

Supplementing Gellius in Fifteenth-Century Italy: the Problem of the Greek

Abstract

The article discusses an important aspect of fifteenth-century textual scholarship, the restoration of Greek passages in Latin texts. Focusing on Guarino Veronese's work on Gellius, it shows the difficulties fifteenth-century textual critics encountered in their endeavours to procure exemplars from which to work. Analysing both his letters and the evidence of the manuscripts connected to him, it also shows how Guarino, in theory at least, was a conservative editor of classical texts.

Keywords

Greek studies, Textual criticism, Florilegia, Aulus Gellius, Plutarch.

Gellius' Renaissance *fortuna*

In a famous article on "Aulus Gellius in the Renaissance," Hans Baron cited many examples of the vivid interest in Gellius' work shown by Renaissance humanists, but he also declared that "Aulus Gellius does not belong among the ancient authors who shaped humanistic culture by their personality, artistic perfection, or profundity of thought" (196). While this is not completely untrue, more recent scholarship has shown that he was a much used source for Renaissance encyclopedias, and I have myself been able to demonstrate how Gellius' preface-epilogue was used as a hypotext by Niccolò Perotti in the preface to his *Cornu copiae seu linguae latinae commentarii*, a hypotext Perotti undoubtedly expected his readers to recognize ("Le Noctes Atticae" and "Intertextuality" 38–39). The *Noctes Atticae* were also cherished enough to be copied in luxury manuscripts with precious illuminations, such as Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, S.P. 10/28 (Bologna, a. 1448) which has as initial a miniature showing a group of writers, statesmen and orators, interlocutors in the work, sitting in an urban space that is supposed to be *civitas Athenarum*, as a banner says, but looks remarkably like the Piazzetta of Venice (Bar-

on 199–200, Codex 53, and Scipioni 73–74). However, the popularity of Gellius' *Noctes* in the Renaissance is in marked contrast to what had been the case in previous centuries. Though his work was often quoted by ancient Latin writers, with the collapse of Antiquity it disappeared. In the Carolingian period a renewed interest in the *Noctes* can be seen, but the work was now transmitted in two parts, Books 1–7 and 9–20 which have separate traditions. There was then a stable but not overwhelming interest during the following centuries, but from the end of the fourteenth century interest in the *Noctes* surged, and we have preserved hundreds of manuscripts containing all surviving books (Reynolds 176–80).

It seems that there was a confusion about the correct form of Gellius' name from an early period: when the Christian writer Lactantius referred to a passage in the *Noctes*, apparently he gave the author's name as *Agellius*.¹ This confusion continues: Servius Donatus knew the correct form of the name, *Aulus Gellius*; but in both Augustine and Priscian we find the form *Agellius* which continues to be in use well into the fifteenth century.

In what follows, I shall discuss one aspect of Gellius' *fortuna* in the Renaissance, namely the restoration of the Greek passages in *Noctes*. As was the case with the texts of other ancient Latin authors, quotations from Greek authors had either been rendered illegible or simply disappeared over the centuries, leaving perhaps blank spaces in the Latin text or a note saying that here should be some Greek. The restoration of Greek passages in writers such as Cicero, Quintilian, Suetonius, and Gellius, was one of the major efforts of humanist philology and an important result of the 'return of Greek' to the Latin West (Weiss; Maisano and Rollo). A central person in this endeavor is one of the greatest Greek scholars in fifteenth-century Italy, the humanist educator Guarino Veronese (1370–1460). In order to elucidate Guarino's method, I shall follow the textual tradition of one Greek passage in *Noctes*, the exchange of letters between Alexander the Great and his teacher Aristotle (Gell. 20.5.11–12, see Texts 1 and 2 below), but with special focus on the letter of Alexander (Gell. 20.5.11).

Text 1

Ἀλέξανδρος Ἀριστοτέλει εὖ πράττειν. Οὐκ ὁρθῶς ἐποίησας ἐκδοὺς τοὺς ἀκροατικοὺς τῶν λόγων. τίτι γὰρ δὴ διοίσομεν

1. "huius [Chrysippi] sententiam interpretatus est A. Gellius [Agellius cod.] in libris Noctium Atticarum sic dicens ..." ("in the *Noctes*, A. Gellius [Agellius cod.] explained what Chrysippus said in the following words ..." Lact. epit. 24.5). For ancient Latin texts I use the abbreviations of the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*.

ἡμεῖς τῶν ἄλλων, εἰ καθ' οὓς ἐπαιδεύθημεν λόγους, οὗτοι πάντων ἔσονται κοινοί; Ἐγὼ δὲ βουλοίμην ἂν ταῖς περὶ τὰ ἄριστα ἐμπειρίαις ἢ ταῖς δυνάμεσιν διαφέρειν. Ἐρρωσο.

(Alexander, to Aristotle, greeting. Thou hast not done well to publish thy acroatic doctrines; for in what shall I surpass other men if those doctrines wherein I have been trained are to be all men's common property? For I had rather excel in my acquaintance with the best things than in my power. Farewell).

Text 2

Ἀριστοτέλης βασιλεῖ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ εὖ πράττειν. Ἐγραψάς μοι περὶ τῶν ἀκροατικῶν λόγων οἰόμενος δεῖν αὐτοὺς φυλάττειν ἐν ἀπορρήτοις. Ἴσθι οὖν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐκδεδομένους καὶ μὴ ἐκδεδομένους· ξυνετοὶ γάρ εἰσιν μόνοις τοῖς ἡμῶν ἀκούσασιν. Ἐρρωσο, Ἀλέξανδρε βασιλεῦ.

(Aristotle to King Alexander, greeting. You have written to me regarding my acroatic lectures, thinking that I ought to have kept them secret. Know then that they have both been made public and not made public. For they are intelligible only to those who have heard me. Farewell, King Alexander). (Tr. Rolfe)

In my transcription of the Greek, I have underlined the adjectives ἀκροατικούς/ἀκροατικῶν which, as we shall see, are the tell-tale words that will lead us through the vicissitudes of the textual tradition.

The medieval tradition

An important branch of the medieval tradition dates back to the Carolingian period. I have examined two manuscripts belonging to that branch, and both have the Greek text of Alexander's and Aristotle's letters, incl. the adjectives ἀκροατικούς/ἀκροατικῶν (see Texts 1 and 2 above). The two MSS are O = Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (hereafter BAV), Reg. lat. 597, f. 199r, saec. ix, written in France, with corrections in the hand of Lupus of Ferrières; and Π = BAV, Reg. lat. 1646, f. 129v. a. 1179, same family as O (Pellegrin II.1, 86–87 and 335–36 respectively).

