of his love. As in the epigrams of the *Pruritus* that we looked at above, he takes an idea from Catullus but moves it in a direction of his own.

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 75

Cum me cogit amor quicquam maledicere de te,
dispeream, si non, Cinnama, discrucior;
discrucior, uerum tanto succendor amore,
ut peream, si non, quae uelit ira, loquor.
Poena tamen praesto est; nam uixdum lingua locuta est,
cum mihi fit subito flebile cordolium,
poenitet et caram dictis laesisse puellam[139]
ac misero in lacrimas uertitur ira mihi.

(When love forces me to speak harshly of you,
may I perish if I am not in torment, Cinnama.
I'm in torment, but on fire with so much love
that I would die, unless I say what my anger requires.
But the punishment is at hand. For the words are barely out of my mouth,
when I am suddenly heartsick;
I regret wounding the dear girl with my words,
and in my misery, anger is turned to tears.)

The mood here is very different from the wry satisfaction in Catullus – or the happy triumph of Propertius, for that matter. Pontano's attention is all on his own feelings – not on the woman's; and the prevailing emotion is acute distress – torment. But Cat. 92 is not Pontano's only intertext. The repeated *discrucior* recalls the conflicting emotions of Cat. 85.

Odi et amo. quare id faciam, fortasse requiris.
nescio, sed fieri sentio et *excrucior*.

(I hate and I love. Perhaps you ask why I do this.
I don't know, but I feel it happening and I am in torment.)

Pontano has used Cat. 92 as both a scholar and a poet – quoting one half of it as a parallel to Propertius in his commentary, and using the other half in an epigram of considerable artistry and emotional complexity. Given the chronology (the *Parthenopeus* was probably completed before Pontano transcribed the Propertius), we have to imagine that Catullus's verses inspired Pontano on two separate occasions, first suggesting the idea for his poem and later occurring to him as a parallel to Propertius as he annotated his manuscript.

Pontano's manuscripts of Tibullus and Propertius give a general idea of the appearance and contents of his manuscript of Catullus. It probably contained the characteristic triangular notes, dots and squiggles, textual corrections, parallel passages, historical and mythological notes. It surely also had copious metrical notes – many more than the Tibullus or Propertius. Catullus's varied metres presented great difficulties to the humanists, and Pontano took what we could call a professional interest in

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 76

the subject. It is at least plausible, though not provable, that his manuscript might have resembled the Tibullus and Propertius even more closely than I have suggested – for it is possible that he transcribed it himself, and perhaps even around the same time, as a companion to the other poets.

Although Pontano's Catullus manuscript is lost, his contemporaries and sixteenth-century successors have preserved some of his readings and interpretations (how correctly we cannot always be sure), and Pontano's own works have provided important clues about its contents. The manuscript itself would be of great interest – not so much for the merits of its text, to which Pontano seems to have made only a relatively small contribution, as for the light it could shed on the ways in which a great poet and humanist studied his ancient predecessor. Pontano felt that he had a great affinity with Catullus, and his contemporaries agreed. The perceived kinship is most strongly exemplified by the reception of the one note that almost everyone attributed to him – the rewriting of Cat. 1.9 (*qualecunque quod ora per uirorum* or *qualecunque per ora quod uirorum*), which made Catullus's prayer for poetic immortality recall the similar claim of Ennius.[140]

> Nemo me lacrimis decoret nec funera fletu
> faxit. Cur? Volito uiuus *per ora uirum*.
>
> (Ennius, 2.9–10, Warmington)
>
> (Let no one glorify me with tears or conduct my funeral
> with wailing. Why? Living, I fly about on the lips of men.)

The line is in the same spirit as Pontano's supplements to Tibullus, although it gained much greater currency. Although it was long abandoned by the time of Statius and can be found in the *apparatus criticus* of no modern edition, it was quoted approvingly in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, printed in the Aldines, and cited by Pucci, as we have seen.[141] We have two fine testimonials of it by Neapolitan humanists of the next generation. Aulo Giano Parrasio quoted it in his unfinished commentary on Catullus.[142]

> Nec omittam quae acri ingenio grauique iudicio poeta Pontanus emendabat: *qualecunque quod ora per uirorum*. Quod ipse Catullus etiam si suum non sit pro suo libenter agnoscat.
>
> (Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS. XIII. B. 12, fol. 4r)
>
> (Nor should I omit the emendation of Pontano, a poet of keen intellect and authoritative judgement, *qualecunque quod ora per uirorum*, which (even if it is not his) Catullus would gladly claim as his own.)

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 77

Parrasio, it should be noted, identifies Pontano not as a scholar but as a poet. His closing words ('Catullus, even if it is not his, would gladly claim it as his own') echo a poem by Pontano's friend Iacopo Sannazaro.

Doctus ab Elysia redeat si ualle Catullus
ingratosque trahat Lesbia sola choros,
non tam mendosi moerebit damna libelli
gestiet officio quam Iouiane tuo.
Ille tibi amplexus, atque oscula grata referret,
mallet et hos numeros quam meminisse suos.

Iacopo Sannazaro, *Ep.* 1.13

(If learned Catullus should return from the Elysian vale,
and his unequaled Lesbia come bringing her ungrateful followers,
he will not grieve so much for the damage of his blemished book
as he will exult in your service, Jovianus.
He would repay you with embraces and grateful kisses,
and he would rather remember these measures than his own.)

Sannazaro's epigram is a compliment to Pontano's rewriting of 1.9, but it is also something more: an elaborate tribute to his friend's artistic kinship with Catullus. In the first couplet Catullus is pictured as coming back from the Elysian vale to greet Pontano and address him as an equal. The second couplet has an intertext, appropriately enough, from Catullus, and, also appropriately enough, on communication between the dead and the living. Sannazaro alludes to the following lines in Cat. 96, addressed to Calvus on the death of his beloved Quintilia:[143]

certe non tanto mors immatura dolori est
Quintiliae, quantum gaudet amore tuo.