However, what we find in other twelfth- and thirteenth-century manuscripts is more typical. In the Gellius vulgate of the late Middle Ages, the passage would most likely look as in V = BAV, Vat. lat. 3452, sec. xii, written in France (Pellegrin III.2, 308–09), which has “[...] in utriusque epistula breuitatis elegantissimae filum tenuissimum GR.a.b. Hoc ego uerbum GR. quaerens uno itidem uerbo dicere aliud non repperi [...]” (f. 131v, “[...] in both letters the slender thread of elegant brevity GR.a.b. Looking for something to express GR. with a single word, I found nothing better than [...],” Gell. 20.5.10–13). Here “GR.a.b.” indicate the two letters, and the following “GR.” the repetition of *ἔχοντες τοὶ γὰρ εἶναι* from the letter of Aristotle. Opposite the passage just above, where Gellius renders the content of the two letters in Latin (20.7.7–9), a fifteenth-century reader noticed “Epistola Alexandri Regis ad Ar(istotelem) ph(ilosophum) et illius ad eum” (“King Alexander’s letter to Aristotle, the philosopher, and his to him”), showing the interest in the letters during the Renaissance period, an interest we shall encounter again (for the medieval traditions, see Reynolds 176–79 and Martinelli Tempesta, “Guarino” 346–53).

Guarino Veronese

Guarino Veronese was a prominent educator, as well as a prolific translator from the Greek and a meticulous textual scholar. As a young man he studied Greek with Manuel Chrysoloras in Constantinople during the years 1403–08, and his successive schools in especially Venice and Ferrara became important centres for Greek studies. He began his career as translator in Constantinople, where amongst other things he translated Plutarch’s *Life of Alexander* into Latin. He would eventually produce Latin versions of eleven Plutarch Lives, as well as of Lucian, Herodotus, and Strabo, amongst others (Pade, *The Reception* 165–77 and 183–218, *Vita Dionis* 3–14).

As early as 1422, Guarino wrote to Ugo Mazzolato about the copies of Gellius and Macrobius in his library, stating that “I think it would be a shame that authors who daily improve my mind should remain unimproved in my house.”² Mazzolato, a close friend of Guarino’s, was chancellor of the Marquis of Ferrara and, as we shall see, keenly interested in Guarino’s textual work (Guarino, *Epistolario* III, 41). Guarino was sincere about his intentions to emendate the texts of the authors he studied, and for about ten years, during the 1420s

2. “Indignum enim censeo ut qui me in dies meliorem faciunt, ii apud me inemendati maneant,” Guarino ep. 224 and Baron 205. Whenever possible I use the sigla listed in Ramminger’s *Neulateinische Wortliste* for Neo-Latin texts. The first fundamental remarks on Guarino’s work on Gellius are in Sabbadini, *La scuola* 118–19, but it is now superseded by Martinelli Tempesta, “Guarino” 367–85. In the following I shall revisit some of the ground covered by Martinelli Tempesta, but with special attention to passages in which we get glimpses of Guarino’s editorial method.

and 1430s, he worked on an edition of Gellius, collating manuscripts from all over Northern Italy and bestowing special attention on restoring the corrupt Greek passages. In 1432, at Ferrara, Guarino finished his edition. His manuscript has not been identified, but already the same year a copy was made of it by Niccolò Pirondolo, a Ferrarese lawyer and old friend of Guarino's (Bertoni 39). Unfortunately Pirondolo's copy is also lost, but, as we will see, it is to some extent possible to reconstruct the *fortuna* of Guarino's edition.

Codicum vel ingenii ope?

We can follow aspects of Guarino's work on Gellius through his letters. He had owned a copy of the *Noctes* from the time he taught at Florence (1410–13/14), but it probably remained there when Guarino left the city (Sabbadini, *Codici latini* col. 416). It might seem that Guarino had his copy with him when in 1418 he answered Niccolò Pirondolo who had asked him about his translations of Plutarch's *Lives* and the *incipit* of Gellius. Guarino explained that it was "Plutarchus in libro quem scripsit" ("Plutarch, in the book he wrote").³ However, he could have quoted that from memory, as perhaps indicated by the word *scripsit*; the copies of the passage I have been able to see with this version of the *incipit* have *scribit* or *conscripsit*.⁴

In October 1422, Guarino again wrote to his friend, Ugo Mazzolato, who had apparently asked him to correct his own copy of the *Noctes*. Guarino answered: "I got your Gellius, but I do not know what I hoped to be able to do with him, as I am so stressed for time. But if I shall be able to snatch a few moments, I'll do what you ask, or I'll send you my copy, if you prefer, so that you can correct yours from it."⁵ Again it might seem as if Guarino had his copy with him, but he could also have been planning to have it sent to Mazzolato from Florence.

The letter to Mazzolato also shows that they discussed the text of other authors. Guarino admits that "with regard to Suetonius there is very little of what is written in Greek that I can understand, unless I happen on an older copy. Ours are so corrupted."⁶ The Greek in Suetonius comes up again in another letter to Mazzolato of 1425 where Guarino complained: "I send you Suetonius, with whom I could do very little, as there is nothing in Greek where 'I could be Oedipus.' I might have been able to make out what he wanted to say by conjecture, but it seemed better not to, lest I should be rash and

3. "Principium libri A. Gellii Noctium atticarum post tabulam, quam omnibus libris praemisit, hoc est: 'Plutarchus in libro quem scripsit' <1418> ep. 95.

4. Modern editions, and many humanist manuscripts, have a different wording in Gell. 1.1, but two MSS closely related to Guarino, BAV, Vat. lat. 3453 and Cesena, Biblioteca Malatestiana, S XVI 4 have "Plutarchus in libro quem scribit." For these two manuscripts, see "The tradition of Guarino" below.

5. "Aulum Gellium accepi, de quo quid sperem nescio, nam undique distringor negotiis ut nullum supersit tempus; tamen si quod furari labori tempus fas erit, 'tibi morem aliquando geram' (Ter. Heaut. 5.1.74), vel meum ad te mittam, si malueris, quo tuum emendes," <1422>, ep. 217.

6. "De Suetonio pauca sunt quae graece scripta possim interpretari, nisi antiquius volumen nactus sim: adeo nostri depravati sunt," <1422>, ep. 217.

7. “Suetonium mitto, cui parum mederi potui, cum nulli adsint graeci characteres, in quibus ‘Oedipus esse possem’ (Ter. And. 1.2.23); nam licet quid dicere velit coniectura possem consequi, tamen ut abstinere potius visum est, ne in scribendo magis quam transcribendo temerarius et arrogans essem. A. Gellium alias mittam, cum vovero,” <1425>, ep. 304.

8. “Is ut multos alios, ita Macrobius de Saturnalibus <at>que Aulum Gellium de noctibus atticis habere dicitur; quos et ego habeo, sed cum eos emendare cupiam, illos te interprete ab eo habere velim,” <1422>, ep. 224. For Giovanni Corvini, see Guarino, *Epistolario* III, p. 145 and now, with newer discussions of his identity, Martinelli Tempesta, “Guarino” 369, n. 4.

9. “Aliud quiddam adiecit, tacitam videlicet accusationem tuam de mea tuis in rebus negligentia, quod scilicet tandiu A. Gellium aliqua ex parte graece loquentem latine loqui non fecerim [...] At illa verissima est, per immortalem deum: nunquam scisse me ut id percuperes; cumque Gellium initio abs te suscepim, nullas tuas accepisse litteras quibus tuae certiore me faceres voluntatis. Quin arbitrabar illum abs te mihi demissum ne sine Gellio mea studia manerent, cum meum ad te ex Florentia dimitti iussissem,” <1425>. ep. 305.

10. “Dudum Suetonium ad te misi, quem ubi acceperis certiore me reddas oro. A. Gellium inter manus verso, cui omnes occupationes cedant faxo,” <1425>, ep. 310.

11. “Sentio A. Gellium meum apud te hospitem esse: siquid apud te agit, iubeo quandiu velis maneat; sin otiosus est, eum reverti iube,” <1425>, ep. 315.

assuming by composing rather than copying. I shall send Gellius another time, when I have been through the text.”⁷ The two passages on Suetonius afford us an important insight into Guarino’s editorial method: if at all possible, he preferred to have solid textual evidence for emendations, he worked *codicum* rather than *ingenii* ope; but as we shall see, it was not always possible.

In December 1422, Guarino wrote to Giovanni Casate (for whom see Guarino, *Epistolario* III, 112) about the library of Giovanni Corvini of Arezzo, a well-known diplomat and bibliophile: “They say that he has both Macrobius, *De saturnalibus* and Gellius’ *Noctes Atticae* – as well as many other books. I have one (*i.e.* the *Noctes*) myself, but as I hope to correct it, I would ask you to act as go-between and get his for me.”⁸ Again it might seem that Guarino had his copy with him, but it could also be Mazzolato’s, which we know was in Guarino’s house only in October that year in order that he could correct it.

Only a month later, Guarino again wrote to Mazzolato. A common friend, Filippo Camozzo, had hinted to Guarino that Mazzolato had been unhappy because he had not translated the Greek passages in Mazzolato’s copy into Latin. Guarino claimed that he had not been aware that Mazzolato wanted him to do so, thinking that Mazzolato had simply sent him his Gellius, so that Guarino would not be without a copy. As it were, Guarino had sent his own copy to Mazzolato – from Florence.⁹ Maybe it had actually remained there since he left Florence almost ten years earlier. However that may be, this is the first time in Guarino’s correspondence that we read explicitly about Gellius’ Greek – but the question is not whether it was correct, or there at all. Mazzolato wanted it translated into Latin for a reader with no or limited Greek (for examples of this, see “The Malatestiana Gellius” below). In March, Guarino wrote that he had sent Mazzolato the Suetonius long ago and begged him to confirm that he had received it. He was working on Gellius and tried to free himself for the work.¹⁰

In a letter of 1425, we read that Guarino’s Gellius is in the library of Cosimo de’ Medici (did Mazzolato maybe lend it to him?). Guarino expresses himself very cautiously, saying that if it is of any use to Cosimo, it can of course stay, but if not, he would like it back.¹¹ Apparently it took awhile before he received it. In a couple of letters to Mazzolato, from August the same year, the subject is again their respective manuscripts of Gellius. Niccolò Pirondolo had written to him about a Gellius that Guarino would finish in a few days. This must be Mazzolato’s copy, which Guarino had promised to emen-

12. “Dominus Nicolaus Pirondulus scripsit ad me super A. Gellio, quem paucis absolutum diebus fecero; tu iube quo mitti eum iubes et cui,” Ex Verona VIII augusti <1425>, ep. 321.

13. “Remitto tibi A. Gellium eodem nuntio, quem, ut credo, emendatiorem multis in locis habebis [...] Meus nondum ex Florentia rediit; vereor ne angues reformidans aberrarit: incommodo mihi magno erit eius absentia. Tabulam in A. Gellio habebis ex cl. viro Andrea Iuliano ...,” <1425>, ep. 322.

14. “Gratum etiam feceris si Gellium illum Florentia missum significaveris,” <1425>, ep. 324.

15. “A. Gellium ipsum diligenter conscriptum libenter accepi, quia in eo te quoque legendo audio,” <1426>, ep. 351.

16. “Philippum meum salvere iubeo utque meminerit Dionis etiam atque etiam roga et tabulae in Aulum Gellium,” <1426>, ep. 363.

17. “Gratum est quod de ta<bula in A. Gellium>quinternum factum esse scribis, ut cl. viro Madio nostro satisfiat ...,” <1426>, ep. 365.

18. “Reliqui sunt libri quos antea inemendatos habebamus. Idcirco siquem ad exemplar repertum emendare liceret, minus esset laboris: de Q. Curtio et A. Gellio dico, quos truncatos habeo et laceros crudeliter ora [Verg. Aen. 6. 495]. Ad hos etiam duos ad nostra studia redigendos alia quaeretur via,” <1430>, ep. 578.

date; Guarino asked where he should send it.¹² Some days later Guarino was able to send Mazzolato the Gellius in which he had corrected many passages. Guarino’s own copy had not been returned from Florence, and he was afraid that it had gone astray. Its absence, Guarino complained, would be a great inconvenience. Mazzolato would receive the chapter headings to the *Noctes* separately, from Andrea Zulian, the Venetian humanist and nobleman.¹³ From a common friend Guarino then heard that the manuscript had reached Mazzolato, and he asked eagerly if his own copy had been sent from Florence.¹⁴

In a letter dated by Sabbadini to March 1426, we read that Guarino had received a Gellius from Martino Rizzon, one of his favourite pupils (Guarino, *Epistolario* III, 188–89). Maybe Rizzon had annotated the copy, because Guarino says that in the Gellius “I also hear you reading.”¹⁵ The same year, Guarino asked Rizzon to remind Filippo Camozzo of Dion, perhaps hinting at a copy of his own translation of the Plutarchan *Life* (modern edition in Pade, *Vita Dionis*), and of the chapter headings of the *Noctes*.¹⁶ The last request must have been for Guarino’s friend Mazzo dei Mazzi, because shortly afterwards he could write to Martino that he had been pleased to hear that a gathering had been produced with the chapter headings, as it would please Mazzo.¹⁷

For a few years, we do not have any letters preserved on the work on Gellius, but then in a letter to Giacomo Zilioli, a Ferrarese notary, of 1430, Guarino mentioned some books in his library which had not been emendated, as he did not have access to a corrected copy he could use for this. “I talk about Curtius and Gellius,” he continued, “whom I possess ‘maimed and cruelly mutilated.’ To restore these two, as the rest, so they can be useful for my studies, one must find a different method.”¹⁸ Guarino, it seems, despaired of acquiring a corrected copy of the *Noctes*, but two years later, that changed. He already possessed a copy with at least some of the Greek, but in the summer of that year, he was waiting to receive a copy belonging to Ugolino Cantello, lawyer, well-known bibliophile, and the year after *podestà* at Ferrara (Guarino, *Epistolario* III, 306). Apparently Cantello’s copy was known to contain also the *graeca*. In the letter, Guarino complained that although he had asked Cantello to send him Gellius, he had received neither an answer nor the book. However, Guarino continues, “you should have hastened to do it of your own accord, as it is of common interest. For, as I wrote to you from here, I have no means of inserting the Greek passages which are either lacking because of the copyists’ ignorance or have been omitted. It will be a work worthy of immortality; if I finish it, this *exemplar* will then

19. “Superioribus diebus unas ad te litteras dedi, ut A. Gellium mitteres; nihil aut verbis aut re, quod equidem mallet, respondi; quam ad rem vel sponte tua properare debuisti, cum res communis ageretur. Nam, ut hinc ad te scripsi, delata est mihi facultas et copia textus inscribendi graecos, qui librariorum ignoratione intercepti vel omisi fuerant Opus igitur immortalitate dignum futurum est; si id perficio, tum futurum est mea opera exemplar, qualia vel nulla vel pauca visa sunt per hosce annos. Accelera igitur et Gellium ipsum advolare facito,” <30 June 1432>, ep. 631.