(Catullus 96.5–6)

(certainly Quintilia does not grieve so much
at her early death as she rejoices in your love.)

Compare Sannazaro: 'he will not grieve so much for the damage of his blemished book / as he will exult in your service'. The third couplet, remembered by Parrasio in his commentary on Cat. 1.9, salutes Pontano as almost better than his great predecessor. Catullus, Sannazaro claims, 'would rather remember these measures than his own'.

Sannazaro's epigram, rich in its poetic intertext, also has an important philological intertext: the idea so often expressed by the humanists that their efforts were a form of necromancy – that they were resurrecting the dead authors of antiquity to bring them to life again in a new age.[144] The conceit takes several forms. Sannazaro's version belongs to the type

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 78

that imagines the ancient poet brought back from the dead to see the fate of his work. Antonio Partenio claimed, for example:

> 'Si ab inferis reuocaretur Catullus, carmina sua non esset agniturus'.[145]
>
> (If Catullus were called back from the underworld, he would not recognize his poetry.)

But the Catullus in Sannazaro has a happier fate. We see him not called up from the underworld to lament the present condition of his work, but returning from Elysium to see his poetry in hands as good as his own. Sannazaro's praise may have been excessive – Muret certainly thought so fifty years later.[146] But over-generous or not, it is a fitting tribute to Pontano's achievement with Catullus – an achievement manifested above all in his literary creativity and understanding of poetry.

Notes

[1] I wish to express my thanks to both Antonio Ramírez de Verger and Dániel Kiss for information about several early books and manuscripts.

[2] Ludwig 1989; Ludwig 1990, 192–7; Gaisser 1993, 220–8.

[3] The poem should be dated before 1458 since it mentions the affectionate love play of the addressee, Lorenzo Bonincontri, with his wife, Cecilia (called Cicella in lines 19 and 26), who died in that year; Monte Sabia in Pontano 1964, 394–5, 534.

[4] Poems from *Parthenopeus* are cited from Pontano 1948 (ed. Oeschger).

[5] For a succinct account of Pontano's life and works, see Monti Sabia 1964, 307–14. See also Pèrcopo 1938; Kidwell 1991.

[6] For Panormita's work and its history, see Coppini (ed.) 1990.

[7] Ludwig 1989, 173–4; Ludwig 1990, 189–90. The standard but very old edition of Pontano's complete poetry is Pontanus 1902 (Soldati, ed.). Ludwig identified the following poems as originating in *Pruritus*: *Parthenopeus siue Amores*, 1.5, 7, 25(?), 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34; *Appendix*, 5, 7, 8, 9.

[8] See the important discussion of Ludwig 1989, 168–70. *Herm.* 1.19 is clearly indebted to the thought of Cat. 97. The expression *uerpum...Priapum* appears at *Herm.* 2.6.35 (cf. Cat. 47.4), and the rare word *multiuolae* in *Herm.* 2.6.17 (cf. Cat. 68.128). Coppini (ed.) 1990 cites four or five other parallels in the index of her edition of the *Hermaphroditus*. She is followed by Charlet 2005, 284–6. In most of the examples cited by Coppini and Charlet, however, the resemblance to Catullus is slight.

[9] Ludwig 1989, 170, 174; Ludwig 1990, 188, 190.

[10] E. A. Schmidt 2003. For the hendecasyllables in *Pruritus*, see Ludwig 1989, 175; Ludwig 1990, 190. For those in *Parthenopeus*, see Gaisser 2009, 181.

[11] Before Pontano only two Renaissance poets are known to have imitated Catullus. Between around 1405 and 1415 Leonardo Bruni (1370?–1444) composed an obscene hendecasyllabic pastiche of Cat. 41–43. See Hankins 1990; Gaisser 1993, 211–15. In the early 1440s Cristoforo Landino (1424–1504) imitated Cat. 8 and 11 in four poems of his *Xandra*. See Ludwig 1989, 170–2; Ludwig 1990, 188–9; Gaisser 1993, 215–20.

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 79

[12] *Priapea* 1.4: 'ruber hortorum custos' ('ruddy protector of gardens'). For the personification of Martial's book as a *puer delicatus*, see Gaisser 1993, 202–8.

[13] 'Cui dono lepidum nouum libellum?' Cat. 1.1. (To whom shall I give the charming, new little book?).

[14] Pontano is probably also thinking of Martial's evocation of the same verses of Cat. 16: 'lex haec carminibus data est iocosis / ne possint, nisi pruriant, iuuare' (this law has been established for playful poems: / that they cannot give pleasure unless they are aroused); Martial 1.35.10–11.

[15] For more on Cat. 16 and Pontano's program, see Gaisser 1993, 222–8.

[16] Soldati in Pontano 1902 vol. 1, L. The verses are an earlier redaction of *App.* 8.1–6 (Pontano 1902 ed. Soldati); see discussion below.

[17] Pontano dedicates *Parth.* 2.11 to Leonte and mentions his death in *Parth.* 2.8 and *De tumulis* 1.11; see Monti Sabia in Pontano 1964, 427.

[18] Gaisser 1993, 226–8.

[19] For Marino Tomacelli (c.1419–1515), see Kiss 2013a; see also Monti Sabia in Pontano 1964, 426–7.

[20] *Herm.* 2.23. For translation and discussion, see Gaisser 1993, 20–1. Charlet (2005, 293, n. 14) argues that the poem is 'only a literary jest unrelated to reality'. Perhaps. But Panormita's complaint, together with the scarcity of echoes of Catullus in his poetry, points the other way. It is also important to note that Catullus was not widely circulated until fairly late in the fifteenth century. Only ten of the 130 extant manuscripts can be dated before 1430; see the list in Thomson (ed.) 1997, 72–92.

[21] Thomson (ed.) 1997, 89; Butrica 1984, 106–10, 332; Kiss 2013a.

[22] For Lucio's biography see Piacentini 2006, with earlier bibliography; for a succinct account relevant to the Tomacellianus, see Kiss 2013a, 692–5. Lucio transcribed several manuscripts in addition to the Tomacellianus, and some of his poetry is preserved (Kiss 2013a, 693, 695).