20. “Guarini Veronensis ad Nicolaum Pirundulum iuriconsultum doctissimum super scriptione A. Gellii. ‘Gratulor atque omni capio nunc gaudia mente,/ Quod tibi tam florens hac tempestate novellus/ Filius in lucem veniat sine matre, tuos qui/ Non vultus aut membra refert, sed viva vigentis/ Ingenii simulacra tui et monumenta tuarum ./ Fit manuum [...]/ Ergo progenitum nonnullis partibus ornem:/ Quem nostras italum lingua demittis ad aedes,/ Accipe et eloquium fundentem ex ore pelasgum.’” <1433> ep. 639, vv. 1–6 and 21–23.

21. “Gratias ago Gellio meo, cuius ope atque opera rem tibi gratam fecisse contingit mihi; quibus pro meritis hoc illi praemii reddas volo, ut cum primum voluntati tuae morem gesserit, reditum ipsi pares in patriam ad patronum suum vel clientem potius, nam saepe numero me tuetur me iuvat et causam meam defendit ac studiis meis praesentem affert opem” <1433>, ep. 639. For the date, see Guarino, *Epistolario* III, 310.

22. “habeo quidem sordidum, veste pannosa et bombicina indutum tunica, sed adeo veridicum et magna ex parte emendatum, ut eum pro Croesi opibus et auro Midae mutaturus non sim,” <1434>, ep. 649.

be my work, as there have been none or few during these years. So hurry up and make Gellius come here quickly.”¹⁹

Guarino finished his edition in 1432 in a now lost manuscript. His colleague Niccolò Pirondolo made a copy of it, now also lost, but Guarino acknowledged the feat in a poem of twenty-six hexametres. He congratulates Pirondolo for having brought forth a son without a mother, *i.e.* the Gellius, a son that does not resemble him physically but is a picture of his intellect and a monument to his craft. But Guarino will enhance Pirondolo’s offspring; the son whom he sent to Guarino as Latin he will get back speaking also Greek.²⁰ So Guarino supplied the *graeca* in Pirondolo’s copy.

Guarino was evidently at the centre of the study of Gellius’ text. He probably did receive Cantello’s copy (see above and n. 16), for in a letter, probably from 1433, we read that he had lent Cantello his new edition – and now would like to have it back: “I thank my Gellius, who has helped me achieve something you approve of. Therefore I would like you to pay him back in the following way: as soon as he has done what you wish him to, take care that he can return home to his patron, or rather his client. He often looks after me, and helps me, defending me and assisting me in my work.”²¹ In 1434 Ludovico, count of S. Bonifazio, had asked him whether he possessed a copy of the *Noctes* and Guarino answered proudly: “I have a filthy copy, in ragged clothes and dressed in a cotton tunic. However it is so true and for a large part corrected that I would not change it for the riches of Croesus or for Midas’ gold.”²²

The tradition of Guarino

1. The copy of Giovanni Lamola

The earliest copy we do have of Guarino’s edition, at least with regard to the Greek, has the date 31 October 1432 and was written by his friend and collaborator Giovanni Lamola (1404–49). It is now BAV, Vat. lat. 3453 (Pellegrin III.2, 310, Sabbadini, *La scuola* 119, Baron 207, Scipioni No. 100. On Lamola, see Arbizzoni). On f. Iv we find the ex-libris of Lamola: “Iste liber est mei Iohannis Lamolae quem propria manu transscripsi” (“this book belongs to me, Giovanni Lamola; I copied it with my own hand”); and on f. 159r “Auli Gellii Noctium Atticarum liber uigesimus et ultimus feliciter explicit M.CCCC.XXXII. pridie Kalendas Nouembrias [!]” (“The twentieth and last book of Aulus Gellius’ *Noctes Atticae* happily ends here 31 October 1432”).

Lamola was himself an accomplished textual critic who often worked with Guarino on his editions (Pade, “Guarino and Caesar” 74). For this reason it has been suggested that we cannot be sure how far his text reflects that of Guarino (Baron 207). However, neither Baron nor Sabbadini, who also commented on the relationship of Lamola’s copy with that of Guarino’s finished edition (Guarino, *Epistolario* III, 307–08), knew of the Malatestiana Gellius which I am going to discuss below, and with the help of which we can show that Lamola’s Greek actually does reflect Guarino’s work.

On f. 155r space was left for the letters of Alexander and Aristotle – but too little and the Greek spills into the margins.²³ This could indicate that Lamola copied the Latin before he had access to Guarino’s finished version, or before it was indeed finished, and misjudged how much space would be needed for the insertion of the Greek here. This would solve the problem of how Lamola could have managed to copy the entire work between the late summer of 1432 – the *terminus post quem* is the letter to Cantello of 30 June (see above note 19) – and 31 October of the same year, if that is indeed the *terminus ante quem* also of Lamola’s insertion of the Greek passages. As Martinelli Tempesta pointed out, compared to the Malatestiana Gellius, Lamola omitted many of the *graeca* in Books 1–7, whereas they are mostly there in Books 9–20. It is highly likely that by the time Lamola used Guarino’s edition, the work of emendating the Greek passages had not yet been completed (“Guarino” 375–76). Moreover, in Books 1–7 Lamola often indicates that some *graeca* are missing either by just a ‘g’ written in the same ink as the text, or by an uppercase ‘G’ in red ink, but I have not found any instances of this in Books 9–20. Whether this means that he did not expect to be able to fill in the missing *graeca* in the first part of the manuscript, I cannot say, but it could be an explanation.

The transcription of the two letters has the forms ἀκροατικούς/ἀκροατικῶν (see Texts 1 and 2),²⁴ but in Aristotle’s letter, in the final greeting to Alexander, the words Ἀλέξανδρε βασιλεῦ are missing – as they are in the Malatestiana Gellius (for which see below). Moreover, in 13.7.2 (f. 94v) Lamola’s manuscript has the same unusual long version of the quote from Herodotus which we shall see in the Malatestiana Gellius, but without Guarino’s Latin translation, and the same is the case with two quotes from Homer’s *Iliad* in 17.7.4–5. In both cases the quotes are longer than those found in the Gellius vulgate.

In the lower margin of f. 155r, Lamola added an interesting note: Text 3

23. Sabbadini, *La scuola* 119, and Baron 213, quoting his description, maintain that the Greek text of the letters was written in *rasura*, but as far as I have been able to see upon close inspection of the manuscript, this is not the case.

24. Baron 213 mistakenly maintains that Lamola has ἀκροαματικούς in Gell. 20.5.11 – but that is the reading of the Plutarch passage quoted in the lower margin. However, this is yet another reason why he questions the relationship between Lamola’s copy and Guarino’s edition.