[23] Quoted from Kiss 2013a, 691 n. 8.

[24] Quoted from Kiss 2013a, 691 n. 10.

[25] For the date and circumstances of Lutius' death, see Kiss 2013a, 693, 695. Unaware of Lutius' identity and date of death, Butrica 1984, 106 dated the Tibullus around 1440 to 1445, placing the Propertius 'perhaps only a little later'.

[26] Butrica 1984, 107. Butrica based his suggestion on the fact that the manuscript of Propertius Pontano transcribed in 1460 (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek – Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lat. fol. 500, on which see below) is 'among the relations of the Tomacellianus', but especially on his imitations of Propertius 'in the poetry of this period' (i.e., the late 1440s). In fact, however, Pontano's Propertius imitations date not from the 1440s but from the early 1450s and his acquaintance with Tito Strozzi in Ferrara; see note 36 below.

[27] Butrica 2002b. Speaking of the Propertius manuscript Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Diez. B. Sant. 41, he includes the Tomacellianus among several manuscripts 'with which its text of Propertius is most closely affiliated' and says that it was 'copied in Naples about 1445'. I believe (*pace* Kiss 2013a, 692) that Butrica's dating in this passage applies only to the Propertius portion of the Tomacellianus.

[28] Kiss 2013a, 697–9.

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 80

[29] Kiss 2013a, 698–700.

[30] Leonte was still alive in 1453 or 1454, as a letter from Lorenzo Valla to Marino Tomacelli attests; see Piacentini 2006, 534 n. 36. On 23 March <1453 or 1454> Valla wrote Marino from Rome, noting that he had just seen his brother ('germanus tuus' – presumably Leonte). The letter is printed in Valla 1984, 386. I am not persuaded by Kiss's argument that Pontano's references to Leonte in *Parthenopeus* 2.8 and 2.11 demonstrate that he died after his father's death in 1457 (Kiss 2013a, 695–6). In 2.8.1–10 Pontano is anticipating his own death, not mourning Leonte's; the mention of Leonte's mother and sister in 2.11.22 is not proof that he had already lost his father (the consoling figures of mother and sister in both 2.8.3–6 and 2.11.22 are a Tibullan motif; cf. Tib. 1.3.5–8).

[31] Leonte's interest in Catullus is also complimented in another poem addressed to him, *Parth.* 2.11, which has Cat. 68 as its intertext. For *Parth.* 2.11 see Schäfer 2003, 59–63.

[32] Ludwig 1989, 173 n. 45.

[33] Pontano celebrates the length of his friendship with Marino in *Hendecasyllabi siue Baiae*: 'Annos sex nouies, Marine, amici / una uiximus integello amore' (*Hend.* 2.28.1–2). ('Marinus, six years multiplied by nine / We dwelt in friendship with an unspoilt love'; Dennis' translation in Pontano 2006, 165).

[34] Marino was the Neapolitan ambassador to Florence from 1465 to 1495, but he and Pontano retained close ties, as Pontano's frequent dedications to him attest. For a list, see Monti Sabia in Pontano 1964, 426–7.

[35] Pèrcopo 1938, 12–14; Tateo 1987, 53.

[36] Ludwig 1989, 173. For Pontano and Strozzi, see Ludwig 1977, 300–7; Tissoni Benvenuti 2003. For a succinct account of Strozzi's life and works, see Gualdo Rosa, 1964, 251.

[37] Ludwig (1989, 173) believes that it was a second version ('zweite Fassung') of *Pruritus* that Pontano dedicated to Strozzi. See also Soldati in Pontano 1902, vol. 1, L; Schäfer 2003, 69–71.

[38] Aurispa was born in 1376. For his biography, see Bigi 1962.

[39] See note 31 above. Schäfer 2003, 80 calls it one of his first elegies.

[40] For the Propertius, see Ullman 1959, 334–5, plates 26–28; reprinted in Ullman 1973a, 427–8, plates 23–28. See also Butrica 1984, 209–10. For the Tibullus, see Ullman 1959, 332–3; reprinted in Ullman 1973a, 425–8. See also Butrica 1984, 209; Hausmann 1986, 620 n. 173; Luck (ed.) 1998, vii and xxxi. For a photographic facsimile, see Leo (ed.) 1910.

[41] The inventory was destroyed in World War II, but had been published by Filangieri in 1898 and again by Pèrcopo 1938, 313–14. See Rinaldi 2007–2008.

[42] The folio numeration is modern. Fol. 30 is wrongly numbered 31, and the error continues through the rest of the manuscript. The text of Tibullus appears on fols. 1r–'38r' (=37r), the *Epistula Sapphus* on fols. '38v–42r' (=37v–41r). The texts of Tibullus and the *Epistula Sapphus* appear on 41 folios, the last of which is a single folio of a fifth gathering.

[43] Pontano 1512, Iv.

[44] Vatican Library, Reg. lat. 2023, fol. 352v. Quoted from Pèrcopo in Cariteo 1892, ccxcvi.

[45] For the meaning of *archetypus*, see Rizzo 1984, 308–17.

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 81

[46] Rizzo 1984, 9–11.

[47] Parenti 1973.

[48] Vatican Library, Reg. lat. 2023, fol. 75r. See also Pèrcopo 1938, 294. For a full transcription, see Lancellotti 1772, 95–6.

[49] Probably to be identified with the Venetian editor and scholar Giovanni Battista Egnazio, on whom see Ross 1976, 536–56.

[50] For Pucci's biography see Santoro 1948; Gaisser 1992, 248–9. Pucci was an interlocutor in Pontano's *Aegidius* and the dedicatee of *Hendecasyllabi* 2.9. Pontano also quotes him in *De sermone* 4.3.38.

[51] For the notes and their history, see Calonghi 1921; Richardson 1976; Butrica 1980; Gaisser 1992, 243–9; Vecce 2002; Thomson, 2011, 221–5.

[52] Gaisser 1992, 243–9.

[53] Vecce 2002 identified Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, SQ. X.H.25 [edition: Reggio 1481] and SQ. XIX.B.4 [edition: Venice 1502]; for further discussion see Thomson 2011, 224–5. Thomson 2011, 225 identified Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, Inc. 694. [edition: Venice, 1491] and Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana, 31.A.31 [edition: Lyons, 1542]; he does not say whether Catullus and Tibullus, as well as Propertius, are annotated. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. 2 R 6.26 [edition: Venice 1502] should also be added to the list. This edition, annotated by the otherwise unknown Marcus Antonius Pocchus, was mentioned by Butrica 1980, 6, but not listed by either Gaisser 1992, 243–9 or Thomson 2011, 221–5. It includes many notes on both Propertius and Tibullus, but far fewer on Catullus.

[54] Butrica 1980, 6.

[55] 'Franciscus Puccius hec annotabat anno salutis MDII, Augustino Scarpinella comite studiorum, sequutus fidem antiquissimi codicis qui primum fuit Berardini Vallae patricii romani, uiri doctissimi, dein ab eo dono est datus Alfonso secundo regi Neapolitano principi litterarum amantissimo'. (Francesco Pucci made these notes in the year of our salvation 1502, with Agostino Scarpinella the companion of his studies, relying on the evidence of the ancient manuscript that was owned first by the Roman patrician Berardino Valla, a most learned man, and was subsequently given by him to Alfonso II, the king of Naples, a prince who was a great lover of letters.) Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana Edizioni rare 372, fol. p 5 v. For Valla's manuscript, see Butrica 1984, 62–95; La Penna 1989, 120–3.

[56] Ullman 1973a, 426–7; Butrica 1980, 7; Butrica 2002a, 377–88.

[57] The note in Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale SQ X H 10 reads *Chalibon*.

[58] *O* reads *celerum*, *G* and *R Celitum*, R^2 *celorum,* Venice 1472 *cęlitum*, Vicenza 1481 and Brescia 1485 *telorum*. Poliziano suggested *Chalybum* in his notes to Venice 1472 (Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana 50.F.37); see Gaisser 1993, 70, 73–4. In *Miscellanea* 1.68 (1489) he proposed *Chalybon*.

[59] See Appendix for 4.3, 8.9, 8.15, 10.26, 10.27, 15.18, 34.2, 36.12, 66.1, 76.18. At 84.11 the annotator of ve3 (Alessandro Sinclitico?) refers the reading to Pontano's *De aspiratione*; see below.

[60] The word *codex* can be used of printed books as well as manuscripts (Rizzo 1984, 69–71), but Petreio is almost certainly referring to a manuscript.

[61] Palladio Fosco 1496, fol. b5r: 'Sed lector aduerte, quod in nouis codicibus tam impressis quam manuscriptis deest tertius uersus, quem nos in uetustiore exemplari inuentum suo loco audacter reposuimus'. (Reader, please note that the third verse is

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 82

lacking in recent books, both printed and manuscript. I found it in an older exemplar and have boldly put it back in its place.)

[62] The line also appears in Vatican Library, Urbinas lat. 812, but Dániel Kiss in a personal communication of 7 November 2012 informed me that the manuscript seems to be a copy of Venice 1502. Statius 1566, 101 condemns the line, which he seems to associate only with the Aldine; he does not mention Pontano. '*Dianae pueri integri* [Cat. 34.3]. Impressit hunc olim uersum Aldus, qui tamen nullo est in manuscripto. Itaque addititium puto, atque alienum, ac germanum Catulli uersum desiderari'.

[63] The note appears on fol. 20r. Kiss kindly informed me of his discovery in a personal communication of 7 November 2012. For the early history of C.l.m.ae. 137, see Kiss 2012 and Kiss 2012b.

[64] Although the line was omitted in the second Aldine, it appears in Avanzi 1535 (as *Dianam pueri integri*). *Dianae pueri integri* has also been added in a second (and later?) hand in ve2. For a related (?) variation in ve3 see Appendix for 34.2.

[65] The fact that 34.3 appears in neither f nor n makes one wonder whether Pucci himself was aware of the reading.

[66] For Zanchi, see Serassi (ed.) 1747, i–xx; Tiraboschi 1812, 7, 1372–4; Minieri Riccio 1969, 191–7; Mercati (ed.), 1934, 103–4.

[67] Quoted from Ullman 1908, 9. The note is almost illegible since everything except the date has been thoroughly crossed out. The name *Sanchi* (or *Sanctii*?), also crossed out, is written (in a second hand?) above the obliterated word after *Petrei*.

[68] 'Ego Laurentius Gambara Brixianus fidem facio librum hunc scriptum esse manu Basilii Zanchi Bergomatis, cuius consuetudine et amicitia usus sum per multos annos. 1581'. Vat. lat. 7044, fol. Ir (also see Ullman 1908, 10).

[69] His father brought him to Rome in 1519 and died on the way home on 1 February 1520: Serassi 1747, viii, n. 2.

[70] His prominence among the Roman poets is demonstrated by the inclusion of his long pastoral lament in the memorial volume for the death of Celso Melini (November 1519): Valeriano (ed.) 1519, B3r–B4v.

[71] Minieri Riccio 1969, 191.

[72] Mercati 1934, 104, n. 1.

[73] It is not the same as the hand in Ald. lat. III.20 (formerly A. 16), whose annotations Fulvio Orsini attributed to Zanchi and Colocci (Nolhac 1976, 258).

[74] See Appendix for 10.27, 15.18, 22.13, 30.6, 34.2, 61.151, 64.37, 64.387, 66.48, 66.93, 67.32 (both *Chinaeae* and *supposita speculae*).

[75] See Appendix for 36.12, 66.25, 66.91, 67.44. Zanchi's text of 1.9 slightly differs from that in Pucci's notes. See discussion below.