Apud Plutarchum in uita Alexandri epistola haec ad Aristotelem extat. Ἀλέξανδρος Ἀριστοτέλει εὖ πράττειν. οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἐποίησας ἐκδοὺς τοὺς ἀκροαματικούς τῶν λόγων· τίτι γὰρ δὴ διοίσομεν ἡμεῖς τῶν ἄλλων, εἰ καθ' οὓς ἐπαιδεύθημεν λόγους, οὗτοι πάντων ἔσσονται κοινοί; ἐγὼ δὲ βουλοίμην ἂν ταῖς περὶ τὰ ἄριστα ἐμπειρίαις ἢ ταῖς δυνάμεσι διαφέρειν. ἔρρωσο. (Plut. Al. 7.7).

The letter is basically the same as in Gellius, with one difference, namely the adjective ἀκροαματικούς instead of ἀκροατικούς. This is a variant we shall meet again.

3. The Malatestiana Gellius

Cesena, Biblioteca Malatestiana, MS S xvi has the coat of arms of the library's founder, Malatesta Novello (f. 2r), and was copied at the beginning of the 1450s for him at Ferrara. The chapter headings are on a separate leaf at the beginning of the volume and written by a different hand from that of the main text (ff. 2r–142r). The scribe of the chapter headings who also occasionally corrected the main text has been identified by de la Mare as Jean d'Épinal (de la Mare 40–43). She also identified the hand that inserted the Greek as well as the marginal translations of it as that of Guarino, obviously working some ten to twenty years after he finished his edition of the *Noctes*.²⁵

Here again we are looking at a volume in which the original layout does not leave enough, or indeed hardly any, space for the Greek. From the digital copy of the manuscript made available by the Biblioteca Malatestiana, it seems that the various signs and letters inserted by Guarino in the text itself, making it possible for the reader to identify the correct Greek word or passage in the margin, are *in ratura*; originally there may have been something like 'G' telling the reader that some *graeca* were missing (for examples of this, see "The medieval tradition" above).

Space is left blank on f. 140v where Alexander's and Aristotle's letters should be, but they are transcribed in the lower margin of f. 140r with the forms ἀκροατικούς/ ἀκροατικῶν, *i.e.* following the Gellius vulgate, and as in Lamola's copy, in the final greeting to Alexander, the words Ἀλέξανδρε βασιλεῦ are missing.

Another point in which the Cesena manuscript resembles Lamola's copy, is the length of some quotes from Greek authors. In 13.3.4–5 the vulgate has two quotes from the *Iliad* about lions, *Il.* 17.133–35 and 18.318–20. Guarino inserts the two passages in a different order, transcribing first the verses from Book 18, but quoting a longer passage than that

25. de la Mare 36 and note 9; for a recent description of the manuscript, see Martinelli Tempesta, "Qualche osservazione" 253–54. For Guarino's Greek hand, see also Eleuteri and Canart, entry LXII.

found in the Gellius vulgate, *i.e.* vv. 318–22, and then the three verses from Book 17. In Lamola's copy the Greek in 13.3.4–5 is almost identical with what we find in the Malatestiana Gellius, but whereas the verses from Book 18 are in the text itself, the passage from Book 17 is in the margin. Another instance is the quote from Herodotus in Gell. 13.7.2 (F. 86R). Here the Gellius vulgate has Ἡ δὲ δὴ λῆαινα ἐὼν ἰσχυρὸν καὶ θρασύτατον ἅπαξ ἐν τῷ βίῳ τίκτει ἓν· τίκτουσα γὰρ συνεκβάλλει τῷ τέκνῳ τὰς μήτρας (“being very strong and bold, the lioness gives birth only once in her life, and then only one cub; for when she has given birth she throws out the uterus with the cub,” Hdt. 3.108 – this is *e.g.* the length of the Greek quote in O, for which see “The medieval tradition” above). In both Lamola's copy and the Cesena MS the quotation continues for several more lines until ... λείπεται αὐτέων ὑγιᾶς οὐδέν (“nothing of their uterus is left whole”). On f. 86v in the margin, Guarino translates the passage – as we read Mazzolato had wanted him to do (see note 10 above): “Fortissimum et audacissimum semel in uita parit unum. Pariens enim uná cum nato matricem eiicit. Haec huius causa est. Cum catulus in matrice existens moueri coeperit, habens omnibus beluis unguis longe acutiores matrices laniat. Crescens multo amplius scalpit. Iam prope partus adest et omnino nulla illarum pars sana relinquitur.”²⁶ In the first half of the fifteenth century, few scholars in Italy were as familiar with the text of Herodotus as Guarino who had owned a copy from 1427 (Sabbadini, *La scuola* 119; Baron 212; Looney, “The Reception” 169–71).

We find traces of Guarino's work on the *graeca* in Latin authors also in texts not so closely connected with his name. In a copy of Cicero's *Familiares*, BAV, Pal. lat. 1501 (Pellegrin ii.2, 158), there is again a Greek passage which is longer than what is found in the modern vulgate. In *fam.* 6.18.5 the *textus communis* reads “Lepta suavissimus ediscat Hesiodum et habeat in ore τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἰδρῶτα et cetera” (“your sweet boy should learn Hesiod by heart and always repeat ‘Sweat before excellence’ and so forth,” ff. 62r–v, cp. *Erga* 289), whereas the Palatinus adds the rest of v. 289 and vv. 290–92, omitting “et cetera.” A rather Gothic hand made an interlinear translation of the passage, but in the margin of f. 62r, a different hand, slightly resembling that of Guarino, wrote

Sudorem prae se fert uirtus mente Deorum
est ad eam longus rectusque per ardua callis
asper et inprimis, ubi in alta cacumina ventum est!
Mollis adest quae uisa fuit durissima quondam.
Eos sic uertit Guarinus Veronensis.
(excellence requires sweat, by decision of the gods. The path

26. The Malatestiana Gellius is unique in containing so many translations by Guarino of the *graeca*. On the Latin translations of the *graeca* in humanist manuscripts of Gellius in general, see Martinelli Tempesta, “Qualche osservazione.”

that leads to her is long and steep and it is rough at the beginning; but when one has reached the top, then she is easy to reach, though she once seemed very hard. Guarino Veronese translated the verses thus.)

Guarino quoted the first line of the passage as early as 1418 in a letter (ep. 125) to Antonio Corbinelli (1376/77–1425), bibliophile and scion of an influential Florentine family, and the lines are also vv. 4–7 of one of his poems (carm. 63).²⁷

27. The passage from Hesiod in Cicero's letter attracted the attention of other humanist scholars. Daniela Gionta discussed some examples of transcriptions longer than that found in the *textus communis* of the letter and accompanied by Latin translation in Gionta, "Graeca" 307–08. For Corbinelli, see Molho.

28. I would like to thank Dr. Suzanne Karr Schmidt of the Newberry Library in Chicago for her invaluable help in getting electronic reproductions of the Gellius.