[76] See Appendix for 8.15, 64.21, 76.18. But it is difficult to be sure from a microfilm whether a particular correction was made by Zanchi himself; see note 88 below.

[77] See Appendix for 4.3, 8.9, 10.26, 64.212, 66.1.

[78] See Appendix and discussion below for 66.1, 66.7, 69.6, 84.1, 84.2, and 84.11.

[79] See Appendix for 1.9. Pontano is credited in all the copies surveyed. *qualecumque quod o patroa* (or *patrona*) *uirgo* appears, along with *qualecumque quod ora per virorum*, e.g., in f, n, m, p.

[80] For the various reportings of Pontano's conjecture, see Gaisser 1993, 345, nn. 82, 84.

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 83

[81] Barbaro was followed by Avanzi 1495 and Palladio 1496. See Pozzi (ed.) 1973, I. cxix–cxxi. The line appears in the first and second Aldines (Venice 1502 and 1515) as *qualecunque quidem ora per uirorum*.

[82] For Parrasio's commentary, see Richardson 1976, 281, 284–5; Gaisser 1992, 249–50.

[83] *Ionios fluctus postquam illuc appulit ipse*; Pontano 1481, fol. 37v. (I cite *De aspiratione* from Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek 2 Inc. c. a. 1096, in which the folio numbers have been added by hand.) See also Germano 2005, 325–6, 378–80. The reading had little currency. The annotator of ve3, who cites *De aspiratione* at the beginning of the epigram, writes *appul(it)* in the margin at 84.11. Dániel Kiss informs me that the note '*illuc appulit ipse Po(ntani) s(e)n(tent)ia*' appears in the marginalia of Ottaviano Ferrari (ca. 1530–1586) in Venice 1515 (Oxford, Bodleian Library: Auct. 2 R 6.28). Ferrari, like ve3, was surely quoting the reading from *De aspiratione*.

[84] Phrasing differs, but the version in n is typical: 'Uria est in Apulia sub radicibus Gargani, qua spectat diomedeas insulas.' The versions in f, m, p, ve1, ve2, ve3 are similar.

[85] Pontano 1481, fol. 5r: *Omnia qui magni suspexit mundi. Suspexit* also appears without attribution in ve3, where it is probably taken from *De aspiratione*.

[86] See the census of Kiss, *ad loc.*: *Catullus Online* (www.catullusonline.org), consulted on 1 December 2013. *Numine* appears in all the texts of Pucci surveyed (Reggio 1481 and the first and second Aldines), except for g (Vicenza 1481), which reads *munere*. Only b contains a note: *munere* (in a later hand).

[87] Pontano 1481, fol. 5r: *Idem me ille Conon caelesti numine vidit*.

[88] It is difficult to be sure which; Degiovanni 2013, 170 reads *Chinaea*, Portuese 2013, 257 *Chinnea*. Degiovanni says that the correction at 67.32 is in a different ink and in a second hand. Portuese suggests that some corrections in Zanchi (including that at 67.32) might be in the hand of Lorenzo Gambara.

[89] The second Aldine (1515) reads *suppositum in specula*.

[90] Modern editions read *Cycneae*, crediting Vossius (1684). For detailed discussion of the history of the various readings, see Degiovanni 2013, Portuese 2013, 255–63, and Portuese 2013a.

[91] Zanchi 1531 47v–48r.

[92] Trappes-Lomax 2007, 225–6 points out that the association between the name Cycnus and Cydnus, the supposed founder of Brescia, is spurious, going back to Giovanni Crisostomo's source, the *Pseudo-Berosus* (1497) confected by 'the fecund Dominican forger', Giovanni Nanni (Annius of Viterbo). I believe that he is correct to assert (p. 226) that Annius' forgery 'has no bearing on the text of Catullus'. Degiovanni 2013, 171–2, however, argues that the reading *Cycnea* was inspired by Annius.

[93] Thomson (ed.) 1997 apparently thought so, although his *apparatus criticus* is ambiguous: 'cycnea *iam Petreius, Pontanum secutus*'. *Cycnea* does not appear in Petreio (b). But I agree with Degiovanni 2013, 170 n. 64, that by 'Petreius' Thomson means Zanchi, whose given name was Petreius. Portuese 2013, 258 suggests that *Cycnea* appeared in 'vari codici *deperditi*', perhaps including that of Pontano. Statius, however, apparently believed that Pontano's reading was *Chinaeae*; see below.

[94] For Statius and his commentary, see Gaisser 1993, 168–78, with earlier bibliography.

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 84

[95] For Statius' use of Catullus manuscripts, see Ullman 1908; for Tibullus, see Ullman 1973b. He apparently did have Pontano's manuscript of Propertius: Butrica 1980, 8.

[96] Statius mentions and rejects the readings at 1.9 and 34.3 attributed to Pontano in other sources, but associates neither with Pontano. See Appendix.

[97] '*Tritius*. In manuscriptis autem omnibus erat, *Tristius*, non, *Tritius*, hoc enim post fecerunt Pontanus, aliique. quod ipsum placet, ut tritum scurram sic dicat, ut Demosthenes Aeschinem περίτριμμα τῆς ἀγορᾶς, Callidum scilicet, et uersatum diu in eo genere. Nisi *Tristius*, odiosius quis interpretari malit'. Statius 1566, 72–3.

[98] See Butrica 1984, 114, 132–5, 248–56. The manuscript was probably transcribed in Naples or Rome (Butrica 114).

[99] *Tritius* is found only twice in the surveyed copies of Pucci: in a (before 1522, the date of death of its annotator, Giano Parrasio) and ve1, (dated 1530), where it appears along with *suauius*. (*Suauius* appears either with or without attribution to Pucci in all the Pucci copies surveyed.) Zanchi's manuscript has *tristius* in the text, corrected to *suauius* and back to *tristius*. *Tritius* is printed in the 1503 Juntine edition, and Pierio Valeriano approves it in his Catullus lectures of 1521–22, ascribing it to the manuscript of Ermolao Barbaro: 'quam lectionem ex Hermolai Barbari codice desumpsi' (Vat. lat. 5215, fol. 245r). (The reading does not appear in Bologna, Biblioteca universitaria 2621, owned by Barbaro.)