3. The Newberry Gellius

Hans Baron was the first to draw attention to Chicago Newberry Library 90. It was written by one Milanus Burrus, of the Milanese branch of the Borri family, in 1445, and probably never left Northern Central Italy before it was bought by the Chicago Library. As already mentioned, Baron was not aware of the existence of the Malatestiana Gellius, but on the basis of Sabbadini's work on Guarino's edition and his description of Lamola's copy, he inferred that the Newberry Gellius is a very early descendant of Guarino's text. (Baron 207–13).²⁸ One of his arguments was that the Newberry Gellius has the same long quotation from Herodotus as Lamola's copy – a quotation which Sabbadini attributed to Guarino, as we have read (see "The Malatestiana Gellius" above). Another was that it had the forms ἀκροατικοὺς/ ἀκροατικῶν at Gell. 20.5.11–12 which he mistakenly maintained that Lamola's copy did not (see note 24 above). I could add that, as in Lamola's copy and in the Malatestiana Gellius, in the final greeting to Alexander, the words Ἀλέξανδρε βασιλεῦ are missing.

There can therefore hardly be any doubt that the *graeca* in the Newberry Gellius reflect Guarino's lost edition. However, there is one aspect in which it differs from the other copies I have examined so far. Whereas the *graeca* in both Lamola's copy and in the Malatestiana Gellius were often copied in the margins, because sufficient space – if any at all – had not been left by the scribe of the Latin text, Milanus Burrus clearly had an *exemplar* in which the Greek was already there, so that he could judge how much blank space he needed to leave for it.

*

My examination of Guarino's statements regarding his editorial principles in correcting the *graeca* in Gellius and other Latin authors showed that he preferred to rely on the medieval tradition (see above "Codicum vel ingenii ope?"). However, the examination of the descendants of his lost manuscript clearly reveals that Guarino did not

29. On Guarino's editorial method, see also Martinelli Tempesta, "Qualche osservazione" 252. In a recent article, "Il Gellio," Martinelli Tempesta examined Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, Parm. 3178 and concluded that it, too, belonged to the Guarinian tradition. The hand of the scribe even resembles that of Milano Burro – although it is not actually his.

30. Rollo, "Sulle tracce" 86–92 and "Interventi" 367–77. For a first overview of the tradition of the *graeca* in humanist manuscripts of Gellius, see Martinelli Tempesta, "Qualche osservazione." In Rocchi and Holford-Strevens there is an interesting discussion of the state of the *graeca* in Gellius' preface in most recentiores, and the work done to restore them in the princeps and the early vulgate.

always manage to follow that principle: very often he 'corrected' or completed Greek passages consulting the direct tradition of the Greek authors quoted by Gellius.²⁹

Other branches

I shall now discuss a few other fifteenth-century copies of the *Noctes* which present a different picture. BAV, Vat. lat. 1532 was produced for Niccolò da Cattaro, Bishop of Modrus (*i.e.* Krbava, in Croatia, c. 1427–80) as is shown by his coat of arms (f. 11v), and written by Giovanni da Itro (fl. c. 1470), cp. "Hoc opus scripsit Iohannes Nardi Fusci de Itro feliciter etc" (f. 139r, cp. Pellegrin III.1, pp. 106–7). The Greek is by Andronico Callisto (1/4 s. xv–before 1487).³⁰

In the text of 20.5 (f. 136 v) there is just a sign for Greek where the letters of Alexander and Aristotle should have been, but in the upper margin we find the Greek text of Alexander's letter, however with ἀκροαματικούς, the reading in Plutarch, Al. 7.7, instead of ἀκροατικούς as found in the *textus communis*. Then, surprisingly, in the left margin, Aristotle's letter to Alexander, with ἀκροαματικῶν instead of ἀκροατικῶν – surprisingly, because Plutarch does not render the actual text of Aristotle's letter, he only gives a summary of its content, and it does not include the word ἀκροαματικῶν. The text is thus clearly from Gellius – though the adjectives ἀκροαματικούς/ ἀκροαματικῶν come from the Plutarchan tradition.

The Greek is written in rather light red ink and in a hand that has a different ductus than that of the main text. Also in the left margin there is a translation of the two letters, written in darker red and not by the scribe of the main text. I have not come across this translation elsewhere:

Text 4

Alexander Aristoteli felicitatem. Abs te haud recte factum est quod disciplinas audibiles edideris. Nos enim qua iure ceteris prestabimus, si doctrine, in quibus eruditi sumus, he uniuersis communes esse reperiuntur? Ego uero optima rerum peritia quam potentia malim excellere. Aristoteles Alexandro felicitatem. Ad me scripsisti de disciplinis audibilibus eas existimans inter arcana obseruari oportere. Scito igitur illas editas et non editas esse. Nam solis illis intelligibiles erunt quibus nos audiuisse contingeret (*sic!*). Vale

The two hands, *i.e.* the Greek and that of the translations, are seen together elsewhere in the volume (for the *graeca* and the Latin translations in this manuscript, see also Martinelli Tempesta, “Qualche osservazione” 268–69).

We have another witness to this contaminated tradition in BAV, Reg. lat. 1626, now in the Vatican Library (Pellegrin II.1, 330–31). The manuscript contains a collection of mainly Cicero’s letters, but followed by a small collection of other Latin letters, and then, almost at the end of the volume and written by a different hand, the Greek text of Alexander’s letter and a translation which differs from that printed above. It is followed by Aristotle’s answering letter, both in Greek and in Latin translation. Like in Niccolò da Cattaro’s copy, Vat. lat. 1532, the Greek text of the two letters is quoted directly, which points to the Gellian tradition, but with the Plutarchan ἀκροαματικούς/ἀκροαματικῶν. The translations are not like any I have seen elsewhere:

Text 5

Alexander Aristoteli sal. Haud recte fecisti qui auscultatorios libros edideris. In qua enim re a caeteris nos item praestabimus, si disciplinae, in quibus eruditi sumus, omnium omnino sint communes? Equidem malim in rerum usu optimarum quam in facultatibus anteire. Vale. Aristoteles regi Alexandro Sal. Scripsisti ad me de libris auscultatoriis inter arcana illos condi putans oportere. Sed tu eos et esse editos et minime editos scito. Cognobiles enim iis tantum erunt qui nos audiverint. Vale (f. 190v, cp. Pellegrin II.1, 330).

The Latin tradition for rendering ἀκροατικός / ἀκροαματικός

The role of Plutarch in the transmission of Alexander’s letter to Aristotle is also seen in a number of anthologies with model letters which contain Guarino’s Latin translation *Alexander* 7.7:

Text 6

Alexander Aristoteli felicitatem. Haud abs te recte factum est quod speculatiuas edidisti disciplinas. Qua enim in re ceteris

iam nos ipsi praecelemus, si ea quibus eruditi sumus, studia omnibus coeperunt esse communia? Mallem enim singulari disciplina quam potestate praestare.

I have found the letter in Guarino's translation in twelve fifteenth-century manuscripts with letter anthologies, and it was of course also found in the many manuscript copies of Guarino's translation of the entire life, of which I have identified 53;³¹ the popularity of the letter will have helped to disseminate one Latin version of the concept of ἀκροατικός / ἀκροαματικός but there were in fact several others.