[100] 'Pontanus pro, *Dico*, fecerat, *Dic*'. Statius 1566, 93.

[101] '*Quae tibi sine fine erit*. In Achillis Maffei libro est, *Quae tibi, sine, seruit*. Itaque probabilis Pontani coniectura, qui legendum putauit, *Quae tibi, sine, seruiat*'. Statius 1566, 190.

[102] '*Sensit* autem Pontanus mutauit in *Sanxit*: quod in manuscriptis non est'. Statius 1566, 255.

[103] 'Pontanus syllabae consuluit, probabiliterque legit, *Pharsalum coeunt*'. Statius 1566, 257.

[104] 'Pontanus in alieno opere tantum sibi permiserat, ut, quae non probaret ipse, deleret, sua poneret. itaque pro *Classi Castae* fecerat'. Statius 1566, 275.

[105] '*Classi* autem pro *classe* dixit ut alibi, *Per medium classi barbara nauit Athon* [Cat. 66.46]. Et Vergil. in viii *Aduectum Aenean classi* [*A.* 8.11]. Et Sisenna, apud Nonium Marcellum in uerbo, Centones *Perpetua classi* [Sisenna, *Hist.* 4.107]'. Statius 1566, 275.

[106] The gloss appears in f, n, g, m, p.

[107] '*Templo in fulgente*. Sic etiam in manuscriptis omnibus. Pontanus fecerat, *A fulgente*. sed illud omnino retinendum ut templo in fulgente annua sibi sacra fieri uideret'. Statius 1566, 293.

[108] '*templo a fulgente* .i. a coelo, nam et ita uocauit ennius'. f, n. The same note appears, e.g., in b, m, ve1, ve2.

[109] 'Legendum omnino, *Atqui*, ut Pontanus legendum censebat. in manuscripto erat, *atque*'. Statius 1566, 307.

[110] 'Pro *Votis* in manuscriptis et *Nostris*, et *Vestris*. Pontanus *Votis* fecit, ingeniose id quidem, sed uidendum etiam, an *Verbis* potius legendum'. Statius 1566, 321.

[111] In the copies surveyed it appears only in m, in a later hand, and with an attribution to *ald<us>*. Pucci's reading was *monstres*; the correction *mōstres esse tui me* appears in f and n, as well as in the other copies surveyed, except for a (va was not checked).

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 85

[112] 'Sic etiam in manuscriptis'. Statius 1566, 322.

[113] 'Docti homines, siue Pontanus is fuit, siue quiuis alius, *Cur retinent*. quod post alii sunt secuti'. Statius 1566, 322.

[114] Pucci's reading seems to have been *iterant* (f, n, b, m, p); it usually appears with the gloss: 'cur uicissim celi uolubilitate subtrahuntur. dolet enim abscissu celi a domine conspectu abripi'.

[115] 'In manuscriptis (*ed.* manuscriptio) omnibus. *Suppositum specula*. Legendum uidetur, ut et Pontanus censebat, *Brixia Chinaeae supposita speculae*'. Statius 1566, 328.

[116] The surveyed copies of Pucci read: *Brixia Cenomanae supposita speculae*. For Pucci as the originator of *Cenomanae*, see Portuese 2013a. For *Chinaeae*, see Kiss' census.

[117] The contradiction is noted by both Portuese 2013, 257–8 and Degiovanni 2013, 170–1.

[118] E.g., Mynors, Thomson and Ramírez de Verger.

[119] 'In manuscriptis omnibus, *Speret nec linguam esse, nec auriculam*. Sed, quo uersus staret, Pontanus primus (*ed.* primum), opinor, fecit *Speraret*'. Statius 1566, 329.

[120] Kiss 2013b, 65–71.

[121] Pontano 1481, fol. 4v: *Nanque totius uobis / frontem tabernae scipionibus scribam* (Cat. 37.9–10). *V* had *sopionibus*; Zanchi has *sciopionibus*, perhaps a slip for *scopionibus*. For other manuscripts, see Kiss's census *ad loc.*

[122] Pontano 1481, fol. 7v.

[123] Tib. 1.7.61, where *-a* is long before the third-foot caesura: *Te canit agricola magna cum uenerit urbe.* (Modern editions read *agricola a magna.*) The final *a* of *agricola* is marked as long in Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek 82.6 Aug. 2°, fol. 11v.

[124] 'Reprehenditur enim quidam qui *chommoda dicebat si quando commoda uellet / dicere*, et *insidias acrius hinsidias*, et de eodem: *et tum mirifice sperabat se esse locutum / cum quantum poterat dixerat hinsidias*. Vides igitur quosdam contra omnem rationem uoluisse *chommodum* cum aspiratione pronuntiare necnon et *hinsidias* et *hionium*, ut hic idem poeta eodem irridet epigrammate: *Ionios fluctus postquam illuc appulit ipse non iam ionios esse sed hionios*'. Pontano 1481, fol. 37v.

[125] See Gaisser 1993, 67–71; p. 71, plate 4 shows Poliziano's annotations in Venice 1472 (Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana 50 F 37, fol. 34r). In his marginalia Poliziano improved on Pontano's interpretation, seeing the name *Arrius* in the corruptions of 84.2 and 11. In *Misc.* 1.19 he recalled 84.3–4 to their correct position.

[126] In 1467 Pontano's old friend Marino Tomacelli lent a copy of *De aspiratione* to a Florentine humanist, Alamanno Rinuccini, who shared it with others in Florence: Germano 2005, 57–75. On Pontano's priority, see also the important discussion of Fabbri 1987, 176–9. Poliziano's claims were denied even by some contemporaries. Writing in 1495, Avanzi falls just short of accusing him of plagiarism: 'Idem Pontanus iam undecim annis agnouit carmen illud: *Chomodo dicebat si quando*, licet Politianus hoc inuentum sibi arroget' (Avanzi 1495, a5v).

[127] Ludwig 1989, 175–6; Ludwig 1990, 190. For the history of the obscene interpretation see Gaisser 1993, 233–54; for *Parth.* 1.5, see *eadem*, 242–3.

[128] Butrica 2002a.

[129] E.g., Wolfenbüttel 82.6 Aug. 2°, fols. 1v, 27v, 28r, 33r, 34r; Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Lat. fol. 500, fols 5v, 16v, 20v, 32r, 35r. The note on Propertius at fol. 20v is illustrated in Ullman 1973, plate 25.

[130] Ullman 1973a, 427–8. There are many marks of this kind in both manuscripts.

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 86

For Tibullus, they can be found, for example, on fols. 3r (on Tib. 1.2.16) and 15v (on 1.10.33–4, 1.10.39–40). Examples in Propertius appear on fols. 15v (on Prop. 2.5.13, 2.5.16, 2.5.19–20) and 17r (on 2.8.3 and 2.8.7–8). The mark on Prop. 4.11.101–2 on fol. 66v is illustrated in Ullman 1973a, plate 23.

[131] Ullman 1973a, 425–6. The signed notes are on fols. 11r (1.7.18), 12v and 13r (1.8.51, signed on both folios), 28r (3.5.24), and 36r (3.11.4). All four are signed with the abbreviation 'Pont' (for Pontanus).

[132] 'Veteres soliti sunt eam syllabam corripere'. Wolfenbüttel 82.6 Aug. 2°, fol. 36r.

[133] The correction appears, for example, in both f and b, but without Pontano's note. The second Aldine prints *dederunt*; the annotator of b, Petreio, writes *dederunt* in the margin, marking both *e*'s as short.

[134] Pontano has written supplements on fols. 3r (Tib. 1.2.26); 15r (after Tib.1.10.25: four verses); 18v (after Tib. 2.3.14a: three verses); 19v (Tib. 2.3.75); 27r (Tib. 3.4.65).

[135] The supplements for Tib. 1.2.26, 2.3.75, and 3.4.65 are written in the text. The first verse of the supplement after Tib. 2.3.14a is written in the text, the other two in the lower margin. The four-verse supplement after 1.10.25 is written in the lower margin. From the photographic facsimile (see note 40 above) it appears that Pontano wrote the supplement for 1.2.26 over an erasure and the one for 3.4.65 at least partly over an erasure.

[136] Thus on Pontano's supplement at Tib. 1.2.26: '*usque meum custos ad latus haeret amor*. sic reposuit Pont(anus)'; quoted from f.

[137] Ullman 1973a, 426. Ullman gives additional examples on the same page. The note below is quoted from f.

[138] Thomson 2011, 185–9.

[139] Pontano has perhaps borrowed *laesisse puellam* from Panormita, *Hermaphr.* 2.25.13, where it also appears at verse end, albeit in a very different context. I am indebted to Dániel Kiss for pointing out the echo.

[140] Gaisser 1993, 128–9.

[141] In his lemma at Cat. 1.9 Statius quotes the line as it appears in Venice 1502 and 1515, but he does not discuss it or attribute it to Pontano: Statius 1566, 15.

[142] Parrasio's commentary (abandoned at Cat. 4.20–1) is dated between 1512 and 1517; see Richardson 1976 and Gaisser 1992, 249–50.

[143] The echo is noted by Fabbri 1987, 182–3.

[144] Greene 1982, esp. 3, 92–3. What seems to be our earliest mention of Catullus by a humanist contains a nice example: the epigram of Benvenuto Campesani (died 1323) on the discovery of a manuscript of Catullus. Benvenuto entitles his epigram *De resurrectione Catulli poetae Veronensis* ('On the resurrection of Catullus the poet of Verona'). Benvenuto's epigram is first found in the fourteenth-century manuscripts *G* and *R*. For the text see Thomson (ed.) 1997, 194. For translation and discussion see Gaisser 1993, 18, with earlier bibliography.

[145] Parthenius 1485, fol. a3r.

[146] Commenting on Cat. 1.9 in 1554, Muret says: 'Amice Sannazarius, et uenuste. Sed Catullus mallet profecto, ut opinor, suos' ('Sannazaro writes with affection and charm, but in my opinion Catullus would surely prefer his own verses'). Muret 1554, fol. 2r.

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 87

Appendix

Evidence for Pontano's Readings in Pucci, Zanchi, and Statius

This appendix is the result of a preliminary study of readings associated with Pontano in several copies of the notes of Francesco Pucci, the manuscript of Basilio Zanchi (Vat. lat. 7044), and the commentary of Achilles Statius (1566), together with those in Pontano's *De aspiratione*. Item I presents a list of the copies of Pucci consulted. (A full collation of the attributions in all the copies of Pucci's notes is beyond the scope of this chapter.) Item II presents a list of readings.

I. Copies of Pucci's notes consulted. (For the known copies, see Gaisser 1992, 243–8 and note 53 above.) Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Edizioni rare 372 and Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale SQ X H 10, considered the most authoritative copies by Butrica 1980, are listed separately at the head of the list. The others are listed alphabetically. If the name of the annotator is known, his name is included.

f Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Edizioni rare 372 (Reggio 1481)
n Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, SQ X H 10 (Reggio 1481)
a Aberdeen, University Library, Incun. 165 (Reggio 1481)
Giano Parrasio (before 1522)
b Berlin, Staatsbibliothek – Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Diez. oct. 2474 (Venice 1515)
Antonio Petreio (1528?)
(The volume also includes many notes by subsequent annotators.)
g Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, MS. philol. 111 (Vicenza 1481)
[annotated only through Cat. 66]
m Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 2 Inc.c.a. 1120 (Reggio 1481)
Pier Vettori (1521)
p Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Rés pYc 379 (Venice 1515)
va Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Barb. CCC. II. 7 (Venice 1502)
Basilio Zanchi
ve1 Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XII, 127 (Venice 1502)
Donato Giannotti (1530)
ve2 Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XII, 128 (Venice 1515)
ve3 Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XII, 187 (Venice 1515)
Alessandro Sinclitico? (ca. 1570–1647)

II. Readings attributed to Pontano in Pucci's notes, appearing in Zanchi's manuscript, attributed to Pontano in Statius' commentary, and appearing in Pontano's *De aspiratione*.
* reading printed in Thomson 1997.