In the passage in the *Noctes* in which Gellius explains about the two parts of the Aristotelian corpus, he says: "Libros quoque suos ... seorsum diuisit, ut alii 'exoterici' dicerentur, partim 'acroatici'" ("He also divided his books up, so that some were called exoteric while a part was for hearing only"). Though Gellius thus established a practice of simply transcribing the Greek technical terms, this is not what we encounter in humanist Latin renderings of Alexander's letter. As we have seen, Guarino rendered Plutarch's ἀκροαματικούς with *speculatiuas ... disciplinas* in his translation of the Alexander from c. 1408. The word is found only in late Latin, in writers such as Boethius and Cassiodorus.

In BAV, Vat. lat. 1532, Niccolò da Cattaro's copy of the *Noctes*, Alexander's letter and Aristotle's answer are transcribed with the Plutarchan variant of the adjective, ἀκροαματικούς / ἀκροαματικών and with a Latin translation added in the margin in which it is rendered with *disciplinas audibiles* (see above Text 4). Again this is a word found only in late Latin; the earliest occurrence of the word recorded by the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* is in Priscian.

We saw yet another version in the translation of the two letters – rendered in Greek with the Plutarchan ἀκροαματικούς / ἀκροαματικών – in BAV, Reg. lat. 1626. Here the books are called *auscultatorii* which is not a word found in ancient nor, as far as I have been able to ascertain, in medieval Latin. However, in his magisterial *Thesaurus graecae linguae*, Henri Estienne explained ἀκροαματικός with "ad auditionem pertinens; vel in auditione consistens, q. d. auditorius, *auscultatorius*," referring to Plutarch's *Alexander*, and to Gellius. Trying to explain why the books were called so, Estienne suggested that it must be because students could only get to apprehend their contents by listening to the teacher. In the much shorter lemma ἀκροατικός, Estienne does not refer to Gellius, explaining the word as "auditorius; ad auditionem pertinens."

So Estienne used *auscultatorius* to render ἀκροαματικός, as we also saw in Text 5, the anonymous translation of Alexander's letter and Aristotle's answer in BAV, Reg. lat. 1626. This is probably not for-

31. Brescia, Biblioteca Civica Queriniana, A VII 3, f. 94v; Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Library, 1, f. 59; København, Det Kongelige Bibliotek, Ny Kgl. S. 134 80, f. 59v; Dresden, LB Depositum Bezirksbibl. Karl-Marx-Stadt 57, f. 70v; München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm. 14634, f. 239; Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, pal. 262, f. 27v; Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense 303, f. 73v; BAV, Barb. lat. 42 (a. 1466), f. 54; BAV, Ottob. lat. 2010, f. 72v; BAV, Vat. lat. 5131, f. 38v; Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 199, f. 31; Wells, Holkham Hall, 487, f. 42. The excerpt is listed in Bertalot, *Initia humanistica Latina*, No. 8513. For this see also Pade, "Plutarch" 57–58. For the manuscript of Guarino's *Alexander*, see Pade, *The Reception* II, 134–35.

tuitous, because the neologism actually had quite a fortune in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Latin, as we can see in the lemma *auscultatorius* in Johann Ramminger's *Neulateinische Wortliste*:

auscultatorius, -a, -um – 1) *zum Hören dienend o. darauf bezüglich*: ALBERTI *aedif* 5,3 *percommodissimae quidem tyrannis sunt occultae et latentes intra crassitudinem parietis fistulae auscultatoriae* [...] – 2) *in der Einteilung der Schriften des Aristoteles*: PICO–GF *vita* p.76 [...] HOLDSWORTH (1590–1649) *praelect* p.350 *Opusculorum Aristotelis decantata est et nota omnibus distributio, quòd duo librorum genera conscripserit: unum eorum quos vocavit ἑξωτερικοὺς extra-neos, seu populares, quòd ad vulgi captum accommodati essent; alterum eorum quos ἀκροαματικούς appellant Interpretes, quasi quis dicat auscultatorios, quia et à Discipulis maiori cum attentione audiendi, et à Magistro maiori curā et intentione erant enarrandi.*

Whereas the earliest meaning recorded by Ramminger, with an example from Alberti, “which helps to hear or has to do with hearing” (the only meaning listed in Hoven) is less interesting in our context, the second section of the lemma is highly relevant. The long quote from Holdsworth, who wrote before Estienne published his *Thesaurus*, describes the two parts of the Aristotelian corpus, of which the second consists of the ἀκροαματικούς *libros*, i.e. the *auscultatorios libros*.

Conclusions

Guarino's letters show that, in theory at least, he was a conservative editor of classical texts. They also show the fifteenth-century textual critic's difficulties in procuring exemplars from which to work – even if that *exemplar* might belong to the editor himself: Guarino's personal copy of Gellius which for some years was left behind in Florence proved very difficult for him to get hold of again.

Though Guarino's own manuscript with his corrected text of Gellius is lost, we have some descendants of it which show that he knew a branch of the tradition which contained at least some of the *graeca* as they appear in the more valuable medieval manuscripts, like O and Π (see “The medieval tradition” above). However, quite often Guarino had to resort to the indirect tradition when restoring the *graeca* in Gellius, inserting passages directly from the authors Gellius

quoted. This led to variant readings and often to the insertion of Greek passages far longer than those found in the *textus communis*.

It seems paradoxical that although Guarino apparently had access to a manuscript with ἀκροατικός of the Gellius vulgate in the letter exchange between Alexander and Aristotle, the ἀκροαματικός of the Plutarchan tradition sometimes sneaked in, not least in what appears to be excerpts from Gellius in various florilegia.

In manuscripts of the tradition going back to Guarino, *graeca* were often accompanied by a Latin translation. Gellius himself was no help in rendering the rather rare ἀκροατικός / ἀκροαματικός, since he simply transcribed the term. As we saw, there is a series of suggestions for a satisfactory Latin rendering, some using terms taken from late Latin writers, but also one which is actually a neologism, namely *auscultatorius*, a word that enjoyed a discreet fortune in early modern Latin.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Estienne, Henri. Θησαυρὸς τῆς ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης = *Thesaurus graecae linguae*. Genevae: excudebat Henricus Stephanus, 1572.

Guarino Veronese. *Epistolario 1–III*. Ed. Remigio Sabbadini. Miscellanea di storia veneta 8, 11, 14. Venezia: Deputazione Veneta di Storia Patria, 1915–16–19.

Perotti, Niccolò. *Cornu copiae seu linguae Latinae commentarii*. 8 vols. Ed. Jean-Louis Charlet, Giancarlo Abbamonte, Martine Furno, Pernille Harsting, Marianne Pade, Johann Ramming, and Fabio Stok. Sassoferrato: Istituto di studi piceni 1989–2001. The full text of the edition is now available on the [website](#) of the Repertorium Pomponianum. Last consulted 12.05.2024).

Modern studies

Arbizzoni, Guido. “Lamola, Giovanni.” *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 63 (2004): 233–37.

Baron, Hans. “Aulus Gellius in the Renaissance: His Influence and a

Manuscript from the School of Guarino.” *From Petrarch to Leonardo Bruni. Studies in Humanistic and Political Literature*. Chicago–London: University of Chicago Press, 1968. 196–215, First published in *Studies in Philology* 48 (1951): 107–25 and *ibid.* 49 (1952): 248–50.

Bertalot, Ludwig. *Initia humanistica latina. Initienverzeichnis lateinischer Prosa und Poesie aus der Zeit des 14. bis 16. Jahrhunderts*. Bearbeitet von Ursula Jaitner-Hahner. 2 vols. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1985–90.

Bertoni, Giulio. *Guarino da Verona fra letterati e cortigiani a Ferrara (1429–1460)*. Geneva: Olschki, 1921.

Codex. I tesori della Biblioteca Ambrosiana. Milano: Rizzoli, 2000.

De la Mare, Albinia C. “Lo scriptorium di Malatesta Novello.” Ed. Fabrizio Lollini e Piero Lucchi. *Libreria Domini. I manoscritti*

- della Biblioteca Malatestiana: testi e decorazioni. Bologna: Grafis, 1995. 35–93.
- Eleuteri, Paolo and Paul Canart. *Scrittura greca nell'Umanesimo italiano*. Milano: Il Polifilo, 1991.
- Gionta, Daniela. "Graeca umanistici in codici antichi di Cicerone e Columella." *I graeca nei libri latini tra medioevo e umanesimo. Atti della giornata di studi in ricordo di Alessandro Daneloni*, Messina, 28 ottobre 2015. Ed. Antonino Antonazzo and Giovanni Cascio. Studi medievali e umanistici 14 (2016): 295–335.
- Hoven, René. *Lexique de la prose latine de la renaissance*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 1994. Second edition. Ed. Laurent Grailet and Karin Renard-Jadoul. English translation by Coen Maas. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006.
- . *Lexique de la prose latine de la renaissance (= Dictionary of Renaissance Latin from Prose Sources. Second edition)*. Ed. Laurent Grailet and Karin Renard-Jadoul. English translation by Coen Maas. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006.
- Lindskog, Claes and Konrat Ziegler, ed. *Plutarchi vitae parallelae*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1964.
- Looney, Dennis. "The Reception of Herodotus in the Ferrarese Quattrocento." *Annali Online di Ferrara – Lettere* 1 (2012): 167–83.
- Maisani, Riccardo and Antonio Rollo. *Manuele Crisolora e il ritorno del greco in occidente. Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Napoli, 26–29 giugno 1997)*. Napoli: D'Auria, 2002. 133–50.
- Martinelli Tempesta, Stefano. "Guarino e il restauro dei graeca in Aulo Gellio." *I graeca nei libri latini tra medioevo e umanesimo. Atti della giornata di studi in ricordo di Alessandro Daneloni*, Messina, 28 ottobre 2015. Ed. Antonino Antonazzo and Giovanni Cascio. Studi medievali e umanistici 14 (2016): 337–429.
- . "Qualche osservazione sulle traduzioni latine e quattrocentesche dei graeca nelle Notti attiche." *Res Publica Litterarum. Studies in the Classical Tradition* 43, ns. 23 (2020): 250–87.
- . "Il Gellio Parm. 3178 e il restauro umanistico dei graeca nelle Notti attiche." *Scripta. An International Journal of Codicology and Palaeography* 14 (2021): 95–120.
- Meagher, Luanne. *The Gellius Manuscript of Lupus of Ferrières*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1936.
- Molho, Anthony. "Corbinelli, Antonio." *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 28 (1983). Last consulted 12.05.2024.
- Pade, Marianne. "Guarino and Caesar at the Court of the Este." *La corte di Ferrara e il suo mecenatismo 1441–1598*. Ed. Marianne Pade, Lene Waage Petersen and Daniela Quarta. *Renæssancestudier* 4. Copenhagen–Modena: Museum Tusculanum and Pannini 1990, 71–91.
- . "Plutarch, Gellius and John of Salisbury in Humanist Anthologies. *Ab Aquilone*. Nordic Studies in Honour and Memory of Leonard E. Boyle, O.P. Ed. Marie-Louise Rodén. *Skrifter utgivne af Riksarkivet* 14. Svenska Institutet i Rom, Suecoromana 6. Stockholm: Svenska Rigsarkivet, 1999: 57–70.
- . *The Reception of Plutarch's Lives in Fifteenth-Century Italy*. 2 vols. *Renæssancestudier* 14. København: Museum Tusculanum, 2007.
- . "Le Noctes Atticae di Gellio e la prefazione del Cornu copiae di Niccolò Perotti." *Studi umanistici piceni* 32 (2012): 21–28.
- . *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Vita Dionis & Comparatio et de Bruto ac Dione iudicium Guarino Veronensi interprete* (1414). Critical edition and introduction. Edizione nazionale delle traduzioni dei testi greci in età umanistica e rinascimentale. Firenze: SISMEL, 2013.
- . "Intertextuality as a Narrative Device. The Epistolographic Genre in the Renaissance." *Fiction and Figuration in High and Late Medieval Literature*. Ed. Anders Cullhed, Anders Hallengren, Brian Møller Jensen and Marianne Pade. *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici Supplementum* XLVII, Roma: Quasar, 2016: 31–40.
- Pellegrin, Elisabeth, with Adriana Marucchi and Paola Scarcia Piacentini. *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*. 3 vols. Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique. 1975–91.
- Ramminger, Johann. *Neulateinische Wortliste. Ein Wörterbuch des Lateinischen von Petrarca bis 1700*. 2003– Last consulted 12.05.2024.
- Reynolds, Leighton D., ed. *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*. Oxford: OUP, 1983.
- Rocchi, Stefano and Leofranc Holford-Strevens. "'Graeca' e 'Latina' stravaganti dalla praefatio alle Notti Attiche nella princeps e nella vulgata (con due appendici)." *Studi medievali e umanistici* 8–9 (2011): 149–65.
- Rolfe, John C., transl. Gellius, *Attic Nights*. 3 vols. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1929.
- Rollo, Antonio. "Sulle tracce di Antonio Corbinelli." *Studi*

- medievali e umanistici* 2 (2004): 25–95.
- . “Interventi di Andronico Callisto in codici Latini.” *Studi medievali e umanistici* 4 (2006): 367–79.
- Sabbadini, Remigio. *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Guarini Veronese*. Catania: Galati, 1896.
- . “Codici Latini posseduti, scoperti, illustrati da Guarino Veronese.” *Museo Italiano di Antichità Classica* 2, 2 (1887), cols. 373–456.
- Scipioni, Silvia. *I codici umanistici di Gellio. Filologia medievale e umanistica* 1. Roma: Storia e letteratura, 2003.
- Thesaurus linguae Latinae*. Leipzig et al.: Teubner, 1900–
- Tinelli, Elisa. “Note sulla tradizione dei graeca nelle Noctes Atticae di Aulo Gellio.” *Classica et christiana* 7.2 (2012): 591–95.
- Weiss, Roberto. *Medieval and Humanist Greek. Collected essays*. Medioevo e Umanesimo 8. Padova: Antenore, 1977.