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 88

Reading		*Source of Attribution*
1.9	quod ora per uirorum per ora quod uirorum quidem ora per virorum	f, n a, b, g, m, n, p, ve1, without attribution in va Zanchi without attribution in Statius
4.3	uolantis...alitis	p attributed to Pucci in g and ve1 without attribution in f, n, a, m, va, ve2 (*uolantis* only), ve3 without attribution in Zanchi, where *natantis...trabis* is corrected to *uolantis...alitis*, which is corrected back to *natantis...trabis*
8.9	iam nunc et illa non uult, tu quoque et nolis	ve3 attributed to Pucci in g, p, ve1 without attribution in f, n, a, b, m, va, ve2 without attribution in Zanchi, who writes *nunc iam et illa non uult: tu quoque impotens es*. *impotens es* is corrected to *et nolis*, which is corrected back to *impotens es* n.b. Vatican Library Aldine III. 20 (not a copy of Pucci), like ve3, attributes the reading to Pontano.
8.15	scelesta quae te, quae te iam manet uita	ve3 attributed to Pucci in p and ve1 without attribution in f, n, a, b, g, m, va, ve2, Zanchi, where *scelesta tene quae tibi manet uita* in the text is corrected to *scelesta quae te, quae te iam manet uita* n.b. Vatican Library Aldine III. 20, like ve3, attributes the reading to Pontano
10.26	commodita uolo	b (perhaps not in the hand of Petreio) without attribution in g, m Zanchi writes *commoditate uolo*, which is corrected to *commoda: nam*
10.27	minime	b (perhaps not in the hand of Petreio)
15.18	atratis	ve3 attributed to Pucci in p without attribution in m, ve1, ve2
22.13	tritius	Statius without attribution in a (*suauius* uel *tritius*), ve1

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 89

Reading	*Source of Attribution*
*30.6 dic	Statius attributed to Pucci in p, ve1 without attribution in f, n, a, g, m, va, ve2
34.2 et *deleted*	p attributed to Pucci in ve1, ve2 (?) without attribution in f, n, g, m, ve3 deletes *puellae et* and replaces with *Dianam*
34.3 Dianae pueri integri *added*	b (*with note*: Pon ex u c) (Pontanus ex uetere codice) attributed to '*aliqui*' in g without attribution in m, ve2 attributed to 'Aldus' in Statius Zanchi (without attribution): *Dianam pueri integri*
*36.12 Uriosque	va without attribution in Zanchi
*61.151 sine seruiat	Statius without attribution in f, n, a, m, p, ve1, ve2, ve3
64.21 sanxit	Statius attributed to Pucci in p, ve1 without attribution in f, n, a (*sansit*), b, g, m, va, ve2, ve3, and Zanchi, where *sensit* in the text is corrected to *sanxit*
*64.37 Pharsalum	Statius without attribution in ve2
64.212 castae	Statius attributed to Pucci in b, p, ve1 without attribution in f, n, a, g, m, va, ve2, ve3 without attribution in Zanchi, where *classi* is corrected to *castae*, but changed back to *classi*
64.387 a fulgente	Statius attributed to Pucci in p, ve1 without attribution in f, n, a, b, m, ve2, ve3

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 90

Reading	*Source of Attribution*
66.1 suspexit	va (*note*: pont. de asp.) Pontanus De aspiratione without attribution in ve3 without attribution in Zanchi, where *suspexit* in the text is corrected to *despexit*
66.7 numine	Pontanus De aspiratione without attribution in Zanchi
66.25 atqui	Statius attributed to Pucci in p, ve1 without attribution in f, n, a, b, f, m, n, va, ve2, ve3, Zanchi
66.48 telorum	f, n, a, b, m, n, va, ve1, ve2
66.91 uotis	Statius attributed to Aldus (?) in m without attribution in Zanchi, where *non uotis* is corrected to *uotis non*
66.93 cur retinent	Statius attributed to Aldus (?) in m without attribution in g
67.32 Chinaeae	Statius Zanchi has *Cycnea* in his text, which is corrected to *Chinaea* or *Chinnea*
*67.32 supposita speculae	Statius attributed to Pucci in p attributed to Pis(anus?) in b without attribution in f, n, m, va, ve1, ve2, ve3 (later hand)
*67.44 speraret	Statius without attribution in f, n, m, Zanchi
69.6 halarum	Pontanus De aspiratione without attribution in Zanchi
71.1 halarum	without attribution in Zanchi
76.18 *deletes* in (*introduced in Venice 1502?*)	ve3 attributed to Pucci in p, ve1 without attribution in va and Zanchi, where *ipsa in morte* in the text is corrected to *ipsa morte*

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 91

Reading	*Source of Attribution*
*84.1 chommoda	Pontanus, De aspiratione Avantius, *Emendationes* (1495) 5v attributed to Poliziano in b without attribution in f, n, m, Zanchi
*84.2 hinsidias (last word in line)	Pontanus, De aspiratione without attribution in Zanchi, where *insidias* in the text is corrected to *hinsidias*
*84.4 hinsidias	Pontanus, De aspiratione without attribution in f, n, m, Zanchi
84.11 appulit ipse	Pontanus, De aspiratione ve3 (note: *Pont: de aspiratione* 34) Zanchi (*Arrius isset* in the text is corrected to *appulit ipse*, with note: *Pont.*)
*84.12 Hionios (*last word in line*)	Pontanus, De aspiratione without attribution in f, n, m, Zanchi

81635_What_Catullus_Wrote:Layout 1 22/7/15 08:32 Page 92